

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Glenn Thomas Hubbard entitled “Interest, Convenience, or Necessity? An Experimental Study of Listener Responses to Localism in Radio Programming and Ownership.” I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Communication and Information.

Benjamin J. Bates, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Mark Harmon

Naeemah Clark

David Schumann

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges
Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

Interest, Convenience, or Necessity?
An Experimental Study of Listener Responses to Localism in
Radio Programming and Ownership

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Glenn Thomas Hubbard
August 2008

Copyright © 2008 by Glenn T. Hubbard
All rights reserved

DEDICATION

I lovingly dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Dr. Glenda T. Hubbard and Dr. William C. Hubbard, who never told me what I should do with my life, but led me to it by example.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the expertise, generosity and patience of my committee chair, Dr. Ben Bates, who always made time for me and always gave sound advice. I believe a dissertation should be a growth experience, and Dr. Bates held me to a standard that made this happen. I also thank my committee members, Dr. Mark Harmon, Dr. Naeemah Clark, and Dr. David Schumann, for their wise counsel. I've heard stories of adversarial committees, but mine was purely collaborative. All doctoral candidates should be so lucky. A special word of thanks to Dr. Schumann for pinch hitting at the last minute and, to continue the baseball metaphor, hitting a grand-slam homerun. I owe a lot to Dr. Schumann for the hours he spent consulting on my research design and data analysis. It has been an honor to work with him. In addition, Dr. Dwight Teeter was a member of my committee before book deadlines and scheduling conflicts necessitated his replacement, but his contribution to this dissertation is significant nonetheless. Few as accomplished as Dr. Teeter are so giving of their time and expertise. I also thank Cary Springer in Statistical Consulting for her many hours of hard work getting the web survey up and running, and for putting me through the ringer in the data analysis process. She's been a great teacher.

It's become a cliché to say one makes friends for life in graduate school, but it's true. I thank Dr. Elizabeth Crisp Crawford for her friendship, wisdom, humor, collaboration, and Wisconsin cheese. Thanks, also, to Dr. Sora Kim for her friendship and expertise – and for introducing me to Korean food. And thanks to Dr. Alla Kushniryk, Charlie Gee, Aya Muchtar, Steve Bales, Bernardo Motta, Dr. Jim Miller, Katerina Spasovska, and all my GTA office buddies for being such a significant part of my life through these most interesting years.

I thank our associate dean, Dr. Sally McMillan, for her good work, and our dean, Dr. Michael Wirth, who lent me a stack of books on regulatory policy from his personal library. I would also like to thank the faculty in my department, the School of Journalism and Electronic Media, especially Dr. Jim Stovall, Dr. Catherine Luther, Dr. Lyn Lepre, Dr. Barbara Moore, Dr. Bob Legg, Dr. Dorothy Bowles, and our leaders, Dr. Peter Gross, Dr. Sam Swan, and Dr. Jim Crook – all wonderful colleagues, mentors and friends. Thanks also to Deborah Douglas, Chandra Eskridge, Diana King, Sherry McNair, John McNair and Anne Hensley for always finding ways to make our lives easier – and for rescuing us from our own foolishness.

I thank my four years' worth of UT broadcasting and journalism students for teaching me probably as much as I taught them. I also have brand new colleagues at the University of Texas at Arlington whom I'd like to acknowledge. I haven't known them long, but I already feel a part of the family because of their kindness.

I'm blessed with a loving family and many wonderful friends. Here's where I really can't list everybody, but I will name (in no particular order) Dave, Heidi, Rog, Matt, Aaron, Kris, Tim, Karla, Pam, Chris, Mary, Pastor Bob, Barbara, Suzy, Billy Ralph, Jane, Eveleen, Carolyn, Jim, Sylvia, Viara, Iveta, and my dear friend Evelyn Deviney, whose enthusiasm for learning is contagious and never-ending.

I thank my brother, Curt, for being a constant source of encouragement, inspiration, and a much-needed diversion from academic work. Also, my dedication says it, but I can't thank my mom enough – for everything. She's the best.

Finally, I would like to thank the immediate family members who have seen me through this process up-close and personally: Holly, Xavier, and Ruby. Their love and support have sustained me, and I thank them from the bottom of my heart. I'm a lucky guy.

ABSTRACT

Localism has long been a key goal of broadcast regulatory policy. In recent years, members of the FCC have echoed the often-repeated claims of community activists that low-power radio stations, being inherently more “local”, not only serve the public interest more effectively but also function as an antidote to what many consider the negative effects of nationally consolidated, corporate ownership of increasing numbers of radio stations. However, such a claim hinges on the assumption that small, low-power and/or community radio stations are able to compete effectively for at least some of the same listeners big corporate stations pursue. Furthermore, there is an assumption in much literature on the subject that localism itself – both in terms of ownership and programming origination – is a quality that listeners find attractive. The purpose of this study was to test these assumptions empirically. The researcher created a series of experimental conditions, delivered in the form of an online survey with embedded audio files, in which subjects heard radio program excerpts manipulated to test the variables of ownership and locality of origination, answering questions after each excerpt. Dependent variables were affective response, medium credibility and source credibility. A total of 331 respondents in Knoxville, Tennessee heard excerpts of a legal-advice program, a newscast, and a religious music show, each manipulated to sound either locally originated or nationally syndicated, on stations identified as owned by companies ranging from non-profit low-power FMs to national groups such as Clear Channel Worldwide and Infinity-Viacom. Results showed slight, statistically significant preferences for local origination of the legal advice show, on the measure of medium credibility, and for the newscast, measured in terms of affective response. Other manipulations and measures pertaining to locality of origination revealed no

significant differences, and there were no significant differences resulting from ownership manipulations. After the experimental portion of the study was completed, subjects responded to Likert-type questions self reporting their radio listening and localism preferences, indicating that they considered radio an important source of information but had only moderate preferences for local origination. A majority registered low levels of concern about broadcast ownership.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Problem.....	1
Rationale for the Study	5
Significance of the Study	9
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
History of Broadcast Regulation in the United States.	11
Early Licensing	14
Localism.....	17
Changes in the 1990s	24
Low-Power Radio	25
Low-Power Radio Predecessors	27
Public Interest, Localism, Ideology, and Service	31
Religious Broadcasting and Local Radio.....	35
Theoretical Framework.....	37
Market Model.....	38
Public Sphere Model.....	43
Industrial Organization Theory.....	47
Krasnow Model.....	48
The Telecommunications Act of 1996.....	49
FCC Report On Localism	51
Audience Theory.....	53
Summary	57
Research Questions	60
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY	67
Research Design.....	67
Online Surveys.....	68
Dependent Variables	71
Instrument	74
Stimuli.....	75
Pretesting.....	86
Participants.....	89
Internal Validity	90
External Validity	92
Data Collection	94
Conditions	95
CHAPTER IV RESULTS.....	98
Sample.....	98
Descriptives.....	100
Scale Reliability	101
Data Analysis	101
Research Question Testing	103
Post Hoc Analysis.....	111

CHAPTER V DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS & FUTURE RESEARCH	114
Discussion	114
Conclusions	120
Limitations	122
Future Research	126
REFERENCES	133
APPENDICES	155
Appendix A – Tables	156
Appendix B – Scripts	181
Legal Advice Show	181
Newscast	186
Christian Music Show	189
Appendix C – Survey Instrument	191
VITA	202

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Randomization Check.....	156
Table 2. Pretest Scale Reliabilities.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Table 4. Conditions for Analysis	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Table 5. Sample Demographics	158
Table 6. Final Scale Reliabilities	159
Table 7. Legal Advice Ownership	159
Table 8. Legal Advice Ownership	159
Table 9. Legal Advice Ownership	160
Table 10. Legal Advice Origination	161
Table 11. Legal Advice Origination	161
Table 12. Legal Advice Origination	162
Table 13. News Ownership.....	163
Table 14. News Ownership.....	163
Table 15. News Ownership.....	164
Table 16. News Origination.....	165
Table 17. News Origination.....	165
Table 18. News Origination.....	166
Table 19. News Reimportation	166
Table 20. News Reimportation	167
Table 21. Music Ownership.....	167
Table 22. Music Ownership.....	167
Table 23. Music Ownership.....	168
Table 24. Music Origination.....	168
Table 25. Music Origination.....	169
Table 26. Music Origination.....	169
Table 27. Stepwise Regression: Local Origination Preference	170
Table 28. Stepwise Regression: Local Origination Preference	171
Table 29. Stepwise Regression: Local Origination Preference	171
Table 30. Stepwise Regression: Awareness of Locality	172
Table 31. Stepwise Regression: Awareness of Locality	173
Table 32. Stepwise Regression: Awareness of Locality	173
Table 33. Standard (Enter) Regression: Don't Care Who Owns.....	173
Table 34. Standard (Enter) Regression: Don't Care Who Owns.....	174
Table 43. Local Full-Power vs. Local Clear Channel Newscast	179
Table 44. Local Full-Power vs. Local Clear Channel Newscast	179
Table 45. Locally Owned Full-Power vs. Clear Channel 2x2 Ownership/Origination	180
Table 46. Locally Owned Full-Power vs. Clear Channel 2x2 Ownership/Origination	180
Table 47. Song Affective Response.....	180

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Diversity, localism, competition. Arguably the most repeated words in scholarship on broadcast regulation, these did not appear together in the 1934 Communications Act creating the FCC (Communications Act of 1934), but they have been guiding principles of the Commission almost since its inception (Hilliard & Keith, 2005). Two of these goals, diversity and competition, are not exclusive to the communications industries, fitting logically into any discussion of a capitalistic economy. Historians of broadcast regulatory policy generally agree that these two goals were primary elements of the legislative intent behind the 1927 Radio Act and the 1934 Communications Act (Barnouw, 1966; Czitrom, 1982; Pennybacker & Braden, 1969), which created the Federal Radio Commission and the Federal Communications Commission respectively. Localism, however, was a newer concept and resulted from a unique characteristic of broadcasting: It did not have to be local in order to succeed. Industries selling physical goods, at the very least, needed enough local presence in their target markets to deliver products to customers, but the technical qualities of AM radio and the existence of national networks made it possible early on for broadcast companies to reach audiences from hundreds of miles away. Moreover, because low-frequency radio signals such as those in the AM band could travel long distances when broadcast at high power, it was possible even in the 1920s and 1930s for a few stations to serve the entire country, a plan advocated by some prominent early broadcasters, including RCA Chairman David Sarnoff (Czitrom, 1982) and the industry's first regulator, Commerce Secretary Herbert Hoover (Benjamin, 1998). But this arrangement was not

considered ideal (Barnouw, 1966), because by the 1930s many had begun to argue the importance of protecting localism (Benjamin, 1998; Federal Communications Commission [FCC], 2004; Hilliard & Keith, 2005), based in part on negative perceptions of European approaches to broadcasting, which had generally favored national radio (Orlick, 1997), and on fear of monopoly (Hilliard & Keith, 2005). The 1934 Act's language requiring broadcasters to serve the "public interest, convenience and necessity" was borrowed from long-established public utilities legislation (Czitrom, 1982) and resembled the spirit of early legislation to ensure that wireless telegraph operators were available to dispatch assistance to ships in distress (Barnouw, 1966; Hilliard & Keith, 2005; Teeter & Loving, 2004). Naturally, rescue efforts were most effective when crews were nearby, so it logically followed that a two-way radio station was most capable of serving those within the range of its transmission. Localism, therefore, was not a major topic of discussion during this period, despite significant variations in the power and reach of ship-to-shore wireless telegraph stations, some of which were capable of transmitting long distances (Barnouw, 1966). As two-way radio and the wireless telegraph gave way to broadcasting in the early 1920s, the medium quickly developed primarily an entertainment function, although it also served the public by providing emergency information during natural disasters and informing the democratic process through the delivery of news and public debate, which had significant local components (Hedges, 1951). Localism eroded in the 1930s with the rise of the broadcast networks (Barnouw, 1968), and many agreed this was detrimental to the industry's public service (Hilliard & Keith, 2005). Thus, certain FCC localism rules, which eventually required stations to provide local news, public affairs and emergency information, went largely unchallenged for many years (Barnouw, 1968).

Though broadcasting has changed drastically since the 1920s, its guiding principles of diversity, competition and localism, as stated by FCC commissioners, politicians, judges, and community activists, have remained (FCC, 2005; FCC, 2008). For instance, the 1953 seven-station rule, limiting the number of stations a given company could own, was justified on the basis of promoting diversity “in order maximize diversification of program and service viewpoints as well as to prevent any undue concentration of media power...” (FCC, 1953 p. 288). Some evidence exists, however, that limits on group ownership actually limit diversity rather than promote it (Wirth, 1982). This point remains the subject of debate, but there is no doubt that diversity in broadcasting has increased astronomically since the industry’s beginnings, from the availability of only two or three AM stations in many 1920s radio markets to hundreds of AM, FM, television, cable and satellite channels, and millions of Internet sources of media content (Staple & Werbach, 2004). Competition, though decreased somewhat after the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Chambers, 2001; Williams & Roberts, 2002), has also multiplied enormously compared to the early days of broadcasting. Many argue, though, that the principle of localism has been neglected as technological advancements and regulatory policy have changed the broadcasting industry (Franck, 1998; Hilliard & Keith, 2005; Nunn, 1981). The early justification for broadcast regulation was spectrum scarcity, and the reduction of this limitation has accompanied a loosening of ownership restrictions, resulting in less effort on the part of government to enforce localism (Horowitz, 1983; Owen, 2003). Many researchers on the subject (for example, Beatty, 2000; Brand, 2004; Bumgartner & Mahoney, 2002; Franck, 1998; Hilliard & Keith, 2005; Howley, 1999; McChesney, 1997) start from the premise that this is bad – operating on the long-standing assumption that the public interest is not fully served when broadcast entities are owned and, in many cases, operated from afar. This notion is closely

associated with the belief that regulatory policy should force the broadcasting industry to serve the public interest in ways that are not necessarily driven by market demand. Fairchild (1999) referred to such a philosophy as “statist”, based on an assumption that the government has a responsibility to protect the public interest and prevent companies from exploiting the public. Fairchild explained that an opposite approach to regulatory policy, which he called “corporatist”, has won out in recent years, with FCC commissioners generally ruling in ways that equate corporate profitability with successful service to the public interest (Prindle, 2003). Certainly, the public-safety function of broadcasting is still pertinent (Hood, 2007), with research supporting the notion that people still tune to local radio in large numbers after natural disasters (Blanks-Hindman & Coyle, 1999). But radio’s service to the public interest in other ways, such as the provision of news, public affairs programming, and even local music, could only be effective if people actually listen to these types of programs and insist that they come from local sources. Uses and Gratifications scholars have explored many aspects of media usage, including radio listenership (Towers, 1985), but the impact of radio ownership and locality of origination on listener preferences has gone largely unexplored (Chambers & Callison, 2003). The present study is premised on the notion that stations only can serve the public interest if they have listeners, and, as a result, listener responses are crucial in determining the potential for a station to fulfill a public-service expectation. If local ownership and content increase a station's favorability to listeners, that station stands a better chance of serving the public interest, convenience and necessity than if they do not (McCain & Lowe, 1990). This study attempts to approach the traditional public interest versus market debate from a different perspective: testing whether uninitiated listeners notice or care about issues considered essential to academic and policy analyses of broadcasting.

Rationale for the Study

Though in the days of extreme spectrum scarcity people had little choice but to listen to whatever came on the radio, 21st century programming is a free market where the most popular stations and programs succeed, and others fail (Owen, 1975; Staple & Werbach, 2004). Much scholarship on the subject of radio localism has ignored this shift or advocated its reversal (Hilliard & Keith, 2005; McChesney, 1997; Ruggiero, 1999), continuing to assume that localism is inherently good and its absence inherently bad, and arguing that market forces should have limited impact on assessments of the public interest.

Prometheus Radio Project, an organization advocating for community radio and non-profit low-power FM stations, quoted several sources to this effect in a 2007 press release, including Consumers Union spokesman Joel Kelsey: “Putting LPFM licenses in the hands of communities where local voices are being silenced by large national radio chains is a step in the right direction . . . finally community members across the nation will have an alternative to McRadio” (Prometheus, 2007, para. 4). In the same release, Prometheus program director Hannah Sassaman argued that the FCC’s Low Power FM (LPFM) service can function as an antidote to what many consider the negative effects of broadcast mergers and national ownership: “Low power FM radio is one strong tool that we can use to fight media consolidation...the big broadcasters can try to keep us down, but we will fight to make sure our legislators listen to local civil rights, school, neighborhood, and community groups – and we will build local radio stations that are accountable to us” (Prometheus, 2007, para. 2). The present study tests claims such as these by Prometheus Radio Project and its supporters, looking at localism in general, but with particular emphasis on low-power FM.

Some scholars have suggested that localism is not necessarily essential to serving the public interest (McGregor, 2006). Owen (2003) analyzed broadcast regulation from an economic standpoint and suggested that localism “appears to lack a coherent policy basis” (p. 25). Several studies have shown that local ownership is at best a weak predictor of the quality or quantity of local news coverage in an area (Smith, 2004). One study of television news showed that network owned-and-operated stations provided a greater quantity and quality of local coverage than other affiliate stations (Spavins, Denison, Roberts, & Frenette, 2002). That study was not necessarily an endorsement for group ownership, however, given that a majority of affiliates and networks at the time were owned by large corporations. Still, the Spavins study’s findings are at odds with those who oppose newspaper-television cross ownership, a component of the broader ownership debate, with Spavins suggesting instead that stations owned by newspaper publishers outperform other affiliates.

Many studies of local broadcasting, especially of low-power and community radio, have taken a case-study approach (for example, Hilliard, 2001; Hood, 2007; Howley, 1997; Reed & Hanson, 2006;), analyzing individual stations’ service to their communities and in several cases documenting instances of positive audience response, but few if any have studied how the element of localism specifically relates to people’s radio preferences.

The purpose of this study is to test whether radio audiences are even aware of the locality and ownership characteristics of the stations they hear and to find out how such information affects listener perceptions of radio stations and programming. It makes sense intuitively to assume that people would feel more personally connected to broadcast talent who shared their locality and culture. Tajfel and Turner (1986) developed Social Identity Theory, suggesting that a person has more than one “level of self”, each corresponding to a different type of group

membership. According to the theory, one's perception of his membership in a certain group forms the basis of his social identity. The theory posits that people show favoritism to members of their own perceived social groups, especially to members of groups they identify with most strongly. Naturally, locale is one element of social identity that could be important to radio listeners as they evaluate programs and personalities, although other elements could be equally or more significant. Still, Gunther (1992) found that people highly involved in certain social groups were likely to distrust media coverage of their own groups, and Harmon (1997) found that paracommunity orientation was a more important aspect of television news anchor popularity than parasocial interaction. He suggested that "a savvy news or promotions director should spend more time fashioning an anchor's image as a concerned, caring member of the community and not just a friendly visitor in the home twice a day" (p.9).

The potential benefits of community radio stations extend well beyond their capacity to connect people socially. In areas where the free market does not support commercial radio, community stations are essential services, especially in places so remote that distant full-power signals are out of range. Reed and Hanson (2006) conducted a case study of three community radio stations operating as a small network in West Virginia, concluding that the stations "come close to matching the ideals of community radio" (p. 229) because they operate on a low budget, are engaged in their communities, and carry very little nationally syndicated programming, all cornerstones of community radio licensing policy (Coyer, 2006; Hilliard, 2001). However, in suggesting future research, the authors posed several questions significant to the study of small radio stations as a means for promoting localism even in communities where full-power radio is available. They asked about the programming and financing of other community stations, and whether the stations serve "communities" primarily geographical or ideological in nature.

Perhaps most importantly to the present study, they asked whether community radio stations present a “viable alternative” (p. 230) to commercial and large-scale public radio stations. “In an era of ratings obsession and corporate consolidation, community radio has the potential to offer audiences more local programming along with a higher level of involvement and access. The question is does it live up to this potential?” (p.230). Reed and Hanson described the stations in their study as having antiquated equipment and mostly non-professional, volunteer staff. These rural Appalachian stations in West Virginia serve areas with few if any other broadcast radio signals available and, consequently, appear to have strong listenership and community participation. However, the question raised by the researchers – as to whether such stations are a viable alternative to larger-scale broadcasters – is key to the present study for the very reasons outlined by Reed and Hanson. Are stations with low budgets, poor production values, and amateur staff likely to be of greater value to audience members than corporate-owned stations, purely by being more local in terms of ownership and programming origination? The present study attempts to answer this question.

In November of 2007, the FCC adopted new guidelines for its Low-Power FM service (FCC, 2007) and, in the process, reaffirmed that LPFM was among the Commission's top priorities for promoting localism. “In order to ensure that the American people have the benefit of a competitive and diverse media marketplace that serves their local communities, we need to create more opportunities for different, new and independent voices to be heard,” Commissioner Chair Kevin Martin said in a statement announcing the new rules. “We need to address the concern that there are too few local outlets available to minorities and new entrants” (FCC, 2007b, para. 1). The new rules require that LPFM stations be locally owned, and they emphasize that satellite-delivered or automated programming does not fulfill the service's

localism requirement (FCC, 2007). The statements of many scholars and most LPFM advocates on the subject of localism are similar to those of FCC commissioners, both Republican and Democratic: Localism remains an important goal of broadcast regulation, and non-profit, low-power radio is essential to achieving it (FCC, 2000; FCC 2007; FCC 2007b). Therefore, a study of these types of radio stations' appeal to listeners is a worthy contribution to scholarship on the subject of broadcast regulation and the public interest. This study tests the responses of subjects randomly assigned to hear radio program excerpts identified as either locally originated or nationally produced, on stations identified as either locally owned non-profits or corporate group broadcasters. Instead of prompting uninitiated respondents to think about broadcast localism as a political, regulatory, or social issue, this study attempts to find out how or even if ownership and program origination affect listeners' first impressions of stations or programs when actually listening to their content. A basic assumption behind this study is that first impressions play a role in listeners' decisions to keep listening or turn the dial – potentially affecting whether low-power FM operators have an advantage or disadvantage when placed on the radio dial alongside corporate group-owned stations.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study could provide a contribution to the discussion of broadcast localism by either adding to or subtracting from its justification. This study might bolster the claims of low-power-FM advocates who suggest there is a public hunger for locally originated programming and local ownership; or it might support the argument that loosened ownership restrictions – resulting in conglomeration – have provided radio offerings that listeners prefer,

giving members of the public more of what they want. Significant differences showing affective response, medium and source credibility being affected by the variables of station ownership and locality would greatly increase understanding of the effects of localism on radio listeners. However, a lack of differences would be equally instructive. If the variables of station ownership and locality have no effect on listener perceptions, a case could be made that the principle of localism is not supported through a market approach to broadcast analysis and that only the public-sphere elements, community service, cultural cohesion, democratization, and public safety, form a viable argument for localism as a means of serving the public interest, convenience and necessity. But there is at least some reason to believe this is not the extent of localism's value to listeners. Etling (1999) conducted a qualitative study in which he interviewed Athens, Georgia radio listeners about their preferences. He found that his participants valued localism, defined in this case as representing the diversity of the community's musical tastes, responding to the community's information needs, and providing local news. Interestingly, though, when prompted for their own opinions on FCC policy, Etling's participants favored a marketplace model in which there was minimal regulation of broadcasters. This study will by no means end the debate between market and public-sphere advocates, but it could very well add support to one side or the other, and perhaps both. Because the author entered the process without a strong leaning, and without a definitive hypothesis rooted in a preponderance of established theory, it is possible that the study's conclusions will have a greater air of objectivity. This study is neither a critical argument in favor of public-service-oriented broadcast regulation nor a libertarian market analysis. It is purely an attempt to answer questions previously unanswered by scholars on either side of the regulatory debate.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the history of broadcast regulation in the United States, with emphasis on the promotion of localism as a means by which the FCC regulates service to the public interest, convenience and necessity. Next, the chapter consists of a review of literature specific to low-power-FM radio, related categories of community and educational radio, as well as historical predecessors of LPFM, including unlicensed pirate radio and UHF television. Then, possible theoretical bases are discussed, considering the market and public-sphere models of broadcast regulation, as well as economic analysis and the Krasnow, Longley and Terry model of regulatory policy making. The chapter concludes with a brief discussion of audience theories, with particular emphasis on Uses and Gratifications approaches, which relate to the present study because of the study's focus on audience perceptions and preferences.

History of Broadcast Regulation in the United States.

At an early 2004 FCC localism task force public hearing in San Antonio, several commissioners reiterated that localism was essential to broadcasters' fulfillment of the "public interest, convenience and necessity" requirement in place since the Commission was established by the Communications Act of 1934 (FCC, 2004b). In fact the public interest language, borrowed from public utilities legislation, predated the 1934 act (Rothenberger, 2004) having shown up in the 1927 Radio Act and resembled the justification behind the Radio Ship Act of 1910 and the Wireless Ship Act of 1912 (Barnouw, 1966). The idea that the airwaves are public

property has been essential to broadcasting since the industry's inception – almost. Guglielmo Marconi, the Italian inventor generally regarded as the father of radio was, according to historians, more interested in profiting from his invention, the wireless telegraph, than in serving the public good (Barnouw, 1966; Teeter & Loving, 2004). He instructed maritime operators of his radio technology to ignore signals, even distress calls, from those known to be using equipment made by his competitors. The U.S. Congress, however, recognized the inherent problems with such competitive behavior and passed the Radio Ship Act of 1910, establishing the idea that those using the public airwaves bore at least some responsibility to serve the public. As is often the case in the history of press freedom, however (Siebert, 1965), the 1910 act left the door open for abuses (Barnouw, 1966). Many resented the Navy's virtual ownership of the broadcast spectrum and engaged in disruptive acts, transmitting phony distress calls that put rescuers in unnecessary peril and led to a boy-who-cried-wolf effect (Barnouw, 1966; Teeter & Loving, 2004). When the Titanic sank in 1912, it took many hours longer than it should have for help to arrive, because (a) radio operators were not required to man their stations at all times and (b) distress calls were received with great skepticism. With the Wireless Ship Act of 1912, Congress reacted to the Titanic disaster, which had killed in excess of 1,800 people, by clamping down on amateur broadcasters, relegating them to an area of the spectrum that was technically inferior to a point of being almost unusable, and requiring that all radio operators be licensed. Though radio at the time was still considered a two-way communications method, and broadcasting was hardly imaginable, the 1912 Act remained the guiding legislation pertaining to radio until well into the 1920s (Czitrom, 1982).

There were barriers to the growth of the radio receiver and, thus, of the commercial broadcasting industries. Marconi's was not the only patented technology required for the

transmission of voices and music over the airwaves. It took equipment from several competing companies, comprising multiple patents, to build radio transmitters, microphones and receivers (Barnouw, 1966). Legal disputes slowed the progress of the industry prior to World War I, and once the U.S. entered the war the development of private radio was practically frozen. All radio frequencies were reserved for Naval operations between 1915 and 1917, and the Navy regulated any use thereof. After the war, the secretary of the Navy argued before Congress that broadcasting should remain a monopoly controlled by the Navy. Congress, however, divided regulatory responsibilities among several government departments, most notably Commerce (Czitrom, 1982). Still, the full extent of the department's authority was unclear (Barnouw, 1966).

With the war over and many legal and technical hurdles overcome, broadcasting developed quickly in the early 1920s, and the first hints of the commercial potential of the industry became evident. General Electric, RCA, and the AT&T subsidiary Western Electric had formed an alliance facilitating the technical requirements of broadcast production and transmission, shutting radio set manufacturer Westinghouse out of the deal (Czitrom, 1982). The government had given RCA control of the patents essential to broadcasting, an arrangement many argue amounted to a monopoly (Hilliard & Keith, 2005), and Westinghouse found its niche promoting broadcasting as a service in order to sell its radios. It acquired what is generally regarded as the first fulltime radio station, Pittsburgh's KDKA, which did not initially air commercials (Hilliard & Keith, 2005). Tribune's WGN and its Chicago competitor WLOS were among the many newspaper-owned stations that sprung up, viewed by media executives as a service to readers, not a for-profit venture (Czitrom, 1982; Hedges, 1951). Eventually, though, largely because so much of early broadcasting was controlled by corporate giants of the time, radio did become fully commercial, and within five years the medium had predominated

American culture (Barnouw, 1966). A big part of the reason for this dominance was the emergence of radio networks, famously championed at first by RCA Chairman David Sarnoff, who created NBC (Barnouw, 1968; Czitrom, 1982). Radio began offering news, music, dramatic programs and comedies, much of which delivered via networks, but also provided local news and information (Hilliard & Keith, 2005). Radio's potential to affect public policy became clear, especially when "talks" such as those featuring H.V. Kaltenborn began airing, first in New York City and eventually across the country (Hedges, 1951). The popularity of network programming eased the burden on local stations to fill their schedules with locally originated material, resulting in debates over localism that have continued ever since (Hilliard & Keith, 2005).

Early Licensing

There were big problems in the 1920s radio industry. Early AM technology did not allow tight containment of bandwidth (Benjamin, 1998). In other words, it was not possible for large numbers of stations to exist in the same market because, even if assigned to different frequencies, they would interfere with one-another. Viewing Commerce Secretary Herbert Hoover as the closest they had to a Congressionally authorized referee, broadcasters asked Hoover to regulate them. Hoover himself commented on the singularity of the situation, saying it was the only occasion he was aware of in which an industry had practically begged the government for regulation (Hedges, 1951; Prindle, 2003). He established, at first, one radio frequency per locality – a number that would eventually rise with improvements in transmission technology. To allow for more than one station per market, he assigned broadcast times for each station; one might be on the air Thursday nights from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m., another from 9:00 to 11:00 p.m., etc. He made judgments as to whether licensees were serving the public interest and

reserved the right to deny applications or renewals (Barnouw, 1966). In 1922, he denied a license renewal for a New York station owned by Intercity Broadcasting, and the company sued. A federal appeals court eventually ruled that Hoover did not have the authority to deny license requests, leading to a significant rise in the number of stations vying for increasingly short broadcast timeslots in radio markets. By the mid-1920s, it was apparent that major regulatory change was necessary in order for the broadcasting industry to grow – or even survive in its current form (Hedges, 1951). Benjamin (1998) chronicled the series of radio conferences held during this period, in which the leaders of large companies with a stake in the radio business, such as AT&T and Western Electric, convened with other broadcasters and government leaders involved in broadcast regulation, including members of congress, the U.S. Navy, and Hoover's commerce department. At the second of these conferences, in 1923, Hoover proposed a system that foreshadowed what eventually became the standard in broadcast regulation and led to the modern debate over the merits of large corporate ownership versus small, non-profit radio. He suggested allocating some frequencies to about 25 of what he called "high class stations" (Benjamin, 1998, p. 73), which operated at high power and could cover large portions of the country. Most of these stations were located in big cities and owned by large companies. Under such a system, Hoover and others at the conference reasoned that the public would be well served because companies with the largest budgets were most likely to provide high-quality programming to the nation – programming which they suggested would be "supplemented" by local stations operating at lower power (Benjamin, 1998). Howley (2005) described the modern relationship between the FCC and powerful broadcast business interests a "cozy" (p.104), and it appears that the symbiotic relationship between big broadcasters and their regulators dates from the industry's earliest years. Czitrom (1982) said Hoover clearly favored commercial

broadcasting when the discussion turned to the potential for educational, community and non-profit radio.

Though his vision of a two-tiered system later became reality, Hoover's authority to assign licenses was virtually eliminated by a 1926 court ruling, when Zenith challenged Hoover's time assignment of its Denver station. The *U.S. v. Zenith* decision effectively ended Hoover's control of the broadcasting industry and resulted in several months of chaos (Barnouw, 1966; Hedges, 1951; Teeter & Loving, 2004). Stations increased their power, creating interference so bad that listeners in many areas could not receive intelligible signals. Broadcasters and audiences were upset (Hilliard & Keith, 2005), and Congress acted quickly, passing the Radio Act of 1927 creating the Federal Radio Commission and laying the groundwork for the 1934 Communications Act, which has guided broadcast regulation ever since (Barnouw, 1966). What has emerged is a complex regulatory system (Carmode, 1986), in which the FCC, Congress, the courts, and various public interest organizations take steps to force broadcasters toward what they consider the public interest (Krasnow, Longley, & Terry, 1982). Advances in technology have changed the landscape of regulation through the years, but localism has often been a major factor influencing policy. Sterling and Kittross (2002) traced the modern ownership and origination patterns in broadcasting to a period of change after World War II:

American broadcasting made the transition from a small radio system dominated by four networks to a far larger AM-FM radio and television system in which networks concentrated on television and left radio stations to their own programming resources during the seven years from late 1945 to early 1952. A reader only familiar with today's broadcasting would hardly recognize the limited

system of 1945, while the 1952 system contained all the elements to be found a quarter century later, and most of those present today. (Sterling & Kittross, 2002 p. 271)

The FCC offered significant pronouncements about localism during the 1940s, including a report on chain broadcasting in 1941 and the so-called Blue Book in 1946, which outlined requirements that stations air non-commercial public interest programming (Napoli, 2001). Such pronouncements have continued through the years. Some have accused the Commission of mere lip-service on the subject (Hilliard & Keith, 2005), but the FCC's most recent report on localism (FCC, 2008) demonstrates how little the arguments have changed in nearly a century.

Localism

Throughout its existence, the FCC has advocated localism in some form or fashion, and some suggest this is because of the commission's interest in promoting diversity and competition. Hilliard and Keith (2005) explained that the 1920s broadcast regulatory debate, coming only a few years after the breakup of the oil trusts, was heavily influenced by a fear of monopoly. National control of the industry, especially through networks, was viewed by many as anti-competitive, according to Hilliard and Keith, with widely distributed licensees serving local communities considered a positive alternative. Many also argued the cultural and democratic benefits of localism early on (Soley, 1999), but the FCC's promotion of it appeared rooted in economic motives. Nevertheless, more than merely naming it as a policy goal, the Commission has taken specific steps to promote localism in its regulatory actions (Napoli, 1999; Napoli, 2001). They have implemented what is known as "geographic" or "special" localism, spreading station licenses to many localities and giving preference to local ownership when granting new

licenses; and “audience” localism in which licensees are encouraged to provide programming that serves the specific needs of their localities (Newton, 2001). The 1934 Communications Act was so specific in its localism provisions that owners were required to take part in the operations of their stations (Chambers, 2003). This rule was eventually relaxed, although several other policy statements throughout the 20th Century continued to enforce community involvement of station owners. In 1965, “ascertainment rules” were implemented, forcing owners to survey the needs of their communities (Chambers, 2003).

The legislative history of the 1934 Communications Act creating the FCC (Paglin, 1989) reveals the same kinds of debates over ownership, and frequency allocation that have continued to the present day. For instance, the National Association of Broadcasters vocally opposed an amendment that would have reserved 25 percent of the radio spectrum for educational, religious, and other non-profit organizations. Though the educational band eventually was created, the NAB argued in 1934 that commercial broadcasters provided better service to the public interest because they served the public “as a whole, as distinguished from service to any particular class, group or denomination” (p. 117). The association further argued that special frequency allocation for certain non-profit groups did not serve the interest of free speech in general – but merely that of groups “lucky, rich or influential enough to secure all the available allocations; for the rest there would be no freedom at all” (p.117).

The question of whether broadcasters should be forced through regulation to serve their localities in specific ways has become an even hotter issue since relatively liberal governmental policies of the mid-20th Century gave way to more laissez-faire approaches of the 1980s and 1990s, resulting in greatly reduced regulation of broadcast ownership and, according to some,

allowing ownership groups to shirk their responsibility to serve the public interest. Since deregulation in the early 1980s, much of the scholarship on radio ownership has focused on concentration of group ownership (Chambers, 2001; Drushel, 1998; Wirth, 2002). Earlier research had also noted effects of deregulation on station ownership and the public interest (Aufderheide, 1990; Bates, 1993; Bates & Chambers, 1999; Hemenway, 1986; Krattenmaker & Powe, 1985), often yielding conflicting arguments. Another example, Barrett (2005), illustrated the mixed results of ownership concentration. She found a positive correlation between the number of television stations owned and operated by a given network and the ratings success of that network's programs on O&O stations; but she also found a slight negative correlation between group ownership and program ratings success. Generally, the ideas of market and public sphere models emerge as common themes of the scholarly debates, with only the occasional economic scholars (Bates, 1993; Chambers & Bates, 1992; Kerkman et al, 1990) providing a middle-ground assessment – that the free market serves the public interest better than a heavily regulated industry in some areas, such as quality and diversity of programming and the provision of local news, but worse in terms of its effects on advertising rates and distribution of competition around the country. Nevertheless, the critical argument that the public interest is better served through regulation than through a free market appears to be much of the basis for the creation of the low-power-FM service (Birnbaum, 2002; Brand, 2004; Hilliard & Keith, 2005; Huntemann, 1999; Lucas, 2006).

Economists Lisa George and Joel Waldfogel (2006) shed light on the discussion of localism in media by approaching it from a non-broadcast-regulatory perspective, looking instead at newspapers. They explained that the presence of national media outlets tends to reduce consumption of local media among certain target audiences but increases it in others – that a

majority of media consumers can cause harm to the minority whose specialized media preferences are different. Specifically, George and Waldfogel analyzed, through longitudinal examination of circulation numbers and other data, the effects of *New York Times* national distribution on readership of local newspapers. They found that when it became available nationally, readers most specifically targeted by the *Times* – primarily those of higher educational levels – moved away from local papers. As a result, the local papers changed their focus to providing more local news and information and actually gained readers who were not part of the *Times*'s target audience. The researchers suggested, based in part on a body of prior economic literature, two potential problems with national outlets moving into the territory of smaller local media entities: 1) As a local media outlet changes its focus, adjusting its content to appeal to those not attracted to national news, it is likely to pursue a less educated audience and, therefore, reduce the intellectual depth of its output – leaving those who prefer the local paper with an inferior product; and 2) Those who switch to the national entity are likely to become disconnected from the local community, resulting in reduced participation in local politics and a general degradation of civic-mindedness. In another paper, George and Waldfogel (2003) compared the scenario to a form of majority tyranny – in which the free market results in harm to a sizable portion of the public whose media preferences are not in line with those of a dominant company's audience. Applying this theory to broadcast regulation, it is possible to conclude that both market and public-sphere advocates have legitimate claims. Reducing ownership regulations can result in increased diversity and quality of programming (Powell, 2003), but it can also have negative effects which could be mitigated somewhat by services such as LPFM. To put it another way, even if LPFM is not in high demand by a majority of media consumers, it can serve an important purpose by satisfying the preferences of a minority, and it can help promote

community participation at least by some citizens (Sussman & Estes, 2005). If nothing else, it is possible that an increased variety of radio stations in a market is favorable to listeners, and the opposite unfavorable (Prindle, 2003). Polinsky (2007) found a positive relationship between the number of stations in a given market and the number of different radio formats available. She further found a positive relationship between the number of stations in a market and the percentage of radio listenership there, as well as a positive relationship between the number of stations carrying the same format and that format's total audience.

Long-standing requirements that licensees maintain public files have specified that stations have records of their community service efforts, including public affairs programming, news and public service announcements (Barnouw, 1968). Local news itself was an FCC requirement of broadcasters for many years. In television, the FCC required a minimum one hour of local programming in prime time, after it became apparent that network programs could usurp local programming all too easily. Ironically, many stations adhered to the letter of this rule but violated the spirit of it, filling much of this timeslot with nationally syndicated, albeit non-network, programs (Barnouw, 1970). More generally, though, it was in this area of local versus network programming that the accepted definition of localism began to waiver. In the early days of radio it was essential that local stations be manned (Barnouw, 1966). Thus, providing local news, weather, emergency information, public service announcements, etc. was as easy as having the operator on the air flip a switch and speak. In addition, networks did not have the resources to provide more than a few hours of programming per day (Hedges, 1951). So there was little debating that a station's service to its community meant airing locally originated programming (Arceneaux, 2005); there simply was no other way to do it. This changed as the networks grew and gained the resources to fill more hours of the day with national programming.

Still, it was understood by many in the broadcasting industry that “local” meant “locally originated.” William S. Hedges was one of the first presidents of the National Association of Broadcasters and an early executive with NBC. In an unpublished interview conducted in 1951, Hedges described his emphasis on localism even when his job was to administer a national network:

It was inevitable that I have considerable concern with the public service aspect of the network, because in the operation of the owned and operated stations which came under my jurisdiction in 1934, I had to sacrifice time which could be used locally either for commercial purposes or for local sustaining and local public service purposes. Inevitably a decision had to be made as to which would serve the public interest best. Many times a network program was not carried in order that a local public affairs program could be carried. I might also add that during election periods the owned and operated stations of the National Broadcasting Company did not hesitate to cancel out network commercial programs in order to provide time, if need be, for local political candidates to bring their messages to the voting public. (Hedges, 1951, p. 12)

It is worth pointing out that Hedges’ emphasis on local origination in the above quotation was not altruistic, given that the local stations to which he referred were owned and operated by NBC. The network would make its money regardless. In a way, though, this provides an even stronger case for the value of localism to early broadcasters: A network executive, whose job was to ensure the success of a large corporation, sometimes considered locally originated public affairs programming to take precedence over national programming – even during election campaigns. “I stated at the time and have reiterated it many times since that no station is of any

more importance to the network as an outlet than it is to its own community,” he said (Hedges, 1951, p. 10). The value of localism, therefore, was hardly in dispute in the early days of radio, but with the advent of television in the early ‘50s, it became apparent that the situation had changed dramatically: Unlike radio, TV programming was very expensive to produce, and the networks were much more able to deliver a steady stream of programming than local stations. Many local stations relied almost exclusively on network and other nationally produced content, and the result was what FCC chairman Newton Minow termed a “vast wasteland” by the early 1960s (Harvard Law Review, 1962). One proposed solution was to license stations that were smaller, cheaper, and inherently more local. The UHF band seemed a good place for such stations, because technical limitations kept their signals from remaining clear when traveling long distances (Rothenberger, 2004; Wilhelm, 1976).

The story of UHF television’s early development carries significant parallels to low-power FM. It faced similar technical and market limitations (Brinson, 2000; Merryman, 1956) and also was touted as holding much the same promise for promoting localism (Godfried, 2002). The idea posited by many UHF advocates was that it would give voice to smaller entities representing diverse populations (Brinson, 2000; Kittross, 1976) and provide an alternative to big corporate broadcasters. Besen, Krattenmaker, Metzger, and Woodbury (1984) had a different idea about television channel availability but also concluded that localism would have increased if the FCC’s handling of spectrum allocation had been different. They suggested the elimination of television regulation, arguing that spectrum policies had prevented more than three stations from locating in most communities, protecting the status-quo three-network system and limiting the availability of programming. Ironically, the researchers’ suggestion was that the presence of more than three *national* networks would ultimately lead to more localism. Nonetheless, it took

a report and order from the FCC, along with Congressional action, to settle disputes over how to integrate UHF into the manufacture of television sets (Webbink, 1969), and, perhaps because of its technical shortcomings and legal delays, UHF never fulfilled the grand vision of its advocates (Brinson, 2000).

Other FCC efforts toward localism have included limiting the amount of network programming allowed in prime time; requiring that public affairs programming be included in the schedules of all licensed radio and TV stations; and considering the input of citizen groups as part of the license renewal process (Krasnow, Longley & Terry, 1982). A mid-1960s court decision forced the issue of citizen input on the FCC, something that became a source of difficulty for the Commission for the next 15 years. The DC Court of Appeals supported citizen group challenges to station format changes during this period, and the FCC fought them, arguing for a more hands-off approach. It took a Supreme Court decision in 1981 favoring the FCC position finally to resolve the matter, but the FCC continued to hear arguments from the public as part of the license renewal process thereafter (Krasnow, Longley & Terry, 1982).

Changes in the 1990s

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 was passed by the Newt Gingrich-led Republican Congress, swept into office in 1994, after lawmakers of both parties had spent years considering the Act's many changes. The Act significantly eased restrictions on broadcast ownership, clearing the way for corporate giants such as Clear Channel Communications and Viacom's Infinity Broadcasting to buy up thousands of stations around the country (Chambers, 2001; Prindle, 2003). Language in the act restated Congress's commitment to serving the public interest, and, although it did not specifically use the word "localism", the act's implication was

that eased ownership restrictions would benefit local broadcasters and may even increase the number of local offerings (Telecommunications Act of 1996), an idea proposed nearly a half century earlier by Steiner (1949). However, as broadcasting became increasingly corporate, much local broadcasting disappeared (Prindle, 2003). Local news staffs were cut or eliminated and public affairs programming became an antiquated concept. Many in the radio industry lost their jobs (Huntemann, 1999). It was in this atmosphere that FCC chairman William Kennard began hearing from a grassroots coalition of minority advocates, left-wing groups and religious organizations asking for a new emphasis on localism through a surprisingly low-tech offering: Low-power FM radio (Lucas, 2006).

Low-Power Radio

The FCC voted in 2000 to create a low-power-FM radio service in the United States (FCC, 2000). Initially the commission specified two categories of LPFM, 10 watt and 100 watt, but to date only 100 watt station licenses have been issued in the LPFM category. The service, according to Lucas (2006), is actually an outgrowth pirate radio, which developed in the 1970s and 80s and blossomed in reaction to increased corporate mergers in broadcasting after the 1996 Act (File, 2000). Because FCC Chairman William Kennard was an African-American, many groups interested in the grassroots political significance of local radio assumed he would be their champion (Lucas, 2006), and to a large degree they were correct, according to Lucas. Kennard steered the FCC toward creating LPFM in 1998, and the Commission crafted the proposed service over the next two years with President Bill Clinton's support. The commission soon ruled out the possibility of commercial ownership of the stations, limiting them to non-profit

organizations, a decision some say was detrimental to the service's success (Brand, 2004; Lucas, 2006). No broadcaster could hold more than three licenses, and the licensee had to reside within ten miles of his station (FCC, 2000). Traditional broadcasters were not happy about the proposal, fearing LPFM stations would cause interference on their established frequencies (Walker, 1997). The NAB and NPR petitioned Congress to put a stop to the service, and in early 2000, just as the FCC was preparing to solicit license applications – Congress debated the Radio Broadcasting Preservation Act (Lucas, 2006). A veto threat from President Clinton watered down the bill, so instead of killing LPFM outright, Congress crippled it with technical specifications (Brand, 2004). The Preservation Act imposed tight restrictions on just how close a low-power station could be, both in terms of frequency and physical location, to existing stations. After the 2000 act became law, FCC engineers were back to the drawing board trying to figure out what frequency and power allocations were acceptable for the service. They froze the issuance of building permits for the stations until 2002, after which time the FCC began an accelerated licensing process that resulted in nearly 2000 LPFM station applications nationally, nearly 46 percent of which filed by religious organizations (Lucas, 2006).

The notion that licensing policy can serve as tool to strengthen communities is almost as old as the FCC itself (Armstrong, 2002; Armstrong, 2007). In modern times, many argue that community broadcasting provides an important service, given that corporate broadcasters often fail to provide local news and information (Walker, 1997). At their localism task force meetings (FCC 2004b), members of the FCC made clear that they considered localism to be at the heart of a station's service. They emphasized, as previous commissioners had for decades with frequent backing from appellate and Supreme Court rulings (Pennybacker, 1969), that access to the broadcast spectrum is a privilege, not a right, and that with the ownership of something as

valuable as a broadcast license came certain responsibilities. Ironically, several commissioners at the San Antonio localism hearing lamented the loosening of ownership restrictions, even as Clear Channel Communications executives looked on (FCC, 2004b). Reading the words of the FCC commissioners, one might get the impression that the 1996 Act went against the Commission's wishes. Such a view is mitigated, however, by the Commission's later discussions of easing ownership restrictions even more (Eggerton, 2007). Broadcast regulation has been in the past and still is justified by spectrum scarcity, even though the current spectrum is not nearly as scarce as it once was. The FCC specified that LPFM licensees must reside near their stations, and LPFM stations have, in some cases, served the purposes conceived by Kennard and the grassroots coalition of the late-1990s. For instance, a LPFM operator on the Gulf Coast was credited with saving lives during the Hurricane Katrina disaster in 2005 (Doyle & Terry, 2007). On the other hand, some LPFMs are not being used primarily for local purposes. Several fundamentalist religious organizations have encouraged local churches to purchase LPFM licenses for the purpose of airing national religious programming (Lucas, 2006).

Low-Power Radio Predecessors

Depending on how one defines "low power" radio, its history traces back at least to the 1940s if not to the very beginnings of radio broadcasting. Engelmann (1996) said the first broadcast stations were of a relatively low power, many of which operated by educational institutions. Charles David Herrold, often credited as the nation's first broadcaster, was an engineering professor in San Jose, California. His station operated years before KDKA in Pittsburgh (Marcus, 2002) but was not on the air continuously, so it is not generally considered the first true radio station. Still, the transition from radio as two-way communication to a mass

communication model began with small broadcasters operating what are now regarded as low-power transmitters serving small localities (Hilliard & Keith, 2005). Madison, Wisconsin's WHA, originally identified with the call-sign 9XM, evolved from a University of Wisconsin engineering professor's experiment with wireless telegraphy into a full-fledged broadcast station, a pioneer of non-commercial radio. It became a rural public service tool early on, when the idea emerged to provide weather bulletins to farmers, a task that first required the development of simple, affordable radio sets that farmers could use (Davidson, 2006). Eventually the university acquired an FM license, placing WHA on the non-commercial band. The idea of reserving bandwidth for educational and non-profit entities dates as far back as Commerce Secretary Herbert Hoover's radio conferences of the early 1920s (Benjamin, 1998), and Engelman (1996) traces the creation of the non-commercial spectrum on the FM dial to the post-war 1940s, pointing out that this area of the dial amounted to 20 percent of the entire FM allocation. The Class D non-commercial license for educational institutions was officially created in 1948 (Marcus, 2002; Richardson & Johanningmeier, 2006; Scroggins, 1981) and is one of the clear ancestors of modern low-power broadcasting. But LPFM also has roots in what is described as "pirate" radio. Unlicensed broadcasting in the United States has often amounted to an act of civil disobedience against the FCC's authority to regulate broadcasting (Dick, 2000; Phipps, 1990), but many argue that it serves an important function. Its capacity to promote culture and serve the public in ways not conceived by government authorities or the free market is well documented across the Atlantic. Robertson (1982) says as many as 11 ships transmitted radio to European countries in the 1960s, breaking what was in much of Europe a series of government-controlled broadcasting monopolies. Robertson suggests that the early success of rock music was, at least in part, the result of pirate radio, because government-run broadcasters such as the BBC shunned

the records. Phipps (1990) suggested that the FCC did not concern itself with sporadic broadcasts by unlicensed radio operators in the United States but did take action when pirate radio stations “sought large audiences, enjoyed wide publicity, and operated in open defiance of the FCC” (p. 148). Coopman (1999) and Brand (2004) pointed out distinctions between pirate broadcasters and unlicensed “micro” radio. They said pirate stations tended to avoid confrontation, preferring to maintain their underground status, whereas micro stations were often highly publicized, openly defying the FCC's regulatory powers. They did so not out of criminal intent, but because of a philosophical belief in radio's capacity to empower the underrepresented, a point echoed frequently in scholarship on both micro and pirate radio (Coopman, 2000; Franck, 1998), and reflected in the FCC's statements creating the low-power FM service (FCC, 2000; Hamilton, 2004). Negrine (1994) outlined the arguments of those advocating broader access to media:

1) That opening up institutions for public participation and involvement is a prerequisite to a more open and active society; 2) that participation in, and access to, the means of communication are not only worthwhile in themselves but could lead on, or contribute, to the creation of a more complete democratic process; 3) that participation in, or access to, the means of communication could not only recreate broadcasting as a two-way form of communication but could also permit non-professionals to communicate. (Negrine, 1994, p. 54)

Negrine, writing before the advent of widespread internet access and the creation of the LPFM service, focused on public-access cable TV as possibly promoting the above benefits, but his points shed light on the potential advantages and disadvantages of LPFM and community radio (Schulman, 1985). Negrine suggested that the increasing affordability of video equipment made it possible for more people to create public-access programs, but he also favored publicly

financed media access channels. Advocating what he suggested would be a return to the public sphere model of broadcasting, Negrine argued that “only on the local (possibly even commercial) communication system, be it cable, radio, or UHF, that local community and participatory forms of communication can exist. The more national or international the technology of communication, the less the potential for local, participatory or access communication” (Negrine, 1994, p.57). Though clearly writing as an advocate for a public-sphere rather than market-based approaches, Negrine raised a question central to the present study:

How can local services survive in a competitive environment? A typical local channel on a British cable system, for example, would have to compete with regional and national commercial television, regional and national commercial channels, and a multitude of satellite-delivered services offering a varied menu of content. Will its content of local snippets and tid-bits – locally produced by amateurs with the assistance of professionals – stand up to the competition? Will it catch the viewers? Will it motivate them to participate themselves? (Negrine, 1994, p. 57)

In making this point, Negrine cited the work of Humphreys (1990), who chronicled the decline of public-service broadcasting in Germany, describing its inability to compete in a deregulated marketplace in which large private companies had more resources to attract and maintain viewership. Porter and Hasselbach (1991) reached a similar conclusion, describing the German system as an attempt at balancing, through regulation, private competitive broadcasting with government supported broadcasting aimed at serving the public interest. The researchers suggested that it was actually private competition that brought diversity to the marketplace, diminishing the importance of public broadcasting.

Public Interest, Localism, Ideology, and Service

A theme that recurs through a review of literature on localism is that broadcasting designed to serve the public interest is not necessarily supported by the free market (Freedman, 1998). It certainly has little bearing on assessments of radio station value (Albarran & Patrick, 2005). On the other hand, audience preferences are conspicuously absent from much of the scholarship favoring a public-sphere model of broadcasting and decrying consolidation (Alvarez, 1995). Chambers and Callison (2003) put it this way: “Although these studies have examined the structural implications of local radio consolidation, there appears to be a research void in terms of effects of consolidation on actual listeners” (p.7). They conducted a national survey of 382 respondents and found that people were more likely to perceive individual programs as local than station ownership. While most respondents named group-owned stations as those they listened to the most, there was a relationship between their perceiving radio personalities as local and their preference for the station. Chambers and Callison also reported that people believed the money earned by an independently owned station was more likely to stay in the community than a group-owned station. On the other hand, they reported that voice tracking and satellite delivery did not appear to affect audience preference negatively. Greve, Pozner and Rao studied LPFM applicants and found higher concentrations of license applications in communities with large numbers of group-owned stations. They concluded that a large presence of group-owned stations provides a “strong, salient enemy, which spurs local activism and efforts to express unique local identities” (p. 819), but the findings of Chambers and Callison suggest that the concern on the part of activists filing LPFM applications is not necessarily shared by a significant portion of the potential audience for such stations. Greve, Pozner and Rao also concluded that a large

concentration of group ownership freed up resources, facilitating more LPFM applications by groups that otherwise might have owned full-power stations. Significantly, the researchers reported that LPFM stations were more likely to hurt independently owned commercial stations' listenership than that of group owned stations.

In its initial statement proposing the creation of the LPFM service, the FCC used the justification that through mergers and consolidation the broadcasting industry had limited the number of voices and opinions in broadcasting (FCC, 2000). Commissioners also suggested that the cost of starting a radio station had increased and that LPFM would remedy the situation. Then FCC Chairman William Kennard echoed many of the points articulated by the Free Radio movement (Brinson, 2006), saying that service to the public interest means providing a diversity of views (Busterna, 1976) because the broadcast media are a key source of information in America (Lucas, 2006). The two dissenters in the initial vote to create the LPFM service were the commission's minority Republican members during the democratic Clinton administration, Michael Powell and Harold Furchtgott-Roth, both citing possible interference with existing full-power stations as chief among their concerns (FCC, 2000). But Furchtgott-Roth also suggested there was little if any apparent demand for the stations. He based this conclusion on the fact that there had been few applications for non-commercial low-power licenses under existing rules at the time. Comparing the arguments of Kennard and other LPFM champions with the dissents of Powell and Furchtgott-Roth reveals an ongoing ideological schism regarding the role of mass media in society (Downing, 2001). Siebert, Peterson and Schramm (1954) outlined the different views as two of their four theories of the press: *libertarian* and *social responsibility*. Rooted in the writings of Milton, Locke and Mill, the libertarian theory assumes the media are privately owned and controlled by "a self-righting process of truth in a free marketplace of ideas" (Siebert,

Peterson & Schramm, 1954, p. 7). Media ownership, under the libertarian theory, goes to “anyone with the economic means to do so” (p. 7), and the chief purpose of the mass media is to “inform, entertain, sell – but chiefly to help discover truth and to check on government” (p.7). Siebert, Peterson and Schramm said the social responsibility theory emerged in the 20th century U.S., based in part on the writings of W.E. Hocking, the Commission on Freedom of Press, and various media codes. The researchers described media ownership under the theory as “private unless government has to take over to insure public service” (p.7), and the chief purpose of media “to inform, entertain and sell – but chiefly to raise conflict to the plane of discussion” (p.7). Significantly, the researchers said under the social responsibility theory, media were controlled by community opinion and consumer action (p.7) and “must assume obligation of social responsibility; and if they do not, someone must see that they do” (p.7). Herein lies the basic ideological distinction, not entirely separate from American partisan politics, that divides the public sphere and market models of broadcast regulation (Kellner, 1997). It is hardly a stretch to suggest that FCC commissioners’ positions relative to these ideological perspectives have predicted shifts in broadcast regulatory policy, with appointees from more liberal administrations often falling into a category Napoli (2006) described as *trustees* of the public interest. However, partisanship itself is not a clear predictor of FCC action. Lichty (1962; Lichty 1962b) studied the backgrounds of commissioners and concluded that the commission changes are more linked to the arrivals and departures of influential members than purely to partisanship. On the other hand, Williams, Jr. (1976) updated Lichty's study, finding that, while party itself was not a reliable predictor of regulatory policy, many commissions have consisted of “block” voters; and different administrations have brought changes in terms of regulatory activism or lack thereof. Gormley Jr. (1978) added that former broadcasters serving on the commission

tended to favor less regulation than commissioners from other backgrounds, and that only a few times in the Commissions history had policies consistently opposed the interests of broadcast industry leaders.

Scholars have continually monitored the FCC's policies regarding localism, generally from the perspective of advocating it. Sauls and Greer (2007) assessed the state of localism and, significantly to this study, started from the premise that localism was necessary in broadcasting. In fact, the very first sentence of their paper asked the question: "How is localism today being protected on the radio airwaves?" (p. 37). They cited several FCC statements to the effect that localism was in itself important because cable and satellite TV, as well as satellite radio, have tended to nationalize broadcasting in recent years, and over-the-air broadcasters can serve the public interest by maintaining local voices (Blakely, 2001). After an extensive review of the history of localism, Sauls and Greer concluded that the radio industry, rather than the FCC, may have the burden of revisiting and possibly redefining localism (Sauls & Greer, 2007, p.46).

One study shedding light on the value of localism to communities dealt with an approach to local news delivery unique to station chains. Hood (2007) studied the concept she identified as *reimported* local news, a phenomenon in which ownership groups use anchors from large stations to voice newscasts for smaller stations that may be hundreds of miles away. The station subject to Hood's case study was in a western U.S. state and received several of its daily, supposedly local newscasts from a newsroom 300 miles away. The station had two local reporter/anchors who delivered their own morning and afternoon drive-time newscasts, but it aired remotely produced local newscasts during non-drive times and in circumstances where the local reporters had to be in the field covering stories. The local reporters provided scripts, sound and information electronically to the remote newsroom but often found that the remotely

produced newscasts did not contain stories of importance to the local community. Hood reported that during the study period, a severe weather event and a major community festival went unreported on the distantly produced newscasts. Overall, Hood portrayed a situation not ideal in terms of service to the public interest, but some people quoted in the article suggested that reimportation was a good thing. They said the remotely produced newscasts freed the local reporters to cover important stories in depth, rather than spend inordinate amounts of time in the station producing hourly newscasts. The suggestion was that, due to economic factors, remotely produced news in a group-owned station context might actually serve a local community more effectively than if that station were staffed only by local news reporters. Reading the problems Hood described, however, the general impression of the phenomenon is negative.

Religious Broadcasting and Local Radio

Since long before special frequency allocations for non-profit and educational radio entered of the legislative debate over the 1934 Communications Act, religious groups have been associated with this category of broadcasting. It has been a complicated relationship, to put it mildly. In simplest terms, religious broadcasting is about evangelism, fulfilling what many consider Christianity's requirement of believers to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ and convert as many as possible to the faith. Evangelical Christian organizations around the country were among the very earliest broadcasters, and they established a tradition that has remained ever since: acquiring as many broadcast stations as possible. Diamond (1989) traced the beginnings of the phenomenon to a rift between liberal and conservative religious denominations. After the Scopes "Monkey Trial" brought national attention and ridicule to fundamentalist groups, they focused on using the mass media to solidify their base of support and clarify their message. Prior

to the Federal Radio Commission's creation in 1927, resulting in federal regulation of frequency allocation, fundamentalist religious broadcasters hoarded the AM radio spectrum in many major cities (Diamond, 1989). The number of religious stations began to decline as a result of the FRC's actions, but religious broadcasters have continued their efforts to maximize their use of the broadcast spectrum, leading to new allegations of spectrum hoarding (FCC, 2007; MediaGeek, 2004; Tyson, 1990). Some LPFM advocates claim that the service has failed to grow as it should have because Christian groups have filled the broadcast spectrum in many areas (Anderson, 2006), mostly with translator station licenses (FCC, 2007; MediaGeek, 2004), which, according to FCC rules, prevent the placement of nearby LPFM stations on the same or even first or second adjacent frequencies (FCC, 1990), a dispute discussed extensively in the Commission's most recent report on LPFM (FCC, 2007) but still unresolved. Religious broadcasting is an area that merits testing of localism concepts because it runs the gamut of ownership categories, from LPFM to large conglomerates, and programming origination, from small-town preachers with cassette recorders to satellite-delivered network programming (Tyson, 1990). Moreover, the competition for regulatory priority between large holders of translator licenses and community radio activists supporting LPFM raises serious questions about which approach is more favorable to audiences and which serves the public interest better. Translator stations are low-power transmitters licensed for the purpose of extending a full-power station's coverage area. Over several decades, translator stations have been employed to great effect in areas too small to support multiple full-power stations and too distant to receive full-power broadcast signals clearly from other radio markets. The stations typically operate at power outputs similar to those of LPFM stations, but in some cases are more powerful. The FCC does not allow translator station operators to originate programming and requires commercial

translators to rebroadcast programming only from nearby stations (FCC, 1990). In other words, commercial translator stations may not exist merely to broadcast satellite-fed content originating far away from the community of license. However, this rule does not apply to non-commercial translator stations, and there is no limit on how many translator stations a single company can own (FCC, 1990). In 2003, the FCC opened a translator station application window that resulted in what some have described as “translator speculation”, in which thousands of translator construction permits were granted to a small number of national religious organizations and, according to some LPFM advocates (Anderson, 2006; FCC, 2007; Prometheus, 2007), eliminated the possibility that low-power FM stations could locate in many communities. Thus, the relationship between religious broadcasters and other non-profit radio station owners remains complicated.

Theoretical Framework

Croteau and Hoynes (2001) identified two models for the study of media: *market* and *public sphere*. The market model is based on the notion of supply and demand – that media will provide what is in greatest demand, and programs not economically viable will not succeed. The public sphere model is based more on the notion that media should serve the greater good and provide services to the public not necessarily supported by the free market. Brooks and Daniels (2002) suggested that broadcast offerings were best understood if analyzed via both models. They did so in conducting a case study of the Tom Joyner morning show in the context of an “age of consolidation” (p. 8). They described how the national show, with more than 100 affiliates, emphasized localism by allowing its stations to maintain “local flavor” (p. 21), with

customized announcements from Joyner and announcements from local personalities during the program. The researchers cited a personal communication with Joyner to the effect that he “does not want his program to take away from local station management control” (p. 21). The researchers concluded that the show operates successfully in a competitive marketplace “marked by consolidation and ownership concentration” (p. 28) but also makes efforts to “serve the public interest and contribute to a more democratic public sphere” (p. 29). This Brooks and Daniels study used both models, but much research on broadcast policy tends to fall into one category or the other.

Market Model

Bates and Chambers (2000) concluded that a marketplace model has replaced the scarcity argument as a prevailing force in the broadcast media, suggesting that in such a framework the “public interest” is defined as “audience interest.” “From the economist’s perspective, it is fairly clear that the foundations and assumptions of the marketplace model and deregulation are more conceptually and theoretically appealing than the scarcity arguments of the early regulators” (p. 28). Ang (1991) suggested that the market and public sphere perspectives mainly amount to differences in conceptions of media audiences, either “audience as market” or “audience as public” (p.29). Thus, any research measuring the success or failure of broadcast policy in terms of economic impact, audience demand, or stations’ competitive success could be loosely defined as “market model” scholarship. This is not to say that those publishing such research necessarily categorize themselves in this way, only that their approaches and/or conclusions are more consistent with an economic paradigm than a public-sphere model. Below are several examples of such scholarship.

Williams (1998) analyzed the effects of the 1998 Telecommunications Act on a small radio market, concluding that Act's most significant effects were on advertising rates. He suggested that the Act's market size designations may have been problematic for stations near the cutoff line between small and medium market, resulting in a possibility that ownership could be too concentrated when stations fall just above the line. Parkman (1982) studied the relationship between television station ownership and ratings. The researcher found that group-owned stations were significantly more successful than other stations and were less susceptible to negative effects from FCC ownership restrictions. He also found that television stations owned by newspapers achieved somewhat higher ratings, but this effect was stronger in the 1960s than in the 1970s.

Owen (2003) analyzed media ownership restrictions from an economic perspective and concluded that, when viewed along with existing antitrust laws, they were redundant and should be abolished. The researcher further concluded that localism, if defined as local origination, was not promoted through restrictions favoring local ownership: "In its most basic historical decisions regarding allocation of broadcast spectrum, the Commission expressly sacrificed consumer breadth of choice in order to promote local ownership and 'therefore' local content. It turns out, of course, that local ownership, while it *permits* local content, does not often *result* in local content" (p.25). While the FCC has considered changes to its spectrum policy in recent years (Calabrese, 2003), nothing resembling Owen's suggestion appears likely.

Rosse, Dertouzos, Robinson, & Wildman (1978) analyzed the economics of mass media for a Federal Trade Commission symposium and suggested that the FCC's localism policy might not have been most conducive to giving the public what it wanted. Specifically on the subject of television, the economists pointed out that viewership of locally originated programming was

minimal – somewhat greater in large markets where production budgets were higher, but still nowhere near network levels. Rosse et al described the FCC’s intent in promoting localism as “egalitarian” but mentioned another possible explanation for the policy:

A cynic might note that this also seems like a policy to put licenses in as many congressional districts as possible. One might also note that bringing licenses as close to the grass roots as possible in rural areas means that considerable distance gets opened up between license holders and the sidewalks in the big cities. (Rosse et al, 1978, p. 48)

The idea that broadcast regulatory policy is essentially a means of spreading technology as widely as possible, but with less than altruistic motives, is supported by other researchers, including El-Fattal (1991) and Nunn (1981). But Rosse et al also described the localism policy as unsuccessful “on its own terms” (p.48), suggesting that, in television, the policy had actually reduced the number of independent voices rather than increasing it.

In the same symposium, Dertouzos (1978) compared group ownership in broadcasting with what had happened in the newspaper industry. He suggested that chain ownership did not limit the marketplace of ideas because there was adequate competition in individual markets regardless of who owned the competitors. He cautioned, however, that a change in this circumstance could be problematic. “For those concerned about diversity in the ‘marketplace’ of ideas, the tendency of conglomeration is disturbing” (p.492), he wrote, “. . . the importance of those industries to the functioning of a democratic society as well as the absence of any strong economic justification for the continued growth of conglomerates suggests a need for investigation of the relevant issues.” Dertouzos’s last point is particularly significant given that he made it before deregulation took place, and there is evidence that the situation has changed in

recent years (Napoli & Yan, 2007). Dertouzos reported that group ownership did not appear to be a problem because it was necessary for media outlets to operate as highly local entities in order to be successful – that, despite some economies of scale at the management level, media chains were not likely to exert much influence over content and were not likely to nationalize the distribution of information to any harmful extent. “The limited role of groups in the creation of news programming makes one less concerned about potential monopolization in the marketplace of ideas” (p. 488). Even so, Dertouzos argued that the FCC should not loosen ownership restrictions because, in the absence of a strong economic justification, it was not worth taking the risk of limiting the marketplace of ideas. After deregulation and the eventual loosening of ownership restrictions, broadcast companies clearly discovered the “economic justification” that Dertouzos suggested was not present as of 1978. Conglomerates grew, and many argue they had precisely the effect Dertouzos feared (Brown, 2000).

A void exists in academic literature on the degree to which preferences for local broadcast ownership and programming origination are strong enough in the general public to justify localism as a market-based demand. However, a few studies have breached the topic, generally in the context of surveying public opinion on corporate media consolidation. The Future of Music Coalition commissioned a national poll, conducted by the Behavioral Research institute in 2002, which showed strong public concern over media consolidation and 75 percent support for low-power FM radio (Hilliard & Keith, 2005). It is unclear precisely how this poll’s in-depth interview process introduced the subject matter to respondents, but no other research suggests that 75 percent of the population is even aware of LPFM, much less that it holds strong favorable views toward it. Such an apparent prompting effect is what the present study was designed to avoid. Two polls conducted on behalf of the Pew Research Centers (Kohut, 2003)

within months of each other traced a shift in public opinion on the FCC's loosening of broadcast ownership restrictions, with 72 percent saying they had heard nothing about the topic in February of 2003 and a majority saying at that time that they thought the changes would have no impact on the country. By June of 2003, however, roughly half the respondents in the national sample of 1000 had heard about the issue and a similar percentage said it would have a negative impact on the country. Ownership consolidation received a large amount of attention that year, probably accounting for the rapid shift in the issue's salience and for the apparent negative shift in public opinion. Another poll the same year (Center for Survey Research and Analysis, 2003) revealed public opposition to increased regulations on media owners. Roughly half of the 1000 surveyed by the Freedom Forum either mildly or strongly opposed increased regulations, with 17 percent strongly in favor and 24 percent mildly in favor. In the cases of both 2003 polls, the relative lack of salience of the topic, along with discrepancies in the two polling organizations' question wording, casts doubt on the clarity of the information they provide. The situation is somewhat different with regard to a Greenberg, Quinlan, Rosner (2007) national poll, in which 70 percent of the 1000 respondents considered media consolidation a problem, and 42 percent called it a "major" problem. This poll yielded information germane to the present study in another way: The researchers interpreted a finding that large percentages believed the media were biased as a further indication of public opposition to media consolidation. The assumption appeared to be that national corporate chain owners of broadcast stations were more biased because they were less attentive to local concerns. Medium credibility (Gaziano & McGrath, 1986) was one of the present study's dependent variables, and the scale developed to test the construct contains one question specifically about a news organization's service to its local community. Whether localism questions are a valid means for testing credibility and bias is subject for debate, but,

regardless, the present study's findings could shed light on the accuracy of Greenberg, Quinlan, and Rosner's assumptions.

Probably the work most important to informing the present study was a random national telephone survey conducted by Chambers and Callison (2003), mentioned earlier. The researchers narrowed localism down to what they called *management themes* and *programming themes*, and asked a series of questions designed to assess public opinion on each. They also asked people to name radio stations they listened to and found that an overwhelming majority of the most popular stations were owned by Clear Channel Worldwide, with Infinity-Viacom a distant second. Subjects responding to the study's ten-point Likert questions generally reflected perceptions that radio programming was more local than ownership. The researchers also found that listeners of independent radio stations were more confident that radio managers and money would stay in their communities. A general theme that emerged from Chambers and Callison's study was that program origination and ownership, though often grouped in academic and regulatory discussions of localism, are not necessarily grouped in the minds of listeners. This is why the present study tested the two variables independently.

Public Sphere Model

Much of the non-economic research focused on the role of broadcasting in service to the public interest has employed case-study methodologies or critical analyses, but collectively it forms what might be loosely defined as a "theory" of broadcasting not entirely unlike the original Habermas (1989) conception of the public sphere. Both Habermas and modern public-interest oriented broadcasting scholars have viewed the public sphere in a socio-political context, pointing out the media's potential to join the masses in positive ways, but also decrying its

capacity to promote or maintain hegemony. Public sphere scholars in broadcasting have chronicled Pacifica radio's innovation of the community radio movement, from its left-wing political bent (Dunaway, 2005) to its stretching of cultural boundaries in its musical offerings (Lasar, 1998), finding that a station operating not purely for mass appeal actually expanded the tastes of its community. Perry (2001) described a shift on the part of early independent station WDZ, from providing rural programming in a haphazard way to a more professional orientation. The author suggested that the station ultimately pursued a mass-audience popularity. Craig (2001) said that rural community radio in its infancy unified the country: "The coming of radio during the 1920s made an essential contribution to the making of the imagined nation and brought rural and urban America together as a cultural community." Podber (2001) placed rural Appalachian radio at odds with a "lonely crowd" analogy, which had suggested that mass media had isolating effects. The author took oral histories from elderly residents of Southeastern Ohio and found that in many cases radio replaced the church as a primary unifying device for Appalachian people.

Several scholars advocating localism as essential to the public interest have employed critiques of specific FCC policies. For instance, Howley (2005) offered a critique of then FCC Chairman Michael Powell's "diversity index" which was intended to provide an objective measure of diversity and localism in broadcasting. The researcher suggested that the concerns of public interest petitioners were not taken into account in Powell's calculation and that the index was flawed in terms of its operational definitions of diversity and localism:

Rather than protect and defend the public interest, the FCC is increasingly beholden to commercial interests. Indeed, unlike other government agencies, which collect, analyze and interpret their own data, the FCC relies heavily on

industry-generated data and self studies. None of this demonstrates any measure of objectivity or reliability. Moreover, this proprietary information is virtually inaccessible to consumer groups and others who seek to evaluate media performance for themselves. In this light, then, the reliance upon these so-called ‘objective and reliable’ empirical studies is highly suspect. (p. 104)

Champlin and Knoedler (2002) also criticized the Powell FCC as failing to serve the public interest. “When monopoly and oligopoly restrict consumer choice for automobiles or deodorant, consumers must purchase the products available or do without. But when a media cartel narrows the spectrum of opinions in the public airwaves, crowding out news of public importance with fluff or irrelevant nonsense or pandering flag waving, the larger welfare of society is endangered” (p. 466).

Silverman and Tobenkin (2001) analyzed the FCC’s “Main Studio Rule” and concluded that it had been relaxed to the point of uselessness. They pointed out that the rule’s original aim, to provide the public physical access to broadcast stations, was not met when main studios could be 80 miles away from their communities of license. Perhaps more importantly, the authors suggested that local origination was not encouraged by the rule, despite the intentions of the rule’s originators:

While the rule was originally intended to encourage the production of local programming, it no longer contains any program origination requirement, and many stations no longer use main studios to create local programming. In addition, the notion that a studio is the most efficient manner of encouraging production of local programming has little support. (p. 493)

The researchers described the rule as “obsolete” (p. 493). Another bleak assessment of regulatory policy came in an early assessment of the 1996 Telecommunications Act. Sterling (1997) suggested that the Act's near assurance of license renewals and its loosening of ownership restrictions had raised concerns with what he termed the “few remaining 'public interest' critics” (p. 6).

Yan and Napoli (2004) provided evidence that commercial interests were not providing adequate amounts of programming many define as serving the public interest. They compared the amount of public affairs programming aired by public television stations with that of commercial stations and found that 59 percent of commercial stations studied did not air any public affairs programming. On average, commercial stations aired approximately 45 minutes of such programming in a two-week period, whereas public stations aired nearly seven hours' worth in the timeframe. In all, nearly 90 percent of public stations aired at least some public affairs programming.

A frequently mentioned element of the public-sphere theory surrounding localism and low-power FM is the notion of democratization (Ruggiero, 1999). Radio has played a key role in supporting government regimes around the world, just as mass media have long been associated with political and governmental change (Siebert, 1965). The concept of “local” has frequently entered into the discussion of precisely how this has taken place in the broadcasting realm (McChesney, 1997). Small community radio stations have often provided a direct means for people to organize themselves culturally and politically, sometimes leading to social and political changes in societies, and becoming the subject of much scholarship both in the mass media and cultural studies fields (for example Bosch, 2006; Clark, 2006; Corominas, Bonet, Guimera, & Fernandez, 2006; Duncan, 1982; Kanayam, 2006; Megwa, 2007; Molnar, 2004; Moshe, 2007;

Rosales, 2006; Siriyuvasak, 2002; Williams, 2005). Lucas (2006) suggested that the history of low-power FM was rooted in forms of activism inspired by the promise of socio-political empowerment. He pointed out, however, that a possible weakness of the LPFM service might be that it eliminated a market approach in favor of an almost exclusively public-sphere model. Originally, the coalition pushing for low-power FM licensing wanted to allow both commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations, but the policy as adopted licensed only non-profit groups (Lucas, 2006).

Industrial Organization Theory

The study of media economics has tied industrial organization theory to the analysis of media markets in a way that relates directly to the concepts of diversity, competition, and ownership concentration. A complex body of literature in this area explains that greater numbers of producers of media product in a given market should result in greater competition (Picard, 1989), which in the simplest terms should provide greater service to the public. This ties in with Besen, Krattenmaker, Metzger & Woodbury's (1984) contention that television localism would have benefited from an increase in available frequencies and the addition of national networks that might have resulted. However, some have argued that format oligopolies and media convergence, especially since deregulation and the 1996 Telecommunications Act reduced or eliminated radio ownership restrictions, have called the assumptions of this theory into question as it applies to broadcasting (Chan-Olmstead, 1997; Wirth & Bloch, 1995), lending some support to the contention of LPFM and community radio advocates that the free market alone is not working for the public good. If nothing else, this discussion among economists makes the point that regulatory policy is best examined from multiple angles.

Krasnow Model

To say the FCC controls broadcasting would be a gross oversimplification. As with any public policy, there are numerous interests and authorities at play (Bumgartner & Mahoney, 2002). Krasnow, Longley and Terry (1982) proposed a model of broadcast regulation explaining the complexities of the process. As the researchers pointed out, the FCC's decisions are frequently reviewed by the courts, most often by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, and the commission is guided by acts of Congress. The Commission's charter came from the Communications Act of 1934, but the role of Congress in broadcast regulation did not end there. Often, when an issue arises that the FCC does not address, either because the commission lacks the authority or because its members refuse to do so, Congress steps in. It was just this type of situation in 1927 that gave birth to the FCC's predecessor, the Federal Radio Commission. Other examples include Congress's eventual involvement in the issue of deintermixture, the question of whether the FCC should license only VHF TV stations, only UHF, or both. In that case, the FCC lacked the authority necessary to force television set manufacturers to build receivers that could handle both bands. Congress resolved the debate by passing a law requiring TV manufacturers to put both kinds of receivers in TV sets, with a phase-in process beginning in the mid 1960s. Congress also dealt with indecency in broadcasting in the 1980s, after the courts had raised doubts about the FCC's authority to do so. Members of Congress pushed for an all-out ban on indecent content but eventually paved the way for the FCC's safe harbor time period, which had to be defined, redefined and adjusted by the courts, after much pressure from activist groups (Lipschultz, 1997).

The Krasnow model lends much explanatory power to the study of LPFM because the service is the result of activist groups pressuring the commission and Congress to act in what the groups' leaders considered the public interest. Clearly LPFM advocates fell into the public sphere category of media theorists, and key elements of the Krasnow model show how they achieved their objectives. Croteau and Hoynes (2001) suggested that studying a mass media phenomenon is best achieved by looking at both its market and public-sphere facets, but it appears that LPFM advocates have rooted themselves in only one of these. Nevertheless, these groups were successful in achieving at least some of their policy goals, and the Krasnow model's depiction of the relationship between interest groups, congress, the FCC, and the courts explains how this has happened.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996

The inner-relationships of entities within the Krasnow model could be analogized to a system of checks and balances. For instance, the FCC itself has continually analyzed the effects of a congressional act that revolutionized the broadcasting industry, the 1996 Telecommunications Act (Williams & Roberts, 2002). As of 2002, the total number of commercial radio stations in the U.S. had increased approximately 5.4 percent since the passage of the Act. The number of radio owners had declined 6.7 percent in the first year after 1996 Act took effect and continued to drop precipitously. At the time of the 2002 report, the number of radio station owners was down 34 percent since 1996. The researchers reported 50 owners at the time holding 20 or more radio stations as opposed to 25 in 1996, and the number of stations held by the largest group owner was 1156 in 2002. The maximum number of stations owned by one group in 1996 had been fewer than 65 (Williams & Roberts, 2002). The FCC researchers

reported that, despite an obvious decrease in ownership diversity after the 1996 Act, there had not been a significant change in radio station format diversity. Many had argued the Act would increase the diversity of radio offerings, and others had predicted the opposite, but as of 2002, the results appeared to be a wash. Research shows that consolidation of radio ownership has resulted in a decrease in local origination of at least some programming types in at least some locations.

Many researchers have monitored changes in the broadcasting industry since the 1996 Act, an area of scholarship important to the present study because of a general agreement that the creation of LPFM came largely in response to the Act's effects (Lucas, 2006). Chambers (2001) analyzed data on small-market radio stations from 1972 to 1998 and found dramatic increases in absentee ownership, with only 181 locally owned stations out of 4,994 stations analyzed. The researcher tested hypotheses based on the claims of those who had advocated deregulation of radio ownership and later arguments in favor of the 1996 Telecommunications Act. One example, the hypothesis that deregulation would bring an increase in local news coverage, was supported as it applied to the deregulation period prior to the 1996 Act, but the situation changed drastically in the negative after the Act's passage. Chambers hypothesized that the Act would bring an increase in the number of news wire services in small market stations, but it actually brought a decrease. He also tested a hypothesis that the 1996 Act would bring an increase in small-market format diversity, which was not supported.

Chambers (2003) analyzed program diversity in a manner more specific than merely counting formats, instead analyzing musical playlists. He found a negative relationship between the number of owners in a market and the number of different songs played on radio stations

there. He also found that markets with high ownership concentration had approximately three fewer radio formats than those classified as having low or moderate ownership concentration.

Researchers took note of the 1996 Act's potential to change the radio industry early on. Sterling (1997) pointed out that radio consolidation increased dramatically as early as 1995 in anticipation of the Act's passage. Sterling cited Steiner (1949) as suggesting that a single owner with multiple stations might provide more diverse programming than multiple owners in the same market. Steiner's theory was that competing owners were more likely to duplicate formats in order to compete with one another, whereas group owners had more incentive to diversify. Sterling pointed out that the 1996 Act provided scholars with an opportunity to test Steiner's theory, because the number of owners was already decreasing dramatically as of the 1997 writing. Another important point Sterling brought out was the 1996 Act's handling of broadcast indecency, which increased potential fines from \$10,000 to \$100,000. Such a crackdown on indecency, while foreshadowing what many perceived as a link between the FCC and social-conservative politics during the Michael Powell era five years later, was by no means the exclusive domain of commissioners or members of congress from one political party or ideological perspective (Lipschultz, 1997). It was, however, an indication of commissioners' and legislators' prevailing views as to how the public interest standard was interpreted: At the same time ownership restrictions were loosened, indecency fines increased.

FCC Report On Localism

In December of 2007, the FCC adopted a report and notice of proposed rulemaking on the subject of localism (FCC, 2008). The report was the culmination of five years' worth of localism hearings in which commissioners heard from hundreds of citizens around the country.

Concerns expressed at the hearings included many of the issues discussed for decades by broadcast regulatory scholars and activists, as well as several FCC commissioners themselves: that corporate consolidation of ownership, brought on by loosened ownership restrictions, had resulted in a reduction in the number of voices represented in broadcast ownership and programming (FCC, 2008). Particularly affected was minority representation on the radio dial, according to many speaking out at the hearings (FCC, 2004b), and many communities were not receiving news and public affairs programming of local interest at all. The Commission's notice of proposed rulemaking acknowledged these issues:

The principle of localism requires broadcasters to take into account *all* significant groups within their communities when developing balanced, community-responsive programming, including those groups with specialized needs and interests. While the Commission has observed that each broadcast station is not necessarily required to provide service to all such groups, it has nonetheless recognized the concerns of some that programming – particularly network programming – often is not sufficiently culturally diverse. (FCC, 2008, p.34)

The primary rule changes in the proposal included converting qualified low power television stations to Class A status, which would require them to carry three hours of local origination per week. As for radio, the proposal would require broadcasters to form advisory boards made up of community representatives who would give input on how the stations could serve their localities more effectively. It also would adopt guidelines for license renewal that would require some local origination in programming. In addition, the report focused on ensuring that the public was better informed of its right to give input on broadcast licensees' performance. Detractors said the report did not go far enough, arguing that it did not make significant changes to ownership

restrictions and did little to increase the likelihood LPFM, community, and locally owned full-power stations would increase in number. Democratic commissioner Michael Copps lamented that the majority on the Commission had continued to treat broadcasting as “just another business” (p.90), failing to “promote a media environment that actually strengthens American democracy rather than weakens it” (p.90). Copps argued that the commission had done nothing in the report to bolster localism in any meaningful way, despite having had ample opportunity to do so:

We are told that we cannot deal with localism and minority ownership because that would require *delay* [emphasis in original]. But these questions have been before the Commission for almost a decade—and they have been ignored year after year. These issues could have been—should have been—teed up years ago. We begged for that in 2003 when we sailed off on the calamitous rules proposed by Chairman Powell and pushed through in another mad rush to judgment. Don’t tell me it can’t be done. It should have been done years ago. And we had the chance again this time around. (FCC, 2008, p. 36)

Despite varying opinions on the significance and impact of the Commission’s 2007 decisions, it is clear that the debate over the relative merits of localism, and over the value of the Commission’s efforts to achieve it, goes on.

Audience Theory

Jensen and Rosengren (1990) identified five approaches common to the study of mass media audiences: effects, uses & gratifications, literary criticism, cultural studies, and reception analysis. More broadly, they broke these categories into what they said were the social-scientific

approaches, effects and uses & gratifications, and the other three more humanistic approaches. However, Jensen and Rosengren pointed out that scholarship like the present study can bridge gaps between these two broad orientations:

In both cases, through intensive and careful observation of a small number of selected cases, new knowledge is produced about what happens under specified conditions. What ‘happens’ is audiences attributing particular meanings to given media content; these meanings, in turn, may come to inform and affect the cognition and behavior of particular audience members. These are forms of impact which can be established through experimental designs or participant observation in family settings. (Jensen & Rosengren, 1990, p.223)

So, the present study is an example of what Jensen and Rosengren described as a way “the field might arrive at terms of cooperation that would serve the interests of further research and, perhaps, those of the audience” (p.222). Clearly, much of the critical and case-study scholarship discussed earlier in this chapter falls into Jensen and Rosengren’s categories of cultural studies and reception analysis. It could be argued that economic studies and policy analyses are not, strictly speaking, audience research, although companies competing for media market share certainly depend on such data, which McQuail (2005) classified as *structural* research, in order to succeed. This type of research would be highly informative to the present study *if* such scholarly papers were available. While, no doubt, broadcast companies conduct proprietary research on a regular basis to determine the numbers and preferences of their audiences, few if any such studies have made their way into academic literature – at least pertaining to the specific topic of the present study, localism. Therefore, the theory pertinent to this study yielding the most fruitful body of literature is Uses & Gratifications. This approach to media scholarship

emerged in the early days of radio and was resurrected in the 1970s by Blumler and Katz (1974) among others. Much of the research in this area was either of a qualitative nature, extrapolating categories of media use from multiple open-ended interviews with audience members, or based on factor analysis of survey responses. Blumler and Katz attempted to gain understanding of how variations in media forms affected people's media usage:

At issue here is the relationship between the unique 'grammar' of different media – that is, their specific technological and aesthetic attributes – and the particular requirements of audience members that they are then capable, or incapable, of satisfying. Which, indeed, are the attributes that render some media more conducive than others to satisfying specific needs? And which elements of content help to attract the expectations for which they apparently cater? (Katz, Blumler & Gurevitch, 1974 p. 515)

Specific to the radio, the Uses and Gratifications approach has yielded several specific categories of use: substitute companionship, excitement, shared companionship with others (Lometti, Reeves, & Bybee, 1977); being happy, understanding what is going on, being stimulated, relieving tension, overcoming loneliness (Kippax & Murray, 1980); being entertained, releasing tension, acquiring information about daily life, killing time, overcoming loneliness, and keeping up with the job the government is doing (Lichtenstein & Rosenfeld, 1983). It is notable from the above list that only three of the uses identified, understanding what is going on, acquiring information about daily life, and keeping up with the job the government is doing, seem to have direct bearing on discussions of localism. The findings of Towers (1985) clarify the potential discrepancy between uses and gratifications scholarship and the assumptions of localism advocates. He isolated two dimensions of radio listening: *surveillance and*

interaction with environment and *diversion from environment*. Presumably, localism would play more strongly into the former than the latter, but in general Towers did not specify gratifications exclusive to locally originated programming or local ownership. He reported that radio gratifications were mostly associated with entertainment and the immediacy of information, which could come from locally owned stations or from other broadcasters, depending on what the information is and what the listener finds entertaining. So, the *surveillance* category contributes a potential description of what people get from localism, but it does not isolate benefits specific to it. Nor does it provide a theoretical basis from which to form hypotheses comparing local broadcasters with non-local sources.

Nonetheless, the present study borrows from the Uses and Gratifications approach by focusing on localism from an audience perspective rather than as a question of economic policy, regulation, public safety, critical studies, or mass media effects. The original uses and gratifications studies of the 1940s came in response to what many considered the incorrect powerful-effects theories, such as the “hypodermic needle” theory (McQuail, 2005). Scholars such as Cantril and Laswell adopted the approach of finding out how people actually used the media (McQuail, 2005), rather than merely assuming movies and radio must have strong influences. In a sense, the present study has similar origins and purposes. Rather than assuming localism must be important, or that low-power community radio must be the solution to what *must* be a problem, the author attempts to find out how actual audience members respond to these issues.

One other theoretical area, mentioned in Chapter I, bears repeating in this section. Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) could provide some explanation as to why people identify with certain radio programs and stations more than with others – particularly important

to many of the arguments in favor of low-power and community radio. The theory would seem to suggest that people are likely to feel more comfortable listening to programs and personalities they relate to. Moreover, McQuail (2005) connected structuralism and semiology to the study of audience, suggesting that people's cultural texts affect the meanings they assign to media content – a concept some could apply when arguing the merits of localism.

Summary

Community and low-power stations can play vital roles in serving their localities. In areas where there are few if any traditional broadcast outlets, community stations are essential sources of news, weather, emergency information, etc. (Reed & Hanson, 2006), in addition to having cultural and political significance (Hilliard & Keith, 2005). The lack of reliable audience-rating data is of little importance to those analyzing the impact of remote community stations, because they are generally are staffed and funded by members of their target audiences and rely on direct listener participation. They would not be on the air at all if they were not, at least according to their own definitions, successful. This is the situation in some rural areas, but advocates of low-power FM suggest it has a more widespread benefit. Members of the FCC at their localism task force hearings, advocacy groups such as Prometheus Radio Project, and researchers studying the effects of media consolidation have all argued that LPFM is an antidote to the negative effects of media corporatization. Prometheus has gone as far as to suggest LPFM licenses should take precedence over translator stations and even full-power stations in the frequency allocation process (Prometheus, 2007). Simply put, LPFM advocates imply that the service has appeal even in areas where the radio dial is full of traditional broadcast offerings, because of an inherent

characteristic they say makes it superior in its ability to serve the public interest: localism, generally defined as local, non-corporate ownership and locally originated programming (Sauls & Greer, 2007).

The idea that localism itself is a virtue in the broadcasting industry is one of the most frequently suggested but least-tested assumptions in academic literature on the subject. Do radio listeners actually care about localism? Some evidence suggests that they do. Anecdotally, the top-rated radio stations in many of the nation's largest markets feature local talent (Howard, 2008), although it is also true that the top-rated programs in many markets are national shows distributed by large corporate entities (Fairchild, 1999). Still, there is little dispute that locally originated programming is appealing to many audiences, and, perhaps as a result, most localities have at least a few local programs on the air. But LPFM advocates suggest this isn't enough. Since the earliest days of radio, the localism argument has hinged not only on locally originated programming but also on local ownership (Kirkpatrick, 2006). So, putting these elements together, the case for LPFM stations is that they provide programming of interest specific to their relatively small localities, *and* they are more sensitive to the needs of their communities because they are owned by local people (Ruggiero, 1999). The arguments are based on established theories of broadcasting and long-held ideals, but there is little evidence in the literature as to whether they are supported by listener preferences. Few if any studies have compared the medium credibility of locally owned radio stations with that of national group-owned stations. Similarly, the source credibility of air-talent on local radio has not been compared with that of national personalities, and few studies have directly pitted local against national programs in assessing listeners' affective responses. In the absence of such literature, the evidence in support of localism as an inherently good attribute in broadcasting is, at best, incomplete. The purpose of

this study is to fill that gap in the literature. It could be argued that this study views public-sphere approaches to broadcasting through a market-based lens, assessing whether audiences are likely to support stations conceived for purposes other than maximizing listenership. Economists have debated whether the “market” in the broadcasting industry is in fact its listeners or its advertisers (Bates, 1987; Ekelund, Ford, & Jackson, 1999), but either way, radio stations must appeal to listeners and preferably generate audience loyalty (Dick & McDowell, 2004) in order to succeed. Vick (2006) suggested that the “market” vs. “public sphere” debate misses the point of what is actually happening in modern communications:

The philosophical assumptions underlying regulatory models are not so much a response to technological or economic ‘reality’, but rather the lens that shapes perceptions of reality itself at the time those models were established. Once established, however, regulatory paradigms have proven resilient, withstanding challenges resulting from the changing fortunes of the political philosophies that gave rise to them. (Vick, 2006, p. 63)

This study attempts to transcend the market and public interest debate by separating the concept of “market” from a purely economic discussion. Audiences make choices with their radio dials just as customers do with their wallets. So, the public interest is, to a degree, a market in itself. This study attempts to shed light on questions previously unanswered either by market analysts who focus mainly on economics, or public sphere advocates, who often claim an understanding of audience preferences but rarely test them empirically. This study tests listener perceptions of station and program locality and ownership, factors often considered essential to a station’s service to the public interest.

Research Questions

This study consists of a series of broad areas of inquiry operationalized into more specific research questions. Because the body of literature on the subject reflects an ongoing philosophical debate, it was not possible to form directional hypotheses for testing. The results could truly have gone either way, so the specific hypotheses remained in the form of RQs. The broader areas of inquiry from which the RQs were derived were as follows:

- 1. How does the locality of a radio program's air talent affect audience perceptions of the program?*
- 2. How does information about a station's ownership characteristics affect listener perceptions of the station's programs or air talent?*
- 3. What demographic and psychographic factors predict differences in people's awareness of and/or preference for local vs. nationally owned radio stations or programs?*
- 4. Is localism more of a factor in determining listener perception of certain program categories than other program categories?*

To answer the above questions, the researcher conducted a series of experiments and tested specific research questions in connection with three different program types. Due to a lack of previous research in a similar vein, it was necessary for the researcher to develop his own strategy for choosing program types to test. Ultimately, the decision came down to two factors:

- 1) The programs tested should be from categories emphasized by those who advocate low-power and community radio as alternatives to corporatization; and
- 2) The programs had to be plausible when manipulated to sound national.

During its public-comments period before the FCC released its latest report on localism, the FCC cited the following as categories important to localism

advocates: “traditional news and public affairs; entertainment programming (e.g., broadcast of a local high school sports event); programming in which local residents participate (e.g., academic contests between local schools” (FCC 2004, p.7). Another category clearly important to the study of low-power radio is religious programming, because of its prevalence both in LPFM and in translator stations. Synthesizing all of the above considerations, it was determined that many of the categories listed by the FCC, such as high school sports, could not be manipulated to sound national. This was not deemed problematic, however, because the categories that lent themselves to a wide array of locality and ownership variations were also the program types most likely to have bearing on issues of democratization and the limitation of voices in the media: news, public affairs or informational shows, and religious programming. Furthermore, it was possible for the researcher to incorporate elements of resident participation into an informational show and a religious show. Similarly, all three program types allowed emphasis on community organizations and public service.

Radio listening often begins with a momentary choice of what program a person prefers, and the motivation behind this choice was tested as affective response, simply the degree to which a person “likes” what he hears. An affective response scale was adapted from the field of psychology (Obermiller, 1985), with questions added to reflect radio listening preferences more specifically. Pretesting confirmed the reliability of the expanded affective response scale. Other dependent variables were chosen based on literature pertaining to news media and public speakers. Gaziano and McGrath’s news medium credibility scale (1986) was originally developed to compare audience opinions of newspapers with those of electronic media, based on the understanding that credibility assessments affected people’s trust in and subsequent usage of various media forms. Though trust is clearly not the only basis on which people choose between

radio stations, a logical extension of much literature on localism leads to the assumption that, if the such literature is correct, people should trust locally owned stations to serve their interests more than national group-owned broadcasters. Similarly, the literature would suggest that locally originated programs should gain more audience trust than national programs. The Gaziano and McGrath scale is particularly germane to localism because it includes questions about a medium's service to the public interest, concern for audience members' individual interests, and – especially important – service to the community. The third dependent variable was chosen based on the informational nature of much broadcast media, especially that which is advocated by those supporting low-power and community radio. A person providing information via the radio is not likely to be effective if not perceived as credible. Therefore, McCroskey's (1966) source credibility scale was used in the study.

The following research questions were tested in this study. The first three questions assessed the effects of ownership identification on the constructs of affective response, medium credibility and source credibility, as applied to listener perceptions of a radio legal advice show excerpt with the variable of locality held constant.

RQ1: Is there a difference in subjects' affective responses to a radio legal-advice program excerpt from a station identified as having local ownership compared to the same excerpt from a station identified as having national ownership?

RQ2: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a station's medium credibility when hearing a legal-advice program excerpt from a station identified as having local ownership compared to the same excerpt from a station identified as having national ownership?

RQ3: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a radio air talent's source credibility when hearing a legal-advice program excerpt from a station identified as having local ownership compared to the same excerpt from a station identified as having national ownership?

Questions 4 through 6 assessed the effects of locality identification on the constructs of affective response, medium credibility and source credibility, as applied to listener perceptions of a radio legal advice show excerpt with the variable of ownership held constant.

RQ4: Is there a difference in subjects' affective responses to a radio legal-advice program excerpt identified as locally originated compared to the same excerpt identified as nationally produced?

RQ5: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a station's medium credibility when hearing a radio legal-advice program excerpt identified as locally originated compared to the same excerpt identified as nationally produced?

RQ6: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a radio air talent's source credibility when hearing a radio legal-advice program excerpt identified as locally originated compared to the same excerpt identified as nationally produced?

Questions 7 through 9 assessed the effects of ownership on perceptions of a newscast, holding locality constant, and using the same dependent variables as with the legal advice show.

RQ7: Is there a difference in subjects' affective responses to a radio newscast from a station identified as having local ownership compared to the same excerpt from a station identified as having national ownership?

RQ8: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a station's medium credibility when hearing a radio newscast from a station identified as having local ownership compared to the same excerpt from a station identified as having national ownership?

RQ9: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a radio air talent's source credibility when hearing a newscast from a station identified as having local ownership compared to the same excerpt from a station identified as having national ownership?

Also using the same dependent variables, questions 10 through 12 assessed the effects of locality on perceptions of a newscast, holding ownership constant. Alternate hypotheses allowed for testing of the reimportation phenomenon:

RQ10a: Is there a difference in subjects' affective responses to a radio newscast identified as locally originated compared to the same excerpt identified as nationally produced?

RQ10b: Is there a difference between subjects' affective responses to a radio newscast identified as locally originated and using a truly local script, compared to a locally originated newscast with a script manipulated to simulate reimportation?

RQ11a: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a station's medium credibility when hearing a radio newscast identified as locally originated compared to the same excerpt identified as nationally produced?

RQ11b: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a station's medium credibility when hearing a radio newscast identified as locally originated and using a truly local script, compared to a locally originated newscast manipulated to simulate reimportation?

RQ12a: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a radio air talent's source credibility when hearing a newscast identified as locally originated compared to the same excerpt identified as nationally produced?

RQ12b: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a radio air talent's source credibility when hearing a radio newscast identified as locally originated and using a truly local script, compared to locally originated newscast manipulated to simulate reimportation?

Questions 13 through 15 held locality constant and assessed the effects of ownership identification on affective responses and perceptions of source credibility and medium credibility of a religious music program excerpt.

RQ13: Is there a difference in subjects' affective responses to a radio religious-music program excerpt from a station identified as having local ownership compared to the same excerpt from a station identified as having national ownership?

RQ14: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a station's medium credibility when hearing a religious-music program excerpt from a station identified as having local ownership compared to the same excerpt from a station identified as having national ownership?

RQ15: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a radio air talent's source credibility when hearing a religious-music program excerpt from a station identified as having local ownership compared to the same excerpt from a station identified as having national ownership?

Questions 16 through 18 assessed the effects of locality on perceptions of a religious music program, holding ownership constant.

RQ16: Is there a difference in subjects' affective responses to a radio religious-music program excerpt identified as locally originated compared to the same excerpt identified as nationally produced?

RQ17: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a station's medium credibility when hearing a radio religious-music program excerpt identified as locally originated compared to the same excerpt identified as nationally produced?

RQ18: Is there a difference in subjects' perceptions of a radio air talent's source credibility when hearing a radio religious-music program excerpt identified as locally originated compared to the same excerpt identified as nationally produced?

The third broad area of inquiry was tested by entering demographic and psychographic variables into stepwise linear regression models with three radio listening preference questions as the dependant variables:

RQ19: What demographic variables predict subjects' self-reported preferences for locally originated programming over nationally produced programming or vice versa?

RQ20: What psychographic and/or ideological factors predict subjects' self-reported preferences for locally originated programming over nationally produced programming or vice versa?

RQ21: What demographic variables predict subjects' self-reported awareness of the ownership characteristics of a radio station?

RQ22: What psychographic and/or ideological factors predict subjects' self-reported awareness of the ownership characteristics of a radio station?

It was outside the scope the present study to test broad inquiry category four through a statistical test of interaction between localism and program type. The present study instead drew inferences from the presence or lack of differences pertaining to the independent variables within a given program category as compared to the presence of lack of differences in another. This offers only broad, exploratory answers to the question, intended to inform future research.

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Survey or qualitative methodologies might have been more effective at determining general audience preferences or public opinion on regulatory issues and localism, but this study had a different purpose: to assess how localism affects listeners when they initially form opinions of radio content – to find out whether localism variables enhance public responses to certain stations. To test the effects of air-talent locality and station ownership on listener perceptions, an experimental study was conducted for which three different program excerpts were manipulated into multiple experimental conditions. The study took the form of a multi-factorial, randomized-groups, posttest-only design, as described by Campbell and Stanley (1963), with each experimental group hearing all three program excerpts, but respondents randomly assigned to hear different manipulations identifying the programs or stations with locale and ownership characteristics necessary to test this study's research questions.

Newton and Potter (2000) used a similar technique and attained significant results testing subjects' responses to radio promotional advertisements. They played ten promos, each 30 to 60 seconds long, to groups in a laboratory setting and asked subjects to respond to a brief survey after hearing each spot. Wheatley and Brooker also showed significant results in an experimental design involving short radio excerpts. They played radio commercials to experimental groups and surveyed subjects' recall of textual information. The present study is different, however, because it was delivered online, with the audio files embedded into pages of a web survey and the experimental nature of the study masked, in order to prevent testing biases and maintain a

“blind” quality to the experiment. Respondents were only told they were participating in a survey of their responses to radio program excerpts. Randomization was achieved through a systematic ordering of the 12 experimental conditions, with assignment on a rotating basis. Because neither the researcher nor the subjects had any knowledge or control over which condition was next in line for assignment, each respondent was placed in an experimental group by the mere chance of precisely when he logged onto the survey system. Hypothetically, if 12 people had logged on at the same moment, the computer system’s assignment of categories would have been truly random. However, this study’s sample might be loosely described as “systematically” random – despite not technically falling into either traditionally named category. Regardless, the groups were well balanced demographically, suggesting an appropriate level of randomization, and ANOVA showed no significant demographic differences between the treatment groups (Appendix A, Table 1).

Online Surveys

The use of online systems, while on the increase in much survey research (Wright, 2005), is a relatively new way to test audience responses to audio or video. Until recently, it was not common for large numbers of people to have broadband Internet access. This has changed in the first decade of the 21st Century (Horrigan & Rainie, 2002), making it more possible for high-quality electronic media content to be delivered to a sample distributed well enough demographically to yield meaningful survey or experimental results. Hubbard and Crawford (2008) used the same technique employed in the present study to test the effects of background music on people’s perceptions of the candidate in a political radio advertisement. They found the methodology adequate to reveal significant differences between their randomly assigned

experimental groups. The present study used a different type of manipulation, verbal ownership and locality identifiers instead of the presence or lack of music, but the similarities were strong enough to mitigate concerns typically raised about Internet surveys, in addition to specific concerns about the ambitious task of testing auditory stimuli online. Specifically, some have argued that online surveys are inferior to paper surveys distributed by a researcher in the same room as his subjects, because it is impossible for the online researcher to know for sure who is completing the study (Kraut et al, 2004). The potential that someone might complete the survey twice is also elevated somewhat when the researcher is unable to count heads and match the number of respondents with a specific number of paper copies. This could be especially problematic in an experimental design, in which a subject completing the study twice would be more likely to notice the manipulations and therefore respond unnaturally. Furthermore, a respondent might, for whatever reason, adopt a phony identity online, causing basic demographics, or actual results pertaining to the dependent variables, to be inaccurate or unreliable. However, Kraut et al (2004) suggested that the potential problems with online research were no greater than those with more traditional approaches – that the necessary precautions in order to avoid testing problems were merely different. Several steps were taken in the present study to maintain the integrity of its results. The sample was drawn by a marketing research panel firm, which screens its members thoroughly and compensates them based on successfully completing surveys. The firm has an established record of delivering good research to large national corporations. Each panel member had a unique PIN number that was assigned when the respondent clicked the link from the company's email solicitation. If someone were to complete the survey twice, his ID would show up twice in the dataset, and his responses could be identified for removal from the study. This only happened once in the present study, reducing the

N from 333 to 331. It is important to note that only the research panel company was able to connect the PIN numbers with people's identities. The researcher complied with the study's human-subjects approval, which specified that no identifying information would be collected. In addition to the university IRB, the panel research company also required that no identifying information be sought in the survey and would not have allowed the study to proceed if it had not been in compliance with this policy.

Aside from the concerns about online surveys discussed above, some have also suggested that in such studies the researcher would be unable to minimize respondent distractions during online data collection, resulting in corrupted data (Kraut et al, 2004). This same potential exists, however, in the collection of mail-in survey data, which has yielded significant results in thousands of academic studies through the years. In fact, the researcher would argue that an online survey involving audio files is more likely to gain and maintain the respondent's attention, because it engages more than one sense. Still, the researcher was careful to avoid data corruption in this area. The study was pretested in a computer-lab setting, for manipulation checks and scale reliability measures, as well as assessments of question clarity, technical functionality, and survey completion time. The researcher was able to monitor pretest subjects closely as they completed the study, ensuring that none of the potential drawbacks of online research occurred. A comparison of pretest results and the full results of the study lends confidence to the reliability of its online methodology. Though the pretest dataset was not large enough to measure statistical significance, the mean differences in the responses by the pretest group were similar to those in the final dataset, as were scale reliabilities. Pretest respondents were interviewed briefly after completing the study to assess any difficulties or concerns they had, and their responses were consistent with those typed into the open-ended comments window at the end of the online study.

Some raised questions about the nature of the study and its purpose; some said they had trouble assessing the credibility of fictitious characters; and some said the radio program types tested were not in keeping with their own radio preferences and were, therefore, difficult to judge; but there were no reports of technical difficulty or expressions of concern over the study's delivery mechanism. The system provides a dataset in which successfully completed surveys are clearly marked and easily separated from those that were abandoned prematurely or crashed a computer's browser. This added even more to the researcher's confidence in the quality of the data, because corrupted responses were not likely to be labeled as "completed successfully."

Dependent Variables

The purpose of this experimental study was to test the effects of listener knowledge of a station or program's locality and listener knowledge of a station's ownership characteristics on perceptions of the station and/or its programs. Stations that depend on advertising revenue must have listeners in order to sell airtime and be profitable. Non-profit community radio stations must have listeners in order to raise money and/or justify their continued operation to potential donors. Even a purely public-interest oriented station cannot serve the public good if it has no listeners. Uses and Gratifications research (Katz, Blumler & Gurevitch, 1974) has shown that radio listeners seek entertainment and/or information from stations and their programs, and it follows that listeners would be more loyal to programs and air-talent they like than those they do not. As a result, the dependent variable of affective response was tested, using a three-item scale developed by Obermiller (1985) plus two additional questions developed to enhance the external validity of the present study by making the scale more specific to radio. Pretesting showed the five-item affective response scale to be reliable, with a Cronbach's Alpha almost unchanged

from that of the original three-item version. Other dependent variables tested included medium credibility and source credibility. Gaziano and McGrath (1986) developed a medium credibility scale for the purpose of comparing newspapers with electronic media news. Their scale dealt with questions of bias, staff quality, service to the public interest, and service to the community. Though not perfectly crafted to every radio program type, the scale generally addresses medium characteristics commonly discussed as part of the localism debate. Localism advocates frequently argue that too much voice tracking and too much group-ownership affect the availability of information important to a community (Hood, 2007), and that providing information is key to serving the public interest (Hilliard & Keith, 2005). As was mentioned in Chapter II, some have even suggested a direct connection between bias and corporate group ownership (Greenberg, Quinlan, & Rosner, 2007). It is the informational element of localism, along with possible perceptions of bias, that the present study attempted to measure using credibility scales. McCroskey's (1966) source credibility scale contained questions similar to the Gaziano and McGrath medium credibility scale, but focused on people's perceptions of an individual speaker rather than a medium. This was deemed worthwhile for the present study because of the issue of familiarity with radio hosts. For purposes of experimental control, it was necessary that personalities in the stimuli be unfamiliar to the respondents, but this left a possible element of localism untested. If a benefit of local radio is that listeners feel more personally connected to its air talent, as is the case with television news anchors (Harmon, 1997), this study could be limited by failing to take such a factor into account. However, this study's independent variables specifically dealt with ownership and locality, so questions pertaining to talent familiarity were limited here to how people's perceptions of air talent were affected by locality and ownership. This meant controlling for the variable of familiarity, which in turn justified the

use of unfamiliar hosts, but it also meant measuring people's perceptions of the hosts as a dependent variable. McCroskey developed several scales to measure various elements of source credibility, but the present study mainly used his Authoritativeness Scale, with questions focusing on the person's qualifications to discuss a given topic, such as, "I consider him an expert." In one case, McCroskey's Character Scale was administered, containing Likert statements such as, "I would like to have the speaker as a personal friend." This latter scale was only used after the legal-advice show stimulus, because the radio host in the stimulus told the caller that he didn't know very much about the question being asked. Though realistic according to two attorneys consulted for this study, this was deemed a potential validity problem because of the risk that even respondents who perceived the host as credible might score him lower on the authoritativeness scale because of his stated lack of knowledge. The researcher supplemented testing of this stimulus with the character scale but chose not to use it for the other stimuli because of the potential of confusing respondents by asking them to evaluate character with very little information to operate on. Furthermore, the entire survey took respondents a median of 25 minutes to complete, and additional questions were deemed excessive given the online nature of the study.

Scales testing this study's dependent variables were adapted only slightly from their original forms, mainly customized to the specific excerpts they were measuring reactions to. For instance, where McCroskey's source-credibility scale referred to "the speaker", questions in the present study used the name of the air-talent identified in the given excerpt. Furthermore, Gaziano and McGrath's medium credibility scale was adapted so its references were to radio rather than newspapers. For instance, the Likert statement that the medium had "well-trained

reporters” was amended to “has well-trained DJs and reporters.” In addition, semantic differentials were adapted to form standard Likert-type statements.

Instrument

The study was made up of three seven-point Likert-type scales to test its three dependent variables, plus an alternative scale to test the source credibility of the legal-advice-show host, due to the above-mentioned anomaly in that program’s script (full instrument with exact question wordings in Appendix C). The order of questions in each scale was varied for the three program excerpts to prevent ordering effects and bias that might have resulted if respondents had become familiar with the question order. To ensure clarity of the survey’s instructions, scales were kept together, not interspersed with other questions, but the order in which the scales were administered was also varied with each program type. After respondents completed all scales for a given program excerpt, they were linked to the next excerpt followed by its three scales. Once respondents had completed all three main sections of the study, they were asked to answer some questions about themselves and their radio listening habits. Basic demographic questions included age, sex, race, income, religious affiliation and years of schooling. Additional questions included political ideology (semantic differentials between liberal and conservative), broken into two questions: fiscal and religious ideology. The purpose of the present study was not primarily to survey political opinion, so in order to minimize completion time, more elaborate scales of ideology were avoided. Other questions in this portion of the instrument included a list-of-values scale (Singhapakdi, Rallapalli, Rao, & Vitell, 1995) and a series of questions generally about people’s radio listening habits, including how many hours per week they listen, as well as Likert-type questions assessing whether they consider radio an important source of information or

mainly a source of entertainment. In order to answer RQs 19-22, the researcher included three questions directly pertaining to the independent variables of the experimental section, although these questions were carefully worded not to prompt participants as to what the independent variables had been. Even though these questions came after subjects had completed their responses to the test stimuli, there was no way to ensure that respondents could not go back and change their answers. Furthermore, there was a risk of prompting effects resulting from the specific nature of the experimental stimuli they had heard. As a result, seven-point-Likert-type questions in this section were limited to, “I am generally aware of the locality of people on the radio,” “I prefer that the people I hear on the radio be from Knoxville,” and “I don’t care who owns the radio stations I listen to”.

Stimuli

Ownership types and air-talent/program locations tested were as follows (full scripts are in Appendix B):

- 1) A listener-supported low-power community radio station owned by an organization with a non-descript, educational, non-profit sounding name.
- 2) A full-power radio station, owned by a national corporation, airing locally originated programming.
- 3) A full-power radio station, owned by a national corporation, airing satellite-delivered national programming.

An underlying hypothesis of this study was that issues of localism might be more important for some program types than others. LPFM advocates specifically mention the service’s potential to advance local music and provide community-oriented information more

effectively than other station types (FCC, 2000). To test such possibilities, three different program types were tested under all of the above ownership categories:

- 1) A legal-advice program featuring an attorney
- 2) A local newscast
- 3) A Christian music program featuring new artists

The second program type, local news, was tested as follows: For the two station categories airing local programming, the same newscast segment was manipulated to reflect each station category, just as with the other program types. However, some additional stimuli were created in order to test other factors. Because news is arguably the program category most subject to bias allegations and most likely to draw fire from those claiming excessive corporate influence on the flow of information, the concept of localism was broken down more thoroughly than in the other program types. In addition to comparing a low-power community station with group-owned stations, the category of a locally owned, full-power station was added. Also, in the area program origination, stimuli were created to study the phenomenon outlined by Hood (2007): reimported local news. Some large group owners of radio stations have, in recent years, used centralized, distant operations to produce newscasts for their smaller-market stations. Though it is not supposed to be evident to listeners that the newscasts are anything but local, people tend to find out when things go wrong, such as when a prerecorded weather forecast predicting fair weather airs at a time when severe thunderstorms are causing damage in the area (Hood, 2007). Hood also points out problems of news story selection, the remote newsroom failing to emphasize a story of great importance to local people, and errors pronouncing well-known local place-names or the names of popular community figures. Other researchers have supported the notion that cultural differences between news gatherers and listeners can be

problematic (Pritchard & Stonbeley, 2007; Quinn, 1994). To test reimported news, a stimulus was created resembling the news excerpts tested with the other station categories, but with a local place-name slightly misidentified and with an emphasis on regional and statewide aspects of stories rather than purely local aspects. For instance, the truly local story about a presidential visit to a nearby city emphasized that Knoxville republicans would be part of a delegation greeting the president when he arrived; whereas the reimported newscast omitted this fact and spent more time on aspects of the visit not related to Knoxville. Because Hood described situations in which listeners became aware of the “canned” nature of their local newscasts, the stimulus was further manipulated to reveal its non-local nature: The end of all news stimuli consisted of a local community events calendar with a tag line soliciting listener input. For the LPFM and nationally owned stations with local talent, this tag mentioned a local address to which people were asked to submit their announcements, with the option given to “bring it by our studios...”. However, for the nationally owned station with a reimported newscast, this tag contained the address of a city approximately 200 miles from the station. This manipulation was intentionally more obvious than is characteristic of reimported local news and could therefore have yielded a falsely significant result. The researcher’s operating hypothesis in designing this manipulation was that reimported newscasts, when done well, would not sound different enough from local newscasts to reveal significant differences. It would not have been feasible to manipulate stimuli to the extent that story selections were completely different, because such a difference would make it impossible to isolate variables for meaningful interpretation of results, nor was it possible to create and test stimuli pertaining to weather conditions at the time of data collection. Therefore, the combination of subtle script variations with a direct reference to the locality of the newscast’s origin was deemed the best way to test the reimportation phenomenon.

Below is a more detailed description of the production process for each of the three program types.

Legal Advice Show Stimulus

The researcher consulted two attorneys for input on the legal-advice show script. The initial idea for the call-in question used came directly from an attorney, based on radio advice shows she was familiar with. The researcher then wrote a draft of the advice-show script, drawing from the first attorney's suggestions and the researcher's own extensive experience with talk-radio programming. The script was then reviewed by another attorney familiar with local issues pertaining to the topic chosen for the call-in, and minor changes were made based on his suggestions. Both attorneys recommended that, for realism purposes, the host of the program not dispense advice that was too specific. This made it easier to manipulate the scripts in a way that varied locality of origination, because a national host would not be as confident talking about the intricacies of legal procedures in a specific locality other than his own. Furthermore, both attorneys consulted for this study said good lawyers would take steps to avoid malpractice while dispensing advice on the radio, often recommending that callers seek advice from others off the air. By keeping the advice vague, consistent with play-it-safe approaches typical of many lawyers, the researcher was able to hold the great majority of the excerpt constant, making edits only where the different manipulations varied from one another. A professional voice talent was chosen to play the part of the attorney in the excerpt, because it was necessary for the show host to sound spontaneous – a difficult quality for less skilled communicators to achieve while reading scripted material. The caller in the stimulus was another associate of the researcher's with professional experience as a communicator. Both voices on the legal-advice show stimulus

were from more than 200 miles away from Knoxville and had not been heard on local radio there, nor had they been on any national radio programs likely to be familiar in the area. The names of both characters in the script were fictitious. All of the above steps were taken to prevent biasing effects that might have resulted if respondents had recognized the personalities they heard in a given stimulus. The researcher used production facilities at the university's student radio station to acquire remote feeds, in addition to his own editing software for post-production of the stimuli. The researcher had extensive professional experience as an audio producer and was able to ensure that the stimuli sounded authentic, with the manipulations achieved seamlessly, as demonstrated through pretesting.

Newscast Stimulus

Creating an authentic radio newscast was not a difficult task for the researcher, a former broadcast news professional with many years' experience both in small and large radio markets. Because Knoxville falls between these market classifications, the researcher was confident in his ability to create a stimulus consistent with the conventions of the locality. Adding to the researcher's expertise in this area was the fact that Knoxville falls geographically almost directly in between the two markets in which the researcher accumulated most of his radio news experience. In addition, the researcher was a broadcast news writing and reporting teacher in Knoxville with two prominent local news anchor-reporters among his former students. The researcher also had experience as a stringer reporter for national radio networks, including the one portrayed in the national stimulus for this study, and, like most local broadcasters, he had heard thousands of radio network newscasts airing on the various stations he had worked for. In

short, the researcher required little outside consultation in order to create the radio news stimuli, but still took steps to confirm their validity through pretesting.

As with the legal advice show, it was necessary for the newscast's subject matter be adaptable to sound both national and local. This was achieved in part by making the lead story a presidential trip, which in the national stimulus was to a distant location but was to a city near Knoxville in the local versions. Having the president visit Knoxville itself could have biased the results, because such a story would have seemed much more significant to local respondents than its national counterpart. As a result, the researcher chose to portray a visit to Chattanooga, about 80 miles south of Knoxville. To enhance the local aspect of this story, however, the script designated as "truly local" mentioned that a delegation of Knoxville Republicans would greet the president when he arrived – a detail pulled directly from the researcher's experience in local radio news. The reimported script, on the other hand, made no such mention and outlined the president's itinerary from a more regional standpoint. Other differences between the truly local and reimported scripts came in the second story, dealing with a string of bank robberies. The reimported story contained references less specific to locality, saying two robberies happened "in Knoxville" as opposed to "on Kingston Pike in West Knoxville", and a slight misidentification of a local place name: The nearby town of Maryville, which is generally not referred to in local media as a "suburb" of Knoxville, was identified as such in the reimported stimulus. In addition, its name was pronounced "Mary-ville" in the reimported stimulus, as opposed to its more common local pronunciation, "Mara-vul", which appeared in the truly local newscast versions. The bank robbery story in the national stimulus was worded the same as in the reimported versions, except that the crime spree took place in Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, hundreds of miles from Knoxville. Finally, all newscast stimuli ended with a brief announcement of a Red Cross

blood shortage. The truly local script mentioned an upcoming blood drive at a local high school, followed by an invitation for listeners to drop any public service announcements “by our studios on Gay Street in downtown Knoxville.” The reimported stimulus identified the blood shortage as statewide rather than local and suggested that people check the Red Cross website to find a donation center “near you.” The most prominent manipulation of the reimported script was its solicitation for public service announcements, which gave a Nashville mailing address despite identifying itself as a Knoxville newscast. For purposes of authenticity, it was not deemed appropriate for the truly national newscast, identified in this study as being from ABC News, to end with a PSA invitation. Instead, the stimulus ended with a brief promotion of the network’s website, running approximately the same length as the PSA solicitations in the other stimuli.

The production of the news stimuli was less complicated than that of the legal advice show because it required only one voice. The voice talent chosen, though identified in the scripts with a fictitious character name, was an experienced newscaster from a large Midwestern radio market. It was important that the newscaster be highly professional in order to sound believable when identified as an ABC News radio anchor. However, his credibility as a local broadcaster was also strong, given that his real-world job was as a local radio news anchor in a market similar to, albeit larger than, Knoxville. For future studies, it would be worthwhile to test the effects of regional accents on listener perceptions of localism variables, but for the purposes of the present study, this variable was controlled. The talent could not sound southern in the ABC News version, so the newscaster was chosen based on his neutral, non-regional accent and his professional radio-news delivery. The talent recorded his excerpts and emailed them to the researcher as digital audio files. The researcher then obtained authentic radio news sounders (introductory music) and assembled the excerpts in digital audio editing software. For the ABC

News version, it was necessary to identify the radio station separately from the newscast itself. A different announcer and background music were used before and after the ABC Newscast, consistent with conventions of commercial radio in which IDs and/or imaging announcements are often placed as bookends to national programming (e.g. “this is WAGU, 1530 AM, Knoxville’s number-one choice for news and information – with the latest from ABC News”).

Christian Music Stimulus

The researcher chose to test a Christian music program because of the prevalence of religious broadcasting in low-power and community radio (Lucas, 2006) and because of the ongoing debate over the regulatory priorities of translator stations relative to low-power FM. A few national Christian organizations have assembled large networks of translator stations airing almost exclusively non-local programming (MediaGeek, 2004). Some Christian LPFMs also fill out their schedules with extensive satellite-delivered material, whereas others offer large amounts of locally originated programming. Moreover, the religious translator networks are held by some of largest broadcast ownership groups in the country, whereas LPFM ownership is inherently local. Therefore, few program categories exemplify the potential variations of ownership and locality of origination more clearly than Christian radio.

The Christian music stimulus provided an opportunity to test localism in a way not possible in the other program categories: In addition to comparing respondents’ perceptions of the station and the program host, it also allowed the researcher to test affective responses to a piece of music. In the local stimuli, the host introduced a song that “I discovered through a friend of a friend who knows the artist...and I had chance to hear it performed live at my church in North Knoxville.” The artist was identified in the local stimuli as being from Jefferson City, a

small town near Knoxville, whereas she was from Oklahoma City in the national stimulus. The program and its host were identified as being from San Antonio, Texas in the national stimulus, as opposed to North Knoxville. A slight difference between the Christian script and the other two program types in the present study was that the ownership groups named in the Christian music program were fictitious, compared to the other program types' uses of Clear Channel Worldwide and Infinity-Viacom. The reason for this was twofold: 1) The largest group owner of Christian stations is Calvary Chapel (FCC, 2008b), an organization whose name would not sound national to an uninitiated listener; and 2) There is a local Calvary Chapel church in Knoxville that owns a low-power FM station, which could have skewed the results if some people were familiar with it but others were not, and if the stimulus tested was not identical to the real station. In addition, the second largest group owner of Christian stations is the Educational Media Foundation (FCC 2008b), which does not prominently identify itself by name on its "K-Love" translator network, and therefore would not likely have been recognizable to listeners as a national group owner of Christian radio stations. As a result, the researcher chose to use a fictitious organization name that more clearly stated the actual nature of the ownership: "National Ministries Fellowship."

The researcher consulted with a pastor and two church music directors, as well as several station websites, for input on the Christian music show script. It was determined that the host should not express herself in overtly theological terms but should instead emphasize inspiration and a family oriented philosophy. There are many variations of Christian radio, but anecdotally it appeared common to the researcher for such stations to avoid references to theological beliefs more specific than general statements of commitment to Jesus Christ, because of the ecumenical nature of Christian audiences. This is not to say, however, that Christian radio as a whole is without a theological bent. On the contrary, literature suggests that a majority of Christian

broadcasters come from a fundamentalist and/or evangelical perspective (Diamond, 1989), and the researcher's anecdotal observations did not contradict this. Nevertheless, the hosts of many Christian music radio programs, particularly national programs such as those airing on K-Love, sounded to the researcher more like radio personalities than preachers, hence the approach to this study's Christian show stimuli.

Because the airing of local music is frequently part of the broadcast localism discussion, the researcher chose to play a significant portion of a song in the Christian music stimulus and measure localism's effect on affective responses to it. The researcher had worked as a producer/engineer on a Christian CD, not yet released at the time of data collection, by an artist residing more than 200 miles from Knoxville, leaving no risk that respondents would have preset biases for or against it. In addition, there were no difficulties obtaining copyright permission to use the song, due to the researcher's affiliation with the artist. During the pretesting process, the song was played for several people who described themselves as fans of Christian music, and all said it was consistent with the type of music they heard on the radio. Incidentally, this did not hold up fully in respondents' open-ended comments at the end of the survey. Some said they liked Christian music but did not like the song or the program in the study. Future research should take into account different musical and broadcast presentation styles and test for differences.

The air talent chosen for the Christian music stimulus was a large-market radio personality in a city more than 200 miles from Knoxville. Though not a Christian-music disc jockey, she was chosen because of her ability to adapt to multiple styles and deliver scripts convincingly. The researcher also discovered during the process of working with the talent that she was a listener of Christian radio and found it easy to adapt to the conventions of the format.

She recorded her audio at a studio in her location and emailed audio files to the researcher, who assembled the excerpt in audio editing software, adding a thematic musical signature sound to the beginning and editing the clip so the song's vocal started immediately after the host finished introducing it.

Editing

All three program types were edited into multiple stimuli by seamlessly connecting separate takes delivered by the talent, reflecting manipulations scripted by the researcher. In other words, elements common to all three versions of the legal advice show were digital copies of one another. The same was true with the newscast and the Christian music show.

Manipulations were edited into the excerpts in a way that was not audible whatsoever – a fact confirmed both through pretesting and through the researcher's informally playing the stimuli for colleagues experienced in audio production. In all three program types, it was necessary for the nationally originated stimulus to be introduced by a "local" announcer, as discussed in the newscast section.

After all editing was complete, 12 audio mp3 files were uploaded to a web server to be linked from the online survey system. The researcher then assembled the online survey and, with assistance from a university consultant specializing in the design and implementation of such studies, programmed the assignment of the audio files to experimental conditions. After extensive testing by the researcher to confirm proper rotational assignment of conditions and to verify that the survey was easily navigable, pretesting began.

Below is a diagram of the study's research design according to Campbell and Stanley's labeling system, with "R" representing randomization, "X" representing program excerpts,

subscript numbers representing program types, lower-case letters representing manipulations of program types, and “O” representing measurement:

R	X _{1a}	O	X _{2b}	O	X _{3c}	O
R	X _{1b}	O	X _{2c}	O	X _{3a}	O
R	X _{1c}	O	X _{2a}	O	X _{3b}	O

Pretesting

Students in two undergraduate university classes were offered extra credit in return for their participation in pretesting. The researcher made clear to the students that their participation was optional. Both classes met in computer labs with high-speed Internet access, making it convenient for subjects to access and complete the study. The researcher emailed a study link to the students and had them enter their course number as an access code, which showed up as a variable in the final dataset so the students’ responses could be easily recognized as pretest data. The two university classes yielded a pretest n of 28, which the researcher supplemented by sending the survey link to ten graduate students, also with a unique access code, who were unfamiliar with the nature of the study. Half of the graduate students responded, and the resulting total pretest sample size was 33. The researcher provided headphones and observed the university undergraduate students as they completed the survey. All appeared attentive to the subject matter as they listened to the excerpts, and a majority appeared to spend time considering their answers to each question. The researcher observed only one anomaly during pretest data collection: Several respondents reacted negatively or laughed at the Christian music stimulus. A few expressed after data collection sentiments to the effect that, “That last show was pretty over

the top!” Upon questioning, subjects with such reactions stated that they were not fans of the musical genre or radio format tested, but they still thought the stimulus was “well done.”

The median completion time was approximately 25 minutes, with a few completing the survey in as little as 18 minutes and one taking as long as 35. After all members of each class were finished, the researcher asked some general questions to assess the clarity and navigability of the survey as a whole, and to check manipulations. The only comments about question clarity dealt with the interval variable used to measure educational level. The researcher had attempted to maintain maximum statistical power by asking for a number of years of education, rather than providing categorical choices. Initially the question was worded, “How many years of formal education have you completed,” but two respondents questioned the use of the word “formal.” As a result, the question was changed to “How many years of schooling have you completed,” but some participants in the final sample expressed confusion about this as well. For future studies, the researcher will use a categorical variable for education. Other than this one question, the survey received favorable responses from all pretest subjects.

Manipulation checks were conducted in two ways: 1) through guided discussions after members of the university classes completed the study; and 2) by playing all stimuli to four individuals unfamiliar with the study who did not participate in other pretesting. After the university classes had completed the study, the researcher said the following: “I’m going to ask a few questions that I’d like you to answer by show of hands; please don’t blurt anything out. At the time you were listening to each excerpt and answering questions about it, were you aware of the locality of the people you heard speaking?” All but three pretest subjects responded affirmatively. The next question dealt with ownership: “As you were listening to the excerpts and answering questions about them, were you aware of who or what kind of entity owned the

radio stations the excerpts came from?” Four pretest subjects answered no, but the others gave affirmative responses. At this point, the researcher asked students to volunteer their recollections of ownership and locality of the different stimuli. Though not all participated in this optional question-and-answer, several correctly identified the exact ownership and locality of the excerpts they heard. Part two of the manipulation check process further confirmed the adequacy of the stimuli. Four graduate students in programs unrelated to electronic media, who were unfamiliar with the nature of the study, were asked to listen to all of the experimental stimuli during individual meetings with the researcher. After playing the stimuli, the researcher asked each manipulation-check participant to name as many ownership entities as he/she could remember from the excerpts. Though as much of a memory test as a manipulation check, the process added to the researcher’s confidence in the manipulations. Some of the descriptions of ownership categories were vague, and participants forgot a few of them, but it was clear that they had heard the manipulated information, which had been intentionally placed both at the beginning and the end of each stimulus, but integrated in a natural way that sounded consistent with radio conventions of station identification and imaging. For further confirmation, the researcher asked participants a question similar to what he had asked the classes: “Even if you don’t remember now, were you aware at the time of the locality and ownership characteristics of the stations?” The answers in all four cases were affirmative, and three participants volunteered their recollections that this information was made very clear, both at the beginning and end of each stimulus.

Pretest data showed all scales to be reliable, as shown in Table 2 (all tables in Appendix A), and despite the small sample size, one of the group comparisons approached statistical

significance. This information confirmed that the study was ready for full data collection, which began the following week and was completed in a period of four days.

Participants

Because localism was the topic of the study, it was essential to identify the local stimuli as being from the same community as the subjects. As a result it was necessary to recruit subjects from a specific DMA and screen out any from outside the area who received the solicitation. The marketing panel firm was able to target its solicitations according to the needs of the researcher, but a screening question was also included at the beginning of the survey: “Do you live in Knoxville or within 30 miles of Knoxville?” Those answering “no” were automatically dismissed from the study. Knoxville, Tennessee was chosen because of convenience factors, although its choice as the location for the study has several advantages. Knoxville is a mid-sized city with thriving radio and television markets (Hudson, 2003). Listeners there have enough local media choices, and see enough talent come and go, that they are less likely than residents of smaller communities to be biased positively or negatively by hearing unfamiliar stations with unfamiliar air talent. On the other hand, a Knoxville sample is less likely to contain the level of heterogeneity found in much larger urban areas (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). Because of the intuitive link between localism and social identity, it was preferable to conduct the study in a locality with a large pool of people who were relatively similar demographically, lest individuals’ narrower radio preferences skew the results. While it is true that community radio’s history emphasizes its value in urban areas, the arguments in favor of LPFM have pointed to its potential benefits across all market sizes. Moreover, the rules regulating LPFM at the time of

data collection made it very difficult for the stations to locate in large cities. So, Knoxville was just large enough to provide a sizable pool of potential respondents similar enough demographically to respond well to the stimuli (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003); but it was not so large as to require narrower demographic targeting of the stimuli and survey solicitations.

The target minimum sample size was 300, a number surpassed in the final results. A wide age distribution was sought, with particular emphasis on avoiding too great a representation of young adults, whose media preferences are known to be different from older demographics (Tuggle, Huffman, & Rosengard, 2007). Albarran et al (2007) found that college students favor MP3 players and streaming media to fulfill uses and gratifications previously associated with radio use, findings largely supported by Ferguson, Greer and Reardon (2007). As a result, a test of college students' responses to radio localism might have yielded very different results than a study of the general population. It would be worthwhile for future research to focus on young people, because they are the future of radio audiences if there is to be a future, but for the purposes of this study it was considered preferable to find a sample mainly of people more likely to use radio.

Internal Validity

Campbell and Stanley (1963) laid out several threats to internal validity and suggested methodological remedies for them. The elements of *history* and *maturation* did not pose significant problems for this study because of its short data collection period. Still, the researcher minimized these risks. The random assignment of experimental conditions as administered to different subjects controlled for maturation effects associated with subjects' hearing three

program excerpts consecutively, because subjects heard various ownership and localities presented in varying orders. Also, the researcher monitored media accounts and other occurrences locally making sure elements of history did not affect subjects' perceptions of radio stations and their ownership characteristics during the data collection period. Given that the study took no more than 36 minutes for subjects to complete, it was unlikely that history problems could have affected any individual's responses, but there was potentially more risk that intervening factors could cause variability in the responses of different subjects participating in the study days apart. However, because assignment of experimental conditions was randomized, it was still possible to make inferences based on comparison of variances even if external factors affected the overall means positively or negatively (Campbell & Stanley, 1963).

The validity problem identified by Campbell and Stanley (1963) as *testing* was likely to present challenges. It was impossible to replicate in a web-based survey the exact circumstances of radio listening. Subjects were encouraged to pay full attention to the stimuli and even use headphones if possible, unlike many real life scenarios in which radio serves as a background sound. Furthermore, the excerpts contained fictitious broadcasters and stations that were familiar to listeners. It could be argued that familiarity is a key component of localism and a key component in the popularity of national programming – a component that was not accounted for in this experimental design. In addition, the mere fact that subjects heard radio excerpts and immediately answered questions about them could have biased the results, given that many subjects might never have thought so specifically about radio programs. Still, the experimental design itself, identified by Campbell and Stanley as a type-six “true” experiment, and the generally accepted inferences made from experimental results, were the researcher's strongest defense against the validity problem of *testing*. In other words, assuming the conditions were the

same for all experimental groups, it was possible to infer that the manipulated variables were responsible for variances in the results, even if the experimental conditions themselves were unrealistic, and even if the experience of being tested biased the participants. Whether the results are meaningful might be subject for debate, but the influence of the variables tested could be clearly established as significant, or not, because the experimental conditions were designed properly. Moreover, the researcher took great care to make the experimental stimuli as realistic as possible, and feedback from pretest participants confirmed this realism. The researcher had an extensive background in broadcast production and put his knowledge to use in creating stimuli that resembled commonly understood conventions of radio content, even including equalization and dynamic range adjustments typical of radio stations.

To avoid problems Campbell and Stanley identified as *instrumentation*, the researcher used previously established scales to test the dependent variables. It was deemed necessary to adjust some questions within the scales, making them reflective of radio programming rather than other media types, but the questions in this study's instrument were measures widely accepted as valid in testing responses to media stimuli.

External Validity

External validity was much more difficult to ensure in the present study than internal validity. The study was designed to test the effects of verbal identification of ownership and locality on respondents' first impressions of radio programs, based on the assumption that first impressions were an indicator of whether people would continue to listen to a given station or quickly select another frequency on the radio dial. Obviously, the real-world scenario of radio

listening is different from the experience of participating in an experimental study. However, this is further reason why it was a good idea to collect data via the Internet rather than in a laboratory setting. Though not a perfect replication of people's radio listening environments, this methodology allowed respondents to experience the stimuli in places where they were more likely to feel comfortable and, thus, more likely to respond naturally. They were not in their cars listening to their radios, but this study tested people's responses to electronic media stimuli in settings where many people actually consume electronic media: at their computers.

For purposes of experimental control, it was necessary to use fictitious radio personalities, programs and stations, because only stations that were unfamiliar to listeners could plausibly be manipulated to have different ownership and locality identifiers. As a result, a limit on external validity is that first impressions were likely to be different from the feelings people develop about a media entity over time. It could be said that efforts to ensure internal validity, themselves, caused external validity problems in this regard, because it's impossible to create experimental stimuli that engender the same responses real local radio stations receive. However, a new radio station entering a market has not yet gained audience loyalty. Much of the literature leading to the present study comes from theorists advocating an increase in the available frequencies for low-power and community radio stations. If more such stations were to enter radio markets, they would be in the position of having to make first impressions and would benefit from whatever strengths they could muster to attract and retain listeners. Their advocates argue that the qualities tested as this study's independent variables are among these stations' greatest strengths, which is why an experiment isolating these variables is relevant. Therefore, the present study's methodology, testing the effects of the independent variables on first-impression judgments of radio stations, offers a valid reading of a phenomenon relevant to the

discussion of localism. The researcher does not claim that the study is the only way, or even the best way, to approach broader questions of regulatory policy, only that it is a valid way to test the effects of ownership and locality on audience first impressions, and that its findings make a worthwhile contribution.

Data Collection

Before hearing any of the experimental stimuli, subjects were asked to click the “play” button on a test audio file link identical in function to the stimulus links that were to follow. This served the purpose not only of testing the sound on people’s computers, but also giving them the opportunity to set volume levels, obtain headphones if they wished, and familiarize themselves with the operation of the audio file links they would use in completing the remainder of the study. All of this reduced the potential for data corruption due to technical glitches or user error. At this point, participants were instructed to use headphones if they had them, with speakers as an acceptable alternative in their absence. The purpose of this was to ensure that people focused on the content of the stimuli as completely as possible, and also to avoid the risk that other potential participants would overhear the stimuli and become aware of the experimental manipulations. The panel research company sent only one solicitation per household but acknowledged that in rare cases duplication within families was possible. Encouraging the use of headphones was a strategy to minimize the negative effects of such occurrences, despite the unlikelihood of their happening frequently enough to affect the study’s outcome. The test link played the Star Spangled Banner, a piece chosen because of its obvious familiarity to the widest possible spectrum of potential study participants. Given a simple multiple choice question as to

what song they heard, subjects who answered correctly, and answered “yes” to whether they heard the music clearly, were then presented the instructions for the first experimental stimulus. Subjects unable to hear the audio clearly, as evidenced either by choosing the wrong answer to what song they heard or answering “no” to the direct question, were asked to correct their computers’ audio problems or temporarily discontinue participation in the study.

Once past the test audio section, subjects were asked to listen to each excerpt only once, although they were allowed to listen again if necessary in order to answer questions about it. After hearing each stimulus, subjects were asked if they had been able to hear the excerpt clearly, and those answering “yes” were then asked to respond to a series of questions about each excerpt before hearing the next one. Those not hearing the stimulus clearly were encouraged to replay it, but were also asked if they had “heard it well enough to answer questions about it.” Those answering “yes” to this question were then given the opportunity to answer questions, whereas a “no” response ended the survey. After answering questions about all three excerpts, subjects were asked to respond to demographic, psychographic and radio-listening questions and were given an opportunity to type their comments at the end of the survey.

Conditions

After data collection, the results were exported from the web-survey system to an SPSS file, where variables were recoded to match directionality, and dependent variable scales were averaged together. Survey conditions were then collapsed to form three different experimental “groups” for the legal-advice and music shows, and six for the newscasts. Because the study was a partial repeated-measures design, the term “group,” as used here, only refers to discretely

different sets of respondents within a given program type. To prevent biasing effects, the study was designed to ensure that no respondent heard the same ownership category more than once. However, due to limitations in the online survey system, it was not possible to randomize the order of the stimuli, meaning that all respondents heard some version of the advice show first, followed by the newscast, and then the music show. There was a resulting possibility of ordering effects, which could not be mitigated through randomization, but the specific order chosen was intended to minimize such effects. In early checks of the stimuli during the production process, it became apparent to the researcher that the legal-advice show received the most favorable feedback, followed by the newscast. The Christian music show was most likely to engender polarized responses, with people either loving or hating it, and was, therefore, placed third. The researcher made the determination that a polarizing excerpt could bias people's perceptions of anything that came after it, whereas the other two programs were likely to be more innocuous. Furthermore, it was evident from manipulation checks that the newscast was more obviously local, or obviously national depending on its manipulation, than the legal-advice show. Thus, the legal-advice show seemed the least likely to reveal to respondents the specific intent of the study, making it a logical choice as the first excerpt. Comments typed in the open-ended remarks section at the end of the study shed light on these decisions: Several indicated that they had no idea the purpose of the study, and a few specified that they were more aware what they should listen for in the last two excerpts after answering questions about the first. Taken together, these points suggest that a) randomization of ordering would have been preferable; but b) if randomization was not an option, the order chosen was probably best. If a local newscast, for instance, had set the precedent in people's minds for judging the other two stimuli, the data could have been more corrupted, because news is inherently local or not, and people would more likely

have been tipped off to the purpose of the study. Similarly, if the Christian music show had been the benchmark, some respondents might have viewed the rest of the study as either Christian or not, and judged it accordingly. In any event, the fact that each respondent heard all three program types and all three ownership categories added to the study's internal validity. An individual subject with a bias for or against a certain ownership category or program type heard others as well, and, thus, a variance in his preferences could still reveal differences pertaining to the test variables. The experimental conditions as assigned in the online system are shown in Tables 3 and 4, with the first part of each stimulus name indicating ownership, and the second part indicating locality of origination:

CHAPTER IV RESULTS

The researcher contracted with a national marketing-research-panel firm for a sample of 300 residents of the Knoxville, Tennessee DMA. The firm conducted what is termed a “soft launch,” beginning April 14, 2008, emailing a solicitation and a link to the study to increasing numbers of Knoxville residents during the first 48 hours. Then, based on calculations from the initial response rate, the company expedited data collection April 16, and 300 surveys were collected by the end of the day April 17. The firm’s members were compensated a combination of honorarium and coupons for national businesses totaling \$7.00 per respondent. An additional 31 responses were added from the study’s pretest data, for a total n of 331. Below is a detailed description of the study’s results.

Sample

Data collected via the panel research firm resulted in a centrally distributed age breakdown between 25 and 86. To supplement the age distribution in the under-25 range, the survey’s 33 pretest subjects, consisting of students from two undergraduate courses at the University of Tennessee and five graduate students, were also included in the final sample. Pretest data was deemed acceptable for inclusion in the sample because the pretesting process revealed no substantive problems with the questionnaire. Scale reliabilities were strong, manipulation tests effective, and pretest subjects reported no major difficulties completing the survey. Only one basic demographic question was reworded due to confusion on the part of two pretest subjects (“How many years of formal education have you completed?” was changed to

“How many years of schooling have you completed?”). Otherwise, pretest data, as well as its collection method, was consistent with the rest of the sample. Furthermore, it should be noted that IRB approval was already obtained at the time of pretesting, and pretest subjects responded affirmatively to the same consent statement presented to all other participants. Tuggle, Huffman, and Rosengard (2007) have pinpointed differences between the radio uses of young people and those of older demographics, but the preferences of college students in this study were roughly in keeping with other subjects’ responses.

After the elimination of one participant whose pin number appeared twice in the dataset, the total sample size was 331 ($n=331$), with a median age of 37 (see Table 5). Racial and ethnic minorities were underrepresented in the sample, a common problem in survey research perhaps aggravated by the necessity of only soliciting respondents with high-speed Internet connections. Nevertheless, the panel-research firm had taken this into account when drawing its sample, controlling for income. Nearly 80 percent of the Knoxville population is white, according to census bureau data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003), whereas this study’s sample was 90 percent white. This was not deemed problematic, however, because the study was not designed to test programs targeted to minority demographics. Low-power and community radio have been shown to be effective organizing tools for minority groups in some urban areas, but the present study was intended to test the value of localism to broader populations, testing the notion that local origination and ownership are qualities in themselves that make such stations preferable to corporate-owned broadcasters. Though a more accurate representation of Knoxville’s demographics would have been advantageous, the fact remains that a huge majority of the city’s residents are white, and therefore, the present study represents Knoxville’s mainstream population effectively. The sample was also skewed more heavily female than the Knoxville

population. According to 2003 U.S. Census data, Knoxville's population was 51.3 percent female, compared to 60 percent in this study. In addition, educational levels skewed somewhat higher than the general population. However, because it was drawn for an experimental study with randomized groups, it was not necessary for the sample to be a perfect representation of the city's population, but it was close enough to offer some insights into public opinion there. Randomization of groups assigned to the 12 experimental conditions was checked using ANOVA, revealing no significant differences between the groups in any of the above demographic variables (Table 1).

Descriptives

In addition to showing the above demographic distributions, descriptives from this study's dataset revealed information pertinent to the localism discussion. The researcher had included several radio listening questions, including but not limited to the ones specifically formulated to answer RQs 19-22. The general breakdown of responses to radio-listening questions offers a mixed impression of subjects' self-reported views on local radio and the concept of localism, when defined as local ownership and origination. Respondents overwhelmingly consider radio a valuable medium, with a significant portion considering it an important source of information (7-point Likert, mean=5.52, sd=1.42) and not merely entertainment (mean=4.50, sd=1.71). The negatively phrased question, "Radio is a dying medium," received an almost universally negative response from this study's respondents (mean=2.48, sd=1.58), who reported listening to the radio a mean of 13.63 hours per week. When the questions turned more specifically to the topic of ownership and programming

localism, however, the results mostly stayed near the center, and one revealed a lack of public concern over ownership localism. The statement “I don’t care who owns the radio stations I listen to” garnered slight agreement among respondents (mean=4.31, sd=1.89), approximately the same level of agreement as their responses to “I am generally aware of the locality of people on the radio” (mean=4.21, sd=1.62). People’s self-reported preference for local origination, phrased “I prefer that the people I hear on the radio be from Knoxville” was below the center point in this study’s findings (mean=3.79, sd=1.81), a slight contrast with a few of the experimental results to be discussed below.

Scale Reliability

Scale reliabilities found in pretesting remained consistent in the actual dataset, as shown in Table 6. The affective response and character scales for the legal advice stimuli had Chronbach’s Alphas higher than .7, and all other scales tested higher than .8.

Data Analysis

Research questions 1 through 18 called for tests of statistical significance in mean differences between experimental groups’ responses on the three dependent variable scales. The legal-advice and Christian-music shows were three-group comparisons, and there were six newscast groups. Because the study tested three dependent variables, a conventional approach would be to use multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) to test for overall significance, followed by post-hoc one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to explore which between-group differences were significant (Leary & Altmaier, 1980). The purpose of such an approach is to

minimize the risk of type-I error, the potential for false statistical significance, which is elevated through repeated univariate tests. A p-value of .05 means that five times out of 100 a difference will be read as significant when it really is the product of mere chance. Measuring the same phenomenon with three dependent variables amounts to combining three p-values, which could result in as much as a 15 percent chance of false significance when using .05 as the significance level or “alpha”. MANOVA is a test for between-groups differences that accounts for multiple dependent variables, mathematically setting a higher bar for significance. The present study found one statistically significant result and one marginally significant result according to this standard of data analysis. However, Huberty and Morris (1989) cited several instances in which multiple dependent measures could be appropriately tested with ANOVA, even when MANOVA results were marginal or non-significant. Among these was exploratory research in which relationships between independent and dependent variables have not been previously established. This was the case with the present study. Furthermore, Cole, Maxwell, Arvey and Salas (1994) found that MANOVA power was reduced when dependent measures were highly correlated. “When selecting outcome measures on which one expects to find sizable effects, one will garner greater power with MANOVA if the measures are quite different from one another (even negatively correlated) than if they are somewhat redundant (or positively correlated)” (p.471). The three dependent measures in the present study were similar – so much so that the mean scores for each dependent measure within a given program type tested out reliable when merged as an overall favorability scale for that program type (Cronbach’s Alpha=.814 for legal advice, .805 for news, and .808 for Christian music), a situation resembling what Cole et al said would lower MANOVA power. It was not within the scope of this study to make comparisons using a merged scale, because such a scale would need to be refined through additional research in order

to prove externally valid, but its reliability demonstrates the redundancy of the measures. As a result, the data analysis that follows will include both MANOVA and ANOVA results. The researcher presents the study's marginal results with the intent of exploring the topic in a new way, informing future research, and being as fair as possible to both sides of the market and public-interest regulatory debate.

Research Question Testing

Legal Advice – Ownership

The first three research questions dealt with listener perceptions of a legal advice show, holding locality constant while measuring the effects of ownership identification (detailed statistical charts in Appendix A, Tables 7-9). This was tested using MANOVA, in order to determine whether significant differences existed between groups, while simultaneously taking into account the three dependent variables of affective response, medium credibility and source credibility. Wilks' lambda, a commonly used MANOVA statistic (Enders, 2003), showed statistically significant differences between groups (Wilks' Lambda value=.952, $F=2028.232$, $p=.03$). However, a MANOVA test alone does not specify which dependent variables showed the significant differences. Therefore, the researcher employed post hoc ANOVA to provide a breakdown of results specific to each measure. This post-hoc test showed one marginally significant difference, resulting from research question 2: Those hearing a locally originated legal advice show on a station identified as a locally owned, non-profit, low-power-FM rated its medium credibility more favorably than those hearing the same excerpt, also locally originated, on what was identified as "an Infinity-Viacom station." This was the only instance in the present study in which local ownership alone appeared to increase the favorability of an excerpt, and it

did so only slightly. Post-hoc ANOVA showed this difference to be marginally significant at the .05 level ($p=.051$), a weaker p-value than the overall MANOVA that included all three measures. Enders (2003) suggested that post-hoc ANOVA after MANOVA was a flawed method under some circumstances because the two tests could occasionally yield conflicting results, and this case appears to reveal such an inconsistency. Nevertheless, the higher-standard MANOVA shows statistical significance, so the slight preference for local ownership is worthy of further study. Below is a breakdown of all the post-hoc ANOVA data for research questions 1 through 3:

RQ	Construct	Means	ANOVA F	P
1	Affective Response	loc/loc=4.54 nat/loc=4.57	.115	.735
2	Medium Credibility	loc/loc=5.00 nat/loc=4.768	3.854	.051*
3	Source Credibility	loc/loc=4.81 nat/loc=4.728	.481	.489

*marginally significant at the .05 level

Legal Advice – Locality of Origination

Research questions 4 through 6, holding ownership constant while measuring the effects of locality of origination, were tested using MANOVA, also taking into account the study's three dependent variables (Tables 10-12). MANOVA showed no statistically significant differences between groups (Wilks' Lambda value=.969, $F=2087.906$, $p=.135$). However, the p-value of .135 could be viewed as approaching a .1 exploratory significance level, justifying further analysis – but with caution. Post hoc ANOVA results show that subjects rated the medium credibility of a locally originated legal-advice show more favorably than one identified as

nationally syndicated. They also rated the host's source credibility more favorably when measured by McCroskey's Character scale, but this ANOVA test was only marginally significant. Other measures in this area showed no significant differences:

RQ	Construct	Means	ANOVA F	P
4	Affective Response	nat/loc=4.709 nat/nat=4.592	.574	.450
5	Medium Credibility	nat/loc=4.76 nat/nat=4.54	4.097	.044**
6	Source Credibility (authoritativeness)	nat/loc=4.728 nat/nat=4.652	.360	.549
6 (alt.)	Source Credibility (character)	nat/loc=4.74 nat/nat=4.46	3.501	.063*

**significant at the .05 level
*marginally significant at the .05 level

Newscast – Ownership

When the variable of ownership was manipulated and locality held constant, MANOVA (Tables 13-15) revealed no significant differences in terms of listener responses to the newscast (Wilks' Lambda value=.979, F=.583, p=.744). Post hoc ANOVA results, reported below for exploratory purposes, were consistent with the MANOVA finding:

RQ	Construct	Means	ANOVA F	P
7	Affective Response	loc/loc1=4.77 loc/loc2=4.91 nat/loc1=4.854	.226	.798
8	Medium Credibility	loc/loc1=4.81 loc/loc2=4.85 nat/loc1=4.94	.301	.741
9	Source Credibility	loc/loc1=4.59 loc/loc2=4.73 nat/loc1=4.81	1.055	.350

Newscast – Locality of Origination

MANOVA revealed statistically significant differences (Tables 16-18) in listener responses to the newscast when the variable of locality was manipulated and ownership held constant (Wilks' Lambda value=.916, $F=2.398$, $p=.028$). Post hoc ANOVA results indicated a preference for the locally originated newscast stimuli as measured by the construct of affective response. Statistically, this result was the strongest in the entire study, possibly because the affective response scale asked whether the excerpt was "boring". Because the news stories in the local stimuli took place in East Tennessee, respondents from Knoxville might have found them more engaging than the exact same stories taking place hundreds of miles away, as in the national stimuli. This is a difference in the news value of *proximity* (Stovall, 2006), which could be construed as either a limitation or a key finding of the present study, depending on one's perspective. This phenomenon will be discussed further in Chapter V. Below is a breakdown of post-hoc ANOVA results for newscast locality of origination:

RQ	Construct	Means	ANOVA F	P
10a	Affective Response	nat/loc1=4.85 nat/loc2=4.76 nat/nat2=4.22	5.852	.004***
11a	Medium Credibility	nat/loc1=4.94 nat/loc2=5.02 nat/nat2=4.667	2.140	.121
12a	Source Credibility	nat/loc1=4.818 nat/loc2=4.813 nat/nat2=4.687	.793	.454

***significant at the .01 level

Newscast – Reimportation

The concept of reimported local news was tested in the present study by directly comparing listener responses to the two variations of the local newscast script. Initially, this

comparison was made using a simple t-test, with the idea that even the slightest difference would be revealed when safeguards against type-I error, such as the use of MANOVA, were removed. If this test had yielded statistical significance, the researcher would then have separated the two local newscast variations for MANOVA and ANOVA testing, to assess which script type had a greater effect on favorability of localism variables. This did not occur, however. T-tests revealed no significant differences between listener responses to the truly local newscast script and the version manipulated to sound reimported (Tables 19-20). The means were very similar:

RQ	Construct	Means	t	P
10b	Affective Response	nat/loc1=4.85 nat/loc2=4.96	-.493	.623
11b	Medium Credibility	nat/loc1=4.94 nat/loc2=5.02	-.399	.690
12b	Source Credibility	nat/loc1=4.818 nat/loc2=4.813	.028	.978

Religious Music – Ownership

Localism manipulations appear to have had much less impact on listener perceptions of the religious music program excerpt than those of the other two program types tested in this study. This may be explained in part by the overall lack of favorability the excerpt garnered. For instance, the newscast and legal-advice shows both received affective response scores higher than 4.5, whereas the religious music affective response means hovered around 3.6. It is possible that people turned off by a program excerpt to which they do not relate pay less attention to it, and therefore are less aware of nuances such as localism variables. It would be useful in future research to test localism variables on music programs more favorable to a majority of respondents. Nevertheless, one could hypothesize based on the present finding that listener responses to entertainment programs such as music shows are less susceptible to localism

differences than informational programming. MANOVA indicated no statistically significant differences whatsoever pertaining to the religious music show. Research questions 13 through 15 (Tables 21-23) held locality constant and manipulated ownership, resulting in nearly identical means on all dependent measures (Wilks' Lambda value=1.0, $F=.019$, $p=.996$). Below are post hoc ANOVA results:

RQ	Construct	Means	ANOVA F	P
13	Affective	loc/loc=3.66	.003	.953
	Response	nat/loc=3.64		
14	Medium	loc/loc=4.269	.034	.854
	Credibility	nat/loc=4.242		
15	Source	loc/loc=4.273	.046	.831
	Credibility	nat/loc=3.243		

Religious Music – Locality of Origination

Holding ownership constant and testing locality of origination (Tables 24-26) also yielded no significant differences pertaining to the religious music show excerpt (Wilks' Lambda value=.998, $F=.171$, $p=.916$). Post hoc ANOVA results point out the similarities of the group means:

RQ	Construct	Means	ANOVA F	P
16	Affective	nat/loc=3.64	.002	.969
	Response	nat/nat=3.68		
17	Medium	nat/loc=4.24	.191	.663
	Credibility	nat/nat=4.17		
18	Source	nat/loc=4.24	.002	.961
	Credibility	nat/nat=4.25		

Predictors – Self-Reported Preferences

The researcher chose to explore respondents' localism preferences in more than one way. After the experimental portion of the study, some radio listening preference assessments were included in the section of the instrument otherwise reserved for demographic and psychographic questions. This provided more detailed information as to what types of people self-reported localism preferences. Research questions 19 and 20 were tested by entering variables of age, income, number of years lived in Knoxville, race, political ideology, and a list-of-values-scale mean as independent variables in stepwise linear regressions with seven-point Likert responses to the questions, "I prefer that the people I hear on the radio be from Knoxville," and, "I am generally aware of the locality of people on the radio," as dependent variables (Tables 27-29).

The model resulting from the preference-for-local-origination variable (Tables 30-31) yielded the following significant predictors: ideology (religious conservatism), time lived in Knoxville, and age ($r\text{-squared}=.050$; $p=.002$). In terms of directionality, people who were more conservative and had spent more time in Knoxville were more likely to self-report a preference for local origination. Somewhat surprisingly, given the "time in Knoxville" predictor, the direction of the age predictor was toward younger people preferring local origination more than older people.

The model resulting from the awareness of locality variable yielded the following significant predictors (Table 32): time lived in Knoxville, sex, and the list-of-values scale ($r\text{-squared}=.087$, $p<.000$). People who had lived in Knoxville longer reported more awareness of broadcasters' locality, as did people with stronger self-reported personal values and women.

RQs 21 and 22 were tested by entering variables of age, income, number of years lived in Knoxville, race, political ideology, and a list-of-values-scale mean as independent variables in a stepwise linear regression with the seven-point Likert response to the question, “I don’t care who owns the radio stations I listen to,” as the dependent variable. The survey divided political ideology into the categories of *fiscal* and *religious* liberalism or conservatism, but for testing this research question, only religious ideology was entered. This was because of the prominence of religious broadcasting in the discussion of low-power, community radio, and translator stations. There were no significant predictors in this model, which means the stepwise regression produced no data. However, a chart showing a standard regression is included in Appendix A for informational purposes (Tables 33-34).

Program Category Differences

The fourth broad area of inquiry outlined in Chapter II was whether people’s responses to localism varied depending on the type of program they heard. The answer to this question is a qualified, preliminary “yes.” The significant differences found came on different dependent measures for the legal-advice show than for the newscast. Also, there were no significant differences associated with localism whatsoever pertaining to the religious music show. Merely glancing at the means, one can tell that reactions to the religious music show did not vary in the same ways they did to the newscast and the legal advice show. For example, the affective response means for the three music conditions were 3.66 (local/local), 3.649 (nat/local), and 3.641 (nat/nat). By contrast, the news affective response means ranged from 4.22 (nat/nat2) to 4.77 (local/local) – still not an enormous difference, but clearly more affected by the localism manipulations than the religious music stimuli. No doubt, further research is needed in order to

say definitively what effect program type has on listener responses to localism variables, but an early impression is that localism is more important with informational programs than with entertainment.

Post Hoc Analysis

The present study was designed to test the effects of its two independent variables, ownership and origination, on listener perceptions of radio program excerpts, with the purpose of finding out which facet or facets of localism, if any, mattered to listeners when choosing stations. It was not designed to measure interaction effects between ownership and origination, because in American broadcasting these factors exist in such a multiplicity of variations and combinations that a perfectly controlled statistical measure of their relationship would offer little insight. Moreover, a full-factorial design would have required a fourth stimulus in each program category, which would have been artificial: A low-power-FM station airing national programming. While this does happen in religious broadcasting, it is not at all in keeping with the regulatory intent behind the creation of LPFM, which was, among other things, to promote local origination (Lucas, 2006; Sauls & Greer, 2007). As a result, such a design might well have generated significant differences and interaction effects, but these would not have been representative of real-world broadcasting. Due to this limitation in the present study's scope, it was not deemed appropriate to generate hypotheses comparing locally owned stations airing local programming against group-owned stations airing national programming, absent the statistical means to distinguish which variable was responsible for any differences found. Nevertheless, for purposes of further exploring the topic and directing future research, such comparisons are included as part of this post-hoc analysis.

Subjects hearing a legal advice program excerpt identified as locally originated, on a station identified as LPFM, rated the station's medium credibility significantly more favorably (Tables 35-37) than those hearing the same excerpt identified as "live from Los Angeles" on a station identified as "an Infinity-Viacom Station" (MANOVA Wilks' Lambda $F=6.240$, $p=.000$; ANOVA $p<.000$). There were no such significant differences pertaining to the legal advice show as measured by this study's other two dependent variables.

A finding similar to the legal-advice show result above came in the area of affective response to the newscast (Tables 38-40). Subjects hearing the newscast identified as locally originated on a station identified as LPFM responded significantly more favorably than those hearing a newscast identified as from ABC News, airing on a station with ownership identified as Clear Channel Worldwide (MANOVA Wilks' Lambda $F=3.433$, $p=.019$; ANOVA $p=.017$). It should be emphasized, however, that the ABC Newscast stimulus, though containing the same stories and very similar wording, was substantially different in that its stories did not take place anywhere near Knoxville, likely resulting in dramatically different news values to its content. This is arguably the point of localism and, therefore, a meaningful contribution to discussions of the topic, but further research is needed before major conclusions are to be drawn from this finding

Splitting the newscast conditions in order to test reimported scripts required the creation of three additional cells in the research design, making it possible to test one more category of radio ownership not covered elsewhere in the study. Thus two versions of the newscast were identified as coming from "Knoxville's number-one source for news and information – locally owned and serving Knox County for 54 years", a test of a locally owned full-power station. This provides further evidence of listener concern over radio ownership, which is apparently quite

low: T-tests showed no significant differences, on any of this study's dependent variables, between a locally owned full-power station and an LPFM airing the exact same local script (Tables 41-42); nor between a locally-owned full-power station and a Clear Channel Worldwide station both airing a local newscast (Tables 43-44).

The locally owned fully power stimuli did provide one logical opportunity for a 2x2 test, because there were both truly local and ABC News versions of the newscast, from both the locally owned full-power and the Clear Channel Worldwide stations. For purely exploratory purposes, the single dependent variable of affective response was entered into ANOVA with ownership and origination as fixed factors (Tables 45-46). Not surprisingly, based on this study's other findings, the variable of origination was significant ($F=11.889$, $p=.001$), but ownership was not ($F=.543$, $p=.462$). There was no significant interaction effect between ownership and origination ($F=.133$, $p=.715$).

One other variable available for testing in the present study did not yield significance. Subjects' affective responses to the song in the religious music stimuli were not affected by localism variables (Table 47). Not only did ANOVA show no statistically significant differences, but there were no appreciable differences at all (Means: loc/loc 3.52, nat/loc 3.59, nat/nat 3.51; ANOVA $F=.071$, $p=.932$).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS & FUTURE RESEARCH

Discussion

The results of this study are mixed. The researcher entered the process without a firm idea of what to expect, and the answer amounts to a split decision. When defined as the locality of program origination, localism has a slight positive effect on audience perceptions, at least in one program category. When defined as the nature and locality of station ownership, localism has a marginally positive effect in one program category and no impact whatsoever in others. Even this marginal result pertaining to ownership is limited, however, by the fact that the significant difference was within the construct of medium credibility, derived from a scale that directly asked a localism question (“Is concerned about community’s well-being”) which might have influenced respondents to view other questions through a similar lens. Nevertheless, it appears that people’s affective responses are more favorable to a local radio newscast than to a network newscast, and that people perceive a locally-owned station as more community oriented than a group-owned station, at least when that locally owned station is airing a legal advice show. Both of these differences are slight, and it was outside the scope of this experiment to measure interaction effects between the variables of localism and ownership. Even so, ANOVAs comparing locally owned stations airing local programming with group-owned stations airing national programming amplified the differences somewhat, a finding that will be of particular interest to localism advocates, despite being dubious in terms of external validity. If such a finding holds up in future research, it could lend some support to those pressing for increased regulatory action in favor of localism, but it could also be misleading. In reality, group-owned

stations do air local programming, and even when they don't their voice-tracking methods are fairly effective at simulating local origination (Chambers & Callison 2003). It appears that what people find appealing about localism is its relatability (Harmon, 1997), and voice-tracking done well is relatable in much the same way as real local programming. Another of this study's findings lends further support to this contention: There were no differences at all between responses to the truly local news script and the reimported script. Manipulations to test reimportation were arguably stronger than in real radio, with the announcer misidentifying a local place name and even giving a non-local mailing address where listeners could send announcements, but, still, there were no differences.

Perhaps the greatest contribution of this study to the body of knowledge is that it informs the discussion of how localism is defined, lending further support to the conclusions of Chambers (2003) and Etling (1999), who both reported audience preferences for local origination, and relative indifference to ownership. This is not to say audience responses are necessarily the definitive measuring stick in a debate over regulatory policy. Such an assertion would place the researcher firmly in the market-model camp and would ignore critical arguments that the public interest is not necessarily the same as mere popularity. Besides, even with its focus on audience responses, this study's results support the arguments of LPFM advocates at least as strongly as they favor defenders of group ownership. The reality is that as ownership groups grow and regulation loosens, local origination diminishes (Chambers, 2001; Hilliard & Keith, 2005; Prindle, 2003) and the present study suggests this trend is not in keeping with audience preferences. Many argue that corporate decisions intended to create economies of scale and maximize profits are not always favorable to the public's preferences (Hilliard & Keith, 2005), and it appears this is what has happened recently in the radio industry: A market-based

approach supports increases in the use of automation, the downsizing of radio newsrooms, voicetracking, paycuts, and homogenization of content, *only* if one defines “market” in financial terms. As Ekelund, Ford, & Jackson (1999) and Bates (1987) have pointed out, broadcasting has more than one market. There truly is the potential for a middle ground between the market and public-sphere perspectives (Entmann & Wildman, 1992), because to a large degree, the public sphere is a market in itself. In a business world where stock value is the benchmark of success, the link between audience preference and a company’s profitability is indirect, but it still matters. This is, no doubt, why group-owned stations, despite their economies of scale, make efforts to serve local communities. Nothing in this study’s findings indicates a deep public concern over corporate ownership. Most people appear simply to want radio programs they like, and have a slight leaning in favor of locally originated programs at least under the circumstances tested in this study.

There is little doubt that broadcast localism has value in American society, and the present study’s findings support this notion. Local stations advance the cultures of their communities and connect to people directly in a way that national networks are incapable of. Some stations air the work of local and regional musicians, giving them opportunities for publicity they would not have if all formats were programmed from afar and limited to major-label acts. Small local stations provide businesses and political candidates with affordable advertising options, reaching at least some portions of markets where big broadcasters’ airtime is out of reach financially. Many small stations provide local news and public affairs coverage that is not available anywhere else, informing voters about candidates and issues in local races unlikely to gain the attention of larger media outlets. Perhaps most importantly, local radio stations are an essential public safety tool, making it possible for emergency and government

officials to communicate with the masses during natural disasters or other crises, even in the midst of widespread power outages. For these reasons among others, the argument in favor of promoting localism through regulatory policy since the earliest days of broadcasting still has validity in modern times. The irony, however, is that none of the above reasons necessarily means that large group-owned radio stations are inherently bad or that small community stations are inherently good. Group-owned stations can and often do serve their communities effectively, if for no other reason because it makes good business sense to do so (Howard, 2008). Contrary to the assertions of some, large group-owned stations often have local program directors and often air programs featuring local music. Some group-owned stations carry local public affairs programming and serve their communities during natural disasters. The arguments of community radio and LPFM advocates boil down to three things: 1) Local ownership is preferable to corporate group ownership because, when local, station owners are stakeholders in their communities of license and serve them better as a result; 2) Local programming origination is preferable to remotely delivered programming because it is more responsive to the specific needs and interests of the community, serving a public safety function while also forging a stronger sense of cultural identity and understanding; and 3) broadcast ownership consolidation results in a decrease in the number of independent “voices” in the media, which erodes democracy and reinforces hegemony. These arguments are debatable and not fully supported through empirical evidence, but even if correct, they fail to address what might seem an obvious question: Do people not immersed in the nuances of broadcast regulatory policy or critical theory – people who make up the audiences for radio stations – consider these issues as vital, and these problems as great, as certain media scholars do? And more specifically to this study, do people register these concerns in their radio-listening choices? The results of the present study suggest the

answer is a qualified no. People respond favorably to local programming, but group-owned stations are every bit as likely to benefit from such favorability as LPFMs. The marginal advantage in medium credibility of one low-power-FM stimulus over its group-owned counterpart could serve as a ray of hope for LPFM advocates, but the overwhelming results of this study are in its failure to reject several null hypotheses, not in its two, small significant differences. It would be difficult for anyone to analyze this study's results without reaching one obvious conclusion: Radio listeners from the general public are not nearly as concerned about localism as are its scholarly advocates. This does not bode well for low-budget, community or non-profit stations trying to compete on the dial with corporate behemoths and satellite radio.

Those wishing to poke holes in this study will argue – correctly – that is difficult to simulate the psychological connection listeners develop with radio personalities or stations they hear every day, while also controlling for the variable of familiarity. Some might say the results pertaining to program origination would have been stronger, or even that the ownership variables would show statistically significant differences, if the methodology had more realistically tested popular stations and their air talent. However, in order to isolate and test the specific variables of ownership and locality, it was necessary to ensure that no respondents recognized the show hosts or stations in the excerpts, as such familiarity would have confounded the results of hypotheses on the most basic localism variables. Specifically, if this study had used well-known broadcasters or the call letters of well-known stations from the Knoxville area, its local stimuli would have been more realistic, but the national stimuli would have been so clearly phony that respondents would have been confused. “Why is the guy I hear every day on Knoxville radio broadcasting from Los Angeles?” they might have wondered, or, “Why did they identify WNOX as locally owned when everybody knows it’s a Citadel station.” If, on the other hand, the study

had used familiar voices on the local stimuli only, it would have been necessary to find equally familiar national voices to record corresponding stimuli, lest listeners' preferences for people they know over total strangers render the study meaningless. In addition to the obvious difficulty of getting nationally famous broadcasters to lend their voices to a research study, it would have been nearly impossible to measure the relative fame or familiarity of the national and local broadcasters in order to control for them statistically. One result of the present study brings emphasis to this point: Only a small percentage of respondents indicated that they knew personally the people they listened to on the radio. This means that comparing familiar local voices with unfamiliar national voices would have been misleading. The familiarity people have with local radio talent comes, to an overwhelming extent, through the radio, not from encountering the personalities in the grocery store or at PTA meetings. Therefore, it is every bit as possible for people to feel personally connected with national personalities as with local ones. How many local broadcasters engender the same audience loyalty and affection as Oprah Winfrey? How many radio personalities are as popular among conservatives as Rush Limbaugh? Social Identity Theory would seem to support the notion that familiarity is an element of localism, because sharing a hometown is a form of group membership, but the effects of this variable are much too complex to control and quantify in an experiment. Using the voices of real radio professionals from distant locations, giving them fictitious names, and placing them on fictitious stations was admittedly a flawed strategy for testing the general preferences of radio audiences, but it was the best way to isolate variables specific to the ongoing debate over localism in regulatory policy.

Conclusions

This study's results, in addition to revealing a subtle public preference for local origination, offer insight into the salience of broadcast ownership characteristics in peoples minds and the possible effects of these characteristics on listeners' judgments of the radio programs they hear. Specifically, these results suggest that ownership is not a salient factor to listeners forming first impressions of radio programs. This is especially important given the ever-increasing numbers of radio channels available in the marketplace and, hence, the number of first-impression-based choices people are likely to make. Satellite radio is a growing phenomenon, translator stations have increased in number enormously, and – if LPFM advocates get their way – restrictions limiting the available channels for that service will be lifted soon. Regardless of whether one prefers a public sphere or a market approach, competition is an inescapable reality in broadcasting. Listener-supported stations and those owned by non-profit organizations may not participate fully in the competition for advertising dollars, but they most certainly do compete on the radio dial for listeners. A church running an LPFM needs a congregation willing to donate money in order to power its transmitter, and probably the best way to add to or sustain that congregation is by reaching out to the public through its radio station. A civic or educational organization might fund the startup costs for an LPFM station, but most boards of directors would find it difficult to justify ongoing expenses if there is insufficient evidence of listener support. Public radio stations raise substantial portions of their budgets during their periodic on-air fund drives, but these efforts would be fruitless if there were no listeners to call in during the drives. Moreover, non-commercial stations have received large percentages of their funding in recent years from business underwriters who are motivated to

contribute in return for on-air announcements. In other words, non-commercial stations sell advertising too; they just call it by a different name. So, radio stations must compete for listeners in order to survive, and the results of this study indicate that what matters to listeners is the quality of the program content, not merely the nature of the station's ownership. This means those running community and LPFM stations have a difficult challenge: to offer programming that competes effectively against large group-owned stations with many times their operating budgets, not to mention much greater power output, clearer signals and larger coverage areas. As if these circumstances were not difficult enough, this study suggests that perhaps the greatest strength the small stations have, localism, by itself does only a little to level the playing field. Indeed, if LPFMs find themselves in competition with locally originated programming on group-owned stations, their greatest strength is rendered nearly meaningless.

A question worth discussing is why this study employed an experimental design instead of survey methodology. Similarly, one could argue that a qualitative interview study might have yielded the same basic information about listener preferences, but in greater depth and with less risk of validity problems. The answer is that it was evident from previous literature and through pretesting of this study that station ownership characteristics were not factors salient enough to emerge from participants' evaluations of programs without prompting effects, which would naturally raise validity questions in any study. The purpose of employing an experiment was to find out whether the clear identification of ownership and locality in radio excerpts affected people's evaluations of those excerpts without any overt discussion of the potential for negative or positive effects. No stations air announcements that "we are owned by a large corporation, and therefore we're the devil." If large group ownership resulted in negative evaluations by listeners, those evaluations would come from listeners' predispositions to dislike such ownership – not

from prompting. Merely asking the question “What do you think about corporate ownership of radio stations?” could lead some people to give the topic more thought than they ever would have otherwise, resulting in a decision entirely different from the real-world choice they would make as to whether they like a given station or its programming. It is these real-world choices, often made very quickly between presses of a car radio’s “seek” button, that have an enormous impact on any station’s success or failure. Though not an ideal way to poll the attitudes of a population, this experiment came closer to simulating the actual decision-making processes radio listeners go through than a survey or interview study could achieve. However, these other methodologies would add greatly to the body of knowledge on the topic and are highly recommended among the suggestions for future research to be addressed later in this chapter.

Limitations

This study took a new approach to addressing an old topic. As a result, its methodology was developed almost from scratch, with little previous literature for guidance. This new methodology offers scholars a different way to address localism questions, but, not surprisingly, it also serves as a warning of the potential pitfalls in approaching them this way. First and foremost, the validity of using fictitious programs with fictitious hosts to test people’s real-world reactions to radio could be the subject of boisterous debate. Some writing in the web-survey’s open-ended comments section pointed out that it was difficult to judge the credibility of fictitious characters – especially after hearing them speak for no more than four minutes. Though, for reasons discussed earlier, it would have posed major problems to manipulate stimuli using real broadcasters and stations, this is a legitimate concern, and future researchers should take steps to

improve on the methodology in this area. One simple improvement would have been to modify the instructions at the beginning of the survey to emphasize that it was a test of *first impressions*. Such an instruction could even have stated that, “We want you to pretend these are new stations or that you’re hearing them for the first time.” If this had been clarified, people might have been less reserved in reporting their judgments, and the differences might have been more pronounced. Another related concern is with the choices of program types tested. Because much programming is unique to small community radio, and much is unique to network broadcasting, it was necessary for the researcher to find a middle ground, choosing programs that could be plausibly manipulated to sound like either category. While necessary for a properly controlled experimental design, this approach raises validity questions and will likely form the strongest argument on the part of this study’s detractors. Simply put, the unique characteristics of local radio, particularly of low-power and community radio, might be what make it more appealing to radio audiences. It could be argued that this study failed to test these station types adequately because the talent in the stimuli had to sound like national program hosts, and the content discussed could not be *too* local. However, the researcher would argue the opposite: This study gave low-power FM stations a competitive edge most real-world low-budget broadcasters do not have. It gave them the very same high-quality talent as the group-owned stations, leveling the playing field to compare them purely on the merits of their stated ownership characteristics. Talent and production quality are important variables that need to be tested in future research, but the present study controlled for these factors in order to address specifically the salience and influence of ownership identification and program locality by themselves. Nevertheless, one finding in this study’s results section comes close to addressing the discrepancy between the real-world nature of low-power community stations and that of corporate group-owned stations:

Despite not having been designed to measure interaction effects between ownership and origination, the study revealed a stronger preference for localism when these elements were combined than when they were isolated. As was discussed earlier, it is not an accurate reflection of the radio industry to imply that only stations with local ownership air local programming, but one could point to this study as evidence that localism, in general, has appeal to radio listening audiences; which, in turn, could support the case that low-power and community stations have a chance to compete on the radio dial with their higher-budget counterparts. Others could argue, however, that the above amounts to a significant leap in logic.

Other limitations of the present study deal with the nature of its sample. Many argue that low-power and community radio are at their best when serving so-called “underserved” populations. This study’s sample, however, consisted largely of people likely to be mainstream radio listeners. The sample underrepresented African-Americans and other ethnic minorities, which could raise further questions about the study’s validity in testing issues pertaining to non-profit radio. However, evidence suggests that programming targeted to minorities is in no way limited to low-power or community radio in the post-1996 Telecommunications Act broadcasting industry. Ofori, Edwards, Thomas, and Flateau (1997) suggested that black-owned radio stations were decreasing in number – in large part because major corporate conglomerates were competing directly for their listeners. The authors suggested that African Americans had only begun to make significant strides toward more widespread media ownership when the 1996 Telecommunications Act reversed their progress. This might well be an argument in favor of low-power FM as an antidote to negative corporate effects, but it also serves as evidence that the present study was justified in testing mainstream radio audiences rather than attempting to focus on specific minority groups. If corporate chains are every bit as likely to target minorities as low-

power stations, there is no reason to assume that variations in the number of minorities in the sample would necessarily have tipped the balance toward one ownership category or the other. On the other hand, testing localism's importance to minority audiences should be a high priority for future research.

Like many exploratory studies, this one was limited because there was no previous experimental research to guide its methodology and instrumentation. As a result, the researcher had to take educated guesses as to what scales were most relevant to the subject matter and what manipulations would be adequate to reveal meaningful differences. It appears from the results that the manipulations proved adequate, and the lack of significant findings pertaining to the religious-music stimuli is likely because localism truly has little impact on listeners' musical preferences in that genre. It will, of course, take much more research to show this definitively, especially given that this study's sample was not specifically drawn for purposes of testing religious programming. Future research along these lines should either test music that is more mainstream, or draw its sample according to the target demographics of its stimuli. In terms of instrumentation, however, this study offers one clear result: Source credibility is not a valid construct for testing people's initial reactions to radio excerpts, at least not to fictitious ones. It makes intuitive sense that affective response and medium credibility were more useful dependent variables for this study, because the scales used to measure these constructs were designed more specifically for testing media content. Elements of Gaziano and McGrath's medium credibility scale, in addition to the Obermiller affective response scale with the two items added for this study, will likely form the basis for a new scale to be developed by this researcher for future studies to be discussed below, but source credibility should only be used to test people's opinions of air talent they've had ample opportunity to form opinions about.

Future Research

A large part of the present study's novelty was its use of an experimental design to test listener preferences, as opposed to survey methodology. As was discussed earlier, this was a way to explore people's real reactions to localism variables presented in a form these variables would actually take as listeners chose stations on the dial. Chief among the reasons for this approach was to avoid prompting people for opinions on issues they may not have consciously thought about otherwise, but this is not to say survey methodology could not offer a valuable contribution. In fact, relatively few studies have directly asked people their opinions on localism, and it would be worthwhile for researchers to undertake this effort more completely. Special care could be taken not to provide setups to the questions planting seeds in people's minds that corporate group ownership must be a bad thing or that localism is inherently good. This leads naturally to another suggestion: qualitative research. During the process of conducting the present study, the researcher was struck by how many casual conversations yielded information similar to the quantitative findings in Chapter IV. When told about the nature and purpose of this study, people with no background in broadcasting whatsoever volunteered the names of local personalities they listened to "all the time" but could not name a single company that owned a station. Even when the researcher offered an explicit description of "the problem" of corporate group ownership proliferation, most responded that they hadn't heard anything about it and didn't care. In the open-ended responses at the end of the present study's survey, many volunteered, unprompted, the names of local radio stations they listened to – a question that should be asked in future studies – but only one said "I hate Clear Channel," or anything to that effect. Incidentally, the researcher considered removing the Clear Channel ownership

designation from the newscast stimuli for fear of excessive biasing due to the company's prominence, but this was obviously not an issue. The benefit of qualitative methodologies to the discussion of localism would be to explore precisely how and with whom localism does figure into audience listening decisions. Such research could give greater fuel to the arguments of LPFM advocates than the largely unsupported claims that corporate group ownership is simply bad. On the other hand, it could lend credence to a market approach, if, as is likely the case, such results confirm that corporate radio gives most people what they want. Another benefit of a qualitative follow-up to the present study would be to explore the regression results reported here. It is somewhat surprising that political conservatism was a predictor of localism preference, because much localism advocacy comes from the political left. However, this result could be explained by the conservative leanings of talk-radio listeners, who might hear more local talk personalities in Knoxville than those who identify as moderate or liberal. Also, the negative relationship between age and localism preference might be explained by existing programs in Knoxville – the kind of information an interview study or open-ended survey question could yield. The same could be true with the list-of-values predictor, which seemed to indicate that people who reflect more on their own values prefer localism, a finding that raises more questions than it answers. It is nearly impossible to draw far-reaching conclusions about any of these regression results, but they have great potential to guide future research.

Other future research should hone this study's approach, eliminating ineffective dependent variables, most notably *source credibility*, and eventually developing a scale of localism listener impressions. This study went a long way in that direction, and future experimental research could begin with a scale-development pretesting process, possibly merging the most effective elements of this study's scales with new questions designed to

address broadcast localism more specifically. Ultimately, the development of an equally reliable and more valid scale could eliminate one of this study's greatest flaws: its use of three dependent variables, which necessitated MANOVA testing and a resulting sacrifice in degrees of freedom. Future studies would have much greater power and validity if they used one good scale and could test their results with ANOVA alone. Also on the subject of statistical testing, future research should employ balanced factorial designs, so interaction effects can be measured. This study mostly avoided such an approach for reasons discussed earlier, but a future study with better scales and somewhat different stimuli might be able to isolate significant interaction effects without creating unrealistic situations that would provide misleading information.

In addition to the ownership-locality interaction, future designs could explore possible interaction effects between locality and program type. This study, though designed to analyze three different program types, was not designed to measure differences between its three categories. Future designs could take this into account. From this study's findings, it is apparent that different program types yield different responses to localism variables, which is a good place to start in forming hypotheses for a similar study in the future. Naturally, the necessity of choosing program types comparable in both low-power and national manipulations, one of this study's greatest limitations, will also present problems for future research along these lines. It is possible, however, to find program categories other than those tested in this study that would provide valid comparisons of locality and ownership effects. Before settling on the three categories used in the present study, the researcher created stimuli to test an Indi-Rock music format with all three ownership or locality conditions eventually tested. An advantage to using this format would have been its direct relevance to one of the criticisms against ownership groups such as Clear Channel Worldwide: that they limit playlists only to the most commercial

music and, therefore, prevent independent artists from being heard. However, preliminary testing revealed flaws in these stimuli, and the researcher chose to go in a different direction for the present study. Still, testing such a category in future research could possibly yield differences much greater than the religious-music program used in this study. Other categories worth exploring in a manner similar to the present study include political talk, religious talk, entertainment or so-called lifestyle talk, and numerous other musical formats. Even the effects of station ownership on listener perceptions of emergency information would be interesting, albeit extremely difficult, to explore.

Confounding factors to any measurement of audience reactions to localism, especially news content, are the effects of proximity on people's perceptions of subject matter. First-year journalism students are taught that *proximity* is one of the important values to consider in weighing the newsworthiness of a story, but there are several others: *impact*, *singularity* (*strangeness*), *conflict*, *timeliness* and *currency*, to name those most commonly discussed (Stovall, 2006). Part of the theory of news judgment is that these values work independently of one another but all contribute to the overall news value of a story. A story that has little impact in terms of the number of people affected, such as a fire at a single-family home, is of moderate news value locally because it is high on the value of proximity, despite being low in terms of impact. Conversely, a tsunami in Southeast Asia, having the lowest possible proximity value in the United States, is a big story because of its impact. Consequently, the news stories in the present study's national stimulus likely did not seem as significant as those in the local stimuli, even though they were exactly the same. More than a limitation of the present study, this is presented as a suggestion for future research because it would be worthwhile to develop measures comparing the news values of the stories tested and then replicate the present study

accordingly. This possible confound is most pronounced in the evaluation of news stories, but it raises questions about other program categories as well. The caller to the legal-advice show in the present study mentioned that he owned land “near the airport”, which might have been a meaningless fact to Knoxville respondents who thought the caller was from St. Louis, but it carried much more context for those thinking the caller was local. None of this necessarily caused people to like the local stimulus more than the national one, but it did potentially affect their responses to questions about it. Developing a research design that controls for this phenomenon would likely require many future studies to achieve, but it is worthy of further consideration.

Future research would do well to focus on public responses to programming unique to low-power radio or unique to national radio without attempting experimental manipulations to compare the two. Low-power radio has great potential value serving the interests of heterogeneous populations too small to support full-power commercial stations but large enough, and unique enough, to create a demand for radio programming not found elsewhere on the dial. The present study intentionally avoided this type of programming because the intent was to test other arguments pertinent to LPFM, namely that it could, in essence, compete against large group-owned stations and fulfill what was claimed to be a public desire for local ownership. However, future studies could test the responses of minority populations to programming specifically targeted to them, testing variables such as talent quality and production value, as well as ownership and locality. Part of the present study did attempt to test programming targeted to one narrow demographic, Christian-music fans, but this would be better achieved through a more specific sampling procedure, or through a qualitative methodology.

Finally, it would be worthwhile for future research to test other variables likely to affect the success or failure of LPFM and community radio stations that were not explored in the present study. As was mentioned above, talent quality and production values could be hugely important, given that low-power stations are not likely to have anywhere near the budgets of group-owned stations. Though conventional wisdom might be that higher-budget stations would be “better” than low-budget stations, this is not necessarily true and is worthy of empirical testing. An alternate hypothesis would be that someone who sounds like an average-Joe is more relatable to regular people than a professional broadcaster and therefore could become more popular. Also, perhaps more to the point, many people probably don’t care about the air talent on radio stations as long as they get the entertainment or information they want. Thus, if an LPFM is more tuned in to the desires of its audience, it is more likely to be successful, regardless of budget or talent quality.

Though it is impossible to know precisely where this research stream will lead, there is potential here for theory development. The researcher has the following plan for theoretical pursuit of the topic:

- 1) Scale building leads to an overall favorability measure for radio programs.
- 2) Qualitative research aids in scale building and helps specify what to test and how to test it in future experiments. It also answers more specifically why people like or dislike certain radio stations or programs.
- 3) Future 2x2 tests establish interaction effects (or lack thereof) between ownership and locality, as well as program type.
- 4) A future replication of the present study uses the new favorability scale as a dependent measure, controls for value differences between local and non-local stimuli, isolates and further

tests interaction effects, and more precisely confirms or rejects the preliminary findings of this study.

5) Additional research refines the above study and specifically tests localism in other contexts, including specific cultural groups, small communities, and urban areas. Other methodologies, such as survey, participant observation, and content analysis, could further refine the information gained from this research stream.

6) Ultimately, a theory could emerge that predicts radio favorability and establishes specifically the extent and nature of localism effects. A model could show locality and origination as two components in a larger picture of radio programming value and audience preference.

All of the above suggestions for future research and theory building deal with audience responses to and perceptions of localism. Needless to say, the steady stream of scholarship in the areas of policy analysis and media economics will continue to make great contributions to the body of knowledge pertaining to localism, as will critical analyses of regulatory policy and case studies of low-power and community radio. Those engaged in scholarship along these lines will not need help from this researcher to come up with new ways of approaching the topic. Viewing localism from an audience perspective, however, is a different and hopefully fruitful area of research to be explored. The present study in no way ends the debates surrounding localism, nor was it intended to. It merely serves as a first step in the process of clarifying, informing and reframing the discussion.

REFERENCES

- Albarran, A. et al (2007). "What happened to our audience?" Radio and new technology uses and gratifications among young adult users. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 14(2), 92-101.
- Albarran, A. & Patrick, L. (2005). Assessing radio station value: A review of academic literature and analysis of contemporary industry models. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 12(1), 3-13.
- Alvarez, S. (1995). Reclaiming the public sphere: A study of public access cable television programming (Doctoral dissertation, Emory University, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57, 13.
- Anderson, J. (2006). Noncommercial radio translators remain big business for crooked Christian broadcasters. Posting on DIYMedia.net. Retrieved April 3, 2007 from <http://diymedia.net/archive/0706.htm#072506>.
- Ang, I. (1991). *Desperately seeking the audience*. London: Routledge.
- Arceneaux, N. (2005). Blackface broadcasting in the early days of radio. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 12(1), 61-73.
- Armstrong, J. (2002). Localism, community, and commercial television, 1948-1960: A value analysis (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Utah, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63, 13.
- Armstrong, J. (2007). Constructing television communities: The FCC, signals and cities, 1948-1957. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(1), 129-146.
- Barnouw, E. (1966). *A tower in Babel: A history of broadcasting in the United States Vol. 1: to 1933*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barnouw, E. (1968). *The golden web: A history of broadcasting in the United States Vol. 2 1933-1953*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Barnouw, E. (1970). *The image empire: A history of broadcasting in the United States Vol. 3, from 1953*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barrett, M. (2005). The FCC's media ownership rules and the implications for the network-affiliate relation. *Journal of Media Economics*, 18(1), 1-19.
- Bates, B. (1987). The role of theory in broadcast economics: A review and development. In M. McLaughlin, ed, *Communication Yearbook*, 10. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Bates, B. (1999). The economic basis for radio deregulation. *Journal of Media Economics*, 12(1), 19-34.
- Bates, B. & Chambers, L. (1993). Testing the assumptions of deregulation. Paper presented at the 43rd annual International Communication Association Conference, Washington, D.C.
- Baumgartner, F. & Mahoney, C. (2002). Gaining government allies: Groups, officials, and alliance behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Beatty, J. (2000). From cooperative to court case: Struggles for alternative radio at KOOP-FM in Austin, Texas. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 7(2), 310-328.
- Benjamin, L. (1998). Working it out together: Radio policy from Hoover to the Radio Act of 1927. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 42(2), 69-84.
- Besen, S., Krattenmaker, T., Metzger, R., & Woodbury, J. (1984). *Misregulating television: Network dominance and the FCC*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Birnbaum, M. (2002). Low-power FM: The federal communications commission's conflicting roles of policing the spectrum and ensuring community access to the airwaves. *Tulane Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property*, 4, 143-159.

- Blakely, P. (2001). The decision-making process for two urban mainstream (hip-hop) radio stations: A case study (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 821.
- Blanks-Hindman, D. & Coyle, K. (1999). Audience orientations to local radio coverage of a natural disaster. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 6(1), 8-26.
- Bosch, T. (2006). Radio as an instrument of protest: The history of bush radio. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 13(2), 249-265.
- Brand, K. (2004). The rebirth of low-power FM broadcasting in the U.S. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 11(2), 153-168.
- Brinson, P. (2006). Liberation frequency: The free radio movement and alternate strategies of media relations. *Sociological Quarterly*, 47, 543-568.
- Brinson, S. (2000). Missed opportunities: FCC Commissioner Frieda Hennock and the UHF debacle. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44, 248-267.
- Brooks, D. & Daniels, G. (2002). The Tom Joyner Morning Show: Activist radio in an age of consolidation. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 9(1), 8-32.
- Brown, D. (2000). Not getting on the policy agenda: Radio station ownership changes following the Telecommunications Act of 1996. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 7(1), 8-28.
- Busterna, J. (1976). Diversity of ownership as a criterion in FCC licensing since 1965. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 20, 101-110.
- Calabrese, M. (2003). The future of spectrum policy and the FCC spectrum policy task force report. Testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, March 6.

- Campbell, D. & Stanley, J. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Carmode, R. (1986). An analysis of the broadcast policy-making system and its application to Federal Communications Commission docket 20735 (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1986). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47, 1101.
- Center for Survey Research and Analysis (2003). June 3-15, 2003, telephone interviews with a national adult sample of 1000. USCSRA.03AMEND.R11. Freedom Forum, American Journalism Review [producers] 2003. Storrs, CT: The Roper Center [distributor]. Retrieved April 9, 2008 from <http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu>.
- Chambers, T. (2003). Radio programming diversity in the era of consolidation. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 10(1), 33-45.
- Chambers, T. (2001). Losing owners: Deregulation and small radio markets. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 8(2), 292-315.
- Chambers, T. & Callison, C. (2003). Let radio's marketplace decide: The public's perception of localism. Paper presented to the Media Management & Economics Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Annual Convention, Kansas City: August 2003.
- Champlin, D. & Knoedler, J. (2002). Operating in the public interest or in pursuit of private profits? News in the age of media consolidation. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 36(2), 459-468.
- Chan-Olmstead, S. (1997). Theorizing multichannel media economics: An exploration of a group-industry strategic competition model. *Journal of Media Economics*, 10(1), 39-49.

- Clark, A. (2006). Radio New Zealand International: The voice of New Zealand broadcasting to the Pacific. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 13(1), 102-115.
- Cole, D., Scott, M., Arvey, R., & Salas, E. (1994). How the power of MANOVA can both increase and decrease as a function of the intercorrelations among the dependent variables. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(3), 465-474.
- Communications Act of 1934*, 46 U.S.C.A., Title III, section 302.
- Coopman, T. (1999). FCC enforcement difficulties with unlicensed micro radio. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 43, 582-602.
- Coopman, T. (2000). Dunifer vs. the FCC: A case study of micro broadcasting. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 7(2), 287-239.
- Corominas, M., Bonet, M., Guimera, A., & Fernandez, I. (2006). Digitization and the concept of “local”: The case of radio in Spain. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 13(1), 116-128.
- Coyer, K. (2006). Community radio licensing and policy: An overview. *Global Media and Communication*, 2(1), 129 - 134.
- Craig, S. (2001). “The Farmer’s Friend”: Radio comes to rural America, 1920-1927. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 8(2), 330-346.
- Czitrom, D. (1982). *Media and the American mind: From Morse to McLuhan*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Davidson, R. (2006). *9XM talking: WHA Radio and the Wisconsin idea*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Diamond, S. (1989). *Spiritual warfare: The politics of the Christian right*. Boston: South End Press.

- Dick, S. (2000). Pirates, pranksters, and prophets: Understanding America's unlicensed "free" radio movement. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 7(2), 329-341.
- Dick, S. & McDowell, W. (2004). Estimating relative audience loyalty among radio stations using standard Arbitron ratings. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 11(2), 26-39.
- Downing, J. (2001). Radical media projects and the crisis of public media. Paper presented at the conference Rethinking Public Media in a Transitional Era, New York University.
- Doyle, M., & Terry, L. (2007). Low-power empowerment. *The Hill*. Retrieved March 14, 2008 from <http://www.freepress.net/news/24224>.
- Dunaway, D. (2005). Pacifica Radio and community broadcasting. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 12(2), 240-255.
- Duncan, J. (1982). Alaska broadcasting, 1922-77: An examination of government influence (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1982). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43, 2821.
- Eggerton, J. (2007, December). FCC loosens newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership limits. *Broadcasting & Cable*. Retrieved April 30, 2007 from <http://www.broadcastingcable.com/article/CA6513656.html>.
- Ekelund, R., Ford, G. & Jackson, J. (1999). Is radio advertising a distinct local market? An empirical analysis. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 14, 239-256.
- El-Fattal, L. (1991). The spatial distribution of technology and public policy: Community access to cable television (Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 3453.

- Enders, C. (2003). Performing multivariate group comparisons following a statistically significant MANOVA. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 36, 40-56.
- Entman, R., & Wildman, S. (1992). Reconciling economic and non-economic perspectives on media policy: Transcending the “marketplace of ideas.” *Journal of Communication*, 41, 5–19.
- Etling, L. (1994). Listener perceptions of localism in radio programming: A qualitative study. Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1994.
- Fairchild, C. (1999). Deterritorializing radio: Deregulation and the continuing triumph of the corporatist perspective in the USA. *Media Culture & Society*, 21(4), 549-561.
- Federal Communications Commission (2008). Report on broadcast localism and notice of proposed rulemaking. MB Docket No. 04-233. Retrieved January 28, 2008 from <http://www.fcc.gov/localism/taskforce-archive.html>.
- Federal Communications Commission (2008b). CDBS Public Access Station Search. Retrieved January 9, 2008 from http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/prod/cdb/public/pubacc/prod/sta_sear.htm.
- Federal Communications Commission (2007). Third report and order and second further notice of proposed rulemaking in the matter of: Creation of a low-power radio service. MM Docket No. 99-25. Retrieved January 20, 2008 from http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-07-204A1.pdf.
- Federal Communications Commission (2007b). Statement of Chairman Kevin Martin re: promoting diversification of ownership in the broadcasting services, et al. (MB Docket Nos. 07-294, 06-121, 02-277, 01-235, 01-317, 00-244 and 04-228). Retrieved January 3,

2008 from http://www.fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2008/db0425/FCC-07-217A2.txt.

Federal Communications Commission (2005). Second order on reconsideration and further notice of proposed rulemaking in the matter of: Creation of a low power radio service. MM Docket No. 99-25, FCC 05-75.

Federal Communications Commission (2004). Notice of inquiry: In the matter of broadcast localism. MB Docket No. 04-233. Retrieved January 12, 2008 from http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-04-129A1.pdf.

Federal Communications Commission (2004b). Localism task force public hearing minutes. January 28. Retrieved March 3, 2007 from <http://www.fcc.gov/localism/hearing-sanantonio012804.html>.

Federal Communications Commission (2000). Creation of a low-power radio service. 47 CFR Part 73.

Federal Communications Commission (1990). Translator station rules: Frequency assignment. FCC § 74.1203.

Federal Communications Commission (1962). The evolution of FM radio: 1947-1950 as reported in the annual reports of the Federal Communications Commission. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 6, 209-221.

Federal Communications Commission (1953). 18 FCC 288, docket no. 8967.

Ferguson, D., Greer, C., & Reardon, M. (2007). Uses and gratifications of MP3 players by college students: Are iPods more popular than radio? *Journal of Radio Studies*, 14(2), 102-121.

- File, E. (2000). And the band played on: The impact of low-power FM. Report to the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (IEEE) to meet the requirements of the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering (WISE). Retrieved April 14, 2007 from [http:// www.wise-intern.org/journal/2000/file00.pdf](http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2000/file00.pdf).
- Franck, P. (1998). The fight for micro radio enters the home stretch. Microradio Empowerment Coalition website posting. Retrieved April 21, 2007 from <http://www.nlgcdc.org>.
- Freedman, E. (1998). Producing communities: The politics of public access cable television (Doctoral dissertation, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60, 1378.
- Gaziano, C. & McGrath, K. (1986). Measuring the concept of credibility. *Journalism Quarterly*, 63, 451-462.
- Gallup (1938), May 22 to May 27, 1938, personal interviews with an approximate national sample of 1500, #USGALLUP.38-123.Q05. Gallup Organization [producer] 1938. Storrs, CT: The Roper Center [distributor]. Retrieved April 9, 2008 from <http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu>.
- George, L. & Waldfogel, J. (2003). Who benefits whom in daily newspaper markets. *Journal of Political Economy*, 111(4), 765-784.
- George, L. & Waldfogel, J. (2006). The New York Times and the market for local newspapers. *The American Economic Review*, 96(1), 435-447.
- Godfried, N. (2002). Identity, power, and local television: African Americans, organized labor and UHF-TV in Chicago, 1962-1968. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 22(2), 117-134.
- Gormley Jr., W. (1979). A Test of the revolving door hypothesis at the FCC. *American Journal of Political Science*, 23(4), 665-683.

- Greve, H., Pozner, J. & Rao, H. (2006). Vox populi: Resource partitioning, organizational proliferation, and the cultural impact of the insurgent microradio movement. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(3), 802-837.
- Gunther, A. (1992). Biased press or biased public? Attitudes toward media coverage of social groups. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 56(2), 147-167.
- Habermas, J. (1989). T. Burger & F. Lawrence, translators, *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Hamilton, J. (2004). Rationalizing dissent? Challenging conditions of low-power FM radio. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 21(1), 44-63.
- Harmon, M. (1997). Television news, anchor longevity, name recall, parasocial interaction, and paracommunity orientation. *Feedback*, 38(2), 6-10.
- Harvard Law Review (1962). The darkened channels: UHF television and the FCC. *Harvard Law Review*, 75, 1578-1606.
- Hedges, W. (1951). Unpublished interview for oral history project. Mass Communication Historical Collection, Wisconsin Historical Archives, Madison Wisconsin.
- Hemenway, P. (1986). Philadelphia commercial radio before and after deregulation: A time-series case study of non-entertainment programming in the nation's fourth market, Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1986). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47, 2785.
- Hilliard, R. (2001). Symposium introduction: Farm and rural radio – some beginnings and models. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 8(2), 321-329.

- Hilliard, R. & Keith, M. (2005). *The quieted voice: The rise and demise of localism in American radio*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Hood, L. (2007). Radio reverb: The impact of “local” news reimported to its own community. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 51(1), 1-19.
- Horowitz, R. (1983). Rationalization and innovation: The regulation of new communications technologies (Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43, 4043.
- Horrigan, J., & Rainie, L. (2002). Getting serious online. Pew Internet & American Life Project. Retrieved June 12, 2008 from <http://www.pewinternet.org/reports/toc.asp?Report=55>.
- Howard, J. (2008). Come gather ‘round: Straight talk for confronting challenging times from veteran Wall Streeter Victor Miller. *Radio Ink*, 8 (7), 25-30.
- Howley, K. (1997). People, places, and communication technologies: Studies in community-based media (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, 1382.
- Howley, K. (1999). Finding a spot on the dial: The struggle for community radio in Bloomington, Indiana. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 6(1), 41-55.
- Howley, K. (2005). Diversity, localism and the public interest: The politics of assessing media performance. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, 1(1), 103-106.
- Hubbard, G., & Crawford, E. (2008, in-press). Music in political advertisements – music to the ears or background noise? A study of music’s influence on message-relevant thinking. *Journal of Radio & Audio Media*, 15(2).
- Huberty, C., & Morris, J. (1989). Multivariate analysis versus multiple univariate analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 105(2) 302-308.

- Hudson, E. (2003, July). Market profile: Knoxville, Tenn. *Mediaweek*, July 28. Retrieved June 16, 2008 from http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/prod/cdb/pubacc/prod/sta_sear.htm.
- Huntemann, N. (1999). Radio post the 1996 Telecommunications Act. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 23(4), 390-407.
- Jensen, K., & Rosengren, K. (1990). Five traditions in search of the audience. *European Journal of Communication*, 5(2), 207-238.
- Kanayam, T. (2006). Community ties and revitalization: The role of community FM radio in Japan. Paper presented at the International Association for Mass Communication Research, The American University in Cairo, Egypt July 23-29.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J. & Gurevitch, M. (1974). Uses and Gratifications research. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509-523.
- Kellner, D. (1997). Intellectuals, the new public spheres, and techno-politics. In C. Toulouse, & T. Luke, *The Politics of Cyberspace: A New Political Science Reader*. London: Routledge, 167-186.
- Kippax, S., & Murray, J. (1980). Using the mass media: Need gratification and perceived utility. *Communication Research*, 7(3), 335-360.
- Kirkpatrick, B. (2006). Localism in American media, 1920-1934 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67, 4376.
- Kittross, J. (1976). A fair and equitable service or, a modest proposal to restructure American television to have all the advantages claimed for cable and UHF without using either. *Federal Communications Bar Journal*, 29, 91-116.

- Kohut, Andrew (2003). Strong opposition to media cross-ownership emerges. News Release, The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, July 13, 2003, Washington, D.C. Retrieved April 9, 2008 from <http://www.people-press.org>.
- Krasnow, E., Longley, L. & Terry, H. (1982). *The politics of broadcast regulation*, 3rd ed. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kraut, R. et al (2004). Psychological research online: Report of Board of Scientific Affairs' Advisory Group on the conduct of research on the internet. *American Psychologist* 59(2), 105-117.
- Lasar, M. (1998). Hybrid highbrow: The Pacifica Foundation and KPFA's reconstruction of elite culture, 1946-1963. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 5(1), 49-67.
- Leary, M., & Altmaier, E. (1980). Type I error in counseling research: A plea for multivariate analyses. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 27, 611-615.
- Lichtenstein, A., & Rosenfeld, L. (1983). Uses and misuses of gratifications research. *Communication Research*, 10(1), 97-109.
- Lichty, L. (1962). Members of the federal radio commission and federal communications commission 1927-1961. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 6, 25-26.
- Lichty, L. (1962b). The impact of the FRC and FCC commissioners' backgrounds on the regulation of broadcasting. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 6, 97-110.
- Lipschultz, J. (1997). *Broadcast indecency, FCC regulation and the First Amendment*. Boston: Focal Press.
- Lometti, G., Reeves, B., & Bybee, C. (1977). Investigating the assumptions of uses and gratifications research. *Communication Research*, 4(3), 321-338.

- Lucas, C. (2006). Cultural policy, the public sphere, and the struggle to define low-power FM radio. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 13(1), 51-67.
- Marcus, A. (2002). Public interest pirates: The history of the micropower radio movement. Paper written by LPFM activist. Retrieved April 14, 2007 from <http://www.geocities.com/mcsquared88/>.
- McCain, T., & Lowe, G. (1990). Localism in Western European radio broadcasting: Untangling the wireless. *Journal of Communication*, 40, 86-101.
- McChesney, R. (1997). *Corporate media and the threat to democracy*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- McCroskey, J. (1966). Scales for measurement of ethos. *Speech Monographs*, 33, 65-72.
- McGregor, M. (2006). When the “public interest” is not what interests the public. *Communication Law and Policy*, 11(2), 207-224.
- McQuail, D. (2005). *McQuail’s mass communication theory*, 5th ed. London: Sage.
- MediaGeek (2004). FCC sees the light on Calvary Chapel apps for LPFM. Posting on MediaGeek.org. Retrieved April 3, 2007 from <http://www.mediageek.org>.
- Megwa, E. (2007). Community radio stations as community technology centers: An evaluation of the development impact of technological hybridization on stakeholder communities in South Africa. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 14(1), 49-66.
- Merryman, P. (1956). The organization and procedures of the federal regulatory commissions and agencies and their effect on small business. Testimony before the House of Representatives Committee on Small Business, Reprinted in *Journal of Broadcasting*, 1, 326.

- Molnar, H. (2004). National public service radio in the South Pacific: A community loudspeaker. In A. Crissell, ed, *More than a Music Box: Radio Cultures and Communities in a Multi-Media World*. New York: Berghahn.
- Moshe, M. (2007). Right-wing pirate radio broadcasting in Israel: The political discourse about channel 7, 1993-2003. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 14(1), 67-83.
- Napoli, P. (1999). The unique nature of communications regulation: Evidence and implications for communications policy analysis. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 43(4), 565-581.
- Napoli, P. (2001). *Foundations of communications policy: Principles and process in the regulation of electronic media*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press.
- Napoli, P. (2006). Media management and the public interest. In A. Albarran, S. Chan-Olmsted, M. Wirth, eds, *Handbook of Media Management and Economics*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Napoli, P. & Yan, M. (2007). Media ownership regulations and local news programming on broadcast television: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(1), 39-57.
- National Conference for Community and Justice (1998). April 9-11, 1998, telephone interviews with a national adult sample of 1014. USBRUSKN.98DIVR.R1H. National Conference for Community and Justice [producer] 1998. Storrs, CT: The Roper Center [distributor]. Retrieved April 9, 2008 from <http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu>.
- Newton, G. (2001). Localism considered...and reconsidered (Doctoral dissertation, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63, 16.

- Newton, G., & Potter, R. (2000). Promotion of radio. In S. Eastman, ed, *Research in Media Promotion*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Nunn, S. (1981). Patterns of inequity: An investigation into the spatial distribution of television frequency assignments in U.S. cities and regions (Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 1981). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 2296.
- Obermiller, C. (1985). Varieties of mere exposure: The effects of processing style and repetition on affective response. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 12(1), 17-30.
- Ofori, K., Edwards, K., Thomas, V., & Flateau, J. (1997). *Blackout? Media ownership concentration and the future of black radio*. New York: Medgar Evers College Press.
- Orlick, P. (1997). *The electronic media*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Owen, B. (1975). *Economics and freedom of expression: Media structure and the First Amendment*. Cambridge: Ballinger.
- Owen, B. (2003). Regulatory reform: The Telecommunications Act of 1996 and FCC media ownership rules. Stanford Institute of Economic Policy Research discussion paper 02-31.
- Paglin, M., ed. (1989). *A legislative history of the Communications Act of 1934*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Parkman, A. (1982). The effect of television station ownership on local news ratings. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 64(2), 289-295.
- Pennybacker, J., & Braden, W. (1969). *Broadcasting and the public interest*. New York: Random House.
- Perry, S. (2001). Securing programming on live local radio: WJZ reaches rural Illinois 1929-1939. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 8(2), 347-371.

- Phipps, S. (1990). Unlicensed broadcasting in the US: The official policy of the FCC. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 34, 137-152.
- Picard, R. (1989). *Media economics*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Podber, J. (2001). Early radio in rural Appalachia: An oral history. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 8(2), 388-410.
- Polinsky, H. (2007). The factors affecting radio format diversity after the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Ownership concentration, stations, and audience. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 14 (2), 122-143.
- Powell, M. (2003). Remarks of Michael K. Powell, chairman, Federal Communications Commission at the Media Institute [as prepared for delivery], March 27. Retrieved January 29, 2008 from http://www.mediainstitute.org/Speeches/powell_speech.html.
- Prindle, G. (2003). No competition: How radio consolidation has diminished diversity and sacrificed localism. *Fordham Intellectual Property and Media Law Journal*, 14, 279-325.
- Pritchard, D. & Stonbeley, S. (2007). Racial profiling in the newsroom. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 84(2), 231-248.
- Quinn, G. (1994). Local radio news and public affairs programming: Perceptions and attitudes of Kentucky listeners (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55, 1132.
- Reed, M. & Hanson, R. (2006). Back to the future: Allegheny Mountain Radio and localism in West Virginia community radio. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 13(2), 214-231.
- Richardson, T. & Johanningmeier, E. (2006). Educational radio, childhood and philanthropy: A new role for the humanities in popular culture, 1924-1941. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 13(1), 1-18.

- Robertson, Jr., H. (1982). The suppression of pirate radio broadcasting: A test case of the international system for control of activities outside national territory. *Law & Contemporary Problems*, 45, 71-101.
- Rothenberger, C. (2004). The UHF discount: Shortchanging the public interest. *American University Law Review*, 53(689), 712-718.
- Ruggiero, G. (1999). *Microradio and democracy: (Low) power to the people*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Sauls, S. & Greer, D. (2007). Radio and localism: Has the FCC dropped the ball? *Journal of Radio Studies*, 14(1), 37-48.
- Schulman, M. (1985). Neighborhood radio as community communication (Doctoral dissertation, The Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47, 1102.
- Scroggins, D. (1981). The origins and development of public radio in Tennessee, 1949-1980 (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, 1981). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 1841.
- Siebert, F. (1965). *Freedom of the press in England, 1476-1776*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Silverman, D. & Tobenkin, D. (2001). The FCC's main studio rule: Achieving little for localism at a great cost to broadcasters. *Federal Communications Law Journal*, 53, 469-494.
- Singhapakdi, A., Kumar, R., Rao, C., & Vitell, S. (1995). Personal and professional values underlying ethical decisions. *International Marketing Review*, 12(4), 65-76.

- Siriyuvasak, U. (2002). Community radio movement: Towards reforming the broadcast media movement in Thailand. Paper by Thai scholar and activist retrieved April 27, 2007 from <http://www.wsisasia.org/materials/uajit.doc>.
- Smith, L. (2004). Consolidation and news content: How media ownership policy impacts local television news (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65, 2814.
- Soley, L. (1999). *Free radio: Electronic civil disobedience*. Boulder: Westview.
- Spavins, T., Denison, L., Roberts, S., & Frenette, J. (2002). The measurement of local television news and public affairs programs. Washington, DC: Federal Communications Commission. Retrieved April 27, 2007 from <http://www.fcc.gov>.
- Steiner, P. (1949). Workable competition in the radio broadcasting industry. Doctoral thesis, Harvard University. Retrieved October 14, 2007 from <http://books.google.com/books>.
- Sterling, C. (1997). Radio and the Telecommunications Act of 1996. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 4(1), 1-6.
- Sterling, C., & Kittross, J. (2002). *Stay tuned: A history of American broadcasting*, 3rd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Stovall, J. (2006). *Writing for the mass media*, 6th ed. Boston: Pearson.
- Sussman, G. & Estes, J. (2005). KBOO Community Radio: Organizing Portland's disorderly possibilities. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 12(2), 223-239.
- Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behavior. In S. Worchel and L. Austin, eds, *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall
- Teeter, D., & Loving, B. (2004). *Law of mass communications*, 11th ed. New York: Foundation Press.

Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L.A. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56. Retrieved April 13, 2007 from <http://www.fcc.gov/telecom.html>.

Towers, W. (1985). Perceived helpfulness of radio news and some uses and gratifications. *Communication Research Reports*, 2(1), 172-178.

Tuggle, C., Huffman, S., & Rosengard, D. (2007). Reporting live from the scene: Enough to attract the 18-24 audience? *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(1), 58-72.

Tyson, J. (1990). Paradigms of religious expression: An analysis of religious broadcasting (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51, 1831.

U.S. Census Bureau (2003). Census quick facts. Retrieved April 12, 2008 from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/47/4740000.html>.

Vick, D. (2006). Regulatory convergence? *Legal Studies*, 26 (1), 26–64. Retrieved April 15, 2008 from DOI: 10.1111/j.1748-121X.2006.00005.x.

Walker, J. (1997). With friends like these: Why community radio does not need the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Cato Policy Analysis No. 277, July 24, 1997. Retrieved May 16, 2007 from http://mediaresearchhub.ssrc.org/resource.2006-07-15.062239-1/resource_view.

Webbink, D. (1969). The impact of UHF promotion: The all-channel television receiver law. *Law & Contemporary Problems*, 34(535), 552-553.

Wheatley, J. & Brooker, G. (1994). Music and spokesperson effects on recall and cognitive response to a radio advertisement. In E. Clark, T. Brock, & D. Stewart, eds, *Attention, Attitude and Affect in Response to Advertising*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 189-204.

- Wilhelm, M. (1976). UHF and the FCC: The search for a television allocations policy. *University of Florida Law Review*, 28, 399-438.
- Williams, F. (1977). Where Citizens Go for Information. *Journal of Communication*, 27, 95-99
- Williams, G. & Roberts, S. (2002). Radio industry review 2002: Trends in ownership, format and finance. Federal Communications Commission media bureau staff research paper.
- Retrieved April 7, 2007 from <http://www.fcc.gov/mb/mbpapers.html>.
- Williams, Jr., W. (1998). The impact of ownership rules and the Telecommunications Act of 1996 on a small radio market. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 5(2), 8-18.
- Williams, Jr., W. (1976). The impact of commissioner background on FCC decisions, 1962-1975. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 20, 239-260.
- Wirth, M. (1982). The FCC's multiple ownership rules and national concentration in the commercial radio industry. *Denver Law Journal*, 60 (1), 77-104.
- Wirth, M., & Bloch, H. (1995). Industrial organization theory and media analysis. *Journal of Media Economics*, 8 (2), 15-26.
- Wright, K. B. (2005). Researching Internet-based populations: Advantages and disadvantages of online survey research, online questionnaire authoring software packages, and web survey services. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10(3), article 11.
- Retrieved June 11, 2008 from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol10/issue3/wright.html>.
- Yan, M. & Napoli, P. (2004). Market structure, station ownership, and local public affairs programming on local broadcast television. Paper presented at the Telecommunications Policy Research Conference, Arlington, Va.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Tables

Table 1. Randomization Check

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
How many years of schooling have you completed?	Between Groups	74.025	11	6.730	.452	.931
	Within Groups	4749.606	319	14.889		
	Total	4823.631	330			
On average, how many hours per week do you spend with the radio on? Don't worry if you can't remember exactly. Just take your best guess.	Between Groups	3736.552	11	339.687	.983	.461
	Within Groups	110184.481	319	345.406		
	Total	113921.033	330			
What is your ethnicity?	Between Groups	13.616	11	1.238	1.113	.350
	Within Groups	354.813	319	1.112		
	Total	368.429	330			
What is your sex?	Between Groups	2.933	11	.267	1.039	.411
	Within Groups	81.834	319	.257		
	Total	84.767	330			
How old are you?	Between Groups	4212.489	11	382.954	1.555	.111
	Within Groups	78545.155	319	246.223		
	Total	82757.644	330			
Which of the following best describes your religious affiliation?	Between Groups	83.110	11	7.555	.783	.657
	Within Groups	3030.633	314	9.652		
	Total	3113.742	325			
What is your annual income?	Between Groups	31.192	11	2.836	1.125	.341
	Within Groups	723.370	287	2.520		
	Total	754.562	298			

Table 2. Pretest Scale Reliabilities

	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items	n
Adv. Aff. Resp.	.830	5	33
Adv. Source Cred.	.844	11	33
Adv. Character	.775	6	33
Adv. Med. Cred.	.849	14	33
News Aff. Resp.	.802	5	33
News Source. Cred.	.815	11	33
News Med. Cred.	.883	14	33
Music Source Cred.	.871	11	33
Music Med. Cred.	.920	14	33
Music Aff. Resp.	.874	5	33

Table 3. Survey Conditions

Survey Condition	Advice Show	News	Music Show
1	LocLoc	NatNat1	NatLoc
2	LocLoc	NatNat2	NatLoc
3	LocLoc	NatLoc1	NatNat
4	LocLoc	NatLoc2	NatNat
5	NatLoc	NatNat1	LocLoc
6	NatLoc	NatNat2	LocLoc
7	NatLoc	LocLoc1	NatNat
8	NatLoc	LocLoc2	NatNat
9	NatNat	LocLoc1	NatLoc
10	NatNat	LocLoc2	NatLoc
11	NatNat	NatLoc1	LocLoc
12	NatNat	NatLoc2	LocLoc

Table 4. Conditions for Analysis

Collapsed Condition	Survey Condition	Audio Filename	Stimulus Name	Station	Origination
News 1	7,9	News_C	NewsLocLoc1	LPFM	Truly local
News 2	8,10	News_D	NewsLocLoc2	Locally owned #1	Truly local
News 3	3,11	News_B	NewsNatLoc1	Clear Channel	Truly local
News 4	0,4	News_A	NewsNatLoc2	Clear Channel	Reimported
News 5	1,5	News_E	NewsNatNat1	Locally owned #1	ABC News
News 6	2,6	News_F	NewsNatNat2	Clear Channel	ABC News
Advice 1	1,2,3,4	Adv_C	AdvLocLoc	LPFM	Local
Advice 2	5,6,7,8	Adv_B	AdvNatLoc	Infinity	Local
Advice 3	9,10,11,0	Adv_A	AdvNatNat	Infinity	National
Music 1	5,6,11,0	Mus_C	MusLocLoc	LPFM	Local
Music 2	1,2,9,10	Mus_B	MusNatLoc	Nat. Christian	Local
Music 3	3,4,7,8	Mus_A	MusNatNat	Nat. Christian	National

Table 5. Sample Demographics

	Knoxville Census	Sample
Male	48.7%	37.8%
Female	51.3%	61%
White	79.7%	91.2%
Black	16.2%	2.7%
Hispanic	1.6%	1.5%
Asian	1.5%	1.8%
Median Age	33.4	37.0
Mean Income	\$23,184	\$20,000-\$40,000

Table 3. Final Scale Reliabilities

	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items	n
Adv. Aff. Resp.	.799	5	331
Adv. Source Cred.	.900	11	331
Adv. Character	.739	6	331
Adv. Med. Cred.	.921	14	331
News Aff. Resp.	.863	5	331
News Source. Cred.	.889	11	331
News Med. Cred.	.932	14	331
Music Source Cred.	.913	11	331
Music Med. Cred.	.932	14	331
Music Aff. Resp.	.895	5	331
Song Aff. Resp.	.895	5	298

Table 4. Legal Advice Ownership

		Value Label	N
ADV_C	1.00	LOCLOC	104
OND	2.00	NATLOC	117

Table 5. Legal Advice Ownership

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.974	2028.232(a)	4.000	216.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.026	2028.232(a)	4.000	216.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	37.560	2028.232(a)	4.000	216.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	37.560	2028.232(a)	4.000	216.000	.000
ADV_COND	Pillai's Trace	.048	2.739(a)	4.000	216.000	.030
	Wilks' Lambda	.952	2.739(a)	4.000	216.000	.030
	Hotelling's Trace	.051	2.739(a)	4.000	216.000	.030
	Roy's Largest Root	.051	2.739(a)	4.000	216.000	.030

Table 6. Legal Advice Ownership

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	A_SC_SCALE	.413(a)	1	.413	.481	.489
	A_MC_SCALE	2.948(b)	1	2.948	3.854	.051
	A_CHAR_SCALE	.205(c)	1	.205	.177	.675
	A_AR_SCALE	.158(c)	1	.158	.115	.735
Intercept	A_SC_SCALE	5013.865	1	5013.865	5839.891	.000
	A_MC_SCALE	5254.040	1	5254.040	6869.190	.000
	A_CHAR_SCALE	4885.663	1	4885.663	4219.672	.000
	A_AR_SCALE	4829.013	1	4829.013	3508.383	.000
ADV_COND	A_SC_SCALE	.413	1	.413	.481	.489
	A_MC_SCALE	2.948	1	2.948	3.854	.051
	A_CHAR_SCALE	.205	1	.205	.177	.675
	A_AR_SCALE	.158	1	.158	.115	.735
Error	A_SC_SCALE	188.023	219	.859		
	A_MC_SCALE	167.507	219	.765		
	A_CHAR_SCALE	253.565	219	1.158		
	A_AR_SCALE	301.436	219	1.376		
Total	A_SC_SCALE	5214.339	221			
	A_MC_SCALE	5428.056	221			
	A_CHAR_SCALE	5160.130	221			
	A_AR_SCALE	5150.640	221			
Corrected Total	A_SC_SCALE	188.437	220			
	A_MC_SCALE	170.454	220			
	A_CHAR_SCALE	253.769	220			
	A_AR_SCALE	301.595	220			

a R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = -.002)

b R Squared = .017 (Adjusted R Squared = .013)

c R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.004)

Table 7. Legal Advice Origination

		Value Label	N
ADV_C	2.00	NATLOC	117
OND	3.00	NATNAT	110

Table 8. Legal Advice Origination

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.974	2087.906(a)	4.000	222.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.026	2087.906(a)	4.000	222.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	37.620	2087.906(a)	4.000	222.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	37.620	2087.906(a)	4.000	222.000	.000
ADV_COND	Pillai's Trace	.031	1.773(a)	4.000	222.000	.135
	Wilks' Lambda	.969	1.773(a)	4.000	222.000	.135
	Hotelling's Trace	.032	1.773(a)	4.000	222.000	.135
	Roy's Largest Root	.032	1.773(a)	4.000	222.000	.135

Table 9. Legal Advice Origination

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	A_SC_SCALE	.320(a)	1	.320	.360	.549
	A_MC_SCALE	2.775(b)	1	2.775	4.097	.044
	A_CHAR_SCALE	4.184(c)	1	4.184	3.501	.063
	A_AR_SCALE	.772(d)	1	.772	.574	.450
Intercept	A_SC_SCALE	4989.369	1	4989.369	5608.554	.000
	A_MC_SCALE	4920.551	1	4920.551	7266.186	.000
	A_CHAR_SCALE	4808.400	1	4808.400	4023.455	.000
	A_AR_SCALE	4905.885	1	4905.885	3646.910	.000
ADV_COND	A_SC_SCALE	.320	1	.320	.360	.549
	A_MC_SCALE	2.775	1	2.775	4.097	.044
	A_CHAR_SCALE	4.184	1	4.184	3.501	.063
	A_AR_SCALE	.772	1	.772	.574	.450
Error	A_SC_SCALE	200.160	225	.890		
	A_MC_SCALE	152.367	225	.677		
	A_CHAR_SCALE	268.896	225	1.195		
	A_AR_SCALE	302.674	225	1.345		
Total	A_SC_SCALE	5197.066	227			
	A_MC_SCALE	5087.592	227			
	A_CHAR_SCALE	5094.818	227			
	A_AR_SCALE	5217.800	227			
Corrected Total	A_SC_SCALE	200.480	226			
	A_MC_SCALE	155.141	226			
	A_CHAR_SCALE	273.080	226			
	A_AR_SCALE	303.446	226			

a R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = -.003)

b R Squared = .018 (Adjusted R Squared = .014)

c R Squared = .015 (Adjusted R Squared = .011)

d R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = -.002)

Table 10. News Ownership

		Value Label	N
NEWS_COND	1.00	LOCLOC 1	58
	2.00	LOCLOC 2	60
	3.00	NATLOC 1	51

Table 11. News Ownership

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.972	1924.052(a)	3.000	164.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.028	1924.052(a)	3.000	164.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	35.196	1924.052(a)	3.000	164.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	35.196	1924.052(a)	3.000	164.000	.000
NEWS_COND	Pillai's Trace	.021	.585	6.000	330.000	.742
	Wilks' Lambda	.979	.583(a)	6.000	328.000	.744
	Hotelling's Trace	.021	.581	6.000	326.000	.746
	Roy's Largest Root	.018	.966(b)	3.000	165.000	.410

a Exact statistic

b The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

c Design: Intercept+NEWS_COND

Table 12. News Ownership

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	N_SC_SCALE	1.470(a)	2	.735	1.055	.350
	N_MC_SCALE	.502(b)	2	.251	.301	.741
	N_AR_SCALE	.617(c)	2	.308	.226	.798
Intercept	N_SC_SCALE	3740.564	1	3740.564	5367.625	.000
	N_MC_SCALE	3991.599	1	3991.599	4782.688	.000
	N_AR_SCALE	3952.610	1	3952.610	2900.351	.000
NEWS_COND	N_SC_SCALE	1.470	2	.735	1.055	.350
	N_MC_SCALE	.502	2	.251	.301	.741
	N_AR_SCALE	.617	2	.308	.226	.798
Error	N_SC_SCALE	115.681	166	.697		
	N_MC_SCALE	138.542	166	.835		
	N_AR_SCALE	226.225	166	1.363		
Total	N_SC_SCALE	3869.785	169			
	N_MC_SCALE	4144.821	169			
	N_AR_SCALE	4199.720	169			
Corrected Total	N_SC_SCALE	117.152	168			
	N_MC_SCALE	139.044	168			
	N_AR_SCALE	226.842	168			

a R Squared = .013 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)

b R Squared = .004 (Adjusted R Squared = -.008)

c R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = -.009)

Table 13. News Origination

		Value Label	N
NEWS_COND	3.00	NATLOC 1	51
	4.00	NATLOC 2	58
	6.00	NATNAT 2	57

Table 14. News Origination

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.968	1623.960(a)	3.000	161.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.032	1623.960(a)	3.000	161.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	30.260	1623.960(a)	3.000	161.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	30.260	1623.960(a)	3.000	161.000	.000
NEWS_COND	Pillai's Trace	.084	2.361	6.000	324.000	.030
	Wilks' Lambda	.916	2.398(a)	6.000	322.000	.028
	Hotelling's Trace	.091	2.434	6.000	320.000	.026
	Roy's Largest Root	.090	4.869(b)	3.000	162.000	.003

a Exact statistic

b The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

c Design: Intercept+NEWS_COND

Table 15. News Origination

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	N_SC_SCALE	1.404(a)	2	.702	.793	.454
	N_MC_SCALE	3.942(b)	2	1.971	2.140	.121
	N_AR_SCALE	18.408(c)	2	9.204	5.852	.004
Intercept	N_SC_SCALE	3735.165	1	3735.165	4219.663	.000
	N_MC_SCALE	3938.034	1	3938.034	4275.449	.000
	N_AR_SCALE	3626.560	1	3626.560	2305.810	.000
NEWS_COND	N_SC_SCALE	1.404	2	.702	.793	.454
	N_MC_SCALE	3.942	2	1.971	2.140	.121
	N_AR_SCALE	18.408	2	9.204	5.852	.004
Error	N_SC_SCALE	144.284	163	.885		
	N_MC_SCALE	150.136	163	.921		
	N_AR_SCALE	256.365	163	1.573		
Total	N_SC_SCALE	3889.769	166			
	N_MC_SCALE	4102.306	166			
	N_AR_SCALE	3906.080	166			
Corrected Total	N_SC_SCALE	145.689	165			
	N_MC_SCALE	154.078	165			
	N_AR_SCALE	274.773	165			

a R Squared = .010 (Adjusted R Squared = -.003)

b R Squared = .026 (Adjusted R Squared = .014)

c R Squared = .067 (Adjusted R Squared = .056)

Table 16. News Reimportation

	NEWS_COND	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
N_SC_SCALE	NATLOC 1	51	4.8182	.88831	.12439
	NATLOC 2	58	4.8135	.87800	.11529
N_MC_SCALE	NATLOC 1	51	4.9468	.90732	.12705
	NATLOC 2	58	5.0209	1.01704	.13354
N_AR_SCALE	NATLOC 1	51	4.8549	1.27504	.17854
	NATLOC 2	58	4.9690	1.14113	.14984

Table 17. News Reimportation

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
N_SC	Equal variances assumed	.460	.499	.028	107	.978	.00470	.16947	-.33125	.34066
	Equal variances not assumed			.028	104.898	.978	.00470	.16960	-.33158	.34099
N_MC	Equal variances assumed	.009	.925	-.399	107	.690	-.07416	.18569	-.44226	.29395
	Equal variances not assumed			-.402	106.974	.688	-.07416	.18433	-.43956	.29125
N_AR	Equal variances assumed	1.039	.310	-.493	107	.623	-.11406	.23142	-.57283	.34470
	Equal variances not assumed			-.489	101.199	.626	-.11406	.23308	-.57643	.34830

Table 18. Music Ownership

	Value Label	N
MUS_C 1.00	LOCLOC	109
OND 2.00	NATLOC	105

Table 19. Music Ownership

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.951	1362.793(a)	3.000	210.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.049	1362.793(a)	3.000	210.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	19.468	1362.793(a)	3.000	210.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	19.468	1362.793(a)	3.000	210.000	.000
MUS_COND	Pillai's Trace	.000	.019(a)	3.000	210.000	.996
	Wilks' Lambda	1.000	.019(a)	3.000	210.000	.996
	Hotelling's Trace	.000	.019(a)	3.000	210.000	.996
	Roy's Largest Root	.000	.019(a)	3.000	210.000	.996

Table 20. Music Ownership

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	M_SC_SCALE	.049(a)	1	.049	.046	.831
	M_MC_SCALE	.039(a)	1	.039	.034	.854
	M_AR_SCALE	.009(a)	1	.009	.003	.953
Intercept	M_SC_SCALE	3879.361	1	3879.361	3611.840	.000
	M_MC_SCALE	3874.495	1	3874.495	3316.691	.000
	M_AR_SCALE	2859.325	1	2859.325	1106.085	.000
MUS_COND	M_SC_SCALE	.049	1	.049	.046	.831
	M_MC_SCALE	.039	1	.039	.034	.854
	M_AR_SCALE	.009	1	.009	.003	.953
Error	M_SC_SCALE	227.702	212	1.074		
	M_MC_SCALE	247.654	212	1.168		
	M_AR_SCALE	548.038	212	2.585		
Total	M_SC_SCALE	4108.983	214			
	M_MC_SCALE	4124.005	214			
	M_AR_SCALE	3408.560	214			
Corrected Total	M_SC_SCALE	227.751	213			
	M_MC_SCALE	247.694	213			
	M_AR_SCALE	548.047	213			

a. R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = -.005)

Table 21. Music Origination

		Value Label	N
MUS_C	2.00	NATLOC	105
OND	3.00	NATNAT	117

Table 22. Music Origination

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.949	1345.604(a)	3.000	218.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.051	1345.604(a)	3.000	218.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	18.517	1345.604(a)	3.000	218.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	18.517	1345.604(a)	3.000	218.000	.000
MUS_COND	Pillai's Trace	.002	.171(a)	3.000	218.000	.916
	Wilks' Lambda	.998	.171(a)	3.000	218.000	.916
	Hotelling's Trace	.002	.171(a)	3.000	218.000	.916
	Roy's Largest Root	.002	.171(a)	3.000	218.000	.916

Table 23. Music Origination

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	M_SC_SCALE	.003(a)	1	.003	.002	.961
	M_MC_SCALE	.230(b)	1	.230	.191	.663
	M_AR_SCALE	.004(a)	1	.004	.002	.969
Intercept	M_SC_SCALE	3992.032	1	3992.032	3696.942	.000
	M_MC_SCALE	3923.097	1	3923.097	3245.151	.000
	M_AR_SCALE	2941.323	1	2941.323	1105.863	.000
MUS_COND	M_SC_SCALE	.003	1	.003	.002	.961
	M_MC_SCALE	.230	1	.230	.191	.663
	M_AR_SCALE	.004	1	.004	.002	.969
Error	M_SC_SCALE	237.560	220	1.080		
	M_MC_SCALE	265.960	220	1.209		
	M_AR_SCALE	585.146	220	2.660		
Total	M_SC_SCALE	4241.645	222			
	M_MC_SCALE	4197.526	222			
	M_AR_SCALE	3534.720	222			
Corrected Total	M_SC_SCALE	237.563	221			
	M_MC_SCALE	266.191	221			
	M_AR_SCALE	585.150	221			

a R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = -.005)

b R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.004)

Table 24. Stepwise Regression: Local Origination Preference

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	On religion : Please place your ideology on the scale from "Liberal" to "Conservative"		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	How old are you?		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a Dependent Variable: I prefer that the people I hear on the radio be from Knoxville. : Please respond to the following statements about radio listening, placing your answers on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

Table 25. Stepwise Regression: Local Origination Preference

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.150(a)	.023	.019	1.792
2	.192(b)	.037	.030	1.782
3	.224(c)	.050	.040	1.773

a Predictors: (Constant), On religion : Please place your ideology on the scale from "Liberal" to "Conservative"

b Predictors: (Constant), On religion : Please place your ideology on the scale from "Liberal" to "Conservative", How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?

c Predictors: (Constant), On religion : Please place your ideology on the scale from "Liberal" to "Conservative", How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?, How old are you?

Table 26. Stepwise Regression: Local Origination Preference

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	22.076	1	22.076	6.871	.009(a)
	Residual	954.225	297	3.213		
	Total	976.301	298			
2	Regression	36.016	2	18.008	5.669	.004(b)
	Residual	940.285	296	3.177		
	Total	976.301	298			
3	Regression	48.861	3	16.287	5.181	.002(c)
	Residual	927.440	295	3.144		
	Total	976.301	298			

a Predictors: (Constant), On religion : Please place your ideology on the scale from "Liberal" to "Conservative"

b Predictors: (Constant), On religion : Please place your ideology on the scale from "Liberal" to "Conservative", How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?

c Predictors: (Constant), On religion : Please place your ideology on the scale from "Liberal" to "Conservative", How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?, How old are you?

d Dependent Variable: I prefer that the people I hear on the radio be from Knoxville. : Please respond to the following statements about radio listening, placing your answers on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

Table 27. Stepwise Regression: Awareness of Locality

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1			Stepwise (Criteria: Probability- of-F-to- enter <= .050, Probability- of-F-to- remove >= .100).
	How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?		
2			Stepwise (Criteria: Probability- of-F-to- enter <= .050, Probability- of-F-to- remove >= .100).
	values		
3			Stepwise (Criteria: Probability- of-F-to- enter <= .050, Probability- of-F-to- remove >= .100).
	What is your sex?		

a Dependent Variable: I am generally aware of the locality of people on the radio. : Please respond to the following statements about radio listening, placing your answers on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

Table 28. Stepwise Regression: Awareness of Locality

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.237(a)	.056	.053	1.569
2	.272(b)	.074	.068	1.556
3	.294(c)	.087	.077	1.548

a Predictors: (Constant), How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?

b Predictors: (Constant), How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?, values

c Predictors: (Constant), How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?, values, What is your sex?

Table 29. Stepwise Regression: Awareness of Locality

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	42.743	1	42.743	17.369	.000(a)
	Residual	721.040	293	2.461		
	Total	763.783	294			
2	Regression	56.602	2	28.301	11.686	.000(b)
	Residual	707.181	292	2.422		
	Total	763.783	294			
3	Regression	66.183	3	22.061	9.203	.000(c)
	Residual	697.600	291	2.397		
	Total	763.783	294			

a Predictors: (Constant), How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?

b Predictors: (Constant), How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?, values

c Predictors: (Constant), How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?, values, What is your sex?

d Dependent Variable: I am generally aware of the locality of people on the radio. : Please respond to the following statements about radio listening, placing your answers on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

Table 30. Standard (Enter) Regression: Don't Care Who Owns

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16.835	6	2.806	.758	.603(a)
	Residual	1080.777	292	3.701		
	Total	1097.612	298			

a Predictors: (Constant), VALUES, What is your annual income?, On religion : Please place your ideology on the scale from "Liberal" to "Conservative", How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?, What is your ethnicity?, How old are you?

b Dependent Variable: I don't care who owns the radio stations I listen to. : Please respond to the following statements about radio listening, placing your answers on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

Table 31. Standard (Enter) Regression: Don't Care Who Owns

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.693	.998		3.701	.000
	How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?	-.067	.084	-.048	-.800	.424
	What is your annual income?	.035	.075	.029	.472	.638
	What is your ethnicity?	.041	.109	.022	.380	.704
	How old are you?	-.010	.010	-.062	-.969	.333
	On religion : Please place your ideology on the scale from "Liberal" to "Conservative"	-.028	.051	-.032	-.549	.583
	VALUES	.192	.142	.079	1.358	.175

a. Dependent Variable: I don't care who owns the radio stations I listen to. : Please respond to the following statements about radio listening, placing your answers on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

Table 35. Truly Local vs. National/National Legal Advice Show

		Value Label	N
ADV_C	1.00	LOCLOC	104
OND	3.00	NATNAT	110

Table 36. Truly Local vs. National/National Legal Advice Show

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.973	2557.044(a)	3.000	210.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.027	2557.044(a)	3.000	210.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	36.529	2557.044(a)	3.000	210.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	36.529	2557.044(a)	3.000	210.000	.000
ADV_COND	Pillai's Trace	.082	6.240(a)	3.000	210.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.918	6.240(a)	3.000	210.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	.089	6.240(a)	3.000	210.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	.089	6.240(a)	3.000	210.000	.000

a Exact statistic

b Design: Intercept+ADV_COND

Table 37. Truly Local vs. National/National Legal Advice Show

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	A_SC_SCALE	1.399(a)	1	1.399	1.446	.231
	A_MC_SCALE	10.951(b)	1	10.951	15.161	.000
	A_AR_SCALE	.212(c)	1	.212	.149	.700
Intercept	A_SC_SCALE	4791.704	1	4791.704	4949.894	.000
	A_MC_SCALE	4872.846	1	4872.846	6746.394	.000
	A_AR_SCALE	4572.509	1	4572.509	3196.813	.000
ADV_COND	A_SC_SCALE	1.399	1	1.399	1.446	.231
	A_MC_SCALE	10.951	1	10.951	15.161	.000
	A_AR_SCALE	.212	1	.212	.149	.700
Error	A_SC_SCALE	205.225	212	.968		
	A_MC_SCALE	153.125	212	.722		
	A_AR_SCALE	303.231	212	1.430		
Total	A_SC_SCALE	4997.504	214			
	A_MC_SCALE	5027.801	214			
	A_AR_SCALE	4877.800	214			
Corrected Total	A_SC_SCALE	206.624	213			
	A_MC_SCALE	164.076	213			
	A_AR_SCALE	303.443	213			

a R Squared = .007 (Adjusted R Squared = .002)

b R Squared = .067 (Adjusted R Squared = .062)

c R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.004)

Table 38. Truly Local vs. National/National Newscast

	Value Label	N
NEWS_COND	1.00	58
	6.00	57

Table 39. Truly Local vs. National/National Newscast

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.968	1112.873(a)	3.000	111.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.032	1112.873(a)	3.000	111.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	30.078	1112.873(a)	3.000	111.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	30.078	1112.873(a)	3.000	111.000	.000
NEWS_COND	Pillai's Trace	.085	3.433(a)	3.000	111.000	.019
	Wilks' Lambda	.915	3.433(a)	3.000	111.000	.019
	Hotelling's Trace	.093	3.433(a)	3.000	111.000	.019
	Roy's Largest Root	.093	3.433(a)	3.000	111.000	.019

a Exact statistic

b Design: Intercept+NEWS_COND

Table 40. Truly Local vs. National/National Newscast

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	N_SC_SCALE	.028(a)	1	.028	.030	.862
	N_MC_SCALE	.603(b)	1	.603	.700	.405
	N_AR_SCALE	8.739(c)	1	8.739	5.833	.017
Intercept	N_SC_SCALE	2440.054	1	2440.054	2654.994	.000
	N_MC_SCALE	2583.975	1	2583.975	2997.170	.000
	N_AR_SCALE	2325.194	1	2325.194	1552.047	.000
NEWS_COND	N_SC_SCALE	.028	1	.028	.030	.862
	N_MC_SCALE	.603	1	.603	.700	.405
	N_AR_SCALE	8.739	1	8.739	5.833	.017
Error	N_SC_SCALE	103.852	113	.919		
	N_MC_SCALE	97.422	113	.862		
	N_AR_SCALE	169.291	113	1.498		
Total	N_SC_SCALE	2543.975	115			
	N_MC_SCALE	2682.883	115			
	N_AR_SCALE	2505.880	115			
Corrected Total	N_SC_SCALE	103.880	114			
	N_MC_SCALE	98.025	114			
	N_AR_SCALE	178.030	114			

a R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = -.009)

b R Squared = .006 (Adjusted R Squared = -.003)

c R Squared = .049 (Adjusted R Squared = .041)

Table 41. Local Full-Power vs. LPFM – each with same truly local script

	NEWS_COND	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
N_SC_SCALE	LOCLOC 1	58	4.5909	.86818	.11400
	LOCLOC 2	60	4.7394	.75086	.09694
N_MC_SCALE	LOCLOC 1	58	4.8128	.91197	.11975
	LOCLOC 2	60	4.8560	.92034	.11882
N_AR_SCALE	LOCLOC 1	58	4.7724	1.09573	.14388
	LOCLOC 2	60	4.9167	1.13871	.14701

Table 42. Local Full-Power vs. LPFM – each with same truly local script

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
N_SC_SCALE	Equal variances assumed	.827	.365	-.995	116	.322	-.14848	.14927	-.44414	.14717
	Equal variances not assumed			-.992	112.438	.323	-.14848	.14964	-.44496	.14799
N_MC_SCALE	Equal variances assumed	.022	.882	-.256	116	.799	-.04314	.16872	-.37731	.29102
	Equal variances not assumed			-.256	115.927	.799	-.04314	.16869	-.37726	.29097
N_AR_SCALE	Equal variances assumed	.494	.484	-.701	116	.485	-.14425	.20583	-.55193	.26343
	Equal variances not assumed			-.701	115.998	.485	-.14425	.20570	-.55166	.26316

Table 43. Local Full-Power vs. Local Clear Channel Newscast

	NEWS_COND	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
N_SC_SCALE	LOCLOC 1	58	4.5909	.86818	.11400
	LOCLOC 2	60	4.7394	.75086	.09694
N_MC_SCALE	LOCLOC 1	58	4.8128	.91197	.11975
	LOCLOC 2	60	4.8560	.92034	.11882
N_AR_SCALE	LOCLOC 1	58	4.7724	1.09573	.14388
	LOCLOC 2	60	4.9167	1.13871	.14701

Table 44. Local Full-Power vs. Local Clear Channel Newscast

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
N_SC_SCALE	Equal variances assumed	.827	.365	-.995	116	.322	-.14848	.14927	-.44414	.14717
	Equal variances not assumed			-.992	112.438	.323	-.14848	.14964	-.44496	.14799
N_MC_SCALE	Equal variances assumed	.022	.882	-.256	116	.799	-.04314	.16872	-.37731	.29102
	Equal variances not assumed			-.256	115.927	.799	-.04314	.16869	-.37726	.29097
N_AR_SCALE	Equal variances assumed	.494	.484	-.701	116	.485	-.14425	.20583	-.55193	.26343
	Equal variances not assumed			-.701	115.998	.485	-.14425	.20570	-.55166	.26316

Table 45. Locally Owned Full-Power vs. Clear Channel 2x2 Ownership/Origination

		N
NewsOwnership	1.00	107
	2.00	108
NewsLocality	1.00	111
	2.00	104

Table 46. Locally Owned Full-Power vs. Clear Channel 2x2 Ownership/Origination

Dependent Variable: N_AR_SCALE

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	19.310(a)	3	6.437	4.374	.005
Intercept	4506.894	1	4506.894	3062.424	.000
NewsOwnership	.799	1	.799	.543	.462
NewsLocality	17.497	1	17.497	11.889	.001
NewsOwnership * NewsLocality	.196	1	.196	.133	.715
Error	310.523	211	1.472		
Total	4890.280	215			
Corrected Total	329.833	214			

a. R Squared = .059 (Adjusted R Squared = .045)

Table 47. Song Affective Response

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.382	2	.191	.071	.932
Within Groups	883.688	328	2.694		
Total	884.069	330			

Appendix B – Scripts

Legal Advice Show

BOB: This is WAGU 96-point-three-F-M – Knoxville’s best choice for information you can use – An Infinity-Viacom

BOB: This is WAGU-LP – 96-point-three-F-M – listener-supported community radio in Knoxville, Tennessee – a service of the Knoxville Education Alliance

Welcome back to Legal Matters – the legal advice show in which...you....choose the topics.

My name is Bob Jackson – I've been a practicing attorney for 17 years, and I'm here to answer whatever legal questions are on your mind.

Let's go to the phones at 335-0215 -- our first question this hour comes from Roger in Alcoa – Hi Roger, you're on Legal Matters....

ROGER: Hi Bob, I enjoy your show.

BOB: Thanks, Roger. What's up?

ROGER: Well, I just got married last fall, and I have a problem with what I thought was a very nice wedding gift – uh – that I'm really wishing now I didn't receive at all...

BOB: This doesn't sound good!

ROGER: No, it's not. What happened is my mother-in-law deeded my wife and me a tract of land that was in the family for several generations, and we were thinking we might build on it at some point, even though we can't afford it yet.

BOB: I don't like where this is going.

ROGER: Well, you probably figured it out before I even said it – but it turns out the IRS got wind of our lovely wedding gift, and now we owe 23-thousand dollars in taxes that we can't possibly pay without mortgaging our first born.

BOB: Roger, that's a tough one! Must be some pretty expensive land – either that or a lot of it, because that's a pretty big hit from the Gift Tax!

ROGER: Well it's about six acres, and it's down near the airport where a lot of developers are moving in...

BOB: Not a bad thing if you can afford to pay the taxes..

ROGER: Yeah, but I'm wondering if we can deed it back to my mother-in-law...

BOB: No no, Roger, don't do that – not yet, anyway – it opens a whole new can of worms. Look... we're getting into an area of tax law that can be really tricky, and if you get it wrong the consequences could be very bad.

ROGER: Yeah, that's what I'm afraid of!

BOB: I don't blame you, Roger. It's too bad nobody told your mother-in-law she could have vested the gift over several years and avoided this kind of one-time tax hit -- but that's water under the bridge now. Listen, there are two things you need to do right away: First, talk to a CPA, because this is a very complicated area of tax law, and you need to do a lot better than calling a radio show to deal with it, OK? If you need me to recommend a CPA in Alcoa, I'd be happy to put you in touch with an old friend of mine who knows a lot more about this stuff than I do – so make sure I get your email address off the air.

ROGER: I appreciate that, Bob.

BOB: Secondly, contact the attorney who handled the deed-transfer from your mother-in-law and find out what your options are from that end. There are several factors that can affect things pretty dramatically, so I'd recommend that you be proactive, find out everything you can, and be sure to keep very good records of everything. OK, Roger?

ROGER: I appreciate it, Bob.

BOB: And call me back, and let me know how this turns out for you.

ROGER: I'll do it, Bob. Thanks.

BOB: Thanks for your call.

Boy, that's a tough situation, and I'd urge anybody to be very careful with big gifts. It may be a good problem to have that much land, but it certainly is a problem from a tax standpoint.

We have some helpful links on my website that might be good for Roger and anyone else in a similar situation.....that's Legal....matters...dot net, and click on "tax law".

You're listening to Legal Matters – I'm Bob Jackson on WAGU-LP – 96-point-three-F-M – listener-supported community radio in Knoxville, Tennessee – a service of the Knoxville Education Alliance

We go next to Martha – with a question about wills -- Hi, you're on legal matters...

[IT FADES OUT HERE]

[ALTERNATE ENDING]:

You're listening to Legal Matters – I'm Bob Jackson on WAGU – 96-point-three-F-M – Knoxville's best choice for information you can use – An Infinity-Viacom

We go next to Martha – with a question about wills -- Hi, you're on legal matters...

[NATIONAL VERSION]

BOB: Welcome back to Legal Matters – the legal advice show in which...you....choose the topics.

My name is Bob Jackson – I've been a practicing attorney for 17 years, and I'm here to answer whatever legal questions are on your mind.

Let's go to the phones at 1-800-LEGAL-U-S -- our first question this hour comes from Roger in St Louis – Hi Roger, you're on Legal Matters....

ROGER: Hi Bob, I enjoy your show.

BOB: Thanks, Roger. What's up?

ROGER: Well, I just got married last fall, and I have a problem with what I thought was a very nice wedding gift – uh – that I'm really wishing now I didn't receive at all...

BOB: This doesn't sound good!

ROGER: No, it's not. What happened is my mother-in-law deeded my wife and me a tract of land that was in the family for several generations, and we were thinking we might build on it at some point, even though we can't afford it yet.

BOB: I don't like where this is going.

ROGER: Well, you probably figured it out before I even said it – but it turns out the IRS got wind of our lovely wedding gift, and now we owe 23-thousand dollars in taxes that we can't possibly pay without mortgaging our first born.

BOB: Roger, that's a tough one! Must be some pretty expensive land – either that or a lot of it, because that's a pretty big hit from the Gift Tax!

ROGER: Well it's about six acres, and it's out near the airport where a lot of developers are moving in...

BOB: Not a bad thing if you can afford to pay the taxes..

ROGER: Yeah, but I'm wondering if we can deed it back to my mother-in-law...

BOB: No no, Roger, don't do that – not yet, anyway – it opens a whole new can of worms. Look... we're getting into an area of tax law that can be really tricky, and if you get it wrong the consequences could be very bad.

ROGER: Yeah, that's what I'm afraid of!

BOB: I don't blame you, Roger. It's too bad nobody told your mother-in-law she could have vested the gift over several years and avoided this kind of one-time tax hit -- but that's water under the bridge now. Listen, there are two things you need to do right away: First, talk to a CPA, because this is a very complicated area of tax law, and you need to do a lot better than

calling a radio show to deal with it, OK? If you don't already know a CPA, there are some good resources online where you can find listings for people in your area – and we have links to those listings on our website – so do check that out....

ROGER: I appreciate that, Bob.

BOB: Secondly, contact the attorney who handled the deed-transfer from your mother-in-law and find out what your options are from that end. There are several factors that can affect things pretty dramatically, so I'd recommend that you be proactive, find out everything you can, and be sure to keep very good records of everything. OK, Roger?

ROGER: I appreciate it, Bob.

BOB: And call me back, and let me know how this turns out for you.

ROGER: I'll do it, Bob. Thanks.

BOB: Thanks for your call.

Boy, that's a tough situation, and I'd urge anybody to be very careful with big gifts. It may be a good problem to have that much land, but it certainly is a problem from a tax standpoint.

We have some helpful links on my website that might be good for Roger and anyone else in a similar situation.....that's Legal....matters...dot net, and click on "tax law".

You're listening to Legal Matters – I'm Bob Jackson in Los Angeles – Coming to you on this Infinity-Viacom station ...We go next to Martha – with a question about wills.....Hi, you're on legal matters...

[IT FADES OUT HERE]

Newscast

[REIMPORTED VERSION]

This is Newsradio 1300, WULY – Knoxville’s number one source for news and information – locally owned and serving Knox County for 54 years. With a look at this hour’s top stories, I’m Greg Hampton.

Police are looking for a man they say has robbed at least four Tennessee banks in the last week. Investigators believe the same man who hit two BB&T branches in Knoxville yesterday also robbed a bank in the Knoxville suburb of Mary-ville, last Friday -- and one in nearby Sevierville a day earlier. The man is described as white – about six feet tall – wearing a red ski-mask and walking with limp. Police say the man did not speak during the robberies – handing the tellers a note demanding money. If you know anything about the cases, call the Tennessee Bureau of Investigation, at 1-800-834-9799.

President Bush is on the road this week – making his case for the continuation of his tax cuts. The president will visit three southern states tomorrow – touring a homeless shelter in Chattanooga, Tennessee and hearing from local faith-based agencies serving the poor there. He’ll then fly to Raleigh, North Carolina to address religious leaders – and end the day at a republican fundraising dinner in Columbia, South Carolina. The president says his tax cuts are the quickest way to stimulate growth and maintain what he calls a “fundamentally sound” economy.

And taking a look at the upcoming events calendar: The Tennessee Red Cross says there’s a shortage of type oh-negative blood statewide – and is holding a series of blood drives tomorrow. To find the location nearest you, go to Tennessee-Red-Cross-dot-org.

If your organization is planning an event you’d like us to announce, call our toll-free events line: 1-800-873-8499 – or send us your announcement by mail to P.O. Box 1933, Nashville, Tennessee, 36912.

That’s the news – I’m Greg Hampton for Newsradio 1300, WULY – Knoxville’s number one source for news and information – locally owned and serving Knox County for 54 years.

This is Newsradio 1530, WBEL – Knoxville’s number-one source for news and information – a service of Clear Channel Worldwide. With a look at this hour’s top stories, I’m Greg Hampton.

That’s the news – I’m Greg Hampton for Newsradio 1530, WBEL – Knoxville’s number-one source for news and information – a service of Clear Channel Worldwide.

[TRULY LOCAL VERSION]

This is WYMC-LP – Listener supported community radio in Knoxville – a service of the Knox Community Action League. With a look at the latest news, I’m Greg Hampton.

For the sixth time since he took office, President Bush is coming to the Volunteer State tomorrow. He’ll visit a homeless shelter in Chattanooga and hear from local faith-based agencies serving the poor – as he makes his case for the continuation of his tax cuts. Some Knoxville republicans will be part of a delegation greeting the president when Air Force One arrives. Bush says his plan for across-the-board tax cuts is the quickest way to stimulate growth and maintain what he calls a “fundamentally sound” economy. Bush’s trip to East Tennessee will be part of a three-state whirlwind tour.

Police are looking for a man they say has robbed at least four area banks in the last week. Investigators believe the same man who hit two BB&T branches on Kingston Pike in West Knoxville yesterday also robbed a bank in Maryville (pronounced like Louisville – MARA-vul) last Friday -- and one in Sevierville (regular “ville” pronunciation) a day earlier. The man is described as white – about six feet tall – wearing a red ski-mask and walking with limp. Police say the man did not speak during the robberies – handing the tellers a note demanding money. If you know anything about the cases, call the Knox County Sheriff’s Office at 334-2791.

And taking a look at the upcoming events calendar: The Knox County Red Cross says there’s a shortage of type oh-negative blood – and will be holding a blood drive tomorrow from 8:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. in the gym at West High School. Call 974-2213 to make an appointment.

If your organization is planning an event you’d like us to announce, call 861-1341, or drop it by our studios on the third floor of the Lee Building on Gay Street in Downtown Knoxville. [Yes, Andrew, Knoxville really does have a “Gay” street. Please don’t giggle when you say it!]

That’s the news – I’m Greg Hampton for WYMC-LP – Listener-supported community radio in Knoxville – a service of the Knox Community Action League.

[NATIONAL VERSION]

From ABC News in New York – I’m Greg Hampton.

President Bush is on the road this week – making his case for the continuation of his tax cuts. The president visiting three western states today – touring a homeless shelter in Cheyenne, Wyoming and hearing from local faith-based agencies serving the poor there. Then it’s on to Butte, Montana for an address to religious leaders before ending the day at a republican fundraising dinner in Denver, Colorado. The president says his tax cuts are the quickest way to stimulate growth and maintain what he calls a “fundamentally sound” economy.

Police are looking for a man they say has robbed at least ten midwestern banks in the last week. Investigators believe the same man who hit several banks in the Cincinnati area yesterday also robbed a bank in the Chicago suburb of Downers Grove last Friday -- and three in nearby Gary,

Indiana a day earlier. The man is described as white – about six feet tall – wearing a red ski-mask and walking with limp. Police say the man did not speak during the robberies – handing the tellers a note demanding money. If you know anything about the cases, the FBI is asking you to call their tip line, at 1-800-834-9799.

The American Red Cross says there's a shortage of type oh-negative blood nationwide – and is holding a series of blood drives across the country tomorrow. To find the location nearest you, go to American-Red-Cross-dot-org.

ABC News is always available online at [ABC News-dot-com](http://ABC-News-dot-com). You can subscribe to podcasts of all of our news programs – and get the latest schedules of what's coming up. You can also read more about the top stories of the day.

I'm Greg Hampton – and this is ABC news.

Christian Music Show

Knoxville's Family-Friendly Christian radio – 104-point-one W-J-L-I—L-P – The Light – A locally-owned non-profit ministry supported by your donations.

I'm Sherry Fredrick, and this show is called New Light – bringing you tomorrow's top Christian artists....today. We all know there's a lot of music on the dial you can choose from -- but here at the Light, we're proud to play the music that inspires – spreads good news – and gets us all closer to the One...True...Light. If you'd like to help us in our ministry, call us at 335-0104, or send us an email – the address is Donate-at-the-light-dot-org.

I first discovered this next song through a friend of a friend who knows the artist – and last week I had a chance to hear it performed live at my church in North Knoxville. The singer's name is Angela Johnson – she hails from Jefferson City, and – if you ask me – she's headed straight to the top of the Christian charts with this song. It has a message that'll touch a lot of people. It's Angela Johnson – “Who Are We” – on Knoxville's Family Friendly Christian Radio – 104-point-one- W-J-L-I—L-P – The Light.

Knoxville's Family-Friendly Christian radio – 104-point-one W-J-L-I – The Light – Part of the National Ministries Corporation.

I'm Sherry Fredrick, and this show is called New Light – bringing you tomorrow's top Christian artists....today. We all know there's a lot of music on the dial you can choose from -- but here at the Light, we're proud to play the music that inspires – spreads good news – and gets us all closer to the One...True...Light. If you'd like to help us in our ministry, call us at 335-0104, or send us an email – the address is Donate-at-the-light-dot-net.

I first discovered this next song through a friend of a friend who knows the artist – and last week I had a chance to hear it performed live at my church on North Knoxville. The singer's name is Angela Johnson – she hails from Jefferson City, and – if you ask me – she's headed straight to the top of the Christian charts with this song. It has a message that'll touch a lot of people. It's Angela Johnson – “Who Are We” – on Knoxville's Family Friendly Christian Radio – 104-point-one- W-J-L-I – The Light – Part of the National Ministries Corporation.

Now back to New Light – live from the National Ministries Corporation Headquarters in San Antonio Texas ---on Knoxville's Family-Friendly Christian radio – 104-point-one W-J-L-I – The Light –

I'm Sherry Fredrick, and this show is called New Light – bringing you tomorrow's top Christian artists....today. We all know there's a lot of music on the dial you can choose from -- but here at the Light, we're proud to play the music that inspires – spreads good news – and gets us all closer to the One...True...Light. If you'd like to help us in our ministry, call us at 800-973-0013, or send us an email – the address is Donate-at-new-light-dot-net.

I first discovered this next song through a friend of a friend who knows the artist – and last week I had a chance to hear it performed live at my church here in San Antonio. The singer's name is Angela Johnson – she hails from Oklahoma City, and – if you ask me – she's headed straight to the top of the Christian charts with this song. It has a message that'll touch a lot of people. It's Angela Johnson – “Who Are We” – on New Light –From the National Ministries Corporation.

Appendix C – Survey Instrument

Consent

Consent statement:

The purpose of this study is to determine your responses to three radio program excerpts and to find out about your radio listening habits. It should take about 25 minutes to complete. If you have questions about the survey, feel free to send an email to ghubbard@utk.edu. In addition, you may contact the University of Tennessee Office of Research at (865) 974-3466 with any questions or concerns.

- **I understand that there are no foreseeable risks involved with my participation in this research study.**
- **I understand that all information I provide will be held completely confidential.**
- **I realize I am free to withdraw my consent and to withdraw from this study at any time without negative consequences.**
- **I reserve the right to leave blank any questions I prefer not to answer.**
- **I understand that my completion of this online survey implies my consent for researchers at the University of Tennessee to use the information I provide.**
- **I am at least 18 years of age.**

Having read and understood the above, do you give your consent to participate in this study?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Test_sound

Thank you for participating in this study. In a moment we'll ask you to listen to radio program excerpts and answer some questions about them, but first let's test the sound and make sure you can hear it clearly. If you have headphones or earbuds, we would prefer that you use them. Otherwise, your speakers will be fine. Please press the "play" button on the audio file linked below.



What song did you hear?

- ☐ Mary Had a Little Lamb
☐ Amazing Grace
☐ Star Spangled Banner
☐ Take Me Out To The Ballgame

Test_UNCLEAR

It appears that your sound is not working properly. Please adjust the volume and try it again.

- ☐ Go back to the test sound
☐ Leave the study

Now we are ready to begin. You will start by hearing an excerpt, roughly four minutes in length, from a radio legal advice show. The program was created especially for this study, and its host will not be familiar to you. However, we ask that you evaluate the program and answer questions about it as if you had actually heard it on the radio in Knoxville. Keep in mind, there are no right or wrong answers. We request that you listen to the excerpt in its entirety only once, although you may play it again if for some reason you miss part of it. Click "next" to proceed to the first excerpt.

Click the "play" button to start the first radio program excerpt. When you are finished listening to the excerpt, click the "next" button at the bottom of this window.



ADV_HEAR_CLEARLY

Were you able to hear the excerpt clearly?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

A_UNCLEAR

You indicated that you were unable to hear the excerpt clearly. Did you hear it clearly enough to answer some questions about it, or would you like to hear the excerpt again?

- ☐ Answer questions
☐ Hear it again

A_AR

Please consider the following descriptions of the excerpt as a whole, placing your reactions on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree":

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
I thought it was good.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I thought it was boring.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
This is the kind of radio I listen to.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I found it unpleasant.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I wish I could hear more of this.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

A_SC

Please place your reaction to Bob Jackson, the host of the program you just heard, on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
I respect his opinion on legal questions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
He is NOT of very high intelligence.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
He is a reliable source of information on legal questions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I have confidence in him.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
He lacks information on legal questions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
He has high status in our society.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I would consider him an expert on legal questions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
His opinion on legal questions is of little value.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I believe that he is quite intelligent.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
He is an unreliable source of information on legal questions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Few people are as qualified to speak on legal questions as Bob Jackson.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

A_C

Continuing to think about Bob Jackson, the radio show host in the excerpt, please rate your opinion of him as a person.

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
He is basically honest.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I would consider it desirable to be like Bob Jackson.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
He is a reputable person.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I trust him to tell the truth about the topic.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Under most circumstances I would be likely to believe what he says about the topic.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I would like to have Bob Jackson as a personal friend.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Now, please turn your attention the radio station from which it sounded like the excerpt originated. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about the station.

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
Tells the whole story	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is biased	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is fair	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is accurate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Invades people's privacy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is concerned about the public interest	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Watches after listeners' interests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is concerned about community's well-being	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Separates fact from opinion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Can be trusted	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is factual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is concerned about making profits	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Has well-trained DJs and reporters	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is opinionated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

You have completed part one of the study. The next excerpt will be about two minutes long and will consist of a radio newscast. As with the previous excerpt, please listen to it completely and answer the questions as if you heard it on the radio in Knoxville.

Click "next" to proceed to the newscast.

Click the "play" button to start the next radio program excerpt. It may take a few seconds for the program to start after you hit "play". When you are finished listening to the excerpt, click the "next" button at the bottom of this window.



NEWS_HEAR_CLEARLY

Were you able to hear the excerpt clearly?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

N_UNCLEAR

You indicated that you were unable to hear the excerpt clearly. Did you hear it clearly enough to answer some questions about it, or would you like to hear the excerpt again?

- ☐ Answer questions
☐ Hear it again

N_SC

Please place your reaction to Greg Hampton, the newscaster in the excerpt you just heard, on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
He is NOT of very high intelligence.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
He is a reliable source of information on news items.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
He lacks information on news items.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I respect his opinion on news.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I have confidence in him.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
He has high status in our society.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I would consider him an expert on news.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I believe that he is quite intelligent.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
His opinion on news is of little value.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
He is an unreliable source of information on news stories.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Few people are as qualified to deliver the news as Greg Hampton.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

N_AR

Please consider the following descriptions of the excerpt as a whole, placing your reactions on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree":

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
I thought it was boring.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I thought it was good.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
This is the kind of radio I listen to.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I wish I could hear more of this.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I found it unpleasant.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Now, please turn your attention the radio station from which it sounded like the excerpt originated. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about the station.

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
Is biased	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is accurate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is fair	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tells the whole story	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Invades people's privacy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is concerned about community's well-being	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Watches after listeners' interests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is concerned about the public interest	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Can be trusted	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Separates fact from opinion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is factual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is concerned about making profits	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Has well-trained reporters	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is opinionated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

You have completed part two. The final excerpt in this study is a portion of a Christian music radio show. After hearing it in its entirety, please answer the questions as if you heard the program on the radio in Knoxville.

Click "next" when you are ready to proceed to part three and hear the final excerpt.

Click the "play" button to start the final radio program excerpt. When you are finished listening to the excerpt, click the "next" button at the bottom of this window.



M_HEAR_CLEARLY

Were you able to hear the excerpt clearly?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

M_UNCLEAR

You indicated that you were unable to hear the excerpt clearly. Did you hear it clearly enough to answer some questions about it, or would you like to hear the excerpt again?

- ☐ Answer questions
☐ Hear it again

SONG_RESPONSE

Specifically thinking about the song you just heard a portion of, please place your reactions on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree":

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
I thought it was boring.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
This is the kind of music I listen to.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I thought it was good.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I wish I could hear more of this song.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I found it unpleasant.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

M_SC

Please place your reaction to Sherry Fredrick, the host of the program you just heard, on the scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
I respect her opinion on Christian music.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
She is a reliable source of information on Christian music.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
She is not of very high intelligence.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
She lacks information on Christian music.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I have confidence in her.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
She has high status in our society.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Her opinion on Christian music is of little value	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I believe that she is quite intelligent.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I would consider her an expert on Christian music.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Few people are as qualified to speak on Christian music as Sherry Fredrick.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
She is an unreliable source of information on the Christian music.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

M_MC

Now, please turn your attention the radio station from which it sounded like the excerpt originated. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about the station.

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
Is concerned about community's well-being	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is fair	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is biased	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tells the whole story	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Invades people's privacy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Watches after listeners' interests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Separates fact from opinion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Can be trusted	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is accurate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is concerned about the public interest	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Has well-trained DJs and show hosts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is concerned about making profits	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is factual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Is opinionated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

M_AR

Please consider the following descriptions of the excerpt as a whole -- placing your reactions on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree":

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
I thought it was good.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I thought it was boring.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
This is the kind of radio I listen to.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I found it unpleasant.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I wish I could hear more of this.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

You have completed part three of the study. You're almost finished! Before you go, we would like to ask a few questions about you and your radio listening habits.

VALUES

We would like to know about what you consider important in your life. Please rate the following items on a scale from "Not Important" to "Very Important."

	Not Important						Very Important
Excitement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Warm relationships with others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Being well respected	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Security	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Sense of belonging	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Fun and enjoyment in life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Self-fulfilment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
A sense of accomplishment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Self-respect	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please respond to the following statements about radio listening, placing your answers on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
Radio is an important source of information.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Radio is mainly a source of entertainment.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I often pay close attention to what's on the radio.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I prefer that the people I hear on the radio be from Knoxville.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I think of radio mainly as background sound and focus on other things.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I listen to radio for religious music and programming.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I am generally aware of the locality of people on the radio.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I would never call-in to a radio station and talk on the air.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I know some of the people I hear on the radio personally.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I don't care who owns the radio stations I listen to.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Radio is a dying medium.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

LISTENING_TIME

On average, how many hours per week do you spend with the radio on? Don't worry if you can't remember exactly. Just take your best guess.

(0 - 255)

--	--	--

RELIGION

Which of the following best describes your religious affiliation?

- ☐ Christian
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Muslim
- ☐ Buddhist
- ☐ Hindu
- ☐ Sikh
- ☐ Unitarian-Universalist
- ☐ Pagan
- ☐ Agnostic
- ☐ Atheist
- ☐ Other : _____
- ☐ No Answer

POLITICAL_AFFILIATION

Please place your ideology on the scale from "Liberal" to "Conservative"

	Liberal						Conservative
On social issues such as abortion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
On fiscal issues such as taxes and spending	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
On religion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

GOVERNMENT_ROLE

Please respond to the following statements about the role of government, placing your answers on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
I believe the government has a responsibility to make things better for people.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I believe the government should mostly leave things alone.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I don't mind paying higher taxes if I know the government is using the money for good things.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I don't trust the government to handle most problems.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

AGE

How old are you?

(0 - 255)

--	--	--

SEX

What is your sex?

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Prefer not to respond

RACE

What is your ethnicity?

- ☐ White
- ☐ Black (of African descent)
- ☐ Hispanic
- ☐ Native American
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Other : _____
- ☐ Prefer not to respond

EDUCATION

How many years of schooling have you completed?

(0 - 255)

--	--	--

INCOME

What is your annual income?

- ☐ Less the \$20,000
- ☐ \$20,000 - \$40,000
- ☐ \$40,000 - \$60,000
- ☐ \$60,000 - \$80,000
- ☐ \$80,000 - \$100,000
- ☐ \$100,000 - \$200,000
- ☐ More than \$200,000
- ☐ Prefer not to respond

TIME_IN_KNOX

How long have you lived in the Knoxville area?

- ☐ 0-2 years
- ☐ 3-7 years
- ☐ 8-10 years
- ☐ more than 10 years

COMMENTS

Do you have any comments or concerns about this study? Feel free to type them below.

Thank you for your participation.

VITA

Glenn T. Hubbard holds a Master of Arts in Educational Media from Appalachian State University and has been a professional broadcaster since 1986. He taught journalism courses at the University of Tennessee from 2004 to 2008 and had previous teaching experience in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Appalachian State University. He has presented papers and published on political advertising, audio production, and broadcast-journalism education. Hubbard will join the faculty as an assistant professor at the University of Texas at Arlington in the fall of 2008.