DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 167 IR 003 557

AUTHOR Dirr, Peter J.; And Others
TITLE An Initial Study of Instructional Television (ITV) Services in the United States. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Washington, D.C.; Public Broadcasting Service, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 70p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Costs; *Educational Television; *Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; *National Surveys; Programing (Broadcast); *Public Television; *Services; Statistical Data; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS United States

ABSTRACT

A study analyzed the instructional television (ITV) services provided by public television stations to schools throughout the country. It also examined the relationship between the schools and the stations. A questionnaire was sent to 141 public television stations in November, 1974, which found that most stations provide instructional programing for grades K-12, (elementary and secondary education). Also, most of the respondents provided additional services besides the broadcasting of instructional programs, such as printed materials, technical consultation, utilization services, and technical maintenance. The licensees' relationships with the schools which they serve often reflected the types of stations which they are and their primary sources of funding. Fifty-six percent of the licensees did not charge a "per student" rate or failed to report what those rates are. The licensees indicated a wide range of involvement by school personnel in program selection and a substantial but somewhat lower involvement in scheduling decisions. (HAB)

AN INITIAL STUDY OF INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION (ITV) SERVICES IN THE UNITED STATES

Corporation For Public Broadcasting
Washington, D.C.

April, 1976

CONTENTS

TABLES

FOREWORD

This study is an initial effort to describe and analyze the instructional television services (ITV) provided by public television stations to schools throughout the country. It also begins to analyze the relationships between the schools and the stations.

It is hoped that the findings reported herein will assist school administrators and the management of public television stations in examining the types and scope of services which the stations provide to the schools.

The study was begun in December, 1974 by Natan Katzman and Peter Spain under the joint auspices of the Educative Services Department of the Public Broadcasting Services and the Information Systems and Educational Activities Offices of the Corporation For Public Broadcasting. This final report has been prepared by Dr. Peter J. Dirr.

1. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

Since the mid 1950's, when educational television first went on the air, many stations have been providing instructional services for elementary and secondary schools within their viewing areas. Some of those services are based upon needs stated by the constituencies served. Others are based upon a tradition of offering services such as utilization services and printed materials. It has been known for some time that the quantity and quality of those services vary greatly from station to station.

This study will provide baseline data which will enable management of public television stations and school administrators (as well as other national agencies involved in public television) to examine the instructional services which are provided by public television stations to schools within their broadcast areas. It attempts to gain or add to knowledge already available on questions such as, "Is there a relationship between instructional services offered and the type of public television station or its primary source of funding?" "What are the specific services other than broadcasting programs which the stations provide to the schools?"

It is expected that the data gathered through this effort will provide a baseline against which to measure changes which might take place in instructional television services. Therefore, in addition to serving management of public television stations and school administrators, this study should assist researchers in future years.

B. METHODOLOGIES

In November of 1974, each public television licensee (141) in each of the 50 states was sent a questionnaire concerning instructional television services. At that time, there were more than 200 public television stations in the country but in some instances, 2 or more stations were licensed to a single licensee. In those instances, only one questionnaire was sent to the licensee.

The questionnaires were followed up approximately 2 weeks later by a personal telephone call to the instructional television director or his counterpart at each licensee. The telephone interviewer asked the respondent each of the questions. The respondent had been alerted to the telephone call and, in most instances, was prepared to answer the questions with specific information. The responses were recorded by the telephone interviewer. In those instances where the respondent was unable to provide information, he was requested to forward it by mail within the following week. Of the 141 licensees interviewed, 118 (84%) provided data which are included in the results presented in this report. The responses from the remaining 23 licensees either (a) indicated that they did not provide instructional programming for grades K-12 (10), or (b) provided insufficient information to be included in the tabulations for this report (13). The 23 cases were dropped from data analysis. However, as a result of further follow-up with those licensees who provided insufficient data, information was finally obtained in 10 of the 13 cases. Those cases are reported in Appendix C.

C. LIMITATIONS

After the data had been received and analysis was begun, several limitations to this study became apparent. The primary limitation, and one which needs to be corrected prior to further studies, dealt with the terminology used in the questionnaire. Terms such as "Formal Agreement", "Informal Agreement", "Number of Schools", "Primary Source of Funding", and others need to be clearly defined at the time when the questions are asked.

Relatedly, the categories identifying "type of station" were ambiguous in a few instances. Some stations indicated that, although they were university based, they provided network-type services. Assigning such stations to either "Network" or "University" category was somewhat arbitrary, based upon the best judgment of the researcher. (See information in Appendix B.)

A third limitation has been the time period over which the study has extended. Since the final data analysis has taken place 12 months after the initial data gathering, some of the data may already be out of date. Even with this time lag, the data represent the most current effort in this area.

D. DATA ANALYSIS

In the following section, the data are presented in raw form and in frequencies. In addition, several categories have been subjected to cross tabulation analysis. The statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) was used for all data analyses.

Frequency distributions show the absolute and relative distribution among the several categories (values) of each variable.

Cross tabulation analysis indicates whether or not a relationship exists between the variables. The percentages in each cell point toward the relationship. In order to determine whether the relationship is statistically significant, the data were subjected to the following tests: chi-square, Cramer's V, and contingency coefficient.

Chi-square is a test of significant difference. It helps to determine whether a systematic relationship exists between two variables. This is done by computing the cell frequencies which would be expected if no relationship were present between the variables and comparing those cell frequencies to the actual values found in the table. If no relationship exists, any deviations from the expected values will be small and can be reasonably expected due to chance. However, large deviations (a high chi-square score) imply that a systematic relationship of some sort exists between the variables. Chi-square helps to determine whether a relationship exists. It does not measure the strength of that relationship.

Cramer's V is a modified version of phi, which measures the strength of a relationship. It takes on a value of 0 when no relationship exists and a value of +1 when the variables are perfectly related.

Actual computations are provided only in instances where statistical significance was indicated.

E. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The findings of this study are presented in detail in the following chapter. However, for the convenience of the reader, the major findings are summarized at this point.

Most licensees provide programming for grades K-12 (99%). Forty-eight percent provide college level programming in addition to K-12 programming.

Most of the respondents provide additional services besides the broadcasting of instructional programs. Seventy-nine percent provide printed materials; 69% provide technical consultation; 63% provide utilization services; 22% provide technical maintenance. Almost one third make programs available in alternative formats. (e.g. cassettes and films).

The licensees' relationships with the schools which they serve often reflect the types of stations which they are and their primary sources of funding. Community-based licensees are deeply involved with the schools and receive a major portion of the funding for the instructional services from the schools. University-based licensees receive less of their operating budgets from instructional programming and therefore tend to provide fewer additional services to the schools.

Fifty-six percent of the licensees do not charge a "per student" rate or failed to report what those rates are.

The licensees indicated a wide range of involvement by school personnel in program selection and a substantial but somewhat lower involvement in scheduling decisions.

II. THE FINDINGS

Twenty-four categorical variables were examined during the course of the study. In addition, data were tabulated to indicate the total number of school districts, schools, and students served by the instructional television services of those respondents who provided such information.

For the purpose of this report, the data will be provided in two stages: (a) frequency distributions, and (b) cross tabulation analyses.

A. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

1. Type of station

Four categories were provided: State Network, University, Community based, School Board. The frequency distribution among the four categories is as follows:

	Total Universe		This Study	
CATEGORY LABEL	Absolute Freq.	Relative (PCT)	Absolute Freq.	Relative (PCT)
STATE NETWORK	26	18.4	22	18.6
UNIVERSITY	45	31.9	35	29.7
COMMUNITY	52	36.9	44	37.3
SCHOOL BOARD	18	12.7	17	14.4
TOTAL	141	100.0	118	100.0

Table 1
Frequency Distribution
Type of Station

Note: The distribution of responses by type of station parallels the distribution of the total universe of licensees by type of station.

2. Provides Instructional Programs

The respondents were asked to identify the grade levels for which they provide instructional programs: K-12, K-12 and higher, Only above Grade 12. (Respondents who indicated they did not provide instructional programming [10] were dropped at this point.) The results are as follows:

CATEGORY LABEL	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
Yes K-12	60	50.8
K-12 & Up	57	48.3
Only Over 12	1	0.8
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 2
Frequency Distribution
Provides Instructional Programs

3. Sources of Instructional Programs

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they relied upon PBS and other sources for the instructional programs which they provided. The overwhelming majority (89.8%) indicated that they relied upon PBS and other sources. Only 1.7% rely solely upon PBS and 8.5% rely solely upon non-PBS sources. (See Table 3 for Frequency Distributions.)

A further analysis of the responses to this question indicated that the majority of the respondents who used sources other than PBS used National Instructional Television/Agency for Instructional Television (NIT/AIT) and Great Plains National Instructional Television Library (GPN). Large numbers also used Western Instructional Television (WIT) and Eastern Educational Network (EEN). Many relied on other local agencies (e.g. other stations,

State Education Department Libraries) for additional programming.

It is apparent from the responses to this question that most licensees turn to a variety of sources for instructional programming. Readers who are interested in more specific information relative to sources of instructional programming are referred to the CPB report, Public Television Program Content: 1974.

CATEGORY LABEL	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
Solely PBS	2	1.7
PBS and Others	106	90.2
Only Non-PBS	10	8.5
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 3
Frequency Distribution
Sources of Instructional Programs

4. Provides Programs in Other Formats

One question focused on the impact which video technology is having on the ways in which the licensees disseminate instructional programming. It was found that 1/3 of the licensees are distributing programming in formats other than broadcast. Video cassette and film account for most of the alternative distribution (22.9%). (See Appendix D for specific listings.)

CATEGORY LABEL	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
No	80	67.8
Yes, Non-specific	1	0.8
Cassette & Film	27	22.9
Electronic (ITFS/CATV)	7	5.9
Multiple	3	2.5
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 4
Frequency Distribution
Other Formats

5. Agreements for Instructional Programs

This question provided major problems for the researchers and the respondents. The term "Agreement" was not sufficiently defined in advance to facilitate valid responses. For instance, if instructional services were mandated by state legislation, the respondent might be inclined to answer "no" to the question. However, by the very nature of legislation, it can be maintained that there is an agreement (mandated) between the broadcasting agency and the schools. Therefore, in the cases where the services were governed by legislation and/or Department of Education agreements, it was inferred that agreements existed between the licensee and the schools. Final determination in instances where questions existed fell to the best judgment of the researcher.

Within those limitations, the following findings are presented:

CATEGORY LABEL	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
No	6	5.1
Yes	112	94.8
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 5
Frequency Distribution
Agreements for Instructional Programs

Further analysis of the data indicated that 62 (53%) of those having agreements indicated that the agreements were with local districts and 30 (25%) indicated that they were with state or local departments of education. The remaining were unspecified.

6. Formal Agreement or Law

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they operated under formal agreements or law in providing their instructional services. Here again, there was a great deal of confusion over terminology. More than 85% of the respondents indicated that their instructional services were provided under formal agreements or under a state or local law.

CATEGORY LABEL	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
No	17	14.4
Yes	101	85.6
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 6
Frequency Distribution
Formal Agreements

Attempts were made to analyze further the data in order to determine the sources of those formal agreements. However, because of a lack of precision in terminology and because of the existence of overlapping agreements further analysis yielded no additional helpful information.

7. Number of School Districts Under Formal Agreements

The data in Table 7 are included as estimates provided by the licensees. However, it must be kept in mind that these data cannot be considered reliable totals since the terminology used to describe "formal agreements" may have been misleading to the respondents. Additionally, many respondents were unable to provide specific information concerning numbers of school districts.

Number Responding "None"	24
Estimated* Number of School Districts for other 94 licensees	5,826

Table 7
Estimated Number of Districts
Under Formal Agreements

*Estimates provided by licensees.

8. Number of Schools Under Formal Agreements

In this category also, the data tend to be misleading. 28.8% of the respondents did not reply to this question. Among those who did respond, there were indications of confusion concerning the number of school buildings.

Again, the data are offered as "estimate" figures in the hope that they may be helpful in designing future studies.

Number Not Responding	34
Estimated* Number of Schools for other 84 licensees	33,230

Table 8
Estimated Number of Schools
Under Formal Agreement
*Estimates provided by licensees.

9. Number of Students Under Formal Agreements

It is with great hesitation that the researcher includes the estimates of the numbers of students who are under formal agreement. The same problems and liabilities which are inherent in the two previous tables also apply to Table 9.

Number Not Responding	29
Estimated*Number of Students for other 89 licensees	18,174,367

Table 9
Estimated Number of Students
Under Formal Agreements
*Estimates provided by licensees.

Persons who might use these data for future reference are urged to bear in mind the limitations which have been included in their derivation.

10. Grade Levels Covered Under Formal Agreements

Since almost 1/4 of all respondents did not reply to the question concerning formal agreements, it is not surprising that an equal number

did not reply to the question concerning grade levels covered under formal agreements. However, most of those who responded to this question indicated that they provided programming from Kindergarten through twelfth grade. Almost 10% provide college level programming in addition to the K-12 programming. Twelve licensees (10.1%) indicated that the highest level of programming which they provided was 6th, 8th, or 9th grade.

It might be noted that there are apparent discrepancies between the data in Tables 2 and 10. However, a close look at the questions will disclose that one question deals with the level of programs provided by the licensee (Table 2) and the other question deals with the grade levels included under formal agreements (Table 10). It would seem that a substantial number of stations provide K-12 programming outside the structure of formal agreements with the schools.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
Lowest Level		
No Answer	28	23.7
Kindergarten	86	72.9
First	4	3.4
Highest Level		
No Answer	27	22.9
6-9	12	10.1
Twelfth	68	57.6
College	11	9.3

Table 10
Frequency Distribution
Grade Levels Under Formal Agreements

11. Informal Agreements

The data indicate that most of the stations rely heavily upon formal agreements in their relationships with the schools. More than 3/4 responded that they did not have informal agreements. Most of those who do have informal agreements have them with local school districts.

The combined number of licensees claiming to have informal agreements (29-see Table 11) and formal agreements (101-see Table 6) exceeds the total number of licensees known to have agreements of any type (112-see Table 5). This overlapping reflects the fact that some licensees function with both formal and informal agreements.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
None	89	75.4
With local schools	18	15.3
With "other"	11	9.2
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 11
Frequency Distribution
Informal Agreements

12. Number of School Districts, Schools, and Students Under Informal Agreements

The data in this category are as questionable as the data presented in the parallel categories dealing with formal agreements. However, it is felt that they should be presented (with all the limitations in mind) in the hope that they might be helpful in designing future studies.

	Number Responding	Total
School Districts	21	1,803**
Schools	8	3,554**
Students	16	3,544,342**

Table 12
Estimated*Number of School Districts, Schools and Students Under Informal Agreements

*Estimates provided by licensees.

**These figures are in addition to those in Tables 7, 8, 9.

13. Grade Levels Under Informal Agreements

An analysis of the lowest and highest grade levels of programming provided under informal agreements indicated that the distribution was similar to the distribution under formal agreements. As might be expected, significantly more respondents did not answer this question since many of them do not function under informal agreements.

14. Agreement Agencies Provide Funding

The respondents were asked whether or not the agencies covered by formal or informal agreements provided funding for the instructional services. Fewer than 10% of the respondents indicated that they did not get funding from the agencies which they served. Eighty-six percent indicated that they did receive such funding. Seven percent did not respond to the question.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
No	8	6.8
Yes	102	86.4
No Answer	8	6.8
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 14
Frequency Distribution
Agency Funding

15. Per Student Rates

More than half of the stations did not respond to this question, many because they do not charge a headcount "membership" fee. Of the 52 (44.1%) reported per student rates, 19 (37%) indicated a per student rate of $1.00 to $1.49 and 13 (25%) indicated a rate of $.50 or less.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)	Adjusted Freq. (PCT)
.50 or Less	13	11.0	25.0
.51 to .99	6	5.1	12.0
1.00 to 1.49	19	16.1	37.0
1.50 to 1.99	10	8.5	19.0
2.00 or More	4	3.4	7.0
No Answer	66	55.9	
TOTAL	118	100.0	100.0

Table 15
Frequency Distribution
Per Student Rates

16. Other Sources of Funding

Many public television licensees depend on sources other than fees collected from contracting agencies to support the instructional services provided. Table 16 indicates that just under half of the respondents rely on various additional sources of funding. A further analysis of those responses indicated that the dependence was equally distributed over station support, state and county sources, and grants.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
None	48	40.7
Various	58	49.2
No Answer	12	10.1
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 16
Frequency Distribution
Other Sources of Funding

17. Percentage of Station Budgets

Instructional programming receives different priority at different stations. In this study, the respondents indicated that the instructional budget represented between one and one hundred percent of the total station budget. While almost 1/4 of the respondents did not reply to this question, those who did respond indicated that instructional services usually represented less than 50% of the total station budget. Those who did not respond most often indicated that they did not have access to the information or that the station budget was not broken down in such a way as to provide the information.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)	Adjusted Freq. (PCT)
1 to 24 Percent	40	33.9	45.0
25 to 49 Percent	28	23.7	31.4
50 to 74 Percent	11	9.3	12.4
75 to 100 Percent	10	8.5	11.2
No Answer	29	24.6	
TOTAL	118	100.0	100.0

Table 17
Frequency Distribution-
Percentage of Station Budget

18. Prime Funding Source

An effort was made to categorize the licensees according to the primary sources of funding for their instructional services. While only partially successful (due primarily to a lack of precise terminology), the data yielded may prove helpful in future studies.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
No Answer	2	1.7
Legislature	8	6.8
State/DOE	25	21.2
Local School Distr.	46	39.0
Regional (e.g. IT Associations)	7	5.9
University	30	25.4
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 18
Frequency Distribution
Primary Source of Funding for Instructional Services

It can be seen from the categories finally chosen that there is overlap among the categories. For instance, the State Department of Education ultimately receives its funding from the legislature. For this reason, some of the data are questionable and should be used only as estimates.

19. Sources of Programming Decisions

Selection of programming to be broadcast is not a simple matter. In the pioneering days of instructional television, such decisions might have been delegated to an individual or an office. Such is seldom the case today. Programming decisions usually involve large numbers of persons functioning as individuals or in committee.

This study sought to identify the person, office, or group which shares the responsibility for programming decisions within each licensee structure.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
Committees (Advisory, Curriculum, Teacher, Combinations)	105	88.9
State Personnel	7	5.9
No Answer	6	5.2
Total	118	100.0

Table 19
Frequency Distribution
Sources of Programming Decisions

As can be seen from Table 19, an overwhelming majority of the respondents indicated that the decision making process involved combinations of persons. Advisory committees play a prominent role in the process. It should be noted, however, that the ultimate responsibility of seeing that the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission are followed remains the responsibility of the licensee and its delegated personnel.

20. Sources of Scheduling Decisions

In contrast to the process of program decision making, scheduling decisions are usually centered within the structure of the licensee itself. More than half of the respondents indicated that station personnel are directly responsible for making scheduling decisions.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
Station Personnel	66	55.9
Advisory Committee	20	16.9
State Personnel	4	3.4
Other (incl. combinations)	26	22.0
No Answer	2	1.7
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 20
Frequency Distribution
Sources of Scheduling Decisions

21. Timetable for Programming Decisions

The respondents were asked to indicate when final decisions were made relative to programming for the school year (i.e. for programs which would be broadcast starting September). At most stations, those decisions are made well before the end of the school year, most during the months of March, April or May preceding the broadcast date.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
No Answer	7	5.9
June-August	16	13.6
March-May	70	59.3
December-February	21	17.8
November or Before	4	3.4
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 21
Frequency Distribution
Timetable for Programming Decisions

22. Timetable for Scheduling Decisions

The respondents were also asked to indicate the timetable for decisions relative to scheduling the programs for September play dates. Here again, most of the licensees indicated that those decisions were made during March, April or May.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
No Answer	8	6.8
June-August	17	14.4
March-May	73	61.9
December-February	17	14.4
November-Before	3	2.5
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 22
Frequency Distribution
Timetable for Scheduling Decisions

23. Utilization Services

In addition to broadcasting instructional programs, many licensees provide additional services to the schools. Almost 2/3 provide utilization services. Those services range from occasional contacts with schools to systematic programs of inservice education. There is no indication of the number of instances where utilization services not provided by a licensee are provided by a parallel agency such as the state department of education.

An attempt was made to determine the numbers of persons providing utilization services for each of the licensees. However, because of the complex relationships between some licensees and the state department of education or a university, it often was not clear whether the utilization services are provided by the licensee or by some other agency closely affiliated with the licensee. This was especially true in the cases of network licensees, some of which were actually an arm of the department of education. Therefore, data concerning the numbers of persons providing utilization services were not tabulated.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.(PCT)
Yes	74	62.7
No	44	37.3
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 23
Frequency Distribution
Utilization Services

24. Printed Materials.

More than 3/4 of the licensees provide printed materials for the instructional series which they broadcast.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
Yes	93	78.8
No	25	21.2
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 24
Frequency Distribution
Printed Materials

The confusion surrounding specification of utilization services also applied to the area of printed materials. For example, were the licensees to respond in the affirmative if printed information was provided by the state department of education or the production agency? Therefore, no analysis was made of the data gathered in response to the question concerning the number of program series for which printed materials are provided.

25. Technical Maintenance Services.

Fewer than 1/4 of the licensees provide services for technical maintenance of television equipment in the schools.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
Yes	26	22.0
No	92	78.0
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 25
Frequency Distribution
Technical Maintenance Services

In those instances where such services are provided, they are frequently related to the maintenance of specialized equipment such as master antenna systems or ITFS equipment.

26. Technical Consultation Services

More than 2/3 of the licensees provide technical consultation services. In most instances, this amounts to an engineer responding to questions received over the telephone. In a few instances, however, the respondents indicated that systematic assistance was provided to school districts which were installing complex reception and/or distribution systems.

	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (PCT)
Yes	81	68.6
No	37	31.4
TOTAL	118	100.0

Table 26
Frequency Distribution
Technical Consultation Services

B. CROSSTABULATION ANALYSES

In the preceding sections, frequency distributions of the responses to the questionnaire were presented. In this section, crosstabulation analyses of selected variables are presented. A total of 23 analyses were run. In reading the crosstabulation tables, the reader is referred to the key found in the upper left hand corner of each table. That key will serve as a reminder that the top numeral in each cell represents the absolute count for the cell; the second numeral represents the relative percentage within the row; the third numeral represents the relative percentage within the column; and the fourth numeral represents the total percentage which that cell represents among all the cells in the grid.

1. Type of Station-By-Provides Instructional Programs.

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	PROVPGMS 1. YES,K-12	2. YES,K-12 AND HIG	3. YES,ONLY ABOVE G	ROW TOTAL
TYPESTA 1. NETWORK	9 / 40.9 / 15.0 / 7.6	13 / 59.1 / 22.8 / 11.0	0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0	22 / 18.6
2. UNIVERSITY	14 / 40.0 / 23.3 / 11.9	20 / 57.1 / 35.1 / 16.9	1 / 2.9 / 100.0 / 0.8	35 / 29.7
3. COMMUNITY	24 / 54.5 / 40.0 / 20.3	20 / 45.5 / 35.1 / 16.9	0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0	44 / 37.3
4. SCHOOLBOARD	13 / 76.5 / 21.7 / 11.0	4 / 23.5 / 7.0 / 3.4	0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0	17 / 14.4
COLUMN TOTAL	60 / 50.8	57 / 48.3	1 / 0.8	118 / 100.0

Table 27
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Provides Instructional Programs

This crosstabulation yielded no statistical significance.

2. Type of Station-By-Sources of Programming

TYPESTA	SOURCEPG 1. SOLELY PBS.	2. PBS AND OTHERS.	3. ONLY NON-PBS	ROW TOTAL
1. NETWORK	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	21 95.5 19.8 17.8	1 4.5 10.0 0.8	22 18.6
2. UNIVERSITY	2 5.7 100.0 1.7	28 80.0 26.4 23.7	5 14.3 50.0 4.2	35 29.7
3. COMMUNITY	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	40 90.9 37.7 33.9	4 9.1 40.0 3.4	44 37.3
4. SCHOOLBOARD	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	17 100.0 16.0 14.4	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	17 14.4
COLUMN TOTAL	2 1.7	106 89.8	10 8.5	118 100.0

Table 28
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Sources of Programming

This analysis yielded no statistical significance. That most of the licensees use both PBS and other sources might be expected since most provide a variety of instructional programming greater than any one source has available.

3. Type of Station-By-Other Program Formats

TYPESTA	OTHRFORM: NO (10.)	YES,NON-SPECIFIE (20.)	CASSETE AND FILM (21.)	ELECTRON IC-CABL. (22.)	MULTIPLE (23.)	ROW TOTAL
1. NETWORK	15	0	4	1	2	22
	68.2	0.0	18.2	4.5	9.1	18.6
	18.8	0.0	14.8	14.3	66.7	
	12.7	0.0	3.4	0.8	1.7	
2. UNIVERSITY	26	0	7	1	1	35
	74.3	0.0	20.0	2.9	2.9	29.7
	32.5	0.0	25.9	14.3	33.3	
	22.0	0.0	5.9	0.8	0.8	
3. COMMUNITY	32	1	9	2	0	44
	72.7	2.3	20.5	4.5	0.0	37.3
	40.0	100.0	33.3	28.6	0.0	
	27.1	0.8	7.6	1.7	0.0	
4. SCHOOLBOARD	7	0	7	3	0	17
	41.2	0.0	41.2	17.6	0.0	14.4
	8.8	0.0	25.9	42.9	0.0	
	5.9	0.0	5.9	2.5	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	80	1	27	7	3	118
	67.8	0.8	22.9	5.9	2.5	100.0

Table 29
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Other Program Formats

This analysis yielded no statistical significance. However, it is interesting to note that almost half of the school board licensees provide programs in the cassette and/or film formats. When added to the number of school board licensees who provide programming through electronic transmission, the percentage exceeds 50%.

4. Type of Station-By-Agreements

TYPESTA	AGRMNTS NO	YES Unspecified 10.	YES,LOCA DISTRI 20.	YES,STAT E+LOCAL 21.	YES,OTHE R 22.	ROW TOTAL 23.
1. NETWORK	0	0	6	14	2	22
	0.0	0.0	27.3	63.6	9.1	18.6
	0.0	0.0	9.7	46.7	11.8	
	0.0	0.0	5.1	11.9	1.7	
2. UNIVERSITY	5	0	13	8	9	35
	14.3	0.0	37.1	22.9	25.7	29.7
	83.3	0.0	21.0	26.7	52.9	
	4.2	0.0	11.0	6.8	7.6	
3. COMMUNITY	1	0	29	8	6	44
	2.3	0.0	65.9	18.2	13.6	37.3
	16.7	0.0	46.8	26.7	35.3	
	0.8	0.0	24.6	6.8	5.1	
4. SCHOOLBOARD	0	3	14	0	0	17
	0.0	17.6	82.4	0.0	0.0	14.4
	0.0	100.0	22.6	0.0	0.0	
	0.0	2.5	11.9	0.0	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	6	3	62	30	17	118
	5.1	2.5	52.5	25.4	14.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 58.90388 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
CRAMER'S V = 0.40792
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.57704

Table 30
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Agreements

This analysis yielded statistical significance. However, the relationships are those which might be expected to exist. For instance, all the school board licensees indicated that they had agreements with the schools. When specified, those agreements were with local school districts. On the other hand, most of the network licensees indicated that they function under agreements (or law) at the state and local department of education level.

5. Type of Station-By-Formal Agreement

TYPESTA	FORMAGRM					
COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	INO	STAE LAW ENFORCEMENT	DOE CONTRACT	LOCAL DISTRICT	OTHER (e.g. regional) CONTRACT	ROW TOTAL
		10.I	21.I	22.I	23.I	24.I	
1. NETWORK		2I	3I	10I	5I	2I	22
		9.1I	13.6I	45.5I	22.7I	9.1I	18.5
		11.8I	75.0I	45.5I	8.3I	13.3I	
		1.7	2.5	8.5	4.2	1.7	
2. UNIVERSITY		10I	0I	4I	15I	6I	35
		28.6I	0.0I	11.4I	42.9I	17.1I	29.7
		58.8I	0.0I	18.2I	25.0I	40.0I	
		8.5I	0.0I	3.4I	12.7I	5.1I	
3. COMMUNITY		3I	0I	8I	29I	4I	44
		6.8I	0.0I	18.2I	65.9I	9.1I	37.3
		17.6I	0.0I	36.4I	48.3I	26.7I	
		2.5I	0.0I	6.8I	24.6I	3.3I	
4. SCHOOLBOARD		2I	1I	0I	11I	3I	17
		11.8I	5.9I	0.0I	64.7I	17.6I	14.4
		11.8I	25.0I	0.0I	18.3I	20.0I	
		1.7I	0.8I	0.0I	9.3I	2.5I	
COLUMN TOTAL		17	4	22	60	15	118
		14.4	3.4	18.6	50.8	12.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 40.11981 WITH 15 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004

CRAMER'S V = 0.33665

CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.50372

Table 31
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Formal Agreement

Here again, statistical significance was recorded. The relationships which account for the significance are those relationships which might be expected to exist. The only figure which might be considered at all unusual is the relatively high incidence of university stations which have contracts with local school districts.

6. Type of Station-By-Informal Agreements

TYPESTA	INFAGRM NO (10.)	YES (20.)	WITH STA (21.)	WITH LOC (22.)	OTHER (23.)	ROW TOTAL
1. NETWORK	14	2	1	4	1	22
	63.6	9.1	4.5	18.2	4.5	18.6
	15.7	66.7	20.0	22.2	33.3	
	11.9	1.7	0.8	3.4	0.8	
2. UNIVERSITY	26	1	3	4	1	35
	74.3	2.9	8.6	11.4	2.9	29.7
	29.2	33.3	60.0	22.2	33.3	
	22.0	0.8	2.5	3.4	0.8	
3. COMMUNITY	38	0	0	6	0	44
	86.4	0.0	0.0	13.6	0.0	37.3
	42.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	
	32.2	0.0	0.0	5.1	0.0	
4. SCHOOLBOARD	11	0	1	4	1	17
	64.7	0.0	5.9	23.5	5.9	14.4
	12.4	0.0	20.0	22.2	33.3	
	9.3	0.0	0.8	3.4	0.8	
COLUMN TOTAL	89	3	5	18	3	118
	75.4	2.5	4.2	15.3	2.5	100.0

Table 32
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Informal Agreements

This analysis yielded no statistical significance.

7. Type of Station-By-Agency Funding

TYPESTA	AGENFUND 1. NO	2. YES	3. NO ANSWER	ROW TOTAL
1. NETWORK	3	19	0	22
	13.6	86.4	0.0	18.6
	37.5	18.6	0.0	
	2.5	16.1	0.0	
2. UNIVERSITY	1	26	8	35
	2.9	74.3	22.9	29.7
	12.5	25.5	100.0	
	0.8	22.0	6.7	
3. COMMUNITY	1	43	0	44
	2.3	97.7	0.0	37.3
	12.5	42.2	0.0	
	0.8	36.4	0.0	
4. SCHOOLBOARD	3	14	0	17
	17.6	82.4	0.0	14.4
	37.5	13.7	0.0	
	2.5	11.9	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	8	102	8	118
	6.8	86.4	6.7	100.0

Table 33
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Agency Funding*

This analysis yielded no statistical significance.

*Agency with which "agreement" exists.

8. Type of Station-By-Per Student Rate

TYPESTA	PERSTAT	.50 OR LESS	.51 TO .99	1.00 TO 1.49	1.50 TO 1.99	2.00 OR MORE	NO ANSWER	ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	
NETWORK	1.	3	1	0	1	0	17	22
		13.6	4.5	0.0	4.5	0.0	77.3	18.6
		23.1	16.7	0.0	10.0	0.0	25.8	
		2.5	0.8	0.0	0.8	0.0	14.4	
UNIVERSITY	2.	5	2	6	1	2	19	35
		14.3	5.7	17.1	2.9	5.7	54.3	29.7
		38.5	33.3	31.6	10.0	50.0	28.8	
		4.2	1.7	5.1	0.8	1.7	16.1	
COMMUNITY	3.	3	3	11	7	0	20	44
		6.8	6.8	25.0	15.9	0.0	45.5	37.3
		23.1	50.0	57.9	70.0	0.0	30.3	
		2.5	2.5	9.3	5.9	0.0	16.9	
SCHOOLBOARD	4.	2	0	2	1	2	10	17
		11.8	0.0	11.8	5.9	11.8	58.8	14.4
		15.4	0.0	10.5	10.0	50.0	15.2	
		1.7	0.0	1.7	0.8	1.7	8.5	
COLUMN TOTAL		13	6	19	10	4	66	118
		11.0	5.1	16.1	8.5	3.4	55.9	100.0

Table 34
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Per Student Rate

Although this analysis yielded no statistical significance (probably due to the high number of respondents not providing adequate information), it is interesting to note that 3 station types (network, university, and school board) include a wide range of student fees. However, the community-based licensees are heavily clustered in the $1.00 to $1.99 rate range.

9. Type of Station-By-Other Sources of Funding

TYPESTA	OTHSRSFD NONE, 1.	VARIOUS, 2.	NO ANSWER 3.	ROW TOTAL
1. NETWORK	10	12	0	22
	45.5	54.5	0.0	18.6
	20.8	20.7	0.0	
	8.5	10.2	0.0	
2. UNIVERSITY	17	12	6	35
	48.6	34.3	17.2	29.7
	35.4	20.7	50.0	
	14.4	10.2	4.2	
3. COMMUNITY	15	25	4	44
	34.1	56.8	9.1	37.3
	31.3	43.1	33.3	
	12.7	21.2	3.4	
4. SCHOOLBOARD	6	9	2	17
	35.3	52.9	8.8	14.4
	12.5	15.5	16.6	
	5.1	7.6	1.7	
COLUMN TOTAL	48	58	12	118
	40.7	49.2	8.5	100.0

Table 35
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Other Sources of Funding

This analysis yielded no statistical significance. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note the high number of university licensees (almost 50%) who indicated no other sources of funding. This might reflect a level of support for instructional services which satisfies the expectations of the station management at university stations whereas management at other types of stations feels a need to increase support through other vehicles. Or it might reflect the fact that some university licensees are prohibited by law or charter from seeking sources of funding outside of the university. It is a topic which deserves further attention.

10. Type of Station-By-Timetable for Program Decisions

TYPESTA \ TMTBPGM	1. NO ANSWER	2. 1-3 MOS BEFORE	3. 4-6 MOS BEFORE	4. 7-9 MOS BEFORE	5. 10 OR MORE MOS.	ROW TOTAL
1. NETWORK	0	1	14	6	1	22
	0.0	4.5	63.6	27.3	4.5	18.6
	0.0	6.3	20.0	28.6	25.0	
	0.0	0.8	11.9	5.1	0.8	
2. UNIVERSITY	5	9	16	3	2	35
	14.3	25.7	45.7	8.6	5.7	29.7
	71.4	56.3	22.9	14.3	50.0	
	4.2	7.6	13.6	2.5	1.7	
3. COMMUNITY	2	4	28	10	0	44
	4.5	9.1	63.6	22.7	0.0	37.3
	28.6	25.0	40.0	47.6	0.0	
	1.7	3.4	23.7	8.5	0.0	
4. SCHOOLBOARD	0	2	12	2	1	17
	0.0	11.8	70.6	11.8	5.9	14.4
	0.0	12.5	17.1	9.5	25.0	
	0.0	1.7	10.2	1.7	0.8	
COLUMN TOTAL	7	16	70	21	4	118
	5.9	13.6	59.3	17.8	3.4	100.0

Table 36
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Timetable for Program Decisions

This analysis yielded no statistical significance. Although the responses from the four types of stations are clustered in the category labeled "4 to 6 months before September," the university licensees tend to lean more in the direction of 1 to 3 months before September while all other licensees lean more in the direction of 7 to 9 months before September. This tendency becomes even more apparent in the next table dealing with scheduling.

11. Type of Station-By-Timetable for Scheduling Decisions

TYPESTA	TMTHSCH: NO ANSWER	1-3 MOS BEFORE	4-6 MOS BEFORE	7-9 MOS BEFORE	10 OR MORE MOS BE	ROW TOTAL
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	
1. NETWORK	1	1	14	5	1	22
	4.5	4.5	63.6	22.7	4.5	18.6
	12.5	5.9	19.2	29.4	33.3	
	0.8	0.8	11.9	4.2	0.8	
2. UNIVERSITY	5	10	16	3	1	35
	14.3	28.6	45.7	8.6	2.9	29.7
	62.5	58.8	21.9	17.6	33.3	
	4.2	8.5	13.6	2.5	0.8	
3. COMMUNITY	2	4	30	8	0	44
	4.5	9.1	68.2	18.2	0.0	37.3
	25.0	23.5	41.1	47.1	0.0	
	1.7	3.4	25.4	6.8	0.0	
4. SCHOOLBOARD	0	2	13	1	1	17
	0.0	11.8	76.5	5.9	5.9	14.4
	0.0	11.8	17.8	5.9	33.3	
	0.0	1.7	11.0	0.8	0.8	
COLUMN TOTAL	8	17	73	17	3	118
	6.8	14.4	61.9	14.4	2.5	100.0

Table 37
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Timetable for Scheduling Decisions

Although this analysis yielded no statistical significance, the university licensees tend to make final scheduling decisions later in the process (June, July, or August) than do licensees in the other three categories. This, taken with the tendency to make later programming decisions and the lack of initiative in seeking additional outside funding, suggests that the university licensees might have characteristics which set them aside from the other three types of licensees.

12. Type of Station-By-Utilization Services

TYPESTA	SERVUTIL YES (1.)	NO (2.)	ROW TOTAL
1. NETWORK	19	3	22
	86.4	13.6	18.6
	25.7	6.8	
	16.1	2.5	
2. UNIVERSITY	17	18	35
	48.6	51.4	29.7
	23.0	40.9	
	14.4	15.3	
3. COMMUNITY	27	17	44
	61.4	38.6	37.3
	36.5	38.6	
	22.9	14.4	
4. SCHOOLBOARD	11	6	17
	64.7	35.3	14.4
	14.9	13.6	
	9.3	5.1	
COLUMN TOTAL	74	44	118
	62.7	37.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.31882 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0399
CRAMER'S V = 0.26552

Table 38
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Utilization Services

This analysis yielded statistical significance. The differences between the network and university licensees seem to account for that difference. Nine out of ten network licensees provide utilization services whereas fewer than 5 out of 10 of the university licensees provide such services. However, the V score indicates that the relationship is not particularly strong.

13. Type of Station-By-Printed Materials

TYPESTA	SERVPRNT 1. YES	2. NO	ROW TOTAL
1. NETWORK	21	1	22
	95.5	4.5	18.6
	22.6	4.0	
	17.8	0.8	
2. UNIVERSITY	17	18	35
	48.6	51.4	29.7
	18.3	72.0	
	14.4	15.3	
3. COMMUNITY	39	5	44
	88.6	11.4	37.3
	41.9	20.0	
	33.1	4.2	
4. SCHOOLBOARD	16	1	17
	94.1	5.9	14.4
	17.2	4.0	
	13.6	0.8	
COLUMN TOTAL	93	25	118
	78.8	21.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 27.74611 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000
CRAMER'S V = 0.48491
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.43632

Table 39
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Printed Materials

This analysis also yielded statistical significance. Again, the university licensees were responsible for the differences. Only 5 out of 10 university licensees provide printed materials for the instructional program. Approximately 9 out of 10 other licensees provide such services.

14. Type of Station-By-Technical Maintenance Services

TYPESTA	SERVTKMN 1. YES	2. NO	ROW TOTAL
1. NETWORK	2	20	22
	9.1	90.9	18.6
	7.7	21.7	
	1.7	16.9	
2. UNIVERSITY	3	32	35
	8.6	91.4	29.7
	11.5	34.8	
	2.5	27.1	
3. COMMUNITY	12	32	44
	27.3	72.7	37.3
	46.2	34.8	
	10.2	27.1	
4. SCHOOLBOARD	9	8	17
	52.9	47.1	14.4
	34.6	8.7	
	7.6	6.8	
COLUMN TOTAL	26	92	118
	22.0	78.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.99385 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0011
CRAMER'S V = 0.36816

Table 40
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Technical Maintenance Services

This analysis yielded statistical significance. In this instance, the large number of school board licensees providing technical maintenance services accounts for the difference. However, the strength of the relationship is only moderate.

15. Type of Station-By-Technical Consultation Services

TYPESTA	SERVTKCN		ROW TOTAL
COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	YES 1.	NO 2.	
1. NETWORK	17	5	22
	77.3	22.7	18.6
	21.0	13.5	
	14.4	4.2	
2. UNIVERSITY	19	16	35
	54.3	45.7	29.7
	23.5	43.2	
	16.1	13.6	
3. COMMUNITY	31	13	44
	70.5	29.6	37.3
	38.3	35.1	
	26.3	11.0	
4. SCHOOL BOARD	14	3	17
	82.4	17.6	14.4
	17.3	8.1	
	11.9	2.5	
COLUMN TOTAL	81	37	118
	68.6	31.4	100.0

Table 41
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Technical Consultation Services

This analysis yielded no statistical significance. It is interesting to note, however, that the category of licensee providing the fewest consultation services is the university licensee.

17. Agreements-By-Prime Funding Source

AGRMNTS	PRIMFUSC: NO ANSWER 1.	LEGISLATURE 2.	STATE DO 3.	LOCAL SCHOOLS 4.	REGIONAL AGENCIE 5.	UNIVERSITY 7.	ROW TOTAL
10. NO	2	0	0	0	0	4	6
	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	5.1
	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	
	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	
20. YES	0	0	1	1	1	0	3
	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	2.5
	0.0	0.0	4.0	2.2	14.3	0.0	
	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.0	
21. YES•LOCAL DISTRI	0	1	4	40	4	13	62
	0.0	1.6	6.5	64.5	6.5	21.0	52.5
	0.0	12.5	16.0	87.0	57.1	43.3	
	0.0	0.8	3.4	33.9	3.4	11.0	
22. YES•STATE•LOCAL	0	7	17	2	0	4	30
	0.0	23.3	56.7	6.7	0.0	13.3	25.4
	0.0	87.5	68.0	4.3	0.0	13.3	
	0.0	5.9	14.4	1.7	0.0	3.4	
23. YES•OTHER	0	0	3	3	2	9	17
	0.0	0.0	17.6	17.6	11.8	52.9	14.4
	0.0	0.0	12.0	6.5	28.6	30.0	
	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5	1.7	7.6	
COLUMN TOTAL	2	8	25	46	7	30	118
	1.7	6.8	21.2	39.0	5.9	25.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 121.16101 WITH 20 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0
CRAMER'S V = 0.50885

Table 42
Crosstabulation of
Agreements-By-Prime Funding Source

This analysis yielded statistical significance. However, all of the relationships were to be expected. For instance, it is expected that licensees which derive primary funding from local schools also have agreements with the local school districts. Those which derive primary funding from the state department of education also have agreements with that agency.

18. Agreements-By-Utilization Services

AGRMNTS	SERVUTIL		
COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	YES 1.	NO 2.	ROW TOTAL
NO 10.	1 / 16.7 / 1.4 / 0.8	5 / 83.3 / 11.4 / 4.2	6 / 5.1
YES 20.	3 / 100.0 / 4.1 / 2.5	0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0	3 / 2.5
YES,LOCAL DISTRI 21.	40 / 64.5 / 54.1 / 33.9	22 / 35.5 / 50.0 / 18.6	62 / 52.5
YES,STATE+LOCAL 22.	20 / 66.7 / 27.0 / 16.9	10 / 33.3 / 22.7 / 8.5	30 / 25.4
YES,OTHER 23.	10 / 58.8 / 13.5 / 8.5	7 / 41.2 / 15.9 / 5.9	17 / 14.4
COLUMN TOTAL	74 / 62.7	44 / 37.3	118 / 100.0

Table 43
Crosstabulation of
Agreements-By-Utilization Services

This analysis yielded no statistical significance.

19. Agreements-By-Printed Materials

AGRMNTS	SERVPRNT YES	NO	ROW TOTAL
	1.	2.	
10. NO	3	3	6
	50.0	50.0	5.1
	3.2	3.2	
	2.5	2.5	
20. YES	3	0	3
	100.0	0.0	2.5
	3.2	0.0	
	2.5	0.0	
21. YES, LOCAL DISTRI	53	9	62
	85.5	14.5	52.5
	57.0	36.0	
	44.9	7.6	
22. YES, STATE + LOCAL	23	7	30
	76.7	23.3	25.4
	24.7	28.0	
	19.5	5.9	
23. YES, OTHER	11	6	17
	64.7	35.3	14.4
	11.8	24.0	
	9.3	5.1	
COLUMN TOTAL	93	25	118
	78.8	21.2	100.0

Table 44
Crosstabulation of
Agreements-By-Printed Materials

This analysis yielded no statistical significance.

20. Percentage of Station Budget-By-Type of Station

PCSTABUD		TYPESTA 1. NETWORK	2. UNIVERSITY	3. COMMUNITY	4. SCHOOLBOARD	ROW TOTAL
1 TO 24PCT.	1.	6	15	18	1	40
		15.0	37.5	45.0	2.5	33.9
		27.3	42.9	40.9	5.9	
		5.1	12.7	15.3	0.8	
25 TO 49PCT.	2.	4	10	9	5	28
		14.3	35.7	32.1	17.9	23.7
		18.2	28.6	20.5	29.4	
		3.4	8.5	7.6	4.2	
50 TO 74PCT.	3.	4	1	4	2	11
		36.4	9.1	36.4	18.2	9.3
		18.2	2.9	9.1	11.8	
		3.4	0.8	3.4	1.7	
75 TO 100PCT.	4.	3	0	3	4	10
		30.0	0.0	30.0	40.0	8.5
		13.6	0.0	6.8	23.5	
		2.5	0.0	2.5	3.4	
NO ANSWER	5.	5	9	10	5	29
		17.2	31.0	34.5	17.2	24.6
		22.7	25.7	22.7	29.4	
		4.2	7.6	8.5	4.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		22	35	44	17	118
		18.6	29.7	37.3	14.4	100.0

Table 45

Crosstabulation of
Percentage of Station Budget-By-Type of Station

This analysis yielded no statistical significance. However, it is interesting to note that approximately the same percentage (25%) of respondents at each type of station was unable to provide the budget information in response to this question.

21. Percentage of Station Budget-By-Per Student Rate

PCSTABDG	PERSTRT .50 OR LESS (1.)	.51 to .99 (2.)	1.00 TO 1.49 (3.)	1.50 TO 1.99 (4.)	2.00 OR MORE (5.)	NO ANSWER (6.)	ROW TOTAL
1. 1 TO 24 PCT.	4	2	10	4	1	19	40
	10.0	5.0	25.0	10.0	2.5	47.5	33.9
	30.8	33.3	52.6	40.0	25.0	28.8	
	3.4	1.7	8.5	3.4	0.8	16.1	
2. 25 TO 49 PCT.	5	0	4	3	1	15	28
	17.9	0.0	14.3	10.7	3.6	53.6	23.7
	38.5	0.0	21.1	30.0	25.0	22.7	
	4.2	0.0	3.4	2.5	0.8	12.7	
3. 50 TO 74 PCT.	1	0	3	1	1	5	11
	9.1	0.0	27.3	9.1	9.1	45.5	9.3
	7.7	0.0	15.8	10.0	25.0	7.6	
	0.8	0.0	2.5	0.8	0.8	4.2	
4. 75 TO 100 PCT.	1	0	0	0	0	9	10
	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.0	8.5
	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.6	
	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.6	
5. NO ANSWER	2	4	2	2	1	18	29
	6.9	13.8	6.9	6.9	3.4	62.1	24.6
	15.4	66.7	10.5	20.0	25.0	27.3	
	1.7	3.4	1.7	1.7	0.8	15.3	
COLUMN TOTAL	13	6	19	10	4	66	118
	11.0	5.1	16.1	8.5	3.4	55.9	100.0

Table 46

Crosstabulation of
Percentage of Station Budget-By-Per Student Rate

This analysis yielded no statistical significance. It seems to indicate that there is no direct relationship between how much a station spends on instructional programming and the rate charged to constituent schools.

22. Prime Funding Source-By-Per Student Rate

PRIMFDSC	.50 OR LESS	.51 TO .99	1.00 TO 1.49	1.50 TO 1.99	2.00 OR MORE	NO ANSWER	ROW TOTAL
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	
1.	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
NO ANSWER	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	1.7
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	
	0	0	0	0	0	8	8
LEGISLATOR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	6.8
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.1	
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.8	
	3	0	3	0	0	19	25
STATE DOE	12.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	76.0	21.2
	23.1	0.0	15.8	0.0	0.0	28.8	
	2.5	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	16.1	
	5	4	8	9	2	18	46
LOCAL SCHOOLS	10.9	8.7	17.4	19.6	4.3	39.1	39.0
	38.5	66.7	42.1	90.0	50.0	27.3	
	4.2	3.4	6.8	7.6	1.7	15.3	
	1	0	2	0	0	5	7
REGIONAL [illegible]	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	71.4	5.9
	0.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	7.6	
	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	4.2	
	5	2	6	1	2	14	30
UNIVERSITY	16.7	6.7	20.0	3.3	6.7	46.7	25.4
	38.5	33.3	31.6	10.0	50.0	21.2	
	4.2	1.7	5.1	0.8	1.7	11.9	
	13	6	19	10	4	66	118
	11.0	5.1	16.1	8.5	3.4	55.9	100.0

Table 47
Crosstabulation of
Prime Funding Source-By-Per Student Rate

This analysis yielded no statistical significance.

23. Prime Funding Source-By-Type of Station

PRIMFUSC	TYPESTA 1.0 NETWORK	2.0 UNIVERSITY	3.0 COMMUNITY	4.0 SCHOOLBD	ROW TOTAL
1. NO ANSWER	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1 50.0 2.9 0.8	1 50.0 2.3 0.8	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 1.7
2. LEGISLATURE	8 100.0 36.4 6.8	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	8 6.8
3. STATE DOE	10 40.0 45.5 8.5	4 16.0 11.4 3.4	10 40.0 22.7 8.5	1 4.0 5.9 0.8	25 21.2
4. LOCAL SCHOOLS	4 8.7 18.2 3.4	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	30 65.2 68.2 25.4	12 26.1 70.6 10.2	46 39.0
5. REGIONAL AGENCIES	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	3 42.9 6.8 2.5	4 57.1 23.5 3.4	7 5.9
7. UNIVERSITY	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	30 100.0 85.7 25.4	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	30 25.4
COLUMN TOTAL	22 18.6	35 29.7	44 37.3	17 14.4	118 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 159.07402 WITH 15 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0
CRAMER'S V = 0.67034
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.75771

Table 48
Crosstabulation of
Prime Funding Source-By-Type of Station

This analysis yielded statistical significance. However, the relationships were to be expected. For instance, university stations might have been expected to receive the bulk of their funding from a university budget. Community stations might be expected to receive most of their funds for instructional services from the local schools. Network stations might be expected to receive most of their funding from the legislature or the state department of education.

24. Type of Station-By-Source of Scheduling Decisions

SCSCHDCS	TYPESTA 1. NETWORK	2. UNIVERSITY	3. COMMUNITY	4. SCHOOLBOARD	ROW TOTAL
1. FIELD CONSULTATI	10 21.7 45.5 8.5	12 26.1 34.3 10.2	19 41.3 43.2 16.1	5 10.9 29.4 4.2	46 39.0
2. ADMINISTRATIVE D	12 17.1 54.5 10.2	21 30.0 60.0 17.8	25 35.7 56.8 21.2	12 17.1 70.6 10.2	70 59.3
3. NO ANSWER	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 100.0 5.7 1.7	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	2 1.7
COLUMN TOTAL	22 18.6	35 29.7	44 37.3	17 14.4	118 100.0

Table 49
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Source of Scheduling Decisions

For the purposes of this analysis, the sources of scheduling decisions were identified as those involving field consultation (e.g. advisory committees and combined sources of input) and those which represented primarily administrative decisions (e.g. station personnel, state department of education personnel). The analysis yielded no statistical significance.

25. Type of Station-By-Source of Programming Decisions

SCPGMDCS	TYPESTA 1. NETWORK	2. UNIVERSITY	3. COMMUNITY	4. SCHOOLBOARD	ROW TOTAL
1. FIELD CONSULTATI	19	27	42	17	105
	18.1	25.7	40.0	16.2	89.0
	86.4	77.1	95.5	100.0	
	16.1	22.9	35.6	14.4	
2. ADMINISTRATIVE D	3	4	0	0	7
	42.9	57.1	0.0	0.0	5.9
	13.6	11.4	0.0	0.0	
	2.5	3.4	0.0	0.0	
3. NO ANSWER	0	4	2	0	6
	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	5.1
	0.0	11.4	4.5	0.0	
	0.0	3.4	1.7	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	22	35	44	17	118
	18.6	29.7	37.3	14.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.38792 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0373
CRAMER'S V = 0.23818

Table 50
Crosstabulation of
Type of Station-By-Source of Programming Decisions

For the purpose of this analysis, the sources of programming decisions were identified as those involving field consultation (e.g. advisory committees, combined sources of input) and those which represented primarily administrative decisions (e.g. station personnel, state department of education personnel). Unlike the preceding analysis, this crosstabulation yielded statistical significance. Although the numbers in the cells are low, the only licensees which indicated one-sided administrative decisions regarding programming were network and university licensees.

This is a question which deserves further attention. Nevertheless, it is clear that the overwhelming majority of each type of licensee relies heavily on input from users in making programming decisions.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It was mentioned in the Introduction that this is viewed as an initial study of instructional television services in the United States. As such, it might raise many questions. If such is the case, it is hoped that in raising the questions the data reported herein will also provide direction for future studies which might seek answers for those questions.

One hundred forty-one licensees were contacted. Usable responses were obtained from 128 licensees (90%). Ten of the usable responses (7%) were from stations which do not provide ITV programming. The remaining stations (118) made up the population of this study.

Most (99%) provide programming for grade levels K-12. Some (48%) provide college level programs in addition to K-12 programs. Only a few indicated that their programming was aimed at a grade level span of less than K-12.

All of the respondents provide some additional services besides broadcasting the instructional programs. Most (79%) provide printed materials for the series which they broadcast. A large number (63%) provide utilization services and technical consultation (69%). A few (22%) provide technical maintenance services. Several (32%) make programs available in alternative formats (cassettes, films, etc.).

The majority of the licensees provide K-12 programming and reach out to a variety of sources for programs. Ninety-one percent use PBS programs. Ninety-eight percent use other sources such as Agency for Instructional Television, Great Plains National and regional network sources.

The licensees' relationships with the schools which they serve are somewhat proscribed by the types of stations which they are and their primary sources of funding. As might be expected, community-based licensees are deeply involved with the schools and receive a major portion of their funding from the schools. University-based licensees receive less of their operating budget from the instructional programming which they provide to the schools, and, therefore, tend to provide fewer additional services to the schools. In this study, data were too scattered to determine patterns in the relationships. However, such patterns might become a topic for additional study.

Most of the licensees (86%) operate under legislative mandate or formal agreements with the schools. Only 25% have informal agreements with the schools (some in addition to formal agreements).

More than half of the licensees do not charge "per student rates" or failed to report what those rates are.

The licensees indicate a wide range of involvement by school personnel in program selection and a substantial but somewhat lower involvement in scheduling decisions. Programming and scheduling decisions at most stations are made between March and May.

Cross tabulation analyses indicated that university licensees might have characteristics which make them uniquely different from the other types of licensees. Those differences are manifest in a lower incidence of outside support for instructional programming, later decisions relative to program selection and scheduling, and a tendency to provide fewer "additional" services. University licensees also tend to rely more on non-PBS sources than do other types of licensees.

Perhaps more important than the facts learned in this study is the experience gained with the methodology. Future studies can benefit greatly from these experiences.

This study has shown that a periodic national study of the status of instructional television services in the United States is feasible. Future studies must incorporate the following important change: terminology must be clear. Definitions must include at least the following terms: agreements (What are the parameters for formal and informal agreements? Does legislation automatically imply agreement? Does agreement with the state department of education automatically imply agreement with local school districts?), school districts and buildings (Only public schools or private and parochial schools also? How are educational "campuses" interpreted?), primary funding source (What are the criteria for making determinations?), persons involved in additional services (Only those on the payroll of the licensee? Full time or part time?), percentage of station budget (What criteria for computing?), sources of programming (Distributor? Producer?).

Based on the findings and interpretations in this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. A survey such as this should be conducted on a bi-annual basis. Use of a standard format will permit the development of a longitudinal data bank. In future years, a mail survey will probably suffice, with telephone follow up only to those licensees who do not respond within three weeks.
2. Future studies (such as this and others) should include questions which examine crucial issues concerning instructional television.

For instance,

-What <u>impact</u> is instructional television (utilization) having in classrooms?

-Are the services provided tied to the number of students served?

-Should PBS/CPB assist in identifying and providing liaison with other sources of programming? If so, how?

-How important are the "additional services" provided by the licensees?

-What determines the number of personnel providing additional services?

-What impact is new technology (e.g. CATV, ITFS, cassettes) having on the services provided by the licensees?

3. Further studies should probe the apparent differences between university licensees and the other types. Are the differences real? What are the implications for instructional programming? What impact does this have on the schools being served?

4. This study should be shared with station management, school administrators, education department personnel and other interested parties. Their input for the design of future studies should be sought systematically.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONS WE WILL ASK YOU

Some of our questions may not apply precisely to your situation, or cover your situation adequately. Hopefully, you can help us overcome any imprecision. In addition, we don't want to demand too much of your time and effort. So, financial data can be estimates to the nearest $1000, and answers to questions 11 and 15b should be the most precise estimates you can make without putting in a great deal of time and effort.

1. Is your station providing programming that is meant to be used in the classroom? (check one answer)

   ( ) A -- yes, service for K-12 grades
   ( ) B -- yes, K-12 and higher levels
   ( ) C -- yes, only above grade 12
   ( ) D -- no (do not continue with the questions if you do not provide any such services)

THE REST OF THE QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO K-12 SERVICES

2. What is the source of these programs?

   ( ) A -- solely PBS material
   ( ) B -- PBS material and material from other sources
   ( ) C -- only non-PBS material

   If (b) or (c), please identify your non-PBS programming sources.

3. Are you providing classroom programs in a format other than open-circuit broadcast? (E.g., film, cassette, ITFS)

   ( ) No
   ( ) Yes -- please explain

4. You said that your station does provide programming that is meant for classroom use. Are there either formal or informal agreements about this programming service between the station and any agencies that administer or support the schools?

   ( ) No (skip to question #10)
   ( ) Yes

   If yes, what kind of agencies are they? (E.g., a single school district, multiple school districts, state agencies, individual schools) Use the back of this sheet if needed.

5. Is there any <u>formal</u> agreement, like a contract, with any such agency? Or do you operate under a state or local law?

( ) No -- skip to question #7
( ) Yes
If yes, please describe each of these relationships.

6a. How many school districts do you serve under all such agreements?

_____

b. How many schools and students does this include?

schools_____
students_____

c. Which grade levels are covered by such agreements?

7. Do <u>informal</u> agreements exist with any educational agency, like verbal agreements or informal requests for programs?

( ) No -- skip to question #9
( ) Yes
If yes, please describe each of these informal relationships.

8a. How many school districts are under any informal agreement?

_____

b. How many schools and students does this include?

schools_____
students_____

c. Which grade levels are covered by informal agreements?

9. Does the agency (agencies) discussed in questions 5-8 provide funding for your station's classroom service?

( ) No -- skip to question #10
( ) Yes

a. If yes, what is the amount?_____

b. If there is a per-student rate, what is it?_____

c. If not, how is the amount of funding determined?

10. Are there any other sources of funds for support of your service to the schools?

Station dollars (amount)_____

Outside dollars (amounts and sources)

11. Roughly, what percentage of all station operating funds is represented by the total budget for your service to the schools?

_____%

12. How does your station decide which programming will be a part of your service to the schools? Please identify the roles that various groups play (e.g., curriculum committees, advisory groups, teacher evaluations, etc.), and be as descriptive as possible.

13. Who determines the placement of classroom programs within the broadcast schedule? How is this done?

14. When are these decisions made?

15. Are there any of the following additional services provided to schools along with your classroom programs?

a. utilization personnel? ( ) Yes ( ) No
if yes (i) how many personnel?_____
(ii) who provides the funds?

b. print materials? ( ) Yes ( ) No
if yes (i) for about how many different program series per year?_____
(ii) who provides the funds?

c. technical maintenance? ( ) Yes ( ) No
if yes, (i) number of people on maintenance staff_____
(ii) who provides the funds?

d. technical consultation? ( ) Yes ( ) No
if yes, (i) number of people involved_____
(ii) who provides the funds?

APPENDIX B

LICENSEES INCLUDED IN DATA ANALYSES
(Alphabetically by State)

TYPE	LICENSEE
Network	ALABAMA ETV
University	KUAC FAIRBANKS
University	KAET TEMPE ARIZ
University	KUAT TUCSON ARIZ
Network	ARKANSAS ETV
Community	KEET EUREKA CAL
Community	KCET LOS ANGELS CAL
School Board	KLCS LOS ANGELS CAL
Community	KIXE REDDING CAL
Community	KVIE SACRAMENTO CAL
University	KVCR SN BERNDNO CAL
University	KPBS SN DIEGO CAL
Community	KQED SN FRNCSCO CAL
School Board	KTEH SAN JOSE CAL
School Board	KRMA DENVER COL
University	KTSC PUEBLO COL
Network	CONNECTICUT ETV
University	WUFT GNSVL FLA
Community	WJCT JKSNVL FLA
School Board	WTHS-WSEC MIAMI
Community	WMFE ORLANDO FLA
Community	WEDU TAMPA FLA
University	WGIV ATHENS GA
Network	GEORGIA ETV
School Board	WETV ATLANTA GA
Network	HAWAII ETV
University	KAID BOISE ID
University	KUID MOSCOW ID
University	KBGL POCATLO ID
University	WSIU-WUSI CRBNDL IL
Community	WTTW CHICAGO IL
University	WILL URBANA ILL
Community	WNIN EVANSVILLE IND
University	WVVT VINCENNES IND
Network	IOWA ETV
Community	KPTS WICHITA KAN
Network	KENTUCKY ETV
School Board	WKPC LOUISVILLE KY
Network	MAINE ETV
Network	MARYLAND ETV
University	WGVC ALLNDLE MICH
Community	WTVS DETROIT MICH
University	WNPB MARQUETTE MICH
University	WCMU MT PLEASANT MICH
University	WUCM UNIV CTR MICH
Community	KWCM APPLETON MINN
School Board	KAVT AUSTIN MINN
Community	WDSE DULUTH MINN.
Community	KTCA-KICI ST PAUL MN
Community	KCPI KANSAS CTY MO
Community	KETC ST LOUIS MO
School Board	KLVX LAS VEGAS NEV
Network	NEW HAMPSHIRE ETV

TYPE	LICENSEE
Network	NEW JERSEY ETV
University	KNME ALBUQUERQUE NM
School Board	WNYE BROOKLYN NY
Community	WNED BUFFALO NY
Community	WSKG BINGHAMTON NY
Community	WLIW GARDEN CITY NY
Community	WCNY LIVERPOOL NY
Community	WNET NEW YORK NY
Community	WXXI ROCHESTER NY
Community	WMHT SCHENECTADY NY
Community	WMPE-WNPI WATRTWN NY
School Board	WTVI CHARLOTTE NC
Community	NORTH DAKOTA ETV
University	WOUB ATHENS OHIO
University	WBGU BOWLING GRN OH
Community	WCET CINCINNATI OHIO
Community	WVIZ CLEVELAND OHIO
University	WOSU COLUMBUS OHIO
Network	WNEO KENT OHIO
School Board	WGSF NEWARK OHIO
University	WMUB OXFORD OHIO
Community	WGTE TOLEDO OHIO
Network	KOKH-KETA OKLAHOMA
Network	OREGON ETV
Community	WLVT BETHLEHEM PA
Community	WQLN ERIE PA
Community	WITF HERSHEY PA
Community	WHYY PHILADELPHIA PA
Community	WQED PITTSBURGH PA
Community	WVIA PITTSTON PA
University	WPSX ST COLLEGE PA
Network	WSBE PROVIDENCE, R I
Network	SOUTH CAROLINA ETV
University	KESD BROOKINGS SD
Network	WTCI CHATTANOOGA TEN
Network	WSJK KNOXVILLE TENN.
Community	WKNO MEMPHIS TENN
School Board	WDCN NASHVILLE TENN
Community	KLRN AUSTIN TEX
Community	KEDT CORPUS CRSTI TX
Community	KERA DALLAS TEX
University	KUHT HOUSTON TEX
University	KUED SLT LK CTY UTAH
Network	VERMONT ETV
Community	WNVT ANNANDALE VA
Community	WVPT HARRISONBURG VA
School Board	WHRD NORFOLK VA
Community	WCVE-WCVN RICHMND VA
Community	WDRA-WSVN ROANOKE VA
University	KCTS SEATTLE WASH
School Board	KSPS SPOKANE WASH
School Board	KPEC TCMA-LKLD WASH
School Board	KTPS TACOMA WASH

School Board	KYVE YAKIMA WASH
Network	WSWP BECKLEY W VA
Network	WMUL HUNTINGTON W VA
University	WWVU, MORGANTOWN W VA
Network	WPNE GREEN BAY WISC
University	WHA MADISON WISC
University	WMVS-WMVP MLWKEE WIS
University	KCSM SANMATEO CALIF
University	KTXT LUBBOCK TEX
University	KBYO PROVO UTAH
University	WTIW BLOOMINGTON IND
Community	WNIT ELKHART IND

APPENDIX C

RESPONSES RECEIVED AFTER DATA ANALYSIS

	North Carolina ETV	WGBH/WGBY Mass. ETV	La. ETV Authority	KBGL Pocatello, Idaho	KOCE Huntington Beach, Cal	KUSD S. Dakota	WCAE St.John,Ind.	Miss. Authority for ETV
TYPE OF STATION	N	C	N	N	U	N	S	N
PROVIDES PROGRAMS	K-12+	K-12	K-12	K-12+	K-12+	K-12+	K-12	1-12
SOURCE OF PROGRAMS	Multiple	Multiple	Multiple	Multiple	Multiple	Multiple	Multiple	Multiple
OTHER FORMATS	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
AGREEMENTS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
FORMAL AGREEMENTS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
# DISTRICTS	?	400	39	20	10	( )	1	150
# SCHOOLS	1,500	2,500	?	?	82	(90%) (of) (the)	7	1,250
# STUDENTS	1,000,000	1,000,000	?	?	50,000	(State)	6,000	525,000
GRADE LEVELS	K-12	K-12	K-12	K-12	K-12	K-12	K-12	1-12
INFORMAL AGREEMENTS	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
# DISTRICTS	---	---	---	---	---	---	20	---
# SCHOOLS	---	---	---	---	---	---	?	---
# STATIONS	---	---	---	---	---	---	?	---
AGENCY FUNDING	Yes (State)	Yes (State)	Yes (State)	Yes (State)	Yes	Yes (State)	Yes (LEA)	Yes (State)
PER STUDENT RATE	None	None	None	None	$.50	None	None	None

	North Carolina ETV	WGBH/WGBY Mass. ETV	La. ETV Authority	KSBGL Pocatello, Idaho	KOCE Huntington Beach, Cal.	KUSD S. Dakota	WCAE St.John, Ind.	Miss. Authority for ETV
OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING	None	Grants	None	None	Station	Grants	Grants	Grants
PERCENTAGE OF STATION BUDGET	33	?	70	40	?	?	?	57
PROGRAM DECISIONS	SED person	Combin.	SED person	Combin.	Combin.	Combin.	Combin.	Combin.
SCHEDULE DECISIONS	station person	station person	station person	SED person	Teachers	SED person	station person	station person
PROGRAM TIMETABLE	February	Jan-March	February	August	December	July	June-August	Jan-Feb.
SCHEDULE TIMETABLE	February	March-May	February	August	December	July	June-August	Jan-Feb.
UTILIZATION SERVICES	Yes (3)	No	Yes (3)	No	Yes (2)	No	Yes (1)	Yes (5)
PRINT MATERIALS	No	Yes (50)	Yes (62)	No	Yes (35)	Yes (36)	Yes	Yes (52)
TECHNICAL MAINT.	No	Yes (1)	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (2)
TECHNICAL CONSULT.	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (2)

NOTES: 1. WYES, New Orleans was contacted and indicated that the Louisiana ETV Authority is responsible for all ITV services.

2. KNCT, Kileen, Texas indicated that it does not provide ITV services at this time.

APPENDIX D

LICENSEES WHO DISTRIBUTE IN OTHER FORMATS

The question was raised concerning alternative means of distributing ITV programs. The information provided below indicates that a sizeable number of licensees are becoming involved, at least in some limited way, in alternative distribution formats.

A. Cassette and/or film

Licensee	Type
Maryland ETV	Network
New Jersey ETV	Network
WSJK-Knoxville, Tenn.	Network
WPNE-Green Bay, Wisc.	Network
KRMA-Denver, Colo.	School Board
WETV-Atlanta, Ga.	School Board
KAVT-Austin, Minn.	School Board
KLVX-Las Vegas, Nev.	School Board
WNYE-Brooklyn, N.Y.	School Board
WTVI-Charlotte, N.C.	School Board
KPEC-Lakeland, Wash.	School Board
WCMU-Mt. Pleasant, Mich.	University
KETC-St. Louis, Mo.	University
WBGU-Bowling Green, Ohio	University
WHA-Madison, Wisc.	University
WOUB-Athens, Ohio	University
WPSX-St. College, Pa.	University
WWVU-Morgantown, W. Va.	University

Licensee	Type
WJCT-Jacksonville, Fla.	Community
WMFE-Orlanda, Fla.	Community
KETC-St. Louis, Mo.	Community
WCET-Cincinnati, Ohio	Community
WVIZ-Cleveland, Ohio	Community
WLVT-Bethlehem, Pa.	Community
WQLN-Erie, Pa.	Community
WNVT-Annandale, Va.	Community
WVPT-Harrisonburg, Va.	Community

B. Electronic Distribution (CATV and/or ITFS)

Licensee	Type
Oregon ETV	Network
WTHS-Miami, Fla.	School Board
KSPS-Spokane, Wash.	School Board
KTPS-Tacoma, Wash.	School Board
WILL-Urbana, Ill.	University
KLRN-Austin, Tex.	Community
WCVE-Richmond, Va.	Community
WVIZ-Cleveland, Ohio	Community

C. Combinations of Alternative Distribution

Licensee	Type
87 South Carolina ETV	Network
24 Georgia ETV	Network
3 KAET-Tempe, Ariz.	University