MAPPING PROGRAMMING DECISION-MAKING OF PBS MEMBER STATIONS: NEGOTIATING CENTRALIZED-DISTRIBUTED POWER AND NONPROFIT-FOR PROFIT ORIENTATION CONTINUA IN PROGRAM SELECTION AND SCHEDULING

Amber M. K. Smallwood

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Departments of Telecommunications and
American Studies of the College of Arts and Sciences,
Indiana University
June 2008

Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Doctoral Committee

Michael McGregor, J.D.

J. Alison Bryant, Ph.D.

Matthew Guterl, Ph.D.

Mark Deuze, Ph.D.

Kierstan Grønbjerg, Ph.D.

May 11, 2007

DEDICATION

To my husband on his fortieth birthday.

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

Thank goodness I do not yet have children. Because of my lack of children, I can say that this dissertation has been the most painful and simultaneously wonderful experience I have ever had creating something.

It goes without saying that I owe a great debt to my committee, but allow me to say it here. Matt Guterl saw connections between American Studies and Telecommunications and encouraged me to stretch beyond academic boundaries to achieve interdisciplinary in my work. Mark Deuze is an amazing professor to teach with and an enthusiastic and inspirational scholar. His article on journalism utilizing ideal-types presented itself at the perfect time to help me make sense of my interviews. Kirsten Grønbjerg's course on the Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector at Indiana University's School for Public and Environmental Affairs was the beginning of this dissertation. None of the theories I learned before this class worked to explain public broadcasting in the U.S. as these did. Dr. Grønbjerg's tireless review of multiple drafts of the manuscript is deeply appreciated. Alison Bryant, the eternal optimist, believed in me and in this dissertation before I did. The countless emails, phone calls, and overnight deliveries, all prefaced with "great work so far" or punctuated with smiles and laughter were essential to this work. And finally, Mike McGregor, who promised me that in a year we would not be able to remember all the stumbling blocks this manuscript faced. A constant source of academic sanity, I am eternally grateful for his guidance through the dissertation, academics, and life. With this committee, how could there be any mistakes in this dissertation? Having said that, any mistakes, oversights, omissions, etc. are mine alone.

In my seven years working in, with, and for public broadcasters, I have made some wonderful friends who have inspired this dissertation and supported me through its creation. At KLRU in Austin, Texas, I met Linda Schmid, perhaps the most patient and generous person I know. I would like to thank Linda and the other women in the Educational Services department for being a second family to me. Lori, Leslie, Kierstan, Maury, and Susan were like sisters and I appreciate their friendship and encouragement. Mary Beth Rogers and John McCarroll taught me what a public television station can be and how to find balance among all the competing forces that exist outside of my academic dissertation world. At WOUB in Athens, Ohio I was fortunate to find more PBS friends and family. Carolyn and Doug again demonstrated leadership and caringly taught me about management in public broadcasting. And Joan Butcher became a new life-long friend. At WTIU in Bloomington, Indiana, Phil and Ann brought me into the public television fold by allowing me to execute an outreach research project. This was my first experience conducting research for a client, and I appreciate their patience as I learned to apply my research and industry skills to their research questions.

I would also like to thank the members of the PBS family that helped me gather data for this project. Though the names programmers and stations that participated are kept confidential, I am grateful to them for their time and trust. Special thanks to the LeRoys who allowed me to attend the 2005 Public Television Programmers' Association meeting to learn about programming philosophies and practices of stations and the system. With strained relations between many public broadcasters and academics, this dissertation would have been impossible without their cooperation.

Ohio University's master's program for public broadcasting in the School of Media Arts and Studies also deserves special mention. Greg Newton, Norma Pecora, Duncan Brown, and Buzz Clift were instrumental in my success in this program. I hope many future public broadcasting professionals and scholars benefit from their guidance and this special program.

My mother Melanie and my sister Ashley are so relieved this dissertation is done. They were always willing to listen to a frustrated, elated, or exhausted version of me. Though they pretended to understand and care about my research, I know what they really cared about was me. I offer Ashley my ear and my shoulder as she begins the process of writing her own dissertation. I know my father would be so proud of his girls.

Lastly, I need to thank the man to whom this dissertation is dedicated: Wayne Korbl—husband, best friend, worst critic, top supporter, and loyal PBS-watching partner. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

Now, on to creating other things…

ABSTRACT

Amber M. K. Smallwood

MAPPING PROGRAMMING DECISION-MAKING OF PBS MEMBER STATIONS: NEGOTIATING CENTRALIZED-DISTRIBUTED POWER AND NONPROFIT-FOR PROFIT ORIENTATION CONTINUA IN PROGRAM SELECTION AND SCHEDULING

Scholarship from the field of public television critiques the structure of the system, its lack of centralizing mission (Day, 1995), and simultaneously, its tendency toward a network model with power centralized in the national organizations (Avery & Stavitsky, 2000). This literature also works to give shape to the system by assigning societal roles, only to find the system falling short of these due primarily to economic and political forces (Aufderheide, 1991; Hoynes, 1999). This dissertation explores power and orientation of PBS member stations in their program selection and scheduling decision-making.

Using primetime schedules from 147 PBS member stations (141 licensees) for September 2005, a quantitative analysis measures power (programming autonomy) as a function of deviation from a national schedule fed by PBS. Results indicate that PBS member stations assume varying degrees of power over their primetime schedules—significant correlation coefficients from the schedule analysis ranged from 0.063 to 1.0 (M=0.586, SD=0.215, N=147). Interviews with station programmers suggest that several emergent power themes work to explain station power scores. Most notably, the theme of localism was expressed by almost all programmers interviewed. Schedules of stations

licensed to local educational or municipal authorities exhibited significantly lower correlation coefficients (M=0.267, SD=0.216, N=6), thus significantly more scheduling power than each other PBS member station licensure type (community, college/university, state authority) ($F[3,143]=3.270$, $p=0.023$).

Interviews also examined the orientation (nonprofit and for profit) of PBS member stations. Five nonprofit ideal-types—derived from overlaps in public television and nonprofit literatures—were utilized for organization and analysis of interviews: provider of public goods, builder of social capital, facilitator of the public sphere, innovator, and government extension. Three ideal-types emphasizing market or for profit orientation were developed from the literature: users of ratings, membership, and underwriting. Eleven stations were classified with higher nonprofit orientation than for profit orientation. Three stations received higher for profit orientation classification than nonprofit orientation. Differences in licensure type were also reflected in orientation ideal-types.

Future research should consider station size, station budget, and community demographics among other variables to better understand the nature of power and orientation and a possible connection between the two.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

ACUBS	Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations
APTS	Association Public Television Stations
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
CPB	Corporation for Public Broadcasting
CSG	Community Service Grant
CTW	Children's Television Workshop (later Sesame Workshop)
ETRC	Educational Television and Radio Center
FAE	Fund for Adult Education
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
ITVS	Independent Television Service
JCET	Joint Committee on Educational Television
NAEB	National Association of Educational Broadcasters
NET	National Educational Television
NPS	National Programming Service
PBS	Public Broadcasting Service
PDP	Program Differentiated Provider
RTL	Ready To Learn
TCAF	Temporary Commission on Alternative Financing
WCP	Wisconsin Collaborative Project

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Is PBS necessary? Many government officials, scholars, and industry professionals have asked this question. The question, in some form, is revisited with each federal budget cycle, in annual conferences of media scholars, and by professionals working in the media industries. In 2008, the most recent person to pose the question publicly was Charles McGrath of the *The New York Times*. Page one of the Arts and Leisure section of the paper's February 17, 2008 edition asked "Is PBS still necessary?" (McGrath, 2008). Within 24 hours, more than 800 online responses to the article were posted (Readers' comments, n.d.).

On February 22, 2008 PBS's flagship news program, *Newshour with Jim Lehrer* broadcasted an analysis of readers' online responses to the article. Ninety percent of responses posted on the *New York Times* website suggested PBS is still necessary (Winslow, 2008). In addition to highlighting the reader responses that believe in the necessity of PBS, the broadcast also highlighted the comments of some readers who do not believe PBS is still necessary. Carl Brookins was one of over 6,600 readers to comment on the article at the Newshour's website.

> Having started in public broadcasting long before PBS was even a gleam in some eye, I, sadly, agree with a lot of the *NYT* article, particularly the mention of "mustiness." The drive to that elusive quality, the intrusion of commercials, has robbed noncommercial television of its verve, its willingness to laugh at itself, its understanding of its role in our society. Whatever happened to experimentation? Whatever happened to a willingness to try new things--to fail and then go again.

> PBS and many local affiliates have become cautious, conservative and yes, musty. All the action in on cable. (Brookins, 2008)

The debates over public television—its purpose, its relevance, its place—may end only when the system itself ends, and perhaps not even then.

The most recent incarnation of the debate is used not as an indication of what questions this dissertation aims to resolve, but rather to illustrate that what many may see as an outdated broadcaster is still as relevant as ever in the popular mindset of many Americans. Scholars from the fields of media studies, broadcasting, nonprofit studies, and organizational communication among others will each find that the debate over public television has relevance to their field through this dissertation. Frameworks, theories, approaches, or methodologies from across these disciplines are invoked in this research. Critical scholars, cultural scholars, sociologists, economists, political scientists, historians, artists, and industry professionals have all contributed to this dissertation in some way. Their contributions span the chapters presented here.

Public television in the United States has a long and torrid history with federal and local governments, scholars, and the American public. The issues range from concerns over the structure of the system to accusations of propagandistic programming. Chapter 2 of this dissertation focuses on these issues, paying particular attention to two of the most prominent criticism of the public television system: centralization of programming decision making power and a trend toward market or for profit orientation.

The issues of power and orientation raised in chapter 2 are explored from different angles in chapter 3. A review of literature concerning media consolidation, organizational power, production of culture, and theories from the nonprofit sector create a foundation from which to begin to understand the unique positioning of public

television in the United States. Theories from these literatures are employed to shape the research questions about power and orientation that drive the dissertation.

Chapter 4 presents an overview of the methodologies utilized to explore power and orientation. The primary focus of this chapter is on the operationalization of power and the results of a quantitative schedule analysis of PBS member stations' prime time schedules. The results of the quantitative analysis are utilized to select stations for participation in interviews.

In-depth qualitative interviews serve two purposed in this dissertation: to give meaning to the quantitative schedule analysis used to measure power and to elicit programming decision making responses to indicate orientation. Chapter 5 explores the interview process, the questions posed to stations' programming staff, and an interpretation of the responses. An inductive approach is used to determine themes of power among programming staff at PBS member stations. Orientation of stations is analyzed through a deductive approach that combines scholarly criticism and nonprofit theories to create ideal-types.

Power and orientation results are discussed in chapter 6. Criticism from the public television literature in chapter 2 and theories from the scholarly literature in chapter 3 are reemployed to give shape to these results. The emergent qualitative power themes are used to interpret the results of the quantitative schedule analysis. The frequency and context of programmers' invocation of the ideal-typical roles used to measure orientation are also discussed. Connections across power and orientation are considered.

Limitations of the research and suggestions for future researchers and future directions are presented in chapter 7. Further, a discussion on the need to bridge the

divide between the academy and the industries is presented. If scholars hope to better understand this or other industries, a commitment to finding common ground between these groups must be achieved.

The answers to the research questions presented here offer possible insights into various disciplines and pose opportunities for researchers who are willing to take an interdisciplinary approach to studying this and other industries. Because this dissertation draws from and utilizes the tools of various disciplines and schools of thought, its questions and approaches are not limited in application to PBS member stations. They are, however, the population under consideration here.

CHAPTER TWO
THE U.S. PUBLIC TELEVISION SYSTEM: HISTORY, ORGANIZATION AND CRITICISM

> When Lawrence Grossman arrived at PBS as president in early 1976, he found that "two words were banned from the lexicon: 'network' and 'ratings.'"
> Stavitsky, 1998

Its unique organizational structure, historical battles fought against internal and external allies and foes, commitment to localism and simultaneous drift toward centralization, and attempts toward, but failure to fulfill, idealized nonprofit roles places public television in the United States in its current, and seemingly always, position of unrest. Its structure, not found elsewhere across the mediascape, combined with a torrential history to create negotiations both at the station and system level whereby values associated with localism are in conflict with advantages of centralization and the idealized nonprofit roles are regularly foiled by economic and market forces. Scholars recognize public television's troubled past as a result and cause of its unique structure, and characterize the negotiations of power (distributed versus centralized) and orientation (nonprofit versus market) as further extensions of the struggles resulting from this structure.

History and Organization of the Public Television System

The public television system in the United States can be said to be the offspring of two distinct parents: European public service broadcasting, specifically the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), and the commercial network model of the United States. The resultant system reflects characteristics of each parent resulting in an organizational mission and structure not like any other public service broadcaster.

Licensing broadcast stations for noncommerical educational use was an afterthought in the early years of American broadcasting (Witherspoon& Kovitz, 2000).

Created as an alternative to the marketplace's product, programming on public television was to serve audiences unserved or underserved by profit-driven commercial television (Ouellette, 2002). From its initial beginnings as a handful of decentralized educational television stations, the public television system in the United States has grown to include, at its core, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), the Association of Public Television Stations (APTS), and the noncommercial, educational television licensees that are PBS member stations. The system, in its many iterations, has managed to survive threats to its funding, organization, operations, and its very existence.

Public television began as educational television. In 1949 Federal Communications Commissioner (FCC) Frieda B. Hennock dissented against her fellow commissioners, who after the television spectrum allocation hearings in the late 1940s, found no reason to reserve space on the dial for noncommerical educational television (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). Hennock argued that though educational institutions were not yet prepared to utilize broadcast television, they would be one day; spectrum should be allocated on their behalf for that day (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). KUHT, licensed to the University of Houston, was the first noncommercial educational station to begin broadcasting in 1953. Educational stations, usually licensed to colleges and universities across the country, were the beginnings of today's public television system. While these stations operated largely independently of one another, they developed relationships through organizations such as the Association of College and University Broadcast Stations (ACUBS), the National Association of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB), the Joint Committee on Educational Television (JCET), and the Educational Television and Radio Center (ETRC), among others (Engelman, 1996; Witherspoon &

Kovitz, 2000). The Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education (FAE) established the ETRC as a programming service designed to support the production and exchange of programming among noncommercial educational broadcasters (Engelman, 1996). Though independent of each other, noncommercial educational (NCE) broadcasters began to come together through these organizations and associations.

Engelman (1996) divides the history of public broadcasting into its early foundation years, later government years, and recent corporate years. When public television was struggling to find a place on the American airwaves the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation were vital to its early achievements. The FAE-supported ETRC, which would later transition into National Educational Television (NET), marked the shift of educational stations from a disbanded group of local television licensees to a more united group of stations with a "bona fide network with headquarters in New York City" (Engleman, 1996, p. 140). By the mid-1960s, NET was the primary source of national programming for its affiliate stations.

The establishment of NET may have begun the distributed-centralized debate over programming power in the public television system. Funding from the FAE was refocused: fund distribution shifted from station support to emphasis on network programming through NET (Engelman, 1996). When NET expressed interest in operating an interconnection system among all noncommercial educational stations, the question of power moved to the forefront.

> Blakely (1979), former vice president of the FAE, recalled how during this period local stations resented their powerlessness over national programming. He wrote that interconnection was clearly necessary to create a national educational television system: "But interconnection raises

to an unavoidable position the always latent question: Who's in charge" (p. 164). (Engelman,1996, p. 147)

NET held a near-monopoly on noncommercial programming distribution, and programs distributed through NET were criticized for their "lack of controversy and creativity" because of the organization's funding, and thus political, ties to FAE (Engelman, 1996, p. 147). The debate over distributed-centralized power of programming within the public television system had only just begun. PBS, the most recent incarnation of NET, inherited its predecessor's programming trials.

The Carnegie Foundation established the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television in 1965. Because the Carnegie Commission would re-emerge later in public broadcasting's history, scholars and professionals refer to the 1965 commission as Carnegie I. With the endorsement of the Johnson administration and support from the Carnegie Corporation, Carnegie I was designed to study the financial needs of the educational television (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). The commission envisioned educational television as a means toward "public enlightenment and social amelioration" (Engelman, 1996, p. 144), filling the gaps of an inadequate public education system (Engleman, 1996; Morrow, 2006), and building an enlightened and active citizenry (Aufderheide, 1991; Engleman, 1996; Hoynes, 1994). To achieve these ends, the system would need substantial support and administration without political strings. Aware of potential funding and political clashes between a future public television system and the federal government, Carnegie I suggested federal funding via an excise tax on sales of new television sets. To minimize political battles, the commission suggested that six of the twelve board seats for the Corporation for Public Television (as the organization was

then proposed) be appointed by the President of the United States with Senate approval, and the other six members chosen by those appointed (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). Neither recommendation was enacted.

Working with prominent leaders in the arts, education, political and business communities as well as the educational stations on the air at the time, Carnegie I made twelve recommendations in its 1967 report *Public Television: A Program for Action*. Their recommendations centered around two foci: increased federal support and the establishment of a Corporation for Public Television (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). Central to achieving these missions was a re-envisioning of educational television. The commission concerned itself with the hours of an educational station's schedule not used for formal education. These hours, intended for a general audience, were termed "public television." Though it was not the commission's intention to redefine educational television, its prominent use of the term "public television" proved an important rhetorical device in winning federal support for the service. A bill based on the recommendations of Carnegie I went to Congress in February 1967. With some retooling, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 was signed into law on November 7, 1967.

The Public Broadcasting Act established federal financial support of public broadcasting and called for the creation of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB)—the result of a compromise between public television and radio groups. The CPB was charged with developing a programming service to facilitate the production and exchange of programs diverse enough to meet the instructional, educational, and cultural needs of unserved and underserved audiences while reflecting issues of local and national interest (Public Broadcasting Act of 1967). CPB was created not as an agency of the

government, but rather serve to protect the public broadcasting system's independence from government, develop programming, and establish an interconnection system among stations. The Public Broadcasting Act laid the groundwork for the future National Public Radio (NPR) and Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000).

In 1969 PBS was formed at the recommendation of CPB. PBS was to serve as a private, nonprofit membership organization funded by CPB to provide national interconnection for its member stations (Engleman, 1996). One lesson learned from NET was stations' uneasiness with a centralized producer and distributor of national programming. Because of this, PBS was specifically prohibited from producing or broadcasting programs though it could work with national and regional production centers to acquire programming for its member stations. Additionally, PBS could not own or operate any station. These two ground rules were established to prevent PBS from resembling a commercial network's centralized programming and decision-making model: the "network" (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). Public television stations would continue to be independently operated and programmed as member stations of the new organization. Though stations maintained their independence, PBS assumed administration of the interconnection system and distribution of programming produced by NET and other centers and stations (Engelman, 1996). With the dissolution of the NAEB, PBS also took on the role of representation of the interests of its member stations (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000).

Engleman (1996) notes the passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 as the beginning of the government years for public broadcasting. The Act and the subsequent creations of CPB and PBS marked the highest level of formal federal government involvement in public television to date. With high levels of involvement came high

levels of politicization. Despite designing the CPB to work independently of the government, its funding and board composition were not shielded from government influence, and as such, CPB became a tool for government administrators to utilize to influence the direction of public broadcasting. The Nixon administration is remembered as most hostile toward public broadcasting. Attempts to dismantle the system, influence program production (including a near-complete elimination of public affairs programming from the system), redistribute power, and cut off funding for the newly created system are all well documented by public television scholars (Aufderheide, 1991; Engelman, 1996; Lashley, 1992a; Wicklein, 1986; Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). By promising but not instituting measures to ensure insulation of the new public broadcasting system from strong political pressures, issues brushed under the rug by the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 re-emerged under Nixon and continue to re-emerge with each new administration (Lashley, 1992a; Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000).

In further attempts to protect public broadcasting from political pressures and ensure stable funding the Public Broadcasting Financing Acts of 1975 and 1978 were passed. However, they fell short of their promise for long term funding and insulation from political influence. A second Carnegie group, the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Public Broadcasting (Carnegie II) hoped to influence the future of the system as Carnegie I had done in the 1960s. Their 1978 report recommendations of a one-time allocation of $350 million to create and improve facilities and federal funds of $600 million by 1985 were largely ignored. The failure to ensure long-term funding of the system, to separate the system from political influence, continues to cripple the potential of public television (Engelman, 1996).

Ever-mounting political and financial pressures at the federal level compelled leaders in the public television community to question the ability of PBS to continue to represent the interests of its member stations, especially if those local interests were in conflict with those of the national organization. PBS's roles as programmer and station interlocutor did not always place it in the best position to represent the stations' interests in legislation, regulation, and CPB budget policies (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). The National Association of Public Television Stations (later renamed the Association of Public Television Stations—APTS) was created in 1979 to assume the role of representation of the interests of America's public television stations.

The 1980s introduced what Engelman (1996) calls the corporate years because the system experienced a shift in funding mechanisms from reliance on federal dollars to experimenting with other funding options. The Public Broadcasting Act of 1981 cut direct federal support while creating the Temporary Commission on Alternative Financing (TCAF). TCAF performed an experiment with advertising on public television: ten public television stations were allowed to air limited corporate advertisements on their air. Critics of the experiment questioned whether allowing advertising on public broadcasting would shift the emphasis from the quality of programming to the quantity and quality of its audience (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). Even the presidents of CPB and PBS feared that commercialization would blur public broadcasting's noncommercial identity (Engelman, 1996). The commission could not recommend advertising for the system—it proved too risky. While it found no reasonable alternative to federal funding in the near future, the commission did suggest that relaxing underwriting guidelines could produce additional revenue without compromising the integrity of the programming or the reputation of the stations or the

system (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). The new "enhanced underwriting" guidelines allowed stations to use brand names, logos, slogans and value-neutral messages, but did not allow for comparisons or calls to action (Engelman, 1996; Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). The "commercialization" of public broadcasting, many feared, had begun. The line between the for profit broadcasters and public broadcasters began to blur.

Growing pressure to find alternatives to federal funding continued to place pressure on CPB, PBS, and its member stations. A rift between local and national constituencies that began even before the formation of PBS continued to expand. Some member stations had a deep seeded distrust of the intentions of the national organization. Trends toward centralization of power, especially programming decision-making, in the national organizations of CPB and PBS were regularly revived only to be reversed. In 1989, PBS created the centralized, national position of chief program executive to replace the Station Program Cooperative previously used to select programming for PBS acquisition and distribution (Lashley, 1992a). Jennifer Lawson, the first to hold this new position, was met with resistance from some stations, but welcomed by others (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). By centralizing programming power at the national level, some thought PBS might be able to overcome the funding dilemmas that have plagued the system throughout its existence. A centralized schedule could facilitate national promotion of programming and, by virtue of a larger national audience, fetch a higher underwriting price for programs. Centralization of the programming decision-making for the system was making a comeback until the common schedule debate between the national and local levels—and even within the local level—reached a boiling point in 1995 (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). Common carriage expectations required stations to carry 350 hours of a common primetime schedule annually, with specific

primetime programs indicated as common carriage (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). A system built from decentralized roots that rejected the network model was also facing decreases in federal funding, and thus was split between fighting for station autonomy and grasping at any hope of keeping public television a viable alternative to commercial television. These debates over a common schedule, the re-emergent trend toward centralization of decision-making, and the commercialization of public television continue today.

Structure of Today's Public Television System

The history of public television in the United States, from its beginnings as educational television through its formal incorporation with the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 to the debates over centralization and commercialism, have worked to form the system as it is know today. What has emerged is a relatively complex and truly unique structure of interlocking, sometimes overlapping, interdependent organizations. The organizations that comprise the public television population are generally understood to include CPB, PBS, APTS, and the 168 PBS member stations.

CPB has become a largely administrative body charged with distribution of tax-revenue to stations, producers, and PBS. PBS's primary duties remain as overseeing acquisition and distribution of programming. Newer to its responsibilities are the promotion of programming, the facilitation of educational services, exploring new media ventures, providing support for station fundraising and technology development, and marketing PBS video. Though PBS has been a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization since its incorporation ("Articles of Incorporation," 1969), able to raise tax-deductible donations from the general public itself, only recently has it elected to bypass stations to solicit major gifts from individuals for the PBS Foundation (Mitchell, 2005). Recognized as the

public television lobbying group, APTS is regarded as one of the most respected organizations in the public television community (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). APTS continues to represent its member stations through orchestrated lobbying efforts, including its annual February Capitol Hill Day where stations representatives meet with legislators to discuss the state of public television. PBS member stations are a group of 168 noncommercial educational licensees. Member stations can be licensed to different organizations, and are generally divided into community organization licensees (*N*=86), college/university licensees (*N*=56), state authorities (*N*=20) and local educational or municipal authorities (*N*=6) ("Corporate Facts," n.d). These licensees serve all fifty states in the nation and Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. They are locally managed and programmed and are arguably still the lifeblood of the system (Rowland, 1993). As Witherspoon and Kovitz (2000) note, "In all their variety, complexity and occasional contrariness, stations are the heart of the industry; the fundamental conversation in public broadcasting is between stations and their audiences" (p. 22). The primary vehicle stations use for this conversation is programming.

Program Selection and Scheduling

Program selection and scheduling on many local stations has changed throughout the history of the station, and many of those changes have been the result of changes at the national level. In the past, PBS has made program purchase choices under different models than the one used today. In 1974, the Station Program Cooperative (SPC) of PBS was begun to allow stations to act as representatives of their local communities to vote on a portion of the programming purchased by PBS. The SPC was described as "an experimental market for public goods" (Ferejohn & Noll, 1976, p. 267). Campbell and Campbell (1978) criticized this approach because its pricing structure "works counter to

the normal economics of the market system"—the more stations who wanted to purchase and air a program, the more expensive the program was to purchase (p. 57). Thus the SPC did not distinguish between public and private goods when purchasing and distributing programming. Those within the public television system also described the SPC model as chaotic, time consuming, and ineffectual. Day (1995) suggests this approach took the freshness out of the schedule as stations chose to vote for tried and true programs rather than take risks on new, experimental series. In an effort to better organize the PBS program selection system, the position of Executive Vice President of National Programming and Promotion within PBS was created in 1989 (Engelman, 1996). This position was charged with centralizing the programming decisions for the system and introducing new programming into the schedule. With varying degrees of success and slight alterations in process, this is roughly how the system currently operates. Stations are surveyed for their input on which programs and genres they would most like to see in the national schedule and PBS works to acquire programming for distribution that best serves the needs of its member stations.

All programs selected by PBS for inclusion in the National Programming Service (NPS) are available to all PBS member stations (with the exception of Program Differentiated Provider—or PDP—stations[1]). Additional programming bundles (either as tiers or themed packages) are available for purchase by individual stations as well to compliment the NPS programming. Programs acquired and distributed by PBS for station schedules have also become, to some extent, required programming. The hotly debated requirements of common carriage rekindled fires over centralization of

[1] PDP stations are a small group of PBS member stations who, for various reasons—primarily a signal overlap with another PBS member station—are allowed to carry only a certain percentage of NPS programming.

programming power. Common carriage (as of this writing) mandates stations to carry 300 of the 350 hours of selected programming which are intensely promoted by PBS in national campaigns. A station that failed to meet the required 300 hours faced threats of "nonstandard usage fees" (Avery & Stavitsky, 2000, p. 94). The PBS Member Station Handbook (1998) suggests if a station consistently under-performs the common carriage expectation, the following actions may be taken: a letter from the Member Committee of the PBS Board of Directors to the licensee "urging the station to honor common carriage requests;" the recommendation to the PBS Board to withhold the program rights of the station in question, with the option to offer those rights to another station in the market; a recommendation to the PBS Board that the station be issued a surcharge of up to 20% of the NPS fees (n.p.). Even though it is generally regarded by member stations that PBS has no teeth when it comes to enforcing common carriage, the majority of stations comply with common carriage requirements of PBS, even if begrudgingly. Their rationales may be explained by the debate over centralizing programming decision-making power into PBS.

Debate over Programming Power: Centralized vs. Distributed

The structure of today's public television system in the United States is itself a continuing source of controversy in the organizational field of public television (Powell & Friedkin, 1987). This field can be understood as public television's stakeholders: including national and local governments, corporations, foundations, individual donors, viewers, community members, and the stations themselves (Friedland, 1995). Furthermore, scholars and journalists can be added to the field to produce a large group of stakeholders at multiple levels for the public television system and for the stations themselves.

The public television system has long differentiated itself from commercial television through its structure. Functioning not as a network but as a member-serving organization, PBS is designed to serve the needs, primarily programming needs, of its member stations across the country. In the four decades since its 1969 inception, the purpose and power of PBS has changed, creating a debate within the system and across its stakeholder groups about centralization of power. Some argue that centralization of power in PBS is necessary for the system to survive in a multi-channel, highly competitive environment (Day, 1995). Others argue that decentralization is necessary for the system to continue to meet the diverse needs of communities served by local stations across the nation (Avery & Stavitsky, 2000).

The strengths of a centralized power structure in the public broadcasting system manifest in four principal ways: shared vision, purchasing power, underwriting, and promotion. PBS has assumed the role as an organizing structure through which stations are linked. Because PBS is a member-serving organization, its goal is to provide the best service possible to its member stations. Its primary vehicle for serving stations is programming. Thus, through system-wide commitment to a schedule selected by the centralized programming authority of PBS, local stations can take advantage of national branding, funding, and promotion opportunities.

For stations to carry a common core of programming selected by PBS, that programming must be consistent with stations' missions. Each of the 168 public television station licensees identifies its own mission. Consider a sample of missions statements from the websites of geographically- and licensee-diverse public television stations:

Independent, free, mass communication is critical to crystallize issues, preserve culture and deliver educational opportunities for everybody. To this end, KLRU reflects, celebrates and inspires Central Texans through creative excellence, community engagement and life-long learning

KLRU, Austin, TX

Oregon Public Broadcasting: giving voice to the community, connecting Oregon and its neighbors, illuminating a wider world.

Oregon Public Broadcasting

Television has the power to change lives. Public television has the responsibility to change lives for the better: a child far from urban resources is inspired to become a scientist, a high school dropout earns a GED, a homebound senior remains connected to the world of the arts and culture, the family of an Alzheimer's patient find strength and support. UNC-TV's unique programs and services provide people of all ages with enriching, life-changing television.

UNC-TV, Research Triangle Park, NC

The mission of the Oklahoma Educational Television Authority is to provide educational and public television programming to the people of Oklahoma on a coordinated statewide basis. The Authority is fully committed to the creative use of telecommunications technologies to deliver essential educational and public television programs and value-added services to enrich the quality of life for all Oklahoma citizens and children.

OETA, Oklahoma City, OK

WGBH enriches people's lives through programs and services that educate, inspire, and entertain, fostering citizenship and culture, the joy of learning, and the power of diverse perspectives.

WGBH, Boston, MA

Our Mission is to "Harness the power of television and other media for the public good". We use television to inform, engage, enlighten, and delight our viewers, to the benefit of all.

Twin Cities Public Television, St. Paul, MN

Television... We are entertained by it, we can be numbed by it, and often we are even moved by it. At KCPT, we use television to enrich people's lives with programming and services that challenge our minds, brighten our spirits and prepare children for a life of learning.

KCPT, Kansas City, MO

> WJCT's mission is to provide programming and services that celebrate human diversity, encourage joyful learning and promote civic participation, all to empower citizens to improve the quality of their lives
>
> WJCT, Jacksonville, FL

> KCET is your personal gateway to the world, in all its complexity and wonder. It is a theater showcasing the finest drama and music... a gallery of art and design and craft... a museum illuminating the natural world... a forum for discourse and news... a library of history come alive... and a classroom where the children we love learn to become joyful, productive adults. As an independent media voice, KCET enriches our understanding of the past, enlivens our present, and prepares us for the future.
>
> KCET, Los Angeles, CA

While some see consistency among these missions, including the promotion of civic participation, learning, entertainment, diversity and culture, others see a fragmented system in need of a common unifying mission (Day, 1995). One strongly voiced argument for a centralized public television system, with power residing in PBS, is the lack of a common mission statement, and thus a perceived lack of focus, among all public television stations. Price (1998) speculates that the lack of centralized vision among stations is the key weakness that threatens the existence of the system. The individuality of stations leads to programming that may be unique to satisfy the missions of the stations instead of a common shared mission and programming schedule to unite all stations. Through a common mission and a common schedule, it can be argued that a stronger brand for PBS and its member stations would develop. Schweitzer (1997) found the PBS brand to be the second most recognized media brand in America. A survey conducted by PBS found its brand strongly associated with terms that describe its programming: "informative, educational, enlightening, respecting, intelligence, responsible, and unique" (Rubel, 1995, p. 1). As PBS continues to position the brand, stations can continue to take advantage of their association with PBS and its programming.

Another important programming advantage of a centralized programming authority for stations is the purchasing power made available through PBS. Stations whose budgets would otherwise not allow for the purchase of what are now considered PBS staples—*Antiques Roadshow, Masterpiece Theatre, Nature, Sesame Street*—are able to acquire these programs through pooling their economic resources into PBS for program acquisition. All PBS member stations have access to programs purchased and made available through NPS. By paying PBS to be a member station, stations are able to combine their financial resources to purchase programming of the caliber that would otherwise not be a financial reality for many stations in the system.

Centralization of programming also creates an environment attractive to national program funders. PBS's common carriage requirement of member stations capitalizes on the programming of a common primetime schedule across the country in order to elicit larger underwriting requests for programs on this schedule. A 2003 PBS financial report listed 51 organizations as spending at least $1 million to underwrite PBS programming; 32 organizations spent between $500,000 and $999,999 on PBS program underwriting ("Our Supporters," 2003). As many organizations shift their view of underwriting from a philanthropic model to an advertising model (Paradise, 2004; Engelman, 1996), the delivery of a national audience at a promised time becomes increasingly important to underwriting the primetime schedule. By agreeing to carry a common primetime schedule, stations facilitate the system's ability to generate additional funding, and further the agenda toward centralization of programming power with PBS.

In addition to underwriting power, centralization of power to select the programming schedule facilitates national promotional campaigns for select programs. When all stations across the system agree to air the primetime schedule as fed by PBS,

stations can all benefit from the national promotion offered by PBS for this schedule. Promotion, including press releases, purchased advertising space, media appearances, and program cross promotions orchestrated by PBS for the common carriage schedule is designed to increase viewership of the schedule on PBS member stations. Deviating from the common carriage schedule can be costly not only because stations must then work to create promotion of their version of the primetime schedule, but also because of the possibility of negative viewer response. Stations that chose to program outside the national schedule often confuse viewers, who having been exposed to the national promotion of the common carriage schedule, tune into their local public television station expecting to find the promised program. A station that differentiates its primetime schedule from the national feed cannot take full advantage of the promotional resources offered by PBS.

Indeed the structures of organizations are products of and produce power relations. Viewing the public television system as a hierarchy with power concentrated at the top (PBS) the and local stations below paints a different picture entirely than viewing the system as a collection of stations that work with PBS to create and deliver programming to the system. Some scholars (Day, 1995; Price, 1998) suggest that centralization of programming power into PBS may be the system's best bet for long-term survival. However, others argue that decentralization of the system is what differentiates, thus justifying its existence and public funding, public television from "network" commercial television—specifically preserving the system's long-cherished connection to localism (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). Localism is the argument most often used against centralization in public television. With increasing concern of conglomerate media ownership (Cooper, 2004; McChesney, 1999) localism is

conceptualized as a tool that fights homogenization of programming in favor of diversity of sources, viewpoints, and exposure (Napoli, 2001). In 2003 the Federal Communications Commission revisited the concept of localism and formed a Localism Task Force to "advise the Commission on steps it can take and, if warranted, will make legislative recommendations to Congress that would strengthen localism in broadcasting" (Federal Communications Commission, 2003). An important rationale behind localism policy in media regulation is to decentralize political power into local communities where this diffused power would serve to promote participation in and education of democracy (Napoli, 2001). Localism permeates debate and discussion of the goals and direction of public television in the United States.

Witherspoon and Kovitz (2000) note, "By tradition, and since 1967, by law, the U.S. public broadcasting system is the least centralized national broadcasting structure—anywhere" (p. 22). The authors argue that the passion for independence long held by public television stations is a product of their diverse institutional licenses and financial situations. The philosophy of localism that may have begun out of necessity, has become a mantra of many public televisions stations today. Early educational television stations were not interconnected through any central guiding organization; stations were by definition independent. Even the introduction of NET—which at first commissioned local stations to produce programming only later to take on the task itself—did not change the fierce independence of local educational television stations. Stations ardently protested NET's request that stations carry a common schedule by broadcasting certain series on specific days (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). The programming authority of educational television remained with the station itself, and "the local schedule was

paramount" (Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000, p. 22). Indeed, much of a station's schedule consisted of locally-produced programming (Stavitsky, 1998).

The creation of PBS as an interconnected system to distribute programming to public television stations was itself a hotly contended issue; the product of multiple years of negotiation among staff from CPB, educational television stations, and the Ford Foundation (Avery & Pepper, 1976). As a result of stations' fierce independence and dedication to localism, PBS did not retain the program production rights of its predecessor. Unlike NET, PBS was designated to acquire and distribute programming and program production grants to stations. It was strictly prohibited from serving as a programming producer (Day, 1995). Though most were pleased with interconnection possibilities, stations fought successfully to maintain their local autonomy, especially in the realm of programming.

Decentralization was reinforced by the Nixon administration. Using localism as a tool, "new federalism" (Lashley, 1992a, p. 774) worked to decentralize public television. Future funding for public television was made contingent on the restructuring of the system: powers once placed with the national organizations of CPB and PBS would be reallocated to the local stations.

> PBS management was relieved of certain legal, research, public awareness, and programming functions—particularly, the ultimate decision making for program production grants, support, and acquisition. The net outcome of the partnership agreement gave increased financing, autonomy, and discretion to local public television stations at the expense of diminished centralized CPB control in exchange for increased and

> stable funding for the public broadcasting systems. (Lashley, 1992a, p. 775)

Programming power further shifted from the national level at CPB and PBS to the local PBS member stations. The increased funding of the system came largely through community service grants (CSGs) which were distributed directly to member stations to aid in their program production or acquisition (Lashley, 1992a). Reallocation of resources firmly placed program production, acquisition, and decision-making with the station. Through decentralization of power and resources, localism was once again repeated as a mantra of the American public television system.

In 1993, *Quality Time*, the Twentieth Century Fund's report on public television, was released (Stavitsky, 1998). Many were concerned with its recommendations of strengthening the national organizations at the expense of the local stations. Then-FCC member and future president of PBS Ervin Duggan commented on his uneasiness of the return of the idea to centralize programming resources into the hands of PBS rather than its member stations:

> I have real misgivings about reconstituting public television's funding in a way that would diminish the resources of local stations. Public broadcasting has long been identified with the public interest, and one bedrock principle of broadcasting in the public interest is localism. In my view, the service that public stations bring to their communities should include serious attention to local needs. Diluting the amount of money that public broadcasting's funding sources provide to local stations could directly undermine the hope for improved local service. Such an

undermining, in my judgment, would be most unfortunate. (Avery & Stavitsky, 2000, p. 77)

Duggan saw decentralization of resources, thus power, as essential to the purpose of public television in American society. To strip stations of their power in the system is to deny the importance of localism in serving the public interest.

Many of those who work with PBS member stations in programming departments continue to view localism as a core value in their scheduling decision-making. The second edition of the Public Television Programmers' Handbook (TRAC Media Services, n.d.) suggests, "Public TV may, in fact, be the last bastion of local broadcasting in the United States" (p. 8). However, others question the degree to which localism goes beyond a value to a practice at PBS member stations. As the tide of power currently appears to be shifting back toward the national level, primarily through common carriage expectations from PBS, expressed localism at local stations is being questioned. This dissertation can begin to answer the question of where PBS member stations currently place themselves along the power continuum that ranges from decentralized to centralized with respect to programming.

Debate over Orientation in Public Television: Nonprofit vs. For Profit

The formal institution of public television in the United States was created by the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, which came well after commercial television had established itself and its networks. Because of its late entrance to the American broadcasting community, the public television system has often struggled with its identity as a "public" institution existing in a market-driven industry. The contradicting expectations of public television to serve as both an alternative to and competitor with

commercial television is a product of its strange hybrid status: not an equivalent to European public service broadcasters nor a true product of the American commercial television system (Rowland, 1993).

Public television was not intended as a competitor to commercial television, but rather envisioned as an alternative. Ouellette (2002) suggests the intended audiences for public television were those that commercial television was uninterested in serving. Further, Ouellette notes that commercial broadcasters eventually welcomed public television with the understanding that these stations would shoulder the burden of public interest expectations of broadcasters. Rowland (1993) counterd that when noncommercial television made the switch from its "educational" label to a "public" label, it began to be asked "whether it ought not to be able to demonstrate a considerably wider audience reach on a more frequent basis" (p. 162).

Such questions placed public television in its currently awkward position: serving as both alternative to and competitor with commercial broadcasting. "Every choice to watch a public television program is a choice not to watch commercial programming, and vice versa" (Friedland, 1995, n.p.). By not trying to become too popular so as to be deemed just another network, and concurrently trying to also not alienate too much of the public to become unaccountable to serve in their interest, public television needs to draw just enough of an audience to justify its public funding without carrying an audience size that would allow it be a direct competitor in the marketplace (Friedland, 1995). American public television walks a highly negotiated line between a nonprofit ideal and market product (Rowland, 1993).

Avery & Stavitsky (2000) and Hoynes (1994) reference this ongoing debate about the commercialization and for profit tendencies of public television as "Mission versus

Market." Mission-driven programming decisions are understood to reflect the missions of PBS member stations, while market-driven programming decisions give more attention to market forces including ratings, underwriting, and other revenue sources. Avery & Stavitsky suggest that "mission" and "market" are "not academic classifications, but real-world choices that broadcasters make each month when they draw up their schedules" (p. 74).

Some media scholars have seen the divide from an academic perspective (Aufderheide, 1995, 1999; Balas, 2003; Blumer, 1993; Howley, 2005; Hoynes, 1994, 1999, 2003; Lashley, 1992b) using primarily public sphere, public interest, or public service models to understand the mission-driven approach. These models can be understood as ideals for public television. These ideals and others can be combined and re-conceptualized to create several ideal-types for public television.

Idealized Roles in the Public Television Scholarship

Without a centralized guiding mission for the system, public television in the United States has been idealized as different constructs. Former PBS President Lawrance Grossman articulated the point: "Public television's dilemma is that everyone has a different view of what its role should be" (2002, p. 67). Its role as educational and cultural tool for American society has brought much criticism to the system. Public television has also been conceived as an electronic public sphere and harshly criticized for not truly reaching that ideal. Those who view public television as a community builder have also been simultaneously excited by its potential and disappointed in its application. These idealizations of public television can be understood as ideal-types (Weber, 1949). The ideal-typical concept emerges through the "unilateral emphasis on certain points of view and through joining together of specific phenomena corresponding

to those points of view" ("The ideal type," 1982). Public television has been charged to work toward, even if never achieve, several ideal-typical roles identified by media scholars: educational and cultural tool, incarnation of the public sphere, and facilitator of community. Much of the criticism of public television in the United States is centered upon its failure to achieve these roles.

Perhaps because of its educational roots, public television stations across the country continue to emphasize the important role of public television as an *educational tool* for children and adults. Through its popular children's series including *Sesame Street*, *Mister Rogers' Neighborhood*, and *Reading Rainbow* among others, public television is conceived as bridging the distance between home and school. Currently, the public television system boasts its Ready to Learn (RTL) services as a link between caregivers and schools, facilitated by public television stations and their programming. Many public television stations also serve the needs of adult students through programs such as *G.E.D. Connection*, *Destinos*, *French in Action*, *Mechanical Universe* and other high school and college curricular programming. Furthermore, many stations, because of their licensee connection with school boards or institutions of higher education, air and produce instructional programming specifically tailored for classroom use. Even the popular PBS series *Nova*, *Scientific American Frontiers*, *Nature*, *American Experience*, along with the numerous documentaries, how-to, gardening, cooking and public affairs programs, and local station productions, could be argued as educational programming that meets the needs of adults who desire lifelong learning.

In spite of the many educational programs found on public television stations across the country, many claim that public television's educational abilities fall short. Critics of public television as an educational tool for American society call into question

the audience of these programs. Public television has two distinct audiences (Morrow, 2006): children—specifically age eight and under—and "a well-educated, affluent minority" of adults (LeRoy, 1980, p. 157). Children are a large and loyal audience for public television, though in recent decades this audience base has begun to erode. Popular children's cable channels Nickelodeon, Disney, Cartoon Network, and Noggin (Bryant, 2003), programming exclusive to home video distribution, and even online educational content have provided alternatives to what was once the dominion of public television: children's educational programming (Morrow, 2006). The 2005 launch of the cable channel PBS KIDS Spout, in cooperation with Comcast, Sesame Workshop and HIT Entertainment, created dedicated cable access to public television's children's programming (PBS member stations, 2005). Further, PBS said the new channel creates "long-term revenue potential to be invested back into further strengthening the local PBS stations' commercial-free children's blocks…delivered to American households free and over-the-air" (PBS member stations, 2005).

Even before the technology boom that challenged public television's dominance over the child viewing audience, critics called into question the educational capacity of television as an effective teacher. Despite the seeming success of early childhood educational programs like *Sesame Street* on public television, childhood scholars debated the capacity of television to truly teach developmental skills, reasoning, and problem solving as opposed to strict memorization (Morrow, 2006). Others see *Sesame Street* as a panacea to the social ills of society: an educational vehicle designed to create a level playing field. All children, no matter their socioeconomic status, would benefit from educational children's television; specifically, poorer children would be able to use *Sesame Street* to become the intellectual equals of their more privileged peers upon

entering elementary school (Morrow, 2006). According to Morrow, *Sesame Street* was criticized for only increasing the achievement gap between the privileged and the impoverished; though all could benefit from *Sesame Street*, those already in a socially and economically advantaged situation learned more than their disadvantaged peers.

Public television's educational value continues to be acknowledged, but its once esteemed position as the "classroom over the air" that could, through educational programming, erase educational inequality in society has itself been erased. However, the Ready to Learn initiative implemented in the 1990s by PBS and its member stations strives toward the ideal of a well-prepared preschool audience through workshops that link station staff with educators and caregivers to incorporate on-air educational programming with activities that help emphasize and articulate curricular objectives.

The adult audience of public television has been described as a culturally-elite, well-educated, minority (LeRoy, 1980; Ouellette, 2002). Some argue that public television's programming acts a *cultural tool*: one that constructs, reflects, and serves the needs of its culturally-elite audience, creating a predictable cycle of program production, acquisition, and consumption. Cultural programming on public television has been argued as inaccessible to those outside its audience core (Ouellette, 2002). *American Playhouse*, *Masterpiece Theatre*, *Live from Lincoln Center*, and *Great Performances* among others appeal to the Eurocentric, upper-middle class audience that public television has cultivated (Ouellette, 2002).

The approach embraced by PBS and its member stations is argued to mirror the BBC: television as a tool for cultural uplift where popular culture is devalued (Ouellette, 2002). Thus programs that emphasize America's high culture are selected for national distribution. Ouellette argues that the strong tie that public television in America has had

with its British counterpart, even from its inception, created and continues to reflect an inherent, Eurocentric, cultural elitism. Even lighter entertainment programming on PBS member stations is largely borrowed from the BBC including PBS's newest icon *Antiques Roadshow*. Comedy on public television is primarily in the form of British comedies, including *Are You Being Served?*, *Keeping Up Appearances*, *Last of the Summer Wine*, *Waiting for God*, *Vicar of Dibley*, and *Monty Python's Flying Circus*. Ouellette's cultural studies critique of public television insinuates the programming choices made by PBS are in an effort to maintain the status quo of America's racist capitalist society. The ideal-typical roles of public television as an educational and cultural tool placed the expectations for the medium high; and critics have taken aim.

The American public television system has also been idealized as an *incarnation of the public sphere*. Interest in the public sphere was revitalized by Jürgen Habermas's (1989) *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. Habermas's conclusion is that any remaining existence of the public sphere is eroding. Criticism pointed to the current commercial media's unwillingness to facilitate an environment supportive of the debate necessary to promote democratic participation. Scholars began to envision public broadcasting as the new "electronic" public sphere in the United States (Engleman, 1996, p. 6). Aufderheide (1991) imagines that public television, in its unique form as a noncommercial and nongovernmental medium, could assume the challenge to create a new electronic public sphere.

> A truly public television would have to become an institution whose first job is not to make programs, whether safely splendid if utterly outrageous, but to make programs that fortify the public sphere. Assuming this challenge would mean forsaking the traditional role of broadcaster to

> become an organizer of electronic public space. It would foreground the struggle to establish relationships between people whose differences are deep, with the goal of finding common ground to articulate and address issues that pertain to the common good. (Aufderheide, 1991, p. 180)

Aufderheide calls for the very purpose of public broadcasting to be reexamined. Rather than a content producer, provider, or distributor, public television should declare its primary mission as a facilitator of conversation, negotiation, and debate to strengthen American democracy. Hoynes (1999) adds to the role of public television as facilitator of the public sphere by focusing on the difference between consumer and citizen. Whereas commercial media regard the audience as consumers, public television should conceptualize its viewers as citizens, and "design a public television system to meet fundamental citizen needs" (Hoynes, 1999, p. 37). Those needs would include airing programming not attractive to commercial television because of its non-mainstream or marginalized perspective to widen the debate of issues beyond "established consensus" (p. 38).

In the 1990s, many public television stations adopted the public sphere metaphor and worked to create an electronic space open for dialogue among community organizations, activists, and citizens. Friedland (1995) evaluates The Wisconsin Collaborative Project (WCP) that sought to create a space for debate not only at the local level, but to diversify the sources of programs offered at the national level by PBS. By seeing the public television system, rather than just the individual stations, as a potential site for recreation of the public sphere, the WCP solicited programs from PBS member stations across the country, regardless of size or license type. Believing a public sphere

requires decentralized power to allow for communication that cuts across group identities, the project sought to increase station participation in program offerings and thus increase the diversity of content in programming available to stations. Friedland's content analysis of programming produced and distributed via participating stations in the WCP indicated a diverse range of topics not typically featured on commercial or noncommercial television. Race and community were the most prominent themes, with more than a quarter of all WCP stories featuring racial minorities compared to the then-flagship PBS program the *MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour* (later the *Newshour with Jim Lehrer*) whose domestic guests were only six percent non-white (Hoynes, 1994). The author concludes that through diversifying the participation of program production and the content of the programs, the WCP begins to meet the criteria of the public sphere.

Public television idealized to reconstruct the public sphere held, and may still hold, promise as a uniting vision of the system. To function in this role, it was necessary for stations to reconceptualize their place among the communities they serve and organize an electronic space that could bridge across the differences of these communities to find the commonalities that define them as a public. Public television's business of providing programming needed to be repurposed, and its values and goals reconceived. And its long-term funding structures secured.

> It would require a financial base protected from corporate pressures and government censorship, and an explicit mandate. That way, the measure of success would be the level of active citizenship, not membership contributions or ratings. (Aufderheide, 1991, p. 180)

Serving as a public sphere would require a shift in thinking, not only in terms of programming but also evaluating success.

Similar to the political sphere metaphor is the idea of public television serving as a *facilitator of community*. Public television stations, perhaps especially community licensed stations, are rooted in their local communities as products of and creators of their communities. The concept of community is relative; among other conceptualizations, it can be defined as geopolitical, cultural, and interest-based (Brint, 2001). In a geopolitical sense, Pittsburgh's WQED was the first public television station to choose a community organization model rather than an educational model or the later emergent state model (Day, 1995). By doing so, the station positioned itself "to serve equally each of the city's educational and cultural institutions" (Day, 1995, p. 38), thus positioning WQED as a facilitator among community organizations and perhaps as an interconnection between people in the community and these organizations.

In its role to foster cultural communities, public television stations often create a community advisory board—usually constructed of a diverse group of individuals who individually and collectively are assumed to represent the interests of and give voice to communities of viewers. Community advisory boards may serve as programming counsel to decision-makers at the stations. Bullert (1997) describes the process of sending preview copies of the controversial *P.O.V.* program *Tongues Untied* to stations: "some even invited their own community advisory committees or other select citizens to preview the film and discuss whether or not to air it" (p. 102). Input from local citizens as representatives of ethnic, class, racial, and cultural groups is utilized to bridge ties with and strengthen communities.

Interest-based communities are also targeted and created by public television and its programming. The creation of "kids' clubs" around children's programming, the dissemination of information about how-to programs, British comedies, and other programs through newsletters, or special events designed to attract gardeners, history buffs, or even thank members and volunteers are each tools to create a sense of community among interest-based viewers. Ouellette (2002) borrows from Anderson (1996) in her critique of these "imaged communities" as shallowly connected group of elite viewers. Perhaps as a result of this critique combined with Lashley's (1992a) conclusion that advocates and critics of public television alike consider public involvement in public television to be a myth, the concept of community seems ever more prevalent in the missions of PBS member stations across the country. A resurrection of community via public television stations may also be influenced by growing interest in localism from the FCC's Localism Taskforce and media activist groups such as the Media Access Group and Free Press.

In these ideal-typical roles, public television represents the epitome of public interest standards expected of all broadcasters. It serves as a platform for education and culture while stimulating citizenship and facilitating community development. In these imagined and utopian roles, it will always fail. Ideals function as imagined constructs, unattainable in their purest form. Even if it could serve in these idealized roles, the structural and funding challenges that have plagued stations and the system from the beginning continue to work against their achievement.

Obstructions to Idealized Roles of Public Television

Progress toward the idealized conceptions of public television is regularly obstructed. Many argue it is the system's complex funding system; stations are

simultaneously accountable to and dependent on multiple stakeholders, never assured of a stable funding base. Others decry its ties to political structures, never granting public television its independence. These two funding and political realities, and their intertwined nature, perhaps along with other obstacles, keep public television from its imagined utopian roles.

Public television in the United States has never existed within an economically stable environment with assured long-term funding. While its initial funding sources—foundation and government moneys—continue as vital revenue lines, public television turns increasingly to other sources. Perhaps the most criticized funding stream for public television mirrors that of its commercial counterparts: corporate funding. Though corporate funding preexisted the Reagan era, the "enhanced underwriting" experiment initiated through the TCAF marked, to many, the shift away from a nonprofit model toward a public television system more dependent on, more answerable to, and thus more reflective of the values and messages of corporate America (Engelman, 1996). Rowland (1993) outright rejects the notion of corporate funding for public television on the argument that corporate involvement creates a system that too closely mirrors commercial television. Additionally, acquisition of corporate sponsorship distracts from stations' missions and redirects resources vital to programming and production goals. By accepting corporate funding, public television becomes less distinct from its commercial neighbors. Hoynes (2003) furthers the argument, "In recent years, U.S. public television, an ostensibly noncommercial system founded on public service principles, has become increasingly integrated into the commercial broadcasting industry" (p. 117). The resultant corporate dependent model of public television affects the nature of programming and

displaces the nonprofit ideals of stations and the system to refelect a commercialized for profit model.

Corporate underwriting can affect which programs are acquired by PBS and aired by local stations. By placing emphasis on the acquisition of programming that is attractive to national corporate sponsorship, programming offered by PBS can be argued as undifferentiated from commercial broadcasters. Controversial programming, marginalized views, or programming that is otherwise not commercially viable becomes excluded from the PBS schedule. Day (1995) laments the loss of The Voters' Channel, an initiative brought to PBS by Lloyd Morrisett—who previously worked with Joan Ganz Cooney to bring *Sesame Street* to PBS. Hailed by Walter Cronkite as "an absolutely vital service to educate the public in the issues and personalities involved in the presidential election process," the idea was heavily scrutinized by PBS (Day, p. 1). Among other issues, PBS was unsure how the $3 million balance of the $12.7 budget would be raised from corporate sponsors to bring the channel to the air. It was a risk PBS was not willing to take.

The Voters' Channel was never created. Corporate sponsorship also becomes an issue for program selection and production at the station level. The early cooperation between WGBH and Mobil Oil illustrates this point. Though WGBH had the final say over program content and scheduling, it was rumored as understood that "Schmertz [Mobil Oil's vice president for public affairs] makes the first judgment and the final judgment. He selects the program or Mobil won't put up the money, and WGBH knows it" (Engelman, 1996, p. 195).

Local productions have also been affected by corporate underwriting. For example, a KQED production profiling wine maker Robert Mondavi was proposed for

production (Avery & Stavitsky, 2000, p. 114). The initial production money was provided by a nonprofit organization funded largely by Mondavi's winery. Production notes revealing a plan to profile Mondavi favorably were leaked to the press and the station was forced to cancel the production and return the funding (Avery & Stavitsky, 2000). The practice of securing funding without relinquishing editorial control of programming is an issue the public television system continues to negotiate by weighing the benefits and consequences of corporate funding

In contrast, the American commercial broadcasting industry has always worked under a corporate advertising-driven model. As a result, its success has always and continues to be measured through ratings. Public television, serving as an alternative to commercial television, enjoys its position of not being dependent upon ratings as a measure of success. Ratings, one audience research tool, measure the size and demographic composition of the audience tuned into a specific channel at a given time. As Hoynes (1994) explains, the goal of commercial "television programming needs to be understood fundamentally as an effort to attract large audiences to the television screen, where they can be sold products during the commercial breaks" (p. 33). Programming itself is only the means to an end. Stavitsky (1998) questions how a model designed for marketplace applications serves the socio-cultural purposes of public broadcasters. Audience research, including ratings, have long been utilized by public broadcasters; in early years to justify the importance of public broadcasting to funding agencies—primarily foundations and governments, and later to understand the nature of viewers in an effort to better serve their interests (Stavitsky, 1998). The use of ratings to appease funders is not limited to the early years of public television. At the national level, "PBS increasingly looks at the commercial television networks as friendly competitors for

'market share' rather than as representatives of a model of broadcasting to which PBS provides an alternative" (Hoynes, 1999, p. 126). Ratings continue as a vital measure of success utilized by today's public television professionals.

Even those who accept corporate funding as necessary for the survival of public television have noted a change in the underwriting environment. The practice of corporate underwriting in public television has shifted from a philanthropic gesture to an exchange model (Paradise, 2004). Scholar and former advertising executive Debra Merskin notes that the

> corporate underwriter has also changed. Where previously many corporations would contribute to public broadcasters with no-strings attached, to burnish the company's image, today they assign marketing staffers to dole out underwriting money with an eye on the firm's overall advertising campaign. (Avery & Stavitsky, 2000, p. 113)

Many public broadcasting organizations "have already altered themselves to operate in the commercial world," hiring underwriting staff with commercial sales experience (Avery & Stavitsky, 2000, p. 113). Station underwriting staff at PBS member stations today are expected to know which programs are the most popular in the schedule and the demographics and psychographics of the audience it attracts. Corporate underwriters attempt to make a good match between the public television program's audience and the corporation's ideal consumers. As the popularity of corporate underwriting grew through the 1980s and 90s, "many firms and trade associations underwrote program categories in which they had a vested interest and could target an audience of potential customers" (Engelman, 1996, p. 195). Public television's audience is seen as desirable to many

corporations because of its "high quality" demographics (Hoynes, 1994; Engelman; Ouellette, 2002).

The attractive demographics garnered by public television programming are desirable not only to corporate underwriters, but to the stations as well.

> Critics have noted fundamental change in the nature of public broadcasting, away from its educational, service-driven origins toward an audience- and funder-driven orientation, in which public broadcasters target demographically upscale segments of the potential audience. (Stavitsky, 1998, p. 520)

Viewers who are able to become members of their local stations are an attractive audience for stations that are simultaneously discouraged from government and corporate dependence while encouraged to justify their existence through audience figures. PBS member stations rely on viewer donations as a major stream of revenue for their annual budgets. Members have been constructed as an ideal, independent revenue stream: one that is not controlled by the state or corporate interests. Their loyalty further communicates a positive message to the station and the system often discouraged by low ratings (Rowland, 1993).

Ouellette (2002) criticizes the membership culture perpetuated by public television's reliance on voluntary contributors. Her argument is that audiences are at the same time imaged and constructed, and from this constructed audience emerged a culturally elite constructed membership.

> People without means…are denied access to this grassroots component of public broadcasting, however unintentionally. Membership—and

> especially leadership—was contingent on unacknowledged social, cultural, and economic advantages. Just as pluralist discourse denies class formations and structural racism, the [public television membership] culture denied its own racial and class privilege. (p. 165-166)

Membership does not equate to viewership in the public television audience. Membership has its privileges: "As scholars have long noted, media respond to the imperatives of their funders" (Stavitsky, 1998, n.p.). Ouellette suggests that by becoming a member, viewers are encouraged to believe that they are influencing the future of public television. Rowland (1993) concurs and questions the "special set of rights for…members to determine program service content" (p. 182). Frequent public television viewers will be familiar with the suggestion by on-air personalities during membership drives that a donation made during a particular program is the equivalent of a vote for that (genre of) programming. Are the voices of members heard more clearly than those of viewers? By adopting a membership model, many question the ability of public television to respond to the needs of viewers who through their taxes support public television, but are not recognized as members with all the (imagined) privileges such status entails.

Corporate money is denounced as tainted. Membership donations tarnish the "public" orientation of public television. Government funding, and the political strings it tugs, do not escape criticism. Lashley (1992a) notes that executive and legislative turnover have powerful effects on public television's structure, programming, and funding. Public television is perhaps even more vulnerable than commercial television to economic and political forces. Though established as an independent, nongovernmental

body, CPB is funded through federal dollars with a board largely appointed by the acting administration. As such, CPB functions as a quasi-governmental body through which funds are distributed to PBS and local stations. Funding and politics, though avowedly separate, are intimately tied. These ties emerge and become apparent in programming of a sensitive political nature (Engelman, 1996).

Each decade has seen the envelope of political tolerance pushed by controversial and experimental programming. *The Banks and the Poor*, a 1970 documentary about the practice of discrimination by banks against the poor and minorities, received harsh criticism from the Nixon administration (Engelman, 1996; Ouellette, 2002). The documentary critiqued practices of the savings and loan and banking industries designed to grow the gap between the elite and the poor though predatory practices of those living in poverty. The names of members of Congress who had ties to the industries were run at the end of the program creating a hostile environment between public television and those who determine its funding (Ouellette, 2002; Witherspoon & Kovitz, 2000). This controversial program is regarded to have severely hurt the relationships between CPB, PBS and the federal government at a critical point in the early development of the system (Witherspoon & Kovtiz, 2000).

Another example, the scheduled 1980 broadcast of *Death of a Princess*, was met with pressure from the Saudi government at a time that the Carter administration was working to secure ties with the country. The program dramatized the true story of the execution of a Saudi Princess because of her love affair with a commoner. The Saudi government pressured the U.S government to prevent the broadcast of the program. Despite intense pressure from the U.S. and Saudi governments, and Mobil Oil, PBS refused to cancel the program further straining ties between the federal government and

the system (Engelman, 1996). In 1995, House Speaker Newt Gingrich led an attack to defund and privatize public broadcasting. Though no single program set off the campaign, the nature of programming decision-making was heavily scrutinized.

> Many queries zeroed in on public affairs programming: the mechanisms that ensure balance for PBS's National Program Service, the criteria used by the ITVS [Independent Television Service] in evaluating proposals, and the reasons for the CPB's selection of *P.O.V.* as the principal vehicle for documentaries with a point of view. The CPB was asked to provide its correspondence with *Frontline* and *The American Experience* in regard to issues of balance and objectivity and to respond to complaints by the National Rifle Association and other organizations about a variety of specific programs. (Engelman, 1996, p. 297)

Public television's lack of insulation from political forces continued to jeopardize not only its funding, but its purpose (Day, 1995; Hoynes, 1994; Lashley, 1992a). Together, unstable funding and political influence act as an eroding force on the integrity and sustainability of an idealized public television in the United States.

Public television continues to represent utopian ideals created by scholars, viewers, legislators, and the system itself. Public television as an educational tool to prepare children for school and overcome inequalities in existing educational structures, public television as a cultural tool to enlighten and entertain through cultural fare, public television as mediator of electronic space to enhance an active and participatory public sphere, and public television as a creator of community represent four prominent idealized nonprofit roles for stations and the system. As an entity that attempts to span

across these imagined conceptions, public television is exemplary. In its quest to fully achieve a single one, it fails. Its failures are argued as the result of a poor funding structure with no long-term plan for stability complimented by a lack of insulation from the changing political agendas of the administration of the day. Or, as Hoynes (1994) recognized, "The comparison between the ideal-type and the concrete form of pubic television highlights a recurring theme: the intrusion of the market on public television" (p. 157).

To many, public television has failed the public (Barsamian, 2001; Ledbetter, 1997; Ouellette, 2002). Some blame its organizational structure (Aufderheide, 2000; Lashley, 1992a; Loomis, 2001; Noam & Waltermann, 1998; Avery, & Stavitsky, 2000), lack of shared vision (Day, 1995; Balas, 2003; Hoynes, 2003; Kelley-Romano, 2005), flawed funding mechanisms (Aufderheide, 2000; Avery, & Stavitsky, 2000; Bullert, 1997; Loomins, 2001; Ledbetter, 1997; Noam & Waltermann, 1998; Witherspoon, Kovitz, 2000) and its lack of insulation from political influence (Engelman, 1996; Lashley, 1992a; Ledbetter, 1997; Sussman, 2003). As a result, most critics of public television have noted its increasing resemblance to privatized commercial media in terms of trends toward centralized program decision-making away from a distributed power model. Further deviation away from a nonprofit focus to a market-driven, for profit orientation has led many to question the direction of public television stations and the system. In their analyses and critiques of public television's struggles for independence from the public sector (government) and the private sector (market), scholars may be overlooking what is possibly a more useful model for understanding public television in the U.S.: the independent sector (nonprofit).

CHAPTER THREE

REVIEW OF THE THEORETICAL LITERATURE

Literature from the fields of mass media, organizational and institutional theory, and the nonprofit sector are drawn together to create a theoretical foundation from which to begin an exploration of the process by which public television stations select and schedule their on-air programming. Many suggest the field of mass media research can be traced to Lasswell (1927) and perhaps even further back to its roots in the beginnings of the studies of biology, psychology, and sociology (Rogers, 1997). Moving from its early positivist media effects approach toward increasingly complex theories of mass media as cultural artifact, the study of mass communication increasingly examines power structures of the industry.

This present state of public television in the United States is shaped largely by the commercial beginnings of the industry. What is argued by many to be a failed system of public broadcasting can be traced back to decisions made early about its organizational structure, lack of a well-articulated mission, complex funding mechanisms, and nonexistent political insulation. Many scholars see public television in the United States as moving increasingly toward the commercial, for profit model to which public television was originally conceived as an alternative. Programming choices and strategies are one among many areas targeted for criticism by scholars of the system. However, few scholars move beyond a macro view of the system at large to examine the practices of local PBS member stations and why the decisions made by these stations matter.

The television industry in the United States is seen by some as in a state of crisis with more power concentrated in fewer owners. Others suggest this view is an

overreaction and the consequences of concentrated ownership actually serve to diversify the mediascape. Issues of power in media are of concern because of the assumed relationship between media and culture, namely that media organizations serve as centers of cultural production. Who owns and controls the media determines who controls culture. Organizational and institutional literature provides a framework to understand power flows; how organizations are structured and evolve as a result of their composition, their interactions with other organizations and the ongoing process of being affected by and thus affecting their social, political and economic environments. This dissertation is focused on the organizational level—that is the level of the individual PBS member station. These stations are situated within a larger population—that of the public broadcasting system including PBS, CPB and APTS. The population of the public television system is itself situated within the larger broadcast community, which includes commercial broadcasters. Within the broadcasting community, power relationships at different organizational levels can be understood through DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) mechanism of institutional isomorphism, network exchange theory—derived from social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1950), and Pfeffer and Salancik's (2003) resource dependency. These theories collectively work to explain the nature of organizational structures as a product of their environments, how interconnected organizations operate with most efficiency, and how the control over scarce resources determines power relations and (re)structures populations and communities. Public television's concerns over localism, especially localism of programming decision-making, are echoed through these theories of power. Furthermore, there is only a suggestion of theory in programming literature, all of which assume an economic market-based approach to attract large audience numbers and high audience quality, which may not be the primary

approach of public television programmers considering the nonprofit status of PBS and its member stations. Thus the nonprofit field contributes theories which may serve as alternatives to an economic market-driven, for profit approach to programming. These economic, political and social theories of the nonprofit sector give shape to and create theoretical grounds for public television programmers whose decision-making may not be reflected in traditional programming practices.

Consolidation Concerns in the U.S. Mass Media Industry

Deregulation of the American media created an environment where fewer corporations control increasingly larger media groups, and has produced considerable concern from leading scholars of mass media. The effects of a corporate, profit-driven media system concentrated in the hands of few invite concern over the role of media in upholding the public interest (Cooper, 2004; Howley, 2005; Aufderheide, 1999), promoting democracy (Bagdikian, 2004; Cooper, 2004; McChesney, 1999) and reflecting diversity (Horwitz, 2005; Howley, 2005; Einstein, 2004; McChesney, 2004). These concerns also raise the question of the nature of information. Should information production and distribution function according to marketplace dynamics? Does who owns the media affect the message? Does the structure of the system (concentrated and profit-oriented) affect the message? Whether the message is the actual content of the programming, or the entire tone of the industry, which in turn may affect the content of the programming, many scholars are deeply troubled by the consequences of an oligopolistic U.S. broadcasting community. Others question the importance and impact of the structure of the broadcast community considering an increasingly large mutlichannel multimedia environment. Compaine (1985, 1995) argues that the emphasis on big business is misplaced and their role in media is misunderstood. Rather than decry

consolidation of ownership, the public should celebrate the social benefits of consolidation including more localized programming and additional services that would not be possible without the deep pockets of large businesses. Because of their size and resources, big media are able to subsidize programming that is in the public interest, promotes democracy and reflects diversity, and likely would not survive in the marketplace without subsidy. Further Compaine argues that increasing numbers of new and smaller companies that enter the marketplace do not often make headlines and go unnoticed by the public. Thus while some scholars argue that media consolidation is destroying the principles of communication policies, Compaine finds these arguments unfounded by empirical evidence.

Public television, designed as an alternative to commercial broadcasters, has much to gain and much to lose in this new environment. If the public television stations at the organizational level are expected to compete with commercial television networks rather than serve as their alternative, public television today can be viewed as a dismal failure. If the purpose of public television stations is to diversify programming choices and the perspectives presented in that programming, they likely would garner more favorable reviews. Because of the distributed power structure of the population-one that resists centralization into a network model—PBS member stations counter the trend toward consolidated ownership of media. Despite interconnection, PBS member stations' mantra of localism suggest they remain largely independent in their programming decision making.

Organizations and Power

The importance of localism in broadcast media has been evident from its early years. The Radio Act of 1927 and the subsequent Communications Act of 1934 echoed

the importance of localism in broadcast policymaking. Localism policy in media regulation was designed to distribute power among local communities where it would promote democracy (Napoli, 2001). However, there is an ongoing power negotiation in public television between a centralized, national system and a distributed, localized system. Organizational theories of power work to explain the dynamics of the structure of public television in the United States.

Structures of organizations are the products of and (re)produce power relations. The theory of social exchange is used to understand differences in power between actors. Differences in power are a result of exchange processes between and among actors (Blau, 1964). Social exchange theory posits that actors wield power to the extent that they control the resources in a network (Emerson, 1962; Monge & Contractor, 2003). At the interorganizational level, empirical research found competition among interorganizational service delivery groups was reduced with a centralized organizational structure with power over a given resource residing in a single organization (Alter, 1990). PBS member stations could be understood collectively as an interorganizational service delivery group: a collection of organizations with similar goals, inputs, throughputs, and shared outcomes. Viewed from this perspective, when a single group (PBS) delivers a service (programming) to the groups (stations), stations can be assured "a steady flow of resources…and enhance their chances of survival" (Alter, 1990, p. 479). Alter explains that this shift in resource allocation comes at the expense of autonomy.

Within the population of public television stations, those that maximize control over scarce resources move from operating at the local level to wielding power at national levels as well. PBS member stations that manage to secure resources to produce programming distributed throughout the system are considered first tier stations

(Friedland, 1995). These national producing stations are generally regarded as WGBH in Boston, WNET in New York, and WETA in Washington, DC (KCET in Los Angeles may also be included) (Friedland, 1995). The ability of these stations to capitalize on local and national resources, including local philanthropy and national grants, to grow their budgets and thus their production capacity locates them as perceived centralized agents in the social exchange network of PBS member stations.

Control over resources, and thus the creation of power, does not only occur among stations themselves. Stations must also negotiate power relationships with PBS. Local stations individually may seem resource deprived compared to the vast budgets, personnel, and programming resources of national PBS. However, local stations have two powerful bargaining points to reduce their resource dependence on PBS.

Traditionally, local PBS member stations produce (or work with outside producers to present to the system) much of the programming acquired by PBS for national distribution, thus PBS is to some degree dependent on stations for the vital resource of programming. Another tool available to stations to balance the power relationship with PBS is the local air time. Stations can refuse to air PBS programs, especially those designated for common carriage, which weakens the centralized power of PBS. However, this is often not in the station's best interest because PBS is often the station's primary supplier of programming and is often an important resource for promotion of the schedule as well.

Resource dependence, first introduced by Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) suggests that power is wielded between organizations to the extent that alternative sources for resources are available and accessible. Stations depend on PBS as a primary source of programming, but also have the option of producing their own programming or looking

to outside distributors for relevant programming. PBS is dependent on local stations for the production of the programming and for airing and popularizing national programming. While some stations are powerhouse producers for the system, PBS also wields power to the extent that it looks beyond stations to independent or international producers as alternative sources of programming. Additionally, the most valuable resource stations provided to PBS, viewers for programming, are also enjoying alternatives, including cable and satellite channels, Internet outlets, and other viewing options. Ongoing adaptations to an evolving and uncertain economic, political, and media environment continues to shift the resource dependence between stations and PBS.

Environments of uncertainty encourage the mechanism of mimetic process (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). DiMaggio and Powell sought to explain how so many organizations have similar structures and practices. Three "mechanisms of institutional isomorphic change" were identified: mimetic processes, coercive isomorphism, and normative pressures. Mimetic behavior is sparked by uncertainty; "when organizational technologies are poorly understood [uncertain and overlapping structural roles], when goals are ambiguous [lack of a shared vision], or when the environment creates symbolic uncertainty [lack of political insulation], organizations may model themselves on other organizations" (p.151). Public television's historical and modern situations reflect the components of mimetic behavior through a complex, little understood organizational structure, lack of uniting vision, and dependence on the administration of the day for scarce resources.

Coercive isomorphism reflects resource dependency through formal and informal pressures placed on organizations by the resource-rich organizations they are dependent upon. Birthed within a commercial, market-oriented media system, public television has,

from the beginning struggled against the "norms" of its environment. The federal government has been unwilling, and at times unable, to implement long-term funding for the system independent of political oversight, thus tying economic stability to the administration of the day. Public television's lack of steady and secure resources puts it at the mercy of institutions and organizations that have the resources to ensure its survival. Engelman's (1996) classification of public broadcasting into its foundation, government, and corporate years is an excellent illustration of the system's reliance on these different resource groups. The programming created (and not created) in these time periods is argued to be a direct reflection of the organizations that wielded resource power over public television (Engelman, 1996; Lashley 1992a).

Finally, normative pressures revolve around the professionalization of the field. Professionals experience mimetic and coercive pressures as well, often modeling their occupations and skills after successful colleagues in the same or other organizations and recognizing the expectations of the larger environment and conforming to meet those expectations. It could be argued that the movement toward a market-oriented, quasi-commercial system that many scholars critique PBS and its stations for embracing is a movement toward a professional norm established by for profit, commercial broadcasters. The first, and maybe even second, generation of public broadcasters have cycled through the system. Their positions within the system and at local stations since the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 have been assumed by newer generations. These new generations have different media experiences and different world views. They may be moving public television into new directions, or as DiMaggio and Powell would argue, the same direction as everyone else in the broadcast or even media community—the model to which public broadcasting was envisioned as an alternative to.

The great irony to their work is the discovery that the more organizations try to differentiate themselves and get a step ahead of each other, the more they simultaneously become the same.

Recognizing the structures of organizations allows for insight into their power relations. These power relations are often dependent on resources and how they are exchanged and allocated with networks and hierarchies. Despite attempts to differentiate, organizations, often in their fear of uncertainty, make decisions which result in unexpected similarity. The presence of a pending digital conversion, uncertain political horizons, funding roller coasters, and lack of vision for the system could easily invoke fear and uncertainty into not only local member stations, but into the system at large. Recognizing these uncertainties in light of DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) theory of institutional isomorphism might work to explain commonalties among member stations program scheduling and what critics have identified as a mimicking process of the public television system to commercial media.

Production of Culture

The relationship between media and culture positions all broadcasting groups, whether public or commercial, among the culture industries. The culture industries are those industries whose principal products are largely symbolic in value relying on interpretations of images, symbols, signs, and sounds (Banks, Lovatt, O'Connor, & Raffo, 2000). Empirical studies of visual art (DiMaggio, 1982; White & White, 1965), book publishing (Powell, 1985), country music (Peterson, 1997), radio broadcasting (Lee, 2004), news making (Tuchman, 1978), and science (Crane, 1972) among many others, collectively give rise to and shaped the production of culture perspective (Peterson & Anand, 2004). This perspective acknowledges the ways that the processes of production

in these industries begins to shape symbolic elements of the culture (DiMaggio, 2000).

One such study by Dornfeld (1998) explored the production process of the PBS documentary series *Childhood*. Through ethnographic field work and archival research, Dornfeld worked to address the gap in scholarly attention to public television programming "despite its prominence in American public culture" (p. 5).

> Through a variety of formats and program genres, public television in the United States presents viewers with depictions of and assertions about the daily lives, institutions, cultural values, and histories of people like themselves or others, both nearby and in far-off places. Through these media texts, viewers grapple with and reproduce understandings of cultural identity and cultural difference (Dornfeld, 1998, p. 5)

Hybridizing anthropology and media studies and applying the perspective to American culture, Dornfeld finds media flows in the United States, even within public television, "are much more controlled by corporate interests than in other countries" (p. 186). Though acknowledging the intertwined nature of audience and producer, a call to give agents of production a more central place in media theory and research, which has drifted toward an audience-centric model, is made.

Banks, et al (2000) explore the relationship between risk and trust in the cultural industries. Beck (1992) argues that former concerns of the industrial society have been replaced in the late modern era (Giddens, 1990)—that of the information age—by a "quest for safety" (p. 455). The large bureaucracies and systems that governed life previously have been destabilized and replaced in the post-industrial. However, cultural producers are well equipped to deal with the risks of this new society due to the

ephemeral nature of their products. In a high-risk society, the importance of trust becomes paramount. Giddens (1994) suggests that new social structures, and thus new relationships, will replace those of a traditional society. These new relationships built upon trust can be "less dependent on physical locality or place than previous relations and that as a consequence of social 'disembedding', new 'imagined communities' (Anderson, 1996) can be developed and sustained across indefinite stretches of space-time (Albrow, 1997)" (Banks, et al, 2004). Because of the importance of symbolic resonance in cultural products, culture industries are dependent upon innovation of ideas and trust; trust built within the networks of cultural producers and between the producers and consumers. The need for trust increases in a doubt-filled, complex and risky society.

Public television stations are cultural producers that work to build an "aura of trust" including " a feeling of quality, reliability, honesty, competence, and good intentions" (Biltereyst, 2004, p. 341). Biltereyst plays down the importance of previous quantitative programming studies of global public service broadcasters, indicating that they ignore the new focus of these broadcasters. "They fail to theorize PSB [public service broadcasters] as an institution seeking to overcome its crisis in legitimacy in a wider societal context with changing symbolic powers" by "constructing an image of reliable trustful social institution" (p. 347). Lack of trust in public television has had severe consequences for stations and the system through its history, resulting in financial crises and an in-severable link to authoritarian political structures. Trust remains a central tenet to the public service ideals of public television.

As a member of the culture industry, public television's main asset is its cultural product, namely, its programming. That programming must create social meaning through symbols, images, sounds, and signs. By having sociocultural ideals rather than

profit-oriented goals, public television stations further work to construct and build trust with viewers and other agents within the broadcast community. The idealized socio-cultural roles of public television in the United States, including facilitator of the public sphere to enhance democracy, are explored through theories of the nonprofit sector.

Theories of the Nonprofit Sector

Much of the criticism and idealization of public television in the U.S. by media scholars is reflected in theories that suggest roles for organizations that are part of the nonprofit sector. Thus, trying to understand the programming actions of noncommercial educational broadcasters from a traditionally market-oriented media perspective is often not useful. Theories from the nonprofit sector provide a more fruitful foundation for many questions. An exploration of these theories gives insight into not only the strategies of public television programmers but also their practices.

Several social, economic, and political theories of nonprofits work toward explaining the existence of the sector as well as its role in society. Though these theories are not mutually exclusive, and thus have considerable overlap, they operate together to provide an explanation for and give definition to what is often considered a hodge-podge of misfit organizations that collectively form the nonprofit sector in the U.S. Only theories that echo the criticism and idealizations of PBS and its member stations discussed in chapter 2 while also suggesting roles for nonprofit organizations in society are presented.

Smith and Grønbjerg (2006) offer a useful framework by which to organize and understand the leading theories of the nonprofit sector. Their three models include: demand and supply perspectives, civil society and social movements, and regime and

neo-institutional perspectives. Theories within these models that offer roles for nonprofits and overlap existing literature on public television in the U.S. are explored.

Demand and Supply Perspectives

The models of market niche and transaction organize demand and supply perspectives of the nonprofit sector. The market niche model relies heavily on three primarily economic theories: government failure, market failure, and contract failure. As Lohmann (1989) noted, these economic theories all assume that the third sector arises only as a result of failure in the first sector (market), a failure in the second sector (government), or both. Nonprofit organizations succeed in these niches of failure.

Government failure theory, as proposed by Weisbrod (1977) relies on the assumption that governments, in a democratic environment, are established to serve the needs of the "median voter," (or on occasion, the "mean voter") and thus "the political process leaves significant numbers of voters dissatisfied with government output and taxation levels" (Weisbrod, 1977, p. 53). Expanding on this constraint of the ability of the state to serve all needs of all citizens, Douglas (1983) identifies five constraints of government to satisfy the needs of citizens.

Douglas's (1983) first constraint is the "categorical" constraint. This constraint of government assumes the purpose of government is to supply to citizens goods and services that are universally and uniformly demanded and consumed. Because assumptions of universality and uniformity are rarely (if ever) realized outside of theory, many groups' and individuals' needs go un(der)satisfied. These un(der)met needs create niches for nonprofit organizations to fill, thus explaining the existence of nonprofits as well as establishing a societal role. An extension of Douglas's categorical constraint implies that because governments are necessarily limited in the goods and services they

can provide, nonprofits often serve the role of experimenters in society by introducing ideas that may later be subsumed by the state once they become the pleasure of a critical majority of citizens. Public television serves in the role of innovator, especially in its programming, including its documentary and children's programming.

The experimenter role extension of the categorical constraint leads into Douglas's (1983) second constraint configuration: the majoritarian constraint. Closely related to the categorical constraint, the majoritarian constraint suggests that because the government must serve the majority of citizens, minority needs may go completely unmet by the state. Whereas categorical constraint may force governments to undersupply (or oversupply) certain goods and services that are assumed to be desired by all, the majoritarian constraint suggests that some goods and services may not be supplied at all to those whose needs fall outside of those expressed by the majority, implying that there is not universal agreement on the good or service to be supplied by the government. Douglas indicates that,

> In a free society there should be room for many views as to what the country needs. Voluntary organization enables these views to be expressed and the goods provided without commiting [sic] others to that view or compelling them to contribute to their cost. (p. 129-130)

Thus, another niche is created for nonprofits: to serve the unmet needs of minority (broadly defined) citizens in a pluralistic society. Public television serves groups or audiences un(der)served by commercial television because of the small size or undesirable demographics of the group.

Douglas (1983) addresses the potential incongruence between political figures' time-horizons and the time horizons of important issues. With the time horizon constraint Douglas argues that the tenure of government officials may influence their perspective on issues of varying time-frames. "[T]he terms of the competitive struggle for the people's vote often tends, in practice, to make politicians themselves into short-term maximizers" (p. 134). Though an unpopular decision may be best for the citizenry in the long-run, a governmental official who may not be held accountable for the long-term results may choose to win the short-term favor of her of constituents, especially during an election season. Because, in practice, the time-horizon constraint rarely works in the reverse direction, where governmental officials would consistently choose to make unpopular decisions for the long-term betterment of society, nonprofits often champion social issues with long-term time horizons.

In approaching such long-term issues, nonprofits are especially critical in generating a plurality of approaches (in case a single, or majoritarian, approach is unsuccessful) and redundancy (to fill in the potential gaps left by governmental institutions). Public television's pronounced commitment to in-depth issue reporting through news and public affairs programming, including *Newshour with Jim Lehrer* and *Frontline*, among others at the national level and local news and public affairs productions has always been a prominent objective of the system.

"Whether decisions are made on a long or a short time horizon, they require knowledge" (Douglas, 1983, p. 137). Douglas continues that governments have a way of creating their own (internal) knowledge systems that are often not reflective of the nation. Nonprofits that serve the needs of non-majority citizens can facilitate the collection and

organization of this knowledge. Young (1998) deconstructs Douglas's (1983) knowledge constraint into two categories: knowledge constraint and size constraint.

The size constraint assumes that the level of complicated bureaucracy which is employed when citizens become involved with government can be overwhelming and intimidating. Thus often leading to the knowledge constraint of governments; governments are unaware of citizen needs because direct interaction with governmental bodies is undesirable. Nonprofits (along with families and neighborhoods) serve as "mediating structures" to channel voices of citizens and serve as a communication medium between citizens and governments (Berger, Neuhaus, & Novak, 1996; Young, 1998). Public television stations assume the role of repositories of local knowledge by documenting community issues and needs through encouraged but not required ascertainment reports. These reports document issues of interest to the community and how stations are addressing these issues. Additionally, by serving as a local and national forum for non-majoritarian idea exchange (through such programs as *In the Life*—addressing gay and lesbian issues, *Tony Brown's Journal*—discussing African-American issues, and *To the Contrary*—focusing on women's perspectives on issues) citizens are able to voice their perspectives on current and important issues overlooked by the majority.

Government failure theory assumes that governments often (and necessarily) fail in these interrelated fields. The very structures of democratic government require that they fail. If the government did take such action, it would fail in its purpose to serve at the pleasure of the majority while not infringing on the rights of the minority. Because governments "fail" in the categories discussed, the existence of and roles of nonprofits are established. Though markets may be able to address some of these failures, markets

themselves fail in some overlapping categories with governmental failure. Thus, nonprofits have a well-defined role in society.

Market failure and contract failure are often treated as nested or overlapping theories, with contract failure as one type of market failure (Hansmann, 1996; Ott, 2001; Rose-Ackerman, 1986). However, these theories deserve distinct attention. Market failure occurs when privately-owned, profit-driven institutions fail to supply citizens with the goods and services they demand. This failure is usually the results of low or "thin" demand that makes creation or delivery of the good or service an unprofitable venture for market groups. Theories used to explain market failure include public goods theory and transaction cost economics.

Public goods theory is mentioned above as one type transaction cost that occurs among consumers. Public goods are indivisible and nonexclusionary; additional consumers of the good do not reduce the benefit of other consumers and it is nearly impossible to preclude persons from consuming the good (Samuelson, 1954). An example of a public good is public television. Generally, including an additional person in the viewing audience does not affect the viewing quality of other viewers. Additionally, it is nearly impossible to exclude a person from viewing public television if they own a television.

Because it is often impossible (and sometimes absurd) to exclude persons from consuming public goods, these goods and services are often not profitable to create and maintain. The problems of "free riders"--those who do not contribute toward the public good . Additionally, problems of overuse or abuse further work to exclude public goods from a market structure (Rose-Ackerman, 1986). Thus nonprofit organizations often take on the role of creating and maintaining public goods. Public television stations have

taken on the role of maintaining and creating educational, instructional, and cultural programming. Though it is not necessarily a profitable enterprise because it is used by so few or is used by those who cannot afford to pay for it, this public good is often created and maintained by the nonprofit organizations collectively known as public television stations.

Transaction costs are the costs associated with market exchanges but that are not necessarily reflected in the cost of goods or services, though they may be. In a theoretically perfectly functioning market, these costs do not exist (Rose-Ackerman, 1986). In practice, these costs do exist, and can occur at any point in the market transaction process: in production, between producer and consumer, and among consumers (Rose-Ackerman, 1986). Examples of transaction costs include monitoring of contracts (in production), obtaining knowledge about costs and quality of products (between producer and consumer), and when too little of a communal good is purchased (among consumers). When transaction costs exceed an amount tolerable by the market, the market for that good or service fails, creating opportunities for (government or) nonprofit intervention.

Contract failure occurs when consumers do not have the knowledge of information they need in order to make informed decisions about the costs or quality of the good or service consumed (Steinberg, 2006). Also subsumed as a version of transaction costs, information asymmetry often occurs when the consumer of the good or service is unable to make an accurate assessment of the quality or cost of the product. Information asymmetries often occur when goods or services are complex or otherwise difficult to measure their quality (news coverage), when contracts are difficult to enforce, when the consumer is unable to judge the quality of the product (children's

programming), when the consumer is not the purchaser of the product (commercial television) (Rose-Ackerman, 1986; Steinberg, 2006).

Because of the nonprofit nature of third sector organizations, an element of trust is established when people believe that the quality of the product will not be sacrificed, nor will its price be inflated for financial gain, by the organization. Nonprofit organizations operate in the realm of trust for delivery of goods and services whose quality and cost-benefit are difficult to judge by establishing trust with consumers. Public television works to build this trust and is often cited as the most trusted television "network" for news and public affairs programming.

The transaction model works to overcome many of the limitations to the market niche model by focusing on relationships between nonprofit and governments. Because broadcasting in the United States was never collectively envisioned as a service to be created and distributed by government, the transaction model may seem unnecessary for inclusion. Though public television and government may seem separate parties, they are intricately intertwined. Smith and Grønbjerg (2006) explain the nature of these relationships of exchange.

Salamon (1987) put forth that the creation and delivery of public goods were often initiated by nonprofit organizations, not by governments, and that nonprofits themselves fail at their delivery of goods and services (Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006). Broadcasting, specifically educational and cultural programming, is a public good provided by public television stations in the U.S. These stations have differing degrees and relationships with governments, specifically through funding (directly and through grants) and in the system's structure (CPB as a quasi-governmental body and the

licensure of many stations is to state authorities, local municipal authorities, or colleges and universities which may be part of state governments).

The primary failures of nonprofit organizations in the transaction model include insufficiency, amateurism, particularism, and paternalism. Insufficiency results when the price of making a good or service available exceeds the ability or willingness of donors or members to contribute. Though many PBS member stations often play down their dependence on government funding, it is substantial. In 2005, 25.1 % of public television's overall funding came from government: federal grants and contracts, state governments, and local governments (Corporation for Public Broadcasting, 2006). If monies received by public television from the Corporation of Public Broadcasting are included, the total rises to 43.4%.

Amateurism is an issued faced by nonprofits that rely heavily on volunteers or staff without professional training. PBS member stations may experience this amateurism to different degrees. Some stations may not consider amateurism a failure. Because stations may have connections with educational institutions, the station may have the role of training ground for future professionals and showcase students' or community members' works on air. Government resources can work to overcome the limitations of amateurism.

Market niche theory posits that nonprofits fill the gaps left by governments and markets, but one of the failures in the transaction model is that nonprofits may focus on one niche to the exclusion of broader social interests: particularism. Salamon (1987) suggests nonprofit can keep their particularistic missions and goals while allowing access to public goods to be equitable and fair through accessing government resources.

Another failure of nonprofits surfaces from the particularistic visions and values of individuals involved in the organization. Paternalism can emerge from the organization's founders, its board, its leadership, its members, and its donors among others. Rather than allowing the community at large to define the problems for a nonprofit organization to address, the mechanisms in place at many nonprofit organizations favors the visions and values of a community's elite and an organization's donors (Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006). This is reflected in the literature on public television and criticism over elitism and programming for membership rather than viewership. Government funding may serve to neutralize this influence because of the positions of governments as under democratic control.

Government resources can help nonprofits overcome each of these limitations, but the benefits may not always outweigh the costs. Benefits can be financial resources, management experience, and influence in policy decision making, among others (Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006). The primary cost to nonprofits is the management and oversight capacity necessary to manage government grants and contracts. Also costs are limited management discretion, sacrifice of other, non-government-supported services, and dependency on government funding at the expense of loss of long-term alternate resource development (Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006).

Supply and demand perspectives take a primarily economic view of the nonprofit sector. The three failure theories suggest nonprofits fill the gaps left when governments, markets, or contracts fail. In opposition, Salamon (1987) suggests that nonprofits often initiate rather than react to deliver goods and services, and where these organizations fail, governments can help remedy. Market niche and transaction models offer one perspective on the roles of nonprofits. Social and political theories posit other roles.

Civil Society and Social Movements Perspectives

Smith and Grønbjerg (2006) offer that groups exist in a society primarily to lower the transaction costs of exchange. They organize the primarily social theories guiding the nonprofit sector into two perspectives. The civil society/social capital perspective draws on Tocquevillian perspectives, communitarianism, and social capital. The social movements perspective give particular attention to political activity and associations.

Considered the derivation of literature on voluntary associations in America, Alexis de Tocqueville's 1835 and 1840 publications of *Democracy in America*, serves current scholarship's revitalized movement on social capital by drawing together the nonprofit sector with civic engagement. Tocqueville (1998) wrote of his observations of American life:

> Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions constantly form associations. They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies…but associations of a thousand other kinds, religious, moral, serious, futile, general or restricted, enormous and diminutive. The Americans make associations to give entertainments, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries to the antipodes…. (p. 215)

Tocqueville's writing of American associations and democracy has its place among political theories of the nonprofit sector, but it was the vast array of nonpolitical associations that most intrigued him. Tocqueville further noted that the people of this experiment in democracy "become powerless if they do not learn voluntarily to help one another" (p. 216). Though the terms "social networks" and "social capital" were not in

popular circulation in the 1830s, Tocqueville's note of the necessity of social networks to produce social capital is echoed in today's scholarship.

One definition, among many, of social capital was popularized by Robert Putnam (1995). Putnam conceptualizes social capital as referring "to features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit" (p. 67). The element of trust involved in social capital reduces transaction costs in relationships and makes formalized contracts unnecessary (Ott, 2001). The role of nonprofits to create social capital is heavily embedded in their ability to facilitate and foster social networks.

Social capital creates benefits across two time horizons: (1) the immediate benefits incurred when people voluntarily gather for a purpose and (2) the delayed benefits that accrue as a result of having worked with others, such as increased trust, increased trustworthiness, and social resources for future projects. Among the social resources accrued is a cohesive support network. Within these networks, trust, trustworthiness, and assumptions of reciprocity reside. Social capital is created by social networks often formed in the space provided by nonprofit organizations (broadly defined).

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, social capital became a buzzword throughout the public television system. Social capital was the new calling for public television, its latest social purpose (Aufderheide, 1991; Bedford, 2001; LeRoy & LeRoy, 2001). Recent research by Avery (2005) suggests that public television viewers have significantly higher levels of social capital than nonviewers. Public television is often idealized as an institution to facilitate social capital by creating connections among viewers through programming and outreach.

Interconnected (or networked) individuals, associations, and institutions are commonly referred to as community. Community is assigned many different meanings in different disciplines, but here is understood as a social group with shared interests. Nisbet (1967) does not use the language of social networks, though his concern of alienation of the individual from his larger community suggests a lack of operational social networks and could be understood as a communitarian approach. In an effort to reconnect the modern individual who has shed "allegiance to caste, clan, tribe or community" (Nisbet, 1967, p. 16) suggested the importance of networks to connect individuals to each other, and to associations and institutions.

The communitarian perspective focuses on the interconnected nature of citizens in a community, with organizations and institutions supporting these relationships. Nonprofit organizations can play particularly important political roles participation in and of these organizations challenges governments or changes their operation (Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006).

Social movements are described by Smith and Grønbjerg (2006) as vehicles of political change. The social movement perspective combines social and political theories to understand the role of nonprofit organizations in social movements and government change.

Berger et al. (1996) describe nonprofit organizations as the mediating structures that exist between the individual and the "megastructures" of modern life. One megastructure is the state (or government). The growing bureaucracies of government can be intimidating to penetrate, often leading to the knowledge constraint aspect of government failure theory. The mediating structures that are most salient in most

American's lives include family, neighborhood, nonprofits, and church (which is usually also a nonprofit institution) (Berger et al., 1996).

Mediating structures, especially nonprofits, create a space for citizens to interact with these megastructures in a manageable and less daunting environment, reflecting Fine and Harrington's (2004) conceptualization of groups as spaces for work to be accomplished. Moving beyond interacting with megastructures, nonprofits can create a space for social revolution as well. The women's movement and the civil rights movement both worked through nonprofit organizations (Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006). "The same basic pattern has repeated in social movements focused on AIDS, developmental disabilities, the mentally ill, the environment, and civil rights" (Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006, p. 232).

The relationship between nonprofit organizations and government is not always about resource exchange, nor is it always spelled out in contracts. Nonprofits also create spaces for social and political struggle to be performed to strengthen communities and civil society. At different points in its history, public television in the U. S. has performed various social roles for communities and society, primarily through its programming. Public television's airwaves are themselves a contested space used by groups to protest and champion political agendas, structures, and ideologies.

Regime and Neo-Institutional Perspectives.

Regime perspectives work to understand the differences of the nonprofit sector among different nations: its scope, function, and size. Four regime types are identified by Salamom and Anheier (1998): liberal, corporatists, social democratic and statist (cited in Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006). The U.S. and United Kingdom fall within the liberal classification because of their low levels of government social spending and relatively

large nonprofit sectors. Understanding the social origins of a nation's nonprofit sector helps give explanation to the characteristics and roles of organizations within the sector and offers insight into its evolution.

In the U. S. certain classifications of nonprofit organizations qualify for tax exempt status with the United States government at the federal and local levels. There is a dizzying array of varying levels of tax benefits available to the thousands of nonprofit organizations in America. While there are different legal qualifications and classifications for nonprofits in order to receive tax exempt status, the most commonly known and occurring type of nonprofit is the charitable nonprofit--tax code 501(c)(03). More than half of America's nonprofits are 501(c)(03) charitable organizations (Ott, 2001). Charitable organizations are popularly understood as groups whose (1) monies generated may not be disbursed to any private individual (such as a shareholder), and (2) activities provide a broad social benefit (Hoyt, 1998). The legal classifications of varying tax benefits accorded by the United States government are well beyond the scope of this paper. Much of the argument for tax exemption lies in economic theory, more specifically, government failure theories. Where governments are ineffective or inefficient providers of a service, nonprofits can step in to take on the role. By allowing specific classifications of organizations to be exempt from paying taxes, governments at all levels are indirectly paying for nonprofit organizations to perform certain services. .

Related to the regime perspective, tax laws can be understood as a system that privileges some organizational structures that enhance government and societal functionality. Tax laws work to promote state-endorsed values which are the product of the social origins of a nation.

Neo-institutional perspectives build on the social origins idea put forth in the regime section to suggest that the health of the nonprofit sector is a direct result of its political, legal and institutional environment (Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006). Neo-institutional approach places specific importance on which institutions affect environments and how the processes operate. Because of blurred and blurring sectoral divides, changes in the environment affect all sectors (Smith & Grønbjerg, 2006). Beyond more formal legal environments, social environments (including social capital and networks) also affect all sectors. From this perspective, the nonprofit sector cannot be understood as an isolated part of society, but as part of an interconnected, interdependent network of organizations (Wagner, 2000).

Understanding public television without understanding its relationships to the commercial, for profit broadcasting industry, or its relationship to federal, state, and local governments, or its relationship to other nonprofit organizations would be shortsighted. These groups collectively form a web of institutions influenced by the political, legal, institutional, and social environments, both historically and contemporarily.

The collective theories of the nonprofit sector have direct connections with the public television system in the United States. Though many public broadcasting scholars have included the concepts behind these theories in their analysis and criticism of public television, none have made the explicit connections between the system and these theories. These theories offer insight into understanding the role of public television in the United States.

Conclusion

As an afterthought to a commercial broadcasting system, and with a federal government that chose not to create a public service broadcasting system run by the state,

educational television grew into public television. Public television is often idealized, criticized, or ignored by scholars, government administrators, and industry professionals. However, PBS and its member stations represent and important population in the broadcast community—they are uniquely structured and public service oriented. The structure of the system situates control of resources—and thus power—alternately between national PBS and local member stations. Stations that control relatively more production and programming resources move beyond their local roles into a national arena as producers of programming distributed via PBS to member stations across the nation.

As producers, distributors, and schedulers of programming, the public television system is a member of the larger cultural industry. Public television stations' most valuable product is programming which builds a sense of trust between stations and viewers and between the system and other agents of the broadcast community. That same trust can be interpreted as a result of public television's nonprofit status.

Nonprofit theory suggests that organizations with goals not oriented to profit-making are more trusted than organizations that strive primarily toward economic returns (Steinberg, 2006). Social nonprofit theories also posit that trust is necessary to imbibe social networks with social capital. Economic and political theories of the nonprofit sector give further definition to the roles of these organizations in American society.

Rather than examining the system exclusively at a population level, this dissertation gives attention to both the population and organizational levels. America's public television stations make daily decisions that affect and are affected by the power and orientation of the station. In relation to their on-air programming, this dissertation asks four research questions related to power and orientation.

The scheduling power of individual stations within the system must be understood in relation to the national organization and other stations within the system. However, no such measure of scheduling power exists in current literature. This dissertation offers one measure of power and asks two questions in relation power distribution.

RQ 1: Where do PBS member stations fall along a centralized-distributed power continuum?

RQ2: How do programmers at PBS member stations describe their programming decision making with regard to power.

These two questions focus on programming power within the public television system. An empirical evaluation at the organizational level brings stations themselves into the spotlight and moves the scholarship beyond its current lens dominated by examinations of the national-level institutions of the public television system in the United States. By understanding the programming power exhibited by different stations and how programmers understand and discuss decision making, the seemingly conflicting issues of centralization and localism can be revisited and understood with empirical, organization-level data.

RQ 3: To what extent do the programming decisions of PBS member stations reflect nonprofit and for profit orientations?

Similar to an operationalization of scheduling power, an operationalization of orientation does not exist. The overlap of idealizations and criticisms from the scholarly literature on public television in the U.S. with the theories that suggest roles for nonprofits presents opportunities to explore the nonprofit orientation of stations. Similarly, market-driven economic theories offer operationalizations of for profit orientation.

With the scholarly criticism surrounding the market-oriented approach of PBS and its member stations, exploring how stations orient with regard to programming decision-making is an important question in this research. Though the research is not longitudinal, and thus cannot measure trends, it can explore whether stations seem to employ one orientation more frequently than another when selecting and scheduling programming.

RQ 4: Is there a difference among licensure types of PBS member stations in relation to power or orientation?

One variable often cited within the PBS system as differentiating stations is their licensure. The four types of license are: community organizations, colleges or universities, state authority, and local educational or municipal authorities. The organization or institution to which a station is licensed may influence the programming decisions made by staff at the station, presumably to reflect the interests and values of the license holder. These decisions may be reflected in a station's power or orientation situation.

CHAPTER FOUR

QUANTITATIVE METHOD AND RESULTS

A multiple methods approach is utilized in order to identify to what extent stations' on-air schedules reflect the national PBS schedule and understand how, from the programming staffs' point of view, on-air schedules are negotiated between local and national needs. Together, an initial analysis of programming schedules and an interpretive analysis of interviews with PBS member stations' programming staff work to answer questions about the current state of America's public television stations.

Multiple Methods Approach

The two methods employed in this dissertation are a quantitative schedule analysis paired with semi-structured qualitative interviews of programming staff. The multiple (or mixed) method approach explores and negotiates the divide between qualitative and quantitative research that has long separated social researchers (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). The division of social research into dichotomies eclipses the object of research by maintaining focus on the methodology.

An unobtrusive quantitative schedule analysis is combined with qualitative interviews to work toward knowledge about the current state of programming power among PBS member stations. The quantitative method and its results are presented first. The results of the schedule analysis were used to inform the selection of stations for the qualitative interviews. The interviews were the only method used to draw conclusions about orientation.

Schedule Analysis

Television research that examines on-air programming tends toward either the content within the programs themselves or the decision-making process of programming.

This dissertation fits into the latter category. However, the majority of research on the decision-making process of television programming is focused on and assumes a for-profit model with the goal of increasing either audience size or desirable demographics (Austin, 1980; Brams, 1977; Cancian, Bills & Bergstrom, 1995; Danaher & Mawhinney, 2001; Henry & Rinne, 1984; Horen, 1980; Kelton & Schneider Stone, 1998; Reddy, Aranson & Stam, 1998; Rust & Echambadi, 1989; Zufryden, 1973). Further, no academic research has established an operationalization of power. This dissertation uses a quantitative approach to this operationalization: the comparison of primetime schedules of local affiliates (or member stations) to the national network (or organization). This operationalization could also be deemed a measure of localism, and there is much research in the area of localism of broadcasting.

Localism policy in media regulation works to decentralize political power into local communities in an effort to promote democracy (Napoli, 2001). Additionally, localism practices are assumed to conserve local cultures and work against a "massification" of society. McChesney (2001) and Hilliard and Keith (2005) take this approach to localism and view it as an expression of diversity. These authors make the connection between the structural definition of localism as local ownership to the content-based definition of a product of local content. Though the two definitions are different, they are, according to these works, linked. However, other views of localism have been expressed by other scholars, thus determining what constitutes local programming is more difficult than might appear at first blush.

Napoli (2001) explores several conceptualizations of the practice of localism, among them localism as point-of-origin and localism as addressing the unique needs and interests of local communities. Point-of-origin, though a structural conceptualization, is

the more restrictive, requiring that a program only be considered local if was originated or produced by the station. The less restrictive content-oriented concept of localism requires only that programs meet the unique needs and interests of the communities served by the station. Localism in public television is also extended beyond its content-laden definition and loosened from its tight structural reigns and understood to be reflective of autonomy of decision-making at the local level. This definition of localism distinguishes passive versus active decision-making in programming. Localized programming would be that which was selected for air by a locally-situated and locally-operated broadcaster.

For this research, localism does not refer to the content of the programming or its point of production, but rather to the level at which the decision to select and schedule the program was made. It could be argued that every programming decision is made at the local station, however, this would be ignoring the national expectations and pressures wielded by PBS for a common schedule. Many stations feel bound to common carriage during primetime, thus taking away their autonomy in programming decision making. By removing a degree of autonomy of the local station, the programming can also be considered less "localized." Comparing the PBS national schedule to schedules of PBS member stations for degree of similarity can achieve a quantitative measure of localism. Power is thus operationalized as a measure of similarity in programming schedules between PBS and PBS member stations.

Data Collection

In August 2005, all 168 PBS member stations were contacted with a request for a copy of their September 2005 on-air program schedule. September was chosen because unlike March, August, and December when PBS feeds much of its programming aimed at

on-air fundraising, September is generally not an on-air fundraising month for PBS member stations. Further, other than Labor Day, no major national holidays that might impact programming schedules are nationally observed in September. Two follow-up attempts were made via telephone or email to each non-responding station. Data collection ended in October 2005. Eighty-four percent of licensees (*N*=141) replied with a copy of their schedule, either in the form of a newsletter/program guide, operations grid, or diskette with this data. Six licensees supplied scheduling data for two distinct broadcast stations. For each of these six licensees, both stations' schedule data are included for analysis, thus data for 147 stations are considered.

All programs scheduled during primetime (Monday through Friday, 8:00 pm to 11:00 pm EST and PST, 7:00 pm to 10:00 pm CST and MST) in the month of September 2005 were included for analysis. Each PBS member station's primetime week day schedule from their provided program guide was coded on a separate summary sheet. Every unique series (or non serial program) aired by the station was written on the summary sheet. Individual episodes within a series were coded according to the series title; no differentiation between episodes within a series was made. Each time the series or program aired in weekday primetime, it received a tally on the station summary sheet. For example, if *NOVA* aired six times in September 2005 on station WXYZ, even if two of the airings were repeats of previously shown episodes, *NOVA* received six tally marks on the WXYZ summary sheet.

This same process was repeated for PBS's Schedule X. Schedule X consists of a variety of NPS programming and can be considered as the "main feed" between PBS and member stations. PBS's National Programming Service feeds programming to stations via multiple satellite channels, including its popular Schedule X. The data from the

station summary sheets were then entered into an electronic spreadsheet for data analysis. All series or program titles coded during data collection across all stations were entered on the rows of the spreadsheet. All station callsigns that participated in providing schedule data were entered on the columns. The tallies were totaled for each series or program within each station and the total was entered in the cell corresponding to the series and station.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting's directory of public broadcasting stations and organizations was used to determine the licensing body and type of license for each PBS member station. Each station's license type was coded: 1=community, 2=university/college, 3=state authority 4=local educational or municipal authority.

Results

Analysis of primetime, weekday schedules of 147 PBS member stations reveals that 981 unique series or non serial programs were scheduled during September 2005. Because all series or non serial programs are included, the data represent a census rather than a sample, thus nonparametric statistics are employed to analyze the data. Of these, fifty unique series or non serial programs were scheduled by PBS on Schedule X in the same timeframe. Using stations as variables and unique series or non serial programs as cases (N=981) ρ (rho) values were calculated for the relationship between each station's schedule and PBS's Schedule X. Spearman's correlations show the extent to which two variables are connected. Here, these variables are the scheduled frequency of a program on Schedule X and scheduled frequency of the same program on a local member station. Spearman's ρ was calculated for each station's schedule.

Nonparametric correlations ranged from -0.025 to 1.0 (M=0.586, SD=0.215, N=147). All but seven correlations were significant at the p=0.01 level (2-tailed), of

these, two were significant at the p=0.05 level (2-tailed). Five scores were not significant. The complete results of the correlation analysis are presented in Appendix A.

Research question one presented in the previous chapter asked where PBS member stations fall along a power continuum from high power (low correlations) to low power (high correlations). The range of correlation scores suggests that some PBS member stations program their primetime schedules more closely to the PBS Schedule X than other stations. The smallest significant correlation 0.063 suggesting only a very small correlation between primetime programming on WUSF and Schedule X during September 2005, and thus exhibits a high level of power in scheduling. WVUT held the highest correlation at 1.0 which can be interpreted as an exact correlation between programs scheduled on WVUT and Schedule X in the same time period, this correlation coefficient is interpreted as reflecting a low level of power in scheduling. The majority of stations (N=95) had ρ values between 0.400 and 0.699. These stations show a moderate correlation between their primetime schedules and the PBS Schedule X.

Research question four asks about the relationship between license type and power. A significant difference between stations licensed to local educational or municipal authorities (M=0.267, SD=0.216, N=6) and each other PBS member station licensure type was found with relation to power (F[3,143]=3.270, p=0.023). The 78 community licensed stations had a mean power score (correlation coefficient) of 0.536 (SD=0.23). The 77 college/university licensed stations had a mean power score of 0.516 (SD=0.208). And the 19 state authority licensed stations had a mean power score of 0.536 (SD=0.216). Stations licensed to local educational or municipal authorities had significantly lower correlation coefficients, suggesting their on-air schedules were not

only significantly different from stations in all other licensure type classifications, but also that these stations exhibited more differentiation of their on-air schedules from the national PBS schedule than other license types. Thus these stations exhibited significantly more power in scheduling than all other license types of PBS member stations.

Three ranges of power based on Spearman's correlation coefficients were created: (1) High -0.025 to 0.299; (2) Medium 0.300 to 0.699; and (3) Low 0.700 to 1.0. The distribution of stations into each of these ranges is show in Table 1.

Table 1

Distribution of Stations into Power Classification

Coefficient Range	Power Classification	Number of Stations
-0.025 to 0.099	**High**	8
0.100 to 0.199		9
0.200 to 0.299		6
		Total 23
0.300 to 0.399	**Medium**	5
0.400 to 0.499		31
0.500 to 0.599		32
0.600 to 0.699		32
		Total 100
0.700 to 0.799	**Low**	18
0.800 to 0.899		2
0.900 to 0.999		3
1.00		1
		Total 24

Stations from across the range of coefficients were identified for further analysis. Forty-five stations were contacted; fourteen agreed to be confidentially interviewed. Among other questions, stations were asked about their programming relationship with PBS. Their answers to this question help to further interpret these correlation

coefficients. Interpretation of the quantitative and qualitative data on power is presented in the discussion chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE
QUALITATIVE METHOD AND RESULTS

Qualitative interviews compliment the quantitative schedule analysis by giving voice to the objects of research (the PBS member stations). The interviews explored the philosophy of programming by staff members at stations across the country in order to give depth to the quantitative power correlations and to determine station orientation in programming decision making.

Interviews

Of the seven key research aims identified by Weiss (1994) which suggest qualitative interviews as the preferred method, five fit the purposes of this dissertation well: (1) developing detailed descriptions; (2) integrating multiple perspectives; (3) describing process; (4) developing holistic description; and (5) learning how events are interpreted. The two aims of qualitative research not particularly applicable to this dissertation are "bridging intersubjectivites" and "identifying variables and framing hypotheses for quantitative research (Weiss, 1994, p. 10-11). "Guided conversations" (Rubin, Rubin, & Piele, 2000) with program directors (or equivalent position) at PBS member stations garnered rich data, from multiple perspectives, which describe the processes of program selection and on-air scheduling negotiated by member stations' staff.

After the quantitative schedule analysis, a series of interviews was conducted with programming staff at PBS member stations. Forty-five stations were contacted via email. Station selection was largely purposive. An attempt was made to secure interviews with programming staff at stations of various sizes, license types, and geographic locations. Stations were selected based on their order in the database after organizing the data by

power scores. From each power classification (high, medium, and low), five (high, low) and ten (medium) stations were randomly selected to contact requesting interviews with programming staff. Based on the characteristics (size, license type, geographic location) of stations that agreed to interviews, other stations within the power classification with different characteristics were then selected for contact. Because the purpose of the interviews is the give depth to the power scores and begin to understand orientation philosophies, not to attempt generalization, probability sampling was not employed. Rather, a purposive attempt at diversity among stations was made. The researcher used her best judgment in each consecutive round of contact to attempt a diverse sample.

Programming staff from fourteen stations agreed to interviews. The distribution of correlation coefficients of stations who agreed to interviews was roughly proportionate to the population of PBS member stations: three stations from the low range, eight from the medium range, and three from the high range. Eight of the interviews were with programming staff from community licensed stations, four with college/university licensees, and two with state authority licensed station programmers. None of the programmers from the local educational or municipal authority licensed stations agreed to interviews. Four interviews were conducted face-to-face and 10 via telephone.

Though the unit of observation is the individual, the role and position of the programming staff within the station allows their information to be analyzed as a representation of the station. Additionally, because almost all respondents have been employed at their current station at least five years, and all have been in the public broadcasting community for at least five years (most have been part of the system much

longer), their responses can be understood to reflect not only personal philosophies, but also those cultivated by the station.

Data Collection

The length of interviews averaged about 45 minutes, ranging from 25 minutes to nearly two hours. Several questions were included in a schedule, however the order of the questions varied and, if respondents addressed a specific issue in a previous answer, a question may not have been asked at all (Rubin et al., 1995). Each interview began with the programming staff member being asked to "tell me a little bit about your station." This question gave respondents the opportunity to express what they considered to be the most important information about their station. Many provided a brief history of the station, its mission, licensure, and information unique to the situation of the station.

To help interpret the quantitative data of power, programming staff were asked about the station's relationship with PBS. Were they happy with the programming provided? What they like about it, what they don't like about it? They were also asked about common carriage and whether the arrangement worked well for the station. This question was used to interpret the quantitative findings regarding power.

Participants were asked to talk about their role at the station. This question allowed respondents to tell, in their own words, about their primary (and secondary, tertiary, etc.) position within the station including job responsibilities. In answering this question, many respondents also addressed the follow-up questions of how long they have been with the station. Knowing how long a respondent has been part of the organizational culture is helpful to understanding their philosophy of decision-making in that organization. Because the majority of interviewees had been with their current

station for at least five years, many for upwards of ten years, their responses can be more validly ascribed to the station as a whole and they are in a position to construct the culture of the organization itself.

Programming staff were asked about their professional careers before their current position at the station. This question was designed to help gain an understanding of how respondents might approach their current position and what other work environments and experiences have shaped their perspectives. Have they only ever worked with this station, or do they have experience at other television stations or outside the television industry? Usually addressed in their answers, but if not, also asked, was what training if any, was provided for their job position. Understanding the training process to become a PBS member station programming director can shed light on the philosophies of programming employed by departmental staff.

Participants were asked about the station's audience. Is there a particular audience the station aims to serve? If so, what are the characteristics of that audience? Many respondents have what they considered unique communities within their viewing area that they make a priority to serve. By understanding the audience of the member station, philosophies of programming selection and scheduling are better understood.

The processes for monthly program selection were also discussed. Programmers were asked how they go about putting together their monthly schedule. Who has input into program selection and scheduling? Further, programming directors were asked to identify and describe the most recent change to their schedule and explain why the change was made. Some respondents had trouble remembering the last time a major change was made while others were in the process of implementing one. The purpose of

the question was to elicit what recent situations programming staff have responded to, how they responded, and what the reaction of viewers, nonviewers, and other station employees was to this change. Answers to the question can also shed light on the priorities of the programming staff. The questions and responses that stemmed from this portion of the interview were most informative for determining classification of nonprofit orientation.

The most difficult question for respondents to answer was how they knew if their scheduling decisions were successful. Most respondents said that this was the hardest part of their job, assessing success. Measuring success suggests that there is a goal to the programming strategy and that attainment of that goal can be known. Answers here articulate the goals of programming at these PBS member stations, and how they seek to measure achievement of these goals. Responses to this inquiry were informative for determining classification of for profit orientation.

Respondents were also asked what they saw as the station's role in the larger community. The phrase "larger community" was left undefined by the researcher to allow for programming directors to interpret and give definition to it in their answers. Responses to this question indicate how the programming director envisions the position and role of the station abstractly. Answers to this question express the various ways that respondents see the station as part of, and contributing to, the larger community, and may or may not reflect the ideal-typical roles emergent in literature on public television and established in nonprofit theories.

Finally, an opportunity to share any additional information left out of the interview was offered. Allowing respondents to have any issues that were not addressed

in the course of the interview created an opportunity to highlight important information that was overlooked or did not receive the level of attention respondents felt it deserved. Many interesting developments of stations were discussed in this final question including opportunities afforded by technological advances in the field, partnerships with school and community organizations, and unique positions that programming staff take in their stations.

Data Analysis

Each interview was audio recorded and transcribed. A systematic approach to analyzing the interviews informed by Corsaro's (1985) ethnographic field work was employed. Transcripts were reviewed to create multi-layered notes which include not only action (if the interview was done face-to-face), but also any personal notes, methodological notes, and theoretical notes. Richly layered notes allow for comparisons across and within interviews.

Research question two presented in chapter three asks how programmers understand their programming decision making with regard to power. To begin to answer this question, each interview was analyzed for themes of centralized-distributed power. Five power themes emerged from the interview data: (1) advantages to adherence to a national schedule, (2) excellence of PBS programming, (3) deviations from the national schedule, (4) commitment to localism, and (5) outsourcing scheduling. These themes are described and illustrated in the power results section below.

Results of Interviews: Power

Each interview was analyzed for themes of centralization-distribution of power and for nonprofit-market orientation in program decision-making. The emergent themes are

interpreted and illustrated with interview data. Themes about power centralization and distribution are used to inform the quantitative results of the schedule analysis, but do not affect the positioning of the stations within the power classifications (low, medium, high). Rather the qualitative themes are used to interpret how programmers understand the relationship of power between stations and PBS and among stations of different license types.

The emergent power themes are: (1) advantages to adherence to a national schedule, (2) excellence of PBS programming, (3) deviations from the national schedule, (4) commitment to localism, and (5) outsourcing scheduling. The themes are generally organized from least power (adherence to the PBS feed) to greatest power (commitment to localism). The fifth theme is less typical within the system, but its mention by two of the fourteen programmers interviewed suggests it is another possibility which presents a mixed power display (not allowing power to be centralized at PBS, but not programming the entire schedule locally).

Power Theme 1: Advantages to Adherence to a National Schedule

A desire to adhere to a national primetime schedule to some degree is common among the programmers interviewed, but their rationales behind carrying a common schedule vary. Pressure from PBS to air a common schedule during primetime is one reason cited for adherence to the national schedule.

> I would be curious to know how much better we could do if we didn't have the common carriage constraints. (Interviewee N, low power, college/university licensee)

Another programmer acknowledges the option to deviate, but chooses not to.

> The primetime schedule, the biggest portion of it is programming that we must carry a large percentage of. We can opt to not carry each program

> specifically if we have a good reason, but in general we carry the PBS primetime schedule pretty completely. (Interviewee G, low power, state authority licensee)

Others suggest that national pressure is not as much of an issue as resources are. Stations with fewer resources may rely on PBS for programming to fill their broadcast schedules.

> I rely on PBS for most of our primetime programming as well as the children's block. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

Other stations with the resources to acquire or produce programming outside PBS distribution choose to carry the national schedule. For some programmers, this decision is part of an overall management effort.

> We have been asked by our management to really stick to the PBS feed schedule as much as we possibly can. So we really do follow that. (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)

Previous efforts to program outside the national schedule have been deemed a failure, and at least one station has reconsidered its programming philosophy.

> Our [former] programmer then tried a lot of different stuff. [H]e put a lot of repeats in where other shows were on. [Our new vice president said,] "No, stop that, let's get back to core." We went back to *Antiques Roadshow* on the regular Mondays, we went back to *Frontline* in its regular hour. (Interviewee D, medium power, community licensee)

For larger stations, carrying a common primetime schedule becomes a necessity. If the station is the producer of the nationally distributed program scheduled during primetime, the station is expected to carry that program with the rest of the nation. A relationship among top producing stations informally obligates each to carry the programs of the others when they are offered as part of the national schedule. Further, as system leaders, the larger stations receive perhaps more pressure from PBS to adhere to the national schedule. As such, much of the primetime hours of larger stations are inflexible.

> Actually right now the people that I'm still in contact with [at a large market PBS member station], the way the system is now, especially with the larger stations, you don't have a lot of freedom, the schedule is pretty much dictated by the national schedule. Because of some of the hard realities that we're in right now of trying to keep the program scheduled at the same time on all the stations so we can have national publicity. So, they don't have the freedom I have. They don't have the choices. (Interviewee M, high power, state authority licensee)

When national schedules are carried by so many PBS member stations across the country, some without any modification, one programmer asked why the concept of the local station has endured.

> One of the things that could be argued is why do we even have a local station now that cable is here and PBS could go on cable and be seen by everybody on cable and by satellite without the local stations. There are those that argued you should just get rid of the local stations and just have PBS fed through satellite and cable right from Washington. (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

This programmer answered the question with a reply that most PBS member stations do not carry the national primetime feed show-for-show. Decisions to deviate from this schedule are the result of connections with local communities and are the topic of the third power theme.

Power Theme 2: Excellence of PBS Programming

Many stations agreed on the high quality of the programming distributed by PBS. Rather than try to fill their schedules with local productions or purchase outside programming, the productions selected and distributed through PBS are generally recognized as some of the highest quality television programs. Station programmers acknowledged this and noted that their viewers also recognize the quality.

Despite finding the previous season's schedule difficult to work with, one programmer was happy with the series previewed at the annual PBS Showcase programming conference.

> The schedule has had its challenges over the last few years, but based on what I saw at Showcase I am very impressed with what looks to be a strong revitalized schedule coming up. … I think generally speaking, we're pretty happy with the PBS programming. (Interviewee K, medium power, community licensee, community licensee)

Another programmer echoed this sentiment, glad to see the system placing less emphasis on news and public affairs programming than in years past.

The PBS schedule is for many stations their primetime schedule. When PBS is acquiring and distributing high quality programming, many programmers see their role as filling in around these programs.

> What you have with PBS is they're basically supplying the meat and potatoes, and what the programmers are doing is figuring out what the garnishes are what the side dishes are, somebody brought green beans, and the other person has a little radish. They argue over what seems to me to be fairly insignificant stuff, because sorry, PBS already supplied the meat and potatoes, *NOVA*, *Nature*, there it is…PBS is a great value for what you get, it's the best shows. (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee[2])

A programmer from a big market station echoed this idea.

> When PBS is feeding good programs, its core programs, [our new vice president wants us to] keep them on at the same time as much as we can... We don't play around with things as much as we used to with our old programmer. (Interviewee D, medium power, community licensee)

The hallmark shows that public television is known for are the foundations of the schedule for many stations. When one of these programs is not offered by PBS, stations hear from viewers.

[2] Programmers from stations A and B each programmed two broadcast stations. One station from each fell into the high power range, the other fell into the medium power range.

> There're some programs and series that are just your mainstays within your schedule and people want them and so you need to keep them. They're your *NOVAs* and *Antiques Roadshow*s. *Mystery!* was another issue when PBS had decided not to fund it at one point, and oh my gosh! *Mystery!* programs…really, people want them here. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

The classic PBS programs become primetime staples for many programmers. Their popularity among viewers keeps them on schedules across the nation. The popularity of such high quality shows lends credence to the role of PBS as a program acquisition and distribution service. When PBS suggests a common national primetime schedule including these programs, many stations are happy to oblige.

Power Theme 3: Deviation from the National Schedule

Almost every station deviates from the national feed at one point or another. Programmers give different reasons for this deviation. One offered by programmers was the fit between program time and audience.

> If we had any issues, it would be where that programming is, particular hours where it's run, just in terms of maximizing it for our own audience. (Interviewee K, medium power, community licensee)

This rationale is illustrated by another programmer who chooses to reschedule a primetime program in order to maximize viewership—not of a particular show, but of the overall viewership of the schedule.

> So when they [PBS] do offer *Dance in America*, chances are pretty good that I'm not running it where it is fed. It may get relegated to a Sunday afternoon because that audience is going to see it no matter where it plays. They desperately want to see it. They may feel ever so slightly disrespected that it's not on in primetime. If I show it on Sunday afternoon chances are it's going to get a bigger audience there than if it were on Thursday night. (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee)

Because of audience loyalty to a program or program genre, the programmer knows that the show can be moved without losing viewership. A more generally appealing show can take its primetime slot and audience will not be lost, but gained by this rearrangement. Another programmer uses this same approach to maximizing audience.

> I'd say to a large degree, we are using [the same programs, but] maybe not necessarily in the same time slot. For instance, a lot of programs that PBS may be feeding at 9 o'clock, [our scheduling consultant] may decide to slide that to 10 and put something a little more accessible at 9. *Frontline* is one of those. *Frontline* does fairly well in this market, but it does as well at 10 as it would at 9, so we put something in at 9 that might get a little more viewership, we haven't lost anything, in fact we've gained something. (Interviewee K, medium power, community licensee)

While some stations may actively rearrange particular programs, others work with the PBS schedule provided. Using the national schedule as a foundation, other shows are used to "fill in" when the PBS schedule is not ideal.

> I actively would program the PBS schedule across the board pretty much, but I would also fill in. There's plenty of room in any given schedule to fill around it with other programs that are available. (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

These programmers work with the basic national schedule, moving some shows in and out of primetime to increase viewership in this day part.

A common point of departure from the PBS national schedule is Thursday nights. Because PBS rarely designates programming on Thursday nights as common carriage, many programmers take this opportunity to bring in new audiences, experiment with programming, or just keep the national schedule.

> Thursday nights are the nights on all PBS schedules that programmers kind of play with. That's one of the nights that we see who can we find and bring 'em in. ... Thursday is one of the main days we try to bring the baby boomers into our audience. (Interviewee D, medium power, community licensee)

Adding new viewership to the station's audience is done at this station through nature and environmental shows on Thursday nights. Another programmer uses this time slot for local news and public affairs programming. Yet another uses this time to air British comedies.

> I look at the Thursday nights. I do not take the PBS schedule on Thursday nights because they're repeating *Antiques Roadshow*, and they repeat *This Old House* and *Ask This Old House*, which I think in inappropriate for primetime. And so that is some time that I've set aside for Brit coms if I can get them. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

In addition to Thursday nights, there are other time slots in a primetime schedule that come available when they are not filled with a program designated for common carriage.

> You do have a few shows down here at the 10 o'clock time slot that you're not bounded by. You sometimes don't move those either because sometimes they really do make sense there, they're going to get the national promotion there anyway, or I don't have a better show to go in there at that time. (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)

Just because a program is not designated for common carriage does not mean that it is not a good fit for the time slot and the station's audience. Many programs keep their primetime schedule for these reasons among others. The tendency of some programmers to constantly keep program schedules in flux, working to differentiate their stations' schedule from the national PBS feed, raises questions from one program director.

> People think that in order to earn their keep they need to switch the schedule around quite a bit. And sometimes they have good reason for it, and sometimes I don't know if they have a reason other than they feel, "I'm not worth my salt unless I make changes to it." (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee)

This programmer shuns unjustified changes to the national schedule, but another programmer suggests a national schedule could be holding back the station from making stronger connections with viewers.

> I would be curious to know how much better we could do if we didn't have the common carriage constraints. The main reason why I'd be curious is for at least one of our fund drives per year, if not two, we slide off of the national dates… We tend to get a lot more compliments during those weeks when we schedule ourselves than we do the rest of the year. That's why I'd be curious to see if we were given more time to customize our schedule each week if we could tailor even more to our local markets and build an even stronger relationship with our viewers. (Interviewee N, low power, university/college licensee)

The connection between a station and its viewers and community at large is an argument for distributed program decision-making power. It faces an argument for centralization of program decision-making power at the national level to best utilize scarce resources. Though these two forces are negotiated daily by programmers, the commitment to localism held by many stations consistently keeps the power of PBS in check.

Power Theme 4: Commitment to Localism

Localism was a frequently referenced concept during interviews. Programmers continue to stress the importance of local programming in their schedules. Localizing schedules allows programmers to choose programs that meet the needs of local audiences.

> Cultural divisions, all these public television stations have their own little missions. ..Maybe 60 % of the programs are the same (across the country), but the rest change. We can still be regional in certain ways. (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee)

> We all are pretty independent and we are trying to work together, but your communities are very different, we are very different from the Bible belt. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

One programmer equates local programming with station mission.

> Mission programming—local programming—is more important than anything else. (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)

Stations discuss issues of autonomy related to creating an on-air schedule that includes local programming, bending toward the local whenever possible.

> There's some leeway for a programmer to be able to flex the schedule and I would also try to flex it locally. (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

One rationale for local programming is to keep the station relevant in its communities rather than just a pass-through for national programming. This sentiment is strongly held and expressed by several stations.

> [W]e want to do that [air local programming] because we want to feel like we're a broadcaster here and not just a translator of other people's programs. (Interviewee E, low power, university/college licensee)

> I'm able to really put together a schedule that I feel that my audience really wants. Not that somebody in DC is dictating. (Interviewee M, high power, state authority licensee)

> We're not going to be just the transmitter on the hill. We have to serve this local audience. We are committed to that local programming. (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)

Many programmers feel that actively programming schedules for local audiences keeps stations connected to communities. By not always following the PBS schedule, stations are able to capitalize on local and regional offerings.

> I don't air everything that PBS offers, it just goes on and on, but I try to choose the ones that would be very beneficial for here. Lots of independent producers come through and there're regional distributors of programs, and so it really is looking at it case by case. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

Others acknowledge constraints on delivering local programming. A large national producing station is working to overcome a perception problem. Because the station is known for its national productions, it is working to regain its localism and connection to a local audience.

> They only thought of us as a national PBS station. That was a real problem. A lot of people just don't know [we're a local station]. [W]hen people think [call sign] they think [city]. We want them to think local [city]. We really want to be the local [city] station. (Interviewee D, medium power, community licensee)

> We try to serve the local community as much as we can. Right now our main thing is to become more local because we're seen so much as a national type station. (Interviewee D, medium power, community licensee)

A different station, in a different scenario, also faces constraints when trying to enhance its local program offerings—a lack of sufficient resources.

> The survey was…trying got get a sense of …what [viewer] interests were, in terms of certainly programming. It runs the gamut; everybody's got their program. Local programming was really standing out, a lot more of that. I wish we could do a lot of it. We have such a small staff. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

Whether resource rich or resource poor, stations communicate an intense interest in scheduling local programming as part of a sense of fulfilling a mission and retaining authority over their schedule.

One specific aspect of localism is local origination or production. A dedicated time slot for locally produced programming exemplifies a dedication to localism.

> We call that our local interest slot so that can be a statewide show or that can be something of local interest to only the [city] or [regional] area. We wanted to find a place, 'cause we have so much programming like that, we've got local producers producing all the time, to have a safe place that can go in. (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)

This programmer continues to explain why the station has such a dedication to local production, namely the viewers enjoy it and it helps the station raise funds.

> We really think [our viewers] love the locally produced stuff. As far as fundraising, we find our locally produced stuff does better than anything else. (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)

Other stations have no shortage of locally produced programming, but rather than that programming competing with national shows for air time, their locally produced shows are the nationally distributed programs.

> We're local TV, but we have a huge national reach, so we do [national program title 1], all these kids programming, a lot of news and public affairs, and all the [national program title 2] which plays a lot into the local schedule. One of our biggest problems is that anything we produce, we have to put on. (Interviewee D, medium power, community licensee)

A prolific production department can have complications for larger stations, namely finding the time to air all the productions. For this station, in-house productions are not working to connect with local communities. Resources are dedicated to producing at the national level, thus placing the station in a different situation than mid- or small-size stations. As this programmer notes, the drawback to being a national producing station is the potential loss of localism. This station has to work even harder to create community connections.

Power Theme 5: Outsourcing Scheduling

Within the PBS system, there is a contingency of stations that outsource their program scheduling. The financial benefits of allowing an outside group or station to program the station were reported as the primary reason for outsourcing.

Considering that many PBS member stations schedule the same programs in the same time slots across the country, some stations asked why they each needed a separate programmer on staff. Rather than hiring a programmer at every station, pooled resources allow stations to collectively hire one programmer to build the foundation of the monthly schedule for each station.

> A lot of stations…especially small stations, find that it's cost effective to actually outsource your programming. Having said that, there's difference

> between the schedule, I'd say 80 percent of it is the same. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out if you outsource it, and have them basically cut and paste their schedule into our schedule, that's a very cheap, good first start. Then you're only spending money on the final 20 percent. So it's purely economic... There's more and more stations looking at that as the model. (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

One programmer who uses the outsourcing approach to programming argues that this does not diminish the station's commitment to localism, nor does it interfere with the station's program decision-making autonomy.

> We are programmed by consultancy through [organization] so we don't like to make that really well known among our audience because that could generate confusion as to whether or not we're programming the station locally or not. The majority of the schedule is programmed by [organization]. Then having said that, I have final review of the schedule. I review it for accuracy, but more importantly [I ask] is there anything locally we should be doing for [our area] that maybe [consulting organization] doesn't get and that we should put in there? (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

This approach was echoed by another programmer who emphasized the success of the outsourcing model.

> If we have local productions that need to be fitted into the schedule, if there's something that has come along that has piqued my interest in particular and I want that added to the schedule, I tell [scheduler]…All I can tell you is it's been hugely successful up to this pint and I don't see any reason why it would no longer be successful. (Interviewee K, medium power, community licensee)

Outsourcing has proven successful for many stations in terms of audience gain and retention at a time when the system at large is losing audience share. Outsourcing of programming is in one way another version of centralization of decision-making, on a smaller scale. However, since the scheduling organization in some cases is independent of the public television system, power is located outside the system suggesting a different

type of decentralization. It is an interesting model that appears to be growing in popularity.

Program directors at PBS member stations constantly negotiate a continuum of power, from the extremes of distributed to centralized. Primetime schedules were analyzed as a tool to measure final decisions made by stations. Interviews shed light on the processes of this negotiation and begin to explain why stations place value at different ends of the continuum. Ranging from stations that try to adhere to the national schedule whenever possible to those stations that place more emphasis on local programming (and some that fall into both extremes—Interviewee C), philosophies of station autonomy are expressed by program directors.

These expressions can begin to explain the range of correlation coefficients derived from station schedules. Three programmers (Interviewees C, G, and N) mentioned either pressure or a strong desire to adhere to a national schedule—the first, and weakest, of the power themes. Two of these three stations were classified in the schedule analysis as expressing low power.

Programmers D, F, and K each expressed the importance of the quality of the programming from PBS as being one of the most important issues affecting their on-air decision-making—when PBS is feeding good, high quality programming, there is no need to make changes to the schedule. All three of these stations were classified by the schedule analysis as exhibiting medium power.

The third power theme of deviation from the national schedule was expressed by several programmers at different levels. Keeping the programs fed by PBS but rearranging them was expressed (Interviewees A and K), filling in gaps in the national

schedule that are not programmed with common carriage requirements was also discussed (Interviewees D, F, and H). Four of these programmers' on-air schedules were classified as medium in the schedule analysis. One was classified as medium/high because the programmer schedules for two distinct broadcasts in different communities (one broadcast was high, the other medium).

Localism was the fourth power theme to emerge from the interviews. By far the most popular, this theme is often understood to be the mantra of public television stations as they work to differentiate themselves from commercial broadcasters. Nearly all respondents who stressed some aspect of localism in the interview were medium or high power stations. Interviewee E (low power) also indicated a commitment to be more than a "translator."

In addition to questions of power, interviews were also analyzed to determine the classification of stations in regard to nonprofit orientation and for profit orientation.

Results of Interviews: Orientation

Beyond power, interviews were analyzed for orientation. Research question three of this dissertation asks to what extent the programming decisions of PBS member stations reflect nonprofit and for profit orientations Nonprofit and for profit orientation classifications (high, medium, low) were determined based on the degree to which participant responses reflected five ideal-types for public television in the United States (nonprofit orientation) and the degree to which participant responses reflected primarily market-based economic programming rationales (for profit orientation).

The social, economic, and political theories of the nonprofit sector give rise to several roles for nonprofit organizations in the United States. These roles are intertwined

with the ideal-typical (Weber, 1949) roles identified in the public television literature. Together, the roles emergent in these literatures are identified and used as a starting point to organize and analyze how program directors conceptualize the role(s) of their station.

The ideal-types are useful as "conceptual instruments for comparison with and measurement of reality" (Weber, 1949, p. 97). The ideal-type is value neutral and does not imply exemplary status; rather it is a logical ideal created as a comparison mechanism (Giddens, 1971; "The ideal type," 1982; Weber, 1949). In current research, the ideal-typical concept is used by media scholars as a start point and an emergent end point. A study of press ownership differentiated the ideal-type "classic" press owners from press barons, comparing findings across the United States, France, and England (Chalaby, 1997). Deuze (2005) challenged the durability of several long-held ideal-typical journalistic values in changing cultural and technological environments. Emergent ideal-types of Scandinavian and British public service broadcasters constructed by academics and media professionals were compared and over-time trends identified (Ytreberg, 2002).

Most similar to this dissertation, Hoynes (1994) applies the concept of the ideal-type to his research of the American public television system—primarily at the population level—and its idealization as the public sphere. To add to the literature, this dissertation utilizes the ideal-type roles emergent in literature on public television in the United States and those derived from theories of the nonprofit sector as a framework to organize analysis of the qualitative interview data.

Overlapping ideal-types from these literatures are synthesized to create five roles for PBS member stations. The ideal-typical roles include: (1) provider of public goods, (2) builder of social capital, (3) facilitator of the public sphere, (4) innovator, and (5)

government extension. The creation of these roles allows for interpretation of the level of nonprofit orientation expressed by each programmer. Respondents were not asked directly about any of these roles, rather their responses to the interview questions detailed above, as well as any follow-up questions in the interview, are analyzed for comparison with the ideal-typical roles.

The creation of each role from the convergence of public television literature and nonprofit theory is first detailed, then excerpts from the interviews are used to illustrate the multiple facets of each role as discussed by the programmers.

Ideal-Type 1: Provider of Public Goods

Because of the free-rider problem, where not every person who utilizes a product or service is in a position to or chooses to pay for its use, nonprofit organizations often assume the role of provider of public goods. Public goods are those goods and services that do not lose their value when shared. They are often nonexclusionary—it is impossible or nearly impossible to exclude people from the benefits of a public good. Public television in the United States is itself an example of a public good. Nearly every single person with access to a television set and signal can watch one or more PBS member stations. Further, with each additional viewer, the value of the programs provided by public television does not diminish. Partially funded by government through tax revenue, public television stations serve people regardless of their ability to directly contribute (beyond tax contributions) for the programming and services available through the stations. One respondent shared how this status separates PBS member stations from commercial stations.

> We are the only station that is serving the public with the programming we air. It does make a huge difference that we are nonprofit. We are not here

> to make a profit. The profit motive is great for commercial stations because the profit motive is good for our economy. But it's not what our motive is; we're here to serve our viewers. (Interviewee J, medium power, college/university licensee)

Two of the primary services delivered by stations via their programming are education and culture. While other institutions exist to serve these needs (child care facilities, public schools, private schools, museums, playhouses, and symphonies among others), public television stations, both historically and presently, have a strong connection with education and culture. Many PBS member stations describe their commitment to this type of programming.

Public television was an early adopter of educational programming, partially because of its origins on college and university campuses. Early childhood educational programs such as *Sesame Street* and *Mister Rogers' Neighborhood* were some of the early successes of children's programming on television. These programs continue as staples of the children's block of programming on most PBS member stations, despite declining viewership in many markets.

> What do I owe it to the viewers to get on the air? An example of that is *Mister Rogers' Neighborhood*. I cannot in good conscious take it off. I've got it on at 6:30 in the morning. I feel I owe it to our viewers to have it on the air. (Interviewee J, medium power, college/university licensee)

A strong commitment to the value of education and a sense of obligation to deliver educational programming permeates much of the population of public television stations. Beyond individual programs, most PBS member stations manage a Ready to Learn program. RTL connects parents, care givers, and educators with information and resources, including public television programming, to encourage active learning in preschool children. While many program directors mentioned being mindful of

educational services in scheduling programming, one programmer explained the relationship between the RTL initiative and the program scheduling process.

> We have a really, really strong and successful Ready To Learn program, so I really work with them. And we really talk about some of the kids' shows, and what would work for them [in the schedule]. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

Public television's focus on education extends beyond the preschool years and the RTL program into elementary and secondary education. Several programmers discussed formal and informal relationships with area schools to deliver programming. University or college licensed PBS member stations frequently have formal relationships with schools and school districts to deliver services.

> In addition to our learning services area, which goes through the university, we also provide a service to the area elementary and high schools though a foundation that we have housed in the station here. (Interviewee E, low power, college/university licensee)

The foundation is a source of funding for educational initiatives by the station and a resource for collaboration with schools and other community institutions. One example given by this programmer was how the foundation facilitated a local documentary produced by the station on the history of the area. The local paper ran articles on the topic throughout the month when segments of the documentary aired. The foundation was simultaneously working with educators to develop curriculum plans to prepare students for state proficiency exams. Collaboration projects around educational goals between stations and schools exemplify the value placed on education by some PBS member stations.

Because of the high resource commitment required to produce local programming, locally produced educational programming reflect the importance of this

genre to a station's mission. Less resource intensive than a local multi-part documentary, a studio-based call-in program is still a large resource commitment for a station, especially smaller stations.

> We do a local program we just kicked it off in January, and it's called *Homework Hotline*. It is a live, call-in show basically grades three through eight although we do get some high school kids calling in and it's to help them with their math and science homework specifically. So we just finished our first semester…it had a great response. It took us a year and a half in the making and really has been very beneficial for us…people are talking about it and it's turned out to be really quite helpful for students. We want to continue that on next year. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

The success of the program speaks to the need for instructional programming, in this case outside the classroom, targeted at school-age children.

Public television stations, especially those with current or historical ties to institutions of higher education exhibit a commitment to education. Services can be targeted for in-classroom use.

> We still broadcast three hours of educational programming directly or that's earmarked directly to the schools each day, Monday through Friday… Even though they're on broadcast and anybody can watch them, they are geared toward the schools to record them and use them in their classrooms. (Interviewee M, high power, state authority licensee)

The commitment of air time to classroom educational purposes rather than working to pull in a more lucrative audience demonstrates a level of engagement with area schools. While many stations may in fact carry these same programs, by explicitly identifying this time as dedicated to classroom use speaks to the perceived importance of education among this station's values.

Education in the classroom is not limited to elementary schooling. Stations also work with colleges and universities to bring programming to instructors.

> While we provide some instructional programs to [university] during the daytime, only about an hour and a half, two hours per day…we used to do quite a bit more of that—six to eight hours at one time. (Interviewee E, low power, college/university licensee)

The amount of the schedule dedicated to instructional programming for classroom use has been reduced at this station and others. These stations identify other sources of educational material, specifically newer technologies including DVDs, CD-ROM, and the Internet as replacements for over the air broadcasts of programming for classroom use.

> We're very active in the video streaming. We provide video streaming to all the schools. (Interviewee M, high power, state authority licensee)

Using technologies other than over-the-air broadcasts, stations maintain their commitment to education and their relevance to the schools. While this approach may signal a shift in the dedication of on-air resources of public television stations, over-the-air broadcasting is still a relevant and primary delivery mechanism for educational programming. While some stations have changed the delivery mechanism of educational programming, other stations have chosen to change the nature of the programming. Though still educational in nature, the intended audience is no longer the classroom student but the instructor.

> Now it's not so much the over the air broadcast of instructional programs that teachers can use in the classroom, its more teaching the teachers and administrators in these areas how they can use the new software and equipment for instructional purposes in the classroom. We do a lot of productions and workshops and teaching of new techniques and new technologies for the university professors to use in their classrooms or for research or whatever. (Interviewee E, low power, college/university licensee)

The shift away from dedicating air time to classroom programming to dedicating air time and resources to professional development broadens public television stations' focus on education.

The dedication of air time to professional development programming further establishes public television's commitment to its role as a public good and as a provider of the public good of education. Programming dedicated to professional development is also targeted to those outside the formal educational setting. Child care providers are another profession served by public television stations' programming.

> We're airing two series, it's the same series actually. It's called *A Place of Our Own*. It has to do with day care providers, and it's targeted toward day care providers. It's basically training, and it's talking about if you have problems, what snacks you can make, play time. And the same program is duplicated in Spanish, and so we air that 5 days a week, Monday through Friday. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

In addition to airing a professional development series for day care providers, time is committed to the Spanish language version of the program as well. The purchase and air of the series targeted toward day care providers is an expression of the import placed on education by this PBS member station.

Dedication to education is a primary value of many PBS member stations. However, this dedication often extends beyond the station's broadcast schedule. Internet streaming to schools and closed circuit feeds to community institutions constitute educational services performed by the station but separate from its on-air programming.

> There are other things going on like our educational resources center will do things that have nothing to do with television. They'll go have any number of educational things going on with museums and other places like that. (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)

Station activities not related to programming are an interesting area for exploration. Are stations further embracing educational values by serving unmet needs in the community through activities unrelated to aired programming? One programmer expresses the

amount of educational activity that goes on behind the scenes and off the airwaves of the station.

> So we are a continuing education television station as well as a station that broadcasts the public television programming that everyone comes to expect. Actually a very small percentage of what we do is what is seen over the air. (Interviewee G, low power, state authority licensee)

Does the drift away from educational, instructional, and professional development programming on the air signal a separation of educational services from the "business of television?" Another programmer seems to take this approach when describing the history of the station.

> When I first got here the station was running instructional television programming from 9 to 3 during weekdays. So it had a limited, wouldn't say it was a full-service public broadcasting station. So over the years we have managed, with the help of some very good programmers with [outside organization], have managed to put ourselves in a situation of consistently being in the top ten percent of stations in the country in terms of gross rating points. (Interviewee K, medium power, community licensee)

For this station, the value of viewership outweighed the value of education. The need to serve the larger community exceeded the need to serve the smaller group of instructional program users. The values of the station were redirected away from instructional television, and seemingly toward a ratings-driven orientation.

Educational programming in its many forms has long been associated with the public television system in the United States. From the expressed experiences of these programmers alone, it is clear that there is still a place for educational programming with public television. However, the over-the-air nature of this programming may be shifting whether because of quality alternatives, technological advances, or a shift in the mentality regarding the purpose and audience of PBS member stations. Public television delivers educational programming that is indivisible and nonexclusionary. However, not all PBS

member stations place the same level of value on educational programming. The emphasis of different purposes of public television, and thus different programming content in its schedule determines the degree of applicability of each PBS member station to the role of provider of the public good of education.

Another prominent value traditionally linked to public television in the U.S. is culture. Culture is a difficult construct to define, but can be understood in the context of this analysis as any variation of art, both high and popular. Satirical commentaries and critics of public television often mock the value placed by stations and the system on high culture arts including symphonies, opera, and ballet. A niche market for such performances and programs was identified and targeted by cable channels such as Bravo and A&E. However, the high production costs makes delivery of high culture via television is not necessarily a profitable enterprise. Thus such programming, valued as mission programming by public television stations, becomes part of the public good delivered by PBS member stations.

> The channels that people perceived as being public television's competitors, in fact aren't. They may have started out that way: A&E started out showing *Masterpiece Theatre* type things. They don't do that anymore. Bravo started out being very artsy. Nothing like that anymore. We're [public television] still the home for that, however small it is. (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee)

Many of the long-running arts programs on public television reflect these values including *Great Performances* and *Live from Lincoln Center.* These programs continue in the on-air schedules of many stations today despite their relatively low audience numbers.

> *Great Performances*, let's say, which in this particular market—it not being New York or San Francisco, which would still tend to get fairly decent ratings for performance based programming—we would still air

> because it's in our mission to begin with. (Interviewee K, medium power, community licensee)

Identifying high art programming with the mission of public television effectively elevates it to a level where many stations will work to include it in schedules regardless of small viewership. Many public television stations strive to include as much mission programming as possible in their schedules, even if they chose not to sacrifice a primetime slot for such programs.

> When I'm not in sweeps I sometimes put in programming that I would refer to as have-to programming. Programming that you want to get on the air but it's probably not something you're going to air in primetime, but you want to get it on at a decent time. In June I have a Frank Sinatra program that I decided I wanted to get in leading into *Live From Lincoln Center*. (Interviewee J, medium power, college/university licensee)

However, at least one programmer acknowledges the fading of high culture programming from the system. Despite a strong perceived link between public television and high culture in the United States, the number of series presented at the national level has diminished since the inception of PBS and its member stations.

> We kind of do a little bit of disservice, PBS, when it says, we're the home for the symphony and ballet. How often we show the symphony and ballet is kind of a joke anymore. They may have shown a bit in the 70s, but that went way down in the 80s, it's extremely rare. It's still there, but every once in a while you'll get one of those hard-core viewers, who says, "I love *Great Performances*" when they're doing the great productions like …the new year's symphony celebration from Vienna…It's a once a-year thing…when else do I get that? (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee)

The shrinking offerings of high culture programming from PBS and likely the resultant diminished airings of high culture programs on member stations may be telling of a shift away from such values. One programmer explains the debate within the system over the presumed value of high culture programming over popular culture programming. This

lengthy interview excerpt speaks to the assumptions of values championed by public television in the United States while questioning the derivation of those assumptions and values.

> This is one of the challenges with being a programmer, that there are probably programs that I would not, that don't necessarily fall into what I call the mission of public television, but for whatever reason, have really gotten the viewers. Right now we're in this stronghold of *Lawrence Welk*. They love it! And these shows are twenty, thirty years old, repackaged shows of an old syndication series that I wouldn't necessarily choose to put on the air. But it is something that our viewers really like and they see it as a service. Other shows I don't have as much of an issue with are the British comedies that are older. It is something we think about it. How come British comedies in a lot of ways are acceptable, old British comedies are acceptable, and we embrace them a little better than we would embrace and old syndication from the United States? We talk about those, and the way most of my colleagues and I really work through this is: this is our mission--to provide the programming that our viewers want to see. And especially these types of programs they're not going to get anywhere else. So that's what we do. (Interviewee M, high power, state authority licensee)

This debate is central to not only programming decision-making at public television stations, but more importantly to the very nature of the system. European public service broadcasters have long been identified with paternalistic values, including the uplifting of cultural values through the dissemination of high culture (Ouellette, 2002; Ytreberg, 2002). One programmer challenges the accusations of elitism in public television, suggesting that such critics are out of touch with today's programming.

> Who said that we have to be the elitists that we're accused of? People who say public television is so elite, they have a vision that is 30 years out of date. And we appeal to rich liberals. Hello, look at the schedule! Watch some of these programs! (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee)

The adherence to high culture values, often portrayed as elitist, versus adherence to popular cultural values, often portrayed as commercial, is resolved not at the population or national level, but at the organizational or local level.

Program directors consider the community served by the station and its audience, as well as the mission of the station itself, to decide the balance between high culture and popular culture programming. Though previously discussed, the following statement by a programming director illustrates this point.

> *Great Performances*, let's say, which in this particular market—it not being New York or San Francisco, which would tend to get fairly decent ratings for performance based programming—we would still air because it's in our mission to begin with. (Interviewee K, medium power, community licensee)

The market or community served by the station as well as the mission of the station itself is taken into consideration when deciding whether to air programming, in this case high culture programming. The driving mission of the station to serve cultural ends wins out over anticipated small viewership of the program. Another programmer compares the audience of his or her station with the audience garnered by the PBS member station in Portland, Oregon.

> Overall we don't have what is a great public television audience. When you see some of these shows which seem much more mission driven, and then there are those markets like Portland, and oh my gosh! They just have fantastic [ratings] numbers, they have the perfect audience. We can tend to kind of skew, not really well. The real fine arts stuff, while those don't score particularly good numbers, we are particularly bad if it's real high-end performance art. [This city] has a really good performance arts community, but it's not something a mass audience is going to watch. You tend to get numbers with those things that are at the low end of public television in terms of entertainment, like a *Lawrence Welk*…like an entertainment thing you want to get a number with, we do better with that. (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee)

This programmer compares his audience not only to an audience in another city, but also to a constructed and imagined (Anderson, 1996) public television audience. A member of the public television audience would enjoy high culture programming whereas a member of this programmer's audience prefers programming at "the low end of public television."

Dedication to education and culture are two of the driving forces behind public television. Both education and culture can be thought of as public goods, especially when delivered over the airwaves by public television stations. PBS member stations place different emphasis on the role of provider of these public goods. Some see their commitment to educational programming as paramount while others see a divide between the delivery of educational services and the station's on-air product. Some stations feel a compelling mission to deliver high culture programs while others see serving audience desires for popular programming as more important. Still others question the distinction between the two. The ideal-typical role of provider of the public good is embraced at varying levels by different PBS member stations.

Ideal-Type 2: Builder of Social Capital

Public television stations are idealized as builders of social capital. Reintroduced in the 1990s by Putnam (1995), social capital is conceptualized as the positive benefits accrued from networks of connections instilled with trust. Though the perceived decline in social capital suggested by Putnam is contested (Norris, 1996), its reinvigoration was not overlooked by PBS and its member stations. The role of builder of social capital may have seemed a natural fit for many stations who already collaborate with institutions in the community to build connections both at the organizational level and with individuals.

Furthermore, because of their nonprofit status among other reasons, public television stations are often trusted institutions in their communities. PBS and many of its member stations across the country adopted the idea of social capital and began to work with it as a guiding principle for stations (Aufderheide, 1991, 1996; Bedford, 2001; LeRoy & LeRoy, 2001). The existing networks of community ties and the perception of trust held by PBS member stations led many to adopt the ideal-typical role of builder of social capital.

A necessary but insufficient aspect of social capital is networks. The networks of individuals, associations, and institutions are commonly referred to as community. The connection between public television stations and their communities is one of the hallmarks of the system.

> The beauty of public broadcasting is that it has local stations. And why? Because the local stations can do so much with the community and usually do a lot more with the community than the commercial stations. (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

Community has many different conceptualizations and definitions (Brint, 2001) that are well beyond the scope of this dissertation. Here, community is operationalized as existing at two levels: a macro level of connections between the station and other institutions and organizations and a micro level of connections between the station and individuals. Stations work at both levels to create community connections.

At the macro level, some stations make connections with other organizations to collaborate on projects. These collaborations are seen as vital.

> We have made a point to be a community station... And our outreach component [to programming] really runs the gamut. Doing outreach you're really developing partnerships with different community groups and that's the key. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

By positioning the station as a prominent member of the organizational community, mutually beneficial connections can be established. Through connecting with other organizations, stations can reach out to make more and stronger connections with individuals. One programmer considers the station a community "hub" which works to bring together "mission-similar organizations" to achieve the goals of the station and its partners.

> [W]e looked at maybe a different model of community programming and production. And we began examining the notion that was put forth by work being done at the Benton foundation and other places about looking at your community's assets and thinking about your… public station in a different role… More as a hub center of being able to serve the needs of the community by bringing the content of organizations that already serve the community: educational organizations, nonprofit institutions, social service agencies, state governments. So we began working on a process where our production model changed, and we identified mission-similar organizations that might be willing to invest in programming and production that would take their content, produce it, and allow us to broadcast it. (Interviewee B, high/medium power, community licensee)

This station used the idea of connections as a starting point for program content and production. The content of the programming forms the connection between the organizations. In many cases, the idea for the local production begins the process of connecting with interest-linked organizations.

> We did a local program called [program title]. We really got involved with the Friends of the Dunes, the discovery museum, and the history museum…lots of more eco-oriented groups. And that was really great. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

The idea for the program exists and collaboration with various organizations follows during the production and promotion phases of the program. However, in some instances, the connections already formed precipitate a production. One programmer

whose station has strong connections with the educational community explained a collaboration under different circumstances.

> About three months ago we had a student commit suicide, in high school here. And it had a dramatic impact on [town], so we did a live two hour cablecast—we didn't put it on our broadcast channel—bringing in counselors and psychologists, guidance counselors from high schools and superintendents and what not, talking to parents and students about the situation. What they could be doing about it. We're kind of like the interlocutor of bringing a number of different organizations together to try to deal with this situation. It got such a response from other schools in the area here they've asked us to do the programs on our broadcast channel. (Interviewee E, low power, college/university licensee)

Existing connections with community organizations allow stations to be responsive and actively address community needs. Rather than just utilizing collaborations to benefit a local production, the state of being connected to organizations in the community creates an environment where a station can become an "interlocutor" or "hub" for involvement around an issue.

Collaboration does not only occur around local productions. Nationally distributed programming also creates opportunities for collaboration. Programming distributed through PBS is strongly encouraged to include educational and outreach materials and is part of the selection process for acquisition. The outreach component to a program can be central to the success of that program, as one programmer explained.

> For example, *Art 21*. When that aired last fall on PBS we went out the community and had specific events at some of the galleries. [We] brought together artists to not only screen the program but to discuss how great it is for public television to be bringing otherwise unseen art to the community…The outreach component can't be underestimated. That one of the things you get with public television in a community is you usually get some of our staff doing something out in the community around the show. (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

Programming can extend beyond the television set when outreach components are used by stations. Outreach can also bring the station's programming to different audiences

who otherwise would not have tuned it. The predominantly older, white, female "public television audience" can be diversified through outreach efforts.

> [W]e're also right now working on one with *Eyes on the Prize* where we're coordinating putting high school students together with civil rights activists and getting their stories archived. Of course we'll be working with our local veterans for Ken Burns' *War* coming up. (Interviewee M, high power, state authority licensee)

The relationships established through outreach to organizations and individuals begins the process of network building, of creating community. Relationships must be maintained and new relationships begun for stations to remain active, engaged in, and relevant to their communities.

> It's like every six months we have something different or sometimes we'll have two or three going on at the same time. Most often it is using a program and then really jumping off of that. That's what we are and that what we can use our broadcast for. It really is a great tool. To really make more of an impact you need to have that community involvement. We really work hard at that. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

Perhaps especially with nationally distributed programming that is not locally originated, outreach efforts are paramount to connecting the local community with the program. Finding local points of connection creates a sense of importance for the program and works to keep the station and its programming relevant.

To maintain their relevance in the community, some stations have a regularly scheduled time slot dedicated to the discussion of local community issues. The time is dedicated to building community through partnerships with organizations and by reaching out to viewers.

> We call [Thursday night] our local interest slot, so that can be a statewide show, that can be something of local interest to only the [city] area or [regional] area. We wanted to find a place, 'cause we have so much programming like that, we've got local producers producing all the time,

> to have a safe place that can go in. (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)

Collaboration with organizations and producers keeps stations in touch with community concerns. The devotion of regularly scheduled air time to this commitment of collaboration over local issues creates a space where viewers can strengthen their connection with the station and its collaborators. Some stations can dedicate half an hour or even an entire evening to this initiative. Other stations have the resources to go further.

> We've created a full-time digital channel that airs [local] programming all the time. As part of the digital channel, we realized that there were other public stations [in the state] in small communities…and we thought that they also are producing like-minded productions about their communities that shared some common interests and needs. And people in our service areas of metro and central [state] are very connected with greater [state]. So we began to acquire programming produced by [these other stations]…with their enthusiastic permission we began to collect that content as well. And fold it into the [new] channel, and we use the best of that on our other channels as well (Interviewee B, high/medium power, community licensee)

The idea of community is expanded beyond the organizations and individuals in the station's viewing area station to include public television stations across the state. The assumption behind this mega-collaboration is that issues affecting one geographic area may be relevant to another. By sharing resources (programming) stations are better able to address issues and concerns affecting people in a larger area. The program director above (Interviewee B) adopted a pluralistic approach to scheduling programming: air programs of differing topics, from different producers, to address different (groups of) people. Because this station is relatively resource rich, it is able to dedicate a digital channel, rather than its "main" broadcast channel, to this initiative. Other resource poorer

stations may not have this luxury. When serving different and diverse communities, a pluralistic approach may not be possible with the schedule.

> We have a whole bunch of small communities like…so it's hard to just concentrate on one particular community. So when we do programs we have to be conscious of that, and hopefully the programs we do are applicable to not just particular community but all the ones in the [region] area. (Interviewee E, low power, college/university licensee)

Determining which programs are applicable to the community, which issues are important and relevant, may also involve collaboration. While most programmers feel a strong sense of connection to the community, many stations call on a community advisory board for additional programming input.

> We get a lot of advice from our public advisory council when we're doing it [putting together the schedule]. We have about 24 people on that council and they're an official representative to the board of trustees here at the university. We meet with them quarterly here at the station and they advise us; not on day-to-day operations, but the kind of things we ought to be looking at to meet community needs. (Interviewee E, low power, college/university licensee)

Advisory boards are one vehicle for understanding community needs. Another station with a larger broadcast area finds it beneficial to travel to the multiple geographic communities it serves.

> Several times a year we go to communities throughout the state. We produce programming from these communities. We have dignitaries and mayors and everyone from that area participate in these programs. (Interviewee G, low power, state authority licensee)

In an effort to continue serving its geographically dispersed communities, the station makes an effort to travel to these areas. Collaborations with organizations and "dignitaries and mayors" on local productions keep a large PBS member station connected with its multiple communities. In contrast, some stations have very little

connection with the communities they serve. One programmer who schedules for two stations spoke of the secondary station as lacking a community connection.

> I don't really think of [call sign] as being part of a community. We have no real connection with [university]. (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee)

The station is licensed to serve a town with a large university. Because the station has no relationship with the university, which is the primary institution in the community, the station therefore lacks a community connection.

Different stations, because of their different licensing arrangements, different structures, and different communities use different approaches to connecting with organizations and individuals. Collaborations are discussed as essential for connecting the station to the community through programming. These collaborations help promote programs and connect to diverse audiences. However, collaborations also instill a sense of responsibility of public television stations to their communities by addressing issues of concern.

Ideal-Type 3: Facilitator of the Public Sphere

Aufderheide's (1991) imagines public television as the facilitator of the public sphere. Rather than focusing on program production, stations would facilitate conversation and interaction on diverse topics from diverse viewpoints, including those of nonmajoritatian and marginalized groups. The public sphere differentiates between consumer needs and citizen needs and serves the latter (Hoynes, 1999). Public television stations that work toward the ideal-typical role of facilitator of the public sphere see as one of their primary missions the facilitation of information delivery. The program director at one such station described the objective of the station.

> We're trying to be a facilitator of information that can be helpful to the community. (Interviewee E, low power, college/university licensee)

For public television stations to serve as facilitators of the electronic public sphere a strong commitment to news and public affairs programming must exist; this programming reflects the views of un(der)served populations and give voice to nonmajoritarian views on issues. In-depth news reporting and public affairs programming are relatively resource expensive enterprises and do not garner high ratings in return. However, the importance of these programs to the public sphere and to the mission of many PBS member stations keeps them in the schedules.

> We continue to air several public affairs kinds of shows that do not draw the largest numbers, but they have a faithful small audience, and we want to continue to keep the public affairs program in. (Interviewee G, low power, state authority licensee)

A commitment to this genre of programming is necessary as a facilitator of the public sphere. Some stations focus on delivering news and public affairs at the local level.

> We are of course covering these stories [of local interest] in the community on each Friday. They'll do a show that is really four guests analyzing those issues in the community. (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)

Others take a more global perspective and focus on delivering programs that include international news.

> We air programs that may not have high ratings, but are important information for people to know, such as world events. (Interviewee I, high power, college/university licensee)

Whether local, global, or even glocal, in nature, news and public affairs programming is an important genre to many stations; further this genre of programming is necessary in creating a functioning public sphere. Also essential is the idea of sharing diverse

viewpoints on an issue. In the nonprofit literature, this can be understood as serving the needs of un(der)served peoples.

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 charged public television stations with serving the needs of unserved or underserved audiences. Stations often define these audiences along lines of racial, ethnic, and nationality identities. Examples of specific audiences served by stations are illustrated by programmers' mention of these groups.

> I also try to do my best trying to find programming that would be pertinent to the community and because of the large Native American population I have scheduled Sundays at 7 pm every week I try to maintain that time for Native American programming. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

> We have a large Native American population. We have the largest or second largest Somalian population. We have the second or third largest Hmong population settlement in the U.S. We are beginning to see a large number of other communities—refugee communities. Our community is changing. We acquire programs to serve all of these. (Interviewee B, high/medium power, community licensee)

> We have a large pocket of German population. Some recently immigrated and businesses that have grown up around the [company] plant many of them are German. We broadcast one hour of programming from Deutsche Welle German origination in our overnight schedule. Half hour that is English, half hour that is German language, but the area right around there is not the only area that is German pocketed, there are a couple of other small areas. (Interviewee G, low power, state authority licensee)

> One of the communities we have worked with is the Armenian community. There is not a lot of programming for the Armenians, but whatever there is [we air]. We're very conscious that that is an audience of ours. (Interviewee M, high power, state authority licensee)

> Our Hispanic population is growing and we do try to keep some Hispanic programming in our schedule. It is not a large number yet, but it is a growing number. Possibly later we will be expanding. (Interviewee G, low power, state authority licensee)

> Our [program title] program deals with older [city residents] and how to make their lives a little bit better. Our [program title] show is probably the longest-running minority affairs show in public television. And that one

> of course tries to talk about, certainly African-Americans, but other minorities as well in [city] and what can help them out. (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)
>
> I would say that the most obvious [audience] would be our African American audience. [City] is about 20 percent African American, so we have a large African American population, and we do do a substantial amount, particularly in February, but all year round programming that would be of particular interest to the African American population; historical documentaries and that kind of thing. (Interviewee K, medium power, community licensee)

The different audiences highlighted by programmers illustrate potentially unserved or underserved groups. Many public television stations see it as part of their mission to find or develop programming to serve specific needs of these groups. However, at least one other station believes programming directly targeted at marginalized groups is demeaning to the group, implying its issues are compartmentalized rather than shared with a larger public.

> I generally however do not do regularly scheduled programs about any ethnic or religious group. I don't feel it's my job to single out one group and say this group is in so much need of attention, or is so oppressed, that I have to address their needs at least once a month or every week. So for that reason, I don't carry *Disabilities Today* or *In the Life*, about gay and lesbian issues. I carry programs about disabled people and I carry programs about and for homosexuals. But I'm not going to single people out and say this group needs special attention. I of course consider it our responsibility and opportunity to serve our entire audience and serve them throughout the year, not just in theme months. … We're licensed to serve the community, the whole community. (Interviewee J, medium power, college/university licensee)

Serving unserved and underserved audiences is conceptualized differently at different stations. Many program directors actively acquire programming targeted toward such audiences in an effort to meet the potentially unique needs of these groups and create a space for them that may not exist on commercial television. At least one program

director, and possibly more, chooses not to air audience specific programs suggesting that it trivializes their experiences and suggests they are not shared by others.

The metaphor of the public sphere requires informational programming from diverse perspectives. Though it may seem at first that stations who choose to air programming targeted at minority or marginalized audiences fulfill this aspect of the public sphere more completely than those who choose not to, that may not be the case. By specifying programming toward a particular group, the audience may become fragmented. A fragmented audience does not hear diverse perspectives of an issue, but rather tunes in and out if the program based on its seeming relevance to the viewer. For this reason, the programmer who does air programs about disabled people without carrying *Disabilities Today*, and airs programs for and about homosexuals without airing *In the Life* is contributing toward the metaphor of the public sphere. Perhaps even more so than programmers who aim to serve the unique needs of specific and marginalized groups.

In addition to a commitment to news and public affairs programs and the delivery of diverse perspectives, inclusion of nonmajoritarian viewpoints is essential to the construction of the public sphere. Nonmajoritatian might be considered as subsumed under serving the needs of unserved, underserved, minority and marginalized groups, but these are not equivalent. Giving voice to nonmajoritarian perspectives also includes diversity of political viewpoints. Inclusion of nonmajoritarian views can sometimes be a risky decision for program directors.

> One of the things that we added to the schedule [at another PBS member station] was a controversial program called *Democracy Now!* which is very left wing liberal, but I felt at the time that it brought a very unheard voice to the forefront. And if you know anything about the show, the

> woman is pretty anti-Bush and pretty anti-war, and very liberal, end of story. Took a lot of heat for putting it on the air. On the other hand those voices weren't being heard. (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

A commitment to unheard voices and unpopular political perspectives can be risky for programmers, especially those with an eye to the ratings. In other cases, it makes sense to some programmers to try to balance political viewpoints of programming. The same programmer describes the viewing area of the station as serving two major towns: a conservative town and a liberal town.

> In [town 1] you have a very conservative market. In [town 2], it a university town, and so there's a very liberal base, so we had to play two sides. So I found a lot of shows that might be intellectually stimulating, and or liberal, environmental shows and things like that to play to the [liberal] base. And I wasn't immune to playing conservative shows, for example that's a huge conservative Mormon base in [first town], and of course the Mormon church puts on shows and I put them on the air. So there' a lot of flux that has to happen. (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

Playing to two sides is one approach to including nonmajoritarian viewpoints, and seems to be popular with stations that serve bifurcated audiences, usually a conservative town and a liberal college town. Another programmer has a similar situation, but makes a stronger point of dividing the programming schedule to target each audience.

> You tend to have your more liberal college town and all the characteristics that go with that: people who want to see a lot of metropolitan operas, they want to see a lot of music programs; they want to see a lot of in depth investigation. You also have your rural outlying area that might be considerably older. They love their quilting and sewing and different programs. They might be much more solid *Newshour* viewers. And so what I have to tend to do is think in terms of when is, if I just want to break into those two audiences for the sake of conversation, I have to think about when is each of the viewing clusters available to watch. I have to program to their day part as opposed to trying to mix it all together into one chunk. (Interviewee N, low power, college/university licensee)

However, "mixing it all together in one chunk" is what is suggested by scholars as required for a functional public sphere (Aufderheide, 1999). Echoing earlier concerns about targeting audiences at the expense of exposure to diverse perspectives, by segmenting audiences to not offend, political viewpoint diversity is weakened.

What makes for excellent programming strategy, specifically audience segmentation and catering to habitual viewing, makes for a nonfunctioning electronic public sphere. Rather than working to bridge the differences experienced by communities, successful programming strategy works to continue their divide by catering to specific audiences at different times.

Accepting the ideal-typical role of facilitator of the public sphere is a risky endeavor. It involves a serious commitment to delivering often expensive news and public affairs programming. Introducing minority perspectives and nonmajoritarian viewpoints into the mix will tax many smaller stations resources. Audience reaction is likely to be initially negative. A change in the schedule is rarely immediately accepted. And ratings may drop as viewers turn away from the station to programming that does not challenge strongly held beliefs. Programming to facilitate the public sphere is not regarded as a wise strategy for ratings conscious stations.

At least one station is managing to begin the process of facilitating a public sphere. Quoted earlier, this program manager's philosophy of programming is worth repeating here.

> [W]e looked at maybe a different model of community programming and production. And we began examining the notion that was put forth by work being done at the Benton foundation and other places about looking at your community's assets and thinking about your… public station in a different role… More as a hub center of being able to serve the needs of the community by bringing the content of organizations that already serve

> the community: educational organizations, nonprofit institutions, social service agencies, state governments. So we began working on a process where our production model changed, and we identified mission-similar organizations that might be willing to invest in programming and production that would take their content, produce it, and allow us to broadcast it. (Interviewee B, high/medium power, community licensee)

Serving as a hub center to bring content from existing organizations together nearly mirror's Aufderheide's (1991) challenge to public television stations. "A truly public television would have to become an institution whose first job is …to make programs that fortify the public sphere. Assuming this challenge would mean forsaking the traditional role of broadcaster to become an organizer of electronic public space" (p. 180). Without forsaking its role as broadcaster, this station reexamined its role as a producing station in the community and chose to work toward including the voices of ethnically, racially, nationality, and otherwise diverse populations in its schedule. Working with organizations to turn their content (speeches, lectures, performances) into programming and working with producers and other individuals to enhance the quality of their productions, this station appears the best able to serve in the ideal-typical role of facilitator of the public sphere.

Ideal-Type 4: Innovator

The ideal-typical role of innovator comes from economic and political nonprofit theories. Nonprofit organizations are often the first to experiment with new ideas. If economically successful, these ideas are often adopted by the market sector. If deemed an innovation necessary to serve the majority of the citizenry, the government sector may also implement it. In their role as innovator, nonprofit organizations are vital for invigorating society with new ideas and approaches. Additionally, the value of the products of the culture industries is dependent on constant innovation of ideas. Public

television is again at the intersection point of these two territories, thus is positioned to exemplify the ideal-typical role of innovator.

Programmers had little to say about innovation in public television. Only one program director spoke of innovation at the station.

> [We have a] long standing tradition of local programming, innovation, and local community support. We have not experienced all the struggles of some other stations in other communities. We are generally really well supported. (Interviewee B, high/medium power, community licensee)

The program director clearly identifies innovation as one of the station's "long standing" traditions. By doing so, it is clear that attention is paid to this role and an effort is made to maintain the tradition. The station's innovation was described in terms of production formats.

> With other [community] organizations we began producing an offering with the opportunity to create more complicated productions than just speeches and lectures: documentaries, town meetings, a variety of formats, some of which we've been inventing as we went along. (Interviewee B, high/medium power, community licensee)

As with the concept of trust, programmers were largely silent on the role of innovation at their stations. Again, this is surprising considering the position of public television in the overlap as a cultural producer and nonprofit organization and its perceived lead in stations across the nation to adopt a digital broadcast platform.

Ideal-Type 5: Government Extension

The final ideal-typical role, that of government extension is constructed from the concept of nonprofit organizations as mediators between individuals large bureaucracies and the concept of nonprofit organizations as knowledge repositories. Young (1998) says that because governments are large bureaucratic entities, people are often frustrated by interactions with the government. Because of this size constraint, the lack of direct

interaction between government and people leads to a knowledge constraint. Governments become out-of-touch with citizen needs. Nonprofit organizations can serve to remedy these situations by serving as mediators between individuals and governments. Further nonprofit organizations can gather information on citizen concerns and communicate those to government.

Many public television stations are licensed to government bodies, specifically states, college and universities, and school boards or local municipalities. Almost all PBS member stations that are not community licensees are, to some degree, extensions of state or local governments. In their ideal-typical roles of government extensions, stations would act as knowledge repositories: gathering, storing, and communicating the concerns of local citizens to government bodies. Additionally, public television stations would serve as lubricants between government and individuals, facilitating interaction to avoid the frustration experienced when interacting with large bureaucracies.

Broadcast television stations are encouraged to keep a public file including ascertainment reports. These reports are designed to track issues and concerns in the community and how they are being addressed by the station. Public television, with its declared mission of localism may be more acutely aware of these issues than commercial stations. However, never in the interviews was the role of public television as a knowledge repository breached. No one mentioned ascertainment reports or even public files. Most stations did acknowledge that they were aware of issues affecting the community and either acquired or produced programming to address these issues. But these mentions were not in the context of providing that information to government bodies.

As mediators between large bureaucracies and individuals, some programmers did see a role for their stations. One programmer discussed the connection between the station and a department within the state government.

> We have a number of outreach and a number of partners that we work with. I have a couple of partners that we're working on the [state] Council of Humanity trying to showcase local filmmakers. So we're working out in the community with that. (Interviewee M, high power, state authority licensee)

The partnership creates an environment where each partner can excel in their own strengths. The Council of Humanity is serving in a bureaucratic role and funding the project, and the station is using its resources—its air time and outreach program—to showcase the filmmakers and their work. A less structured approach to mediating between government bureaucracy is the idea of producing programming with participation from local government officials.

> Several times a year we go to communities throughout the state. We produce programming from these communities. We have dignitaries and mayors and everyone from that area participate in these programs. (Interviewee G, low power, state authority licensee)

Including the mayors of the cities and towns is another way that public television stations serve as extensions of the government by mediating between bureaucracy and individuals. Another station, in the process of restructuring its local production approach, decided to work with community institutions to produce local programming. Among its partnerships are social service agencies and state governments.

> [W]e looked at maybe a different model of community programming and production. … More as a hub center of being able to serve the needs of the community by bringing the content of organizations that already serve the community: educational organizations, nonprofit institutions, social service agencies, state governments. (Interviewee B, high/medium power, community licensee)

In both of these latter examples of the stations working with local and state governments, information delivered from government officials via television can be a more palatable model than direct interaction with government bodies to obtain and understand the information. Often stations will use these programs to give context to the issues discussed by government officials, ask important questions of them, and offer resources for viewers interested in more information.

Though few stations directly addressed the position of serving as a repository of knowledge, they are obligated to do so in their obligation to serve in the public interest. It is interesting that none chose to discuss this obligation, even in the context of serving the community. However, some stations did discuss their role as mediator between governmental bodies and viewers, primarily through program production, but also through outreach efforts.

The ideal-typical roles presented for organization and analysis of the qualitative interview data are logical ideals; they represent tools for comparison. No station is expected to exemplify any, much less every, role. While some stations appear to strive toward these roles and their component parts, no station will ever achieve an ideal-type. The ideal-typical roles considered for analysis included (1) provider of public goods, (2) builder of social capital, (3) facilitator of the public sphere, (4) innovator, and (5) government extension.

Public television has long held as two of its values that of education and culture. The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 requires stations to program to meet the instructional, educational, and cultural needs of the audience. Many stations still hold these two values tightly, especially education. The formalized tie between many PBS

member stations and the educational institutions to which they are licensed works to strengthen this role.

In the role of builder of social capital, community connections and trust are explored. Stations form community connections at multiple levels, for differing lengths of time, to achieve different objectives. Community networks benefit stations by promoting the station and its programming through organizations and bringing in diverse audiences. Stations are also connected to the community through these ties and are expected to be responsive to community needs. Trust is implied across these networks, though it was never directly stated in interviews.

The facilitator of the public sphere role requires a commitment to news and public affairs programming from diverse perspectives that gives voice to nonmajoritarian viewpoints. Many stations stated an explicit commitment to news and public affairs programs, but few discussed airing diverse perspectives or nonmajoritarian political viewpoints. Program acquisition, production and scheduling specifically tailored for minority and marginalized audiences was discussed. Segmenting the audience by assumed political affiliation was also mentioned, but these approaches work against the public sphere by separating divergent viewpoints rather than creating a space where they converge.

The role of innovator was only mentioned by one programmer. The PBS member station has a tradition of innovation and is innovating program formats for its new digital channel that focuses on local productions. Finally, the role of stations as government extension was expressed by programmers in their station's role as mediators between individuals and state and local governments.

It is important to note that an interpretive approach to analyzing data does not allow for, nor does it strive to deliver, quantifiable or generalizeable results. Rather, interpretation and analysis of the qualitative data is undertaken in an effort to show the difference in PBS member stations' programming philosophies with regard to serving in a nonprofit orientation. Programmers were not asked directly about any of the nonprofit ideal-typical roles, but rather their responses to the questions presented in the qualitative methods section were analyzed for these roles. Stations that consistently and extensively mentioned nonprofit ideal-types were classified in the "high" category. Those who offered relatively few mentions (generally 3 or less) of the employment nonprofit idea-types in schedule decision-making were classified at "low." Stations falling between the extremes were classified as "medium." A summary of nonprofit orientation is presented in tables 2 and 3.

To provide contrast and a depth of comparison across stations, themes that represent a tendency toward market or for profit orientations were also explored. Using the obstructions to idealized nonprofit roles presented in the review of the literature on public television as a framework, the following for profit oriented themes were identified: (1) commitment to ratings, (2) emphasis of membership over viewership, and (3) a focus on program underwriting. Because ratings, membership, and underwriting are not in and of themselves for-profit motives, references to ratings, membership, and underwriting by participants in the interviews are dissected for their for market or neutral approaches. Each of these themes is illustrated with market-oriented examples from interviews and neutral examples in the orientation results presented below.

For profit Theme 1: Ratings

While several programmers expressed using ratings as one way to measure the success of particular programs in the schedule, some stations' focus on ratings seemed to go beyond their use as an indicator. One programmer acknowledged a perceived stigma associated with ratings use by public television stations.

> You try not to be a ratings-driven station, but you kind of have to be. (Interviewee D, medium power, community licensee)

Ratings are extremely important to measuring the success of the schedule at some stations. In order to keep the schedule successful, one station hired a person dedicated to ratings analysis

> We try to look at ratings. We have hired a consultant who helps us keep track of the ratings and where best many programs would go, where they would work best. (Interviewee G, low power, state authority licensee)

The emphasis is moved from the viewer to the rating, and placing programs in select day parts to achieve higher ratings. The pressure on some stations to keep ratings numbers up can seemingly come at the expense of mission programming.

> Now I know theoretically and realistically, I should be using those non-measured months to continue build audience so that they will be there when we are being measured by Nielsen. But I do use those months for a lot of mission programming because I don't have to worry about what my ratings are then. (Interviewee J, medium power, college/university licensee)

Though this programmer has to worry about the ratings, rather than use them as an indicator, mission programming still works its way into the schedule, even if it is not the primary type of programming scheduled.

Ratings were also discussed in a neutral way where emphasis was either on use of the numbers as an indicator or their general use as a means to an end of understanding the audience, rather than being the end themselves.

> What we're trying to do is something that's very utilitarian we know that we're not going to please everyone, we can only try to please as many people as we can to make it as useful to people and you know what sounds like…ratings. Oh my god ratings. . .well ratings are important to a certain extent. I mean obviously we don't live and die with ratings like commercial station, there's relevance to ratings, it is a measure of do you matter to the community you are serving. (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee)

The phrase "we don't live or die" by the ratings was repeated by many programmers, thus deemphasizing the importance placed on the measure.

> We don't go 100% by ratings. We don't live or die by them. We like to keep them as an indicator. (Interviewee L, medium power, community licensee)

Another programmer uses ratings as a tool to understand the audience.

> You certainly try to keep a little bit of an eye on the ratings as far as how many people are we really serving. We don't like and die by them. When something strange happens like [a really high rating], trying to understand why did that happen? And how can I make it happen again to serve more audience? (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)

When asked how the programmer knows that the schedule has been successful, one respondent immediately referenced ratings, but then softened to say that they are not the primary criteria for program selection.

> Obviously the Nielsens, because we're looking at making sure at least somebody's out there looking, watching our shows here. That's not necessarily the primary criteria for determining whether the show should be in there. (Interviewee E, low power, college/university licensee)

Harder to classify was one programmer's primary reliance on ratings data. However, the language used to explain the use of ratings references them as a reliable and valid tool, a means, rather than an end themselves.

> The primary thing that I rely on, to be honest with you, is my Nielsen book that I get 4 times a year. It measures what I'm doing reliably and validity. It measures those things so that they are statistically significant. (Interviewee J, medium power, college/university licensee)

The line between for profit orientation and neutral is a blurred one, but an effort has been made to make the distinction. The extent to which ratings are a vital part of a programmer's decision-making and the use of ratings—as a means or as the ends—help distinguish these two approaches to ratings by PBS member station programmers.

For Profit Theme 2: Membership

Membership themes with a market or for profit orientation center around catering to members over a general viewers. Rather than serving the overall audience, a focus on serving viewers who financially contribute to the station through membership is regarded as a market oriented approach to program selection and scheduling. The transactional approach to scheduling—selecting and programming content to meet the needs and desires of dues paying users above others—is not inherently for profit, but does suggest a more marketplace orientation to programming philosophy. Stations who exhibited this orientation during the interview generally mentioned program selection being, to some degree, influenced by membership donations.

> There's a certain amount of discretionary money, what are we going to spend that on? If the Welk people want to give you a lot of money, which they do, you're going to make damn sure they get *Lawrence Welk*. (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee)

Programming around contributions suggests a certain cult of funding. Implied is the suggestion that those people with money who choose to donate it to the station are more deserving of having their favorite programming aired. It is a transactional market-oriented approach to programming. Programmers use on-air fundraising or pledge drives as a voice for program or program genres.

> And of course pledge drives tell us a lot. People throw a lot of money behind certain kinds of programs, sort of gives us a vote of confidence in

> that kind of genre of show. (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

Even shows with a relatively small audience are kept in the schedule, especially if that audience is loyal and donates to public television.

> We'll keep programs on the air that have a relatively small audience, but we know that it's a very loyal audience, and that it's something that is really important for them to have there. *Nightly Business Report*—it doesn't really, and I think you'd find this very typical across the country in public television, it doesn't really get that much ratings. But that audience as we've learned is extremely loyal to public television and contributes to public television. (Interviewee M, high power, state authority licensee)

These three excerpts identify the ways that membership is used as a for profit or market oriented approach to programming. These approaches are transactional in their nature suggesting a direct and personalized return on investment in the station.

Attention paid to membership is not always market oriented. In many cases it carries a neutral tone. This programmer identifies what is considered by many programmers as a flaw in the membership process.

> It's really nice to do some fundraising around mission programming. It doesn't happen too often. I think everybody would like to get back to something that signals the value of your organization. When you change all the programming…you know the difference between many of the pledge programs and the regular schedule…a lot of the people that we serve with our regular programming just go away [during pledge time]. It becomes very transactional. Not everybody, not all the time, but it's a lot. And I think the system is recognizing it. (Interviewee C, medium power, community licensee)

By changing programming during membership drives, public television stations bring in viewers and members on a transactional basis. Their needs are often not met in any time other than pledge. Other programmers recognize and decry the shift away from mission programs during fundraising months.

> If we make any money during a pledge drive, but even that is difficult, Because it's hard to. The way the system is set up, is that say in March, that's the big [on-air pledge drive], all the regular schedule programs go

> away. You're only offered the performances; well they're not in your regular schedule. And that's been one thing that has really been a complaint from our end. (Interviewee F, medium power, community licensee)

Stations that strive to keep mission programming the focus of membership drives tend toward a neutral approach to membership. Rather than being a one-time or three-times-a-year transaction between members and the station, membership around mission programming suggests support of the overall purpose of the station. For some stations, mission versus transactional programming does not affect membership.

> This is a community that tends to be not of a real philanthropic bent. Given the community, I would say our membership numbers are good, but not great. (Interviewee K, medium power, community licensee)

A major emphasis is not placed on membership by the programmer, thus suggesting that program decision making is not contingent on membership donations. Again, the difference between a market orientation to membership and a neutral orientation is not distinct, but the conceptual approach to making that distinction presented is applied in this dissertation.

For Profit Theme 3: Underwriting

Underwriting was cited by a few stations as a measure of the success of the programming schedule. Underwriting mentions considered as for profit oriented focused primarily on underwriting as a financial measure of success, while neutral mentions interpreted underwriting differently.

> So yeah, there's different ways [to measure our success] and we're fairly financially successful here in [our area]. A lot better off I might add than a lot of stations our size, so we measure that success. We have ways through CPB to measure ourselves against other stations our size. (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

The direct link between the financial aspect of underwriting as a measure of the success of the on-air schedule clearly creates a market oriented approach to corporate philanthropy.

Neutral approaches to underwriting include noting the success of underwriting but not tying its value to financials, interpreting underwriting as a corporate gesture of approval, and the separation of underwriting from program selection. One programmer describes how the station measures success.

> The fact that our underwriting operation is hugely successful is another good measure. (Interviewee K, medium power, community licensee)

This comment is particularly hard to classify, but because it is void of transactional references and leaves why the operation is successful unanswered, it cannot be classified as market-oriented and is thus neutral. The same programmer who previously used underwriting in a market-oriented approach also offers a neutral approach.

> Do our corporate partners see us as a successful organization that they are willing to put money behind it in a philanthropic way? Because frankly a lot of organizations don't get a lot of advertising dollar bang for their buck underwriting programs, but they do see it as a way to support a good organization. (Interviewee H, medium power, community licensee)

The focus here is on the philanthropic approach to corporate funding. Corporate funding is not referred to as an end; it is a means to measure whether the station is viewed as a valued partner, a successful organization. Another programmer chooses not to toe the line between underwriting and programming.

> You know underwriting, commercials have nothing to do with my decision on what programs I choose. My decisions are based on what I think my audience is really going to want to watch. (Interviewee M, high power, state authority licensee)

Underwriting and corporate support are growing funding mechanisms for PBS member stations. How stations conceptualize these partnerships determines how the partnerships

influence programming decisions. Identifying market-oriented versus neutral approaches to the relationship between underwriting and programming on stations is an important step to being able to classify stations using the power-orientation model.

Stations with a relatively higher emphasis on the market-oriented themes were classified in the "medium" category. Those with relatively little of no mention of any of the for profit ideal-types were classified in the "low" category. No programmer suggested that their station's program schedule was decided largely with a for profit agenda, thus no station is classified in the "high" category. Classification of the results of the for profit orientation qualitative analysis are shown in tables 2 and 3.

Table 2

Stations Identified by License Type, Power and Orientation Classification

Station	License Type	Power	Nonprofit Orientation	For Profit Orientation
B	Community	High/Medium	High	Low
A	Community	High/Medium	Medium	Low
F	Community	Medium	High	Low
D	Community	Medium	Low	Medium
K	Community	Medium	Low	Medium
C	Community	Medium	Medium	Low
H	Community	Medium	Medium	Low
L	Community	Medium	Medium	Low
I	College/University	High	Medium	Low
J	College/University	Medium	Medium	Low
E	College/University	Low	High	Low
N	College/University	Low	Low	Medium
M	State Authority	High	Medium	Low
G	State Authority	Low	Medium	Low

Table 3

Distribution of Stations into Power and Orientation Classification

		Power		
		Low	Medium	High
Nonprofit Orientation	Low	1	1	1
	Medium	2	4	1
	High	0	3[3]	1[4]
For Profit Orientation	Low	2	5	4
	Medium	1	2	0
	High	0	0	0

The results of the quantitative and qualitative research presented in this chapter are discussed independently and in relation to each other in chapter six.

[3] The programmer from stations A programmed two broadcast stations. One station was classified in the high power range, the other in the medium power range

[4] The programmer from stations B programmed two broadcast stations. One station was classified in the high power range, the other in the medium power range

CHAPTER SIX
DISCUSSION

This dissertation set out to answer four research questions: two regarding measures, and two the results of those measures. The utility of the operationalizations of power and orientation presented in this dissertation will be discussed briefly in this chapter and their limitations presented in chapter seven. The results of the quantitative (power) and qualitative (power and orientation) analysis will also be discussed here, as well as any connections that can be drawn between the two studies.

Power

The operationalization of power as a correlation score comparing member stations primetime schedules with the PBS Schedule X feed is a major contribution of this dissertation to the scholarship of the field. By using correlation analysis, an agreement score can be determined and used as an indicator of scheduling autonomy at the organizational level. At the system level, the distribution of scores can be used to interpret whether the system at large exhibits a preference toward centralization or distribution of power.

Correlation scores from the quantitative study were divided into three classifications of power: high, medium, and low. Stations classified as low power were those whose correlation scores were 0.700 or higher (N=24), suggesting a schedule that closely reflects the one fed from PBS on Schedule X. Close to 16% of responding stations were classified into this category. Though not a stated hypothesis, this number was fewer than anticipated by the researcher. More than 80% of the responding stations

had a correlation score of 0.700 or less. The number of stations classified as high power with correlation scores at or below 0.299 (*N*=23), about 15% of responding stations, was higher than anticipated by the researcher.

Research question two asks how programmers at PBS member stations describe their programming decision making with regard to power. Some explanations to the power scores' distribution may be found in the power themes of the interviews—specifically localism. Others may lie in the unique situations of the stations whose low correlation scores classified them in the high power range.

The most popular power theme from the interviews proved to be localism. Nearly every station interviewed made at least one comment about the importance of localism to the station and its programming schedule. The Public Television Programmers' Handbook's (TRAC Media Services, n.d) claims public television as the last home for local broadcasting in the nation. As previously noted localism has several conceptualizations and operationalizations, ranging from a locally produced program to a locally selected program, in broadcasting scholarship.

Localism was presented as the highest power theme to emerge from the interviews. Aggressively programming an on-air schedule to meet the needs of a local audience suggests, on its face, that those needs will be different from a national audience. However, because nearly every programmer weighed in with some expression of localism, the theme does not capture the highest programming power stations alone.

Beyond the theme of localism, the classification of stations into a high power category may have less to do with power and more to do with unique circumstances. Two of the stations classified as high power are not the only broadcasts from a licensee.

In each of these two cases, the high power station is not considered the "primary" station of the licensee. One programmer described the situation:

> I don't really think of [high power station] as being part of a community. We have no real connection with [university]. For the community, it's like a value added, not only are you getting PBS as you know it, you're getting another public television station. (Interviewee A, high/medium power, community licensee)

The value of the high power station is its ability to provide "additional material" to the station that is considered to be the primary station for the licensee—a medium power station. Another instance of having two broadcast stations operated and programmed by one licensee is station B. Unlike the interview with the programmer from station A, in the interview with the programmer from station B, the emphasis was almost entirely on the high power station despite it not being the primary station for the licensee. The primary station for the licensee fell into the medium classification as well.

There are also several stations that fall into the special categorization of PDP stations. These stations contract with PBS to have access to a percentage of NPS programming. Most PDP stations are smaller member stations with a significant signal overlap with a larger PBS member station. Thus, rather than exhibiting high power by differentiating local schedules from the PBS Schedule X feed, these stations are contractually obligated by PBS to do so. Interviewee M (high power, state authority) programs for a PDP station.

Also, any station choosing to do on-air fundraising during this time would have a differentiated schedule. This is an expression of power to conduct a pledge drive outside of the national pledge dates, however, it masks the possibility that during non-pledge dates, the station may program in accordance with the PBS Schedule X feed. Because of

the differing approaches to utilizing programming for fundraising, it is impossible to know how many stations were conducting on-air pledge campaigns. Some stations elect to air their usual prime time schedule with short fundraising appeals between programs or inserted within programs. Other stations, or the same stations at different times, may elect to air programming created specifically for fundraising purposes. This programming may be locally produced, produced by another station within the PBS system, or produced by an outside organization and either distributed via PBS or purchased directly by the station.

Deviation from the national schedule can be interpreted as a medium power theme. Stations who deviated tended to do so only in time shifting or when PBS was not mandating common carriage in a given time slot (Thursday nights). Still, these stations took advantage of opportunities to change the national feed to meet the station and audience's needs.

Excellence in PBS programming should also be understood as a medium power theme. Programmers who stressed this theme in their interviews fell mostly into the medium power category on the schedule analysis. The primary message of many programmers who expressed this theme was that PBS delivers high quality programming, and other than complimenting it with local productions or outside programming acquisitions, there is no need to deviate too heavily from the PBS national schedule.

The least powerful theme was the advantages of adherence to the national schedule. This theme was most often discussed by low and medium power stations and can be interpreted as a low power theme. Programmers who adhered to the national PBS schedule often cited pressure from PBS or station management to do so, and at least one

programmer mentioned imagining how much better the station could do if the common carriage requirement was not so restrictive.

The final power theme that emerged from the interviews is difficult to classify as high or low power. Outsourcing of scheduling was mentioned by two programmers. Both programmers' schedules were classified as medium power in the schedule analysis. Outsourcing could be understood as high power because of the choice to pay someone else (other than PBS, who stations are essentially already paying for this service) to create the on-air schedule. Alternately, outsourcing can be understood as low power because of the seeming lack of control that a station exhibits over their on-air schedule.

The emergent power themes generally map well onto the power classifications of stations. Though they do not offer rigid categorizations, they do allow for a deeper understanding of the quantitative power scores offered through the schedule analysis.

Research question four queried, in part, the relationship between station license type and power. A one-way ANOVA found a significant difference in power scores among license types. Post hoc t-tests revealed that stations licensed to local educational or municipal authorities had significantly higher power scores (lower correlations) than each of the other three license types (community, college/university, and state authority). These stations' schedules were significantly different from other license types. Their significantly lower correlation coefficients suggest they exhibit significantly greater power in scheduling than other license types. On its face, this finding makes sense: these stations exist primarily to serve very local audiences, and the licenses are generally held by schools or local governing bodies whose programming needs and decisions would likely differ from other licensees. However, this finding should be interpreted cautiously

because of the population size. Only six out of 168 stations are licensed to these types of entities.

Orientation

The operationalizations created for orientation through the ideal-types present an opportunity to examine the extent to which a station conforms to idealized roles. Nonprofit ideal-types for public television are created by the intersections of social, political, and economic theories from the nonprofit sector with literature of public television in the United States, whereas the for profit ideal-types stem primarily from the criticisms of the public television system. While other scholars (Aufderheide, 1991; Friedland, 1995; Hoynes, 1999) have assigned an ideal-type to public television, the operationalization presented in this dissertation presents five nonprofit ideal-types for public television in the United States. To provide a space for contrast, three for profit ideal-types are also created. The ideal-typical framework presented here provide future research with a point of comparison or evaluation, not only for programming schedules, but for other station activities as well.

Research question three asks to what extent do the programming decisions of PBS member stations reflect nonprofit and for profit orientations. Interviewees had much to say about the nonprofit ideal-type provider of the public good. This ideal-type to many represents the foundation of public television: education and culture. Educational and instructional programming are central to the missions of most college- and university-licensed PBS member stations (N=56). Three such licensees participated in interviews, with two expressing relatively high interest in serving the educational and instructional needs of schools and the community.

Culture is the other public good that public television is idealized as maintaining. The dichotomy between high and popular culture is clearly distinguished by most programmers, even those that question the distinction and how it is determined. *Lawrence Welk*, communicated by several participating programmers as the most base cultural offering currently on public television stations, may have acquired this label because of its commercial roots. The strong distinction made between public television and commercial television is challenged when programming crosses the lines between the two camps. Programming crossing over from public television to commercial television is acceptable. However when public television acquires and airs commercial programming, questions are raised about the distinction between the two systems, thus bringing the purpose and mission of public television into question.

What is perhaps more interesting is the shift from a concentration on high culture fare to more popular culture programming. Other than *Lawrence Welk*, decisions to acquire and air programs such as the *Red Green Show* and *America's Ballroom Challenge* begin to challenge Ouellette's (2002) constructions of elitist offerings and the public television audience they construct. Public television programmers appear to embrace both high culture and popular culture programs, but for different reasons. A sense of mission helps high culture find its place on the public airwaves, but the reasons for popular culture airings is less clear from participants or scholarly literature. For some stations, it may be a pull scenario, where viewers are demanding this type of programming. For others it may be a push scenario, where programmers put these programs out without demand and discover improved ratings. The motivations behind

the acceptance of popular culture programming into the schedules of PBS member stations is not answered by this dissertation, but is likely to vary station by station.

Many programmers, especially community licensees, also spoke at length about the connections formed between the station and the community. An important aspect to social capital not mentioned by programmers is trust. No one from the sample of stations discussed the role of trust between the station and the community. It can be understood and implied in relaying stories and experiences with community collaborations. Ongoing collaborations imply trust (Interviewees B and F). Communities turning to public television stations in a time of community crisis implies trust (Interviewee E). However, trust was never explicitly mentioned. Perhaps trust is taken for granted by public television programmers or they are unaware of its importance in the two fields that overlap at the point of public television: the cultural industries and the nonprofit sector. Its absence from conversation may seem at first a small omission, but trust is critical to the livelihood of organizations in the culture industries. Trust is an equally critical factor in the operation and success of nonprofit organizations. Thus, while program directors are eager with examples of community collaborations and networks, trust is somehow overlooked or assumed as implied in discussion.

Specifically in discussing the niche audiences served by the station, many programmers, again mostly community licensees, made a connection to the ideal-type of facilitator of the public sphere. Though Aufderheide (1991) insists bringing together of diverse groups is necessary for a functioning public sphere, the interview data suggest that programmers prefer to schedule programming in pockets for niche audiences rather than "mix it all together in one chunk" (Interviewee N). Thus the beginnings of the

foundations for the ideal-type of facilitator of the public sphere are evident through interviews with programmers, but their realizations as defined by Aufderheide (1991) and Hoynes (1999) are not fulfilled.

It is worth noting again how diverse programmers views on serving diverse and un(der)represented audiences in programming selection is. Many programmers saw it as part of their mission as a PBS member station to serve these audiences, but one programmer (Interviewee G) suggests it is not his or her role to determine who is and is not empowered in society. Thus an attempt to schedule programming for any specific disempowered group is not made.

Interestingly, the role of innovator was largely missing from the interviews with programmers. Historically PBS and its member stations have been associated with innovative programming series. The *Public Broadcasting Laboratory (PBL)* aired from 1966 to 1968 and exemplified the effort to create public television as a space for experimentation. *PBL,* funded by the Ford Foundation, was designed to be an "innovative and controversial national television magazine covering public affairs and the arts" (Engelman, 1996, p. 151). As a response to the counterculture movement of the time, *PBL* sought to reveal concealed truths, serve as an alternative voice, and embody the challengers of the dominant culture (Engelman, 1996). *An American Family* debuted in 1973 as one of the earliest now-termed reality television shows. Using a cinéma vérité style of filmmaking, production crews attempted to convey a level of realism as they filmed the Loud family. Over a period of seven months the filmmakers accumulated over 300 hours of film that documented a ruined marriage and the pronouncement by one

Loud son of his homosexuality (Witherspoon & Kovtiz, 2000). *An American Family* was an early innovator of the reality genre on television.

Whether innovation has disappeared from public television or was simply overlooked by programmers in the interviews cannot be answered by the research in this dissertation, but stations with very low correlation with Schedule X which exhibit high power might be offering innovative programming or practicing innovative scheduling of their stations. Unfortunately, this was not revealed in the interviews, but does present an interesting question for future research.

The ideal-typical role of government extension was most strongly embraced by the two stations that are state authority licensed PBS member station. Interviewee M discussed how the station works with governmental agencies to achieve larger social and community goals. Interviewee G, rather than explaining how the station works with government bodies, focused on how the station works to feature government officials. The licensee or parent organization, whether it be a state authority, a local educational or municipal authority, college or university, or community organization influences the nature of the station and likely its orientation. This distinction raises an important point of discussion for this dissertation: the use of nonprofit theory to create ideal-typical roles.

Nonprofit theories were combined with literature from the field of public television in the United States to create five idea-typical roles for public television stations. In studying the theories of nonprofit organizations, there is a clear intersection and overlap with the literature on public television. Public television scholarship discusses many of the concepts of nonprofit theories without specificly referencing

theories from this sector. This dissertation works to tie these two fields together. However, not all PBS member station licensees are nonprofit organizations.

PBS member stations licensed to community organizations are the majority of license types in the system. Their status as a nonprofit institution is the most pure. The other three license types begin to blur the distinction between nonprofit and government. Specifically PBS member stations part of a state network or local municipality are more closely aligned to the public or government sector. There are twenty state authority licensed public television networks, primarily in the southeast United States, including South Carolina Educational Television (SCETV), Georgia Public Broadcasting (GPB), Oklahoma Educational Television Authority (OETA), and Kentucky Educational Television (KET) among others. The structure of these organizations varies, but usually includes a 501(c)(3) fundraising organization. For example, the governing body for KET is the Kentucky Authority for Educational Television, an agency of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Two independent nonprofit foundations, the KET Foundation and the Commonwealth Fund for KET, solicit and manage the corporate, institutional, and individual contributions that support local productions as well as the acquisition of PBS and other national programs. Though it is a relatively small percentage of licensees in the PBS system (12%), they are an important group to address and recognize that due to their governing bodies their orientation may not reflect the nonprofit ideal-types created here as strongly as other licensees. Data from 19 of these twenty licensees were included in the quantitative power analysis and programmers from two state authority licensed stations were interviewed. One of these licensees had a power classification of low and

the other had a high power classification. Both were classified with a medium nonprofit orientation and low for profit orientation.

Theories from the nonprofit sector may not be as useful in understanding state authority licensees or local educational or municipal authority licensees. Rather, their roles may be better understood through an exploration of theories from the public sector which are not presented as part of this dissertation.

For profit orientation ideal-types are primarily based in economic criticisms of the public television system. The most common theme across all stations interviewed was the use of ratings, but not dependence on ratings—the mantra "we don't live or die by the ratings" was expressed by several programmers. However, they are considered a useful tool by many programmers for viewer information. The use of underwriting and membership as metrics for success present an interesting situation for member stations. These measures suggest a for profit or market orientation to measuring success which stations may be relying on for two reasons: lack of other metrics and the necessity of these metrics in an increasingly competitive marketplace.

Today's nonprofit organizations "face an environment characterized by higher levels of competition for funding, clients and audiences, talent, and recognition" (Phillis, 2005, p. 1). Though this dissertation presents alternate measures of evaluation through the five nonprofit ideal-types, the increasing levels of competition in the American mediascape are leading many public television stations to use marketplace measures to evaluate nonprofit performance.

The second part of research question four asks about relationships between station license type and orientation. Again, the relationships were not rigid, but may be helpful

in understanding the orientations of different types of stations. Provider of public goods (education and culture) was embraced most strongly by college/university licensees. Unfortunately no local educational or municipal authority licensed stations were available for interviews. Local educational licensees may have been able to offer differentiation within this ideal-type.

Community organization licensees were aggressive embracers of the builder of social capital and facilitator of the public sphere. Perhaps because their license holding organization is directly linked to the community rather than having that link mediated by another institution (educational or government) these organizations spent a great deal of time discussing the importance of public affairs programming and connecting members of the community.

Only one programmer discussed innovation. While an important aspect of the nonprofit sector, and arguably public television, it would be inappropriate to suggest that because this programmer of a community licensed station referenced innovative programming that there is a relationship between this license type and the ideal-type of innovator.

Three licensees discussed working with or as part of government organizations to serve audiences. Two of these three stations are licensed to state authorities. The third programmer uses the station's secondary broadcast as an outlet for many different local organizations and institutions, including government. On its face, this ideal-type does seem to fit well with state authority licensed stations, and the empirical data support this. Interviews with programmers at local municipal authorities would have been helpful in validating this relationship or finding additional dimensions or nuances.

No clear license type relationship existed within the for profit ideal-types. Most stations were classified as low, and of the three exceptions that were classified as medium, one was a college/university licensee and two were community licensees.

Power and Orientation Connections

Is there a relationship between power and orientation at PBS member stations? Though not a stated research question in this dissertation, basing the selection of interviewees on power classifications does imply a connection between the two concepts. The data do not present clear evidence of a relationship, but do make some suggestions.

Stations classified as medium or low power stations did not exhibit any trends across orientation classifications. High power stations (A, B and M) exhibited a medium or high nonprofit orientation and a low for profit orientation; programmers for high power stations focused more on nonprofit ideal-types in the interviews than for profit-ideal types. While this relationship may be interesting, and a promising line for future research, very little can be drawn from these data. The small sample size and dual nature of the data—quantitative and qualitative—each used to measure a different concept create a situation where no firm conclusions can be made about the relationship between these concepts.

Conclusion

The concepts of power and orientation are two primary strands of criticism in the public television literature (Phillis, 2005). The operationalizations of these concepts presented in this dissertation are useful starting points for research in this field. However, these operationalizations do have inherent limitations which are presented in chapter 7.

The results of the schedule analysis to measure power suggest stations are actively scheduling their on-air programming, differentiating it from the PBS Schedule X feed. Interview data on power point to an embrace of localism at the station level as a primary reason for the differentiation of member stations' schedules from the PBS feed. Three other power themes offered organization and explanation to the correlation scores. The fifth power theme of outsourcing was an unexpected emergent theme. Stations presented several illustrations of their (partial) embrace of nonprofit ideal-types.

For profit ideal-types were also explored and only three stations communicated a medium classification in this orientation. All others were classified as low, either because of an absence of these ideal-types from the interview data, or their careful neutral use of these ideal types as indicators, but not determiners of programming.

Stations licensed to local educational or municipal authorities exhibited significantly more power in programming than other license types. Licensure of the station may also be an indicator of the ideal-type expressed. Data suggest community licensees toward to creator of social capital and facilitator of the public sphere ideal-types, college/university licensees tended toward the provider of public goods ideal-type, and state authority licensees toward the government extension ideal-type. .

CHAPTER SEVEN
CONCLUSION

This dissertation works to use media theory, organizational theory, sociological theory, economic theory, and political theory to understand the program decision making of PBS member stations on two dimensions: power and orientation. An operationalization of power is presented and used to analyze 147 PBS member station schedules. Spearman's rho is a correlation score comparing program schedules of member stations with the PBS feed on Schedule X. Significant correlations ranged from 0.063 to 1.0. Orientation was operationalized as ideal-types emergent from the criticism of public television (for profit) and the intersections of nonprofit theory and criticism of public television (nonprofit). These ideal-types were used to code interviews conducted with programming staff at fourteen PBS member stations. Results suggest that PBS member stations exhibit variance among scheduling power with five main power themes emerging to offer explanation. Orientation classifications suggest most PBS member stations embrace a more nonprofit than for profit philosophy.There is no clear relationship between the concepts. Though license type appears to have some relationsip to power and orientation. This chapter will discuss the limitations of this study and suggestions for future research.

Limitations

The limitations of this dissertation exist primarily in the validity of the operationalizations of power and orientation and in data collection. The proposed operationalization of power has not been (to the author's knowledge) presented in previous research or utilized in previous studies. Further neither its validity nor reliability are rigidly tested as part of this study, though the emergent power themes do

offer some indication of validity. Similarly, the ideal-types suggested from the intersections of nonprofit theory and public television criticism which are operationalized to address research question 3 have not been presented previously and their validity as operationalizations of orientation are unknown. Future research should include validity and reliability testing of the operationalization of power and further use of the ideal-types to determine their usefulness in the operationalization of orientation.

Limitations in data collection were also problematic for this study. Though on-air schedules were requested from all 168 licensees in the PBS system, only 141 licensees (representing 147 stations) responded. The researcher later discovered that programming data for PBS member stations is also available online through station schedule link from the PBS.org Website. Future research in this area might utilize this database to achieve a full data set.

The choice of programming from the month of September was justified because aside from Labor Day this month does not include any other nationally observed holidays that might disturb usual programming schedules. Further, September is not one of the months traditionally designated as an on-air fundraising month. Those months are March, August and December. However, many stations are "sliding off" the national pledge dates to maximize viewership. Because of summer vacation plans and school schedules, many viewers are unavailable during August. Programmers have begun using September as an on-air fundraising month. This was evident in the schedule analysis of some stations when many presumed fundraising programs were scheduled across stations (e.g. *Bob Hope: The Road to Laughter*, *David Bowie: A Reality Tour*, *John Denver: A Song's Best Friend*, and *My Music: My Generation - The 60s* among others), however it

is not possible to know how many stations had scheduled fundraising programming for reasons discussed earlier. It is possible that the distribution of correlation coefficients calculated in other months would be different. Unless the fundraising programs are replaced with those not included in the primetime national schedule, higher correlations would be expected, suggesting a more centralized approach to scheduling during non-pledge weeks.

When entering programming data from station schedules, no differentiation among episodes was made within a series. Thus if PBS's Schedule X fed a different episode of *Antiques Roadshow* than was aired by a station, that data was lost, only the series title (*Antiques Roadshow*) was recorded. A programmer's choice to air a different episode than the one being fed by PBS could suggest a higher power classification than was assigned using the less detailed method employed in this study. Though quite tedious, future research could give unique program codes to each episode within a series to improve the validity of the power measure.

Solicitation of programming schedules also presented another problem with data collection. Several licensees in the PBS system program and manage more than one member station. Three such licensees provided scheduling information, each for both of their stations. The researcher could have made a decision to include only the "traditional" broadcast station—the one whose programming stream most resembled the PBS feed—but this was decided against because of the inherent bias it would introduce to the study. Rather, both broadcasts were included for these three stations. Future research should recognize this situation and choose the population of the study accordingly (perhaps only primary broadcast schedules of licensees or every PBS member station).

Data collection through interviews presented several limitations. In two instances, programmers selected for interviews programmed and operated two broadcast stations each. When discussing programming philosophy, it was not clear if the same philosophy applied to both stations or if the programmer was making reference to one station or the other in the interview. Also, though the quantitative study in this dissertation focuses on primetime programming, the interviews were not so narrowly cast. Programmers were not asked to only reflect on their primetime schedules, and thus the interview data pertaining to power cannot be directly linked to the quantitative data.

Finally, and most disappointing, I was not able to secure interviews with any programmers from the small group of stations licensed to local educational or municipal authorities—the only license type that was significantly different in its power scores. In fact, the majority of stations contacted with interview requests were unwilling or unable to offer an interview. The combination of professional schedules and a sense of distrust of the academic community, or outsiders in general, was palpable from some stations. Face-to-face interviews were requested via email from programmers who would be attending the annual PBS Showcase conference in 2006. Many programmers obliged, but one was overheard telling another programmer not to talk to me because I was doing academic research on public television. Thus only fourteen programmers were interviewed for this study, limiting the number of stations that can be categorized into orientation classifications.

Suggestions for Future Research

Where this dissertation stops short is in being able to show trends. Data collected are not longitudinal and therefore only represent a snapshot view of PBS member

stations. The literature of the field and, to some extent the interview data can hint at trends, but no valid empirical data has been gathered and applied to this model to allow an over-time analysis of stations. This criticism is important because organizations evolve over time. As an organization passes through evolutionary stages including emergence, transformation, and reemergence among others, their structures, purposes and relationships change (Aldrich, 1999). Over time many nonprofits move away from their starry-eyed, mission driven beginnings to adopt a political and economic organizational structure that allows for survival while meeting their mission. Thus, the age of the PBS member stations themselves can help to understand differences in orientation of program decision-making. Longitudinal data and age of the member stations is not available or considered in this dissertation, but could provide rich ground for future research.

Differences in station size and budget may account for differences in philosophies of programming. Stations with larger budgets that produce programming for national distribution would seem to have more power within the system and thus more flexibility with their schedules, but from data gathered here, the opposite emerges. Larger stations are, to some degree, more central to the system in terms of program production and distribution through PBS. This centralized role may create an inflexible situation for larger stations. Distributed power structures allow for more flexibility (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Banks et al., 2000). Flexibility is an important factor of survival for producers of the culture industries (Banks et al., 2000; Biltereyest, 2004). Though economies of scale benefit centralization, people trust local groups more than bureaucracies, and thus are more likely to trust a system where power resides locally. (Biltereyest, 2004). By including size and annual budget of stations, as well as whether

the station is considered a major national producing station, a better understanding of the dynamics behind scheduling could be explored.

Demographics information about the communities and audiences served by each station may affect the programming power and orientation of a station. A community or area's population density, average household income, average level of education, age distributions, and other factors may reflect a relationship with programming power or orientation of the station. How those relationships may look presents an interesting area for future research.

Additionally, programmers I spoke with have been with their stations or in the system for at least five years. Many have been in the system much longer, upwards of thirty years. These positions are beginning to turn over to a new generation of programmers. The programmers of tomorrow, and even today, do not know a world before the 1967 Act—there has always been public television for them. How will this next generation of programmers choose to schedule their air? Anecdotal evidence suggests they tend toward a market-orientation in their program decision-making. There is no clear divide between market and nonprofit orientation for them as exists with other programmers. This suggestion is only based on anecdotal evidence and should be explored further. Another call for longitudinal data gathering and analysis is in order.

Finally, we sit on the cusp of a digital transition. Stations will soon, if they do not already, have the capacity to muticast. Sending multiple streams of digital programming to audiences is an exciting new frontier for public television stations. APTS president John Lawson suggests this technology is public television's "public television's great second chance" (Everhart, 2005). An interesting project for future research is to see how

PBS member station utilize these new programming streams. Do they carry the equivalent to another PBS feed (perhaps a Schedule X, Y, and Z)? Or do stations carry a PBS programmed feed on one stream, and use other streams to fulfill the ideal-typical roles presented here for public television stations? Data collection and analysis in a mutlicasting digital environment will prove challenging, but could contribute significantly to the scholarship on public television in the United States.

If researchers are going to be successful in many of these suggestions for future research, they will need to work to repair and improve the relationships between public broadcasting scholars and the professionals working in the field.

Bridging the Academic-Practitioner Divide

Academics have taken an interest in the public television system because of its unique structure and organization and its sense of social mission that separates public television from commercial television. Not to mention they were some of its earliest founders (DiMaggio, 2006). From the vantage point of some industry professionals this academic attention is unwanted because of the criticism it espouses. The divide between academics and industry in this field works to create an environment that discourages empirical research for theoretical or applied purposes.

The experiences of this researcher in the field of public television are not isolated. In an attempt to conduct ethnographic research on the process of producing a documentary for national distribution through PBS, Dornfeld (1998) was turned away time and again by station executives.

> My appeals to various station administrators remained fruitless. An administrator had become concerned about protecting both the station's public reputation and its relationship to its production partners… Participation in my study could risk embarrassment for any of the partners. (p. 20)

Hall (1979, cited in Engelman, 1996) characterized public television as essentially a

> closed system dominated by the bureaucracies of the CPB, PBS, and member stations, which all lack mechanisms for community accountability. These bureaucratic entities operated in an atmosphere in which "management considers the questioner his enemy. Creative staff persons are dismissed or driven to resignation. Community input is discouraged…" (p. 193)

Bullert (1997) also spoke of the insider-outsider dilemma to doing research or even participating as a journalist and activist in the world of public television.

> I felt I was once again an unwelcome guest in the PBS world. By excluding the press, and a lone community activist, PBS was excluding representatives of the public from its domain. It was treating us as arrogantly as General Motors had treated Steve Talbot and Michael Moore. (p. 195)

These accounts describe interactions with the public television community at the national level. Bullert makes a point to distinguish between experiences with PBS and

experiences with its member stations. Bullert's experience speaks to a divide between industry and academics.

One couple working to overcome this divide is the LeRoys. David and Judith LeRoy are co-directors of TRAC Media Services, a major supplier of audience and fundraising data and analysis for PBS member stations. The each hold a PhD and are able to bridge the gap between academic or theoretical research to industry or applied research for public television.

The LeRoys allowed me to register for and attend the Public Television Programmers Association meeting hosted by TRAC Media Services in the days leading up to PBS Showcase. At this meeting I learned about the most recent research being done for stations and the success and failures experience by stations. Though I was not the intended audience of this research, I was never asked to leave or sit-out a session. The willingness to share by the LeRoys and the fourteen programmers who consented to interviews is vital to continue research in the field.

Whereas more often than not, my interview requests were ignored by program directors, some programmers expressed an eagerness to participate and hear about my research. Their eagerness was encouraging and their cooperation appreciated. More work needs to be done to further the spirit of cooperation between industry and academic groups.

Possibly because of issues of trust and cooperation, the number of interviews conducted was limited to fourteen. Fourteen interviews allow for a glimpse into the philosophies of public television programmers, but that glimpse is small. Fourteen interviews accounts for less than ten percent of the population of stations. In order to

really understand the dynamics behind programming decision-making more interviews need to be conducted. However, who they are conducted with can affect the results. The fourteen programmers willing to talk with me about their philosophies cannot be said to represent any larger group. Their experiences are not generalizeable beyond their stations. Due to the nature of much qualitative research, generalization is not possible nor is it the goal of this research approach. However, to truly understand the stations in the PBS system, more of them must be engaged in conversation.

Conclusion

Criticism of the public television system in the United States is largely directed at the institutions at the national level, namely CPB and PBS. While the importance of these institutions is acknowledged here, they are not the focus. This dissertation picks up where much of the literature on public television leaves off: at the organizational level of the station. By presenting operationalizations of power and orientation, a new perspective to studying these concepts at the organizational level is explored.

This research allows for a snapshot of the member stations that make up the public television system with regard to their scheduling power and philosophies of programming. Future research could include longitudinal data to show trends at the station- and system-level over time. With much concern over where the future of public television is headed, and the emergence of digital multicasting, the presented measures of power and orientation may have many future applications.

REFERENCES

Albrow, M. (1997). *The global age.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Aldrich, H. (1999). *Organizations evolving*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Alter, C. (1990). An exploratory study of conflict and coordination in interorganizational service delivery systems. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 478-502.

Anderson, B. (1996). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York: Verso.

"Articles of Incorporation of Public Broadcasting Service." (1969, Nov. 3). Public Broadcasting PolicyBase. Retrieved November 11, 2007 from http://www.current.org/pbpb/documents/PBSarticles69.html.

Aufderheide, P. (1991). Public television and the public sphere. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 8*(2), 168.

Aufderheide, P. (1995). Will public broadcasting survive? *Progressive, 59*(3), 19-21.

Aufderheide, P. (1996). Public service broadcasting in the United States. *Journal of Media Economics, 9*(1), 63-76.

Aufderheide, P. (1999). *Communications policy and the public interest: The Telecommunications Act of 1996.* The Guilford Press: New York.

Aufderheide, P. (2000). *The daily planet: A critic on the capitalist culture beat*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Austin, B. A. (1980, April). Commercial network television: Strategies for programming and the content of prime time TV, 1976-1979. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Popular Culture Association, Detroit, MI.

Avery, R. (Ed.). (1993). *Public service broadcasting in a multichannel environment: The history and survival of an ideal*. New York: Longman.

Avery, R. K. (2005, April). Public Television and social capital. Presentation given at the annual conference for the Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas, NV.

Avery, R. K. & Pepper, R. (1980). An institutional history of public broadcasting. *Journal of Communication, 30*(3), 126–138.

Avery, R. K., & Stavitsky, A. G. (2000). Mission versus market. In Witherspoon & Kovitz, *A history of public broadcasting* (pp. 73-128). Washington, D.C.: Current.

Bagdikian, B. H. (2004). *The new media monopoly*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Balas, G. R. (2003). *Recovering a public vision for public television*. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.

Banks, M., Lovatt, A., O'Connor, J., & Raffo, C. (2000). Risk and trust in the cultural industries. *Geoforum, 31,* 453-464.

Barsamian, D. (2001). *The decline and fall of public broadcasting*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity.* London: Sage.

Bedford, K. E. (2001, 23 April). PBS goals: Reverse slides in audience, membership. *Current*. Retrieved May 12, 2005 from http://www.current.org/pbs/pbs0108.html.

Berger, P. L., Neuhaus, R. J., & Novak, M. (1996). *To empower people: From state to civil society*. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute.

Bielby, W., & Bielby, D. (2003). Controlling prime-time: Organizational concentration and network programming strategies. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 47*(4), 573-596.

Biltereyst, D. (2004). Public service broadcasting, popular entertainment and the construction of trust. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 7*(3), 341-362.

Blakely, R. J. (1971). *The people's instrument: A philosophy of programming for public television.* Washington, D.C: Public Affairs Press.

Blakely, R. J. (1979). *To serve the public interest: Educational broadcasting in the United States*. New York: Syracuse University Press.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life.* New York: J. Wiley.

Blumer, J. G. (1993). Meshing money with mission: Purity versus pragmatism in public broadcasting. *European Journal of Communication, 8*(4), 403-424.

Brams, S. J. (1977). The network television game: There may be no best schedule. *Interfaces, 7*(4), 102-109.

Brint, S. (2001). Gemeinschaft revisited: A critique and reconstruction of the community concept. *Sociological Theory* (19)1, 1-23.

Brookins, C. (2008, February 19). Online transaction. Message posted at http://www.pbs.org/newshour/aboutus/feedback/2008/times/2008/02/page3.html

Bryant, J. A. (2003). *From networks to Nickelodeon to Noggin: A communication networks perspective on the evolution of the children's television community.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Bullert, B. J. (1997). *Public television: Politics and the battle over documentary film.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Campbell, D. C. & Campbell, J.B. (1978). Public television as public good. *Journal of Communication, 28*(1), 52-62

Cancian, M., Bills, A., & Bergstrom, T. (1995). Hotelling location problems with directional constraints: An application to television new scheduling. *Journal of Industrial Economics, 43*(1). 121-124.

Chalaby, J. K. (1997). No ordinary press owner: Press barons as a Weberian ideal type. *Media, Culture & Society, 19*(4), 621-641.

Chan-Olmsted, S. M., & Kim, Y. (2002). The PBS brand versus cable brands: Assessing the brand image of public television in a multichannel environment. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 46*(2), 300-320.

Clemens, E. S. (2006). The Constitution of citizens: Political theories of nonprofit organizations. In W. W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.) In *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook (2nd edition)*, (pp. 207-220). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Compaine, B. (1985). The expanding base of media competition. *Journal of Communication, 35*(3), 81-96.

Compaine, B. (1995). Impact of ownership on content: Does it matter? *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal, 13*(3), 755-780

Cooper, M. (2004). Limits on media ownership serve the public interest! *Television Quarterly, 34*(3/4), 4-10.

Corporate Facts (n.d). The Public Broadcasting Service: An overview. Retrieved April 12, 2005 from http://www.pbs.org/aboutpbs/aboutpbs_corp.html

Corporation for Public Broadcasting. (2006). Public broadcasting revenue: Fiscal year 2005. Retrieved June 2, 2008 from http://www.cpb.org/stations/reports/revenue/2005PublicBroadcastingRevenue.pdf

Corsaro, W.A. (1985). *Friendship and peer culture in the early years.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Crane, D. (1972). *Invisible colleges: Diffusion of knowledge in scientific communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Danaher, P. J. & Mawhinney, D. F. (2001). Optimizing television program schedules using choice modeling. *Journal of Marketing Research, 38*(3), 298-312

Day, J. (1995). *The vanishing vision: The inside story of public television*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The research act in sociology*. London: Butterworth.

Deuze, M. (2005). What is journalism? *Journalism, 6*(4), 442-464.

DiMaggio, P. (1982). Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston, Part I: The creation of an organizational base for high culture in America. *Media, Culture & Society, 4*, 33-50.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160.

DiMaggio, P. (2000). The production of scientific change. *Poetics, 28*, 107-136.

DiMaggio, P. (2006). Nonprofit organizations and the intersectoral division of labor in the arts. In W. W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.) *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook (2nd edition)*, (pp. 432-461). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dornfeld, B. (1998). *Producing public television, producing public culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Douglas, J. (1983). *Why charity?: The case for a third sector*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Douglas, J. (1987). Political theories of nonprofit organizations. In J. S. Ott (Ed.), *The nature of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 205-216). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Einstein, M. (2004). Broadcast network television, 1955-2003: The pursuit of advertising and the decline of diversity. *Journal of Media Economics, 17*(2), 145-155.

Eliaeson, S. (2000). Max Weber's methodology: An ideal type. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 36*(3), 241-263.

Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review, 27*(1), 31-41.

Engelman, R. (1996). *Public radio and television in America: A political history*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Everhart, K. (2005, Oct. 17). Proposed for multicasts: Viva channel in Spanish. *Current*. Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://www.current.org/dtv/dtv0519spanish.shtml

Federal Communications Commission. (2003, Apr. 20). "FCC Chairman Powell launches 'Localism in Broadcasting' initiative: Agency actions are both immediate and comprehensive." Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-238057A1.pdf

Ferejohn, J. A. & Noll, R. G. (1976). An experimental market for public goods: The PBS Station Program Cooperative. *The American Economic Review, 66*(2), 267-73.

Fine, G. A., & Harrington, B. (2004). Tiny publics: Small groups and civil society. *Sociological Theory, 22*(3), 341-356.

Friedland, L. (1995). Public television as public sphere: The case of the Wisconsin Collaborative Project. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 39*(2), 147-176.

Giddens, A. (1971). Capitalism and modern social theory. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Giddens, A. (1994). *Beyond left and right: The future of radical politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Grossman, L. K. (2002, Sept./Oct.). PBS: Problematic broadcasting system. *Columbia Journalism Review, 41*, 67-69.

Grønbjerg, K. A. (1998). Markets, politics, and charity: Nonprofits in the political economy. In J. S. Ott (Ed.), *The nature of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 217-231). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (Thomas Burger, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hagenaars, J. A. & Halman, L. C. (1989). Searching for ideal types: The potentialities of latent class analysis. *European Sociological Review, 5*(1), 81-96.

Hall, L. S. (1979). Controlling public telecommunications: Theory and practice for human management of electric literature. In T. Haight (Ed.), *Telecommunications policy and the citizen* (pp. 169-199). New York: Praeger.

Hansmann, H. B. (1996). The role of nonprofit enterprise. In S. Rose-Ackerman (Ed.), *The economics of nonprofit institutions: Studies in structure and policy* (pp. 57-84). New York: Oxford University Press.

Henry, M. D. & Rinne, H. J. (1984) Offensive versus defensive TV programming strategies. *Journal of Advertising Research, 24*(3), 45-56.

Hilliard, R. L. & Keith, M. C. (2005). *The quieted voice: The rise and demise of localism in American radio*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Homans, G. C. (1950). *The human group*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Horen, J. H. (1980). Scheduling of network television programs. *Management Science, 26*(4) 354-370.

Horwitz, R. (2005). On media concentration and the diversity question. *Information Society, 21*(3), 181-204.

Howley, K. (2005). Diversity, localism and the public interest: The politics of assessing media performance. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics 1*(1), 103-106.

Hoynes, W. (1994). *Public television for sale: Media, the market, and the public sphere.* San Francisco: Westview Press.

Hoynes, W. (1999). Democracy, privatization and public television. *Peace Review, 11*(1), 33-39.

Hoynes, W. (2003). Branding public service. *Television & New Media, 4*(2), 117.

Hoyt, C. (1998). Tax-exempt organization. In J. S. Ott (Ed.), *The nature of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 148-151). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Jarvik, L. (1998*). PBS: Behind the screen*. Rocklin, CA: Prima Publishing.

Kelton C.M.L. & Schneider Stone L.G. (1998). Optimal television schedules in alternative competitive environments. *European Journal of Operational Research, 104*(3), 451-473.

Kropf, M. & Knack, S. (2003). Viewers like you: Community norms and contributions to public broadcasting. *Political Research Quarterly, 56*(2), 187-197.

Lashley, M. (1992a). Even in public television, ownership changes matter. *Communication Research, 19*(6), 770-786.

Lashley, M. (1992b). *Public television: Panacea, pork barrel, or public trust?* New York: Greenwood Press.

Lasswell, H. D. (1927). *Propaganda technique in the world war*. New York: A. A. Knopf.

Lee, S. S. (2004). Predicting cultural output diversity in the radio industry, 1992 to 2002. *Poetics, 32*(3/4), 325-342

Ledbetter, J. (1997). *Made possible by--: The death of public broadcasting in the United States*. New York: Verso.

LeRoy, D. J. (1980). Who watches public television? *Journal of Communication, 30*(3), 157-163

LeRoy, D. J., LeRoy, J. M., & Corporation for Public Broadcasting. (1995). *Public television: Techniques for audience analysis and program scheduling: A collection of articles originally published in Current.* Washington, D.C.: Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

LeRoy, D. & LeRoy, J. (11 June 2001). Commentaries on its purposes and reality from *Current* newspaper: What's all this I hear about 'social capital'? *Current*. Retrieved May 12, 2005 from http://www.current.org/why/why0111Leroy.html

Lohmann, R. A. (1989). And lettuce is nonanimal: Toward a positive economics of voluntary action. In J. S. Ott (Ed.), *The nature of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 197-204). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Loomis, K. D. (2001). American public broadcasting: Will it survive adolescence? *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 45*(3), 522-530.

Maloney, R. (2005). 500 Channels and no choice: How media companies support the status quo. *Review of Communication, 5*(2/3), 119-127.

McChesney, R. W. (1999). *Rich media, poor democrac*y. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

McChesney, Robert W. (2001). Global media, neoliberalism, and imperialism. *Monthly Review,* 52(10).

McChesney, R. W. (2004). *The problem of the media: U.S. communication politics in the twenty-first century.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

McGrath, C. (2008, February 17). Is PBS still necessary? *The New York Times*, p. AR1.

Mitchell, P. (2005, May 24). Public trust is the rating that matters most to PBS. Speech delivered at the National Press Club, Washington, D. C. Retrieved November 11, 2007 from http://www.current.org/why/why2005mitchell.shtml.

Monge, P. R., & Contractor, N. S. (2003). *Theories of communication networks*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Morrow, R. W. (2006). *Sesame Street and the reform of children's television.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Napoli, P. M. (2001). *Foundations of communications policy: Principles and process in the regulation of electronic media*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Nisbet, R. A. (1967). *Community & power*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Noam, E. M., & Waltermann, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Public television in America*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Foundation Publishers.

Norris, P. (1996). Does television erode social capital? A reply to Putnam. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 29*(3), 474-480

Ott, J. S. (Ed.). (2001). *The nature of the nonprofit sector*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Ouellette, L. (2002). *Viewers like you?: How public TV failed the people*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Paradise, A. (2004). No longer "just a word" from your sponsor: The increasing presence (and power) of corporate sponsorship on PBS kids television. *Kaleidoscope: A graduate journal of qualitative communication research, 3*, 22-42.

PBS member stations across the country join the PBS KIDS sprout local marketing affiliation program. (2005, April 11). Retrieved February 14, 2008, from http://www.pbs.org/aboutpbs/news/20050411_sproutlocal.html

Pepper, R. (1976, Jan./Feb.). The interconnection connection: The formation of PBS. *Public Telecommunications Review, 4*, 6-26.

Pepper, R. (1979). *The formation of the Public Broadcasting Service*. New York: Arno Press.

Phillis, J. A. (2005). *Integrating mission and strategy for nonprofit organizations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, R. A. (1997). *Creating country music: Fabricating authenticity.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peterson, R. A. & Anand, N. (2004). The production of culture perspective. *Annual Review of Sociology, 30*, 311-334.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Business Books.

Phillips, T. M., Griffiths, T. A., & Tarbox, N. C. (1991). Public television efficiency versus diversity. *Journal of Media Economics,4*(1) 19-33.

Powell, W. W. (1985). *Getting into print: The decision-making process in scholarly publishing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Powell, W. & Friedkin, R. (1987). Organizational Change in Nonprofit Organizations. In. W. W. Powell (Ed.) *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (pp. 180-92). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Price, M. E. (1998). Public television in America project: Public television and new technologies. *International Journal of Communications Law and Policy,(1)*1.

Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. 47 U.S.C. § 396 (1992).

Public Broadcasting Service (1998). *PBS member station handbook.*

Public Broadcasting Service. (2003). Our supporters: PBS programming underwriters 2003. Retrieved April 12, 2005 from http://www.pbs.org/aboutpbs/content/annualreport/2003/FY03NPSUnderwriters.pdf

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6,* 65-78.

Readers' comments: Is PBS still necessary? (n.d.) *The New York Times*. Retrieved on March 23, 2008 from http://community.nytimes.com/article/comments/2008/02/17/arts/television/17mcgr.html?s=2.

Reddy, S. K., Aranson, J. E., Stam, A. (1998). SPOT: Scheduling programs optimally for television. *Management Science, 44*(1), 83-102.

Rodger, E. J., Jürgensen, C., & D'Elia, G. (2005). Partnerships and collaboration among public libraries, public broadcast media, and museums: Current context and future potential. *Library Quarterly, 75*(1), 42-66.

Rogers, E. M. (1997). *A history of communication study*. Free Press: New York.

Rose-Ackerman, S. (1986). *The Economics of nonprofit institutions: Studies in structure and policy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rowland, W. D. (1993). Public service broadcasting in the United States: Its mandate, institutions and conflicts. In R. Avery (Ed.) *Public service broadcasting in a multichannel environment: The history and survival of an ideal*, (pp. 157-194). New York: Longman.

Rowland, W. D. (2002) Public broadcasting in the United States. *Encyclopedia of Communication and Information.* New York: Macmillan Library Reference USA.

Rubel, C. (1995, August 14). PBS TV stations seek new revenue through licensing. *Marketing News, 29*, 1-2.

Rubin, R. B., Rubin, A. M. & Piele, L. J. (2000). *Communication research: Strategies and sources*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Rust, R. T. & Eechambadi, N. V. (1989). Scheduling network television programs: A heuristic audience flow approach to maximizing audience share. Journal *of Advertising, 18*(2), 11-18.

Salamon, L. M. (1987). Partners in public service: The scope and theory of government-nonprofit relations. In W. W. Powell (Ed.) *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook*, (pp. 99-117). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Salamon, L. M. & Anheier, H. (1998). Social origins of civil society. *Voluntas, 9*(3) 213-248.

Samuelson, P. A. (1954). The pure theory of public expenditure. *Review of Ecodricanomics and Statistics, 36*(4), 387-389.

Schweitzer, C. (1997). Coaching with a new game plan. *Association Management, 49*(5), 38-40.

Smith, S. R. & Grønbjerg, K. A. (2006). Scope and theory of government-nonprofit relations. In W. W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.) *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook (2nd edition)*, (pp. 221-242). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Stavitsky, A. (1998). Counting the house in public television: A history of ratings use, 1953-1980. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 42*(4), 520-535.

Steinberg, R. (2006). Economic theories of nonprofit organizations. In W. W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.) *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook (2nd edition)*, (pp. 117-139). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sussman, G. (2003). The struggle for and within public television. *Television & New Media, 4*(2), 111.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

The ideal type. (1982). *International Journal of Sociology, 12*(1), 50-66.

Tocqueville, A. de (1998). *Democracy in America* (H. Reeve, Trans.). Ware: Wordsworth Editions Limited. (Original work published 1835 and 1840)

TRAC Media Services (n.d.) Public television programmers' handbook (2nd ed.). Presented by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Programmers' Research Council, and TRAC Media Services.

Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news.* New York: Free Press.

Wagner, A. (2000). Reframing "social origins" theory: The structural transformation of the public sphere. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 29*(4), 541-553.

Webb, E. J. (2000). *Unobtrusive measures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Weber, M. (1949). *The methodology of the social sciences* (E. A. Shils and H. A. Finch, Ed. and Trans.). New York: The Free Press.

Weisbrod, B. A. (1977). *The voluntary nonprofit sector: An economic analysis*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies.* Free Press: New York.

White, H. & White, C. A. (1965*). Canvases and careers: Institutional change in the French painting world.* New York: Wiley.

Wicklein, J. (1986). The assault on public television. *Columbia Journalism Review, 24*(5), 27-34.

Witherspoon, J. & Kovitz, R. (2000). *A history of public broadcasting*. Washington, D.C.: Current.

Winslow, L. (Executive Producer). (2008, February 22). *Newshour with Jim Lehrer* [Television broadcast]. Washington, DC: WETA.

Young, D. R. (1998). Government failure theory. In J. S. Ott (Ed.), *The nature of the nonprofit sector* (pp. 190-192). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Ytreberg, E. (2002). Ideal types in public service television: Paternalists and bureaucrats, charismatics and avant-gardists. *Media, Culture & Society, 24*(6), 759-774.

Zufryden, F. S. (1973). Media scheduling: A stochastic dynamic model approach. *Management Science, 19*(12), 1395-1406.

Appendix A. Programming Schedule Correlation Coefficients by Station

Station	Coefficient	Station	Coefficient	Station	Coefficient	Station	Coefficient
KRSC	-0.025	WCFE	0.336**	KUHT	0.479**	KUED	0.537**
KSMQ	0.043	WPBA	0.340**	WHYY	0.480**	WLVT	0.540**
WYCC	0.049	WQLN	0.352**	KUSD	0.485**	WCMU	0.548**
KLCS	0.050	KCTS	0.390**	KTWU	0.488**	WTTW	0.550**
WPTO	0.051	WKLE	0.402**	KOPB	0.489**	KTCA	0.557**
WUSF	0.063*	KRWG	0.411**	KVIE	0.489**	KLRN	0.561**
KTEH	0.076*	KRMA	0.420**	WTVS	0.489**	KLVX	0.561**
WLRN	0.096**	KENW	0.424**	KUSM	0.489**	WGTE	0.563**
WKYU	0.115**	WNEO	0.424**	WCNY	0.495**	WSIU	0.563**
WNJN	0.127**	WGVU	0.425**	KCPT	0.498**	WMFE	0.568**
WCEU	0.133**	WPBT	0.427**	WMPB	0.498**	KACV	0.569**
KCSM	0.136**	WUNC	0.428**	KUID	0.504**	KLRU	0.573**
WSBE	0.136**	KUAT	0.429**	KDIN	0.508**	KETS	0.578**
KBTC	0.139**	KPBS	0.430**	WNET	0.508**	WUFT	0.580**
WYIN	0.145**	WHA	0.431**	WPBS	0.509**	WJCT	0.583**
WTVI	0.166**	KETC	0.432**	KCOS	0.510**	WPTD	0.587**
KRCB	0.177**	WKAR	0.437**	WPSX	0.510**	WNIN	0.587**
WGBX	0.218**	KVPT	0.438**	WKNO	0.512**	WQED	0.588**
KBDI	0.244**	KERA	0.441**	KSPS	0.514**	WBIQ	0.590**
WCVW	0.251**	WSEC	0.442**	WETA	0.517**	WDCQ	0.600**
WENH	0.256**	WFWA	0.443**	KSYS	0.519**	WCET	0.601**
KTCI	0.270**	KQED	0.453**	WGBH	0.528**	WSKG	0.601**
WMVT	0.286**	WGTV	0.461**	KFME	0.530**	KCET	0.609**
WNED	0.302**	WSRE	0.474**	KAET	0.535**	WNMU	0.614**

Appendix A. Programming Schedule Correlation Coefficients by Station (cont'd)

Station	Coefficient	Station	Coefficient	Station	Coefficient
WMEB	0.619**	KMBH	0.661**	KAWE	0.735**
WCVE	0.636**	KEET	0.677**	KIXE	0.743**
WVPT	0.638**	KETA	0.677**	KAKM	0.753**
KCWC	0.638**	WKMJ	0.683**	KHET	0.760**
KPTS	0.644**	WNIT	0.684**	WLPB	0.761**
WNPB	0.645**	WOUB	0.684**	WFUM	0.770**
WITF	0.646**	KTXT	0.688**	KOZK	0.773**
WTVP	0.646**	KWBU	0.697**	WIPB	0.785**
WETK	0.648**	WVIZ	0.698**	WMPN	0.788**
WXXI	0.648**	WGCU	0.699**	KWCM	0.791**
WNPT	0.650**	WBRA	0.700**	WBGU	0.792**
WOSU	0.651**	WFYI	0.711**	WRLK	0.822**
KOOD	0.654**	WMHT	0.716**	KMOS	0.846**
WEDU	0.657**	WMVS	0.723**	KAMU	0.905**
WHRO	0.658**	WQPT	0.726**	WKOP	0.924**
KNPB	0.660**	WDSE	0.731**	WXEL	0.962**
WILL	0.660**	WTIU	0.732**	WVUT	1.000**

AMBER M. K. SMALLWOOD
CURRICULUM VITAE

Position: Assistant Professor
College address: Department of Mass Communications and Theatre Arts
University of West Georgia
1601 Maple St.
Carrollton, GA 30118

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Ph.D. Indiana University, Mass Communication and American Studies, 2008
Minor: Sociology
Specializations: nonprofit/community/NCE media, social network analysis
Dissertation: *Mapping programming decision-making of PBS member stations: Negotiating centralized-distributed power and nonprofit-for profit orientation continua in program selection and scheduling*
Directed by: J. Alison Bryant; Chaired by: Michael McGregor

M.A. Ohio University, Telecommunications, 2003
Specializations: PBS and NPR systems, media management, new media, laws & regulation

B.S. University of Texas at Austin, Radio-Television-Film, 1997
Minor: Asian studies
Specializations: new media, cultural studies

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Bridgewater College, 2006-2008
Mass Media and Society (COMM 230)
News and Media Writing (COMM 255)
Journalism in the Information Age/Advanced News and Media Writing (COMM 305)
Public Relations in Organizations (COMM 347)
Nonprofit Communication (COMM 349)
Quantitative Research Methods (COMM 350)
Personal Development Portfolio/Introduction to the Liberal Arts (PDP 150)

Indiana University, 2003-2006 (as teaching assistant)
Living in the Information Age (TEL 101)
Promotion and Marketing in Telecommunications (TEL 347)
Media History (TEL 311)

PUBLICATIONS

Smallwood, A. M. K. (June 2008). Negotiating Sesame Street: Sesame Street and the Reform of Children's Television (Book review). *Journal of Broadcast and Electronic Media.*

Bryant, J. A., Sanders-Jackson, A., & Smallwood, A. M. K. (2006). IMing, text messaging, and adolescent social networks. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11*(2).

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Smallwood, A. M. K. (2008). Scheduling power in the PBS system: Negotiating localism and centralization. International Communication Association, Montreal, Canada [Mass Communication division].

Smallwood, A. M. K. (accepted for 2008). Measuring success at PBS member stations: Multiple instruments, multiple frustrations. Broadcast Education Association Annual Convention and Exhibition, Las Vegas, NV [Research and Radio/Audio Media divisions]. Panel organizer and presenter.

Smallwood, A. M. K. (2007). Incorporating nonprofit media management into the liberal arts curriculum. Broadcast Education Association Annual Convention and Exhibition, Las Vegas, NV [Broadcast Management division].

Smallwood, A. M. K. (2006). Don't forget the public: NCE media and community based research. Broadcast Education Association Annual Convention and Exhibition, Las Vegas, NV [Courses, Curricula, and Administration division]. Panel moderator and presenter.

Smallwood, A. M. K. & Newton, G. (2006). Low power FM and the role of nonprofit media in society: A policymaking case study. International Communication Association, Dresden, Germany [Communication Law and Policy division].

Smallwood, A. M. K. & Bryant, J. A. (2006). News and public affairs network of PBS-member stations: A network analysis of the exchange network of producing and programming stations. International Communication Association, Dresden, Germany [Journalism Studies division].

Bryant, J. A., Jackson-Sanders, A., & Smallwood, A. M. K. (2006). The effect of IMing and txt msgN on kids' social networks. International Communication Association, Dresden, Germany [Instructional and Developmental Communication division].

Smallwood, A. M. K. (2005). News and public affairs exchange networks of PBS-member stations: Moving toward a model of influence for cultural exchange. Organizational Communication Miniconference, Athens, OH.

Smallwood, A. M. K. (2005). Constitutionality of "total-multiple-multichannel-multicast" must carry: And what it means for public broadcasting. International Communication Association, New York, NY [Communication Law and Policy division].

Smallwood, A. M. K. (2005). And you'll get this handy tote bag…An historical analysis of reality TV on PBS. Broadcast Education Association Annual Convention and Exhibition, Las Vegas, NV [History division]. Panel organizer and presenter.

Smallwood, A. M. K. (2005). Starve an artist, feed an environment: Black Mountain College. Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association, San Diego, CA [ACA: Academics division].

Newton, G. & Smallwood, A. M. (2004). Locally powered FM radio: A survey of low power FM. Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association, San Antonio, TX [PCA: Radio division].

GRANTS and AWARDS

Faculty Research Grant, Bridgewater College, 2007
Seminar Grant-Convergent Journalism, International Radio and Television Society Foundation, 2006
Travel Grant, International Communication Association (ICA), 2006
Travel Grant, Communication Law and Policy division, ICA, 2006
Travel Grant, Graduate and Professional Student Organization, Indiana U, 2006
Travel Grant, College of Arts and Sciences, Indiana U, 2006
Research Award, Institute for Communication Research, Indiana U, 2005
Summer Fellowship, Department of Telecommunications, Indiana U, 2004
Graduate Assistantship for Women and Persons of Color, Department of Telecommunications, Ohio U, 2002-2003

STUDENT RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Upshaw, J., An oral history of WGMB: Through the voices of Bridgewater College's student radio station alumni, senior honors project (chair)

SERVICE to the ACADEMY

International Communications Association, Conference paper reviewer, 2007-
- Global Communication and Social Change division
- Mass Communication division

National Communication Association, Lambda Pi Eta paper reviewer, 2007-
Collegiate Forensics Association, judge, various tournaments, 2007-
Federal Communications Law Journal, Indiana U, Associate editor, 2005-2006

SERVICE to the INSTITUTION

Bridgewater College
- Undergraduate Research Committee, 2008-
- Cultural Studies Committee, 2008-
- Economics and Business Administration hiring committee, outside member, 2008
- Institutional Review Board, 2007-
- Committee on Service Learning, 2007-
- Committee on Library, 2007-
- Committee on Convocations, 2007-
- Committee on Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, 2007-
- WGMB student radio station, faculty advisor, 2006-

Indiana University
- Graduate representative to the faculty search committee, 2005-2006
- Graduate student representative to the telecommunications faculty, 2004-2005
- American Studies Graduate Student Association, 2004-2006
- Graduate and Professional Student Organization
  - Funding committee chair, 2004-2005
  - Funding committee, member 2003-2004
  - Departmental representative, 2003-2004

SERVICE to the COMMUNITY

WVPT Public Television, Harrisonburg, VA, on-air talent, 2007-
Bridgewater Retirement Community, Bridgewater, VA, volunteer, 2007-
WFHB Community Radio, Bloomington, IN, volunteer reporter, 2004-2005
WTIU Public Television, Bloomington, IN, community researcher, 2003-2005
Partners in Education, Ortega Elementary School, Austin, TX, tutor, 1997-1998
KLRU-TV, Austin, TX, volunteer multiple areas, 1995-1997

INVITED TALKS

Supporting volunteers. Valley Volunteer Forum. Harrisonburg, VA.
Critical social issues in three geographic regions of Indiana. WTIU Community Advisory Board, Bloomington, IN.

MEMBERSHIPS

International Communications Association (ICA)
Broadcast Education Association (BEA)
Association of Educators in Mass Communication and Journalism (AEJMC)

BROADCAST INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT

Director of Special Events, KLRU-TV, Austin, TX, 2001-2002
Planned and executed fundraising and public relations events for *Austin City Limits* and other national PBS productions, including annual $300,000+ *Austin City Limits* gala. Coordinated annual KLRU Distinguished Speaker Series including speaker selection and booking, public relations and marketing decisions, and ticket sales. Managed budgets and small staff.

Special Events Associate and Volunteer Coordinator, KLRU-TV, Austin, TX, 2000-2001
Produced on-air promotional pieces for station events. Co-hosted live on-air fundraising campaigns. Served as station liaison for community events and station tours. Managed volunteer records and station volunteer requests. Recruited and trained new volunteers.

Production Coordinator, KLRU-TV, Austin, TX, 1998-2000
Co- and associate-produced local public affairs programming. Acted as departmental liaison to outside stations, clients and public. Scheduled facilities and staff.

Educational Programming Associate, KLRU-TV, Austin, TX, 1997-1998
Reviewed, selected, and scheduled interstitial material for broadcast and cablecast stations.

INDUSTRY HONORS

Special Fundraising Award, *Austin City Limits* Gala, PBS Development Conference, 2002
Special Achievement Award, KLRU Distinguished Speaker Series, PBS Development Conference, 2002
Special Event Award, *Austin City Limits* Gala, PBS Development Conference, 2001
Special Event Award, *Austin City Limits* Gala, NETA Conference, 2001
Cultivation and Stewardship Certificate, KLRU Distinguished Speaker Series, PBS Development Conference, 2001