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ABSTRACT

It is argued in this thesis that culture is not a primary priority in Canadian broadcasting. However, evidence is presented which indicates that it should be. The thesis describes how and why the newspaper should be used to generate an understanding of the broadcasting-culture issue. It asks: is there cultural coverage of broadcasting in the newspaper?

The study was undertaken to determine how much cultural coverage of broadcasting there was in The Globe and Mail, what this coverage was like, and the agenda-setting potential that coverage had. A content analysis of stories dealing with broadcasting and culture which appeared between January 1, 1980 and March 31, 1983 was conducted. Major variables analyzed were: prominence, amount of space actually given to cultural coverage, subjects covered, types of stories conveying coverage, treatment of themes and details, and the cultural relevance of broadcasting the newspaper drew.

It was found that The Globe's coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue was weak. Only 95 stories actually provided coverage. The amount of space devoted to coverage was minimal: 4.37 inches per story on average. Coverage gener-
ally lacked elaboration of the issue, particularly of the underlying fundamental themes.

It is concluded that The Globe and Mail is not performing a socially responsible role. It is concluded further that the resolution of the issue requires substantially greater coverage and better coverage. The newspaper industry should be made aware of this in the interests of society.
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Chapter I

THE ROLE OF NEWSPAPER COVERAGE IN THE BROADCASTING-CULTURE ISSUE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Canadian broadcasting system sacrifices Canadian programming and with it Canadian culture for the economic bliss of American programming. As Peers (1982:9) warns:

A country that does not take charge of its own mass communications is in peril, since otherwise the content and style of the majority of messages received will not correspond to the values and beliefs, the social and political relationships, nor indeed the practical concerns of that people.

Particularly since the arrival of television in Canada, the importance of broadcasting for cultural purposes has been expressed (cf. Fowler, 1957; Fowler, 1965; LaMarsh, 1966; Davey, 1971; DOC, 1983a). Despite numerous Royal Commissions and special committees (Aird, 1929; Massey, 1951; Fowler, 1965; Davey, 1971), policy papers (LaMarsh, 1966; CRTC, 1983a; DOC 1983a), acts of Parliament (Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act, 1932; Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1936; Broadcasting Act, 1958; Broadcasting Act, 1968), and other measures intended to stimulate Canadian programming (Consolidated Regulations of Canada, 1978a,b,c; Department of Finance, 1983), Canadian television still seems mostly a conduit for American programming.
If television is indeed a vital asset in the expression of Canadian culture, if there is in fact cause for concern, and if Canada is, as Peers suggests, in peril, it must be asked why culture is still apparently a secondary concern in broadcasting reality and what can be done to establish culture as a priority in that reality.

This thesis presents the argument that despite the concern for culture in Canadian broadcasting, culture remains a tertiary priority, but that because the broadcasting-culture issue is so important, culture should be the real priority in broadcasting. That is, although there is much concern expressed by government, broadcasting reality in Canada hardly addresses this concern. Moreover, decisions such as those which allowed cable and satellite delivery of American television signals throughout Canada directly contradict the espoused cultural aims of Canadian television. Evidence will be presented which indicates that Canadian culture is adversely affected by American programming, which in turn underscores the need to translate the concern into reality.

It is then argued that one possible and even necessary strategy to make culture a priority is establishing public awareness of the cultural implications of broadcasting. In order to counter the threat that (U.S.) broadcasting poses to Canadian culture, and in order to provide for decisive, acceptable policy, Canadians must be aware of the cultural dangers broadcasting poses and the cultural benefits it can contribute.
It is demonstrated next that the newspaper is likely the optimum source for this awareness because of its agenda-setting effect with issues such as the broadcasting-culture issue. There is, in other words, a cultural role for the newspaper to play by providing comprehensive coverage of the issue, thus placing it in the public mind and subsequently, providing the needed understanding of the issue.

It is argued, however, that it is questionable whether the newspaper is in fact providing awareness. The critical view of the press, which sees the press acting largely in its own self-interest, suggests that full, detailed coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue is not in the newspaper's best interest. So although the newspaper has the resources and, according to the Social Responsibility Theory of the press, the social obligation to provide a remedy for the state of Canadian culture in broadcasting, it may well be contributing to the economic forces which preclude making culture a real priority to begin with. Since the issue is pressing, since the newspaper (at least in theory) does have a beneficial role to play, and yet since it is questionable whether the newspaper is contributing to public awareness of the issue, an investigation of the newspaper's role in the broadcasting-culture issue is warranted.

This study asks what the role of one medium (the newspaper) is in reporting on the cultural role of another (television). Through content analysis, it assesses the amount
and kind of coverage the newspaper provides of television and culture and in so doing, it assesses the contribution the newspaper makes toward generating a consciousness of the state of Canadian culture at least with respect to television broadcasting.

1.2 THE RHETORIC OF CULTURE

"Culture" is a broad, intangible term often used in communications research but not always adequately defined. Perhaps it defies precise definition. Still, there are probably as many definitions of culture as there are cultures so only a few will be noted here. The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines culture as

Improvement by (mental or physical) training; intellectual development; particular form, stage, or type of intellectual development or civilization.

For Asante, Newark and Blake (1979:14) culture is "...the sum total of our collective beliefs and values." In a similar vein, Naeole (1961:3) defined culture as "...those general patterns of belief and knowledge, expression and artifact." Culture, then, is a way of thinking, of perceiving, and of expressing perceptions.

Ostry (1978:1;2) calls culture "...the element in which we live" and refers to culture as "...the soul of a nation." Although it is abstract, Ostry's definition is still appropriate since culture itself can be viewed as generally abstract. Finally, Crean (1976:9) provides a broad definition of culture which is the definition used in this thesis:
Culture is a process of communication in which everyone participates, by virtue of belonging to the human race. Culture is the process whereby groups and individuals share and exchange ideas, perceptions and experiences; whereby the collective attitudes of a social group, its goals and values, are formed and transmitted to succeeding generations. Going beyond language or shared understanding, culture provides a modus operandi for all aspects of social activity, from manners and mores to the practical side of everyday life.

Thus, culture is the way a social group thinks, believes and behaves.

A distinction should be made between "culture" and "programming." Whereas culture is the entire "modus operandi," programming is an expression of culture or the expression of part of culture. Both as an expression and as an artifact, then, programming is only a part of culture and not the culture itself. A distinction should also be made between two terms frequently used in the study: acculturation and enculturation. For the study, acculturation means the assimilation of a culture foreign to a host culture, while enculturation means the assimilation of domestic culture. It should be noted, too, that in this study "Canadian culture" is limited to meaning English-Canadian culture.

Broadcasting is perceived as an important cultural ally and there is apparent concern in Canada that it be used as such. For instance, the preamble to the second Fowler Report (Fowler, 1965:4) emphasized that

In Canada, specifically, broadcasting services have a vitally important role...broadcasting should be a major instrument for the development of a distinctive Canadian culture.

The same concern that broadcasting be used as a cultural agent exists today:

For Canada, with its two official languages, its vast size, its strong regional differences, its multicultural reality and its proximity to the United States, broadcasting is a vital means of maintaining a sense of national identity. (DOC, 1983a:1)

The new broadcasting strategy for Canada (DOC, 1983a:4) emphasized further that "Broadcasting stands at the nexus of our broader cultural concern... Broadcasting is, therefore, crucial... ."

A.W. Johnson, then president of the CBC, expressed the cultural concern succinctly, saying "They [children] are in danger of growing up American," (Johnson, 1979:4) in referring to the amount of American programming available to Canadians. The CRTC was equally grave in its urgent plea for increased Canadian programming (CRTC, 1983a:5):

For if Canadians do not use what is one of the world's most extensive and sophisticated communications systems to speak to themselves—if it serves only for the importation of foreign programs—there is a real and legitimate concern that the country will ultimately lose the means of expressing its identity. Developing a strong Canadian program production capability is no longer a matter of desirability but of necessity.
The concern and sense of urgency are also evident in the broadcasting strategy announced in early 1983. The strategy (DOC, 1983a) enunciated four specific government goals as formal policy dealing with satellite signal reception and Canadian program funding, production and exhibition. In summarizing the policy response, the document (DOC, 1983a:13) clearly expresses the pressing concern with which the government views broadcasting in Canada:

These four policy initiatives represent an urgent priority to the federal government and to all Canadians. Their implementation is now vitally important.

However, that culture is a primary government concern in broadcasting could be suspect. For instance, in 1966 the White Paper on Broadcasting which resulted from the second Fowler Report said that "...public policy should require...that all broadcasters include a substantial Canadian content in their programming, particularly in prime time," (LaMarsh, 1966:11). Parliament was told by the committee which reported on the White Paper (Stanbury, 1966:10):

We believe it is essential to avoid monopolization of prime time by foreign programs and to increase true Canadian content in radio as well as television.

Yet 17 years later in a policy statement on Canadian content, the CRTC (1983a:6) noted disapprovingly that

An examination of the stations' logs during the last three years indicates an unacceptable decline in the amount of Canadian programming scheduled by a number of private television broadcasters serving major markets during the hours of heavy viewing...
The statement then asserted essentially the same point made in the 1966 White Paper (CRTC, 1983a:12):

There is no doubt in the Commission's mind that the goals of the Broadcasting Act will only be met if the proportion and quality of Canadian programs are substantially enhanced.

If the government was truly concerned about Canadian programming and thus, Canadian culture in television broadcasting, how could almost identical diagnoses of the state of Canadian programming be made 17 years apart?

The "latest available" viewing figures confirm that Canadian programming and culture are faring poorly in Canadian broadcasting. For instance, the CRTC (1983a:7) notes that

Overall, English-language Canadian television programming has not attracted a significant audience. The latest available figures show that foreign programs account for 77 percent of the total viewing of English-language television programs over the entire day and 85 percent between 7:30 p.m. and 10:30 p.m. Canadian-produced entertainment programs only attract four percent of the audience over the total broadcast day.

That culture is only a secondary concern, if a real government concern at all, is corroborated by several decisions made or actions undertaken by government since the Broadcasting Act was passed. For example, the CRTC allowed the carriage of American television stations by cable even further into the Canadian interior than those signals already reached. This has been seen as one reason why the viewing of American programming has increased at the expense of Canadian programming (CRTC, 1979:97; Audley, 1983:265). This has also tended to undermine the intent of the Canadian content regulations as Audley (1983:266) explains:
Permitting Canadian companies in the cable industry to sell foreign programming services that are not required to make any contribution to Canadian programming or to meet any Canadian-content criteria has substantially eroded the legitimacy of the content requirements imposed on those private Canadian companies running television stations and networks, stiffening their already strong resistance to such requirements.

With respect to the Canadian content regulations themselves, the original regulations were relaxed considerably by the CRTC following pressure from broadcasting's private sector (Babe, 1979:146). In both cases, the CRTC placed the economic interest of profit-motivated cable companies and broadcasters above the concern for culture.

The simultaneous substitution rule (Consolidated Regulations of Canada, 1978a) also has provided economic gain at the expense of culture. The rule was intended to bolster the financial position of broadcasters by discouraging Canadian advertising on American border stations. The rule basically says that when a Canadian station carries a U.S. program in prime time at the same time as an American station, the Canadian signal is to be substituted for the American signal on the cable channel. This means that the Canadian advertiser has a monopoly on viewers of that program and thus, the Canadian station can fix its advertising rates accordingly.

However, since it is in the Canadian station's financial interest to duplicate the scheduling of as many American programs as possible with American stations, the effect of
the rule has been to "help drive Canadian programs out of the prime time schedule." (Audley, 1983:276). Not only does this decrease potential viewership of Canadian programs, it also lessens production and investment incentive in Canadian programs since they would earn less revenue in off-peak viewing hours (Audley, 1983:276).

Two recent CRTC decisions can be seen as further ignoring culture. The pay television licencing decision (CRTC, 1982a) established a competitive pay system in Canada thereby dispersing the financing available for productions and potentially limiting the quality and competitiveness of Canadian pay programming. This in turn potentially limits the number of viewers willing to watch Canadian pay programming.

Secondly, the CRTC recently licenced CanCom (CRTC, 1983c), which was already distributing four Canadian channels via satellite to remote communities, to carry the four American networks (including PBS) as part of its package. Not only are the schedules of three of the four Canadian channels (CCH, CITV, BCTV) laden with American programs, but the outright distribution of the four U.S. networks further increases the penetration of American programming in Canada.

Finally, the new broadcasting policy for Canada has at least one glaring contradiction. That is, more money was made available for video production in recognition that more Canadian television programming is required. But that pro-
programming faces new competition—U.S. pay signals available by satellite. The government provides for the expansion of Canadian programming at the same time as expanding the availability of foreign programming. Moreover, because the Canadian programming still needs to be produced and distributed, the immediate effect of the policy is to increase the availability of foreign programming since it is already there. In effect, then, although the government moved to help Canadian programming, it strengthened the competition even more so. As a result, the cultural concern was compromised by at least one incompatible move.

Thus, despite whatever concern for culture there may be in broadcasting, the reality of broadcasting in Canada accords it only secondary priority at best. The concern—whether real or mere rhetoric—and the danger that culture is not a priority in reality matters little if there is no detrimental cultural effect accompanying the foreign programming available in Canada. That is, television must first be capable of effecting changes in the audiences, of affecting what they think and do—in short, the culture. Secondly, the Canadian and American cultures must be demonstrably different. That is to say, the originating culture must be different from the receiving culture if the latter is to be culturally affected by television. Otherwise, it would make no cultural difference if the programming was American or Canadian. While there may be effects, there would
be no cultural displacement or cultural assimilation if the culture of the originating nation were the same as the culture of the receiving nation.

If, on the other hand, there is a danger of detrimental cultural effects, then the concern is valid and it becomes imperative that culture is made a real broadcasting priority. The scientific literature should provide the means to assess the validity of the concern for culture, and subsequently provide an indication whether the fact that culture is only a secondary concern in broadcasting places "the soul of the nation" in peril.

1.3 MEDIA AND CULTURE

Perhaps the reason that television is perceived as a cultural agent is that effects of the medium on society have been demonstrated. That the mass media generally exert an influence on attending audiences has been a research interest for several decades and the findings have been voluminous, if not entirely consistent. Early effects research, notes Hall (1982), showed strong, direct media influence on audience attitude and behaviour. Contrary to the stimulus/response effects of the media demonstrated previous to the 1940s, later research indicated that the mass media exert only a limited influence, their effects mediated by a host of intervening variables such as interpersonal contact (Klapper, 1960). Yet the media were shown to be influential under
certain circumstances such as when information was involved, when the media source was trusted, when there was no predisposed attitude toward the message portrayed, or when the issue in the message was somewhat distant from personal experience or concern (Katz and Lazarsfield, 1955; Klapper, 1960; Schramm and Roberts, 1971).

Recent research has returned to hypothesizing that the media do have powerful effects (Katz, 1980), particularly on cognition (Blumer and Gurevitch, 1982). McQuail (1977:83), for instance, argues that media portrayal of violence expands the parameters of what is acceptable aggressive behavior in society. Consequently, the media increase the tolerance of violence and society accepts it more as a means of solving problems than it once did. In this way, the media contribute to the formation of social norms.

The work of the Cultural Indicators Group (Gerbner and Gross, 1976; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, and Signorelli, 1980) indicates that the media, particularly television, are influential in telling society what is acceptable social practice and what is not.

Bittner (1980) summarizes a considerable amount of research showing that the media are particularly effective socializing agents for children. The depictions of life, whether fictional or real, which the media constantly package and present lead Schramm and Roberts (1971:392) to assert: "What the media say, and how they say it, does affect the way in which people relate to their world."
Perhaps the most extensively researched behavioural effect of the media, and television in particular, is violence. The Report of the Ontario Royal Commission into mass media violence referred to numerous instances where the media have been at least partly responsible for aggressive behaviour (LaMarsh, 1976). Constock (1981:250-252) notes that there is "unambiguous" evidence indicating that television does influence aggressive behaviour "...by giving examples, by suggesting [violent] behaviour is socially approved, efficacious, or rewarding..."

With respect to attitudes, Robinson (1974; 1976a) concluded that distrust of government was a result of high media exposure, particularly to television. The media can affect opinions and attitudes during a political campaign if direct experience with or information about the subject matter is not available (McQuail, 1977:80). Maloney and Buss (1979) found conditional support that informed, politically-interested voters were more likely to change their attitudes about a candidate as a result of high media exposure. There is evidence which suggests, then, that the media can affect political attitudes in certain circumstances.

But political behaviour can be affected by the media as well. Jackson-Beeck (1979) found that frequent media use affects political behaviour in that frequent newspaper readers and frequent television viewers in the sample she studied tended to be more politically active than light media users.
The "powerful" effect of the media has probably been demonstrated most consistently in agenda-setting studies of the media. The agenda-setting concept posits that there is a causal relationship between topic coverage in the media and public perception of salience and discussion of topics so covered. The media provide the public with an agenda of topics to think about and the salience or priority attached by the media to their agenda is adopted by the public. Katz (1980:128) says that "...as a latent consequence of telling us what to think about, the agenda-setting effect can sometimes influence what we think."

The first recent study which specifically examined the agenda-setting effect of the media was undertaken by McCombs and Shaw (1972) in North Carolina. They began with the premise that voters in an election campaign learn from the mass media. They hypothesized that the media establish the agenda in political campaigns and influence what the public considers the political issues to be. Considerable agreement was found between what the voters judged and what the media emphasized as major and minor items in the campaign.

Funkhouser (1973), in a study of issues prominent during the 1960s, found a correlation between press coverage of several issues and national public opinion on the importance of those issues. Public opinion was determined by answers to a Gallup poll question on "the most important problem facing America today" asked throughout the decade. The an-
swers were compared with coverage (measured in number of articles) of numerous issues in three national news magazines. The results suggested a "strong connection" between media coverage of an issue and public perception of the issue as "the most important problem." (Funkhouser, 1973:67-68).

Other studies (Tipton, Haney and Baseheart, 1975; Glavin, 1976; Palmgreen and Clark, 1977) have also demonstrated agenda-setting effects for both newspapers and television.

Agenda-setting research has investigated contingent conditions which may mitigate or enhance the mass media's influence in setting the public agenda of discussion and issue priority. Level of exposure to a particular medium can be a determining factor in the agenda-setting effect, particularly for newspaper readers (McClure and Patterson, 1976). Erbring, Goldberg, and Miller (1980) found that media impact in agenda-setting depends on audience sensitivity to a given issue. Media impact was minimal, if evident at all, on audience members not sensitive to the issue. Erbring et al. concluded that the audience's pre-existing sensitivities and media coverage of an issue would trigger salience perception. Zucker (1978) found an agenda-setting effect occurred only when the issue was unobtrusive, or removed from the audience's immediate experience or concern. Atwood, Sohn, and Sohn (1978) found that agenda-setting effects were strongest with national issues. An array of studies (McCombs, Shaw, and Shaw, 1972; Mullins, 1973; Chaffee
and Izcaray, 1975; Hilker, 1976) have likewise demonstrated agenda-setting effects under certain conditions.

Not only do the media establish salience of a given issue in general, they can also establish the salience of certain aspects (or attributes) of the issue by emphasizing these aspects over others in covering the issue (McCombs, 1981). Benton and Frazier (1975) and Cohen (1975) both demonstrated that media influence on the salience of certain aspects of an issue is similar to their influence in placing the broader issue on the public agenda in the first place.

The demonstrated effects of the media give cause to reason that since the media affect people, they affect culture as well. Moreover, because the media convey values and norms, they convey culture (Comstock, 1981). Television in particular transmits cultural values which are assimilated, for the most part, unconsciously (cf. Gerbner and Gross, 1976; Gerbner et al., 1980). Newcomb (1976:xiv) says that the unconscious assimilation of culture from television viewing occurs "...largely without evaluation on the part of the audience."

The cultural effects of the media are most evident in studies which examine the effect of foreign media content on a particular society. The nature and perceived threat of American media "imperialism", for example, has received considerable attention (cf. Schiller, 1971; Nordenstreng and Varis, 1974; Boyd-Barrett, 1977; Tunstall, 1977; Lee, 1979;
Pejes, 1981; McPhail, 1987). American media imperialism has been seen to lead to cultural assimilation, acculturation and cultural displacement (cf. Lumsden, 1970; Wells, 1972; Schiller, 1976; Beltran and Cardona, 1979; Fisher, 1979; Masmoudi, 1979; MacBride, 1980; Pinegree and Hawkins, 1981). The viewing of television programs not indigenously produced exposes the receiving culture to the alien attitudes, values, behaviour and lifestyle in those programs which are perhaps incongruent with the domestic culture. Understandably, many nations, including Canada, are concerned. But the concern is valid only if it is true that Canadians are different from Americans. If Canadians were no different from Americans culturally, then watching American television programming would pose no cultural danger.

There has not been a lot of research on American-Canadian differences and what there has been seems to suggest that differences are relatively small or subtle. Historians and sociologists have cited the different historical and political experiences between Canada and the United States in postulating differences between the two countries.

According to Clark (1962), Canada's different history accounts for several attitudinal and social differences between Canadians and Americans. Canada experienced a stronger religious tradition, controlled frontier development, a fear of American expansion, and a counter-revolutionary development. Out of this grew the Canadian tendency toward conser-
vatism, elitism, respect for authority and acceptance of government involvement, our multicultural philosophy of the "mosaic", and our greater orientation to the collective good.

Naegle (1961) also noted differences between Canadians and Americans, saying there is less emphasis in Canada on equality than there is in the United States and since there is greater acceptance of authority in Canada, Canadians accept limitations on personal freedom more so than Americans (Naegle, 1961:27). Lipset (1963a) also concluded that Canadians are more conservative than Americans. And, like Clark (1962), he saw a greater respect for law and order in Canada as well as greater particularism or the political, economic and class organization of various social strata.

Canada's greater particularism is evidenced by the presence of a number of "particularistic" third parties such as the Social Credit Party and the NDP (Lipset, 1963a:527). Lipset argued that because of Canada's greater emphasis of the values of elitism and particularism, Canada is more collectively-oriented than the United States which stresses instead individualism and individual achievement (1963a:527).

Lipset concluded, then, that Canadians are less achievement-oriented, less individualistic, less self-oriented, less equalitarian (more elitist), and more conservative than Americans (1963a). In later works (1964; 1965), Lipset elaborated upon and reaffirmed his conclusions about Canada-U.S. differences.
Several studies were undertaken in the 1970s to test Lipset's hypotheses. Truman (1971) examined Lipset's equalitarian-elitist dichotomy and concluded that, contrary to Lipset's claims, Canada was more equalitarian than the United States. He cited Canada's relatively higher post-secondary educational enrollment, Canada's more extensive welfare system, and the existence in Canada of social democratic parties (for example, the NDP) as support.

But which nation is more or less equalitarian perhaps is not the point here. While Truman and Lipset disagree over which nation values the provision of opportunity more, both provided evidence that there is a difference in the equalitarian values between Canada and the United States. The concern here is not what the difference is; rather, the concern here is that there is a difference.

Crawford and Curtis (1979) subjected Lipset's hypotheses to the test of time. They were suspicious whether his claims would hold in modern Canadian society. They found that only Lipset's hypotheses on achievement-orientation and elitism were supported without qualification (Crawford and Curtis, 1979:40).

Arnold and Tigert (1974) also found Canadian values to differ from American values. They determined that Canadians accept changes in traditional values "...whether they be with respect to moral issues or greater control by the state" more readily than Americans. (Arnold and Tigert,
On the other hand, Americans are less permissive and oppose government intervention in the exercise of individual rights and responsibilities (Arnold and Tigert, 1974:82).

Although no clear consensus as to what precisely the differences are between Canadians and Americans surfaces in the literature, there is evidence that differences exist. But whether or not this means there is a cultural difference between Canada and the United States depends upon the definition of culture. Referring to the definitions provided earlier, it can be seen that the two cultures are different.

For instance, it might be agreed that the acquisition of values and attitudes constitutes mental training. The different values and attitudes that Canadians and Americans have thus means the two nations have different mental training and therefore, different cultures.

If we accept that values and attitudes determine in part beliefs, knowledge and expression, then different values and attitudes would reflect different patterns of beliefs, knowledge and expression. Since research indicates that Canadian values and attitudes differ in some respects from American ones, then the "sum total" of beliefs and values and the "general patterns" of beliefs, knowledge and expression probably differ between the two countries. Thus, the Canadian culture is different from the American culture.
As well, since Canadian attitudes differ from American attitudes, it can be argued that the collective attitudes, and therefore culture, differ. Because the different values, orientations and attitudes which research suggests Canadians and Americans have, probably help to determine each society's "modus operandi", or the way each society goes about life, then it is clear the Canadian culture differs from American culture.

Since the media convey culture, since the media affect culture, and since American culture is different from Canadian culture, it stands to reason that Canadian culture is affected by the American media fare widely available in Canada. If this is the case, then the fact that culture merits only secondary priority in broadcasting is cause for grave concern.

Schiller (1976:2) says that

Communication...defines social reality and thus influences the organization of work, the character of technology, the curriculum of the educational system, formal and informal, and the use of free time—actually, the basic social arrangement of living.

As noted above, Canadian culture is indeed different from American culture. It may not be vastly different, but it is different nevertheless. The social reality Canadians receive from American film and television (and print) influences, if Schiller is right, the basic Canadian social arrangement of living. But because the two cultures are different, it just may be that this influence from American media is not appropriate to Canada.
Schiller also sees danger in the imitation of American programming (Schiller, 1976:2). In essence, a nation imitating content also imitates the culture.

Once commercial, series of economic pressures thereafter ensure that the broadcast media everywhere will carry the cultural material produced in the core areas [such as the United States and Britain]. Imitation of that material may appear when and if the indigenous broadcast/film/print industries demand a share in the home market. Directly or indirectly, the outcome is the same. The content and style of the programming, however adapted to local conditions, bear the ideological imprint of the main centres of the capitalistic economy. (Schiller, 1976:10)

This would suggest that some Canadian domestic productions contain an American ideological imprint. It is true that Canada is a capitalistic nation so that imprint may be no different than it would be otherwise. But it is a question of "degree" of capitalism: Canada has considerable more state enterprise than the United States. It is also true that Canadian culture is different from American culture. If ideology is considered part of culture, then Canadian productions might contain some aspects of American culture that are not necessarily appropriate to Canada.

The imitation of American content is particularly evident in American-Canadian co-productions. Although such productions qualify as Canadian content, they have been criticized for not actually "being" Canadian (CRTC, 1976:159; Babe, 1979:146; MacDonald and Ramsey, 1982:170). While this may be because there is some American control (mostly financial, but also creative), it is also because producers wish to
make a production which is saleable in the tough U.S. market (MacDonald and Ramsey, 1982). As such, the productions are often "tailor-made" to suit American, rather than Canadian, tastes. As MacDonald and Ramsey (1982:170) put it, programming for export seems to blur anything distinctly Canadian so that the product says little to ourselves or to the world about what we have been, are or want to be as a people.

Thus, Schiller's analysis appears accurate. Some Canadian programming, especially programming co-produced with Americans, may have a style, an imprint, that is not entirely Canadian and thus, Canadian culture is being partially displaced through the imitation of American programming.

The sociocultural model of communication also provides insight as to whether Canadian culture is endangered by the prevalence of American media fare in Canada.

The sociocultural model...is based upon the assumption that mass-communicated messages can be used to provide individuals with new and seemingly group-supported interpretations—social constructions of reality—regarding some phenomenon toward which they are acting. By so doing, it may be possible to mediate the conduct of individuals as they derive definitions of appropriate behaviour and belief from suggested interpretations communicated to them. (De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1975:248-249)

In essence, the media help to determine the individual's perception of what is acceptable (normal) behaviour and what is not. The individual learns through the media about his society and about social reality (De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1975:250-251; McQuail, 1977:76). This learning is, however,
mediated by experience and social interaction (De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1975:248; McQuail, 1977:90).

If the sociocultural model holds, then Canadian culture can be seen to be endangered. That is, American media present norms and a "reality" which Canadians indirectly absorb. However, since the two cultures are different, the norms and the social reality so absorbed may be appropriate to the United States but inappropriate to Canada. Canadians could be learning cultural norms that are foreign to Canada through watching American television programs, for example. In short, Canadian culture—or part of it—is being displaced. If adoption of these norms is occurring, acculturation could be taking place (McQuail, 1977:90). And there is some, although not extensive, evidence that this is indeed occurring.

Beattie (1967), for instance, found tentative evidence that American media have an effect on Canadians. A questionnaire was submitted to 666 first-year university students in late 1965 to measure the impact of U.S. media presence in Canada. The results indicated that Canadian students knew as much about the United States and in some cases more, than they did about Canada. The average score on American persons and events was 1.1 percentage points higher than on Canadian persons and events (Beattie, 1967:669). President Johnson was better known by slightly more students than Prime Minister Pearson. While the Conservative Opposition
Leader (Diefenbaker) was better known than his counterpart in Congress, Barry Goldwater; the latter was better known than Canada's Governor-General, Georges P. Vanier. As well, the American defense secretary and secretary of state were much better known than their Canadian counterparts. Defense Minister Paul Hellyer and External Affairs Minister Paul Martin (Beattie, 1967:670).

With respect to television specifically, it was found that CBS anchorman Walter Cronkite was better known than CBC anchorman Earl Cameron (Beattie, 1967:671). As well, a question using incorrect (American) terminology was asked in an attempt to "assess attention paid to U.S. media or U.S. material relayed through Canadian media." A statement about a hypothetical court case was given to respondents using "District Attorney" instead of the Canadian term "Crown Attorney" and "State" in place of "Crown." The students were asked to make corrections in the statement if they found anything wrong with it. Only 18 percent made the correct changes (Beattie, 1967:671).

It was inferred from this that many young Canadians, reading U.S. crime news or viewing TV programs such as 'Perry Mason', tend to absorb foreign terminology as though it were Canadian. While not in itself important, this finding was a small indication of Americanization via the mass media. (Beattie, 1967:671)

Beattie concluded that there is a displacement of Canadian viewpoints caused by the influence of American media in Canada (1967:672):
To some extent, there is evidence that this influence of U.S. media, directly or through the relay of selected events via the news agencies, TV or magazines, militates against Canadian identity and Canadian viewpoints.

This can be construed as detrimental to the dissemination of Canadian culture via the Canadian media.

Tate and Trach (1980) began with the premise that if Canadians learn about courtroom procedure only from the television programs they watch, they will be familiar with American legal procedure but ignorant of Canadian legal procedures. They found that the more influential television was perceived to be as a source of information about the Canadian judicial process, the less accurate were the beliefs about Canadian court procedure (Tate and Trach, 1980:9). Tate and Trach (1980:15) concluded that

Because knowledge of the Canadian judicial process is inversely related to reliance upon television programs about lawyers, this is one small indication of the Americanization of Canadian culture.

A story in The Globe and Mail (Oziewicz, 1980) reporting the results of a Gallup Poll commissioned by the Ontario Ministry of Transport and Communications, told of how two-thirds of the sample believed that police must read the accused his "rights" upon arrest in Canada. No such right exists in Canada although the police can, but are not required to, read a "caution" to the arrested person. (Oziewicz, 1980). The poll also found other instances of misinformed beliefs about the Canadian legal system. The poll probably did not seek to determine whether the misinformed beliefs
were a result of American media but it must be asked, how else would Canadians form such beliefs? Since the judicial process influences in part the way Canadian society goes about life, and if Tate and Trach's findings are accurate, then it is clear that American television is affecting Canadian culture by causing Canadians to form incorrect beliefs about part of their culture.

Winter and Baer (1982) examined the effect U.S. news media have on attitudes toward government in a Canadian border city. They determined that "American media serve to undercut the Canadian orientation towards greater governmental role in the economy," (Winter and Baer, 1982:14). Canadians who watched or read American news displayed an anti-government sentiment that would reflect the individualist-oriented attitudes of Americans more than it would the collective-oriented attitudes of Canadians (Winter and Baer, 1982:15). This is further indication of the acculturation effect of American media.

There is, then, minimal but gradually accruing evidence that there is some effect of American media—particularly television—on Canadian perceptions and attitudes and thus, on Canadian culture. The presence of American media content in Canada potentially displaces the attitudes, values and norms indigenous to Canada. Whether these are only subtly different from those in the United States—or even if many are similar—it remains that the American media presence in
Canada restricts Canadian exposure to indigenous attitudes, values, expressions; indeed, to Canadian culture. The television viewing statistics (CRTC, 1983a:7) cited earlier indicate that this is perhaps most pronounced with the television medium.

In addition, the range of choice among U.S. stations increased more than did the range of choice among Canadian stations between 1967 and 1976. During the same period, the increase in available U.S. stations measured province-by-province was greater than the increase in available Canadian stations. Finally, in 1977, 62 percent of English-speaking Canadians had access to at least four American television channels while only 45 percent had access to at least four Canadian channels (CRTC, 1979:24-26).

The cultural effects of television documented in this section coupled with the viewing figures for foreign programming in Canada appear to justify concern about acculturation since the Canadian culture is different from the American culture. Presumably, then, the harnessing of the television medium for cultural purposes is a worthwhile pursuit for public policy. But as noted in Section 1.2, policy does not appear to treat the concern for culture as a priority in the reality of broadcasting. Yet the evidence summarized in this section provides more than sufficient reason to make culture a priority in Canadian broadcasting. Even if the concern for the state of Canadian culture is genuine-
ly intended as a primary priority, that it only translates as a secondary priority in reality makes that concern even more exigent.

Summarizing thus far, it was illustrated how culture is paid little heed in broadcasting reality. Yet because broadcasting affects culture, and because American programming seems to be affecting Canadian culture, broadcasting must be made to be more responsive to Canadian culture in reality if it is to be used as a cultural ally. In effect, television is currently a cultural enemy. What, then, can be done to reverse this?

There may be several strategies to make culture a real broadcasting priority. One valuable strategy would be the raising of public awareness of the broadcasting-culture issue. A public understanding of the issue, it is argued in the next section, would effect a decisive, appropriate and acceptable policy response. In a sense, awareness of the issue is requisite since the public is an agent in broadcasting policy-making and, perhaps more important, is affected by broadcasting policy.

1.4 THE NEED FOR AWARENESS

The need for cultural awareness generally is important because culture is so difficult to perceive. Ostry (1978:205) points out passionately that

only in democratic argument, in democratic debate, and in democratic discussion can our perceptions of cultural development be clarified and brought
under scrutiny. It is time we became more conscious and rational about it and its function in all our lives. Otherwise we shall continue to be blind to the forces that shape our lives, our country and our future; and we shall fail to con-
nect.

Yet, because it is difficult to perceive, scrutinizing our culture is difficult and because of this, the need to be aware of culture generally is that much more acute. We have to be aware of it and of its value in order to appreciate the danger broadcasting poses to its very survival. Conceiving its importance and calling for evaluation of our culture is a formidable task because it cannot readily be touched or seen; its presence is often unnoticed despite the importance of its meaning. Like the "lost love" perhaps, we cannot appreciate its presence until it is lost. But if culture is so important to our lives, to the life of Canada—and again, this is difficult to perceive because culture is intangible—it is perhaps not worth waiting to find out if it was ever there. Precisely because culture is so diffi-
cult to perceive consciously, public consciousness of its very existence, not to mention its value, must be raised.

Moreover, the public must be made aware of the problems and triumphs culture faces. Because culture is unnoticed, the dangers it faces can also go unnoticed. Thus, an aware-
ness of those things which threaten its demise is particularly important so that its demise can be prevented. Broad-
casting, as we have seen, is one of those things which threaten the demise of Canadian culture. Thus, public
awareness (knowledge) of the broadcasting-culture issue is requisite to help ward off the demise of Canadian culture.

Another argument for the need for awareness generally is related to the level of awareness of U.S. presence in Canada. Canadians might not be consciously aware of the American economic presence in Canada and as a result, they may be unable to readily distinguish between things which are American and things which are Canadian. For instance, Selby (1982) argues that the cultural similarities which Canada and the United States share are more important than the cultural differences. After all, he writes, we have the same lightbulbs. He neglects to point out that G.E. and Westinghouse are American conglomerates whose subsidiaries produce in Canada for the Canadian market. In other words, we share the same lightbulbs, or the same cosmetics, or the same chocolate bars not necessarily because we are culturally similar but because of U.S. economic enterprise in Canada.

It could be speculated—it would be difficult trying to prove—that Canadians are not consciously aware of the American influence in Canada, the Foreign Investment Review Agency notwithstanding. For instance, when a person in Senegal reaches for a Hershey Bar or a tube of Colgate, that person is no doubt aware that the product is not Senegalese in origin. Do Canadians, on the other hand, actually perceive that the chocolate bars they eat and the toothpaste they use to brush their teeth with afterward are, in es-
sence, American? The people of Senegal can think in terms of industrialized/modern versus traditional/developing whereas Canada is both industrialized and "modern" and no doubt has more ownership of industry and we are therefore less likely to perceive the American cultural presence in its economic presence.

Unlike the Sénégalais, Canadians are not consciously reminded that every time we purchase a chocolate bar or a deodorant or a box of cereal our purchase is a cultural artifact from another country even if it was produced in Canada. Not only is the Canadian culture infiltrated, but awareness that there is a difference is dulled. Without this awareness, how can Canadians properly assess what is Canadian and what is not? In short, because an awareness of the distinction between Canadian and American cultures is dulled by the omnipresent American conglomerates in Canada, there is less cultural defence for the American culture to break through because of its economic presence in Canada (cf. Ostry, 1978:176).

Thus, cultural awareness generally is necessary. But because of culture's vulnerable situation vis-a-vis broadcasting, awareness of the broadcasting-culture issue is especially requisite.

In Canada, the CRTC calls public hearings to gather information which it assesses in making licensing decisions. The Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee also sought
public input in preparing its analysis of cultural policy in Canada. The public is perceived, then, as an active agent in cultural development. But can the public contribute to cultural development with critical, scrutinizing eyes if it does not first have the information available to understand the shape the culture is in, has been in, or might be in? And can the public be expressing its true concern — if it is ignorant of certain aspects involved in critical cultural issues such as television broadcasting? Would the public opine differently, perhaps relax demands for foreign programming for example, if it were aware of the detrimental implications (acculturation) of such demands? And if this were the case, would the government's decision-making be made easier knowing the public fully understands the intricacies of the issue?

The Canadian government desires and solicits public input in formulating broadcasting policy. But, and in answer to the first question posed rhetorically above, the government expects public participation to be based on informed opinion. To wit, the last section in the new broadcasting strategy (DOC, 1983a:21) announced March 1, 1983, entitled "The Need for an Informed Debate" reads:

The four policy initiatives, put forward in the previous section as firm government policy, establish the framework for a Broadcasting Strategy for Canada. But that framework must be fleshed out. The policy proposals advanced in this section will, after modification through public debate, perform that task.
But that debate must be informed and involve all Canadians. Broadcasting touches all of us. It entertains and informs us. It is the most powerful communications medium in the world today; and, with the new technologies, it is becoming even more powerful. It shapes cultures, the societies and the economies of nations around the world.

All Canadians must have a voice in the debate on our broadcasting future. This policy booklet is their invitation to join this debate.

How much of the debate will actually transform into input into policy-making is unclear. But no matter how much is used or how it is used, the public debate is evidently considered by the policy-makers to be an integral part of the broadcasting policy-making process. It would seem reasonable, then, that this part of the process should be based on a well-rounded, critical awareness of the issue.

Thus, there is a need for Canadians to be aware of the cultural implications in broadcasting because, basically, the government is relying upon their input.

As well, policy which might be unpopular, for example restrictions on the importation of foreign programming or a substantial increase in required Canadian content, might be more acceptable if the Canadian public were aware of the cultural implications of broadcasting. And if the government could sway public opinion to its side by keeping it informed, the power of the private broadcasters' seemingly endless lobby for American programming could be weakened since less American programming would not necessarily mean a smaller audience, and in turn, less advertising revenue.
Awareness of the broadcasting-culture issue would not necessarily cause the public to watch Canadian programs or ignore American programming. It would, however, make the public's policy input more valuable, make the public aware of broadcasting's cultural implications, and therefore, provide for decisive, acceptable policy which would make culture a primary priority in broadcasting reality.

In sum, awareness of the broadcasting-culture issue could lead to a policy and a system which maximizes the acculturation potential of Canadian television. The more the public is aware, the less vulnerable culture will be to the foreign television fare available in Canada. Public awareness is therefore a vital if not requisite element to prevent the potential demise of Canadian culture brought on by Canadian television.

This chapter has shown that culture needs to be made a real broadcasting priority because of the vulnerable situation in which Canadian television places our culture, largely through the acculturation effect of foreign programming. One strategy to achieve this is the raising of public consciousness of the broadcasting-culture issue since an understanding of the issue would make the formulation and implementation of effective, appropriate policy easier.

Since culture must be made a priority and since public awareness of the broadcasting-issue can bring this about, it must be determined what the best vehicle is for creating the
awareness of the issue. Because it is the type of issue about which information likely comes primarily from the mass media, awareness will have to come from the media. However, as we have seen, television is, if anything, contributing to the acculturation of American culture rather than the enculturation of Canadian culture. As a source of awareness of the broadcasting-culture issue, then, the television medium may not be reliable. And because of the agenda-setting effect and other characteristics of the newspaper, the best source for public awareness of the issue is the newspaper. There is, in other words, a vital role for the newspaper to play in the broadcasting-culture issue.

1.5 THE CULTURAL ROLE OF THE NEWSPAPER

There are several reasons why the newspaper is the best source for awareness which will be discussed in this section. The key to the newspaper’s cultural role, however, is its agenda-setting effect.

Although the media generally exert an agenda-setting effect, the newspaper has been shown to be a stronger agenda-setter than television, particularly when information about public issues (imparting knowledge about issues as opposed to events, for instance) is involved. McClure and Patterson (1974), for example, could find no evidence that television news had an independent effect on voters’ beliefs about the 1972 U.S. presidential candidates’ issue positions. To
McClure and Patterson, the television news format is not effective in conveying issue information. Because television coverage of the issues was sandwiched between coverage of other news and events, the issues got "lost" in the news format. (The nature of the television and newspaper media is an aspect to which we will return.)

McClure and Patterson (1976) also compared the agenda-setting power of television with the agenda-setting power of newspapers. They found that while level of television viewing had no effect on respondents' perception of the salience of two issues, level of newspaper readership did. In other words, the newspaper exerted an agenda-setting influence on newspaper readers, but television did not exert an agenda-setting effect on television news viewers. Tipton, Haney, and Baseheart (1975) also found significant correlations (Pearson r) between newspaper and public agenda, but not between television and public agenda.

Benton and Frazier (1975) conducted a more complex investigation of the agenda-setting function by identifying three levels of information and determining the agenda-setting effect at each level of both newspapers and television. The three levels of information were: (1) general issue names (for example "economy"; "population"); (2) sub-issues, including problems, causes and proposed solutions; and (3) specific information regarding the sub-issues such as the advantages and disadvantages of proposed solutions and the
individuals or groups connected with proposals. As is evident, the information on the agenda becomes more extensive, more specific—more complex if you will—in ascending order.

Benton and Frazier found that newspapers were able to set the agenda at the more complex levels of information (levels 2 and 3) whereas television had minimal impact on setting the agenda at these levels even with television-oriented respondents. The newspaper medium, then, could explain the issue whereas television either did not or could not. Other studies, too, have found the newspaper medium to be a stronger agenda-setter than television (cf. McCombs, Shaw, and Shaw, 1972; Glavin, 1976; McCombs, 1976a; Williams and Larsen, 1977).

Although television affects culture unconsciously, it does not appear to be as capable of explaining information as the newspaper is. If awareness is to be raised, the newspaper is the better medium since it has a stronger effect when imparting knowledge is concerned.

Because the newspaper is a stronger agenda-setter and because it can explain issues whereas television cannot (or does not—see below), the newspaper can play a cultural role by explaining the implications of broadcasting and culture in Canada. But there are other reasons why the newspaper has a role to play. To begin, the newspaper medium is perceived as an information medium (Clarke and Ruggles, 1970; Atkin, 1972; Comstock, 1981) whereas television is perceived
primarily as an entertainment medium (Comstock, Chaffee, Katzman, McCombs and Roberts, 1978; Audley, 1983:256). The newspaper, then, is a more likely source to provide information on the broadcasting-cultural issue than is television.

The nature of the newspaper medium makes it more suited to providing information and explanation. Compared with television, for example, the newspaper has a larger news hole to devote to detail and number of topics. The newspaper permits individual analysis and reflection. As well, "...print is durable while broadcast material is transient, or at least more difficult to recall," (Cumming, Cardinal, and Johansen, 1981). Television, on the other hand, is more event-oriented (McClure and Patterson, 1974). It is difficult for the medium to convey issue information because issues are not visually stimulating and they "...demand a level of attention viewers are unwilling to give," (McClure and Patterson, 1974:24). The television news format simply provides a "headline service" lacking in-depth reports and providing only limited coverage of a large number of stories (McClure and Patterson, 1976).

Thus, the newspaper is better able to provide information on public issues. Its cultural role, then, can be seen as one which would contribute to the conscious, critical awareness of the cultural implications of broadcasting. Another reason why the newspaper can be perceived as having a role to play is that it is not television. Television is "...an
essential conservative agency concerned with protecting its self-interest (Comstock et al., 1978:31). It is unlikely, therefore, that Canadian television will inform its viewers about the dangers of watching foreign programming—a strong revenue base for Canadian television—and discuss the cultural implications because to do so could mean a loss of viewers.

Finally, the contribution that television is making to culture is restricted because of the viewing levels of foreign programming. To some extent, the cultural assimilation that is occurring is of American, not Canadian, culture. Thus, the newspaper could contribute to cultural awareness if only because television is not contributing very successfully.

Moreover, the broadcasting–culture issue is the type of issue that can likely be learned about only from the mass media. Our knowledge of "second-hand" reality comes from the mass media (McCombs and Shaw, 1977). Shaw (1977:20) is assertive in presenting his interpretation of agenda-setting when he writes that

The agenda-setting power of the press may be thought of as a process of consensus-building between those who have access to the press or whom the press regularly covers with news, the press itself, and the audience or society at large. Agenda-setting represents social learning.

Eyal, Winter and McCombs (1980:216–217) concur:

The media are our primary sources of information about public issues...public awareness and knowledge about public issues is more often an incidental learning process than a formal educational one.
By ordering the vast amount of information concerning events and issues that is generated daily and by presenting this information, the agenda-setting function enables individuals to learn about things outside their immediate experience. While television viewing itself may be within the individual's experience, awareness of the implications of that viewing may not be. Thus, the broadcasting-culture issue is a public issue that can likely be learned about only through incidental learning primarily from the mass media.

For the reasons outlined above, the newspaper is probably the best medium from which to learn about the broadcasting-culture issue. Because it is the ideal medium as a source of information on the issue, the newspaper's cultural role can be seen as one which would provide a conscious, critical awareness of the broadcasting-culture issue—awareness which is needed if culture is to be made the primary broadcasting priority. Because there is a vital need for awareness and understanding of the issue, and because the newspaper is the ideal source for this awareness, it can be argued that the newspaper ought to be playing such a role.

While it may be that the newspaper should play such a vital role, it does not necessarily mean that it in fact does. There are two views of the press which suggest that on the one hand it does and on the other, that it does not. One view, the Social Responsibility Theory of the press, sees the press as acting in the public interest. Since the sur-
vival of a society's culture is doubtless in the public interest, this view of the press would suggest that the newspaper is providing comprehensive coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue. There is, however, the critical view of the press which sees the press acting in its own self-interest. As is argued in the next section, it is possible that comprehensive coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue is not in the newspaper's best interests and that it would thus not provide the cultural role that is so necessary to prevent the demise of Canadian culture.

1.6 THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Social Responsibility Theory of the press was articulated formally by Peterson (1956). It sees the role of the press as catering to the political system by providing information and discussion or debate about public affairs (Peterson, 1956). Although the Social Responsibility Theory resembles the Libertarian Theory of the press, the latter sees a more adversarial role for the press as a guardian of individual freedom and critic of government (Peterson, 1956:73-77). From an array of voices emitted from an array of diverse sources, the truth emerges through man's ability to reason, to recognize the truth in the "market place of ideas." Such is the premise of the Libertarian Theory (Siebert, 1956). Since the government is one source of ideas, the press, as watchdog, becomes another source of ideas—ideas which are necessarily different from the government's.
The Social Responsibility Theory, however, does not assume this. The press can be critical of government as in instances such as Watergate where power was abused, but it does not necessarily have to be. The Social Responsibility Theory also views the press as conduits of information in matters concerning the public good. Generally, the press is seen as working for the social good or on behalf of the public interest. In a sense, the press decides for the individual what the truth is and presents it.

But this does not necessarily make the press an adjunct of the government. As Peterson (1956:90) points out, social responsibility "...means that the giants of the press should carry views contrary to their own without abdicating their own right of advocacy." In other words, criticize where criticism is due, not just for the sake of criticism. As well, the press should "...try to represent all important viewpoints, not merely those with which the publisher or operator agrees," (Peterson, 1956:90). Westell (1980:30) sums up the social responsibility role:

They [the media] ought to think of themselves as primarily a channel of communication between those who hold power and responsibility in public and private institutions and the public to which they are accountable.

In other words, rather than having absolute freedom to say what it wants to say as the Libertarian Theory holds, the press must be a fair arbiter of the ideas and present and represent ideas when it is in the public good to do so.
Since the individual cannot decide by himself what is good or is truth and what is not, the press must assume that role and it must be performed responsibly, fairly and presumably, without bias. Since the individual is unable to do all this by himself, the press has the responsibility to do it on behalf of society. If the press does not, then the government should step in and ensure that it does.

Peterson (1956:81) says that the Social Responsibility Theory has displaced the libertarian, adversarial theory of the press. In Canada, the Libertarian Theory never really took hold since the watchdog of government was institutionalized in the form of the Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and it was the role of the press to report the debate of ideas in parliament "faithfully." (Westell, 1980). Westell (1977), citing the Hamilton Harbour dredging scandal and the journalistic investigations into the activities of the CIA, argues, however, that the Canadian press is now playing more of an adversarial role. He contends that the press in Canada has adopted the more liberal, the more American role as government adversary. So while Peterson viewed the adversarial role of the press giving way to a social responsibility role, Westell sees the reverse occurring in Canada.

If it is accepted that the broadcasting-culture issue is significant to what Ostry (1978:2) calls "the soul of the nation", then presumably it is the responsibility of the press to provide a comprehensive account of the issue. If
the Social Responsibility Theory is tenable, then newspapers should be providing adequate, critical coverage of the cultural issue in broadcasting. As argued earlier, awareness of the issue is vital and the newspaper is not only a valuable source for information, it may well be the only major source of information to raise consciousness. Moreover, it would be the duty of the newspaper to provide the information to fuel the public discussion and policy input that the government seeks. If, in other words, the press in Canada is performing a socially responsible role, it should be evidenced in its covering the broadcasting-culture issue. Is it, then, providing coverage?

The newspaper industry has come under criticism for providing largely homogeneous content and if this criticism is accurate, it would be difficult to perceive a socially responsible press in Canada since the press would necessarily be denying representation to some potentially important viewpoints. Fletcher (1981), for instance, investigating the influence of chain ownership on public affairs coverage in Canada, determined that no influence existed. What he did conclude, however, is that the newspaper industry presented a diversity of ideas but that the diversity "...lies within a very limited spectrum," (Fletcher, 1981:4). With respect to public affairs coverage in particular, the parliamentary press gallery presented a largely uniform political coverage of national affairs. "The diversity of perspective remains limited," Fletcher concluded (1981:56).
This could lead us to expect that whatever coverage of the cultural issue there may be, it will be within a limited perspective. The next question to be asked then is: What kind of perspective is presented. Kesterton (1975:17) provides a clue:

critics feel dailies have tended to become bland, undogmatic, unlikely to disturb the status quo. This condition is coupled with the fact that the characteristic newspaper owner is a big business or a big businessman. Such journals, so say critics of the modern newspaper, reflect the views of the 'Establishment'.

Porter (1965:483) sees media and business elites sharing similar backgrounds and the elite's conservative ideology tends to support (reinforce) prevailing views on numerous social and economic matters. As well, the owners hire those who share a similar ideology which serves to sustain the ideology (Porter, 1965:486). Scholars in the United States (Breed, 1955; Baqikian, 1972) confirm this.

Clement (1975:342) argues that the media elite is a "...subset of the economic elite" dependent upon the economic elite for advertising revenue. Fletcher (1981:7) says that the media are therefore "...inclined almost by instinct to support their ideological outlook." Or as Clement (1975:342) puts it:

class control. In the interest of corporate capitalism is, indeed, characteristic of the mass media in Canada...the 'diverse and antagonistic sources' are actually different faces of the same upper class and its elite.
Such a view of the media is not limited to recent times of increased concentration of ownership. McNaught (1940) and the Massey Commission (Massey, 1951) also expressed concern about the business-backed ideology of newspapers. And as Fletcher (1981:45) warns,

One consequence is that news presents a fairly consistent framework for analysis of public affairs which reinforces dominant perspectives.

Clement (1975:292) agrees:

The major identification of the media...is with liberal democracy and capitalism. Put another way, this means identification with the prevailing political and economic orders.

Clement also describes the interrelationship and interdependence of the media, business and government (1975:288-347). Corporate interests, for example, also own media outlets and the media are used to "protect" the economic interests of Big Business (Clement, 1975:291). As well, the media rely upon government for information and the government relies upon the media for access to the people and for favourable coverage (Clement, 1975:303). Thus, the two try to maintain a "cordial" relationship. The media elite, who along with the economic elite are part of the overall corporate elite, also "travels in very similar social circles as the state elite" or the bureaucratic elite (Clement, 1975:340).

Moreover, 69 percent of the media elite "simultaneously hold important corporate positions outside the media," (Clement, 1975:325). There is also a considerable amount of cross-media ownership (Clement, 1975:288).
Thus, there is a strong interrelationship among the media, business and government in Canada. Since their interests are mutual and since they are all part of the same corporate elite (Clement, 1975:343), it is unlikely that anyone will do anything to disturb the status quo.

There is, then, a view of the press which tends to see it as responsive to a business elite, of which it is a part, and which propagates its perspectives and protects its interests. In so doing, the newspaper is also protecting its own interests. Obviously, this view conflicts with the Social Responsibility Theory of the press since the press cannot serve two masters—the public and the economic elite.

The critical view could also explain why culture is a secondary concern in the reality of broadcasting: policy acquiesces to the media-economic elite interest as well as to public demand for increased foreign programming. In return, the government upsets neither the media nor the public—it serves its own self-interest. So despite the concern—real or rhetorical—for culture in broadcasting, the mutual and interrelated interests of the media-economic-state elite (as well as government dependence on the media for access and favourable coverage and upon the public for longevity) necessarily preclude Canadian culture in broadcasting.

In effect, although the government may truly intend that policy meet the "cultural challenge" head-on, the heed it
must pay to the media-economic elite and public demand apparently take precedence. The government and culture are thus both trapped by the present economic system which governs Canadian broadcasting and by the structure of the power elite of which the government is a part.

Whether or not it genuinely intends otherwise, the government is forced to deal with the "cultural challenge" within the present system. The present system necessarily exacerbates the challenge to begin with because it makes economics the priority: it is more economical to import programming and imported programming generates more revenue than domestic programming. In essence, the measures the government takes simply respond to and reinforce the system which inhibits making culture the primary broadcasting priority to begin with. As part of the system, the newspaper would be unlikely to criticize it or advocate ideas which would oppose the status quo since the newspaper would be threatening its own self-interest because it is itself part of the status quo.

Thus, if the view of the newspaper as a medium which is basically conservative, purporting a uniform, pro-business perspective which reinforces the prevailing "political and economic orders" holds, then newspaper coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue will likely be primarily business-oriented. It will likely downplay the cultural significance altogether, downplay the adverse cultural effects of
broadcasting in Canada, and deflect or neutralize any criticism towards industry management. But if, on the other hand, the press is really socially responsible, it will provide coverage which perhaps warns of the dangers of acculturation, provide coverage which analyzes the causes of the cultural concern in broadcasting and explain solutions.

It is possible, then, that the press is not providing critical, comprehensive coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue and is thus catering to its own self-interest. (If the newspaper, for example, told of how foreign programming could be acculturating Canadians, it might possibly draw attention to its own practice of using American wire and syndication services which could also be acculturating Canadians.) On the other hand, it may well be playing a socially responsible role. If it is providing critical, comprehensive coverage, there may be room for minor recommendations. If, on the other hand, the press is not—and this could be construed as contributing to the perpetuation of the present system which precludes making culture the primary broadcasting priority in the first place—then it becomes more important to work out a strategy in which the newspaper would make its vital contribution to resolving the "cultural challenge" in broadcasting by creating an awareness of the issue. In either case it remains that public awareness is needed and it must therefore be determined what role the newspaper is playing. The present study, then, seeks to
assess the cultural role of the newspaper in its coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue.

Of course, evidence of critical, comprehensive coverage will not necessarily prove the press is socially responsible. It will, however, provide some evidence against the critics who argue the press acts only in its own self-interest. Similarly, should the press concentrate primarily on the economic aspects of the issue, it would not prove the case of critics such as Clement, although it would lend support to their claims. The study seeks, simply, evidence supporting one side or the other.

1.7 THE STUDY
The study is an evaluation of the amount and quality of information about Canada's cultural concerns with respect to broadcasting through content analysis of the most likely source of information, the daily newspaper. Specifically, the study examines and assesses the coverage given by The Globe and Mail to four areas of concern in the broadcasting-culture issue:

1. The CBC English network's and CTV's role/programming/performance

2. Pay-television

3. The piracy or satellite reception of U.S. pay television signals

1 The policy announced March 1, 1983 (DOC, 1983a) removed the requirement for most satellite dish owners to obtain a licence to operate their dish. Although this was widely reported in the media as "legalizing" the use of dishes to
4. The CRTC's Canadian content (Cancon) regulations for television

These four areas are collectively referred to as "the broadcasting-culture issue" or "the cultural issue in broadcasting". To be sure, there are doubtless other aspects involved in the broadcasting-culture issue but these four areas are most important, readily identifiable and provide a manageable context for the study.

Moreover, two of the issues, pay-television and piracy, evolved and reached at least an initial climax during the study's time frame (1980-Spring, 1983). Too, all four have been in the news with varying frequency. As well, the four areas have cultural implications. The CBC and CTV programming is intended to promote national identity (Broadcasting Act, 1968). Pay-television represents a potential boon to Canadian culture but it poses a threat as well. Finally, it

pick up American television signals, the policy did no such thing. The government warned in the policy that reception of pay-television was still illegal as it contravened both international copyright law and an agreement signed between Canada and the United States concerning reception of trans-border satellite signals. While the latter was recently revised to allow for reception of data, and even though the two governments are negotiating to include television signals, viewers of satellite-delivered television signals are still, in essence, pirating those signals. If the Canadian and American governments reach an agreement on the reception of television signals, it is unlikely to include pay signals. The new policy said that viewers must come to some agreement with the originators of the pay-television signals by their own accord. This is equally unlikely. In short, the reception of U.S. pay-television signals via satellite is still piracy although ownership and use of a satellite dish no longer requires a licence. For this reason, and for stylistic purposes, piracy and satellite reception of television signals are used interchangeably throughout the study.
is the responsibility of the CRTC to see that the Broadcasting Act's intentions, including the cultural intentions, are realized.

The Globe and Mail was specifically chosen as the source for analysis for several reasons. First, it calls itself "Canada's National Newspaper" and it would presumably cover stories of national significance such as the cultural issue. As well, it is considered to be Canada's premier newspaper. Merrill and Fisher (1980:143) write that The Globe and Mail "...continually attempts to inform its readers with a well rounded and reasoned picture of any given situation."

Furthermore, The Globe and Mail is seen as a prime agenda-setter for other newspapers. Winter and Einsiedel (1980:6) call it the "Canadian agenda-setter". Merrill and Fisher (1980:138) refer to it as the pace setter "for all of Canadian journalism", while the prestigious Times of London, report Merrill and Fisher (1980:138) says "...it is the only newspaper which is capable of 'setting the tone of newspaper play' on a national basis in Canada." As well, Fletcher (1981:9) says that other news organizations use The Globe "...as a source of guidance for their own coverage and comment." The Canadian Press also refers to The Globe in determining its news priorities (Fletcher, 1981:20) and carries a daily listing of the paper's stories on the wire (Fletcher, 1981: 59). Moreover, the print medium is seen to initiate coverage to set the agenda for television (Eyal, Win-
ter, and McCombs, 1980). Fletcher (1981:20) says that The Globe and Mail likely sets the agenda for the other media in Canada. Thus, The Globe and Mail sets a national agenda for the print medium and quite likely, for the broadcast media as well.

Because of its stature, then, we could not expect better coverage of the cultural issue than what The Globe provides. It can also be said that if a national issue is not in The Globe and Mail then it is probably not in the English daily newspaper medium or on television. Thus, The Globe and Mail is the most likely source of popular coverage of the cultural issue; it would provide the best coverage, and it might spur additional coverage in other newspapers and on television. Also, its stature allows us to assume its coverage is the best of any mass media coverage there may be, thus providing a gauge for at least a general assessment of the entire newspaper medium's coverage.

This study is not investigating why the media deem a topic or issue salient or whether the audience also deems it important. Rather, the study is looking at print as the most likely source of information on a single, significant national issue and is assessing its performance in covering the issue over time. The study seeks to determine how much discussion and what kind of discussion of the broadcasting-culture issue there is in newspaper stories regarding the four areas of the issue identified earlier.
It should be noted, too, that this study distinguishes between "cultural awareness" and "cultural cognition." Cultural cognition is conscious knowledge of cultural concerns (in this case the broadcasting-culture issue) whereas the latter is simply an awareness of Canadian culture. Thus, this study is looking for how, or if, the newspaper contributes to cultural cognition.

Generally, then, this study asks how much cultural coverage of broadcasting there is in The Globe and Mail and what this coverage is like. Specifically, it asks:

1. What kind of perspective is presented?
2. How comprehensive is the coverage?
3. What, then, is the nature of the potential agenda-setting effect?
4. What are the implications for policy-making?
5. What are the implications in terms of the role of the newspaper in society?

1.8 SUMMARY
It was argued in this chapter that culture is not a priority in the reality of broadcasting. Various government policies or measures have tended to place the economic interests of owners in various sectors of the industry above the concern for culture often expressed by government and others. It was also argued that it is imperative that culture be made the primary priority for the very survival of Canadian culture might be depending on it. This is because two pre-con-
ditions for cultural detriment to occur exist: the media, and particularly television, do affect culture and the American culture is different from the Canadian culture. As a result, broadcasting in Canada places the culture in a vulnerable situation and is preventing the television medium from being used as a cultural ally.

It was then explained how public awareness of the broadcasting—culture issue is a valuable asset in making culture a priority in reality. Awareness would enhance the public's policy-making input, and because the public would understand the issue, make potentially unpopular policy more acceptable. Thus, a critical consciousness of the issue is a vital element in making broadcasting in Canada a cultural ally.

The best popular source for this awareness is the daily newspaper. It has a demonstrated agenda-setting effect stronger than television, and the nature of the newspaper permits it to devote space and time to covering the issue. It has a role to play, then, by contributing to the cultural cognition needed to help to prevent the demise of Canadian culture.

On the one hand, the Social Responsibility Theory of the press would suggest that the newspaper is playing this role. However, the newspaper generally tends to present a narrow, pro-business perspective; and the newspaper mandarins, because of the media-economic-state interrelationship and interdependence, are part of the status quo which precludes
Canadian culture in broadcasting to begin with. Its contribution to cultural cognition, then, can be questioned. And because this contribution could be a vital ally in redressing the vulnerable situation Canadian culture is in, an investigation of the cultural role the newspaper plays with respect to its coverage of television broadcasting is warranted.

As an account of the numerous aspects involved in the broadcasting issue and subsequently as an arbiter of the quality of the newspaper's coverage of the issue, Chapter II describes the nature of the issue.
Chapter II

THE CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS OF BROADCASTING

2.1 INTRODUCTION

It was thought that the best way to assess the cultural coverage of broadcasting in the daily newspaper would be to look for the mention and explanation of themes in the newspaper. As such, this chapter identifies and explains possible cultural themes in the broadcasting—culture issue which the newspaper might mention.

There is no shortage of potential themes surrounding the broadcasting—culture issue in Canada. Neither is there a dearth of sources from which to extract the themes. The sources used to compile the analysis which follows represent analyses and viewpoints from government (CRTC and DOC publications, for example), industry (CBC and CTV publications and presentations), interest groups (presentations to the Federal Cultural Policy Review Commission, for example), and, indirectly, the public. As well, academic sources were consulted.

It was thought that to compile a well-rounded and complete analysis, minority viewpoints or those viewpoints which differed from the mainstream should be included.
Thus, the alternative press was consulted.\(^2\) However, due to the lack of availability of many of the periodicals, this pursuit proved to relatively unsuccessful. Still, Canadian journals of opinion us (Canadian Forum and \textit{THIS Magazine}, for example) were used to elicit ideas which were thought not to be in the industry-government domain.

Thus, the following is based on extensive analysis of expert, special interest and social commentary viewpoints representing a hybrid of opinion-majority and minority—from government, industry, academe, the public and political pundits. Besides representing a well-rounded account of ideas, the sources used also mean the ideas are on record and available to the daily press. There exists, in other words, an agenda of ideas to which the daily press has relatively easy access.

2.2 \textbf{CULTURE AND THE ECONOMICS OF BROADCASTING}

By far, the dominant aspect of the broadcasting-culture issue expressed was the financial aspect of the Canadian broadcasting system or what the CRTC (1976) calls "the economic realities of Canadian television production." On its own, the economics of broadcasting cannot be considered a cultural theme. It is, however, perhaps the single most important source of many of the cultural implications of Canadian broadcasting. As such, "the economic realities" will

\(^2\) The Alternative Press Index and Woodsworth (1972) were used to identify possible sources.
be considered the root of the cultural tree in this study rather than a cultural theme in and of itself. As will become evident, many of the themes identified in this chapter are tied to the financial aspect of television broadcasting and production; many of the themes, directly.

The economics of the Canadian television industry—production, distribution and exhibition—are explained extensively elsewhere (CRTC, 1976; Hallman and Hindley, 1977; Hindley and McNulty, 1977; CRTC, 1978b; Babe, 1979; CRTC, 1979b; Nelson, 1979; McFayden, Hoskins, and Gillen, 1980; DOC, 1982a) so only a general summary will be provided here.

Commercial television generally is a business (Babe, 1979; McFayden et al., 1980). Its purpose is not to make programs as a public service, but to make money. To do so, it must attract audiences with whatever kind of programming the audiences will watch. If a television screen dancing wildly with video "noise" attracted more viewers than Dallas or The Beachcombers or Hockey Night in Canada, then that would be the kind of programming competing for our attention. Broadcasters procure and air programs for one primary reason: to deliver an audience to advertisers. As McFayden, Hoskins and Gillen (1980:55) assert, "...broadcasters are not in the business to produce programs. They are in the business to produce audiences." It is this premise, which applies equally to the CBC and the private sector (CRTC, 1976), which constitutes the motivation of the telev-
And as business-wise entrepreneurs, the private sector moreso than the CBC seeks to maximize profits (McFayden et al., 1980:xii).

Because the American market for television programming is so large, production costs for expensive quality productions can be recovered in the U.S. domestic market (Ellis, 1976). This enables program originators to sell programs abroad for much less than cost. Or, as some observers claim, American programs are "dumped" in the export market (Nelson, 1979; the Canadian Council for the Arts in Applebaum and Hebert, 1982a:219). As a result Canadian broadcasters can purchase quality programming from the U.S. far more inexpensively than they can produce or purchase domestic programs even though production costs are less in Canada. (Although it is cheaper to produce a program in Canada, it is still far less expensive to purchase American programming because production costs for programs are recovered in the U.S. domestic market.)

In 1980 for example, the "economic reality" looked like this:

Production costs of American programs such as Three's Company, Dallas and Archie Bunker's Place average $500,000 per half-hour. Budgets for CBC-produced Flappers and Home Fires average $100,000 per half-hour. Such American shows are available in Canada at or below $15,000 per episode and normally attract two or three times their purchase

---

3 Television industry is defined in this study as the production, distribution and exhibition of television programming. It is used interchangeably, unless otherwise specified, with Canadian broadcasting system.
price in advertising. (DOC, 1980:4)

Furthermore, American programs generate higher advertising revenue than do Canadian programs since the popular appeal of the former attracts larger audiences (Babe, 1979:64). For instance, based on 1981 peak time advertising rates, CTV earned over $50,000 more per hour in advertising revenue for American programs than for Canadian programs (DOC, 1981b:2). The greater potential revenue, then, adds to the attractiveness to Canadian broadcasters of American programs. While this may be a more appealing attribute of American programming to CTV than the CBC, the public network is still influenced by advertising revenue prospects (McPayden et al., 1980:xvii).

Thus, American programs are cheaper than Canadian programs and they mean more advertising revenue to both the private and public broadcaster. And, American programs attract a larger audience than Canadian programs on average.

Another economic aspect of the broadcasting industry in Canada further inhibits domestic production. Investment in Canadian production of English-language television programs is discouraged by the small, 17-million person English market (DOC, 1982a:8) where only 20 to 25 percent of program production costs can be recovered (DOC, 1980:4). This means Canadian programs must be exported, principally to the U.S., to recover costs (not to mention to show a profit), but because of the competitive nature of the U.S. market, this is
a high-risk proposition at best (DOC, 1981b). Moreover, Can-
nadian program access to the U.S. domestic market is re-
stricted because of the amount of American programming there
(DOC, 1981b:2). Investment in Canadian productions is thus
discouraged because of the high risk involved caused by Ca-
 nada's small market and the competition with American pro-
gramming in export markets. What all this means is that
there is an extensive amount of American programming on the
Canadian television screen which is watched by more Canadi-
ans than the limited amount of Canadian programming that is
available. Potentially, this could cause acculturation and
limit Canadian enculturation. It also means that the fi-
nancing of Canadian programs is extremely limited. This in
turn means fewer Canadian programs are available to the Ca-
nadian viewer than might be otherwise. In short, the eco-
nomics of the television industry limit the Canadian broad-
casting system's potential to imbue the nation with its own
culture. At the same time, the economics contribute to the
potential of acculturation.

This economic reality is an "...inescapable fact which
applies to the CBC and to private broadcasters with equal
force..." (DOC, 1980:4) and is responsible for "...the re-
lated shortcomings identified in Canadian television,"
(CRTC, 1983a:9). Several cultural themes can be extracted
from this brief summary of the economics of the Canadian te-
levision industry.
First, it is rather evident that the economic reality translates into cultural detriment for Canada. Secondly, it is clear that in broadcasting economics and culture are not discrete. Just as foreign economic presence in the Canadian consumer market has cultural implications, the economics of the television marketplace do as well. One cannot look at economics and culture as two distinct elements of the broadcasting system. The two are inseparable (Crean, 1980a:31).

Implied in the preceding analysis, too, is the notion that Canadian television can do little culturally if it is not economically successful. As the DOC (1981b:3) puts it,

> It is even more important to note that economic viability in the program production component of broadcasting is complementary to the social, cultural and national identity objectives, enshrined in the Broadcasting Act, and is indeed, a prerequisite to the achievement of these objectives.

So, production must first be successful and, following this through, the use of Canadian productions by broadcasters must make economic sense before any cultural benefit can be expected. This is a third broad cultural theme related to the economics of television broadcasting in Canada.

This is complicated, however, by the economic reality that Canadian broadcasters need foreign programming and its cost-efficiency and higher advertising revenues to finance the production and purchase of Canadian programming. If, in other words, Canadian broadcasters did not have the opportunity to make money by importing foreign programs, there would be even less money going into the production of Canadian programs (CRTC, 1976:158).
If it appears that the broadcasting-culture relationship is caught in an economic catch-22 situation, then the reader has grasped the essence of the economic reality of Canadian television broadcasting. By way of summary, then, four broad cultural themes extracted from the preceding economic analysis are:

1. The economics of the Canadian television industry have cultural implications which inhibit the broadcasting system's ability to promote Canadian culture.

2. Economics and culture in broadcasting are directly related and inseparable.

3. To achieve the cultural objectives of the Broadcasting Act, Canadian television must be economically successful.

4. To be economically successful, a substantial amount of imported American programming is required.

2.3 ROLE/PROGRAMMING/PERFORMANCE

Economic reality influences the programming practices of both the CBC and CTV and this in turn affects their performance in fulfilling their cultural responsibility. The roles of the two national English networks are spelled out in the Broadcasting Act as part of the overall objectives for the Canadian broadcasting system. Both networks are expected to contribute to national identity "using predominantly Canadian creative and other resources," (Broadcasting Act, s. 3d). The CBC is alone, however, in being responsible for contributing to national unity (s. 3q).

The CBC, says the CRTC (1980c:43) is
required to serve the special needs of geographic regions and actively contribute to the flow and exchange of cultural and regional information and entertainment.

No such mandate is specifically handed to CTV. Still, in the 1979 CTV licence renewal decision, the CRTC was concerned that CTV was not showing enough of French Canada to its English-Canadian viewers (CRTC, 1980c:453). This would suggest that CTV, if not "required" to contribute to national unity, is at least expected to make English Canada aware of French Canada from time to time.

The Canadian ownership requirement in the Broadcasting Act indicates that the Canadian broadcasting system generally, including the CBC and CTV, must contribute to the enrichment and strengthening of Canada's cultural, political, social and economic fabric (Broadcasting Act, s. 3b). Both networks, too, are to perform their roles using "varied and comprehensive" programming (s. 3d).

From the CBC's point of view (CBC, 1978c:365), its role "...is to reflect and interpret Canada to Canadians" which is to be achieved in television by providing balanced, "distinctly Canadian" programming consisting of "popular programs for general audiences and more specialized programs to cover a range of audience interests."

But the role of the CBC goes beyond merely airing Canadian productions. It involves seeking Canadian programming, developing it and financing it. As well, its role is to be a market for Canadian culture, for without the CBC, the de-
velopment of Canadian creative resources would be lessened (CBC, 1981b). Thus, more is expected of the CBC than of CTV.

Two more themes in the broadcasting-culture issue, then, are:

5. The CTV and CBC are expected to contribute to national identity using Canadian resources in balanced and diverse programming.

6. The CBC's cultural role is more extensive than CTV's in that the former is expected to contribute to Canadian unity and to the development of Canadian creative talent.

A seventh theme which is related to the role/programming/performance area which has not yet been stated explicitly is:

7. Television broadcasting in Canada is intended to fulfill a cultural responsibility through the expression of Canadian identity.

But the network program production and procurement practices dictated for the most part by the economic reality of Canadian broadcasting limits the two English national networks from performing their roles optimally.

For instance, CTV tends to program entertainment during the period (8-10 p.m.) likely to attract the largest audience share (Babe, 1979:62). This kind of programming is also the most expensive to produce. Because it is cheaper to buy American entertainment than to produce Canadian entertainment, and because the popularity of the former commands higher advertising revenues, it is almost always American entertainment programming which is aired on CTV when the greatest number of Canadians is watching (Babe, 1979).
Furthermore, even though informational programs and talk shows are less attractive to the Canadian viewer than entertainment, these are the types of programs produced by and for the CTV and the private sector because they are the cheapest way of fulfilling Canadian content regulations (Babe, 1979:62; McPayden et al., 1980:198). Adding insult to injury as it were, the usual practice is to schedule programs during low viewer periods where the theory goes, revenue loss due to a small audience is minimized (Babe, 1979:62; CRTC, 1980c:951).

While the CBC's programming behavior and scheduling has been somewhat more conducive to the achievement of the objectives of the Broadcasting Act than has CTV's (CRTC, 1980c; CRTC, 1983a), it is not immune to criticism. The Applebaum-Hebert Report (1982b) in particular noted shortcomings in the CBC's programming diversity. Although the public network is not as entrapped by the economic reality as CTV is, it is still susceptible to the economic programming implications to some degree. The search for audience and advertising revenue, says the Applebaum-Hebert Report (1982b:278), inhibits "distinctive" programming. The CBC has made some accomplishments in this regard, but the competition for advertising revenues still causes it to produce much programming which differs little from each other or from private sector programming (Applebaum and Hebert, 1982b:278). This suggests as well, then, that the diversity
and balance in Canadian television in general falls short of the intent of the Broadcasting Act.

The performance of both English national networks in fulfilling their perceived cultural roles has been especially inadequate in the production of drama programming. Because drama is the most expensive kind of programming to produce and because it is available so inexpensively from the U.S., Canadian drama on English-language television is almost non-existent and when it is available, the audience is virtually tuned elsewhere. Even so, drama accounts for 49 percent of total viewing time of English-language television and 66 percent of peak viewing time (DOC, 1983a:8). Drama is popular, obviously, and its appeal makes it a programming staple. However, despite the efforts of Canadian television in producing sports, news and public affairs programming, only five percent of the drama on English television (mostly on CBC) is made in Canada. And this five percent represents a meagre two percent of total viewing time of dramatic programs (DOC, 1983a:8).

The reason, of course, that American drama is so omnipresent on Canadian television is economics: drama is the kind of programming evidently most in demand and it must therefore be aired, but it is far cheaper to import than to produce in Canada and the American dramas command the highest

* The definition of drama used in this study is the CRTC's (1983a:4): "...drama includes feature films, situation comedies, adventure series, plays and serials."
advertising revenue. Even the CBC, mindful of its annual parliamentary funding and reliant upon 20 percent of its budget from commercial revenue, must budget and behave as a responsible business should. Like CTV, it realizes it can make the most of its drama programming investment through importing at least some of it.

But the CBC cannot be considered as culpable as CTV for the deficiency of Canadian drama, or so believes the CRTC (1983a). The CRTC does note, however, that Canadian drama is "under-represented" on the CBC's mid-evening schedules (CRTC, 1983a:7).

At the 1973 CTV Network licence renewal hearings, the CRTC asked the network to devote more programming to Canadian drama with Canadian themes and locales (Babe, 1979). Still displeased three years later, the CRTC told CTV it (CRTC) "...expects the network, in future schedules, to correct the deficiency of no weekly Canadian drama in the 1976-1977 network schedule," (CRTC, 1977). In the 1979 licence renewal decision, the CRTC ordered CTV to present 26 hours of new Canadian drama in the 1980-81 season and 39 hours of new Canadian drama the following season as a condition of licence (CRTC, 1980c:451). Thus, of the two networks, CTV has been more neglectful than the CBC of Canadian drama.

Canadians, then, are watching a considerable amount of American drama and little Canadian drama. One obvious im-
lication of this is that the potential for acculturation is high, while the benefit of enculturation is being missed.

But perhaps more important is the power of drama in expressing culture. Television programming in general conveys culture, but drama does it best. Gerbner and Gross (1976:187) wax eloquent saying that dramatic programs are the

most ubiquitous, translucent and instructive part of television (or any cultural) fare...that populate and animate for most viewers the heartland of the symbolic world.

Said the DOC draft strategy (DOC, 1982a:16):

Drama programming, in particular, is very influential. It conveys attitudes and social/cultural values.

The Canada Consulting Group (quoted in Babe, 1979:80) recommends that "...complex and labour-intensive drama series" are best able to "portray Canada to Canadians." And according to Al Johnson (1981c:15), former president of the CBC, drama is the kind of programming where

a nation's cultural identities are reflected most vividly. It is often from drama that viewers form appreciation of themselves and their society, of their values and heritage and their way of living...and indeed of their differences or particularities or idiosyncracies.

What they are all saying is that drama transmits culture probably better than anything else on television. Thus, since Canadians watch more American drama than Canadian, the potential for acculturation is far greater than the potential for enculturation. Other themes, then, become evident:
8. Drama, the genre best suited to convey culture, is rarely produced in Canada.

9. The Canadian drama that is produced and aired cannot be considered a significant cultural force since viewership is so low.

10. Because so little Canadian drama is presented or viewed on Canadian television, optimal use of the medium for cultural purposes is not being made.

11. Because so much American drama is watched, Canadians are highly susceptible to acculturation.

Whether it be drama or comedy, news or variety, for Canadian programming to be successful economically and culturally, it must be good enough to attract viewers. Good quality productions require good talent. Canadian broadcasters can help the development of Canadian talent by using Canadian talent.

As self-evident as this may be, both the CBC and CTV have been chided for not contributing to the development of Canadian talent (Applebaum and Hebert, 1982b:276-277;281). As well, the reliance upon in-house productions, where 90 per cent of the CBC and CTV programming budgets is spent (DOC, 1981b), prevents new and unemployed (or underemployed) Canadian writers, producers, directors, technicians and actors from developing their creativity and expertise to world-competitive standards. In a sense, the reliance upon in-house talent limits the experienced talent base.

The CBC's management and structure have been singled out as the reason for its "insufficient" contribution to the fostering of Canadian talent. The Applebaum-Hebert Report (1982b:277) is particularly critical:
It is not motives that are at fault but institutional dynamics... The reason why institutions like the CBC tend to rely to such a great extent on in-house series relates to the privileged position of one sort or another which those organizations occupy in society. Because some are able to operate as monopolists (sole suppliers or quasi-monopolists), they eliminate virtually all the pressures of competition to operate more efficiently... The result is a hardening of the creative arteries and protection of the institutional status quo. The CBC is that type of over-protected operation. It is not a monopolist, but the fact that it receives so much of its gross income from Parliament effectively shields it and its employees from having to respond to changing circumstances.

Crean (1983:23) suggests that one reason for the shortcomings noted by the Report (but which is not stated explicitly in the Report) is that the CBC is "insanely badly managed." The decision-makers at the public network, not the production staff, are responsible for the network's failures in talent and program development.

The Applebaum-Hebert Report (1982b:281) also noted that private television uses little Canadian talent and spends little to develop new Canadian talent. Overall, then, Canadian broadcasters do little to encourage the development of Canadian talent, meaning that the production sector's ability to produce programming with high production value—so necessary to attract viewers—is hampered. Not enough Canadian talent is gaining professional experience. And no production can compete for viewers or financing if its talent does not have sufficient experience.
It was noted earlier that economic viability of the production sector is a prerequisite to achieving the cultural objectives of the Broadcasting Act. But economic viability in turn depends in part on talent—the development of which receives little help from broadcasters. In essence, the broadcasters are contributing insufficiently even to the prerequisite of successful achievement of television's cultural objectives. Even if Canadian productions are made, they can contribute to culture only if they are good enough to attract a substantial Canadian audience. The quality of a program depends to some extent on the quality of talent involved, but if this talent is not given the opportunity to develop, the quality of productions could suffer. From this analysis of talent development in Canada, the following theme can be identified.

12. Canadian broadcasters are not contributing enough to the development of Canadian talent—talent which must be good enough to ensure high production values so necessary to assure program financing, sale and viewership.

Generally speaking, then, the CBC and CTV have not been entirely successful purveyors of Canadian culture. Just exactly what is "successful" is not clear. However, there is a consensus shared by many involved with the television industry that the CBC and CTV could do more particularly with respect to programming Canadian drama and with respect to increasing programming diversity. A final, rather broad theme relating to role/programming/performance, then, is:
13. The CBC and CTV have achieved only limited success in performing their cultural roles.

Since it is economics which accounts for a large part of the problem in achieving the cultural objectives of Canadian television, economic strategies have been posited as the means to better achieve the objectives. The theory behind this is best summarized in the new broadcasting strategy (DOC, 1983a). Basically, more money for production means increased quality, which means increased competitiveness, which translates into viewership. (Without Canadian viewership of Canadian programs, no enculturation can occur.) The CBC (1981b), the CRTC (1983a) and the DOC (1983a) all have indicated the need for economic incentives in the production industry. The DOC responded with the creation of the Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund as part of the Broadcast Strategy for Canada (DOC, 1983a). This fund provides for $60 million to be put into private and independent production over five years where the producer must raise $2 for every dollar acquired from the fund.

Thus, the need for increased funding in production leads to another theme:

14. Economic strategies are required to assist Canadian broadcasting in achieving its cultural objectives.
2.4 **PAY TELEVISION**

Pay television is another aspect of the broadcasting-culture issue which gives rise to several themes. It was noted in Chapter I that pay television is both a benefit and a challenge to Canadian culture. This apparent contradiction can now be elaborated.

It was predicted that the six pay services licensed in Canada would make available 11,100 hours of Canadian programming annually in the first three years of operation and 17,500 hours annually in the last two years of the first licence period (DOC, 1982a:46). That is much more Canadian programming than is available now on conventional television. The catch, however, is that not all Canadians will subscribe to pay television. Still, the fact that pay television provides a new market for Canadian programming and will thus spur the production of new programming cannot be overlooked.

Pay television's basic contribution to culture stems from its financial contribution to production. Pay television puts money into production through direct financing and program acquisition. Since it creates both demand for programming and financing for programming, the economics of program production are improved by pay television in increasing the domestic revenue base for Canadian programs (DOC, 1981b:3). The demand provides incentive to produce and financing assistance (as well as outright purchasing) provides the capability for program production.
The continuing revenue base provided by pay television (Woodrow and Woodside, 1982a) for program production assures the "production" of Canadian culture for broadcast. That pay television generates revenue in the production sector also means that programming diversity will expand (DOC, 1982a:45). And because increased production provides work, Canadian talent will gain the experience and capabilities required to make attractive programming of high production value that Canadians will watch. Moreover, the better the quality, the better are export prospects which in turn adds more revenue to production which in turn translates into cultural benefit.

The cultural benefits of enculturation from pay television programming is limited if the audience, because it has to pay for the programming, is limited. But it is expected that a considerable amount of the "made-for-pay" programming will be sold to conventional broadcasters (DOC, 1981b; Johnson, 1981b). The enculturation potential of that programming will thus be increased since it will become available to all Canadians.

The present deficiency in drama programming on Canadian television could be alleviated through the exhibition of such programming on "free" television following the initial run on pay television (DOC, 1981b; DOC, 1982a). The enculturation potential will thus be enhanced since, as indicated in the previous section, drama is the best genre for convey-
ing culture. As well, the availability of Canadian drama on conventional television will displace some of the American drama so prevalent on Canadian television thus lessening the acculturation potential of American programming.

By providing both a market and financing for program production, therefore, pay television will inject sorely needed revenue into the production sector thereby increasing program availability, diversity and, through the incentive of competition and through talent development, the quality of production. Through the contribution to drama programming in particular and through the exhibition of pay programming on conventional television, Canadian pay television can bolster the enculturation potential of the Canadian broadcasting system.

As well, the competitive system with its regional pay services established by the CRTC is expected to induce greater regional expression (Fox, 1982a). This should expand awareness of Canada and its diversity. Pay television, then, is a cultural shot in the arm for Canadian television.

But as Johnson (1981b:1) warns, pay television creates the potential to "...further Americanize an already Americanized system," because much of the programming will be American-produced. Woodrow and Woodside (1982a:27) view pay television as creating an even greater cultural domination of Canada. For Peers (1982:9), pay television could easily undermine the objectives we have spelled out in existing legislation, while at the same time [reduce] rather than [enhance] the capacity
we have for Canadians to speak to Canadians with an even chance of being heard.

Thus, Canadian pay television makes even more popular American programming available. If this is not worrisome enough, the increase in foreign programming choice--choice which the government deems desirable (DOC, 1983a)--also increases the competition against Canadian programming. That is, while pay television certainly increases the availability of Canadian programming, it also gives that domestic programming slick, made-in-Hollywood competition. In other words, the enculturation potential of pay television is hounded by a strong Americanization potential.

While Communications Minister Francis Fox perceived a cultural advantage in the competitive system of Canadian pay television, others see it as a hurdle. A universal system (i.e., one national pay channel alone) would have been more beneficial to Canadian culture since the return on programming investment would be twice that available under the competitive, discretionary system (Applebaum and Hebert, 1982a:224). This would make program production even more attractive. Johnson (1981b), implying that the discretionary system fragments financing, believes a universal system would have concentrated production funds thus guaranteeing a financially reliable and financially viable pay television industry.

In a meticulous examination of the potential detriments of the discretionary system, Peers (1982) concurs that the
fragmentation of potential revenues undermines the financial capabilities of Canadian pay television. The competitive system prevents economies of scale from operating, and creates duplication in marketing, packaging and promotion costs, effectively driving up the costs of production. As well, the competitive bidding for American programming increases the cost of that imported programming (Peers, 1982:16-17). This means that with the discretionary system, there is less money than there would be otherwise for production, procurement and exhibition of Canadian programming because of the higher costs of operating in a competitive system.

It can be seen, then, that because of the availability of American programming and the competitive nature of the Canadian pay television system, Canadian pay television presents problems for the Canadian broadcasting system's ability to promote Canadian culture.

Several cultural themes can be culled from the foregoing analysis of Canadian pay television:

15. Pay television represents both a boon and a challenge to Canadian culture.

16. The increase in domestic programming that pay television provides is a cultural benefit.

17. Pay television can benefit culture through the emphasis of drama, the genre best suited to convey culture.

18. Pay television can benefit culture through increasing Canadians' awareness of the regions and diversity (national identity) of Canada.
19. The increase in American programming that pay television provides is a cultural danger.

20. The cultural potential of pay television is undermined by the higher costs inherent in the competitive nature of the discretionary system.

2.5 PIRACY

Whereas Canadian pay television represents legitimate choice of watching American programming, the viewing of American satellite television signals represents an illegitimate choice. Although the government gave up its hopeless pursuit of satellite signal pirates in March of 1983, it did not actually legalize the viewing of those signals. It simply gave up trying to catch pirates and removed the licencing requirements for individuals and some commercial establishments for dish ownership and operation (DOC, 1983a). Watching the American pay television signals is still theft since Canadians do not pay program originators for that right. Indeed, Francis Fox made it clear in the Broadcast Strategy for Canada that "operators of earth stations may still require permission to receive satellite programming signals from their originators." (DOC, 1983a:13). Appearing on the CBC's The Journal two days after announcing the new strategy, Fox reiterated this point (Fox, 1983). In effect, satellite signal viewers are still committing piracy although they are breaking no Canadian law.

The government may have seemed to have done an about-face on the piracy issue, allowing it, as it does, after the many
warnings issued to pirates. The new broadcasting policy is, in a sense, contradictory: on the one hand, it provides for public funding of television production while on the other, it permits increased competition by allowing the use of satellite dishes. This contradiction is, in essence, a prime example of the quandary the government faces in broadcast regulation.

The government wants to stimulate Canadian program production but it realizes, too, that Canadians are entitled to watch the best the world has to offer (DOC, 1983a). The government also recognizes it cannot prevent Canadians from watching television satellite signals originating from the U.S. (DOC, 1983a) and that if it tried, it knows full well the public outcry that would ensue (DOC, 1982a). Because of satellite technology and because of the popularity of the signals the technology brings and because of the prevalent use of the technology to bring in those signals, there is nothing, in short, the government can do about the reception of American pay television satellite signals. It accepts this as part of the "challenge of the 80s" in broadcasting (DOC, 1983a). And a challenge, at least with respect to Canadian culture, it is.

The reception of satellite signals—legitimate or otherwise—presents a very real financial threat to the Canadian broadcasting system and the Canadian production industry, and in so doing, to Canadian culture. Sometime before giv-
ing up the pursuit of pirates, Francis Fox (DOC, 1980a:9) described the financial threat gravely:

Allowing the unlimited importation of the 25 or more channels of U.S. satellite television into major Canadian markets would seriously undermine the financial foundation of the Canadian broadcasting system, lead to the bankruptcy of Canadian television stations and networks, and destroy the Canadian broadcasting system.

The DOC's draft of the new broadcasting policy was equally foreboding when it warned: "The effects of receiving U.S. satellite signals on an already weak domestic production sector could be disastrous," (DOC, 1982a:60).

The financial well-being of the production sector, as we have seen, has been bolstered somewhat by pay television and by the Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund. Since program financing is central to the cultural implications of satellite signal reception, a very brief summary of the financing is provided below.

The pay industry's demand for programming provides a continuing revenue base for production from the private sector, including the pay television companies. As well, the government has provided two methods to put money into production coffers. As a condition of their licences, pay television companies are required to turn over a percentage of their profits over a period of five years to program production (CRTC, 1982a). The Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund established in the new broadcasting strategy will be used to finance production for conventional and pay te-
levision. The Fund will itself be funded by a 6 percent sales tax on cable programming services, including cable rental, pay television, and equipment rental such as decoders for pay television reception (Department of Finance, 1983:35–36). As well, the government expects private broadcasters to contribute some $30 million to program production in coming years (DUC, 1982a).

How then does piracy disrupt the financial well-being of Canadian broadcasting? Piracy takes potential subscribers away from cable and pay companies. The fewer subscribers there are, the less will be a pay company's revenue. The less revenue a pay company has, the less it will be able to devote to program procurement and direct program financing. Thus, the pay television companies might be able to buy and exhibit fewer programs, including Canadian programs, than would be the case if piracy were non-existent. As well, revenue generated from the federal tax on cable rental and other legitimate Canadian programming services would be less if many potential subscribers are instead tuned to their dish.

As well, because the pay companies are earning less than is potentially possible, less money is made available to Canadian productions. That is, piracy prevents the pay companies from earning potentially greater profits thus lowering the potential amount turned over to production as a percentage of profits.
The reception of television satellite signals also potentially represents lost revenue to local broadcasters since they must compete for audiences. If part of the audience is tuned to HBO or ESPN, the local broadcaster earns less advertising revenue than he otherwise might. With less available revenue, the local stations—and the networks—have less money to purchase Canadian programming or to produce their own. In the worst scenario, a local broadcaster might be forced out of business.

Broadcasters are already facing an uncertain financial future and Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB) Chairman John Anséll estimated that as many as 60 percent of member stations would lose money in 1983 (CAB, 1982:8). Piracy is perhaps more dangerous to small market broadcasters than it is to major market broadcasters. Most small market broadcasters are in a more precarious financial situation than major market broadcasters and thus, any competition is worrisome. Moreover, many of the small market broadcasters are in areas where satellite television signal reception is most prevalent—in northern and remote communities. It is clear then, that piracy poses a financial threat to Canadian broadcasters.

---

5 The CAB is an association of private radio and television broadcasters, including privately owned affiliates of the CBC.
As the economic analysis which began this chapter would indicate, the financial threat of piracy is translated into a cultural threat. Piracy hinders the dissemination of Canadian culture on Canadian television by diminishing the television industry's ability to produce and exhibit Canadian programming and by diminishing its ability to compete for viewers. As well, piracy increases the amount of American programming available in Canada and thus increases the chance that viewing these signals will result in Canadian cultural displacement or acculturation. In sum, the viewing of U.S. television signals via satellite increases competition against Canadian programs and decreases potential exposure to those programs. Not only does piracy mean that there might be less Canadian culture on Canadian television, but it also potentially decreases exposure (and therefore, acculturation potential) to the Canadian programming and culture that is produced.

Piracy does indeed present cultural implications in the broadcasting-culture issue, then, which are expressed in the following themes.

21. The reception of American television satellite signals undermines the Canadian broadcasting system's ability to promote Canadian culture.

22. The reception of American television satellite signals increases the potential for acculturation.

23. The reception of American television satellite signals exemplifies the challenge to culture that technology can create.

24. The government is virtually helpless in fighting the threat to Canadian culture posed by the reception of American television satellite signals.
2.6 THE CRTC AND CANADIAN CONTENT REGULATIONS

The final aspect of the broadcasting-culture issue to be looked at in this study is the Canadian content regulations for television. Having come into effect on October 1, 1970, the "Cancon" regulations require that a minimum 60 percent Canadian content must be shown on television between 6 a.m. and midnight. Between 6 p.m. and midnight, private television must show at least 50 percent Canadian content and the CBC 60 percent. The percentage is averaged annually.

The regulations were established to defend the Canadian airwaves from the cultural onslaught of American programming and to provide the Canadian production industry with a competitive chance. The objective of the regulations is to provide and exhibit in all broadcasting time periods, including the most popular viewing hours, a wide range of high-quality, Canadian produced programs that a significant number of Canadians will choose to watch. (CRTC, 1983a:3)

Canadian television's performance outlined earlier in this chapter would indicate, however, that the Cancon regulations have not realized their objective. The shortcomings are particularly evident in English-language entertainment programming. Although the regulations would seem to be a worthwhile cultural endeavour, they have fallen short of inducing television to "...reflect Canadian experience and the social, visual and linguistic idioms of the country," (CRTC, 1983a:5). Put simply, the Canadian content regulations have not been effective (Peers, 1982:19).
The networks have been able to program, purchase, produce and schedule in such a way as to relegate Canadian programming—Canadian culture—to minor status. Through scheduling Canadian programs in off-peak hours and during summer months, broadcasters make it more difficult to view Canadian programs than American programs even if they choose to watch the former. And, as noted earlier, Canadian broadcasters are not exhibiting a "wide range of high-quality" programming made in Canada. The broadcasters have managed to contradict the spirit of the regulations, a contradiction which has not gone unnoticed.

Experience of the past several years shows clearly that simple compliance with the minimum quantitative requirements under the current regulation has not been enough to achieve this objective. Widespread practices have evolved which are at odds with the spirit of the Canadian content regulation. (CRTC, 1982a:3).

Thus, a cultural theme can be identified.

25. Here quantitative Canadian content quotas have not been effective in contributing to the cultural (Canadian) prowess of television despite the compliance thereof.

But the fault for the failure of the regulations cannot be shouldered by the broadcasters alone. For its part, the CRTC has been tame in instituting and enforcing the regulations. Habe (1979:142) notes that the CRTC buckled under to private sector pressure three times before the present quotas were instituted. This diluted the potency of the regulations considerably.
Furthermore, the CRTC chooses not to use its most powerful punitive measure—licence revocation—against stations that fail to meet the Canadian content quota (Babe, 1979:146). This is partly because of the amount of legal and administrative work involved. It is also because the CRTC’s statistics on quota fulfillment are anywhere from one and a half to two years out of date and it is thus forced to act long after the fact. Instead, the CRTC uses persuasion and hints of disciplinary action (Babe, 1979:147). Part of the failure of the Cancon regulations, then, can be blamed on the weak enforcement (monitoring) measures brought on by the institutional infrastructure which denies the regulator speed and simplicity in enforcing the regulations.

Woodrow and Woodside (1982a) point to another reason which may inhibit effective performance of the Canadian content regulations and which hinder communications policy-making in general. They see the federal-parliamentary context within which communications policy is made as presenting an obstacle to the CRTC in carrying out its "statutory mandate" (Woodrow and Wilson, 1982a:30) which indirectly includes enforcing the Cancon regulations.

There is, they note, the ever present provincial-federal disagreement over jurisdiction. On occasion, the DOC and the CRTC take contradictory positions on certain matters. As well, within the federal government, there is "contention" among government departments, the CBC, and the CRTC
over their respective policy-making roles (Woodrow and Woodside, 1982a:30).

Thus, this bureaucratic mix of ill-defined roles, of disputed jurisdiction, and the mix of stages in the decision-making process—the CRTC considers proposals and takes positions but the federal Cabinet makes the final decision through the Minister of Communications—do not lend well to smooth, efficient and concerted policy formulation or enforcement of policy intent. This mitigates policy's furthering of the cultural contribution of television.

Two cultural themes related to the CRTC's performance in overseeing Canadian content can thus be stated.

26. The CRTC is not contributing fully to the realization of the cultural objectives of television at least with respect to Canadian content regulations enforcement.

27. The federal and parliamentary policy-making context hinders the CRTC and policy itself from performing optimally in achieving the cultural objectives of television.

To rectify the shortcomings in the Cancon regulations, the CRTC announced proposed changes in the regulations in January, 1983 (CRTC, 1983a). The quotas will remain the same. The Commission proposed to establish a more precise definition of Canadian content which would be used throughout government.

To ensure adequate Canadian programming is available during peak-time viewing periods, the CRTC proposed, pending further consideration and discussion with the industry, to
introduce a 35 percent minimum requirement of Canadian programming during the "mid-evening" (CRTC, 1983a:16). As well, the CRTC proposed to change the reporting period from annually to semi-annually. Private broadcasters in particular tend to over-stock their schedules with Canadian programming during the summer months, when average viewing levels are lower. In this way the broadcasters can fulfill the annual content quota without foregoing the additional revenues American programming provides during the winter.

The CRTC also proposed to make greater use of conditions of licence "...to stimulate improvements in Canadian television programming," (CRTC, 1983a:18). It is hoped that these measures will overcome the "widespread practices" used by Canadian broadcasters to dodge the Canadian content regulations. The proposed reporting and mid-evening scheduling requirements would increase the potential viewership of Canadian programming thus affording a greater enculturation opportunity. The proposed changes in the Canadian content regulations, then, could benefit culture and this represents another theme in the broadcasting-culture issue.

28. The proposed changes in the Canadian content regulations could benefit Canadian culture by increasing the opportunity of exposure to Canadian programming.
2.7 *Some Additional Themes*

Relevant sections from Chapter I on media and culture can be expressed in the following themes:

29. Television expresses culture.

30. The American and Canadian cultures are different.

31. Viewing foreign signals can cause acculturation.

32. Viewing Canadian signals can cause enculturation.

33. The availability and popularity of American signals decreases exposure to Canadian programming thereby increasing the acculturation potential of the former and decreasing the enculturation potential of the latter.

If there was not a cultural difference between Canada and the United States, the cultural significance of Canadian broadcasting would be minimal—there would be no threat to Canadian culture since viewers would be getting it from American programming. It would not matter, then, what the Canadian government or Canadian television, or the other media did to promote cultural awareness since American television programming would supply all we need.

However, there is a difference and this cultural difference is at the heart of the significance Canadian broadcasting has both beneficially and detrimentally to Canadian culture. Given the competition facing Canadian television, and given the less than optimum performance by government and the industry in contributing to television’s cultural potential, and given the agenda-setting function of the newspaper, can the newspaper if not assisting Canadian cultural
assimilation, at least contribute to an understanding of the many interrelated issues and sub-issues operating both for and against Canadian cultural wellbeing?
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS

3.1 METHODOLOGY

The themes identified throughout Chapter II are presented in Appendix B. The content analysis of The Globe and Mail looked for these themes in the newspaper's coverage of the four subject areas of broadcasting also identified in the previous chapter.

All stories in The Globe and Mail dating from January 1, 1980 to March 31, 1983 with the keywords 'Canadian content/Cancon', 'CBC', 'CRTC', 'CTV', 'dish', 'DOC', '(Francis) Fox', '(Al) Johnson', '(Pierre) Juneau', '(John) Neisel', 'Pay TV' (and company names), 'piracy/pirates', 'programming', and 'satellite' in the headline were initially gathered. It was thought that in some headlines, words such as 'policy', 'strategy', or 'broadcasting/television' might involve one of the four areas in the story. Thus, if the keywords listed above did not appear in a headline, but if the headline implied the story was about one of the four subject areas (for example, "Study Urges Broadcast Policy Changes"), the story was selected.

The stories were then scanned. If a story did not deal with one of the four subject areas, the story was eliminated from inclusion in the study.
It was thought that not every story initially selected relating to the four subject areas could necessarily be expected to provide cultural coverage. Chapters 1 and 2 indicated the numerous possible themes and the extent of the implications in the broadcasting-culture issue. But while there are a considerable number of aspects to consider, the journalism craft, the story context, and proper, customary style would dictate that some stories could not be expected to provide cultural coverage.

Still, it was expected that there would be many stories where reference to at least one theme and some elaboration could rightfully be expected. Reference to a theme was expected if some aspects of the theme were provided in a story. Conversely, reference to a theme justified a reasonable expectation of some kind of elaboration.

For example, a story might simply have been about a new program to air on CTV. If the context of such a story was purely a review or critique of the program (most stories about individual programs on both CTV and CBC were of this type), or if it was simply a talent or program profile, it would not be reasonable to expect cultural coverage or some kind of relevant connection to culture to be made. On the other hand, if such a story also said that the new program was part of the 29 hours of new Canadian programming demanded by the CRTC, then it would be reasonable to expect some cultural coverage. In other words, the context of a story
of the first type does not provide a relevant connection to culture whereas the context of a story of the second type does. Mentioning or referring to a cultural theme with some kind of explanation would not be out of context or irrelevant. Neither would it be an abuse of journalistic standards nor stylistically inappropriate. It could even be argued that it is necessary.

As another example, a story which is primarily about cable television’s quest for a pay TV licence, or about the federal-provincial dispute over pay television jurisdiction could not lead one to expect cultural coverage. But a story about the federal-provincial dispute which alludes to how this affects the achievement of the Broadcasting Act objectives could reasonably be expected to provide some cultural coverage.

Thus, the story selection distinguished between stories in which cultural coverage could be expected and stories in which cultural coverage could not be expected. An inter-coder reliability test (Holsti, 1967) was conducted using both a random and purposive sample of newspaper stories. Inter-coder reliability on expectation of coverage was .90. (Appendix C details the procedure and results of the inter-coder reliability test). Only those stories which dealt with at least one of the four subject areas and in which cultural coverage could reasonably be expected were selected for analysis (N=166).
It was expected that some stories which provided cultural coverage would mention or refer to a theme or themes but would perhaps fail to provide some of the "details". Likewise, it was also expected that some stories would provide details but not mention or refer to a theme specifically.

In this study "mention" means a declarative statement about the relationship between culture and the subject area (story subject) which paraphrases or resembles or is analogous to one of the 33 themes listed in Appendix B. The term "details" refers to the story's reference to or elaboration of any part of the analysis in Chapter 1 or 2 relating to the corresponding theme which explains the cultural connection or implication to broadcasting expressed in the theme.

To recapitulate the purpose of the study, the study seeks to determine how much cultural coverage there is in The Globe and Mail with respect to the four subject areas, what the agenda-setting potential is and what the coverage is like. The first part of the research problem—whether there is coverage—and second part of the problem—the likelihood of an agenda-setting potential—were pursued using quantitative coding procedures and measurements. The third part of the research problem—what is the coverage like—was pursued using critical, qualitative analysis of the coverage provided with Chapters 1 and 2 acting as the standard of comparison. Thus, the content analysis was both quantitative and qualitative. The coding sheet is reproduced in Appendix D.
Such factors as story size, placement and headline size were analyzed as indicators of amount of coverage as well as indicators of the story's agenda-setting potential. The more prominent the story, the more likely it is to be read thus increasing its agenda-setting potential. Headline size was coded as small (less than 2.99 square column inches), medium (3 to 6 square column inches) or large (more than 6 square column inches). Column-inch measurements are all expressed in six-column format.

Just as a story's placement in the newspaper was considered an indicator of its agenda-setting potential, so too was a theme's placement in a story considered an indicator of the individual story's agenda-setting potential for cultural coverage. In the journalism profession, the details of a story are placed in descending order of importance. The newspaper's ascription of priority to a theme can thus be determined. As well, stories are not always read from beginning to end. The higher a particular detail is placed in a story, therefore, the more likely it is to be read. The higher cultural coverage is placed in a story, therefore, the more likely it is to be read and thus, the greater is the cultural agenda-setting potential of the story.

The amount of space, rounded to the nearest column inch, devoted to themes and details was taken as the measure of extent of cultural coverage in the story. It was expressed both in absolute terms and as a percentage of the story's total space.
As noted earlier, this study was concerned as much with what kind of cultural coverage there is as with the agenda-setting potential of that coverage. Initially, an attempt was made to assess the quality of coverage through purely quantitative coding procedures. A small pre-test of this procedure, however, failed to adequately assess or measure the kind of coverage provided. A second, revised pre-test also proved a failure. Quantitative procedures simply could not measure what the story said or did not say about culture and broadcasting. Thus, a qualitative procedure was devised to assess the kind of coverage provided by *The Globe and Mail*.

To maintain as neutral an assessment as possible, a series of questions was devised which were asked of all stories. The analysis was restricted to answering those questions. As well, the possible answers were predetermined and a series of rules was established for each question to determine which answer would be most suitable. In this way, all stories were treated equally and were subjected to identical analysis.

The questions sought to determine what each story said about culture, what each story did not say, and how the cultural coverage was provided. Some of the questions were devised prior to the quantitative pre-tests and then revised following the pre-tests. Revisions were based on the problems encountered in the pre-tests. Other questions were ad-
ded after the revisions were made. A more detailed description of the qualitative procedure is provided in Appendix A.

By pursuing the qualitative analysis in this way, the methodology accomplished four things:

1. It subjected each story to the same criteria.
2. It brought a standard line of investigation to each individual story and standardized the possible performance of each story by restricting the range of answers to questions.
3. It pre-determined and standardized the focus of investigation on each story.
4. It treated all stories equally in the assessment of the individual story's quality of coverage and permitted results to be aggregate compared.

Holsti's inter-coder reliability test was conducted between this student and a communication studies student on 40 randomly selected stories from the 166 selected for analysis. Average inter-coder agreement was .94, 'confidently' high enough to proceed with the study. The findings are presented in the next section.

3.2 FINDINGS: AMOUNT OF COVERAGE
A total of 166 stories dealing with the four subject areas was found in which cultural coverage could reasonably be expected. Of these, 95 stories or 57% actually provided some kind of coverage. The frequency of stories that provided coverage works out to one story every 11 publishing days.

6 All percentages cited in the text are rounded to the nearest whole number. Actual percentages are as shown in the Tables.
Ten publishing days during the study's time frame were randomly selected and an average number of stories per issue was calculated to assess how the frequency of cultural coverage compared with total news coverage during the period. Based on the random sample, there are on average 241 stories per issue in The Globe and Mail. This means that 75,192 stories (241 x 312 publishing days) appear in The Globe every year. Therefore, during the study's time frame (January 1, 1980 to March 31, 1983), a total of roughly 244,374 stories appeared in The Globe. Thus, the 95 stories which provided cultural coverage of broadcasting represents 0.04% (95 out of 244,374) of all stories which appeared between January 1, 1980 and March 31, 1983 in The Globe and Mail.

Slightly more than half of the stories in which coverage could reasonably be expected actually provided cultural coverage (95 of 166). If this were interpreted as a measure of The Globe and Mail's performance in placing the broadcasting-culture issue on the public agenda of discussion, The Globe's performance could be considered mediocre at best. It only covered cultural aspects of broadcasting in a little more than half of the stories it could have. Thus, culture was part of the agenda only half as often as it could have been.

7 The Globe and Mail published every day of the year, including holidays, except on Sundays during the study's time frame.
Of the 95 stories that provided coverage, all but four mentioned or referred to at least one theme (Table 1). Forty-three stories or 45% of those stories with cultural coverage covered two themes, while 18 stories or 19% covered three themes or more. With respect to coverage of details or information explaining the cultural implication expressed in the theme, 62 stories or 65% provided some details while 33 stories or 35% of the 95 provided no details.

**Table 1**

Coverage of Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Themes</th>
<th>% of 95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Themes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Theme</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Themes</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Themes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Themes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Themes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amount of coverage was analyzed more specifically in terms of story subject, type of story and source of story. The results are presented in Table 2 - Table 4.

Table 2 presents the frequencies for all stories (766) in the upper portion and the frequencies for those stories with cultural coverage (95) in the lower portion of the table.
TABLE 2

Frequency of Subject Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% of Expected Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role, Programming, Performance</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Television</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piracy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CanCon Regulations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>166</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subject (n=95)                        |                   |    |                        |
| Role, Programming, Performance        | 22                | 23.2| 71.0                   |
| Pay Television                        | 26                | 27.4| 48.1                   |
| Piracy                                | 14                | 14.7| 40.0                   |
| CanCon Regulations                    | 5                 | 5.3 | 71.4                   |
| Multiple                              | 28                | 29.5| 71.8                   |
| **TOTAL**                             | **95**            | **100.1%**|             |

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)*

Coverage dealt with two or more of the four story subjects about equally and was therefore coded multiple in 28 stories. The single subject covered most frequently was pay television which accounted for 27% of the stories with cultural coverage. Stories dealing with CBC and CTV role, programming and performance made up 23% of the cultural coverage. Despite the fact that piracy was a growing worry and the government was in active pursuit of pirates during much of the study's time frame, only 15% of the stories which provided cultural coverage were about piracy. Finally, only five stories or 5% were about Canadian content regulations.
That the greatest proportion of stories dealt with a combination of subjects could be explained by the interrelated nature of the various broadcasting aspects and the journalistic convention of combining separate but related events in a single story. The proportion of stories about pay television is not surprising since it became reality during the study’s time frame.

The right hand column (% of Expected Coverage) in the lower portion of Table 2 presents the number of stories about each subject which actually provided coverage as a proportion of coverage expected from stories about each subject. That is, 22 out of 31 or 71% of stories about CBC and CTV role/programming/performance provided cultural coverage.

That only 14 of a possible 35 stories (40%) on piracy provided cultural coverage might indicate that The Globe’s perception of the problem was that the cultural danger of signal piracy was unimportant. With respect to pay television, 26 of a possible 54 stories or (48%) of all stories about pay television actually provided cultural coverage, suggesting that news treatment of the subject considered other aspects of pay television more important. Roughly 71% of all stories dealing with the three other subject areas provided cultural coverage, however. This would indicate that The Globe does perceive the cultural relevance of certain aspects of broadcasting.
The type of story conveying coverage is important since we might expect more extensive coverage from columns, features and perhaps editorials where the newspaper is somewhat more able to elaborate, explain and comment. Thus, the greater the proportion of those types of stories providing cultural coverage, the better would be The Globe's coverage.

Table 3 presents the amount of cultural coverage provided by each type of story. The upper portion of the table presents the frequencies for all stories (166) while the lower portion presents the frequencies for those stories with cultural coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% of Expected Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE (n=166)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE (n=95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By far, the type of story most often conveying cultural information was the News story, accounting for 77% of the
stories with cultural coverage (Table 3). Editorial accounts for 11% of the coverage, features for 10% and columns for 3%. In absolute terms, then, stories better able to describe and explain in detail provided cultural coverage rather infrequently, thus limiting the potential for extensive, comprehensive coverage. This could be interpreted as coverage being event-oriented as opposed to information-oriented.

More important perhaps, at least with respect to judging The Globe's performance in providing detailed coverage, is the number of story types with cultural coverage expressed as a proportion of the total story types in which coverage was expected. The right-hand column (% of Expected Coverage) in the lower portion of Table 3 presents the number of each story type which actually provided cultural coverage as a proportion of the coverage expected from each story type. For example, 73 out of 123 news stories or 59% of all news stories in which coverage was expected actually provided cultural coverage. Similarly, 10 out of 13 editorials or 77% of all editorials actually provided cultural coverage.

Whereas 59% of news stories stories and 77% of editorials actually provided coverage, only 43% of columns (3 of 7) and 39% of features (9 of 23) in which cultural coverage was expected actually provided coverage. Because of space restrictions and news reporting convention—brevity—the ability of straight news stories to report full and detailed
information is somewhat limited. But a greater proportion of news stories, as well as editorials, conveyed cultural coverage than columns or features. In other words, proportionately less advantage was taken of columns and particularly features to explain the cultural implications of broadcasting despite the better ability to elaborate in them.

Thus, not only were there fewer columns and features conveying cultural coverage than news stories, the proportion of each which provided coverage was lower than for news stories. Whether this reflects a reluctance or a professional inability to explain the cultural implications on the part of *The Globe and Mail*, or whether it simply did not deem it necessary cannot be determined. The finding does indicate, however, that there does not appear to be a deliberate, purposeful attempt to explain the cultural implications of broadcasting extensively. *The Globe* simply did not make optimum use of columns and features to provide potentially more detailed coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue.

The amount of cultural coverage can also be determined by the amount of space given to coverage. Mean story size of all stories where coverage was expected \( n=166 \) was 20.6 column inches. The mean story size of those stories which actually provided cultural coverage \( n=95 \) was 22.1 column inches. While the mean story size of stories which provided coverage was slightly larger than the mean story size of all
stories in which culture could have been covered, the amount of space (content) within each story devoted to culture is the best determinant of the amount of cultural coverage of broadcasting provided by The Globe and Mail.

Table 4 presents the amount of story-space devoted to culture in absolute terms while Table 5 presents it as a proportion of story space. Most stories (76) or 78% of stories with cultural coverage devoted less than five column inches to coverage of culture. Fifteen stories or 16% of stories which provided cultural coverage devoted between six and 10 column inches to cultural coverage. Only six stories or 7% of all the stories which provided cultural coverage devoted more than 10 column inches to the cultural aspects of broadcasting. On average, 4.37 column inches were devoted to cultural coverage.

The average number of column inches devoted to all editorial content in The Globe and Mail was calculated to determine how the amount of space (content) given to cultural coverage compared with the total editorial space available. First, the total space on a page available for content was determined: 134 column inches in a six-column format. Next, an average number of pages per issue was determined by taking the average number of pages per issue from the 10 randomly selected publishing days during the study’s time frame. The average was 70 pages per issue.
This average was then multiplied by 134 (column inches) to arrive at the figure of 9,380 column inches available for all newspaper content. Finally, using a ratio of 60% advertising content to 40% editorial content, it was determined that there is a maximum of 3,752 column inches \((9,380 \times .40)\) given to editorial content each day.

Thus, the 4.37 column inches devoted to cultural coverage of broadcasting represents 0.10% of the available editorial space in an average issue. Since the 4.37 column inches appeared only once every 11 days, the space devoted to cultural coverage represented 0.01% of the total available editorial space during those 11 days.

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5&quot;</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10&quot;</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)*

As a proportion of total story size, 69 stories or 73% of those stories which provided cultural coverage devoted less
than .25% of the story space to that cultural coverage. (Table 5). Eighteen stories or 19% of all stories with cultural coverage devoted between one-quarter and one-half of story space (content) to cultural coverage. Only eight stories or 8% devoted more than half of the story content to a cultural discussion of broadcasting.

**TABLE 5**

Space Devoted to Culture as a Percentage of Story Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;75%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)*

With respect to the amount of cultural coverage of broadcasting, then, story space devoted to culture was meagre: 4.37 column inches of cultural coverage every 11 days is not much coverage. Since the vast majority of stories which provided coverage devoted less than a quarter of story space to that coverage, it is possible that what little coverage there was got "lost" amidst other details in the other three-quarters of the story. Thus, even when cultural coverage was provided, something other than culture was far more likely to be discussed throughout most of the story.
And in terms of agenda-setting, if the amount of information provided on an issue is a determinant of agenda-setting potential, the agenda-setting potential of The Globe and Mail's cultural coverage of broadcasting cannot be considered strong.

### Table 6

Amount of Cultural Coverage Devoted to Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Story Given to Culture</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)*

A = CBC and CTV Role/Programming/Performance
B = Pay Television
C = Piracy
D = Canadian Content Regulations
E = Multiple

Table 6 provides an indication of the extent of cultural coverage of each individual subject by showing the amount of story space given to culture for each subject. Cultural coverage was most extensive in stories dealing with Canadian content regulations, while coverage of piracy provided the
least amount of cultural discussion. In 60% of stories about the content regulations more than 50% of the story was devoted to culture. With respect to network role, programming and performance, 64% of stories dealing with this subject devoted less than one-quarter of the story content to culture. Nineteen stories or 73% of the stories about pay television devoted less than one-quarter of story space to cultural coverage while 86% of the stories about piracy gave less than one-quarter of story space to cultural coverage, making it the subject covered least extensively. In 79% of stories dealing with more than one of the subjects, less than one-quarter of the content was devoted to cultural coverage. Except for Canadian content regulations, none of the story subjects were treated extensively culturally since the majority of stories dealing with the other subjects devoted less than 25% of story space to culture.

Table 7 presents the results of the proportion of cultural coverage provided by each type of story. Features provided the least amount of cultural coverage in that 89% of features or eight out of nine features devoted less than 25% of story space to cultural aspects of broadcasting. Six of the 10 editorials or 60% of editorials devoted less than one-quarter of the story to culture. Of the news stories, 73% devoted less than one-quarter of the content to cultural coverage of broadcasting, which was the average for all stories. Two of the three opinion columns (67%) also devoted less than 25% of story space to cultural coverage.
TABLE 7
Amount of Coverage Provided by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% OF STORY GIVEN TO CULTURE</th>
<th>News</th>
<th>Editorial</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)*

Again it would seem that the elaboration potential of columns and particularly features was largely ignored in The Globe's cultural coverage of broadcasting. It would not be unreasonable to have expected more features to devote more story space to culture since the function of features is to provide a more in-depth account of issues, events and persons. The features which dealt with broadcasting obviously dealt more extensively with aspects other than culture.

The intent of this study is to assess the agenda-setting potential of The Globe's cultural coverage of broadcasting as well as its contribution to generating a cultural cognition of broadcasting. With respect to agenda-setting, the threshold for story frequency below which agenda-setting no longer occurs, is still not known precisely. As such, no
prediction about agenda-setting can be made reliably with regard to the amount of cultural coverage of broadcasting provided by The Globe and Mail. However, considering that the 95 stories with cultural coverage of broadcasting represented only 0.04% of the total possible number of news stories in 39 months, it is likely that if agenda-setting exists, its impact is minimal. The number of stories about culture and broadcasting as a percentage of all stories in 11 publishing days (1 story out of a possible 2,651 on average) is also 0.04%.

Moreover, even if one story about broadcasting and culture appearing every 11 days represented moderate (as opposed to minimal) agenda-setting potential, the amount of space actually given to culture in that coverage is small: 4.37 column inches per story on average every 11 days. This represents 0.01% of the average space available for editorial content in 11 publishing days. It is unlikely, therefore, that the agenda-setting potential is very strong.

Given the significance of the broadcasting-culture issue, the amount of information possible to convey (Chapters 1 and 2 representing the standard), and given the minimum amount of space accorded cultural coverage of broadcasting by The Globe and Mail, the newspaper's performance in contributing to awareness of the issue is weak or at least much weaker than it could be. The cultural coverage of pay television is particularly noteworthy in that fewer stories about pay
television provided cultural coverage than those which did not. That is, of the 54 stories about pay television in which cultural coverage was expected, 26 stories (40%) provided coverage while 28 did not. Pay television is arguably the most significant development in broadcasting since the introduction of cable television. It presents both a benefit and a threat to Canadian culture and it encompasses virtually all the economic factors which are at the root of many of the cultural implications of broadcasting. Yet, more stories about pay television covered something other than culture. Viewed in this perspective, The Globe's cultural coverage of pay television specifically might be considered inadequate and its contribution to cultural awareness of pay television can be considered lacking.

As well, the findings indicate a disproportionate lack of coverage rendered by columns and features. Most (75%) of the contribution to a cultural cognizance of broadcasting by The Globe and Mail was made by news stories: a type of story with less elaboration ability than columns and features. The Globe's cultural coverage, and therefore contribution to an understanding of the broadcasting-culture issue might be enhanced if it conveyed more coverage through columns and features.

Finally, The Globe's cultural coverage of broadcasting also would be enhanced if more space was devoted to the cultural implications of broadcasting. Since most of the cul-
ultural coverage provided represented less than 25% of the story in which it appeared, there is also the danger that what little coverage there was devoted was lost amidst coverage of other aspects of broadcasting. Not only might this have inhibited the chance that the cultural coverage was read, it also might have imparted the notion that culture is an unimportant consideration in broadcasting. It certainly did not convey the significance of culture in broadcasting.

The preceding assessment focused on the amount or quantity of cultural coverage provided by the Globe and Mail. Further assessment of The Globe and Mail's contribution to generating an awareness of the broadcasting-culture issue is possible through analyzing the nature or quality of the coverage that was provided. It has been shown, thus far, that not much cultural coverage was provided. However, if that coverage was of a superior quality, it might be that The Globe's contribution to an awareness of the broadcasting-culture issue, is better than it first appears. On the other hand, if the nature of the cultural coverage was incomplete or narrowly focused, the contribution The Globe makes to our understanding of the issue might be worse than it first appears.
3.3 NATURE OF COVERAGE—PREDOMINANT COVERAGE

A general indication of the quality of The Globe and Mail's coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue can be derived from identifying the context in which the cultural coverage appeared. That 95 stories provided cultural coverage does not mean that all stories dealt solely or primarily with culture. Indeed, the previous finding on amount of space devoted to culture would indicate that most stories did not deal primarily with culture. First, little better than half (57%) of the stories expected to deal with culture actually did. Secondly, in those that did, the average amount of content devoted to culture was 4.37 column inches. The cultural coverage that was provided in a story could have been provided as part of a context dealing primarily with another topic of discussion. Thus, the context of the coverage was determined by the predominant coverage accorded each story.

Predominant coverage was defined as the angle or topic or nature of discussion given the most space (measured in column inches) in the story. It was coded cultural if the coverage dealt predominantly with the cultural implications of broadcasting as detailed in Chapters 1 and 2. (For a more detailed explanation, see Appendix A).

Table 8 presents the absolute and relative frequencies for the predominant coverage variable. The top portion of the table presents the frequencies of predominant coverage for all the stories in which cultural coverage was expected
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predominant Coverage</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% of Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-Financial</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy-Legislative</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal-Jurisdictional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>99.9*</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predominant Coverage</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% of Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-Financial</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy-Legislative</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal-Jurisdictional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)*

(166) while the bottom portion presents them for those stories which actually provided cultural coverage (95). Of the 95 stories which provided cultural coverage, culture itself was the predominant coverage in only 8%. Of all stories in which coverage was expected (166), culture was the primary topic of discussion in only 5%. Policy-legislative matters were the predominant coverage in 40% of the stories. Business-financial matters were the predominant coverage in 34% of the stories and a legal-jurisdictional discussion was the predominant coverage in 10% of the stories. Thus, the cultural coverage that was provided rarely appeared in a primarily cultural context.
The predominance of policy-legislative matters is not surprising since broadcasting is regulated by the government and since there was a fair amount of federal activity in broadcasting during the study's time frame. It was indicated in Chapter 1 that predominant attention to purely business aspects of broadcasting could be interpreted as evidence supporting the critical view of the press. The findings show that policy-legislative matters were the predominant coverage in the greatest percentage of stories, not business matters. However, the difference was only six percentage points.

Moreover, of all 166 stories where coverage was expected (referring to the right-hand column in the lower portion of the table), business-financial matters were the predominant coverage in the largest percentage of stories (40%). So although policy-legislative matters were the predominant coverage in the largest percentage of stories which provided cultural coverage, overall The Globe's coverage of broadcasting was more often in a business-financial context. In this sense, support for the critical view of the press can be found. The infrequent appearance of broadcasting in a predominantly cultural context even when there was cultural coverage provided indicates that The Globe makes relatively little attempt to convey the cultural implications of broadcasting. In short, there is little to suggest The Globe is playing a socially responsible role in terms of covering broadcasting in a cultural context.
The context of the cultural coverage that was provided can be analyzed more specifically by crosstabulating the predominant coverage by subject and type. This will determine how each subject was predominantly covered and how each type of story predominantly conveyed the coverage of culture and broadcasting.

**TABLE 9**

Context of Subject Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDOMINANT COVERAGE</th>
<th>STORY SUBJECT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Financial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Financial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Jurisdictional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99.9*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>99.9*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>99.9*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)*

A = CBC and CTV Role/Programming/Performance
B = Pay Television
C = Piracy
D = Canadian Content Regulations
E = Multiple

The subject most often treated in a cultural context was the Canadian content regulations (Table 9). Three out of five or 60% of the stories dealing with the regulations gave predominant coverage to culture. The rest of the story sub-
jects were treated in a primarily cultural context less than 10% of the time. Culture was the predominant coverage in one story (5%) about network role, programming and performance and in one story or 7% of the stories about piracy. In only 4% of the stories about pay television was pay television treated in a primarily cultural context. Since there is so little space proportionately devoted to cultural coverage (73% of stories devoted less than 25% of content to culture), it is no surprise that so few stories treated the story subject in a primarily cultural context.

Stories dealing with role, programming and performance of the networks, piracy and pay television were about evenly treated in a policy-legislative context. The policy-legis-
lative nature of coverage predominated most in stories cov-
ering two or more subjects (57%).

Perhaps most interesting is that half of all stories with cultural coverage about pay television treated the subject in a business-financial context. Even though pay television has numerous cultural implications, and even though pay television policy and licencing were main government concerns during the study's time frame, the developments in pay television were covered in a predominantly business-financial context 50% of the time. Moreover, the subject of pay television was least likely to be covered in a cultural context. This is further indication that The Globe's cultural coverage of pay television was weaker than its coverage of
any other broadcasting subject selected for this study. It is also further indication of The Globe's attention to economic, rather than cultural concerns.

Finally, although culture was the predominant coverage most infrequently, it was distributed among the subjects about evenly. Each subject, then, appeared in a primarily cultural context at least once in 39 months although this hardly can be considered a significant contribution to an understanding of the role culture plays in broadcasting.

Looking at what context each type of story presented culture in (Table 10), the performance of feature stories is again noteworthy. Only 11% of features treated the cultural coverage of broadcasting in a predominantly cultural context while 44% provided predominantly business-financial coverage. It would seem again, then, that the value of features in providing in-depth comprehensive cultural coverage was unexploited and instead, the forum was devoted primarily to business-financial coverage.

Editorials tended to apportion the predominant coverage about evenly. Most news stories (43%) provided cultural coverage in a predominantly policy-legislative context. Only five news stories, or 7% of all news stories with cultural coverage, provided predominantly cultural coverage. With respect to columns, one of the three columns (33%) provided predominantly cultural coverage while the predominant coverage in the other two was policy-legislative.
TABLE 10
Predominant Coverage by Type of Story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDOMINANT</th>
<th>News</th>
<th>Editorial</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Financial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Legislative/Jurisdiction</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Jurisdictional</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>99.9*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)*

The context in which the cultural coverage appeared is important since the reader might perceive policy-legislative or financial aspects of broadcasting as more important than the cultural aspects, since they are treated that way more often by The Globe and Mail. In other words, since broadcasting is rarely treated in a cultural context, the overall impression conveyed might be that culture is not an important aspect of broadcasting. The significance of broadcasting's cultural implications is downplayed, thus weakening the newspaper's potential to develop an understanding of broadcasting's impact on culture.
3.4 NATURE OF COVERAGE—TREATMENT OF THEMES AND DETAILS

The preceding analysis of predominant coverage provided a general description of the nature of The Globe and Mail’s coverage of the cultural issue in broadcasting. The remainder of the chapter examines the nature of The Globe’s coverage in more detail with respect to treatment of themes and details, the nature and extent of information conveyed as determined by frequency and treatment of predominant themes, the cultural perspectives The Globe conveyed, and the cultural relevance of broadcasting it draws in general. The themes identified in Chapter II are listed in full in Appendix B. For ease of recognition and for simplicity, the themes were abbreviated and assigned labels. These are listed in Table 11. Theme numbers will be used when referring to the themes in the tables and text.

In the 91 stories in which themes appeared, a total of 152 themes were covered. Of these, 44 or 29% were mentioned and 108 or 71% were simply referred to. Five themes were not covered at all: 9, 11, 17, 28, 32. Themes 9 and 11 deal with the lack of Canadian drama viewed by Canadians and the amount of American drama that is viewed. Theme 17

---

8 The term “mention” was defined as a declarative, explicit statement about the relationship between culture and the story subject which paraphrased or resembled or was analogous to one of the 33 themes. If the theme was covered but was not expressed completely, the theme was considered as only being “referred to.” If, in other words, the connection to culture was not stated explicitly, the story was considered as only alluding to or referring to the theme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME #</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Economics have cultural implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Economics and culture related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cultural success dependent on economic success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>American programming necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Role=National Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CBC's role more extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Television has cultural responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Drama rarely produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Canadian drama viewership low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Optimal use of TV not made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>American drama=Acculturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Not enough talent development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Networks=Limited cultural success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Economic strategies required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pay=Boon and threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pay=More domestic programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pay=More drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pay=More awareness of identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pay=More American programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Competitive pay system undermines culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Piracy hurts broadcasting system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Piracy=Acculturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Piracy=Technological challenge to culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Government can't fight piracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Content quotas not enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CRTC not contributing fully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Policy context=Hindrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>New content regulations would help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>TV=Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>U. S. different from Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Foreign signals=Acculturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Domestic signals=Enculturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Popularity of American signals=Undermines culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
states that pay television is culturally beneficial since it provides an outlet for more Canadian drama. Theme 32 says that Canadian programming can lead to enculturation. That the proposed content regulations could lead to more viewing of domestic programming is expressed in theme 28. The five themes which were not covered at all, then, dealt with the enculturation potential of Canadian programming and the lack of viewing thereof.

Table 12 presents the frequency and treatment of the individual themes.

Theme 21 was covered the most number of times (13 times). This is interesting since the theme deals with piracy and piracy was the story subject in only 15% of the stories that provided cultural coverage. It is possible that it appeared frequently in "multiple" stories. Although theme 21 was most frequently covered, it was explicitly stated (mentioned) only 15% of the time.

Theme numbers 4, 14, and 16 were covered second most frequently at 12 times each. Themes 4 and 14 both deal with the need for successful economic operation of the Canadian broadcasting system to assist culture, while theme 16 states that pay television can benefit culture through increasing the availability of Canadian programming on Canadian television. Themes 4 and 16 were mentioned 42% of the time they appeared and theme 14 was mentioned one-third of the time it appeared. Themes covered least—once—were 2, 3, 6, 18, 22, 30, and 31. Themes covered only twice were 10, 15, and 29.
TABLE 12

Coverage and Treatment of Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME NO.</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>% of Stories</th>
<th>% Mentioned</th>
<th>% Referred to</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other than the fact that themes tended to be referred to rather than mentioned, there appears to be only one pattern to the frequency and treatment of cultural themes in The Globe's coverage of broadcasting. The coverage and treatment of themes was basically irregular but for one consistency: the lack of coverage of themes 29, 30, 31, and 32. While it is true other themes were rarely covered or not covered at all, the lack of coverage of these four themes is particularly significant.

That television expresses or conveys culture (theme 29) was covered only twice. That Canadian and American cultures are different (theme 30) was covered only once. As well, that viewing foreign programming can cause acculturation (theme 31) was covered only once. That viewing domestic signals can cause enculturation (theme 32) was not covered at all. These four themes are the most significant cultural implications of broadcasting since if these were not so, the other themes—indeed the entire cultural concern in broadcasting—would be irrelevant. Thus, the most direct and significant cultural implications of broadcasting were all but ignored in 39 months of coverage by The Globe and Mail.

For instance, theme 29 was stated explicitly in one editorial which quoted from the Applebaum-Hebert Report (Globe and Mail, 1982a:6): "It is no exaggeration to say that broadcasting continually...shapes the way we see the world around us." While this certainly was a "mention" of the
theme, the entire coverage of the theme in the editorial was limited to that one line. As was the case in the only other instance when the theme was covered, no explanation or elaboration was provided. Similarly, the two stories which covered themes 30 and 31 merely referred to the themes and provided no details explaining the theme.

As well, since these four themes are the basic concerns or the foundation upon which the broadcasting-culture issue rests, it could be argued that knowledge and understanding of these themes is requisite to any understanding and certainly a full understanding of the broader issue. Since the basics of the issue are hardly covered, can the reader come to understand the significance and the meaning of everything else that is covered? It just might be that a full appreciation of the cultural concern in broadcasting cannot be derived solely from The Globe and Mail since coverage of the basics is lacking. The tendency for the themes generally to be alluded to (referred to) and not explicitly stated might compound this.

In the final analysis, it remains that The Globe failed to provide even rudimentary coverage of the most fundamental cultural aspects of broadcasting. It thus failed to contribute to an understanding of the fundamentals of the entire broadcasting-culture issue. So while the range of themes covered by The Globe and Mail was substantial, coverage of themes basic to the broadcasting-culture issue and therefore
fundamental to an understanding of the issue was virtually non-existent.

The predominant theme in a story was often defined as being either the sole theme in a story or the theme to which most of the space with cultural coverage was devoted. Table 13 shows that 32% of the stories mentioned the predominant theme, while 61 stories or 64% simply referred to the predominant theme in the story. Most stories, then, only alluded to the theme without explicitly stating the relationship between culture and the particular story subject.

For example, in referring to the limited cultural success of the CBC (theme 13), one story (Westell, D., 1983:1) said:

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has come under sharp criticism from television producers who feel the corporation has become too commercial and should devote its efforts entirely to meeting its public broadcasting mandate.

It is hinted in the story, but not stated explicitly that the CBC has achieved only limited success in performing a cultural role. Culture itself is not even expressed in the story's reference to the theme. As was the case in many stories, culture was not expressed in the theme and therefore, the story was considered as only referring to the theme and not mentioning it explicitly.

On the other hand, a mention of theme 13 was:

The Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission has reprimanded the major television stations in the Toronto-Hamilton area for failing to lead the way in the development of new Canadian programming. (Stephens, 1982:5)
The story referred to two stations (CBLT and CPTO) as flagships of the CBC and CTV respectively. Thus, a direct assessment of the failure of the networks in contributing to Canadian programming, and therefore culture, was made.

Similarly, a mention of theme 21—which states that piracy undermines the Canadian broadcasting system—appeared in one story (Westell, D., 1982:85) as:

With the increasing availability of satellite programming from the United States, the Canadian broadcasting system will not be able to retain its character or be able to contribute to national unity unless the government takes 'bold new initiatives.'

On the other hand, most of the coverage of this theme was more along the lines of:

Communications Minister Francis Fox told a news conference that groups showing U.S. pay-TV and sports programming to Canadians represent unfair competition for broadcasters, cable operators, advertisers...(Globe and Mail, 1982b:1)

It does not explicitly state that such "unfair competition" undermines the broadcasters' ability to promote Canadian culture and it implies that the broadcasters are the only ones hurt by piracy. Thus, in this instance, the theme was considered as only being referred to.

In many stories (64%), then, the relationship between culture and broadcasting was not clearly expressed. As Table 13 indicates, the relationship was twice as likely to be implied (theme referred to) as it was explicitly stated. In terms of providing an explicit connection between culture and broadcasting, then, The Globe's performance was weak.
Fewer than a third of the stories directly linked the cultural implication with the story subject by mentioning the predominant theme.

**TABLE 13**

*Treatment of Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No themes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99.8*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)*

Table 14 presents the treatment of the predominant themes individually. Table 15 summarizes how the themes were explained generally while Table 16 shows how extensively the individual predominant themes were explained with details.

Table 14 displays no particular pattern except that, as should be expected, predominant themes were more likely to be referred to rather than mentioned. Themes which were mentioned more often than they were referred to were: 4, 5, 6, 12, 15, 18, 25, 30, and 33.

Theme 21 was the most frequent predominant theme which might be expected given that it was also the theme which appeared most frequently. Despite this, it was mentioned only 11% of the time it was a predominant theme.
TABLE 14
Coverage and Treatment of Predominant Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th># Predominant</th>
<th>% of Time</th>
<th>% Mentioned</th>
<th>% Referred to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Themes 6, 7, 10, 15, 18, and 30 were the predominant themes every time they appeared in the coverage although theme 7 was the only one of these themes to appear more than twice. Still, the theme does express the intent of Canadian broadcasting ("Television broadcasting in Canada is intended to fulfill a cultural responsibility through the expression of Canadian identity."). Although it was referred to more often than it was mentioned, that it was the predominant theme in all six stories it appeared in suggests The Globe does make a partial effort to convey the idea that Canadian television is intended to fulfill a cultural responsibility.

Themes 6, 12, 15, 18, and 30 were mentioned every time they appeared as the predominant theme although four of them appeared only once and theme 15, only twice. Overall, the frequency and treatment of predominant themes was mixed. No type of theme or no theme dealing with a particular subject appeared or was mentioned any more often than others.

With respect to the treatment of details, the study considered details to be elaborated if the story explained the cultural connection or implication to broadcasting expressed in the theme. Details were considered as "referred to" if the story failed to explain this cultural connection (refer to Appendix A). Table 15 shows that 35% of the stories with cultural coverage provided no details, 26% elaborated the details, and 39% merely referred to details. Since details were defined as coverage which explained the cultural impli-
cation expressed in the predominant theme, it is clear that The Globe and Mail did a poor job in explaining the cultural implications of broadcasting. Slightly more than a third of all stories with cultural coverage provided no coverage of details whatsoever while 39% provided incomplete explanation by only referring to details. In 70 stories, then, the cultural implications of the various predominant themes were covered poorly. This, despite newspapers' ability to cover issues in more detail than the other media, as discussed in Chapter I.

**TABLE 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th># of Stories</th>
<th>% of Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Details</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details Elaborated</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details Referred to</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99.9*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)*

Table 16 shows the extent to which each predominant theme was explained. Only two themes (themes 20 and 25) were explained more than half the time they appeared. Themes which were explained the most poorly (details provided less often than not) were themes 6, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 30. Themes which were only partially explained as often as not
explained at all were themes 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 19, and 33. While the extent of explanation was generally weak, these themes were explained the least.

Themes 5, 6, and 7 deal with the cultural role of broadcasting generally and of the networks in particular. Clearly, the responsibility of both the system and the networks is covered poorly. Themes 8 and 10 concern the lack of Canadian drama on Canadian television. Themes 9 and 11 which also deal with drama were never predominant themes and thus, not explained at all. Thus, the cultural prowess of the genre and the lack of domestic drama on Canadian television also was explained poorly by The Globe.

Themes 15 to 20 deal with pay television. As noted earlier, theme 20 was one theme that was explained well. But the other pay television themes were covered poorly. Theme 15 says that pay television is both a boon and danger to Canadian culture but, contradictory as this appears at first glance, it never was elaborated upon. For instance, the theme states that pay television is both a boon and a threat to Canadian culture. One story said that "...pay television raises real and important implications for the whole of the Canadian broadcasting system," (Davidson, 1980:B2). The story did not say whether these implications were good, bad or both. As well, the story did not explain what the implications were or how they affected the Canadian broadcasting system and Canadian culture. This was typical of the cover-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME NO.</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Time No. Details</th>
<th>% of Time Details Elaborated</th>
<th>% of Time Details Referred to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
age of this theme and it left the apparent contradiction unexplained: that on one hand pay television means more Canadian programming and is therefore a potential boost to culture while on the other, pay television also means more American programming and is therefore potentially harmful to Canadian culture.

Themes 16 and 17 both express the cultural benefit of pay television but only theme 16 was elaborated upon and then, only 29% of the time it appeared. Half the time theme 19 appeared the cultural danger that pay television poses was not explained at all. The other 50% of the time, details explaining this were only alluded to. Thus, both the benefits and danger of pay television received little explanation in The Globe. The one pay television theme that was explained (theme 20), dealt with the financial nature of the system. It seems that at least with respect to pay television, The Globe and Mail places far more importance on explaining the cultural implication of the competitive nature of the system than of the strictly cultural benefits and dangers that that system presents.

That is, there were a total of 17 stories in which a theme dealing with pay television (themes 15-20) was the predominant theme. In five of the stories, details provided with the predominant theme dealing with pay television were elaborated. In three of these five stories, theme 20 was the predominant theme. Theme 20 states that "The cultural
potential of pay television is undermined by the higher costs inherent in the competitive nature of the system." This theme appeared three times and was explained all three times. Of the other four themes related to pay television, (15-19), details were elaborated in two of the 14 stories the themes predominated in. In other words, theme 20, which is primarily an economic theme, was explained all three times it was the predominant theme while in 14 other stories, the other four pay television themes were explained only twice. In short, it appears that more attention was paid to explaining the financial nature of the system as it relates to culture rather than explaining the cultural benefits of domestic programming on pay television or the cultural dangers of American programming on pay television.

Apart from the overall poor explanation of themes provided by The Globe and Mail, the treatment of predominant themes was mixed with no individual pattern emerging. No type of predominant theme was mentioned or elaborated upon more often than any other. The poor explanation provided applied to all subject areas as well. The poor coverage given themes 29-32, the fundamentals of the issue, as predominant themes is again noted. Themes 29, 31, and 32 were never predominant and theme 30, only once.

When theme 30 (the Canadian and American cultures are different) did appear as the predominant theme, no details were provided. It was expressed in the story as "Let us
not forget that cultural conditions in Canada are very
different," from those in the United States (Stephens,
1981). The theme was "buried" in the last quarter of the
story and no explanation of how we are different was pro-
ffered. Indeed, the story then went on to explain that CRTC
Chairman John Meisel's argument of why deregulation in Cana-
dian broadcasting was unwise due to the different market
conditions in Canada. Thus, while the theme was the predo-
minant theme (and only because it was the only one of the 33
covered in the story), and although it was mentioned, there
was no elaboration of the theme.

The generally poor coverage as depicted in Table 12 given
the fundamental cultural implications expressed in themes
29-32, then, was worsened by the fact that only once in 39
months of coverage was a fundamental theme the predominant
theme in a story. Even at that, the theme was "buried" and
it was not explained.

In sum, there was an overall failure to draw an explicit
connection between the predominant theme and the story sub-
ject. Generally, *The Globe* did not provide substantially
explicit coverage of the implications of broadcasting. While
a variety of themes was covered, many appeared infre-
quently and the connection to culture expressed by the theme
was more often implied rather than mentioned directly. As
well, the explanation of that connection, which is perhaps
more important in understanding the broadcasting-culture is-

issue, was twice as likely to be inadequate (no details pro-
vided or details only referred to) as it was to be adequate.
Finally, coverage of the fundamentals of the broadcasting-
culture issue was especially lacking.

3.5 NATURE OF COVERAGE—PERSPECTIVES

Identifying the source and tone of the predominant perspec-
tive in each story enabled the study to determine the origin
of the cultural information conveyed by The Globe and whether
the information thus conveyed represented a positive con-
tribution or a negative contribution to a cultural cognition
of broadcasting. Predominant perspective was defined as the
viewpoint or perspective dealing with the theme and/or de-
tails given the most space in the story (Refer to Appendix
A). Table 17 shows the frequency of the sources of perspec-
tives provided in each story.

The source of perspective which occurred most often was the newspaper. This is perhaps not unexpected since any un-
attributed summation of information was coded as the newspa-
per's perspective. Nearly half of the perspectives (48%) originated from what might be collectively called the public sector: the government, the CRTC, and the CBC. On the other hand, only 6% of the perspectives originated from what might be collectively called the private sector: pay and cable companies, independent production, "other industry", and the CTV.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRTC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Production</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTV Management</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC Management</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTV Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Licensee</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Applicant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Licencee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Applicant</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Industry</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't Determine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This lack of viewpoints from broadcasting's private sector is interesting. It may be that The Globe and Mail, assuming an adversarial role, is more concerned with reporting (scrutinizing) the ideas and activities of the public sector. Or it might be simply that the public sector has more to say about culture. Too, it might be that the CRTC, CBC and DOC are the primary news generators in broadcasting and that information is more accessible from them.

Since so few perspectives originate from the private sector in The Globe's cultural coverage, it might appear that no support for the critical view of the press can be derived from the analysis of this variable. But it could be that by
not conveying private sector perspectives, The Globe is in effect "covering up" that which might make the CTV in particular look bad. Thus, while The Globe conveys little that might defend the private sector, it also conveys little that is critical of it.

Most interesting is that not once did a CTV perspective appear in The Globe's coverage. Here again, there might be several reasons for this. It might be that CTV simply has nothing to say about culture. Or it might be that the network is reluctant to talk to the press about its operations. Perhaps The Globe does not consider CTV as significant a source as others. It could be that The Globe does not print any information it might receive from CTV. The most likely reason for the absence of a CTV perspective, however, is the lack of coverage of the network to begin with. Of all 95 stories that provided cultural coverage, only five stories dealt with the CTV and only two of those, primarily with the CTV.

This lack of coverage of CTV could be because much of what could be said of CTV would be negative. If this is so, that The Globe does not cover the CTV extensively in cultural coverage of broadcasting, could be interpreted as support for the critical view of the press.

Whatever the reason for the complete absence of a CTV perspective and the lack of coverage generally about the network, several implications cannot be overlooked. The CTV
is perceived as a culprit in the dearth of Canadian culture on television as CRTC indignation voiced at the network's recent licence renewals would attest (see pp. 71-72). The CTV airs virtually no Canadian drama, its prime-time schedule is laden with American programming, and its program scheduling practices effectively relegate Canadian programming to low viewing periods such as in summer months. The lack of coverage of CTV, then, means a significant element in the broadcasting-culture issue is virtually ignored.

Since The Globe rarely covers CTV, the potentially adverse cultural impact of its programming is also rarely covered. The network's programming practice is a good example of why economics work against Canadian culture. It is a good example of the cause and implications of the cultural concern in Canadian broadcasting. But the information and lessons that can be learned from this example are lost because of the absence of coverage of the CTV in The Globe and Mail.

It was suggested in Chapter I that if coverage downplayed the adverse cultural effects of broadcasting, support for the critical view of the newspaper as a medium sympathetic to business would be found. The lack of coverage of CTV can thus be construed as evidence supporting this view since CTV is a "cultural culprit." In rarely covering CTV, The Globe and Mail does not expose or explain a significant source of potentially adverse cultural effects.
The study also sought to determine the tone of the predominate perspective. If the predominant perspective agreed with or supported the assessment of the cultural implications related to the story subject presented in Chapter II, the tone was coded "Supportive". If the perspective was critical of an implication or downplayed it or disagreed with it, the perspective was coded "Non-supportive".

A supportive perspective, for example, was a quote from A. W. Johnson: "Canadian television as a cultural force is seriously threatened," (The Globe and Mail, 1980b:46). A non-supportive perspective, representative of the critical perspectives which appeared, appeared in an editorial about pay television (The Globe and Mail, 1980a:6):

The viewer's right to choice which Pay-TV could give him is to be sacrificed to defend what the CBC sees as Canadian culture—Canadian programs on television. It sees wrong. Television has never been more than a small part of Canadian culture and probably never will be.

The perspective received a "Neutral" designation if it was not possible to determine the tone or if there was no overt bias for or against the relevant cultural implication. The perspective was thus interpreted as contributing positively (tone was supportive) or negatively (tone was critical) to a cultural cognition of the particular broadcasting subject of the story. Since a neutral perspective contributed nothing overtly supportive, it too was considered a negative contribution (as opposed to being positive).
TABLE 18

Tone of Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TONE</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-supportive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 shows that 51% of the perspectives conveyed in The Globe's coverage were supportive of the cultural assessment provided in Chapter II.

TABLE 19

Tone and Source of Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF PERSPECTIVE</th>
<th>Non-supportive</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes pirates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)

Neutral perspectives represented 36% of the perspectives while 14% of the perspectives were non-supportive. Thus,
while half of the perspectives contributed positively toward an understanding of the broadcasting-culture issue, perspectives were as likely to be non-supportive or neutral, thus contributing negatively to an understanding of the broadcasting-culture issue.

Table 19 shows that of the supportive perspectives, 69% originated from the public sector. The Globe and Mail itself accounted for only 8% of supportive perspectives. On the other hand, the Globe initiated 54% of the non-supportive perspectives. Thus, it rarely initiated supportive perspectives while it initiated more than half of the non-supportive ones. It can be interpreted from this that the Globe and Mail is far more critical of the cultural concerns in broadcasting than it is supportive.

Again, if the provision of details is considered a measure of extent of explanation, it is possible to determine how extensively each tone of perspective was covered by crosstabulating the tone of perspective by details provided in the story. This is possible since the details explain the cultural implications and the perspective is the viewpoint of those implications. In other words, if details were elaborated, then the tone of the perspective could be interpreted as being better conveyed than if details were only referred to or not provided at all.

Table 20 shows that a greater proportion of stories provided details when the tone of the perspective was neutral.
A greater proportion also elaborated upon the details when the tone of the perspective was non-supportive. Although the difference in both cases was slight, it would be expected that if The Globe were consciously performing a socially responsible role, details would be provided and elaborated in a greater proportion of stories that contained supportive perspectives. Thus, while it is true half of the perspectives provided positive contribution to a cultural cognition of the story subject, it cannot be taken as support for social responsibility on the part of The Globe since proportionately more stories with non-supportive perspectives provided and elaborated details.

**TABLE 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEPTIVE</th>
<th>Non-supportive</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TREATMENT</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF DETAILS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Details</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.1*</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Proportion not exact due to rounding)*
3.6 NATURE OF COVERAGE—CULTURAL RELEVANCE OF BROADCASTING

The cultural relevance of the story refers to the entire story's (rather than the perspective alone) treatment of the cultural relevance of broadcasting generally. If there was more agreement with the analysis provided in Chapters I and II than there was disagreement throughout the cultural coverage in the story, the story was considered to be supportive of the cultural relevance of broadcasting in general. Where there was more disagreement than agreement, the story was judged to be non-supportive of the cultural relevance of broadcasting. Where the overall cultural relevance could not be determined one way or the other or where there was an equal amount of agreement and disagreement, the story was considered to be neutral toward the cultural relevance of broadcasting. Table 21 presents the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TONE</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-supportive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 21.**

Cultural Relevance
Almost half of the stories that provided cultural coverage were, overall, neutral or non-committal toward the cultural relevance of broadcasting generally. Thirty-nine of the 95 stories or 41% were supportive of the cultural relevance of broadcasting while only 9% were non-supportive.

Thus, using the tone of the cultural relevance as an indicator of the story's contribution to cultural cognition, 59% of the stories contributed negatively, since 9% were non-supportive and 50% were neutral. That is, 9% of the stories overtly disagreed with the cultural relevance of broadcasting while 50% provided no explicit or overt support for the cultural relevance of broadcasting. By contributing nothing, the neutral stories were considered as contributing negatively (as opposed to positively) toward imparting the significance of culture in broadcasting.

Given the significance of the broadcasting-culture issue, as well as the need for public awareness of the issue and given the generally mediocre coverage accorded the issue in The Globe and Mail, more coverage explicitly supporting the cultural relevance of broadcasting is required, perhaps, to generate an understanding of the implications of broadcasting. Still, 41% of the stories with cultural coverage did contribute positively to a cultural awareness of broadcasting by directly supporting its cultural relevance. Is, however, the overt support that is provided sufficient to convey and sustain an ongoing understanding of the importance
of culture in broadcasting? Or, does the 9% of stories which in effect contradict the cultural relevance and the 50% which does not directly support the cultural relevance offset (or counteract) the potentially positive impact of the supportive stories? Unfortunately, this study cannot answer these questions.

In the end, however, it would again not be unreasonable to expect more explicit support for the cultural relevance of broadcasting if The Globe were indeed playing a socially responsible role in its coverage of broadcasting. And, since more than half of the non-supportive perspectives originated from the Globe and Mail, support for the critical view of the press is evident.

The study also sought to determine the story's position (stance) on the perspective provided and this was to be used as a direct indicator of The Globe's position on the relevance of culture and broadcasting. However, because the vast number of stories (83) did not take an overt stance on the perspective, most stories were coded "Not Applicable" for the story position variable. As a result, no meaningful analysis of the story's position on the perspective was permitted. Still, the analysis of tone of perspectives was instructive.
3.7. PROMINENCE OF COVERAGE

On the strength of agenda-setting research (summarized in Chapter 1), the study assumed that coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue would likely have some agenda-setting impact. No attempt was made to predict the strength of the impact, but given that the coverage was infrequent and generally lacking in elaboration, the impact that the coverage had was likely weak.

In assessing the nature of The Globe and Mail's coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue, the study also assessed the nature of the potential agenda-setting impact: the coverage was not extensive and the issue was not extensively explained so that the agenda-setting effect was probably minimal. However, it was assumed further that the greater the story prominence, the greater the agenda-setting impact. Therefore, those stories which displayed greater than average prominence were analyzed further to determine what the coverage was like in those stories with the greatest potential for agenda-setting.

The prominence variables (headline rank, page placement and total story size) were correlated (Pearson r) in an attempt to construct a prominence index from which a mean prominence could be determined. None of the correlations, however, were strong. An arbitrary rating was therefore devised which assigned one point to each value in the prominence variables. In this way, a story with a large headline (more
than six square inches) received three points, a story with a medium headline received two points, and a story with a small headline (less than three square inches) received one point.

Similarly, a story placed on page one received five points. A story on the first page of an inside section received four points, while editorial and op-ed page stories received three. Stories inside the first section received two points and a story inside any other section received one point. Seven points were assigned to stories measuring larger than 30 column inches, six points to stories measuring between 26 and 30 column inches, five points to stories measuring between 21 and 25 inches and so on down to one point being assigned to stories of five column inches or less.

The values for each story were then summed to arrive at the story's prominence rating. The maximum possible rating was 15 and the minimum, three. The mean prominence rating for all 95 stories which provided cultural coverage was 7.5. While this rating is meaningless outside this study, it enabled the stories to be classified as above average in prominence or average/below average. Those stories with a prominence rating of eight or better were considered to be of "above average" prominence and were analyzed to determine what kind of coverage was present. In this way, the study sought to determine what the cultural coverage was like in stories with the greatest agenda-setting potential.
A total of 35 stories, or 37% of the stories with cultural coverage, had a prominence rating of eight or better. Five of these, or 14% (5 out of 35), were about pay television. Nine stories with higher than average prominence were about network role, programming and performance. This represents 26% of the 35 stories. Seven stories, or 20%, were about piracy. Twelve stories, or 34%, dealt with more than one subject while 6% (2 stories) of the stories with higher than average prominence were about Cancon regulations.

Thus, 19% (5 of 26) of stories about pay television, 40% (9 of 22) of stories about network role, programming and performance, 50% (7 of 14) of stories about piracy, 34% (2 of 6) stories about Cancon regulations and 43% of stories about more than one of the subjects were in stories which had higher than average prominence ratings. Thus, stories about pay television were least likely to be prominent.

With respect to story types, 72% (25 of 35) of the stories with higher than average prominence were news stories. This represents 34% (25 of 73) of all news stories with cultural coverage. Columns made up 3% of the higher than average prominent stories while features made up the remaining 26% (9 out of 35). This represents 33% (1 out of 3) and 100% (9 out of 9) of columns and features respectively. No editorials had an above average prominence rating. In a sense, the prominence of features was wasted in that they were unlikely to provide detailed coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue (Table 7).
With respect to amount of space actually devoted to culture in prominent stories, seven stories or 20% devoted better than one-quarter of story space (content) to culture. The other 28 stories (80%) with higher than average prominence devoted less than 25% of the story space to culture. Two of the four stories which devoted more than 75% of space to culture had better than average prominence (with ratings of 9 and 11). Two of the four stories which devoted at least half of the content (but less than three-quarters) to cultural coverage also had higher than average prominence (with ratings of 8 and 12).

Four stories or 11% of those stories with a prominence rating of 8 or better gave predominant coverage to culture. This represents 50% of those stories which gave predominant coverage to culture. Business-financial coverage and policy-legislative coverage each predominated in 37% of the stories with better than average prominence. That is, 13 of the 35 stories gave predominant coverage to business-financial matters while another 13 devoted predominant coverage to policy-legislative matters.

The 13 prominent stories which gave predominant coverage to business-financial matters represents 41% of the 32 stories in which business-financial matters were the predominant coverage. Thus, those stories which gave predominant coverage to culture were more likely to be prominent (50% were prominent) than were business-financial stories. Since
there were only four such stories, however, it would be difficult to infer a pro-cultural bias especially since in absolute terms, there were more prominent stories oriented towards business-financial matters than towards culture.

With respect to treatment of themes, 32% (11 of 25) of stories with better than average prominence mentioned the predominant theme while 32% also elaborated on details. The 11 predominant themes mentioned in the prominent stories represents 37% (11 of 30) of all theme mentions while the 10 stories with higher than average prominence which elaborated on the predominant theme represents 38% of all stories which elaborated details. Thus, the treatment of themes was slightly better in the prominent stories than it was on average for all 95 stories.

Finally, 6 stories or 17% of the stories with higher than average prominence provided perspectives which were non-supportive of the cultural relevance of broadcasting. These 6 stories represent 67% of stories with non-supportive perspectives. Seventeen stories with better than average prominence ratings (49%) were supportive of the cultural relevance. These 17 represent 44% of all stories with supportive perspectives. Thus, proportionately more stories with non-supportive perspectives tended to be stories with higher than average prominence.
3.8 SUMMARY

The study was undertaken to determine how much cultural coverage of broadcasting there was in The Globe and Mail, the kind of coverage that was provided, and the agenda-setting potential that coverage has. The amount of cultural coverage provided by The Globe and Mail was analyzed with respect to frequency of articles with cultural coverage that appeared, the total size of those articles and the amount of space within those articles devoted to cultural coverage. The kind of coverage was analyzed for what subjects were covered, what themes were covered, how extensively themes were explained with details, what types of stories conveyed the coverage, the tone of cultural perspectives provided, and the cultural relevance the newspaper draws. The agenda-setting potential of The Globe's coverage was analyzed in terms of total story size and a prominence rating devised and tailored for the study.

The amount of coverage provided by The Globe was meager. In just over three years, 166 stories on topics related to culture and broadcasting appeared. Of these stories in which cultural coverage might reasonably be expected, 95 or 57% actually provided coverage. Based on an average of 241 stories per day, the proportion of stories devoted to cultural coverage in three years was 0.04%.

Moreover, in 69 stories or 73% of stories which provided cultural coverage, less than 25% of the content of the story
was devoted to cultural discussion. On average, 4.37 inches every 11 days was devoted to cultural coverage. Based on an average of 3,752 column inches (six-column format) available in the average daily issue, the 4.37 column inches devoted to cultural coverage every 11 days represents 0.01% of the total available editorial space in 11 days. Given the significance of the broadcasting-culture issue and given the need for public awareness of the issue, this is minimal coverage. The agenda-setting potential of this coverage was likely weak as a result.

The type of story most often providing coverage was the news story (77% of stories with coverage). The nature of the news story permits little in-depth coverage. Columns and features, stories which have greater ability to explain issues in detail, accounted for only 13% of the cultural coverage provided. As well, only 34% and 11% of columns and features respectively devoted more than one-quarter of story content to cultural coverage. Not only did few columns and features convey coverage, then, little was devoted to culture when they did provide coverage.

Culture itself was the predominant coverage in only 8 stories or 8% of the stories which provided coverage. Policy-legislative matters were most often the predominant coverage (in 40% of the stories). Business-financial matters were the predominant coverage in 34% of the stories. Of all 166 stories in which cultural coverage was expected, the
greatest percentage (40%) devoted predominant coverage to business-financial matters. In this sense, coverage of broadcasting even when cultural coverage could reasonably be expected was more often provided in a business-financial context. And, of all 166 stories in which cultural coverage was expected, only 5% devoted coverage primarily to cultural coverage. Thus, the cultural coverage that was provided in the 95 stories rarely appeared in a predominantly cultural context.

In short, many stories which might have been expected to deal with cultural implications of broadcasting did not. This was especially true in stories about pay television and piracy. Only 48% of stories about pay television and 40% of the stories about piracy provided cultural coverage where it was expected.

Most of the stories which provided coverage only alluded to themes. The 33 themes identified in this study were covered a total of 152 times and 29% of these were mentioned (stated explicitly) while 71% were simply referred to. Of the predominant themes in each story, 30 or 32% were explicitly mentioned while 61 or 64% were simply referred to. (Four stories provided no themes.)

Moreover, themes fundamental to an understanding of the broadcasting-culture issue appeared in only 4 stories or 5% of all stories in which coverage was provided. These themes state that television expresses culture (theme 29), that the
American and Canadian cultures are different (theme 30) and that watching television can lead to acculturation (theme 31) or enculturation (theme 32). These are themes basic to an understanding of both the cultural benefits and dangers of television. Without understanding these, the significance of the issue is lost. Yet, in 39 months of coverage, these themes appeared a total of four times.

The explanation of the cultural implications of broadcasting was limited as well. Only 26% of the stories with cultural coverage elaborated on details related to the predominant theme in each story while 39% provided only partial explanation. No details were provided in 35% of the stories with coverage.

Overall, then, cultural coverage was minimal and when it was provided, coverage often failed to state the cultural implications explicitly and often failed to explain the implications.

Over half of the stories contributed "negatively" to an awareness of the cultural significance of broadcasting. That is, 59% of the stories contributed negatively in preferring perspectives non-supportive of (9%) or neutral towards (50%) the cultural relevance of broadcasting. As well, 54% of the non-supportive perspectives were initiated by The Globe and Mail.

Overall, then, The Globe and Mail's coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue was not extensive and it could
not be considered as contributing much to an understanding of the issue. As such, The Globe and Mail cannot be considered to be playing a socially responsible role in its coverage of culture and broadcasting. The amount and quality of the cultural coverage of broadcasting accorded the broadcasting-culture issue indicates there is no conscious attempt on the part of The Globe to impart an awareness of or an understanding of the cultural implications of broadcasting.

It was suggested in Chapter I that if The Globe and Mail did not provide comprehensive coverage, it could be construed as contributing to the perpetuation of the present system which precludes making culture the primary broadcasting priority to begin with since it is itself part of the system by virtue of being a member of the media-economic elite. The evidence summarized here indicates that this may indeed be so. The Globe is not behaving according to the expectations of the Social Responsibility Theory of the press.

It was also suggested in Chapter I that if there was coverage which concentrated on financial or economic aspects of the broadcasting-culture issue, or which downplayed the cultural significance of broadcasting and its potentially adverse cultural effects, that support for the critical view of the press sympathetic towards business interests would be found. There is some evidence from this study which would support this.
To begin, of all stories (166) in which coverage was expected, the greatest percentage (40%) of stories treated broadcasting in a primarily business-financial context. While policy-legislative matters were the predominant coverage (primary context) in the 95 stories which actually provided coverage, business-financial matters predominated in only 6% fewer stories. This also represented slightly more than a third (34%) of the cultural coverage.

Moreover, coverage of CTV was almost non-existent. The network's programming practices, as described briefly in Chapter II, are a prime example of the cause and implications of the cultural concerns in Canadian broadcasting. The amount of American programming on CTV has potentially adverse cultural effects. The lack of coverage of CTV means The Globe and Mail does not expose or explain a significant source of potentially adverse cultural effects. There is, in other words, no critical coverage of CTV.

The CTV of course is not solely to blame for the troubled state of Canadian culture on Canadian television. The network is, however, one of the two national networks in Canada and its audience is considerable. It is a large and significant element in the Canadian broadcasting system and its cultural irresponsibility should, then, be covered or at least covered more extensively than it is. The Globe's apparent lack of attention to CTV can thus be interpreted as downplaying the adverse cultural effects of foreign televi-
sion programming on Canadian television screens. This, then, would support the critical view of the press which views the press as acting largely in its own self-interest. As a member of the media-economic elite, The Globe possibly preferred not to cover CTV at all, rather than provide potentially negative coverage of its cultural performance.

This could be explained by print's tendency to ignore television generally because it represents competition. However, it is also likely that The Globe chose not to cover the acculturation potential of CTV because it did not want to draw attention to its own use of American wire and syndication services. Rather than criticize television and risk drawing attention to itself, The Globe ignored CTV to protect itself from criticism.

As well, of all critical or non-supportive perspectives of the cultural relevance of broadcasting, 67% were provided in stories with higher than average prominence. Moreover, 54% of non-supportive perspectives were initiated by The Globe while only 8% of supportive perspectives were. This can be interpreted as downplaying the cultural significance of broadcasting altogether and thus, support by The Globe for the prevailing economic order which precludes making culture the primary priority in broadcasting. This would thus lend credence to the claims of those purporting the critical view of the press.
In sum, *The Globe and Mail* did not perform a socially responsible role in its coverage of broadcasting and culture by providing explicit, comprehensive coverage. If its coverage during the 39 months between January, 1980 and March, 1983 did have an agenda-setting impact, it was likely limited. Moreover, because the coverage that was provided generally was not extensive, it is likely that *The Globe and Mail* contributed little or nothing to an understanding of the broadcasting-culture issue. Because such a contribution is vital to the resolution of the issue, and whatever else might be hindering a resolution, the fact that *The Globe* has a cultural role to play which is not being taken advantage of merits consideration from two perspectives: policy-making and the social role of the newspaper.
Chapter IV

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The findings of the study show *The Globe and Mail* is not performing a role it could and even should be performing. A total of 95 stories in 39 months on an issue of considerable significance is not much coverage especially considering it represents only 0.04% of all possible stories in that period. While the newspaper has the time and the space to devote to in-depth coverage of public issues, *The Globe* provides minimal space to the issue: 78% of the stories devoted less than 5 column inches to the issue and 73% of the stories devoted less than 25% of the content to actual cultural coverage. When coverage was provided, it was more likely to be shallow than detailed. Full explanation of predominant themes was provided in only 26% of the stories while the themes themselves were explicitly mentioned in 32% of the stories.

The kind of story most often conveying coverage was the news story (77% of stories) although this kind of story is least likely to provide elaboration and detailed coverage. While news stories have an advantage over columns in that there may be more space available in a news story, the na-
ture of the story does not permit the commentary and back-
grounding of the column. As well, only 10% of the stories
were features, which is the type of story best able to con-
vey in-depth coverage. Of this 10%, 89% devoted less than
one-quarter of story space to culture.

If people are in fact consciously and completely aware of
the details and implications of the broadcasting-culture is-
sue, it is unlikely that The Globe and Mail contributes much
to this awareness. For people whose awareness of the issue
is based solely on the coverage provided by The Globe, their
awareness can only be considered shallow. The overall poor
coverage of the cultural implications given by The Globe and
Mail raises implications for both policy-making and the role
the newspaper plays in society. These implications are dis-
cussed below.

4.2 IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY-MAKING

It was mentioned in Chapter I that the government actively
solicits public input in broadcasting (and cultural) policy-
making. The government receives this input either in public
hearings or through written submissions. Some social policy
matters, for example the concern over pornography and pros-
stitution, derive valuable input from public opinion and the
measurement of public attitude. So-called motherhood issues
such as world peace also doubtlessly command useful input
from assessing public opinion.
Unobtrusive issues such as the broadcasting-culture issue, however, require input based on more than mere opinion especially because culture itself is so unconscious. It is likely easier to have an opinion about pornography than about the state of Canadian culture in broadcasting. Public input into broadcasting policy-making, then, must be based on information, a point the government concurs with (DOC, 1983a:20). Obviously, the better informed the public, the more valid its input.

It was also argued in Chapter I that the media are likely the best sources for information on the broadcasting-culture issue. Indeed, where else but from the media can the public learn about the issue? As we have seen, of all the media, the newspaper is likely the best popular source. Thus, if public input is to be based on solid, comprehensive information and a complete understanding of the issue, the newspaper would have to provide extensive, detailed coverage of the issue. Thus, the value of the public's contribution to broadcasting policy-making is determined in large part by the quality of information provided by its source, the newspaper. As Canada's premier newspaper, The Globe and Mail is probably the best media source on the broadcasting-culture issue. But as the findings suggest, its coverage of the issue, and likely therefore public awareness of the issue, is shallow.
The findings showed that some aspects of the broadcasting-culture issue such as the CTV's lack of contribution to Canadian culture and the fundamentals of the issue as expressed by Themes 29-32 were rarely covered or not covered at all. The coverage also often failed to draw an explicit connection between culture and broadcasting, as was the case in many of the economic-related themes. While there was coverage, then, the coverage frequently omitted relevant, crucial details.

The agenda-setting power of the media to influence cognition, explains Shaw (1979:104), is two-fold:

This power can be exercised not only by commission but also by omission. Those public matters and those aspects of the social environment that are not reported, not discussed, not depicted in newspapers and over the broadcast media are also not likely to enter into or affect people's discussions and evaluations. And so the consensus reached by the body politic may be inappropriate to the real problems, events, or issues confronting a democratic society. Out of sight can be out of mind.

Given the lack of coverage of several aspects of the broadcasting-culture issue by The Globe and Mail, then, how appropriate is the consensus—the broadcasting policy—that is reached to deal with the issue? Or is it appropriate at all? If Canadians did know and understand that viewing foreign signals could cause acculturation, would there be less demand for these signals? If, in other words, The Globe and Mail and Canadian newspapers collectively covered and explained this moreso than they do, would a consensus be ar-
rived at where the demand or the right to view foreign signals ranked lower in the policy priority? The study has shown that of all the broadcasting subjects covered, pay television was least explained. The current government regulations require that 50% of pay television programming be Canadian. In the broadcasting strategy for Canada (DOC, 1983a), mention is often made of the government's desire to recognize and serve the public's right to view foreign signals. Perhaps if the controversy over the dangers of viewing foreign signals were made more apparent by the newspaper, regulations for Canadian content on pay television could be higher, say 75%. Without extensive cultural coverage of pay television in the newspaper, the consensus of 50% is reached.

Communications Minister Francis Fox also let it be known that certain American pay television channels might be allowed distribution in Canada if no comparable Canadian service is available (Fox, 1983). Thus, 30 minutes of every hour of pay programming in Canada is permitted to be foreign and the government is considering allowing the wholesale importation of certain types of American pay programming. This is the consensus reached when the newspaper provides inadequate coverage of the broadcasting and culture issue vis-à-vis pay television. And this consensus acquiescing as it does to public demand for foreign programming is not only inappropriate to resolving the issue, it is contradictory as
well. That is, a concern already exists over the amount of American programming available in Canada. Despite the potential cultural danger of this programming, and despite the concern about it often expressed in government documents (cf. CRTC, 1983a; DOC, 1983a), the government is contemplating making even more American programming available.

It might be that even were The Globe and Mail to convey and explain the fundamentals of the broadcasting-culture issue regularly, the public input and the consensus reached through policy would be no different than it is now. But if the press persists in omitting essential coverage, neither is it likely that an appropriate policy response will be initiated which will deal justly but effectively with the amount of foreign programming and the potentially ill effects thereof in Canada. In other words, covering specific broadcasting aspects in more detail and covering the fundamentals of the issue may or may not lead to better policy. But the present nature of the coverage, if The Globe and Mail's coverage is representative, will certainly not lead to better policy.

In the end, the mediocre and incomplete cultural coverage of broadcasting that is provided means that public input into policy making is mediocre as well. The Globe and Mail, it is said, is one of the best, if not the best, newspaper in Canada. If this is so, then the cultural coverage of broadcasting provided by the rest of the Canadian press is
even more lacking. Policy formulation and the resolution of the broadcasting-culture issue suffers because a prime source for the public's input provides shallow coverage of the issue. The coverage, and therefore the public's input and presumably therefore the policy, could be much better. If public awareness is vital to resolving the issue, coverage will have to be better.

Another policy implication worth considering is the public response to the policy. This study has shown that if the newspaper is a primary source for knowledge of issues, there is much the Canadian public does not know about the broadcasting-culture issue. The significance of the issue could well be lost. As such, the policy measures taken by the government may be misunderstood. The outcry that ensued when Ottawa attempted to close down earth stations receiving American pay signals could have resulted partly from the pirates not understanding or being completely ignorant of the cultural danger they are courting. The less the public—those affected by broadcasting policy and regulations—understands about the issue, the less likely it is to accept unpopular measures such as restrictions on the importation of foreign programming.

Petryszak (1979:32), citing Singer (1971:425) says that

In many instances, the Canadian public react [sic] just as angrily [as private broadcasters] to Canadian content regulations and object to the Federal government depriving them of their [sic] right to watch American stations... Such widespread dis- sensation over Canadian Content regulations makes it difficult for the CRTC to operate on a basis of popular support and mutual understanding.
Could the government do more if public awareness of the broadcasting-culture issue were greater? If Canadians knew the whys and the hows, the potential consequences of imported programming and the benefit of domestic programming, would the government not be able to deal more effectively with imported programming? It is possible. That is, if Canadians understood and appreciated the cultural dangers inherent in the present broadcasting reality, perhaps they would be willing to accept even if grudgingly policy and regulations which might restrict their viewing of foreign programming. For this to happen, however, it would appear that The Globe and Mail and the other Canadian dailies (as well as the other media generally), as agents of information, would have to perform better in explaining the cultural implications of broadcasting.

The Report on the White paper on Broadcasting (Stanbury, 1966:5) told Parliament that it is its responsibility "to define the public interest to be served by our broadcasting system and to enunciate the national policy." In other words, the government might have to tell Canadians what is best for us and implement broadcasting policy which assures cultural benefits even at the expense of raising public ire. Surely were the government confident that the public was fully aware of the issue, it would be more confident in making potentially unpopular, hard-nosed broadcasting policy. But it must first define the interest and convey the ratio-
nate of the policy. There is likely no better way to do so than by the mass media. The government must transmit its agenda to the public via the media. However, this study has shown that information about the broadcasting-culture issue is generally shallow. The advantages the newspaper offers for potentially explaining issues because of its greater newshole (space), are not being seized.

The end result is that the government is not defining the issue as well as it could be defined. It is forced into timid policy-making because the public does not understand the issue; because the policy problem—in this case, the survival of Canadian culture—is not clearly defined. The government receives no help from The Globe and Mail in defining the issue, in that the fundamental concerns, the very basics of the issue, are hardly treated in the paper. In sum, broadcasting policy is likely to be greeted with the public hostility that Singer (1971) and Petryszak (1979) allude to as long as the public remains unaware of the broadcasting-culture issue. And facing the spectre of this hostility, the government is unlikely to establish policy any less timid than exists now.

Thus, while there is cultural coverage provided by The Globe and Mail, the information the public needs in order to provide valid input and the information the government needs to convey to make way for effective, decisive measures is lacking. What and how much is needed cannot be predicted.
Given the small amount of space accorded the issue by The Globe, given the general tendency of the coverage to skirt explanation, and given the almost total absence of the fundamental concerns of the issue around which everything else centres, however, it is reasonable to conclude that the amount and quality of cultural coverage of broadcasting provided by The Globe and Mail is insufficient to provide for effective policy input from the public or decisive policy output from the government.

The foregoing discussion assumed that the newspaper, as a popularly used source of information, has an obligation to society to set the appropriate agenda and provide sufficient details of the issue on the agenda. It is to this assumption that we now turn.

4.3 THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE NEWSPAPER

The study could find little evidence to support the Social Responsibility Theory of the press. The results indicate that The Globe and Mail is performing much less of a responsible role than it is capable of in its coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue. Awareness of the issue is barely provided and the advantages of the newspaper are not being used fully to convey information about the issue. There is indeed coverage, but it is inadequate in amount, it lacks elaboration, it ignores some essential aspects such as the cultural irresponsibility of the CTV, and it all but ignores
the fundamentals of the issue: that Canadian and American cultures are different and that television can acculturate or enculturate. The coverage is certainly less than optimal and probably less than is necessary to contribute to an understanding of the broadcasting-culture issue. It is because The Globe and Mail is not providing the coverage that is needed and because it is not providing the coverage it could be that this study has to conclude that The Globe is not playing a socially responsible role or any substantial cultural role in its cultural coverage of broadcasting.

Since public consciousness of the issue is vital to its resolution and because the newspaper is probably the best popular source for information on the issue, the significance of The Globe's mediocre coverage is made more acute. That is, if there were numerous other sources and if the other media were as capable of providing the information with the agenda-setting potential of the newspaper, the fact that The Globe's coverage of the issue is weak would not be cause for as much concern. But how many other sources are there as readily available as the newspaper which are able to cover the issue with the detail and the style that the newspaper can? What aspects of the issue—if any—are on the high school, college and university curricula? How many people take the time and effort to visit the library, or go to university, or write to the government for information on the issue? And of the other media, how extensive could
their coverage be, given that the newspaper's is likely the best?

In short, the newspaper not only has a role to play by raising awareness of the broadcasting-culture issue, it might also be the major agent capable of performing the role. Since public awareness is vital to the resolution of the issue by making policy input and implementation more effective, the role ought to be performed.

Whether the newspaper wants the responsibility of raising public consciousness about culture and broadcasting or not, perhaps it should be obligated to assume it. The issue is urgent although it is unobtrusive. Public awareness is a worthy, if not requisite ally in preventing the cultural misuse of television and thus, in sustaining the "soul of the nation." Considerable cultural responsibility has been placed on television, but it might be that much of this responsibility and the attention given to seeing that it be discharged is misdirected.

So much attention has been paid to television's cultural role, that it would seem the role of the newspaper is virtually ignored. Certainly television can help culture by exhibiting Canadian productions and conveying culture unconsciously. But the newspaper, as a medium of information and with the demonstrated ability to convey information better than television, can play a cultural role as well. The government has relied almost solely upon broadcasting to
spread cultural awareness. But television might be the wrong medium to do this. American and imported programs fill the Canadian airwaves and CRTC figures (CRTC, 1983a) show that these programs are watched more than Canadian programs. Television's Americanization potential, then, is far greater than its enculturation potential. Canadians must be made aware of the cultural implications of broadcasting if we are to prevent the American content on the Canadian broadcasting system from acculturating us and if we are to use it to sustain Canadian culture. Perhaps too much attention has been placed on broadcasting while the medium best likely to create public awareness of the problems culture faces because of broadcasting is ignored.

The potential of the newspaper to inform us about the broadcasting-culture issue and to explain it should be looked at closely. More attention should be paid to the newspaper to resolve the issue by using its capability to explain and its agenda-setting potential to provide complete, comprehensive and detailed coverage on the issue. The newspaper is better suited than the other media to provide such coverage. If it were a medium truly responsive to the interests of society, it would be providing such coverage. But as this study has shown, The Globe and Mail at least is not.

The newspaper might not want a cultural responsibility, it might not want to be a social servant, but if Canadian
culture is to survive the cultural onslaught wrought by the Canadian broadcasting system, it just might have to assume the responsibility. The Globe and Mail's coverage of the issue does not reflect a concerted, sincere attempt to be socially responsible. It could, and because of the vital need for awareness of the issue, should do more.

The findings in this study indicate that in terms of providing conscious cognitive awareness of the broadcasting-culture issue, the role of the newspaper is a prime role which is going unfulfilled. It is not only a prime role, it may well be a vital role. Government long ago recognized the power and the cultural potential of television and duly regulated the medium because the electro-magnetic frequency is a "limited resource." The newspaper also has tremendous cultural potential: providing the public with cultural coverage of broadcasting so necessary to Canadian cultural survival. The newspaper, too, is a limited resource in that not everyone, indeed very few, can own one. If the newspaper does not take it upon itself to provide the coverage, perhaps it should be prodded into doing so. If the newspaper does not voluntarily assume the role, then according to the Social Responsibility Theory of the press, the government should step in and ensure that it does.

Newspaper publishers are the most vociferous, the strongest proponents of freedom of the press. And a strong, vital, free society must have a free press to spur the inter-
play of ideas, debate and challenge that can be so beneficial to society. Still, this idea of a free press must be looked at in relative terms. A free press is not necessarily a responsible press and when a seemingly crucial responsibility such as providing comprehensive coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue is not assumed freely by the press, it may well have to be handed to it.

Television cannot be the cultural saviour it was once perceived as. If anything, Canadian television is acculturating us with foreign programming. The newspaper is likely the only source able to assist by informing us about the problems facing culture such as those in broadcasting. It is likely the only source able to explain potential solutions. The state of Canadian culture on television requires considerable help and there is no reason why newspapers should be exempt from providing assistance just because asking them or telling them to would be unheard of.

Is freedom of the press more important than freedom from cultural domination? Can a people live without its soul? If a nation's--any nation's--culture is vital, and if it is threatened as Canada's is, it might be that drastic measures such as demanding coverage of the issue from the press is called for. If this demand must come from government, so be it. However, it would be far more acceptable to point out the problem to the press. The press should be made aware of the cultural implications of broadcasting and should be made
aware of the need for better coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue. The newspaper is, after all, capable of providing comprehensive, in-depth coverage of public issues. The newspaper industry must first, however, recognize the need for coverage and be made aware of the deficiencies in the coverage it provides. Only if the press continues to treat the broadcasting-culture issue with little concern should more drastic measures be taken.

There are times, perhaps, when ideology simply becomes irrelevant such as a time when, by all standards, the true public interest is at stake. So long as a seemingly drastic measure such as compelling newspapers to provide detailed coverage of an equally drastic issue is sincerely taken with the public interest in true regard, such a measure regardless of the prevailing ideology should be permitted. Dogmatism might be worse than pragmatism in some instances and a free society has the luxury to choose which is best. With respect to compelling newspapers to provide full, comprehensive coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue, this choice might not only be a luxury, it might be a necessity as well.

This study does not pretend to provide a solution or a strategy. Rather, it recommends that somehow, the newspaper must do more in its coverage of the broadcasting-culture issue. It points out that there is something which needs to be done with respect to providing cultural cognition of broadcasting and that the newspaper is the ideal medium to
provide it. It shows, too, that the ideal medium is not providing the coverage.

The study is not calling for a regulated press. Rather, it is pointing out the need for consideration of action and ideas which have to proceed beyond accepted or prevailing attitudes or ideology. That is, is it not more potentially beneficial to explore all possible alternatives in searching for a solution to the broadcasting-culture issue than to preclude some for whatever kind of reason? The consideration of "drastic" alternatives and the pursuit of ideals expands the parameters of perception wherein strategies may subsequently lie which would otherwise be overlooked. As wild, or as impractical or as unreasonable the ensuing ideas may be, the realm of possibilities is diversified. Judging by the state of Canadian culture on television and recognizing the mediocre contribution one potentially great, if not solely--the newspaper--is making in resolving the broadcasting-culture issue, Canadian broadcasting needs all the possibilities that can be offered. While regulation cannot be ruled out, the preferred "possibility" is newspaper self-correction.

In conclusion, the newspaper could be performing a more socially responsible role in covering the broadcasting-culture issue. If The Globe and Mail's coverage of the issue is representative of the newspaper medium's coverage of public issues generally, then the Social Responsibility
Theory of the press would call for the government to ensure better coverage of public issues. If Canadian television is to perform a beneficial cultural role in Canada, it will have to rely on the newspaper performing a better cognitive cultural role. Culture is too intangible, too threatened to be left to ratings-minded television-programmers seeking their programming staple from outside Canada.

The resolution of the broadcasting-culture issue calls for more than mere broadcasting policy, more than improved economics in the industry. It calls for more than better scripts or better productions. These are necessary, but they all depend upon an informed public to offer input and support for Canadian broadcasting. The resolution of the issue calls for better coverage of the issue by the press and if this coverage does not come voluntarily, it might well have to come involuntarily.
Appendix A

A NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

A series of questions was put to all stories to determine the kind or quality of The Globe and Mail's cultural coverage broadcasting. Three of the questions (5, 6, and 12) required written answers and the rest, quantitative answers according to predetermined rules for coding.

Asked first of all stories was whether cultural coverage was provided. An affirmative answer would have necessitated that mention of or reference to a theme and/or elaboration of or reference to one or more relevant details was present in the story. If neither was present, that is if no cultural coverage was provided, the story was coded only for predominant coverage and analyzed no further since there was no cultural coverage to evaluate. The remaining questions on the question sheet provided in Appendix B were then asked of all stories which provided some cultural coverage.

The second and third questions ask whether the theme and details (if present) are mentioned or simply referred to. The term mention means a declarative explicit statement about the relationship between culture and the story subject which paraphrases or resembles or is analagous to one of the 33 themes listed in Appendix B. The story's coverage of a
theme had to satisfy this definition to be coded "mention" for Question number 2. But it was thought that some stories might not state a theme completely. For instance, a story which says only that not much drama is produced in Canada would only allude to theme 8 not mentioning it fully since it does not make the connection to culture by saying drama is the genre most effective in conveying culture. Similarly, a story which describes how the Canadian networks rely on American programming because they are inexpensive is only part of theme 1: that the economics of Canadian television have cultural implications which inhibit Canadian broadcasting's cultural potential. In other words, if the connection to culture was not made or if the cultural implication was not drawn, then the story was considered as only alluding to the theme. In such cases, Question 2 was answered with "reference".

Similarly, the coverage of details could have been inadequate or incomplete (or, as with themes, nonexistent). For example, a story which says that there will have to be American entertainment programming on Canadian pay television to be successful but which does not explain that this could hurt Canadian culture through the assimilation of American culture would receive a "reference" score in its treatment of theme 4 for the third question. For a story to receive the "elaboration" score, it would have had to explain the cultural connection or implication to broadcasting expressed in the theme.
Thus, the theme was a statement of the relationship between culture and the story subject while the details were the explanation of the relationship. The relevant parts of Chapters I and II constituted the basis upon which full or partial mention of themes and details was determined. Finally, by determining what was missing as judged by Chapters I and II in the theme and details, Questions 5 and 6 permitted an assessment of the deficiency, if any, in cultural coverage for each story.

A distinction was made among "story subject", "predominant coverage", "theme", "predominant theme", and "predominant perspective". Story subject refers to the four areas of the broadcasting-culture issue identified in Chapter I under consideration in the study: CBC and CTV role/programming/performance; pay television; piracy; Canadian content regulations. If a story dealt with more than one area, it was coded "multiple".

Predominant coverage refers to the topic or nature of discussion given the most space (measured in column inches) in the story. It was coded cultural if the coverage dealt predominantly with the cultural implications of broadcasting as detailed in Chapters I and II. If, that is, more space was given to mentioning or referring to themes and elaborating or referring to details than to anything else in the story (i.e. if Question 14 on the Coding Sheet was coded 1 or 2), the predominant coverage was designated cultural. A
business/financial designation was given to coverage which primarily described money or financial details, involved financing aspects (for example, of pay television programming), or described the pursuit and competition for audiences or ratings and other matters related to the administration of business. Story coverage predominantly describing either existing or proposed policy, the intent or effect of policy, support or opposition to policy or legislation, or parliamentary legislation (existing or proposed) relating to broadcasting was designated policy/legislative. The legal/jurisdictional designation was given to coverage which was primarily about the involvement of the courts, police or law profession in broadcasting, or was about who exercises what power over what aspect of broadcasting, who claims jurisdiction and who disputes it.

Theme was defined earlier. Predominant theme was the cultural theme given the most space in stories where more than one theme was mentioned or referred to.

Predominant perspective refers to the viewpoint, or perspective dealing with the theme and/or details given the most space. It is, in other words, the cultural perspective within the story given the most space. This is perhaps the most important part of the investigation since, in essence, it assesses what information about culture The Globe and Mail is conveying about broadcasting. Identifying and analyzing cultural perspectives provided an indication of what
kind of view was presented with what frequency; that is, what perspective is on the agenda. However, it was not possible to predesignate possible answers for this question (Question 12) so the predominant perspective was summarized.

Questions 13-16 analyze the predominant perspective in more detail. Question 11 identifies the source of the perspective, or whose viewpoint (and from broadcasting industry sector) is predominantly expressed. The range of answers is somewhat self-explanatory.

In determining the tone of the predominant cultural perspective in the story, the study attempted to identify the nature of the cultural message in each story, and, considering all stories in aggregate, of the cultural coverage in general. Chapters I and II provided considerable evidence that culture is an important consideration in television broadcasting, that television broadcasting affects culture, that concern for Canadian culture as a result of foreign television programming is probably valid, and that broadcasting could be a cultural ally. In short, there are numerous cultural implications in broadcasting which should not be overlooked. Does the predominant cultural perspective in the story agree or disagree with the assessment of the broadcasting-culture issue provided in Chapters I and II? More specifically, does the story's perspective agree or disagree with the cultural implication of cultural relevance or cultural concern of the topic under discussion?
For instance, if a matter described as a cultural threat in Chapter I or II is also treated as a threat in the predominant perspective, then the perspective agrees with that particular matter's cultural implication. If, on the other hand, the perspective in a story is critical of such an implication, or downplays it or disagrees with it, then the story's perspective disagrees with the cultural implication of that particular matter. Thus, with respect to Question 14, stories were coded "non-supportive" or "supportive" of the cultural relevance of the topic of discussion in the story. Stories were coded "neutral" if there was no overt bias for or against the cultural implication, relevance or concern of the topic of discussion or if it was not possible to determine the tone of the perspective.

Identifying the newspaper's position--where it is provided--is instructive as well. Where it is possible to identify a stance, does it concur with or oppose the predominant cultural perspective in the story? And is this position thus critical or supportive or (or neutral towards) the cultural implication, relevance or concern of the topic under discussion? To answer this question, the same categories and criteria were used as in Question 14.

Whereas Questions 14 and 15 refer to the cultural relevance of the particular story subject or some aspect of the subject, Question 16 refers to the story's treatment of the cultural relevance of broadcasting generally. If there was
more support for the analysis in Chapters I and II than there was disagreement through the entire story, the story itself (as opposed to the perspective in the story or the newspaper's response to the perspective where provided) was considered to be supportive of the cultural relevance of broadcasting generally. Where there was more disagreement than agreement, the story was considered to be non-supportive of the cultural relevance of broadcasting generally, where the cultural relevance could not be determined one way or the other, the story was coded neutral towards the cultural relevance of broadcasting.

Thus, as well as identifying what cultural perspectives were provided in The Globe and Mail's coverage of broadcasting, the study also identified the tone of each perspective, the newspaper's position on each particular perspective (where it could be determined as having one), and the story's--and therefore the newspaper's--position on the cultural significance of broadcasting. It was therefore possible to determine whether The Globe and Mail is contributing positively (supporting the assessment provided in Chapters I and II) or negatively (disputing the assessment provided in Chapters I and II) towards cognitive awareness of culture and broadcasting in Canada. Considered in aggregate, analysis of perspectives provided an indication of what kind of message about culture and broadcasting The Globe and Mail provided, or what ideas about the broadcasting-culture issue
were ultimately placed on the newspaper's agenda and potentially, on the readers' agenda.

As alluded to throughout this Appendix, Chapters I and II were used as the benchmark against which the cultural coverage of broadcasting in *The Globe and Mail* was assessed. Holsti (1967:31-33) says that critical evaluation of content requires that it should be compared with some standard of adequacy or performance. McLeod, Becker and Byrnes (1974:141) suggest that satisfactory control conditions in newspaper coverage of issues should include a comparison with either the agenda of another medium or outlet or with the agenda of a nonmedium outlet. Chapters I and II were thus considered a standard of performance derived independently of newspaper content and thus, an "agenda" against which *The Globe*’s coverage could be compared. As noted earlier, they were also used as the basis for determining perspective- and story-tone towards culture and broadcasting.

Although a simple description of content would have sufficed for drawing inferences (Holsti, 1967:67), comparison with a standard enabled a more reliable and valid assessment of the quality of cultural coverage to be made. It also enabled the establishment of criteria for identifying the tone of cultural coverage, and provided a gauge of the actual extent of cultural coverage of broadcasting on *The Globe and Mail*’s agenda.
Appendix B

THEMES

1. The economics of the Canadian television industry have cultural implications which inhibit the broadcasting system's ability to promote Canadian culture.

2. Economics and culture in broadcasting are directly related and inseparable.

3. To achieve the cultural objectives of the Broadcasting Act, Canadian television must be economically successful.

4. To be economically successful, a substantial amount of imported American programming is required.

5. The CTV and CBC are expected to contribute to national identity using Canadian resources in balanced and diverse programming.

6. The CBC's cultural role is more extensive than CTV's in that the former is expected to contribute to Canadian unity and the development of Canadian creative talent.

7. Television broadcasting in Canada is intended to fulfill a cultural responsibility through the expression of Canadian identity.

8. Drama, the genre best suited to convey culture, is rarely produced in Canada.

9. The Canadian drama that is produced and aired cannot be considered a significant cultural force since viewership is so low.

10. Because so little Canadian drama is presented or viewed on Canadian television, optimal use of the medium for cultural purposes is not being made.

11. Because so much American drama is watched, Canadians are highly susceptible to acculturation.

12. Canadian broadcasters are not contributing enough to the development of Canadian talent—talent which must
be good enough to ensure high production values so necessary to assure program financing, sale and viewership.

13. The CBC and CTV have achieved only limited success in performing their cultural roles.

14. Economic strategies are required to assist Canadian broadcasting in achieving its cultural objectives.

15. Pay television represents both a boon and a challenge to Canadian culture.

16. The increase in domestic programming that pay television provides is a cultural benefit.

17. Pay television can benefit culture through the emphasis of drama, the genre best suited to convey culture.

18. Pay television can benefit culture through increasing Canadians' awareness of the regions and diversity (national identity) of Canada.

19. The increase in American programming that pay television provides is a cultural danger.

20. The cultural potential of pay television is undermined by the higher costs inherent in the competitive nature of the discretionary system.

21. The reception of American television satellite signals undermines the Canadian broadcasting system's ability to promote Canadian culture.

22. The reception of American television satellite signals increases the potential for acculturation.

23. The reception of American television satellite signals exemplifies the challenge to culture that technology can create.

24. The government is virtually helpless in fighting the threat to Canadian culture posed by the reception of American television satellite signals.

25. Here quantitative Canadian content quotas have not been effective in contributing to the cultural (Canadian) prowess of television despite the compliance thereof.

26. The CRTC is not contributing fully to the realization of the cultural objectives of television at least
with respect to Canadian content regulations enforcement.

27. The federal and parliamentary policy-making context hinders the CRTC and policy itself from performing optimally in achieving the cultural objectives of television.

28. The proposed changes in the Canadian content regulations could benefit Canadian culture by increasing the opportunity of exposure to Canadian programming.

29. Television expresses culture.

30. The American and Canadian cultures are different.

31. Viewing foreign signals can cause acculturation.

32. Viewing Canadian signals can cause enculturation.

33. The availability and popularity of American signals decreases exposure to Canadian programming thereby increasing the acculturation potential of the former and decreasing the enculturation potential of the latter.
Appendix C

INTER-CODER RELIABILITY TEST

An intercoder-reliability test using Holsti's test procedure was conducted in two parts with a communication studies student recently graduated with Honours. The first part checked for inter-coder reliability on expectation of cultural coverage. A random sample of 20 stories about television was drawn from the calendar years 1980-1982 and January 1-March 31, 1983 (study time frame). This sample was combined with a purposive sample drawn from the 166 stories selected for analysis from which the author expected cultural coverage. This sampling was so-conducted to ensure that there would be sufficient stories in the sample where at least one coder expected coverage. Agreement was found for 36 of the stories for an agreement level of .90.

The second part of the test was conducted on the coding procedures for the Coding Sheet (Appendix D) and Question Sheet (Appendix E). From the 166 stories selected for analysis on the basis of expected cultural coverage, 40 stories were drawn randomly. The inter-coder reliability test results for each variable are provided in the following table.
### TABLE 22
Inter-Coder Reliability Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>80/80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Subject</td>
<td>78/80</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Type</td>
<td>76/80</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Size</td>
<td>80/80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pix Size</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Story Size</td>
<td>80/80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headline Rank</td>
<td>80/80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement by Department</td>
<td>78/80</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement by Section #</td>
<td>74/80</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement by Page #</td>
<td>80/80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Given to Cultural Coverage</td>
<td>72/80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Given to Coverage</td>
<td>80/80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Coverage</td>
<td>76/80</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is There Cultural Coverage?</td>
<td>80/80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Theme</td>
<td>46/52</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes Provided</td>
<td>44/52</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details Handled</td>
<td>46/52</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Placement</td>
<td>48/82</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone of Perspective</td>
<td>44/52</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Position</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Relevance</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE INTER-CODER AGREEMENT = 0.94**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Story Placement by Section #**

**Story Placement by Page**
1=Page 1
2=Section First
3=Editorial/Op-Ed
4=Department first (inside section)
5=Inside .............

**Space Devoted to Culture**

**Proportion Devoted to Culture**
1= ≥75%
2= 51-75%
3= 25-50%
4= < 25%
5= 0
Appendix E

QUESTION SHEET
QUESTION SHEET

1(a). Is there cultural coverage?
   1=Yes
   2=No

(b). THEMES?
     [00-33]
     (21-30)

(c). DETAILS?
   1=Yes
   2=No

(d). BOTH?
   1=Yes
   2=No

2. What is the predominant theme?
   (33-34)

3. How is theme provided?
   1=Mention
   2=Reference

4. How are details provided?
   1=Elaboration
   2=Reference

5. What, if anything, is missing from theme?
   (Cannot predetermine--use space next page)

6. What, if anything, is missing from details?
   (Cannot predetermine--use space next page)

7. If there is more than one theme, how is each (other than the predominant theme) provided?

   Theme#   Mention   Reference

8. Where are themes placed?
   1=Headline
   2=Lead (first para)
   3=First quarter
   4=Second quarter

   Theme#   Placed
9. Where is predominant theme placed? (37)

10. If more than one theme provided, are any details provided on themes other than predominant theme?
   1=Yes
   2=No (38)

11. What is the predominant coverage?
    1=Cultural
    2=Business/Financial
    3=Policy/Legislative
    4=Legal/Jurisdictional
    5=Other (specify) (39)

12. What is the predominant perspective?
    (Cannot predetermine—summarize next page)

13. Whose perspective is it?
    01=Government
    02=CRTC
    03=Independent production
    04=CTV management
    05=CBC management
    06=CTV other (specify)
    07=CBC other (specify)
    08=Pay licencee
    09=Pay applicant
    10=Cable Licencee
    11=Cable applicant
    12=Other industry management (specify)
    13=Pirate
    14=Special interest group (specify)
    15=Newspaper
    16=Other (specify)
    17=Cannot determine (40-41)

14. What is the tone of the perspective?
    1=Non-supportive
    2=Supportive
    3=Neutral (42)

15. What is the newspaper's position on the perspective?
    1=Non-supportive
    2=Supportive
    3=Neutral
    4=Not applicable (43)
16. How does story treat the cultural relevance? 
   1=Non-supportive  
   2=Supportive  
   3=Neutral 

MISSING FROM THEME (Q5):

MISSING FROM DETAILS (Q6):

SUMMARY OF PERSPECTIVE (Q10):
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