



SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY

**Diversity of Programming
in the Broadcast Spectrum:**

**Is there a Link between Owner
Race or Ethnicity and News
and Public Affairs Programming?**

A report prepared by

Christine Bachen
Allen Hammond
Laurie Mason
Santa Clara University

and

Stephanie Craft
University of Missouri

submitted to the

Office of Communications Business Opportunities
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C.

December 1999

Author Notes

This study was performed under contract with the Federal Communications Commission (2700-FCC-97-P-0722) and augmented with grants from the College of Arts and Sciences dean's office at Santa Clara University and from the Minority Broadcast Education and Advocacy Fund.

Christine Bachen (Ph.D., Stanford University, 1982) and Laurie Mason (J.D., Santa Clara University School of Law, 1997; Ph.D., Stanford University, 1991) are associate professors in the Communication Department, Santa Clara University.

Allen Hammond (J.D., University of Pennsylvania School of Law, 1975) is a professor at the Santa Clara University School of Law.

Stephanie Craft (Ph.D., Stanford University, 1999) is an assistant professor at the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

Contribution of the authors to this study is equal.

Correspondence concerning the legal analysis contained in this report should be addressed to Prof. Allen Hammond, School of Law, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA 95053.

Correspondence concerning the study research methodologies and findings may be addressed to Prof. Laurie Mason, Department of Communication, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA 95053.

The authors wish to thank colleagues Paul Soukup and Pedro Hernández-Ramos for their help with data entry, and George Fegan and Robert Mason for their assistance with methodological issues.

Steve Wildman provided consultation on broadcast industry economic issues.

Prof. Hammond wishes to thank Jennifer Hodges and Laura Arsaga for help with the legal history encompassed in Appendix I.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study provides empirical evidence of a link between race or ethnicity of broadcast station owners and contribution to diversity of news and public affairs programming across the broadcast spectrum, a finding stronger for radio than for television. In addition, a link was found for both media between racial and ethnic composition of newsroom staff and contribution to spectrum diversity. Minority ownership and minority presence in the newsroom predicts greater attention to topics of presumed interest to minority audience members.

Broadcast industry data were merged with data from 211 telephone interviews of news directors or public affairs programming directors at minority- and majority- owned radio and television stations across the country between July and October 1998.

Analyses point to important differences in the news and public affairs programming of minority- and majority-owned stations that regularly broadcast some news or public affairs programming; in particular, radio stations. Despite the fact that minority-owned stations report having fewer resources at their disposal, they report delivering a wider variety of news and public affairs programming and more ethnic and racial diversity in on-air talent, although some of these differences achieve statistical significance within only one medium. Minority-owned radio stations do more public affairs programming, and in particular, they appear to focus on ethnic and racial minorities.

While both minority radio and television station owners own fewer stations per person, it is only the minority radio station owners who appear to be more integrated in their stations, holding more titles and becoming more actively involved in decision-making regarding news and public affairs. Television owners are, for the most part, not involved in their stations' day-to-day programming decisions. In short, from choosing a program format that appeals to minority audiences through a range of decisions pertaining to news and public affairs, minority-owned radio stations and, to a lesser extent, television stations, depart from their majority-owned counterparts.

These findings support Federal Communication Commission policies to increase numbers of minority owners and staffers in broadcast stations, a practice long-assumed to increase diversity within the broadcast spectrum.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Methodology and Results	5
Summary and Conclusions	37

List of Tables

Table 1: Summary statistics for dependent and independent measures	31
Table 2: Separate comparisons between each independent variable and the dependent measure of programming diversity for radio	32
Table 3: Separate comparisons between each independent variable and the dependent measure of programming diversity for television	33
Table 4: Results of regression for radio sample ...	35
Table 5: Results of regression for TV sample	35

List of Appendices

Appendix I: Legal Analysis
Appendix II: Methodology
Appendix III: Survey Instrument
Appendix IV: Non-Response Bias Analysis

INTRODUCTION

As the 20th Century draws to a close, the racial and ethnic diversity of American society is rapidly growing. Accompanying this growing diversity of individuals, groups, languages and beliefs, is the potential for the expression of diverse viewpoints and the friction such expression can engender. This uniquely American diversity resonates with the "Marketplace of Ideas," view of a healthy democracy that finds its most prominent expression in the guarantees of free speech and free press provided by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The courts have interpreted the speech and press clause as granting rights upon message senders and recipients. Through the articulation of opinions we grow as individuals; by exposing ourselves to the divergent opinions of others we grow as a society. The spirit of the First Amendment is perhaps best seen as it protects unpopular, controversial, and minority perspectives.

This report examines a critical forum for the exercise of such speech: the mass media of radio and television.

Along with their role of assigning licenses, government regulatory agencies have promulgated standards for broadcasting in the public interest. These have included political broadcasting rules and the Fairness Doctrine, which required broadcasters to seek out controversial issues and to broadcast a balanced account of the viewpoints that surround them. The courts have accepted these governmental efforts to facilitate viewpoint diversity in broadcasting.

In addition, the Federal Communications Commission has for years attempted to foster diversity of programming through intermediate routes. One effort has been to increase the number of radio and television stations owned by racial and ethnic minorities. Another is to expand minority representation among broadcast station staff. The explicit expectation is that increasing the number of minority owners or minority representation in the staff will increase the diversity of viewpoints expressed in the broadcast spectrum.

As political and judicial philosophies have changed during the past two decades, some members of Congress and the judiciary are increasingly challenging FCC minority ownership and employment policies. Among the questions raised is whether increased minority representation among owners and staffers actually increases broadcast spectrum diversity. For a more extensive discussion of the FCC's rationale and the courts' response, see Appendix I.

This judicial scrutiny has prompted the FCC to seek empirical data to answer the question of effectiveness of its policies. Specifically, does a link exist between station owner race or ethnicity and the contribution of that station to spectrum programming diversity? Does a link exist between staffing diversity and contribution to broadcast diversity?

Studies that directly address these questions are rare. The findings are not consistent, and perhaps this is largely due to a lack of definition for the term "diversity." The most relevant effort was conducted in 1987 by the Congressional Research Service and was based upon responses to a questionnaire mailed to all broadcast license-holders.¹ The questionnaire announced itself as an FCC product, which could be responsible for the low response rate and perhaps could have affected answers from those who chose to respond. The CRS study found that minority-owned stations reported programming to suit the interests of minority audience members, but the study authors, who had not designed the survey instrument, tempered their claims about the results. While stations differentiated by ownership on a question regarding number of hours of programming targeted to minorities, this single measure reveals little about the nature of programming offered.

Dubin and Spitzer² undertook a reanalysis of the FCC data, dropping television stations from the sample and including census data on the demographic composition of audiences in radio broadcast markets. After offering the repeated caveat that the definition of minority programming employed in the survey was deficient (unlike the CRS, they relied solely on format labels),

¹ Congressional Research Service, *Minority Broadcast Station Ownership and Broadcast Programming: Is There a Nexus?* (On file with the Library of Congress, 1988)

² J. Dubin & M.L. Spitzer, *Testing minority preferences in broadcasting*, 68 S. CAL. L. REV. 841 (1994).

Dubin and Spitzer reported that "minority ownership has a distinct and significant impact on minority programming, even after [controlling for] the composition of minorities in the marketplace" (p. 869). The researchers also found that simply increasing the number of radio stations in a market did not increase the amount of minority programming. However, the presence in a market of stations programming for one minority group increased the total amount of programming for all minority groups in that market.

Dubin and Spitzer also analyzed the integration of owners into station management based on responses to a question asking the job title and number of hours per week owners worked at the stations, an analysis not attempted by the CRS. They found the number of hours owners worked at their stations had no apparent effect on the amount of minority-oriented programming broadcast.

The few studies specifically addressing minority broadcast ownership indicate that stations owned by minorities offer more minority-oriented programming than other stations. But this research focuses on entertainment programming, and not news - the kind of programming that is arguably most consonant with the purposes the marketplace of ideas is meant to serve. Moreover, the inconsistent and superficial definitions of "minority programming" found in the literature suggest that a broader approach to the concept may be in order.

Diversity of programming has also been examined in connection with other factors such as ownership structure and competition within a market. Some have found interesting connections.³ But

³ See, e.g., K.J. Nestvold, *Diversity in local television news*, 17 J. B'Cast 345 (1973); J.C. Busterna, *Television station ownership effects on programming and idea diversity: Baseline data*, 2 J. Media Econ. 63, 71 (1988); J.M. Bernstein & S. Lacy, *Contextual coverage of government by local television news*, 69 Journalism Q. 329 (1992); P.W. Cherington, L.V. Hirsch & R. Brandwein, *TELEVISION STATION OWNERSHIP*(1971); J.C. Busterna, *Ownership, CATV and expenditures for local television news*, 57 Journalism Q. 287 (1980); J.M. Bernstein, S. Lacy, C. Cassara & T. Lau, *Geographic coverage by local television news*, 67 Journalism Q. 663 (1990); W.R. Davie & J. Lee, *Television news technology: Do more sources mean less diversity?*, 37 J. B'cast & Elec. Media 453 (1993); D. Berkowitz, *Assessing forces in the selection of local television news*, 35 J. B'cast & Elec. Media 245 (1991).

as these studies have not factored in owner race or ethnicity or racial make-up of a station's staff, a picture of the relative contributions of all these factors has yet to be drawn.

The goals of this study are to provide a more in-depth and focused measure of news and public affairs programming that would encompass minority issues and perspectives, to individually examine relationships between these measures and a host of potential independent factors including owner and staffing race and ethnicity, organizational structure and station resources, and examine all these elements in a model that attempts to assess relative impact with regards to programming diversity.

METHODOLOGY and RESULTS

The study's focus on news and public affairs reporting led to a decision to query not station owners but the people in their employ most likely to have detailed information about programming and audience assessment. News directors or public affairs programming directors thus became the target pool. Telephone interviews were conducted with these individuals at radio and television stations across the country between July and October 1998. The small population of minority-owned radio and television stations drove the sampling effort; after an interview was completed with a news director (or someone similarly titled) at a minority-owned station, an interview was attempted at a majority-owned station in the same market and of the same medium. Of 197 attempts, 92 interviews were obtained at minority-owned stations for a response rate of 46.7 percent. Of 230 attempts with majority-owned stations, 119 interviews were completed for a response rate of 51.7 percent.

For a more complete discussion of the study methodology, see Appendix II. A copy of the questionnaire is included under Appendix III.

In addition to data from the survey instrument, this study incorporates data from the Broadcast Industry Association November 1998 database. These data allowed for an investigation of the possibility that respondents differ in important ways from non-respondents (e.g., in terms of station revenue, ownership structure, or choice of format in the case of radio stations). This investigation uncovered few differences between the groups (See Appendix IV).

Comparison of minority- and majority-owned broadcast stations

This section provides a comparison of minority- and majority-owned commercial broadcast stations that broadcast news or public affairs programming, beginning with station characteristics such as size, staffing, revenue, and then moving to the more central question of how ownership is related to production of news and

public affairs programming.⁴ As licensing preferences have historically been based upon race or ethnicity of a station's owner, this study focuses on station ownership throughout this section. The sample includes 71 minority-owned radio stations, 21 minority-owned television stations, 77 majority-owned radio stations and 42 majority-owned television stations. Separate analyses were performed for radio and television.

⁴ The statistics that follow will be of two types. A comparison of two categorical variables such as respondent/non-respondent by format requires a Chi-Square statistic (appearing as χ^2 in footnotes) that contrasts the pattern of distribution expected when no relationship exists between the variables with the pattern obtained in the data. When the dependent variable is continuous, such as percent of Asians in a market (which could conceivably range from zero to 100), a t-test is employed to compare the means of the two groups with reference to their sample variance and number of cases. In both cases, significance is reported as a "p" value. Small p values (conventionally, anything less than .05 or five percent) indicate the difference observed between the sample groups is unlikely to be attributable to sampling error but is more likely attributable to a true difference between population groups. Thus, when the report indicates no significant difference between groups on a given comparison, the difference observed between the samples does not rise to the necessary level to be considered statistically significant. Number of cases in a comparison will vary based on a number of factors. Sometimes a question was not put to a respondent because of responses to previous questions. For example, a television station would not have a format, thus the total number of responses to the format question reflects only the radio stations in the survey. In addition, respondents are encouraged to skip any item to which they do not know the answer. A t-test displays number of cases in terms of degrees of freedom, a number that is either $N-2$ when group variances are not significantly different from each other according to Levene's test or a lower number when the test needs to accommodate unequal variances (in this case, degrees of freedom are often non-integer). Footnote 5 presents a t-statistic from an analysis with unequal variance: the test involves 147 cases but only 105.81 degrees of freedom, producing a t -statistic of -2.73 and a significant p value of less than .01. Footnote 7, based on equal variances, involves an N of 147, resulting 145 degrees of freedom producing in this case a smaller t statistic (1.81) that just misses significance ($p=.07$). Number of cases is reported as " N " in a Chi-Square (see, for example, Footnote 13 shows a statistic concerning 148 cases that produces a significant statistical difference (12.92; $p<.001$)).

Station staffing characteristics

By many measures, majority-owned radio stations are bigger than minority-owned stations. Respondents from majority-owned radio stations report significantly more people in their employ: an average of 30.64 persons compared to an average of 19.17 persons at the minority-owned stations.⁵ They also have significantly more people working in the news or public affairs programming division (a mean of 10.57 in majority-owned stations compared to the minority-owned stations' average of 3.28).⁶ Majority- and minority-owned radio stations do not differ significantly in the proportion of the news and public affairs staff who are women (44 percent for minority-owned stations and 35 percent for majority-owned stations).⁷ However, minority-owned stations do have a higher proportion of news and public affairs staff who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups. Respondents indicate that 85 percent of the staff in minority-owned stations are minorities, compared to 35 percent in majority-owned stations.⁸

⁵ $t(105.81) = -2.73, p < .01$

⁶ $t(77.51) = -2.92, p < .01$

⁷ $t(145) = 1.81, p = .07$

⁸ $t(138.18) = 9.01, p < .001$. This last outcome must be viewed with caution, particularly with regards to the percentages of minority employees working in news or public affairs on average across the two types of stations. Eight cases were omitted from this calculation because the reported number of minority news team members was larger than the reported number of total news staffers. For these data to exist, the CATI screen for such mathematical impossibilities (that appeared to work properly on other such question sets) must have failed. While much of the data for this item (Q141) is likely valid, additional hidden errors may exist in the following form:

Question	Response
Q138: About how many people work at your station?	70
Q139: And about how many of these employees work On news or public affairs programming?	20
Q140: About how many of the news and public affairs employees are women?	5
Q141: About how many of the news and public affairs employees are members of racial and ethnic minorities, for example ...	19

Employee data from television stations did not reveal these same differences between majority- and minority-owned stations. In terms of number of station employees, majority-owned television stations average 91.51; minority-owned stations, 89.71.⁹ For news and public affairs workers, majority-owned stations count an average of 36.07 while minority-owned stations count an average of 32.14.¹⁰ Of those workers, majority-owned stations count 51 percent to be women while minority-owned stations count 54 percent to be women.¹¹ Of the news and public affairs workers, majority-owned stations count 34 percent to be racial and/or ethnic minority members while minority-owned stations count 40 percent of their news and public affairs staff in those categories.¹²

Station ownership, size and revenue

According to Broadcasting Industry Association data, a larger proportion - 68 percent - of majority-owned radio stations are group-owned (owner owns stations in more than one market or three or more within any one market), compared to 38 percent of minority-owned stations being group-owned.¹³ This relationship does not emerge within television station data, where the vast majority are group-owned regardless of race or ethnicity of

Where "19" in response to Q141 actually is keyed to Q138 - total staff - rather than Q139 - total news staff. As this sort of error is not likely to differ across minority- and majority-owned stations, the difference observed between the two groups is probably worth relying upon. Indeed, it comports with previous findings (see, e.g., Akousa Evans, *Are Minority Preferences Necessary? Another Look at the Radio Broadcasting Industry*, 8 Yale Law & Policy Review 380, 407-8 (1990)). But the raw percentages should be viewed with suspicion on this comparison and on those involving women and those later in the paper that relate to questions regarding employees working for the station's top-rated public affairs show.

⁹ $t(60) = -0.10, p = .92$

¹⁰ $t(61) = -0.45, p = .65$

¹¹ $t(59) = 0.54, p = .59$

¹² $t(50) = 0.62, p = .54$

¹³ $\chi^2(1, N=148) = 12.92, p < .001$

station owner (83 percent of majority-owned television stations are group owned while 95 percent of minority-owned television stations are group owned).¹⁴

BIA's measurement of "owner rank" - a formula based partly on estimates of an owner's annual revenues - was collapsed due to skewness in the data into "high" and "low" categories according to midpoint for each medium. These data revealed a difference between minority- and majority-owned radio stations but not for television. Within radio, 67 percent of the majority owners fall into the more-highly ranked category, as compared to 27 percent of minority owners.¹⁵ By contrast, 46 percent of majority television owners and 50 percent of minority television owners fall into that higher category.¹⁶ Within both samples of radio and television stations, however, majority owners on average own more broadcast stations (of either type) than do minority owners (for radio, majority owners own, on average, 51.21 broadcast stations while minority owners own 12.75 stations; for television, majority owners own 12.07 stations on average compared to the 7.03 stations owned by minority owners.¹⁷

Station gross revenues are also higher for both radio and television majority-owned stations. Majority-owned radio stations brought in an average of \$4,278,500, compared to the minority-owned radio station's average of \$1,786,200.¹⁸ Majority-owned television stations brought in an average of \$24,745,950 in 1997 while minority-owned television stations grossed \$10,570,580.¹⁹ These comparisons should be viewed with some caution, however, as the BIA database constructs its information using a system of estimates across markets over time that leaves many stations without data. This situation could not be improved by augmenting with the study's survey data as most respondents did not provide this information.

¹⁴ $\chi^2(1, N=61) = 1.49, p = .22$

¹⁵ $\chi^2(1, N=116) = 18.61, p < .001$

¹⁶ $\chi^2(1, N=57) = 0.07, p = .79$

¹⁷ $t(122.58) = -4.01, p < .001$; $t(53.87) = -2.24, p < .05$, respectively

¹⁸ $t(87.62) = -2.36, p < .05$

¹⁹ $t(44.08) = -2.57, p < .01$

It should be recalled that the majority-owned stations were selected for interview from the same or similar markets as minority-owned stations providing completed interviews. This strategy was successful with both radio and television stations, as shown in an analysis of radio through Arbitron and television through Nielsen rankings,²⁰ and thus these differences do not appear to be attributable to market factors.

In summary, the data for radio point to significant differences in the ownership structure, human and financial resources associated with stations, with minority-owned stations registering as smaller on these measures. For television, significant differences appear only for station revenue and number of stations owned by a station's owner, once again favoring majority owners.

Station Service and Format

While most stations are broadcasting around the clock, a significant difference did emerge between majority-owned and minority-owned radio stations. Respondents at majority-owned radio stations report being on the air on average 23.18 hours per day, whereas minority-owned radio stations report service of 21.34 hours per day.²¹ Majority-owned television stations run an average of 23.05 hours per day while their minority-owned counterparts average 23.43 hours per day, not a statistically significant difference.²²

Drawing upon the BIA's assessment of radio station format and following the recoding of format described in Appendix IV (Footnote 120), 61 percent of the minority-owned radio stations can be classified as delivering minority-format programming, compared to only 14 percent of majority-owned radio stations.²³ This means that minority-owned radio stations are delivering programming classified as Black, Ethnic, Spanish or Urban - including subcategories that emphasize national, religious and linguistic perspectives - in far greater amounts than their majority-owned counterparts.

²⁰ $\chi^2(1, N=134)=0.09, p=.76; \chi^2(1, N=61)= 1.60, p=.21,$
respectively

²¹ $t(113.87)= -3.02, p<.01$

²² $t(60)= 0.80, p=.43$

²³ $\chi^2(1, N=148)= 34.14, p<.001$

News Programming

As stated earlier, the sample was limited to stations that regularly broadcast news or public affairs programming. No differences emerged between minority- and majority-owned stations in the amount of news they produce overall, nor in the major types of news (local, state or regional, or national or international) they broadcast. Respondents at majority-owned radio stations reported an average of 8.9 hours of local news per week, 4.0 hours of regional news, and 6.1 hours of national or international news while their counterparts at minority-owned radio stations reported 6.4 hours of local news per week, 4.6 hours per week of regional news and 6.6 hours per week of national or international news.²⁴ For television, respondents at majority-owned stations reported 14.8 hours per week of local news, 5.7 hours per week regional news and 8.5 hours per week devoted, on average, to national and international news while their counterparts at minority-owned television stations reported 13.6 hours of local news, 4.3 hours of national news and 6.9 hours national and international news broadcast per week on average.²⁵

Similarly, minority- and majority-owned stations are equally likely to utilize wire services (overall, 77 percent of all radio stations and 91 percent of all television stations do so).²⁶ Neither majority nor minority ownership differentiates radio or television in terms of how much news a station creates or produces. For radio, 40 percent of stations report creating "most" and 60 percent report creating "some" of the news they broadcast; for television, 87 percent report creating most and 13 percent report creating some of the news they broadcast.²⁷ Ownership also did not predict whether a station would opt to localize wire news (bring out a community angle to a story that begins as a regional, national or international story). In

²⁴ $t(127) = -0.83, p = .41; t(127) = 0.47, p = .64; t(127) = 0.26, p = .80$, respectively

²⁵ $t(51) = -0.44, p = .66; t(51) = -0.56, p = .58; t(51) = -0.61, p = .54$, respectively

²⁶ $\chi^2(1, N=136) = 0.45, p = .50; \chi^2(1, N=54) = 1.24, p = .26$, respectively

²⁷ Minority versus majority ownership differentiates neither radio stations ($\chi^2(1, N=136) = 0.50, p = .48$) nor television stations ($\chi^2(1, N=54) = 0.12, p = .73$) on this factor.

radio, 69 percent of stations report localizing wire news while 90 percent of television stations report this practice.²⁸

However, of stations that localize, the race or ethnicity of radio station owners successfully predicted whether a respondent would say his or her station opted to tailor a national or regional wire story to minority community concerns. Seventy-three percent of the minority-owned radio stations localize on this basis, compared to 36 percent of the majority-owned stations.²⁹ The same was not true of television, where, 61 percent of both the minority- and majority-owned stations localize with this concern in mind.³⁰

Just over one third (35 percent) of all respondents reported that they could think of a major news story in the past three months that their station had covered but their chief competitor in news had not.³¹ When asked to think about the most recent story in which this occurred, respondents from both minority-owned radio and television stations were significantly more likely than their majority-owned counterparts to say that they decided to cover this story with a particular audience in mind (15 of 22 minority-owned radio stations vs. 9 of 26 majority-owned radio stations; five of seven minority-owned vs. three of 12 majority-owned television stations).³² Of the 15 respondents from minority-owned radio stations who gave as their reason for covering the event the fact that it would appeal to a particular audience segment, 11 indicated they were thinking of a racial or ethnic minority audience. Of the eight respondents from majority-owned stations, only one reported having a racial or ethnic minority audience in mind. For television, three of the five respondents from minority-owned stations reported thinking specifically of an

²⁸ This factor produced no differences between owners for radio ($\chi^2(1, N=101) = 0.26, p=.61$) or for television ($\chi^2(1, N=48) = 1.47, p=.22$).

²⁹ $\chi^2(1, N=69) = 9.52, p<.01$

³⁰ $\chi^2(1, N=41) = 0.002, p=.96$

³¹ $\chi^2(1, N=136) = 0.007, p=.93$ for radio; $\chi^2(1, N=54) = 0.0005, p=.98$ for television stations

³² $\chi^2(1, N=48) = 5.37, p<.05$; for television, a chi-square cannot be performed due to insufficient cell count; however, the pattern emerges in raw numbers reported above.

ethnic or racial minority audience while one of three respondents from majority-owned television stations made such a report.

A similar pattern appears when respondents considered whether they had approached a recent news story (covered by both) differently from their chief competitor in news. Forty-six percent (63 of 136) radio respondents and 63 percent (34 of 54) television respondents said yes to this question. Of those, 52 percent (33 of 63) radio respondents and 41 percent (14 of 34) television respondents said they based their different approach on having in mind a particular audience. For radio, minority-owned stations significantly more often than majority-owned stations had a racial or ethnic minority audience in mind (14 of 18 minority-owned stations gave this response as opposed to only two of 15 majority-owned stations).³³ For television this pattern did not emerge, with one of six minority-owned stations reporting this intent while two of eight majority-owned stations reported similarly.

Respondents were also asked about their mission as news directors and were given three options: Primarily to reach out to the widest possible audience, to a particular audience, or that neither goal described their mission. For radio respondents, 48 percent responded that their goal was to attract the widest possible audience, 34 percent said they aimed at a particular audience, and 18 percent said neither was their goal. For television respondents, 54 percent aimed at a wide audience, 18 aimed for a particular audience and 28 percent said neither was a goal. Among those who aimed either at a wide or at a particular audience, differences emerged between majority- and minority-owned radio stations such that majority-owned stations tended to aim for wide audiences (68 percent) while minority-owned stations tended more toward particular audiences (52 percent).³⁴ Majority-owned television stations also leaned toward attracting a wide audience (20 of 24 stations made this report) compared to nine of 15 minority-owned stations. A statistical comparison of majority- and minority-owned television stations was not performed due to low cell counts.

In summary, radio and television minority and majority owners show similar approaches to the amount of news broadcast, the composition of the news in terms of wire versus self-produced and

³³ $\chi^2(1, N=32) = 12.70, p < .001$

³⁴ $\chi^2(1, N=112) = 4.72, p < .05$

tendency to localize. But a more specific line of questioning reveals significant differences between majority and minority owners of radio stations and a similar but not statistically significant trend among television owners. Minority radio owners are more likely to localize based on audience ethnicity, and to think of a particular racial or ethnic group when choosing to cover different events, or the same events differently, from their competition. Their different approach is reflected also in how respondents describe their job as news director, with minority-owned stations employing people who more often seek particular audiences as compared to news directors working for majority-owned stations. Again, this difference is statistically significant for radio but not for television.

Public Affairs Programming

Most stations regularly broadcast public affairs programming, but minority-owned radio stations are significantly more likely to report doing so than their majority-owned radio counterparts (87 percent vs. 70 percent).³⁵ For television, 76 percent of both majority- and minority-owned stations report such broadcasts.³⁶ (It should be recalled that stations were chosen for this survey only if they regularly broadcast news or public affairs programming.)

Respondents were also asked about types of public affairs programs they broadcast. Seventy-four percent of radio respondents said they broadcast programs concerning health or medicine while 41 percent of respondents at television stations said they do likewise. No significant differences emerged between minority- and majority-owned stations, be they radio or television, on this measure.³⁷ Sixty-seven percent of radio respondents said they broadcast political or current event shows other than the news while 58 percent of television respondents said they did so. For radio, no significant difference emerged between majority- and minority-owned stations, but a significantly greater proportion, 80 percent or 12 of 15, minority-owned television stations reported broadcasting this

³⁵ $\chi^2(1, N=146)=6.45, p<.01$

³⁶ $\chi^2(1, N=62)=0.002, p=.96$

³⁷ $\chi^2(1, N=111)=0.80, p=.37; \chi^2(1, N=46)=2.26, p=.13,$
respectively

type of public affairs programming as compared to 47 percent or 14 of 39 majority-owned television stations.³⁸

Asked whether a station broadcasts shows about culture, music or the arts designed to appeal especially to certain racial or ethnic minority groups, 55 percent of all radio respondents and 51 percent of all television respondents said yes. Majority- and minority-owned radio stations differ significantly, with 72 percent of minority-owned and 35 percent of majority-owned radio stations reporting they broadcast programming of this nature.³⁹ Television stations do not show such a difference (64 percent for minority-owned stations and 45 percent for majority-owned; while this presents a similar pattern as do the radio stations, these data miss statistical significance due to smaller numbers overall).⁴⁰ Fifty-eight percent of all radio stations report broadcasting shows about issues of concern to senior citizens and 40 percent of all television stations report a similar effort. Minority-owned radio stations were no more likely to do this than majority-owned stations, but for television, minority ownership signaled a significantly greater likelihood (60 percent or nine of 15) compared to majority ownership (30 percent or nine of 30 stations).⁴¹

Asked if a station does live broadcasts of community events such as government meetings or parades, 64 percent of radio respondents and 69 percent of all television respondents indicated that their station did so. Minority radio station ownership significantly predicted this response, with 73 percent of those stations carrying such live broadcasts compared to 55 percent of majority-owned radio stations.⁴² For television, no such significant difference emerged, with 67 percent of minority-owned stations and 71 percent of majority-owned stations making this claim.⁴³

³⁸ $\chi^2(1, N=111)=0.07, p=.79$; $\chi^2(1, N=45)=4.55, p<.05$, respectively

³⁹ $\chi^2(1, N=110)=15.42, p<.001$

⁴⁰ $\chi^2(1, N=43)=1.43, p=.23$

⁴¹ $\chi^2(1, N=111)=0.29, p=.59$; $\chi^2(1, N=45)=3.75, p<.05$

⁴² $\chi^2(1, N=146)=4.88, p<.05$

⁴³ $\chi^2(1, N=62)=0.11, p=.74$

Respondents were next asked if, during the past year, they had broadcast special programming related to certain holidays or events in addition to any news coverage of those events. Some of these questions produced differences according to station ownership. Events of concern to African Americans were reported to be broadcast by 59 percent of all radio stations and 38 percent of all television stations. Among radio stations, minority ownership significantly predicted this response as 71 percent of these stations said they aired such broadcasts versus 47 percent of their majority-owned counterparts.⁴⁴ For television stations, the relative proportions - 71 percent of minority-owned stations versus 56 percent of majority-owned stations - were not significantly different from each other.⁴⁵

Programming of special interest to Native Americans follows a similar pattern. Twenty-one percent of all radio stations and 22 percent of all television stations report this programming. Twenty-nine percent of minority-owned radio stations report this programming versus 13 percent of majority-owned radio stations, a significant difference.⁴⁶ As with African American programming, television does not differ significantly by ownership (for minority-owned stations, 20 percent or four of 20 stations report this programming as compared to 22 percent or nine of 40 majority-owned stations make a similar report).⁴⁷

Programming of interest to women, such as programs dealing with women's health, presents a slightly different pattern. Sixty-nine percent of all radio stations and 62 percent of all television stations report programming of particular interest to women. For radio, minority-owned stations are significantly more likely to offer this programming (81 percent of minority-owned stations versus 57 percent of majority-owned stations).⁴⁸ For television, minority-owned stations report this programming 47 percent (nine of 19 stations) of the time while majority-owned stations report

⁴⁴ $\chi^2(1, N=143)=8.29, p<.01$

⁴⁵ $\chi^2(1, N=60)=1.30, p=.25$

⁴⁶ $\chi^2(1, N=144)=5.34, p<.05$

⁴⁷ $\chi^2(1, N=60)=0.049, p=.82$

⁴⁸ $\chi^2(1, N=145)=9.82, p<.001$

this programming 69 percent of the time (27 of 39 stations), not a statistically significant difference.⁴⁹

Forging a similar pattern to that presented with women's programming are the data with respect to programming of particular interest to Hispanic audiences. For radio, 39 percent offer this coverage while 45 percent of all sampled television stations report doing so. Minority-owned radio stations dominate here, with 54 percent reporting coverage of particular interest to Hispanics while only 25 percent of majority-owned radio stations do so.⁵⁰ For television, in a trend that just misses statistical significance, 54 percent or 22 of 41 majority-owned stations report programming for Hispanic interest while only 29 percent or six of 21 minority-owned stations do so.⁵¹

Coverage of religious events or holidays was reported by a majority of stations, with 61 percent of both radio and television offering such programming. Station ownership did not significantly differentiate on this question, with 67 percent of minority-owned radio stations compared to 56 percent of majority-owned radio stations featuring such programming.⁵² For television, 76 percent or 16 of 21 minority-owned stations offer religious programming as compared to 52 percent or 21 of 40 majority-owned stations, a comparison that misses statistical significance.⁵³

Two programming areas - shows of particular interest to Asians and special programming about political or civic holidays - resulted in clearly non-significant differences by station ownership. Only 10 percent of all radio stations and 23 percent of television stations report offering programming of particular interest to Asians.⁵⁴ Political programming fares better

⁴⁹ $\chi^2(1, N=58)=2.59, p=.11$

⁵⁰ $\chi^2(1, N=142)=12.54, p<.001$

⁵¹ $\chi^2(1, N=62)=3.53, p=.06$

⁵² $\chi^2(1, N=144)=1.72, p=.19$

⁵³ $\chi^2(1, N=61)=3.24, p=.07$

⁵⁴ Majority versus minority ownership does not differentiate radio station responses ($\chi^2(1, N=144)=0.45, p=.50$) nor television responses ($\chi^2(1, N=62)=0.027, p=.87$) to this item. The NTIA report for 1998 listed only five stations - all radio -

overall, with 52 percent of radio stations and 29 percent of television stations reporting such coverage, yet no differentiation by ownership.⁵⁵

Respondents were asked if stations ever broadcast programs in a language other than English. Thirty-one percent of radio stations and 19 percent of television stations report such broadcasts. This question broke down along ownership lines for radio stations, with minority-owned stations significantly more often reporting such broadcasts (43 percent) and majority-owned stations reporting a lower percentage of non-English broadcasts (20 percent).⁵⁶ For television, 29 percent or six of 21 minority-owned stations and 15 percent or six of 41 stations report such broadcasts, not a significant difference.⁵⁷ Nearly every case of alternative language programming involved Spanish. Two stations (one minority- and one majority-owned) program in Asian languages; majority-owned stations broadcast in Polish and Italian (one each) and minority-owned stations broadcast in Navajo and Haitian (one each).

Most respondents could name the news or public-affairs show they broadcast that draws the largest audience. These tended to be described in mainstream terms, yet sizeable numbers were reported as appealing especially to women and minorities. While for neither radio nor television does station ownership predict whether this popular show held special appeal for women (just over a quarter of each group agreed it did),⁵⁸ minority-owned radio stations reported more often that their most popular show appealed especially to minority audiences (69 percent compared to 30 percent of the majority-owned stations). While no significant

owned by Asians.

⁵⁵ Again, ownership does not predict differences among radio stations ($\chi^2(1, N=142)=2.35, p=.12$) or among television stations ($\chi^2(1, N=62)=0.003, p=.95$) on this item.

⁵⁶ $\chi^2(1, N=146)=9.13, p<.01$

⁵⁷ $\chi^2(1, N=62)=1.73, p=.19$

⁵⁸ $\chi^2(1, N=134)=1.62, p=.20$; $\chi^2(1, N=56)=0.22, p=.64$, respectively

difference emerged between minority- and majority-owned television stations.⁵⁹

In terms of staffing this most-popular show, minority-owned radio stations report significantly smaller numbers of on-air employees (2.03 compared to the majority-owned stations' average of 3.28), a difference that does not emerge in the data from television stations (6.85 compared to 5.62, respectively).⁶⁰ Station ownership appears to bear no relation to ratio of women to men on-air for this popular program,⁶¹ but minority-owned radio stations report significantly greater proportions of on-air personnel who are members of minority groups. On average 89 percent of the on-air staff in minority-owned radio stations are members of ethnic or racial minority groups, compared to just one-third (33 percent) for the majority-owned radio stations.⁶² No such difference emerges for television stations, who report 47 percent minority on-air staff at minority-owned stations versus 30 percent at majority-owned stations.⁶³

As another measure of their approach to public affairs programming, respondents were asked if their stations used call-in formats for any of their public affairs shows. The use of call-in formats represents an important feedback mechanism by which audience members can contribute to conversations about topics that interest them. Most stations report using such formats, with 77 percent of all radio stations versus 45 percent of all television stations making this report. Ownership predicts this response for radio but not for television, as 86 percent of minority-owned radio stations as compared to 68 percent of majority-owned radio stations use call-in formats and

⁵⁹ $\chi^2(1, N=135) = 20.81$; $p < .001$ and $\chi^2(1, N=58) = 0.77$; $p = .38$, respectively

⁶⁰ $t(103.79) = -2.23$, $p < .05$; $t(58) = 1.08$, $p = .29$, respectively

⁶¹ $t(120) = 1.70$, $p = .09$; $t(52) = -0.28$, $p = .78$, respectively

⁶² $t(112.83) = 9.18$, $p < .001$. See, however, Footnote 8.

⁶³ $t(52) = 1.67$, $p = .10$. However, see Footnote 8.

43 percent (nine of 21) minority-owned television compared to 46 percent (19 of 41) majority-owned television use this format.⁶⁴

Stations define themselves principally through their programming, but they are also visible to their audiences through their participation in community events or projects where they may help sponsor or underwrite certain events. While 91 percent of all radio and 90 percent of all television stations reported such community participation, and minority-owned radio stations were more likely to participate in projects targeted to women or minority groups (92 percent vs. 70 percent), this difference did not emerge for television (84 percent versus 92 percent).⁶⁵

For radio stations, then, a significant difference emerges such that minority-owned stations pay special attention in public affairs broadcasting to events or issues of greater concern to ethnic or racial minority audiences. They report putting greater effort toward live coverage of government meetings; to issues concerning women, particularly health issues; and to broadcasts in languages other than English. The public affairs show that draws a station's largest audience is one that minority-owned radio stations say more often than majority-owned radio stations appeals to a minority audience and is staffed by a greater proportion of minority on-air talent. In addition, minority-owned radio stations feature call-in formats, which enhance audience participation, and are more likely to themselves take part in minority-related events in their community than are their majority-owned counterparts. For television, some of these trends appear, though many fail to reach statistical significance. In two instances, minority ownership significantly predicts greater attention to political/current events coverage and issues of special concern to senior citizens, findings absent in radio.

Intended Audience and Audience Assessment

Respondents were asked if their station attempted to attract a particular audience; 73 percent of all radio respondents and 57 percent of all television respondents said their station did. Of the 107 radio respondents who said "yes" to this question, 68

⁶⁴ $\chi^2(1, N=146)=6.10$; $p<.01$; $\chi^2(1, N=62)=.068$; $p=.79$, respectively

⁶⁵ $\chi^2(1, N=130)=10.58$; $p<.001$; $\chi^2(1, N=56)=0.77$; $p=.38$, respectively

percent of those working at a minority-owned station said that their station tries to attract a Black or Hispanic audience compared to 50 percent of the respondents at majority-owned stations reporting efforts to attract a similar audience.⁶⁶ This significant difference is not reflected among television stations, where 29 percent or four of 14 minority-owned stations and 20 percent or four of 20 majority-owned stations sought a Black or Hispanic audience. A statistical comparison was not performed due to small numbers.

A commonly used tool for assessing audiences is the commercial information offered by such groups as Nielsen (for television) and Arbitron (for radio). According to respondents, majority-owned radio stations are significantly more likely to use such a service than minority-owned radio stations (75 percent of majority owners versus 49 percent of minority owners), a difference that does not emerge among television stations (where nearly every station reports using Nielsen data: 93 percent among majority-owned versus 91 percent among minority-owned stations).⁶⁷

An alternative or supplement to subscribing to Nielsen or Arbitron is to do audience research in-house, and most respondents (63 percent of radio and 66 percent of television stations) reported such a practice. Station ownership did not correlate with presence or absence of this activity.⁶⁸

Fewer than half of respondents reported hiring programming consultants. This expensive but potentially effective practice is correlated with radio but not for television station ownership, with 40 percent of majority-owned radio stations

⁶⁶ $\chi^2(1, N=107)= 31.42$; $p<.001$. This measure should not be confused with previously reported data on station format. A station may have a majority format yet intend to attract a minority audience, or may have a minority format in hopes of attracting non-minority audience members.

⁶⁷ $\chi^2(1, N=144)= 9.88$; $p<.01$; $\chi^2(1, N=62)= 0.09$; $p=.76$, respectively

⁶⁸ $\chi^2(1, N=141)=0.01$; $p=.92$; $\chi^2(1, N=61)=2.47$; $p=.12$, respectively

having hired these consultants, compared with 30 percent of minority-owned radio stations.⁶⁹

Audience Feedback

Station ownership does not predict reported frequency of contact initiated by audience members about news or public affairs programming although this contact appears to be more frequent for television than for radio. For television, audience contact occurs at least several times a week - with many reporting calls or letters nearly every day - for 79 percent of stations while only 59 percent of radio stations report this level of contact. However, the type of program (news or public affairs) that generates the most audience feedback does vary between minority- and majority-owned radio stations, a difference absent for television stations. Whereas 80 percent of the respondents from minority-owned radio stations identify most audience feedback coming in response to public affairs programming (compared to 50 percent of majority-owned radio stations so indicating), it is news programming that prompts an equally strong response from both minority-owned and majority-owned television stations (95 percent minority-owned and 84 percent majority-owned stations say this is where the bulk of their audience response focuses).⁷⁰

Majority-owned radio stations are more likely to report receiving calls from audience members offering suggestions or ideas for programs (43 percent of majority-owned stations report this happens "frequently" compared with 21 percent of minority-owned stations), a difference not reflected among television stations.⁷¹ Praise, however, appears to come more often to minority-owned radio stations, with 65 percent responding this happens frequently compared with 42 percent of the majority-owned stations doing so; again, a difference that is not reflected

⁶⁹ $\chi^2(1, N=140) = 5.51; p < .05; \chi^2(1, N=60) = 1.13; p = .29$, respectively

⁷⁰ $\chi^2(1, N=127) = 12.74; p < .001; \chi^2(1, N=57) = 1.52; p = .22$, respectively

⁷¹ $\chi^2(2, N=130) = 7.11; p < .05; \chi^2(2, N=58) = 3.84; p = .15$, respectively

among television stations.⁷² Finally, neither radio nor television stations demonstrate an ownership difference (though for radio the trend is similar to those reported above and just misses significance) when questioned about reliance upon audience feedback as a way of knowing the audience and what it wants. One-third of minority-owned radio stations report relying frequently upon audience feedback in contrast to 18 percent of majority-owned radio stations, while for television stations a similar trend (40 percent or eight of 20 minority-owned stations reporting frequent reliance versus 26 percent or 10 of 38 majority-owned stations) does not result in a significant difference.⁷³

Decision-Making Processes at the Station

Station ownership – minority or majority – strongly predicts whether a radio station owner holds a management position with the station. Of radio stations sampled, 66 percent of minority owners are reported to play a direct role at their radio station compared to 32 percent of majority owners.⁷⁴ A similar significant difference does not appear among television station owners, 90 percent of whom are reported to have no management role in their stations.⁷⁵

Respondents identified up to seven positions held by owners (e.g., general manager, station manager, program director). The number of hats worn by minority owners of radio stations, while tending to be greater than the average worn by majority owners, misses statistical significance. Minority owners averaged 2.00 positions, while majority owners averaged 1.44.⁷⁶ Such a comparison is not possible for television owners, given the scarcity of owners who play any managerial role at their stations.

⁷² $\chi^2(2, N=132) = 7.13$; $p < .05$; $\chi^2(2, N=58) = 0.13$; $p = .94$; respectively

⁷³ $\chi^2(2, N=133) = 5.23$; $p = .07$; $\chi^2(2, N=58) = 1.44$; $p = .49$, respectively

⁷⁴ $\chi^2(1, N=147) = 16.23$; $p < .001$

⁷⁵ $\chi^2(1, N=62) = 0.77$; $p = .38$

⁷⁶ $t(69) = 1.87$; $p = .07$

Regardless of whether an owner works at a station, he or she could impact how a station's newsroom operates. Thus all respondents were asked to comment on this potential for owner involvement. While neither radio nor television respondents reported differences between minority and majority station owners in terms of setting the overall direction of news and public affairs, radio owners appeared to be more involved than their television counterparts (34 percent of radio owners were reported to be "very involved" and 29 percent were seen as "somewhat involved"; 13 percent of television owners were seen as very involved while 33 percent were seen as somewhat involved).

For radio, the greater presence by minority owners at the station is reflected in specific tasks in the newsroom. Minority-owned radio stations report their owners tend to be significantly more involved in suggesting topics and stories (62 percent are very or somewhat involved compared to 40 percent of the majority owners), doing on-air editorials (39 percent are very or somewhat involved compared to 10 percent of the majority owners), attending daily news meetings (30 percent versus five percent) and in hiring news and public affairs staff (59 percent versus 44 percent).⁷⁷ Small numbers of involved television owners - be they majority or minority - prevent a statistical comparison of the owners on these items.

Competition with Others in Market

Respondents from minority-owned stations describe their station's approach in the marketplace in terms that do not significantly differ from their majority counterparts. For all radio stations sampled, 17 percent take a head-to-head approach to competition within the market; 32 percent take a market segmentation approach; and 51 percent describe their approach as somewhere in between these two strategies. For television, 29 percent favor a head-to-head competition approach, 24 percent try for a segment of the market and 48 percent attempt something in between.

Respondents were asked to estimate how their audience compared to the market as a whole in terms of income or wealth. Majority-owned radio stations tended to estimate their audience to be "more wealthy than average" significantly more often than did minority-owned stations. More than one third (38 percent) of respondents from the majority-owned radio stations characterized

⁷⁷ $\chi^2(2, N=148) = 9.06, p < .01$; $\chi^2(2, N=148) = 16.95, p < .001$; $\chi^2(2, N=148) = 15.75, p < .001$; $\chi^2(2, N=148) = 15.35, p < .001$, respectively

their audience as wealthier than average compared to the market, while only 20 percent of minority-owned radio station respondents did the same.⁷⁸ For television, the trend is similar but not significant, with 29 percent (12 of 41) majority-owned television stations and 16 percent (three of 19) minority-owned television stations classify audience on average as wealthier than the market average.⁷⁹

Respondents were asked whether advertisers consider the station's audience to be different from the overall market in terms of purchasing habits. Station ownership did not significantly differentiate on this question. Overall, 57 percent of radio respondents agreed, compared to 46 percent of those at television stations. Those who answered "yes" to this question were asked if they would attribute this perceived difference to any of three factors: advertiser perception of audience income, gender or cultural background. No differences emerged by station ownership for income or gender for either radio or television data. However, for those who said advertisers consider their station's audience to differ from the market, radio station ownership did correlate with perception that advertisers were focusing on their audience's cultural background, with 93 percent of minority-owned stations perceiving this to be the case compared to 56 percent of majority-owned stations.⁸⁰ A similar trend (five of six minority-owned stations versus six of 15 majority-owned stations) was not statistically significant for television.

Respondent Characteristics

Most respondents were news or public affairs directors; others listed their role as programming director, general manager or some title that indicated decision-making authority over programming content.

Most respondents - 204 of 211 - gave a response when asked their ethnicity (Hispanic or non-Hispanic). Respondents' ethnicity was correlated with radio station ownership but not television station ownership, with 37 percent of Hispanics as respondents in minority-owned radio stations as compared to 17 percent in

⁷⁸ $\chi^2(1, N=139) = 5.29; p < .05$

⁷⁹ $\chi^2(1, N=60) = 1.26; p = .26$

⁸⁰ $\chi^2(1, N=74) = 13.75; p < .001$

majority-owned radio stations.⁸¹ For television station respondents, 16 percent or three of 19 working for minority-owned stations were Hispanic versus 12 percent or five of 41 at majority-owned stations.

Race of respondent was also queried, with offered categories being White, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Asian, or something else. Respondents could indicate more than one category. Of the 202 who responded as to their race, 110 indicated being White. Race of respondent correlated with radio station ownership in that respondents were White in 71 percent of the majority-owned stations compared to just 17 percent of the minority-owned stations.⁸² For television, racial diversity is less prevalent. Majority-owned television stations have 78 percent or 32 of 41 White respondents as compared to 68 percent or 13 of 19 White respondents working for minority-owned television stations, not a significant difference.⁸³

Station ownership did not predict whether the news director was male or female.⁸⁴ Seventy-five percent of the radio station respondents and 68 percent of those at television stations were male.

Summary of bivariate results

This series of individual comparisons has highlighted some important differences in the news and public affairs programming of minority- and majority-owned stations that regularly broadcast some news or public affairs programming; in particular, radio stations. Despite the fact that minority-owned stations report having fewer resources at their disposal, they report delivering a wider variety of news and public affairs programming and more ethnic and racial diversity in on-air talent, although some of these differences achieve statistical significance within only one medium. Minority-owned radio stations do more public affairs programming, perhaps because they reportedly spend more time thinking about particular audience subgroups' interests and needs. In particular, they appear to focus on ethnic and racial

⁸¹ $\chi^2(1, N=144)=7.70; p<.01$

⁸² $\chi^2(1, N=142)=42.09; p<.001$

⁸³ $\chi^2(1, N=60)=0.64; p=.42$

⁸⁴ $\chi^2(1, N=145)=0.18; p=.67; \chi^2(1, N=62)=0.10; p=.75$

minorities. While both minority radio and television station owners own fewer stations per person, it is only the minority radio station owners who appear to be more integrated in their stations, holding more titles and becoming more actively involved in decision-making regarding news and public affairs. Television owners are, for the most part, not involved in their stations' day-to-day programming decisions. In short, from choosing a program format that appeals to minority audiences through a range of decisions pertaining to news and public affairs, minority-owned radio stations and, to a lesser extent, television stations, depart from their majority-owned counterparts.

The differences between radio and television responses may be due to a number of factors that separate the two media. In some cases, it appears that smaller numbers of cases for television accounts for the difference between significant and non-significant findings. Often, however, the data seem to spell a truly different pattern traceable to sharp differences in ownership structure. Finally, the single area of potential confound due to non-response bias appears most powerfully among the majority-owned television stations (the minority-owned non-respondent stations being too few for comparison). This factor - market size - puts respondents in smaller markets than non-respondents and leaves open the question as to whether data generated for television stations is representative of all minority-majority comparisons in the population.

These questions regarding the findings for television aside, the data from radio stations show support for the FCC's historic programs promoting minority ownership of broadcast stations in an industry historically dominated by Whites. These data show minority radio station owners are more directly involved in day-to-day programming, that they hire for such positions as news and public affairs director people who are racial and/or ethnic minorities, and that together, these decision-makers create programming that is particularly tailored to minority audience interests and needs.

A Multivariate Approach to Predicting Programming Diversity

A number of significant differences (especially for radio) have emerged between minority-owned stations and majority-owned stations in their programming of ethnically or racially diverse content, as well as in some of their station characteristics such as ownership structure or staffing composition. But does the race or ethnicity of the station owner continue to be a significant predictor of minority-oriented programming once

ownership structure or racial or ethnic composition of the staff are factored in? In other words, perhaps the observed differences in programming might really be a function of ownership structure (group or not group owned) or, alternatively, a function of the racial or ethnic composition of the staff. Either way, once these variables are controlled for, race or ethnicity of owner could offer very little additional predictive power.

The final analyses presented here attempt to answer the question of how these elements interrelate and which, once the others are accounted for, remain significant predictors of programming diversity.

As a concept, programming diversity has no single clear definition. Scholars speak of diversity across the radio or television dial and of diversity within a single channel or station. Diversity has also been studied as an issue of content, sometimes in terms of format or program type, sometimes in terms of demographics of those featured within programs, and sometimes as a question of ideas and viewpoints expressed. It has been investigated as an issue of audience selection rather than the menu offered to the audience at any given moment. See Napoli (1999) for a discussion.⁸⁵ We combined a number of these elements to conceptualize programming diversity as any programming efforts related to race or ethnicity. We measured this concept using questionnaire responses that queried a station's efforts to include ethnic or racial perspectives in programming, to shape broadcast content with ethnic or minority audiences in mind, to engage in community activities geared toward women or minorities, or to include racial or ethnic minorities in on-air positions. For radio, responses to 13 such questions were combined into a single measure, where stations would receive a 0 if they registered no programming diversity on any of the 13 items, and a 13 if news directors responded affirmatively to all diverse programming aspects. Across all radio stations, the mean response was 4.54.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Philip M. Napoli, *Deconstructing the Diversity Principle*, 49 J. Comm. 7 (1999)

⁸⁶ Items that made up the dependent measure of programming diversity for radio were: Q16 (localization based upon appeal of story to ethnic or racial subgroup within audience); Q23 (for story competition didn't cover, was target audience ethnic or racial minority); Q28 (for story covered differently from competition, was target audience ethnic or

Television programming diversity was similarly measured, with the addition of one question pertaining to children's educational programming.⁸⁷ Thus, a television station's score could range from 0 to 14. Across all television stations, the mean response was 4.79.

The chief independent variable in our study is race/ethnicity of station owner (minority or majority). This variable has, as already noted, surfaced as a significant correlate of a variety of programming and station characteristics. To challenge or, perhaps to clarify, the relationship between ownership and these other factors, we examine a host of variables that could act as intermediaries or as the true causal factors driving a station's level of programming diversity. One such factor is the involvement of the owner, measured on a 7-element scale. The level of involvement of station owner included how active the owner was perceived to be in decisions concerning hiring, scheduling, setting overall direction, topic selection, editorial production, daily news meetings, and communicating news values to the staff. Owner involvement may affect a station's programming diversity as an intermediary between station owner's race or ethnicity; in other words, minority owners may be philosophically committed or economically constrained to adopt such practices. Or, we may find that any involved owner will push for diversity

racial minority); Q40 (does station cover culture, music or arts to target ethnic or racial minority audience); Q51 (does station broadcast in language other than English); Q57 (does station participate in community events targeted toward women or minorities); Q60 (does station broadcast programming about holidays, etc., of interest to Hispanics in particular); Q61 (does station broadcast programming about holidays, etc., of interest to African Americans in particular); Q62 (does station broadcast programming about holidays, etc., of interest to Asian Americans in particular); Q63 (does station broadcast programming about holidays, etc., of interest to Native Americans in particular); Q66 (is station's intended audience racial or ethnic minority?); Q106b (does most popular news or public affairs show aired by station appeal especially to ethnic or racial minorities); Q108 (for that most popular show, is there on-air talent representing ethnic or racial categories). Cronbach's Alpha (a measure of the reliability of the scale) equals 0.734.

⁸⁷ The added item, Q116, dealt with whether any characters or hosts of children's programming were members of ethnic or racial minorities. Alpha equals 0.646.

regardless of race or ethnicity. Putting both potential independent variables into one common model will help determine the relative strengths of both.

Another factor is the race and ethnic composition of the staff, including the news and public affairs director. The ratio of minority members of a station's news and public affairs staff (a measure that could range from zero to one) was added to the measure of respondent race or ethnicity (zero for Whites, one for racial or ethnic minority members) to create an index that ranged between zero and two. Once again, adding this element to the model will help answer the question of the true role of owners' race and ethnicity in station programming. Do owner characteristics affect programming diversity chiefly through the intermediary of newsroom personnel? Or, apart from owner race or ethnicity, could another explanation (based solely on newsroom staffing) emerge to account for differences in programming outcomes?

Finally, we examine two other factors that could affect a station's ability to diversify its programming should those efforts prove time- or money-consuming. These are station revenue and ownership structure (group-owned or not). Each of these measures was selected for its potential to help clarify why programming in a majority or minority-owned station would differ, and to query whether some other factor - aside from race or ethnicity of owner - was not the real predictor of programming diversity (for example, a measure related to the station's resources).

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for each of the independent variables presented above, plus statistics for the dependent measure of programming diversity.

Table 1: Summary statistics for dependent and independent measures				
Measure	Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation	(N)
Programming Diversity	Radio	4.54	2.76	148
	Television	4.79	2.55	63
Owner Race/Ethnicity+	Radio	0.48	0.50	148
	Television	0.33	0.48	63
Owner Involvement	Radio	7.85	5.70	147
	Television	4.16	3.43	63
Staffing Diversity	Radio	1.19	0.85	139
	Television	0.60	0.59	51
Station Revenue	Radio	3,145,636	5,960,958	110
	Television	20,283,333	27,219,158	54
Ownership Structure+	Radio	0.53	0.50	148
	Television	0.87	0.34	61

+ Owner Race/Ethnicity and Ownership Structure are 0/1 variables, with racial/ethnic minority owners and group-owned stations coded as 1.

Table 2 presents how, for radio, programming diversity breaks down across categories of each independent variable. For independent variables that consist of continuous measures, data were split at the median so as to illustrate differences in condensed tabular form. Table 3 presents the same information for television.

Table 2: Separate comparisons between each independent variable and the dependent measure of programming diversity for radio			
	Mean	s.d.	(N)
Owner Race			
Minority	6.14	2.15	71
Majority	3.06	2.43	77
Owner Involvement			
Higher	5.14	2.75	71
Lower	4.04	2.65	76
Staffing			
More Diverse	6.03	2.33	70
Less Diverse	2.90	2.13	69
Station Revenue			
Higher	4.36	2.80	55
Lower	4.62	2.80	55
Structure			
Group-owned	4.27	2.82	79
Not group-owned	4.86	2.68	69

Table 3: Separate comparisons between each independent variable and the dependent measure of programming diversity for TV			
	Mean	s.d.	(N)
Owner Race			
Minority	5.24	2.88	21
Majority	4.57	2.37	42
Owner Involvement			
Higher	5.08	2.53	26
Lower	4.59	2.58	37
Staffing			
More diverse	5.50	2.13	28
Less diverse	3.52	2.06	23
Station Revenue			
Higher	5.30	2.18	27
Lower	4.26	2.94	27
Structure			
Group-owned	4.66	2.55	53
Not group-owned	5.62	2.82	8

To test the effect of each independent variable while controlling for the others, a stepwise multiple regression analysis⁸⁸ was performed for radio and television separately. All variables except race or ethnicity of owner were first entered into the statistical model so that their explanatory power could be seen. Then race or ethnicity of owner was entered to see if, once these other related variables were factored in, race or ethnicity had any further predictive power.

Table 4 presents the results for the analysis of radio stations. The four variables entered in the first step of the analysis accounted for more than one-third of the variance in programming diversity (R^{289} equals 0.384), but only one variable among the

⁸⁸ Multiple regression analysis, a widely used statistical tool, models the mean of a response variable (in this case, programming diversity) as a function of several explanatory variables. For a user-friendly text on the subject, consult Fred L. Ramsey & Daniel W. Schafer, *THE STATISTICAL SLEUTH*, Duxbury Press (1997)

⁸⁹ R-squared (R^2), or coefficient of determination, is the percentage of the total response variation explained by the explanatory variables. Statisticians acknowledge that the

group contributes significantly to that result – the diversity of newsroom staff. As ethnic or racial diversity of a newsroom increases, so does programming diversity.

When the race or ethnicity of the station owner is added to the equation, explained variance increases significantly (R^2 equals 0.429; Adjusted R^{290} equals 0.417). Status of owner as a racial or ethnic minority member or group persists as a factor leading to greater programming diversity independent of the previous significant factor. None of the other factors – station revenue, ownership structure of the station, or degree of involvement of the owner – emerge as statistically significant.⁹¹

context of a study has much to do with expectations for R-square. Considering the challenges of measuring complex concepts in social science, Ramsey & Schafer characterize an R-square of 50% as "remarkably good."

⁹⁰ Adjusted R-square is a conservative version of R-square that includes a penalty for additional explanatory variables.

⁹¹ Regressions were performed using SPSS set to pairwise deletion with entry at the .05 level. Results indicate no difference whether the model was tested using stepwise entry of variables, forced entry of all Block 1 variables followed by forced entry of the main independent variable in Block 2, or (not shown in tables 4 and 5) when variables were released from the equation using the backward function of SPSS. In addition, natural log transformations were performed for the dependent measure, for the measure of station revenue and for owner involvement. These, combined with a transformed measure of staffing diversity (collapsed into three categories – no, some, or maximal inclusion of ethnic or racial minority staff members), were subjected to additional regression tests. No significant departures from Tables 4 and 5 were observed.

Table 4: Results of Regression for Radio Sample		
Variable	Forced Entry Beta	Stepwise Beta
Block 1: Owner Involvement	0.035	0.065
Staffing Diversity	0.457***	0.445***
Station Revenue	0.088	0.106
Ownership Structure	0.044	0.07
Block 2: Owner Race/Ethnicity	0.310**	0.274**

** indicates p-value below .01; *** indicates p-value below .001

Table 5 presents the results for the analysis of television stations. Following the same procedure outlined above, the results demonstrate that staffing diversity significantly and positively correlates with programming diversity (R^2 equals 0.2233). When entered in the second block, owner race/ethnicity fails to join the equation. No other factor is significant.

Table 5: Results of Regression for Television Sample		
Variable	Forced Entry Beta	Stepwise Beta
Block 1 Owner Involvement	-0.217	-0.199
Staffing Diversity	0.437**	0.473**
Station Revenue	0.215	0.147
Ownership Structure	-0.074	-0.021
Block 2 Owner Race/Ethnicity	0.150	0.080

** indicates p-value below .01

Thus, television stations did not follow the same pattern as radio stations. While both samples showed a significant relationship in the regression for staffing diversity - the more the staff was made up of racial or ethnic minority members, the more diverse the programming - only radio stations showed a significant additional explanatory power for station owner race or ethnicity. For radio stations, ownership predicted programming in that minority owners were more likely to be associated with diversity.

Three other measures that might have helped explain any link between owner race and ethnicity and programming diversity did not significantly enter the model for radio or for television. As noted above within bivariate analyses, involvement of the owner in day-to-day station activities related to news and public affairs programming was correlated, for radio but not for television, with race or ethnicity of station owner where minority owners tended to be more involved with their stations than were majority owners. Despite this association, no relationship appeared in the regression to independently link owner involvement to programming diversity.

The other two failed measures - group ownership and station revenue - were attempts to capture the concept of a station's ability to budget for diversity programming efforts. As such, these measures leave something to be desired. For example, a group-owned station may be able to draw resources from the group, or may be constrained in its ability to budget resources at the local level. Similarly, high station revenues may reflect a policy of cost-cutting or may represent resources upon which a newsroom could draw. Broadcast revenue issues are complex, particularly when viewed in a minority context.⁹²

⁹² See, e.g., Raymond Suarez and Robert Cull, CAPITAL FORMATION AND INVESTMENT IN MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISES IN THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRIES, U.S. Department of Commerce (1995); Joann Anderson, project director

SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS

The question that directed this study was whether race or ethnicity of a broadcast station's owner has a meaningful influence on the contribution by that station to broadcast spectrum programming diversity. While particularly for radio there were many indicators of such a relationship at the bivariate level, it is the multivariate analysis reported in the final portion of the results section that offers the most challenging and focused test of our research question.

Programming diversity - a complex measure comprising 13 or 14 indices of station attention to minority audience needs - varied greatly across stations. One television and 11 radio stations scored zero, indicating no effort to program to appeal especially to racial or ethnic minority audience members. One radio station scored a 12 on the scale where 13 was the maximum; on their 14-point scale, the two highest-scoring television stations earned 11 points each. The fundamental question posed by this study is whether minority-owned stations exhibit more of this type of programming diversity than their majority-owned counterparts. For radio, the answer is yes. In addition, radio stations (regardless of who owns them) are more likely to program for diversity if their news staffs include ethnic and racial minority composition.

For television, only the latter measure - staffing diversity - is associated with greater programming diversity. The more the station's staff includes members of racial or ethnic minorities, the more diverse appears the programming from that station, on average. But ethnicity or race of station owner did not emerge as a significant factor.

Added to the regression were three additional measures that could have significantly improved the explanatory power of the model, yet none did. As discussed above, owner involvement did not significantly predict programming diversity. For reasons likely linked to measurement ineffectiveness, neither did ownership structure nor station revenue. Future research could attempt more precise measures of a station's ability to budget resources for creative and audience-specific programming, a concept that

may truly belong in a model of how ownership characteristics affect programming diversity.

Beyond the measure of race- and ethnicity-linked programming diversity, a number of other aspects of a station's programming were associated with station owner race or ethnicity. For radio, minority-owned stations were significantly more likely to present programming in the areas of women's concerns and live coverage of government meetings. They were significantly more likely than their majority-owned counterparts to adopt a minority format in their music programming. For television, minority-owned stations were significantly more likely than their majority-owned counterparts to air programming related to current events and issues of special concern to senior citizens.

Policy Implications

For television, owner race does not appear to be linked with programming content oriented toward issues of concern to minorities. Perhaps the failure of the television data to mirror radio data in all respects is due, at least in part, to the smaller numbers of interviews that were conducted. In addition, the greater public visibility of persons involved in television news-gathering efforts may predispose the television industry to a greater sensitivity to differential audience needs. Finally, the lone signal of a potential response bias occurred with the television data, as respondents were significantly more often from smaller markets than were non-respondents.

For both television and radio, the data show a connection between the racial composition of staff and the content of programming; as racial and ethnic minorities compose more of a radio station's staff, greater attention to minority issues is the result.

Additionally for radio, this study provides considerable empirical support for historic assumptions linking owner race and ethnicity to diversity of the broadcast spectrum. Minority-owned stations, on average, focused more of their news and public affairs programming on issues and events of presumed interest to minority audience members.

APPENDIX I

Legal Background

LEGAL BACKGROUND

Since the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia's "TV-9" decision,⁹³ the Federal Communications Commission developed and subsequently maintained policies that sought to increase the employment of minorities in the broadcast industry and the ownership of broadcast facilities by minorities. The Commission has argued that a nexus exists between minority employment and viewpoint diversity, and that such employment promotes minority ownership by creating an experienced cadre of individuals possessing the requisite industry background to manage and own broadcast facilities. Similarly, the Commission has argued that a nexus exists between minority ownership and viewpoint diversity and that such ownership serves the public interest in democratic representation.⁹⁴

Two components of the ownership policy - awarding an enhancement for minority ownership in comparative hearings to allocate broadcast licenses and providing through a distress sale policy special procedures for the transfer of the licenses of broadcasters designated for a hearing on disqualifying issues - were affirmed by the Supreme Court in *Metro Broadcasting*.⁹⁵ In affirming the policy components, the Court found that "a

⁹³ *TV 9, Inc. v. FCC*, 495 F.2d 929, 937-938 (D.C. Cir. 1973), rehearing en banc denied 495 F.2d 941, cert. denied, 419 U.S. 986 (1974). In *TV 9*, the court held that "when minority ownership is likely to increase diversity of content, especially on opinion and viewpoint, merit should be awarded" and found that "it is upon ownership that public policy places primary reliance with respect to diversification of content, and that historically has proved to be significantly influential with respect to editorial content and presentation of news." *Id.* at 937-38.

⁹⁴ The Commission's judgment that a nexus exists between rules fostering minority ownership and fostering viewpoint diversity was affirmed by the court in *Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC*, 497 U.S. 547, 569-600 (1990).

⁹⁵ *Metro Broadcasting, Inc.* at 568.

diversity of views and information on the airwaves serves First Amendment values...[and] the benefits redound to all members of the viewing and listening audience." The Court also stated that "[a] broadcasting industry with representative minority participation will produce more variation and diversity than will one whose ownership is drawn from a single racially and ethnically homogeneous group."⁹⁶ The Court determined that the federal government had a substantial interest in promoting the diversity of viewpoints via broadcasting. In addition, the Court found that ownership of broadcast stations by minorities promoted the government's substantial interest.

Five years later, in *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, a reconstituted Supreme Court overruled the *Metro Broadcasting* Court's use of intermediate scrutiny to analyze the constitutionality of federal government programs that rely on racial criteria.⁹⁷ That Court held that any federal program using racial or ethnic criteria as the basis for decision making is subject to strict judicial scrutiny. According to the *Adarand* Court, racial classifications used in federal programs "must serve a compelling governmental interest, and must be narrowly tailored to further that interest."⁹⁸

More recently, in the context of broadcast employment, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held in *Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod v. FCC* that the promotion of broadcast diversity does not constitute a compelling government interest.⁹⁹ The court, citing the O'Connor dissent in *Metro Broadcasting*, found that the government's arguments that a nexus exists between minority employment in broadcast stations and greater diversity in broadcast programming had not been

⁹⁶ *Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC*, 497 U.S. 547, 568 (1990), at 579.

⁹⁷ 515 U.S. 200 (1995).

⁹⁸ *Id.* at 235.

⁹⁹ *Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod v. FCC*, 141 F.3d 344 (D.C. Cir.), petition for reh'g denied, 154 F.3d 487 (D.C. Cir. 1998), petition for reh'g en banc denied, 154 F.3d 494 (D.C. Cir. 1998).

proven, and that the government does not appear to have a compelling interest in fostering such diversity.¹⁰⁰

The *Lutheran Church* opinion relied heavily on the dissent in *Metro Broadcasting*, which argued that the nexus between ownership and diversity had not been established,¹⁰¹ and that the market controls ownership expression even if a minority owner might prefer to program differently.¹⁰² As a consequence, the *Lutheran Church* opinion questions the nexus between equal employment opportunity and diversity, and, by implication, the nexus between ownership and diversity as well.

However, because the *Adarand* decision only overruled *Metro Broadcasting* to the extent that it applied intermediate rather than strict scrutiny, the question of whether the diversity interest can survive strict scrutiny has yet to be addressed by the Supreme Court.¹⁰³ For this reason, the FCC has commissioned this study as part of its efforts to develop a factual record that will help determine whether the FCC has a compelling interest in promoting broadcast diversity. Specifically, the FCC, through this study, seeks to begin the examination of whether there is an empirical nexus between the race of station owners and the content of programming on radio and television stations.

In addition to the FCC's reasons for commissioning this study, the researchers note that there are others as well. First, there have been potentially significant changes in the broadcast market

¹⁰⁰ Id. Also see Frank W. Lloyd and Janell F. Coles, D.C. Circuit Overturns FCC Broadcast EEO Rules, Cable TV & New Media Law & Finance, April 1998, Pg. 1.

¹⁰¹ Dissent by Justice O'Connor, with whom the Chief Justice, Justice Scalia, and Justice Kennedy joined. *Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC*, 497 U.S. 547 (1990).

¹⁰² Id. A number of legal scholars have taken issue with the *Metro* dissent's reasoning. See Rogovin, *The Regulation of Television in the Public Interest: On Creating A Parallel Universe in Which Minorities Speak and are Heard*, 42 Cath. Univ. L. Rev. 51 (1992); Hammond, *Diversity and Equal Protection in the Marketplace: The Metro Broadcasting Case in Context*, 44 Ark. L. Rev. 1063 (1991); and Williams, *Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC: Regrouping in Singular Times*, 104 Harv. L. Rev. 525 (1990).

¹⁰³ See 515 U.S. at 257-58 (Stevens, J., dissenting).

since *Metro Broadcasting* was decided based on inter alia the Congressional Research Study in the late 1980's. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 further relaxed the Commission's multiple ownership rules.¹⁰⁴ The radio and television mergers made possible by this Congressionally mandated relaxation, as well as the existence of television Local Marketing Agreements (LMAs),¹⁰⁵ are alleged to have affected the ability of minority and majority broadcasters to compete and maintain their presence in the market.¹⁰⁶ These changed circumstances are problematic in

¹⁰⁴ The Telecommunications Act of 1996 set off a torrent of mergers in the radio industry by relaxing the limits on radio ownership. Subsequently, the diversity and number of owners has decreased. Andrea Adelson, *Minority Voice Fading For Broadcast Owners*, *The New York Times*, May 19, 1997, Sec. D; P. 9; Col. 1. It has been argued that television ownership would be adversely affected in a similar manner. Kim McAvoy and Don West, *The Battle Over Bigness: Broadcasting's Fatal Attraction*; *Broadcasting & Cable*, May 22, 1995, p. 50. Over the years the Commission has established various limits on the number of AM, FM or television stations that could be owned by any one party. See, for example, Report and Order, 7 FCC Rcd 2755 (1992) (radio) and Memorandum Opinion and Order, 100 FCC 2nd 74 (1984) (radio and television).

¹⁰⁵ The Commission's ownership attribution rules permit a television licensee in a local market to have a financial and program supply (LMA) relationship with another television station in the same market. The Commission is considering whether to attribute such relationships for purposes of the television duopoly rule. See MM Docket No. 91-221 and MM Docket No. 94-150.

¹⁰⁶ From 1997 to 1998 the nationwide, percentage of radio stations owned by minorities dropped from 3.1 to 2.8 percent. Fahizah Alim, *Fading Signal*, *Sacramento Bee*, May 6, 1998, p. E1. "The Telecommunications Act of 1996...has opened the door to media concentration. Matt Pottinger, BET President Says Telecom Act Damaging Minority Ownership Prospects, *States News Service*, January 16, 1997, (quoting Debra Lee, President and Chief Operating Officer of BET Holdings, Inc.). Also see Andrea Adelson, *Minority Voice Fading For Broadcast Owners*, *The New York Times*, May 19, 1997, Sec. D; P. 9; Col. 1. In its recent report on minority ownership trends, the National Telecommunications Information Administration has stated that:

If media concentration continues at its current rate, small and less well capitalized minority broadcasters will find it increasingly difficult to compete with group owners and will

that there has been no study to determine whether and/or how they may have affected programming decisions made by minority or majority owned stations and the diversity of programming choices available to the public.¹⁰⁷ There is concern (see, e.g., Scott 1993) that service to minority communities may have suffered as a result.¹⁰⁸ Second, prior studies¹⁰⁹ tended to analyze the diversity of entertainment programming rather than the diversity of news and public affairs programming. Historically the FCC has considered the provision of news and public affairs programming to be essential to the provision of broadcast service in the public interest.¹¹⁰ Consequently, the study provides a

be more likely to sell their stations and exit the industry. Financial barriers, increased competition, and higher station prices, are likely to be significant obstacles to new minority entrants to this marketplace. A significant loss in the number of minority broadcast owners may result in fewer employment opportunities for minorities in broadcasting and less diverse media. Minority Commercial Broadcast Ownership in the United States, August 1998.

¹⁰⁷ Geraldine Fabrikant, Slow Gains by Minority Broadcasters, *The New York Times*, May 31, 1994, p. D1 (quoting Dr. Rubin). Regardless of the state of empirical analysis, minority communities become concerned when minority talent and minority oriented programming are dropped from a station's format. See Valerie Fields, Leaders taking concerns to FCC, *The Dallas Morning News*, November 18, 1998, Pg. 1A. Also see Tracy Dingmann, Black Groups Question TV Hiring, Albuquerque Journal, May 30, 1998, Pg. B2.

¹⁰⁸ Matthew S. Scott, Can Black Radio Survive an Industry Shakeout? Black Enterprise, June, 1993, p. 254.

¹⁰⁹ See, e.g., Dubin, Jeff and Matthew L. Spitzer, "Testing Minority Preferences in Broadcasting," 68 Southern California Law Review 841, 1995.

¹¹⁰ See generally, In the matter of the Revision of Programming and Commercialization Policies, Ascertainment Requirements, and Program Log Requirements for Commercial Television stations, 98 FCC2d 1076 (1984); and In the Matter of formulation of Rules and Policies Relating to renewal of Broadcast licenses, Final Report and Order, 43 FCC2d 1, 87-88, (1973). Also see Deregulation Comes to Television, Broadcasting, July 2, 1984, p. 31; Patricia Koza, FCC Deregulates Radio, UPI, April 3, 1981; and Associate Press, FCC. Ends Curbs on Radio

critical opportunity to examine the relationship between ownership and the provision of news and public affairs which the FCC, minority owners and others assert is at the heart of service to communities.¹¹¹

Stations, New York Times, January 15, 1981, p.1.

¹¹¹ Andrea Adelson, Minority Voice Fading For Broadcast Owners, The New York Times, May 19, 1997, p. Also see KJLH-FM's General Manager Says Minorities Want Information that is Relevant to Their Lives; "Our Listeners Hold Us Accountable," Los Angeles Times, March 21, 1993, p. 22. Also see Kim McAvoy and Don West, The Battle Over Bigness: Broadcasting's Fatal Attraction, Broadcasting & Cable, May 22, 1995, p. 50 [Bill Ryan Interview]; Laura Castaneda, Turning Up the Volume; Radio Duopolies Spark a Boom, but Draw Criticism, The Dallas Morning News, January 7, 1995, p. 1F.

APPENDIX II

Methodology

METHODOLOGY

Of the total of 11,475 broadcast stations licensed in the United States in August 1997, 322 (or 2.8 percent) were reportedly licensed by individuals or groups mainly comprising individuals of ethnic or racial minority status. Most - 193 or 1.7 percent of the total - were owned by Blacks. Another 120, or 1 percent, were owned by Hispanics. The remainder fell to Asian or Native American ownership; four stations were listed as being Asian-owned and five, by Native Americans.¹¹²

Sampling the Populations

Minority- and majority-owned broadcast stations were regarded as separate populations for the purpose of this study. The vastly smaller group of minority-owned stations were approached as a census effort. Once the minority list produced a completed interview, one or two majority stations were selected for interview from the same geographical area, an approach that would control for a number of potentially confounding variables such as market demographics and regional economics.

Minority Commercial Broadcast Ownership, produced annually by the United States Department of Commerce National Telecommunications and Information Administration, provides a complete national listing of commercial minority-owned television and radio

¹¹² August 1997 figures are derived from the August 1998 Minority Commercial Broadcast Ownership in the United States, an annual publication of the United States Department of Commerce National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

stations. The listing includes call letters, location and telephone number, and whether the station is television or radio. The August 1997 edition listed 322 such stations, 38 television and 284 radio. This list, upon inspection, contained only 300 usable cases, others dropping out because of duplication within that database or because a station, upon further checking, appeared to be out of business. This initial culling left 265 radio and 35 television stations. All were scheduled for interview.

A sample frame for the majority population - those majority-owned stations existing in markets containing at least one minority-owned station - was created in the following ways: For radio, each minority station's market was identified in the Spring 1996 American Radio, a commercial guide to broadcast stations published annually by James H. Duncan, Jr. (This worked when a station's "location" in the Minority Commercial Broadcast Ownership report was synonymous with its market; that is, when the city in which the station was located was also considered a market in the Duncan guide. When this failed - chiefly the case with smaller or non-rated minority stations - the 1997 Broadcasting and Cable Yearbook was employed to identify each minority station's market.) For television, each station's market could be obtained through this latter source. Through these efforts, a list of all other commercial stations sharing a market with a minority station, along with name and telephone number of each station's news director or public affairs director (if available), was obtained. The majority-owned station sample frame contained 1,554 radio and 163 television stations.

Interviewing Procedure

The study's focus on news and public affairs reporting led to a decision to query not station owners but the people in their employ most likely to have detailed information about programming and audience assessment. News directors or public affairs programming directors thus became the target pool. The Portland, Oregon, survey firm Bardsley & Neidhart began in June 1998 to train interviewers on a Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) version of the questionnaire, which would take an average of 40 minutes to administer. As they did so, the firm tackled the list of 300 minority-owned stations, calling each to verify names, titles, numbers and probe for interview availability. This process reduced the list to 204 stations - only 28 being television stations - fitting the study's triple criteria of a

station that was still in operation under minority ownership,¹¹³ devoting air time to news or public affairs programming,¹¹⁴ and with a news director who was not already on the list with a sister station.¹¹⁵ Pretesting of the survey instrument then began with respondents at minority-owned stations.

Cost estimates from the survey firm (based on pretest interview length and robust availability of respondents) suggested the possibility of completing 150 interviews with news directors or their equivalents at minority-owned stations. Having obtained approval for the study from the U.S. government's Office of Management and Budget, we directed the survey firm to enter the field on July 15, 1998, to begin augmenting pretest data with some new questionnaire items and to begin interviews from both populations.¹¹⁶

¹¹³ Initially, the study additionally aimed to estimate effect of female and small-business ownership on news and public affairs programming, as all three criteria have historically been used by the FCC to the advantage of such license applicants. However, as no lists of license holders by gender or business status were available, that portion of the project was abandoned.

¹¹⁴ As the study focused on dependent measures surrounding news and public affairs programming, data-gathering focused only on those stations that would provide useful data. Before an interview began, potential respondents were asked about news and public-affairs broadcasting among other screening questions. Potential respondents who indicated no such programming were thanked for their time and the interview was not begun.

¹¹⁵ Ninety-five radio stations shared 43 news directors.

¹¹⁶ Once a minority interview was completed, the survey firm located that minority-owned station in its market and consulted the list of majority-owned stations in that same market. They then selected the subset relevant to the minority station in terms of radio versus television and for radio, a.m. versus f.m.; for example, if the minority interview was with an a.m. radio station, the majority sample frame for the matching interview was reduced to all majority-owned a.m. radio stations in the same market. If that list included more than 10 stations, a subset of 10 was pulled at random and the order then randomized before the list was placed in the CATI system. If the list contained 10 or fewer, that list was likewise randomized before being placed in the system. Interviewers would then begin calling stations for a matching interview; when one was

The survey firm reported few outright refusals - at least in the early days of fieldwork - but a substantial number of potential respondents who could not begin or conclude an interview when called. On Oct. 16, 1998, as completion rates dwindled and expense per interview rose (some completions coming at the cost of nearly 50 attempts), the survey window closed. At that point the data set included interviews from 99 news directors at minority-owned stations and 112 from majority-owned stations in matching markets. Of the interview attempts among minority-owned stations, 29 attempts ended in outright refusals, 12 dead-ended with repeated attempts at contact via answering machines, and another 64 resulted in no data because the survey window ended before willing but busy subjects found time for the interview. Of attempts made to obtain a majority sample, 38 ended in outright refusals, and 73 stations were listed as willing but busy at the time the survey left the field.

As the data from these interviews merged with data from archival sources, discrepancies as to status of minority station owner emerged in several cases. Investigation led to seven cases moving from minority ownership to majority ownership. For the most part, this shift was necessitated by a change in ownership relevant to the time between when the minority list was first reduced and the onset of the survey itself.

Thus, of 197 attempts, 92 interviews were obtained with news directors at minority-owned stations for a response rate of 46.7 percent. Of 230 attempts with majority-owned stations, 119 interviews were completed for a response rate of 51.7 percent.

Dependent Measures

Given the historic tendency of the FCC to focus upon non-entertainment programming when discussing contributions of broadcasters in the public interest, the study operationalized the concept "diversity of programming" strictly along the lines of news and public affairs reporting. Through close to 200 questions, the survey instrument measured many facets of this concept, from descriptions of what a station has chosen to cover in the months preceding the survey to more preliminary issues

completed, the remaining cases were returned to the main list should that market again produce a like minority interview. Occasionally two interviews would be completed from the list when one interview, begun but suspended, was completed after another had been started and successfully concluded.

such as how a station goes about assessing and meeting the needs of its audience. Themes include (See survey instrument, Appendix III):

1. Amount and type of news broadcast (local, state, national, international; produced or purchased by the station);
2. Efforts of a station to find a local news angle within a regional, national or international news story, especially when attempting to meet the needs of a particular audience;
3. How a station distinguishes itself from its perceived primary competition, and whether such efforts are related to meeting the needs of a particular audience;
4. Amount and type of public affairs reporting, and whether this coverage was approached with the needs of a particular audience in mind;
5. How a station defines its intended audience;
6. How the station assesses the needs of its intended audience, including attention paid to direct feedback from audience members;
7. Decision-making processes at the station;
8. Ownership characteristics and involvement of owners in various levels of station activity;
9. Composition of the station's staff, including diversity in terms of gender, ethnicity and race;
10. A station's efforts to compete within its market, with particular attention to audience concerns.

Archival Data

Data on station format, ownership, revenues, market and audience exist in above-mentioned and other databases (including a commercial database produced by the Broadcast Industry Association (1998 version)). These data were gathered for three purposes:

- To create a basis for assessing response bias between

actual respondents and those who refused or were unable to complete an interview;

- To double-check and supplement responses from stations;
- To explore differences that appear in bivariate comparisons of minority- and majority-owned stations on the dependent measures derived from the survey.

APPENDIX III

Survey Instrument

Basic information (interviewer fills in before beginning interview)

Date of interview: _____ Starting time: _____ Interviewer _____

Respondent ID # _____ Station ID _____
Location (city, state) _____Title of respondent: owner station manager news director
 program director other _____If radio, type of format: _____ If TV, network affiliation: _____
 AM FM VHF UHFIntroduction

Hello, my name is _____. I am calling on behalf of researchers at Stanford University and Santa Clara University who are working on a study about news and public affairs programming. We are surveying hundreds of broadcast stations nationwide. We would like to interview you about your station's programming. This interview is voluntary. You have the right to skip any question you prefer not to answer, and to stop at any time. The Federal Communications Commission is one of the funding sources for the study, which has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget. However, your responses will be kept confidential; nothing you say will be connected to you personally or to your station. We foresee no risks associated with participation in this study. The interview takes about 45 minutes. In addition, to thank you for your participation, we will send you, via email, a copy of the results that will be made public at the conclusion of our study. Shall I begin, or do you have questions first?

[Note to interviewer: If at any time during the survey, respondent has questions about his or her rights as a study participant or expresses dissatisfaction with the study, advise respondent that he or she may call the Administrative Panels Office at Stanford University collect at 650-723-4697]

1. *[Note: radio respondents only]*
What is your station's predominant programming format? _____
[All respondents]
2. For how many hours a day is your station on the air? _____
3. Does your station broadcast news of any kind? yes no
-->[If yes, go to Q4]
-->[If no, go to A]
4. Does your station broadcast news about local events?
 yes no
5. Do you broadcast news about events in your state or region that happen outside your community? yes no
6. Do you broadcast news about national or international events? yes no
7. Which of the following best describes how the news is presented? Is it presented in a continuous, or 24-hour news format, on regularly scheduled news programs, or does your station broadcast only brief newsbreaks throughout the day?
-->[If continuous, go to Q11]

- >[If programs or newsbreaks, go to Q8]
8. About how many hours of local news do you broadcast in a week? ____
9. How about state and regional news? About how many hours of that do you broadcast in a week? ____
10. And about how many hours of national and international news? ____
11. Roughly how much of the news your station broadcasts is produced or created solely by members of your staff? Would you say most of it, some of it, or none at all?
12. Does your station broadcast news produced by any wire services or networks? yes no
- >[If yes, go to Q13]
-->[If no, go to 17]
13. How many wire services does your station subscribe to, 1, 2, 3, or more than that?
14. Does your station localize news from wire services or network feeds? yes no don't know
- >[If yes, go to Q15]
-->[If no/DK, go to 17]
15. Would you say that happens a couple times a month, about once a week, a couple times a week, or more often than that?
16. Are decisions about which stories to localize ever based mostly on the appeal of a story to specific ethnic or minority groups in your audience? yes no don't know
17. What are the call letters for the station you consider your chief competition when it comes to news? _____
18. Can you think of any major news stories in the past three months that your station covered but [*competition*] didn't? yes no
- >[If yes, go to Q19]
-->[If no, go to Q24]
19. About how often in the past three months would you say that happened, once, two or three times, or more often than that?
- >[If once, go to Q20]
-->[If two or more times, go to Q21]
20. What story was that? _____
[SKIP TO Q22]
21. What was the story the most recent time that happened? _____
22. Was your decision to cover that story made with a particular audience in mind? yes no
- >[If yes, go to Q23]
-->[If no, go to Q24]
23. Who was the intended audience? _____
24. In the past three months, has [*competition*] covered a story you didn't, but wished you had? yes no
- >[If yes, go to Q25]
-->[If no, go to Q26]
25. What story was that? _____
26. Can you think of any news stories that you and [*competition*] both covered, but differently? yes no
- >[If yes, go to Q27]

-->[If no, go to Q30]

27. What was the most recent news story you covered differently from [competition]?

28. Was your decision about the approach to take with that story made with a particular audience in mind? yes no [If no, go to Q30]

29. Who was the intended audience? _____

30. Is your mission as news director primarily to broadcast news and public affairs programming that appeals to the widest possible audience, to serve the needs of a particular audience, or do neither of these statements describe your mission?

31. All things being equal, do you think journalists should report events objectively, or provide interpretation of events?

A. Next, I'd like to ask about public affairs programs. The term "public affairs" is sometimes used to describe programs that consist of talk, commentary, discussion, speeches, editorials, documentaries, forums, panels, roundtables or similar programs that deal mostly with local, national or international issues of political or public importance.

32. Would you say that definition includes more types of programs than what you consider to be "public affairs," fewer types of programs, or is it about right?

33. Does your station broadcast any regularly scheduled public affairs shows?

yes no

-->[If yes, go to Q34]

-->[If no, go to Q50]

34. Does your station broadcast any shows about health or medicine? yes

no don't know

-->[If yes, go to Q35]

-->[If no/DK, go to Q37]

35. About how many hours a week are these shows broadcast? ____

36. Are any of the health or medical shows produced by your station? yes

no don't know

37. Does your station broadcast any political or current events show other than the news? yes no don't know

-->[If yes, go to Q38]

-->[If no/DK, go to Q40]

38. About how many hours a week are these shows broadcast? ____

39. Are any of the political or current events shows produced by your station?

yes no don't know

40. Does your station broadcast any shows about culture, music or the arts designed to appeal especially to certain ethnic or minority groups? yes no

don't know

-->[If yes, go to Q41]

-->[If no/DK, go to Q43]

41. About how many hours a week are these shows broadcast? ____

42. Are any of the culture, music or arts shows produced by your station? yes

no don't know

43. Does your station broadcast any shows about issues of concern to senior citizens?

yes no don't know

-->[If yes, go to Q44]

-->[If no/DK, go to Q46]

44. About how many hours a week are these shows broadcast? ____
45. Are any of the shows for senior citizens produced by your station? yes
 no don't know
46. Are there any other kinds of shows your station broadcasts that you would consider news or public affairs programming? yes no
-->[If yes, go to Q47]
-->[If no, go to Q50]
47. Can you describe in a few words what those shows are about? _____
48. About how many hours of these other shows do you broadcast in a week? ____
49. Are any of these shows produced by your station? yes no
50. Does your station ever air live broadcasts of community events, such as government meetings or parades? yes no don't know
51. Do you broadcast any programs in a language other than English?
 yes no
-->[If yes, go to Q52]
-->[If no, go to Q55]
52. About how many hours of foreign language shows do you broadcast in a week? ____
53. In which other languages do you broadcast? Spanish, Mandarin or Cantonese,
 Tagalog, Korean, Japanese, Vietnamese, French,
 Portuguese, or something else?
54. Are any of the foreign language shows produced by your station? yes no
55. For any of the kinds of programs we've mentioned, does your station use a call-in format, where [viewers/listeners] can ask questions or state opinions? yes no
 don't know
56. Other than providing news and information, does your station participate in community events or projects by, for example, sponsoring events or underwriting scholarships? yes
 no don't know
-->[If yes, go to Q57]
-->[If no or DK, go to Q58]
57. Are any of those events or projects targeted to women or minority groups?
 yes no don't know
58. Stations sometimes broadcast special programming related to holidays or events in addition to any news coverage of those events. In the past year, has your station broadcast any special programming about political or civic holidays, such as President's Day or the Fourth of July? yes no DK
59. How about religious events or holidays? In the past year, did your station broadcast any programs, other than news, related to holidays, such as Christmas or events like religious gatherings? yes no DK
60. Did your station broadcast any programming about holidays or topics of particular interest to Hispanics, such as Cinco de Mayo? yes no DK
61. How about programming about holidays or topics of particular interest to African Americans, such as Black History Month? Anything like that in the past year?
 yes no DK
62. Did your station broadcast any programs about holidays or topics of particular interest to Asian Americans, such as Chinese New Year? yes no DK
63. Did your station broadcast any programs about holidays or topics of particular interest to Native Americans, such as Native American Month? yes no DK
64. And how about programming about holidays or topics of particular interest to women, such as programs dealing with women's health? yes no DK

65. In general, does your station try to attract a particular kind of audience?
 yes no don't know
-->[If yes, go to Q66]
-->[If no or DK, go to Q67]
66. Can you describe that intended audience in a few words? _____
67. Does your station use rating services, such as Nielsen or Arbitron, to help you find out who is in your audience? yes no DK
-->[If yes, go to Q68]
-->[If no, go to Q69]
-->[If DK go to Q73]
68. How often do you look at information from one of these services? Would you say it's once a week, once a month, a couple of times a year, once a year, or less than that?
[GO TO Q73]
69. Do you know any reasons why your station doesn't use rating services?
 yes no
[If yes, go to Q70]
[If no, go to Q73]
70. Is one reason because it is too expensive? yes no
71. Is one reason that the information would not be very useful in making decisions? yes no
72. Is one reason because you feel you know your audience better than anyone else does?
 yes no
73. Does your station conduct formal audience research of its own, such as local focus groups or surveys? yes no DK
-->[If yes, go to Q74]
-->[If no, go to Q75]
-->[If DK, go to Q79]
74. Would you say you do that once a year, more often, or less often than that?
[GO TO Q79]
75. Do you know any reason why your station doesn't conduct its own audience research?
 yes no
-->[If yes, go to Q76]
-->[If no, go to Q79]
76. Is one reason because it is too expensive? yes no
77. Is one reason that the information would not be very useful in making decisions? yes no
78. Is one reason because you feel you know your audience better than anyone else does? yes no
79. How about other market studies, such as government or Chamber of Commerce reports about local income levels and the like? Does your station use that kind of information? yes no DK
-->[If yes, go to Q80]
-->[If no, go to Q81]
-->[If DK, go to Q85]
80. Would you say you use them once a year, more often, or less often than that?
[GO TO Q85]
81. Do you know any reason why your station doesn't use that kind of information?
 yes no
[If yes, go to Q82]

[If no, go to Q85]

82. Is one reason because it is too expensive? yes no
83. Is one reason that the information would not be very useful in making decisions?
 yes no
84. Is one reason because you feel you know your audience better than anyone else does?
 yes no
85. Does your station ever hire consultants to help you decide which programs to air? yes
 no DK
-->[If yes, go to Q86]
-->[If no, go to Q88]
-->[If DK, go to Q92]
86. Would you say you do that once a year, more often, or less often than that?
87. How much would you say you rely on consultants' advice regarding your audience's preferences, a lot, a little, or not at all?
[GO TO Q92]
88. Do you know any reason why your station doesn't use consultants?
 yes no
[If yes, go to Q89]
[If no, go to Q92]
89. Is one reason because they are too expensive? yes no
90. Is one reason that the information would not be very useful in making decisions? yes
 no
91. Is one reason because you feel you know your audience better than anyone else does?
 yes no
92. Aside from call-in shows, do [viewers/listeners] ever call in or write to the station about news or public affairs programs? yes no
-->[If yes, go to Q93]
-->[If no, go to B]
93. Would you say that happens nearly every day, a few times a week, about once a week, a few times a month, or less often than that?
94. Thinking about only news and public affairs programming, which kind of program prompts [viewers/listeners] to call or write the most? Would you say that news or public affairs shows prompt the most response? Don't know
95. Do [viewers/listeners] contact the station to complain about a show's topic or content?
 frequently sometimes rarely not at all don't know
96. Do [viewers/listeners] contact the station to complain about an advertiser? frequently
 sometimes rarely not at all don't know
97. Do [viewers/listeners] contact the station to offer suggestions or ideas for programs?
 frequently sometimes rarely not at all don't know
98. Do [viewers/listeners] contact the station to praise or compliment a program?
 frequently sometimes rarely not at all don't know
99. Do [viewers/listeners] contact the station to seek additional information about a show or show topic? frequently sometimes rarely not at all don't know
100. How often would you say you rely on people writing in or calling the station to form your idea of the audience and what it wants? Would you say you rely on that kind of contact
 frequently sometimes, rarely, or not at all?

B. Now I'm going to list a few ways stations might use to determine what their audiences want. For each one, tell me how much your station relies on it.

101. How often does your station rely on your staff's professional training and judgment to learn about the audience and what it wants, frequently, sometimes, rarely, or not at all?
102. How much does your station rely on information gathered at professional conferences or seminars to learn about the audience, frequently, sometimes, rarely, or not at all?
103. Does your station rely on information obtained from talking to colleagues and competitors frequently, sometimes, rarely, or not at all?
104. How often does your station rely on comments overheard "on the street" to get an idea of who is in the audience, frequently, sometimes, rarely, or not at all?
105. Now I'd like you to think of the news or public affairs show you produce that draws the largest audience. What program would you say this is? _____
[If not clear... Is that a newscast, talk show...? If continuous news is broadcast, ask respondent to consider the time slot that draws the largest audience.]
106. Does that program appeal especially to women? yes no don't know
- 106b. Does that program appeal especially to minorities? yes no don't know
107. How many of your staff regularly appear on this show? ____
- 107b. Of those, how many are women? ____
108. And how many are members of minority groups? ____
109. During the time this news or public affairs program airs, are other stations in your market also airing news or public affairs programs? yes no don't know
110. Are the primary advertisers for your station's show local merchants, regional companies, national chains, or are you not sure?

[Note: Interviewer skips to Q118 if R is at a radio station.]

111. Now think about the children's programming your station broadcasts that is designed to meet the requirements of the Children's Television Act. About how many hours of children's programming that meets these requirements do you broadcast in a week? ____ don't know
112. What programs are these? _____ don't know, skip to Q118.
113. Are any of these programs produced by your station? yes no don't know
114. Do any of these programs feature live actors? yes no don't know
 -->[If yes, go to Q115]
 -->[If no or DK, go to Q117]
115. Are any of the characters or hosts on these shows girls or women? yes no don't know
116. Are any of the characters or hosts members of minority groups? yes no don't know
117. What about the children's shows the station purchases? Who makes the decisions about which programs to buy, the owner the program director, or someone else? don't know
118. Next, we are interested in who is involved in making decisions at your station. First, do owners of the station hold management positions with the station?
 yes no don't know
 -->[If yes, go to Q119]
 -->[If no or DK, go to Q120]
119. Please tell me the job titles for the management positions the owners hold. Are any of them general manager, station manager, program director, news director, music director, producer, or director? *[Interviewer marks all that apply.]*

120. Are you as [*respondent job title*] involved in making decisions about what your station broadcasts on the news and on public affairs shows?

yes no

-->[If yes, go to Q121]

-->[If no, go to C]

121. Would you say you are very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved in those decisions?

C. I'm going to read a list of other people who might be involved in making decisions about what your station broadcasts on the news and on public affairs shows. For each one, please tell me whether that person is very involved in such decisions, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved. If there is no one at your station with one of these job titles, just let me know and we'll move on. [*Note: Omit respondent job title from list*]

122. First, the general manager. Is that person very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved in making decisions about news and public affairs?
 no such job title

123. Is the station manager very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved in decisions about news and public affairs shows? no such job title

124. Is the program director very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved in those decisions? no such job title

125. How about the news director? Very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved no such job title

126. Is the executive producer very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved in decisions about news and public affairs shows?
 no such job title

127. Is the assignment editor very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved in decisions about news and public affairs shows?
 no such job title

128. How involved is the news producer? Is that person very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved in decisions about news and public affairs shows? no such job title

129. Are [*anchors or disc jockeys*] very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved in deciding what your station broadcasts on news and public affairs shows? no such job title

130. Are reporters or writers very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved in decisions about news and public affairs shows? no such job title

Now I'm going to read a list of activities related to news and public affairs programming. For each one, tell me how involved the owners of your station are in that kind of activity.

131. How involved are the owners in setting the overall direction of news and public affairs programming, very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved?

132. How involved are the owners in scheduling news and public affairs programs, very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved?

133. How involved are the owners in suggesting topics and stories, very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved?

134. How about doing on-air editorials? Are the owners very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved?

135. How involved are the owners in daily news meetings, very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved?
136. And how involved are the owners in hiring news and public affairs staff, very involved, somewhat involved, not very involved, or not at all involved?
137. Who communicates your station's news values to employees, the owner, the news director, or someone else?

The next questions deal with the composition of your station's staff. If you work at a company that owns more than one station, just answer for the one you, personally, work at.

138. About how many people are employed at your station? _____
139. And about how many of those employees work on news or public affairs programming? _____

140. About how many of these news or public affairs employees are women? _____

141. About how many of the news and public affairs employees are members of racial and ethnic minorities, for example, American Indian or Alaska Native, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or Asian? _____

-->[If more than 0, go to Q142]

-->[If none, go to Q149]

142. Are any of the minority news or public affairs employees women?

yes no

149. Do any of the news or public affairs employees speak a language other than English as their first language? yes no don't know

150. Were any of the news or public affairs employees born outside of the United States?

yes no don't know

151. About how many of the people who work on news and public affairs would you say went to a journalism school or have a degree in journalism or communication? _____

152. Did you, personally, go to a journalism school, or major in communication?

yes no

153a. What is your ethnicity? Hispanic or Latino, or Not Hispanic or Latino

153b. What is your race? Are you White, American Indian or Alaska Native, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Asian, or something else?

[Note to interviewers: It's possible for respondents to pick more than one category for Q's 153a and 153b]

Now I'd like to ask you some questions about the ownership of your station.

154. Do you know who owns the station? Is it a person, a family, a small group of individuals, a company that owns more than one media outlet, a corporation that owns holdings that are both media and non-media, or do you not know?

-->[If know, go to Q155]

-->[If don't know, go to E]

155. Thinking just of the person or people at the ownership level who directly control this station, are any of them women?

yes no don't know

-->[If yes, go to Q156]

-->[If no/DK, go to Q157]

156. Do the women owners hold a controlling interest in the station? yes no

don't know

157. Are any of the station's owners members of minority groups? yes no

don't know
-->[If yes, go to Q158]
-->[If no/DK, go to D]

158. Do minority owners hold a controlling interest in the station? yes no
 don't know

[Note: If respondent is owner, skip to E]

D. Now, thinking about just the owner or owners of your station, tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. Remember, your responses will be kept confidential.

160. The owner's image in the community represents me as well.
Would you say you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree with that statement?

161. I have a lot in common with the station owner(s).
Do you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree with that statement?

162. I find it difficult to agree with the owner's policies on important matters.
 strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree

163. I find that my values and the values of the owner(s) are not very similar.
 strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree

164. In general, the owner(s) and I are working toward the same goals.
 strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree

E. Now I would like to know about your station's market. I want to reassure you that your answers will be kept confidential, so please try to be as specific as possible when answering. First, some stations compete with rival local stations for each time slot by providing similar programs. Other stations try to capture a specific segment of the audience with specialized programs targeted just to that segment.

165. Which of these strategies describes your station better, the head-to-head competitor approach, the market-segment approach, or is your station's strategy somewhere in-between?

166. Do any stations in your market compete directly with you for listeners or viewers? yes
 no

-->[If yes, go to Q167]

-->[If no, go to Q171]

167. What are the call letters for those stations? _____

168. What types of programming are those competitors providing? _____

169. Are any of those competitor stations owned by minorities? yes no
 don't know

170. Are any of your competitors owned by women? yes no don't know

171. Do any stations in your market compete directly with you for advertisers?
 yes no

-->[If yes, go to Q172]

-->[If no, go to Q173]

172. What type of programming are those competitors providing? _____

173. Approximately what are your station's total annual advertising revenues? _____

174. Would you say that most of your station's advertising revenue comes from
 national accounts, local accounts, or are you not sure?
175. What is the total amount, approximately, that your station spends on programming in a year, not including salaries? _____
176. About how much is spent just on news and public affairs programming? _____
- 176b. Are news or public affairs employees offered any financial incentives, such as stock, that are tied to the performance of the station? yes no don't know
177. How does your station's audience compare with the market as a whole in terms of income or wealth? Would you say your audience is about average below average, above average, or are you not sure?
178. Do advertisers consider your audience to be different from the overall market in terms of purchasing habits? yes no don't know
 -->[If yes, go to Q179]
 -->[If no/DK, go to F]
179. Do you think that is a reflection of the audience's income? yes no don't know
180. Do you think that is a reflection of the audience's cultural background? yes no don't know
181. Do you think that is a reflection of how many women are in the audience? yes no don't know

F. Now I'd like to ask about the public inspection files that all radio and television broadcasters maintain. Every quarter, information about the programs a station broadcast dealing with significant community issues is included in the file.

182. What is the job title of the person responsible for compiling the information for the public file? Is it the owner, station manager, program director, news director, a reporter, a producer, someone else, or are you not sure who does the report?

As part of our research project, we'd like to receive a copy of the most recent report from your station's public inspection file. Could you fax or send a copy to the researchers? *[Interviewer: If yes, provide fax number 408-554-4913 or address, Prof. Laurie Mason, Communication Department, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA 95053]*

Conclusion

Thank you, these are all the questions I have. We appreciate your help. Do you have the information you need to send us the latest report from the public inspection file? *[Interviewer: If necessary, again provide fax number 408-554-4913 or address, Prof. Laurie Mason, Communication Department, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA 95053]*

Do you have any questions or comments about the survey?

Thanks again. You've been very helpful to our study.

Ending time _____

APPENDIX IV

Non-Response Bias Analysis

NON-RESPONSE BIAS

When a substantial number of attempted interviews fail to result in completion, the question of response bias - of how representative the sample is of its population - emerges. Put simply, people missed by the survey might have provided a different pattern of answers than those the survey captured.

The 46.7 percent response rate reported above for news and public affairs directors at minority-owned stations is a conservative calculation as it combines 29 outright refusals with 76 cases involving either the ambiguity of unresponsive answering machines or, and for the most part, potential interviewees who plausibly pleaded being too busy yet interested in participating at some later time that, unfortunately, outlasted the survey window.

But even a creative reassessment of non-response without reference to the hard-to-get-but-"willing" and the silent prospects, a tactic that provides a much more satisfactory 76 percent response rate, places the study among those that have prompted public opinion researchers and others to investigate with great concern the potential of distortion to inference inherent in a sample that missed many attempts within its sample frame. The problem, of course, in assessing response bias is that the data needed for such an analysis - the answers from non-respondents to compare with answers from respondents - is missing.

Smith (1990)¹¹⁷ reviews and rejects numerous methods found in the literature to estimate attributes of non-respondents, including:

- * External population checks
- * Geographic/aggregate level data
- * Interviewer estimates

¹¹⁷ Smith, Tom W. "The Hidden 25 Percent: An Analysis of Nonresponse on the 1980 General Social Survey." Public Opinion Quarterly 47:386-404, 1983.

- * Interviewing non-respondents about non-response
- * Sub-sampling of non-respondents
- * Substitution for non-respondents
- * Extrapolation based on difficulty
- * Conversion adjustments

One promising avenue - considering temporary refusals as resembling ultimate refusals more than they resemble immediate completers - was equally soundly rejected by Ellis, Endo and Armer (1970).¹¹⁸ While the literature presents a dismal picture of non-response investigation, this study is in a better position than most in its access to relevant archival data for a respondent/non-respondent comparison. Such data as radio station format, station owner size, market, race and ethnicity for market population, and region of the country in which a station is located are available for respondents and non-respondents alike.

Radio and television differ as media fundamentally, both in terms of technology (sound versus pictures and sound; delivery chiefly through broadcast versus cable; ability to reach large and diverse audiences being less with radio than with television) and how expectations for a medium have shaped choices of station operators (i.e., radio tends to specialize in format while television offers a wider range of programming throughout the broadcast day, typically). Recognizing this circumstance, this study separates the data on this basis and reports findings for radio and television separately.

Minority-Owned Radio Station Non-Response Bias

Little evidence of response bias arose in archival data comparisons between the 71 respondent minority-owned radio stations and the 101 non-respondents from that population.¹¹⁹ The

¹¹⁸ Ellis, Robert A.; Calvin M. Endo; and J. Michael Armer. "The Use of Potential Nonrespondents for Studying Nonresponse Bias." Pacific Sociological Review pp. 103-109, Spring 1970.

¹¹⁹ The statistics that follow will be of two types. A comparison of two categorical variables such as respondent/non-respondent by format requires a Chi-Square statistic (appearing as χ^2 in footnotes) that contrasts the pattern of distribution expected when no relationship exists between the variables with the pattern obtained in the data. When the dependent variable is continuous, such as percent of Asians in a market (which could conceivably range from zero to 100), a t-test is employed to compare the means of the two groups with reference to their sample variance and number of cases. In both cases, significance is reported as a "p" value. Small p values (conventionally, anything less than .05 or five percent) indicate the difference

two groups did not vary with respect to radio station format,¹²⁰ region of the country where station is located,¹²¹ presence or absence of group ownership (where owner owns stations in more

observed between the sample groups is unlikely to be attributable to sampling error but is more likely attributable to a true difference between population groups. Thus, when the report indicates no significant difference between groups on a given comparison, the difference observed between the samples does not rise to the necessary level to be considered statistically significant. Number of cases in a comparison will vary based on a number of factors. Sometimes a question was not put to a respondent because of responses to previous questions. For example, a television station would not have a format, thus the total number of responses to the format question reflects only the radio stations in the survey. In addition, respondents are encouraged to skip any item to which they do not know the answer. Number of cases is reported as "N" in a Chi-Square (see, for example, Footnote 120 shows a statistic concerning 172 cases that produces a small statistical difference (0.139) and a large and insignificant p (.71)). A t-test displays number of cases in terms of degrees of freedom, a number that is either N-2 when group variances are not significantly different from each other according to Levene's test or a lower number when the test needs to accommodate unequal variances (in this case, degrees of freedom are often non-integer). For example, in Footnote 123, based on equal variances, the test involves an N of 172, resulting 170 degrees of freedom producing in this case a small t statistic (0.32) and an insignificant p value (.75)). Footnote 124, presents a t-statistic from an analysis with unequal variance: the test involves 172 cases but only 108.81 degrees of freedom, producing a t-statistic of 1.70 and an insignificant p value of .09.

¹²⁰ $\chi^2(1, N=172) = 0.139, p=.71$. Following the lead set by the Civil Rights Forum on Communications Policy in its January 1999 report ("When Being No. 1 is Not Enough: The Impact of Advertising Practices on Minority-Owned & Minority-Formatted Broadcast Stations," Ofori, Kofi A.), this study categorized program formats as either general market appeal or minority appeal based on categories employed by BIA Research Inc. Specifically, formats denoted as Black, Ethnic, Spanish or Urban were categorized as minority appeal. These general classifications include subcategories (for example, Ethnic encompasses Asian, Greek, Hawaiian, International, Japanese, Korean, Polish, Spanish/Portuguese and Portuguese). All other formats were categorized as general market appeal.

¹²¹ $\chi^2(8, N=172) = 4.86, p=.77$

than one market or three or more within any one market)¹²² (although this comparison approaches a significant relationship with respondents less often working for stations that are owned in conjunction with other stations than do non-respondents), number of stations owned by station's owner,¹²³ or in percent of Asians, Blacks or African Americans, Whites, or Hispanics or Latinos in station's market.¹²⁴

Likewise, no differences emerged between respondent and non-respondent minority-owned radio stations in terms of BIA's "owner rank" - a formula based partly on estimates of an owner's annual revenues¹²⁵ - or 1997 station revenues.¹²⁶ Differences approached but did not achieve significance with respect to Arbitron ranking of stations' markets, with the tendency toward non-respondents working in bigger markets than respondents.¹²⁷

Minority-Owned Television Non-Response Bias

Survey interviewers were instructed to spend the maximum time securing completed interviews with respondents at minority-owned

¹²² $\chi^2(1, N=172) = 3.50, p=.06$

¹²³ $t(170) = 0.32, p=.75$

¹²⁴ $t(108.81) = 1.70, p=.09$; $t(170) = 0.52, p=.61$; $t(170) = 1.16, p=.25$, and $t(170) = .79, p=.43$ respectively. Because of a few outliers, the distribution of percent Hispanics in a market was severely skewed. Normalizing this variable through recoding of all data over 50% to a category of "50% and above" did not produce a significant difference between respondents and non-respondents ($t(170) = .78, p=.44$).

¹²⁵ $t(123) = -0.97, p=.33$; in addition, adjusting for skewness in the data by separating cases into categories at the median (the mid-way point in the data) produced no difference in results: $\chi^2(1, N=125) = 0.83, p=.77$.

¹²⁶ $t(109) = 0.95, p=.34$; This comparison should be viewed with some suspicion, however, as respondents were generally unwilling or unable to provide this data to interviewers, and the BIA database constructs its information using a system of estimates across market over time that leaves many stations without data.

¹²⁷ $t(118.34) = 1.85, p=.07$. Collapsing this rankings into two categories (1-100 = "big" and 101+ = "small") did not change these results: $\chi^2(1, N=120) = 2.83, p=.09$.

television stations as that group (ultimately only 25 in all) was so small. These efforts succeeded in producing 21 completed interviews, leaving insufficient power to evaluate differences between these stations and their four non-respondent counterparts.

Majority-Owned Radio Station Non-Response Bias

A comparison of archival data between the 77 respondents and 80 non-respondents from the majority-owned radio stations produced a similar pattern as the one reported for minority-owned radio stations, above. Format choice was not significantly different across the radio stations within the two response groups,¹²⁸ nor was region of the country where station was located,¹²⁹ presence or absence of group ownership,¹³⁰ number of stations owned by a station's owner,¹³¹ or market racial or ethnic demographics.¹³²

Like the comparison of minority-owned radio stations, rank of majority-owned station owner¹³³ did not differentiate between majority-owned station respondents and non-respondents, nor did station revenues.¹³⁴ But, following the trend in the minority-owned radio station data, Arbitron rank of a majority-owned station's market showed a tendency to significantly vary across response groups, with non-respondents coming from bigger markets more frequently than expected (as was the trend with the minority-owned stations). This relationship misses significance

¹²⁸ $\chi^2(1, N=157) = .57, p = .40$

¹²⁹ $\chi^2(6, N=157) = 6.4, p = .075$

¹³⁰ $\chi^2(1, N=157) = 2.58, p = .11$

¹³¹ $t(155) = -.15, p = .88$

¹³² Percent Asians in the market, $t(155) = -0.97, p = .82$; percent Blacks in the market, $t(155) = 0.20, p = .81$; percent Whites in the market, $t(129.09) = -1.46, p = .15$; percent Hispanics or Latinos in the market, $t(155) = -0.68, p = .50$; percent Hispanics or Latinos adjusted to account for outliers, $t(155) = -1.00, p = .32$.

¹³³ $t(132) = .43, p = .67$; $\chi^2(1, N=134) = 0.00, p = 1.0$

¹³⁴ $t(119) = -0.05, p = .96$

when the data are collapsed into "high" and "low" market categories, however.¹³⁵

Majority-Owned Television Station Non-Response Bias

The 42 respondent and 31 non-respondent cases in this category provide sufficient data for non-response bias comparisons. These comparisons mirror the trend - absence of significant differences between respondent and non-respondent stations - set in the radio station analyses, above.

Format choice does not apply to television programming. Region of the country where station was located provided no significant differences across response groups,¹³⁶ nor did presence or absence of group ownership,¹³⁷ number of stations owned by a station's owner,¹³⁸ or market racial or ethnic demographics.¹³⁹

Like the above comparisons of minority-owned and majority-owned radio stations, rank of majority-owned television station owner¹⁴⁰ did not differentiate between majority-owned station respondents and non-respondents, nor did station revenues.¹⁴¹ But, following and sharply enlarging upon the trend in the radio station data, market rank (as measured by Nielsen) of a majority-owned television station's market varied significantly across response groups, with non-respondents coming from bigger markets more frequently than expected (as was the trend with the radio stations).¹⁴²

¹³⁵ $t(131.20)=1.98, p=.05; \chi^2(1, N=149)=3.34, p=.068$

¹³⁶ $\chi^2(7, N=73)=7.67, p=.36$

¹³⁷ $\chi^2(1, N=73)=0.20, p=.66$

¹³⁸ $t(71)=-.37, p=.71$

¹³⁹ Percent Asians in the market, $t(71)=-1.57, p=.12$; percent Blacks in the market, $t(71)=-0.17, p=.86$; percent Whites in the market, $t(71)=.86, p=.39$; percent Hispanics or Latinos in the market, $t(71)=-1.09, p=.30$; percent Hispanics or Latinos adjusted to account for outliers, $t(71)=-1.65, p=.10$.

¹⁴⁰ $t(67)=.75, p=.46; \chi^2(1, N=69)=.75, p=.39$

¹⁴¹ $t(62)=-0.37, p=.71$

¹⁴² $t(70.59)=3.21, p<.005; \chi^2(1, N=73)=6.6, p<.05$

Non-Response Bias Summary

For the most part, no significant differences arose between respondents and non-respondents, whether they be from minority-owned or majority-owned radio or majority-owned television stations. This includes comparisons based on market demographics, choice of radio format, region of the country and for ownership characteristics. Only market size appeared to differentiate, sometimes to a point of statistical significance, putting non-respondents consistently in larger markets, on average, than their respondent counterparts.