INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8222930

BLUHM, VIRGINIA

THE CHANGING IMAGES OF TELEVISION NEWSCASTERS

City University of New York PH.D. 1982

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1982

by

BLUHM, VIRGINIA

All Rights Reserved

THE CHANGING IMAGES OF TELEVISION NEWSCASTERS

by

VIRGINIA BLUHM

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1982

COPYRIGHT BY

VIRGINIA BLUHM

1982

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

6/10/1982
date

Chairman of Examining Committee

6/10/1982
date

Executive Officer

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ABSTRACT

This study examines the process of a social movement that sought to integrate the images of television newscasters. It focuses on how a major social institution, television broadcasting, acquiesced to the demands of activists and pressure groups.

The depiction of minority group members in the images of television became an issue in the early 1960's when activists and organizations supporting minority interests in the society began pressuring broadcasters to abandon the practices that stereotyped or excluded minority group members from many of the on-camera roles in television. It was widely believed that employing more minority group members in the visible roles of television and depicting minority individuals in a manner comparable to that of whites would hasten the acceptance of minorities in other occuptions and areas of the society. News programming became a special target of criticism during the sixties as racial issues intensified. Black leaders, critics of television, and later government investigations reported that many deficiencies of television news related to the lack of integration in newscasting. Most blacks thought television news represented white views and the black community gave it little credibility. Beginning in the late

sixties, as the women's movement developed, criticism was directed towards broadcasters about the images of women.

The course of this movement was followed to 1978, relying mainly on data obtained from published sources and interviews with minority and women newscasters, television executives, and participating activists. A reconstruction of the historical sequence of events, which provided the context in which newscaster images became integrated, included the growth and development of television news and the efforts of activists seeking to reform television images. As newscaster images were closely linked to the employment practices of broadcasters, legislation and government policy concerning equal employment were also important factors. Two variables important to this analysis were the force of the social movement and how broadcasters perceived the demands for change would affect their businesses.

The findings indicated that broadcasters cautiously introduced minority newscasters into television news and these changes were likely to follow events that subjected broadcasters to public criticism, posed new needs for broadcasters, or occurred under unusual conditions, such as during labor strikes.

As broadcasters were the implementors of the changes demanded of them, this allowed them much leeway in how they

integrated newscaster images. The findings showed that broadcasters were receptive to change that favored their business interests and resisted or manipulated changes that offered them little advantage. Although professional values governed the work relationships of newscasters, their ethnic, racial, and sex statuses were factors that affected their hiring and their work before before the camera, and consequently their images. In addition, the employment of outstanding individuals as professional personalities reduced the impact of minority or female status in this process of change. The broadcasters achieved an uneasy balance between overall integration and optimal competitive advantages.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to the individual newscasters and television executives and the women of the National Organization for Women who generously contributed their time and information to this endeavor.

I appreciate the efforts of my thesis committee members, Professors Joseph Bensman, Patricia L. Kendall, and Charles Winick, whose demands, criticism, and editorial assistance, in addition to encouragement, were invaluable. Dr. J. Ronald Milavsky was very helpful in raising methodological and theoretical points for consideration.

A special debt of gratitude is due to two dear friends, Arlene and Maurice Newman, and to my husband, Robert, who provided the encouragement needed to see me through this undertaking.

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY AND METHODOLOGY	49
III.	CHANGES IN TELEVISION NEWS	89
IV.	STRUCTURAL FACTORS AFFECTING MINORITIES	136
V.	RESPONSES TO MINORITY DEMANDS	167
VI.	THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES	228
VII.	TENSIONS IN THE SEVENTIES	296
VIII.	EMERGENT PATTERNS OF THE MID-SEVENTIES	356
IX.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	417
APPENDIX A		456
APPENDIX B		457
APPENDIX C		462

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study will focus on the change that has occurred in the images of television newscasters.[1] Visually, present day reporters of television news contrast sharply with those of the past when newscasting was traditionally a domain of white males. During the 1960's a social movement emerged that sought to integrate the images of television. This movement grew out of the Black Movement,[2] the Women's Liberation Movement, new legislation, and the efforts of government agencies concerned with the media images of minority groups. As the number of non-whites, women, and national ethnics reporting television news began to increase substantially, the traditional white male stereotype of the television newscaster was transformed into a diversified imagery; now minority[3] statuses are discernible on the television screen and are elements in the public images of individual newscasters.

Exploring this change should contribute to the theoretical understanding of how social change is accepted and utilized by groups or institutions pressured by a social movement that achieves some or all of its goals. This is an

aspect of sociological theory that is relevant to a major concern of our present day society--bringing minorities into the mainstream of American life. For several reasons, newscaster images were particularly interesting: The television medium had become the foremost source of news information in American society[4] and, therefore, an important social force. Before the social movements of the 1960's, minority images could not be projected in the important roles of television programming, because broadcasters believed that if they presented minority group members in these roles, viewing audiences would reject their programs and advertisers would not buy program time.[5] Thus, to present minority statuses in the imagery of newscasters required a reversal of long standing attitudes and practices. Since the images of newscasters are used to facilitate the communication process in news programming, it is important when introducing changes that the credibility of news messages not be diminished. In addition, the vast proportion of television news in American society emanates from the commercial companies of a highly competitive industry where the primary goal is making profits. News production, like television programming generally, is oriented to attaining the highest possible ratings.[6] Presenting any kind of change in the format of a television program poses both a risk and an opportunity to the broadcaster, depending upon the effect on the ratings.

Indeed, in this context, the introduction of minority images into television news programming could be done only with deliberation and a watchful eye on the ratings. A new kind of imagery could finally be accepted only if it supported the primary commercial goals of the broadcaster. For these reasons, studying this problem should help in understanding the factors that facilitated integration in newscasting and allowed minorities to take a viable role in one of society's major social institutions. In the following sections of this chapter, the issues and concerns that related to changing the images of television newscasters will be set forth.

Social Significance of Newscaster Images

In television news programs the newscaster functions as an instrument to the communication process, because much of the credibility of news reports depends upon how the image the newscaster projects via the television camera impresses viewers. Increasingly the newscaster is a mediator who first assimilates information and then makes it known to others,[7] rather than being merely a reader of news copy. The intelligibility of news messages depends upon his or her capacity to project an understanding of what is reported. Demeanor, gestures, and manner of speech create impressions that have the power to influence how the audience will interpret news.[8] A vacant look or a lack of fluency in reading news scripts or teleprompters, which is

noticeable to viewers, may reduce the newscaster's capacity to communicate. Roby Paul Madsen points out that the visual image "has a direct link to the brain and is the primary means by which the physically normal person learns about and relates to his environment."[9] Spoken words are indirect; they are a symbol system that needs translation. Film, however, has become so much a part of our daily life that "film literacy" is a language we have learned.[10] Thus, the visual images of newscasters are a primary form of communication that may strengthen or weaken the understanding of television news messages.

Newscasters have become celebrities, and celebrity status tends to correlate with how one is regarded as a communicator of news messages, with the best known rated as having the highest standing in this occupation and accorded the most credibility.[11] Individual qualities, personal appeal, and appearance influence the popularity of television newscasters.[12] To gain prominence, the television newscaster must be more than just good; he must be a "personality" with some distinctive characteristic that sets him off from others who are also good.[13] Broadcasters regard newscasters as "talent," and this makes newscasting a star system with a show business aspect. Local news people have become as famous in their viewing areas as Walter Cronkite did nationally.[14]

Newscasters, especially those in the anchor role,[15] contribute an element of continuity and familiarity to a news show that helps to overcome some of the difficulties inherent in news programming. By its nature, news has an ephemeral quality, because it consists of many unrelated items.[16] At times news topics may be repugnant to viewers, because they seem too violent, socially disruptive, or politically biased.[17] Viewers, however, recognize newscasters who appear regularly. Many people come to have favorites and tune in to hear a particular newscaster's report, not just what events have occurred, and an anchorperson's appeal may be the key to a program's success in the ratings.[18] Newscasters are groomed, dressed, and given props to enhance their appeal.[19] Each newscaster attracts some segments of the viewing audience more than others, so broadcasters have been concerned with presenting the "correct mix" of personal appeal and related characteristics in order to compete for the highest ratings.[20] Promotional ads for television news shows feature individual newscasters and news teams.[21] Thus it is clear that the images television newscasters project are more than the equivalent of a newspaper reporter's by-line. They are devices used to attract audiences to news shows, in addition to being vehicles in the communication process itself.

Pseudo-Personal Relationships

The high degree of visibility that makes the newscaster personally identifiable tends to create a mystique,[22] one that adds another dimension to the "human interest technique," a form of journalism television inherited from the print media. The human interest approach presents news in a highly personalized, appealing, and entertaining way, which was used in the past as a strategy to increase newspaper readership.[23] Now, the television medium seems to have an inherent property that favors human interest appeals:

> Television has a natural attribute that is recognized though not completely understood--the peculiarly personal and graphic impact on its viewers which the printed word cannot match. This close relationship with the audience is not by any means confined to entertainment television, but occurs just as strongly if not more so in journalistic television. . . . There are elements of emotion and of involvement in television's chemistry. . . . The rapport between reporter and viewer is almost total.[24]

The stylized behavior of the newscaster simulates a personal relationship with the viewer. The best newscasters affect an eye contact and manner as if actually talking to the viewer sitting in his living room. Looking down at a news script for too long cuts off the rapport with the viewer. Teleprompters are placed in line with the camera to maximize an appearance of eye contact with the person watching the television screen. The intent is that "they go through that lens. They talk to you."[25] Newscasters employ

other mannerisms that reflect behavior characteristic of personal interaction, such as turning one's head away from the camera to look with the viewer at stills or film clips, or to introduce another newscaster--the news is shared with the viewer.[26] Many news teams engage in informal bits of conversation or pleasantries, the purpose of which is to make viewers feel they are participating with a small intimate group. Thus, the style of newscasting, in addition to the nature of the medium, helps to draw the viewer into a pseudo-personal relationship with the newscaster.

The viewer enters into a form of intergroup relations when these pseudo-personal relationships cross group boundaries, as when the viewer and the newscaster have different ethnic, racial, or sex statuses. The viewer has an opportunity to relate to the minority newscaster, who is in the role of an authority figure, as a reliable source of information and to feel impressions suggesting he has a personal relationship with a minority person. To people who

> have little or no direct contact with those of other groups these symbolic portraits may be the major sources of impressions and information that certain people have about others . . . and the quantity and quality of minority group portrayals may have important consequences for the mass media's impact on socialization.[27]

Despite the fact that a contrived imagery links newscasters with viewers, these images are an element of our real world. Obviously, news messages help to shape perceptions of the world held by viewers. But even when the

content of news messages is not believed by the public, the act of reporting news is an institutionalized form of behavior. The newscaster, although a performer, subject to staging and direction; is not oriented towards fantasy as in the case of an actor. Viewers rarely experience more than a mediated, one-way relationship with newscasters, but when observing newscaster images on the television screen, people in the audience often feel that they know newscasters personally. A popular newsperson is accepted, at times, as would be a clergyman or teacher, and may serve as an ombudsman when members of the community contact him with tips on stories or about problems.[28] Some newscasters and their employers regard the roles of both ombudsman and investigative reporter as specialized areas of journalism. The task of gathering news immerses newscasters in the affairs of the community, and they act as society's watchdogs.[29] During emergencies well known newscasters have been effective in mobilizing the public, because they are readily believed.[30]

Elements of the Real World

As the newscaster performs his occupational task of reporting news before the camera, other aspects of the real world are evident. A television picture picks up all kinds of trivia that cannot be masked out as in still pictures. The viewing eye reacts to these unintended elements and notes items that are normally sloughed away by live

perception.[31] As an example, newscasters function as models displaying fashions and hairstyles.[32]

"Portrayals of people at work may be a major learning source for young people in a society, especially those who are unlikely to know an adult so employed."[33] This is true in the case of the television newscaster's occupation. Although the major portion of a newscaster's tasks are hidden from the public, viewers are able to see the newscaster actually at work in the on-camera duties of his job. The camera reveals how reporters cope with some of the conditions under which they work, such as in bad weather, noisy streets, and crowds, or with uncooperative news subjects, etc.

Symbolic Functions

Cultural meanings may be attached to newscaster images, which gives them symbolic significance. A commonplace example is how easily a news program is recognized. If a viewer turns on the television set and hears a newscaster's voice or observes news people on the screen, he knows immediately that it is a news program; and the newscaster's personal image may identify the program.

Audiences use newscaster images to judge whether or not news reports are reliable. In the past, a feminine voice affected an audience's response to news messages; if women reported hard news or war stories, audiences did not accept them as credible reports.[34] Regional accents

continued to be avoided as they may suggest to viewers a bias in the report towards the views of the reporter's original area or they may seem incongruous to the viewers of a different region.[35] The Kerner Commission, investigating racial disorders in 1967, discovered that the black community attributed greater credibility to information supplied by word-of-mouth or rumor for matters important to blacks than to television news reports produced by whites. The absence of black reporters symbolized not only the communication gap that existed between blacks and whites but the lack of regard the white society held for black views.[36]

Still another kind of information evident in television images relates to the status-conferral function of the mass media. The extent to which minorities are represented in the images of television indicates how well they are regarded and, therefore, how much they matter. The status-conferral function "enters into organized social action by legitimizing selected policies, persons and groups which receive the support of the media."[37] The absence or underrepresentation of a group in television's images indicates the society's rejection of that group. In addition, "distorted portrayals and stereotyping contribute to prejudicial and discriminatory treatments of individuals in real life."[38]

In the course of giving news reports, newscasters display the patterns of behavior of social relationships.

Even though this is stylized behavior, when newscasters are seen interacting with members of news teams or people who are of a different sex, race, or ethnic group, they function as models for intergroup relations. Conventionally commercial television favors maintaining the status quo, not raising questions about it.[39] Therefore, the appearance of minority newscasters demonstrates that an emergent norm has gained acceptance. The presentation of minorities on news shows in roles comparable to those of people who are not minority group members legitimates the society's commitment to equality. Minority newscaster images show the audience that the broadcaster accepts these people in this occupation.[40] Viewers are also able to observe and compare what types hold the preferred positions--the types that fill the anchor spots, appear on weekday shows rather than on weekends, that do special assignments, featured stories, or are given star billing.

Intergroup Relationships

It must be granted then, that since newscaster images are a significant element of the visual messages projected by a station or network, and they have a potential for affecting intergroup relations. Simpson and Yinger observed that television was the foremost communications agency that could positively or negatively affect attitudes towards minorities,[41] and that it was the mass media that provide "the most 'educational' stimuli which the great

majority of people in the United States receive after their formal schooling."[42] Minority newscasters present audiences with positive images of their groups and allow vast numbers of viewers an opportunity to reevaluate people long stereotyped as inferior. Presumably this could have a substantial influence on attitudes towards intergroup relations. In addition, minority viewers are able to observe positive role models to identify with and to emulate. The visibility of newscasters on the television screen reveals the extent to which news broadcasting, at least in its publically visible elements, is an integrated industry. This public aspect of integration may not apply to positions outside of camera range which include a whole host of technical, professional, administrative, and executive positions. Nevertheless, on camera integration becomes a mechanism for legitimating the national commitment to equal employment and social equality when minorities are presented successfully in a role previously barred to them. A popular black newswoman in the New York Area said,

> A black reporter on camera is as much the message as is the news story he is there to communicate. In effect, the black reporter, simply by his presence on the screen, conveys a message to an audience of millions--telling them, without words, something about his company, its hiring practices, its attitude about race relations. For the blacks in the audience, the black reporter symbolizes the inroads they have made in an industry that until a few years ago did very little to acknowledge their existence, much less encourage their participation.[43]

Socio-Historical Context

Neil J. Smelser theorizes that structural strains are an underlying basis of collective behavior such as manifested by a social movement. He notes that the inequality between blacks and whites in American society and the cultural values of civil liberty of opportunity is an example of such strain. Efforts to change mass media images, that arose out of the civil rights movement, constituted a norm-oriented movement, which Smelser defines "as an attempt to restore, protect, modify, or create norms in the name of a generalized belief."[44] As the civil rights movement shifted to striving for equal employment, a formidable obstacle to breaking down employment discrimination was the stereotyping in attitudes of potential employers and the general public that blacks and women were not suitable for many occupations, including newscasting, because of their race or sex.

Television images became a foremost concern, because of this medium's great impact on the society. Underlying this issue was the widely accepted belief that the images of the mass media affect the society's attitudes and behavior towards minorities. Television did not have to function solely as a mirror of society, a highly selective mirror that reflected only the distortions and stereotypes held by whites, but could, instead, take a leadership role by providing models to correct the misunderstandings and

indignities to which minorities had long been subjected. As a social movement develops, one of the primary functions of leadership is to put forth ideas that guide the efforts of activists participating in the movement and to persuade increasing numbers of people to support their cause.[44] Numerous opinions expressed by spokesmen for the Black Movement and the Women's Liberation Movement, and others concerned with minority problems advocated a change in the prevailing images of minorities in the mass media, because the stereotyping and negative portrayals were thwarting the nation's commitment to equality.[45] Motivated by this belief in the effect of television images, blacks launched a campaign in the early 1960's to pressure television broadcasters to change the images they projected.[46] Other groups also took up the issue, most notably feminists when the women's movement got underway. As will become apparent in the following discussion, their concerns about media images developed somewhat differently.

Black Concerns about Television Images

Television images of blacks became an issue during the 1960's even though black leaders and demonstrators used tactics that concentrated on getting television coverage, a means to making the white society aware of the problems of blacks. The medium became a central factor that accelerated and "forced a much speedier confrontation of emotions and ideas than otherwise would have been the case."[47] Events

such as bus boycotts, freedom rides, school desegregation, sit-ins, marches and civil disorders, caught the eye of newsmen, because they were unusual, represented conflict, and had dramatic action. These events "fit almost any reporter's definition of 'news.' Most important, they provided material uniquely suited to the new medium."[48] A problem, of news, however, is that common everyday events in the life of the society do not draw attention and so are not newsworthy. Conflict and drama on television attract audiences. Therefore, as the events of the Black Movement unfolded before the public through the eye of the television camera, critics sympathetic to the black cause became concerned that its portrayal of blacks was one-sided and negative. Too often, they argued, television showed blacks involved in violence, public disturbances, and rebellion, and this perpetuated a bad image of blacks. Television's portrayals of blacks were hindering their advancement into the mainstream of American society.

The negative portrayal of blacks in news reports, which continued through most of the 1960's, presented an anomaly in the images of blacks projected on the television screen. Blacks, when the subjects of news stories, were shown as resistant, hostile, violent, and willing to challenge whites--exactly the opposite of the stereotyped images blacks were permitted to project in other programming. Ironically, television news presented images

that contradicted television's own long-standing policies. The practices inherited from radio and motion-pictures restricted blacks to stereotyped roles portraying them as indolent, passive, or shiftless types, or simply excluded them from the television screen.[49] Black actors rarely appeared in dramatic shows, and when they did, it was in stereotyped roles depicting low ranking social statuses, typically as menials or servants. Taboos existed that did not permit black actors and actresses to play the roles most glorified by the mass audience, as adventurous or romantic heroes. Black entertainers could appear as guests on the variety shows of white hosts but not host their own programs.[50] Hardly ever were blacks invited as informed guests on public affairs programs or talk shows; and, in their rare appearances, they were expected to speak as representatives of black views, not in other areas of expertise, such as their professions.[51] In commercials, blacks were relegated to roles that corresponded to the restrictions that prevailed in entertainment shows; the black actor could not be presented selling a product unless he was shown as a waiter or other menial type in a manner intended to flatter the viewer, suggesting the viewer was a person of higher social status.[52] The NAACP had long been critical of black images in the mass media, in print, motion-pictures, radio, and then television; but efforts to bring about any change had had only limited success. Two

years of negotiations finally got new programming of "Amos 'n' Andy" off the television screen in 1953, but its syndication continued until 1966.[53] Another example in the 1950's, reported by Erik Barnouw, was that a script for a television drama about a black family moving into a white neighborhood was accepted by one of the networks with the proviso that blacks be written out of the story. It was unthinkable that Southern viewers should be presented with a beleaguered protagonist who was black.[54] The few times when black stars, such as Nat King Cole, did get their own shows, sponsors would not buy time on their programs even if ratings were good, because an association with blacks would be bad for the images of the products of the sponsors.[55]

Information programming and sports reports conformed to the same restrictions. In sports, black athletes had won the adulation of millions; but black athletes were not the ones asked to endorse advertised products,[56] nor did they appear as sportscasters after retiring from athletic careers.[57] In news programming, blacks were visible only as news subjects. Reporters and other visible news staff were white, despite the fact that school desegration and civil rights had become leading news topics in the years following the 1954 Supreme Court decision to desegregate schools.

It was not enough that stations allocated time in their programming schedules for shows that attracted principally black audiences. Programming for special

interests is often aired by many stations during marginal hours, as on Sunday mornings. Far more significant was the problem of integrating programming that attracted the mainstream of white viewers, because the white society needed to be reeducated in how they viewed blacks.

Television has been an important instrument for awakening the white society to the fact that blacks were discontented and angry, that they had serious problems. Although many demonstrations were planned to come within camera range to convey the blacks' plight to television audiences, the problem remained that the negative images prevalent on the television screen and widely held in the society, whether militant or docile, would not encourage white acceptance of blacks. Neither was it likely that journalists would put an equal emphasis on "good" news about blacks.[58] The aim of the Black Movement was to integrate the institutions of the society. If blacks could become visible in all the roles seen on the television screen, their images would be comparable to those of whites. Creating a positive black imagery seemed to be one desirable strategy in a much larger movement. In short, television could be viewed as a tool for social change; potentially, television could become a means to changing white perceptions of blacks. By its use blacks would be accepted more easily into the mainstream of the society.

Beliefs about the Effects of TV Images

Opinions expressed by a number of civil rights leaders and other activists indicated their belief in the capacity of television images to affect public opinion. To illustrate, the actor, P. J. Sidney, when filing a complaint with the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, charging that dramatic television shows did not present Negroes in roles they might normally play in life, said that his aim was to improve the image of the Negro.[59] George H. Fowler, Chairman of the New York State Committee for Human Rights said,

> Television, radio and other communications media play an important role in the education of our citizens, . . . and the commission is concerned that they properly educate people. . . . There still is not a general awareness of the problem.[60]

In a similar vein, Robert Lewis Shayon, the television columnist, wrote,

> The affirmative contribution that television can make to the nation's struggle for integration is incalculable, particularly in the modification of Negro stereotypes. TV ought not to wait for public attitudes to change, as the mirror theory counsels. In every industry and institution it is men at the top with vision and guts who make change.[61]

Barbara Ann Teer, a black television actress, claimed in a newspaper article that "TV, with vast audiences, has power to correct many myths and stereotypes."[62] A report by the Ethical Culture Society stated that

> it seems to us that employment of Negro actors is secondary to the more general educational problem of the Negro image conveyed to millions of homes.

> Here, with vision, the television industry could serve well its nation by portraying the emergent Negro. . .[63]

The issue of television images sprang forth as the Black Movement took up the task of improving the economic conditions of black Americans. Discriminatory practices in the television industry held a special significance: not only was this an industry that hired too few minorities, but, more important, gaining greater access to the occupations of television was the key to changing the stereotyped images of blacks projected to the public. Exclusion from jobs in television resulted in exclusion from the roles visible on TV screens. Both behind-the-scenes occupations, especially those involved in decision-making, and those seen on-camera were targets. Of immediate importance, however, was integrating the visible roles which have a direct impact upon the audience. Speaking before the National Association of National Advertisers, Roy Wilkins explained why it was the policy of the NAACP to bring more Negroes into mass media messages:

> The average Negro is concerned about both jobs and the image of his race. . . . By using Negroes in ads, advertisers can meet both concerns by building the image of the Negro and providing employment opportunities for Negro models.[64]

Another spokesman for the NAACP argued that

> artistically, movies and television must treat the Negro "truthfully" in showing him on the screen and portray the "richness and diversity" of his life instead of limiting his roles to those of menials.[65]

Additional benefits were to be derived from improving the images of blacks projected by television. If blacks could see themselves in a more positive light, this would raise their sense of self-worth and aspirations to higher levels,[66] and whites could become better informed about what life was actually like in the black community. The Protestant Council of the City of New York declared,

> Such exclusion does injury both to the minority group members and to the members of the white majority who are thereby insulated from exposure to the ethnic realities of America's pluralistic society.[67]

Government reports published late in the 1960's gave an official support to the belief in the power of media images. In 1968 the Kerner report stated that

> the absence of Negro faces and activities from the media has an effect on white audiences as well as black. If what the white American reads in the newspapers or sees on television conditions his expectation of what is ordinary and normal in the larger society, he will neither understand nor accept the black American. By failing to portray the Negro as a matter of routine and in the context of the total society, the news media have, we believe, contributed to the black-white schism in this country.[68]

The following year, the Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence said that the unbalanced surveillance of the American media contributed to the gap in intergroup communication and to the black-white conflict. White news organizations did not have sufficient knowledge or rapport with the black community to perform the surveillance function. The report urged that more minority

newspeople be trained and hired as a way of producing reliable intergroup communication so badly needed by the society. A common black-white understanding of racial problems would more easily resolve the racial conflict.[69] To include the images of black newscasters in TV news would be an important support to closing this communication gap:

> The very presence of black reporters in a news organization helps allay the antipathy of some blacks toward the media.[70]

Media operators bear a responsibility in keeping the marketplace of ideas open, so public tastes could be molded in new ways. Noting the experience of marketing and advertising, the report argued that the media messages most available become familiar, and, like advertised products, are the most likely to be consumed.[71]

Thus, throughout the 1960's, the public commentary of well known individuals, professional critics of television, and spokesmen for organizations working in behalf of black interests repeatedly voiced the belief that television had a capability to improve relations between blacks and whites. A movement within the Black Movement thus emerged which aimed at changing the television images of blacks. Integrating the occupations of the television industry, particularly getting blacks admitted to <u>all</u> on-camera positions, whether fictional portrayals or not, would have wide-ranging effects on discriminatory practices in many areas of the society. Removing the old stereotypes in

media images would improve both white perceptions of blacks and blacks' self-images. The promise was that integration in other areas of the society would be achieved more easily.

Feminist Concerns about Television Images

Feminist criticism of television images developed quite differently than did the concerns voiced about black images. The publication of Betty Friedan's book in 1963, The Feminine Mystique, stimulated interest in women's media images, but it was not until the later sixties when the women's movement was well underway and gaining momentum that this problem was given wide attention and concerted efforts were attempted to change media images.

Betty Friedan, primarily concerned about the image of women that had pervaded American culture, charged that

> a mystique of feminine fulfillment became the cherished and self-perpetuating core of contemporary American culture. Millions of women lived out their lives in the image of those pretty pictures of the American suburban housewife, . . . gloried in their role as women. . .[72]

She discovered, however, when studying women's attitudes and expectations, that many women who were living this idealized lifestyle shared what she first called "the problem that has no name." These women, conforming to the cultural prescription were regarded as better off than women elsewhere, but they were nevertheless unhappy and dissatisfied. While the secret of feminine fulfillment was to have children, the growing evidence of desperation among women was occurring,

paradoxically, just when there was a new freedom to choose how many children one might willingly have.[73]

Friedan states, "In 1960 the problem that has no name burst like a boil. . . . In the television commercials the pretty housewives still beamed over their foaming dishpans," but suddenly the unhappiness of the American housewife was being reported in magazines, newspapers, and on television. Explanations varied, depending upon the specialities of those analyzing the problem, but essentially housewives were advised that they did not realize how lucky they were, they had never had it so good, and the problem was "dismissed by shrugging that there are no solutions: this is what being a woman means, and what is wrong with American women that they can't accept their role gracefully?"[74]

On the other hand, Friedan pointed out that the unnamed problem arose as an identity crisis. When women of her generation were growing up, they could not see themselves beyond the age of twenty-one and had no image of their future as women.[75] Despite the fact that most women conformed to the "feminine mystique," there was also an underlying rejection of the housewife's role when women regarded their mothers as role models. She said,

> Many of us know that we did not want to be like our mothers, even when we loved them. We could not help but see their disappointment. . . . Strangely, many mothers who loved their daughters . . . did not want

> them to grow up like them either. . . .
> But even if they urged [a rejection of their own role model], . . . they could not give us an image of what we might be.[76]

So pervasive, however, was the feminine mystique that it was also the standard by which daughters evaluated the role model provided by mothers: mothers were frustrated because they did not love husbands and children enough; but daughters, by conforming to the idealized housewife image, could succeed where their mothers had failed.[77]

> The feminine mystique permits, even encourages, women to ignore the question of their identity. The mystique says they can answer the question "Who am I?" by saying "Tom's wife . . . Mary's mother."[78]

The identity problem of women was

> a stunting or evasion of growth that is perpetuated by the feminine mystique. . . . Our culture does not permit women to accept or gratify their basic need to grow and fulfill their potentialities as human beings, a need which is not solely defined by their sexual role.[79]

The housewife was the only positive role model with whom girls growing up had any personal contact. Career women, as an alternative example, were pitied and stigmatized.[80] Against this backdrop, the images that streamed forth from the media provided no substitute models either:

> The public image, in the magazines and television commercials, is designed to sell washing machines, cake mixes, deodorants, detergents, rejuvenating face creams, hair tints, but the power of that image . . . comes from this: American women no longer know who they are. They are sorely in need of a new image to help them find their identity. As the motivational researchers keep telling the advertisers, American women are so

> unsure of who they should be that they look to this glossy public image to decide every detail of their lives. They look for the image they will no longer take from their mothers.[81]

Moreover, this model was ideally suited to selling purposes:

> The perpetuation of housewifery, the growth of the feminine mystique, makes sense (and dollars) when one realizes that women are the chief customers of American business. Somehow, somewhere, someone must have figured out that women will buy more things if they are kept in the underused, nameless-yearning, energy-to-get-rid-of state of being housewives.[82]

According to Friedan, other sectors of the society that were major forces shaping women's attitudes, failed to recognize this need for an independent identity felt by so many women. Educators, social scientists, and clinicians, instead, helped perpetuate the feminine mystique, mainly because they shared the assumption that women's lives were biologically determined. Therefore, the role of wife, mother, and housewife was the one most consistent with a women's nature. Granting undue importance to other types of roles would produce mental and physical maladjustments, neglect of children, and dysfunctions in the society's division of labor.[83]

Friedan further observed that as the feminine mystique spread, the proportion of American women working outside the home was increasing. Two-thirds were still housewives, but it was obvious that the media images did not reflect the expanding female labor force. One reason she offered for this discrepancy was that the housewife image was a creation of men. Using popular magazines as an

example, Friedan pointed out that before World War II women had participated more in producing the content of magazines than they did afterwards. The images of women in magazines had been more varied, and non-fiction articles had presented more serious discussion to women readers than those of the 1950's. But as young men returned from the war older women writers were forced out of the field and younger women were not going into writing and editing. The new images were those of men who had gone off to war and dreamed about home and a cozy domestic life. Women on the staffs of magazines serving housewives carried out the dictates of male superiors, who did not believe women had the capacity to think about abstract ideas or serious subjects.[84]

Another reason was that marketing strategies exploited the feminine mystique. Promoting an image of the "true housewife," who took pride and satisfaction in maintaining a picture-book home, was more profitable than trying to attract a minority of working women or women with outside interests. Sales pitches took into account the discontent of women and urged them to use the mass market products to deal with their problems. Labor saving products would free women to be creative; but using X Mix in twelve different ways was the way to express talent. Using the right cleaning products would help her achieve status, move her into the world of modern science, and demonstrate the expertise of a "professional." All this would elevate

housework to "a matter of knowledge and skill, rather than . . . unremitting effort."[85] New cleaning appliances or products were marketed so as to offer economic security and luxury--to feel like a queen. The advertisers avoided mentioning that the pie mix might allow more time for an interest such as astronomy, because that would take women out of the kitchen. Going to the department store to buy more products was a better way to go out into the world. The endless round of housework was something for sellers to capitalize upon: make women feel guilty about dirt so they would use more products. At the same time, however, they stressed the joy, spiritual rewards, and social recognition that would result if the seller's advice were followed.[86]

In sum, Friedan states her case against the media:

> The manipulators and their clients in American business can hardly be accused of creating the feminine mystique. But they are the most powerful of its perpetrators; it is their millions which blanket the land with persuasive images, flattering the American housewife, diverting her guilt and disguising her growing sense of emptiness. They have done this so successfully . . . that an observer of the American scene today accepts as fact that the great majority of American women have no ambition other than to be housewives. If they are not solely responsible for sending women home, they are surely responsible for keeping them there. Their unremitting harangue is hard to escape in this day of mass communications; they have seared the feminine mystique deep into every woman's mind, and into the minds of her husband, her children, her neighbors. They have made it part of the fabric of her everyday life.[87]

In this manner Betty Friedan helped to formulate an ideology about the mass media images of women that later

would become a guiding force of the women's movement, when Friedan later assumed the leadership role of the National Organization for Women which was at the forefront of the women's movement.

Belief that Images Impede Equality

Other feminists continued to speak out against the media images of women. To illustrate, in 1968 feminists demonstrating against the annual television event, "The Miss America Pageant," said they were protesting "the degrading, mindless, boob-girlie symbol" that was a gimmick to sell sponsor's products.[88] Another radical feminist said there was a need to "demystify the myth of women," and to recognize the "domestic imperialism of consumption" that cripples human beings, especially women who are the "consumate products of this process."[89]

Alice Embree further described how media images discourage initiative and autonomy among women, arguing that the communications technology was used to exploit all types of people, but especially women. Repeating Friedan's criticism, she pointed out that media images of women were designed to create desires and needs which can be satisfied only by using more of the products of the mass market. The media channel women into "routinized consumption patterns" instead of helping them to find more life-fulfilling roles. The theme of media messages aimed at the female audience carried a subliminal message of "containment and

control," as when

> feelings, dirt, hair must be controlled. The underlying message is one of . . . self-imposed passivity. The mass-media-created woman must have a fragmented grip on reality, must view herself not as the controller of the technology surrounding her, but as the one controlled. . . . Her thoughts must be in terms of commodity. She must be the object, not the subject, of her world.[90]

Further, women are doubly used when portrayed as sexual objects to sell products to the mass market. The depersonalized commercial images of women come to degrade the general image of women held by the society and by women themselves. Like the earlier critics of black images, Embree thought that the mass media could better serve human needs. It did not have to relegate women to subordinate, passive roles as consumers.[91]

By the 1970's the concern about media images of women had expanded beyond what advertisers put forth. The whole range of women's portrayals mattered, because they reaffirmed patterns of discrimination and sex role segregation feminists were trying to eliminate from the society.

The belief that television images of women had a detrimental impact on society was formally documented in 1972 in NOW's petition before the FCC to deny the license application of WABC-TV in New York:

> Much of the discrimination women face stems from unfair and highly prejudicial stereotypes which are force-fed in a daily barrage by radio and television to millions of men, women and children. According to television's stereotypical image, women function

> almost exclusively in a single, classic role; as wives, mothers and housewives. In addition, they are often portrayed as frivolous, flighty, undependable, over-emotional, childish, and generally in need of masculine guidance.[92]

NOW's criticism of WABC-TV extended to the other two major network's stations and the other commercial stations in the New York Area. Making this station their target was largely a random choice. Except for the limited resources of the organization, similar challenges might have been directed against the other New York stations renewing licenses at the same time.[93]

Citing statistical sources that indicated more than half of all adult women work outside the home, and that in the New York metropolitan area over 40 percent of the work force was female, NOW's petition charged that WABC-TV nevertheless "consistently presented the view that the proper and predominant role of women in American society is in the home, and that women function and ought to function primarily as wives, mothers and housewives."[94] The station did this by "showing women primarily in domestic family related roles" and by "characterizing women in ways which reinforce commonly-held stereotypes about women as a class."[95]

The petition catalogued examples of stereotyping derived from monitoring television programs: In soap opera, few characters worked outside the home, and when they did, it was in traditional female occupations. In game and quiz

shows successful women contestants won home applicances while men received recreational items. The dialogue of dramatic programs explicitly stated men were breadwinners and women housewives, and that pregnancy and motherhood were important, desirable, and necessary for a full, rich life as a woman. Domestic tasks were rigidly patterned in sex-segregated roles, as when women were shown physically serving men's needs. Women were portrayed as physically attractive, but dependent on men and incapable of filling positions of independence and authority outside the home. They gained approval by doing domestic tasks, and it was male voices that advised women on products, provided information, and expressed approval. Occasionally, if women were shown to be intelligent and achieving outside the home, they were criticized as unfeminine. Monitoring of local and network news found these programs were dominated by male anchormen and reporters, and pleasantries exchanged among the male news staff, visible on-camera, included remarks and laughter disparaging and insulting to women.[96]

The petition further argued that stereotyped

> programming of this kind cannot help but mold society's attitudes toward women. Based on what they see, WABC-TV viewers will believe, for example, that all women are pregnant housewives--although fifty percent of all adult women work outside the home. They will believe women work to catch a man and can be paid low wages--although two-thirds of women work to support their families. They will believe women are emotional, childlike, sexy and

> irresponsible--although generalizations about women as a class are no more valid than similar generalizations about Blacks.[97]

The petition continued, that reforms achieved in the portrayal of blacks were still being sought by women:

> Media stereotypes about minority groups have largely disappeared. WABC-TV, like other stations, has abandoned the "Amos 'n' Andy" image. It would never call Black leaders "boy" or snicker about the civil rights movement. Nor would it portray Black men exclusively as porters, waiters and song-and-dance men. Women should be accorded similar unbiased treatment.[98]

Such stereotyping, intolerable if about blacks or any other minority group, is just as damaging to women.

> Women are working hard to overcome barriers against them in employment and other areas. By programming as it does, WABC-TV reinforces those barriers, perpetuates invidious sex-based discrimination, and does a major disservice to its broadcast community as a whole.[99]

Other Minorities' Concerns

Other minorities voiced concerns about television images depicting their groups. In the 1950's old Hollywood movies that stereotyped Native Americans as blood-thirsty savages and Asian Americans as menials, war mongerers, or exotic characters, came to be a substantive part of television programming, which stimulated complaints from organizations representing these groups.[100] Television programming itself came to be similarly criticized. By 1961 several Italian-American Congressmen conferred with network officials, protesting that the "Untouchables" as a derogatory representation of Italian-Americans.[101] However,

in these early years of the decade, blacks were the most vocal about media images, but by 1968 other ethnic group organizations had joined the protest: Polish-American groups together with those of Italian-Americans announced they would ask Congress for laws enabling the FCC to enforce rules against insulting portrayals of national, racial, or religious groups.[102] A spokesman for the National Congress of American Indians declared "that the depiction of Indians on the television screen caused them serious economic problems and loss of self-esteem."[103] The Mexican-American Anti-Defamation Committee organized a program to improve the Mexican-American image, and one of their first campaigns was "to abolish the demeaning and degrading stereotypes in commercials," such as the Frito Bandito character being shown as a lazy, shiftless, guitar playing type.[104] Continuing their protest, in 1969 this group claimed they were "defamed parties" because of the commercial.[105]

Finally, in 1977, the images of all minorities in network television were the subject of a report published by the United States Civil Rights Commission. As a study sponsored by the CRC had found stereotyped treatment prevalent in network programming, the report concluded that this was an "industry-wide problem" in need of an "industry-wide remedy," and recommended that the FCC undertake an inquiry and "explore ways to require that network programming serve all members of the viewing public."[106] In news

departments, a need to improve training and placement opportunities in decision-making positions was viewed as "critical to the development of a broader and more varied concept of what constitutes news."[107] Because relatively few racial or ethnic minority or female correspondents appeared in network newscasts, or rarely were minority activities and achievements reported, this indicated to the society that minorities were considered insignificant and unimportant.[108]

All this makes clear that numerous groups shared the belief that the long standing use of negative stereotypes and the absence of minority images in television was harmful to their groups and changing to positive types of images would benefit them. This belief set the basis for taking action to get broadcasters to make the desired change. Television was a primary target, because this medium had become so popular in the society. Therefore, in this research, the intent is to study the manner in which broadcasters responded to minority efforts to persuade, pressure, and force them to comply with demands for new images.

Issues and Concerns to Be Explored

In studying the process of changing newscaster images, our primary interest is in how broadcasters responded to minority demands. Briefly, as they will be discussed below, several major areas of inquiry are the broadcaster-minority relationship, changes within television

news that relate to minority images, changes in the society at large that affected television news production in respect to minorities, and the manner in which the broadcaster acquiesced to minority demands and presented images of them in news shows.

The first task of this study is to describe the relationship between minority groups advocating change and the broadcasters. Smelser points out that the classic model of the stages of a social movement follows a sequence, beginning with a preliminary state of unrest, building up to a stage of collective excitement, then on to a stage of formal organization, and finally reaching a terminal point of institutionalization.[109] Efforts to change television images extended over a long period of time, and the broadcaster-minority relationship followed a slow developmental process. Several stages were evident, because minority strategies shifted as these groups acquired additional resources with which to pressure broadcasters, and the behavior of broadcasters underwent continuous modification as their experience with minorities increased and as they adapted their operations to the fluid conditions existing in television news and in the outside market. The first stage, in the early years of the 1960's was when television images became an issue, but before there was any viable legal means available to support the minority position. Nonetheless, token advances were achieved. The

mid and later years of the decade constitute a second stage, when legislation was passed and government agencies were set up to insure equal employment. The third stage occurred in the 1970's. By that time substantial changes had been made in television images and broadcasters had gained experience in presenting minorities in news shows, but minorities, particularly women, continued to strive for still better representation on the television screen. In these different phases we will examine the broadcaster's response to minority actions, particularly how broadcasters perceived meeting minority demands would affect their interests and what they did.

Another aspect of this study relates to structural factors. Minorities, particularly women, have long functioned as a latent labor pool drawn upon only when manpower shortages occur. Hiestand has noted, however, that besides the growth of a field, increases in the employment of minorities also reflect the internal changes in the field.[110] Throughout the period when minorities were being introduced into news shows, television news was evolving new forms--expanded programming time, larger news staffs, improved technology, wider coverage, and new formats for presenting news--which created a fluid structural context in which to initiate change. As the conditions of broadcasting changed so did the values and practices of broadcasters. For that reason, another objective in this study is to

explore the implications for minorities that resulted from the trends in television news. What factors encouraged broadcasters to employ minorities? What emerging needs of the broadcaster could be met by the minority newscasters? The intent is to examine how television news, as an expanding industry, could open its doors to minorities.

There were significant forces of change occurring in the society at large which are to be taken into account as our third objective. Television images of minorities changed while numerous social movements were taking place in the society, which, no doubt, influenced audience attitudes towards minorities, and consequently the kinds of appeals broadcasters might use to attract viewers. Government, through legislation, court decisions, and agencies oriented to eliminating discrimination, gave support to minority efforts, and these changed the conditions under which broadcasters could conduct their businesses.

Economic factors are still another important aspect to be examined, such as the significance of black purchasing power or the costs of affirmative action suits. Several underlying questions guide this part of our inquiry: How could broadcasters benefit by presenting minority newscasters on their news shows? How were broadcasters innovative in exploiting the changing market situation? The aim here is to explore the broadcaster's response to minority demands as it was affected by the changing social

and economic milieu.

Still another objective in this study is to examine how broadcasters actually incorporated minority images into television news shows. We will consider adjustments made to accommodate minorities, the value of minorities to news shows, and the emerging attitudes and practices of broadcasters affecting minority newscasters. The objective here is to examine how the broadcaster has complied with minority demands to change television images and consider the continuing concerns of minority newscasters.

Finally, then, the purpose of this study is to provide some information about the employment of minorities in one of society's mainstream institutions. We will attempt to explain the shift in broadcaster perceptions, attitudes, and policies from a position that rejected minorities from employment as newscasters to eventually accepting them in news shows in a routine manner. Further, Hiestand, in studying minority emplovemnt, found "that minority groups differ from one another in the way their employment opportunities respond to changes in occupational fields. Each minority is unique, and generalizations that apply to one may not apply to others."[111] Therefore, an additional facet of the institutionalization of minority images into television news to be explored is the relationship between different types of newscasters employed in television news. The last step in this research is to

summarize the findings and present the conclusions.

Objectives

To summarize, the purpose of this study is to analyze the integration process as it relates to the images projected by television newscasters, a process in which a major social institution, television news, acquiesced to changes sought by the activists of social movements. Based on the discussion above, the specific objectives are the following:

- To examine the developing relationship between broadcasters and those minority groups advocating change in the images of television newscasters, focusing on the assets and liabilities that would ensue to the broadcaster presenting minorities in news programming.

- To explore the changing internal conditions of the television news industry and their implications for presenting minorities in news shows.

- To identify forces in the society that affected broadcaster attitudes and practices towards including minorities in news programming.

- To determine to what extent broadcasters actually comply with minority demands to integrate the images of television newscasters.

- To study factors and conditions under which a major institution of the society accepts and institutes change sought by social movements.

The next chapter presents the over-all framework for this study and a description of the methods used.

Footnotes

[1]Newscasters are those who convey the messages of news programs. Their duties vary considerably, from simply reading wire copy to doing one's own investigation, writing news reports, and presenting editorials. I. E. Fang, Television News (New York: Hastings House, Publs., 1972), pp. 57, 59, 114.

[2]The Black Movement refers to the actions taken by and in behalf of blacks beginning in the early 1950's with the Supreme Court decision to desegrate schools, and includes the civil rights movement, in which bus boycotts, freedom rides, sit-ins, and marchs, were used as strategies to gain equal voting rights and the desegregation of public places. In addition, we would include the drive, principally by blacks, to gain equal employment and the disruptions in urban ghettoes in the 1960's that brought problems of blacks to the attention of all Americans.

[3]In this study "minorities" refers to women as well as racial or ethnic minorities. See Helen Meyer Hacker, "Women as a Minority Group," Social Forces, (October, 1951), pp. 60-69.

[4]Frank Wolf, Television Programming for News and Public Affairs (New York: Praeger Publs., 1972), p. 8; Sidney Head, Broadcasting in America, (2nd ed.; New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972), p. 490.

[5]Erik Barnouw, The Image Empire: Vol. III: A History of Broadcasting in the United States, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 34-35.

[6]Ratings are measures of the number of households that tune in to television programs and are used to determine the cost of television time. See Head, pp. 296-297.

[7]Fang, p. 117.

[8]Richard R. Cole and Donald Lewis Shaw, "'Powerful' Verbs and 'Body Language': Does the Reader Notice?", Journalism Quarterly, (Spring, 1974), p. 66.

[9]Roby Paul Madsen, The Impact of Film, (New York: Macmillan Publ. Co., 1973), pp. 5-6.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Herschel Shosteck, "Factors Influencing Appeal of TV News Personalities," Journal of Broadcasting, (Winter,

1973-74), p. 70; William A, Wood, Electronic Journalism, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 7.

[12]Shosteck, p. 70.

[13]Ibid., p. 67; Jack Gould, "TV: Changing News Face," New York Times, Aug. 3, 1970, p. 63.

[14]John R. Rider, Ph. D., The Student Journalist and Broadcasting, (New York: Richards Rosen Press, Inc., 1968), p. 90; Wood, pp. 41-42.

[15]The newscaster who anchors becomes a frame for a news show, greeting the audience at the beginning and bidding them goodbye at the end. During the newscast he serves several functions. Besides delivering news reports, he introduces reporters in the studio, film reports, and breaks for commercials. An anchorperson is expected to be able to ad lib when unexpected interruptions occur in the sequence of items comprising a news program, such as when the sound track of a film report fails or news bulletins about a developing event are inserted into a newscast after it has gone on the air.

[16]Martin Mayer, About Television, (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), p. 202.

[17]Robert T. Bower, Television and the Public, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973), pp. 110-116; Dennis T. Lowery, "Greshan's Law and Network TV News Selection," Journal of Broadcasting, (Fall, 1971), p. 397; Byron Shafer and Richard Larson, "Did TV Create the 'Social Issue'?" Columbia Journalism Review, (Sept./Oct., 1972), pp. 12-15.

[18]Les Brown, "Two Anchormen Hired by WABC-TV," New York Times, June 11, 1975,p. 87.

[19]Bob Williams, "Ch. 2 News Lands on Top, but Don't Expect a Laugh," New York Post, June 10, 1977, p. 67.

[20]Shosteck, pp. 63, 71.

[21]As example, see New York Post, Sept. 27, 1977, p. 49; New York Times, Nov. 24, 1976, p. 66, Oct. 19, 1977, p. C24, Jan. 21, 1978, p.38.

[22]Wood, pp. 145-146; Mayer, p. 173; Christopher H. Sterling, "Some Basic Limitations in Mass News," in David J Leroy and Christopher H. Sterling, Mass News: Practices, Controversies and Alternatives, (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Printice-Hall, Inc., 1973), pp. 70-79.

[23]Helen MacGill Hughes, News and the Human interest Story, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940), pp. 8-15, 18; Robert E. Park, "Introduction," Ibid., p. xiii.

[24]Wood, p. 7.

[25]Fang, p. 117.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Charles R. Wright, Mass Communication: A Sociological Perspective, 2nd ed., (New York: Random House, 1975), p. 127.

[28]Fang, pp. 118-119.

[29]Wood, pp. 111-112.

[30]Ibid., p. 118.

[31]Meyer cites the Pilkington Committee Report in Britain, p. 201.

[32]Judy Klemesrud, "What to Wear Is Special Problem for Women on Television," New York Times, Feb. 9, 1970, p. 43.

[33]Wright, p. 123.

[34]Shosteck, pp. 63, 71.

[35]In an interview, a television reporter originally from the South said that when she first looked for employment in New York, she was continually turned down because of her accent which was regarded as inappropriate for New York audiences. After Jimmy Carter was elected, however, a Southern accent became more acceptable and she was hired by a New York station. She was then given voice lessons and urged to give up her accent.

[36]Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Kerner Report), Otto Kerner, Chairman, (Wash., D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, March 1, 1968), pp. 207, 211-212.

[37]Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Robert K. Merton, "Mass Communication, Popular Taste, and Organized Social Action," in Mass Culture, Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White, eds., (New York: Free Press, 1957), pp. 461-462.

[38]Wright, p. 127.

[39]Lazarsfeld and Merton, p. 462.

[40]In an interview a television news producer said that presenting women in news shows provided a showcase for the station in respect to its policy to employ women.

[41]George Eaton Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities, 4th ed., (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), p. 645.

[42]Ibid., 3rd ed., p. 479.

[43]Melba Tolliver, quoted in M. L. Stein, Blacks in Communications, (New York: Julian Messner, 1972), pp. 118-119.

[44]Neil J. Smelser, Theory of collective Behavior, (New York: Free Press, 1962), pp.50-51,270-71.

[45]C. Wendell King, Social Movements in the United States, (New York: Random House, 1968), pp. 30-33; Hans Toch, The Social Psychology of Social Movements, (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1965), pp. 17-23.

[46]Although media images had already become an issue, in 1963 the NAACP formally announced a national campaign to take measures against the practices of Hollywood and TV. Craft and actors' unions, charged with having too few Negro members, were also targets of this campaign. In the actors' union, however, getting an acting job entitled one to union membership. See Simpson and Yinger, 3rd ed., p. 485; George Gent, "Church Protests Bias by Stations," New York Times, April 25, 1967, p. 86.

[47]William B. Monroe, Jr., "Television: The Chosen Instrument of the Revolution," in Paul L. Fisher and Ralph L. Lowenstein, Race and the News Media, (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1967), p. 89.

[48]Robert K. Baker and Sandra J. Ball, Mass Media and Violence, Vol. XI: Report to the National Commission on the Causes of Violence, (Wash., D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, Nov. 1969), p. 49.

[49]William L. Rivers and Wilbur Schramm, Responsibility in Mass Communication, (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), p. 212.

[50]Barnouw, Vol. II, pp. 289-290.

[51]Jack Gould, "The Negro Actor in TV," New York Times, June 10, 1962, Sec. II, p. 17.

[52]Barnouw, Vol. III, p. 33.

[53]Marilyn Diane Fife, "Black Image in American TV: The First Two Decades," The Black Scholar, (November, 1974), pp. 9-10.

[54]Barnouw, Vol. III, pp. 35-36.

[55]Leonard C. Archer, Ph. D., Black Images in the American Theatre, (Brooklyn, New York: Pageant-Poseidon, Ltd., 1973), p. 260.

[56]"NAACP Asks FCC to Investigate Bias in Staffing for TV Commercial Spots," Advertising Age, Aug. 28, 1967, pp. 3, 240.

[57]Barnouw, Vol. II, pp. 289-290.

[58]Baker and Ball, pp. 147-148.

[59]Richard F. Shepard, "Series Weighed for Top Artists," New York Times, March 7, 1962, p. 71.

[60]New York Times, May 18, 1962, p.63.

[61]Robert Lewis Shayon, "TV and Radio," Saturday Review, Nov. 24, 1962 p. 25.

[62]Barbara Ann Teer, "The Black Woman: She Does Exist," New York Times, May 14, 1967, Sec. II, p. 15.

[63]Lawrence Plotkin, "Report of the Television Monitoring Survey on the Frequency of Appearance of Negroes," (New York: Report for the Committee on Integration, New York Society for Ethical Culture, April, 1962), p. 4.

[64]Peter Bart, "Advertising: Negro Market Stirring Interest," New York Times, Sept. 11, 1963, p. 51.

[65]Murray Schumach, "NAACP Attacks Movie-TV Unions," New York Times, July 19, 1963, p. 11, and June 30, 1963, p. 5; "NAACP Asks FCC to Investigate Bias in Staffing for TV Commercial Spots," Advertising Age, Aug. 28, 1967, pp. 3, 240.

[66]Peter Bart, "Advertising: Use of Negro Models Widening," New York Times, June 13, 1963, p. 41.

[67]George Dugan, "Jesuits to Seek Negro Students," New York Times, Dec. 14, 1963, p. 16.

[68]Kerner Report, pp. 210-211.

[69]Baker and Ball, pp.44, 51-52, 153, 161, 179.

[70]Ibid., p. 61.

[71]Ibid., pp. 179-180.

[72]Betty Friedan, The Feminine Mystique, (New York: Dell Publ. Co., 1970 (1963)), p. 14.

[73]Ibid., p. 24.

[74]Ibid., p. 19.

[75]Ibid., p. 62.

[76]Ibid., p. 65.

[77]Ibid.

[78]Ibid., p. 64.

[79]Ibid., p. 69.

[80]Ibid., p. 67.

[81]Ibid., pp. 64-65.

[82]Ibid., p. 197.

[83]Ibid., pp. 95-196.

[84]Ibid., pp. 41-48.

[85]Ibid., p.206.

[86]Ibid., pp. 199-218.

[87]Ibid., pp. 218-219.

[88]Peter Babcox, "Meet the Women of the Revolution, 1969," New York Times Magazine, Feb. 9, 1969, VI, p. 34.

[89]Ibid., p. 85.

[90]Alice Embree, "Madison Avenue Brainwashing--the Facts," in Robin Morgan, ed., Sisterhood Is Powerful, (New York: Vintage Books, 1970), p. 191.

[91]Ibid., pp. 184-190.

[92]NOW, "Petition to Deny" the license application of the American Broadcasting Co., before the Federal

Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., 1973.

[93]Ibid., p. 77.

[94]Ibid.

[95]Ibid., pp. 77-94.

[96]Ibid., p. 94.

[97]Ibid., p. 95.

[98]Ibid.

[99]This was explained during a discussion at the meeting of the Committee on the Image of Women in the Media, New York Chapter of the National Organization for Women, Jan. 11, 1978.

[100]Brown, "Ethnic Pressures Are Effective in Barring 'Offensive' TV Films," New York Times, Nov. 28, 1973, p. 90.

[101]Broadcasting, March 13, 1961, p. 40.

[102]"Ethnic Groups Seek Ban of Slurs on TV," New York Times, July, 1968, p. 62.

[103]Robert E. Dallos, "American Indian Group Accuses Several Media of Discrimination," New York Times, March 22, 1968, p. 94.

[104]Broadcasting, Sept. 23, 1968, p. 32.

[105]Ibid., Dec. 15, 1969, p. 37.

[106]Window Dressing on the Set, A Report of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, August 1977), p. 150.

[107]Ibid.

[108]Ibid., p. 54-55.

[109]Smelser, p. 18.

[110]Dale L. Hiestand, Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities for Minorities, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), p.34.

[111]Ibid., pp. 109-110.

CHAPTER II

SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

Sociological Theory

A review of the literature indicates that our study touches on aspects of social change and mass communications theory where there is still need for further study.

Social Change

Even though social change is a major focus of academic sociology theory, certain gaps in this knowledge remain. Foremost contributors to the discipline, Marx, Weber, Veblen, were concerned with long range trends and undirected developments, but "the study of social change through collective action has long been one of the great terra incognita of sociology."[1] Following the unrest of recent years and nationalist movements of the Third World, collective action, in which human purposes are pursued through deliberate design and organization, has gained new attention from social scientists. Most studies of social movements or revolutions follow the progress of coalescing groups pushing towards desired goals, but give no more than minimal attention to groups towards whom these efforts are directed or their responses to such efforts.[2] In the study

of the assimilation and acceptance of social change, except for the work of very few theorists, "almost everything remains to be done to develop our understanding of this topic."[3]

Our research, though concerned with change deliberately sought by groups active in the Black Movement and the Women's Liberation Movement,[4] will focus on the broadcaster who adopts new practices in hiring minorities and projecting their images in television. The intent is to examine the acceptance of social change and the institutionalization of new behavior patterns into existing social structures.

Mass Communications

The great popularity of television seems to have stimulated a new interest among social scientists in mass communications.[5] The thrust of mass communications research is usually in the following areas: the communicator, the content of the message, the channel of communication, the characteristics of the audience that is reached, and the effects of the message on the audience.[6] Recent research tends to be one-sided, concentrating largely on the "effects" on audiences.[7] Halloran has proposed that communicators be given more attention in terms of their relationships and affiliations.[8] In suggesting new directions for study in mass communications, McQuail directs attention to the complex patterns of interaction and interdependence between individuals in a communication

situation. He specifically points to the role of the communicator and "the shaping of mass communication content by social values, norms and societal needs" as areas of the communications situation in need of investigation, especially in broadcasting.[9] The statement of our problem conforms to these recommendations, requiring an examination of those factors in the communicator's situation that influence his response to the demands of social movements and societal change.

A number of studies of mass communicators in the print media indicate that organizational needs, values, and relations affect the content of mass media messages. Breed found that writers and reporters informally complied with the policies of the newspaper publisher, because of their subordinate status, their feelings of obligation and esteem for those in authority, their desire for career success, and the pleasant relations they had within the group in which they worked.[10] According to White, the newspaper editor functions as a representative of his culture, relying on subjective judgments and professional experience in determining what news to publish.[11] Gieber, studying wire editors, reported they were task oriented. Organizational goals, such as production deadlines and bureaucratic routines, interpersonal relations within the newsroom, and collaboration with news sources were foremost factors determining the selection of news.[12] Tuchman demonstrated

that the rituals of writing news reports were a mechanism protecting publishers from libel suits.[13]

Analyses of television communicators also indicate organizational factors that are important in shaping their messages. An example, one publicly denounced by Fred Friendly, was CBS's decision to keep entertainment programs on the air during the Senate hearings on Vietman.[14] Gans found that news reports reflected the middle class values and attitudes of news personnel, largely because this occupation requires skills that are mainly those of middle class people.[15] Muriel Cantor's study of Hollywood television producers reported that relations with colleagues and co-workers, groups associated with the bureaucratic structure of the networks, and the audience not only influenced but frequently placed limitations upon the production and ultimate form of a television series.[16] Epstein's analysis of network news organizations showed they present distorted representations of the social reality because of corporate policy and budget limitations imposed upon news gathering activities.[17] In Britain Blumler found that organizational rules and policies, news sources, as well as producers' attitudes and anticipated reactions from the audience affected decision making in BBC's coverage of an election campaign.[18] Tom Burns described the unique conditions at BBC, reflecting the structure and poorly defined goals of the organization, that allowed television

producers to withdraw into a closed, isolated world of ideas and activity where they produced shows with an autonomy hardly affected by audience ratings or organizational needs.[19] In the present study, a primary concern is how the broadcaster, as a communicator modifying newscaster images, reconciles the pressures from social movements with the goals and needs of his organization.

Pertinent to our problem is the "reflection hypothesis," that the structure of media institutions is related to the social structure. Tuchman argues that American television reinforces the existing political and economic structures of the society and legitimates the status quo. All programming activities are oriented towards corporate profits. Tuchman supports her statement by analyzing the development and structure of the broadcasting industry, showing that the broadcasting industry is structured like American corporations, that television owners greatly influence regulators, and that economic motives are a factor pervading relations in media organizations and the programming they produce.[20] Molotch and Lester take the position that news is a constructed reality which makes news reporting political work. The selection of news avoids any challenge to the social order, except when scandals and unintended events become public issues. Normally news reports promote the interests of existing power elites.[21] Pye noted that communications

systems of developing countries reflect the transitional character of these societies, with modern mass media systems serving the modern, urban populations and traditional forms of communication serving the less westernized segments of these societies.[22] Siebert, Peterson, and Schramm showed that the mass media institutions of four different types of societies varied according to the political philosophies of each country.[23] In light of these findings, we would expect that if a significant change occurred in the society, especially one affecting political and economic structures, this would lead to corresponding changes in media institutions, in that they would assume the role of supporting the newly modified social order.

Content analyses of mass media messages contribute additional evidence of a relationship between media institutions and the social structure. Berelson and Salter, studying portrayals of magazine fiction characters, found minority characters were depicted as inferior, in a manner consistent with the society's stereotypes, and heroes in the stories represented members of the dominant group.[24] Lowenthal's classic study not only discovered that biographies of successful people in magazines reflected the economic structure of the society, but the kind of success these fictional characters experienced changed when a shift in the economy occurred--"heroes of production" were replaced by "heroes of consumption."[25] Martel and McCall

note that the locales and the ethnic diversity of fiction characters in magazine stories changed during different time periods in their study spanning the years 1890 to 1955. They could not assume a causal relationship between the changing social structure and the content of these stories, because readership changed at times and writers and editors would select their materials accordingly.[26] While these studies have been important contributions to the literature in that they show a relationship between some aspects of the social structure and the content of mass media messages, they do not examine the role of the communicator who is the link that makes the relationship possible.

Another line of inquiry in the literature relevant to our problem concerns the communicator's perceptions of audiences. Commercial broadcasters make considerable use of audience research to determine not only the size of viewing audiences but their character and tastes as well. Broadcasters are concerned with the impact of their messages on audiences, because this is a paramount factor in their competitive standing with one another. It is noteworthy that in the early experimental use of blacks in television programs and commercials, sponsors and advertisers encountered very little of the negative audience response they had feared.[27] In this context several studies should be noted: Pool and Shulman found that newspapermen thought of an imaginary audience, one thought to be significant

instead of the actual one, and this shaped their writing of news stories.[28] Bauer proposed that communications are usually directed to secondary audiences or reference groups in addition to the single manifest audience. Communicator's perceptions and the way they organize new information are also influenced by these secondary audiences.[29]

Comparing mass communication with person-to-person communication, McQuail explores the problem of the communicator's need to establish a relationship with his audience. In personal communication the immediate response of the audience allows adjustments to be made during the communication process; but the mass media are handicapped in identifying their audiences by a number of difficulties: audiences, especially in television, are heterogeneous; the communicators may have little in common with the audience; and the possibility for feedback is indirect and limited.[30]

Still other studies are concerned with the role of the mass media in social change, particularly in the modernization process. For example, Lerner shows that the movies and radio helped to change people's values and aspirations in Moslem countries.[31] Blumer's study of the influence of motion-pictures on teen-agers indicates that values may be influenced by the mass media and that film content may be imitiated in real life.[32] Himilweit's study of the effect of violence and crime in the mass media also

suggests that the attitudes of school children are influenced by mass media messages.[33] Such an approach as this, however, views the mass media as a stimulant to social change, and provides some evidence that gives credence to the belief shared by activists that reforming TV images wouls benefit minority groups. However, this is a model that is not consistent with our problem. Ours is one in which the television broadcaster responds to social change.

Our discussion thus far has attempted to place our problem in the overall context of social change and mass communications theory. In the following section we will indicate a theoretical orientation that is specific to the broadcaster's situation when confronted with demands from activist groups seeking to change television images.

Theoretical Orientation Specific to the Broadcaster's Situation

Social movements may be viewed as mechanisms that stimulate societies to make changes and modifications in the social order.[34] By the early 1960's the Black Movement was shifting its goals; earlier efforts had been directed towards achieving school desegregation and civil rights, but in the new phase the movement sought equal opportunities in employment. Similarly, later in the same decade the women's movement sought to end discrimination against their sex, and with a growing proportion of women in the work force, equal employment was one of their principal interests. The

diverse strategies used by groups and individuals striving towards these goals drew the attention of all sectors of the society. At the same time these movements, pointing out discrimination that violated the American belief in equality, provided an impetus to the rest of the society to reappraise and update established social practices. Changes advocated by social movements, however, are not always easily adopted; when movements confront the well entrenched behavior patterns or situations where there are divergent interests, resisting parties may hinder attempts to bring about any change.[35]

Although broadcasters were mainly concerned with the profitable operations of their businesses, they were hardly able to escape the repercussions of social movements as widespread as those of blacks and women in the 1960's. Since television is so pervasive a medium, it was a prime target for groups seeking public support. It was inevitable that such groups would attempt to pressure television broadcasters in order to make that medium a vehicle for their ends.

While social movements generate pressure on an established organization, such as the TV network or station, to alter its practices, the new demands may also serve as a catalyst that enables the organization to take advantage of new opportunities that become available because of changes in the society, using the rhetoric of a movement to justify

the introduction of modifications into its organizational practices. For example, when large numbers of minorities have migrated to a given viewing area and constitute a sizable proportion of the public buying advertised products, broadcasters may want to feature minority performers on the television screen to attract these viewers. Advertisers faced the problem of pitching commer-cials to the minority consumers in a way that would not alienate larger numbers of mainstream consumers. In such a case, a social movement may provide an impetus for breaking with tradition.

Guy E. Swanson analyzes a key aspect of the process of the acceptance of social change. In this process an established organization, pressured by groups making new demands,

> accedes only to demands that are irresistible or have predictable and acceptable consequences. It then tries to implement any change in the manner least disruptive to its existing routines. Explorations are required to determine the meaning of the changes that are proposed and the form of acceptance that is least disruptive.[36]

Until the implications of an issue are specified, the organization will resist pressures for change or express, at most, a generalized sympathy. Changes most readily acceptable are those least affecting basic organizational structures and values.[37]

Swanson further notes that bargaining is a characteristic way of dealing with pressure groups,[38] implying that power relations and compromise condition the

achievement of social movement goals. The government has traditionally been supportive of broadcasters' interests, but legislation such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the FCC's policy decision in 1968 to comply with this law gave activist groups access to governmental support for their ends and may have compelled television stations to accept their demands when perceived as undesirable. Demands viewed as useful to the broadcaster might be taken up voluntarily, even in the absence of strong pressure. Whatever the circumstances, the broadcaster is the ultimate implementor of such changes and new images of minorities appearing on the television screen must first pass through the gates of his organization.[39]

The present study, therefore, will be primarily concerned with the factors that stimulate broadcasters to accede to the demands of activists and the manner in which they either exploit social change or avoid disruptions in their operations.

Analytical Framework

Objectives

Our focus is on the broadcaster as a target of groups pressing for social change and the broadcaster's response to these demands. Substantively, the intent is to explore how demands for change may be useful or a disadvantage to the broadcaster. Since the employment of minorities in on-camera newscasting generally preceded their

hiring in off-camera positions,[40] it can be assumed that the visibility of minority group employees may be of value to broadcasters. In our inquiry we will seek to discover how broadcasters benefitted by instituting the changes advocated by a social movement as well as why they are often reluctant to employ and present minorities as newscasters.

Questions to be answered are as follows: How have the broadcaster's perceptions of minorities changed? As pressures from activist groups and other sources mounted, how did the broadcaster respond to their strategies? Under what conditions does the broadcaster accept social change affecting established business practices, and, conversely, when does he resist such change?

Substantive Focus

In light of the preceding discussion, two variables implicit in the broadcaster's response to social movements will constitute the broad elements of this analysis: first, there is the power relationship, or the capacity of activists to affect the conditions under which the broadcaster pursues his goals, and, second, there are the broadcaster's perceptions of how the proposed change will affect news ratings in the struggle for ever larger portions of the mass audience, an intensifying struggle as news becomes more lucrative.[41] From these dichotomies, the force of a social movement and the broadcaster's perceptions of its effects on the ratings, we constructed a paradigm of

broadcaster responses to social movements, as follows:

Broadcaster Responses to the Demands of a Social Movement

Effect Perceived by Broadcaster	Force of Social Movement: Strong	Force of Social Movement: Weak
Positive	Accepting (1)	Co-opting (3)
Negative	Conflicting (2)	Rejecting (4)

In the Accepting response (cell 1) it is assumed that the broadcaster under pressure will adopt the recommended changes. Because the movement is capable of producing considerable strength, it is likely to face a minimun of opposition from the broadcaster as the desired changes also benefit him. Trends that produce a social movement affect the market situation as well. Broadcasters, who like other businessman, whose profits and survival require meeting fluid market conditions with flexibility, are not averse to innovations offering better ratings. As a powerful movement probably has a strong basis of legitimacy and public support, its main strategy is to convince the broadcaster that there are alternative ways to conduct his affairs and make him aware of new market conditions.

The movement espousing change which the broadcaster perceives as having negative economic value, as when the broadcaster fears a change will result in lower program ratings, encounters a Conflicting response (cell 2), with the achievement of change reflecting the use of diverse strategies by the opposing parties. When movement groups actually compel the broadcaster to accept their demands, the broadcaster, who is the implementor of such change, is still able to manipulate, as far as conditions allow, the ultimate form in which the change is instituted in order to obtain the highest possible ratings.

The Co-opting response (cell 3) occurs when the ideas advanced by the activist groups, lacking sufficient force to impel change, are taken up voluntarily by the broadcaster to be used as competitive weapons in the ratings struggle.

The fourth catagory, the Rejecting response (cell 4), is produced by a weak social movement advocating changes that the broadcaster perceives as having no value. With nothing to force change, this allows a continuance of the status quo.

This typology is purely analytical and much over simplified; in a complex business organization, such as that of a television station, actual behavior may simultaneously include elements from several or all of these categories. A broadcaster must weigh a variety of factors when deciding to

place minority group members on-camera. These include the tastes and prejudices of sponsors and advertisers, audience ratings, regulatory obligations, ethics, and profits. For example, when a broadcaster believes his audience would respond favorably to minority newscasters, he may still comply with the wishes of sponsors hostile to the idea. In some programs the broadcaster may feel more free to experiment and initiate a new imagery depicting minorities than in others, depending upon how he perceives his business will be affected.

Leading Principles

In line with the discussion above, the following principles govern our research:

Decisions by broadcasters to present menbers of minority groups as newscasters are made only when considered useful to the economic goals of their companies. As profit-making is the primary aim of a commercial television company, all programming is intended to contribute to this end. If program content does not serve the profit motive directly, it must provide, at least, indirect value, such as a public relations function. Whenever program messages allow a competing broadcaster an advantage in the ratings, these messages do not serve the profit motive and efforts are made to modify or replace such programming.

Embodied in our first leading principle are several derived principles:

Broadcasters who willingly employ minority newscasters in compliance with the demands of a social movement do so because they perceive that these changes favor their businesses. Negative reactions would not be anticipated from sponsors, advertisers, or audiences. In addition, such change avoids bad publicity and possible license challenges from groups enjoying widespread support. Presenting new images of minority newscasters would be consistent with other changes occurring in the community. At times the rhetoric of a social movement may be a source of new ideas that are useful to the broadcaster for livening up program formats and attracting audiences.

Broadcasters who are confronted with a powerful social movement but resist hiring minorities as newscasters perceive negative consequences for their operations if minorities are placed in on-camera positions. Although forcefully pressured the broadcaster may resist any change in newscaster imagery, because he does not wish to lose either sponsors or viewers. He will employ minorities only if he feels pressures compel him to do so, and then he will present them in a manner that has the least negative impact upon his ratings.

When a weak social movement attempts to persuade a broadcaster who does not want to employ minority group memvers as newscasters, the changes sought by activists will not occur. The broadcaster is able to maintain the status

quo despite demands from social movements because they lack sufficient power to bring about the desired change.

Large, expanding television news organizations are more likely to integrate their newscaster staffs than stations with small, stable staffs. At this point, we would expect that large, expanding news staffs are better able to integrate than are small, stable ones. Staffs recruiting news personnel have a better opportunity to recruit minorities without jeopardizing those already employed. We would further speculate that the more prosperous broadcasting stations, which have more extensive news facilities and larger news departments,[42] would be better integrated than news staffs of less successful stations.

These principles will be discussed in a later chapter after the findings of this study have been presented.

Methodology

The first stimulus to studying the images of minorities in television arose from the day-to-day viewing of television shows during the 1960's. Whether in news or entertainment programs, it was obvious that minorities, mainly blacks at that time, were being introduced into a wider variety of television's roles. This was a phenomenon that attracted coverage in the print media; television critics discussed it in their columns and feature articles were written about minority group members who had come into

a limelight previously closed to them. The new television season in the fall of 1968 was hailed as one of progress for blacks. Afterwards, women became more and more visible as television reporters. When Barbara Walters was made a network anchorwoman, many viewed this as a breakthrough for women and speculated on how long it would be before the other networks would have women anchoring their news shows.

Still another factor suggested this was a topic worthy of sociological study. The depiction of minorities in television has been a troublesome matter to minority groups ever since television became a popular medium. The problem had been present in motion-pictures and radio. We have noted in Chapter I that the NAACP had sought to cut down on discriminatory broadcasting practices in the 1950's, but they had had little success. During the sixties, however, various activists critical of television's minority images began pressuring broadcasters. Early efforts were primarily in behalf of blacks and were elements of the Black Movement. In time, other racial and ethnic groups also sought to improve the way their people were depicted. When the women's movement developed, sex bias as well as racial bias in television became an issue. Newspapers and trade journals reported the activities and strategies of those who were attempting to change the images of minority groups on the air. This struggle was not easily resolved and continued over a number of years before any substantial

change was introduced. Although many minority group members believe that the desired goal, full equality on the television screen, is still to be realized, the improvement since 1960 is nonetheless dramatic.

As different types of groups participated in pressuring broadcasters to change their imeges, one has a further opportunity to observe the manner in which television, as a social institution, responds to various minorities simultaneously advocating change. Viewers in the nation's largest television market could not see members of racial minorities report news in 1960. Only two women who reported news on evening shows were visible on New York's TV screens. An ethnic identity noticeably different from the established stereotype was kept off the air. By the end of the decade, however, it was no longer a novelty to see women or minorities on news shows. Some had become popular TV personalities.

Racial, ethnic, and sex status became exploitable characteristics of newscasters, whose presence stations publicized as appeals to potential audiences. Here was a kind of social change that reflected a shift in the values and norms of one of the society's major institutions, commercial television. Minority performers, newscasters or actors, came to be idolized by a public that earlier had though them unsuited to their new roles. This shift in personnel offers us an opportunity to examine an occupation

in which integration has to some degree apparently been achieved. It provides an opportunity to examine how a major institution has acquiesced to the demands of a social movement and modified its policy and operations.

The concerns and motivations of broadcasters were crucial factors determining how they responded to such demands. We also wished to examine the manner in which broadcasters changed their practices. Was the broadcaster's acceptance conditional? How have they avoided making some of the changes sought by minorities? How did they use the new images to serve fundamental needs that earlier excluded minorities?

The answering of these questions took several steps. First, there was an intensive reading of printed materials and the frequent viewing of television news shows in order to become more familiar not only with the public images of newscasters but with television news generally. An enormous volume of literature has been published about television and a substantial part of it is about television news. Specific information and studies about minority newscasters or their images, however, is limited. Before the late 1960's almost nothing was published; but as issues concerning minorities became more controversial, articles and essays about this subject increased. By the 1970's women's images on television had become an important concern of feminists. Other types of information and criticism

about television news provided the background and insights relevant to our study. In fact, a wide variety of publications were helpful--scholarly journals, publications for journalists, trade journals of the televison and advertising industries, popular magazines, text books, newspapers, government publications and the unpublished reports and criticism of private organizations. Much desirable data about television news have been collected by market researchers, but these are usually provided as confidential information to clients and rarely become accessible to individual researchers or available in libraries.

The viewing of news shows served several purposes. It was a helpful complement to the reading of library materials, as it was possible to observe techniques described in the literature. One could observe who the minority newscasters were; and the credits following newscasts listed the names of people responsible for news programming added to the pool of suitable potential respondents. Further, by watching news shows it was possible to observe the social characteristics of the individuals who occupied different kinds of newscasting roles, such as anchorman or anchorwomen, specialized reporters, weather reporters, etc.

The next step was to do systematic research. That included first a historical study and then a comparative

analysis.

Historical Study

The historical study would allow me to develop several lines of inquiry important to this research. It would help me to reconstruct the sequence of events that constituted the process of transforming newscaster images, such as the efforts expended in behalf of minorities and the broadcaster's response. Once this chronology was documented, it could function as a framework within which other kinds of change affecting the newscaster's role could be examined.

The reconstruction of the chain of events leading to a new imagery of newscasters would also permit the discovery of the stages in this process. It was postulated that, as conditions changed, broadcasters actions would reflect the circumstances under which they hire and present minority newscasters.

The beginning year for which data would be collected was 1960, a time when newscasters who were members of minority groups were absent from television news programs in the New York Area and when very few women were employed to do this work. In the years ahead, television news was to undergo a major transformation aside from the images of newscasters--experiencing technological improvements, developing new styles for communicating news, and enjoying greater popularity. The period under study continued

through 1978, covering nearly two decades. One can not assume that the process of change being studied here has ended; on the contrary, it is quite evident, as will become clear in later chapters, that newscasting is still undergoing change.

A second task related to the historical study was to trace changes that occurred in the production of television news. Technological improvements have significantly altered the character of news programs. Color, video-tape, lightweight hand operated camera equipment, and the use of satelites have permitted a new elasticity in news coverage and shortened the time needed to get pictures before the viewers. In addition, in the past eighteen years dramatic events in American society have stimulated an increase in the air time devoted to news reports and an improvement in the quality of reporting. It is assumed that this expansion of television news has created additional needs for new skills and talent. Our objective here is to highlight the important developments in the production of television news and determine how they related to the broadcaster's need or willingness to present minorities as newscasters on news shows.

Another type of change relevant to our subject was the changing nature of intergroup relations in American society. We have assumed in this study that the evolving relationship between the races and ethnic groups and later

the sexes in the society would affect the receptiveness of television audiences to minority newscasters. In addition, it seemed likely that broadcasters would attempt to exploit the new social conditions of their market by developing appropriate appeals to help them to compete for ratings. In sum, our objective here was to examine social change occurring in the society and its influence on the role of the minority newscaster.

The final line of inquiry in the historical phases of this study had to do with governmental action taken in behalf of minorities. It was important to trace changes in government policy, the passage of new legislation, the creation of new administrative agencies to enforce new laws, the rulings made by regulatory agencies, court decisions, etc. Such changes altered the power relationship between minorities and broadcasters. Governmental action created new forces which minorities used in pressuring for their goals. We sought to determine how broadcasters perceived and responded to the new regulations and how this affected their attitudes and practices towards having minorities in their news shows.

Thus, the historical study allowed us to examine not only the chain of events that made up the process by which the collective images of newscasters were transformed, but also several chains of structural change having a bearing on the occupation of the newscaster. The latter included the

expansion of television news production and the changing social conditions which affected the audiences towards whom news programming was directed.

Comparative Analysis

A comparative analysis was made in order to approach our subject from a different perspective and to probe more deeply into the behavior of the broadcaster towards minority newscasters. The strategy in this part of our study was to seek information directly from minority television news reporters or from television officials who are responsible for the images of newscasters. It was believed that the latter would represent management's views towards the employment of minority newscasters. Data obtained from the minority newscasters would provide information with respect to station practices and to serve as a check against the information supplied by station representatives. Another objective in this part of our study was to compare the behavior patterns and characteristics of different stations. For this purpose additional factors were taken into account, such as the type of news show (local or network), the size of news staffs, and the amount of air time allocated to news shows, the competitive standing of a news show, etc. The intent here was to determine what conditions were conducive to the hiring of minority newscasters or were associated with lessened resistance to hiring minorities. Still another objective was to discover how broadcasters avoided

acceding to the demands of minority groups. How did they fend off hostile criticism and the pressure of activists?

Data Collection

Data for this study were collected from a variety of sources. Library materials were essential, but other kinds of information, data from interviews and observation of news shows, were equally important.

To reconstruct the chronology of change in newscaster images, the most reliable sources available were the news reports of daily and weekly periodicals, particularly newspapers and trade journals. Publications such as The New York Times, The Amsterdam News, Variety, Broadcasting, and Advertising Age were especially useful for this purpose, though numerous others were consulted as well. To avoid the bias of a particular publication, news items were sought in several publications. In reconstructing the process of change, interview data were less helpful than data taken from the print media, because respondents had difficulty recalling precisely when events in the past had occurred. Even individuals whose careers had been profoundly affected by the kind of change with which we were concerned became more vague as distance in time from the event increased. Ironically, had not the print media reported on the occurrences and trends in television news, this study would have been greatly handicapped, and probably impossible to do. If the tapes of television news shows had

been preserved and accessible, it is doubtful that they would have been as useful or as detailed in providing information as were the newspapers and trade journals. Certainly, tapes would not have furnished background discussion or reports on broadcasters' opinions and actions that affected what was ultimately presented on the air, which points to a major weakness of such sources. Whatever happened in television news that was not regarded as newsworthy by the print media is largely lost.

Other kinds of materials where helpful too. Documents and interviews supplied insights and information supplementing that of the periodicals. The trade journals were particularly useful for tracing changes in television news production. In their surveillance of the specialized broadcast environment, journals, such as Broadcasting, function to keep the industry abreast of the latest developments. For news producers, this might include information about new technological devices, successful formats used to report news, management policies of successful stations, articles about personalities, etc. Other publications, such as TV Guide, and newspapers which carry program listings, helped in determining the amount of air time given to news programming at various times. Other library sources contain information about audience behavior and attitudes, commentary on news shows and the people involved with television news. Thus, it was possible to trace developments in tele-

vision news production as they related to the employment of minority newscasters and their images in television.

Data needed to highlight the changing social conditions of American society and the actions taken by government were obtained from many kinds of sources. Both printed materials and the verbal reports of respondents provided factual information and insights about the broadcaster's behavior towards minority images.

In the comparative analysis one objective was to interview people who held key types of positions related to our subject. Television executives were sought out, because they could present management's views. Activists seeking change were a second type. It was assumed that their ideas were opposed to those of management. A third important category of respondents were the minority newscasters. We believed they could be informative in several ways. Changes affecting newscasting would be of interest to them, and so they would be alert to developments in their industry. As newscasters were in regular contact with news officials or station executives, they could be informative about the problems and behavior of television news executives. In reporting about their experiences, they would reveal much about the actual behavior in and policies of television news organizations. Informations from these different categories of people could be used as a check on the reliability of the data provided by any one individual or category.

This study was concerned with the commercial VHF stations serving the New York Area[43] which regularly scheduled evening news shows. Demands for integrating television images confronted these stations with problems that did not affect more specialized stations, because they were dependent upon attracting the mass audience and advertising revenues. Commercial UHF stations and cable TV in the New York Area often cater to special audiences. Public television does not share the profit motive of the commercial stations. The choice of evening news programs was based upon living patterns. Evening news is the heart of television news, bringing together reports of the day's affairs when most viewers are winding down their own work days. Although special events may draw larger audiences, for our purposes they do not occur with sufficient frequency to provide a systematic basis for study.

Our sample was intended to be representative of different positions and viewpoints on the issues concerning our problem. When beginning to assemble the sample it became apparent that a sample ideally including all who might influence newscaster images was not possible. Even attempting to obtain a quantitatively representative sample posed a problem. Selecting people according to the titles of their positions was not practical, because organizational patterns and responsibilities vary from one station to another. It also became evident that not everyone we wished

to contact would be available.

The names of possible respondents were acquired mainly by observing news shows and by using snowball techniques.[44] Newscasters' names are easily picked up when they are presented on news shows. Obvious minority group members and women were selected. respondents identified two newscasters who se minority statuses were not recognized. The credits run at the end of news programs identify people responsible for news production. Here the intention was to select a good representation of people in positions that enabled them to be knowledgable about decisions affecting newscaster images. Most of these people were white males. Snowball techniques were helpful in getting names difficult to obtain in the above manner and for filling out desired categories of respondents. People known personally and respondents helped to establish some contacts. Fifty-six requests for interviews were made of people in television and 44 (79 percent) were accepted. Twenty-five (81 percent) of 31 newscasters and 19 (76 percent) of 25 news, station, or network executives who were asked to participate in our study did so. Over four-fifths of our television respondents represented primarily local stations and local news. Greater efforts were directed towards obtaining interviews from TV personnel on the local level because information about local television is much more difficult to find than in the case of the networks, which are extensively

covered in the print media. Minority organizations were less cooperative and only representatives of the National Organization for Women were interviewed. When individual station or news executives could not be interviewed, they usually arranged for another person to substitute for them. Only one newscaster to whom several requests for an interview were sent did not respond in any way. Some were not willing to be interviewed, but the great majority were cooperative. A few were very encouraging, saying that a study such as this was indeed needed. In sum, the response of people in television news who were asked for interviews was extremely gratifying.

The response from activist organizations varied. Except for NOW, minority organizations were not cooperative. This seemed to be because individuals who had been active in pressuring broadcasters some years earlier were no longer available. Some had left the organizations contacted. In other cases, when these organizations were approached, they were reluctant to give out the names of suitable respondents. We could only speculate on why this happened. Perhaps it was that people working in such organizations are hard pressed for both time and funds, or they do not have the same commitment to maintaining good relations with the general public as do broadcasters. Women at NOW, however, were cooperative, opening their files and extending invitations to attend meetings of the Image of

Women in the Media Committee. It is also quite possible that the sex or ethnic status of the researcher was a determining factor. As a result, we have more specific detailed information on the inside process of pressuring and negotiation undertaken by NOW than we have for blacks. We believe, however, that the print media, particularly that oriented to black audiences and the trade literature informing broadcasters of black activism, helped to compensate for this deficiency. In addition, black leaders, more than feminist leaders, were often guest speakers at the organizational meetings of broadcasters and advertisers, and the discussion and arguments put forth in their speeches as well as commentary by others attending such affairs were reported in the print media. In addition, a well established black press reported on the relations of blacks with broadcasters. Feminist women lacked a public voice as well organized as that of blacks and so the coverage of women activists was less extensive. Despite the proliferation of feminist publications and the increased attention given to women's issues in the popular media, the efforts of women activists did not get the same day-to-day coverage as the activities of and for blacks. Another reason for this difference may have been that blacks and their supporters were forging new ways to pressure broadcasters, particularly during the sixties. Then when women took up similar issues, their newsworthiness dissipated. For example, it ceased to

be news that a citizens' group was monitoring the programming of a television station. Further, one of the major complaints of feminists about the mainstream press was that topics concerning women were generally overlooked. The women's periodicals with large circulations, as noted in Chapter I, were criticized by Friedan and other feminists as exploiters of women. An exception was Ms. Magazine which was published to promote the new views concerning women and succeeded in building up a substantial circulation.

The procedure for obtaining interviews was first to send a formal letter (see Appendix A) to the selected person and then to follow it up by calling several days later on the telephone. Sometimes the prospective respondents called upon receiving letters. For a good many, however, especially newscasters who spent much time in the field, numerous calls had to be made before they could be reached. Some would leave messages suggesting when it would be a good time to call. Calls were made as early as seven o'clock in the morning and as late as after midnight. Interviews similarly were scheduled over a wide range of hours during the day. The interviewing was conducted in several ways and in a variety of places. Of the 44 people who agreed to be respondents, 11 were interviewed on the telephone. One respondent would accept only a written questionnaire, which was promptly completed and returned. The remaining 32 respondents were personally interviewed,

and these meetings took place in news rooms, offices, meeting rooms, people's homes, restaurants, and the Graduate School of the City University of New York. Some interviews lasted close to three hours. The two shortest ones were barely fifteen minutes long, as they were interrupted and cut short. Two other interviews were interrupted and continued at a later time. Several people at NOW were seen repeatedly and, therefore, for a greater over-all length of time than were any of the other scheduled interviews. Generally, in-person interviews were at least an hour long and the telephone interviews averaged about a half hour.

The respondents were, of course, exceptionally articulate people. This was true even among those who were not professional communicators. It was not unusual for responses to one question to be fairly lengthy and to include information that was to have been asked in a later question. Moreover, the interviews were semi-structured and, at times, revealed information other than what the interview schedule intended to elicit. A copy of the interview schedule is in Appendix B. During telephone interviews brief notes were taken and immediately after completion of a call, the notes were rewritten in greater detail while recall was still fresh. At first notes were also taken during the personally conducted interviews, but it soon became apparent that using a tape recorder would be better. One newsman even complained when a recorder was not

used, because the only way he could be sure that his statements would be accurately remembered was if they were taped. News people, accustomed to working with tape recorders, are comfortable in the presence of one, probably more so than people of may other occupations.

Mobility tends to be high in the newscaster's occupation, even though a few stars tend to hold fairly stable positions. Several respondents went to jobs away from New York even before the period of interviewing ended, and a few made changes within the area. A succession of new minority reporters became evident on the television screen after interviewing was terminated. Credits at the ends of news shows also showed name changes suggesting that other news personnel also tend to be mobile.

In sum, the intent in this study is to examine the manner in which broadcasters came to accept minority newscasters on their news shows and to explore the factors in television and in the society that related to this change.

The next chapter begins our examination of the changes which resulted in transforming newscaster images.

Footnotes

[1]Joseph R. Gusfield, Protest, Reform, and Revolt, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970), p. vii.

[2]Ibid., pp. vii-viii, 5.

[3]Guy E. Swanson, Social Change, (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1971), p. 177.

[4]Examples are the NAACP and NOW.

[5]Herbert Gans, "The Famine in American Mass-Communications Research," American Journal of Sociology, (January, 1972), p. 697.

[6]This is based on the classic statement by Harold D. Lasswell:

Who
Says What
In Which Channel
To Whom
With What Effect?

See Wilber Schram, ed., Mass Communications, (Urbana, Ill., Univ. of Illinois Press, 1960), p. 117.

[7]Melvin L. De Fleur, Theories of Mass Communication, 2nd ed., (New York: David McKay Co., 1970), p. 155; J. D. Halloran, "Introduction," in P. Halmos (ed.), Sociological Review Monograph #13, p. 5.

[8]Halloran, pp. 5-6.

[9]Denis McQuail, Towards A Sociology of Mass Communications, (London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1969), pp. 58-194.

[10]Warren Breed, "Social Control in the News Room," in Schram, pp. 178-194.

[11]David Manning White, "The 'Gatekeeper': A Case Study in the Selection of News," in Lewis Anthony Dexter and David Manning White (eds.), People, Society, and Mass Communications, (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1964), pp. 160-171.

[12]Walter Gieber, "News Is What Newspapermen Make It," in Dexter and White, pp. 173-181.

[13]Gaye Tuckman, "Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity," American Journal of Sociology, (January, 1972), pp. 660-680.

[14]Fred W. Friendly, Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control. . . , (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), pp. xii,xxv.

[15]Herbert Gans, "How Well Does Television Present the News?" New York Times Magazine, Jan. 11, 1970, pp. 30-35, 38.

[16]Muriel G. Cantor, The Hollywood TV Producer, (New York: Basic Books, 1971).

[17]Edward Jay Epstein, News from Nowhere, (New York: Vintage Books, 1974).

[18]Jay G. Blumler, "Producers' Attitudes Towards Television Coverage of an Election Campaign: A Case Study," in Halmos, pp. 85-115.

[19]Tom Burns, "Public Service and Private World," in Halmos, pp. 53-73.

[20]Gaye Tuchman, The TV Establishment: Programming for Power and Profit, (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974), pp. 1-39.

[21]Harvey Molotch and Marilyn Lester, "Accidents, Scandals and Routines: Resources for Insurgent Methodology," in Tuchman, The TV Establishment: Programming for Power and Profit, pp. 53-65.

[22]Lucian W. Pye, Communications and Political Development, (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1963), p. 26.

[23]Fred S. Siebert, Theodore Peterson, Wilbur Schramm, Four Theories of the Press, (Urbana, Ill.: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1965).

[24]Bernard Berelson and Patricia J. Salter, "Majority and Minority Americans: An Analysis of Magazine Fiction," in Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White (eds.), Mass Culture, (New York: Free Press, 1957), pp. 235-250.

[25]Leo Lowenthal, "Biographies in Popular Magazines," in Paul Lazarsfeld and Frank Stanton (eds.), Radio Research 1942-43, (New York: Duell,Sloan and Pearce, 1944), pp. 235-250.

[26]Martin U. Martel and George J. McCall, "Reality and the Pleasure Principle: A Study of American Mass-Periodical Fiction (1890-1955)," in Dexter and White, pp. 312-315, 333.

A representative of the Association of National Advertisers, at a meeting of 200 members, reported that all who had used Negroes in advertising experienced no negative reaction and most received laudatory mail in considerable volume, Peter Bart, "Advertising: Airline Agency Changes Due," New York Times, Nov. 29, 1963, p. 62.

[28]Ithiel de Sola Pool and Irwin Shulman, "Newsmen's Fantasies, Audiences, and Newswriting," in Dexter and White, pp. 141-158.

[29]Raymond A. Bauer, "The Communicator and the Audience," in Dexter and White, pp. 125-139.

[30]Denis McQuail, "Uncertainty About the Audience and the Organization of Mass Communications," in Helmos, pp. 75-84.

[31]Daniel Lerner, The Passing of Traditional Society, (New York: Free Press, 1958).

Herbert Blumer, Movies and Conduct, (New York: Macmillan, 1933).

H. T. Himmelweit, A. Oppenheim, and P. Vince, Television and the Child, (London: Oxford University Press, 1958).

[34]Ron E. Roberts and Robert Marsh Kloss, Social Movements, (St. Louis: G. V. Mosby Co., 1974), pp. 10-20.

[35]Swanson, pp.104-109; Roberts and Kloss, pp. 10-20.

[36]Swanson, p. 114.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Kurt Lewin coined the term "gate-keeper' to describe the movement of something through a channel in which a series of decisions are made, each determining whether or not it goes on to the next gatekeeper, in "Frontiers in Group Dynamics," Human Relations Nov., 1947, p. 145.

[40]Tony Brown, Executive Producer of "Black Journal," during a panel discussion, "All About TV," WNYC-TV, Feb. 19, 1975.

[41]Marvin Barrett, (ed.), The Fifth Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism: Moments of Truth?, (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1975), p. 90.

[42]Wolf, p. 90.

[43]The VHF stations serving the New York Area with commercial television are WABC-TV, WCBS-TV, WNBC-TV, WNEW-TV, WPIX-TV, and WOR-TV. The New York Area includes up to twenty-two counties in four states in a radius surrounding the transmitters of these stations.

[44]In snowball sampling respondends suggest others who might be contacted as potential respondents.

CHAPTER III

CHANGES IN TELEVISION NEWS

Evening news shows underwent significant change during the period covered in our study. Although television licensees point to their news shows with pride as evidence that they are fulfilling the public service responsibility, news programming became an important profit tool for broadcasters, particularly local stations, during the sixties and seventies instead of merely an instrument of exchange for the right to use the air waves.

Television License Requirements

Every three years a television station must apply to the FCC to renew its license in order to continue using the air waves. At that time, the FCC reviews the licensee's past performance, checking if it has been broad-casting in the public interest. Stations present lengthy reports describing their service to the community and document their programming to show how they met this obligation. The first FCC statement issued in 1946, known as the "Blue Book," emphasized a need for sustaining programs, or programs that had no commercial sponsors. When the FCC revised its policy statement in 1960, the new "Blue Book" rejected the require-

ment for unsponsored broadcasting. Instead, fourteen categories of programming were specified as necessary to meet the public interest and needs, and the desires of the community. Besides news, other categories included weather reports, religious programs, sports, political broadcasts, public affairs programs, children's shows, entertainment, etc. By 1960 news had already gained some support from commercial sponsors, but the new FCC policy opened the way for broadcasters to treat news as programming to generate profits.[1] Other factors influenced the growth and development of television news. As the employment of minorities in newscasting is inextricably linked to newscaster images in this study, the intent in this chapter is to examine some of the changes that occurred in television news that affected the hiring of minorities and, consequently, the images of minority newscasters.

News in the Television Business

Television broadcasters have often looked upon meeting their public service responsibilities as a duty that was not easily performed except at considerable cost to themselves, mainly as write-offs against profits. Finding sponsors to bear some or all the costs of time and production for news, informational, or public affairs programming was, at first, difficult. Moreover, these problems have never been fully resolved. For example, the special news events is not always salable, especially if an

event is controversial or connotes little that would enhance the image of a potential sponsor's products. Even if sponsors are found, production costs may exceed advertising revenues. Documentaries usually get low ratings. In addition, the inability to estimate accurately in advance the size of audiences for these programs or for a given special event hinders the marketing of informational programming. If special news coverage requires displacing sponsored programs already scheduled, this cuts into anticipated income.[2] One technique devised in the early sixties to sell special news coverage was to line up sponsors in advance, prepare commercials, and organize production staffs to be ready on short notice. Such a strategy as this did not assure the sale of time when an event occurred, because sponsors retained the right to decline having their names or products associated with an event if its reporting was not consistent with their goals. Regularly scheduled evening news shows, however, were less affected by these difficulties than were other kinds of informational programming. On the contrary, by the early 1960's the evening news shows were selling well and were generally regarded as heightening the images of products and companies with which they were associated.[3]

News in Broadcasting

Edwin Diamond reminds us that an important characteristic of television news is that it is only a part

of the business of broadcasting. The economic factor shaping the TV medium as a social institution has always been foremost since radio developed into a selling medium.

> The National Broadcasting company, the first radio network, was started in 1926 by the Radio Corporation of America in part to encourage the sale of RCA radios. Soon broadcasters found that they had something much more valuable to market--the selling of audiences to advertisers. The bigger the audience, the more the advertiser could be charged. On strictly economic grounds, the requirements of successful broadcasting were quite straight forward: popular entertainment shows could earn higher revenues than less popular entertainment, news, or public affairs programming.[4]

Nevertheless, Diamond points out much of the concern about radio, and later television, centered around its function of disseminating news and information. He stated, "Most of the discussions about the impact of the medium seem to assume that it exists for this purpose,"[5] Indeed, if one looks back at the early development of broadcasting, it was reports of elections, political conventions, and other on-the-spot coverage of actual events that spurred interest in the medium.[6]

The telecasting of news events has demonstrated the unique capability of television, despite the fact that the average viewer "can talk about television at length without mentioning news programs."[7] As live telecasting declined in entertainment during the late 1950's, live coverage at the scene of news events became more significant. Events such as the racial conflict in Little Rock, Khruschev's tour of the United States, and the summit meeting in Paris in the

late fifties were mere precedents to a long series of events occurring in the sixties that demonstrated the potential of television in disseminating information. The skills and resources of television news organizations were repeatedly challenged when covering news stories of the 1960's, such as the Kennedy-Nixon debates, the civil rights movement, UN conferences, a President's funeral, urban riots, anti-war demonstrations, battle fields and battles in the war in Vietnam, etc. The television medium brought news into American homes with an unprecedented directness.[8]

Broadcasters, in business to deliver audiences to advertisers, relied mainly upon the profitable entertainment programs as vehicles for audience delivery. Diamond noted, originally news developed as

> an after thought, to be done inexpensively, if possible, in fringe time. So it was with radio, and so it was with television--until quite recently.[9]

News as Public Relations

During the early years of television, news had been aired on sustaining time. A broadcasting company not only bore the cost of producing the news but also lost out in earning revenues from advertising for the time news was on the air. Sponsors were elusive when broadcasters sought to sell informational programming.

In order to neutralize angry criticism following the quiz and payola scandals in the late 1950's,[10] the three networks promised FCC officials that they would produce more

public affairs programs.[11] This led to an expansion of news staffs, adding experienced journalists whose skills were also useful to news shows.[12] More documentaries were put on the air in the early 1960's, but they usually got poor ratings. On the other hand, Nielsen ratings for the hour during which the evening newscasts were then televised, between 6:30 and 7:30 P.M., showed that nationally the number of homes using television rose continuously throughout the first half of the 1960's. The same was true for time slots used by local news programs later at night, after 10:00 P.M. From this Frank Wolf concluded,

> That the audience grew faster during these "news periods" than during other portions of the broadcast day is evidence that local news broadcasts became increasingly popular.[13]

News programming served valuable latent functions. News became a public relations device for stations and networks, symbolizing a company's service to the community. The public showed a high regard for television news, apart from whether programs were actually liked or not. Thus, any costs sustained by the broadcaster, as when rates charged to sponsors were not sufficient to cover news production, could be justified as a worth while business expense rather than merely a costly duty. During interviews conducted for this study, newscasters and television executives often referred to a news show as "the station's showcase." Quaal and Martin have also pointed out the economic value of a station's image:

> The image of the station conveyed to advertising agencies has assumed increased importance in the placement of spot business. Station image may be an asset not conveyed in the ratings.[14]

Further,

> Some agencies consider station image so important that they employ personnel to collect as much information about the various local stations as possible in each market.[15]

Usually the more affluent stations use their news programs to project the station's image to the public. Popular news programs often function as lead-in programming to manipulate audience flow and to enlarge audiences for other programs in a station's lineup. In the New York market, local news shows at network owned and operated stations are usually scheduled before the network newscast and so lead into network programming. On the other hand, the marginal standing of a station is likely to be reflected in its news programming. Such stations may provide only a minimal amount of news coverage, what is sometimes described as "rip and read," by a limited staff of news readers who lack the time to go into the field for stories. Instead, they relay reports received from the wire services or any other available source, including the local newspapers.[16]

Another factor stimulating local news production was the FCC specification that it was a licensee's obligation to meet the "localness" requirement, which was intented to provide programming for local self-expression, local talent, and service to the community.[17] Ralph Renick, the keynote

speaker addressing the annual conference of the Radio and Television News Directors Association in 1965, made clear the importance of local news:

> News is the reason for local stations existing. It is the only creative local programming left, the factor determining good stations and bad ones. It is the "identifying watermark of a station" and the barometer indicating a station's public service obligation.[18]

Magazine Concept

News was one of the first categories of programming to shift to the magazine concept, in which broadcasters sell participations in programs and spot commercials instead of the whole time slot to one sponsor. As broadcasters were the producers of news, this was easily accomplished. Many entertainment shows in the early sixties were still being produced by sponsors or their advertisers. Broadcasters merely sold the time, and that deprived them of control over the programs they transmitted. If entertainment shows were replaced with news programming, the broadcaster gained control over that much more of the broadcasting day. Many have argued that the magazine concept was probably inevitable even though it was criticized and abhored by the broadcasters themselves before it gained wide use. Critics feared it would produce a distasteful clutter of commercials, but none offered a feasible plan to prevent its use. An explanation was offered in Broadcasting:

> The hard fact is that it's becoming uneconomic to sponsor a half-hour program every other week because costs are about $3 million a year. The high risk of backing the wrong show makes it necessary for advertisers to diversify.[19]

News programming was ideally suited to the magazine concept. Rapid sequences of commercial clutter could be inserted into the sequence of short, brisk news stories that comprised a newscast. Two of the network flagship stations in the New York market were criticized in a 1977 study for having "exceptional amounts" of commercial clutter in their news shows.[20] Besides allowing broadcasters greater control over programming, especially formats, content, and scheduling, the magazine format raised the ceiling on what could be earned for a given time slot from what a single sponsor could afford to what a group of sponsors could spend collectively.[21]

The magazine concept helped to resolve the broadcasters' greatest obstacle to business expansion. The day, with a finite number of hours and far fewer broadcasting hours during which good-sized audiences are available is difficult to expand. Attracting more viewers is a continuing struggle. Given the popularity of television as an advertising medium, however, the magazine concept enabled the broadcasters to accommodate the demands of a greater number of advertisers. Marvin Barrett noted some of the pressure that broadcasters were under:

> The responsibility was not all with the broadcaster. Even with such evidence of glut, some advertisers, left out in the stampede for TV time, were clamoring for an additional advertising minute every half hour.[22]

The Economic Value of News

By the seventies, in some cases, local news shows had gained such popularity that news production not only became self-supporting but an important aid to selling time for other time slots and other programming. The news director at an independent New York station pointed out in an interview that his news show, which had long been sold out, helped sell other programming:

> You can't get into this show with a shoehorn now, not between the airlines and General Motors and all the big national advertisers. . . . There are one or two local advertisers who may get in because they spend a lot of money with the company. You know, . . . [XXX sponsor], which is the biggest . . . [XXX business] in the world, spends a fortune on the show, but that's because they spend a fortune on the station.

David Brinkley, appearing on the "Tonight" show stated that "the biggest thing that ever happened to television news was the discovery it could make money."[23] Indeed, the efforts of stations to compete in the ratings with their news shows became a major force shaping television news.

Television news gained a new respect among advertisers during the sixties. While some sponsors felt news was not suited to their products, others showed a new enthusiasm for news. Advertisers were more sensitive and

critical about documentaries than they were of news. The enhanced status that news shows gained among viewers helped attract commercial sponsors.[24] In the early seventies Barrett reported that the response to a survey of the hundred top television sponsors showed their attitudes towards news and public affairs programming, particularly the latter, was still ambivalent, but he found the number of responding companies planning to increase their sponsorship of these kinds of programming was much greater than the number that was going to decrease their sponsorship.[25]

The capacity of television news to earn profits was evident by 1970 despite the difficulty of estimating the earnings of news programming. Barrett noted, "Newscasting has established itself as one of broadcasting's biggest revenue producers."[26] Local programming of all kinds had become profitable, and "the programming which drew the highest gross revenues in 92 percent of the cases was local news."[27]

Public affairs programming and news programming were usually combined in a single budget and were produced by TV journalists. News people often shift back and forth between the two types of programming. The staff producing a documentary is thus not necessarily distinct from the staff producing news. A reporter may go on "a special assignment" in order to produce a documentary. But public statements made by station or network officials about the cost or

amounts of money lost on public affairs and news rarely separated the two kinds of programs, and so reveal little about the earning capabilities of news programming. Moreover, the fixed costs of maintaining extensive worldwide staffs for news shows and special coverage cannot be determined for any given show. As a result, this made it difficult to estimate the profitability of network news. Wolf found, however, in his study based on samples collected in 1967 and 1971, that network executives thought the evening news shows would be shown to be moderately profitable if actual costs could ever be accurately computed. Wolf also concluded that local news was moderately profitable. Like the networks, local stations found it was easier to attract audiences, and therefore sponsors, for local news than for local public affairs programs.[28] Martin Mayer explained how bookkeeping techniques clouded profit estimates:

> Network books are kept in such a way that the program department always loses money and a news department loses lots of money, while the facilities show a handsome profit. Networks rent facilities such as studios and theatres, video machines for editing, oversize vinyl tiles for floors, etc. to be paid out of program budgets. . . . Sales of spots total more than the price of a show.[29]

The disparity in the ratings of documentaries and regularly scheduled newscasts indicated the sales value of the two types of programming was sharply different. This was an important factor in the development of television news.[30] The receptiveness of audiences to newscasts rather

than to documentaries supporteded decisions to expand the evening news programs. The comparatively larger audiences of news programs, though small if measured against those of popular entertainment, made news more profitable than public affairs programs.[31]

The economic value of television news, particularly local news, was well recognized by the later seventies. Barrett described it as "big business within an even bigger business--broad-casting."[32] An editorial in Broadcasting summed up the success of TV news:

> News is generating enormous revenues for stations that present it professionally. There could be no more accurate measurement of public acceptance of the television journalism form.
>
> Advertisers go where the audience is and will pay premium rates for an interested audience. Television journalists may take it as a point of professional pride that their work is attracting audiences that can be sold at a profit. In the commercial system unprofitable news is unlikely to be more than token news.
>
> But the best thing to be said of local television journalism in 1978 is that its evolution shows no signs of abating.[33]

Regularly scheduled news programs came to account for the largest portion of public service programming stations produced. Other types of public service programs, interviews, documentaries, editorials, coverage of special events, discussions, etc., were not as widely used as the scheduled news shows.[34] In fact, local news and weather came to be the staples of locally originated programming in most markets.[35] Local news had an advantage in terms of audience appeal that network news lacked. Viewers of news

are generally more receptive to reports about events and conditions in the local community than to national news, because local news is more likely to reflect their personal environment and interests. News programming, whether regularly scheduled or special events coverage, as well as other public affairs programming, is reviewed every three years in the television station's license renewal application.[36] Although licenses are hardly ever revoked, a station wants to be well regarded in the community in order to avoid negative criticism at license renewal time and to have little difficulty continuing its broadcasting operations. Thus, television news has come to be one of the broadcaster's most important products.

The Expansion of Television News

A significant change in television news occurred in 1963, when NBC and CBS doubled the length of their evening newscasts from fifteen minutes to a half hour. Many local news stations, especially those owned by these two networks, did likewise. News staffs had been enlarged in preparation for the extended time on air. Generally, each succeeding year saw the networks increasing the staffs and budgets for news production.[37] ABC, the smallest of the three major networks at that time, did not lengthen the news show, but did take steps to upgrade their newscasts. The news director began "building a reserve of roving reporters" who could be sent anywhere, and ABC's staff in Washington was

doubled to sixteen correspondents. All three major networks were building up their overseas staffs, opening news bureaus in more European cities and in Africa.[38]

NBC had the most popular newscast of the networks, the Huntley-Brinkley show, which had a nightly audience of 18.5 million people. CBS reported their audience for the "Evening News with Walter Cronkite" to be 16.7 million. ABC trailed far behind. Local news programs, produced by local stations, generally achieved comparable popularity.[39]

Apart from a very few exceptional years, throughout the sixties and seventies the combined budgets of news and public affairs were increased annually. But public affairs programming was subject to many fluctuations in the time and money allotted to it while daily news shows were almost continually increased. In 1961 ABC's news budget, smallest of the three major networks, was $6 million. NBC budgeted $22 million for radio and TV news as well as for other public affairs programming. CBS committed an amount similar to that for NBC's news and related programming.[40] In the season of 1963-64 the three networks together had "committed themselves to spend $70 million for the production of news and documentary programs for the season,"[41] roughly an increase of 40 percent over the expenditures in 1961. News budgets continued to grow. By 1971, CBS had a budget of $47 million, with an estimated 80 percent going into the Cronkite show. NBC had a larger budget, but it covered the

"Today" show and local news as well as the network news. ABC's budget, at $35 million, was still the smallest, but six times what it had been ten years earlier.[42]

Beginning in January of 1970, the ban on cigarette advertising took a set of sponsors off the air who had been important sources of revenue. In addition, the television industry moved into a more restrictive business climate as sponsors tightened up their advertising budgets because of a downturn in the economy.

ABC and NBC experienced a decline of 50 percent in profits for the first quarter of 1971, but profit levels were still above those of 1968. Television companies reacted strongly and made deep cuts in news and public affairs programming. All the networks and their owned and operated stations reduced news budgets and news staffs. Local television stations reacted in this manner too. Barrett wrote,

> The situation was similar at the local stations. The phenomenal increase in news staffs and budgets, both of which had tripled in the sixties, stopped and in some instances reversed itself.[43]

The slump was brief and Barrett criticized the broadcasters for shortsightedness. Given the high profits being earned in television, he thought the cutbacks were unreasonable.[44] Within a year or two, however, the expansionist trend returned.

The Growth of Local News

Following the lead of their parent organizations, in 1963 the network owned and operated stations in New York stepped up their production of news by expanding program time and news staffs, and by using more expensive techniques for covering stories. William Wood described this change:

> Local news expanded following the increase in network news programs to even out time segments. This change was accompanied by increased budgets and larger staffs. With more reporters assigned to special beats, there was greater expertise in a particular news area. There was more on-the-spot coverage, via film or tape and occasionally live.[45]

NBC reorganized its news department and set up a separate local news organization. The local staff was filled mainly with network personnel from NBC News. At WCBS-TV there was a similar splitting off from CBS News to create a local news organization there. Local and network news had already been separated at ABC in 1962.[46]

News organizations continued to expand in the following years. By 1967, according to one kind of count, NBC had the largest worldwide television news staff, a group of 900 men and women, but this included local affiliated stations' reporters and stringers in addition to the full range of full-time people. Counting in a similar manner, CBS had 800 and ABC 750 people in their worldwide news organizations.[47]

A network executive at NBC, interviewed in the late seventies, provided a more conservative estimate of the size

of newscaster staffs at the three networks:

> There are three networks. We have less than 75 correspondents and reporters on our network news operation. And CBS may be a little bit bigger. I mean, worldwide. You multiply that by maybe times three. So we're talking about less than 250 people in the world--for the three.

These news staffs, compared with earlier years, had grown considerably. Our respondent at NBC went on to discuss the the increased size of local news staffs:

> They have expanded, but probably not as much as you think. . . . There are more people working. We increased by somewhere between 15 and 20 percent when we went to two hours. News staffs at the other New York stations have increased slightly, at ABC more than CBS, but again CBS started off with a bigger base. There has been this competition and the emphasis has been to increase in size.

Another NBC executive added,

> We have 28 people in New York, locally, on our own station. Over the last five or six years, . . . the number of job opportunities in local news increased in a higher proportion than the number of jobs in network news.

A newscaster respondent said that when she began working at WNBC-TV in the early seventies, the local news staff had only seven reporters, a fourth of the number in 1978.

Color TV

In January of 1967, when the ABC network's newscast went to a half-hour length, it also shifted to color.[48] CBS had been telecasting news in color since 1960, though news reports in black and white had been intermixed for several years. NBC started broadcasting entertainment shows in color in 1959, but held off introducing news in color until

1965, because color TV is so much more costly than black and white.[49]

The public accepted color television rapidly. While less than 10 percent of American households had color TV sets in 1965, by 1977 over 80 percent did. Almost all households, 99.9 percent, had at least a black and white set.[50] Color TV sets outsold black and white sets for the first time in 1968.[51]

Color television added a new dimension to news programming. For example, in scenes of war or violence blood no longer looked like mud or dark shadings; instead, it was vividly apparent.[52] Color made news studios look more glamourous. Individual newscasters could be identified more readily when their images were projected in color. Generally, color brightened news shows with an illusionary attractiveness that made news more appealing than it had been in black and white.

The Quality of TV News

If one compares the quality of reporting in television news in the later seventies with that of the early sixties, it is obvious that news programming greatly improved as a result of technological advances and better journalism. Nevertheless, the quality, and the adequacy of TV news, the main source of information for the majority of Americans, has been continually criticized. During interviews for this study, one news director commented on

the improved quality of TV news:

> There's been a tremendous improvement in the quality of news in New York City over the past six or seven years. News happened to have been far from the best in the country six or seven or eight years ago. It is now probably . . . as good as any place now for a number of reasons. There's more emphasis on it, there's more money spent on it. . . . It is better. . . . The quality, certainly in New York--and to a significant extent around the country--of local and network news, especially local news, has improved considerably over this period, because more attention, more money, more effort, and more different types of people have been involved in it.

He further noted that competition among newscasters helped to bring about this improvement:

> There's an awful lot more competition now for essentially the same number of jobs, so if you force expanded competition, which is what affirmative action really tries to do, of necessity, ultimately if not from the beginning, you're going to end up with a better product.

At another local station the news director talked of his concern for the quality of news on his newscasts. He emphasized the importance of having a high quality staff that does high quality, committed work. The responsibility for securing such a staff and work was that of the news director. He discussed this matter as follows:

> I have told everybody here enough times so that I think they finally got it through their heads, that nobody is going any place or not going anyplace on any other basis other than the quality of their work. If they give me the highest quality of work, I'll give them heaven and the stars. They give me garbage quality, I'll cut their lousy throats. It is as simple as that.
>
> Well, you see, all of that has to do with the leadership involved. I mean, whoever runs the place sets a tone. And they know what I want out there. If I see a piece on the air and I think it was a pass-off, I take that reporter and clean the room

> with the reporter. I'm an awfully nasty person to deal with when I don't like something. But we deal here on the basis of quality of your work. You also have to remember I have the best reporting staff in the nation, bar none. And so the peer pressure for quality is now built up to the point that I don't have to do it as much. The pressure is already on them, they know. Somebody looks over and sees what . . . [----- -----] did at the White House yesterday and they say, "Gee, I have to work harder. I better not pass this off." The peer pressure, not to let it down, becomes very important. It is like the marines instead of the army.

Despite the striving for quality that this news director demanded of his staff, he was as cynical about television news as many other critics:

> My opinion of television news, in general, is that it stinks, that it is a fashion show, that the capacity of most people to deal with the events that are under their very noses are close to the incompetent, if not inept, and that newspapers aren't all that much better. It is just that they have less technological problems to deal with, and, therefore, the beauty of it doesn't tend to come in as much.

Another news director commented on the quality of news that audiences expected He stressed both an increasing reliance on television news and rising expectations and demands upon news programs:

> In levels of what they expect, they have grown. There has been a reliance, an increasing reliance, on television news as a basic source. Therefore, there has been a greater responsibility to deliver some meaty information. And I think that what an audience would have accepted five or six years ago they would not accept today.

Increased Time for News

During the mid-sixties the networks attempted to extend the network newscasts to hour-long reports, but these

plans were strongly opposed by affiliates who preferred to keep such time for their own more profitable local programming, usually local news. Plans for an hour news show were periodically revived and repeatedly abandoned when affiliates objected. At one point, during the 1968-1969 season, CBS aired the first daily full-hour network newscast, scheduled, however, in the early morning.[53]

Longer local news shows, however, became a national trend. A majority of the nation's commercial stations (60 percent) reported increasing local programming in 1966 and 1967. In most markets news accounted for about 40 percent of local programming time.[54]

Program listings in past issues of TV Guide supply information on the amount of air time allotted to newscasts. In the New York Area, in 1962 the network owned and operated stations of NBC and ABC had given over twice as much time to local news as their parent networks gave to national news. CBS had fifteen minute programs for both local and network news. If one considered the late news offerings at 11 P.M., that was an additional fifteen minutes of news. WNEW-TV had only a ten minute newscast at 11 P.M., and WOR-TV had no evening newscasts listed. Thus even before the networks had expanded newscasts to half-hour programs, local news and weather had already been allocated larger time slots than network news programs.

In 1967, when the ABC network newscast went to a half-hour, local evening news at WNBC-TV and WCBS-TV had already increased their news show to an hour. WNEW-TV had already introduced a ten o'clock news show, but WPIX-TV had terminated their 7 P.M. newscast and substituted a short news report after 11 P.M. WOR-TV continued to play down evening newscasting in favor of interview shows and news reports during the morning hours. In 1974 WNBC-TV began their two-hour local newscast, beginning at 5 P.M. that led into the network news at 7 P.M.

Time allocated to telecasting daily news programs increased more than any other kind of informational programming. According to William Wood, "by 1967 three times as much air time was given over to national news each week as was five years ago."[55] By the late sixties and into the early seventies "the weight of television news operations was shifting from documentaries to regular newscasts, which in some markets totaled more than three hours daily."[56] Mini-documentaries, included within the format of daily newscasts, were advertised during station breaks and presented in daily installments that helped to entice the audience back for newscasts on successive days. This allowed for the production of documentaries while easing the problem of giving over to them valuable time slots during entertainment hours that usually got low ratings. They also helped to fill out the time allotted to news.

Throughout the sixties the three network owned and operated stations were the strongest sources of television news in the New York Area. One local station, WPIX-TV, produced a daily half-hour of evening news in the early sixties, but this program survived several only years. By the late sixties another local station, WNEW-TV, had introduced news at 10 P.M. as counter-programming to entertainment during prime time and to attract viewers who would like news somewhat earlier than 11 P.M. News shows were further lengthened in the seventies. WNEW-TV doubled the time for its ten o'clock news show to an hour, and WPIX-TV reintroduced an early news show at 7:30 P.M. following the network newscasts. WPIX-TV also moved its late news to 10 P.M., which put both newscasts in counter-programming strategies. WOR-TV did not produce an evening news show other than short reports at the end of movies and sports programs or at station breaks. Instead, as in earlier years, newscasts were scheduled in the morning and alternative kinds of informational programming were featured during the evening hours. These included discussion programs, interviews, and panel shows.

Principle Source of News

By the 1970's commercial television had entered its third decade of broadcasting, and the medium had gained universal acceptance. Radio had regained a new popularity after suffering a stunning setback from television's

competition in the early fifties; but it was to the millions of TV sets that people went to idle away leisure hours, find out about weather conditions, and see what was going on in their communities or in distant parts of the world.

Of all the mass media, television took the lead in the mid-sixties as the principal source of news and information for the majority of Americans. While newspapers were regarded by TV journalists as far superior to television news in their capacity to provide greater depth of news coverage, newspapers took second place to television news with the general public. As the decade progressed, public approval and acceptance of televison's information heightened. Roper samples revealed a majority were pleased with the existing balance in programming although about a fourth of their samples said most would like more news and public affairs programs. Younger people and less educated people were more satisfied with television than older and better educated people.[57] While television news was not without its critics, the viewing public generally held it in high regard. Gary Steiner found this to be true even before TV news had gained the acceptance it would achieve in the years following his study. In the early sixties, Steiner's research showed that even people who hardly ever watched news programs held good opinions of television news.[58] Viewers continued to approve of TV news, and they granted it a high degree of credibility. At the beginning of the

seventies, Bower found that respondents to his study thought television gave them "the most complete news coverage," presented "the fairest, most unbiased news," and considered newspapers far less reliable.[59]

The Expanding Audience for News

Keeping up with the affairs of the world was regarded traditionally as a male activity or responsibility. Marya Mannes wrote that in television the prevailing attitude was that public affairs were male affairs and women did not belong except in the early morning hours.[60] A Neilsen study, however, as early as 1961 showed that the audiences for informational programming, including news, documentaries, etc., consisted of more adult women (40 percent) than adult men (33 percent), with the rest made up of teenagers and children.[61] More women watched television generally. This was a factor that favored the expansion of news, particularly into earlier evening hours when women viewers were more available than men. By attracting a large number of women, all kinds of programming become more appealing to advertisers. One news producer who was interviewed said that a strong female audience was good for a news show:

> Substantial numbers of women in the audience is what makes a program appealing to the advertisers. It will sell better. This is because women, especially those between eighteen and forty-nine years old, are the principal shoppers for advertised products.

If television news programming was to expand it had to do so

by attracting women. This may have made it easier for broadcasters to respond to the pressures of women activists.

A news producer for WNBC-TV described how audience composition changed, depending on the hour when a newscast was on the air. After "News Center 4" went to two hours, telecasting from five to seven o'clock, the station found that the audiences for each hour differed. The producer pointed out that

> the ratios shift. The five o'clock hour has more women and the six o'clock hour more men than the hour before.

A vice-president at WCBS-TV also noted the importance of women in the news audience:

> Women have always controlled the television set.
>
> [Even news shows?]
>
> Sure. And they've always dominated the television audience with the exception of certain sports programs.

The news director of an independent station's news show, scheduled during the tenth hour, described his audience:

> Well, I will tell you this. Statistically, our audience is half urban, half suburban. The urban people cover a wide stance of the economic scale, so do the suburban people. We tend to have a more educated audience on the average than anybody else except Channel 2, and I think we are ahead of them, but not by much. It's pretty well neck-in-neck with Channel 2, that is on our education level and, therefore, income earning. But as far as the other things go, no, it is pretty well divided between the city and the suburbs. Our audience tends to be a little older, more mature, or you can call it what you like; I don't have all that many 18 to 22 year olds watching the show. But by the time you get to 30, then it gets heavier and heavier until you get into the 40's and 50's, and then it is very heavy in

> that area. The more mature they are, the more they like to go to bed earlier, and the less likely they are to be out horsing around at night. You know, families, or they're just older and less interested in going out at night. So they're more available to watch a television show. I think that . . . the hour has more to do with that than the content, or as much to do with that as the content.

This news director did not remember the ratio of males to females in the audience when interviewed, but for him the female audience held special significance. That was where he hoped to find more viewers for his news show:

> I have target audiences. I mean there are people that I am trying to bring in as regular viewers of this show. Right now my big target is the suburban woman between thirty and fifty, because she is the least committed of television viewers. . . . I am targeting that suburban woman's audience, . . . because by and large they are rather well educated and can appreciate some of the things we are doing. . . . What I want to do with the show is going to appeal to someone with more education, because I'm going to want to go deeper into things.

A news executive for the other independent station's ten o'clock news show said their audience tended to be middle-class and middle-aged. Blue collar people or working class people, classifications he regarded as the same, had to get up early, and so they go to bed before the ten o'clock newscast.

An executive at ABC discussed the station's reliance upon audience research:

> We have a very healthy research department and they can give us not only the composition of the work force by age groups--ABC primarily attracts 18 to 49 as an age group in television--but we figure it out to such a point that we can break up the ethnic percentage of that group, which in the long run goes to determine what shows will go on-air. . . . I

> think probably one of the reasons why ABC is in the position that it is now is because we have a very healthy research department--a very strong research department. And they can give statistics that I didn't think were available to anybody, to tell you the truth.
>
> [How important is the minority audience for news programming?]
>
> It is factored in. It does become part of the decision-making process.

It was further explained that at ABC

> there is a trend for getting the younger person. They [management] see the younger person as a prime target. Once they establish that prime target, if that be the case, then they try to get a program that will appeal to more than one segment of that population. . . . Age group is always first.

The emphasis on the quality and appeal of news continued after audience growth slowed, even though Happy Talk (discussed below) came into fashion and seemed to detract from the quality of news. The news director at an owned and operated station described how the stations reach the New York audience:

> The total news audience over the past several years has not grown. It has remained relatively stable, but it has remained stable at a high level. For example, in the course of a week, almost every person in the New York Metropolitan Area has seen a television newscast on one of the stations. We reach about 55 percent of the total New York market in the course of a week. Our two network competitors reach about the same. . . . So among just the three networks, without the independents, you see that the total market is covered. So, how much higher can you go? Now on a given newscast that's not true. On a given newscast, in the early evening, among the three network stations, you are reaching a total of about 40 percent of the New York Metropolitan Area on any given night. On the late newscast, you are reaching a total of roughly 45 percent of the total market area--but in the course

> of a couple of days that overlaps. So really, you know, in totals it shows.

Scheduling News Shows

The extension of local news programming in the New York Area followed two patterns. First, at the network owned and operated stations, local news was scheduled prior to the network newscast, leaving the prime time hours between seven-thirty and eleven o'clock reserved mainly for network entertainment. Informational programming, such as documentaries, are occasionally inserted into the program lineups. Late evening news was broadcast after prime time, that is after 11 P.M. Therefore, when local news shows were lengthened, they were put into earlier and earlier time slots just before the network news. This allowed the popular local news shows to serve as lead-in programming for the network news. A news correspondent at WNBC-TV pointed out that moving news to earlier hours related to the economics of television. The five o'clock news hour was in a time slot that replaced marginal programming, usually movies or reruns. The production of a second hour of news was less costly than the first hour, because much of it was repetition. The correspondent explained,

> Good commercial time is running out. They can do two things. They can cut out more of the news, but the FCC allows no more commercials, or they can extend the news show. It may mean knocking out old reruns, "I Dream of Jeannie." We trade that not very good time for very good commercial time on news shows. Nobody watches TV late in the afternoon. Kids maybe.

A second way in which local programming developed was characteristic of independent television stations. The two independent stations with strong local news shows practiced counter-programming by scheduling their news shows when the owned and operated stations were airing entertainment. For example, WPIX-TV presented its early news show at 7:30 P.M. following the network newscasts. This time slot attracted viewers who did not get home early enough to watch the owned and operated stations local news shows. WPIX-TV and WNEW-TV put news on during the last hour of prime time, which allowed whoever watches the ten o'clock news to go to bed by eleven o'clock. Moreover, these programs were alternatives to entertainment shows.

In sum, the scheduling of news programs reflected the economic conditions at the various stations. Several factors, growing audiences, news-worthy events that captured the attention of American society, and the marketable composition of news audiences, all helped to make news more competitive with other kinds of programming and led to increasing the amount of time committed to television news.

Styles in TV News

The presentation of television news underwent a number of stylistic changes during the sixties and seventies. Competition among stations and networks contributed to these changes. As noted in Broadcasting,

> A business where stakes are so high and the difference between success and failure so small as two or three rating points, has, like other intensely competitive businesses, produced its share of trends. And it is still, says one less charitable observer, "a business that abounds in gimmicks."
>
> The rise of local TV news can even be traced along parallel lines with some of those fashions.[62]

Television news had originally been modeled after radio news and motion-picture newsreels. In the early sixties an important shift took place when the major networks and many stations decided to upgrade TV news. Programming took on a more serious style, with the prestigious newspapers, such as the New York Times, becoming the model for broadcast journalism. Even the language used by print journalists was adopted, as when Walter Cronkite, the newly appointed anchor of the "CBS Evening News," called himself the "managing editor."[63] Increasingly news reporters could no longer be mere readers of wire-copy from the news services. Journalistic experience and writing skill became necessary qualifications if one aspired to television newscasting. At more and more stations the duties of newscasters and announcers became more distinct, as news personnel increasingly stopped delivering commercials as an on-air duty. Broadcasting reported in 1960 that CBS-TV had revised their rules for commercials:

> One of its few specific provisos deals with newscasters. It prohibits them from leading into commercials with any descriptive phrases beyond a simple mention of the sponsor's name.[64]

This was a slow process, however. Barrett noted that one of the lesser incentives to Barbara Walter's move to ABC in

1976 was

> getting away from the reading of commercials (a form of primitive TV hucksterism that "Today" was one of the last news and public affairs programs to require its reporters to engage in).[65]

At the same time that television news began to upgrade its quality in the early sixties, news shows also promoted themselves by projecting the glamour of the new electronic journalism. Background scenes during newscasts showed cameras, lights, and other paraphenalia of the television medium.

Television reporters were sent out into the field to get their own stories. Reporters became producers of their own reports, responsible for getting the story, editing its content, and presenting the finished product on the air. Some newscasters interviewed in this study pointed out that their job title was "producer-reporter," and they were responsible for the full process of producing news stories.[66] To give a news report a beginning and an end, or a "wrap-around," the reporter was often filmed at the news scene introducing the topic and then giving the story an ending.

The Star System

The star system that became so important an aspect of television newscasting can be traced to the early sixties. At that time the "Huntley-Brinkley Report" was the most popular network news program. The pairing of Chet

Huntley with David Brinkley as co-anchormen, which juxtaposed two personalities very different from one another, was widely acclaimed for creating a "successful chemistry."[67] Their appeal to millions of viewers was generally regarded as an important reason why the program was so well accepted. They were capable, experienced journalists, but their stardom enabled them to be symbols for NBC News. CBS's Walter Cronkite would eventually replace Huntley and Brinkley as the superstar of network news, but not for several years.

When Cronkite achieved first place among newscasters, his success was attributed to his personal qualities. Journalistic skills were a necessary prerequisite to becoming a network anchor or a prominent newscaster, but many excellent journalists lacked the personal qualities needed for success before television cameras. As a result, skill in journalism tended to be taken for granted while stardom was built upon the presence one could project. On the other hand, Cronkite explained how the skills of television journalists differ from those of the print media:

> What we on-air broadcasters do comprises a dimension beyond the skills required by the newspaper reporter, writer, and editor. If we do our jobs well, we do those things--reporting, writing, editing--as well or better than the print journalist, but beyond that we have to have the special skills--talents, if you please--to present our material through the spoken word and in a visual medium, frequently to think on our feet, and to be right the first time with no editor imposed as a

> protective buffer between us and the public. We must be able without reference to written works to pull from our heads the background of a given story, complete with the historical reference when relevant. We have to balance the moral and the immoral, the appropriate and the grossly inappropriate, the acceptable and the offensive, the right and the wrong even as facts are tumbling in upon us, and there are no second guesses. With a certain degree of immodesty, I suggest that those of us who can do that are worth a little more than the print journalist--or, perhaps, a lot more.[68]

The star system began to flourish about the same time that TV news was gaining sponsors and greater financial strength. The decisions as to who would anchor news programs had to take into account how ratings might change and how a network or station would be affected. The end product of the image a newscaster projected was how it related to other types of images, such as the institutional images of broadcasting companies or sponsors and their products.

One function of the star system is that celebrity newscasters identify news shows. If one compares the different newscasts, they often look very much alike--in what news is reported, the sequencing of news stories, the manner of delivery, and the visual settings. Diamond quoted the president of NBC News:

> "When you turn your dial back and forth between Channels 2,4, and 7 during the film pieces you can't tell what network you're with. Only the anchorman tells you where you are. . . . [The anchorman is] the equivalent of the newspaper layout of the New York Times or The New York Daily News; when audiences see him they know where they are."[69]

Once broadcasters discovered that ratings reflected who anchored a news show, the star system was accepted. It became just as significant in local news as it was at the networks. Each major market had its own group of local celebrity newscasters. An item in Broadcasting commented on the value of celebrity newscasters:

> The use of news personalities--anchorpeople, sports and weather people--is a trend that was at the heart of TV news's great awakening. As stations learned that viewers tuned in to see their favorite news celebrity, the trade in anchorpeople became frenetic, with the biggest prizes--big city markets and high salaries--going to anchors with the best combination of personality and good looks. . . . Today they continue to be the center of attention in trade talk.[70]

Describing the situation for news personalities at WABC-TV's news department, Geraldo Rivera said,

> They make celebrities, man. . . . I mean, the television news bosses see to it that their personalities become stars. Stars, in direct proportion with their popularity.[71]

Rivera became a superstar who outgrew the limitations of a local market, albeit the largest in the nation.

Stations search constantly for ways to increase the appeal of their news shows. As an example, during the time that interviews for this study were being conducted, one local station was experimenting with the anchor spot, filling it with different newscasters on their staff. Usually they paired a man and a woman as co-anchors, but the news director said that they had gotten a better audience

response when two popular women newscasters anchored together. That was laughingly dismissed as unsuitable for other than a trial run. Nonetheless, some time later the station did indeed present two women co-anchoring, an arrangement that lasted for a short time.

In time, techniques were used to appeal to ethnic and racial groups in the audience, though they varied from one station to another. One news director pointed out that it was not practical to try to hire minorities who would be identified with many ethnic or racial groups. New York had too many minorities. Another executive at the same station, said that, instead, they had made an effort to air feature stories about events among many ethnic groups in the local area. Another news executive at a different station thought it was important to have newscasters of varied ethnic background, because "the audience likes seeing someone of their own group on the news show."

An additional element added to brighten news shows was that of the good looking newscaster with sex appeal. As greater numbers of women became newscasters some news departments made a point of finding very pretty, attractive women. The trend affected men too. This was so much so, that during interviews several women newscasters made remarks about the "anchor studs," disparaging the abilities of their handsome male colleagues or noting that they were planted on news shows to attract women viewers.

"Happy Talk" emerged in the early seventies as stations adopted a more personalized style of reporting. They attempted

> to infuse the news presentation with some of the informed and friendly atmosphere of entertainment shows by having anchor people casually converse, even clown, between news items.[72]

Happy Talk was a profit tool intended to make news entertaining. It created an

> aura of exaggerated joviality and elbow-jabbing conradship. . . . Once it had proved itself as a salable gimmick in Chicago, Happy Talk quickly spread across the country, imitiated by grinning, lantern-jawed news teams from New York to San Francisco, and most stops in between.[73]

As local news competition intensified in the late sixties another trend developed in which TV news departments hired news consultants to help them improve their ratings. The Eyewitness News format, developed by Frank N. Magid Associates and adopted by a number of stations around the country, was a foremost example of a news style that would affect all stations to some degree. Ron Powers described the news style recommended bv Magid and others as "the cybernetic newscast."[74]

The cybernetic newscasting concept was built upon the theory that television viewers hear and see mass media messages selectively, so that if the broadcaster provides viewers with what they want to hear, and it is told in a very personal manner, ratings will rise.[75] For an example of this kind of reporting, when a producer at one of the

independent New York stations was interviewed, he said that since the audience for his news show tended to be middle-aged and older, they made a greater effort to report news items that are of interest to people of these ages.

The Eyewitness News format used the Happy Talk technique and played up newscasters' personalities. Market research indicated the kinds of topics viewers would like to hear about in news reports. The news itself was presented in a fast sequence of short items. Field reporters and anchorpeople intermingled with one another during newscasts and bits of jolly conversation were interspersed among news stories. The camaraderie displayed by the news staff showed audiences that the members of the "news team" were delighted to be working with one another; and, just by tuning in, viewers could participate with these attractive people, even if only vicariously. Jokes or humorous stories concluded a news show, so as to leave viewers feeling good and wanting to tune in again.[76]

When news staffs began to consist of groups of celebrities their collective capacity to appeal to TV viewers was greatly increased. There were different newscasters for many tastes and senses of identity in the audience. Each newscaster was more appealing to some segment of the public than another; all together, the "news team" could draw in many more groups in the audience than a single star. Rotating celebrity newscasters in the anchor

spot was a technique adopted to please viewers wishing to see more of their favorite newscasters.

The Eyewitness News format was developed to make news more appealing, and therefore more profitable, during the period when many households were acquiring color TV sets. An informal delivery of news stories was well suited to the brightly colored visual images projected by color television. This format became contagious; it appealed to viewers and raised the ratings of shows using it. More staid newscasting styles did not entirely resist its influence. They had, at least, to relax the style of reporting. When WABC-TV adopted the Eyewitness News format on the local evening news program, other local stations in the New York Area took similar steps to enhance the popularity of their newscasts. All used Happy Talk to some extent. WCBS-TV's "Channel 2 News" was probably the most resistant to this style; but the news program for quite some time featured a bearded anchorman who appeared on-camera in shirt-sleeves, even when these fashions were still controversial, and the newscasters did engage in pleasant, if brief, conversation.

Another trend labeled the "war of the sets" took place in the mid-seventies. Stations spent many thousands of dollars to design attractive settings in news studios. Anchor desks, paneling, elaborate displays for weather maps, lighting, etc., were designed to present the news more

attractively than one's competitors. Eventually after almost all stations had remodeled their news studios, the fad waned.[82]

The Rapidity of Change

The development of television news from 1960 to the late seventies reflected many kinds of change. We have described how television news grew in economic value, how technological change led to using new techniques in gathering and presenting news, and how business competition in the ratings involved TV news in fads and the tastes of people who controlled news production. Consultants and market research studies guided the production of news shows. During this period television news developed into a major social institution, becoming the public's primary source of information. These changes occurring in TV news broadcasting during the sixties and seventies were an underlying factor that affected broadcasters, subject to the economic pressures of their industry, reacted to the pressures and demands emanating from the social movements in the outside society. If broadcasters perceived that some of the changes sought by activists were undesirable, the growth of television news also created new needs for broadcasters that favored the hiring of minorities and women in newscasting.

The expansion that occurred in television news was a factor that certainly helped minorities advance toward their

goals. Newscasting was an occupation such as described by Simpson and Yinger:

> It is often in the rapidly growing occupations that Negroes can make substantial gains. Growing occupations, and occupations with higher turnover, have greater hiring needs and upgrading is more prevalent than in declining fields. . . . When workers are needed, discriminatory barriers are more quickly lowered.[78]

In the following chapters our intent is to describe and analyze specifically the processes by which broadcasters dealt with the demands to transform newscaster images. Of particular interest in this study is the turnaround in the broadcaster's behavior, from excluding minorities and women from newscasting to eventually seeking them out as needed personnel. Other topics we will investigate are how the broadcasters actually integrated their newscasting staffs, whether or not they benefitted from complying with activist demands, and how government legislation altered the relationship between the broadcaster and groups representing minorities and women. Throughout the long process in which the images of newscasters became integrated, the changes in television news described in this chapter set the basis for how broadcasters responded to the demands of activist groups.

Footnotes

[1]Sidney W. Head, Broadcasting in America, 2nd Ed., (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972), p. 393.

[2]For example, broadcasters are reluctant to grant any political candidates air time unless the candidates buy the time, because under the equal time provision they would have to allow all candidates the same exposure on the air, and not all would attract sizable audiences.

[3]Broadcasting, Dec. 12, 1960, p.34, Sept. 17, 1962, p. 44; Editor & Publisher, Feb. 10, 1962, p. 14; "Sponsors Go for King-Size Local Video News," Sponsor, Jan. 29, 1962, Part I, p. 34; "Insurance Firms Hop into TV," Sponsor, Aug. 20, 1962, pp. 35-36, 47-48; Albert R. Kroeger, "You Needn't Go Broke in Public Affairs," Television Magazine, Jan. 1961, p. 112.

[4]Edwin Diamond, The Tin Kazoo, (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1975), p. 69.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Eric Barnouw, A Tower of Babel: Vol. I: A History of Broadcasting in the United States, (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1966), pp. 13-16.

[7]Broadcasting, May 1, 1961, p. 33.

[8]Jack Lyle (ed.), The Black American and the Press, (Los Angeles, Calif.: The Ward Richie Press, 1968), p. 148; William Wood, Electronic Journalism, (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1967) pp. 100-101; Head, p. 207; Kroeger, p. 112; "Focus on News," Television Magazine, Jan. 1961, p. 31.

[9]Diamond, p. 69.

[10]In the late 1950's quiz shows were popular with television audiences, such as the "Sixty-Four Thousand Dollar Question" or "Twenty-One," which offered expensive prizes and large sums of money to successful contestants. As thw winnings increased so did the suspense of the games, but eventually it was revealed that the shows were rigged. Audiences quickly became disillusioned with this kind of entertainment. The payola scandal involved mainly disc jockeys in radio who plugged songs if payments were made to them personally. Both scandals were a great embarrassment to the broadcast industry and cost broadcasters much of their prestige.

[11]Lyle, p. 148.

[12]Martin Mayer, About Television, (New York: Harper and Roe, 1972), p. 70.

[13]Frank Wolf, Television Programming for News and Public Affairs, (New York: Praeger Publs., 1972), pp. 132-133.

[14]Ward L. Quaal and Leo A. Martin, Broadcast Management, (Hastings-on the Hudson, Hastings House, 1968), p. 141.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Wolf, pp. 6, 110.

[17]Head, p. 395.

[18]Wood, p. 145.

[19]Ibid., Feb. 22, 1961, p. 91.

[20]They were WABC-TV's "Later Saturday News" and WNBC-TV's late nightly news. See Barrett, ed., The Sixth Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism: Rich News, Poor News, (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1978), p. 74.

[21]Mayer, pp. 23-25.

[22]Barrett, Rich News, Poor News, p. 74.

[23]David Brinkley, appearing as a guest on the "Today" show on WNBC-TV, New York, March 7, 1978.

[24]Wood, p. 5.

[25]Marvin Barrett, ed., The Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism, 1970-1971: A State of Seige, (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1971), p. 86.

[26]Ibid. p. 84.

[27]Ibid., pp. 84-85.

[28]Wolf, pp. 107-112.

[29]Mayer, p. 70.

[30]During the 1950's the leading news shows such as "NBC Camel News Caravan" and "Douglas Edwards with the News"

and local programming on WPIX-TV and WABD-TV (the Dumont station in New York) all had regular sponsors. See Erik Barnouw, The Image Empire: Vol. III: A History of Broadcasting in the United States, (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970), pp. 43-44; Wood, pp. 16-17.

[31]Wolf, p. 111.

[32]Barrett, Rich News, Poor News, p. 39.

[33]Broadcasting, Aug.28, 1978, p. 114.

[34]Wolf, p. 38.

[35]Advertising Age, May 29, 1961, p. 3.

[36]Head, pp. 393-396, 473.

[37]Broadcasting, Dec. 12, 1960, p. 58.

[38]Editor & Publisher, Aug. 19, 1961, pp. 9-10.

[39]Wolf, p. 4.

[40]Editor & Publisher, Aug. 19, 1961, pp. 9-10.

[41]Mayer, p. 189.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Barrett, A State of Seige, pp. 83-85.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Wood, pp. 38-39.

[46]New York Times, June 7, 1963, p. 63; Broadcasting, Jan. 15, 1962, p. 40.

[47]Ibid., p. 35.

[48]Jack Gould, "Kintner Urges TV Networks to Expand Newscasts," New York Times, Dec. 6, 1966, p. 95.

[49]Issues of TV Guide between 1960 and 1980 were consulted to determine local news scheduling.

[50]New York Times, Jan. 6, 1969, p. 134.

[51]Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1978, (Wash., D. C.: Government Printing Office), pp. 583, 795;

Broadcasting, Dec. 30, 1968, p. 54; New York Times, Jan. 6, 1969, p. 134.

[52]Lyle, p. 301.

[53]Barrett, ed., The Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism, 1968-1969, (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1969), p. 16.

[54]George W. Darlington, "The Many Worlds of Local TV," Television, Aug. 1967, pp. 33-43.

[55]Wood, pp. 34-35.

[56]Barrett, ed., The Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism, 1968-1969, p. 16.

[58]Gary Steiner, The People Look at Television, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), pp. 126, 188.

[59]Bower, pp. 99-100.

[60]Marya Mannes, "Should Women Only Be Seen and Not Heard?" TV Guide, Nov. 23, 1968, pp.6-8.

[61]Sponsor, June 5, 1961, pp. 46-47.

[62]Broadcasting, Aug. 28, 1978, p. 38.

[63]Diamond, p. 70.

[64]Broadcasting, March 14, 1960, p.62.

[65]Barrett, Rich News, Poor News, pp. 12-13.

[66]This agrees with Fang's description of the television reporter's job. See I. D. Fang, Television News, (New York: Hastings House Publs., 1972), p. 218.

[67]Gary Paul Gates, Air Time, (New York: Berkley Publ. Corp., 1978), pp. 78-83.

[68]"Remarks by Walter Cronkite at CBS Affiliates Conference, Century Plaza Hotel, Los Angeles, California," May 5, 1976, Appendix I, in Barrett, Rich News, Poor News, p. 185.

[69]Diamond, p. 59.

[70]Broadcasting, Aug. 28, 1978, p. 38.

[71]Ron Powers, The Newscasters, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977), p. 184.

[72]Broadcasting, Aug. 28, 1978, p. 38.

[73]Powers, p. 35.

[74]See Powers, p. 79; Diamond, pp. 96-98. Other news consultants were Hugh and Hoffman Inc. of McLean, Virginia; Rierson Broadcast consultants of New York, etc.

[75]Joseph T. Klapper, The Effects of Mass Communications, (New York: Free Press, 1960).

[76]Fang, p. 85.

[77]Broadcasting, Aug. 28, 1978. p. 38.

[78]George Eaton Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities, Fourth Edition, (New York: Harper & Row, Publs., 1972), p. 327.

CHAPTER IV

STRUCTURAL FACTORS AFFECTING MINORITIES

Integrating minorities and women into television news, or into television generally, was not a primary concern of broadcasters in 1960, the beginning of the period covered by this study, even though the civil rights movement had already begun to intensify. The images of blacks projected by news coverage showed them to be assertive, resistant, and hostile, which increasingly widened the gap between their traditional stereotyped roles in television and the political roles they were now assuming in the society. Demonstrators and pressure groups attempting to reform TV images faced the problem of making television broadcasters aware of their concerns and getting them to comply with their demands. In this chapter we will examine several structural factors affecting the TV images of minorities and women.

"Minority" Audiences in 1960

Upon entering the 1960's decade, a topic of discussion in the television trade journals was the minority audience. The term "minority," in television circles, then referred not to racial or ethnic groups, but to categories

of viewers who preferred programming other than that popular with the majority of TV users. People who selected the more "cultural" forms of entertainment or informational programs that did not attract large audiences, were said to have "minority tastes" or to prefer "quality programming."[1] Technically blacks might have constituted such an audience if a show had attracted mainly black viewers but not enough people to get good ratings. Audiences of day time shows that were largely made up of women, however, were not categorized in this way. Daytime television was targeted mainly towards women, generally housewives, because women comprised most of the daytime audience. When shows attracted only viewers who shared a taste for a special kind of program content, not a "bad" show with a small audience, such an audience was regarded as a "minority" audience.

Several factors, however, accounted for the growing recognition that the "minority" viewers of news programming deserved more attention. It was becoming evident that more and more homes were acquiring second TV sets, which stimulated a fear that this would fractionalize television audiences in the future.[2] Still another problem was that of selling time. The supply of television time being finite, a twenty-four hour day, broadcasters could not expand the amount of programming produced. On the other hand, if TV time could be made more valuable to the advertiser, it could become more profitable. By 1960 advertisers were becoming

concerned that buying the largest audience was not necessarily an efficient way to spend a client's money, especially if it were for the high-priced television medium. As TV costs were rising, it became prudent to select audiences more carefully. An example of the problem was a western used as a vehicle for selling a denture cleaner, which attracted more children and teen-agers than older people. Obviously, ratings alone were not enough to determine the value of a show. Market researchers had begun to offer demographic data to enable advertisers to match audiences to their products so as to "avoid wasteful sponsorship."[3]

Besides economic motivations, an important stimulus to considering the elite cultured minority audience was the desire of sponsors and TV stations to maintain good public relations and favorable images of themselves in the community. Critics of television charged that too much emphasis was placed upon mass appeal shows and not enough programming was offered having artistic or intellectual merit. News fit into the category of quality programming and attracted a "quality" audience.[4] Many of the most vocal critics of television were among the cultured minority of viewers whose opinions might influence the opinions of others. Reminding broadcasters of this, the trade literature published reviews of the Katz and Lazarsfeld study which showed how the personal opinions held by opinion

leaders influenced the opinions of others.[5] Further, by this time the television industry had been sensitized to negative commentary. The quiz show and payola scandals in the late 1950's had embarrassed television broadcasters all over the nation, and much of the prestige this new industry had come to enjoy had been destroyed.[6]

News was a kind of programming that offered broadcasters certain benefits, having the latent functions discussed in Chapter III. In the trade literature, television news was described as an "advantageous purchase arrangement" that fulfilled the "corporate obligation" and gave a sponsor a "higher identification." Sponsors could enjoy satisfaction and prestige resulting from serving the community. As news programming was controlled by the broadcaster rather than advertisers, who at that time were often the producers of programs telecast in time slots bought for sponsors, the broadcaster could sell participations, juggle programs, and design program content to make their stations more competitive in the ratings. Moreover, there was a great demand for TV time by advertisers with budgets too small to buy an entire program. By 1960, evening news shows were one kind of informational programming that was acceptable to advertisers, though only a few years earlier news had often been carried on sustaining time. In contrast, documentaries lagged far behind in salability.[7]

Marketing strategies played upon the uniqueness of news. Evening news shows lacking mass appeal were scheduled before prime time or very late when fewer viewers were available. Time salesmen stressed the lower cost of news as compared with entertainment. These lower costs, that were determined by the lesser ratings, nonetheless promised a concentration of affluent viewers. Continuing sponsors of news reported sales gains traceable to these programs. The evening news was television's bargain basement; placing commercials on a news show could eliminate the wasteful spending abhorred by sponsors when non-buying viewers were the receivers of their commercials.[8] An ad agency official speaking before a meeting of advertising executives in Chicago questioned the wisdom of advertising agencies that turned their backs on news: "Is it not better that the smaller audience of thinking people might do you more good than the vast audience?" Using Chuck Percy of Bell and Howell as an example, he said that Percy, who "did not seem to worry about getting into shows most . . . sponsors won't touch, was doing pretty good" using news programs.[9]

It was evident that broadcasters could recognize special audiences--those having "minority tastes," "minority interests," or a desire for "quality programming"--if these advanced the interests of the television companies. It demonstrated that television broadcasters could flexibly meet special conditions of the market by devising ways to

increase the salability of air time. It also demonstrated that the prevailing practice of appealing to majority tastes could be suspended when such a strategy offered an advantage. In 1960 the concept of a minority audience, as used by broadcasters, did not extend to recognizing the programming desired by ethnic and racial groups in the society. The recognition of an elite minority, however, presaged future adjustments to changing social conditions in the society when television broadcasters would be affected.

Awareness of Racial and Ethnic Minorities and Women

In 1960 broadcasters either showed no awareness of the needs of racial and ethnic minority groups or they held negative views of the value of minority group members to television programming. In the case of blacks, it was generally believed that their images on camera were not suitable for television; but their exclusion was also the result of long standing discrimination. They were excluded from off-camera jobs as well as from those on-camera. The lack of concern for these minority interests was evident in various ways. To illustrate, the Charlie Chan series was much resented by Chinese-Americans who spent many years pressuring to get the program off the air. In 1960, however, before it was eventually discontinued, a shirt commercial was televised in which the actors from the series, playing Charlie Chan and his Number One Son, modeled the shirts.10 Towards blacks, the attitudes of the 1950's

persisted. Advertisers openly claimed that they did not want their products identified with Negroes.[11] Barnouw cites a letter explaining the advertisers' rationale:

> It is the general policy of advertisers to glamorize their products, the people who buy them, and the whole American social and economic scene. . . . The American consuming public as presented by the advertising industry today is middle class, not lower class; happy in general, not miserable or frustrated . . .[12]

Blacks could not glamourize products since they were stigmatized as an inferior group in the society. Moreover, the Black Movement was making the frustrations of blacks a vivid element of the social scene.

In a different manner, women were also shown little regard. They were subject to restrictions in TV roles. As an example, when Betty Furness was to do the Westinghouse commercials at a national political convention, commercials that made her a familiar personality to the national audience, her sponsor decided that she should not be permitted to comment except in a minimal way. Instead, a male announcer would deliver the corporate messages and she would mainly demonstrate the appliances. In commercials aired during the convention coverage, Westinghouse felt "discussion of some subjects sounds better coming from a man."[13] Weather reporters, however, were both male and female. Carol Reed was a popular weatherwoman who appeared nightly on WCBS-TV. As is often the case with the job of reporting weather, one of her functions was to add a light

note to the program despite bad weather or grim news. This she did. Carol Reed had many fans in the audience who followed her taste in fashions as well as her information about the weather. She did not report news stories.[14]

Very rarely were women seen reporting hard news, partly because there were so few, but also because they often prepared stories behind the scenes for on-camera delivery by men. Pauline Frederick was one of the first women to report news in television. Previously she had worked in radio network news. She claimed the networks were opposed to putting a woman on the air when she first began to work in New York in 1946. After moving to television, she encountered the same resistance, and at times from the same people who also had by then moved into television. ABC was willing to call her on a free lance basis "for things like covering a forum on how to get a husband." Instead, she would go to the United Nations on her own, and if she came up with an exclusive story, she would get on the air. She never had trouble being accepted by people at the UN. It was at the networks that she found great opposition to a female being on the air. Reporting on her specialty, international relations, meant being relegated to part-time work for long periods of time.[15] Nancy Dickerson was one of the earliest women to appear regularly before the television cameras. After six years as a radio news reporter and TV documentary producer at CBS, she was promoted to

correspondent in 1960. Her beat was the national capitol. She said she was always controversial at the networks because of being the only female in her position.[16] In 1961 the news chief at ABC News praised Lisa Howard, who had joined his staff, as a very competent journalist.[17] These women were exceptions and no minority group members reported news. Newscasting was an occupation for white men.[18]

Women, in comparison with their male colleagues, were often at a disadvantage in getting assignments or access to news sources. One handicap was that they were barred from interviews with visiting dignitaries at the National Press Club, because only men were granted membership. In addition, news producers and directors often thought women were not able to go after hard news stories. News executives were reluctant to send women into dangerous situations or even out into the streets.[19]

Identifiable members of ethnic or racial minorities were non-existent among television newscasters. One black veteran radio and television announcer[20] worked at CBS, but male minorities had no role in television news reporting in New York. Neither did women if they were also members of racial or ethnic minority groups.[21] Such were the conditions for minorities in television news as the 1960's decade got underway. It would be several more years before the numbers of women appearing on news programs would increase. The disregard for minorities is well illustrated

by an announcement published in 1962 in Newsweek magazine: Right after Labor Day, James Hagerty, formerly President Eisenhower's press secretary, announced that he would be hiring a Negro television reporter for ABC News, the first on a television network. Even though Hagerty had spent eight years in the White House in close contact with people of the news media, he was surprised by the absence of minority reporters. Hagerty said that he never realized "there was no opportunity for Negro reporters in the networks" and he added, "I should have known, but I'd never thought of it."[22]

The exclusion of women and minorities from television news in the early sixties was part of a larger-scale pattern evident in all kinds of television programming. As long as news functioned as a showcase for televison stations and as a public relations vehicle for sponsors, in addition to being a carrier for sales messages, the types of people who reported news would not be chosen lightly. Only those who projected images consistent with the symbolic preferences of sponsors and broadcasters qualified as newscasters.[23] When public sentiment was understood to hold that minorities were inferior members of the society, their images hardly qualified to fulfill the intended functions, particularly latent functions, of news programming. Furthermore, the nature of competition among televison companies, discussed below, discouraged any

pioneering on the part of broadcasters to upgrade racial or ethnic group images by deliberately placing minority people in the newscaster's role.

Ratings

The way in which competition among television broadcasters was structured in the early 1960's discouraged the projection of minority images in news programming. Television companies were engaged in a constant struggle to get better ratings, the accepted measure by which broadcasters conducted their businesses. To air programming desired by small segments of the public was thus contrary to the pursuit of profits, the primary reason for which broadcasters were in business.[24]

Rates charged for television time reflected the number of homes a program reached. Television stations' charges for time increases with the size of audience. The Neilsen, and other, ratings report what proportions of households with television sets tune in to each program. Other factors which affect audience size also affect the value of televison time. The number of people available to be in the viewing audience varies according to time of day, week, and seasons of the year. People are more likely to watch TV in the evening, during the "prime time" hours, and when special events occur. Aiming programs towards the types of people available during the various time periods was a way of meeting the deficiencies of the viewing

cycles. Rather than attempting to satisfy all tastes, programming tried to draw the greatest number of people into the television audience. In this manner, the calendar and the clock determined the type of audience to which a program would appeal. Programming schedules thus reflect the cyclical routines of everyday life. An additional factor associated with these fluctuations in the use of television is the composition of the audience, or the "demographics," such as discussed above in repect to the elite audiences who watched TV news. Audiences differ according to age, sex, economic status, educational achievement, special interests, etc.[25]

Catering to majority tastes in programming content and scheduling, however, was the ideal expedient for maximizing revenues from advertising, because of the dependence of stations on the ratings. As long as TV operates as an advertising medium and ratings determine the cost of air time, the total number of people who tune in to a station's programs is crucial.[26]

The networks had long stressed the importance of the "national audience." This was part of the heritage from radio. In 1938 David Sarnoff stated that broadcasting should not be limited to "any narrow or class interest," and that broadcasting to the national audience, "the interests of all classes, all races, all creeds," was the way to pursue cultural goals and better programming.[27] Twenty-two

years later Sarnoff was still holding fast to this belief, and he said that NBC's concept of service in the public interest was to give reasonable satisfaction to the varying interests of the main audience, although minority interests should not be suppressed. Nor did he think broadcasting, at least at NBC, was neglecting minority interests:

> I do not think it can be questioned that out of a total week's TV offerings, there is a volume and variety of rewarding material for every significant element of the audience if viewers well make the slight effort to seek it out.[28]

Similarly, Frank Stanton stated CBS's policy: "It is a major part of our function to try to appeal to most of the people most of the time." The broadcaster who would do otherwise would lose his support and disappear from the scene.[29] At ABC the outlook was the same. The network's chief executive, Leonard Goldenson, defended his network's policy, saying, "What puzzles one a great deal about the critics of TV is their persistent attack on the fundamental concept of the vote of Americans with the type of program they prefer." He further pointed out that the large and varied choice available in TV programming neglects few segments of the community.[30]

Several arguments have been advanced to justify this system. Specialized audiences would not be lost to advertising. These viewers would still see commercials, because they also watch the popular programs along with everybody else.[31] Others argued that the main inhibition to

good programming, especially in the informational areas, is economic, and large audiences for entertainment, as well as other programs, are needed to bring in the revenues that allow good programming and good news reporting to be produced.[32]

As long as ratings were the basis for conducting business, specialized in programming for small portions of the viewing audience was too costly for a station. Even if such programs could earn profits, the "cost" in terms of the ratings would be too great. By airing a program having only a narrow appeal, a station would allow viewers to switch to competing channels, and thus contribute to the ratings of one's competitors. They would also lose the "general audience" who tuned out of specialized programs and would not tune back to the channel after the special show was over. In effect programming for small audiences would produce a chain of problems for a broadcaster: It would lower ratings, and then the rates a station could charge, and, finally, the revenues earned would diminish. This risk existed at both national and local levels of TV broadcasting; local stations had to strive to attract the largest number of viewers within their market areas just as the networks competed for the largest national audiences.

Competition within the television industry permits innovation and creativity if the risk of losing an audience to competitors is minimized. For this reason, only the new

and novel that staved within the boundaries of proven formulas could be safely presented. This aspect of television competition operated against the interests of racial and ethnic minorities in the early 1960's. Although a widely held belief in American society is that competition results in better products and services for the consumer, such was not the case for television viewers. Broadcasters operate within a constricted market situation; they have only a finite supply of time to sell and a finite number of people to appeal to. Being competitive means they must take viewers away from one another or entice greater numbers of the public into joining the TV audience. Retaining audiences, as well as expanding them, requires constant effort. Unless a specialized audience can offer distinct advertising advantages, the broadcaster must appeal to the largest audience. In 1960 minorities and women were generally valued negatively by broadcasters, so there was little incentive to do away with the exclusionary practices directed towards members of ethnic and racial groups. Nor had minorities or women in the society become vocal enough to challenge the status quo.

Economic Censorship

An informal system of practices pervaded the television industry in the early sixties which excluded minorities from on-camera roles if they did not conform to the prevailing stereotypes. Barnouw's concept, "sponsorship

strategy," referred to the corporate practice of selecting and vetoing programs to be broadcast. Many excellent programs were televised, but only if they were first approved by the sponsor and were shown to serve the sponsor's interests. Among TV executives refusing to accept a program was known as the "sitout."[33] In the past, serious programs about Negroes were among the subjects that had been turned down.[34]

Sponsors and advertisers acted as a check over broadcasters by withholding sponsorship when they felt the content of a program did not enhance the sales of their products. In 1960 it was the white majority who was seen as the consumer, so this was the group to whom appeals were directed. To illustrate, one attempt to feature Sidney Poitier was vetoed during the 1950's, because the sponsors were unwilling to have a black actor play a leading role on the "Philco Playhouse" for fear "it would arouse the wrath of the South and hurt sales." The leading role had to be played by a white actor, with the script changed so as not to be about blacks.[35] Usually, however, sponsors acted more subtly; they simply rejected programs they thought unsuited to their products.

In 1963, after previewing "East Side, West Side" on a closed circuit, two CBS affiliates declined to schedule the show because it featured a black actress.[36] The rejection of programs by affiliates was something a network

had to avoid, as that would lower network ratings. Network broadcasters feared tampering with the prevailing types of images projected in their programming because of the economic threat posed. As earlier in radio, the practice was that nothing should go on the air that would offend regional groups, most notably in the Southern states.[37] The South accounted for a substantial segment of the national market, and, of course, sponsor's markets. To avoid whatever was regarded as offensive programming, to only a few viewers, was one way to keep the ratings high.

Barnouw's concept, however, dealt only with the selection of programs that would be televised. We would argue, however, that the exclusion practiced against racial and ethnic minorities and women, which permeated all television programming, constituted a form of censorship. As generally used, "censorship" is a concept that refers to political control. It is the systematic suppression of information at the request or demand of a government official, backed by coercive powers of the state, when information is deemed to be harmful to the state or the society.[38] It was not this kind of censorship that restricted minority images in television. The ever present pressure of station or network competition and the need to service advertisers fostered an <u>economic censorship</u> of TV messages. This economic censorship was systematic, in that any content that might hurt the sales of television time to

advertisers or the sales of sponsors' products would be suppressed before going on the air. All participants in the relationships producing TV's messages engaged in self-censorship or in censoring the others with whom they worked and did business. Economic censorship was a normal aspect of the work of people employed by broadcasting and advertising companies. It applied to employing Negroes on camera, as evident in an article in Broadcasting:

> Producers . . . put together programs with the idea of selling them and instinctively avoid including elements that might impede a sale. . . . Because many advertisers fear that the inclusion of Negro actors, even as extras, may hurt sales in many areas of the country, they shy away from the use of Negro performers.[39]

Another report said that among Hollywood executives there is a belief that one of the most influential network bosses in New York has stated that he wants no shows about "Chinks or Niggers." Whether true or not, the executives act as if it were.[40] To get programs on the air, they had to first be produced in a form that was marketable. In sum, the form of censorship practiced in television bas backed by economic force rather than political force.

Economic censorship was fundamental to the operations of commercial television, and took the form of collaboration between broadcasters and advertisers. Sarnoff explained, for example, that NBC took the objectives of advertisers into account in determining its program schedule. He justified this policy by stating, "The

influence of the advertiser on broadcasting is expansive, because it makes possible the resources for all we do, sponsored or unsponsored."[41] As a result, economic censorship was integral to program planning. The networks preferred to stay within the bounds of what they thought the sponsors and their affiliates would accept.

The content of special coverage programs is sometimes incompatible with the needs of sponsors and may be considered unsuitable for advertising messages which would be adjacent to the coverage of what are often controversial issues.[42] Such was the case in 1963 when the networks had difficulty trying to sell sponsors their special coverage of the Civil Rights Movement. Almost all of the programs prepared to provide background and to report the Labor Day march on Washington to promote the civil rights of blacks were turned down by prospective sponsors.

> The fear of the advertiser is that the dramatic footage of the actual strife gets people riled up, in the core of their stomachs, and such an experience might alienate customers and outlets of national advertisers, especailly in the South.[43]

Sponsors were not likely to intrude into the content of news messages or news documentaries as in entertainment shows, but their abstention from backing a program could accomplish the same end.[44] This affected controversial documentaries most. Advertisers were less likely to reject news, because in news, especially that which was televised daily, the problem of negatively affecting a sponsor's

product was eased by the use of special techniques. Commercials could be suspended on days when conflicting news stories were reported. If a story was about an aircrash, the commercials for an airline sponsor would not be shown during the newscast for a day or two. News programs with their varied content can be manipulated more easily than documentaries that devote entire programs to one topic. Humor and human interest stories can also be injected easily into news shows. This is done on many shows as they go off the air, so that the viewers will be left with a pleasant feeling and a desire to tune in again. The chit-chat engaged in by anchorpeople with other reporters also distracts viewers from dwelling on more serious thoughts associated with bad news. Thus, while keeping the community abreast of ongoing affairs, the techniques of news production were designed to both avoid offense to sponsors and assure the return of the viewers.

The images and impressions news programs were expected to convey far exceeded the mere transmission of commercial messages. The association of a sponsor with news was expected to project an impression of his prestige and responsibility to the community. For a television station, news was its showcase. The images of newscasters, particularly anchormen, were supposed to contribute to the credibility and prestige of news programming as well as its ratings.[45] Thus, the self-censorship engaged in by the

commercial broadcasters gave serious attention to newscaster images.

In the early 1960's there was an evident sensitivity to the nuances of the white male stereotype, rather than to minority images. Actions affecting several newsmen demonstrate not only the television broadcaster's concern about newscaster images, but also how management censored or controlled these images. To illustrate, Robert Trout, a radio star, who for several years had anchored the local evening news for WCBS-TV and who was given a brief opportunity to co-anchor CBS's television coverage of the Democratic convention in 1964, was passed over as a possible anchorman for the network's evening news because of the image he projected. The executive who "had much of the power to decide who appeared on the network's evening news show said Trout looked like 'an Armenian rug merchant.'"[46] Trout had proved his capability in covering political conventions, doing so in radio for the past thirty years, and he had tutored Edward R. Murrow in the techniques of newscasting, but in network television his smooth, swarthy looks were held against him.[47] William Paley, who headed CBS, exercised an avid interest in who anchored news shows. Another outstanding journalist at CBS was not given the anchor spot because of his image:

> Charles Collingwood . . . was so handsome, so debonair, so infernally elegant that he was perceived by some of his superiors as being just a bit too soft and indolent. In this regard, Person

> to Person worked against him. The program brought ample rewards in extra income and viewer recognition, but it also hurt him in other ways. . . . Collingwood nattered [sic] his way through the interviews with such grace and charm that he usually seemed to be thoroughly enjoying the idle chitchat. His performance reinforced the notion that he was more comfortable in this milieu--tu-tutting with the celebrity set, the beautiful people--than he was in the clenched-fist world of breaking news.
>
> That was extremely unfair to Collingwood. The man, after all, had trudged through the mud of European battlefields as a reporter, which was a lot more dues than most of his detractors had ever paid. But his patrician clothes and manner set him apart from his colleagues.[48]

At ABC Leonard Goldenson was reported to have a "deep concern" in his network's programming, and although "he leaves the day-to-day decisions to others, he makes program suggestions . . ."[49]

When Walter Cronkite was picked to anchor the evening network news program for CBS, his image as well as his journalistic qualifications were thought to have helped him. An article in TV Guide stated,

> There's little doubt that CBS hoped that Cronkite would charm the viewers as NBC's successful pair do, and yet give information in as much depth as the medium can sound, expressed without prejudice.[50]

Dan Rather, Cronkite's successor, noted an important quality of Cronkite's image:

> What made Walter Cronkite a star, at the network level, was his inner integrity. Over the years the viewers came to believe him.[51]

One reason why the anchorperson is so important is that the bulk of a day's news stories are much the same on

competing news shows. The technicalities of staging and direction are lost on the viewer who can easily turn the dial to a similar report. Thus, "the contest comes down to a quality easily named, hard to define: believability, charisma, personality, warmth."[52] Yet there is no pattern of success if one observes the images of anchormen. No two look or sound alike. The only common denominator is believability--the believability that comes across the screen.[53]

NBC's "Huntley-Brinkley Report" was the most popular news show on the networks in the early 1960's, and much of its success was attributed to the images projected by the co-anchormen. They were, according to Halberstam,

> an almost perfect anchor: Huntley, from Montana, Cronkite-like in his rock steadiness; David Brinkley, from North Carolina, the tart, slightly rebellious younger brother who could by deft tonal inflection imply a disbelief and an irreverence that the medium in its inherent overseriousness badly needed.[54]

Obviously, the matter of newscaster images was very important. The hands off policy towards actual news messages did not extend to the images of newscasters or the overall character of a news show. A creditable, believable anchorman was the key to selling a news show. As long as concerns focused on the suitability of white males, the improvement and integration of newscaster images did not concern television executives. The absence of minority reporters was normal in television news and consistent with

the exclusion evident in other kinds of programming.

Responsibility for Television Images

Where to place the blame for the stereotyping of minority images was not always clear. Choosing an anchorman for a news show was a management concern, but the general character of minority images that pervaded television resulted from widespread actions by people occupying diverse roles as they practiced or were subject to economic censorship. This complicated the task of seeking change. It was necessary for activists to pressure not only broadcasters but advertisers, sponsors, and all others who might be involved in the production of TV programs. It was assumed that the viewing public would be offended by minority images, but economic censorship prevented the television audiences from having the opportunity to veto programs featuring minorities. No one really knew if product sales would be adversly affected if minorities were associated with a product.

Some activists held that advertisers were ultimately responsible. For example, George H. Fowler, speaking for the New York State Commission for Human Rights held advertising agencies and sponsors as responsible. He said,

> The nation, including the South, is more receptive to a fuller participation in our national life for all minorities. . . . Either agency men are ignorant of this fact or they choose to cling to old fears and ignore it.[55]

The Urban League of Greater New York, after a three year survey, charged in 1963 that the advertising industry was responsible because of a pervasive prejudice existing within that industry. Blacks were almost totally excluded; only eleven out of over 23,000 employees in ten large ad agencies were black.[56] This condition spread over into television mainly because of its dependence on advertising revenues. A black theatre critic, Dave Hepburn, commented,

> The two go hand in hand, and it is apparent that the same prejudices which keep an executive from hiring Negroes on the programs which agencies put together, also keep him from hiring a Negro artist, account executive or copywriter.[57]

Moreover, it was further pointed out in the trade journal, Broadcasting, that the FCC permitted this double standard by refusing to interfere in how ad agencies treated minorities.[58] On programs that were not produced by advertisers, the advertisers harboring such prejudices would not likely select programs featuring minorities in new images when buying time and placing sponsor's messages. Another black critic, George Norford, noted, however, that

> no definitive position has yet emerged as to who with the broadcaster, decides policy and controls the content of television programs and commercials--the agency or the sponsor.
>
> Some said it was one. Some said the other. Someimes it was both. Other times neither.[59]

Broadcasters could point out that they had no control over advertisers and sponsors, on one hand, nor over unions, artists associations, or audience tastes. They could stand behind public statements saying they did not

descriminate against minorities, while still supporting and participating in the patterns of behavior they denied existed. It was apparent that the broadcasters did little to counteract the stereotyping of minorities. As for exercising their manipulative skills to influence audiences to acquire new attitudes, or even to test existing attitudes, broadcasters were extremely timid.

A factor affecting the structural patterns of television was the youth of the industry. As compared with motion-pictures, Norford further commented,

> Television is not so frozen. With each new season starting in September, it changes. And this augers well for the effort now underway.[60]

Summary

In this chapter we have described several structural factors that were important in shaping newscaster images in 1960, the beginning of the period covered by this study. All fit the Conflicting response of our paradigm described in Chapter II. Broadcasters were not concerned with matters important to racial and ethnic minorities and saw no advantage in using minority group members or women as newscasters, except for weatherwomen. Nor were there any forceful pressure groups to get the broadcasters to change practices that would later on be considered blatant discrimination. As the discontent of minority groups was not loud enough to attract the attention of television officials, the broadcasters took for granted that minority

viewers were part of the mass audience during the evening hours and that they would accept whatever programming was directed to the majority audience. One of the unwritten rules of economic censorship, a mechanism controlling television production, was that minorities amd women were to be excluded from newscasting. So pervasive was this censorship that in the succeeding years, when minority activists organized to pressure broadcasters to reform their employment practices and the images they projected, there was often doubt as to where these efforts should be directed. The problems affecting minority images of the early 1960's were not easily resolved; in fact, these problems continued throughout the sixties and into the next decade. In the following chapters we will discuss the changes that broadcasters introduced in the images of newscasters after minority activists and their supporters began prodding station and network executives.

Footnotes

[1]Broadcasting, Jan. 18, 1960, pp. 64, 85; Apr. 18, 1960, pp. 31-32; June 20, 1960, p. 50; Aug. 29, 1960, p. 42; Nov. 5, 1960, p. 24; Oct. 23, 1961, p. 72; "Focus on People," Television Magazine, Jan. 1960, pp. 47, 51, 55; Albert R. Kroeger, "You Needn't Go Broke on Public Affairs," Television Magazine, Jan. 1961, p. 108.

[2]Broadcasting, Sept. 5, 1960, p. 74; "Focus on Business: Television's New Dimensions, Television Magazine, Jan. 1960, p. 148.

[3]Broadcasting, June 20, 1960, p. 50; Oct. 23, 1961, p. 72; Sal Nuccio, "Advertising Programming Policy Criticized," New York Times, Nov. 12, 1964, p. 60; "Focus on People," Television Magazine, Jan. 1960, p. 148; "Why Some Products Fail on TV," Printer's Ink, Aug. 5, 1960, pp. 32,36.

[4]Broadcasting, Jan. 4, 1960, p. 36; Jan. 18, 1960, pp. 64, 85; Kroeger, p. 108.

[5]Eliuh Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence, (New York: The Free Press), 1955; Kroeger, p.87; Stanley Matz and Martin Ryan, "The Concept of Personal Influence," Television Magazine, May 1960, pp. 93-95.

[6]Erik Barnouw, The Sponsor, (New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), p. 56; Broadcasting, Jan. 4, 1960, p. 36.

[7]Broadcasting, Apr. 18, 1960, pp. 31, 32; Apr. 25, 1960, p. 32; June 20, 1960, p. 50; Aug. 29, 1960, p. 42; Nov. 5, 1960, p. 10; Dec. 19, 1960, p 39; "Focus on People," Television Magazine, Jan. 1960, p. 47; "Focus on Business," Ibid., pp. 47, 51, 55; George G. Huntington, "The TV Scene," Television Magazine, June 1960, p. 43; Kroeger, Jan. 1961, p. 88; Printer's Ink, May 26, 1961, p. 41; Television Magazine, Jan. 1960, p. 73; James J. Dailey, "The Sponsor Was the Last to Know," TV Guide, June 1, 1962, pp. 18, 21.

[8]Broadcasting, Apr. 25, 1960, p. 32; Dec. 19, 1960, p. 39; "Focus on People," Television Magazine, Jan. 1960, p. 47; Kroeger, p. 112.

[9]Broadcasting, Apr. 25, 1960, p. 32; Nov. 5, 1960, pp. 24, 26; "Focus on People," Television Magazine, Jan. 1960, p. 47; Kroeger, p. 112.

[10]Broadcasting, Nov. 28, 1960, p 34; Window Dressing on the Set: Women and Minorities on Television, A Report of

the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Aug. 1977, pp. 7-8.

[11]Broadcasting, July 25, 1960, p. 40; Sal Nuccio, "Advertising: Programming Policy Criticized," New York Times, Nov. 12, 1964, p. 60; Richard F. Shepard, "Broadcasters Warned to Speed Hiring of Negroes," New York Times, June 25, 1963, p. 16.

[12]Barnouw, pp. 50, 196.

[13]Broadcasting, May 30, 1960, p. 83.

[14]Bernard Weintraub, "Rainy Days Are Fair for Weathermen," New York Times, Oct. 4, 1964, II, p. 17; The Institude for Motivational Research, Inc. in association with Market Planning Corp. (an affiliate of McCann-Erickson, Inc.), "An Analysis of the Motivational Research Study of New York Television Channels," 1959 (mimeo.).

[15]Anita Klever, Women in Television, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975), pp. 122-125; Judith Gelfman, Women in Television News, (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1976), p. 115.

[16]Nancy Dickerson, Among Those Present, (New York: Ballantine Books, 1976), pp. 20, 34, 172.

[17]"TV-Radio Networks Budget $50 Million fo Cover News," Editor & Publisher, Aug. 19, 1961, p. 9.

[18]M. L. Stein, Your Career in Journalism, (New York: Julian Messner, Inc., 1965), p. 16.

[19]"Women Seek Equal Access to Press Talk," Editor & Publisher, Nov. 25, 1961, p. 16; Gelfman, pp. 94-96.

[20]The television announcer is usually not seen on camera. His voice-overs are heard at station breaks, when technical problems arise, etc. Thus, no visual image is projected.

[21]Amsterdam News, Feb. 16, 1963, p. 3.

[22]Newsweek, Aug. 20, 1962, p. 62.

[23]Broadcasting, Dec. 12, 1960, p. 34; May 26, 1961, p. 41; Maurine Christopher, "And Now a Word from . . .," Advertising Age, June 28, 1971, p. 54; Herschel Shosteck, "Factors Influencing Appeal of TV New Personalities," Journal of Broadcasting, Winter, 1973-1974, p. 63.

[24]Sydney W. Head, Broadcasting in America, 2nd Ed., (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972), pp. 274-275, 295-304.

[25]Ibid., pp. 276-282; Broadcasting, Nov. 11, 1960, pp. 1, 9; Oct. 23, 1961, p. 72; "Why Some Products Fail on TV," Printer's Ink, Aug. 5, 1960, pp. 32, 36.

[26]Broadcasting, Jan. 11, 1960, p. 9.

[27]David Sarnoff, "Serving a National Audience," a speech before the Women's National Radio Committee at the Hotel St. Regis, New York City, May 4, 1938 and broadcast by NBC-Blue Network at 2 P.M.

[28]Broadcasting, Jan. 4, 1960, p. 43.

[29]Ibid., Feb. 1, 1960, p. 62.

[30]Ibid., Feb. 8, 1960, p. 62.

[31]George G. Huntington, "The TV Scene," Television Magazine, June 1960, p. 43.

[32]Broadcasting, Feb. 1, 1960, pp. 42-43; Oct. 31, 1960, p. 53.

[34]Barnouw, pp. 50-51; Broadcasting, July 25, 1960, p. 40; Head, p. 337; New York Times, Nov. 5, 1963, p. 63; Window Dressing on the Set, pp. 4-8, 25.

[35]Barnouw, p. 50; Broadcasting, July 25, 1960, p. 40.

[36]New York Times, Nov. 5, 1963, p. 63.

[37]Window Dressing on the Set, p. 25.

[38]Barnouw, p. 34; Head, pp. 434-435.

[39]Broadcasting, July 1, 1963, p. 25.

[40]Murray Schumach, "Stars Join Drive Against Bigotry," New York Times, July 15, 1963, p. 25.

[41]Broadcasting, Feb. 1, 1960, p. 42.

[42]Broadcasting, Apr. 18, 1960, pp. 33, 36, 39; Apr. 25, 1960, p. 31; Head, pp. 274-275.

[43]Richard Elden, "TV Nets Pick up Some Big Costs," Chicago Sun-times, Sept. 3, 1963. Also see Barnouw, pp. 52, 114.

[44]Barnouw, pp. 34-35; Broadcasting, Apr. 25, 1960, p. 8.

[45]"Behind Those Gulf News Specials," Printer's Ink, May 26, 1961, p. 4; Broadcasting, Dec. 12, 1960, p. 34; Christopher, p. 54; Shosteck, p. 63.

[46]Gary Paul Gates, Air Time: The Inside Story of CBS News, (New York: 1978), p. 119.

[47]Ibid., see program listings in TV Guide, Jan. 5, 1962.

[48]Gates, pp. 49-50.

[49]Albert R. Kroeger, "Miracle Worker of West 66th Street," Television Magazine, Feb. 1961, p. 68.

[50]Richard Gehman, "The Deliberate Dutchman," TV Guide, June 29, 1962, pp. 24-27.

[51]Dan Rather, The Camera Never Blinks, (New York: Ballantine Books, 1977), p. 316.

[52]Ibid.

[53]Ibid.

[54]David Halberstam, The Powers That Be, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979), p. 422.

[55]Richard F. Shepard, "Sponsors Resist Negro TV Roles," New York Times, Apr. 10, 1963, p. 79.

[56]New York Times, Apr. 16, 1963, p. 15.

[57]Dave Hepburn, "In the Wings," Amsterdam News, May 11, 1963, p. 14.

[58]Broadcasting, Nov. 5, 1962, p. 68.

[59]George Norford, guest columnist writing in "In the Wings," Amsterdam News, July 20, 1963, p. 14.

[60]Ibid.

CHAPTER V

RESPONSES TO MINORITY DEMANDS
1960 - 1964

The early sixties were significant because broadcasters began changing the stereotyped images of minorities. Minorities were beginning to organize to protest discrimination in the entertainment and mass media industries, principally the broadcasting, motion-picture, and advertising industries, and the Broadway theatre, all of which were linked to the production of images. When the decade began, few groups were organized to pressure broadcasters. The taboos limiting the roles of blacks were then in full force, and the exploitation of demeaning racial and ethnic stereotypes was an acceptable practice. Blacks were the most publically active group during this period, and conditions affecting women had not yet become an issue.

In this chapter we will outline what activists did and examine how the broadcasters responded to their demands during the first half of the 1960's. Events and changes that related to television images in the later half of that decade and in the 1970's will be examined in subsequent chapters.

Efforts to break down the stereotyped television images of minorities were inextricibly linked with attempts to get the television and advertising industries to hire more minority people, whether on camera or in behind-the-scenes jobs. As already shown, it was widely believed that gaining entry to on-camera jobs was most important, because that would effect public opinion. On the other hand, if more minorities were working in the non-visible occupations, that would ultimately affect decisions determining who went on the air and, most importantly, the transmitted images.[1]

Pressures on Broadcasters

Activists, individuals and groups, used various techniques to pressure broadcasters to change television images. Some attempted to educate and persuade the broadcasters to change the images of minorities and then, if progress was too slow, to generate public attention and bad publicity. Threats of campaigns to boycott selected products were an additional weapon of the activists. Complaints lodged with government agencies, such as the New York State Commission against Discrimination (later called the New York State Human Rights Commission), and appeals to Congressmen brought government into the issue.[2] Blacks were the most active minority during this period. Protesters received additional support, mainly verbal, from many organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union, the Protestant Council of New York, the United Federation of

Teachers, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, and others.[3] Critics of television and the theatre writing in magazines and newspapers were an important factor in bringing the issue of minority images to the attention of the public. Numerous public statements that were put forth comdemning the discrimination in television imagery have already been noted in Chapter I. These statements were most frequently reported when activists engaged in protests, government agencies held hearings, or organizations sponsored panel discussions concerning television images. Adding emphasis to the activities in New York was the intensification of the Black Movement during the early sixties, with violent confrontations in the South and news reports constantly reminding the society of the dissatisfactions of blacks.

Following are actions taken by individuals and groups who sought to get television images changed:

1960-1961:

After NAACP officials had spent years conferring with broadcasters to get the syndicated programming of "Amos 'N' Andy" off the air, an incident occurred in 1960 that involved a black actor, Sidney Poitier, which generated a new kind of criticism about discrimination in television. Following interference by the sponsor's advertising agency in a "Philco Playhouse" production, because Poitier had been cast in the leading role, the Fund for the Republic

sponsored a panel to discuss the advertiser's influence on programming.[4]

The Federation of Italian-American Democratic Organizations of New York, distressed and angered by television images of their group, organized to pressure executives of the ABC network in 1961. They sought to get "The Untouchables" off the air because of the program's negative portrayals of their ethnic group. Several techniques were used: Italian-American Congressmen from the New York viewing area met with ABC officials, Italian-American activists picketed ABC's New York offices and a hotel where radio and television executives were holding an annual banquet, and the group threatened to start a boycott against the sponsor's products. The matter was then taken before an FCC hearing.[5]

1962

It became apparent in 1962 that activists were taking a more forceful stance. In March, P. Jay Sidney, a black actor, led off with the first important action of that year by filing a complaint with the New York Commission Against Discrimination, charging that two television shows, the "Armstrong Circle Theatre" and the "United States Steel Hour," failed to depict Negroes in roles they might normally have in real life. Then, as the Commission was reluctant to suggest how shows should be cast, Sidney led a group out to picket, first, the New York City offices of United States

Steel and, a few weeks later, the Human Rights Commission itself to force an investigation of black exclusion from television programs. Thereupon, Bernard Katzen, a commissioner of the agency, arranged a conference in which Sidney and officials of NBC met in April.[6] The Human Rights Commissions of the state and the city thereafter continued to be involved in the problem of minority images. By late summer, George Fowler, of the New York State Human Rights Commission, had begun meeting with top echelon network executives in order to work out plans to implement placing more Negroes in television programs.[7]

At the same time, action directed towards other industries in which black images had become controversial were an additional stimulus making television executives more aware of minority complaints. As actors often seek work in either television or the theatre, the employment practices of Broadway producers also became a target of activists. In support of the minority cause, the Actors Equity Association held a series of meetings in March on alleged discrimination in Broadway shows.[8] A few weeks later members of the Congress of Racial Equality picketed two shows that "did not present a true picture of American life because they excluded Negroes from the theatre."[9] Later on, in October, the film, "The Longest Day," was picketed because casting had unrealistically excluded Negroes. Although the film had been released and could no

longer be changed, the picketing actors thought they would "point out the basic inequities of Hollywood casting."[10]

Another related event, in October of 1962, was when the House Committee of Labor and Education, presided over by Representative Adam Clayton Powell, convened in New York to investigate charges by Negro actors that the television networks practiced racial discrimination.[11] In addition to Negro performers, officials from many types of organizations testified, including television company executives, union officials, and advertising executives.[12]

At the close of the Congressional hearings, a group of black performers banded together calling themselves the Committee for the Employment of Negro Performers. With Chuck Gordone as chairman, and using Adam Clayton Powell's office in New York, the committee worked to "spearhead and coordinate the work of other organizations".[13]

In November, the New York Ethical Culture Society sent copies of its monitoring report to the FCC, the New York State Commission on Human Rights, Negro organizations, the news media, and the three television networks, which accused the television industry of not keeping abreast of changes in American society. The survey, summarizing data gathered by volunteers who monitored the programming of the three network owned stations in New York, reported no black reporters had been observed in news shows.[14]

By December, the Mayor's Committee on Job Advancement, which had been formed a few months earlier with Theodore Kheel as chairman, had gotten a letter campaign underway. Writing to key people in 100 businesses and industries with headquarters in New York, the committee urged that Negroes and members of other identifiable minorities be used in advertisments, commercials, and other image related occupations.[15]

At the end of the year, despite these increased efforts to chance minority images and employment, the theatre critic of the Amsterdam News contradicted claims by broadcasters that they could not find suitably qualified minorities to employ in their companies. Dave Hepburn wrote a detailed description in his weekly column about how executives at one New York station blatently discriminated against a well qualified black they had regarded with great interest until they discovered he was a Negro.[16]

Changes in the behavior of black consumers constituted another form of protest. As advertising supported television, any threat to the effectiveness of advertising was a potential threat to broadcasters. Surveys of the Negro market indicated that black consumers were a substantial factor in the marketing of mass produced products. Market researchers put forth information, such as revealed in a survey by Pulse, Inc., that the Negro in New York had reached a socio-economic level only slightly below

that of the the white inhabitants in New York.[17] Surveys, one as far back as 1955 and another in 1961, pointed out that when blacks felt a company discriminated in employing Negroes, their interest in the products of the company declined.[18]

Traditionally black consumers were loyal to nationally advertised name-brand products, but in the early sixties this was rapidly changing. By 1962, a study by the Center for Research in Marketing, in Peekskill, New York, found that 89 percent of over 1100 Negroes interviewed said they would boycott companies or products they believed unfair to their group. Nearly all had already joined in some sort of local boycott. "Selective buying" had become a means of expressing militancy.[19] Newsweek reported on a survey that showed many Negroes considered their purchasing power a weapon to be used in the battle for equal rights.[20]

The new black mood, as the Civil Rights Movement progressed, was beginning to reduce the effectiveness of "white" advertising messages, and, as a result, the cost of advertising for sponsors would increase. As early as 1960, as reported in Advertising Age, the director of research for the Johnson Publishing company, publisher of popular magazines for the Negro market, warned that to keep selling the black consumer, advertisers would have to "establish the brand as a symbol of status and racial progress"[21] by showing recogition to the Negro and helping him increase his

self-respect before he would buy it.[22] No longer could advertisers and producers of mass market goods take black consumers for granted.

Reports of the success of "selective patronage" campaigns in Philadelphia showed that the black clergymen there could indeed organize the buying power of their congregations. Businesses in that city that did not hire blacks had been singled out, one at a time, and presented with requests to hire Negroes--specifying how many be hired, the job positions they should be given, and a date when these requests should be met. Otherwise, the products of the companies would be boycotted. Several companies suffered severe reductions in sales, especially when black consumers were important to their businesses; others complied voluntarily to avoid such pressure. Using these techniques soon caught the interest of black leaders and black clergymen in New York.[23]

1963

Minority efforts became better organized and more vigorous in 1963. Representatives from the Human Rights Commissions of New York City and New York State continued to meet with key officials of the networks, local television stations, advertising agencies, and companies that sponsored television programs to persuade these decision-makers to have their organizations hire more blacks for on-camera work.[24] To assist broadcasters who claimed they did not

know where to find qualified blacks, agencies sympathetic to blacks, such as the New York State Human Rights Commission, also drew up lists of outstanding blacks available to participate in various kinds of television programming.[25] This drive continued into the Fall. By October, frustrated with the slow results of persuasive techniques, the New York City Commission on Human Rights adopted a new policy that called for "preferential treatment," to compensate Negroes for one hundred years of inequities.[26] But a month later, George Fowler of the State Human Rights Commission reported that after months of countless meetings, little had been accomplished.[27]

Public discussion continued. Black leaders, acting individually or as representatives of black organizations, scheduled meetings and forums as occasions to confront television officials with their grievances. In October, the New York Chapter of the National Academy of Arts and Sciences sponsored a forum on the Negro in television. Besides defending the practices of their organizations, representatives of broadcasting stations, advertising agencies, and unions offered reasons why they were reluctant to accept Negroes. Minorities attending the meeting tossed back angry charges at these officials, and the discussion was reported in the press. Network officials faced this kind of pressure in cities across the nation. For example, when Dick Gregory, a television comedian who had been active

in the South, attended a forum in Cleveland, he engaged in a heated exchange with a network official.[28]

The Mayor's Committee on Job Advancement, stepping up its activities in 1963, followed up their letter-writing campaign of the previous year. The committee adopted techniques used by the Human Rights Commissions, but on a larger scale. They contacted 500 leading companies, ceaselessly urging them with soft-sell proposals to include more Negroes in ads and commercials and to employ more in their companies.[29]

In still another drive, P. Jay Sidney and Charles Gordone, chairman of the Committee to Employ Negro Performers, joined forces with members of CORE to press broadcasters and sponsors to create more job opportunities for blacks. Working quietly behind the scenes, and under the leadership of James Farmer of CORE, they contacted officials at one big company after another. These activists backed up persuasion with threats of boycotts and reminders of the success of the selective patronage campaigns in Philadelphia. With the aid of churches and community groups in New York as well as Philadelphia, CORE did a marketing survey on brand selection by black consumers, so as to target in on companies whose sales would suffer if blacks stopped buying their products. The first visit to a company was repeated by another in order to follow up and reinforce what had been done. The main limitation of this effort was

the time and energy of the activists.[30]

Julian Thomas, with members of the National Urban League, used these techniques to seek out producers and urge them to use blacks on camera. The Urban League also formed the Broadcast Skills Bank, a roster of qualified minorities interested in broadcasting which was made available to over fifty stations in major markets.[31]

Other organizations aided the black cause. The American Civil Liberties Union announced a national campaign against racial bigotry. Notables of the television and motion picture industries backed the ACLU strategy and urged boycotts of those who discriminated against Negroes. The American Federation of Television and Radio Actors (AFTRA) and other organizations, such as the American Guild of Variety Artists, signed formal statements to end discrimination.[32]

A first step in the NAACP's new policy, intended to bring attention to the practices hindering black employment in the motion-picture and television industries, was to picket the Broadway opening of the film, "Cleopatra," because "it would have been more realistic to cast a Negro woman instead of a white woman in the leading role."[33] Following the picketing of the film, George Norford, of the New York State Human Rights Commission said broadcasters could avoid image damage and being subjected to similar demonstrations if they recruited more Negroes.[34] Two weeks

later, the NAACP formally announced a national campaign to integrate the motion-picture and television industries. Planned strategies included demonstrations at studios, distribution centers, theatres, and the offices of companies in Los Angeles and New York, and boycotts of the products of companies that sponsored programs unfair to Negroes. Then in July, at the national convention of the NAACP in Chicago, the NAACP called upon its local chapters to take up the issue in their areas, with demonstrations in forty or more cities.[36] Unions and producers alike were warned that the NAACP would appeal to the Labor Relations Board when it found a qualified Negro had been refused employment.[37] NAACP leaders met with more than fifty Hollywood producers.[38] In September, the NAACP made the TV series, "Hazel," a target as it was going into production in Hollywood, because no blacks had been hired on the technical crew and that violated the new policy of the NAACP. A boycott was to begin against the sponsor, the Ford Motor Compnay.[39] Production of the series was delayed until NAACP demands were met--that a black worker be hired on the technical crew and that another black be employed at the management level.[40]

Thus, 1963 was a year when many groups pressured broadcasters and their associates in related industries. Altogether, demands of one group often duplicated those of another, but this strengthened the efforts of the

activists. The black theatre critic, Dave Hepburn, wrote that these multiple pressures were making it "difficult for the white employer to ignore any Negro complaint--no matter how small the person or organization."[41]

Conventions of trade associations serve to enable members to meet and discuss their problems and set forth new ideas. Black leaders were often guest speakers at the conventions of advertisers where they usually offered advice and warnings about reaching Negro consumers who were increasingly militant. Advertisers were beginning to show a concern about reaching what was estimated to be a $23 billion market at that time. John H. Johnson, publisher of Negro oriented magazines, reminded one group that the black consumer was demanding that his hopes, fears, needs, and dreams be recogized.[42] Roy Wilkins, speaking before the Association of National Advertisers, advised members that as long as their clients sell their products to Negroes and want more purchasers, they would have to let this fact be known through their advertisements in television and the mainstream press, not just in the black media. Otherwise, boycotts would likely develop.[43] Another speaker, William P. Grayson, publisher of Ebony International, a popular Negro magazine, urged the advertisers to recognize the "shift in the Negro mood."[44] Several weeks later, another national convention, that of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, heard several speakers repeat these

warnings in discussions of the Negro consumer, the featured topic of the convention.[45]

1964

There were fewer reports about activist pressure on broadcasters in 1964. The Ethical Culture Society, however, repeated its study monitoring the programming in the New York market and circulated a report of the findings, as they had done in 1962. The new report praised the television and advertising industries for using more Negroes in commercials and documentaries. But not all areas of television had shown similar gains. Entertainment, for example, was still "lily-white." The report further criticized the networks for playing it safe by avoiding to integrate their programming, as it was mainly the local programs that were using more Negroes.[46]

Despite the lessening of pressure on broadcasters by activists, 1964 was a pivotal year. Two important events that would benefit minority groups several years later took place. One was the United Church of Christ's petition to the FCC to deny the license renewal of a Jackson, Mississippi station. The other was the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that promised equal employment opportunities regardless of one's race, religion, national origin, or sex.[47]

In sum, activists who pressed for new television images during the early sixties attacked a very broad front,

spanning several industries that produced mass media images of minorities. Although much effort was expended by minority activists during these early years of the sixties, their ability to force change in television images was generally weak. Legislation to prohibit the discrimination they were battling was not passed until near the end of this period and it would be a while before it was implemented. Until then, the activists had to rely mainly upon generating public opinion sympathetic to their demands. Even though selective buying campaigns could succeed in local areas or against several companies, if was very difficult to organize the widespread use of this technique, because the resources of the protesting individuals and groups were limited. Nevertheless, some changes were achieved, as will be shown below. The employment of minority newscasters was one of the initial changes, along with other early experimental attempts at integrating images. Activist efforts of the early sixties eroded the established patterns, but did not eliminate them.

Women

A forerunner of later actions to be taken by women occurred in 1961. The Woman's National Press Club petitioned the State Department for use of its auditorium for a press conference given by a visiting head-of-state when they were denied admission to the National Press Club, which excluded all but male members. The incident

demonstrated the discrimination to which women journalists were subjected.[48]

Then, in 1962 some of the groundwork for the future movement of women into television news, and other occupations as well, was being prepared. The President's Commission on the Status of Women met in Washington, D.C. Stating an idea that was to become a major issue of the Women's Movement, the President said that it was time women were paid and evaluated equally with men on the work they do.[49] Then in 1963 some words of encouragement were offered women by Lady Bird Johnson: "Doors are opening wider for the women performers in entertainment and in news and it's long overdue."[50] Criticism was directed towards the broadcasters about the restrictions placed on women in their industry. In a TV Guide article, Betty Davis charged that women were not given fair opportunities for work in television programming. Although concerned more about entertainment than news, she asked why women could not be given more of the roles filled by men.[51] In respect to news, Jack Gould pointed out in his New York Times column that the program, "Ladies of the Press," indicated that there were enough women reporters available if broadcasters wanted to make use of them. He could not understand why women such as Barbara Ward or Marian Young Taylor (Martha Deane) were not given more substantial news assignments.[52]

The Responses of Broadcasters

The broadcasters used an extensive repertoire of responses that they used in dealing with minority demands. Typically, when answering to a dissident individual or group, press releases were sent off to the news and trade media where the broadcasters' response would be reported if considered newsworthy.

Anti-Discrimination Statements

At first, the typical response of television broadcasters to charges that they discriminated against minorities was to state firmly that they had long standing policies against discrimination, that opportunities for minority employment were provided by their companies, and that the conditions in their companies being criticized by activists did not exist. For example, when P. Jay Sidney filed a complaint with the New York State Commission against Discrimination, all three networks asserted that they had long standing policies of non-discrimination in the use of Negro actors in television.[53] When testifying before the Congressional Committee hearings in 1962, a vice-president of NBC said that the network could not have any discrimination, because RCA's employment manual dating back to 1919, explicitly excluded discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or national origin from the company's employment policies. This network spokesman further added that program

executives constantly inquired of outside producers what they were doing in casting Negroes and members of other racial groups. An ABC vice-president pointed out that non-whites were employed at his company in many creative and technical capacities, including managerial positions. He presented documentation to the committee listing all the programs that featured Negro performers or personalities during the previous two years, but without indicating what proportions of ABC's employees were black or the distribution of minorities within the network's staff. Attempting to show blacks were fairly treated, a vice-president representing CBS at the hearings testified that CBS employed 250 Negroes on its permanent staff, in forty-two categories in New York City, and in two of its leading shows. Again, this was a response with no breakdown in the categories of employment or what proportion of the entire staff consisted of minorities. That two leading shows used Negroes was obviously a small portion of the CBS lineup.[54] Statements continued to be issued by officials in the television industry that suggested they supported exactly the goals for which the minority activists were demonstrating.

In the early sixties statistics on the number of Negroes employed in TV were scarce. By 1963, this was noted as a major drawback in studying Negro employment in television. In addition to the three black newsmen the

network had employed by that time, some minorities worked in clerical and production jobs, but no one knew how many.[55] A representative of the National Association of Radio Announcers, a professional association, estimated that only one percent of television emplovees were Negroes, and "the few Negroes employed at radio and TV stations and networks were mainly in off-air positions such as porter."[56] The networks declined to reveal the number of Negroes on their payrolls, claiming it was impossible because payroll records did not contain information on an employee's race. Another report said, "They stress that they do not discriminate but actively seek qualified Negroes in white-collar and executive as well as craft jobs."[57] Yet if one could go back to observe television at that time, the absence of minority images would quickly become apparent.[58]

In an almost band-wagon manner, various organizations, within or related to the television industry, asserted publicly that they did not discriminate against minorities, including the American Guild of Variety Artists, the Writers Guild of America, etc.[59] Several unions reported that they had anti-discrimination clauses in their contracts. An article in Broadcasting noted the diversity of individuals and groups responding in this manner after the NAACP launched its campaign in 1963:

> The major elements of the broadcasting, advertising and recording industries issued a joint policy statement early last month agreeing "to continue and strengthen implementation of their

> longstanding policy against discrimination of the employment of talent."
>
> The agreement was worked out by the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists and representatives of producers, networks, stations, independent packagers, transcription companies, agents, managers and others. It was also reviewed and agreed to by a committee representing advertisers and agencies using performers in TV and radio.[60]

Later in the year another CBS official reiterated his network's position, that Negroes were "adequately and accurately" depicted on its programs.[61] On the other hand, after few weeks later the same official implied that blacks were underrepresented on television's air waves when he assured Dick Gregory, a TV comedian and black activist, that "a real revolution is underway in television. As a result you're going to see that Negroes are shown . . . just like whites."[62] This official further attempted to assure Gregory that there was a desire among advertiser's to change minority images. He said that everyday he received letters from advertisers "asking that Negroes be shown in all the professions and occupations. And the letters urged that this be done 'now--not in five years.'"[63]

Most organizations of substantial size formally prohibited discrimination in their company codes, personnel manuals, and publicly stated policies. In television, company policies concerned with discrimination were broadly formulated to include all types of personnel. Thus news programming, commercials, and entertainment were subject to the same rules. The weakness inherent in these mechanisms

was that there was no provision to observe if these anti-discrimination policies were carried out or for any enforcement. Generally, discrimination was not an important concern of company executives responsible for the operations of their departments.

Black activists voiced their skepticism of these assertions, although they hoped the constant disavowals of any bias might eventually reduce discrimination if this kind of talk would encourage some of the more hesitant producers to be a little bolder when assigning people to TV's visible roles.[64] The activist, Chuck Gordone, commented on these pronouncements: "Some of this will be ineffectual, but, we take the position, at this time, that every little counts."[65] As pressure increased and such statements became commonplace, Dave Hepburn, summed them up: "Integration pronouncements are a fashionable hogwash that became the thing to do."[66]

Meetings with Minority Representatives

When minority activists contacted broadcasters, particularly in 1963, as did members of NAACP, CORE, and the Urban League, to discuss minority images and employment, broadcasters typically agreed with the the spokesmen for the minorities and claimed that efforts were already underway to do just what was being asked. Similar responses were made to governmental agencies working in behalf of minorities. For example, following the charge by the New York State

Commission for Human Rights that television was not presenting a true picture of the Negro, NBC and ABC reaffirmed their "long standing" policies of non-discrimination in the use of Negro performers. To demonstrate its compliance, CBS announced it had issued new instructions to its program producers to depict the Negro in a manner more consistent with how he actually lives in today's society.[67] At the forum sponsored by the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences in 1963, the same pattern was evident. Fred Friendly and Hal Graham respectively defended NBC and CBS, avowing that their networks "had consistently followed a program of employing Negroes where and when feasible."[68] A performer in the audience, however, charged that the networks only practiced "integration by memo."[69]

An ad agency official participating in the forum responded in a sharply different manner than the network representatives. He explained that he handled millions of dollars worth of advertising for his firm and that his first job was to protect the client's products regardless of civil rights. If he felt that it would hurt a client's sales, he would not hire blacks.[70] A black critic attending the forum summed up the situation for blacks, as follows:

> These men battling for ratings have too many other problems which to them are more important. The Negro to them is a "necessary evil" which they will come to some time, but for now, the idea is to approach the subject very slowly. It is a matter of conscience fighting expediency.[71]

When Italian-Americans organized to protest the depiction of their ethnic group, and local Congressmen conferred with network officials, nothing was accomplished. Despite the tact broadcasters normally exercise in relations involving members of Congress, "The Untouchables" was a successful program and persuasion, even when reinforced with threats that the sponsor's products would be boycotted by Italian-Americans, did not get the program off the air.[72] Only after a complaint was sent to the FCC and after the FCC had admonished ABC, the show was discontinued.[73]

Thus, when responding to minority charges, television officials typically maintained a positive stance and did not admit to discriminating against minorities. The standard answer to any charges of bias was to restate company policies forbidding discrimination that had never been enforced. Their resistance to minority demands, however, was evident if one looked at the slow progress made in actually changing the images during this early half of the sixties. As we have shown in Chapter III, each station had acquired a token black newsman. Three women correspondents could be seen on network news shows when their stories were aired. On locak news programs, the only women on the air were weather women.

Breaking Through Stereotypes

The first half of the 1960's decade was a period of gradually breaking through television's stereotyped images of minorities. Important advances were made into new roles, even though such achievements were at token levels. Yet each new breakthrough demonstrated that television could be changed. On one occasion when a black was hired for a new on-the-air role, a critic wrote,

> In yet another area the image of the Negro on television has improved and the chipping process into all areas of the broadcast industry scored another bullseye.[74]

Outside of television news, as minority images and employment gained attention, noticeable changes affected a number of television's images in 1962 and 1963. As examples, the producer, David Susskind cast Cicely Tyson in a leading role in which she was to appear regularly in the "East Side, West Side" series, and Negro models began appearing in a variety of TV commercials aimed at the mainstream audience.[75] A United Cerebral Palsy telethon, aired locally to the New York audience, featured four black models.[76] A newspaper report said that NBC included a Negro woman in its plans for future talent needs. Ena Hartman, a model, was signed up in 1962 for the first salaried talent development contract granted to a Negro performer, under which she was to receive drama and voice lessons.[77]

In television news no effort was made to allow minorities to report news until August of 1962. ABC News,

the first of the major networks, employed Mal Goode, who was brought to New York from Pittsburgh to report from the United Nations.[78]

During the newspaper strike in the winter of 1962-1963, television news became the important information source for the New York Area, and the strike offered broadcasters an unusual opportunity. Experienced newspaper journalists, temporarily out of work, could be hired by the local TV stations without long term committments or contracts. This gave the television news broadcasters a chance to try out minority reporters on the air, and perhaps quell some of the developing criticism about discrimination in the images of television.[79]

NBC and CBS followed the example set by ABC. NBC temporarily hired two black reporters from the New York Times, Layhmond Robinson and Robert L. (Bob) Teague. After the strike ended Teague was hired permanently to work for NBC News. At that time NBC News produced the local news telecasts as well as the network news programs. Teague was usually seen reporting local news.[80] Another black man appeared on WNEW-TV's news programs, but after the strike he returned to print journalism.[81] CBS brought Ben Holman to New York from their Chicago station. Holman was not the first black to go on the air in New York for CBS, as another black man, Pat Connell, a veteran radio and TV announcer had been given an experimental news reporting assignment for a

short time. Holman, however, was the first to be employed specifically to report news. He was an experienced journalist, having ten years of newspaper work before going to the Chicago station.[82] Thus, by 1963 each network had acquired a black newsman who appeared on the air.[83]

From the comments of critics and spokesmen for the black community, we can further infer some of the behavior and attitudes of the broadcasters. One critic expressing approval of NBC's hiring Bob Teague said that he was one newsman "who can be seen any night on NBC-TV News and who leaves no doubt in your mind that he is a Negro."[79] In effect, the network news officials had made an open break with the established images of newscasters. They did not hire someone so light skinned that the audience would not recognize him as a minority person.

The reaction to these changes varied. Theodore Kheel, reporting for the Mayor's Committee on Job Advancement, expressed optimism regarding the progress of portraying blacks in TV shows, commercials, and other mass media. Kheel said he had "found encouraging signs that the situation can be improved."[85] Others were less satisfied with the amount of change that was taking place. George Norford, of the New York State Human Rights Commission, said that Negroes would always appear as performers and entertainers. The areas that needed to be developed were the panel shows and news programs. He added, "It's the

consistent showing of Negroes in a strong positive light that is necessary."[86] He believed it important that "there should be someone pushing constantly and helping to mold the policy of these producers about what they really need to do."[87] George Fowler, who was then Chairman of the New York State Commission for Human Rights, in limited praise of the new television images said, "The vigorous campaign to put more Negroes in front of the television cameras has produced impressive results in recent months."[88] But he also noted the resistance of the broadcasters and added that television had made "visible but not measurable progress."[89] Fowler thought Americans were "losing consciusness of color and religious difference to the extent that television and advertising allow minorities opportunities to perform," but, he warned, the battle was not yet "one-quarter or one-half won." Avowals of good will by TV officials resulted only in slow progress.[90]

In-House Efforts

Another type of action taken by the networks was to assign executives from programming, personnel, and casting sections to work on Negro employment and to make sure the presentation of Negroes would appear more consistent with American life.[91] How much authority these executives had in approaching this task was not clear. After an ABC radio affiliate in Detroit had successfully put a black weather woman on the air,[92] a local New York station speculated

about trying the same thing on television. Management thought that the viewers would hear the weather and forget about the color of the woman.[93] As long as selective buying campaigns could be organized more effectively within a city than nationally,[89] observers thought that local stations responded more favorably to black demands than the national networks.[95]

Persuasion

The main weapon available to minority pressure groups at this time was persuasion. Governmental agencies such as the Human Rights Commissions of New York City and New York State, established to investigate and ameliorate issues related to human rights, had no enforcement powers. At best, they could bring the conflicting parties together to discuss complaints, suggest ways to resolve them, make known the findings of their investigations, and send recommendations to the City Council or the state legislature. Few difficulties were effectively dealt with by these commissions, because, as one spokesman said, this was a "difficult" area. Often the Commission was not sure what action could be taken, if any.[96] Nor did the federal government, in the early sixties, offer a viable mechanism for resolving minority complaints. There was a reluctance to attempt any regulation of TV images, as that could be an infringement on the First Admendment.

The campaign conducted by the Mayor's Committee for Job Advancement in 1962, in which letters were written to more than 100 companies, got responses that gave "wide spread support in principle."[97] Actual support, in the form of expanding minority employment, was negligible. "Several executives of large companies replied that they would restudy their positions and seek to remedy the situation."[98] Only one airline promptly employed minorities whose images would be presented to the public. The airline altered an advertising campaign by switching to ads and commercials showing Negro figures in a "readily identifiable" manner.[99]

In the next campaign of the Mayor's Committee on Job Advancement, when 500 leading companies were called upon with proposals to show more minorities in their advertising, the companies responded with varying enthusism. Most said they would consider the committee's proposals, but only about a half dozen, or about one percent, made firm commitments. Ten percent rejected the proposals outright. A marketing official said it would be five years before many major advertisers would cooperate with such an objective. The major block to changing TV images was the fear of repercussions in the South and what competitors were doing.[100]

As already noted, many groups and individuals contacted broadcasters to discuss minority images and

employment. It was impossible to determine if the television broadcasters responded directly to persuasion on moral principles; yet when persuasion seemed to be effective, one could also detect economic or political pressures lending force to this technique. When P. Jay Sidney and James Farmer met with a great many corporation officials in order to get them to employ more blacks and to portray them more favorably in the programs which they approved, persuasion was more effective when contacts were followed up with repeated visits. Other factors helped. The growing militant mood among blacks added force to soft-sell proposals. Consumer boycotts, like those in Philadelphia, began to spread to New York.[101] Persuasive techniques were also strengthened when federal agencies were drawn into the issue. Although ineffectual, this did pose a threat that, in the future, could result in new legislation. The fact that the FCC held a hearing in Chicago at this time, at which representatives of several ethnic and racial groups criticized the way they were treated on the television screen, was an early warning to broadcasters.[102]

Confusion was one reaction TV broadcasters showed as the number of individuals and organizations joined in to pressure for new portrayals of minorities. There was a continuing repetition of demands.

> The same things one group may demand today and on which some settlement is reached, can be thrown right back in their faces again the next day. . . . [The broadcasters] are belabored with letters,

> individuals, small organizations, big ones and then the SCHR [New York State Commission for Human Rights]. The criss-cross of all this leaves a wave of utter frustration at times, despite some progress.[103]

Some activists hoped that the persuasive techniques being used would have a long range effect if not an immediate one. Making company officials aware of how they excluded minorities from television would also make them more conscious of the need to equalize employment opportunities.[104] When television officials were influenced by arguments of the activists, they were probably projecting the current trends, particularly of the developing Black Movement, and preparing for the future. A black spokesman said,

> All of this is not altruistic on the part of the companies. Some think it good business, some have felt the pressure of governmental force--all are afraid of organized boycotts by Negroes. The SCHR [State Commission for Human Rights] and other agencies have been putting pressure on the sponsors; the sponsors put pressure on the advertising agencies, the agencies put the pressure on the producers. As long as it works for the good of everyone, who cares?[105]

Fear of Offending White Audiences

It was firmly believed by television officials that the presentation of minorities in many of TV's roles would offend the white audience. The networks argued that they did not want to offend their Southern audiences. Sponsors and advertisers shared this fear. To risk the loss of viewers was the same as risking the loss of revenues. At

the Congressional hearings conducted in New York, advertising executives explained how the conditions of the market place, as perceived by advertisers, required the exclusion of blacks. The director of broadcasting of a large ad agency, Foote, Cone and Belding, said, "The national advertising dollar is apt to lose much of its impact if it identifies too closely with any minority group."[106] He estimated the consuming public to be 80 to 90 percent white, and that was the group to whom appeals had to be addressed.[107] The manager of the TV department of Young and Rubican, another of the large advertrising agencies in New York, said that Negro performers were most useful when used in appeals to the Negro market. He explained, "This is simply a fact at this moment in our social growth."[108] These advertising men stated the crux of the problem. When designing TV messages, whether commercials or the content of TV programs, advertisers and broadcasters share a primary concern, that the audience will be receptive to their messages. Moreover, the advertising executives could speak more freely than the television officials, because advertisers are not obligated to government as are broadcasters under the licensing system. At the same hearings, network representatives took their usual stand, claiming there was no discrimination in their companies.[109]

Several who advocated placing more blacks before the TV camera challenged the validity of the explanation that

Southern resistance was the reason why blacks could not be shown on television: A report from the New York State Commission for Human Rights said that the

> employment of minorities in TV in other than menial roles has not been adverse, not even in the South. . . . This long feared and much discussed Southern opposition is today nothing more than a broad and baseless myth.[110]

Another spokesman from the commission reported that he had exploded the "Myth of the South." Reporting on conversations with numerous TV producers in 1963, almost all held the opinion

> that the South was not the block. The block was some sixth rate executive in the ad agency on Madison Avenue, who, in his terror, has over-dramatized the virulence of Southernism. Producers told him that they had received few if any criticisms from the South about using Negroes in programs, and in some cases received commending letters.[111]

Others who doubted Southern objections as a factor pointed to evidence that contradicted it. For example, when Bill Cosby was hired to appear regularly in "I Spy," the producer said,

> Everybody told us we were going to have trouble with the sponsors, but none of the boogie men we had foreseen ever materialized. We have more sponsors then we need.[112]

Many producers feared negative reactions that would be disruptive to getting their shows on the air, and the desire to attract sponsors and audiences outweighed the desire to introduce innovative images. One claimed that segregationists were the most vocal viewers, writing

prolifically to broadcasters of their displeasure, while more liberal minded people who accepted black images were less apt to inform stations and networks of their opinions.[113] Other producers reported that more complaints came from audiences in the North than the South.[114]

Gunnar Myrdal observed that what one thought were the beliefs of one's colleagues, associates, and customers affected how one acted towards minorities. Myrdal wrote that in numerous contacts with business men responsible for the employment policies of their companies, many said they had nothing against hiring minorities, and Myrdal believed they were sincere in this, but that they held back out of consideration for the attitudes of their employees and customers and others with whom they maintained relationships. Myrdal further explained,

> The driving forces are attitudes of white people. . . . Those attitudes cause them to commit millions of individual acts of discrimination and segregation. They are often not conscious of what they are doing and still less aware of the consequences for Negroes.[115]

Then, Hubert O'Gorman, studying patterns of housing segregation, found a condition that matched Myrdal's observation. He found homeowners refused to sell their houses to blacks, because they believed their neighbors would object. But, when residents of the community were asked individually how they felt about having black neighbors, most said they would not mind. Nevertheless, the rule was to bar Negroes from the area, because the residents

believed that that was the way everybody wanted it. O'Gorman labeled this condition "pluralistic ingnorance."[116] It appeared that pluralistic ignorance existed in the television industry and its related industries, and that it was a factor underlying economic censorship. To maximize sales, producers of TV images avoided whatever they believed associates did not accept.

On the other hand, by 1964, one report said that advertising people were coming to see hiring Negroes as good business.[117] An executive of a large Madison Avenue agency expressed the emerging interest in the "new consciousness" for integrated TV images when he said, "Its a big topic for clients and agencies."[118] Another report stated that the "more hesitant producer is responding with encouraging steps forward."[119] In television, Ed Sullivan said he had had no major trouble presenting Negro performers during the past fifteen years, nor had there been a threat of Southern boycotts preventing the use of Negro performers on his show, although appearances on his show generally fit the limitations imposed on minority entertainers.[120] Sports audiences helped to ease the fear of using minority images. Large numbers of whites were attracted to televised baseball and football games, and many thought that the color of the player had been so subordinated to talent that color was hardly noticed anymore.[121]

Generally, there were few reports of negative reactions by viewing audiences. Although one company reportedly received over two thousand letters protesting the use of Negroes,[122] other companies found audiences accepted integrated images quite well. Even when responses were mixed, the majority was likely to favor integrated commercials.[123] One problem was that not much was actually known about how audiences in the early sixties would respond to integrated television images. Responses to integrated images in other media suggested the responses of viewing audiences would probably be favorable.[124] A spokesman for the New York State Human Rights Commission said that it was difficult to pin down just what the general attitude was. While it was hard to find instances where the use of Negroes hurt sales, judgments continued to be based on fear rather than actual experience.[125] A black activist said that since no one really knew what the effects on audiences were when Negroes appeared in TV programs, a sociologist was needed to study television audiences to discover these effects.[126] The result was that few were willing to take a chance on integrating TV images.

Broadcasters were sensitive to program rejections by affiliates. Yet, when Southern affiliates did refuse to air a program for racial reasons, only one or two did so at any given time. The majority of Southern affiliates usually accepted the programs.[127] This also suggested that the fear

was greater than the threat.

A recommendation from the Mayor's Committee on Job Advancement advised that "evidence must be developed to prove to the advertiser that the use of Negroes in ads will help, not hinder, sales."[128] If black images could be shown to be effective advertising vehicles, blacks would find it much easier to get work before the TV camera.

A producer of the "Perry Mason" series pointed out another factor that should have encouraged broadcasters to present more minorities. He said, "We cannot afford to distort the image of the Negro when we are selling in 44 foreign countries."[129]

In the coming years, market research would attempt to determine how whites reacted to black images. This will be discussed in later chapters.

Finding Qualified Minorities

Broadcasters frequently said they would hire minorities if they could find the kind of talent and skills they needed, but critics charged they did not look very far for minorities. One black complained that a double standard favoring whites was used to determine who was qualified.[130] Another said, when openings required having specific kinds of experience in jobs that had been closed to blacks, it was impossible for them to meet such requirements, or even to develop a desire to acquire such experience.[131] Still another problem was that producers

usually have the right to cast as they see fit. This subjects the minority person to the individual tastes and whims of people in these positions.[132] One of the problems of black recruitment was that qualified blacks had less access to the sources from which broadcasters obtained workers. Their contact with the word-of-mouth networks was limited and commercial talent or employment agencies performed a screening function that helped to exclude minorities from television. Inasmuch as broadcasters did little to develop new ways to find qualified minorities, their argument that they could not find suitable talent held some truth. As already noted, the New York State Human Rights Commission sought to counteract this argument by preparing lists of qualified people to aid stations claiming they did not know where to find suitable Negroes.[132]

Experiences reported by blacks made apparent that some television executives continued to practice blatant discrimination. As noted above in an example reported in the Amsterdam News, one man with an impressive background in television production was enthusiastically received by CBS officials on the basis of his resume and contact on the telephone, but, when he appeared in person and could be identified as a Negro, there suddenly was no place for him. In addition, the executives at CBS, seemingly in a well-meaning manner, advised him to return to France or to go to the Voice of America.[134]

Another complaint voiced by blacks was that broadcasters were more demanding of minorities who were put on the air for the first time in a particular type of role. The minority performer would have to be the best the first time on the air or he would be told he was not right for the role. There was little willingness to allow the minority person to improve upon a performance as was sometimes the case with whites. If an initial performance by a black in a new role did not go well, it would be pointed to at later times as the failure that justified the continued exclusion of blacks.[135] Further, when the minority person was hired, the broadcaster considered his job done. There was no upgrading of skills or horizontal movement to prepare for upward mobility. "As a result, the Negroes in those jobs stagnate and become frustrated. . . . Caucasian protocol gave the white boys a green light to move on" while blacks were left where they were without benefit of any direction in advancing their careers.[136]

Introducing New Images

When television broadcasters put minorities on the air in news shows for the first time, no public fanfare, which is characteristic of new events in television, prepared viewers for the change. Moreover, the minority newscaster was usually scheduled to do newscasts during marginal hours. As already noted, when Pat Connell, an announcer at CBS, was given an opportunity to report news

for the first time, it was early in the morning on the "7 O'Clock News." Bob Teague reported news after midnight following a movie. If the minority reporter appeared on the evening news program, he was gradually brought in and shown reporting stories he had covered in the field. Mal Goode reported from the United Nations, as did Pauline Frederick for NBC.[137] Was the UN beat considered a suitable place for reporters who did not fit the stereotyped image? One might also ask if quietly slipping a minority reporter into news programs was a way of quelling any objections? Or was it a way to avoid admitting to the public how minorities had been discriminated against in television news? Whatever the reason, when minority newscasters were first shown on the TV screen, it was done without the publicity typical of the television industry, that whatever was new was exploited as an appeal to the audience.

Meetings of Associations

Another approach to dealing with minority pressure was to schedule minority problems as a topic on the agendas of meetings of trade and professional organizations. An article in Broadcasting in 1963 noted the increasing frequency of discussion about black issues; it said that the subject of television's relationship to the civil rights issue was bound to arise in any gathering of broadcasters. Network officials were confronted in many areas of the country. For example, when the TV comedian Dick Gregory

engaged in an exchange with the CBS-TV vice-president for programming during a panel discussion, which we noted above, it was in Cleveland.[138]

At numerous meetings minority leaders were featured speakers or a member of the organization would discuss problems related to minorities. Roy Wilkins, National Executive Secretary of the NAACP, addressed such a meeting of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists about "fair play for Negroes" behind and in front of the television camera.[139] On another occasion, Wilkins addressed the Association of National Advertisers, informing the group of black concerns about building up the image of the Negro.[140] When the New York unit of the Television Arts and Sciences Academy sponsored the panel on the "Role of Negroes in Television," the Director of Public Relations at Lever Brothers participated discussion and reported on the mail his company had received which approved of blacks appearing in their commercials.[141] Then another time, a vice-president and media manager of BBDO, a large advertising agency in New York, spoke at a meeting of the Association of National Advertisers about the "media reach" to Negro families.[142] Still another was a closed meeting of two hundred advertising men where a vice-president for communications of the National Biscuit Company presided and discussed the positive response integrated advertising had received.[143] On the West Coast, fifty producers attended a

meeting with officials of the NAACP to find ways to improve black images and employment in motion pictures and television programs.[144] These kinds of activities took place at the meetings of many organizations in the early sixties and were the beginning of a long stream of such meetings in future years.

The New Black Mood

Indications of a new mood among blacks, that they would no longer passively respond to messages designed for white audiences, placed still another pressure on broadcasters. Blacks had shown a noticeable receptiveness to messages broadcast by radio stations that were oriented to programming for black audiences.[145] There was a growing distrust among blacks of information transmitted by the white television media. Radio programs and personalities on stations oriented to black audiences were granted greater credibility, so much so that it effected the 1960 election. It was widely believed that black radio listeners of these stations had swung enough of the large city vote to Kennedy to enable him to win the election.[146]

Sponsors could not willingly allow the sales of their products to be reduced 5 to 10 percent because of the disenchantment of black customers. On the contrary, as the buying capacity of blacks began to rise during these years, the concern was to increase sales in the black community. Advertisers and broadcasters were being informed by market

research of the new mood of black consumers.[147] Consequently, broadcasters and advertisers would have to consider the black consumer more carefully and try using minorities on camera in new ways.

The reluctance to integrate TV images was creating a dilemma for broadcasters. The Civil Rights Movement had become quite intense, with violent outbreaks occurring in Alabama and Mississippi in 1963. If the broadcasters did not integrate on-camera personnel, the increasing black militancy threatened to support and spread selective buying campaigns. The problem was to present images that satisfied black demands, thus retaining blacks as viewers and consumers, but, at the same time, maintaining appeals to whites. "How to go about correcting it through mutual understanding and cooperation was the question."[148]

Women in Television News

Women's television images and employment opportunities had not yet become an issue in the early sixties. None of the token few reporting news were members of ethnic or racial minority groups. As noted, in 1960 and 1961 women were more likely to appear on evening news shows in the New York market as weatherwomen than as reporters of news stories. From 1952 to 1964 Carol Reed reported the weather at WCBS-TV.[149] Some of the other weatherwomen during the early sixties were Jeanne Paar, also at WCBS-TV, Gloria Okon, Marilyn Grey, Vivian Farrar at WPIX-TV, and

Rosemary Haley at WABC-TV. Men were also weather reporters and, at times, at local stations, male newscasters reported the weather.[150] At one local station, officials considered hiring a black "weather girl" (a title that would be sharply criticized some years later).[151] Women who actually worked in news more often did the "woman's angle," a kind of programming that was normally scheduled during the daytime hours.[152] Even then, a woman may have been teamed with a male colleague so as to give the program a "proper weight of authority."[153] The exclusion of news women from the male domain of the evening hours was consistent with the patterns of male dominance characteristic of television programming.

If one examines the way broadcasters manipulated female audiences, certain clues point to how women would later be presented in news programs. Television has been described as a medium oriented to women, because women make up the majority of the viewing audiences during most hours of the broadcasting day. To appeal to such an audience, men are presented on the TV screen in much greater numbers than are women. One critic stated, "The female of the species is gorged on a steady diet of beef cake, while cheesecake is served to male viewers only fleetingly."[154] A network official commented that when casting male performers, "we're always on the lookout for virile looking men. . . . The primary consideration . . . is his age.[155] The male dominance extends from upper stardom down to non-speaking

roles.[156] The women who did succeed in television and survived for a lengthy time were not sex symbols. Typically, a female sex symbol is a short-lived phenomenon in television. Women who were attractive and lady-like, with a purposeful demeanor, much like that displayed by such supersaleswomen as Betty Furness and Jeanne Parr, were characteristic of women who would later become familiar as news reporters, correspondents, and anchorwomen.[157]

The popularly accepted belief in the early 1960's was that women did not compete with men on the job market. Esther Peterson, for example, former head of the Women's Bureau, wrote that women were employed mainly in occupations for which men had not prepared nor sought employment.[158] Talent agencies were known to advise women seeking positions in television news to find something else, and professors in journalism schools told women students they would fare better in print journalism.[159] The pattern prevailing in television news was like that which was widely accepted elsewhere at that time.

Women journalists were at a disadvantage in respect to their male colleagues. The attitude held by most news executives, that women could not be given assignments like those given to male reporters and that women would better report on women's news, limited women's access into television news. There were widely held sentiments that women, particularly because of their voices, were unsuited to

newscasting. Several news executives, quoted by Lee Graham, revealed their stereotyped views. To illustrate, a vice-president in charge of television programming at NBC said,

> A woman's manner is not suited to news and serious discussions; all right as a panelist or on a public affairs program if she is provocative enough or has "hate" value. . . . Women are not in the habit of asking probing questions or getting tough with unruly guests. Women generally prefer to be the glamourous, gracious hostess.[160]

Another executive, a news chief at ABC, said,

> Many women possess knowledge and authority but seldom can convey it through their voices. Even the best trained actress cannot compare with men in this respect. Her voice is naturally thinner, with less timbre and range. It's not as appropriate for reporting crucial events. For hard-core news, the depth and resonance of the male voice are indispensible.[161]

Despite the belief that feminine voices were a disadvantage, Lee Graham noted that women had gained greater acceptance in radio. She wrote, that they have succeeded in "invading the more cogent side of radio--as distinct from TV. They do not function as newscasters or commentators, but many florish as interviewers, especially on local stations."[162]

Marlene Sanders was the first woman to anchor an evening network news program in television, a position she held for two weeks in 1964 when ABC's anchorman was sick. The "persistent prejudice" against women's voices kept women off the air and out of newscasting. As this attitude carried over into all areas of television, Helen Epstein wrote, "there will be no real equality for women reporters as news personnel . . . until women move into

management."[163]

In the years following the hiring of minority males in television news, the numbers of women added to news staffs began to increase. In 1964, an article in Variety remarked on this change: The networks were putting more women on the air. The stress was on having a good news background and being able to do what any man can do. The article suggested that the increased number of female newscasters reflected the evolving role of women.[164]

Summary

The emerging question for television broadcasters in respect to minority images was how to resolve the complaints of minorities without diminishing TV's value as a medium for advertising messages. A black critic summed up the problem:

> The question of the Negro's integration into TV is not just a pure civil rights matter. It hinges on image, big business in millions of dollars, creative experience and unknown conditions . . . in a business that is very young and running scared at a terrific pace.[165]

The strength of appeals to the white audience, the crucial base needed to bring in advertising revenues, had to be maintained. All types of TV messages were involved. At the same time, as the black mood grew more militant, appeals to the black consumer had to be made more direct if this market was to be captured as well. Broadcasters, advertisers, and sponsors found themselves entering a marketing situation that required new selling techniques.

Television appeals to blacks could not be segregated as in radio where audiences had become fractionalized. Generally, broadcasters revealed the Rejecting response to the demands of activists, who could assert only limited pressure at this time. On the other hand, to experiment and gradually introduce new television images was one way to prepare for the developing trends. Blacks had gotten the attention of the nation and black images had become an everyday element of news stories. Indeed, it was television news that was forging the initial step in establishing new images of minorities in television. To inject a more forceful or positive portrayal of minorities into other areas of television imagery, besides news stories, would be a reflection of changes occurring in the society.

Broadcasters could and did seize upon opportunities to experiment in using minorities in on-air roles. By making unobtrusive changes and seemingly acquiescing to the demands of protestors they could prepare for the future and avoid bad publicity that the activists might generate. News programming was especially suited to the co-opting strategies of the broadcasters. As pointed out in Chapter IV, the magazine concept gave the broadcaster control over news programming. That news shows consisted of many reports meant a minority reporter could appear as one among many newscasters who would not attract too much attention if audiences did not react favorably. Hiring minority

newscasters only in token numbers, putting them on the air during strikes when no committment to a contract was necessary, and putting them on in marginal time slots reduced the risk to the broadcaster. The concerns and beliefs about the tastes of white audiences among the image-makers was, however, a persistant obstacle, especially as many feared minority images would affect the economics of television.

Women had not yet organized to put pressure on the broadcasters during the first half of the 1960's, but they were beginning to gain a greater acceptance in TV news. One might say they had always had a foothold in newscasting, because they had been employed in token numbers long before minority males made their breakthrough. But it was after television news organizations began hiring minority males that they also began to add more female newscasters to their staffs. This certainly exemplified the Co-opting response. If women as well as minority men were hired to report news, would it lessen the impact of presenting racial and ethnic minority images on-camera?

The pressure to employ more minorities could be expected to intensiy. Towards the end of this first period of our study, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act set forth

> a federal right to equal opportunity in employment, and it created an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to assist in implementing this right. Employers, labor unions, and employment agencies are

required to treat all persons without regard to their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. This treatment must be given in all phases of employment, including hiring, promotion, firing, apprenticeship and other training programs, and job assignments.[166]

Footnotes

[1]New York Times, Nov. 12, 1963, p. 3.

[2]Broadcasting, July 1, 1963, pp. 28-29.

[3]Ibid., July 22, 1963, pp. 58-59; Jack Gould, "Negro Participation in Television," New York Times, June 23, 1963, II, p. 17; Dave Hepburn, "In the Wings," Amsterdam News, June 22, 1963, p. 14; New York Times, May 18, 1962, p. 63; June 22, 1963, p. 14.

[4]Broadcasting, July 25, 1960, p. 40.

[5]Ibid., Oct. 2. 1961, p. 68.

[6]New York Times, March 24, 1962, p. 51; April 7, 1962, pp. 13, 71; Richard Shepard, "Report Chides TV on Negroes," New York Times, Oct. 3, 1962, p. 82.

[7]Hepburn, Sept. 8, 1962, p. 18.

[8]Louis Calta, "Equity Gathers Report of Bias," New York Times, March 7, 1962, p. 31.

[9]New York Times, Apr. 1, 1962, p. 61.

[10]Hepburn, Oct. 6, 1962, p. 18.

[11]David Anderson, "Ad Agencies Give View on Negroes," New York Times, Nov. 3, 1962, p. 15; Broadcasting, Nov. 5, 1962, p. 68.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Hepburn, Nov. 17, 1962, p. 18; Dec. 8, 1962, p.47.

[14]Shepard, Oct. 3, 1962, p. 82; Robert Lewis Shayon, "TV and Radio," Saturday Review, Nov. 24, 1962, p. 25; Lawrence Plotkin, "Report of the Television Monitoring Survey on the Frequency of Appearances of Negroes," a report of the Committee on Integration, the New York Society for Ethical Culture, New York City, April 1962. (Mineographed.)

[15]Hepburn, Sept. 1, 1962, p. 19; New York Times, Dec. 7, 1962, p. 27; Amsterdam News, May 2, 1963, p.22.

[16]Hepburn, Dec. 29, 1962, p. 17.

[17]Peter Bart, "Advertising:" Bank TV Campaign Aimed at Millionaires," New York Times, Aug. 29, 1962, p. 42.

[18]D. Parke Gibson cites studies conducted by Opinion Research Corporation in The $30 Billion Negro, (London: The Macmillan Co., Collier-Macmillan, Ltd., 1969), p. 56.

[19]Advertising Age, Sept, 26, 1960, p. 116.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Newsweek, Nov. 5, 1962, p. 92.

[22]Bart, "Advertising: Role of Negroes Is Discussed," New York Times, Oct. 6, 1963, III, p. 14; Broadcasting, Oct. 18, 1963, p. 52.

[23]John D. Pomfret, "Negroes Building Boycott Network," New York Times, Nov. 25, 1962, p. 1, 67.

[24]Shepard, "Broadcasters Warned to Speed Hiring of Negroes," New York Times, June 25, 1963, p. 16.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Sydney H. Schanberg, "Preferment for Negroes Is Sought by Board Here," New York Times, Oct. 28, 1963, pp. 1, 17.

[27]New York Times, Nov. 12, 1963, p. 31.

[28]Hepburn, Nov. 9, 1963, p. 16; Broadcasting, Nov. 18, 1963, pp. 82.

[29]Shepard, "Negroes Seek More On-Camera Jobs in TV," New York Times, Apr. 14, 1963, p. 15; Bart, "Advertising: Use of Negro Models Widening," New York Times, June 13, 1963, p. 41.

[30]Shepard, "Broadcasters Warned to Speed Hiring of Negroes," New York Times, June 25, 1963, p. 16; Hepburn, Aug. 31, 1963, p. 14; Sept. 21, 1963, p. 14.

[31]Hepburn, Sept. 21, 1963, p. 14; Geotge Gent, "Jobs in TV Available to Racial Minorities," New York Times, June 24, 1966, p. 75.

[32]Val Adams, "Broadcast Units Back Bias Pledge," New York Times, June 7, 1963, p. 63; Hepburn, June 22, 1963, p.14.

[33]Reason given by picketers and quoted by Murray Schumach in "NAACP is Split on Movie-TV Jobs," New York Times, June 13, 1963, p. 20.

[34]Shepard, "Broadcasters Warned to Speed Hiring of Negroes," New York Times, June 25, 1963, p. 16.

[35]Schumach, "Hollywood's Negro Crisis," New York Times, June 30, 1963, pp. 5, 16.

[36]M. S. Handler, "N.A.A.C.P. Warns of Unrest Until Negro Demands Are Met," New York Times, July 7, 1963, p. 44.

[37]Schumach, "Hollywood Faces Protest on Rights," New York Times, Aug. 1, 1963, p. 17.

[38]Schumach, "Producers Agree on Using Negroes," New York Times, Aug. 22, 1963, p. 19.

[39]Broadcasting, Sept. 30, 1963, p. 55; New York Times, Sept. 10, 1963, p. 79.

[40]Broadcasting, Sept. 30, 1963, p. 55.

[41]Hepburn, Oct. 12, 1963, p. 17.

[42]William D. Smith, "Advertising: Drives Aim for Negro Market," New York Times, Oct. 11, 1964, III, p. 14.

[43]Bart, "Advertising: Negro Market Stirring Interest," New York Times, Sept. 11, 1963, p. 51.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Paul Gardner, "Ethical Culture Unit Assails Attitude of TV Toward Negro," New York Times, Dec. 7, 1964, p. 71; Regina Loewenstein, Lawrence Plotkin, Douglas Pugh, "The Frequency of Appearance of Negroes on Television," Report of the Second TV Monitoring Survey, The Committee on Integration of the New York Society for Ethical Culture, Nov. 1964. (Mineographed.)

[47]Hepburn, Feb. 8, 1964, p. 16.

[48]"Women Seek Equal Access to Press Talk," Editor & Publisher, Nov. 25, 1961, p. 16.

[49]New York Times, Feb. 13, 1962, pp. 1, 21.

[50]Broadcasting, May 6, 1963, p. 88.

[51]"Awaiting Her Day in Court," TV Guide, Jan. 26, 1962, p. 16.

[52]Lee Graham cites Jack Gould in "Women Don't Like to Look at Women," New York Times Magazine, May 24, 1964, p. 58.

[53]Peter Bart, "Advertising: Concern Over Negro Groups," New York Times, Sept. 9, 1963, p. 40, and "Advertising: Role of Negroes Is Discussed," Oct. 6, 1963, III, p. 14; Broadcasting, July 22, 1963, p. 58; George Dugan, "Jesuits to Seek Negro Students," New York Times, Dec. 14, 1963, p. 16; Hepburn, Sept, 15, 1962, p. 19; Jan 5, 1963, p. 17; June 22, 1963, p. 14; George Norford, guest columnist writing "In the Wings," Amsterdam News, July 13, 1963, p. 14; Murray Schumach, "Stars Join Drive Against Bigotry," New York Times, July 15, 1963, p. 25; New York Times, June 7, 1963, p. 63; Hedrick Smith, "87 Unions to Sign Equality Pledge," New York Times, Nov. 4, 1962, p. 40.

[54]Val Adams, "Networks Affirm Negro-Image Aim," New York Times, June 4, 1962, p. 59; Broadcasting, Nov. 5, 1962, p. 64.

[55]Broadcasting, July 1, 1963, p. 28; New York Times, Nov. 12, 1963, p. 31.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Ibid., p. 29.

[58]The author recalls the comments--surprised, disapproving, and approving--of friends and acquaintances when they first saw black reporters appearing on news shows in the early sixties.

[59]New York Times, June 4, 1962, p. 59.

[60]Ibid., July 1, 1963, p. 29.

[61]Ibid., Aug. 5, 1963, p. 44.

[62]Ibid., Nov. 18, 1963, p. 82.

[63]Ibid.

[64]Norford, July 20, 1963, p. 14.

[65]Hepburn, Jan. 5, 1963, p. 17.

[66]Ibid., June 22, 1963, p. 14. For examples see Brodacasting, July 1, 1963, p. 29; Nov. 18, 1963, p. 82; Hepburn, Sept. 15, 1962, p. 19; Sept. 22, 1962, p. 19; June 22, 1963, p. 14; New York Times, July 1, 1963, p. 29; Nov. 18, 1963, p. 82.

[67]Ibid.; New York Times, Nov. 18, 1963, p. 82.

[68]Amsterdam News, Nov. 9, 1963, p. 16.

[69]Ibid.

[70]Ibid.

[71]Hepburn, Nov. 9, 1963, p. 16.

[72]Broadcasting, Feb. 6, 1961, p. 70; Mar. 13, 1961, p. 40.

[73]Broadcasting, Oct. 2, 1961, p. 68; Window Dressing on the Set: Women and Minorities on Television, A Report of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Aug. 1977, p. 9.

[74]Hepburn, Feb. 9, 1963, p. 14.

[75]New York Times Western Edition, Feb. 23, 1963, p. 13; Richard Shepard, "Broadcasters Warned to Speed Hiring of Negroes," New York Times, June 25, 1963, p. 16, and "News of TV and Radio," New York Times, June 30, 1963, p. 15.

[76]Amsterdam News, Sept. 15, 1962, p. 19; Bart, "Advertising: Colgate to Use Negro Models," New York Times, Aug. 23, 1963, p. 30; Hepburn, Sept. 22, 1962, p. 18; Ibid., Feb. 9, 1963, p. 14.

[77]Amsterdam News, Sept. 1, 1963, p. 3; Ebony, Dec. 1962; New York Times, Aug. 25, 1962, p. 43.

[78]Amsterdam News, Sept. 1, 1962, p. 1; Newsweek, Aug. 20, 1962, p. 62; Damon Stetson, "More Salaried Positions Are Opening to Negroes," New York Times, Nov. 12, 1963, pp. 1, 31.

[79]Amsterdam News, Feb. 16, 1963, p. 1; Mar. 23, 1963, p. 19; Hepburn, Oct. 27, 1962, p. 21; Jan. 5, 1963, p. 17.

[80]Amsterdam News, Feb. 16, 1963, p. 1; Mar. 23, 1963, p. 19; Jesse H. Walker, "Theatricals," Amsterdam News, Apr. 6, 1963, p. 17.

[81]Richard Shepard, "Negroes Seek More On-Camera Jobs in TV," New York Times, Apr. 14, 1963, II, p. 15.

[82]Amsterdam News, Dec. 15, 1962, p. 19; Feb. 16, 1963, pp. 1, 43.

[83]Shepard, "Negroes Seek More On-Camera Jobs in TV," p. 15; Jack Lyle (ed.), The Black American and the Press, (Los Angeles, Calif.: The Ward Richie Press, 1968), p. 224.

[84]Walker, Apr. 6, 1963, p. 17.

[85]Cited by Hepburn, Mar. 2, 1963, p. 22.

[86]Hepburn, Apr. 13, 1963, p. 14.

[87]Ibid.

[88]New York Times, Nov. 12, 1963, p. 31.

[89]Ibid.

[90]Broadcasting, July 1, 1963, p. 29; Paul Gardner, "Ethical Culture Unit Assails Attitude of TV Toward Negro," New York Times, Dec. 7, 1964, p. 71; Gould, "Negro Participation in Television," p. 17.

[91]Gardner, p. 71; Gould, "Negro Participation in Television," p. 17; New York Times, July 29, 1963, p. 41.

[92]Hepburn, Aug. 24, 1963, p. 14.

[93]Shepard, "Broadcasters Warned to speed Hiring of Negroes," p. 16.

[94]Bart, "Advertising: Negro Market Stirring Interest," New York Times, Sept. 11, 1963, p. 51, and Advertising: Role of Negroes Is Discussed," p. 14; M. S. Handler, "N.A.A.C.P. Warns of Unrest Until Negro Demands Are Met," New York Times, July 7, 1963, p. 44.

[95]Gould, "Negro Participation in Television," June 23, 1963, II, p. 17; John D. Pomfret, "Negroes Pressing Hard to Abolish discrimination in Jobs," New York Times, Aug. 12, 1962, IV, p. 8; Loewenstein, Plotkin, and Pugh, "The Frequency of Appearance of Negroes on Television," Nov. 1964.

[96]Shepard, "Series Weighed for Top Artists," New York Times, Mar. 7, 1962, p. 71.

[97]Amsterdam News, Mar. 2, 1963, p. 22.

[98]Ibid.

[99]Ibid.

[100]Bart, "Advertising: Use of Negro Models Widening," New York Times, June 13, 1963, p. 41.

[101]Broadcasting, Aug. 12, 1963, p. 63; Hepburn, Aug. 31, 1963, p. 63; Pomfret, "Negroes Building Boycott Network," New York Times, Nov. 25, 1962, pp. 1, 67; Sydney H. Schanberg, "Preferment for Negroes Is Sought by Board Here," New York Times, Oct. 28, 1963, pp. 1, 17.

[102]New York Times, Mar. 22, 1962, p. 71.

[103]Hepburn, Oct. 12, 1963, p. 17.

[104]Gould, "Negro Participation in Television," June 23, 1963, II, p. 17; Hepburn, Apr. 13, 1963, p. 14; New York Times, May 18, 1962, p. 63.

[105]Hepburn, Aug. 17, 1963, p. 14.

[106]David Anderson, "As Agencies Gave View on Negroes," New York Times, Nov. 3, 1962, p. 15.

[107]Ibid.

[108]Ibid.

[109]Ibid.

[110]Shepard, "sponsors Resist Negro TV Roles," New York Times, Apr. 10, 1963, p. 14.

[111]Hepburn, Apr. 13, 1963, p. 14.

[112]Ebony, Aug. 1965, pp. 65-66, 68.

[113]Hepburn, Feb. 22, 1964, p. 16.

[114]Shepard, "Broadcasters Warned to Speed Hiting of Negroes," June 25, 1963, p. 16.

[115]Gunnar Myrdal, Against the Stream, (New York: Pantheon, 1973), pp. 303-304.

[116]Hubert O'Gorman, "Pluralistic Ignorance and White Estimates of White Support for Racial Segregation," Public Opinion Quarterly, Fall. 22, 1962, p. 18.

[117]Hepburn, Sept. 22, 1962, p. 18.

[118]John M. Lee, "Advertising: Mixed Scenes in Negro Press," New York Times, Aug. 12, 1963, p. 31.

[119]Norford, June 20, 1963, p. 14.

[120]Broadcasting, Nov. 5, 1962, p. 68.

[121]Gould, "The Negro Actor in TV," New York Times, June 10, 1962, II, p. 17.

[122]Bart, "Advertising: Role of Negroes Is Discussed," p. 14.

[123]New York Times, Oct. 29, 1963, p. 71.

[124]Bart, "Advertising: Airline Agency Changes Due," New York Times, Nov. 29, 1963, p. 62; Lee, "Advertising: An Integrated Scene in Boston," Aug. 7, 1963, p. 40. Also see New York Times, Nov. 11, 1963, p. 51.

[125]Shepard, "Broadcasters Warned to Speed Hiring of Negroes," p. 16.

[126]Hepburn, Sept. 8, 1962, p. 18.

[127]For example, two CBS affiliates declined to schedule an episode of "East Side, West Side," New York Times, Nov. 5, 1963, p. 63.

[128]New York Times Western Edition, Feb. 13, 1963, p. 3.

[129]Hepburn, Apr. 13, 1963, p. 14.

[130]Ibid.

[131]Ibid., Aug. 24, 1963, p. 14, and Feb. 15, 1964, p. 16. Also see Broadcasting, Nov. 5, 1962, p. 68; Les Brown, "Leading Lady," New York Times, Feb. 8, 1976, II, p. 33; Hepburn, May 11, 1963, p. 14, and Sept, 21, 1963, p. 14.

[132]Amsterdam News, Dec. 8, 1962, p. 47.

[133]Shepard, "Broadcasters Warned to speed Hiring of Negroes," p. 16.

[134]Hepburn, Dec. 29, 1962, p. 17.

[135]Ibid., Sept. 29, 1962, p. 18.

[136]Ibid., Feb. 29, 1964, p. 16.

[137]Amsterdam News, Sept. 1, 1962, p. 1; Dec. 15, 1962, p. 19.

[138]Broadcasting, Nov. 18, 1963, p. 82; July 1, 1963, p. 29.

[139]Schumach, "Steps Towards Integration in TV," New York Times, Aug. 18, 1963, II, p. 13.

[140]Bart, "Advertising: Negro Market Stirring Interest," p. 51.

[141]New York Times, Oct. 29, 1963, p. 71.

[142]Bart, "Advertising: Negro Market Stirring Interest," p. 51.

[143]Bart, "Advertising: Airline Agency Changes Due," Nov. 29, 1963, p. 62.

[144]Schumach, "Producers Agree on Using Negroes," Aug. 22, 1963, p. 19.

[145]Broadcasting, Feb. 25, 1963, p. 39.

[146]Ibid., Nov. 14, 1960, p. 5.

[147]Newsweek, Nov. 5, 1962, p. 92.

[148]Norford quoted George H. Fowler, Chairman of the New York State Commission for Human Rights, July 13, 1963, p. 14.

[149]Broadcasting, Aug. 29, 1960, p. 83; New York Times, May 29, 1964, p. 57, and May 30, 1964, p. 41.

[150]TV Guide, March 2, 1962, p. A-53; Jan. 5, 1963, p. A-33.

[151]Shepard, "Broadcasters Warned to Speed Hiring of Negroes," p. 16.

[152]Graham, p. 48.

[153]Broadcasting, Dec. 24, 1962, p. 22.

[154]Morris J. Gelman and Deborah Haber, "Here's Why It's Still a Man's World on Television, and Why the Women Are Glad of It," Television Magazine, Mar. 1962, p. 53.

[155]Ibid., p. 61.

[156]Windows on the Set, pp. 4-26.

157Gelman and Haber, p. 58.

[158]Majorie Hunter, "U. S. Acts to Raise Status of Women," New York Times, Nov. 2, 1963, p. 27; Esther Peterson, "Are Women Taking Men's Jobs?" Personnel Journal, Feb. 1962, p. 82.

[160]Graham, p. 50.

[161]Ibid., p. 53.

[162]Ibid.

[163]Helen Epstein, "Women on the Air," Report III, in Marvin Barrett, ed., The Alfred I. duPont Survey of Broadcast Journalism, 1970-1971: A State of Seige, (New York: Grossett & Dunlap, 1971), pp. 141-143.

[164]"More & More TV, Radio Giving Prominance to Distaff Journalist," Variety, May 22, 1964, pp. 29, 59.

[165]George Eaton Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities, Fourth Ed., (New York: Harper & Row, Publs., 1972), pp. 429, 463.

CHAPTER VI

THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES
1965 - 1969

In this chapter our attention will turn to the second half of the 1960's. Minorities, mainly blacks, had broken into newscasting, but by 1965 they had not achieved more than token acceptance. By this time most broadcasters were including a few women on their newscasting staffs. Other movements besides the Civil Rights Movement emerged to engage the society, the anti-war movement and the Women's Movement. School desegregation, an issue in many communities, was widely reported by the news media. More distressing, beginning with the Watts riots in 1965, was the erruption of major riots in black ghettoes across the nation. As the Women's Movement developed in the late sixties, much of the feminist criticism directed towards broadcasters echoed sounds voiced earlier by minorities.

During this period, as pointed out in Chapter III, television became the nations's primary source of news information. In network competition, CBS and NBC were locked in a perpetual race with one another while ABC was straining to catch up.[1] Producers of television news were

still striving for better quality in news programming as technical advances and new production techniques also contributed to changing the character of news shows. An important change was the shift to televising news daily in color to attract more viewers to TV news.[2] NBC began daily broadcasting of the "Huntley-Brinkley Report" in color in 1965 to keep up with CBS. By January of 1967 ABC shifted to televising news in color when the network also lengthened its nightly news show to a half-hour, the length of the competing network newscasts.[3]

Although minorities and women had made important advances into TV news, the problem of television images, so troublesome to these groups during the early sixties, continued to be issues during the second half of the decade.

The Persistance of Minority Grievances

In the following pages events and actions by minorities, such as contributed to the pressure on broadcasters to change TV images, are noted chronologically by year:

1965

In entertainment programming, 1965 was another breakthrough year for blacks, but discrimination in TV news was widely condemned. The successful airing of the weekly series "I Spy," which co-starred the black actor, Bill Cosby, demonstrated not only that the networks had made a move towards meeting minority demands, but also that

television audiences would accept blacks in leading roles. When this show got almost full clearance from the NBC network affiliates, a newspaper writer commented that NBC no longer had to be apprehensive about the Southern response.[4] On the other hand, the images of minorities in TV news coverage were still a serious problem, particularly to blacks, and one which was closely related to the issue of minority employment in television news. In fact, television news in general had become a vexing matter and so was a special target of concern among blacks.

Television's coverage of the Civil Rights Movement was the theme of a conference held at the Freedom of Information Center in 1965 at the University of Missouri. This was the first of several inquiries into the practices of television news during the second half of the sixties. Criticism generated from conferences, hearings, and investigations conducted by private and governmental groups, which pointed out the deficiencies of TV news in respect to minorities and the more serious social disorders confronting the nation, would increasingly become a forceful pressure on broadcasters. While it was mainly minority leaders who criticized the media at the Missouri conference, in later years it would be quasi-governmental groups, discussed below, which were a greater threat to broadcasters.

Black leaders at the conference discussed television news extensively. Whitney Young said that news coverage had

made segregation into something undesirable.[5] The white press "fails to show Negro grievances are real; instead of a mild inconvenience the Negro is reacting to a catastrophe, a disaster, an emergency."[6] Roy Wilkins of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People said that the quality more than the quantity of coverage of the Civil Rights Movement was at fault. The news media too frequently exhibited a "vast ignorance of the origin, nature, and extent of the civil-rights movement."[7] Another speaker at the conference said that the white press "intentionally closes its eyes to issues that should be reviewed" and he cited de facto segregation as an example.[8] A black community leader from New York held that the press was "dishonest, unethical, and unprincipled."[9] Malcolm X accused the white press of distorting the news so flagrantly that it "produced only an image of hate, terror, and fear."[10] Kenneth B. Clark, although acknowledging the civil rights revolution had been fairly and fully reported, and that the press had kept the story before the American people, condemned "the way the white press reports black power and the backlash which has resulted" as the most significant trend in the news.[11] Granting that some progress had been made in the relationship between the white press and blacks, James Farmer of the Congress of Racial Equality held that the coverage of the Civil Rights Movement had helped non-violent action and helped get public

acceptance of desegregation.[12]

A complaint voiced by black representatives from several large cities, such as New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia, said that the white press was irresponsible in what it reported about the black community. White newsmen did not distinguish between individuals calling press conferences to propose ridiculous action and those who should be taken seriously. They held that at the bottom of the problem was the second-rate coverage the white media gave black affairs. "Media managers hold the Civil Rights Movement in low esteem and assign less experienced reporters to cover this issue."[13] Too often white newsmen would not venture into what they perceived were danger areas of the black community, which was especially true during disturbances.[14]

Blacks distrusted the white media. A spokesman at the conference said that "the new media are guilty of what a large part of the Negro revolution is all about: token integration and token employment."[15] The executive director of the Urban League of Greater New York, the Reverend Eugene S. Callender, blamed media executives for hiring too few Negroes.[16] Another spokesman said, "There is a need for Negro reporters who understand Negro problems and can be trusted by the Negro public."[17] The race of television reporters indicated that minority affairs were being slanted, since in the mainstream media reporters were still

almost entirely white. Many of the black leaders attending this conference shared the idea that the absence of black reporters demonstrated there was no input from blacks to temper distortions and bias in news stories. Another argument put forth in the 1965 conference was that the news media lacked trained specialists knowledgeable in Negro history.[18]

The United Church of Christ developed a new strategy to spread monitoring of television programs by black groups to areas where discrimination had been reported. The church provided local groups with teams of advisors who would instruct them in how to monitor programs and then in how to file objections to the renewals of station licenses.[19]

Another important development in 1965 was the difficulty WLBT-TV of Jackson, Mississippi faced when applying for a renewal of its license. Following an objection the United Church of Christ filed with the FCC, the station was granted only a probationary term of one year instead of the usual three years.[20] This was not a complete victory for the church activists, but it was significant that the FCC recognized the black position by requiring the station to comply within the probationary year. The WLBT-TV case caught the attention of television broadcasters across the country. It was the first time that charges of racial discrimination had become a factor affecting a TV license.[21]

The Urban League continued its earlier efforts; representatives called upon advertising and broadcasting company officials using persuasive techniques.[22]

In respect to women in 1965, the rhetoric of the Civil Rights Movement stimulated discussion about women's place in society. At that time, however, most groups focusing on women's concerns were not organized to pressure broadcasters.[23] Yet by October of 1965 the New York City mayoral candidate, Abraham Beame, proposed the creation of a New York City Commission on the Status of Women, which "would perform an advisory role in exploring new job opportunities and in seeking to utilize the know-how of women . . . in government and public life."[24]

1966

The public acclaim bestowed upon Bill Cosby was a positive stimulus for broadcasters to further integrate TV images. Besides being given the honor of co-hosting the television industry's most prized annual event, Cosby was awarded an Emmy for "outstanding continued performance by an actor in a leading role in a dramatic series ['I Spy']."[25]

The National Urban League, still attempting to place more blacks in advertising, received assistance from other non-profit organizations. The Advertising Council, a trade association, administered a campaign funded by the Ford Foundation to promote Negro employment in advertising. Several large advertising agencies were persuaded to

increase their recruitment of Negroes, particularly at Negro colleges.[26] By mid-year the Urban League formed the Broadcast Skills Bank with the cooperation of the large networks, which established an inventory of qualified minority group manpower interested in broadcasting. The roster of the Skills Bank was made available to broadcasters seeking to employ minority group members.[27]

P. J. Sidney, continued to lead picket lines in New York to protest discrimination in the broadcasting industry.[28]

Public discussion concerning women's roles increased in frequency and volume.[29] Early in 1966 President Lyndon B. Johnson conferred approval upon the emerging ideas related to women's employment when he announced that he would appoint a study group "to help open doors of opportunity to every American woman."[30] Governor Nelson Rockefeller announced that Community Guidance Centers would be set up in New York State to help women move into more useful roles, and, later that year, the governor signed a bill prohibiting discrim-ination based on sex.[31] The National Organization for Women was formed in October. Styled after the NAACP, the organization would strive to insure full equality for women.[32]

1967

A number of organizations pressed the FCC to do something about discrimination in television. In the spring

of 1967 when the license period of television stations in the South expired, several agencies of the United Church of Christ petitioned the FCC to withhold licenses from all broadcasters that discriminated unfairly in employment practices. They urged that the FCC require licensees to furnish satisfactory evidence at least once a year that they did not discriminate in employment.[33] Several months later, the NAACP's Legal Defense and Education Fund presented data, accumulated by groups monitoring TV programs, to the FCC and requested an investigation of racial bias in the production and broadcasting of TV commercials. The NAACP pointed out that the FCC had never issued a statement on discrimination in broadcasting,[34] although, as already noted, in 1964 there had been a hearing in Chicago in which FCC officials listened to minorities present their grievances.[35] Studies conducted by the New York City Commission on Human Rights and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission substantiated claims that there was discrimination in television images.[36] Newspaper and magazine critics kept the subject of minority images before the public. As an example, a newspaper critic charged that a few years ago you suddenly began seeing Negro faces in TV commercials, but then a standstill was reached and "Negroes still can't get their voices in or over a commercial."[37]

A symposium, at the University of California, Los Angeles, in July 1967, focused on the relationship of black

Americans with the news media. Some of the comments brought forth at this meeting reflected those of the conference in Missouri two years earlier. To illustrate, one speaker said that if the press was going to report about "black people in an accurate way, they are going to have to get black people on their staffs. Whites do not know blacks well enough."[38] One participant in the symposium argued that if there are police reporters, aviation editors, science reporters, etc., why not have journalists who specialize in the black community and black affairs? The black leader, Charles Evers, commented that "foreign correspondents are experts in the areas in which they are stationed--but there are no experts on the Negro problem in this country."[39] Another speaker added, however, that it was important for the "black journalist to be a good journalist instead of a token or stereotype staff member."[40] He added, "Being Negro alone does not mean doing a good job; he must be a good reporter."[41] Thus, leaders of black organizations were concerned with getting skilled black reporters into television newscasts. Such a change was seen as a way to help the white society to understand black problems better, though it was blacks who regarded this with urgency rather then whites. They felt this would also help to produce more accurate news reports and reduce the communication gap that exacerabated relations between blacks and whites. Though a black reporter could distort news as much as any other,

still the presence of black reporters on news shows would indicate to the black audiences that there were people on news staffs who shared the problem of being black in American society. The presence of such people would, to some degree, temper the bias of the mainstream news media, even if television news continued to be controlled by white directors and producers.

This year the City Commission on Human Rights began a new investigation of the patterns of minority group employment in the broadcasting and advertising industries, giving particular attention to the projection of minority images:

> The commission sought to illuminate an issue which cannot be defined completely in statistical terms--the nature of image projection, in particular how the Negro and the Puerto Rican are portrayed in the radio and televison programs and commercials which advertisers and broadcasters send hour after hour into almost every American home.[42]

Questionnaires were sent to television broadcasters in September of 1967 to gather data in preparation for the hearings scheduled for the following spring.[43]

Minority consumers were again a subject of interest. For some products and services blacks were better customers than whites with comparable incomes. As black incomes were increasing, so was the potential of the Negro market.[44] Consequently, more warnings of the possible loss of the Negro market were put forth to the advertisers and broadcasters by black spokesmen such as a vice-president at

the Pepsi-Cola Company and a vice president of the Johnson Publishing Company in Chicago, who pointed out that "Negroes are becoming more aware of their effectiveness as citizens and as consumers."[45] Another reason why advertisers and broadcasters should not overlook the Negro market was its concentration in urban centers, areas that are "readily reachable" for advertising messages and usually within the broadcaster's most dominant zone.[46]

During this year still more attention was given to the problems women faced in employment. In February, Governor Rockefeller established the Woman's Unit of New York State. With five full-time officials, the group was to be a clearing house providing information and guidance for women.[47] As public discussion concerning women's roles continued, the knowledge that paid employment was supplementing homemaking roles for greater numbers of women was more widely distributed, and these changes were raising new issues.[48]

A campaign to help the equalization of employment opportunities was launched in December, when women from NOW and the Lucy Stone League announced a demonstration to take bundles of newspapers to the offices of the EEOC in Manhattan. Their intent was to force the agency to set up guidelines for employers who run help-wanted ads in sex segregated columns.[49]

In television, a black actress wrote in an article in the New York Times that Negro women faced casting problems from which white women were exempt. Although all performers are judged on their looks, for Negro women racial identification was a factor complicating whether or not they were given equal access to television roles, particularly dramatic parts. Generally, traditional stereotyping influenced the casting of minority women.[50]

1968

In 1968 there were more investigations into discrimination in advertising and broadcasting, and particularly television news. Starting off the year, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission held hearings in New York in order to examine the hiring practices of the communications industry.[51] Another investigation, in February, was led by William Booth, Chairman of the New York City Human Rights Commission. In addition to the questionnaires sent out in 1967, Booth sent another set to the top advertising agencies to find out how many minorities were employed by the agencies and to do commercials.[52] Several weeks later the Human Rights Commission announced a "crash program followed by a continuous effort" to get more minorities employed. The commission planned to meet separately with broadcasters and advertisers before taking any corrective action, such as forwarding records to the FCC or going to court to force compliance.[53]

The Human Rights Commission's report on the hearings in March, substantiating claims of discrimination in broadcasting,[54] stated that

> advertisers and broadcasters in the New York Area have consistently failed to employ Negroes, Puerto Ricans, American Indians, and other minority group members over-all, . . . in image-making roles in numbers commensurate with the size and talent of these groups in the total population.[55]

Data collected by the Human Rights Commission showed that of 148 reporters or newscasters in the news departments of the networks, seven (4.7 percent) were Negro and none were Puerto Rican. At the independent television stations blacks comprised 4 percent of the workers in craft occupations,[56] which included newscasters, announcers, and writers as well as musicians, producers, electricians, etc. who were union members. Puerto Ricans accounted for 2 percent of the craft workers.[57] One would expect that very few or none of these craft workers were newscasters, and, at that time, the number of minority newscasters employed by the networks was about the same as at the independent stations.

Thus, after six years of campaigning to achieve greater minority employment, the few minority group members employed in television and the resultant absence of their images in televison programming attested to the failure of broadcasters to eliminate discrimination. Moreover, as one witness said,

> It is surprising that television, the most modern communication medium, continues to act as if there have been no changes in racial attitudes in the past 20 years."[58]

Television news programming was as much a part of the problem of minority employment and minority imagery as any other kind of programming. The Report of the Human Rights Commission questioned why Negroes were not shown in what purported to be "factual reporting" in the "depiction of real life and newsworthy events."[59] White newsmen cover the situations where the Negro is demonstrating, rioting, or violently participating in a community conflict with police or other established authority. Black newsmen are rarely seen. Negroes are not among the commentators who gather together to discuss the significance of these events. "The medium shows no counter-balancing scenes of normal Negro home life or constructive community activities. Even street scenes and shots of crowds at theatres, restaurants, and other public places rarely include the quota of Negro patrons that is typically found in any fair-sized city."[60] Even though Negro athletes are prominant, they are not sports commentators, referees, or other officials. Neither were Negroes present when discussion groups debated world events, politics, or other matters of human importance. Television news departments have few Negroes on camera or in news writing behind the scenes. The impression the medium conveys to the viewer is that blacks "either are not concerned with issues not strictly racial, or their opinions

are not worth listening to."[61] Thus, the commission restated complaints voiced earlier by black spokesmen.

The Human Rights Commission held that "the qualitative nature of the representation of Negroes and Puerto Ricans on the broadcaster's staff was . . . more important than a simple nose count."[62] A black newsman on the staff of a TV station helps to assure the public that the minority view will be given consideration when a tense situation arises. Moreover, the minority community resents it when "experts," none of whom are minority group members, gather on panels and round tables to analyze minority problems.[63]

Several groups other than blacks took complaints to the Human Rights Commission. At the hearings a spokesman for the Puerto Rican Community Conference pointed out that too few Puerto Ricans were employed in the advertising and broadcasting industries, and warned that there was a "rising tide of dissatisfaction and militancy in the Puerto Rican community because of discrimination."[64] The president of the National Congress of American Indians, condemned "the one-sided image of the American Indian which derives from the 'enemy' heritage of the white man."[65] The Human Rights Commission was informed that the American Indian population in the city totaled about 15,000 according to the 1960 census. It was urgent to this group that unemployment be reduced and that "the white population be reeducated to rid

it of widespread ignorance and stereotyped ideas."[66]

Other minority groups also had representatives attempting to persuade broadcasters to project more favorable images of their people. Mexican-Americans, trying to get the disparaging Frito Bandito commercials off the air; threatened to sue for equal time under the Fairness Doctrine.[67] Italian-American and Polish-American groups lobbied Congressmen for new legislation to eliminate insulting portrayals of national, racial, and religious groups.[68]

Policy regarding images was stressed more than jobs by the Human Rights Commission, as indicated by Counsel summarizing the 1968 hearings who was quoted as follows:

> We are not interested in getting somebody a job, however desirable it may be. It is the significance of having Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the sensitive areas where they will do for everybody what, unfortunately, the current crop is not doing for everybody--this is the reason we are concerned with this aspect.[69]

Various other activities added to the pressures on broadcasters. Governor Rockefeller set up the Committee on Minority Groups in News Media with thirty-three members to explore ways to expand opportunities for minorities in mass communications industries.[70]

As a result of a new ruling on the United Church of Christ petition against WLBT-TV, the FCC assumed responsibility for upholding the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The agency warned it would refuse to renew a license if a complaint

against a station about discrimination was found to be valid. The FCC did not penalize WLBT-TV at that time as the new policy was to be effective in the future. The FCC urged that stations start affirmative recruitment and training programs for Negroes, but would not make this mandatory .[71]

In 1968 an event encouraging of change in television images occurred in entertainment television; the new weekly series, "Julia," which was the first with a black person cast in the leading role was a success. Moreover, the show attempted to project a new image of the Negro family, unlike that of the old stereotypes, and black writers were hired who would know black family life.[72] On the other hand, even though efforts to get more minorities into TV commercials went on, few showed any blacks or other minorities.[73]

How to sell the Negro market, now estimated to be worth $40 billion,[74] remained a problem confronting marketing specialists. The Association of National Advertisers and the American Association of Advertising Agencies ran a clinic on the the use of minority group performers in television commercials. A marketing consultant speaking at a meeting of the American Marketing Association advised that there is an important potential for development in the Negro ghetto, but the people there are looking for an identity and "this can have a significant effect on the sales curve."[75] At another seminar for advertisers and public relations people, a speaker reminded

the group that the mass media are a political force, but only recently are people realizing business men have been making political and social decisions for years, and that minorities are realizing "free speech is only a technicality if they can't plug into the mass media."[76]

News programming drew considerable attention in 1968. Early commentary on the Kerner Report pointed out that the President's commission urged the news media to expand coverage of the Negro community.[77] The FCC commissioner, Nicholas Johnson, called upon broadcasters not only to provide more news to Negroes, but to integrate Negroes into broadcast journalism to assure more accurate reporting.[78] One network news executive admitted that there was an unfilled gap on his news staff, that the committment to hire more black talent had yet to be filled.[79]

When published, the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Kerner Report) again set forth criticism that had been voiced previously; it pointed out that a credibility gap existed when television news was received by black viewers. Television coverage of the 1967 riots had been cautious and restrained, but it became distorted when reporters relied too heavily upon the police and city officials for information, interviewed whites in predominantly black neighborhoods, and emphasized law enforcement actions.[80]

> Television coverage tended to give the impression that the riots were confrontations between Negroes and whites, rather than responses to underlying slum problems.[81]

The Kerner Report held that the news media were responsible if blacks did not believe the messages of television news. Again the charge was that long standing patterns of discrimination in the hiring of black reporters and covering the black community had made it impossible to report events in ghetto areas in a knowledgeable manner. Generally, white reporters were handicapped when covering these areas. The report stated,

> We believe that most news organizations do not have direct access to diversified news sources in the ghetto. Seldom do they have a total sense of what is going on there. . . .
>
> The development of good contacts, reliable information, and understanding requires more effort and time than an occasional visit by a team of reporters to do a feature on a newly discovered ghetto problem. . . . The journalistic profession has been shockingly backward in seeking out hiring, training, and promoting Negroes. . . . The lines of various news organizations to the militant blacks are, by admission of the newsmen themselves, almost non-existent.[82]

The government investigation verified the complaints of black leaders about the news media. Skilled black reporters needed to permanently assigned to the ghetto beat; reporters who had a rapport with the minority community should be allowed to develop their knowledge of this area and gain experience in getting information out to the society. The report stated,

> news organizations must employ enough Negroes in positions of significant responsibility to establish an effective link to Negro actions and ideas and to meet legitimate employment expectations. Tokenism--the hiring of one Negro reporter, or even two or three--is no longer enough. Negro reporters are essential.[83]

In 1968, several training courses were opened up to help minorities prepare for careers in television. In March the New York Urban Coalition, an organization of 160 business, labor, and community leaders, formed the Inter-Media Skills Bank, which was a central registry and job placement agency. The Coalition cooperated with the School of Journalism at Columbia University in implementing a training program there.[84] The Ford foundation financed the summer courses at Columbia and others at the New School and Syracuse University.[85]

This year broadcasters were reported to be facing the beginning of a "crisis of confidence" by the general viewing public in addition to that of the blacks' lack of credibility. Mainstream white audiences had become less accepting of TV news, which was probably a result of the great amount of violence covered, such as mass demonstrations, riots, and the disarray at the Democratic Convention in Chicago.[86]

In the society at large, the Black Movement was reaching its peak. Militants advocated new identities for blacks; "Black is Beautiful" became a popular slogan and its underlying mood, requiring recognition in media messages and

special consideration in employment, was reaching a new intensity. The riots in major cities and then the subsequent Kerner Report pointing out that media discrimination against blacks which aggravated the relationship between blacks and whites were further pressures on broadcasters. The television news media, reporting this unrest was more and more finding it had to defend itself against criticism.

Women's employment received more attention in 1968. A conference on the status of women met in Washington, D.C. in June to consider legislation for labor standards and family law. Another developing pressure that would have future significance was the strength of civil rights legislation, most of which by this time had been applied to discrimination against women as well as minorities. The main drawback was the capacity of government agencies with limited funds to deal with the problems referred to them.[87]

1969

In January the City Human Rights Commission again held hearings, and William Booth reported that the advertising and broadcasting industries still discriminated against minorities in employment and "image-making." There had only been a "slight degree of progress" since the hearings in March of the previous year. Strategies adopted by the commission included asking the FCC to cancel the licenses of stations continuing discrimination, as had the

United Church of Christ, insisting that stations employ minorities in all job catagories, asking stations to keep up-to-date employment records, and continuing the surveillance of the number of minorities seen on television.[87]

New criticism of the use of Negroes in commercials pointed out that integrated ads often got different exposure than other commercials; those using blacks were shown selectively in different regions instead of getting national exposure. Marketing specialists still were being reminded of the potential of the Negro market, and market research data were presented and debated at Advertising Age's annual creative workshop in Chicago. How to target in on Negro consumers, many of whom were upwardly mobile as educational achievement improved and incomes rose, remained an unresolved problem.[89]

An event that shocked broadcasters across the nation was the denial by the FCC of the license renewal of a Boston station, WHDH-TV, because a challenger to the license renewal showed that station was giving unsatisfactory service. More important, this license denial was a departure from previous FCC policy. It was the first time that a challenging citizens' group rather than professional communicators trying to obtain a station took over a television license. With greater numbers of licenses being challenged by minority groups monitoring TV programming, the fact that the FCC would deny a license renewal because of

programming quality was a singular warning to broadcasters that minority petitions might also succeed.[90]

When the National Mexican-American Anti-Defamation Committee asked three San Antonio, Texas stations for equal time under the Fairness Doctrine to counteract the negative stereotyping in the Frito-Lay commercials and were refused, they announced they were would seek relief from the FCC.[91]

In 1969 the publication of the staff report of the Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence[92] was another occasion when the need for increasing the number of minority television reporters was brought to the attention of the American public. The report, in a repetition of earlier statements, said that "the very presence of black reporters in a news organization helps allay the antipathy of some blacks toward the media.[93] Moreover, "black reporters are probably clearly more qualified to serve as a conduit for intergroup communication than their white counterparts," and as reporters who serve this function must be more familiar with both communities, black reporters are more suitable because "blacks are more knowledgeable about the white community than whites are about the black community.[94]

Just as other groups had previously urged, the Commission recommended getting more minority group members into TV news in order to remedy the existing problems affecting the society. From a long range perspective, the

Commission did not think hiring reporters on the basis of their color was a good practice. Ideally, a reporter's color should not matter, and eventually it might not, but immediate needs required the prompt hiring of more minority reporters.[95] This was another important reminder to the television industry that reforms were needed. The main threat from the Congressional commissions were the recommendations for new legislation that they would make to Congress.

Persisting Responses of the Broadcasters

The deficiencies of the television news media, as voiced by minority leaders attending conferences and hearings where these matters were important topics, showed how slowly broadcasters acceded to minority demands to integrate TV images and occupations. Many of the obstacles to minority employment in television news evident in the early sixties were still seen in the late sixties despite efforts to eliminate them.

Broadcaster Awareness

It has been shown in Chapter IV that in the early sixties television officials were hardly aware of the discrimination practiced in their companies. After five or more years the Report of the Human Rights Commission indicated this was still a continuing problem. Testimony presented before the Commission indicated that generally

sponsors followed a policy of non-interference in programming, and even took pride in mentioning that they would not reject a program because it included Negroes or Puerto Ricans, but the callousness of their practices became evident in the cross-examination:

> When Counsel dissected some of the shows because they included Negroes or other minorities, the witnesses were compelled to admit that their judgment sometimes revealed a lack of sensitivity. Too often the program in which the sponsor had seen nothing wrong was in fact offensive to the minority community most concerned.[96]

At the hearings, it was repeatedly stressed that "only the employment of Negro and other minority group personnel in all occupational catagories would provide . . . the 'built-in awareness' needed to insure a true representation of minorities."[97]

When representatives of broadcasting companies were confronted with evidence of discrimination in their organizations at the hearings of the Human Rights Commission in 1968, their reactions were quite different than they had been in the early sixties. The Commission report noted that

> most witnesses expressed shock and embarrassment at the poor showing of their own organizations and of the [broadcasting and advertising] industries as a whole and were fervent in promising to do better hereafter.[98]

Although sensitivity to discrimination in television organizations was very low, compared with the early sixties, there did appear to be a new level of awareness of the

problem. Whether this reaction was a consequence of some fear that broadcasters were vulnerable because of their dependence upon retaining station licenses or that they had been sensitized by this time by the ongoing Black Movement cannot be determined. Anyway, the advertisers, with only one or two exceptions, were similarly shocked and embarrassed by the findings of the Commission's survey.[99]

Economic Censorship

Economic censorship continued to function in the late sixties. A witness before the Commission pointed out how it affected the writer of entertainment programs: "The professional writer knows what he must sell in order to live. Therefore, he writes what he knows sponsors will buy, even though he might prefer to write something entirely different."[100] Another witness explained how subtly economic censorship operates in respect to minorities. One must understand

> how the industry operates in this area. Not the formal way--not the way which looks good in print, but how it actually is! Television is a very subtle and sophisticated institution. Delicate matters like this don't have to be reduced to writing. I don't suppose anybody could ever find a written memo directing that the use of Negroes in stories should be avoided. You don't need it in writing--it's in the air. Everybody knows. Everybody is practical and reasonable.[101]

It has to be assumed that a practice so subtle and so well understood in the entertainment sector of television would be equally understood and in force in news

departments. Moreover, the witness noted, "Of course, the definition of what is 'practical and reasonable' does shift. . . . When shows are produced in New York, they should coincide with a better use of minority people."[102] Therefore, we conclude, not only was economic censorship based upon informal rules of television production, but informal reinterpretations could also change how it was applied. If minorities appeared in more television programs or more frequently as newscasters, it was likely that this happened after a collective understanding developed, at least among those responsible for and contributing to program imagery.

Denials of Discrimination

Almost all companies had issued formal policy statements condemning discrimination but had done little to eliminate it. There had been little or no effective planning to remedy these historic policies and no constructive recruitment and training programs were in operation. As before, television officials merely promised reforms in the future. To illustrate, a vice-president for employee relations, speaking before an EEOC hearing, claimed that CBS employed Negroes in all types of executive positions and that special efforts were being made to seek more qualified Negro workers. He did admit, however, that "not enough efforts to find Spanish speaking employees had been made."[103]

Responsibility for Images

Black leaders had been perplexed in the early sixties as to where to place responsibility for the negative television images of minorities. One usually passed the blame to another--the broadcaster to the advertiser and the advertiser to the sponsor, or vice versa, etc. There was still evidence of this pattern in 1968. To illustrate, the Report of the Human Rights Human Rights Commission described how the blame was passed on to others in respect to entertainment programming:

> Network spokesmen claimed to have little control over the the content of programs and their casting. They insisted that these factors, which involve the issues of realism and truthful representation are the sole responsiblilty of the so-called creative people in the industry--the writers and producers. Network spokesmen expressed horror over the thought of "interfering" in the delicate creative processes by making any demands for greater minority representation.[104]

When investigators for the Human Rights Commission questioned station and network spokesmen about their lack of control over the programs they bought, the executives from the networks and independent stations seemed to contradict themselves. Despite the cooperative relationship they had with producers, and admittedly a strong influence on what producers did, they claimed they could not take affirmative action in respect to program content.

> They insisted that the "freedom of creative people," which they claimed meant a hands-off policy, must be maintained at all costs. On the other hand, it was admitted that a continuing dialogue is carried on between producers and networks and that no producer

ever totally rejects the suggestions of the network.[105]

Witnesses representing sponsors also claimed to have no control over programs--the casting, direction or anything else. In a posture of near helplessness, they argued that they only bought programs from the networks: the sponsor could exercise control only at the time the storyboard was submitted for his approval or rejection. Although the sponsor's final approval was required, most claimed they practiced a hands-off policy or minimal involvement. If it were to be specified that a minority member was to be cast for a certain on-camera role, that would have to be done very early when plans for the program were first being formulated.[106]

Unlike entertainment programs, news was produced directly by the station or network organization. But like entertainment, news programs sell advertising. When decisions are made about casting minority reporters or anchorpeople, the broadcasters would have to admit to their responsibility. Yet, even here, testimony before the Human Rights Commission indicated news programming was not entirely exempt from the pattern of passing the blame. One witness testified "that his own station would like to open up more apprentice news writing spots but that the Writers Guild held it by contract to one such position only."[107] Here the buck was passed to the unions.

It was pointed out during the hearings of the Human Rights Commission that Negroes constitute 18 percent and Puerto Ricans 10 percent of the population of New York City,"[108] but this held little relevance for broadcasters or advertisers. The viewing area, which extends far beyond the city's borders, was predominantly white. As the New York Area, or market, included up to thirty-five counties in four states in which 50 percent or more of the households receive a station's programming,[109] the white suburban population was a significant, and more valuable, consumer group than minorities concentrated in the urban core. It was made clear to the Commission that attracting these consumers would not be jeopardized:

> Advertisers and broadcasters would gladly use Negroes and other minority performers more often if only their inclusion in program stories and commercials were "suitable" and "natural." . . . Because most Americans are white, the argument ran, Negroes do not readily fit into programs and commercials planned, for commercial reasons, to attract the largest possible . . . audiences.[110]

So now the buck was passed to the audiences. Advertisers still held to the idea that programming should appeal to the life styles of white families and present images that would not jeopardize the sales of goods they advertised.

Fear Regarding White Audiences

The inadequacy of information about the effects of minority images was another unresolved problem that had produced complaints from minorities in the early sixties.

While it was feared that presenting minorities on camera would alienate white audiences, testimony before the Human Rights Commission revealed there was no evidence for this assumption. For example, in respect to television commercials,

> witnesses declined to generalize as to whether or not the use of a Negro does or does not impair the effectiveness of a commercial, but no witness was able to point to any instance in which utilization of a minority person had been responsible for fewer sales. Traditionally, the single principle in commercials has been white because most consumers are white, but it was admitted by some of the witnesses that the reasoning behind this tradition could be irrational. There is, in fact, no proof derived from reliable research to justify the present practice--or its scrapping.[111]

It is assumed that the practice of such caution reflected widespread industry attitudes that also applied to newscasters.

At another point the report noted the failure of advertisers to study how audiences respond to minority images:

> There is a disturbing paucity of reliable research studies sponsored by the industries on the effect of utilization of minority group persons on white viewers and audiences.[112]

Such was the case in industries whose very existence depended upon attracting viewers and relying upon ratings, or audience research data, as the basis for conducting business.

Minority Recruitment

The Urban League's long effort to expand black employment in advertising and broadcasting achieved only minimal results. Despite the widespread network created when the Broadcast Skills Bank was set up, very few blacks got jobs. Advertisers recruited minorities but rarely hired any. P. J. Sidney called the Skills Bank a "complete fraud," because it functioned as a screening mechanism that kept qualified blacks out of broadcasting. The Skills Bank lasted about two years and its main achieve-ments, according to the Urban League, were that it furnished substantial assistance to broadcasters and stimulated many members of minority groups to make direct applications to broadcasting companies.[113] The Human Rights Commission noted the lack of success achieved by the Urban Skills Bank but held that it should be given a longer time to prove its usefulness.[114]

The report of the Human Rights Commission indicated that interpersonal networks were as important to the recruitment of minority personnel as they were to others in broadcasting:

> Experience shows that competent and satisfied minority group employees already on the payroll are the most successful recruiters of others. Negroes who have attained high level positions have proved more willing than white men in the same positions to recognize ability in others of their race and to give them the opportunity to show what they can do.[115]

Another witness explained that minorities already employed in a company helped members of their own group gain entry:

> Something of the insidious atmosphere of discrimination in the industry was conveyed by the witness who told the hearing that he, a Negro, has obtained most of his professional assignments initially through other Negroes in the industry. . . . He would not have had the chance to prove his worth if he had had to wait to be called by white men in the business.[116]

As in the past, broadcasters said it was difficult to find suitable minorities. When it was suggested that a widescale crash program be launched to reassure minority groups that old practices of institutionalized employment discrimination had been discarded, broadcasters' representatives claimed that experienced Negro and Puerto Rican applicants were hard to find. They also claimed that there is a low rate of turnover among key broadcasting personnel. Moreover, when vacancies do occur they must be filled quickly with experienced people, and staff needs did not justify continuing or periodic recruitment programs.

Another factor affecting minority employment during the late sixties was that many blacks doubted that they would even be considered for employment in broadcasting. If they were, it was for dead-end jobs, which kept down the numbers of candidates who applied for broadcasting positions. At the same time the broadcasters preferred to have a large pool of eligible recruits so as to have an ample choice when deciding whom to hire.[117] This practice probably contributed to the broadcasters' claims that minorities were hard to find.

Specifying precise qualifications and experience of minority job applicants and giving them inadequate support once they were hired were additional problems noted during the Commission hearings and ones about which black activists had long complained The report stated,

> If experience is needed for hiring, and no Negroes, for example, have been hired in the past, then all Negroes will continue to lack experience, no Negro ever will qualify, and therefore none ever will be hired.[118]

Another witness who testified described this problem:

> One error frequently made by an industry, for example, is first to fail to hire any minority group employees at all on the mistaken impression that none can qualify, and then to hire a few minority employees but fail to give them the orientation training or sensitive supervision they need to help them adjust in the unfamiliar office environment, and then to let them go after a short trial period only to repeat the process. This pattern not only confirms the employer in his initial conviction that minority group members are incompetent but is economically and socially wasteful.[119]

Data obtained from interviews conducted for this study reflected these problems. Several respondents commented about a black man hastily hired by a television company in 1968 as a newscaster without being provided with adequate training. One respondent said,

> They hired him for his name. [He was a well recognized public figure.] They brought him in and put him on the air as the anchorman. He didn't know television. He had no training, and it hurt him. It really hurt him, hurt his career. He became an embarrassment to the station, so they took him off. It was unfair.

Other respondents mentioned this newscaster to illustrate how a black man could get hired in the late sixties

regardless of whether he could do the job. Some made fun of how he performed on camera, and others complained that he "made it look bad for other blacks." Black respondents were concerned that being black might mean skin color was a substitute for journalistic skills. Some said they were indeed hired because they were black, but they were good journalists and it was important that they be known as such. Two respondents said that in the late sixties the broadcasters suddenly discovered that they needed black reporters in order to take the heat off themselves for discrimination. "They would take anybody off the street if he was black" was a complaint repeated many times by respondents. But after a few years of poor results with people who didn't have the talent or skills for newscasting, and when more minority group members had gained experience, the broadcasters started making sure that they hired qualified minorities. Minority respondents were much happier with a truly competitive situation, because that indicated that they were hired because they were the best people to do the work, despite their minority status.

In our interviews several respondents described the support they received from their stations during this period. At one New York station, a black newscaster said that in 1968 when he was applying for a job, he was hurriedly sent out to cover a riot in a black community. He covered the story successfully and the station hired him.

Fortunately, he was an experienced radio news reporter who had the skill to go on the air immediately and report the story in a competent manner. At another station, at the same time, a black news staff member who had begun working at the station as a beginner in behind-the-scenes jobs, moved into on-the-air assignments as the need for a black journalist was felt to increase. He said that his news department had been very supportive, providing training and allowing him to gain reporting experience. Eventually he was sent out on all kinds of assignments, stories involving only whites as well as those involving blacks. Another black man was put on the staff of a network station in a high level position, that of associate producer and correspondent, because he was regarded as having a high potential due to his previous background as a scholar, writer, and experience as a producer in his own film company. His credentials enabled him to enter a new career in television news, but, once on staff, he became frozen in his position and was not permitted to try other tasks, particularly a chance to try anchoring. Thus, it seems that charges that minorities were not given proper support once they were hired or were too rapidly pushed into work they were not prepared to handle were valid, but this was not the case for every minority member hired during the sixties. Generally, the pattern of providing or not providing training and support was mixed.

The Increased Number of Minority Newscasters

According to Baker and Ball, by 1968 the three major networks had hired a larger proportion of minority professionals for their television and radio news staffs, including the owned and operated stations, than did the broadcast industry generally. CBS employed more minority professionals than did its competitors. Fifty-one, or 4.5 percent, of the 1,123 professionals on various CBS news staffs were Negroes. Twenty-nine black news professionals worked in the NBC news organization, or 4 percent of the 718 people on staff. ABC was close behind with twenty-six, or 3.9 percent, of its 672 professional news people being black.[120] Over half of the black news professionals working in the three network organizations had been hired that year and only a fifth had been on staff for two years or more. This may be partly explained by the high rate of turnover characteristic of the newscasting occupation.[121] But it may have been a consequence of other factors as well, such as ghetto eruptions requiring news coverage and the investigation begun by the City of New York Commission on Human Rights in 1967, which confronted broadcasters with data demonstrating discrimination in television. A change in broadcaster behavior was noted towards the close of the hearings:

> Agencies, broadcasters, and sponsors were eager later to correct or supplement the data they first submitted. Presumably, the realization of the impact on public opinion served as a spur . . . .[122]

> Even before this report goes to press, there are clear evidences of a marked effort by the broadcasting and advertising industries to present more Negroes on camera in both commercials and programming.[123]

A number of television news people interviewed for this study recalled this opening up of television news in 1968 or in the late sixties to minorities in New York City. A black correspondent who, besides reporting news on WABC-TV's evening news show, worked as a producer, director, and news analyst for the station, told of how he came into television news in 1968:

> It was in connection with the book [I wrote]. I was going to make a speech . . . to talk about the book. I never gave the speech, but some people talked to me about working in television, and I was offered a job at ABC. There was the crisis of the civil rights movement at that time, and I had good credentials--writing, educated, and knowledgeable about the society.

A black reporter-anchorman at a local owned and operated station said he began working there "in the sixties, about the time Martin Luther King died. I came in with the uplifting of consciousness of the American public." Another black anchorman and producer of programming oriented to the minority audience said,

> No single event contributed to the national consciousness and committment; it was a gradual evolving process. There was the assassination of Malcolm in '65, followed by Martin being murdered. It really began to pick up speed, and by '70 was well underway, . . . While Malcolm and Martin were leaders, there was a tremendous cause. Then there were pangs of consciousness and there were flurries of jobs. It was not only guilt that was the reason for the flurry of jobs. There was the Kerner Report too.

A black anchorman on a nightly news show and the producer-anchorman of a weekly black news program began working at his station in the 1967-1968 season. At that time this independent station was building up its newscast to be more competitive and to be a programming leader for the station. This occurred when the half-hour newscast was lengthened to an hour. Moreover, several local stations added weekly news programs aimed at black audiences. The minority journalists working on these shows also reported news on the daily evening newscasts. A black woman reporter at an independent station recalled the change for blacks: "It happened in 1969 and 1970--about that time. In 1969, we got shows like 'Black Journal,' 'Positively Black,' 'Black News,' and 'Like It Is.' We got more black reporters at that time." A black correspondent at WCBS-TV also noted 1969 as the year when more blacks started gaining notice in television news. A white anchorwoman-reporter-theatre critic said that the turning point was "in the late sixties, when I was beginning."

One television critic was prompted to comment that the increased use of black reporters had resulted in "more colorful broadcasting staffs."[124] Black reporters had become more visible on evening news shows. When first brought into television news in the early sixties, they were usually put on-camera in newscasts aired during marginal hours, such as in the early morning. By 1968 th numbers of

black reporters had increased slightly. CBS, for example, had three black network reporters. Local stations had hired black women as well as black men. as a result the viewer of evening news programs saw images in which the ethnicity, race, or sex of newscasters varied.[125]

Two important reports made known to the public were noted by a black newswoman who worked at "News Center 4," WNBC-TV's local news show: the study done by the United Church of Christ and the publishing of the Kerner Report were important factors affecting the employment of minority newscasters. "There was a very dramatic increase in the number of black people who were working in television." Then, qualifying her statement, she added that "it was an increase from point zero." She further noted, the change did not result from desires emanating from the audience, because they had only a passive choice to accept or not accept what was broadcast. Instead, by the late sixties pressures had become more significant, especially when coming from government agencies, and these pressures forced broadcasters to reevaluate their situations:

> It came down to a question of being pointed at by a very substantial, certainly not very radical, commission like the Kerner Commission and the President of the United States and other outside influences, . . . and then making an effort to change. Well, I think once that happened, it kind of made people see a lot of other things. It made broadcasters at least say to themselves, "Look, there's a big audience out there that does spend money, and maybe if we did certain kinds of things, we'd be able to capture this audience."

The militant mood among blacks ruled out the old practice of taking black viewers for granted, about which our respondent commented as follows:

> Before they [the broadcasters] were just saying, who needs them [blacks] really. They're going to watch, because this is all they have to watch. Maybe not saying it that consciously, but I think that was pretty much the spirit of the way people were behaving. . . . There is a sizeable audience out there that watches television, as far as blacks are concerned, more than whites do on the average, and they are people who have money to spend. And so, I think, all those things really did contribute to changing the hiring pattern.

Women in Newscasting

In 1965 there were so few women working as TV newscasters that, like racial minorities, they could be considered tokens in their respective departments. This was, however, the beginning of a trend in which women would become more numerous in television news. The Women's Liberation Movement was still in a very early stage of development; but the circulation of ideas concerning women's roles was increasing at conferences and in discussion in the popular literature, and small groups were forming. But women had not yet organized pressure groups as had blacks. Although Title VII of the Civil Rights Act banned discrimination because of sex, it would be near the end of the sixties before the force of this new law would become evident. In the larger context, the period 1965 to 1969 was when the Black Movement peaked, other protests captured the attention of the society, and broadcasters were severely

criticized for their treatment of minorities in television programming. Despite competing pressures on broadcasters, it was in this period that women began to make important advances into television news. It seemed that the media were more responsive to the as yet unorganized pressures of women than they had been to the organized pressures of blacks.

Women reporters become more visible on New York's local television news shows during the latter half of the sixties, a trend that had begun in 1964. Many were new to television. Until that time only the few who worked in network news could be seen by television audiences; none appeared in local news except as weather reporters. In 1965 WNBC-TV announced that Elizabeth (Liz) Trotta had been hired for the staff of the "Sixth Hour News" as the station's first local woman reporter. Coming from Newsday, she was an experienced newspaper journalist, but this was her first television job. At WCBS-TV several women were added to the local news staff for on-camera reporting, including Jeanne Parr, Mary Pangalos, and Joan Murray. The latter was the first black woman television reporter in New York.[126] Marya McLaughlin, who had worked behind-the-scenes for six years assisting David Brinkley, was another woman who moved into on-the-air reporting of local news at WCBS-TV. After a brief period there, she shifted to CBS's national news staff. CBS was the last of the three networks to put a

woman reporter on its news staff, and this occurred after its local news department had hired a woman. The other networks showed a reverse pattern; women were employed on the network news staffs before any worked on-camera in local news in New York. In 1965 Aline B. Saarinen was added to the staff of correspondent's at NBC News where Pauline Frederick and Nancy Dickerson were also employed. Marlene Sanders worked at ABC News.[127] Barbara Walters, who later would make news herself when she became an anchorwoman, worked off-camera until 1964, mainly as a writer and researcher. She was permitted to report her own stories on a morning show.[128] Remarking on the quest for women newscasters being hired at that time, she said, "The networks are actually beginning to go out looking for capable women,"[129] and she thought there would be more successful women in television because there were more open doors.[130]

Throughout the sixties there was still resistance to hiring women as newscasters because of widely accepted ideas about the inability of women to report news. In addition to the common sentiment that women's voices were unsuited to communicating serious information, particularly hard news, the belief that one could not send a woman out on many kinds of assignments, such as explosions, earth-quakes, or brutal crimes, was still very strong. And neither could a woman be sent out to carry heavy equipment, even though the advancing

technology was rapidly easing this problem by reducing the weight and size of cameras and other equipment.[131]

News executives also expressed concerns about displeasing women viewers if they presented women as newscasters. A network executive was quoted as follows:

> We figured that women didn't want to watch other women, except on very girl-type subjects. So we had one or two homemakers, a couple of kiddy show types, a couple of glamourous ones on night time when men watched, and that was it.[132]

Another news official, a network vice-president, explained that women were jealous of women they saw on the TV screen, especially if they looked good, had brains and poise. The viewing women, he surmised, did not want their husbands comparing them with such women when they were presented on news programs.[133] Still another reason put forth by a television executive was that women wanted to see men on television. Women were unsuited for television newscasting because

> women want male companionship via the tube during the daytime and in the evening men do not watch women. Women in TV lose in the ratings.[134]

A poll conducted by a professional woman's organization in 1964 did indeed confirm that women held a weaker preference for watching women as television commentators than men. While 50 percent had no preference, 35 percent preferred males, and the remainder, 15 percent, favored women.[135]

Women newscasters at this time were expected to look young and attractive, perhaps trading "good" looks for the

sense of authority that women were presumed to lack. Marya Mannes, who was on the staff at CBS News, said that viewers do not care if

> Walter, Chet, David, Erik, Frank, Ed--wonderful guys, superb professionals-- . . . [were] handsome or homely, or 40 or 50 or 60, because they have authority, they have presence, they have experience and reason--because they are men.[136]

In sum, broadcast executives generally accepted the belief that women newscasters would not be well received by the viewing audience, particularly women viewers who were the important buyers of the advertised products. It would not be good business to put women on the air in commercially competitive news programs unless frivolity were desired. Women could report the weather, because providing the light touch was a function of weather reporters. Nancy Dickerson, a correspondent at NBC did not think that this belief was valid. She had found from her mail that viewers did not object to seeing a woman report news. It was more important to display good reporting skills, to know people, and to develop a style and technique that balanced femininity and authoritativeness. She said the main handicap was that most people were not used to seeing women report news.[137]

Broadcasters claimed that it was difficult to find qualified women to do newscasting, the same claim they had made about trying to find minority newscasters. For example, Julian Goodman, Vice-President for NBC News, said,

> Finding a competent TV news reporter is difficult, and rarely is it a woman. Newspaper background is

> essential, but few women have by-lines unless handling special features. The proportion of women follows their proportion in newspapers.[138]

Thus, discrimination in one field was held to be a determining factor for discrimination in another. At another time Goodman stated,

> I am constantly bombarded by actresses who have voice, looks and personality and want to be newscasters. But all that means nothing without newspaper experience.[139]

Similar to a complaint put forth by blacks, M. L. Stein argued that the practice of recruiting women from newspaper journalism discriminated against women, and because they were discriminated against there, that kept down the number who were eligible in television.[140]

In the early days of television news, people who looked good and read well reported news and weather; but they did not necessarily have to know much about what was reported. As journalism experience became an important qualification for television newscasting, men were hired almost exclusively. Women's television roles did not change. Most women worked in entertainment programming, and were subject to strict limitations even there.[141] The informational programming to which women could gain access was more often of a quasi-news type, interviewing guests on camera or appearing themselves as personalities on various kinds of shows. They usually worked in daytime programs. The women reporter who scooped a story that was not later covered by another reporter, usually male, might then be

seen on camera during the evening news hour.[142]

The interesting fact about television news in the mid-sixties is that, in spite of the widespread belief that women were unsuited to news reporting and that women had not yet organized to pressure broadcasters to admit them into television news, the networks and the local stations in New York hired more women for on-camera news reporting. There were still very few of these women, but there was a significant shift to on-camera work if compared with the past. The Women's Liberation Movement was underway at the end of the decade after this news trend had already emerged.

Forces of Change

The period from 1965 through 1969 was when both minorities and women gained a greater acceptance in television newscasting. Black Americans became a focal point of the society during this period. In 1966 Adam Clayton Powell coined a new slogan, "Black Power," in a speech at Howard University. The slogan was rapidly picked up and widely used to symbolize the goals and force of black militants in many sectors of the society. Another slogan, "Black is Beautiful," which promoted blacks in a positive light, also became popular.[143] During this period the nation suffered numerous urban disorders, which confronted broadcasters with unforeseen reporting needs and led to much negative criticism about the reliability of TV news. Besides the events related to black unrest, we have pointed

out numerous pressures that helped to open the doors of television news to these groups. In Chapter III we noted changes in the production of TV news and the increasing competition with other stations. In this chapter we have pointed out pressures affecting broadcasters, such as inquiries into the patterns of employment at television stations or the manner in which television news was produced. Blacks continued earlier campaigns to gain more employment in broadcasting jobs, with black activists pressuring and picketing television broadcasters, threatening boycotts of selected companies, and a reduction of the effectiveness of advertising budgets, if programming did not favorably recognize their group. Women were not yet organized well enough to assert pressure on the broadcasters.

Strategists striving to improve minority images on television threatened to use legal action, and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was an important support for these efforts. The Act established the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission to implement the right to jobs without discrimination. Many states, including New York, had passed similar legislation to prohibit employment discrimination. These laws, however, lacked an enforcement arm to compel the termination of discriminatory practices. Title VII was a weak instrument, because it provided only for conciliation and no enforcement provisions. The power

to compel employers to conform to the law was granted to the Attorney Gereral of the United States.[144] Thus, anyone seeking to benefit from the Title VII provision had to be involved for lengthy periods of time with government agencies and complex legal procedures. Eventually there were cases that succeeded in court and the law became a social force.

Black challenges to the renewal of television station licenses became a widely used weapon during the late sixties. The Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ set the groundwork for this tactic in 1964, when the license of WLBT-TV of Jackson, Mississippi, came up for renewal. This church unit attempted to intervene in behalf of minority viewers who were adversely affected by the station's programming. At first, the FCC denied the church's petition, because there was no legally protected interest or direct and substantial injury. The church appealed the decision and the court reversed the FCC, requiring it to allow public intervention at license renewal hearings. This court ruling opened the way for other community groups to challenge license renewals. Not until 1968 did the FCC itself rule that the Title VII employment provisions would apply to broadcasters, and the agency then warned that television and radio station owners faced losing their licenses if they discriminated against minorities. Eventually the owners of WLBT-TV did lose lost the right to

operate the station and the license was turned over to a local committee until a new licensee could be chosen. Besides shocking the industry, this case revealed a new standard that had to be met if broadcasters wanted to retain their licenses. Years later, when interviewing for this study respondents was done, respondents still recalled this as a landmark case.[145]

Black groups, many under the guidance of the United Church of Christ, proceeded to monitor station programming in many communities and collect data that could demonstrate discriminatory practices affecting program content and on-air personnel. Since many grass-roots organizations used this technique, no station knew when it might be struck by such a challenge. Consequently, TV stations felt compelled to hire minorities and orient some programming towards minority audiences as a protective mechanism in order to avoid such license challenges and the bad publicity associated with them.

The inquiries, surveys, and hearings, conducted by government agencies, such as the Human Rights Commission, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Kerner Commission, the National Advisory Commission for the Prevention of Violence and Disorder, all showed broadcasters had been remiss in hiring minorities and in neglecting to televise constructive images of minority group members.[146]

The growing pressures over employment and image discrimination occurred at the same time, during the mid and later sixties when television news was expanding. News staffs were enlarged to produce longer newscasts and more competitive programming. Some of the newcomers were minority members and women. Another factor that may have helped minorities was that the mid-sixties was also a period when there was "a shortage of trained and competent radio and television newsmen."[147] Journalism schools reported that there were jobs in broadcasting that they could not fill. Moreover, the stress then in television news was on journalistic competence.[148] At the same time, television coverage of unrest and disorders in ghetto communities, plus criticism of how television had failed blacks, created a special demand for reporters who could gain a rapport with black citizens and provide more balanced news reports. Moreover, blacks were pressing many industries to open their doors wider to minority recruits.

Strikes have provided the opportunities for minority group members to enter television news in the early sixties, and this continued to be true. One black woman got her first taste of newscasting during strikes in 1967. When AFTRA went on strike in support of another broadcasting employees' union, Melba Tolliver filled in for a newswoman who would not cross the picket line. After these strikes were settled, she returned to her secretarial job at ABC.

Then in 1968, during AFTRA's own strike, the year minorities were being hired and when local television news shows were lengthening to an hour, Melba Tolliver became a permanent member of ABC's local news staff in New York.[149]

Other changes occurring in television news could also affect the employment of minority newscasters. In the later sixties "personality" in newscasting was beginning to be emphasized as a means to gaining an advantage in station competition. The minority or female newscasters who had the talent and on-camera personality to attract a following of viewers were a valuable asset in this competition. The change to color television and then to the Happy Talk formats, particularly in local news, made news programming more lively and entertaining than before. Presenting a variety of types of newscasters was well suited to the new styles of news programming. Happy Talk, with formats that put field reporters on camera, intermingling with anchorpeople in the studio, expanded the range of on-camera newscasters.

In the early sixties and before, when television news was the domain of white males, minority members and women seemed inappropriate to news shows. Hughes theorized that

> people carry in their minds a set of expectations concerning the auxiliary traits properly associated with many of the specific positions available in our society.[150]

But with the new styles in news programming of the later

sixties, the desire to produce news that sent more people into the field, and the shift to Happy Talk, it became easier to introduce new types of people into newscasting. The colorful, playful environment from which news was reported invited experimenting with newscaster personnel, a change that affected both women and minorities. Critics often accused news executives of seeking out the pretty face, even though journalistic skills continued to be emphasized. Local stations played up the ethnic differences among the members of their news staffs as a timely appeal to the audience.

Similar to their response to blacks, broadcasters felt it prudent to allow the viewing audience to get used to seeing women newscasters. Employing a few women on news staffs did not overwhelm a news show with feminine images. Late in the sixties it was a way of offsetting feminist criticism. Moreover, as Gunnar Myrdal and James W. Vander Zanden have pointed out, the American public had long shown a sensitivity to aggressive behavior by blacks, particularly black men. A black man moving into an economic status equal or better than those of many whites was traditionally regarded as a form of aggression.[151] Adding women to news shows could lessen the impact on the audience of seeing black men as newscasters. Putting black women on the air in newscasting would also accomplish this, because the traditional prejudice was less fearful of minority women.

Still another reason for hiring more women newscasters was that this demonstrated the fact that stations were keeping up with the times. Women were moving into many occupations that were new for them. While broadcasters, though not yet willing to grant women full access to newscasting roles--for none anchored regularly--found that a sprinkling of feminine images was increasingly well received by the audience. With all stations facing the same pressures, a few, careful innovative steps would not give one competitor a substantial advantage over another.

The progress of women and blacks in newscasting followed different courses during the sixties. Blacks were the most highly organized minority group to pressure broadcasters, but the progress made by blacks was slow. In the early sixties, blacks had to break down long standing barriers to gain entry into newscasting. In the late sixties, the numbers of blacks who made it into television news could still be regarded as tokens. On the other hand, in the mid-sixties, when television news departments began to increase the numbers of women on their staffs, the broadcasters acceptance of women newscasters was larger and voluntary.[152] Most women who became newscasters in the mid-sixties were white. In the later sixties when more black newsmen were hired, the number of minority newswomen also increased. Although Title VII of the Civil Rights Act included sex as an unlawful reason for denying employment,

this legislation did not become useful until the end of the decade, well after the trend to hiring more female newscasters had begun. Thus, the employment of women as on-camera newscasters began later than it did for black newsmen, but white women preceded minority women in TV news. Other minorities, such as Hispanics, achieved gains as a result of less organized pressure than did blacks.

The Shifting Response of Broadcasters

Broadcasters continued to disply a resistance to change. That they had taken a characteristic of the Conflicting response was evident in how little they were aware that they did indeed discriminate in employment and were insensitive to black viewers, in their denials of any discrimination at their companies, and in their unwillingness to resk "offending" the shite audience. By 1968, however, it appeared that broadcasters were facing stronger opposition, especially the criticism of govermental investigations, and they began to shift towards an Accepting response. This was indicated by the increased hiring of minority reporters, the evolving rules of economic censorship, and the greater sensitiviey expressed by some broadcast officials in attitudes towards blacks, though not in actual behavior, at the hearings of the Human Rights Commission. Recognizing the power of the opposing forces, it became important to improve the images and employment of black newscasters in order to avoid the risk of further

regulation of their industry. On the other hand, since the black-white issue was the big news story of the sixties, taking on some minority newscasters was a way of keeping up with the times. Therefore, to some extent, the Co-opting response would also characterize the response of the broadcaster.

In the case of women, it seemed more likely that the Co-opting response would account for the way broadcasters responded to women newscasters. The ideas being put forth about women's roles at that time made it fashionable to present women on news shows. Playing up women's images and the ethnicity of newscasters reduced the impact of presenting black newsmen on the air, because of the fear of offending the white audience. Besides fitting in with other changes occuring in television news, featuring both white and minority women along with minority men helped to prevent friction caused by traditional prejudices.

Just as the Black Movement inspired women, it sensitized broadcasters to a new appeal, that of adding variety to the images of newscasters. "A pretty face now and then," as one news director who was interviewed said, "brightens up a news show." Presenting a variety of newscasters better utilized the color dimension in television and was more compatible with the Happy Talk formats and the personalization of news reporting that became popular.

Television executives had by the late sixties experienced much pressure to broaden the range of characteristics of newscasters. They had, in addition, begun to learn that it cost them little in the ratings; in fact, it could be profitable if a woman or minority newscaster became popular with the audience. Once the broadcasters learned these lessons from pressure groups, mainly blacks, they could apply the same lessons to the anticipated and worsening pressures from women.

Footnotes

[1]Nielsen ratings showed NBC to be the leading network, but other rating services, Arbitron and Trendex, disagreed. ABC occasionally overtook the two leaders when one of that network's programs got the best share of the audience. Jack Gould, "Television: Battle of the Ratings," New York Times, Sept. 21, 1965, p. 5; Val Adams, "C. B. S. Recaptures Lead in Nielsens," New York Times, Jan. 6, 1965, p. 79.

[2]Val Adams, "C. B. S.-Owned Stations to Show Films in Color Starting in Fall," New York Times, March 12, 1965, p. 67.

[3]Jack Gould, "Kintner Urges TV Networks to Expand Newscasts," New York Times, Dec. 6, 1966, p. 95; and "Winter of Discontent", New York Times, Nov. 20, 1966, II, p. 19.

[4]Val Adams, "'I Spy' with Negro Is Widely Booked," New York Times, Sept. 10, 1965, p. 71.

[5]Woody Klein, "The New Revolution: A Postscript," in Paul L. Fisher and Ralph L. Lowenstein, eds., Race and the News Media, Freedom of Information Center, Univ. of Missouri, and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1967), pp. 141-158.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Quoted by Klein, Ibid., p. 158.

[8]Klein quoted Paul Zarber, a Negro attorney, Ibid.

[9]Milton A. Galamison, quoted by Klein, Ibid., pp. 145-146.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Roy Wilkins, quoted by Klein, Ibid., p. 153.

[12]Klein in Fisher and Lowenstein, p. 158.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Fisher and Lowenstein, p. 8.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Cited by Klein, Ibid., p. 155.

[17]Quoted in Fisher and Lowenstein, p. 8.

[18]Klein, Ibid., pp. 144-145.

[19]George Dugen, "Church of Christ Hits Racial Bars," New York Times, July 6, 1965, p. 22.

[20]New York Times, Nov. 14, 1965, p. 84.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Walter Carlson, "Advertising: Negroes finding Jobs--Slowly," New York Times, March 30, 1966, III, p. 14.

[23]An example of such activities in 1965 was a symposium held at the University of California Medical Center in January to discuss the roles of women and their emerging opportunities after child-rearing, in New York Times, Jan. 25, 1965, p. 21.

[24]Douglas Robinson, "Beame in Middle in Urban Dispute," New York Times, Oct. 20, 1965, p.36.

[25]Quoted by Val Adams, "Bill Cosby of 'I Spy' Series Wins TV Emmy," New York Times, May 23, 1966, p. 83.

[26]Carlson, New York Times, March 20, 1966, III, p. 14.

[27]George Gent, "Jobs in TV Await Racial Minorities," New York Times, June 24, 1966, p. 75.

[28]Val Adams, "Negro Skills Bank Assailed," New York Times, Aug. 9, 1966, p. 75.

[29]More and more organizations sponsored forums at which experts advanced ideas and counsel that would later be reported in the news and popular media. For example, Dr. Mary Calderone, Director of Sex Information for the Education Council of the United States, Herman Kahn, Director of the Hudson Institute, and Dr. Richard E. Farson, Director of the Western Behavioral Science Institute, spoke at a conference sponsored by the Ladies Home Journal and Kelly Services. See Lisa Hammel, "Quo Vadis, Women? Toward a Better World, Experts Say," New York Times, Oct. 7, 1966, p. 47. Bruno Bettleheim's opposing views were published along side the report on the conference. See Joan Cook, "One Psychiatrist Has Other Ideas," New York Times, Oct. 7, 1966, p. 47.

[30]"Careers for Women Pushed by Johnson," New York Times, March 1, 1966, p. 42.

[31]Marilyn Bender, "State Plans Women's Guidance Units," New York Times, May 27, 1966, p. 49.

[32]Thomas Buckley, "Governor Eases Underdog Role," New York Times, Oct. 2, 1966, p. 36.

[33]The agencies of the United church of Christ were the Office of Communications, the Board of Homeland Ministries, and the Committee for Racial Justice Now. See George Gent, "Church Protests Bias by Stations," New York Times, Apr. 25, 1967, p. 86.

[34]Broadcasting, Aug. 28, 1967, p. 32.

[35]New York Times, March 22, 1962, p. 71.

[36]"Agencies Say They Don't Know How Many Minority Employees They Have," Advertising Age, Oct. 23, 1967, p. 6; Maurine Christopher, "Agencies, Media Lag in Hiring of Minorities, N. Y. Hearing Reveals," Advertising Age, Jan. 22, 1968, pp. 1, 72.

[37]Clifford Mason, "Can Negroes Jingle TV's Jangles?" New York Times, Dec. 10, 1967, II, pp. 25, 26.

[38]For example, Jules Bergman had specialized as a science reporter for ABC since 1961. See "TV-Radio Networks Budget $50 Million for News and Documentaries," Editor & Publisher, Aug. 19, 1961, p. 9; Ray Williams, in Jack Lyle, (ed.), The Black American and the Press, (Los Angeles, Calif.: The Ward Richie Press, 1968), p. 79; Tommy Jacquette, in Lyle, p. 76.

[39]Beverlee Bruce, in Lyle, p. 78.

[40]Williams, in Lyle, pp. 79-80.

[41]Ibid.

[42]"Report of the Public Hearing on the Employment Practices of the Broadcasting and Advertising Industries, and the Image Projection of Members of Minority Groups in Television and Radio," (mimeo.), held by the City of New York Commission on Human Rights, March 11-22, 1968, p. a.

[43]Advertising Age, Oct. 23, 1967, p. 6.

[44]According to William P. Greyson, as reported in "Negro Businessmen Urged to 'Trade Up' Negro Market Image," Advertising Age, June 5, 1967, p. 50.

[45]H. Naylor Fitzhugh, quoted in "The Negro Market--Two Viewpoints," Media/Scope, Nov. 1967, pp. 71-72.

[46]Areas of dominant influence are inner zones closest to the broadcaster's transmitter which receive the strongest television signals. They are also important in market research as test markets, because the "potential broadcast audience can be considered as virtually identical with the population itself." Such is not the case in areas receiving programming from two or more transmitters located in different areas or with a low penetration. See Sydney W. Head, Broadcasting in America, 2nd ed., (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972), pp. 293-294.

[47]Lisa Hammel, "State Lends an Ear to Women's Woes," New York Times, March 20, 1967, p. 34.

[48]Deidre Carmody. "Parley Studies Changing Women," New York Times, Nov. 26, 1967, p. 55.

[49]Marilyn Bender, "the Feminists Are On the March Once More," New York Times, Dec. 14, 1967, p. 56.

[50]Barbara Ann Teer. "The Black Woman: She Does Exist," New York Times, May 14, 1967, II, p. 15.

[51]Douglas Robinson, "New Media Charged With Giving False Image of Minorities," New York Times, Jan. 18, 1968, p. 28.

[52]Maurine Christopher, "Impact of New York's Minority Group Survey is Being Seen in TV Ads," Advertising Age, Feb. 5, 1968, pp. 3, 86.

[53]Maurine Christopher, "No Letup in Push for Minority Hiring: Booth," Advertising Age, March 25, 1968, p. 3, 142.

[54]Harry Belefonte, "Belefonte: 'Look, They Tell Me, Don't Rock the Boat,'" New York Times, Apr. 21, 1968, II, p. 21.

[55]Report of the Human Rights Commission, p. a.

[56]This is the job catagory the report of the Human Rights Commission used to classify newscasters, who must be members of the union, AFTRA, to do on-the-air reports of news.

[57]Report of the Human Rights Commission, pp. A-20 and A-21.

[58]Ibid., pp. 21-22.

[59]Ibid., pp. 14-15.

[60]Ibid.

[61]Ibid., pp. 70-71.

[62]Ibid., pp. 59-60.

[63]Ibid.

[64]Ibid., p. 119.

[65]Report of the Human Rights Commission, pp. 126-127.

[66]Ibid.

[67]Broadcasting, Sept. 23, 1968, p.32; Dec. 15, 1969, p. 37.

[68]New York Times, July 15, 1968, p. 62.

[69]Report of the Human Rights commission, p. 102.

[70]"News Jobs Sought by Minorities Panel," New York Times, May 21, 1968, p. 40.

[71]Eileen Shanahan, "TV, Radio Stations Warned on Bias," New York Times, July 6, 1968, pp. 1, 41.

[72]Judy Stone, "Black Is the Color of Diahann's 'Julia,'" New York Times, Aug. 18, 1968, II, p. 17.

[73]Maurine Christopher, "Agencies, Media Laq in Hiring of Minorities, New York Hearing Reveals," Advertising Age, Jan. 22, 1968, pp. 1, 72; "No Letup in Push for Minority Hiring: Booth," Advertising Age, March 25, 1968, pp. 3, 142.

[74]Robert Dallos, "Ad Agencies Concede They Use Too Few Negroes in TV Spots," New York Times, March 20, 1968, p. 95.

[75]Advertising Age, Sept. 9, 1968, p. 14.

[76]Broadcasting, Sept. 16, 1968,. p. 38.

[77]Ibid., March 4, 1968, p. 47.

[78]Ibid., Apr. 22, 1968, p. 45.

[79]Advertising Age, May 27, 1968, p. 86.

[80]Otto Kerner, Chmn., Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (The Kerner Report), (Wash., D.C.: 1968), pp. 204-207.

[81]Ibid.

[82]Ibid., p. 211.

[83]Ibid.

[84]Television/Radio Age, Dec. 9, 1968, p. 24.

[85]"Ford Grants to Stimulate Reporting on Minorities,"New York Times, June 20, 1968, p. 91; "Journalism for Negroes," New York Times, June 26, 1968, p. 94; "20 in Minority Groups Get Radio-TV News Diplomas," New York Times, Aug. 31, 1968, p. 46.

[86]Broadcasting, Oct. 28, 1968, p. 56; "Public Distrusts TV News, Says Reuven Frank of NBC," Editor & Publisher, Dec. 14, 1968, p. 69.

[87]Myra MacPherson, "The Woman's Lobby Meets in Capitol," New York Times, JUne 27, 1968, p. 38; Irene L. Murphy, Public Policy on the Status of Women, (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1973), p. 19.

[88]Robert Windeler, "City Again Scores Media Over Hiring," New York Times, Jan. 14, 1969, p. 90.

[89]Maurine Christopher, "Integrated TV Ads Draw Praise of Admen," Advertising Age, Feb. 3, 1969, p.3; Ernest Holsendolph, "Middle-Class Blacks Are Moving Off the Middle," Fortune, Dec. 1969, p. 91; "Grey Agency Reports Data About Blacks," Editor & Publisher, Aug. 23, 1969, p. 16.

[90]Martin Mayer, About Television, (New York: Harper & Row, Publ., 1972), pp. 351-352; Broadcasting, Nov. 23, 1970, pp. 48-50.

[91]Broadcasting, Dec. 15, 1969, p. 37.

[92]Robert K. Baker and Sandra J. Ball, Mass Media and Violence, A Staff Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, (Wash., D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 61.

[93]Ibid.

[94]Ibid.

[95]Ibid.

[96]Report of the Human Rights Commission, p. 92.

[97]Ibid., p. 56.

[98]Ibid., p. 129.

[99]Ibid.

[100]Ibid., p. 121.

[101]From testimony quoted in Ibid., pp. 121-122.

[102]Ibid.

[103]Ibid., pp. 103, 131; Douglas Robinson, "News Media Charged With Giving False Image of Minorities," New York Times, Jan. 18, 1968, p. 28.

[104]Report of the Human Rights Commission, pp. 26-27.

[105]Ibid., p. 73.

[106]Ibid., pp. 72-73, 88.

[107]Ibid., p. 70.

[108]Ibid., p. 44.

[109]This was the case in the mid-seventies. We also note that all stations broadcast to additional counties where smaller proportions of the households received their messages. See Television Factbook, Stations Volume, 1976 Ed., No. 45. Publ. by Television Digest, Inc., 1836 Jefferson Pl., N.W., Wash., D.C. 20036, pp. 561b-581b.

[110]Ibid., p. 25.

[111]Ibid., pp. 95-96.

[112]Ibid., p. 133.

[113]Val Adams, "Negro Skills Bank Assailed," New York Times, Aug. 9, 1966, p. 75.

[114]Report of the Human Rights Commission, p. 28; Gent, New York Times, June 24, 1966, p. 75; and Val Adams, "Negro Skills Bank Assailed," New York Times, Aug. 9, 1966, p. 75.

[115]Ibid., p. 63.

[116]Ibid., p. 64.

[117]George Gent, "Jobs in TV Await Racial Minorities," New York Times, June 24, 1966, p. 75.

[118]Report of the Human Rights Commission, p. 25.

[119]Ibid., p. 107.

[120]Baker and Ball, pp. 58-59, 61.

[121]Ibid.

[122]Report of the Human Rights Commission, p. e.

[123]Ibid.

[124]William B. Branch, "The Need Is for True Involvement," New York Times, July 14, 1968, p. 17.

[125]Ibid., Advertising Age, May 27, 1968, p. 86; Val Adams, "C.B.S. Network and WNBC-TV Get Their First Girl Reporters," New York Times, May 7, 1968, p. 83.

[126]Ibid.

[127]Ibid.

[128]Gloria Steinem, "Nylons in the Newsroom," New York Times, Nov. 7, 1965, II, p. 23.

[129]Angela Taylor,"Demands of the Camera Limit Choice of Clothes," New York Times, May 24, 1965, p. 35.

[130]Quoted by Taylor, Ibid.

[131]Lee Graham, "Women Don't Like to Look at Women," New York Times Magazine, Mar. 24, 1964, p. 58.

[132]Quoted by Steinem, New York Times, Nov. 7, 1965, II, p. 23.

[133]Graham, p. 50.

[134]Quoted by Graham, p. 50.

[135]Graham, p. 50.

[136]Marya Mannes "Should Women Only Be Seen and Not Heard?" TV Guide, Nov. 23, 1968, pp. 6-8.

[137]Steven V. Roberts, "Another First for Nancy," New York Times, Jan. 3, 1965, II, p. 16.

[138]Graham, p. 58.

[139]M. L. Stein, Your Career in Journalism, (New York: Julian Messner, Inc., 1965), p. 127.

[140]Ibid.

[141]For example, there were no women MC's on shows with games or audience-participation formats, and no female staff announcers. See Graham, p. 48.

[142]Ibid.

[143]Klein in Fisher and Lowenstein, pp. 148-149.

[144]George Eaton Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities. 4th Ed., (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), pp. 428, 463.

[145]Marvin Barrett (ed.), Survey of Broadcast Journalism 1969-1970: Year of Challenge, Year of Crisis, (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, Inc., 1970), p. 71; Head, p. 362-363; New York Times, July 6, 1968, pp. 1,4; Nov. 14, 1965, p. 84; Dec. 4, 1965, p. 62; Eileen Shanahan, "TV, Radio Stations Warned on Bias," New York Times, pp. 1, 41; John Herbers, :"F.C.C. Tells Southern Stations to Halt Radio-TV Racial Bias," New York Times, May 21, 1965, p. 1, 36; George Dugan, "Church of Christ Hits Racial Bars," New York Times, July 6, 1965, p. 22; Broadcasting, Nov. 9, 1970, p. 44.

[146]Douglas Robinson, "News Media Charged With Giving False Image of Minorities," New York Times, Jan. 18, 1968, p. 28.

[147]Stein, p. 120.

[148]Ibid.

[149]George Gent, "3 A.B.C. Newsmen Return to Work," New York Times, Oct. 6, 1967, p. 79; Robert E. Dallos, "TV Strike, Burden for Some, Gives Others the Big Chance," New York Times, Sept. 26, 1967, p. 95.

[150]Everett Cherrington Hughes, Men and Their Work, (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958), p. 106.

[151]Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma, (New York: Harper & Row, Publs., 1944), pp. 60-61, 957-958.; James W.

Vander Zanden, American Minority Relations, 3rd Ed., (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1972), pp. 330-331.

[152] New York Times, Oct. 7, 1966, p. 47; Jan. 25, 1965. p. 21.

CHAPTER VII

TENSIONS IN THE SEVENTIES

Upon entering the 1970's minorities continued to pressure broadcasters to reform television images and to gain entry into areas of television that still alluded them. Blacks were the vanguard group, but the Women's Liberation Movement was building up and advocates for women's rights rapidly moved into the forefront seeking additional changes in on-camera roles. Women activists who sought to reform television images in the seventies confronted entrenched attitudes and practices as had blacks, but, compared with the situation of blacks ten years earlier, they had certain advantages. Blacks had already broken through a number of barriers and had demonstrated that pressure could be applied to gain reforms. By this time legal mechanisms existed to give support to femininist claims. From this standpoint, the patterns of women's employment in newscasting continued to advance.

Pressures in the New Decade

Conferences continued to be used in 1970 as forums to voice complaints against broadcasters who failed to treat minorities fairly. In January, at a conference at Fordham

University, discrimination against blacks and Puerto Ricans in the television and radio industries was condemned, and broadcasters were urged "to take direct action to implement positive programs in equal opportunity employ-ment."[1] At a joint luncheon of the International Radio and Television Society and the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, black speakers addressing the membership accused the broadcast industry of being a major cause of black rage because its programs were daily reminders of the whites' unwillingness "to deal with black Americans as mature, serious, complex human beings." Again, broadcasters were warned that they better open up jobs and opportunities through normal channels or other, distructive means were about to be used.[2] On another occasion James Farmer, then Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, advised the Radio and Television News Director's Association to temper over-dramatic violence and to put individual news events into a larger perspective. He charged, as had been charged in many other such meetings, that TV news was too preoccupied with negative controversies. The way to gain a better perspective was to hire more blacks.[3] The group, Black Efforts for Soul in Television, working mainly in Washington, D. C., questioned the accuracy of the ratings that television companies and advertisers depended upon and lobbied in Washington for the appointment of a black person as a commissioner on the FCC.[4] The Legal

Defense Fund of the NAACP reported a study which showed that the proportion of Negroes asked to do personal endorsements for advertised products greatly underrepresented their proportions in professional sports.[5] The Reverend Everett C. Parker of the United Church of Christ spoke before a conference of the Federal Bar Association and the Federal Communications Bar Associations where he condemned the censoring of performers by the networks.[6] At a conference held by the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting, a group that concerned itself with matters reflecting the public interest in broadcasting, speakers assailed broadcasters for intellectualizing instead of starting some action that would benefit minorities.[7] Tony Brown, who produced "Black Journal" in public television and was president of the National Association of Black Media Producers, spoke at a meeting of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, and he charged that the commercial broadcasters systematically disenfranchised blacks because their only interest was making a dollar.[8] At the same meeting, a spokesman for the Mexican-American Anti-Defamation Committee said Chicanos had become broadcastings "new nigger," and that while broadcasters attempted to placate black demands, they ignored the country's second largest minority group.[9]

Other kinds of pressure were undertaken in 1970. The NAACP and the United Church of Christ joined together to

organize citizen groups to study employment and hiring practices in their viewing areas.[10] The United Church of Christ also announced a new policy to replace formal license challenges with more informal meetings with broadcasters. This was similar to the technique long used by the Urban League and the NAACP, except that with the expansion of program monitoring, when informal meetings were not effective, they could be backed up with documented evidence to present in formal challenges.[11]

Black activists staged more protests. Sixty or so demonstrators interrupted a taping of the Merv Griffin Show because not enough black musicians had been employed on the show.[12] Another group of blacks, called the Jazz and People's Movement, disrupted tapings of the Dick Cavett and the Johnny Carson shows in order to call attention to the problems of minorities in television.[13]

The loss of the WLBT-TV license after exhausting all appeals signaled citizens' groups all over the nation that they could use the license challenge to achieve their programming goals.[14]

Additional training programs were made available to individual members of minority groups in 1970. The American Film Institute conducted a six-week course attended by twenty-five Negro and Puerto Rican students in the techniques of TV journalism at New York University, a program funded by the Federal Office of Economic

Opportunity. The summer program for minorities at the School of Journalism at Columbia University was also repeated with funding from the Ford Foundation.[15]

Broadcasters were still being reminded that the Negro market was lucrative and would be lost if not properly recognized in commercials and programming.[16]

Government Policy

It had become evident by 1970 that the laws intended to enforce equal employment were a viable force available to those who could prove they were the victims of discrimination. In other industries the Civil Rights Act of 1964 had been successfully applied to cases of discrimination against women as well as minorities. Numerous federal enactments, including statues, judicial decisions, Constitutional interpretations, Executive Orders, and other regulations, were, combined together, a wide-reaching prohibition against job discrimination.[17] Awareness of discrimination against minorities and women was increasing considerably in the society, and in many industries women, as well as minorities, were taking their complaints to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.[18]

On the other hand, the 1970's decade ushered in a social climate quite different from that of the late sixties. Government under the Nixon administration showed little inclination to go on supporting programs intended to benefit minorities or to promote equality for women. The

President ignored the recommendations of his Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, which had grown out of a White House conference to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the sufferage admendment. While departments administered by Nixon appointees had inherited an involvement in combating problems of racial discrimination, they showed a resistance to taking up the matter of sex discrimination. The Task Force criticized the Nixon administration:

> Although the Justice Department has participated in more than forty cases of racial bias, it has not intervened on behalf of an individual discriminated against because of sex, except in one case on a procedural point.[19]

The the economy was in a recession, and government policies instituted several years earlier to help minorities lost favor. The broadcast industry reacted in a defensive manner as the Nixon administration became more hostile to the news media, particularly after the Vice-President, Spiro Agnew, accused TV news of having a liberal bias.[20]

Conditions in the Television Industry

We have already noted that in 1970 the television industry briefly moved into a more restrictive business climate, which resulted from the ban on cigarette advertising and a recession in the economy. Several black newsmen recalled the early seventies as a period when blacks experienced a setback in newscasting opportunities:

> Opportunities diminished during the Nixon years. The climate during the 1960's was a blossoming renaissance that was turned off. . . . The priorities once talked about have taken a step backward. Nixon and Agnew set a tone that hurt.
>
> . . .
>
> It was during the Nixon administration. They did not continue what was started in the Democratic administrations earlier--the New Frontier with Kennedy and the Great Society under Johnson. . . . The conditions made to upgrade minorities were cut back.

As profit levels declined, the television industry responded by temporarily cutting news and public affairs budgets for a year or so. Afterwards the expansion in news programming was resumed.[21]

Despite thses setbacks, several positive developments came to light in 1970 that indicated minorities had made some gains. In May the first regularly scheduled all-black TV news program, "Black News," on a commercial station, WNEW-TV, went on the air. The program, staffed and produced by blacks, was aimed at black communities in the New York market.[22] The New York City Commission on Human Rights reported that the employment of blacks and Puerto Ricans at the three owned and operated stations had increased by 100 percent since March 1968, when the agency had held hearings, to a total of 14.8 percent of the labor force of the three companies. The three networks also signed detailed agreements with the commission to hire, train, and upgrade minority employees in the future.[23]

Up until the mid-seventies, newscasting at the local level was growing all over the country as indicated by the amount of time alloted to news programming and sponsors' willingness to buy time as an advertising vehicle. Program formats were redesigned to attract audiences and local news became very competitive. In New York, the ABC flagship station "claimed to have lured 400,000 viewers away from its competition."[24]

Pressure from Women

Women activists engaged in efforts that indicated the Woman's Movement had attracted many followers by 1970. In January, women employed at CBS staged a demonstration because the company would not permit them to wear pants at work even though they were then fashionable.[25] A group of femininist women interrupted a CBS stock holders meeting complaining of CBS's exploitation of women and made demands for more equal employment.[26] In August the Women's March down Fifth Avenue, followed by a rally in Bryant Park, launched a nationwide drive for women's equality. Newsweek magazine reached an agreement with the New York City Human Rights Commission to open all jobs at all levels to women.[27] Several organizations took steps on behalf of women. An association of professional media women, American Women in Radio and Television, passed a resolution reaffirming its policy that "qualified professional employees of the broadcasting industry, regardless of sex,

be given equal consideration for employment and advancement, and equal remuneration based on performance," and they announced they would attempt to implement this policy.[28] A new organization, Women Broadcasters of America, was formed "to recognize and solve the unique problem of the woman on-the-air broadcaster."[29] The National Organization for Women filed a petition in December asking the FCC to amend its equal employment rules to include women along with other minorities.[30] The American Civil Liberties Union filed a complaint with the New York City Human Rights Commission against ABC News charging the company discriminated against women in employment.[31]

Despite many ongoing efforts to help women in the broadcasting media, women journalists failed to resolve an old issue, gaining admission to the National Press Club, when too few of the membership bothered to vote to change the rules barring women from membership.[32]

1971

Then in 1971, NOW began monitoring the local news programs of WABC-TV, the reports of which were later documented and used as evidence against the station in their license challenge. During this year the FCC added women to their equal employment opportunity rule, as NOW had requested. As a result, stations would have to report each year the numbers of women on their staffs along with the numbers of minorities.[33] The New York City Human Rights

Commission announced it would take up the issue of women's images in the media in addition to those of blacks and other minorities.[34]

The most significant activist efforts in succeeding years shifted to using legal mechanisms to achieve reforms in television images and employment, mainly challenging station license renewals and taking employers to court if they discriminated against women and minorities. Generally, demonstrations and public protests against broadcasters declined.

1972

Giving further impetus to the Women's Movement was the passage of the Equal Rights Admendment. The Equal Employment Opportunities Act of 1972 was also passed to strengthen the powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission created by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The EEOC gained the the power to file suits in court to get compliance and was given sole authority to take such action on its own, a power previously shared with the Justice Department.[35] In the society, a Harris poll indicated women had reached a new level of consciousness about discrimination.[36]

In 1972 NOW made WABC-TV a target of protest and legal action. The organization undertook monitoring the station's news programs for a second period of time and a report was produced showing how the station discriminated

against women. Besides failing to report news important to women and commenting disparagingly about women, only one newswoman was seen on the stations local news programs during each of the two periods of monitoring.[37] A group of women in NOW went into the reception area at WABC-TV and refused to leave until station executives gave them an audience. Thereupon the women awarded the company an "Old Hat Award" for its biased coverage of women's issues and problems as an attempt to communicate their grievances to company officials.[38] Failing to get any positive response from the station, NOW filed in May a petition with the FCC to deny the license renewal of WABC-TV. The petition charged that extensive monitoring had shown the station presented distorted and one-sided images of women. In addition to ignoring women's rights organizations in their ascertainment process, the station employed a smaller percentage of women then any other local station. When the FCC refused to accept NOW's petition, so NOW appealed to federal court.[39] This struggle lasted several years.

1973

In 1973 the women's movement continued to influence opinion in the the society. For example, a study conducted by Redbook magazine found that 90 percent of its readers believed there was discrimination against women in pay and job opportunities.[40] In television, women had yet to catch up with minorities. The Office of Communications of the

United Church of Christ reported that from 1972 to 1973 minorities had made greater gains in broadcasting than women, although, as pointed out previously, the report did not provide information specifically about newscasters.

During 1973, a group at NBC, called the Women's Committee for Equal Employement Opportunity, filed a formal complaint against the network because of discrimination based on sex. Fifty women who worked in a wide range of positions, but not in newscasting, signed the complaint.[41] Although some women had been advanced into more responsible positions, they were few, and dissatisfaction with the slow pace of equalizing job opportunities increased.[42] The formal complaint was followed by a class-action suit that was successfully brought against NBC by sixteen women employees in 1974 who claimed they were the victims of employment discrimination. The case indirectly affected women in television news and the employment practices at other stations and networks. The main charges in the suit were that women were segregated in jobs that barred them from career development and promotions to higher levels. Work performed by women was classified into lower paying categories for equivalent work done by men. The case went to court and was eventually settled in 1977 with back pay awards totaling $540,000 and pay increases for 1978 amounting to $860,000. The settlement also included cash awards for the plaintiffs and legal fees of $650,000. This

action taken by the Women's Committee, following the challenge begun against WABC-TV's license renewal in 1972, was to have a major impact upon broadcasters in New York.

1974

In 1974 the networks were still being criticized for their inadaquate coverage of blacks in TV news. Local stations in big cities usually gave more attention to blacks than did the networks because of the concentrations of minorities in the inner cities, but this was not enough to placate critics. Neither could black programs provide sufficient news because they had limited budgets, staffs, and air time. Although the percentage of blacks in the broadcast industry rose from 3.6 percent in 1967 to 11.5 percent in 1973, there was still much dissatisfaction among blacks across the country. In commercials, however, blacks were featured more than ever and this was attributed to a greater recognition of the financial power of blacks and that there had been little white blacklash.[43]

Behind the scenes pressure never ceased. As a matter of caution in protecting their licenses, broadcasters continue to meet frequently with representatives of community groups. Broadcasters appear to be more receptive to established, well recognized groups than those that suddenly spring up in relation to a current issue. Some of these meetings are regularly scheduled. The Women's Advisory council, an example of such a group, is composed of

representatives from thirty or so women's organizations in the viewing area. The Council meets regularly with broadcast executives to discuss programming and advise station executives about community needs.

Thus, as the new decade began, the techniques that had been developed during the sixties were still being used by those who advocated change in the images and employment practices of television. This was to change, however, because more effective means had become available.

License Challenges

We have described, in Chapter III, the care with which broadcasters prepare their license applications. Nevertheless, the review process has been criticized as ineffectual, even as a sham, because the FCC lacks the staff to properly evaluate license applications.[44] Since the 1960's the reviewing function has increasingly been assumed by public interest groups who challenge license renewals when they disapprove of the way stations serve the public interest. Very rarely has the FCC denied the renewal of a license; between 1934, when the FCC was established, and 1968, only a few dozen of approximately 50,000 license renewal applications were denied.[45]

We have also noted that until the first FCC license challenge charging discrimination in programming because of racial bias was brought in 1964 against WLBT-TV, challengers were only those who sought to acquire the contested license

for themselves. After a successful court appeal, which resulted in a decision that the listening audience had an "obvious and acute concern" in a broadcasting station, citizens' groups gained the right to petition the FCC to deny a license renewal.[46] After that, however, the FCC required that a petitioning citizens' group prove its case rather than follow the usual practice whereby broadcasters prove their commitment to serving the community. Another court appeal resulted in a decision setting forth a major set of precedents that made WLBT-TV a landmark case. It determined that an audience represented by citizens' groups had a right to challenge license renewals, that the licensee must prove it operates in the public interest, that data collected by monitoring a licensee's programming could be accepted as evidence in court, and, significantly, a license could be denied to a broadcaster who did not fairly serve all portions of the listening and viewing audience.[47] The license of the Jackson, Mississippi station, as noted, was finally taken away from its owners in 1970.[48] Another station in Alabama, a public broadcasting station, also lost its license for discriminating against blacks.[49] Consequently, in the seventies the license challenge, and the threat of one, became an important weapon with which to pressure broadcasters.

By 1971 numerous action groups had taken up using the license challenge in their strategies to get reforms in

television.

> Dozens of license challenges were registered between January 1970 and the fall of 1971. In preparation for such challenges, action groups from coast to coast were presenting to local broadcasters demands that they serve the needs of a particular group. Among the groups making such representations were Indians, Mexicans, Negroes, women, Chinese, and white ethnics.[50]

By 1974, more than 125 challenges to station licenses were on file with the FCC.[51] Black groups, with the assistance of advisors from the United Church of Christ, as we have noted, took up this strategy in large numbers. Women's groups followed the example set by blacks.

NOW's Challenge

A significant challenge was that of the New York Chapter of NOW, when it petitioned the FCC to deny the license renewal of WABC-TV because the station discriminated against women.[52] Prior to filing applications for license renewals, broadcasting stations obtain ascertainments from a wide variety of community leaders to determine what kinds of programming the local community desires and needs so as to serve the public interest.[53] NOW's formal complaint charged that WABC-TV had not contacted leaders of their group, nor had the station taken into account that women were a special demographic group with particular needs in their analyses of the area's population. The station had violated the Fairness doctrine by presenting biased views of women in programming and had failed to submit an equal employment

opportunity program for women.[54] Further, NOW's efforts to communicate the concerns of women they represented had been spurned by the station's officials.

When the FCC did not answer the "Petition to Deny," NOW got a court order requiring the FCC to respond.[55] The FCC acknowledged

> WABC-TV's compositional study makes no mention of the female population in the New York Area. . . . In spite of the fact that ABC's compositional study falls short of the obligation the commission imposes, we do not view this shortcoming as either substantial or material in light of the fact that ABC interviewed a substantial number of women community leaders, including leaders of women's groups.[56]

Following this defeat, NOW took its case into federal court.

Dozens of court decisions and FCC rulings were cited as precedents by NOW in its cast against WABC-TV. Many of these precendents had been made in suits concerning discrimination against blacks. Case after case was cited to show broadcasters had been required to do such things as to afffirmatively seek out the views of local leaders, a woman's group in one case and black community leaders about race relations in a number of cases. Other cases had been about those found guilty of employment discrimination against blacks, etc.[57]

NOW based its case primarily on WABC-TV's failure to adaquately ascertain women's needs in the New York area. This charge was further supported by much documented evidence that alleged that the station also failed to serve

the public interest because of its bias and discriminatory practices against women. NOW's documentation demonstrated that the station engaged in behavior towards women that would not be tolerated if it were directed towards blacks. NOW presented data closely parallelling that cited in cases where other stations had been found guilty of employment discrimination against blacks. Still other evidence showed that programming produced by WABC-TV was biased because women were excluded from many on-camera roles; and when seen on television, they were portrayed in a stereotyped manner. News programming omitted reports significant to women, and anchormen spoke insultingly about women.[58] NOW charged that WABC-TV "ignores their needs and fails to provide services and information which would enable women to change their condition as a class."[59]

The main argument in NOW's suit was that when WABC-TV had failed to properly consult women's civil rights groups, the station had violated the rules governing who could hold a television license. WABC-TV's defense was that they had indeed contacted many women leaders in the community. In addition to conferring with women leaders from many kinds of organizations, including educational interest groups, cultural centers, organizations dealing with the elderly, religious organizations, etc., they had talked with leaders of groups concerned specifically with women's needs. These included the Girl Scouts, the Nassau

County and Stanford Day Care Centers, and the City and State Human Rights Commissions. Although WABC-TV had not contacted any women's civil rights groups, the Appeals Court rejected NOW's license challenge, saying that WABC-TV had fulfilled its duties as prescribed by FCC regulations, even though the station did not seek contact with NOW or a similar organization. The supporting issues argued by NOW did not have sufficient bearing on the charges brought before the court. The Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights explained that the underlying weakness of NOW's challenge

> differs from those brought against WLBT-TV. . . . In the NOW challenge, the alleged discriminatory programming was more subtle. Women were not consciously excluded from the screen as had been determined to be the case with blacks in the two previous challenges. Instead, the challengers argued that women appear much less frequently than would be expected, judging from the number of women in the local population, and when they do appear they are portrayed in a one-sided and derogatory manner.[60]

NOW lost its case, but the effect of such a license challenge was not lost on the broadcasters. By the mid-seventies, following this conflict, NOW representatives participated in the Women's Advisory Council, described above, and so had regular contact with station officials. Another suit, to be discussed in the next chapter, was brought against WNBC-TV, charging employment discrimination against women. License challenges and legal action by women's groups had become an effective pressure on

broadcasters. News programming was a direct target when programming was monitored, because that was the main kind of programming local stations produced and for which they could be held responsible. These pressures aided the movement of women into television news.

The Responses of Broadcasters

Equal Employment

Among regulatory agencies, the FCC was unique in its responsibility for equal employment. In 1969, the agency formally adopted an Equal Employment Rule prohibiting discrimination because of race, ethnicity, or religion. Later, in 1971, sex was added as an additional catagory to assure women equal employment as specified in the Civil Rights Act. The FCC also provided guidelines to licensees to develop EEO programs. Stations were instructed to post notices informing job applicants of employment rights and to actively recruit minorities and women in places where notices could readily be found.

The FCC had been slow to undertake any action to enforce equal employment. The agency had preferred that employment discrimination be dealt with only if minorities organized to prove it existed, but a court ruling determined this unfairly put the onus of proof upon the audience instead of the licensee who sought to use the public air waves.[61]

Following the adoption of its EEO rule in 1969, the FCC required licensees with five or more full-time employees to submit statistical information indicating the racial and ethnic composition of their staffs. Form 395 was used for this purpose. The data was to provide the FCC with a profile of employment at each station and to indicate how well licensees complied with the EEO rule.[62]

The design of Form 395 was based on one developed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which specified nine job categories and four types of minorities, Negroes, Orientals, American Indians, and Spanish-surnamed Americans. Critics charged that these job catagories were unsuitable, as they were irrelevant to the types of jobs found in broadcasting, and so would not be effective in uncovering discriminatory practices. The FCC retained the form as it was. One shortcoming became obvious when sex was added as a category. There was no provision made to report data on white female employees. That information had to be derived from other data. Moreover, the FCC's annual employment reports summarizing data from Form 395 collapsed the nine job catagories into two, "higher pay" and "lower pay," for all minority employees and all women. Another criticism was that minority women were counted twice, in the minority category and as women. The result was that the true pattern of employment of white women, minority women, or minority men was obscured.[63]

Other criticisms have been directed towards these data, because, despite their obvious faults, they have been used to show that the employment of women and minorities has improved in broadcasting. An analysis by the United Church of Christ pointed out that while Form 395 data indicated there were substantial increases in the number of women and minorities in the upper job catagories during the early 1970's, at the same time the data also showed that the proportion of all employees in these catagories had increased even more. A survey conducted for the Civil Rights Commission, which sampled forty television stations, found that the four upper level job categories on Form 395 accounted for over three-fourths of all station employees. Were jobs reclassified and given new titles during the seventies?[64] As a result, data from Form 395 revealed very little about actual employment patterns, even though this was the data used for determining when there was discrimination in broadcasting. No categories indicated anything about who was employed in TV news. Nor did the job categories identify differences significant to activist groups, such as whether people worked on camera or behind the scenes, in entertainment or other programming, during prime time or marginal time, in stereotyped or non-stereotyped roles, etc.

A cursory review of the data on Form 395 when licensees applied for renewals constituted the FCC's main

effort to control employment discrimination by broadcasters. In essence, the FCC was more supportive of the broadcasters and the status quo than of minority interests. On the other hand, the documentation of minority employment submitted annually by the stations could be challenged by activist groups with supplementary evidence when station licenses came up for renewal.

The Implementation of Equal Employment

Stations typically professed to follow the FCC's guidelines in respect to their employment practices. In New York, one independent station conspicuously displayed EEO rules in its reception area. An executive at CBS said, "CBS is an equal opportunity employer and so states in all its advertising. And CBS sets up policy to use that." The Fcc's annual collection of data on the employment of minorities and women on Form 395 seemed to effect hiring practices, but it also contained many loopholes.

Minority newscasters commented on how inadaquate data from Form 395 was:

> The FCC's impact on the employment of minorities inside broadcasting is just numbers, but where it really counts, the employment figures suffer. All employment figures are thrown into one pot. But if you were to ever take out the upper echelon of jobs, you would find less participation.
>
> . . .
>
> I think you find talking to black women, probably Oriental women, Spanish women, that there is a very keen awareness that we are counted twice. That's true in the reporting procedures of stations. In

> the FCC's form there's a grouping of blacks and a grouping of women. So we get counted in both of them.

Several news executives did not think Form 395 would effect any particular job category. Only the overall employment pattern mattered and this allowed news departments flexibility in how they conformed to FCC requirements. Several news executives claimed that the FCC requirements did not affect them at all. Following are typical comments:

> Well, there are no FCC requirements. I mean there are requirements for a station, but they don't require that it be in news. Nobody says it has to be in news.
>
> . . .
>
> We have always taken the position that if we thought people were good they would go on the air, and whatever other factor was involved became secondary.

A station executive, discussing the recruitment of two newswomen, also indicated that the overall distribution of minorities was important, and explained that the news director

> was looking at the pressure he would have to bear if he didn't bring on two women. He's looking for diversity. He's looking for a combination of complexions, if you will, on the air, but the FCC is not necessarily there looking at that. They're looking at the supportive roles too. So even though you've got a face on the tube, what's helping to put that face up there is very important to the FCC, the EEOC, and a lot of others.

Obviously, Form 395 did influence the hiring practices of broadcasters, but it still allowed them great leeway in deciding how a specific position would be filled. Two news

executives commented:

> If there is an opening, we look over what we have. If a man quits, it is a fifty-fifty chance that a woman or minority will replace him, probably a woman. It depends on the staff make-up at the time.
>
> . . .
>
> If management is looking for a qualified reporter, a qualified journalist, they might just pick one out of that group because the FCC says to. They go along. They should try to pick the best of the lot.

A black woman reporter noted how Form 395 favored her situation:

> Frankly, it is still an advantage to be a woman in terms of the fact that we are a critical factor in the FCC requirements and of necessity in equal opportunity employment.

Other news executives resented the FCC requirement, because they felt it reduced the quality of news produced by their departments. One news director said that the government had created a quota system that "tends to produce less excellence." He felt handicapped in striving for the best quality news program. "The federal government attempts to determine the ratio of employees by the ratio of the population, [which] has led to a lot of people who don't deserve, on the merits of it, getting the job." Besides, he said it was hard on people who lacked the necessary qualifications to be sent out on stories on which they would be expected to do adequate reports. A producer also complained that the restrictions brought mediocre people onto news staffs who brought nothing of interest for the audience:

> We do not hire anyone we want. . . . I see a lot of mediocre women and minorities hired and available to be hired. I do not believe there are not better people available. . . . As a producer, I speak personally. I do not believe people racially or sexually appeal to people as do people with similar minds and interests.

Still others felt equal employment created certain difficulties. A black woman correspondent described how a white friend had been unfairly treated because of minority hiring:

> I have a friend in ABC radio who has to leave her job. She accepted the job on the premise that a black was being prepared for it in six months, but it took longer to train the woman, one and a half years. And then after all that time she has to leave. It is extremely unfair. It is fair to hire minorities, but they have to be qualified and experienced. Tokenism insults women, men, Hispanics, and other minorities. There are enough talented people out there.

An executive explained how inconvenient equal employment was: "There's a bottom line to equal employment incentive. . . . I reach out toward women and toward blacks if I can find them. I would like to have a better balanced staff. It is very difficult." He said that finding people who would be motivated to do the work that needed to be done and who had enough training to justify additional training was a major problem. He thought a large organization should make the attempt to hire the less experienced minority group members and women, but a small organization could not afford to take on such a burden. Since employers were looking for the well qualified black or woman, the really good ones were usually overpriced.

In practice, in order to reform television images, activists still had to take the initiative against the broadcaster when licenses came up for renewal. The FCC was formally responsible for the enforcement of equal employment, but did nothing unless prodded. Broadcasters were able to work around the many loopholes in the rules governing employment discrimination.

Reaction to the NBC Suit

A significant kind of pressure on broadcasters was the successful class-action suit brought against NBC by sixteen women employees because of discrimination based on sex. The costly settlement stimulated all broadcasters to reassess their employment practices. NBC immediately adopted a new program to equalize the work of men and women within its company. Other television companies, observing the conflict, took it as a warning to themselves.

Following the suit at NBC, an executive at ABC reported that it had taken over a year and a half to come up with an effective program to deal with employment discrimination. A problem at ABC was that executives were apparently not conscious of employment discrimination occurring within their lines of authority. The company's new program was aimed at educating company officials in this respect and making them see the possible dangers they faced if the existing patterns persisted. This executive, who had been in contact with NBC officials to discuss the problem,

explained how it effected ABC:

> It cost NBC from New York "only" $2,250,000. In any case, what that shows us is that the money comes off the bottom line. so if it happened in say television, it would come off profits that ----- ----- would be expecting from his division. If it happened in radio for us, it would come off the bottom line that ----- ----- would be expecting. So it has really a very, very personal impact that these fellows don't realize. They think it comes out of a separate fund. It doesn't. It comes out of broad budget lines, and if you [as department or division head] can absorb $200,000 to $250,000, do whatever you want, but I don't think you can. We've also translated it into costs. If ABC was to suffer that amount of settlement, we figure that it would probably affect our earnings per share by seven cents. A lot of these people [executives at ABC] own a lot of stock in the company. We have to translate it into dollars and cents. It's the only way they're going to understand it. We are a very financially based company. They're used to counting their pennies. . . . It means a lot more to them when they can see that they would be having to shell out. . . . Many are just kind of hiding under the bushel baskets, saying, "Nothing is going to happen to us," and it may very well not happen to us. But we don't want to risk anything at this point.

In this manner, the integration of the television industry finally came to be regarded as a worthwhile business practice.

Women versus Minorities

The response in the hiring patterns of broadcasters affected each minority group somewhat differently. Although blacks, women, and other activists attempted to bring about changes in the images of television, generally each group was concerned about the projection of their own group members. Usually, femininist and black groups did not form coalitions, nor did other minority groups, to put pressure

on broadcasters. Only when government organizations or advocacy groups having no direct identification with a particular minority sought reforms, were joint efforts expended for several minority groups.

As the broadcasters began to employ more women in news, this brought women into competition with blacks and other minorities for newscasting jobs. To broadcasters, white males continued to be the preferred type for newscasting, particularly as anchors. The practice of pairing a minority group member or a woman with the white male anchor, however, became popular. This allowed broadcasters to put women and minorities on the air as anchors without giving up their white male anchor. In New York, by the mid-seventies, an emerging competition between women and blacks was alluded to by several black newscasters who felt there had been a noticable shift to hiring women:

> I was hired by Channel X [in 1967] directly as a result of upheavals in the world. . . . I think, initially, when my people raised a grievance, and because of the upheavals, a number of actions were taken to include blacks in the American mainstream. Now that other groups have joined the upheaval, that the established institutions have been beseiged by other groups, they cut back on blacks.
>
> . . .
>
> There has been some sliding back. It is hard to gauge, because blacks who are qualified and good do not get the same opportunities.
>
> . . .
>
> Women are hot now, white women. You see more of them than blacks coming in.

Most black women newscasters identified primarily with the Black Movement but they were also interested in and benefitted from the women's movement. One critic identified a pattern that had emerged, that there had been an increase in the number of black women newscasters. Of the seven women employed in 1970 by the three network affiliates, five were black, one Puerto Rican, and one white.[65] Their dual statuses, offered broadcasters an advantage, particularly after 1971 when, as noted above, broadcasters were required to report annually the number of women employed at their stations as well as the number of minorities. They were counted in two categories, which made a station seem more integrated. Many respondents thought this also gave minority women an edge over minority men or white women. One minority woman quipped, "If I improved my Spanish and used another name, I could be a triple token, and they would all want me. I would never have to look for a job."

An executive at ABC considered the shifting pressures on broadcasters a factor determining whether more minorities or women were presented in news programming:

> I think that the emphasis is on women's rights of late. It is my opinion that the minority cause has lost a little bit of its momentum. So if I were to weigh the two, I would say having a woman on a show has more of a value than a minority. That's not to say we discount minorities, because we don't. It's just, I think, wise, and with the strength that the women's movement has, I think that they tend to be looked at as having more value than the minorities if on-air people.

In contrast to the leveling off of opportunities for blacks in the seventies, women gained greater access to television news. Once the economic recession and the setback resulting from the curtailment of cigarette advertising abated, the continuing expansion of television news staffs during the seventies helped this trend. Our respondents commented on this. For example, a white newswoman who occasionally co-anchored described the change that occurred at WNBC-TV since she had begun working at that station in the early seventies:

> News had expanded dramatically in the last few years. "News Center 4" has the largest staff in the country. It is not typical. TV news has become more important, has increased in the post-Watergate period. "News Center 4" had a staff of seven people on camera and a total of fifty overall. The expansion has helped everyone.

By 1977 the on-camera news staff at "News Center 4" numbered twenty-seven, almost a fourfold increase, and eight were women.

Recruitment

Not all television markets opened up to minorities at the same time. A black newsman who had worked in several markets before coming to New York discussed the receptiveness of different markets to minorities:

> TV, being a reactionary medium, does not lead the way. It opened up in different places at different times. First in large urban areas like Washington and New York. Blacks are concentrated in these areas. Blacks are larger than any other group in the major TV areas. In Iowa, where I come from, they are still waiting for a weekday black and a

black anchorperson. It opened up at different times for different folks.

A station executive at WCBS-TV confirmed the notion that various parts of the country initiate and adopt changes at different times and rates of speed. He explained that our popular culture ideas frequently originate in California and then move eastward to the large cities. "One of the reasons we have problems with television programming from time to time is that there are parts of the country that are just not ready for certain things. To illustrate, he said, "We are getting complaints all of a sudden from certain areas of the population about "All in the Family," a popular weekly comedy series that had then been on the air for eight years. He added that in television "there is always that kind of dissonance."

Differences such as this affected the supply of minority and women newscasters in the early seventies. Newscasters are usually oriented to a national job market which implies a high degree of mobility. People who become exceptionally successful in a local market may succeed in avoiding movement from one market to another; but, even then, there may be mobility among stations within that market. The normal route of upward mobility in newscasting is to start in a small market and gradually move on to larger markets. This pattern did not help minorities or women gain access into newscasting because smaller markets were less receptive to members of these groups. The larger

markets, though more receptive and willing to provide training because they were unable to recruit in the usual manner, were more demanding and more competitive.

Several respondents discussed how opportunities for minorities varied according to market size:

> I don't know that there is a significant difference between New York per se and other cities. There is probably a difference between major cities and minor cities, in that the major cities have more minorities. First of all, the staffs are larger. But, too, they were the ones who would be more attuned to the changes in society. Therefore, they would be more attuned to making these kinds of reflective changes in their staffs, and it filters to the smaller stations. If it is not New York first, it is Chicago or Los Angeles. Its the top twenty or twenty-five cities in the country versus the rest.
>
> . . .
>
> The large cities are the ones where awareness is at the highest point. The competition is greater there. In the big markets where there is more awareness, they are willing to give minorities a chance and train them. The small markets are not interested. There are minority training programs in the big markets.
>
> . . .
>
> New York is the epitome of tremendous achievement. They [newscasters] have to start outside the city, outside any large city. New York wants experience.

By the mid-seventies, however, the minority counselor at one of the major networks reported that more smaller markets were accepting minority newscasters:

> Upstate New York is open. Colorado is open. There are limitations in many areas. Prejudice is less than it was.

The networks often drew upon talent that had been proven successful in local markets. There was a pattern of

progression in which reporters became correspondents. Years of experience were important. Limitations in the recruitment and upgrading of minorities and women at local stations could slow their eventual movement into network news. A network executive explained,

> If there are not many women or minority correspondents, it is because they have not had the experience yet. There certainly will be more in the future. On-air jobs have a flatter career line. The desk assistant moves to an on-air job. There are fewer steps than in finance or the sales area.
>
> . . .
>
> There are more steps in the vertical direction. One can make more lateral moves and still keep in a career line too.

Not everyone agreed that women or minorities had encountered discrimination in television news. For example, an executive with ten years experience in television news exemplified the lack of awareness of television officials in respect to the special difficulties minority and women newscasters had encountered:

> I have an enormous quarrel with the "minorities-women" approach. By "women" or "minorities," I mean classifying people according to sex and race. Anyone who is serious and able could always get into TV news. It is more difficult now that people are being forced to hire them. There were no minorities until people started saying there was this group and that group. When government started forcing people, and government determined policy, it became much more difficult for everybody. . . . I have never seen discrimination per se. The discrimination attitude has increased, and it is since they are forced to hire against their will.

When asked if there had been no discrimination fifteen years ago when there were very few women and almost no minorities

in television news, the answer was,

> I do not personally know of any discrimination. If a person is in his own field and good, he will get in. [Fifteen years ago] women statistically were housewives. That is what women wanted to do then. There were always some outstanding women in journalism.

Obviously, the problem of unawareness persisted into the mid-seventies.

Career Opportunities for Minorities

Our respondents, interviewed in 1977 and 1978, expressed optimism, concern, and, at times, anger when asked to evaluate career opportunities for minorities and women working in television news. For some, progress towards equality was too slow. Minority males were more pessimistic about their situations than either minority women or white women. White women regarded their situation favorably, believing they were gaining a solid foothold in TV news. Although there was a strong consensus that the employment patterns of the mid-seventies were better than those of several years earlier, criticism pointed to practices and attitudes that discriminated against minorities and women.

Several minority newsmen were bitter about their opportunities. A black correspondent at a local station railed at the conditions in his company:

> Opportunities are very limited, not there. Seems to me all they want is to have a face in front of the camera. . . . I would like to see blacks as producers, news directors, VP's, more technicians. The opportunities are very limited. They do not have to pay attention to minorities as when the

> pressure was on. I'm the only black man on the air here, except for ----- -----. In the anchor spot, hell no, there are not enough blacks.

He described his superior qualifications of which the company was quite aware:

> They do surveys regularly to see who is popular. I'm the most popular correspondent. I've had a great year. Won four great journalism awards. It's been a great year for me. Why am I not an anchorperson in a market with blacks? There is indeed no week-day anchor person in this major market where there is a minority audience. They pay me a great amount of money. In the last survey I did spectacularly. I was recognized by people who watch [the other leading news shows]. . . . This business is money. I am the fourth most popular newsman. I wonder why I am not an anchorman.

The respondent went on to criticize the use of double tokens, and its effect on black men. He also was critical of the promotional possibilities of both minority men and women.

> It's a trick bag in this business. They can use black women as a "two-for." The business is very hard for women in general. More are offered jobs as secretaries. You see some as corres-pondents, very few as executives. There are no top ranking women, Latins, or blacks as executives. Hell no, there aren't enough. Women are doing better than black men. We are still the ones. Traditional fear, want-to-keep-them-down attitude. Fear. It's a racist system. Still primative attitudes.

In sum, he thought that station policy was the result of a top management reluctantly responding to pressure. Top management employed minorities without any committment or enthusiasm for the task:

> They hire minorities because they have to pay some attention to it. The fact is, if I weren't making a real contribution, I wouldn't be here. They do not hire enough. I don't like to hear the thing that

> they can't find qualified blacks. They are out there. If a qualified white and a qualified black were being considered to be hired, it's the white that gets hired unless up in that room they see a need for a black in this market. I see no real committment to understanding and growth or responsibility to the entire audience or public.

A Puerto Rican newsman who had been reporting TV news in New York for almost nine years also felt opportunities were too few:

> They only hire minorities in the big cities. Across the country they have no minorities or Spanish people. There are four minorities here [at this station]. ----- ----- is an Islander. I'll bet you didn't know that. Most people don't. The people after us are all white. The opportunities for minorities, blacks or Puerto Ricans, are few. Always have been.

A black anchorman and reporter at an independent station pointed out how segregated anchoring was:

> For anchormen, no opportunities. They've got minorities on on the weekends, the ghetto hour. On Saturday now you see black people as anchors. Lots of women are anchoring weekends and that's it. It could be a lot better with more minorities on weekday programs.

He said that with the competition from women, blacks could not relent in their efforts if any of the gains they had made were to be retained:

> Blacks started out for equal rights. With the dilution since women stepped out, blacks have lost what was gained. I would say that the gains that minorities have made in this industry have undoubtably been good gains and profitable for them. It has shown they have ability and the wherewithall as well as anyone else. They can't sit back and say we have made it. If not ever vigiliant, they will lose ground and let what was gained slip away. They can't sit back in their laurals, not until this business is in balance. Now it is out of balance, though not as bad as it was

before the sixties.

Similarly, another black newsman, a correspondent at a network owned and operated station said that the trend was shifting to women, whereas it had previously been on blacks. While policy at his own station illustrated this trend, with blacks losing out to women, both groups were being confined to the weekend ghetto.

> The focus is shifting. At one point, previously the emphasis was on employing blacks. Now that some blacks are in the business, it is more towards women. The emphasis is on women now. . . . Look at this station, the flagship station of the network. No blacks anchoring on the weekdays. Here they have women and blacks in that old tradition, weekend roles, not in weekday anchors where the committment is. The tradition generally is that blacks are tossed into that weekend position. They use weekends as equal opportunity dumping grounds.

An Hispanic newsman at an owned and operated station complained that his group was being overlooked even more. Blacks were benefitting from some changes, but Hispanics were being relegated to the previous role of blacks in the industry:

> If you look you can see we are relegated to hard street stories. . . . We are house niggers. It holds to that. Among the writers, there is the first black, and recently two desk assistants. There is no such thing as opportunity in this business. There have never been opportunities.

Not all minority newsmen, however, were pessimistic. A black correspondent, at a local flagship station since the early sixties, noted that minorities could compete more equally than ever before: "Now minorities don't have to be supermen; they can be mediocre like the others. . . .

I am a professional journalist. I sell a professional skill, and I want to do a good job." Another black correspondent with eleven years experience in TV news who regarded the mid-seventies optimistically said, "Opportunities are terrific! It is sort of a wide open field now. I do believe that after a station has a certain amount of blacks or women, they don't go wild with it. Then as others had commented, he said, "Women seem to be getting hired right now."

An Hispanic newsman, a correspondent at an owned and operated station, thought that opportunities had improved throughout the seventies. "Blacks are in demand, especially if they are women. For the Spanish-surnamed, there were good opportunities in New York, Miami, California, and Texas. Orientals worked in television news in such insignificant numbers that he could not discern any change for them. As for Indians, he said he didn't know any in the business. Pointing out that as a group women were doing very well, he added, "They have better opportunities than men. Women are being allowed to function as any other reporter. Minority women have the best bet for a job."

Several minority women concurred with the optimistic view. A black women correspondent with five years experience in TV news regarded the mid-seventies opportunities as better than she had expected and they continue:

> I thought they would dissipate after a while, but they are still good. Very good. They are putting women and blacks on. They have to cover each sex and race. News has more to do with personalities, sex, and the races than news. It is more show business than news.

A Puerto Rican woman, who anchored regularly on weekdays at an independent station emphasized the continuing improvement of opportunities in on-camera positions, for all categories of minorities and women:

> Yes, it is more open each year and they care less if you are a woman. They are more open to women doing what anyone else can do, more camera work, and in all areas. I am both a woman and a minority, as I am Puerto Rican. The anchor spot--who gets it--depends on ability. It is done quite fairly. If a great black comes along, there would be a black anchor. There are a few stray people who do not like women, but not at this station.

Women's Career Opportunities

The long standing restrictions that had been placed upon women in television still prevailed at the beginning of the seventies. If women conducted talk shows or reported news, it was mainly for the female audience during daytime hours. Typically the subject matter of women's programming was "girl talk" rather than the serious affairs of the world or even serious matters that affected women. One critic of television during these years wrote, "The juiciest jobs in the industry--the on-air network newscasters--have been given to few women."[66] To illustrate, at NBC where more women were employed to report news than at any other television company, less than 10 percent of the staff of

newscasters were women. When news directors from markets all around the country were surveyed, 94 percent said they were willing to hire qualified women reporters, but only 45 percent said there was even one woman reporter working at their stations.[67]

There was continuing resistance to accepting women as newscasters because many executives still believed women could not appropriately report many kinds of news stories or be sent out on certain assignments because of their feminine characteristics or because they were women.[68] One anchorwoman spoke of the difficulty of gaining on-camera jobs and of advancing to anchor positions:

> In my opinion, we were kept off the air for very basic reasons. Years ago, when I first started looking for work, I was told that television is first of all a business where the object is to make money, and, therefore, attract viewers. The major viewers that television wants to attract are the 18 to 45 year old women, because they are the most interested in spending money in this country. The primary focus is on these women. For years, I was told that when it came to anchoring, that women did not want to listen to did not want to see another woman. Men were making those decisions. They said lots of things from their point of view, like you cannot have too many females doing this in television. They really didn't at that time realize what there was to be gained, that a great many women really would accept another woman. And women were not thought to be authority figures either, since the voice of authority was traditionally a man's voice. So it had to take considerable prodding and pressure to get people to realize that indeed the voice of authority can be . . . a female voice.

She further pointed out how recently favorable changes had occurred:

> Up until four years ago, I was usually the only woman on the staff. This was true in Cincinatti, in New York [at another station] and my first year in Boston--that was in '71 and '72. It has changed tremendously. Now it is different. Women were not taken as casually as today.

Hiring as a Reflection of Pressure

The pressures on broadcasters were seen as a factor that affected these opportunities. Several respondents mentioned that opportunities were probably better for women than for minorities because women were the ones putting the most pressure on the broadcasters in the seventies. One black newswoman commented,

> We see it in other industries as well. Who gets hired seems to be the people who call attention to their own lack of representation and organize to bring some kind of pressure that changes hiring patterns. Now the trend seems to be on the side of women. I would say, when you look at the catagories of all minorities that are defined by the FCC, if you look at blacks in that group, the hiring has leveled off, and I'm sure that it has probably affected black men more severely than black women.

Another black newswoman at an owned and operated station said, "For minorities it is not the same as three years ago. Much of the heat is off. We have been infiltrated in to a point to satisfy management. It has become more difficult again." A white newswoman also linked opportunities to pressures:

> I think NOW and legal pressures are responsible. The audience is reluctant to accept a woman anchor-person. The push is from women's groups and civil rights groups putting legal pressures on the stations. It can be shown on the book for the FCC. Upper management is all male and it is the same at other corporations. The TV industry is no

> more aware than other corporations, just in the public eye more and can be seen. There are more women than if the industry was not in the public eye. The white management of IBM is not opening. They are looking for a Puerto Rican woman here, and, if pushed to the wall, might get one. High visibility is important. Then they hire more minorities.

A white newswoman at WNBC-TV agreed that opportunities at this station were good but it depended on what group one represented and the available pool of talent:

> Opportunities have increased, but not as far as they ought. We have a fair share of minorities here, and fewer Hispanics. We are looking desperately for them. Anybody they bring in, they have to train. They brought in a couple of people, but it has not worked out. They did not find seasonsed TV reporters and had to take chances. One reporter, Hispanic and half black--they had him on, but he just was not a reporter. Hispanics are not on the job market. If they said that about women, I would say nuts. There are many capable women. Maybe there is something about being Hispanic. They may not be attracted to TV news. It is a sink and swim system. Everybody is subject to that. They trained a boy, helped him with his accent. It was hard to understand his English. There is a push for minorities and this is not a small station. An Hispanic, with a little glimmer of talent--they would grab him. There are plenty of blacks, but no Hispanics.

Another newswoman at the same station pointed out that talent was the primary factor in the employment of anchors. Once women and minority members were accepted, then talent could operate in the selection of anchor##oing away. Now it is more personal. They don't like the way I look or do something. I think they are sort of trying to slide them [women and minorities] in on the weekends and in substitute positions. Recently they hired John Cafferty to

replace Tony Guider [two white men]. Mary Alice Williams [a white woman] was filling in and everyone thought she would fill it. Others were available, Pia Lindstrom [a white woman], Carol Jenkins [a black woman], and Gerald Harrington [a black man]. When these four were told Cafferty was to be hired, they signed a petition and told the personnel department they were full of shit. They talked with us. Since then Carol Jenkins and Gerald Harrington substituted as anchors. From my judgment, John Cafferty is the best.

Effects on White Males

Respondents were asked how they thought the employment of white men had been affected after women and minorities had been brought into television news. Many respondents thought that white newsmen were finding it more difficult to get jobs as TV newscasters. Several commented as follows:

> Yes, it is harder for them now. The broadcaster sometimes hires underqualified minorities and women instead of WASP males.
>
> . . .
>
> The employment of non-minority men is more difficult. I know. I have a little brother, just twenty-one years old. He is discouraged in this industry and is going into journalism. There is less chance for him now. He is over six feet tall, blue-eyed, and blond. His type is needed less on the screen.
>
> . . .
>
> Sure, its harder for white men. If the stations didn't hire minorities, there would be more jobs for them. There are more opportunities for disenfranchized people now. It is a polygot of people. It is happening all over.

Generally, black newsmen scoffed at the idea that white males were suffering any disadvantage. The majority felt that white males still had the advantage or that there were so many opportunities for them, that they did not suffer by the addition of minority group members to news staffs:

> TV news has expanded. There are no more single anchors, except Walter Cronkite. I do not think anybody is being squeezed out. I don't see anybody shafted because of blacks.
>
> . . .
>
> I really do not know. I can only speak from here. I don't see how it has affected anyone at this station. I know of no one who was passed over or bumped because he was white instead of black.
>
> . . .
>
> Stations are having more hours of news. Things are changing. Things are opening up. They are getting new reporters. The will get new minorities, but they will get two or three new white men too.

Other respondents held little sympathy for white male newscasters facing greater competition. To illustrate,

> They [white men] think they are. They are upset about it, but they have nothing to complain about. They are still far ahead.

Some respondents felt that white males suffered from the new competition, but this was because they had lost an unfair privileged position:

> Yes, white men are facing stiffer competition, but not to the detriment of fairness. It is only fair that others should hold jobs. Where is it written that only white males should hold jobs? Why should there be an outrage that that system be overturned?

Another felt that weeding out those who could not compete on merit helped to improve television news and in the long run

benefitted everybody:

> What has happened is that the marginal white male has been very seriously affected. He's going to be the first to go. It's raised the level. You've got to be good. You've got to be better than you had to be fifteen years ago, or ten years ago. But that's all to the good for everybody, including that white marginal male who wasn't going to make it anyway.

To a certain extent, white male newscasters were prevented from fully enjoying the expanding opportunities in television news because minorities and women often filled the new openings. On the other hand, the rapid growth of TV news and the need for greater numbers of reporters minimized the effects of any contraction of newscasting jobs available to white newsmen because of the new conpetition between women and minorities.

Effects of Race, Ethnic, or Sex Statuses

Several newswomen thought that they enjoyed a preferred position because of their sex. Comparing conditions for blacks and women, a white newswoman said,

> Some darker skinned people have a rougher time than women. Women are better off. After all they are fifty percent of the population. It comes down to numbers. There are more women than blacks, Hispanics, etc. trying to enter this industry. There has been some change in the attitudes of people doing the hiring. There used to be a need for a woman's slot. Now they are looking for good people.

A white woman reporter in television news for eleven years thought that WNBC-TV, where she worked, was, with respect to women, the most integrated station in New York:

> NBC was faster in doing this. There are more women here. They give preferences to other minorities too, hired blacks and women without experience, and men and women Hispanics. NBC is more integrated than other stations, more women in important jobs. We have a bigger staff here. There are more reporters here; more are women too. There is a wider age range too. Heather Bernard is the youngest and Betty Furness the oldest.

Newscaster respondents described restrictions they experienced in their work. Minority group members felt that the sub-cultures of their groups were alien to that in which they worked, and there was little they could do to enlighten audiences about their own groups. A black newswoman said,

> When I want to say something I believe and can't say it, I'm just not going to do it. It is not my function. It's not part of my job. I hold it in.

An Hispanic newsman complained that rarely was he able to do a story in a Puerto Rican neighborhood. Even if he did, he was likely to be prevented from conveying any positive information about that community:

> For example, yesterday I covered the Puerto Rican market in the Bronx. It is not just a place to shop. It is home. It is a community. It is a place to get it cheaper. But I've been trying for so long to do that story. . . . One day I got a story on gypsie cabs and when I sent it back, I was stuck with a piece of plastic with two bullets. Nothing about gypsie cabs, what they are like, why they are there. It is always Puerto Ricans and blacks shooting up whites when it's really Puerto Ricans and blacks shooting up Puerto Ricans and blacks.

A black woman correspondent who had been reporting television news at a network owned and operated station for three years argued that competitive demands of her position prevented her from being a black spokeswoman. She had to do

her job as a newscaster, not as a black newscaster or as a woman:

> Working in New York is an unusual circumstance. We all have it rough here. I'm aware of the way we are perceived by management and the audience, that we are black. I cannot be too black or too strong about our heredity. I have to assimilate, walk a middle line, but our cultural experience does not prepare us to do that. I'm in a nice position now. A certain amount is expected of me each day. If I do it inadaquately, I'll be out. It has nothing to do with being black. The boss is concerned with the right facts going out and the ratings. The onus is on me, like it is on everybody else. Women are still looked askance at in fields other than on-air work, in writing, directing, producing. Many apply and are not accepted. It is hard for anybody to get a job in this work, unless a personality or a fluke. I've seen men fired or treated badly. A woman, because she is a woman, does not get a bad shake. When there is a good opportunity, it is a matter of having to distinguish yourself.

A white newswoman described problems encountered when looking for a job in New York City. She also felt that the objective difficulties, the competition in finding a job in television news, were as great or greater than sex discrimination:

> When I first came to New York several years ago, I tried to get a job as a reporter. I didn't for various reasons. I had not learned the mentality of New York. It was very difficult to do this. New York is a very hard place to come to. Friends told me not to say I wanted to be a reporter. "Say you want to be a writer." I hated writing. I wanted to be on camera.
>
> When I came here they sent me for voice lessons. Then Jimmy Carter was elected, and I got on the air. They wanted me to get rid of my Southern accent. I won't do that. I'm Southern. I felt discriminated against.
>
> If you want it bad enough, don't ever give up. I'd been in New York six months without a job. Only in New York had I slept on the floor.

> [At this station] I never felt any discrimination because I'm a woman. Never denied a job because I'm a woman. I did find disadvantages when I went to ----- [a competing station] for a job. The man doing the hiring wanted hanky panky and wouldn't take me seriously. Now, he is no longer there.

She also spoke about opportunities she lost to colleagues perhaps because of her own inadequacies:

> I was passed over twice, once for a WASP man and once for a black man. The fault was that I was already there as a producer. The other two came from the outside. I felt discriminated against. I had been promised the job. They had reasons which were true.

Another white newswoman also emphasized that competition was a constant factor affecting one's career:

> This is a competitive business. You have to build up immunity. You are hired and fired all the time. Get overlooked. You have to stand criticism, pressure, and back-stabbing politics. This industry attracts egos of varying sizes.

The Availability of Talent

While much attention has focused on the disadvantages management faced in trying to find and train competent minorities or women for newscasting, respondents also noted an advantage for the broadcaster in New York, a larger pool of talented people. Respondents commented as follows:

> There are more people to apply for each job. They all want to come to New York. This is a flagship station, so there are always people looking to come to work here.

. . .

> They [broadcasters] have discovered it is not so painful. They have a lot of competent people. Women are very ambitious.
>
> . . .
>
> It's a bigger slice of the pie that is going to other than white males. Whether that will continue, I don't know. But that's true of on-air talent, and it's also true for our other positions as well. I mean, we have other people who do things that normal businesses do, not only the glamourous things. . . . There are more people competing. I don't think knocking out mediocre white men is bad, although it hurts them. But, you know, maybe they shouldn't have those jobs in the first place.

An official at WCBS-TV said women had advanced faster in New York than had the minorities because as a group white women offered broadcasters a valuable pool of talent, were generally better qualified, and had better access to the interpersonal relationships used for recruiting personnel than minorities:

> The progress of women has been much faster. It will continue to be much faster in broadcasting, because there was a great pool of women already well educated, who were already moved into and had long experience in the middle class, who had contacts, who knew the system, and in many instances, were already working in it at levels far below their capacity. And so there has been an opening up to that. For the minority group members, it is a little more difficult. People have to go out and find and train them. Now, it takes time for somebody to get on the air in [network] television. It's not something that good intentions put on tomorrow. It takes time. Ed Bradley paid his dues, Chris Borgan paid his dues, and the same is true of all the [other] minority group members and women who are on television now. They spent their time learning their trade.

Several network and station officials discussed the sources of opportunities in the mid-seventies available to minorities and women. One executive at an independent local

station pointed out that opportunities reflected FCC requirements. Stations had become very conscious of the fact that they need women and minorities, so "these types are likely to get the jobs if they are fairly good reporters." A woman vice-president at NBC said the trends in the society at large were an important influence on the employment of minorities and women:

> I think NBC has a committment here. It is an evolving revolution. It reflects what is happening in the society. The changes here are not just what is seen on the screen. It is happening in all parts of the organization. There is an effort to bring women in everywhere. We're a business here, and there are lots of us working in the back, just as in any business organization. This is the trend, one that is still developing. News reporters were one of the first roles in the organization to change. There were more pushing to be hired in that occupation. Gradually they will be moving into higher positions, in management, in the networks. There is a natural progression. In seven years, it will be a whole new situation.

The news director at a flagship station considered the situation of the mid-seventies quite different than that at the beginning of the decade. No longer were minorities and women with the necessary experience and capabilities in such short supply. It was no longer necessary to look consciously for token blacks or women to work in TV news. Journalism schools were graduating many more black and women students. The emphasis now was on talent, on people who could communicate and could contribute to making a good news show. Another official at a competing flagship station agreed that women and minorities had to qualify for their

positions in the mid-seventies, and they would not be hired if of doubtful talent. He suggested that this was not the case earlier:

> I see a steady progress. To the extent that there were ups and downs in 1968, suddenly everybody woke up to the horror show that was on our hands. There was a great effort to recruit people, sometimes people who shouldn't have been recruited. And, in some instances, one suspects people got their jobs simply because they were minority group members or women. I think that has changed. There has been a leveling out of that.

A network spokesman believed that technical changes within broadcasting were effecting the on-camera mix. More reporting of stories from the field would change newscasting roles and, therefore, opportunities for women and minorities:

> In news programming their history has been that they have risen or fallen on the strength of individuals. Cronkite is unassailable. . . . What you are seeing more of, and I think this may be the solution for those who are asking how can we get more women into positions of exposure, is more and more remotes with reports on the evening news. The anchor people are playing a somewhat diminished role on both NBC and CBS and a very much diminished role on ABC which is trying to find its own way, because the old way didn't work. And so you are getting the field people in, many of whom are women, and, I suppose, at some point you won't automatically expect the next report from someplace is going to be a man giving it to you. It's going to be whoever happened to be assigned to that beat.

The timing of the expansion in television news was given by one station official as a reason for greater opportunities for minorities and women:

> The expansion in television news has created a lot of employment. And employment at a time when consciousness had been raised a great deal, either

> through legislation or through the currents running through the society, so that there is a happy coincidence of expansion and pressure to admit new faces by color or sex. . . . A much higher percentage of minorities and women came in than ever before. And, I mean, you see them. There is not a city that doesn't have its black faces on the news or women on the news. That is just the way it has become, when fifteen years ago that surely wasn't the way it looked.

Summary

The seventies decade was a period of shifting strategies. As the pressures exerted by activist groups were wide ranging, it was generally not possible to point out direct cause and effect relationships between the actions of pressure groups and the images seen on the TV screen. Nevertheless, these pressures were cumulative. The role of government and the power vested in the FCC to enforce equal employment were available to those who would make use of them. As already shown, the FCC acted only when prodded. Routine reviews of license renewal applications did not directly threaten a station even if it did not serve the interests of all groups in the community. Similarly, there did not have to be an abatement of employment discrimination unless the agrieved parties appealed to the EEOC or sued the broadcasting company.

The manner in which broadcasters responded to demands from women and minority groups varied. Taking an overall view, according to the categories of our paradign in Chapter II, the broadcasters behavior reflected the

Conflicting response. The license challenge was a powerful weapon for activist groups even though it was costly, especially when a case was forced into court. Many protestors did not have the financial capacity to follow through on their threats, but as long as a broadcaster did not know what station would be the next target, all could fear hostile groups. Broadcasters faced having to choose among different risks. Trying new talent might reduce ratings, but one could not pursue ratings if a license was jeopardized. It was also an unacceptable business practice to risk the loss of earnings in legal battles and awards to aggrieved parties. More and more broadcasters accepted equal employment as a necessary element in their operations. Thereafter some of the newcomers to newscasting became popular with the audience.

The implementation of change in newscaster images suggests another response category in our paradign, the Rejecting response. As broadcasters could determine how and where minorities and women would be presented on the air, they were able to exercise caution and protect their own interests. Broadcaster resistance was everywhere apparent. Successful formats were not given up in the face of demands from pressure groups. The segregation evident in the scheduling of women or minority newscasters and the continuing dominance of white males in this occupation indicated that the broadcasters were still in control; by

manipulating how images were integrated, they could minimize unwanded effects. Weekend ghettoes thus were examples of a reluctant accomodation that minimized the integration of prime time newscaster images.

There was also evidence that the Co-opting response continued to operate. When hiring newscasters, broadcasters took into account what was "a proper mix" of newscaster images. They deliberately selected the racial, ethnic, or sex characteristics of perspective newscasters according to their needs. The expanded labor pool provided a wider range of talent and allowed broadcasters to present a greater variety of personalities and types of individuals as added appeal on news shows.

As in earlier years, a prime factor aiding the broadcaster in acquiescing to minorities and women was the expansion of television news. Greater amounts of air time given over to news, with technological advances allowing more reports from the field, increased the need for more newscasters. As minority group members and women saw more opportunities opening up, more prepared for newscasting careers, and this in turn benefitted the broadcasters.

In the next chapter we will examine how newscasters viewed their situation in the mid-seventies and how broadcasters responded to the equal employment laws.

Footnotes

[1]Fred Feretti, "Survey Sees Bias in Broadcasting," New York Times, Jan. 21, 1970, p. 95.

[2]"Blacks in Rebuke to Broadcasters," New York Times, May 15, 1970, p. 67.

[3]Broadcasting, Sept. 28, 1970, p. 9.

[4]New York Times, May 2, 1970, p. 66; William D. Wright, National Coordinator, Black Efforts for Soul in TV, Wash., D. C. in "Letter to Editor," New York Times, May 24, 1970, IV, p. 15; Broadcasting, Nov. 2, 1970, p. 5.

[5]Broadcasting, Sept. 28, 1970, p. 39.

[6]Ibid., Oct. 5, 1970, p. 60.

[7]Ferretti, "Parley Assays Minorities' Rights in TV," New York Times, Oct. 27, 1970, p. 91.

[8]Broadcasting, Nov. 15, 1970, p. 38.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ferretti, "N.A.A.C.P. Fund and Church Score F.C.C. 'Inertia' on Hiring," New York Times, Feb. 26, 1970, p. 79.

[11]Ferretti, "Foe of Bias in Broadcasting Is Hopeful," New York Times, July 1, 1970, p. 91.

[12]New York Times, Aug. 28, 1970, p. 63.

[13]"Taping of Cavett's Show Disrupted by Jazz Group," New York Times, Oct. 14, 1970, p. 41.

[14]For examples, see "License Renewals in Memphis Opposed," New York Times, July 2, 1970, p. 40; "Ohio Stations Held Unfair to Negroes," New York Times, Sept. 2, 1970, p. 75; Broadcasting, Nov. 30, 1970, p. 22.

[15]Feretti, "16 Young Men Set for Careers in TV," New York Times, Feb. 28, 1970, p. 57; David K. Shipler, "Negro Legislator From South Rejects Tactics of Some Blacks," New York Times, Aug. 29, 1970, p. 11; Broadcasting, Sept. 21, 1970, p. 53.

[16]D. Parke Gibson, The $30 Billion Negro (London: The Macmillan Co., Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1969), pp. 23-29.

[17]Irene L. Murphy, Public Policy on the Status of Women (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1973), p. 19.

[18]Linda Charlton, "The Feminine Protest," New York Times, Sept. 28, 1970, p. 20.

[19]Neither did the Department of Justice assist any women challenging the constitutionality of state laws on the basis of sex, except for one case in which race was a factor as well. See Murphy, p. 22.

[20]Spiro T. Agnew, "Transcript of the Address by Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, Des Moines, Iowa, Nov. 13, 1969, in Marvin Barrett, (ed.), The Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism 1969-1970: Year of Challenge, Year of Crisis (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, Inc., 1970), pp. 131-138.

[21]Marvin Barrett (ed.), The Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism 1970-1971: State of Seige (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, Inc., 1971), pp. 83-85.

[22]Feretti, New York Times,Apr. 28, 1970, p. 83.

[23]Broadcasting, Nov. 23, 1970, p. 60; Ferretti, "Minorities Gain in Network Jobs," New York Times, Nov. 19, 1970, p. 95.

[24]Barrett, Year of Challenge, Year of Crisis, pp.29-30.

[25]Marilyn Bender, "Pants-Ban Tempest at C.B.S.," New York Times, Jan. 21, 1970, p. 42.

[26]Robert A. Wright, "Women Disrupt Meeting of CBS Stockholders, "New York Times, Apr, 16, 1970, p. 49.

[27]New York Times, Aug. 27, 1970, pp. 1, 30.

[28]Broadcasting, Oct. 4, 1970, p. 29; Oct. 26, 1970, p. 48; Nov. 30, 1970, p. 22.

[29]Broadcasting, Dec. 7, 1970, p. 23.

[30]Ibid., p. 9.

[31]"A.C.L.U. Says A.B.C. News Shows Bias Against Women," New York Times, Aug. 13, 1970, p. 33.

[32]"Move to Admit Women Rejected by Press Club," New York Times, Oct. 29, 1970, p. 46. [33]Judith F. Gelfman, Women

in Television News, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), p.4.

[33]Judith F. Gelfman, Women in Television News, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), p.4.

[34]National Organization for Women, et al. v. F.C.C. No. 74-1853, D.C. Cir.

[35]Murphy, pp. 51-53

[36]Cites the "1972 Virginia Slims American Women Opinion Poll," Ibid., p. 74.

[37]Joan Nicholson and Deborah Biele, "Analysis of WABC-TV Local News Programs: April-May 1971 & Jan.-Feb. 1972," (Mineographed, 1972), pp, 25-27. The passage of the ERA got less than ten seconds of news time on WABC-TV's Channel 7. Not until two days later, after complaints were made to the station, "Eyewitness News" did a sixty second story on the admendment.

[38]National Organization for Women, et al. v. F.C.C. No. 74-1853, D.C. Cir., p. 10.

[39]Reported at meeting of the Committee for the Image of Women in Television, New York Chapter, National Organization for Women, 59 East 19th Street, New York, New York, July 13, 1977; Window Dressing on the Set: Women and Minorities in Television, Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights (Wash., D. C.: Government Printing Office, Aug. 1977), pp. 64-65

[40]Murphy, pp. 74-75.

[41]Gelfman, p. 110.

[42]Maurine Christopher, "Males-Only Pick NET TV Shows, but Vow They Keep Feminine Viewers in Mind," Advertising Age, Apr. 9, 1973, p. 89.

[43]Joel Dreyfuss, "Television Controversy: . . .," Washington Post, Sept, 1, 1974, p, K1; "TV Selling: Black or White, Money is Green," Sept. 2, 1974, p. D1; "Presence Without Power," Sept, 3, 1974, pp. B1-B2.

[44]Window Dressing on the Set, pp. 59, 61.

[45]Ibid., Sydney W. Head, Broadcasting in America, 2nd Ed., (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972), pp. 398, 400.

[46]Window Dressing on the Set, p. 60.

[47]Ibid., pp. 60-61.

[48]"F.C.C. Withdraws Jackson License," New York Times, Sept. 5, 1970, p. 43.

[49]Window Dressing on the Set, pp. 61-62.

[50]Barrett, State of Seige, p. 58.

[51]Dreyfuss, Sept. 1, 1974, p. K1.

[52]"Petition to Deny," Before the Federal Communications Commission, Wash., D.C., Re Application of American Broadcasting Co., License of WABC-TV, New York, New York, p. 3.

[53]Head, pp. 456-457.

[54]Reported at meeting of the Committee for the Image of Women in Television, New York Chapter, National Organization for Women, July 13, 1977.

[55]Ibid.

[56]NOW's chapter in Washington, D.C. filed a similar petition to challenge the license renewal of WRC-TV, the NBC station in that city. Later the suit against WABC-TV was joined with the one against WRC-TV. Memorandum Opinion, Re Petition to Deny License Renewal of WABC-TV. F.C.C. Opin. 20 J.A. 363-364 (1973).

[57]As cited in National Organization for Women, et al., v. F.C.C. No. 74-1853, D.C. Cir.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ibid. p. 2.

[60]Window Dressing on the Set, p. 65.

[61]Ibid., pp. 74-76.

[62]Ibid., p. 132.

[63]Ibid., p. 87; Broadcasting, Oct. 5, 1970, p. 42.

[64]Window Dressing on the Set, p. 88.

[65]Helen Epstein, "Women on the Air," in Barrett, A State of Seige, p. 141.

[66]Ibid.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid.

CHAPTER VIII

EMERGENT PATTERNS OF THE MID-SEVENTIES

The intent in this chapter is to examine, mainly at the time of interviewing in 1976 to 1977, how the services of minority group members and women in newscasting were utilized by broadcasters and how assignments and relations with co-workers affected their on-camera images.

Although minorities had been struggling to integrate television for over fifteen years, by the mid-seventies women had gained a rapid admission into television news, overtaking minority group members. According to a survey conducted in 1976 for the Radio Television News Directors Association, 90 percent of the country's television news operations employed women (excluding clerical help), while only 68 percent had minority group members on their news staffs. Indicating the trend to a greater use of the services of women, in 1972 12 percent of all who worked in television were minority group members and 8 percent were women, but by 1976 the proportion of women had doubled to 16 percent while it increased only to 14 percent for minority group members.[1]

Station Integration

We asked respondents how they viewed integration at the stations where they worked. In Chapter VII, we quoted women respondents who thought WNBC-TV was more willing to employ women than most stations. Yet a producer at this station pointed out how progress in integrating newscasting was unevenly distributed among minority groups, including women:

> It's hard to say. CBS has always had a black anchor person, which we have not really until recently, and now we are trying out some black guys and trying some other people. I think there are women here who feel they aren't getting an equal opportunity. . . . There certainly is a high percentage of blacks. We do not have very many Puerto Ricans or other Hispanics, or other groups that I am aware of.

Some respondents, both black and white, were more positive with regard to their stations. Typical comments follow:

> We are fairly well integrated at this station--writers, production staff. There is a fairly good balance of people around here.
>
> . . .
>
> It is about as well integrated for the amount of people here as at any other station. Here, for on-air as well as off-air people.

But some voiced mild criticism:

> We all have a mix now. The main anchor, no. This area, no. There it is not good.
>
> . . .
>
> There is a pretty mixed group of people here. Representation to the population is lacking. Seems to me there are more women than there used to be. Men are in the more important positions.

A black woman correspondent compared the news departments at two stations where she had worked, noting

that one was larger than the other and she though that station size was probably related to minority employment:

> I've been very surprised at the number of women they have here . . . which is a great deal more than at the station I left. But then again, their staff here is much larger too. I think the more people you have, the more room you have, the higher turnover, all offer opportunities to show what your intentions are more quickly than someone who has only a staff of five. You know you hire one woman and one black, or one Spanish person, then that's about all the hiring you can do.

An anchorwoman at a smaller newsroom also believed it was easier for minorities to get into a large news department. Where she was, the staff was too small to include more than one or two minority group members and the station did not hire new people as frequently as larger stations. Yet, interestingly, this small station had a larger proportion of women and minority group members than some larger ones.

Frequent turnover of minorities or women could make a station seem more integrated than it was, an idea pointed out with cynicism by a black newsman:

> All the big stations have a stable of blacks, a stable of women, more or less. I'm over here at NBC and I was at CBS before I came here. I will be counted on the FCC forms by both.

According to a news director, however, the turnover rate was a positive factor. Besides allowing more new people to move into newscasting, broadcasters could keep searching for a higher level of talent:

> There is opportunity for new people to come in, but it makes it very stiff and, therefore, the quality of the news, broadly indicated, is good.

One minority newscaster at WCBS-TV noted that when considering how integrated a station is, one should take into account what minority newscasters do. Minority group members still have secondary positions:

> This is tricky. The number is not important. It is the kinds of spots that count. I would like to see more minorities as anchors. I would like to see black people moved off the weekends, more color on weekdays. I do not know if I can point to any bias. Washington has two anchors on weekdays. In New York demographics dictate. There is not such a demand for a black anchor on weekdays. On the weekend, they are relegating minorities. I see no difference in the quality of weekend anchors. They have to give the majority audience what they think the majority audience wants.

Respondents were asked if integration at their stations differed if one compared on-camera jobs with those behind the scenes. A news executive at a flagship station answered,

> No difference. Behind-the-scenes people are neglected. People are not aware of their existence. People never see them.

Similarly, a news executive at another flagship station commented:

> No difference. There are more jobs behind the scenes though. These are changing times. It is just like in other companies.

A black correspondent agreed, but only if one were not comparing managerial positions:

> No, I do not think there is much difference. There are black writers, sound men, cameramen. So, I don't think so. I don't sense that as a problem now. . . . There could be more minorities in those heavy positions--news director, station manager.

Other respondents also observed that higher level, decision-

making positions were less integrated:

> Yes, it is integrated behind the camera, up to a certain point. It hits about the level of management positions. I do not know where the cut off point is. I only know it is loaded with women around here, a lot of blacks, no Hispanics.
>
> . . .
>
> The station has done a remarkable job. Minorities here have good paying jobs. Not in the upper echelon level. There there are few women and minorities. They are in the peon jobs, the nuts and bolts levels. It is not equal in the decision making levels.

According to several respondents, the numbers of women and minorities seen on the television screen were not a reliable indicator of the overall level of integration at a station. Behind-the-scenes jobs account for most television jobs, but there may be a greater incentive to integrate on-camera jobs because they are the visible ones. After examining employment data collected by the FCC on Form 395 for the years 1971 to 1975, the Civil Rights Commission concluded in its report that this was indeed the case after studying the employment statistics collected on television personnel and its survey of 40 television stations:

> Women and minorities are not being fully utilized at all levels of station operations. . . . In comparison with their presence in the work force in general, a relatively high proportion of minority females (and to a lesser extent minority males) are employed in visible positions as on-the-air talent. Increased visibility on the screen without comparable representation in decision-making positions suggests that minorities and women serve merely as window dressing.[2]

The Commission also reported that about one-fourth of all

minority male and female professionals were on-air personnel. Apart from the professional catagories, minorities had made more progress as technicians while women had made greater gains as officials and managers. Proportionally, minority women were more likely than any other catagory to hold on-air positions. Generally "minorities and females have been placed in a few highly visible positions while being excluded from the decision-making process."[3]

Several respondents thought this was still true in the later seventies despite the statements of news executives, quoted above, who said there was no difference. An anchorwoman compared her own situation with that of other women in the news department in which she worked:

> Behind the scenes it is more difficult for a woman to get hired, I think. I don't think there are so many as those visible. There is more acceptance of women all way around, but I think you have the higher percentage of women achieving more success in front of the camera than behind the camera. You have a lot of production types of women; you don't have too many directors. Locally we have one. We have no real full-time Monday to Friday producers. Whereas I am a full-fledged anchorwoman and correspondent.

When another newswoman working at a different station described the news department there, her conclusion was not very different:

> I have seen no statistics. In the office, women are secretaries, desk assistants. All production people, producers, assignment editors, management, are men. It is changing slowly. There is a gal producing Saturday evening news. Crews are mostly men.

Some of our newscaster respondents said that more improvements were needed. One newswoman did not think the changes in TV news were very impressive:

> From what I see and what I know from talking to other people is that if you were to go into the morning meetings that most stations have--the meetings that the people who are the producers, the associate producers, the news directors, the various managers attend--the meeting would not be overwhelmingly women and minority people. It would be overwhelmingly those people who ran things before. There would be more women than there might have been five years ago, but if you have one, that's more.

A Puerto Rican reporter, looking around the news room of an owned and operated station, said that the news staff that worked behind the camera was not at all like the integrated group of newscasters seen in news shows:

> They haven't had a minority face in here. It is like a crime. We project it all wrong. . . . They do demographic studies. They capture a certain audience. The middle class and the upper middle class is in control. The station shoots for that. Yes, they hire minorities as on-air personalities. They can throw them on the air. In the production area--I'm looking around here--I see a sea of white. I'd like to see a black, Puerto Ricans.

Several station and network executives explained that on-camera integration had preceded integration behind the scenes. They shared the opinion held by many newscasters that magagement level position were the least integrated. They explained, however, that as women and minority group members rose through the ranks of company hierarchies they would rise into management levels in the future. Thus, if one compares the views of executives with

those of minority and women newscasters, generally the newscasters were less positive than the executives in assessing how well integration had progressed at their stations.

A black correspondent discussed this matter in a broader context. He emphasized regional differences, especially differences caused by the percentage of minority members in the audience:

> It depends on the market. Some are not willing to take a chance in getting their feet wet. There are a lot of blacks in engineering and such in, for example, Ohio, lots of blacks in the background and not on camera. It depends on the market and on the audience. In a market where there are more blacks in the audience, there are more on the air. In Washington it is safer to show more blacks.

All stations in the New York market were integrated to some extent. Whether or not a company was well integrated depended on one's views and expectations. A number of executives had complained that a quota system had been imposed upon the television companies, but none were able to identify any specific quota numbers. The distributions of minority group members and women varied from one company to another. Moreover, within a company, there was often considerable variation over a period of several months. All stations were searched for on-air Hispanics in 1977 and 1978, but no one mentioned a need for newscasters who were orientals or American Indians, and there were none. It appeared that behind-the-scenes jobs were becoming integrated at that time and catching up with

the on-camera levels of integration. Management positions were least representated by on-air images.

Newscaster Images

One station official acknowledged that the visibility of newscasters was a factor related to job opportunities. The stations could appear to be integrated by integrating on-camera personnel who were the most visible representatives of television:

> If you compare what has happened since Kerner in broadcasting with what's happened in print, you see that there has been enormous change. Now, part of that is because print favors the more experienced journalist and the print media already had a larger establishment. Part of it too is because braodcasting is a more exciting place to be and a place where younger people would move anyway. . . . And also the fact that the change, the sense to which a newspaper responded to societal change, could be perceived or handled in other ways--changes in format, changes in content, changes in makeup of the news pages of the product--not of the practitioners. You know television's practitioners are there for all the world to see. So I think for those reasons, these changes have occurred.

When Eyewitness News and Happy News techniques were brought into television news to attract more viewers, the addition of women newscasters served a purpose. Women newscasters were publicized to entice viewers to certain news shows as evident in the promotional messages of television stations. An example of this criticized by Helen Epstein follows:

> "News isn't always glamourous," reads the logo WCBS placed beside a subtly-shaded photo of Miss Lindstrom in TV Guide. "But Pia is. Pia brings her

> own special qualities to every story she covers. Be it a subway evacuation. The arrival of the circus. Or interviewing unusual New Yorkers." Less the implicit condescension elude the male reader, he has only to apply the formula to, say, John Chancellor. "News isn't always attractive,' the ad would read, next to a smokey snapshot of NBC's top correspondent. "But John is."[4]

In the early seventies television newswomen were indeed expected to be youthful and pretty. Even though broadcasters professed to want only experienced journalists on their news staffs, they were still criticized for hiring female reporters who were former models, receptionists, and secretaries whose faces and figures counted for more than their resumes.[5] It was male executives, however, who decided what types of women were hired. So if newswomen had to meet certain standards of beauty, that reflected the tastes and judgments of those who controlled the images of newscasters. In 1976 a local woman newscaster, speaking before a meeting of women, predicted that in the future there would be less emphasis on the youth and beauty of newswomen. As the first generation of women in television news grew older, the image of newswomen would also mature in the expectations of audiences and broadcasters alike.[6] Indeed, by 1977, two women frequently seen on local news shows were grandmothers, although typically most newswomen were much younger.

The appearance of the female newscaster, especially her attire and hair style, was often the result of editorial decisions. Jeanne Parr, for example, was told how to dress

for certain assignments and so was televised reporting news in an evening gown one night and a steel helmet on another occasion. Melba Tolliver was kept off-camera when she first took up wearing a Afro hair style.[7] The appearances of male newscasters were also controlled, but not as much as those of women.

A white newswoman discussed how her image was a constant factor in her work. She implied that she was continuously harrassed about her looks and appearance, but from a variety of contradictory perspectives:

> They were nasty about the way I was dressed. I looked too nice, too ladylike. One man appologized months later. Another was against me. He complained I was attractive and nice. . . . Women have to put up with hair. They told me they hated my hair and to get my teeth fixed. I was told women do not wear jeans, but I wear them anyway. I do the job, and do it well. They shoot me from the waist up, so it doesn't really matter. Others wear them sometimes. The assignment editor will say I look too nice today and then send a guy with a suit and tie. I have gone home to change clothes. I wear no lipstick. I won't. . . . My voice coach advised me about my hairstyle and clothes. A wardrobe consultant costs twenty-five dollars for a half hour. If I have a voice coach, that's important. If lucky enoug, at the end of the summer, they will send me to a make-up consultant. My news director said to wait about my teeth. I have this big space between my two front teeth. He said if I am still there next year, maybe the station would pick up the cost of fixing them.

A white newswoman felt that women often enjoyed an advantage when male executives sometimes deliberately placed them on-camera, and this became an economic advantage:

> Women come into the studio more to do talking. They are told to. Men often do not go into the studio. They want to see the woman sitting there, want to

> see women more. A pretty face to look at makes the day pleasanter even with the extra fee. Women have a better chance to get the extra fee. Men are kept off the camera more, do voice-overs more. It's not totally equal.

We noted in Chapter I that popular newscasters, those having celebrity status, were regarded by audiences as having the greatest credibility. This was confirmed by our newswomen respondents. In addition, the public recognition helped to overcome the resistance of many viewers to receiving messages from a woman. One of our newswomen respondents commented on this:

> People just didn't believe a story when a woman reported it, especially if it was political. This has changed a lot in the last three or four years. Three years ago I really noticed it. Now, from the man out on the street the recognition factor makes it much better. Men react much better now. At Channel X the recognition factor is great. That helps.

Several newscasters observed that the standards for youth and beauty applied to men as well as women:

> Everybody is getting prettier, lovlier. Very lovely. Nice looking men now.
>
> . . .
>
> Most news people are very plastic types and are hired because they conform to the norm, the pretty woman and the man who looks like a stud. If not under thirty, then there is prejudice because of age.

A white newswoman at WNBC-TV, however, pointed out that newscaster images were not entirely "plastic" contrivances:

> We are real people. In TV, we are the only people on the air who represent ourselves. We speak our own words, express our own feelings. The mail indicates we fill a need for people who need someone--a mother, friend, whore. . . . From the

> tone of the people in the streets, they think I am a person. I like that. I do not want to be looked at as a standard bearer or symbol.

News executives generally claimed that good looks were not important qualities for newscasters. A network executive at CBS said,

> The qualifications for the job get top priority. I don't think you could be very ugly, out of the ordinary or an unconventional looking person, and expect to have the same consideration as someone who was a more grass-roots looking person.

The news director at a local station claimed that he did not follow the practice of hiring beautiful newscasters as other stations in the area were doing:

> We're just as successful as they are in terms of ratings, money earnings, and things like that. And I have one beautiful person in the entire room. The rest of them look like people. . . Outside of here they need a good hairline and a good makeup artist. In here, they better bring me the vest story that got done that day. If I see the Times or the News or any other news outlet doing a better job than our story that my people have covered, I'll have their hides on the western wall. . . . They all develop their own way. I don't really give a damm if their hair is tosselled. I want to be assured they're relatively neat, but other than that, I don't give a damm if their clothing is wrinkled and they may look like their hungover. Most of them are hungover with work. Most of them look exhausted because they're exhausted. I'm not running a beauty contest. I let Channel 7 and Channel 4 run beauty contests. I don't have to.

Another news director disclaimed the value of beauty:

> We don't hire a woman because she is attractive. In fact, in many cases, that almost can become a negative factor. That goes back to the ability to communicate. People will be attracted to certain people. On the other hand, we have a person who is on our staff, not in a reporting role, kind of a beginning role who wants to be a reporter, who is applying to station's around the country. In fact,

> she has an offer right now from a station out in Arkansas, but she is very attractive. This has almost been a negative factor, because someone says, "Gee, she's so attractive. Is she believable as a gutsy newsperson?" So there is that factor. But we never hired any women because whe happened to be attractive or because they added beauty to the set.

Interview data revealed, however, that when station or news executives denied women newscasters were hired for their looks, officials at another station would nonetheless point to them and their news staffs as examples of where women had been but on the air for this reason. This was true of almost all stations.

A network spokesman explained that local news broadcasters were more likely to stress youth among newscasters, and there were practical reasons for the stress on youth. But at the networks, experience and maturity outweighed youth and good looks:

> I don't see any evidence in the network news of attention to a somewhat yuounger audience, because when you get up to 49, you no longer are talking about kids, obviously. I find it more in local news.

He went on to explain that the consuming audience, or the advertisers' audience, is young. When you add to your staff you not only want people who will attract your audience, but you want People who will stay with your company. He cited WNBC-TV's local anchorman as an example: "Chuck Scarborough is quite young--not yet thirty." Another reason given was that television attracts younger people. It is a young industry and this attracts

young people beginning their careers. But, while youth appears to be favored, it also has limitations:

> There are special demands which news broadcasting places on you. You've got to have people who have some understanding of the news and background in journalism, and you don't find them right out of high school or right out of college.

He further explained that in network news, where the economic stakes are greater than in a local market, newscasters must have proven records that come only with years of experience:

What you have in network news is a reluctance to toy with what is successful. Certainly in the case of NBC and CBS. When ABC took on a new man a few years ago, it was not a kid, it was Harry Reasoner. Now, Harry's no boy. And Howard Smith is still in there. Those were tried and proven newscasters, Reasoner a long time at CBS and Howard a long time at ABC. And, Lord know, Barbara Walters is no kid. . . . It takes a while before you can really learn the score. And at the network level, the score is read in much bigger numbers than it is locally. Some are just too young. They are not old enough to have gotten the experience that they required to do the job.

During the hiring process, respondents said that the characteristics associated with minority statuses were carefully scrutinized. A black woman reporter described her own experience when interviewed for employment:

> At first they didn't want to hire me because I am light. I had long straight hair then, and they wanted a big Afro and dark skin. I looked more like an Indian.

A white newswoman had a problem because she also looked too much like a native American Indian:

> They wanted me to cut my hair. I wore it long and straight, parted in the middle. That was very popular then if you were young. They said on-camera I looked like an Indian, but I'm Jewish.

Whether or not a newscaster's minority status was played up varied from one station to another. A black newscaster compared the conservative approach at one station with that competing station which played up ethnic and racial statuses. At the respondent's station,

> How you are perceived in the public eye is important. Any extreme in perception, too light, too dark, etc., is not of value to anyone [at this station.] Geraldo Rivera was an opposite example. He was distinguished as the great Puerto Rican. We are not promoted that way here. . . . Management does not say, "The black community likes you." They stress a belief in us that we are part of a news team. I say to myself, "I am a minority reporter," but I do not get that from them.

Along with talent and experience, a newscaster's image was a primary factor in hiring decision. A pattern of youthful, good looking people dominated newscasting, but with occasional exceptions. Once employed, a newscaster's image was subject to standards set by company executives and used as a promotional device for news programming.

The Value of Minorities to Newscasting

Another question asked of respondents was how they thought women or minority newscasters might benefit news programs. Some attributed only minimal value to this, as in the following examples:

> By the merit points from the FCC, and that a Puerto Rican is visible. No other way.
>
> . . .
>
> A minority has the same value as a white person, to report the news. . . . It is easier to send a black or Hispanic into those communities where they have a rapport with the people there.

Others saw no value that related to one's sex or racial status:

> I do not think they should be chosen because they are women. Barbara Walters has paid her dues, but she does not belong where she is. That is detrimental to news.
>
> . . .
>
> A minority or woman has no special value. I do not believe women or minorities have special insights, views, etc. They are people. News reflects human interest, not special interest.
>
> . . .
>
> The basic purpose of the news broadcast, of course, is to inform people. Those standards by which the broadcast is geared are decided upon by management, and those technical experts, journalists, or whatever. I'm not sure it matters that a person is black, female, white. I don't know that that's the important issue. It's how good they are, how they are perceived by the public receiving them, how we perceive them after having put them there.

A network executive thought a newscaster's ethnic, racial or sex status did relate to how news might be reported but would not place any valuation on this difference:

> You have people who won't watch Barbara Walters. I don't know whether it's because she's female or they don't like the way she reports the news. But it happens. The overall consensus is that this does not negatively affect the viewing audience. What you tend to find is that minorities who report news tend to emphasize or put the emphasis a little differently when they are reporting news, when they report local ethnic events.

Other respondents did think it made a difference if news stories were covered by one type of person rather than another. A reporter's background and past experiences could provide insights that improved news reports. Special views could not be allowed to take dominance over what management regarded as balanced reporting, and professional journalists, no matter what their backgrounds or personal characteristics, should be able to report any story, seeing and understanding the viewpoints implicit in the stories they cover, but people from diverse backgrounds could make important contributions to a news show. One news executive thought that reporters with a special expertise or from a particular background might be more suited to reporting certain stories, but whether or not reporters got such assignments was determined by the assignment editor and others responsible for making such decisions. As this news executive explained,

> Because they come from a certain area, they may, in fact, carry with them a certain expertise, just as an education reporter may have some expertise in education. Someone who has lived in the ghetto and happens to be black may be able to relate to a certain kind of story better than someone else. We have to balance those considerations. But only in those particular cases where that type of story pops

> up. Generally, we have a list of reporters who come in in the morning and a list of the sites. You match them up on the basis of that reporter's interests and prior record in covering their stories. ----- ----- was in prison. When a story comes up concerning the inside of a prison or the penal system, he is more atuned and more capable of getting an insight into that story than someone else. But that's the basis of the judgment. Not, per se, what race or sex one happens to be.

Another news executive also thought that a reporter's background could, though not necessarily, be a factor enabling him to be a better communicator of particular news stories, but it is not possible to generalize that women, for example, can report stories relevant to women more effectively than men:

> There are some people who, because of their backgrounds, have developed a perspective that is particularly helpful. First of all, if that perspective is articulated, it would be helpful in analyzing what's happening in our life, in our society. There are some women who are very good at that; there are some who are terrible at it. So overall, I think that perceptive, articulate, inquisitive people are really what we are looking for. . . . It is very possible that because somebody has had certain kinds of experiences, that better equips them to evaluate circumstances.

An executive at a television station acknowledged that black or women reporters might be more perceptive than white newsmen in doing stories that related to their cultural experiences as blacks or women living in the society. As in the case above, this executive thought one could not assume that a reporter's sex or race automatically meant that he was more perceptive in covering certain stories. And, besides, the truly professional journalist would have the

skill to detect the subtleties of any news:

> I do not believe that black reporters are better able to report black events than white reporters. I do believe that there are certain things that come out of your personal experience that are not duplicated by somebody else. Therefore, there are some things that you might understand faster than I might understand or vice versa. And that conditions, to be sure, certain kinds of stories that a woman would understand culturally, in terms of her upbringing, as a man might not, or the other way around. But I think those sensitivities can be developed, since basically a reporter's job is to develop that kind of sensitivity and awareness.

Still another news executive commented on this matter:

> I think sometimes women are assigned stories men used to be assigned to and which women can cover better. A man who played body contact sports might be a better reporter of that.

Thus, it was one's experience rather than sex, race, or ethnicity per se and an ability to incorporate that experience into a news report that made the woman or minority person a valuable member of a news staff.

Several news directors held that the individual differences among newscasters had to be taken into account in the course of producing a news show. For example,

> There is no such thing as unbiased reporting. Any person comes from a background that biases his view of whatever he's telling. Therefore, what we have or really strive for is a balance of biases. And the broader based your reporting staff and your management staff, the more different types of people you have, the better types of backgrounds they come from, the better job you're going to do in coming up with what is generally a fair and accurate picture, because all of these biases will meld together and you will be able to view everything from the different viewpoints and come up with a better total.

Another news director saw the varied experiences and

backgrounds of newscasters as an asset to the news staff, but he did not think that would effect the news that was reported:

> Women and minorities will bring something special to it, the same as everybody else. So does the guy who studied physics and mathematics. There was the guy who was going to be a doctor. I mean everybody brings something to it and everything makes a difference, but I don't think the news would change if it were being done by purely blacks and Puerto Ricans if they were being honest.

A black correspondent at a flagship station, offered another reason why it was important to have different viewpoints. This brings variety to the reporting and the possibility of meeting the needs of minority viewers:

> It is important in a democracy for the population to be reflected in all aspects. There should be enough non-white people around to say they too aspire to do this. Minorities may have needs that are not seen by others. My presence is valuable. I bring a different point of view that they think is new. I think it is old hat. I add that bit of wisdom. In ways of relating, I can bridge that. That is the most a newsman can do. If I go to a fire, I won't always see it as someone's home swept away--not when it's a slum building. I may see a story differently. With different pairs of eyes, there are different stories.

Thus, there were no neat patterns of agreement or disagreement that minority or women newscasters contributed something special to news programming. Some officials with the same television companies sharply disagreed with one another. Neither did women or minority group members consistently agree that because of their statuses they necessarily added special insights to the reporting of news. Two viewpoints seemed to prevail. One was that

professional journalists could report any kind of news and it was not important that reporters be members of particular demographic groups. The other held an opposite opinion, that the unique experiences of a reporter were a special asset when covering stories related to one's background or special knowledge. Individual reporters could, at times, offer a depth of understanding, not opinion, that added to the quality of news reports. The deficiencies of the first view, that any professional journalist could competently report stories about minority groups and women, had long been a motivating factor for activists who had pressured for the hiring of members of these groups as newcasters. On the other hand, a news show could not allow the biases of any one person or group to become obvious. As news programs increasingly consisted of reports by many newscasters, one kind of bias, at least, could be balanced by another. In television news, maintaining objectivity was an important concern, because disgruntled groups in the community could claim under the Fairness Doctrine that they were not equally or fairly represented by the broadcaster.[8]

Recognition of Groups in the Audience

In addition to presenting minority newscasters, news departments used an alternative strategy to show recognition to ethnic or minority groups in the viewing area; occasionally efforts were made to televise stories about events of particular interest to these groups. As noted in Chapter

VII, some minority newscasters felt frustrated because there was little opportunity to report news that would help the public to better understand their own groups, although feature stories, such as those about a Greek-American wedding or the annual religious festivals in Italian-American neighbor-hoods, were aired. An executive producer at a local station described a technique used to cater to ethnic interests:

> We are trying to create visibility among everyone. We cover stories about everyone. For example, we report news in Ireland for Irish people, in Italy for Italians, Hungary for Hungarians, and so on. We do not encourage ethnic identity. We do try to air stories for the ethnics. . . . Community leaders call up if a story is derogatory, so we know they watch these stories.

A policy that attempted to please all groups, however, had difficulties. To illustrate, a Puerto Rican reporter complained that some groups were favored over others. Citing two news reports, the reporter said that the Jewish community got more attention because more time was given to stories that would interest Jews than those that related to Puerto Rican matters:

> Recently a Jewish kid was thrown off a roof. It got two days of coverage with two crews--the whole bangle. A Puerto Rican girl got thrown off a roof and it got coverage with one crew and two minutes on the air. Puerto Ricans resent that. I protested and got called a liar. It is not an evil insidious thing. There are no Puerto Ricans or blacks in the production area. The producer has the final say.

But this reporter did not consider management to be pro-Jewish:

> Management was considering hiring a man who works at the Times, who has a heavy Jewish accent. But they were very sensitive to the audience and iced it.

Assignments:

In order to better understand how newscaster images might be related to a newscaster's sex or minority status, respondents were asked if the assignments they were given reflected their other statuses. Did they think that their particular statuses should be considered when given assignments to cover certain stories? Did being a woman or a minority person limit or enhance one's opportunities to cover news stories? Did newscasters try to minimize their own feminine or minority statuses or were these useful to them in their work?

Respondents indicated one difficulty that minority reporters often faced, particularly black men when they were brought into mainstream news organizations during the sixties. It was to avoid becoming known as a "black reporter." Yet, the need for black reporters who understood the black community was a major incentive for originally bringing blacks into television news. Women had long struggled to move beyond the limitaion of reporting "only for the women's page" if in print or of doing "women's features" and "chit-chat" if in broadcasting. If women or minority reporters were relegated to certain kinds of news stories, or excluded from others, this would to some extent affect the kinds of images that they could project during

news programs.

Opinion varied in response to this question. Several black newsmen rejected the idea that assignments might be made according to a reporter's race. One black newsman argued that it was necessary to transcend limits imposed because of one's racial status. Only in special situations could an exception be made:

> I always steered away from that. The conditions in '67, when I came here, were that I was not to be known as a black reporter, not to do just ghetto stories. I'm assigned everything as a general assignment reporter. There may be special times when there is a situation, a tight situation in the ghetto. I would be asked by the station to do the story. But to do only black stories, I do not do that. I'm not asked. And a few times when I've been asked, I refused.

Another black newsman similarly avoided this role because it would not advance his career:

> I worked hard for assignments not to reflect my racial status. I do not want to be "the black." In terms of ability I can cover anything as well as anybody else. I have to monitor that very carefully. If I want to make a living, I have to relate to everyone else. Assignments should relate to status at times, covering a story when tensions are involved. Yes, you have to be a realist. Just as long as they are not using it to box in the reporter. It should be limited.

Still another newsman denied being a "black reporter." He acknowledged that some attention had been given to covering certain ethnic groups, but this had not developed as a speciality in television journalism:

> I'm a general assignment reporter. I get them across the board. It's not a rule. I am assigned anything. I'm not the "black reporter." I think the day will come when we do have people who

specialize in special groups. There has been special coverage of ethnic groups.

While not wanting to be circumscribed in the kinds of stories they covered, some respondents did think there were occasions when a reporter of a certain sex, race, or ethnic status could do a better job because of his background which would reflect his personal statuses. For example, a black correspondent thought it was all right if some of his assignments reflected his racial status:

> There are two ways to look at that. I've heard of some who do not want to do something complain, "You are dumping that kind of thing on me." Or, I can do that kind of news better, can showcase better stories, because I am black. You do have good reasons for making special assignments. It's not all bad.

Many women newscasters rejected the traditional woman's assignment. For example,

> I do not do features. It was the only thing women did when I was hired. It's not my style; the wit and humor needed for this are not my talents. Assignments are made according to a person's talents. Some are better at handling a fast breaking story; some write faster than others. It is not sex that is important. No assignments should reflect sex status.

Some newswomen believed their backgrounds, reflecting their extra-professional statuses, helped them report some stories more effectively than others. For example, a black newswomen said,

> There are so many different kinds of black people or women. In getting a story, there are certain kinds of cooperation that a woman can get, for example, if about pregnancy. And we will be sent out to get a story that has nothing to do with my heritage. It is more of a challenge to me to get it as right as I

> can, but a better job might be done by a person closer to it.

Another newswoman pointed out other advantages associated with her ethnic or sex statuses.

> As a Puerto Rican I have an advantage interviewing other Puerto Ricans. I can speak to them in Spanish. In certain areas it is better to send a woman--to fashion shows. Knowing what counts is important.

Several newswomen thought being a woman helped them get news stories from men. They took advantage of their "inferior" status as women in order to entrap men into giving them a story:

> As a correspondent, it is a distinct advantage to be female. I can get more than a guy. A guy will ask a politician a question and get a standard answer. If I ask a politician something, he will tell me. If you walk up and ask him to explain such and such, they will tell me everything they know. They will go out of their way to set up a story for me. You have the help of all the prejudices of a man in this society.
>
> . . .
>
> My ability to gather news is better as a woman. I have the ability to twist people's arms and get information. Men are limited by their attraction to women. It's a weakness, and if you take advantage of it, which I do, then you are more powerful than they are. I'm not talking about seducing people, just talking about persuading them. I just want to do my job, getting the story. If it requires batting eyelashes, I will do it. That is their problem. I do not consider it degrading to smile and wink to get what I want. It is probably because of the culture.

One reporter gave a particularly vivid report of how she used her sex to get a story:

> I did a story on Tom Seaver. Everybody was trying to get in with the team's owner. They sent me over, an impossible assignment. I stopped the crew, went

> into a florist, and got some daisies. The elevator man took me right up. It looked like I had a delivery for Mr. Grant. A man opened the door and I said I have a message for Mr. Grant who was right there on the telephone. He was in his shirt sleeves, trying to talk and at the same time hear what I had brought him. I think I did something that a man couldn't do. Not on camera, but I was able to talk to him and get a story.

Some news people thought sending someone who did not fit the expected pattern might get a better news report, as suggested by one newswoman:

> I would like to see a man go to the woman's conference at Albany. Maybe it is better with a woman. A man would have questions a woman wouldn't have. Maybe more women would listen if it were reported by a man. Recently I went to the Bronx. There were two bodies severed in half. I did that story a different way. I told people I wouldn't watch this. Many people have dinner when the news is on. A man wouldn't have done that.

Some newswomen resented the idea that "women's news" was regarded as less important than other news. Anything of interest to women should be equal to what interests men. One newswoman defended her assignments to women's stories because she felt these were important:

> Yes, assignments do reflect my sex status. I do that willingly. I do not any longer seek street assignments. I do not want to do that. These stories are not interesting from my point of view--for instance, holding up a mike to a police chief. It bother's me, the idea that men's stories are better and women want to do them. Why not women's stories? Why is what is of interest to women second class?

News executives tended to give some consideration to the sex and other statuses of reporters, and to their skills and interests as well, but they did not expect to assign

stories according to categories that would be match a reporter's sex, racial or ethnic status.

> One thing we are mindful of, I think, is that while sometimes someone's background makes him or her amenable to handling a particular story, you don't want that to circumscribe the kinds of stories that they would be assigned.

An executive at CBS went further. He did not think a person's sex, race or ethnicity should be played up at all in a news show:

> We don't exploit our people's ethnicity, because we believe that the reporter can report. To be sure, if a reporter had particular language skills, he is going to be able to report on a certain story that others aren't. But I would hope that we don't ever exploit people's womenhood or their race or any other characteristic. I think that there is a danger of vulgarizing one's appeal. We have been asked, for example, why don't you have a Polish-American reporter, why don't you have an Italian-American reporter, and you could carry that to ridiculous extremes. And then nobody would be paying attention to anything else. That is not what news is about.

A network representative, however, seemed to think that the different statuses of newscasters, such as race or sex, were inevitably a factor when stories were assigned. They could not be avoided:

> Well, I think an audience will recognize the appropriateness of one assignment as against another when there are overtones, undertones, what you will, which finally coalesce in the individual viewer's belief that a woman should uncover that or a man should uncover that. There are instances where physical risk is concerned, where I suppose women are less apt to be sent. I don't know if its gallantry or prudence or what it is, but when there is a hostage situation and guys are going down there who are going to get into the line of fire, no matter what the police chief says, in that kind of situation, probably you will find men assigned

> rather than women. I think it is part of everyone's belief that a man somehow would be safer. Maybe he's been in the army and knows how to keep his head down.

However, all stations are not alike. A woman who had changed jobs found that her new employer was less likely to send her on stories because of her racial status than her previous one:

> I find less of that here. Maybe people think that, but I don't hear it. I've been here for the last two months. But I found in my last couple of years or so at [the other station] that that had been managed from "There's a black story and I think you should do it."

A few newswomen complained that traditional attitudes towards women persisted and at times limited what stories they were assigned. For example, a white newswoman said that

> in a dangerous situation male executives send out male reporters, but they send them out to a plane crash too and there is no danger there. It's already crashed, but they send a man. Men are also getting assignments that used to be reserved for women. Any subject of interest, men have an opportunity to do it, regardless of what the subject is, cooking and so on.

A news director at a local station indicated that the reporter's personal tastes and skills were an important consideration when assigning stories:

> We do consider the reporter when sending someone out to cover a story. Some reporters do certain kinds of things well. They like some kinds of stories better than others.

A newscaster at WABC-TV also reported that often reporter's personal styles and images were matched to assignments:

> We do a lot of that here at "Channel 7 News." At meetings they talk about finding a Rose Ann story, an Evelyn story. For Gloria, find a story on education, a teacher's strike somewhere. For Doug Johnson, send him off to sanitation something. A Milton Lewis story, and so on.

But requests for certain types of reporters from people seeking media coverage was regarded an an infringement on the authority of news executives. For example, a news director explained:

> Once a woman's group was sitting in at one of the women oriented magazines. I can't remember which. It was down on Madison Avenue several years ago. They occupied the building and I heard about it. I had scheduled a reporter and crew to go on down there. I got a call from inside the building, and it's the caucus leader or whoever she was. She said, "Are you sending someone down?" And I said, "Yes, I am." She said, "Well, it had better be a woman." I said, "It had better be nothing lady. I'm color blind and sex blind, and the world will be too. They'll talk to who I send to talk to them, because they're my representatives." I'm not running a popularity contest for people and pressure groups. I hire people because they know what they are doing. I'm not changing a thing for the pressure group or anybody.

When it was pointed out that he had recently been featuring a woman as co-anchor, he replied that he was not putting a pretty face on the screen. It was the reporter's personal talents and skills that determined her assignments:

> It's because she has culled her skills down to be able to do that. I wouldn't put her up there if she couldn't do it. She wanted to do it a year before. I told her she wasn't ready, and I wasn't going to do it until she got her act down and was ready. Well, instead of going in and saying, "You need a woman," she came in and said, "I'm good." And when she was good, she got it. There is nothing that beats quality.

A black woman correspondent believed it important to have some influence over what stories one reported. She distinguished between how one might be better able to report a story or whether an assignment was made according to a stereotype:

> I think that after a certain point I am as capable of making some decisions about what I do well and what I think audiences are interested in as a lot of other people making those decisions, so I want the assignments to reflect that. Do I then pick assignments that either deal with black people or deal with women? I don't make any conscious decisions to do either. I try to make a decision based on what I think are interesting situations or interesting kinds of people. . . . I've heard women who've had a complaint I've had a lot in the past, that they have been given assignments because somebody will say, "You should do this because I think this is a woman's story." I used to find that particularly irritating when a man said that. Who is he to judge what is a woman's story. In fact, you know, I just don't like those kinds of labels being put on stories, and I don't like the idea that people who really don't have a certain kind of experience make certain kinds of definitions. It's one thing to say I think you should do this story because it's a woman's story and another to say I think you're the kind of person who could handle it and you do a good job. It is two different things.

The areas of news reporting where minority group members and women might have enjoyed an advantage because of their experiences associated with their sex, racial, or ethnic statuses were little valued in the mainstream news media. Stations needed blacks and other minorities on their staffs, but they did not need or want specialists in race and ethnic relations or women's matters, as they did theatre and motion-picture critics, consumer reporters, education reporters, White House Correspondents, weather reporters,

sportscasters, etc. Ironically, one of the most significant areas of news stories in the nation's recent history was not an area in which to build up a newscasting career in prime time news shows, except to get one's foot in the door of a news organization. Stations could call upon the black or ethnic group members on their news staffs if needed for certain stories, but the professional capabilities of individual newscasters were judged by how they handled general news assignments or one of the established specialities. Implicitly, this meant that the success of a minority group member in newscasting depended upon how well he reported news that was primarily for and about whites. Most women seeking success in newscasting similarly avoided the stigma of being a "woman's reporter" if they wished to work on prime time news shows. To succeed in television news, it was more important to become adept in the areas traditionally monopolized by men.

Intergroup Relations

When interviewed, respondents were asked if they saw any competition or friction between different groups, such as men and women, white women and minorities, etc. The purpose was to discover whether or not the interpersonal relations newscasters experienced behind the camera contributed in some way to images observable on TV screens.

The factor newscasters reported as most important in their relations with co-workers was maintaining professional

standards of work. A white woman reporter at a flagship station pointed out that just as news was a showcase for the station, the individual newscaster was a showcase of the news staff. Another woman reporter at the same station described how she felt obligated to the off-camera staff:

> It is difficult to be on the air everyday. They are merciless out there. It strips you naked. Also, if you do a job that is not up to the level of all the 250 others, especially those behind the scenes, you are letting them down. You represent them and their standards of work.

Other newscasters agreed that competence in one's work was an important criterion governing their work, and maintaining peer standards of competence was especially important:

> I like to work with people who are good. We all have individual preferences. It has nothing to do with sex, race, etc. You want to work with those who make your work look good.

A black correspondent at a network owned and operated station explained that he ignored social relations that carried racial overtones and did not allow them to interfere with his work.

> I do not let that bother me. No professional does. I like to think I am respected and well liked. It doesn't make any difference what the others are. They should work well. That's what's important.

An executive at CBS said that there would always be tensions of some sort, but agreed professional behavior helped to avoid this problem:

> In every news organization I know, it's a very highly charged meritocracy. People really don't care who's what. Now, having said that, you have to understand that in any organization of a couple of

> hundred people, there are people who harbor certain feelings that others don't. But in the mind of working professionals, they deal with each other on a professional level.

Good support from the production staff was crucial to the performance of a reporter. An uncooperative or hostile film crew could make the newscaster look ridiculous on-camera. Difficulties arose for women and minority newscasters when their work placed them in higher positions than white male co-workers who regarded them as inferiors because of traditional attitudes held towards members of their sex or race. Several women newscasters complained bitterly about male co-workers. A common problem to them was the resistance to supervision by film crews in the field, especially in the early seventies when women were getting more assignments to cover news at the scene of the story. Several newswomen said that the film crews were often chauvinists who didn't like being supervised by women. The reporter could not effectively cover a story without establishing her authority over the crew. A particularly hostile camera crew could easily undermine a reporter's story and harm her career by getting bad film shots, of either the newscaster or the subject. This kind of tension was reported to have eased by the mid-seventies, but several women reporters said they were still more resented by some of the camera crews than by any other co-workers and there were still incidents laden with friction. One newswoman, for example, told of an encounter

with a crew member a few days before she was interviewed. He had accused her of taking a job away from some man who probably had a family to support. Similarly, a black newsman, a correspondent at a flagship station, said that he faced this problem of giving orders to white workers: "I had an awful time when producing. People did not know how to take orders from a black man. They did not think they ought to."

Our newscaster respondents reported observing and experiencing other kinds of relations with their co-workers. A white woman reporter noted tension at times between men and women if a woman worked well and was likely to move up the career ladder: "Men in management and in news fear women. I know of one case. It's not because she is a woman, but because she knows what she is doing and is more organized."

Another kind of difficulty arose because minority members were regarded as being especially protected by equal employment laws. At one station several newscasters complained about a particular film crew composed of minority group members. They said no one wanted to work with this crew because they were incompetent; but the station could not fire them without getting into a dispute about employment discrimination. A strategy that reporters used to was to go out early with a film crew they could work well with before all the crews were assigned. To maintain a

higher quality of news coverage for the station and reduce friction, crew assignments were often made with some consideration of what people worked well together.

Competition between Men and Women

In Chapter VII, women and black men were shown to be groups in competition with one another as more women moved into TV news. Tension between these two groups was apparent in the mid-seventies. A black male, a correspondent, emphasized this point:

> More women in TV does nothing for me. I do not think black people find it entertaining to see more women. I do not want to come off as a male chauvinist, and women have been excluded, but they are not a minority. That there are more women does not necessarily open things up for others.

Women also mentioned tensions with men and minority group members, and justified themselves in this competition by stressing their greater drive and competence:

> We sort of fight them. They jeopardize our positions too.
>
> . . .
>
> Women are much more ambitious and try harder. I'm not sure blacks do. This has been the complaint. Some think minorities are owed something. There is not so much of that with women.
>
> . . .
>
> Status makes a definite difference. Women are not accepted by male reporters. Women have a very hard time on and off the air. ----- ----- will do anything to get me out. When we go to two hours of news, I well be anchor. This threatens him--if we do. They have hired a lot of extra people, obviously getting ready.

The news director at a local station explained that tensions

resulted because women and minorities were not yet secure in their positions:

> Because there is more to prove, the pressure on a woman is more than the pressure on a man if she was taken off the women's segregated area. The same for a black or Hispanic or anybody who has things to overcome. You know, I'm sure it was the same thing for the first Jewish people who went into a field, or the first Italian or the first Irish. If you don't start out with a full deck of cards to play with, and you have to go fight to get your deck or the cards are missing, it is just harder on you than it is on other people. It's a fact of life.

A network executive thought that the competition among women, minorities, and white male newscasters was typical of what was going on in other industries, but that white women, especially, have certain advantages:

> From what I'm able to see, it's a competition between minorities and women and not necessarily in our industry. They are seeing the white female get ahead. And that will go for J. C. Penny or Citibank just as much as it will go for the networks. The women are making better strides than the minorities. That's a fact. So there is a certain amount of resentment. It's not necessarily confined to news or confined to the broadcasting industries. . . . In my opinion, women have an edge because women, specifically white women, tend to be more articulate, salable, and presentable than minority males. I think it has to do more with the white male who is able to relate to a white female on a business level a lot easier than with a minority male and a minority female. And I think that, numberwise, white women are more available. . . . It seems to me minority females are going more toward the executive type positions than the minority males who are still going for the labor type of position or the technical type of position.

Several black newscasters reported racism was still deeply imbedded in their work relationships. A black woman correspondent described the racism she had encountered as

more subtle and impersonal than in the past and, consequently, more difficult to deal with:

> I don't think just because you see women and you see blacks around here that those two problems have been addressed and removed. I don't think it's gotten worse. There have been some improvements. . . . There are a lot of things that are not just individual acts. Someone once said something about racism, that it is just not random individual acts, but it is kind of institutionalized, a built-in kind of thing. That people at the time they are behaving a certain way don't even recognize it, because this is the way it's always been. And that is more insidious and it's more difficult to identify. It's more difficult to do anything about it. If somebody just walked in and called me a nigger, that's something you deal with immediately. But if it is something more subtle than that, it's hard to get a handle on it. Things that might have been common say ten years, fifteen years ago, in terms of attitudes, language, and behavior and all that, probably have improved, because people just can't do things that could be blatently sexist or racist. But I think certain things again that aren't just random acts of individual malevolence have not improved that enormously.

A black newsman angrily described the racism he encountered at his station:

> I have to go around here in this business and still have to hear black jokes. "Hi ya all." and "Put him in the back of the bus." Clearly, there is a keen awareness that I am a black. In this competitive business, where I am doing well and competing with others, it is one of the things still surfacing. You may be up there doing this, but you are a nigger. By and large the average person in this business has very few relations with blacks. I'm an acceptable black--educated, look nice, speak right. It is a basic ignorance. I believe it has to do with hate attitudes between us all.

He described the situation for black women as being less threatened or threatening than that of black men:

> I do not say black women have it better than black men. They really don't. Black women are less

> threatening than black males. That's my gut reaction. It is easier to deal with women. I do not mean anything bigoted by that.

When asked why it was more difficult for whites to deal with a black man, he searchd a few moments for an answer and then said, "There is always an underlying thing, a fear, that a black guy will punch you in the face. It is just that primitive." Another black man, a correspondent and anchorman, thought the traditional fear and hostility whites felt towards black men was evident in TV news departments. White men were threatened by masculine black males, in a manner that implied deep, underlying insecurities, similar to those underlying slavery and all racism. They thus preferred black women as newscasters.

> Just from observation, if you watch TV news, you see large amounts of white females. When white women moved in, it was easier for stations to hire them. It was easier to work with white women. . . . It is nothing new. It has always been that way in the society. During slavery the docile male was put in the kitchen. The black buck, anyone who looked militant, was kept in the fields. The light female was taken into the house. I think the slave mentality still exists. I think the white man finds it difficult to deal with a black male. He would rather promote a black female to a high position. The black female is not a threat. The black male is a threat. Is easier to put white females into positions. The FCC does not care what minorities are hired. Women can be both. The audience will accept whatever is put on, as long as a person is doing a good job, and the guy out there is watching news programs to be informed.

Techniques of Reducing Tension

By the mid-seventies all three networks had devised programs intended to reduce racial tensions. One network

executive reported,

> Racism exists. It is the way of life in this country. Of course, we're going to have it. This network conducts numerous seminars for blacks and other minorities here. We try to deal with it, to reduce it.

Another executive at the same network further explained that the network formally encourages cooperation between workers of different levels, in which the higher ranking people act as sponsors who assist workers pursuing career routes. This program allows the network to develop talent and allows employees to discover channels for moving up in the company's hierarchy without relying entirely upon informal networks and strategies. However, these techniques were more likely to be used outside the news department and certainly outside of newscasting. At this network's flagship station none of the minority or women newscasters had moved into the news department from other areas of the company, except if from the news departments of other owned and operated stations.

A news director at an independent station spoke of the newswoman's situation as follows:

> I think it's a little difficult for a woman who hasn't worked in a newsroom before when she comes in. If they've already worked in newsrooms, they know a newsroom is kind of like the rest and recreation area for a bunch of combat soldiers, with everybody going out snapping towels at people's butts only because it is a release from the pressure of the day. You can't make the world change for anybody. But, you know, they adjust well; they make their own rules. Somebody is out there playing grab-ass and the woman says, "Keep your hands off me," and they keep their hands off the same way they

> keep their hands off a man. I will not tolerate anybody abusing anybody. But, on the other hand, the world doesn't change.

Several respondents described techniques they used in relations with co-workers. A black reporter said she found relating with whites or minorities, men or women, was an individual matter that

> has to do with how you conduct yourself. There are some you do not associate with and some you are close to. I may be very friendly with a white man and have nothing to do with a black man. It is individual.

But white anchorwoman thought women should be more supportive of one another:

> I've had a kind of unwritten rule in my own head that there are too few of us in a news department to be pitted against each other. That sometimes is the case. My feeling is there are so few women we have to be supportive of one another. I think I have found, in recent years, much more camaraderie among most of the women. Not everybody, and I'm not making a blanket statement on that. But many of them, I feel, really are this way. I try to be supportive.

Another white newswoman disagreed with this view and said she found it easier to work with colleagues of the opposite sex:

> I tend to be friendlier with men. It is very competitive among women, and among women it is very subtle. I think it is fear. When competing with a man, there is no competition. When it is with a woman, she is shaped like you are, has a voice like yours, a story from a woman's view. I think men are probably the same way. I've noticed it a little. For instance, on the scene of a news story, women won't talk to me, men will.

Still several woman reporters explained they made their job more secure by developing informal contacts and relation-

ships which took into account the power structure of the company. One woman reporter explained her strategy as follows:

> I certainly do all I can to solidify myself with powerful people where I am. I have a backer, a very powerful executive. I have direct bosses whose whim might change from one day to the next, like find a pretty lady to put in my spot. I go over their heads and court executives. It is more important for women to do this, if one of them falls in love when the glamourous lady walks in and wants to give her my spot.

A black newsman pointed out that he had been brought into his present position by an official high up in the organization, even higher than that of the news director. He did not think he would have been in that news department if this sponsor had not backed him.

Another newswoman explained that it was important not to expect women to behave the same way as men even if they occupy similar positions:

> Men and women are different. It is a basic fact. It is the nature of things. We all had mamas and papas when we were young; we still have mamas and papas when we are working. A woman cannot act in the same way a man does. It doesn't work. I have to do things in my own way, and I do things as a woman. You cannot work effectively if you are a woman and try to act like a man. There are differences. This is the way it is, but it is not sexism. It is just different. I can work well with men, but I work as a woman, not as a man.

A black correspondent spoke of a certain kind of recognition that blacks extended to other blacks within his company:

> I think all black people relate to one another in one way that is different than with white people. We have our language, dialect, but we all work together. Working together allows us to bear down some on those old boundaries. I will speak to guards, script-writers, and so on--people on a much lower level--because we are black. There is a difference.

Newscasting Competence

Journalistic skills had long been a primary consideration determining who was hired, but as pressure built up to employ minorities and women in television news, there were times when greater weight was given to other qualifications, such as television experience in areas other than news or to one's personal appearance as an obvious member of a minority group. Besides the types of people who might be seen, the kind of reporting that one did, and the manner in which their reports were presented contributed additionally to the imagery of women and minority newscasters.

Increasingly, the minorities and women employed in newscasting had to meet universal standards. A black newswoman said that competition between stations and networks resulted in demands for efficiency.

> The crazy part of this business is they have such a preoccupation about competition, doing the popular thing. My impression of management is that they want the most efficient person. That is the bottom line. It has to go back to competition. Black or white, they will fire you.

We have already pointed out that black newscasters complained about blacks being put on the air who lacked

sufficient training or skill. Women were distressed by the charge that beauty was favored over competence. Pushing the unqualified minority group member or woman in front of the camera was regarded as a hindrance to their respective groups. They resented this.

Stations watched the preferences of audiences for individual newscasters by regularly commissioning surveys of the popularity of newscasters among the viewing audience. Some stations informed individual newscasters of their ratings, though the ratings of other newscasters were kept confidential. Besides survey data, letters and telephone calls were another kind of audience response available to newscasters, but these are often unreliable ways of assessing a newscaster's performance. People concerned enough to write in or call usually had a particular interest.

A few reporters discussed responses from the viewing audience. Especially frustrating to women newscasters were comments and questions about their clothes and hair instead of their news reports. Several said that if they did a poor job someone might call the station to criticize it. Occasionally audiences responded to their statuses as minorities or women. A black reporter told of a hostile reaction from viewers who called the station one evening because all the newscasters presented on-camera in the news show were minority group members:

> There is rampant racism. One weekend there were four of us [minorities], ----- -----. who is in Washington now, ----- -----. who was fired last week, and ----- -----, who was anchorman, and me. We got a barrage of calls. Some of them said they would never tune in again. Management takes that into account.

Not all audience reaction, however, was so hostile. An executive director reported that audiences increasingly accept minority newscasters and judge them on the basis of competence:

> Very rarely are there comments about reporters. Maybe about how a story is covered. Basically the minority reporter is still a novelty, but the white audience accepts black and Puerto Rican reporters. They do not see color. They see the reporter and judge the job he does. If he is a rotten reporter, black, green, or other, that is what they complain about.

Yet two women reporters, one white and the other black, said they received positive feedbacks from the audience that reflected their and the ausiences' statuses:

> I get a lot of nice comments from women. Women feel good about seeing a woman reporting news. Women say they get a kick out of seeing women jumping in with their boots on like men.
>
> . . .
>
> Letters that I receive say, "We are proud of you, a black woman," or, "We like to see a black woman." Letters refer to the racial line.

The New York stations had brought some women and minorities with little or no television news experience into newscasting if they were regarded as having a good potential. A successful example was Giraldo Rivera, who was hired by WABC-TV and sent to a local university to attend a special summer program for minorities who were beginning in

television news. Several respondents pointed out that on-the-job training had been important to them and some said that their stations had been generous in providing such assistance. Others combined work and school on their own initiative to improve their skills. During interviewing for this study, some television executives admitted that earlier there had been a rush to find minorities and women and some unsuitable people had been hastily hired. Some of these early recruits succeeded while others did not. They had also given greater weight to a woman's personal attractivess than they did in the mid-seventies. As much as these practices were resented, one can argue that some of the criticism about incompetency was also unfair. When minorities and women had had little access to jobs in television news, the complaint that had been voiced by black activists, that their backgrounds and preparation for newscasting could hardly be expected to fit into the prevailing career patterns immediately after newscasting opened up to them. In fact, many of the women and minorities who worked as newscasters had never expected to do this work.

Television newscasting was not an occupation that encouraged the aspirations of young women or minority group members who grew up prior to the late sixties and the seventies. Anyone who watched television news saw that it was an occupation monopolized by white men. Many who were

working as newscasters in the seventies had gotten into it after starting out towards different career goals. For example, an anchorwoman and correspondent who had been working as a model on the West Coast described how she accidentally got into newscasting in 1973:

> I went out to lunch with a news director who needed an anchorwoman. He said I was a college grad, was familiar with TV--I had done commercials--and he asked me to anchor his show. I had done all the things a little girl does, dancing lessons, speech lessons, beauty contests, modeling, etc. I never imagined I would do this.

Another white newswoman who had begun her career in television news attested to the accidental nature of her career:

> I got into TV news by accident. The day after my high school graduation, I got a summer job in at a television station. It was in 1968 and they had to have some women. That was in Minneapolis.

A black network correspondent also described the haphazard beginning of his career in television news in 1970:

> I was out of work. I was offered a TV job by a station in Iowa. I came in as a photographer and all round bottom of the heap sort of person. . . . Then I worked in Columbus, Ohio reporting and anchoring. I've been in New York the last two years.

In all these cases, it was apparent that the pressure to hire minorities and women constituted the "accident" that gave these individuals their opportunity.

Another black newsman recalled the lack of information about media occupations among minority people:

> There are a lot who never tried to get into the media. There was no pipeline to let them know they could try. There was no pipeline being used to admit beginners. There is always some winnowing out. If eighteen try and one gets in, that's OK, but there should be more trying to get in.

A black woman reporter who did prepare for her career by majoring in journalism in college, first went to work for a public agency, writing TV and news shows which helped her move on to employment in television news at a commercial station where she eventually became a correspondent. She described her career route as fraught with difficulty:

> Through that job I met the news director here. That job prepared me for this job. Much to my chagrin I came in as a secretary. I had always said I would never do that, though it happened. After an eternity, or what seemed like an eternity, one and a half years, I moved into the job of general reporter, writer, and up.

Marjorie Margolies, who worked for WNBC-TV during the early seventies, had been teaching for several years when she decided to pursue a career in television. She began as a volunteer at an educational station, putting in long work weeks in order to gain experience and finally got into a paid job in television.[8]

Some television newswomen, however, had very strong backgrounds in journalism before going to television news. Liz Trotta, for example, whose professional competence was admired by several respondents, had become a seasoned newspaper journalist prior to working in television news. Another, Lynn Sherr, was a correspondent for CBS who began

her career at a woman's magazine and then worked for seven years for the Associated Press before she went into television news.

Two kinds of experience seemed to be of value to women and minorities seeking jobs in television newscasting, experience in the print media and in areas of broadcasting other than television news. In the print media, writing skills could be developed and demonstrated. Then if one could shift to the writing techniques of television news, learn film techniques, and effectively communicate news orally on camera, one could find opportunities in television news. Television experience was valuable even if it were not in news. Women were able to use previous work, such as in talk shows and commercials, as springboards to television news. Any kind of on-camera work allowed future newscasters to develop the presence necessary for television and the speaking skills appropriate for newscasting.

Not all the newscasters interviewed aspire to permanent careers in newscasting. Several who said they regarded themselves primarily as journalists also spoke of writing novels or plays on the side and hoped in the future to be able to earn their livelihoods as independent writers. Several minority newscasters had recently published books, both novels and non-fiction. One newscaster was a serious painter who had shown his work in

New York. Another newscaster had at times been a restauranteur.

Several respondents had moved into television news from radio where they had worked in various capacities, though not necessarily in radio news. Among women, experience as radio talk show hostesses was often the stepping stone to television news. Two black women newscasters who had worked in radio said they really wanted to be actresses, and if a good acting opportunity came along, they would take it. In the meanwhile, they worked as TV reporters. As one of these women said, "I'm doing this because one has to live, and I like to live well." So fine was the distinction between show business and TV news to some of our respondents, that some--men as well as women--said they hoped one day to have their own televison show, usually interviewing of some sort or presenting cultural subjects rather than news.

Many of the newscasters interviewed regarded TV news as a form of show business. They regarded themselves as "talent" or personalities and performers first and journalists second. But all agreed one had to be able to communicate effectively in order to do newscasting.

An impression received from newscasters during the interviewing was that they had little or no awareness of the viewing audience beyond the camera while reporting a news story. Feedback on their performances came from various

sources. If reporting in the studio, their audience was the other people in the studio. The comments of colleagues or of directors and producers to whom the newscasters were responsible were the significant responses while work was being performed. When covering a news story in the field, bystanders were a live audience. Indeed, to be aware of the vast viewing audience receiving the message via the camera seemed to be too awesome to think about while one was actually on camera. This, however, did not rule out a concern about viewers. Newscasters considered it important to be popular or at least accepted by the viewing audience. The comparative standing of each news show as determined by the ratings was generally known. Indirect responses, which included letters, telephone calls to the station, and Q scales, ratings that measured how popular and how well a newscaster was recognized, were important. These various indicators that affected one's continuing employment and earnings also functioned as measures of competence.

Anchoring

Trends developed during the seventies that helped to enhance the status and popularity of reporters and correspondents and to bring them into closer competition with anchorpeople. After broadcasters placed minority and women newscasters more prominantly before the viewing audience, a greater splitting and sharing of the anchoring function followed. Among the networks, ABC News was most

notable for breaking with the stereotyped anchor. First, in 1976, Barbara Walters was officially designated as the network's anchorwoman, to co-anchor with Harry Reasoner. When the ratings did not rise remarkably following this change, she was increasingly used for special assignments which apparently suited her talents better. That took Walters away from the news studio and allowed the anchor spot to become more fluid when others filled in for her. After Reasoner left ABC, the network adopted a new anchoring style, which featured three people telecasting from different cities. In this format, there were often three types of newscasters, such as a black man, a woman, and a white man, which made ABC News the first major network to integrate anchoring on its prime evening news show. NBC and CBS were locked into long established formats, white male co-anchors at NBC and a single white male anchor at CBS. It was in the weekend news slots that minorities and women were allowed to anchor at these networks.

At the local level, a more flexible pattern of anchoring was evident. Even though news shows had regular anchors, reporters and correspondents were often given an opportunity to take a turn anchoring, as substitutes or as candidates to permanent anchoring assignments. As a consequence, many newscasters labeled themselves anchorpeople as well as reporters or correspondents. This trend and the increased exposure of reporters, seen in their

reports at the news scene or in the news studio, helped make them as well known and popular as anchor people. The favored pattern was to pair a man and a woman. One station, WNEW-TV, presented a threesome which usually included a black man. The news studios built by most stations during the mid and later seventies included extra desk space so reporters could be presented in news shows sitting with the anchorpeople. The constant search for talent at some stations opened up occasional opportunities to reporters and correspondents to anchor. As a result, traditional anchorpeople dominated news shows even less. Even though Walter Cronkite was acknowledged more than ever as the foremost anchorman in televison and broadcasters showed no tendency to dispense with this role, the distinctions between anchors and reporters became less clear. The limelight was bright enough for many to share in its glow.

One local news director described how anchoring in local news had changed in the New York market:

> It is really a function of longevity. Roger Grimsby has been anchoring on ABC for now about eight years. Jim Jensen has been on CBS for thirteen years. There has been a greater turnover up till recently at NBC. Chuck Scarborough has now been there three and a half years. And you are talking about what is maybe three or four or five positions--that's all there are--and people who have been in them a long time. What you have seen is a trend to additional people. It is in that area that you got in extra people. It is because of the toughness and the reluctance in New York when you have success to change, whoever you are. In Philadelphia there have been a number of female co-anchors during the week, and black co-anchors and anchors on all three network affiliates. In fact, they had a black

> anchor person. And you have seen more of it in Los Angeles. In New York, I think it has been a functioning of the length of time and the success of the people who are in those jobs. As that changes or as those people move out, you'll see more minorities and women anchoring.

At the network level few women were allowed to anchor even though Barbara Walters had broken into the mainstream evening news. The time slots on weekends and morning or daytime hours allowed women opportunities to anchor network news. For minorities, this intensified the competiton in the "weekend ghetto," but, for the networks this kind of scheduling posed little risk in the prime news hours. An executive at ABC said,

> I think you find that, especially on the network, the majority type of people are on right now. I watch the news, and I watch to see specifically ABC, not because I'm working here, but because I want to see the difference between the network news before Arledge took over and what he's doing. I can see them bring Sylvia chase into "Good Morning America" where Steve Bell used to be. And I can see them co-anchoring a network show when they've got Sylvia Chase and Tom Jerrell co-anchoring. And I think it is his way of just trying out the strongest person, but giving an on-air opportunity to these people.
>
> [Is the weekend a training time?]
>
> Not necessarily, but if you take in network, there are certain times, like Monday through Friday is prime time, and maybe not even Friday but Monday through Thursday. On Saturday, possibly, you can do a little bit more experimenting. . . . So if he is going to experiment, he'll probably experiment on Saturday or maybe the morning news rather than the evening. The evening has always been a tough nut to crack. I know that local tends to be a little bit more of a training ground or a spot to experiment rather than network.

Summary

The activists' original aims, to pub pressure on broadcasters to integrate television images, to include minority viewpoints in news reports, and to expand the employment of minorities, were only partially fulfilled by the mid and later seventies. Images had become mixed but the distribution of different types of individuals was uneven, as shown by the continuing preference for white males in the prestigeous anchor spots and the greater representation of minority group members and women in weekend slots. Generally, respondents agreed that integration was achieved more below than above managerial levels. Newscasters had little opportunity to present viewpoints other than those approved by the decision-makers in their news departments; they had only limited control over what they reported, depending upon what assignments were given, whether one got the use of necessary equipment and the assistance of film crews, and, lastly, air time allotted for one's story.

At the time of interviewing, conscious efforts were being made to recruit women and minorities on all news staffs, even though some executives denied that FCC regulations influenced their hiring choices. Respondents indicated that all news departments in New York were looking for Hispanic newscasters. At that time only one news operation was not criticized for employment discrimination

by their respective employee respondents who were interviewed. All the other stations covered by our study were criticized for this by some respondents; but there were other respondents in the same news departments who commented favorably about the fairness of management towards these minority group members and women. In sum, the opinions of respondents held of their respective employers on the issue of integration was mixed.

Newscasters, regardless of ethnic, racial, and sex statuses, tended to emphasize behavior as professionals and adopt the values that assured advancement in their careers. As a result, economic censorship was still a significant factor controling newscaster behavior. The important evaluations of a newscaster's work, in addition to those inferred from ratings, were made by news executives and co-workers.

Professional values affected TV newscasters in amother way. The widespread belief that a professional journalist could cover any news story conflicted with the belief that the employment of minority group members or women in newscasting could overcome the deficiencies in news reporting, which had been the basis of activists' complaints. As a result, there were often differing opinions about the contribution that a minority person or woman might make to newscasting because of their extra-professional statuses. Even though specialized journalists,

such as science or consumer reporters, had become popular, to be known as a "black reporter," or a reporter of "women's news," was regarded by most newscasters as a stigma that would limit their careers.

The lack of awareness of employment discrimination by company executives still impeded progress towards integration in the mid-seventies. By this time, however, the broadcast companies were attempting to stimulate a greater consciousness of this problem. This attempt to get executives to deal with employment discrimination was, however, a defensive measure. In face of effective equal employment laws, the possible cost of failing to comply had become too great. In this sense, a Conflicting response, according to our paradign in Chapter II, was still operating.

Although women's groups actively pressured broadcasters to employ more women, it appeared that to a certain extent broadcasters were also responding to women according to the Co-opting response. Recalling that broadcasters had increased the number of newswomen on their staffs when under pressure from blacks in the sixties, the rapid advancement of women into newscasting in the seventies suggested the broadcasters were again exercising a Co-opting response in respect to women. The opinions of television company officials, that white male executives preferred working with women because white women were easier to work with and that

minority women were less threatening than minority men, suggested this response.

In sum, all the tensions of the society related to racial, ethnic, and sex statuses were evident in the news departments of New York's commercial TV stations. Given the competitive nature of the newscaster's occupation, tensions were inevitable. Working according to professional standards, however, became paramount among news broadcasters and this helped to reduce day-to-day frictions. Yet when questions arose concerning job assignments and promotions, the extra-professional statuses became an additional factor linked to the purely occupational and professional issues.

Footnotes

[1]News release from the Radio and Television News Directors Association, 1735 DeSales N.W., Washington, D.C., Dec. 6, 1976, pp. 1-2; Vernon Stone, "TV and Radio News Staffs and Salaries Surveyed," in RTNDA Communicator, Dec. 1976, pp. 9-11.

[2]Window Dressing on the Set: Women and Minorities in Television, Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, August 1977), pp. 88-130, 148.

[3]Ibid., p. 108.

[4]Helen Epstein, "Women on the Air," in Marvin Barrett (ed.), The Alfred I. DuPont-Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism 1970-1971: State of Seige, (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, Inc., 1971), p. 143.

[5]Ibid., pp. 143-144.

[6]"Women in Television News," a breakfast and panel discussion held at Abraham & Strauss, Brooklyn, New York, Sept. 11, 1976.

[7]Epstein, p. 143.

[8]New York Women, Sept. 24, 1974, p. 3.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has been concerned with the process of integration in television newscasting and the images newscasters project on the TV screen. We have sought to ascertain how these images changed from the overwhelming dominance of stereotypical white male images to ones that were diversified, including those of minority group members and women. We have shown that several factors restricted the hiring of minorities and women as newscasters up until the early 1960's, but changes in the television industry and in the society at large helped to facilitate change in established practices. From the broadcaster's perspective, a gradual shift occurred and the hiring of minority and women newscasters offered broadcasters certain advantages. To better understand this change, we have examined the experiences and observations of minority and women newscasters and station officials who have been involved in the production of television news and, consequently, the projection of newscaster images.

The material on which this study is based was derived largely from publications, other library sources and

interviews with minority and women newscasters and television executives. In reconstructing the historical changes in the development of television news, we found that pressures from various minority and feminist groups strongly affected newscaster images. Action taken by government agencies in response to these pressures were an additional and often decisive factor affecting newscaster images. We have examined how the services of minority and women newscasters were utilized by broadcasters. Interview data provided information on how minority and women newscasters viewed their situation in television news and the resulting effect on newscaster images. Printed sources provided valuable information about trends in the television industry and about the policies and practices of broadcasters.

The following pages will provide a summary of the major findings of the study and the conclusions drawn from them.

Summary and Conclusions

Structural Factors

Broadcasters were hardly aware of the concerns of blacks or other minorities about their images in the early 1960's, and had little incentive to become involved in the matter. Although broadcasters had long been proud of their public service, from the days of the earliest radio transmission to the present, in commercial broadcasting the

profit motive was primary. Advertisers were the broadcaster's customers; assembling audiences to receive advertising messages was the profit-making tool. Programs that attracted the largest audiences increased the value of television time and earned broadcasters the greatest revenues. Programming was designed to have mass appeal, that is, to attract all groups so as to create the largest audiences. Broadcasters could not serve specialized interests during hours when most people would be able to watch television, as in the evening hours. To do that would help the ratings of competing stations; even one unpopular show would encourage viewers to switch to the programs of competing stations. As a result, little attention was given to minority tastes and interests during the evening hours.

The concept of a minority audience, as understood in 1960, referred to viewers whose tastes were culturally more elitist than those of the general television audience, to people who wanted to watch more artistic programming than was usually scheduled. Technically, the concept could refer to minorties if one considered programming that related to the specific interests of a minority group but which did not attract other types of viewers. The concept also came to be associated with news programming in the early sixties, because market research studies revealed that the demographic characteristics of news audiences differed from audiences for popular entertainment. News viewers were more

affluent and better educated than viewers generally. Stations began selling news by stressing its "minority" appeal. By switching to a magazine concept as well, advertisers could more efficiently and economically aim their messages at the consumers most likely to buy their products. These marketing techniques raised the earnings of news programs, demonstrated that broadcasters could respond flexibly as conditions required. They could also exploit special characteristics of audiences during the prime evening hours.

Newscasting was a white man's occupation. So narrow was the range of acceptable nuances in the images projected by newscasters at that time, that many well qualified white newsmen were unacceptable as nescasters, particularly as anchormen.

As the Black Movement intensified during this period, news programming made apparent the incongruity in the images projected by television. News coverage of the Black Movement televised pictures of blacks that were forceful and hostile and showed blacks in leadership roles--types of images that were excluded from other television programming. The news coverage of black activists contrasted sharply with the portrayals of blacks that might be seen in any other kind of programming where they were restricted to subordinate types of roles. News programming related to black images in other ways. As newscasters were

almost exclusively white males, this reinforced the belief in the black community that the news media were controlled by whites and represented only white interests. Moreover, as newsmen sought to cover black protests and social disorders, they often found themselves in unfamiliar areas trying to get stories from and about people with whom they had little rapport. Reporting credible news stories about blacks, the big story in American society in the sixties, became exceedingly difficult.

Still another development within the Black Movement related to newscaster images. Blacks organized to protest the stereotyping in television and to campaign for better on-air portrayals of blacks. All television images were a target, as were the images of motion pictures and advertising. Blacks aimed at breaking down the taboos that limited how they could be seen in the media. The leaders of these efforts, black and non-black activists, believed that television helped to shape public opinion in the society towards minorities. Consequently, if images were made to show blacks in a positive manner, then blacks generally would be granted more respect in the society.

Minority employment was directly linked to media images. First, in order to change attitudes more minorities had to be employed in those occupations that projected images of people in the mass media. Second, if statuses depicted in minority images were raised, the resulting

improvement in public opinion towards minorities would open up jobs and occupations that had excluded minorities. This widely accepted belief, though untested, became the motivating factor for activist pressure on broadcasters for black on-air newscasters. Other minorities joined in pressuring television broadcasters on behalf of their own groups. In the late sixties, women activists made women's images in the media an issue around which they organized campaigns to reform the distribution of images of women projected on television.

During the period examined in this study, new structural factors emerged that affected newscaster images. Broadcasters cautiously changed the proportions of minority and women newscaster's on their staffs, and the time slots in which they appeared. The practice of presenting minority newscasters as anchors on the weekends more than in the weekday evening news resulted in the on-air segregation of minority anchormen and anchorwomen into a week-end ghetto. The traditional preference for a white male type as anchor persisted, although they were now often teamed with a woman or a minority group member. New programming formats that increased the visibility of individual newscasters reporting their own news stories heightened the recognition of those who did not anchor and helped to narrow differences in status between anchors and other newscasters. Popular newscasters were publicized by

their stations to attract viewers to news shows, and presenting different types of newscasters was a way of appealing to diverse segments of the audience.

The collection of data on the employment of minorities and women at television stations required by the FCC counted women and minorities separately, which gave minority women a greater weight in the employment statistics of a station because they were counted twice. Although the broadcasters' primary concern never ceased to be the ratings and profits, news shows functioned as station showcases and the integration of their newscaster staffs symbolized to the viewing public the station's acceptance of equal employment. Newscasters, regardless of race, ethnicity, or sex, were expected to contribute to the ratings of news programming. Once stations had acquired a substantial number of women and minority newscasters, the capabilities and appeal of newscasters were given precedence over the desire to find particular types to appear on the air.

New rules and new needs guided the practices of TV news in the mid-seventies. Conditions in the society had changed. Moreover, broadcasters became less fearful that audiences would not accept minorities and women as communicators of news. It had become prudent to consider minority groups so that these consumers would not be lost as advertising targets. The "rules" enforced by economic censorship in the seventies were often the reverse of

earlier ones maintained by this same mechanism. Yet relations with co-workers still acted as checks over individuals who might deviate from the accpeted practices of commercial television. Stations adopted protective strategies such as maintaining regular contact with leaders of minority and women's groups whom they had shunned in the past. Programs were organized to educate company officials about the wisdom of complying with equal employment rules. Further, advertisers had given up much of their resistance to having products associated with minorities and were willing to buy integrated programming.

New stereotypes replaced older ones. Women who report news tend to conform to what has become a recognizable style of newscasters, particularly in speech and appearance. Minority newscasters generally speak and act in the same manner as white newscasters. Rarely are regional or ethnic accents discernible; people who are visually different, ethnically or racially, usually speak the English typical of television.

Employment

Minorities were first hired as television newscasters in the New York Area in the early sixties. By 1963 each network employed a black reprter. During the next few years the local stations and the networks increased the numbers of minority personnel on their news staffs. Minority newscasters were so few, however, that critics

claimed that tokenism was a common practice. Some of the minorities hired during the sixties at local stations were women. A few more white women were added to local news staffs than had previously been employed. The addition of women to news staffs began in the mid-sixties, when demand for changes in the status of women were beginning to circulate; but this was before women activists organized campaigns to change television images of women. By the early seventies many more women were recruited into television news, when women's groups had indeed organized to pressure broadcasting officials.

In the New York Area the first minorities employed in TV news were blacks. Hispanics were hired in the late sixties and in the seventies, and for a while two Oriental women reported news.

Minorities and women were limited in what they were permitted to do as newscasters. In the early sixties, the black newsmen were first put on the air during marginal time slots, such as in the early morning. Gradually, they were brought into the evening news shows. Minorities and women were rarely allowed to anchor until the seventies, and even then--at most stations--they did not share anchoring equally with white males. Minority males have been permitted to anchor on weekends more than on weekday evenings on both local and network news. Even then, during the mid-seventies many local stations paired a minority person or a white

women with a white anchorman. The intermingling of newscasters with anchor people during a newscast, a pattern that has become evident in the late sixties, increased the number of newscasters seen in a given news show. Some stations rotated newscasters in the anchor spot, especially during summer months. They thus projected a greater variety of images and tested the audience appeal of newscasters who were potential anchors. On early evening network news, until the seventies, minority anchors could be seen only on the weekends. Anchorwomen were then also put in these time slots which heightened the competition between women and minority men. Often a minority man was teamed with a woman. Moreover, white males continued to anchor on weekend news shows. In network news on weekday evenings, only ABC's anchoring became integrated, when Barbara Walters co-anchored with Harry Reasoner and later when Max Robinson, a black, was featured as one of three anchors. CBS and NBC kept their successful formats of white male anchors.

Newscasters reported that blatant racism and sexism had in most cases disappeared, but they perceived that some still persisted and could affect one's career in newscasting. One's on-air presence could be affected if one's assignments were curtailed in some way, if the visual image of the newscaster was omitted in a news report in preference for a voice-over, if supporting services were inadaquate, as when a newscaster was assigned a balky film crew, or if

uncoordinated support in the studio caused disruptions when reporting a story live, such as when film clips failed to be shown at the expected time.

Although the need to cover the black community created jobs for minority newscasters, most minority newscasters said they refused to become specialists in black news. Acknowledging their special ability to cover the black community, most said they would do so in some cases, but not as a regular assignment; a truly professional newsman has to cover a much wider range of news stories. Most women claimed to shun "women's stories," though a few did prefer to do the feature story or the tradtitional woman's story. Some broadcasting executives admitted a preference for white women newscasters over minority newscasters, because they felt they faced a lesser cultural gap in the day-to-day work relationships and because they thought there were greater numbers of white women who were educated and qualified to do newscasting. The cultural gap between blacks and whites was most sharply pointed out by some black male newscasters who charged that the traditional fear and prejudice towards black men affected their careers as newscasters and, consequently, the opportunity for them to appear to the best advantage for themselves or their groups on the television screen.

Changes in the images of particular groups reflected whatever pressures on broadcasters were greatest at any

given time. When blacks were most active during the sixties, they were able to make significant gains, such as overcoming long standing taboos before there were any laws requiring equal employment. Women's groups became active in the seventies as the Black Movement dissipated, and women began making greater gains than blacks. By the mid-seventies, when it became evident that charges of employment discrimination could have punishing consequences if broadcasters were found guilty, broadcasters increased efforts to find Hispanic newscasters and to keep a substantial representation of the New York Area's major minority groups on their staffs. Newscasters who were members of smaller minority groups in this area, such as Orientals and American-Indians who were also included in reports to the FCC, were virtaully absent from New York news shows.

Although white males had monopolized television newscasting in the past, the movement of minorities and women into this occupation did not force out many white men. White males faced intensified competition, but they remained the most visible type in newscasting. Television news had expanded so much since the early sixties that there were opportunities for them as well as for minorities and women. The white male competing with the newcomers to newscasting simply did not enjoy as great an expansion of opportunity as would have been the case had the old

restrictions stayed in force. Expanding opportunities allowed all groups to benefit.

Once substantial numbers of minorities and women had gained entry into newscasting, this benefitted broadcasters because they were able to draw upon larger pools of talent and could use reporters with more varied backgrounds. The broadcasters profited despite their own previous resistance to employment integration.

Television News

The changes that occurred in television news during the sixties and seventies that aided minorities and women in gaining access to newscasting were manifold. The amount of television time allotted to news programming increased, and the first hiring of minority reporters occurred when news programs were lengthened from fifteen minutes to a half hour. Later in the sixties and then in the seventies, still more women and minorities were added to news staffs whenever stations lengthened their news shows. Other techniques adopted to improve news reporting required larger staffs. As light weight equipment became available, and as videotape replaced film, reporters increasingly went into the field, becoming producers to make their own on-the-scene news reports. Newscasters were usually shown in these visual reports, and this kind of reporting replaced much of the "talking head" format that had previously dominated television news. This helped to elevate the status of

newscasters. They became familiar to viewers and an important audience appeal. Stations in turn promoted newscasters as personalities in their news shows. The expansion of newscasting staffs thus increased the opportunities for minorities and women. Those minority newscasters who became popular with viewers became valuable to their stations. A few newscasters like Barbara Walters and Heraldo Rivera who enjoyed large followings of fans left news to become personalities in other kinds of programming.

Broadcasters had provided news and coverage of special events on sustaining time in the early fifties when television was gaining popular acceptance, and prestige was the main reward received for these services. By the sixties, however, finding sponsors for evening news programs was no longer a problem, but the ratings for news programming were not high and the costs of producing news often exceeded the earnings. By the seventies, popular local news shows were earning substantial profits for their stations. As local news had become extremely competitive, new formats and more glamourous sets were used to broaden audience appeal. All news shows succumbed to some degree to using Happy Talk techniques and the Eyewitness News approach, which redesigned news shows according to the findings of audience studies. This led to changes in the kinds of stories presented on news shows and the manner of reporting them. Such changes favored minority and women

newscasters; presenting a greater variety of people added additional dimensions to the appeals that were then pervading local news.

Another trend accompanying the expansion of television news was the continuing effort to improve the quality of news reports. From the early sixties, the emphasis when hiring newscasters was that they be experienced journalists. The first minorities hired by New York broadcasters did indeed have backgrounds in journalism, usually newspaper experience. In the later sixties when broadcasters needed minority reporters to do the stories on inner city disorders, experienced journalists were still being recruited, but occasionally there was a relaxation of this requirement; broadcasters had difficulty finding minorities with the desired experience. This background was in short supply, because of years of employment discrimination in the print industries and because stations in many cities of the nation were beginning to recruit minorities at the same time. Consequently, broadcasters brought in new people from diverse backgrounds. Some minority newscasters without news backgrounds succeeded after only brief but intensive training. A number of women and Hispanics who had little or no experience in journalism or television were hired to report news along with others who had come from the print media or had worked behind the camera in television news.

Women and minorities could not easily be recruited from smaller television markets as easily as white newsmen, because they had not been readily accepted in smaller market areas and hence were not readily available. Broadcasters did hire less experienced minorities in order to integrate their newscaster staffs, but these new people faced a number of barriers to success. They had to compete with well seasoned newscasters recruited because they had been successful in other markets. The minority member who failed to surmount such a hurdle also was viewed as blemishing the image of all minority newscasters, an effect which was widely resented. Women in this situation were often regarded as being hired for their looks more than for their reporting ability, a charge that was not always untrue. But as newscasting grew to be a popular occupation, more people were attracted to this work and prepared for it in colleges and journalism schools, and this increased the supply of available talent. Therefore, by the mid-seventies, broadcasters were demanding that minority and women newscasters meet the same standards of competence expected of any other category of people in newscasting. Generally, however, broadcasters continued to favor having white males in newscasting, and so the level of integration in this occupation tended to stabilize. Moreover, as the most prestigous positions were still dominated by white newsmen, minority men and women and white women had to vie with one

another for the positions allocated to them.

The Effect of Changes in the Larger Society

Changes occurring in the external society during the sixties and seventies supported the emerging newscaster images. The Black Movement caused all sectors of the society to reevaluate attitudes towards minorities as did the Women's Movement towards women. Blacks produced the initial thrust leading to change in television imagery, and these changes occurred at the same time that blacks began to seek and gain admission into occupations in many other industries. New laws and administrative decisions granting minorities and women greater civil rights and equal employment signaled an era of greater tolerance and led many Americans to follow govermentally enforced principles and ideals even though they often produced conflict or bitterness. Americans in all sectors of the society were being forced to question and examine their attitudes towards minorities and women. Moreover, as the society became more receptive to change, one group could help to open the way for another, as when women followed in the wake of pressures and precedents created by blacks.

The process of changing newscaster images went on over a lengthy and sustained period of time. The viewing public not only had time to adjust to accepting new televison images but could simultaneously observe minorities and women moving into many other spheres of the society.

What was new in one area parallelled the new in another; the break down of taboos in the images on television reflected and may have helped to cause other changes occurring in American society.

Local conditions contributed to the integration of newscaster images. The significant minorities in the New York Area, blacks and Puerto Ricans, were concentrated in the central core of the viewing area where television signals were strongest and reception was best. Moreover, these large groups of people were consumers of products advertised on television, and a loss of these markets would constitute a substantial sales loss when groups organized boycotts against products if discriminating companies. Less directly, other local events helped to integrate newscaster images. During the newspaper strike in 1962 the owned and operated stations experimented with using minority journalists from local newspapers. The AFTRA strike in the late sixties was another occasion when newcomers got a chance to go on the air. Thus minorities gained entry into new occupations and skills in the same ways that they traditionally had done,as in strike breaks.

Government

Government action was an important, perhaps necessary, influence on the change in the projected images of television. One of the earliest kinds of action taken by government agencies related to newscaster images was to hold

hearings such as conducted by a Congressional committee in 1962 and those held by the Human Rights Commissions of New York City and by New York State during the following year. Other inquiries followed. Commissions organized by the federal government to investigate violence and civil disorder reported on the deficiencies of the television news media and criticized the lack of minority representation in the images of newscasters. Television news, they charged, was not providing credible information to the black community. Moreover, it faced major problems in getting accurate news from and about minorities. Until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed, government agencies had no power to enforce compliance with their recommendations and had to rely mainly upon negative criticism and persuasion set forth in their reports as the means to changing broadcasters' behavior. Eventually broadcasters were subject to the enforcement of equal employment laws from two sources, license renewal challenges and suits brought against them because of employmemt discrimination. The FCC was given responsibility for overseeing equal employment in the television industry as part of the agency's regulatory powers in granting station licenses. The FCC was slow to accept this responsibility and it was not until 1970 that a method was instituted for collecting information on the employment of minorities, and on women in the next year. Citizen groups first had to win the right to challenge

television license applications throught the courts. The fear that the right to broadcast could be lost became one of the forces persuading broadcasters to integrate their staffs and images. As in other industries, suits were brought against broadcasting companies that failed to abolish employment discrimination. When NBC faced this kind of suit, one which was settled out of court in an agreement that awarded substantial sums of money to the aggrieved parties, other broadcasters took steps to avoid similar problems in their companies.

Broadcasters were still left with a good amount of discretion in the integration of their staffs and in the images they produced. Although some respondents claimed a quota system had been imposed upon television stations, it was not one that was rigidly enforced or even specifically prescribed. The FCC collected data that could indicate station integration only on an overall basis. Their criteria for an integrated staff were based upon such minimal cutting points that integration at lower levels would compensate for segregation at higher ones. One department, in fact, could make up for the deficiencies of another. Moreover, equal employment was enforced only after someone had successfully brought charges of discrimination against a station. The costs in money and effort to citizens' groups seeking to challenge licenses was so great that accepting small gains accumulated over time became the

most feasible way to achieve reform. Keeping pressure on broadcasters, with the force of law as a ultimate power, continued to be an important strategy of minority and women activists.

NOW's license challenge against WABC-TV was an important warning to all broadcasters in the area even though ABC successfully defended its posiion in the controversy. The success of the class action suit against NBC by women employees charging employment discrimination demonstrated that profits could indeed be jeopardized. To avoid the risk of future challenges against license renewals of law suits over employment discrimination, it was safer to assuage dissatisfactions before a conflict developed.

The Broadcaster's Response

During the period this study covered, broadcasters' attitudes and behavior towards minorities and women as newscasters underwent dramatic change. Blatant exclusions from the newscasting occupation gave way to acceptance. For decades broadcasters claimed that they did not discriminate against minorities, but an examination of the practices of the television industry indicates that--besides the prejudices harbored by some station officials who controlled the hiring of newscasters--a widespread fear of offending white audiences and losing advertising revenues ruled out the use of minorities or more than a token number of women as newscasters. Broadcasters, however, operate in an ever

changing social milieu; as conditions changed, the strategies and techniques used for pursuing the profit-making goal had to be reevaluated and readjusted to the new conditions. The constant factor underlying the process of change in newscaster images was the profits of the broadcaster. News programming was only a tool for this end.

Broadcasters responded cautiously to minority actions and to changes in societal conditions that effected the context in which they conducted business. The response to minority demands, a slow process of small, incremental concessions that took place over many years, allowed broadcasters to minimize the risks they faced in transforming newscaster images. They had the time to gain experience with using the new types of newscasters before making a full committment to integration.

Depending upon conditions, broadcasters exhibited complex responses during the long period when newscaster images were being transformed. In Chapter II we theorized that two variables were implicit in the broadcaster's response to social movements seeking to reform newscaster images, the power relationship with which activists affected the conditions under which the broadcaster conducted business and the broadcaster's perceptions of how the proposed changes would affect his ratings. By converting each variable into a dichotomy, the strong or weak force of a social movement and the positive or negative effect

perceived by the broadcaster, we found that at one time or another the responses of broadcasters fit all categories of our paradigm.

Accepting Response.--When a social movement is strong and the broadcaster perceives that the recommended changes will be of value to him, he accepts them relatively easily. This response was most noticable in 1967 and 1968 when urban disorders produced negative criticism of television news. These produced forceful pressures that caused broadcasters to take steps to employ minority newscasters who could go into the black community to cover needed stories. Stations had to protect themselves from gaps in the news about blacks, because these gaps threatened the over-all credibility of television news.

This response was evident again in the later seventies when television companies realized it was necessary to make their executives aware of the hazards they faced if the company was found guilty of employment discrimination. To protect profit levels and the right to keep a television license, it became important to the broadcaster to seriously consider changes minorities had been advocating for many years.

Conflicting Response.--When confronted with a forceful social movement perceived as having negative effects on his goals, the broadcaster resists complying with the demands for change. For many years, broadcasters saw no

value in using minority and women newscasters. The fact that it took from the early sixties to the later seventies, when equality in the images of the weekday evening news shows still had not yet been fully achieved, demonstrated the broadcaster's reluctance to implement change.

The timing of changes also shows this response operated. Resistance to image changes broke down as new situations and needs developed. When the image issue was first raised, broadcasters responded to minority demands with claims that no discrimination existed in their companies, with excuses that others were responsible, or with empty promises of cooperation. Confronted by a strong, militant black community, however, broadcasters relented somewhat and introduced token changes. They used unusual situations, such as the newspaper strike at the end of 1962, to experiment with using minority reporters on a temporary basis. These changes also occurred when news programs were lengthened, and the impact of minority images among a larger number of reporters working on-camera would be less noticable. To further ease the impact of departing from the dominance of white male on-air personnel when minority males were put on the air, broadcasters soon followed up this change with another. During the next few years, notably 1964 and 1965, local television stations hired several women, including one black woman, to report news. Black groups continued to pressure for reform in television

images, but with less public notice, and, consequently, with less force than earlier. Tokenism was spreading to other kinds of programming, as when a black actor, Bill Cosby, was co-starred with a white man in the weekly adventure series, "I Spy." By this time advertisers were cautiously integrating some of their commercials. In addition, broadcasters, who were proud of their service to the community, were becoming very competitive at the local level. Color TV had become predominant in newscasts, and the appeal of news was beginning to broaden. The outlook for television news as a profitable kind of programming was increasingly favorable. These factors made the negative criticism emerging in the late sixties a significant pressure on the broadcasters. Bringing more minorities into newscasting was one way of remedying the problem.

Broadcasters did present more minorities on newscasts in the late sixties when confronted with charges of being biased, of having an inability to cover black affairs, and in government reports concerned with violence mishandling their coverage of urban disorders. The spread of organized action, expecially the monitoring of television programming in order to document discrimination in television messages and to challenge license renewals, was a growing threat, even though the legal right of citizen groups to do this had not yet been established.

By the seventies broadcasters were again showing resistance to any further change in newscaster images. The Black Movement had lost force and the political climate had become less supportive of black interests. These factors eased the pressure on broadcasters. Moreover, as the decade began, the broadcasters were troubled by the removal of cigarette advertising from the air. Having experienced a reduction in revenues, they cut back on news budgets. Opportunities for minorites and everyone else in newscasting tightened up. By the time television revenues increased to their former levels, the situation had again changed, and new forces confronted broadcasters. The Black Movement continued to weaken, but women's groups had organized to press for changes in the on-air images of women. Accordingly, broadcasters stepped up the hiring of women, sometimes in preference to other minorities.

By the early seventies it was apparent that legislation to enforce equal employment could be effective and court decisions had determined that citizen groups could challenge license applications of television stations. These were new forces confronting broadcasters who continued to discriminate against minorities in employment and programming.

When finally faced with the fact that laws requiring equal employment could indeed be punishing if a broadcaster was found guilty of an infraction, television companies

changed their responses to minority groups. WABC-TV had refused to have any serious discussion with members of NOW or to recognize NOW as a group that should be included in the station's ascertainments of community needs until NOW petitioned the FCC to deny the renewal of their license. Even though WABC-TV won when the women's group took their complaint before the Court of Appeals, it nevertheless changed its response to activist women. NOW did gain recognition, not only at WABC-TV, but at competing stations as well. None wanted to be the next target; another petition to deny a license might succeed. Similarly, NBC's costly out-of-court settlement of the employment discrimination charges they faced, warned all other stations that there was sufficient force available to compel compliance with laws they had preferred to ignore. Thus, by the mid-seventies, stations and networks were giving serious attention to the need to integrate newscaster staffs and images, but no more than was necessary.

Broadcasters still resisted integrating newscasters to a certain extent well into the seventies despite these pressures. The idea of fully integrated newscaster images had not as yet supplanted the broadcaster's preference for white males as anchors. Women and minority newscasters got their greatest exposure on local news; but, even there, white males remained the dominant type. Women and minorities have shared the premier anchor spot, and even

held if exclusively for brief periods at one station; but more often the long standing anchors in the New York Area were white males who were sometimes seen on the air with women or minority co-anchors. Moreover, women and minority group members who anchor tend to be rotated in and out of that slot more often than do white anchormen.

The networks were more resistant to using minority and women newscasters than were local stations in New York. They were also slower than the local stations in putting women or minorities on the air in news reporting. Following the rules of economic censorship, they sought to avoid the rejection of programs by their Southern affiliates. That would, they believed, immediately lower ratings and could have long-term reprecussions if an affiliate sought to link up with another network. Ratings for national audiences reflected the number of affiliates in a network and the strength of their markets, all factors underlying national ratings. It is apparently for this reason that the major networks lagged behind local news in New York in integrating newscaster images.

Co-opting Response.--The co-opting response occurs when a weak social movement advances new ideas that are voluntarily taken up by the broadcaster to be used in the competition with other stations. The co-optation of minority images, that is the presentation of minority newscasters in news programming before any strong force

compelled broadcasters to do so, characterized some of the responses of broadcasters. The presentation of minority and women newscasters during the early and mid-sixties was a way of keeping up with the times, of showing that television news was consistent with the world about which it informed audiences. Minority members were first put on the air after minority groups became openly critical of television. This was particularly true of blacks who were more effectively organized at that time. Although there were no legal means available to minority activists to force their demands upon broadcasters, diminishing the negative publicity that activist groups generated was in the broadcaster's interests. Moreover, it was economically unwise for broadcasters to disregard minority concerns about their images. A substantial part of the New York audience consisted of blacks, and this was too large a market to lose once the new black militancy made recognition of black demands mandatory. Broadcasters found that the primary problem of preserving the ratings of the white audience was less difficult than they generally anticipated, because most whites did not object to integrated images. By the later sixties, using black newscasters to report on black problems increased the credibility of news programming.

Thus, there were incentives to broadcasters to use newscasters who reflected the changing composition and moods of their audiences. To introduce more minority members into

on-camera roles in news shows was a way of initally avoiding conflict that might later require even greater cost and inconvenience to accomplish the same end.

The personalized style of news reporting that became popular in news formats of the late sixties reduced the risk that might be associated with using a minority newscaster. Once accepted by the viewers, minority newscasters became media celebrities, which gave them distinction and prestige in the community at large. The black celebrity, for example, may be highly regarded by white fans who disregard his identification with blacks as a group. Similarly, the popular woman newscaster became a favorite television personality who incidentally reported news. Moreover, activists seeking changes as a means to influencing public opinion towards minorities or women could be satisfied that broadcasters were complying with their demands.

If the minority or woman newscaster could be presented as a personality popular with many viewers, was an their appeal could help ratings and even gain an edge over the competition. Further, the successful use of minorities and women in the early stages of change was preparation for the time when their use would likely become mandatory. Audiences could more easily accept seeing minority members on television in general programming once they had accepted a favorite minority newscaster.

As news programming became profitable, the magazine concept gave broadcasters control over the content of news shows. By the mid-sixties, when more minority newscasters were being put on the air, advertisers no longer sponsored entire news shows. This freed broadcasters to experiment, and any change that improved ratings became acceptable. News was adaptable to such a purpose than most other kinds of programming because it consisted of many relatively short items and changes of subject. A minority newscaster could report a story without affecting the overall format of the show. If well received by the audience, the newscaster would then became regarded as an asset to the station.

When Happy Talk became an accepted technique in the late sixties and early seventies, when newscasts were televised in color and news was glamourized, an additional appeal was the presentation of various types of people, including good-looking people, to report news. At about the same time, the Eyewitness News concept was first used at WABC-TV. While this attempted to stress the kinds of news people wanted, it favored the use of newscasters with varied ethnic and racial identities as a device to broaden the appeal to the viewing audience. Other stations adopted similar techniques in their formats, though less extreme than WABC-TV.

As news programming was the station's showcase, integrated newscaster images symbolized to the community the

integration of the television station whether or not the numbers of minorities and women seen on news shows reflected the level of integration behind the camera. As long as white audiences accepted integrated images, stations could use the images of minority and women newscasters to show they were keeping up with the times. Besides being reporters of what was happening in the society, television companies also could show that they were an integral part of the community. In sum, the Co-opting response operated intermittently during the period under consideration. but the advantages of co-optation became apparent only after initial resistance and then only after earlier resistances had proven to be mistaken. Co-optation in effect was a device to increase ratings and profits and to resist even greater pressures.

Rejecting Response.--The rejecting response occurs when a weak social movement advocates change that the broadcaster perceives is without value and no change is initiated by the broadcaster. This response was most evident around 1960 when broadcasters saw minorities and women mainly as a liability to television news and excluded them from newscasting. At this time little was done to raise this problem to public consciousness, since activist groups had not yet organized to make television images an issue. Broadcasters were not concerned with minority images or with programming that might be desired by ethnic or

racial groups. They maintained the status quo that discriminated against minorities and women.

The broadcaster's manner of dealing with representatives of community groups pressing for new images also fit this attitude. The normal stance of the broadcaster was to maintain good relations with all groups. When meeting with activists, broadcasters were respectful and sympathetic in manner. Typically they expressed a desire to remedy the stated problems; but once the meeting was over, little was done to follow up or comply with the demands. To achieve any change, even token changes, activists had to confront television officials repeatedly, restating demands and suggesting specific techniques for implementing the desired change.

The rejecting response never entirely disappeared. If one considers the resistance of broadcasters to hiring minorities and women as newscasters and the long period when only token numbers worked in television news, it is clear that the rejecting response was continuously operating. The limitations still imposed on minorities and women as late as the mid-seventies, notably in the scheduling of minorities, women and non-minority men in news shows, particularly in the anchor role, indicated that broadcasters continued some old practices in the absence of strong pressures. Since there was no organized effort to pressure for equality in the anchor role, the broadcasters continued to show a

preference for white males as weekday evening anchors. The pattern was evident in both local and network news, though more pronounced in the latter. Moreover, some news executives openly showed a distain for FCC regulations that required equal employment. Data collected to report how many women and minorities were employed at a station only gave an overall view of the entire workforce. There was no breakdown for news staffs. If a news department hired very few women and minorities, some news executives claimed it did not matter because other departments could hire more and balance out the numbers.

The behavior patterns of the broadcasters did not always fit the categories of our paradigm in a consistent manner. At times more than one category of response could apply to a broadcaster's behavior. This may have been due to the fact that as changes were incremental, broadcasters manifested new responses that overlapped older ones in their reactions to the complex forces affecting their businesses.

Competition with other stations was also an important factor affecting broadcaster responses to minority demands. Generally all broadcasters faced similar conditions; that is, the forces favoring integrated images affected all stations in the area. All three networks, concerned with audiences that were national rather than local, integrated newscaster images more slowly than local stations in New York and the larger cities. They had to

sell their programming to affiliates in many markets that were less receptive to minorties and women than did stations broadcasting in the New York Area.

Without any discernible exception, broadcasters integrated newscaster images to serve their own interests. When broadcasters perceived proposed changes as negatively affecting their profits and costs, they normally ignored them. If they were confronted by forceful demands, they were more likely to comply. When facing strong opposition, it was often more in the broadcaster's interest to give in, because continued resistance could create an even more difficult situation for the broadcaster. It was essential to the stability of a television business that good relations be maintained with organized segments of their audiences. When unwanted changes were proposed without any compelling force to back them up, such changes were usually rejected by the broadcasters. Thus, until minorities and women organized and could assert sufficient pressure on the broadcasters, little was done to integrate newscaster images. When the activist groups found ways to implement their demands and make broadcasters aware of unwanted consequences, they were more successful in achieving integrated newscasting. On the other hand, there were times when broadcasters saw the demands of minority groups as useful. Even in the absence of strong forces to compel change, broadcasters would take up and use some of the ideas

put forth. In this way a social movement could be the source of novel ideas that broadcasters continually search for to appeal to the audience and to boost the ratings of their programs. The movement could thus generate trends in newscasting.

Ultimately, in the case of integrating newscaster images, broadcasters had to be the implementors of the changes minorities and women wanted, and this allowed broadcasters considerable leeway in how images were actually integrated. They could distribute the new types of newscasters into time slots and program formats that were most useful or least harmful to them, and, if the change was unwanted, they could seek to avoid or delay making it.

The size or stability of newscaster staffs in the late seventies did not correlate with the level of integration that had been achieved at the five television stations providing most of the television news New York viewers watched. All these stations were integrated to a fairly equal degree. The integration of women and minorties varied somewhat at different stations. One owned and operated station and one independent station seemed to accept minority men more than they did women. The smallest and largest news staffs of these five stations employed more women than did the others, but all stations became more receptive to ethnic newscasters. Although one station promoted their news shows by publicizing the ethnic statuses

of their newscasters, and another played up the attractiveness of women newscasters, most stations merely let ethnic, sex, and racial characteristics of their on-camera newscasters manifest itself on the TV screen. The old practice of changing one's name if it was too foreign sounding was abandoned by most newscasters. Ethnicity at the public level became an accepted fact of life.

The rate of newscaster turnover at a station did not help to integrate newscaster images except when stations were building up the numbers of minorities and women on their staffs. Only then did minorities and women replace white males. Typically a newcomer replaced a person of the same type as himself or herself. Thus the composition of newscasting staffs became stabilized. When news staffs were expanding, however, minorities and women could be hired without displacing anyone. Yet, in individual cases, hiring an exceptionally talented newscaster would take precedence over acquiring a desired type.

The broadcasters thus achieved an uneasy balance between overall image integration and optimal competitive advantages. The employment of outstanding individuals as professional personalities reduced the impact of minority or female status in newscaster images.

Recommended Research

Newscasting was still in the process of becoming integrated in 1978, when this study was terminated. On the

local level, Hispanic newscasters were being sought, and at the network level, the first woman and the first black man were anchoring on weekday evenings at ABC, but none were anchors for the other networks in the prime news hours. Respondents raised questions about the kinds of reporting minority and women newscasters could do and whether their exposure on the air was equal to that of white males. While it was beyond the scope of this study to do a content analysis of news programming shown in the New York market, that also seems to be a desirable approach to determining how integration has progressed in television news, particularly if such a study were repeated periodically. Observing the number of appearances of women and minorities on news shows during designated periods, and ideally repeated each year, would give some indication of the exposure these types of people receive. In addition it seems like a worthwhile endeavor to examine the kinds of stories they report and the positions they occupy, such as in anchoring or as specialized reporters. The collection of data such as this would provide information on the progress, or possibly the sliding back, of the integration process in newscasting.

Since this study was concerned only with what viewers in the New York market would see on their television sets, and no claims can be made that conditions in other markets are the same, we also recommend that the images of

newscasters be studied in other markets to provide comparisions and a better understanding of this kind of change.

Footnotes

[1]The stations were WABC-TV, WCBS-TV, WNBC-TV, WNEW-TV, and WPIX-TV. The sixth commercial VHF station in the New York Area was dropped because it did not produce a regular news program in the evening as the other stations did except for a few of years in the early seventies. Instead, WOR-TV scheduled alternative types of information programming in the evenings and telecast news during the daytime.

[2]Window Dressing on the Set: Women and Minorities in Television, Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, August, 1977), p. 50.

APPENDIX A

The Graduate School and University Center
of the City University of New York
Graduate Center: 33 West 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10036

Dear

I am conducting a study of the employment of minorities and women who report news in television. The objective of this research is to learn how changes in this occupation relate to change in the society. This is one of several studies planned to permit an analysis of different industries and to provide important comparative knowledge.

Because of your position and experience in television news, you could be very helpful. I would appreciate it if I could interview you.

I will telephone you within the next few days to schedule an interview and gladly answer any questions you may have.

Yours truly,

Virginia Bluhm
Department of Sociology

Telephone:
Home: --- ----
Office: --- ----

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW GUIDE--NEWSCASTERS

1. Who is your employer?

2. What is your present title?

3. What are the main duties of your position?

4. How long have you worked in television news?

5. How long have you worked in television news in New York?

6. How did you get into television news?

7. In addition to your present employment in television news, do you work in
   (a) any other area of television,
   (b) radio?

8. What would you like to be doing five years from now?

9. Compared with the past, do you think that the opportunities in television news have changed very much for
   (a) women,
   (b) racial and ethnic minorities?

10. (If respondent notes any change:) When do you recall that this change occurred?

11. Do you think that presenting women and other minorities on news shows makes your station more competitive?

12. Do you think that the television news staff at your station is as well integrated as news staffs at other stations in this area
   (a) for women,
   (b) for racial and ethnic minorities?

13. Do you think the anchor position at your station is as well integrated as at other station in this area
   (a) for women,
   (b) for racial and ethnic minorities?

14. Do you think the employment of minorities has been better in on-camera or off-camera positions?

15. Have you received any information about the audience's response to seeing minorities reporting news?

    (If yes:) What was the audience's response?

    Do you know if some viewers in the audience prefer men who are not members of minority groups to report some kinds of news?

    Does that affect your assignments?

16. Do you feel that if a newscaster is a woman/minority group member this has special value for your employer?

    (If yes:) In what way?

17. In your judgment, what is the main reason why your station employs minority group members to report news?

    What other reasons are important?

18. Do you feel your job assignments ever reflect your sex, ethnic, or racial status?

    (If yes:) In what way?

19. Do you think that some kinds of news assignments should be given to a minority person?

20. Do you think that some kinds of women and other minorities in television news has cut down on the opportunities for men who are not minority group members?

    (If yes:) To what extent?

21. Are your relations with co-workers more agreeable if these people are women, ethnic or racial minorities, or men who are not minority group members?

22. Do you think that the black movement of the 1960's affected the employment of women in television news?

23. Does having more women reporting news help ethnic and racial minorities in this occupation?

24. Are you aware of any official guidelines for hiring minorities
    (a) at your company,
    (b) from the FCC?

25. Are you aware of any pressure groups who want more women or other minorities employed in television news?

    (If yes:) What are the names of these groups?

26. Do you belong to any professional groups organized for women or minorities?

    (If yes:) How often do you attend meetings (specify organization)?

    How does this organization help you in your career?

27. With whom are you most likely to discuss problems concerning your career?

28. Have friends been helpful to you in your career?

29. Is there any particular television news person whose work you particularly admire?

    (If yes:) Has this person influenced how you work?

30. Would you like to add any other comments about women or other minority group members working in television news?

31. What advice would you give to a young person planning a career in television news
    (a) if a woman,
    (b) if a member of a minority group.

32. Do you in your career publicly identify with an ethnic or racial group?

33. Sex of respondent:

34. Date:

INTERVIEW GUIDE--EXECUTIVES

1. Who is your employer?

2. What is your present title?

3. What are your main responsibilities?

4. How long have you been working in television news?

5. How long have you been working in television news in New York?

6. Compared with the past, do you think that the opportunities in television news have changed very much for
   (a) women,
   (b) ethnic and racial minorities?

7. (If respondent notes any change:) Do you recall when this change occurred?

8. Have you observed any diminishing of opportunity for either minority group members or women since that time?

9. Are your news shows more competitive because women and minority members are seen reporting news?

10. Has the selling of time on news shows been affected because women and minorities report news?

11. Do you feel that the news staff here at your station/network is as integrated as at other news staffs in this area for
   (a) for women,
   (b) other minorities?

12. Here at your station/network, is the news staff seen on-camera more integrated than the rest of the news staff that the viewing audience does not see?

13. Do you think there should be more women or minorities in the anchor position?

14. What is the audience's reaction to seeing minorities reporting news on your news shows?

15. How do audience preferences affect who is hired to report news or to fill the anchor position?

16. Does a minority reporter or a woman reporter offer any special value to a news show?

17. Apart from FCC regulations, what are other reasons why your station hires women and minority reporters?

18 Do assignments ever reflect a reporter's sex, race, or ethnic status?

19. Should some types of news be reported by people of certain statuses?

20. Has the increased employment of women and minorities affected the opportunities for men who are not minority group members?

21. How does having more women in television news affect the opportunities for minority men?

22. Do you find that relations among members of the news staff are affected by sex, race, or ethnic statuses?

23. What are the main characteristics of the audience that watches your news shows?

24. How important is the minority audience to your news shows?

25. How important are women viewers to your news shows?

26. Do these special segments of the viewing audience affect who is hired to report news?

27. Does it help a news show if the audience is aware of the reporters' sex, race, or ethnic status?

28. What criteria are important in choosing new reporters or anchor people?

29. How has this changed if compared with the past?

30. Are you presently aware of any pressure groups urging that more women or minorities be employed in news departments?

31. Would you like to add any other comments about women or minorities working in television news?

APPENDIX C

CATEGORIES OF TELEVISION RESPONDENTS

Category	Number
Minority group women	6
Minority group men	9
Non-minority women	10
Executives	19
Total	44