

## **WINDOWS ON THE WORLD: CANADIAN VERSUS U.S. TELEVISION VOICES**

**Tannis MacBeth Williams, Susana Phillips, Lisa Travis,  
and David Wotherspoon  
The University of British Columbia**

### **ABSTRACT**

Similarities and differences in the portrayal of Canada, the U.S.A., and other world regions by Canadian and U.S. television programming were examined, as was evidence of Canada as bilingual and Francophone/Anglophone culture/Canadians. Comparisons were made for country of production (Canada, U.S.A.) as well as among five channel categories: CTV, CBC English, CBC French, U.S. private (ABC, CBS, NBC combined), and PBS.

Analyse des ressemblances et différences de la représentation du Canada, des Etats-Unis et d'autres régions du monde dans la programmation télévisuelle canadienne américaine. Comparaison entre les pays producteurs de même qu'entre cinq catégories de postes: CTV, Radio-Canada (réseaux anglais et français), réseaux privés américains (ABC, CBS et NBC) et le réseau public américain PBS.

### **WINDOWS ON THE WORLD: CANADIAN VERSUS U.S. TELEVISION VOICES**

In our own and others' previous research it has been demonstrated that several aspects of the content of television influence viewers' behaviour (e.g., Joy *et al.*, 1986 for aggression), attitudes (e.g., Kimball, 1986, regarding gender roles), and perceptions of social reality (e.g., Hawkins & Pingree, 1982). Viewers are not, however, passively influenced; they play an active role (Dorr, 1986; Katz, 1988).

The communication outcome results from an interaction of message and viewer characteristics, and two viewers may take away different meanings from the same content. Nevertheless, all meanings do not exist equally in the message; a dominant or preferred meaning has been inscribed, with that preferred meaning itself part of the message (Morley, 1980). Media content is thought to be most influential when reinforced by personal experience or when other sources of information are limited (Hornik *et al.*, 1980; Lazarsfeld & Merton, 1971; Schramm, 1973). It is likely, therefore, that the media play a role in both the formation and maintenance of the attitudes and expectations of residents of one country regarding their own and other countries, and within their country, of attitudes and expectations regarding regions and subgroups. Some of the studies do not permit causal inferences, but the evidence to date is consistent with this hypothesis (e.g., Baer & Winter, 1983; Tate & Trach, 1980; Winter, 1986). Moreover, as McQuail (1987) points out, "most good content analysis does lead to propositions about possible effects, but the results should be interpreted first of all as themselves *an effect*—whether of media intention, of assumptions about the audience or of working procedures, or all three" (p. 180, emphasis in original).

In recognition of potential media effects on viewers' knowledge and attitudes about their own and other countries, many governments have established regulatory policies. In Canada, the Broadcasting Act (1978, incorporating amendments to the 1968 Act) specifies that "the Canadian broadcasting system... safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada" (3b), "provide reasonable, balanced opportunity for the expression of differing views on matters of public concern" (3d), and use "predominantly Canadian creative and other resources" (3d). For the national broadcasting service (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, CBC) the Broadcasting Act (1978) further specifies (3g) that it "be a balanced service of information, enlightenment and entertainment" (i), "actively contribute to the flow of cultural and regional information and entertainment" (iii), and "contribute to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity" (iv).

The Caplan-Sauvageau Task Force on Broadcasting Policy (1986) reviewed evidence that the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) has significantly diluted the notion of a "predominantly Canadian" broadcasting system as specified in the Broadcast Act. The Task Force recommended that the "Canadian broadcasting system should play an active role in developing an awareness of Canada, reflect the cultural diversity of Canadians and make available a wider range of programming that is Canadian in content and character and that provides for a continuing expression of Canadian identity. It should... actively contribute to the flow and exchange of information and expression among the regions of Canada" (p. 165). With regard to the CBC, the Task Force recommended that the Broadcasting Act provisions that it "be predominantly

Canadian in content and character, and... provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity, should be left intact in new legislation. The provision that the national service contribute to the development of national unity should be rescinded and replaced by a more socially oriented provision, for example, that the service contribute to the development of national consciousness" (p. 285). "Paramount consideration" should be given to "the funding, production and scheduling of Canadian programming of all types whenever these are in conflict with private interests" (p. 288).

The Broadcasting Bill (C-136; *Canadian voices: Canadian choices*, 1988) proposed in June 1988 to replace the Broadcast Act includes the statements that the Canadian broadcasting system "shall contribute in an appropriate manner to the creation and presentation of Canadian programming, making maximum use of Canadian creative and other resources" [3(1)(d)] and "should serve to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada" [3(1)(c)(i)]. The programming provided by the CBC "should (i) be predominantly and distinctively Canadian, (ii) reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences... (iv) contribute to shared national consciousness and identity..." [3(1)(n)]. The "private networks and programming undertakings should, to an extent consistent with the financial and other resources available to them, (i) contribute significantly to the creation and presentation of Canadian programming" [3(1)(p)]. Bill C-136 officially died when parliament was dissolved with the Fall 1988 federal election call, but interest in updating the Broadcast Act has not waned.

In view of the continuing debates concerning Canadian broadcast policies, it seemed timely to study the TV networks received nationally in Canada with regard to portrayal of Canada, the U.S.A., and other regions of the world.<sup>1</sup> Whether a country is represented and how it is represented both are central to audience impressions. The goal of this research was to give a broad overview, with some attention to both the whether and how questions. This overview, covering an entire week of programming on seven channels, could not address the subtleties or variety of messages. Instead, it was designed to complement in-depth analyses by other researchers of selected facets of subsets of programming (e.g., Singer, 1970; Winter, 1986).

In many content analyses researchers have focused only on informative programming, e.g., news, or only on entertainment programming. When both have been studied the data have been analyzed separately. The implicit question is: What is the content available when viewers seek information versus entertainment? It is clear from uses and gratifications research that viewers do choose different programming for different reasons. It does not follow, however, that viewers' attitudes and behaviour are influenced only by content intended to be informative. Nor do they learn only from such programs. Discussions of the effects of televised

violence on viewers' aggressive behaviour are not restricted to the effects of violence in certain kinds of programming, nor are discussions of the influence of TV on viewers' perceptions of social reality or attitudes (e.g., regarding gender roles). Because attitudes and behaviour can be influenced by all types of content, the first question implicit in this study was: What is the content available when the audience is largest and therefore the potential impact of content is greatest? The major analyses focused on the question: When Canadians watch TV in prime-time, how are Canada, the United States, and other world regions portrayed? Canadian content in prime-time was identified as a priority in the Caplan-Sauvageau report (1986) and by the Minister of Communications (MacDonald, 1988) when she tabled Bill C-136. Other analyses focused on the second and third questions: For viewers who seek information in news programming or choose to watch primarily for entertainment, how are countries portrayed?

Several hypotheses guided the research.

1. Programs shown on the television networks of a given country, or produced in that country, will focus more on that country than on any other country. For Canada this hypothesis is explicit in the Broadcasting Act (1978), Caplan-Sauvageau (1986) report, and proposed Bill C-136 (Canadian choices: Canadian voices, 1988). It is implicit if not explicit in U.S. policies.
2. The U.S.A. will be evident in more programs on Canadian channels and produced in Canada than vice-versa. As Robinson (1981) pointed out, small countries must be more concerned with what the major powers are doing than vice-versa.
3. Because they share a border, one language, and are major economic partners, both Canadian and U.S. programs will focus more on the other North American country than on any other country or region in the world.
4. There will be greater focus on regions outside North America by Canadian than by U.S. channels and programs. This hypothesis is prompted by Canada's official policy of multiculturalism and by the unofficial melting pot philosophy of the U.S.A., as well as by the results of several content analyses of newspapers (e.g., de la Garde, 1981; Hart, 1963; Robinson, 1981).
5. The special mandates of CBC with regard to Canadian culture will be reflected in greater attention to Canada by CBC channels than by the privately-owned national Canadian network, CTV.
6. Third world and non-Western regions will receive more negative than positive portrayals, as Larson (1984) found for evening news coverage

from 1972 to 1981 by the three major privately owned U.S. networks. From several perspectives Canadian and U.S. programming would be expected to be similar in this regard. For example, complaints by residents of these regions refer to "western" media, and both Canadian and U.S. networks rely to a large extent on the same few global news agencies (e.g., Associated Press, Reuters) whose news values emphasize the exception over the rule (Lorimer & McNulty, 1987). On other bases (e.g., as outlined in Hypothesis 4) Canadian and U.S. programming might be expected to differ.

## METHOD

### Program Sample

All 1089 programs shown between 7 a.m. and 1 a.m. October 2 through 8, 1985 on the seven TV networks received nationally in Canada were videotaped in Vancouver. Use of one entire week rather than a composite week ensured that differences among networks occurred because of differences in the content they chose to depict about the same world events.

### Coding System

The method developed for this research lies between the extremes of the two dimensions of content analysis described by Rosengren (1981). Its starting point was the coding system developed at the Center for Research on the Influences of TV on Children (CRITC; 1983) at the University of Kansas. That system was designed to enable knowledgeable viewers to categorize a program with which they are familiar on several basic dimensions, such as whether it is intended to be informative or not, and which program type it represents (e.g., non-fiction, and within that category, informative, and within that category, news analysis/commentary). The eight-variable CRITC coding system, which does not require watching any specific program episode, was expanded considerably for this research in terms of both the number of dimensions covered (e.g., countries, gender roles) and the depth with which each is examined (Williams *et al.*, 1986). The goal is to reliably assess the "take-home" message for the (mythical) average viewer. Trained coders watch a show in its entirety before answering the 25 pages of questions. Unlike traditional content analysis, they are not allowed to stop or rewind the tape. (They are, however, instructed to fast forward through the commercials.) The questions are designed to assess global, final impressions, based on both the manifest and latent content.

For Canada and the United States coders were prompted by the coding sheet to indicate whether the country received a major focus, minor focus, passing reference, or no mention. For all others, they listed the country or region (e.g.,

Middle East) and coded it similarly. In essence, passing reference meant it was mentioned in a sentence or two or shown briefly and was incidental to the focus of the program segment. Major focus meant it was given noticeably more airtime focus than other countries in the program (e.g., news) or that there were numerous cues (e.g., accent, references to the people or history) and the program could not have been set in another country (e.g., in dramatic fiction). Minor focus meant it fell in between. In describing results, the phrase "some focus" includes major focus, minor focus, and passing reference. The country's name need not be mentioned, provided there were other salient cues. Coders also decided whether the take-home message about each country or region was positive, negative, balanced, or whether insufficient information was provided to make such a judgment. This occurred most often for passing references. Negative portrayals included not only portrayal of a country and/or some of its people as "bad", that is, in a negative light, but also portrayal of bad news, for example natural disasters, provided that the overall final impression was negative. The balanced category required presentation of both positive and negative aspects, and approximately equally.

The major departures from the average viewing experience are that coders are intensively trained, know the questions they will be asked, and take a few notes during coding, including a list of countries. For programs such as news with many short segments, they also list the segment topics. Coders may consult these lists when answering questions at the end of the program. This is enough of a memory jog to ensure adequate reliability even in programs with many characters or many short segments.

Another way in which this method differs from traditional content analysis and is more similar to audience research is that the coding team was large (20) and relatively heterogeneous. The coders were university students who ranged in age from 19 to 30 years but varied on several other dimensions, including marital status and socioeconomic status (SES). Their cultural backgrounds also were quite varied (British, Chinese, Indian, Hungarian, Korean, Portugese, Quebecois, Ukrainian). Several were bilingual and spoke English as a second language. These coders' evaluations of the content of a subset of the prime-time programs was found for most items to be similar to the evaluations of untrained or naive viewers who did not know the topics or questions in the coding system until after viewing their program (Wotherspoon & Williams, 1989).

### Reliability

Inter-coder reliability was established in three phases. First, during an extended training period all 20 coders watched, coded, and discussed a series of programs used only for training. Second, during pair coding, two coders watched a randomly assigned program together, independently answered the questions, compared their

answers, and discussed each disagreement until they agreed. The pre-discussion answers were used to calculate reliability; the agreed upon answers were the data for analyses. During the third phase (blind coding), coders were randomly assigned to code programs individually and a random 20% sub-set was coded independently by two coders. None of the coders knew which programs were in the blind coding reliability sample. To reduce chance agreement coders were instructed not to guess. Mean percent agreement for the variables in this article was .91 (range .81 to 1.00).<sup>2</sup>

### Statistical Analyses

Because of low expected cell frequencies, significance tests (chi-square,  $X^2$ ) sometimes could not be conducted without combining cells. This was done as consistently as possible but some variations did occur because the categories with low expected frequencies varied. When  $X^2$  was significant, the Sheffé theorem as described by Marascuilo (1966) was used to test all paired comparisons, setting the maximum significance level for the entire set within each category (e.g., of 10 comparisons between pairs of 5 channels) at  $p < .05$ . To enable readers concerned that Type 1 error has not been adequately controlled to apply a Bonferroni criterion, exact significance levels are reported, but only up to  $p < .0001$ .

## RESULTS

The data analyses involved two types of comparison. First, five *channel categories* were compared: (1) the privately-owned Canadian network CTV; the government-owned Canadian networks, (2) CBC English (CBCE); and (3) Radio Canada or CBC French (CBCF); (4) the privately-owned U.S. networks (ABC, CBS, and NBC combined); and (5) the publicly-owned U.S. network (PBS). Second, *programs produced* in Canada and the U.S.A. were compared. Some of the analyses focused on the prime-time programs ( $n = 238$ ) shown 7 to 11 p.m. Monday through Sunday. The extent to which results for that period generalized to the week as a whole and applied to both news ( $n = 217$ ) and non-informative entertainment ( $n = 618$ ) programming also was examined.

### Prime-Time: Country of Production Differences among Channel Categories

The proportions of prime-time programs on each channel category produced in Canada ( $n = 65$ ) versus the U.S.A. ( $n = 149$ )<sup>3</sup> were: 22.2% vs 77.8% for CTV; 75.0% vs 20.0% for CBCE; 79.4% vs. 5.9% for CBCF; 0% vs 99.0% for U.S. private, and 5.7% vs 54.3% for PBS,  $X^2(4) = 141.46$ ,  $p < .0001$ . Post hoc comparisons revealed that the two CBC channels were similar; that both carried more Canadian-produced programming than did CTV, PBS, and the private U.S. channels; and that CTV did not differ from the two U.S. channel categories. Stated the other way around, in Fall 1985, 87.7% of the Canadian-produced programming

available in prime-time was provided by CBC (46.2% CBCE, 41.5% CBCF), and only 9.2% by CTV. For comparison, de la Garde (1981) reported that during the 1967-68 season, 22.8% of the CTV network programming shown between 8:00 and 10:30 p.m. was Canadian, and that figure fell to 5% for 1978-79.

### Portrayals of Canada versus the U.S.A.: Prime-Time

*Channel comparisons.* To what degree did each channel category focus on its own country versus its neighbour, Canada versus the U.S.A.?<sup>4</sup> As Table 1 indicates, Canada was evident in more than half the programs on both CBC networks, about one-quarter of those on CTV, and was essentially absent on the U.S. networks. Canada usually was a major focus of programs on the Canadian networks (75.0% of CTV programs in which Canada was portrayed, 95.8% for CBCE, 75.0% for CBCF). The U.S.A. was evident in more than half the prime-time programs on CTV and CBCE, and almost half on CBCF. It is striking that, contrary to Hypothesis 1, almost three times as many prime-time CTV programs had a major or minor focus on the U.S.A. as on Canada<sup>5</sup>, and that 71.4% of prime-time CTV programs portrayed no evidence of Canada. Prime-time programming on PBS focused less explicitly than did the privately-owned networks on the United States, probably because 45.7% was imported from the U.K. and other countries. PBS did not focus more than did the U.S. private networks on Canada. The prime-time PBS programming (5.7%) with some focus on Canada was produced in Canada.

Another way of examining the data in Table 1 is to ask whether the Canadian and U.S. channel categories differed in focus on their *own* country, (that is, focus on Canada by CTV, CBCE, CBCF and focus on the U.S.A. by U.S. private and PBS; first three columns of top half of Table 1 and last two of bottom half). The answer is yes;  $X^2(4) = 73.49$ ,  $p < .0001$ , U.S. private > CTV, CBCE, and PBS; CBCF > CTV. The channels also differed in focus on the *other* country, that is, focus by Canadian networks on the U.S.A. and vice-versa,  $X^2(4) = 208.20$ ,  $p < .0001$ , U.S. private and PBS < CTV, CBCE, and CBCF; CTV > CBCF.



**TABLE 1**  
**PRIME-TIME AND NEWS PROGRAMS: FOCUS ON CANADA**  
**VERSUS U.S.A, BY CHANNEL CATEGORY**

	Canadian Channels			U.S. Channels	
	CTV (n=28)	CBCE (n=40)	CBCF (n=35)	U.S.Private* (n=100)	PBS (n=35)
<b>Prime-Time</b>					
<b>Canada</b>					
Some focus	28.6%	60.0%	68.6%	2.0%	5.7%
None	<u>71.4</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>31.4</u>	<u>98.0</u>	<u>94.3</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$X^2(4) = 127.30, p < .0001$ ; CBCF > U.S. private, PBS, & CTV; CBCE > U.S. private & PBS.					
<b>U.S.A.</b>					
Some focus	82.1%	67.5%	45.7%	90.0%	42.9%
None	<u>17.9</u>	<u>32.5</u>	<u>54.3</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>57.1</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$X^2(4) = 50.30, p < .0001$ ; U.S. private & CTV > CBCF & PBS.					
<b>News(entire week)</b>	(n=31)	(n=36)	(n=18)	(n=114)	(n=18)
<b>Canada</b>					
Some focus	100.0%	91.7%	83.3%	28.1%	22.2%
None	<u>0.0</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>71.9</u>	<u>77.8</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$X^2(4) = 98.84, p < .0001$ ; CTV, CBCE, CBCF > U.S. private, PBS					
<b>U.S.A.</b>					
Some focus	96.8%	77.8%	88.9%	97.4%	83.3%
None	<u>3.2</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>16.6</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2$  could not be calculated because of low expected frequencies.

Note: \* ABC, CBS, NBC combined.

These findings are consistent with Hypothesis 2 but provide only limited support for Hypotheses 1 and 5. The differences between CBCF and CTV were statistically significant, as hypothesized, but CBCE/CTV differences were not.

If the networks differed in prime-time in quantity of emphasis on Canada versus the U.S.A., did they also differ in type of emphasis (positive versus balanced versus negative)? The *other* country was portrayed similarly by all channel categories; 70.7% of the programs providing sufficient information for coders to judge were positive, none balanced, and 29.3% were negative. There were, however, differences in *own* country portrayals,  $X^2(6) = 39.06, p < .0001$ , with the U.S. channels combined because of low frequencies. More prime-time programs on the four U.S. channels (79.1% mean) than on CBCE (46.4%) and CBCF (62.5%) portrayed their own country positively; CTV was in between (66.7%) and not significantly different from the other channel categories. More CBCE (35.7%) and CBCF (29.2%) than CTV (0.0%) or U.S. (0.0%) programs portrayed their own country in a balanced manner. The proportion of negative portrayals did not differ significantly by channel category (mean 18.7%).

### Production source comparisons

The results for comparisons based on country of production underscore the channel category comparisons. Most (84.6%) of the prime-time programs produced in Canada contained some focus on Canada, whereas only 2.0% of the U.S. produced programs did so,  $X^2(1) = 152.95, p < .0001$ . Consistent with Hypothesis 2, some focus on the U.S.A. occurred in more U.S.-produced (87.9%) than Canadian-produced (55.4%) programs,  $X^2(1) = 27.95, p < .0001$ . Note that the pattern was not symmetrical; prime-time viewers of most Canadian-produced programs encountered the U.S.A. but Canada was hardly encountered at all in U.S.-produced programs.

Canadian and U.S.-produced prime-time programs also differed in the way in which they portrayed their own country,  $X^2(2) = 31.65, p < .0001$ ; significantly more U.S. than Canadian programs did so positively (92.7% versus 55.9%), fewer were balanced (0.0% versus 28.8%), and there was no difference for negative portrayals (7.3% versus 15.3%). Portrayals of the other country could not be compared because so few U.S. produced programs portrayed Canada.

In keeping with Hypothesis 3, the U.S. was evident in more prime-time Canadian produced programs (55.4%) than was any other region of the world (Western Europe, at 50.8% was next, followed by U.K., 36.9%, and Mideast/N. Africa, 24.6%).<sup>5</sup> The converse aspect of Hypothesis 3 was not supported; all other regions arose in more U.S. produced programs than did Canada<sup>5</sup> (2.0%; Western Europe, 28.9%; U.K., 20.1%; Far East, 10.7%; Mideast/N. Africa, 9.4%;

India/Near East, Central America, South America, Caribbean each 6.0%; Australia/New Zealand, 3.4%; and Eastern Europe/U.S.S.R., 2.7%).

### **Portrayals of French and English Canada: Prime-Time, Canadian Networks**

#### **Channel comparisons**

To what extent did CBCE, CBCF, and CTV portray French Canada and English Canada?<sup>6</sup> They differed significantly in whether they portrayed both language groups versus only the language of their channel versus neither group,  $X^2(4) = 14.07$ ,  $p < .01$ . Both Francophone and Anglophone culture/individuals were apparent on more CBCE (33.3%) and CBCF (36.4%) than CTV (14.8%) programs. Only the group matching the language of the channel was evident in 38.5% of CBCE, 33.3% of CBCF, and 24.8% of CTV programs; these differences are not significant. More CTV (70.4%) than CBCE (28.2%) and CBCF (30.3%) programs portrayed neither Francophone nor Anglophone culture/Canadians. "Would a person from another country get any indication from the program that Canada is bilingual?" The answer was yes for 21.4% of prime-time programs on the three Canadian channels, with no difference among them.

When the English channels did portray English Canadians they tended to be the major focus of the program (77.8% CTV, 88.9% CBCE), and the same was true of CBCF for French Canadians (73.5%). Perhaps more interesting is that when French Canadians were portrayed on CBCE they were the major focus in almost half (45.5%) the programs, whereas on CTV they were always a passing reference. When English Canada/Canadians were on CBCF they were almost always a minor focus (91.7%) and never a major focus.

#### **Production source comparisons.**

More Canadian produced (35.1%) than U.S. produced (0.0%) prime-time programs provided some evidence that Canada is bilingual,  $X^2(1) = 57.90$ ,  $p < .0001$ , some mention of French Canada/Canadians (63.1% vs 1.3%),  $X^2(1) = 107.42$ ,  $p < .0001$ , and some mention of English Canada/Canadians (70.8% vs 6.0%),  $X^2(1) = 99.3$ ,  $p < .0001$ . Almost half the Canadian produced programs had a major focus on French Canada/Canadians (43.4%) and the same was true for English Canada (47.5%). It is striking, however, that when considered the other way around, 64.9% of prime-time Canadian-produced programs contained no evidence that Canada is bilingual, 41.5% contained not even a passing reference to French Canada, and that was true of 31.1% for English Canada. Might this reflect a purposive attempt to be North American as opposed to Canadian, and thus perhaps to appeal to U.S. audiences? This possibility was examined for entertainment programming over the entire week and is discussed below.

### Portrayal of Canada versus the U.S.A. in Prime-Time: Summary

There was little evidence of Canada in prime-time programming on the U.S. networks. This also was true of most of the prime-time programming on the national Canadian privately-owned network, CTV. The only channels to provide even a passing reference to Canada in more than half their programs were the two CBC channels. Note, however, that only the difference between CBCF and CTV was statistically significant. Moreover, in absolute terms<sup>5</sup> only CBCF had proportionately more prime-time programs providing at least a passing reference to Canada (68.6%) than to the U.S.A. (45.7%). More prime-time programs on both CBCE and CTV referred to the U.S.A. (67.5% and 82.1%, respectively) than to Canada (60.0% and 28.6%, respectively)<sup>5</sup>.

CBC differed from the other networks in prime-time in carrying an hour of national news and news/current events programming on weekdays (*The National*, *The Journal* from 10 to 11 pm on CBCE and *le Telejournal* and *le Point* from 7 to 8 pm on CBCF). Along with PBS (62.9%), the two CBC networks also had more prime-time programming intended to be informative (47.5% CBCE, 42.9% CBCF) than did both CTV (7.1%) and the U.S. private networks (8.8%),  $X^2(4) = 49.22, p < .0001$ . Assuming that Canada would be more evident in news than in entertainment programming (a question addressed later) it might be argued that the prime-time differences in evidence of Canada are confounded with or due merely to the type of programming scheduled by the different networks. But these are important, purposive choices. If the audience for the informative CBC programs were small one might argue that the greater emphasis on Canada would have little impact, but this is not the case. Based on the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement (BBM) audience data for adults 18 and over in the Greater Vancouver area for the Fall of 1985, the 10 weekday programs of *The National* and *The Journal* on CBCE were among the top 32 (or 13.3% of) programs in this sample shown in prime-time on all seven channels for the entire week. The large audience lends weight to the evidence regarding presence or absence of Canadian content in prime-time. It leaves open the question of whether the channels would vary in portrayal of Canada versus the U.S.A. if news or other programming were examined over the week as a whole.

### Portrayal of Canada versus the U.S.A.: News Programs over the Entire Week

Four of the 12 categories (CRITC, 1983) of programming intended to be informative involve news. Of the 217 news programs shown on the seven channels, 64.1% were news/weather, 2.3% were special news coverage, 15.7% were news analysis or commentary, and 18.0% were news current events programs. All news programs on the three Canadian channels were produced in Canada ( $n = 85$ ) and

all on the three U.S. channels were produced in the U.S.A. ( $n = 132$ ), so only channel comparisons were made.

As hypothesized, almost all news programs (94.5%) had a major focus on their *own* country. Almost all (92.2%) also had some focus on the U.S.A. (see Table 1). The channel categories differed in portrayal of the *other* country, as hypothesized,  $X^2(4) = 205.10, p < .0001$ . Most Canadian news programs (96.8% CTV, 77.8% CBCE, 88.9% CBCF, with no difference among the three) included some focus on the U.S.A., but the proportions of U.S. programs including some focus on Canada were significantly lower (U.S. private, 28.1%, PBS, 22.2%, with no difference between the two). As Table 1 indicates, the channel categories also differed significantly in portrayal of *Canada*, as expected, with lower proportions for the U.S. networks than for all three Canadian ones. Canada was a major focus of 100.0% of the Canadian news programs in which it was evident but was most often a passing reference (52.8%) or minor focus (44.4%) when evident in U.S. news programs. The U.S. networks' high degree of focus on their own country and lack of attention to Canada in prime-time thus was not simply due to differences in the type of programming scheduled then. It was echoed in news programs over the entire week.

The Canadian and U.S. networks differed in the manner in which they portrayed their *own* country in news,  $X^2(6) = 62.70, p < .0001$ . The U.S. was portrayed positively in most U.S. news programs (79.4%; PBS was combined with ABC, CBS, NBC because of similarity and low expected frequencies) but Canada was portrayed positively in only about one-quarter to one-third of the news programs on CTV (35.5%), CBCE (27.8%) and CBCF (27.8%), with U.S. > all three Canadian networks. Balanced portrayals were the most common on Canadian channels: CTV (61.3%), CBCE (44.4%), and CBCF (61.1%), but no U.S. news programs portrayed their own country in a balanced manner; U.S. < all three Canadian networks. Negative portrayals of own country were true of 3.2% of CTV, 27.8% of CBCE, 11.1% of CBCF, and 20.6% of U.S. programs; CTV < U.S. and CBCE.

The manner in which Canadian and U.S. news programs portrayed the *other* country also differed significantly (the three Canadian channels combined because of similarity were compared with the four U.S. channels combined because of similarity and low frequencies),  $X^2(2) = 10.95, p < .005$ . Significantly more U.S. programs portrayed Canada positively (77.8%) and fewer did so negatively (11.1%) than was true of Canadian news portrayals of the U.S.A. (44.9% positive, 42.9% negative). They did not differ in balanced portrayals of the other country (12.2% of Canadian and 11.1% of U.S. programs).

Only the Canadian networks' news programs gave the impression that Canada is bilingual,  $X^2(4) = 107.95, p < .0001$ . More CBCF programs (88.9%) than CTV

(31.0%) and CBCE (48.6%) news programs did so; CTV and CBCE did not differ, but all Canadian networks exceeded the U.S. ones (0.0%). The three Canadian channels also differed,  $X^2(2) = 8.09$ ,  $p < .02$ , in whether they portrayed both English and French Canada/Canadians (58.1% CTV, 66.7% CBCE, 88.9% CBCF, with CTV < CBCF) or only the language group of their channel (42.9%, 33.3%, 11.1%, with CTV > CBCF).

### Portrayal of Canada versus the U.S.A.: Entertainment Programs over the Entire Week

Entertainment programs were defined (CRITC, 1983) as not primarily intended to be informative. Non-fiction entertainment (e.g., talk show-variety) and fiction (e.g., situation comedy) both were included. Across the seven channels, 618 (56.7%) of the 1089 programs were classified as entertainment; of these, 444 were produced in the U.S. and 119 in Canada.

#### Channel comparisons

Whereas news programs on the five channel categories were similar in having some focus on their *own* country, entertainment programs differed substantially,  $X^2(4) = 237.52$ ,  $p < .0001$ . For CTV, CBCE, CBCF, U.S. private, and PBS the proportions were 31.9%, 37.1%, 58.4%, 92.8%, and 78.6%, respectively, with CTV < CBCF, U.S. private, PBS; CBCE < U.S. private, PBS; and CBCF < U.S. private. The channel categories also differed significantly in portrayal of the *other* country in entertainment programs,  $X^2(4) = 272.00$ ,  $p < .0001$ . The proportions were 79.2%, 55.7%, 33.7%, 7.9%, and 11.4%, respectively, with all comparisons except U.S. private versus PBS significant. As can be seen in Table 2, the prime-time finding that almost three times more programs on CTV had some focus on the U.S. than on Canada<sup>5</sup> also held true for entertainment programming over the week, as did the prime-time finding of greater focus on Canada by CBCF than by CTV. The figures for CBCE and CTV did not differ significantly for prime-time or entertainment portrayals of Canada or for prime-time portrayals of the U.S.A., but the U.S. was less evident in entertainment portrayals on CBCE than on CTV. In absolute terms, more CBCE and CTV entertainment programs had some focus on the U.S. than on Canada.<sup>5</sup>

All networks tended to portray their *own* country positively, but, as was true for news, more entertainment programs on the U.S. (95.8%) networks than on Canadian ones (84.5%) did so,  $X^2(1) = 11.97$ ,  $p < .005$ . Most entertainment programs on all channels that did portray the *other* country also did so positively (85.4%, versus 1.0% balanced and 13.5% negative).

Only 14 of the 254 entertainment programs (5.5%) on the Canadian networks gave coders the impression that Canada is bilingual, and no U.S. network program

**TABLE 2**  
**ENTERTAINMENT PROGRAMS FOR THE ENTIRE WEEK:**  
**FOCUS ON CANADA VERSUS U.S.A. BY CHANNEL CATEGORY**

	Canadian Channels			U.S. Channels	
	CTV (n=72)	CBCE (n=97)	CBCF (n=89)	U.S.Private* (n=290)	PBS (n=70)
<b>Entertainment (entire week)</b>					
<b>Canada</b>					
Major focus	6.9%	21.6%	51.7%	0.3%	2.9%
Minor focus	15.3	13.4	3.4	0.7	1.4
Passing reference	9.7	2.1	3.4	6.9	7.1
None	<u>68.1</u>	<u>62.9</u>	<u>41.6</u>	<u>92.1</u>	<u>88.6</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$X^2(8) = 209.03, p < .0001$ with minor + passing reference combined; for major, CBCF > all others & CBCE > U.S. private, PBS; for minor + passing, CTV > CBCF, U.S. private; for none, U.S. private > CTV, CBCE, CBCF; PBS > CBCE, CBCF; CTV > CBCF.					
<b>U.S.A.</b>					
Some focus	79.2%	55.7%	33.7%	92.8%	78.6%
None	<u>20.8</u>	<u>44.3</u>	<u>66.3</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>21.4</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$X^2(4) = 167.57 p < .0001$ ; CTV, U.S. private, & PBS > CBCE, CBCF; CBCE > CBCF.					

\*Note: ABC, CBS, NBC combined.

did so. The three Canadian channels<sup>6</sup> differed,  $X^2(4) = 28.07, p < .0001$ , in whether they portrayed both Francophone and Anglophone Canada/Canadians (2.9% CTV, 14.7% CBCE, 11.5% CBCF, with CBCE > CTV), only the language group of their channel (20.3%, 16.8%, 44.8%, with CBCF > CTV, CBCE), or neither (76.8%, 68.4%, 43.7%, with CTV > CBCE, CBCF).

### Production source comparisons

The possibility that some producers of Canadian programs try to make them seem generally North American or specifically U.S. in origin, perhaps in the hope of selling the programs to U.S. networks, was pursued in the next analyses. Canadian produced ( $n = 54$ ) and U.S. produced ( $n = 275$ ) entertainment programs shown over the week that were classified as dramatic fiction (CRITC, 1983) were

examined for focus on Canada and the U.S.A. Canada was a focus of more Canadian produced (14.8% major or minor focus, 59.3% passing reference, 25.9% none) than U.S. produced (4.0%, 1.5%, 94.5%, respectively) dramatic fiction programs,  $X^2(2) = 172.49$ ,  $p < .0001$ , with comparisons in all three categories significantly different. Conversely, the U.S.A. was some focus<sup>4</sup> of more U.S. produced programs (92.7%) than Canadian-produced ones (18.5%),  $X^2(1) = 158.64$ ,  $p < .0001$ . In sum, as many Canadian-produced dramatic fiction programs had some focus (major, minor, or passing reference) on the U.S.A. (18.5%) as had a major or minor focus on Canada (14.8%), Canada was most often (59.3%) a passing reference in Canadian-produced programs, and only 7.3% of U.S. produced programs had no focus on their country versus 25.9% of Canadian ones. These findings provide some support for the hypothesis that Canadian-produced dramatic fiction programs are designed to be generally North American but do not support the hypothesis of specific orientation to the U.S.

The pattern of results for all 119 Canadian-produced entertainment programs was similar to that for the subset of dramatic fiction. The larger number of programs (21 on CTV, 41 on CBCE, 57 on CBCF) permitted comparisons among the Canadian channels. There was no difference in focus on the U.S.A.; 80.7% had none. The figures for major focus on Canada were: 23.8% CTV, 36.6% CBCE, 78.9% CBCF (CBCF > both CTV and CBCE); for minor focus, 38.1%, 24.4%, and 5.3% (CBCF < both CTV and CBCE); for passing reference all = 0.0%; for none, 38.1%, 39.0%, 15.8% (CBCF < both CTV and CBCE);  $X^2(4, \text{omitting passing reference}) = 28.88$ ,  $p < .0001$ . Thus there was some evidence of greater focus on Canada in Canadian-produced entertainment programs on CBCF than on the two English networks. This may be additional evidence of general North American focus in English language Canadian productions. There would be economic advantage via potential sales to U.S. channels of programming in English but not French.

### Portrayals of other Regions of the World: Prime-time

The next analyses addressed portrayals of other countries and regions of the world in prime-time ( $n = 238$ ). Individual countries often occurred but references to areas (e.g., "the Mideast") also were common. Most countries and regions occurred relatively infrequently in prime-time so were grouped into larger categories.

### Channel comparisons

There were no prime-time differences among the five channel categories in proportion of programs containing any mention of Central America/South America/Caribbean (18.5%), India/Near East/Far East (15.5%), Middle East/Africa (15.1%), or Eastern Europe/U.S.S.R. (3.8%). There were significant differences for two regions. The proportions of prime-time programs that portrayed



or referred to United Kingdom/Australia/New Zealand for the CTV, CBCE, CBCF, U.S. private, and PBS channel categories were 17.9%, 30.0%, 40.0%, 20.0%, and 60.0%, respectively,  $X^2(4) = 23.07, p < .0001$ , with CTV and U.S. private both  $<$  PBS. For Western Europe,  $X^2(4) = 27.38, p < .0001$ , the proportions were 17.9%, 50.0%, 60.0%, 24.0%, and 48.6%, with CBCF  $>$  both CTV and U.S. private. These prime-time results do not contradict Hypothesis 4 but provide little support for it.

### Production source comparisons

A significantly higher proportion of prime-time Canadian produced ( $n = 65$ ) than U.S. produced programs ( $n = 149$ ) contained some mention of the United Kingdom (36.9% vs. 20.1%),  $X^2(1) = 6.76, p < .01$ ; Western Europe (50.8% vs. 28.9%),  $X^2(1) = 9.49, p < .003$ ; and Mideast/North Africa (24.6% vs. 9.4%),  $X^2(1) = 8.30, p < .004$ . There was no difference for Central/South Africa (mean 2.8%), Eastern Europe (4.2%), India/Near East (5.1%), Australia/New Zealand (5.1%), South America (5.6%), Caribbean (6.1%), Central America (8.4%), or the Far East (12.6%). Again, these prime-time comparisons provide only minimal support for Hypothesis 4.

As can be seen in Table 3, the concern expressed by residents of some regions that they receive more negative than positive attention in western media (Hypothesis 6) was true of both Canadian and U.S.-produced prime-time programs. There were 66 (total) portrayals of Central America, South America, Caribbean, Eastern Europe, the U.S.S.R., the Mideast, Africa, India, the Near East, and the Far East which provided enough information for coders to judge the presentation; 63.6% were negative, 9.1% were balanced, and only 27.3% were positive. By contrast<sup>5</sup>, most portrayals of North America (74.99%) and half for U.K./Western Europe/Australia/New Zealand (49.09%) were positive. As Table 3 indicates, Canadian-produced prime-time programs provided more varied coverage of North America than did U.S. productions, which were more uniformly positive, but there was no difference in the way they portrayed the U.K./Western Europe/Australia/New Zealand or the remaining world regions.

### Portrayal of Other Regions of the World: News Programs over the Entire Week

In CTV, CBCE, CBCF, U.S. private, and PBS news programs over the week ( $n = 217$  total), Western Europe (69.6%), United Kingdom/Australia/New Zealand (47.0%), India/Near East/Far East (38.7%), and Eastern Europe/U.S.S.R. (8.3%) were equally often represented. The overall test was significant for Mideast/North Africa (mean 60.4%),  $X^2(4) = 11.64, p < .025$ , and for Central/South America/Caribbean (mean 45.6%),  $X^2(4) = 10.83, p < .05$ , but no pair of channels differed significantly. The channel categories did differ significantly for Central/South Africa,  $X^2(4) = 17.67, p < .0015$ . The proportions were 25.8%, 25.0%, 5.5%,

**TABLE 3**  
**PRIME-TIME PROGRAMS: TYPE OF PORTRAYAL**  
**ACCORDING TO WORLD REGION**

**Production Source**

	<b>Canada</b>	<b>U.S.A.</b>
<b>North America</b>	<b>(n=86)</b>	<b>(n=87)</b>
Negative	23.2%	9.2%
Balanced	19.8	0.0
Positive	57.0	90.8
	100.0	100.0
$X^2(2) = 29.17, p < .0001$ ; for negative and balanced Canada > U.S.A.; for positive, U.S.A. > Canada.		
<b>U.K., W. Europe, Australia, N.Z</b>	<b>(n=28)</b>	<b>(n=27)</b>
Negative	25.0%	29.6%
Balanced	35.7	11.1
Positive	39.3	59.3
	100.0	100.0
$X^2(2) = ns$		
<b>All other Regions</b>	<b>(n=34)</b>	<b>(n=32)</b>
Negative	64.8%	62.5%
Balanced	17.6	0.0
Positive	17.6	37.5
	100.0	100.0
$X^2(1, \text{omitting balanced because of low expected frequencies}) = ns.$		

16.7%, and 55.5%, respectively, with PBS > both CBCF and U.S. private. News programs provided even less support for Hypothesis 4 than did prime-time programs.

In keeping with hypothesis 3, the U.S.A. was a focus of more Canadian news programs (87.1%) than was any other country/region of the world.<sup>5</sup> The converse was not true; more U.S. news programs had some focus on Western Europe (70.4%), and Mideast/North Africa (65.1%) than on Canada (46.2%).<sup>5</sup> U.S. news

programs nevertheless provided more support for hypothesis 3 than did prime-time programs on the U.S. channels.

Hypothesis 6 focused on the way in which different world regions are portrayed. The greater number of news programs made it possible to analyze smaller regions than was possible for prime-time. For Western Europe there was no difference in the proportion of Canadian and U.S. news programs providing positive (mean 14.6%), balanced (50.3%), and negative (35.1%) portrayals. This also was true for the United Kingdom/Australia/New Zealand (13.5%, 54.8%, 31.7%), for India/Near East/Far East (26.5%, 40.2%, 33.3%), and for Central/South America/Caribbean (5.0%, 26.3%, 68.7%). For Mideast/Africa, negative portrayals were more characteristic of U.S. (89.9%) than Canadian (77.4%) news programs, by comparison with positive and balanced portrayals (combined because only 3 programs were positive; 10.1% U.S. versus 22.6% Canadian),  $X^2(1) = 4.39, p < .05$ . This also was true for Eastern Europe/U.S.S.R. (for U.S. news programs, 90.9% negative, 9.1% balanced, 0.0% positive; for Canadian news, 14.2% negative, 42.9% balanced, 42.9% positive),  $X^2(1, \text{Yates, with positive and balanced combined}) = 7.29, p < .01$ . Some of these results are consistent with Hypothesis 6 (both U.S. and Canadian portrayals of Central/South America/Caribbean and the Mideast/Africa; U.S. portrayals of Eastern Europe/U.S.S.R.) but some are inconsistent (both Canadian and U.S. portrayals of India/Near East/Far East; Canadian portrayals of Eastern Europe/U.S.S.R.).

#### **Portrayal of other Regions of the World: Entertainment Programs over the Entire Week**

##### **Channel comparisons**

The five channel categories did not differ in portrayal/reference to Eastern Europe/U.S.S.R. (mean 1.9%) or Western Europe (23.5%). For Mideast/Africa (combined because of low frequencies) the overall test was significant,  $X^2(4) = 12.53, p < .02$ , but no pair of channels differed (mean 7.8%). They did differ significantly for the U.K./Australia/New Zealand,  $X^2(4) = 14.82, p < .01$ . For the CTV, CBCE, CBCF, U.S. private, and PBS categories the proportions were 12.5%, 17.5%, 6.7%, 15.2%, and 27.1%, respectively, with CBCF < PBS. For India/Near East/Far East,  $X^2(4) = 11.51, p < .025$ , the proportions were 8.3%, 7.2%, 5.6%, 11.4%, and 22.9%, respectively, with CBCF < PBS. For Central/South America/Caribbean,  $X^2(4) = 11.93, p < .02$ , they were 5.5%, 10.3%, 3.4%, 11.7%, and 11.4%, with CBCF < U.S. private. These results provide no support for Hypothesis 4 and some contradictory evidence.

### Production source comparisons

Proportionately more U.S. produced than Canadian produced entertainment programs portrayed or referred to India/Near East/Far East (13.3% vs. 5.5%),  $X^2(1) = 5.84, p < .02$ ; Mideast/Africa (9.5% vs. 2.4%),  $X^2(1) = 9.61, p < .005$ ; Caribbean (7.7% vs. 1.6%),  $X^2(1) = 8.55, p < .005$ ; and Central America (7.4% vs. 1.6%),  $X^2(1) = 8.14, p < .005$ . There was no significant difference for Western Europe (21.5%), U.K./Australia/New Zealand (12.6%), or Eastern Europe/U.S.S.R. (2.1%). Again, Hypothesis 4 was, if anything, contradicted.

### Discussion

Taken together, these results document and underscore the need for a new Broadcasting Act in Canada, one that would state in stronger terms than the current Act the need for more Canadian content on both the private television networks and CBC. This conclusion rests on several lines of reasoning and evidence.

First, there is very little evidence of Canada in programming on the major U.S. networks. This is especially true of prime-time programs and entertainment programs over the entire week. Even in news and news analysis programs, however, Canada is less evident than might be expected, given the shared border and economic trade between the two countries. Particularly absent are French Canada/Canadians and evidence that Canada is bilingual. Moreover, the situation is not symmetrical; there is considerable evidence of the U.S. not only on the four U.S. networks analyzed in this study, but also on the Canadian networks, especially CTV. Robinson (1981) contended that small countries must be concerned about what the major powers are doing, but the major powers have less need to know about small countries. She also reported that foreign news in Canada is a more important category than in the U.S., occupying double the space (27% versus 12%) of the total news hole (in newspapers). She pointed out that the "infinitesimal 1.6 percent coverage (of Canada) in the U.S. press" is totally unexplained by such measures as level of trade between the two countries, gross domestic product, and size of population" (p. 122). Rosengren (1977) argued that economic variables such as import and export values are better indicators of media coverage of other countries than are more diffuse concepts such as "strength" or "cultural proximity". The data in this study are more consistent with Robinson's conclusions in this regard than with Rosengren's. In effect, Canada is reflected back to Canadians only on Canadian television networks, so Canadian broadcast policy must ensure that Canadian networks provide Canadian content.

Second, does programming on the private networks, in particular the national network (CTV) meet the intent of the current and proposed Broadcasting Acts with regard to Canadian content? The answer is yes with regard to news. The answer is clearly no, however, for both prime-time and entertainment programming. How is

a Canadian network able to offer so little Canadian programming during prime-time? CRTC regulations currently require 50% Canadian content between 6 p.m. and midnight from private TV stations and networks. By broadcasting Canadian content from 6 to 7 pm and 11 to 12 pm they can reduce their Canadian content between 7 and 11 pm (when the audience is larger) to only 25% and still comply with the regulations. The Caplan-Sauvageau Task Force (1986) recommended unanimously that the CRTC require private TV broadcasters to air Canadian content for 45% of the 7 to 11 p.m. period.

Third, to what extent are the national broadcasting service CBC channels meeting their Broadcasting Act (1978) mandates? For prime-time, when most Canadians watch TV, the answer depends on whether one focuses on the half full or half empty glass; Canada is a major focus of about half the CBCE and CBCF prime-time programs. Moreover, Canadians must depend on the CBC for prime-time programming about their own country, since it is almost entirely absent on the other channels. These and other results obtained in this study provide strong support for the Caplan-Sauvageau Task Force (1986) and Broadcasting Bill (C-136; 1988) recommendations that CBC not carry U.S. programming in prime-time (since it is readily available to Canadians on other channels), and that CBC focus instead on increasing Canadian and international (non-U.S.) perspectives. CBC's own stated intention (October, 1987 corporate plan) to reach 95% Canadian content in prime-time by 1990-91 was laudable. Given that it costs so much less to purchase than to produce a program, and the limited market elsewhere for programs produced in Canada (Lorimer & McNulty, 1987), it is not surprising that in the face of severe financial cutbacks CBC has postponed their goal indefinitely. With regard to entertainment programming over the entire week, the U.S. was less evident in CBCE than in CTV programs, but there was no difference in evidence of Canada. Only CBCF did better than CTV in this regard, and even then, Canada was evident in only about half CBCF programs. To place these results in context, the U.S. was evident in 90% of entertainment programming on the U.S. channels. The possibility that Canadians will find any significant amount of Canadian content in entertainment programming other than in prime-time currently seems remote.

The apparent effort by CBCE to portray French Canada/Canadians in their prime-time English programming is noteworthy. On the other hand, more than half the Canadian-produced prime-time English and French programs contained no evidence that Canada is bilingual. More evidence on all channels might encourage bilingualism and contribute to Canadians' sense of their distinctiveness from the U.S.A, in keeping with the Bill C-136 statement that the "Canadian broadcasting system should serve to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada" [3(1)(c)(i)].

The differences found for the ways (positive, balanced, negative) in which Canadian and U.S. produced programs, especially news, portrayed their own and the other country are open to two possible interpretations. The differences may be real. That is, despite relying on the same global news agencies, Canadian producers may strive for more varied portrayals than do U.S. producers. In discussing the principle of news objectivity, McQuail (1987) noted that, "most European public broadcasting systems either legally require or expect news and information to be neutral (non-evaluative and factual) or balanced, according to various criteria, depending on the particular society" (p. 130). This may be more characteristic of Canadian than U.S. programming. The other possible interpretation is that the differences reflect the perceptions of the coders, who were residents of Canada, not the U.S.A. Perhaps U.S. coders would perceive Canadian portrayals of Canada to be mostly positive, portrayals of their own country to be more balanced, and so on. These two interpretations could be arbitrated with empirical evidence. Reliability was achieved despite the large number of coders and their heterogeneity (with respect to both SES and familiarity with North American culture), which may be some evidence against the perception hypothesis. More importantly, to the extent that the coders can be considered representative of Canadian viewers, one would expect coders and viewers to have similar perceptions. That is, whether the differences are real or perceived, Canadians take away more varied portrayals of Canada and the U.S.A. from Canadian than U.S. TV programs, particularly news. This points to the need for Canadian broadcast policies that ensure that Canadians receive Canadian perspectives on their own and other regions of the world.

In describing the proposed new broadcasting policy (Bill C-136), Canadian Choices: Canadian Voices (1988) stated, "the lack of an international flavor, particularly on English-language television, is of concern because Canada is an internationalist country, a trading country, a nation of immigrants and descendents of immigrants, and a country of global interests. We need windows on the world" (p. 21). The results of these content analyses provide strong support for this proposal. Regions of the world outside North America were portrayed to the same extent and more similarly than differently in Canadian and U.S. television programs. This was true of news as well as prime-time and entertainment programs. These findings provide little support and some contradictory evidence for Hypothesis 4, which was based in part on previous findings for newspapers (de la Garde, 1981; Hart, 1963; Robinson, 1981). Only in the sense that Canadian programs provided more coverage of the U.S.A. than U.S. programs provided of Canada could it be said that Canadian programs provided more international coverage. It is possible, of course, that more in-depth analyses or the use of different measures (e.g., time devoted to each region) would point to a different conclusion.

The belief that Canadians prefer U.S. to Canadian productions has been widespread, but much of the evidence on which it was based did not take into account the quality and type of program and when they were aired. Historically, very few Canadian dramatic programs of high quality have been aired in prime-time. The popularity of more recent ones (e.g., *Anne of Green Gables* and its sequel; *John and the Missus*) suggests that Canadians will watch prime-time TV programs that reflect Canadian culture. In our view, the important question is whether Canadians have access to Canadian culture and a Canadian perspective on the rest of the world via all the Canadian TV networks, not whether they always choose Canadian culture and a Canadian perspective over the U.S. culture and perspective to which they have access via the U.S. networks.

### FOOTNOTES

1. The portrayal within Canada of people from other countries, for example, immigrants, no doubt contributes to viewers' perceptions of those countries. This will be addressed in a subsequent article on ethnic minorities.
2. This reliability estimate has the disadvantage that small disagreements between adjacent categories are weighted as heavily as large ones. Kappa (Fleiss, 1981) has the advantages that it weights large disagreements more heavily than small ones and corrects for chance/guessing. It has the disadvantage of being low for events unevenly distributed in the population (a common occurrence in TV content), even when agreement is high. For the variables in this article mean Kappa was .78 (range .60 to 1.00). Maxwell's RE (Janes, 1979) has the same advantages as Kappa, but does not have the disadvantage of assuming an even distribution of events on the diagonal. Its disadvantage is that it applies only to 2 x 2 tables. For such variables in this article mean RE was .92 (range .83 to 1.00). For Kappa and Maxwell's RE .75 is considered to be excellent agreement beyond chance and .40 to .75, fair to good agreement beyond chance (Landis & Koch, 1977, cited in Fleiss, 1981).
3. The remaining production sources contributing more than 5% of the programming per channel category were: CBCF - 5.9% France, 8.8% other; PBS - 22.9% United Kingdom, 17.1% other. In addition, coders were unable to discern the production source of 1 CTV and 1 CBCF program.
4. Coders reliably distinguished among major focus, minor focus, passing reference, and no portrayal for Canada and for other countries, but for the U.S.A. were reliable only at the level of some focus (major + minor + passing reference) versus none. The analyses for the U.S.A. (reported in Tables 1, 2 and the text) therefore could be conducted only at that level. In some instances (e.g., Table 1) the analyses for Canada also could be conducted only at that

level because of low expected frequencies (most prime-time portrayals of Canada were major focus).

5. Statistical comparisons cannot be made because the categories are not independent; only absolute, descriptive comparisons are possible.
6. The U.S. networks were not included because so few programs had any focus on Canada.

## REFERENCES

- Baer, D., & Winter, J. (1983). U.S. media imperialism in a Canadian community: The inculcation of anti-government sentiment. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 10(1), 51-86.
- Broadcasting Act. (1978, including amendments C.16, C.10, C.51, C.49 to 1968 R.S., C.B-11). Hull, Quebec: Supply and Services Canada.
- Canadian voices: Canadian choices. (1988). Hull, Quebec: Supply and Services Canada.
- Caplan, G. L., & Sauvageau, F. (1986). *Report of the Task Force on Broadcasting Policy*. Hull, Quebec: Supply and Services Canada.
- Center for Research on the Influences of TV on Children. (CRITC, 1983). *CRITC program categorization system coding manual*. Available from CRITC, Department of Human Development, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A. 66045.
- de la Garde, R. (1981). The media connection. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 7(4), 1-27.
- Dorr, A. (1986). *Television and children: A special medium for a special audience*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Fleiss, J. L. (1981). *Statistical methods for rates and proportions*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Wiley, Chapter 13.
- Hart, J. (1963). The flow of news between the United States and Canada. *Journalism Quarterly*, 40, 70-74.
- Hawkins, R. P., & Pingree, S. (1982). Television influence on constructions of social reality. In D. Pearl, L. Bouthilet, & J. Lazar (Eds.), *Television and behavior: Ten years of scientific progress and implications for the eighties* (Vol. 2, pp. 224-247). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.



- Hornik, R. C., Gould, J., & Gonzalez, M. (1980, May). *Susceptibility to media effects*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.
- Janes, C. L. (1979). Agreement measurement and the judgement process. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 167(6), 343-347.
- Joy, L. A., Kimball, M. M., & Zabrack, M. L. (1987). Television and children's aggressive behavior. In T. M. Williams (Ed.), *The impact of television: A natural experiment in three communities* (pp. 303-360). New York: Academic Press.
- Katz, E. (1988). On conceptualizing media effects: Another look. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Television as a social issue*. Applied Social Psychology Annual, Volume 8, 361-374. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kimball, M. M. (1986). Television and sex-role attitudes. In T. M. Williams (Ed.), *The impact of television: A natural experiment in three communities* (pp. 265-301). New York: Academic Press.
- Larson, J. F. (1984). *Television's window on the world: International affairs coverage on the U.S. networks*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., & Merton, R. K. (1971). Mass communication, popular taste, and organized social action. In W. Schramm & D. Roberts (Eds.), *The process and effects of mass communication* (pp. 554-578). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Lorimer, R., & McNulty, J. (1987). *Mass communication in Canada*. Toronto: McLelland and Stewart.
- Macdonald, F. (1988, June 23). Notes for news conference. Ottawa: Information Services, Communications Canada.
- Marascuilo, L. A. (1966). Large-sample multiple comparisons. *Psychological Bulletin*, 65, 280-290.
- McQuail, D. (1987). *Mass communication theory: An introduction* (2nd ed.). London/Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Morley, D. (1980). *The "Nationwide" audience: Structure and decoding*. British Film Institute (BFI) Monograph 11. London: BFI.
- Robinson, G. J. (1981). *News agencies and world news*. Fribourg, Switzerland: University Press of Fribourg.
- Rosengren, K. E. (1979). Four types of tables. *Journal of Communication*, 27(1), 67-75.

- Rosengren, K. E. (1981). Advances in Scandinavian content analysis: An introduction. In K. E. Rosengren (Ed.), *Advances in content analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Annual Reviews of Communication Research, Vol. 9, 9-19.
- Schramm, W. (1973). *Men, messages and media*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Singer, B. D. (1970). Violence, protest and war in television news: The U.S. and Canada compared. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 34, 611-616.
- Tate, E., & Trach, L. (1980). The effects of United States television programs upon Canadian beliefs about legal procedure. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 6(4), 1-16.
- Williams, T. M., Phillips, S., & Travis, L. (1986). *The University of British Columbia TV content coding system (UBCCS) and manual*. Unpublished manuscripts available from Williams, Department of Psychology, UBC, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1Y7.
- Winter, J. (1986, June). "Windsorites" use of American media and the inculcation of anti-government sentiment. Paper presented at the meeting of the Canadian Communication Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Wotherspoon, D., & Williams, T. M. (1989, May). Television content analysis: Agreement between expert and naive coders. Poster presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco, CA.

This research was funded in part by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the meeting of the Canadian Communication Association, Montreal, May, 1987. We are grateful for the assistance of many others, especially Ainslie Winter, Doug Balson, Deneen Baron and Susan Curror. We also would like to thank Jean McNulty and two anonymous reviewers for their detailed and helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.