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ABSTRACT

Radio and television have long been used as a means of communication with many people at once. In the past various reasons made it necessary to regulate media use and media access, but in the future we see the possibility of changing some of these conditions, which will open the question of decontrol and deregulation of the electronic media.

In addition, as we move into the future, economic conditions will require that as a society we learn how to increase our productivity by learning how do more with less. Planners will need to learn how to become more efficient and effective in their practice, but no matter which role model a planner decides to use, the ability and need to communicate information and ideas, both inside the profession and outside, will continue to be of great importance.

In this thesis we will look at the telecommunications access and regulatory environment of the past, present, and future. We will then look at five questions concerning the use of radio and television as planning tools, and we will arrive at a framework that will allow equal use and equal reception opportunities for everyone.
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Department of Urban Studies and Planning
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of my thesis committee, Bill Harris, Rob Hollister and Hassan Minor, who gave so willingly of their time, patience, and knowledge. Without their support not only would this thesis never be completed, it never would have been started.

Thanks also go to my many dear friends who never let me forget just how close to the deadline I was, by continuing to ask "Aren't you done yet??!". To Jim, Marilyn, Mark, Rosanne, Wroc, and Pincus I now say, "I hope so!"

To Mom, Dad, and little Sister I give my warmest feelings for their continuous applications of faith, hope, love, and prayer. Without their attention this term, and for the last five years at M.I.T., I would still be a freshman struggling to get through "Intro to Physics" without falling asleep.

Finally, I want to offer special thanks to Harlan Ellison, my favorite writer, for explaining to me what the process of writing a thesis is all about:

"I curse the lesson and bless the knowledge"
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE PAGE</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 1: THE MACRO-MEDIA ENVIRONMENT**

| Description of access outlets                   | 17   |
| Notes                                          | 25   |

**SECTION 2: USING RADIO AND TELEVISION AS PLANNING TOOLS**

| Why should planners need to use the media?     | 48   |
| How have planners used the media in the past?  | 50   |
| "The Dorchester Project"                        | 53   |
| "Choices for '76"                               | 54   |
| Public Access Broadcasting Conference           | 58   |
| What do we know about the effects of radio & T.V.? | 64   |
| How might planners use the media in the future? | 67   |
| What special media education will planners need? | 72   |
| Notes                                          | 79   |

CONCLUSION

REFERENCES

| REFERENCES                                     | 99   |
"...I really think of the power of the media as almost a fourth branch of Government. I definitely think of it as the executive, the legislative, and judicial and then the media."

-Geraldo Rivera

"The purpose of all higher education is to make men aware of what was and what is; to incite them to probe into what may be. It seeks to teach them to understand, to evaluate, to communicate.

-Otto Kleppner

"This instrument can teach, it can illuminate; yes and it can even inspire. But it can do so only to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise it is merely lights and wires in a box."

-Edward R. Murrow

"Do you realize that if it weren't for Edison, we'd all be watching T.V. by candlelight?"

-Al Boliska
INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

During the past twenty years the planning profession has undergone a number of changes both in the way it is perceived by the general public, and in the way it has chosen to define its own role in terms of modern day public policy and public management. Indeed, the "new" urban planner has a large number of role models from which to choose. The planner as designer, advocate, mediator, evaluator, and policy maker are but a few of the career paths that planners have taken in recent times. With each of these new roles comes the need to communicate, both inside the profession and outside, with other planners, citizens, politicians, and policy makers. What we need to communicate is information and ideas, problems and solutions, controversy and support, and issues and answers, and radio and television can help us to reach this end.

To understand the use of radio and television as planning tools, we will need to address five questions:

1. Why should planners want, or need, to use the media?
2. How have planners used the media in the past?
3. What do we know, and what should we know, about the effects of radio and television as planning tools?
4. How might planners use the media in the future?
5. What types of specialized education will planners working with radio and television, have to have?
Before we can begin to answer these questions, it will be important to have an understanding of the media access and regulatory environments, the "Macro-Media Environment".

Along with changes seen in the planning profession, there have also been a number of changes in the radio and television industry. Advances in technology have both raised the quality, and lowered the cost, of the transmission and reception of electronic media signals, and we have seen viewership and listenership levels rise to all time highs. Studies have shown that more than 95% of American households watch more than six hours of television each day, and most of this same group listens to approximately four hours of radio every day.

In addition to radio and television, the print media, newspapers and magazines, are used in the daily exchange of information and ideas. We know that all forms of mass communication are protected under the "freedom of speech" provision in the First Amendment of the Constitution, however, in the regulatory arena, radio and television are looked upon differently from the print media. This is because, from the very beginning, it was understood that users of the electromagnetic spectrum were taking advantage of a scarce resource. In this thesis we will only be looking at the planning profession and its use of the electronic media, but it is important to understand why and how print and
electronic media differ.

Newspapers and magazines have not been regulated in the same manner as radio and television because those resources which are necessary to present ideas on paper do not have the same type of "natural limit" of spectrum scarcity found in the electronic media. The only real requirement needed to start a newspaper or magazine is capital, however, someone wishing to "start" a radio or television station must either (1) get approval from the F.C.C. or (2) purchase an already existing station, which also requires an O.K. from the Federal government. This is because of an actual physical limitation on the number of radio and television stations that can be places on any given frequency in any given geographic location, and still be pulled apart by a receiver. To prevent total information confusion and interference, regulation became necessary. We should also note that in the original media environment, without regulation, anyone could start a station and broadcast over the air. The alliance of businessmen already set up in the broadcasting business were very interested in closing the door to the airwaves in order to decrease competition and increase profits, so they pressured the Federal government to set up controls.

It is for the reason of spectrum scarcity, then, that the F.C.C. today regulates the use of the public airwaves,
using a framework set forth in the Communications Act of 1934. This piece of legislation mandated the issuance and renewal of radio (and later television) licenses every three years, and the regulation of the spectrum, if "the public interest, convenience, or necessity will be served thereby."³ In addition to the original Act, the Supreme Court has served down a number of decisions which help to further clarify the role and responsibilities of the F.C.C. The most famous of these decisions comes from the "Red Lion Case"⁴ where it was states that "(i)t is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount."⁵

To continue to make sure that the public interest is served, (and that licenses are renewed), the media environment has developed certain outlets to allow those who cannot afford to pay for access an ability to be heard and seen on radio and T.V.. Some of these outlets include Public Service Announcements, Public Affairs Shows, and station Editorials and Editorial Rebuttals. These outlets have been at the base of the media access/regulation-deregulation debate, but recent technological advances have begun to make it possible to change the traditional restrictions on broadcasters. New communications equipment will make it possible to have an almost infinite number of channels of television or radio available in any area, perform two-way
communications through a T.V. set, receive direct transmissions from satellites in space, and purchase, or record and store, television programs on discs or cassettes.

All three branches of the Government, the executive (F.C.C.), the legislative, and the judicial, have input into the telecommunications regulatory process, and recently the Congress and the F.C.C. have begun the process of radio and television deregulation. A number of bills have been introduced into the House and Senate that have at their base the notion that, because of new technologies, it will no longer be necessary to control and regulate broadcasters. The bills take the position that in a free market economy, with perfect entrance and exit into and out of the market place, an equitable structure will develop which will allow media access to all at a "fair" price. The new broadcasting technologies will help to "perfect" the market place.

We run into a number of policy problems with these new pieces of legislation, the most basic being that policy makers may be trying to do too much too soon. New technological advances have not found their way into all markets yet, and in addition, it appears possible that those groups that currently take advantage of public access channels, mainly non-profit and special interest groups, may not have the resources, financial or personal, to be able to take advantage of these new outlets. Also, there are a
number of policy questions concerning who will be able
to afford to be connected to receive these new transmissions.
Do the poor have a right to a cable television connection,
especially if the cable carries "neighborhood" programming?
If they do, who is going to pay for their connection?
Additionally, it is important to look at who will decide
who gets access to the cable in the first place: cable
operators, broadcasters, the government, the public, etc.?

It will become increasingly important for planners
to understand the existing media access structure and
existing access outlets so that they will be able to play
a larger part in future policy development. In the 1960's
the problems facing urban areas were under a national
spotlight, with many well funded Federal programs in oper-
ation, each working towards a solution. Today the situation
has reversed itself. Our country is experiencing sharp
fiscal pains, with major cuts in spending being made or
planned in almost all areas, and for most programs. To
bring our economy back into control it will become necessary
to increase our productivity. One way to do this will
be to use scientific advances to do more with the same
amount of resources, or even to do more with less.

One tool which planners have recently begun to use
to increase their efficiency and effectiveness, and to
facilitate their professional objectives, is the electronic
mass media. Belief's, action's, motivation's, and behavior are four ways all policy makers try to influence their constituents, and as we will see, pilot programs have clearly demonstrated that radio and television programming can be a very powerful and useful tool in this process of change.

In addition, by using the electronic mass media in their work, planners can help to increase their own productivity by reaching a larger audience, having an ability to increase levels of citizen participation, and affecting public and private perceptions of the city. We know, for example, that many Americans learn more about their country from watching a half hour situation comedy than they do from reading newspapers, magazines, or books. For the most part, we find that these shows all tend to present the same basic, stereotyped, views of urban life and urban values. Much of this has to do with the problems network executives face on their own financial front. A new show can be an expensive and risky venture, so many offerings are simply copies of already successful shows. This creates an information problem because the First Amendment is based on the assumption that the widest possible distribution of information and ideas from many different and antagonistic sources is of the utmost importance to the general welfare of the public. As planners we are also concerned with
public welfare, and for this reason current and future regulation, deregulation, and reregulation of radio and television should be an area of interest to the planning profession.

The study of urban planning results in the sensitization of the planner to problems that affect the upper, middle, and lower economic classes in our society. This sensitivity makes the planner a useful person on any policy making team because he or she can place the wants and needs of the "people" in perspective with the demands of the Federal, state, local, or business "system". The telecommunications policy arena is filled with decisions that, when made, will affect the different strata of society in different and unequal ways, and I believe that planners will be able to use their unique training and insight to equalize the demands places on each group, to arrive at a more balanced outcome for all.

This idea of balanced outcome is grounded in the notion that we can model most public and private sector activities in the form of input/process/output. Since, as planners, we have the greatest ability to work with, and change, input and process in almost all our activities, it seems to follow that we will need to work with the input to and process of telecommunications regulation to assure that its output is as good as possible, and we ought to begin to use radio
and television to better the input and process of the "planning process" to assure that its output is as complete as possible.

This thesis will be presented in two parts. First, we will look at the "Macro-Media" environment, that is, the regulatory environment and the media access environment that planners using radio and television will have to understand. After an analysis of the past, present, and future we will look at some media policy questions that will need to be addressed, and see what role planners may need to take in the future decision making process.

Part 2 of the thesis will examine the five questions we raised relating to planning and the media, and we will try to come up with a framework that will allow planners wishing to use the electronic media to do so in a relatively straightforward manner. We will look at past and future use and effects, and will study the institutional barriers planners may face in making radio and television accepted planning tools. Finally, we will lay out a series of questions that, when answered before a media-use project, will allow the practicing planner to make the best use of his or her radio and television budget.
NOTES:

INTRODUCTION


2) Radio Advertising Bureau, Radio Facts, 1979


4) The case of the Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. the Federal Communications Commission - 1964. After station WGCB carried a broadcast by the Rev. Billy James Hargis in which the Reverend discussed a book written by Fred Cook and later said that Cook had been fired by a newspaper for fabricating false charges against city officials, and that Cook had worked for Communist-affiliated publications, Cook said that he had been personally attacked and demanded free reply time, which the station refused.


6) Ibid., p.683
SECTION 1: THE MACRO-MEDIA ENVIRONMENT
In 1909, Enrico Caruso sang into a megaphone, with a vibrating diaphragm at its apex, located on the stage of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City. A telephone line carried his voice back to Lee B. DeForest in his laboratory on the banks of the Harlem River. There he took the telephoned music from the first remote-controlled wire in history and put it on the air. Wireless telegraph operators on ships reported that they had heard fragments of Caruso's voice through their earphones.

For nearly ten years after this initial broadcast anyone who wanted to could set up broadcasting equipment on any frequency desired. Business interests in the broadcasting industry realized that the more stations there were, the more the audience would be cut up, and the lower their potential profits would be, so they urged the government to adopt a unified system of radio regulations that would limit access to the airwaves, and with the passage of the Radio Act of 1927, the Federal Radio Commission (later the Federal Communications Commission - F.C.C.) was established.

On June 19, 1934, the Congress of the United States approved the Communications Act of 1934 which broadened the scope of Federal Control over telecommunications so as to include the telephone and telegraph, as well as the
radio. The act also made certain changes in the commission itself, but basically left the radio laws as they were defined in the Radio Act of 1927.

The Communications Act of 1934 was based upon three fundamentals: first, the airwaves should be considered public property; second, the radio and telecommunications industry should be privately owned and operated; and third, that the concept of free speech and public access to the airwaves should be preserved. These principles were incorporated into Title Three of the Communications Act of 1934, and when coupled with the requirement that licenses must be renewed every three years, (renewals being based, in part, on community service), have remained as the foundation of our media regulatory environment. These ideas of public property, private ownership, and public access have defined the role and responsibilities of broadcasters in this country, and have provided a base for the government's position that radio and television will be regulated on the basis of "public interest, convenience, and necessity." This notion is best stated in the ruling from the Red Lion Case, where it was said that "(I)t is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount."3

As we have noted, the history of regulation, deregulation, and reregulation of our electronic broadcast media is quite
different than of our print media. This is primarily because of the limited ability of the electromagnetic spectrum to cater to the needs of any and all who might choose to use it. In addition, it is important to consider that when a person buys a newspaper or magazine, he or she takes almost complete control over what types of messages they are letting into their household. On the other hand, when this same person brings a radio or television into their home, although there is an on/off switch and channel selector knob, they do lose a certain degree of freedom of choice. There are only four national television networks, and about fifteen national radio networks (which are almost all "news" networks). In most areas of the country there are no more than eight or nine television stations, and ten to twenty radio stations, but there are hundreds of national and local magazines and newspapers which can be brought into any home, and in addition to the greater number of choices, there is a greater range of choice as well. It is possible to find a publication aimed at almost every possible special interest group, from professional journals to magazines on bathing.

This issue of broadcasting versus narrowcasting is important because, depending on the kind of audience you are trying to reach, one type of forum may be more effective than the other, and as planners we should be aware of the relative merits of each outlet.
Additionally, there is the notion that the airwaves are public property while newspapers and magazines are private property. In the "Tornello" court case, tried in Florida, the court said that nobody has the right to mandate access to newspapers, just the opposite of Red Lion and the electronic media. We also have the Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ v. F.C.C., where Justice Burger stated that "A broadcaster seeks and is granted the free and exclusive use of a limited and valuable part of the public domain; when he accepts that franchise it is burdened by enforceable public obligations. A newspaper can be operated at the whim or caprice of its owners; a broadcast station cannot." 4

What we are finding, then, is that broadcasting in the public interest, convenience, and necessity has turned into a web of legal rules and regulations that force the F.C.C. to watch over the radio and television industry. Radio and television stations are required to keep signed program logs showing time and air content, ascertain community problems from responsible leaders in the communities they serve, and provide coverage and facilitate dialogue about these problems and issues. These are key points in the regulatory structure because broadcasters are checked in these areas when their license renewals come up every three years. Community groups and individuals dissatisfied with
the performance of a broadcaster may challenge their renewal, and the challenge will be made on the grounds that the broadcaster has failed the community in one of the above areas.

In addition to these license requirements, broadcast stations are required to abide by three F.C.C. additions to the Communications Act of 1934: the Fairness Doctrine, the Equal Time Rule, and the Personal Attack Rule.

From the very beginning of regulation, the government has been concerned that broadcasters secure a complete and many sided picture of public issues. The Radio Act of 1927 required that stations allot equal portions of time to opposing political candidates for campaign purposes. From the very begining of regulation, the government has been concerned that broadcasters secure a complete and many sided picture of public issues. The Radio Act of 1927 required that stations allot equal portions of time to opposing political candidates for campaign purposes. Additionally, the F.C.C. has stated that it is the right of licensees to editorialize, as long as they remembered their underlying obligation to present all sides of opinion in the discussion of public issues.

Additionally, the F.C.C. has stated that it is the right of licensees to editorialize, as long as they remembered their underlying obligation to present all sides of opinion in the discussion of public issues.

The two parts of the Fairness Doctrine basically say that one, broadcasters must present a multitude of issues and two, they must present these issues fairly. The fairness doctrine does not give any specific group or viewpoint the right to command air time, but it does provide a basis by which groups or individuals representing a viewpoint opposed to one that has been broadcast, can request rebuttal time. In terms of the planning profession, the fairness doctrine can be a useful base for gaining access to local television
and radio stations in order to present alternate points of view on planning, and planning related issues (housing, growth control management, health issues, historic preservation, etc.).

The Equal Time rule is perhaps the most noted provision of the Communications Act. "Although disliked by many broadcasters, it has become a vital part of the political process. It prevents broadcasters from favoring one candidate and ignoring all others. The statute operates as a guaranty that broadcasters will be responsive to the dependency of the political process on the mass media." In most cases, the equal time rule will not affect planners, but it is important to understand that although stations are allowed to back political candidates, they cannot use their position to an unfair advantage.

The Personal Attack rules are descendent from the fairness doctrine, and provide citizens with the right of reply. The personal attack rules define a personal attack as "an attack on the honesty, character, integrity, or like personal qualities of an identified person or group". When a personal attack is made, the station must notify the person or group attacked of the time, date and identity of the offending broadcast, within a week of the broadcast. They must then deliver to the person or group, a script, tape, or accurate summary of the attack. The station must
then give the person or group attacked a reasonable opportunity to respond using the same facilities. These are not the only rules and regulations that broadcasters have to obey, but we can see that they all appear to be consistent with the underlying that use of the public airwaves should be in the public's interest. Indeed, this is one of the strongest rationale's for asking planners to learn how to take advantage of electronic media access opportunities. Planners are most often concerned with the economic and social growth of towns and cities, and in this light it would only seem natural that a forum explicitly set up in the name of the public interest be brought into the planning sphere of influence and understanding.

What we find, then, is that due to the prevailing air of "public", the media environment has allowed to develop a number of recognized and carefully defined access outlets. It is through these outlets that we, as planners, will be getting our "messages" out to the public, and it is very important that we understand what the concept of "access" can really mean to community groups and planners.

In its broadest sense, media access will usually mean that individuals or groups will be more able to effectively reach their constituents with their ideas; and inform them about products and services they offer. In addition, greater
media access can help to stimulate public participation in policy making processes, and help to increase the public's understanding of community issues and events.\textsuperscript{11} This last point clearly shows an area where radio and television can help to modify the components of our input/process/output model.

Briefly, a radio or television station can usually be counted on to provide one or more of the following access opportunities to non-profit groups and community groups: \textsuperscript{12}

1. **A PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT or (PSA).** This is usually a brief message from a non-profit, tax exempt group that describes an activity or service that the organization performs. Some stations distinguish between ongoing, or generic PSA's, which describe services that are available, and Calendar or Community Bulletin Board announcements, which describe upcoming events sponsored by local groups. Most PSA's are 10, 15, 20, 30, or 60 seconds long, and are run throughout the day, although their concentration is heaviest during periods when broadcasters cannot obtain paid advertising.

2. **Station EDITORIALS.** These are usually one or two minute segments which allow radio and television station
management to present their own views and positions on matters of current community interest. Stations which air editorials are required to provide time for EDITORIAL REBUTTALS from "responsible spokespeople" expressing opposing opinions on controversial issues. Since most editorials are shown or heard right after the station's news program, they usually have an air of credibility to them. For this reason, it is very important that planners take advantage of editorial rebuttals to balance the public perception of important community issues.

3. A FREE SPEECH MESSAGE, GUEST EDITORIAL, or, SPEAK OUT MESSAGE (sometimes with the title "FOCUS", "ACCESS", etc.). This is another kind of access opportunity that some stations provide for the public. These are usually brief statements pre-recorded at the station by an individual representing either a personal opinion, or the official position of an organization. Free Speech Messages do not necessarily require the station to provide time for rebuttals, and should not be confused with station Editorials. Some stations offer both kinds of opportunities, some offer neither, and some offer only one. Most Speak Out Messages have the same kinds of "placement" problems as PSA's. However, some stations do have a specified slot in their prime-time schedule where these segments can be viewed each day.
4. The NEWS. All radio and television stations produce some type of daily news program, and most stations will often provide news coverage of events and issues that involve non-profit or community groups. Planners should be aware that issues attracting large amounts of community interest will usually get better and longer coverage than issues involving isolated special interest groups. In addition, it is important to remember that television is a visual medium, and those functions and activities that will "look good" on the screen will generally get the longest coverage. We should also note that the news value of a story is enhanced if it is timely, and of interest and significance to the broadcasters particular audience.

5. LOCAL PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMS. These types of programs vary in format from live, in-studio interviews or discussion programs, to pre-recorded documentaries and specials. Unfortunately, at most stations the public affairs department is part of the news department which means that they get a smaller staff, a smaller budget, and usually the least desirable air slots. For this reason, most of the in-studio interview and discussion programs tend to be of the "talking head" variety, and while this format might make for good radio programming, especially with the ability to have listeners phone in to join the discussion, it usually makes for "bad" television. We will see that there have
been exceptions to this rule, most notably "The City Game", produced by a planner in San Diego, but in general we find that response is better to documentaries and specials.

6. MAJOR PUBLIC SERVICE PROJECTS. These are usually programs that involve a substantial commitment of resources, both time and money, by a station for a particular cause, program, charity, or community issue. Telethons, "Year of the Child", and "Mental Health Month" are a few examples of the kinds of special projects undertaken by local stations.

For the most part, stations considering such a commitment will judge an idea partially in terms of its potential for maximum utilization of all of the above access formats. In other words, a station undertaking such a project will want to make use of PSA's, Editorials, and the like, and the more a specific cause lends itself to being presented in these formats, the more likely the cause will get special attention.

It is also important to realize that radio and television stations will give more consideration to projects that will directly benefit the public interest that they serve in measurable ways, than other projects. Because of the effort, time, and expense required, however, stations are very cautious and selective about the few major public service campaigns they adopt each year.
Although these are not the only media access outlets available to the planner, they are the most easily defined, primarily because they have been in place the longest. At this point, however, what is most important is that planners understand that suitable openings in radio and television do exist now, and that there has been a precedent set for their use.

The next question, then, is what can planners expect to find in the future of the "macro-media" environment. What we are seeing at the present time is a shift in policy based on three important considerations.

First, radio and television transmission and reception is being affected by a new series of electronic breakthrough's which will allow for better signal quality with more signals in the same portion of the electromagnetic spectrum. We are also seeing a number of new products which will be available to consumers and which will broaden their listening and viewing options. Home video tape recorders, two-way cable television connections, video disk players, digitally controlled radio receivers, and direct satellite to home transmissions are only a few of the upcomming products which will reduce spectrum "scarcity".

The second consideration has to do with government, manpower, and money. As the Federal bureaucracy becomes more and more entangled in its own red tape, it will be
increasingly difficult for government agencies, including the F.C.C., to enforce their own directives. Many times an agency will get so bogged down in its own paper work, it will find it easier to change the rule than to enforce it.

An example of this is the F.C.C. ruling to decontrol Citizen's Band radio (C.B.) licensing and use. When originally set up, C.B. was to be used for short haul and short term personal communications that could not be accomplished through any other means, such as the telephone. When a boom in the electronics industry made it possible to produce C.B. radios, and mass market them at a substantially lower price than before, hundreds of thousands of men and women bought the little radios and spent hours just sitting around "chewing the rag". The Commission had neither the time or money or personal to process all the license applications and interference complaints it was receiving, so it chose to make the "problem" go away by changing the rules that made C.B. radio a problem.

The third consideration has to do with the industry's lobby group, the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB). The NAB is a powerful lobbying group in Washington, and they have been putting a large amount of pressure on the Congress and the F.C.C. to deregulate radio and television. They point to their record of "self-regulation/internal control", and make the point that, if left alone, market forces would
cause broadcasters to provide more and better public access outlets and public affairs programming.

In the telecommunications policy arena we can see all of these pressures. The F.C.C. does not have the ability to check each radio and television station's license renewal to make sure logs are kept in order, proper ascertainment is occurring, and the station is playing a responsible part in the community. Broadcaster groups are asking the Commission to untie their hands so the market will be able to function, and they will be better able to serve the public. And, new technologies are helping to wipe out the old problems of spectrum scarcity. Combined, these impulses have moved both the Congress and the F.C.C. to a position where they are looking at the present radio and television regulating structure to see if it might be possible and useful to "reregulate", or totally "deregulate".

As planners we are in the position of "having the rules change just as we learn how to play the game". I think that as planners it will be important to understand what kinds of regulation, deregulation, and reregulation have been proposed, and may be proposed, and to look at how these changes will affect our use of the electronic media.

Within the last five years, a number of pieces of legislation have been drawn up and introduced into the
House and Senate that would amend or totally rewrite the Communications Act of 1934. H.R.13015 ("Rewrite"), H.R.3333 ("Son-of-Rewrite"), S.611, and S.622 have all been presented in the interest of reregulating some portion of the telecommunications industry. Parenthetically, it should be noted that both of the House bills were introduced by the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications, Lionel Van Deerlin, from California, a member of the broadcasting industry, and a broadcaster himself.

In addition to the Congressional legislation, the F.C.C. has considered a number of dockets, perhaps the most important being F.C.C. Docket No. 79-219, a proposal to deregulate radio. Essentially what the F.C.C. has proposed to do is to cease all "responsible stewardship of radio broadcasting on behalf of the listening public. Station owners, network executives, and the 'market place' will determine the civic, social, and moral value of radio programming."  

The House and Senate bills also assume that 'the market place' will determine the content of radio programming, and in addition, they 'soften' the public interest requirements of television broadcasters. H.R.3333, in its section on "Purpose" (Section 101.) says, "The Congress hereby finds that the regulation of interstate and foreign telecommunications is necessary to the extent that marketplace forces are deficient, in order to—
telecommunications services which are diverse, reliable, and efficient, and which are universally available at affordable rates;...(emphasis added). We find, though, that in a later section of the bill, it asks that television stations "(1) include in their programming the provision of news, public affairs, and locally produced programming (including news and public affairs) throughout the broadcast day; and (2) devote a reasonable amount of time to controversial issues of public importance and afford responsible opportunity for the discussion of conflicting view on such issues. (emphasis added)" H.R.3333 also proposes that the term of any license granted to a radio broadcast station be for an indefinite period of time. This presents a special problem for the public access structure, which we will look at in a moment.

So, what we are seeing in H.R.3333, and the others, is the reaction of government to the three pressures I pointed out earlier: market pressures, less need for regulation due to a reduction in scarcity through electronic means, and the inability of the bureaucracy to keep up with itself. The feeling is, if left to its own devices, the market place will take care of the needs for regulation, and broadcasters will continue to make available to the public "access outlets", because it will be in their own best "economic" interest to
There are those who claim that this will not be so. Dr. William Harris in his comments before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on H.R.3333, made the following points: "Public access exists today because of the public interest, convenience, and necessity standard in the '34 Act and the application of that standard at license renewal time. Once this standard is removed as suggested in H.R.3333, our only hope that public access will continue to be available lies in the general language of Section 101. (Section on "Purpose") ... When you remove that requirement (access), there is no evidence of which I am aware that the marketplace force will be sufficient to take into account the diversity of voices which need to gain access to the audiences out there ... We have had excellent cooperation. But there is no doubt it is provided within the context of the current law where the broadcasters believe this is something which helps them at renewal time. Many of them have told us that they would not provide this access without it."¹⁸

Newton Minow, a former chairman of the F.C.C., made these comments on H.R.13015: "To begin with, why do we have regulated communications in this country? Why did we do it? We did it after a long debate in the twenties because we decided this was not a business to be left to the market.
There were too many social interests and obligations involved, and that leaving it to the market alone would leave a lot of people short-changed. (emphasis added)." 19

In light of these views, it becomes possible to see why these new rounds of legislation may well do more damage than good. The proposals in H.R.3333 only ask in the broadest kind of way that television broadcasters include a "reasonable amount of public interest programming, and if we follow the reasoning in the testimony given by Dr. Harris and Mr. Minow, it would be safe to conclude that an indefinite license would remove the incentive from radio broadcasters to handle public affairs programming, which by and large, does not have a strong profit making history, and substitute them with more "popular" shows.

We should also note that H.R.13015 did say that after two consecutive five year license terms, a television station could have its license renewed for an indefinite period of time. 20 We can see that the problems that public media access would suffer under indefinite radio licenses would be same under indefinite television licenses; no worry about renewal leads to no worry about access.

The policy makers are under pressure to decentralize and deregulate government control as much as possible, and it is easy to see how the hope of "unlimited" access would let them logically assume that a free market system, with
perfect entrance and exit into and out of the market place would no longer need regulation. However, I believe that what we have is a problem of doing too much too soon. The House and Senate bills have not been passed, and recent reports from the committees working on rewriting the Communications Act of 1934 are of the opinion that it will not be until 1984 before a completely revised bill gets out of committee and passed in both chambers. We also know that the F.C.C. Docket No. 79-219 ran into a heavy amount of public commentary. The filing deadline for making comments on the proposal was moved from January 25, 1980 to March 25, 1980 so as to allow more time for response, and as of March 25 more than 25,000 comments, more than 8,000 of those being "formal" comments, were filed.

Most of the organized efforts to block 79-219 were concerned with the following three points. First, public interest programming (news, PSA's, unsponsored religious programming, etc.) would no longer be mandated. Second, the requirement that broadcasters survey the local community which they serve in order to determine the needs, desires, and interests of that community - ascertainment- would no longer be required. And third, that the program logs, which each station is required to keep and which are open to public inspection, would no longer be necessary. Generally, as mentioned before, if the public feels that a station
has failed to serve the community, it may challenge the renewal of that station's license using signed program logs as evidence of their position. These groups feel that without the public access rule, ascertainment rule, or program log rule, the public will lose all ownership and control of the airwaves.

So we are seeing a shift in policy, on the regulator's side, towards less control of the broadcasting industry, and we are noticing citizen response that counters the feeling that a free market system will allow equal access for all. At this point I think it is appropriate to take a brief look at two other issues that the Congress, the F.C.C. and the people have not given full consideration: the questions of who will be able to place programs on these "new" electronic media systems, and who will be able to receive these new shows. It may not be possible to solve these questions without more time and more information, but if we start to think about them now, we will shorten the path to their solutions.

It would make sense to assume that those groups who took advantage of media access through old radio and television outlets would continue to try to continue their activities through the new systems. In addition, with increased channel capacity, which will reduce the problem of spectrum scarcity, and the ability to target in on
smaller and more "defined" portions of the population, we will probably find new groups and individuals beginning to take advantage of electronic media access outlets.

Before this can happen, though, it will have to be decided whether each new communication technology is an actual broadcasting station, which would fall under the public access umbrella, or if the new technology is simply a "common carrier", meaning that they only act as a pipeline into the home for the broadcasters. This will be an important consideration for both cable installations and the future satellite-to-home receivers. For example, does a company which sells an S-T-H receiver have to provide public access outlets if they are only a pay service that shows uncut movies and sporting events? Also, if a cable operation has a public access channel on its cable does the operator have to provide studio facilities and technical assistance?

To finally decide who will decide who will be able to put what material on which channel is going to be difficult. It is my feeling that consumer "purchased" media, such as video discs, video tape recorders, and the proposed S-T-H systems (which are designed to be used in a pay per program situation) will not fall under the regulator's power. Only existing over the air broadcasters, and cable operations which actually take the place of
over the air transmissions will need to be regulated in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. This analysis may need to be changed completely if in the future the media environment, due to economic or technological pressures, changes in ways that make the whole "broadcasting" industry a relic of the past, but at the present time this line of thinking appears to be consistent with both the regulator's and radio and television industry's goals.

There is really another side to this question of access, and it is who will be able to 

receive transmissions from these new electronic media systems. At the present time almost all broadcasting is done over the air. This means that anyone with a standard television or radio receiver has full access to any program material transmitted. In the future, however, we may see situations where complete cities are wired for cable television and radio, because of the improved quality in signal and the increase in available programming these systems offer, and in these cities there may not be any over-the-air broadcasting.

If we assume that each household with a cable connection will pay a basic monthly rate for service, will it be decided that those who are unable to afford to pay for connection to the system will get hooked up for free? Today, the telephone is considered a necessity, rather
than a convenience, and telephone companies are required to provide some from of basic minimum service for each customer who requests it. In most cases this minimum charge is considered a living expense, and is payable with supplemental income. If, in the future, it is decided that all are entitled to minimum cable service, who will pay for those who cannot afford to pay for themselves? Will it be the broadcasters, the cable company, the government, or some collective?

My feeling is that if a cable system has a neighborhood access channel, or channels, for each area of a city, then the system becomes a public service that should not be denied to anyone. Cable operating companies make a profit from their ownership of the cable, and broadcasters find it advantageous to have a city wired for cable television and radio reception because it means that their signals do not experience degradation because of environmental problems. It is my opinion that cable operators, the broadcasting industry, and the government should be required to subsidize minimum cable connections for all citizens.

Not only is there a need for all to access to information on broadcasting systems, but if we think about the possibilities for opinion gathering in a two-way interactive cable system, if we only include the responses of people who can afford the cable installation in the first place,
than a "natural selection" process may skew the results of any survey taken over the cable in favor of the better educated, and more affluent, sections of the population. To avoid these "class" distinctions, it will be necessary for everyone to have access both into and out of these new systems.

On the other hand, satellite-to-home systems, video disc systems, and the new wave of home video tape recorders are all specialized pieces of equipment currently being used on a pay-per-program basis only. If this continues to be their function, I feel that they ought to be exempt from the regulatory process. However, if advertising paid productions become a regular feature of these systems, it will be necessary to reexamine their role as either a broadcast station or a common carrier.

To summarize, the challenge will be for planners to be able to put into perspective the future of broadcasting abilities and policies in terms of the present and the past. What we have seen in the past four years has been a commitment to the idea that the airwaves are public property that are being held in trust by the broadcasters. The legislature has continuously reaffirmed the concepts of broadcasting for the "public interest, convenience, and necessity, and the Judiciary has made it clear that not only do citizens have a right to access to the
airwaves, but they have a right to receive a multitude of viewpoints. "It is the right of the public to receive suitable access to social, political, esthetic, moral, and other ideas which is crucial here. That right may not be constitutionally abridged by either the Congress or the F.C.C.".23

Today what we have is not so much a shift away from these goals and ideas, but rather a response to explicit pressures on the regulatory system. Too little time, too little money, and too little help are one set of forces being applied to the Congress, the Courts, and the F.C.C., and in addition, we are seeing a move to reduce economic pressures on private business and citizens; a move headed by a number of powerful national lobby groups, including the National Association of Broadcasters. Lower taxes, less government interference, and a general return to a laissez-faire theory of economic development should continue to force policy makers to consider which areas currently under government control would best be served by a reduction in that control.

The future, then, should cause us to see increasing incidences of policy makers moving to deregulate and decontrol portions of the telecommunications industry (telephone, telegraph, and computer data transmissions as well as radio and television), but, an increase in awareness
and the understanding of the importance of public media access rights by grass-root's citizens groups, non-profit special interest groups, and professional groups concerned with media access, will also have an effect. Most likely we will see new efforts to reregulate the telecommunications industry with a stronger emphasis places on maintaining the requirement of open public access.

In addition, longer or indefinite license terms, which are preferable from the industry's and the F.C.C.'s point of view, will probably continue to be explored, but we should also expect to see that free access will not be left to the market place. Rather, traditional controls, ascertainment, logs, etc., will continue to be required for the good of all. Those who have a stake in the current system know that it is much harder to regain a lost right than it is to keep it in the first place. Many feel that once existing channels of access are closed off, causing the loss of news, PSA's, public affair's shows, and the like, it may be impossible to open these channels again even if the marketplace and the new technologies function as expected.

As planners the conclusion that we need to draw from all of this information is that for the present time, and probably for the next five to ten years, the media environment, both access and regulatory, will continue to
remain in a kind of "meta-stable" state. Changes in access structure will probably occur, but the basic outlets will most likely remain the same. New technologies will become more and more available to both the industry and the private consumer, but if we can judge the future by the past, then the new equipment will be used just like existing equipment until people understand how to use it to its own "special" advantage.

It should be noted that there are those who believe that the "worst case" is possible, and that total deregulation and new technology will completely destroy the broadcasting industry in this country by breaching the national audience into so many small pieces that it will no longer be possible to call radio and television "mass" media. I personally don't think this will happen because the current broadcasting industry has too much money, time, and manpower invested to let either the government or the engineers make major changes that would bring down an entire institution. In either case, changes will be important to watch.

As a profession we should become aware of each round of legislation to determine how it might possibly affect the overall structure of the media access system, both into and out of, and I further believe that we should use our specialized knowledge and expertise in urban related
issues to help shape the communication's policy of the future, in order to maintain the number and quality of media access choices available to ourselves and our constituents.

At this point we should have a pretty clear understanding of the "Macro-Media" environment. We know how and why radio and television stations are regulated, and why the print media is not. We have looked at some of the future innovations that may make regulation due to scarcity no longer necessary, and we have looked at testimony which refutes the theory that a free market broadcasting system will provide public access opportunities. Finally, we have examined two questions on future media access policy that will give us guidance on the issue's of who will be able to get in to new broadcasting systems, and who will be able to get material out. With this understanding we will now be able to look at the real question of how planners have, can, and should use radio and television as planning tools, and investigate some of the barriers planners will face in their efforts.
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SECTION 2: USING RADIO AND TELEVISION AS PLANNING TOOLS

In the last section we looked at the past, present, and possible future of the telecommunications environment, issues, and policies both in terms of access and regulation. In this section we will be addressing questions that will allow us to understand how and why planners will be using the electronic media, and what problems they may run into.

Planners have been using radio and television in their work for a number of years, but recent changes in the economy, and changes in the media environment, are going to make it more important, and more productive, for planners to use these electronic forums in the future. Individuals and groups use radio and television to inform, entertain, and sell audiences different products, ideas, images, and lifestyles. Planners have used the media in much the same way, but with the increase in modern broadcasting technologies, which will allow not only better one-way transmissions, but two-way transmissions as well, it will become important to see which areas of planning practice can be most helped with these new technologies, and to look at some of the institutional barriers planners will face in their media efforts.

To understand the use of radio and television as planning tools will be easiest if we break down the area
into five questions:

1. Why should planners want, or need, to use the media?
2. How have planners used the media in the past?
3. What do we know, and what should we know, about the effects of radio and television as planning tools?
4. How might planners use the media in the future?
5. What types of specialized education will planners working with radio and television have to have to be effective in practice?

I believe that planners who understand the answers to these and related questions will be better prepared to use the electronic media in their work, and will thereby be better able to serve their clients.

1. Why should planners want, or need, to use the media?

The answers to the questions of wants and needs are tied into many of the issues discussed in Section 1., and the basic goals of the planning profession. The first part of our basis for use lies in the three part concern of increased productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness. To increase productivity and efficiency a worker or business must be able to get a bigger and/or better output from their process using the same or even fewer resources. To be more effective means that this same worker or business
is able to more completely furnish a product or service to its client. Practicing planners assume many different roles and furnish many different products and services to their client groups. Planners work in the public and private sector as policy makers, mediators, designers, evaluators, and advocates. Some of the many concerns of planners include land use zoning and growth management, housing and health planning, and public education and transportation needs. In all of these jobs and in all of these areas it is of the utmost importance that the planner be able to communicate and facilitate the exchange of information and ideas, since the final result of many planning actions is to have an effect on an individual's or group's belief's, action's, motivation's, or behavior.

For example, a planner working in the field of community health care may be involved in a project that is designed to help prevent infant lead poisoning. This project combines a series of free clinics with a public education campaign that points out areas that are most likely to be affected lead problems, and shows how health problems can be detected and avoided. The key factor in this program is being able to let the community know the clinic exists, so treatment is possible, and to highlight to those who might be affected, the dangers that exist. There is a need to communicate information.
In another example we might find a transportation planner working on improving a city's mass transit system. In this instance to make a large scale public transportation system viable, it might be necessary to insure a large daily rider-ship. In our country there is a certain value connected to the ownership and use of a private vehicle, and in this project a planner would need to communicate a new set of values that would make subways and busses more desirable than automobiles. Studies have shown that radio and television are, in many cases, the most cost efficient, and often the fastest, way to reach a large audience. In addition to the questions of economy and speed, we have found that the legitimacy of print or broadcast messages are often more real than life, and more authoritative in influence than any actual human interaction. 1

Finally, we can look at the planner's need to use the electronic media as a tool that has the ability to bring "perfection" to the marketplace by increasing the flow of information and enabling consumers to make decisions based on a more perfect knowledge of market conditions. An example of this kind of use is planners working in the area of neighborhood housing markets. Many have found that "information blockage", or the lack of communication between what housing stock is available and potential buyers, is one of the biggest problems in community growth,
and by using radio and television as direct lines to the public, they can begin to reverse the "bad" or "wrong" messages, and allow the system to operate in a more ideal way.

So, we can conclude that the answer to the question of why planners want and need to use the electronic mass media is based on the idea of communication. There is the desire to educate the public, to redirect personal values, and to "fix" market externalities, and radio and television can serve as tools towards these ends. Now, with an understanding of some planning goals, and where the electronic media can help, we are in a better position to look at the ways in which planners have used radio and television in the past.

2. How have planners used the media in the past?

We now know why planners use the media; it's time to look at how they've done so in the past. There have been a number of attempts, by planners, to use radio and television as tools of the planning profession, and I believe the clearest way to look at media experiments is to compare the media's "abilities" with the planner's "goals".

Radio and television can be used in either a one-way mode, which allows for the outward expression of information,
and a two-way mode, which can be used in the same way as one-way communications, but in addition, allows for audience feedback. The goals of planning can generally be broken down into support for projects or policies, efforts at public education, description of the availability of a service, the increase of public participation in a policy making process, or the increase in membership in some public organization or program.

In this section we will be looking at an example of a planning use of one-way communication, and of two-way communication. At the end we will compare the goals of these experiments with their results, and try to come up some thoughts on what types of media intervention work best towards which goals.

For our example of a one-way communication use of the electronic media, we will look at the hour long television documentary, "Dorchester: A View from Melville-Park". Produced in cooperation with the Boston city government, and funded in part by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, this program sought to encourage "residents of neighborhoods to remain in Boston, to stimulate others to buy homes, and to change the attitudes and behavior of realtors, bankers, media staffers (at local television and radio stations), and city officials, in order to promote public confidence in the future of the city of Dorchester."³
The Dorchester program was created as a part of a larger project conducted in the City of Boston from the fall of 1976 through the summer of 1978. To quote from the final evaluation report: "The Neighborhood Confidence Project was a series of information strategies for building neighborhood confidence and for marketing neighborhoods. It was designed to stimulate positive self-images and public opinion of neighborhoods in three sections of Boston --- Dorchester, Roxbury, and Jamica Plain. The project developed as a reaction to the predominant problem-orientation of current city planning. The "confidence building" approach was initiated by a group of planners and neighborhood association activists who found prevailing theories of neighborhood change to be inaccurate and less than useful when applied to the areas in which they were working." 4

Instead of concentrating on the negative images and problems existing in each area, the project leaders decided to build on the positive characteristics of local communities. To reach this end, the project sought to fulfill three specific goals:

1. Encourage owner-occupants to stay in their neighborhoods.

2. Encourage tenants already living in city neighborhoods and people from outside the Boston area to buy homes in the Dorchester, Roxbury, and Jamica Plain
sections of Boston.

3. Change the attitudes and actions of "key actors"—real estate brokers, bankers, municipal officials and media personnel—whose work influences the decisions of present owners to stay and of others to move in. 5

The Dorchester program represented one of the largest investments of project resources. It was an hour long documentary about life in the Melville-Park section of Dorchester, and was put together by the Confidence Project staff, and by Public Interest Communications Service (PICS). During the hour, the show focussed on encouraging present residents to remain in and invest in their homes. Homeowners were interviewed on location, with an overall image generated that many ethnic groups and races live together in Melville-Park, and while everything might not be perfect, it's still a great area buy a home and raise a family.

The documentary reached 170,000 T.V. viewers in the metropolitan area. Ratings for the show were particularly high in Dorchester itself, where almost one-half of the T.V. sets in use tuned in to the program. 6 Public response was mostly, but not uniformly, positive. Irish residents responded favorably to seeing themselves on the show, and they seemed to feel, "At long last the media is saying
something positive about our area."\(^7\) Black residents, however, tended to be more critical of the show. They felt that sections showing a Hatian family and a Black couple, seemed to focus on the Hatian family while downplaying the Black couple.\(^8\) The group that was least impressed with the show was the area's young professional residents. Many of them wanted the show to focus more on their own lives.\(^9\)

In general, long-term Dorchester residents liked the show better than did recent home buyers in the Melville-Park neighborhood. The program seemed to make a positive change in the minds of some viewers, at least temporarily. Real estate brokers felt that the show helped their businesses, although not as much as by other activities of the Confidence Project. It is important to note that the effects of the Dorchester program were not merely due to the one-time showing of the documentary, but rather to a whole set of communications that went with it.\(^10\) In addition, it was noted that the program and project generated or influenced 26 other T.V. news and public affairs program segments which took a positive tone in discussing city issues.\(^11\)

In summary, it appears that the program "Dorchester: A View from Melville-Park" did contribute to the results of the confidence project, and did have a positive effect in changing citizens image of the city.
An example of a two-way communication's project is the New York Region's "Choices of '76", a series of television town meetings held in the spring of 1973. Through these televised programs, some 10 percent of the 20 million people of the New York Urban Region were confronted with 51 critical issues on the Region's living conditions, ranging from questions on housing allowances and housing subsidies, to transportation, environment, poverty, cities and suburbs.\textsuperscript{12}

The Regional Plan Association presented the issues and arguments, both pro and con, in five films each shown on every single television channel covering New York City, Newark, New Haven, Bridgeport, Paterson, Trenton, and Long Island, plus two channels in Hartford, which is outside the N.Y. Region. Nineteen station in all showed the films over Saturday-Sunday-Monday periods from March 17, 1973, to May 17, 1973. An average of 600,000 of the Region's households was tuned in to each program bringing the of viewers to one household out of every eleven.\textsuperscript{13}

Ballots to register citizen's choices were widely available, with an average of 26,500 ballots submitted after each of the five presentations - 41,000 after the first film, 14,500 after the fifth.\textsuperscript{14} In addition to the television coverage, all 46 daily newspapers in the region publicized the project to some degree; 36 ran at least one article or editorial on the project every week; and 26 ran
at least four out of the five ballots. As a public service, thirteen published background information on the issues before the people voted, and six publicized ballot results extensively.  

The results of the CHOICES ballots were made available to policy makers and government officials, but the significance of the project is that it was an effort to improve the kind of pluralistic political process that shapes policies in our large urban areas. The project report saw five major results based on the CHOICES project:

1. Enlarging the number and broadening the type of people involved in the civic-political process.
2. Providing positive options -- citizen groups are adept at stopping proposals but not at finding solutions.
3. Providing better information on which people can base their views.
4. Giving more people practice in the processes of civic-political action, practice absorbing the background information, discussing the issues in small groups, facing the hard trade-offs and making the yes/no choices that have to be made.
5. Stimulating a sense of community both by the process of discussing serious issues with colleagues or neighbors, and by seeing the reality of a regional community.
In a follow-up to the Choices for '76 project, the Regional Plan Association created a handbook giving a thorough evaluation of the "Mass Media Town Meeting" process, and presenting needs and concerns that would have to be addressed in future programs of the same type.\textsuperscript{17}

In addition to the Dorchester program, and the Choices for '76 project, planners have made a number of other attempts to integrate the electronic media into their work. In the May 1978 issue of the Journal of Architectural Education, Dr. William W. Harris, and Dr. Robert M. Hollister gave brief descriptions of other experiments. Among these were included:

- Two recent programs produced by Bill Moyers - "The Fire Next Door" (concerning the severity of the arson problem in the South Bronx, C.B.S.) and "Rosedale" (probing the resistance to housing desegregation in a district in Queens, P.B.S). These programs took a sensitive and analytical look at urban conditions in a way that was gripping, disturbing, and informative.\textsuperscript{18}

- A city planner in San Diego produced a show called "City Game", a low-budget, local interview program that ran for three years, had an average viewership of "30,000" homes, and "...was the most popular show on KPBS-TV.\textsuperscript{19} The program utilized a common public affairs "talking head" format, and topics included: alternative transportation policies, the
philosophies and work of prominent urban planners, an airport expansion controversy, and redevelopment possibilities, and architectural preservation efforts. 20

- Architects and associated consultants responsible for drafting a master plan for the development of land along the Miami River in Dayton, Ohio, produced six hour long T.V. programs that presented planning alternatives and invited viewers to participate by phoning in their ideas. 21

- The city of St. Louis sponsored the production of some public service announcements (PSA's), each communicating the merits of a particular neighborhood. The spots featured visual images of houses and the physical environment, with quotes from enthusiastic residents. 22

- The Seattle Department of Community Development produced six 30 second PSA's which were broadcast in 1977 to encourage suburban residents to live in, and use, central city Seattle. The Director of the Department said that he was selling the city "like soap". He explained, "Private developers in the suburbs pick names from historical English novels, hire good public repatations firms that produce ads showing ducks on a serene pond, and that is their image. Why not do the same for cities?" 23

These examples do not constitute an exhaustive study of planner's projects in the electronic media, but they do cover a wide enough base of problems, (housing, land develop-
ment, arson, transportation, etc.) to allow us to be comfortable with the idea that a precedent has been set for the use of mass media by urban planners.

If we look at Figure 1. on the next page, we can compare the broad planning goals, amount of success, and type's of media use of both the Dorchester project, and the "Choices for '76" experiment. The first thing that is important to point out, is the the measure of "Success" is not absolute. As we will see in the next question, effects are not always easily measured; but in the Neighborhood Confidence Project I believe we could say that success was only partial, because although there was some fixing of the market, and education of the public, it was not all inclusive. Perhaps the "Choices" program was more of a total success because it's goals were less tangible.

In both projects a number of media outlets were used, and both programs found it necessary to use the non-electronic media in addition to radio and television. It is my belief that we could take the other projects mentioned in the previous pages and fit them into the graph, but the most important connection we would come up with is that almost all planning attempts to use the electronic mass media have been short term. The Dorchester project was two years, Choices for '76 for three months, and the other programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>SUCCESS</th>
<th>MEDIA USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Participation</td>
<td>Notice of Service</td>
<td>Citizen Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Education</td>
<td>Market &quot;Fix&quot;</td>
<td>Planner Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value &quot;Shift&quot;</td>
<td>Total Success</td>
<td>Value &quot;Shift&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner Support</td>
<td>Partial Success</td>
<td>Planner Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Success</td>
<td>No Success</td>
<td>Total Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Success</td>
<td>One-Way</td>
<td>Partial Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Success</td>
<td>Two-Way</td>
<td>Public Affair's Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;News&quot;</td>
<td>PSA's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Elec. Media</td>
<td>Non-Elec. Media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dorchester Project:**
- Citizen Participation
- Notice of Service
- Market "Fix"
- Planner Support
- Value "Shift"

**"Choices for '76":**
- Citizen Education
- Planner Support
- Total Success
- Partial Success
- No Success
- One-Way
- Two-Way
- Public Affair's Show
- "News"
- PSA's
- Long Term
- Short Term
- Non-Elec. Media

**FIGURE 1.**
were mostly one shot. How this short term "nature" affects the success of reaching planning goals is not totally clear, but as we will see in the question on "effects", there is some cause to believe that **time** is a significant factor in the usefulness of radio and television as planning tools.

Now that the Dorchester and "Choices" projects have been over for at least two years, it would be interesting to see if any changes have remained in terms of market fixe and public participation, or if continous planner intervention is required. Before we continue, I think it is important to point out that a new kind of planner/citizen/media connection has come to be.

In each of the previous examples we have been looking at planners taking on some of the more traditional roles in their work: land use management, growth control, housing, etc. In more recent times, however, planners have moved into a greater number of positions of citizen group advocacy, and we are finding a new way for planners to work with radio and television; they are training their clients to be more effective communicators.

An example of this kind of work is a project that was undertaken by Public Interest Communication Services, Inc. (PICS) with the Boston Neighborhood Network. Funded principally by the McDonalds Corporation, approximately 200 people representing Boston area non-profit organizations
and radio and television stations, took part in a Public Access Broadcasting Conference held at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The goals of the conference were:

1. To provide conference participants with improved skills for gaining access to the mass media;
2. To increase public understanding of existing access opportunities and procedures in the local electronic media;
3. To expose community people to a number of key actors in the media who often control access, and to give both groups a chance to interact.

During the course of the day, six panel discussions were conducted with a question and answer session following each panel. In addition, participants were given a copy of a "Boston Area Broadcasting Resource Book". This guide provided a complete directory of radio and television stations in the Metropolitan Boston area, and gave a summary of PSA, news, editorial, local programming, and public affairs opportunities at each of the different stations. PICS produced an evaluation report of the conference, and based on pre-conference "attendant access data" it appears that the six workshops achieved the conference's three goals. Additionally, the Resource Book seems to be filling a very important gap that has existed in the Boston media market. A number of letters written to PICS after the conference,
both by broadcasters and community groups, praised the value of the conference, and mentioned how "valuable", "spectacular", and "extremely useful" the guide was.26

Based on the success of the Boston conference, a similar project was undertaken in the Tampa/St. Petersburg area this spring, and a grant was obtained to develop a "kit" that would allow groups all across the country to run their own conferences and create their own resource books.27

In addition to the PICS related projects, there are a number of other programs operating in the country whose goals are to train citizens in the process of media access. The University of Massachusetts at Amherst Citizen Involvement Training Project has put together an excellent book entitled "We Interrupt This Program... A Citizens Guide to Using the Media for Social Change".28 This book explains to the media novice such concepts as "The Media as a Social Force", "Choosing Media Strategies", "Choosing Your Audience", "Electronic Media - Radio & T.V.", "The Cable Connection", "Who Owns/Controls the Media", and "The Future of Media Technology and Implications for Public Access". Other groups who have produced similar handbooks include the Boston Community Media Council's "Media Access Guide", the League of Women Voters "Media Kit", and the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing's "Media Action Handbook".
We find, then, that there are basically two ways in which planners have used the media as planning tools. First, there is the use of radio and television as communication tools, allowing planners to more easily, cheaply, and quickly reach their planning goals of education, participation, support, etc. Second, we see that planners have taken the position of citizen advocate to educate their clients in the value and methods of public media access. Conferences and published guides enable planners to inform citizens about the abilities of the electronic media as tools of social change, and the importance and use of public media access.

We have now matched planning goals with past planning uses of the media, but before we look at the future of radio and television as planning tools, we need to look more closely at the question of effects. The future promises to provide planners, and the rest of the population, with increased technology that will expand the role of the electronic media in our society, but I believe that to make the best use of the future we need to learn as much as we can from the past.

3. What do we know, and what should we know, about the effects of radio and television as planning tools?

This is a difficult question to answer because, as mentioned,
media use examples are from one-time, single use planning efforts. It would be nice if it were possible to gauge how each person reacts to every stimulus they receive. We would then be able to choose media outlets and times more carefully in order to have the most effect on our target group. It would also be helpful to know what balance of "time-of-day" versus "quality of production" would yield the the best results. Television and radio productions usually require that some amount of money be spent in production. In addition, planners wishing to purchase air time are faced with the problem of different costs based on the slot they want in the broadcast day. If we had a more exact relationship between the two we could more efficiently portion our resources. Finally, it would be useful to know what the best ratio of length to "number" of spots is when you are trying to affect long term opinions or habits.

Evaluations were performed on the Dorchester project, the Choices for '76 project, and the PICS Access Conference. While the results of the three studies did not appear to arrive at "statistics" that would make any of the projects into an "overwhelming" success, anecdotal data seems to bear out the assertions that each of the programs attained some level of success.

Additionally, we know of a study in Stanford that appears to prove the belief that repeated media exposure
can effect lifestyles. We are aware of the studies linking television and violence and television and child development, but in each case for every set of numbers supporting an issue, it is possible to find another set of numbers disputing it. The Stanford experiment, however, seems to distinct results.

In 1972, the Stanford Heart Disease Prevention Program (SHDPP) Community Studies group tried to "develop and test health education programs that will prevent premature death and disability from cardiovascular disease." Two communities were selected for the program, while a community served as a control group. After an initial random sample survey of citizens between 35 and 59, who were asked to complete interviews and tests to explore their knowledge about heart disease, and to determine the degree to which their behavior and lifestyles affected their risk of a heart attack, a mass media educational campaign was started in the two test communities.

The media spots advocated dietary changes, the giving up of cigarettes, the return to an ideal weight, and a program of regular exercise. The campaign consisted of 50 television spots, three hours of television programming, over 100 radio spots, many hours of radio programming, weekly newspaper columns, articles, and advertisements, and the use of direct mailings. In short, the use of complete media
saturation. In addition, a group of particularly high-risk residents was selected for an additional 14-week program of intensive instruction on the methods of heart disease prevention.

According to a published report, "Surveys and medical examinations were undertaken after one, two, and three years of the campaign. As might be expected, those receiving intensive instruction showed the sharpest initial reduction in risk. But two years later, those receiving health messages through only the media had caught up with the members of the intensive instruction group. Test group participants showed reductions of between 16% and 18% after two years. In the control community, which received no education campaign, the average risk had increased by 64%."

While this study does not present us with conclusive evidence of the effectiveness of radio and television as belief, knowledge, motivation, and behavior change agents, it does seem to show that the electronic media does have some type of effect on our lives. In addition, it also points out the important notion that results may not be immediate and massive, but rather slow and steady. We know from evaluation theory that it is almost impossible to measure the impact or importance generated by an isolated event, but we should not confuse the idea of no knowledge with the feeling of no effect.
Additionally, the SHDPP program gives us a basis to believe that one of the major problems with past attempts at media usage by the planning profession was that results could not be slow and steady because the programs ran for only a short time. To analyze media effects, we should come to the conclusion that one-shot media blitz's are not as effective as long term campaigns.

Our conclusion, then, to the effects of the electronic media as a planning tool is that there does appear to be some evidence, albeit soft, for the belief that radio and television can be of use in the modification of behavior, the education of the public, and the increase in citizen participation. Anecdotal data can be just as useful as statistical information. When we look at the examples of past planning attempts, this is what we usually find, but the evaluation of this data gives the general sense that the program or project would not have been as effective without the inclusion of the electronic media.

Future users of the media will have to be aware of this information, and ought to design their programs with this data in mind. An experimental design approach to media projects will, in the future, allow the exact effects of radio and television use to be better understood. By experimental design I mean that the project is set up in an input/process/outcome manner that allows for
the evaluation of each section before the program is begun, while the program is in progress, and after the program is complete. This kind of process is described in the book *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*, by Rossi, Freeman, and Wright (California: Sage Publications, 1979). In this book the authors describe a model of program development that begins with problem formulation, moves on to goal statements, defines a problem solving delivery system, and ends with an evaluation of program outcomes and effects. This information is then fed back into the formula, and the process is started again. I don't believe that it is always necessary to redefine the program over, and over again, and frequently there is neither the money or the time to do so, but if this model is followed, over the long run the entire planning "process" may be "fine tuned" so as to provide the desired effects.

At this point we have looked at the past, and studied it's effects on the present. Now we can use this knowledge to see where planners might take their use of the electronic media in the future.

4. How might planners use the media in the future?

The question of the future is an interesting one, and it allows us to stretch our imaginations and consider many new possibilities based on the future of planning and the
To understand the future we must look at four key issues: economic trends, technical trends, planning trends, and the question of "institutional" barriers to planning's use of the media.

The first of these, the economic trends, are perhaps the most difficult to predict. However, it is not important to know exactly where our economy will be in the next ten years, but to understand that recent economic trends seem to show that we are, as a nation, going to have a problem with too many dollars "chasing" too few goods, and this is the textbook start of inflation. If we assume that there is no major action (such as a natural disaster, or war) to change the course of our economy, that we will have to begin to increase our national productivity, and start doing more with less. Since we have seen that radio and television can be useful tools in increasing efficiency and effectiveness, it is likely that more groups will try to take advantage of the media outlets that are offered. As planners we will have to "hone" our media skills to make sure we are able to take our "portion" of this scarce resource, and to increase our own abilities to be professional planners.

In the future not only can we expect planners to become more familiar with the uses and limitations of
current media outlets, but increased technology is going to bring new outlets within our reach. We are already seeing the introduction of some of this new equipment, and we can begin to speculate about what others may follow.

In December 1977, Warner Communication's now famous QUBE interactive cable television system went "on-line" in Columbus, Ohio. With the ability to bring more that 30 channels of television into the home (and the possibility of cable radio and T.V. games) QUBE now tallies more than 40,000 subscrivers. QUBE has generated a large amount of excitement because it is an "interactive" system. What this means is that each home gets a connection to the cable system, with the standard channel selectro box. In addition, the home also gets a QUBE response box. With this box it is possible to feed multiple choice answers to questions presented on the television screen, back to the central QUBE computer.

In Upper Arlington, Ohio, one of the communities in Warner's franchise area, the town board has used the system for polling viewers on planning issues with a joint session of the local preservation commission, and the city council. QUBE has also been used to connect the city councils of Columbus and Baltimore, Maryland together for discussions by satellite. The QUBE system is being installed in more and more areas of the country, and it seems likely that we
will probably see it, or a system like it, in the Boston area in the near future.

As a matter of fact, the city of Boston is currently in the midst of discussions on how the city should go about having itself wired for cable television. In an October 1979 "Report of the Mayor's Cable Television Review Commission", a note was made of "(t)he profound impact an all-encompassing telecommunications system could have on the City's cultural, economic, and social fabric, and... (that there is) a need for policy guidelines that account for public interests, technological advancements, and economic incentives required by franchise holders".30

The Commission proposed that "(t)he system be a dual cable system with the capacity for at least forty channels on each cable. The first cable will carry a basic service of over-the-air television signals from Boston and elsewhere, public access channels, channels that are available for lease by potential program suppliers, and other users, and networks of special interest programming, as will as "Pay Channels" providing sports, entertainment, and other program services at an additional charge. Although the second cable will ultimately be used to supplement these home services, its immediate use will be to inter-connect the major institutions in Boston."31 Some of these institutions include the private, public, and parochial schools,
the universities and colleges, and the hospitals, museums, libraries and agencies of the city.

The Boston system is still under consideration, but it has already come under criticism. The Cable Television Access Coalition has already prepared a report outlining their concerns about the proposed Boston system; they feel that before any system is installed, the city should answer questions concerning neighborhood access, city-wide access, ownership, privacy, and questions as to how the system will be used as an educational outlet, in addition to being used as an entertainment outlet. 32

In addition to cable systems which will help to make a major increase in the way that planners use the electronic media in two-way modes, we can expect to see a proliferation of new electronic media devices. Home video tape recorders have been available for only a short time, but their numbers are rising at an incredible rate, and as the demand for them becomes greater, we will see large price reductions what will make them available to anyone who could afford a color television. One interesting note about VTR's is that while manufactures had originally thought that the public would use their machines to play first-run movies in their homes, studies show that movies that are bought are not commercial, but pornographic, and that most people use their VTR's to shift time; to tape one
show while they watch another. Since it is not easily possible to remove commercial programming from the tape, it will be interesting to see what effect shifted PSA's have on the population.

So economic trends will require increased productivity, and technical trends will make two-way access more popular and more available. The third trend we need to look at is trends in the planning profession. In recent years planners have moved away from the "standard" of physical planning: laying out a zoning map and a master plan. As we have mentioned many times, planner's are being found in positions of policy makers, citizen advocates, and mediators. I believe that these trends will continue, with citizen participation becoming more important, and planners moving out of the office and into the street more frequent. These trends will mean that planners will have to become more proficient in assessing their needs and priorities, and that their courses of action will need to be more tightly tied into future economic and technological trends.

The fourth, and final, issue of future media use has to do with the barriers planners will face; barriers that are institutional, social and political. In the broadcasting industry, which is a business, planners are not disliked because they are planners, but because they want "free" airtime. Planners will have to overcome this barrier
by learning how to work within the existing media access system, and by showing broadcasters that public affairs programming can be "good television". In this way planners will be able to "legitimize" their actions and become more accepted.

Other barriers are not as explicit, but rather form a kind of hidden agenda. There is a general feeling that television is a "vast wasteland", or "chewing gum for the eyes". Also, there is the belief that television and radio are "magic", and that to use them well requires knowledge most people will never have. Projects in the past have shown this to be false, but planners in the future will have to keep their successes will publicized to reverse these feelings.

Our conclusion, then, is that future economic considerations and future technological advances will make it easier and cheaper to, and more important, to use radio and television to increase the effectiveness of the planning profession by reaching more people at once, and with more two-way capabilities, by increasing the level of citizen participation in the policy making process. Planners will find this attractive because they will be moving away from the notion of physical planning, towards a goal of comprehensive planning. There will be barriers to this media use, both inside the industry and the profession and outside, but
we should feel confident that these barriers are not insurmountable, but rather due to self-interest on the part of the broadcasters, and the fear of something that has not been "tried before" in the planning profession. Hard work, and some luck, should break through the professional barriers by showing that "it can be done", and government regulations, and a good working relationship with the broadcasting industry, should reduce the problems they might have to offer.

Our final question in the use of radio and television as planning tools has to do with what kinds of special knowledge, and what "specialized questions" should planners have and ask if they are to be as effective as possible in their work.

5. What types of specialized education will planners working with radio and television have to have to be effective in practice?

I believe that in the future it will be important to train planners in the utilization of the electronic media as planning tools. The first, and probably most important, area the planner will need to understand is the previously discussed "Macro-Media" environment. This will include a thorough knowledge of both the past and present of the access
environment, and regulatory environment. Broadcasting is a large business interest in this country, and it seems likely that rather than move it into a more tightly controlled market, the Congress, the Courts, and the F.C.C. are going to attempt to deregulate it and decontrol it based on the pressures of business, lessening of "scarcity", and the continuing inability to enforce rules. However, media access outlets are currently available, and if the planner understands where his or her application fits into the total environment, the reality of access, exposure, and effectiveness becomes more certain.

To reach this goal, I think there are nine questions that should be asked when developing a media strategy.

1. **What are the objectives of the project or program?**
   Before beginning any effort, it is important to define goals. Do you want to raise public knowledge, or do you want to actually change behavior? Asked at the beginning of a project, the question of objectives becomes valuable in the process of evaluation at the end of a project - did we meet our objectives?

2. **What is/are the message(s) to be transmitted?**
   Like #1, it is important to define the messages you will actually be sending out over the airwaves. Do you want to inform people about a particular service being offered? Then
it is important to get all of the relevant specifics into the message. Media access time is usually short, so a clear understanding of the "message" is very important.

3. What is the time frame of the project?
In addition to knowing what you want to say, it is important to know how long you have to say it, both in terms of actual air time, and in terms of project length. Given an unlimited amount of airtime, a long term project would probably develop media messages that built upon each other, while a short term project would need to take a "blitz" approach. Like objectives and messages, time frame should be understood at the beginning.

4. What is going to be the geographic distribution of the program or project?
Is this program or project going to serve the country, state, city, or local neighborhood? The answer to this question is important because it will help to later determine how best to allocate project resources. It is also important in the evaluation sense, because it allows us to see if we had an effect on those we wanted to have an effect on.

5. Where is the "market"?
This question is similar to #4, but it asks the planner to
further define the client group. If we are going to try to prevent lead poisoning we might have a state-wide program, but our "market" will not be in the richer suburbs; it will be in the lower income and older housing markets. One problem the planner will face is that it will not always be possible to know where the market is. However, the advantage of "mass" media is that it can reach across classes and geographic boundaries, helping to bridge gaps in our knowledge.

6. What media are best able and available to deliver the message?
Not all radio and television stations try to reach every market. In the past, television was considered a very broad medium, with radio targeting its transmissions to distinct groups (classical, rock, country & western, all news, etc.). In the future, however, television too will begin to narrow in on certain audiences. We can already see this effect on some of the UHF stations which show almost continuous reruns of old situation comedies. When thinking about using the media as a planning tool, it will be important to think about which station and what kind of outlet (PSA's, editorials, talk shows, etc.) can transmit your information most efficiently, and effectively.
7. **What is the "competition" up to?**

When planners take an advocacy role on one side of an issue, it is usually safe to assume that there is someone else on the other side. Knowing what the "others" are doing is always important in the planning profession, but it is especially important when using the limited resources of radio and television. When planning a media strategy, the knowledge of what "other" or counter messages are being transmitted to the marketplace is just as important as the understanding of your own message. The "competition" should be figured into any media plan.

8. **How much money is available?**

The bottom line in most projects is the financial limits. Staff, production equipment, and in some cases air time will all cost money. Before you pursue a project using the electronic media it is a good idea to know what the monetary limits will be. A half complete documentary or PSA is of little use. Also, it is generally more effective to produce three good ten second spots than one weak sixty second spot. A well defined media budget before a program begins will save a lot of trouble in the middle and at the end.

9. **What will be the best way to allocate limited**
resources between production and air time?

This question ties together the issues of budget and effect. Before beginning a media campaign we will have to decide between a few "long" time slots, or many "short" ones. It is also important to remember that in addition to production and air costs, there may be a charge for publicizing your show or project. Unfortunately, we do not know the exact effects that any one spot or program has on the desired audience, but it is possible to look at past efforts to get an idea of the relative value of the time and money factors depending on your group's goals. Allocation of resources should be decided upon before the project begins.

The better a planner is able to answer these questions, the more likely it is that he or she will be effective in getting access to media outlets, and in reaching desired audiences with desired effects.

In addition, I feel that not only should we be teaching planners in the field how to make use of the electronic media, but I believe that the understanding and use of radio and television should be introduced into planning education. Many people are awed by radio and television because of the electronic mysteries inside them, and the celebrities that come through them. Knowledge can open
the locks of reas, and will go a long way towards making planners more "professional". Courses in media production techniques, media access opportunities, and the regulatory structure should help to better equip planners to be able to develop urban policies and solve urban problems.

Therefore, to summarize, we can say the following things. First, planners have a general set of professional goals ranging from policy and program support to public education. In the course of reaching each of these goals, it is necessary to communicate, and radio and television are the best tools of our time to communicate with the population quickly, and in most cases cheaply. This increase in communication ability will eventually result in the increase of the planning profession's productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness.

Second, we can say planners have used radio and television in the past to help reach a number of goals, but in most uses, radio and television were "one shot" rather than long term tools. In question three we saw this one shot technique to be part of the problem facing planners effective use of radio and television, but we were still able to see that our example projects might not have been totally successful, they did have some positive effects, and some statistical data and much anecdotal data points to the conclusion that radio and television are
useful planning tools. In addition, we realized that future experiments should be designed better with emphasis placed on recording the input/process/output of the project before and after the experiment. This will allow us to begin to build a base of knowledge that will enable planners to better understand where and when to use the media.

The future, with its electronic advances and economic changes seems to leave planners with a "mixed-bag". There should be more outlets available for those who want to use them, and the emphasis will be on two-way interactive use of the media, but the audiences for each channel will probably be less because of the greater number of choices. Planners will continue to use the electronic media as they have in the past, but there will be an increased emphasis on citizen training and policy decision input.

And finally, we can say there are nine questions that media planners will need to answer to get the most benefit out of radio and television programming. These questions have to do with the allocation of time, money, and staff, and if answered before the project begins, will help to assure the planner that he or she is using the right outlet and the right format to reach the desired audience. We also see that it will be important to train future planners in media access techniques, and regulatory policy so that the use of radio and television will not
seem strange and foreign, but rather an accepted and well understood tool.
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CONCLUSION
CONCLUSION

The understanding and use of radio and television as planning tools is the issue this paper has tried to address. At this point I think it is important to summarize the two sections of the issue we have looked at, and to see what new information we will be able to take into the planning profession.

In the first section we looked at the "Macro-Media" environment. This is really two environments, a media access environment, and a media regulatory environment. We have seen that in the past, the electronic media were brought under government control for two reasons. First, the electromagnetic spectrum was a scarce resource, so it was necessary to "fix" the market problems that would not allow everyone to enter and exit the broadcasting marketplace if they chose to do so. Second, it was felt that the ability to reach mass portions of the population was an ability that had tremendous power, and the regulators felt that this kind of power could not be left totally in the hands of market forces. For this reason both the Courts and the Congress made it clear that broadcasting in this country would be performed in the "public interest, convenience, and necessity". A number of court cases challenged the validity of this concept, but in the "Red Lion Case" it was stated
that the right of viewers and listeners to receive diverse forms of programming was more important than the rights of the broadcasters. We also learned that the print media are not regulated in this same way, because in print there is not the same problem of scarcity. Basic capital is all it takes to start a magazine or newspaper, and no approval is necessary to sell a print media business when the owner wished to leave the market place.

In the first section we saw that there are currently a number of different access outlets available to the public. Some of these include Public Service Announcements, Public Affairs Shows, News programs, and Editorial rebuttals. We also saw that the regulatory structure required broadcasters to keep program logs, and to ascertain leaders in the community about the issues they feel need to be addressed by the media. Broadcaster license renewal's require that these actions are performed, or the license will not be renewed, and citizen groups and others who feel that a licensee has not served the public interest can challenge the license renewal using logs and ascertainment as evidence.

We noted that there are currently changes being brought about in the communications regulation arena, and we looked at three reasons why there changes were taking place. First we saw how new technologies are making it possible to eliminate the past problem of spectrum scarcity. Cable reception and
new receivers will make it possible for many more channels to fit on the airwaves without causing interference. Second, we noted the problems the regulators are having in enforcing their own rules. A lack of time, money, and manpower make it difficult for the F.C.C. to check on each broadcaster, so one possible solution the government is looking at is to make the "problem" no longer a problem by changing the regulations. Third, we saw how industry lobby groups, especially the National Association of Broadcasters, are placing pressure on the Congress to free up government control of the market place so that free enterprise can take over and the broadcasters be better able to serve the needs of the public.

We looked at a number of the recent proposals both by the Congress and the F.C.C. to deregulate radio and television, and at some testimony given on why the electronic media should not be deregulated. The basic feeling was that broadcasters currently allow public access to the airwaves because doing so helps them at license renewal time. Left on its own, some feel the market would completely ignore the need for diverse programming, and would allow competition to dictate the content of the air which might cause many different examples of the same show.

We concluded, then, that the process of deregulation would probably continue for the next five to ten years, but
that while realizing that new technologies might remove the need for complete spectrum control, the concepts of "public interest" and a "multitude of voices" would mean that regulators would need to continue to keep some level of control on the broadcast industry.

We also looked at the need to know who will be able to transmit information over the new media systems, and who will be able to receive signals from the new media systems. We found that in the future, medium's will have to be classified as either broadcasters of common carriers. If they are the former, then public access regulation will be necessary, but if they are the latter, then it will not. We also looked at the issue of radio and television being necessities as opposed to conviences, and therefore determining what a "basic" level of service might be, and who would subsidize those who could not afford to pay.

In the second section we looked at the actual use of radio and television as planning tools. We examined the questions of why planners would want or need to use the electronic media, how they have used it in the past, what we do know, and what we would like to know about the effects of radio and television as planning tools, how they might use it in the future and what barriers they may face, and we looked at a series of questions that
planners using the media would need to answer to be as efficient and effective as possible.

The WHY question showed us that radio and television can be used to increase productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness of planning, and to help planners reach their professional goals.

In the HOW question we looked at two examples of planners using the media in one-way image boosting, market "fixing" situations, and in two-way public participation public education situations. The future HOW's seemed to be dependent on future economic trends, technological trends, planning trends, and institutional barriers, but we came to the conclusion that the future would be close to the present expect that we hoped to see more examples of radio and television as planning tools because of the increased outlets that would be available through new electronics. We also took note of the ability of future cable systems to act in an interactive fashion, and saw what this might mean in terms of future citizen participation.

The question of effects was one that was difficult to answer. We looked at one example where radio and television seemed to prove that they could affect knowledge, behavior, and motivation. The Stanford Heart Disease Prevention Program used a steady stream of media messages over a
three year period, and they found a reduction in heart
disease in their experimental groups, while there was
an increase in their control group. Most of our data in
the other programs was anecdotal, never the less, the
Dorchester program, the Choices for '76 project, and the
PICS conference and book did seem to have positive effects
and to some degree reach the goals they were trying for.
We concluded, then, that radio and television probably
were useful as planning tools, but that in the future
it would be important to design experimental programs
that looked at the input/process/outcome of a project
before the introduction of the electronic media, and compare
it to the i/p/o after.

Finally in Section 2., we examined a series of questions
that would be useful for planners wanting to use the media,
to answer before their project began. These questions
dealt with objectives, distribution, competition, and the
allocation of resources, and helped the planner scope
out his or her needs, wants, and abilities so that they
would be able to use radio and television to be as efficient,
effective, and productive as possible.

Together, these two sections should allow planners
to have a better understanding of the issues of media
access and media regulation, their place in the media
environment, and some fo the questions that will have to
be answered by future policy makers. In addition, it should make it clear that radio and television are tools that need to be learned how to use properly. And finally, we should now feel better qualified to say how the use of the electronic media by the planning profession has the potential to make planners more efficient, effective, and productive in reaching their professional goals, and the goals of their clients.
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