

Y 4-AP 6/11: 1 71/2000/194-6

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

HEARINGS

BEFORE A
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS

JIM KOLBE, Arizona, *Chairman*

FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia
ANNE M. NORTHUP, Kentucky
JO ANN EMERSON, Missouri
JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire
JOHN E. PETERSON, Pennsylvania

STENY H. HOYER, Maryland
CARRIE P. MEEK, Florida
DAVID E. PRICE, North Carolina
LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California

NOTE: Under Committee Rules, Mr. Young, as Chairman of the Full Committee, and Mr. Obey, as Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, are authorized to sit as Members of all Subcommittees.

MICHELLE MRDEZA, BOB SCHMIDT, JEFF ASHFORD, and TAMMY HUGHES,
Staff Assistants

PART 6

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN



DEPOSITORY
SUPERINTENDENT
OF DOCUMENTS
0393A

MAR 06 2000

ST. JOHN'S LAW LIBRARY

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

ST. JOHN'S LAW LIBRARY



3 5952 01140 6254

**TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL
GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 2000**

HEARINGS
BEFORE A
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL
GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS**

JIM KOLBE, Arizona, *Chairman*

FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia
ANNE M. NORTHUP, Kentucky
JO ANN EMERSON, Missouri
JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire
JOHN E. PETERSON, Pennsylvania

STENY H. HOYER, Maryland
CARRIE P. MEEK, Florida
DAVID E. PRICE, North Carolina
LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California

NOTE: Under Committee Rules, Mr. Young, as Chairman of the Full Committee, and Mr. Obey, as Ranking
Minority Member of the Full Committee, are authorized to sit as Members of all Subcommittees.

MICHELLE MRDEZA, BOB SCHMIDT, JEFF ASHFORD, and TAMMY HUGHES,
Staff Assistants

PART 6

**OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY
YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN**



Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

61-357 O

WASHINGTON : 2000

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-060048-0

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

C. W. BILL YOUNG, Florida, *Chairman*

RALPH REGULA, Ohio	DAVID R. OBEY, Wisconsin
JERRY LEWIS, California	JOHN P. MURTHA, Pennsylvania
JOHN EDWARD PORTER, Illinois	NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
HAROLD ROGERS, Kentucky	MARTIN OLAV SABO, Minnesota
JOE SKEEN, New Mexico	JULIAN C. DIXON, California
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia	STENY H. HOYER, Maryland
TOM DELAY, Texas	ALAN B. MOLLOHAN, West Virginia
JIM KOLBE, Arizona	MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
RON PACKARD, California	NANCY PELOSI, California
SONNY CALLAHAN, Alabama	PETER J. VISCLOSKEY, Indiana
JAMES T. WALSH, New York	NITA M. LOWEY, New York
CHARLES H. TAYLOR, North Carolina	JOSE E. SERRANO, New York
DAVID L. HOBSON, Ohio	ROSA L. DELAURO, Connecticut
ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR., Oklahoma	JAMES P. MORAN, Virginia
HENRY BONILLA, Texas	JOHN W. OLVER, Massachusetts
JOE KNOLLENBERG, Michigan	ED PASTOR, Arizona
DAN MILLER, Florida	CARRIE P. MEEK, Florida
JAY DICKEY, Arkansas	DAVID E. PRICE, North Carolina
JACK KINGSTON, Georgia	MICHAEL P. FORBES, New York
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey	CHET EDWARDS, Texas
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi	ROBERT E. "BUD" CRAMER, JR., Alabama
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR., Washington	MAURICE D. HINCHEY, New York
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California	LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California
TODD TIAHRT, Kansas	SAM FARR, California
ZACH WAMP, Tennessee	JESSE L. JACKSON, JR., Illinois
TOM LATHAM, Iowa	CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK, Michigan
ANNE M. NORTHUP, Kentucky	ALLEN BOYD, Florida
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama	
JO ANN EMERSON, Missouri	
JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire	
KAY GRANGER, Texas	
JOHN E. PETERSON, Pennsylvania	
ROY BLUNT, Missouri	

JAMES W. DYER, Clerk and Staff Director

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2000

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1999.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

WITNESS

GENERAL BARRY McCaffrey, DIRECTOR

Mr. KOLBE. Good morning. This hearing of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government will come to order.

We are very pleased this morning to welcome as our first witness General Barry McCaffrey, the director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy. He is a frequent visitor before this subcommittee, so he is not exactly new to us. But during our regular hearings, budget hearings, earlier this year, we indicated that we wanted to have some more in-depth discussion of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, and in particular, as we have had an opportunity to learn more about this and hear more about this, to examine the role of programming content in the media campaign.

Following General McCaffrey's presentation, we will be hearing from Susan David of the National Institute of Drug Abuse, NIDA.

The goal I would like to accomplish this morning is really just to understand better the nuts and bolts of how the media campaign that this subcommittee funds is working and how it seeks to influence entertainment media content and how that, in turn, seeks to influence behavior on the part of those who we seek to influence.

As far as the influence within the entertainment media, that has taken several forms. One is the active engagement by ONDCP and outreach to the industry to achieve accurate and supportive messages in the entertainment media, and the other is acceptance by ONDCP of entertainment content as a pro-bono match for campaign purchases of advertising time or space.

I think when you testified in the budget hearings, General, last March, you said that the overall match for the campaign is about 102 percent and 109 percent for the broadcasting sector. And we understand from your statements and what we have been told by your office, that about 85 percent of that is what you call a hard match; that is, an equivalent amount of time given in public service announcements, time and space.

Some, however, is a soft match. And by a soft match—we do sound like we are talking about campaign finance reform, don't we, here—between hard dollars and soft dollars here. [Laughter.]

Soft match is, as I understand the definition, where a network wishes to get a match credit for conveying the ONDCP message in the context of entertainment programming, such as an episode on a program like "Dawson's Creek" or "The Cosby Show."

You have also testified that thanks to this effort, the campaign's strategic messages have been greatly expanded and supported in more than 50 TV scripts and incorporated science-based anti-drug story lines and that at least 32 of these were on the shows that young people watch most frequently and using the stars, the TV stars that most of them know about.

So what I hope we can, today, learn is more about how this match program works when it comes to just the nuts and bolts of how it works, but specifically, of course, about the programming content and about the entertainment industry outreach element of the campaign. I know you also have a very extensive program of meeting with them and discussing these issues.

So we hope to come away today with an understanding of the practices that are being followed: How the campaign values programming and other media content for the purpose of matches and how ONDCP and its contractors assess the impact these efforts have on the success of the campaign.

I think these are appropriate questions because our role is to fund this campaign and we, indeed, have a responsibility—and it is a large amount of money, and the public feels that we have a responsibility, I believe, for us to look at the issue of how well this program is doing and specifically how we are going to measure how well it is doing.

But it certainly does also raise I think some other broader questions. And while I have no answers to these, and I am not here today on any kind of a mission, I just want these questions to be out there on the table for us to consider, and those have to do with the appropriate form of engagement between a government agency, such as ONDCP and the entertainment media industry. In particular, I hope we can get some understanding of whether financial incentives of leverage that is offered by the advertising campaign results in some kind of pressure on writers or producers to alter story lines to fit a particular message, even if the intentions are very positive or even benign.

Certainly, our concern, as a subcommittee, is to see that the campaign is effective in reducing the use of drugs by our young people, and we want to do that with whatever means that we can. But we also want to do it within the context of a free media, free press, free society, and I know that you certainly share those goals.

So I hope that with this we can clarify some concerns that may have been raised about how we achieve these desirable ends that we all seek. I think it is going to be an informative hearing for us.

And before I ask General McCaffrey for his statement, let me turn to my good friend and ranking member, for whom I want to say once again publicly, thank you for your assistance in getting our appropriation bill passed. And it is nice that ours is enacted into law, so that we can have this hearing and not be worrying about getting that done.

Mr. Hoyer.

Mr. HOYER. We agree on that. Thank you. And I thank the chairman for his leadership in getting us to a point where the bill could pass and the President could sign it. It was a good effort.

I want to welcome General McCaffrey, and Susan David and others of you as well to this hearing. I think this is an important hearing. General McCaffrey has been a visionary in the fight against drugs, and the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is a major component of this strategy.

I have a prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, that I would like included in the record at this time. But let me make a comment. I think this is a very important oversight hearing, and I thank the chairman for scheduling it. And like the chairman, I not only vote for, but believe strongly that one of the hallmarks of America is the First Amendment, and we have the freedom of speech to say things we do not agree with and things that ought to be said.

On the other hand, I think that does not mean the rest of us do not have the right to freely criticize in a free market, the expressions that we think are harmful. I think that is what a free market is all about. And there is clearly concern that we may be spending \$195 million or \$185 million annually on this program. But if there are billions of dollars being spent to deliver contrary messages which undermine that message, that is not helpful. And there needs to be, I think, some discussion about the concerted effort.

Now, I want to make it clear that I do not believe the entertainment industry is spending billions of dollars to send a contrary message, for those of you that represent the private-sector media or entertainment outlets. I know we have ABC, CBS, Warner Brothers, NBC, and others represented here. But it is to say that we, as a country, need to think together as to how we can send a positive message to our young people as to how they can most positively act in their own lives to enrich their lives and to enrich our community. We know that there are a lot of negative messages out there.

And, fortunately, our young people are very connected today, more connected than they have ever been before in the history of the world. They get more information now than any previous generation has ever gotten, they get it quicker, and they get it in a freer market than we have ever had before, the Internet. They are all a mouse click away from getting whatever information they want. And that is of concern.

And we, as I say, as a community need to think about this. And my perception is the entertainment industry, as we are, are concerned about the welfare of our children, and our families and our country. And so it is in that context I think we need to work and think about this together, and I am very interested to hear how we are doing that cooperatively, not through coercion, but through cooperation. And I think that is the key.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The information follows:]

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN STENY H. HOYER, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND
GENERAL GOVERNMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY—OVERSIGHT YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA
CAMPAIGN

I'm very pleased to welcome General Barry McCaffrey, Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, to testify before the subcommittee on the use of programming content from the entertainment media as a component of the ONDCP National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

I am also pleased to see Susan David from the National Institute of Drug Abuse who will testify later this morning.

General McCaffrey has been a visionary in the fight against drugs and the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is a major component of his strategy.

When you last testified, we learned of the positive outcomes from the first phase of the campaign. Your goal of reaching 90 percent of the overall target audience with four anti-drug messages was exceeded in each case.

Over the summer we received the results from phase II of the campaign which showed that the anti-drug campaign's message has begun to influence attitudes. The final report on phase II showed that the percentage of youth who thought the ads "Made Them Stay Away From Drugs" increased from 61 percent to 69 percent.

The percentage reporting that they "Learned About The Dangers of Drugs" from TV commercials also increased from 44 to 52 percent.

Phase III is now under way which entails a more integrated communications approach at the national level including partnerships with various media outlets such as TV, radio, movies and retail. These outlets are powerful vehicles that can be used to convey the anti-drug message to our young people.

Our children have more information available to them than anytime in our history. They are accustomed to a world of information through television and the Internet which is just a remote control away. So what children are watching on TV and reading on the Net is very important.

General McCaffrey has done an excellent job in making the entertainment industry a partner in creating a solution to drug use among the youth of this country. I am happy to be here today to learn more about it.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you.

General McCaffrey, please proceed. Obviously, we will be happy to place your whole statement in the record, if you wish to summarize it or however you want to proceed.

Thank you.

General McCaffrey. Thanks, Mr. Chairman, to both you and your committee members, and Congressman Hoyer, in particular, for the opportunity to come down and lay out some of our own thinking. And I would like to put that written statement in the record.

These hearings give us a tremendous incentive to be blunt, to write down and document where we think we are on these issues. The minute this hearing is over, we put these statements on the Internet allowing the press and the academic community, to watch this issue very closely. So it is really a good chance for us to organize or reorganize our own thinking and make sure we know exactly what we can say in an ethically sound way about how the campaign is evolving.

You have some very important people in the room today, some of them testifying, but all of them will be available to your committee's staff today or in the following days. Rich Hamilton, Zenith Media, is here. We owe Zenith a big debt of gratitude. Bates and Zenith got this thing off the ground when Alan Levitt and I and a handful of people, including Partnership for a Drug Free America, Sean Clark and Jim Burke, were trying to sort out where to go.

The reason Rich Hamilton, CEO of Zenith, is important, is because he did the first network negotiations and developed this notion of the pro-bono match. I think we learned a lot from Zenith during that period, and we are very grateful.

Dr. Tony Bigland, Oregon Research Institute, is here. You know he sits on our Behavioral Science Change Panel. He is an expert in the area of youth development. He has become a major factor in trying to help educate the most creative community on the face of the Earth, the producers, the writers, the directors who create this programming content.

Ogilvy & Mather and Fleishman Hillard are represented here. Shona Siefert, the senior partner, who really works our account, is a brilliant, creative person. We have been very proud of the way the firm has managed their responsibilities. Bev Schwartz, vice president of Fleishman Hillard is here. They have done superb work with a very small pot of money. They have about \$10 million, essentially. But I think a few years from now we may find that their impact was disproportionate to the amount of resources we put into it.

You are going to have Marcy Kelly testify from Mediascope. They have also done some important work. We should not talk about these issues in an anecdotal fashion only. We need some data. There are substantial resources you have given us. And if I may, let me underscore our admiration for the way this committee got their work done and shaped a bill that was signed into law.

So we are starting our third year of responsibly dealing with a matter of enormous import. Marcy Kelly and her people have quantified what we are talking about when we look at the impact of the media on shaping youth attitudes. In January, they are going to put out another very important document when they analyze the impact of broadcast television. We very much appreciated her creative work.

Most of this media campaign is focussed on primarily shaping youth attitudes and the attitudes of their adult mentors. But it also connects the problem of drug abuse to community organizations in America. Sue Thau is here representing Major General Art Dean, Chairman and CEO of Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America. An enormous amount of this program content now has a telephone number or a Web page. And that connects us, as citizens, not to a national agency, but back to a regional partner. When you call in 1-800, whether you are worried about your 16-year-old daughter's compulsive drug use or you are looking to get engaged, we vector you back to Community Coalitions.

Clarke Moorehouse is here from Channel One Network. As you know, they deliver satellite coverage to over a third of the Nation's teens daily in classrooms. When we talk about program content, they have done some of the best work we have seen. They developed a show that tried to capture the notion of children of addicted parents. The children are all sitting in a classroom. If you tried to get at that audience through broadcast television, it would be very hard to justify the approach. We think this is a kind of pro bono work, matching creative content programming has a big impact. The Channel One Network has also done one on women involved

in drug-related crime in prisons. This work has a tremendous impact through refinement of programming content.

Robbie London is here from DIC Entertainment. As you know, they are owned by Disney. They helped us develop a website for children.

Rogers and Associates are here represented by Sarah Ingram. They have been working with our entertainment and celebrity outreach. And I believe you have some questions along those lines.

Steve Salem from Boys & Girls Clubs is here along with Kathleen Sheehan from NASADAD, and the National Drug Prevention League, represented by their chairman, Kathleen Wingfield. We thank all of the partners who either you invited here or come because they have been so fundamentally involved in this effort.

Let me, if I may, run through some charts, Mr. Chairman, and talk to some of the issues. First chart.

Again, to remind all of us, everything we do in this program, which is less than 1 percent of the \$17.8 billion that the Congress provided in the fiscal year 1999 act relates to a national drug strategy, that I have to have approved by the administration, signed off on by OMB, and I bring down to Congress for consultation.

So we are back on Goal Number 1: How do we educate and enable America's young people to reject illegal drugs, as well as alcohol and tobacco? That is the heart and soul of the campaign. It is beginning to work. Donna Shalala and I did release last year's household survey demonstrating about a 13-percent drop in adolescent drug use in the 12- to 17-year-old population. We still have a million kids using drugs. We have a huge problem. Drug use has gone up dramatically in the last year. Despite this increase we think we are moving in the right direction. And, clearly, the program that we are discussing this morning is going to be a huge part of that.

Next chart. Again, what is the basis of this? A lot of this is not just academic data, it is historical data from Partnership for a Drug Free America. By shaping youth attitudes, youth behavior you can affect. Now, when you ask children, "Do you personally disapprove of drugs, yes or no? Do you personally fear drug use threatens your development, yes or no?" those numbers are indicative of the kind of trailing behavior that you can expect.

And as we look back through history, we see that when we get energized, when we get outraged and we communicate with youth through a variety of means, drug use goes down. In fact, it is going down again. I would argue, Mr. Chairman, our real challenge lies in the hearings five years from now, when we have had a major impact on youth drug use rates. At that time how will we maintain the energy to focus on each new generation of children as they leave the sixth grade and start being exposed to gateway drug-using behavior in American life? And that is where drug use is happening, in middle schools in America.

Next chart. This chart basically says the slope of the curve is going down, however not fast enough for any of us. But I must admit we are somewhat surprised. I thought there would be more like a two-year-plus lag time between multiple programs and impact. Instead we are seeing a change in the direction of that slope.

Next chart. This chart represents what you told us to do, and this is really my charter from you, the board of directors, on what we are going to do with the money you give us each year. More importantly, we are going to see the negotiated matching aspect of those funds as being as much a part of our efforts as are the appropriated dollars.

You told us to not only go out there and deliver a message on target, but to make sure I can come back here and explain, with scientifically based studies, why we think we are doing the right thing, where we see the program going awry, and how we can give steering instructions and modify it.

Susan David from the National Institute of Drug Abuse will testify next. NIDA has a \$7 million a year program to evaluate what we are doing. It is brilliant in conception. This is really breakthrough scientific work on how to understand social change. And it is not only taking a baseline sample. I know Dr. David will talk to this issue, looking at the better part of 8,000 respondents, and then every six months for four years going back out to measure it. But they are also going to go into 3,000 families and four different media markets and try to do longitudinal analysis of how that family is affected by this media campaign and all of its components. I do think we are going to try and deliver rational feedback to Congress on how we are doing with your resources.

We have also taken very seriously the other components of this: the entertainment industry collaboration. I will talk more about this; interactive media; public information corporate sponsorship, which we really have not gotten off the ground adequately; and partnership and alliances with organizations which are doing pretty well.

Next. Hopefully, I will not say much to this chart. It is sort of mind-boggling, but it is meant to underscore the fact that this is not the 1980s, where people develop some TV material, 30-second, 15-second spot ads, throw them out there and hope they are played in some market at some time. The chart clearly states that we took congressional guidance very seriously. That this is an integrated communications campaign, that is a 360-degree approach to surrounding the target audience and their adult mentors with a scientifically based message that we will evaluate as a process and change the message to keep it on target.

Next. Here is the problem, and Marcy Kelly can talk to it in greater detail than I can. But just as snapshot, we do have a problem in popular media. And I am not getting at the whole notion of the multi-billion dollar advertising effort, which is clearly affecting youth attitudes relating to alcohol consumption and cigarettes, I am referring to the notion if you are watching movies or listening to music, how you see the consequences.

I think there has been one sort of false charge. I do not believe the media glamorized drug use. I think what you and I need to be concerned about is to what extent drug abuse among youngsters is normalized, to what extent do they think they are the only ones not engaged in this behavior and that it is acceptable and low risk.

So the stat in there that I am most concerned about is only 12 percent of the portrayals of drug use showed long-term consequences. As I will respond to during the questions phase, I think

that is what we are worried about. We have gone out to this creative industry and said, we are not arguing for a message, we are arguing for the message to look like what drug abuse really is. We want you to show the kids and families who get involved in compulsive poly drug use behavior. If the message is accurate, it will make the argument that we support.

You might note also that music tends to be a bigger problem. I would, just as a broad generalization, suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the TV industry is a pretty responsible group, they are listening very intently, and they want accuracy in the way they depict this problem.

Entertainment outreach goals. This chart portrays, in bar graph form, both in songs and movies—I think I will leave this to Ms. Kelly to talk to later—entertainment outreach goals. Here are the four goals we have outlined for ourselves.

Next, let me talk very briefly about some of the entertainment outreach results. We have mentioned the whole notion of 50 TV scripts incorporating anti-drug messages. Probably a better number is that there are 350 million contacts with a person and a message. That is what the impression means up here. We have seen all of the TV networks get involved. All seven TV networks have produced PSAs, and have been enormously effective.

We are, I might add, in the matching component, representing 37 different organizations. One hundred ninety-one thousand pro-bono match PSAs have been aired. So we have, in fact, been conducting the largest underage anti-alcohol abuse campaign in history. And it is pretty well put together. As you know, we can talk about the Ad Council's enormous contribution. The American Advertising Federation, every three months has been developing a reel, getting it out here to the media; TV stations, radio, and print. They are playing this material, and they are not putting it on at 2 o'clock in the morning. They are not getting credit for it if they do it. But I would, if I can, underscore their cooperation and the energy they have brought to bear on this process.

Finally, let me just say campaign message delivery rates have been spectacular. As you know, we did a pretty decent Phase I evaluation. We did a 12-city test across America. We had 12 control cities. We did get data. We were after awareness. We found surprising impact on actual youth attitudes. We did a national one. We went national, and used largely existing Partnership for a Drug Free America material. We got a huge impact on the target audience. Rather than four times a week, 90-percent market penetration, we got up to the rates you see on the national test Phase II.

As of 6 September in the print market and 20 September in the TV-radio market, we have gone nationwide. Directed by Ogilvy & Mather, and Fleishman Hillard, ours is an integrated campaign using 11 languages, and 102 different media markets, and we are starting to bite into the problem. We are getting a tremendous exposure rate. We are going to evaluate this and talk to you on an interim basis as we see these results being developed.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, let me show you a 2-minute video out-take of seven different programming content. We diced it up to save time. But it will give you an insight into some

of the things that are going on right now on television, in particular.

Go ahead and show it.

[Video played.]

General McCaffrey. We can go into some detail, Mr. Chairman, how we go about dealing with the industry on these programmatic decisions. There is an industry standard on how you credit content. It is a pretty conservative one. It certainly gives us enormous leverage for our dollars. A generalization is, if we had an hour-long show that was completely on-platform, on-message, we would give them credit for five 30-second ads. If it was a 30-minute show that was entirely on-message, it would be three 30-second ads. By and large, programming credit is one 30-second ad where we get one of a scientifically accurate message in the correct platform into the show. And in some cases, if there is also a PSA at the end of the show, they will get another 15 seconds credit. That is just a general description of the mechanical way that these are added up in terms of media-matched dollars, a pretty conservative way of going about it.

And on that note, Mr. Chairman, let me, if I may, end these opening remarks and respond to your own interest.

[The information follows:]



**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY
Washington, D.C. 20503**

**STATEMENT OF BARRY R. McCAFFREY
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY
*The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign
And Entertainment Industry Outreach*
BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE,
AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999**

Introduction

Chairman Kolbe, Representative Hoyer, distinguished members of the subcommittee, all of us in the Office of National Drug Control Policy thank the Committee for the opportunity to testify today about the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign and, more specifically, its entertainment industry outreach component. This anti-drug campaign is an integrated youth- and adult-oriented marketing and public-health communications effort to reach American audiences with traditional and modern communication strategies to influence attitudes and action regarding drug use. We appreciate your interest in all aspects of drug control policy and your bipartisan support. We welcome this opportunity to explain important aspects of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign and to urge you to continue supporting its science and research-based communication strategy.

I would like to recognize several individuals and organizations that have played important roles in shaping and conducting this vital drug-prevention campaign. We are all indebted to **Mr. Jim Burke and the Partnership for a Drug Free America**. The Partnership has been our lead partner in implementing the Campaign. The ads they have produced are helping change how our young people view drugs and drug use.

Dr. Alan Leshner and the National Institute on Drug Abuse play a critical role in the evaluation of the Campaign, helping to ensure that we are producing the results we need. Dr. Leshner is, without question one of the world's leading authorities on drug abuse. NIDA sponsors roughly 85 percent of the world's research into drug addiction.

Major General Art Dean and the **Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America (CADCA)** are also key partners. For this Campaign to succeed, we need to reach people not only via the airwaves, but also in their communities. Through the help of CADCA, and others such as the **Prevention Through Service Alliance** (an alliance of 47 service groups ranging from the Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks of the World, YMCA of the USA, Boys and Girls Clubs, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., to 100 Black Men, Inc.), we are "localizing" the Campaign. We are developing ways, from parenting programs to anti-drug soccer tournaments, to reach Americans, where they live, work and play.

Peggy Conlon of the Ad Council is the quarterback of the anti-drug campaign's public service component. The Ad Council is the nation's largest clearinghouse for public service advertising. Through the Ad Council's help, the Campaign has succeeded in actually building new opportunities for Campaign-related public service advertising efforts, even in a time of declining PSA air time.

Part I of this testimony provides background on **the influence of popular culture**. **Part II** outlines the **communications strategy** we are following. **Part III** explains the media campaign's **entertainment initiative**. **Part IV** discusses the ways the media campaign **uses programming** and the creative process to reach this country's youth. **Part V** discusses why we believe **our strategy is sound**.

I: The Influence of Popular Culture

What we see and hear in the entertainment media influences our beliefs about the world around us.¹ Today's adolescents are deeply immersed in popular culture as it is conveyed through various forms of media. On average, American children are exposed to at least eight hours of media per day including television, radio, movies, recorded music, comics, and video games.² The ubiquitous presence of the media in our lives is underscored by the following statistics:³

- Ninety-eight percent of American households have a television set. Among households with children, nearly 87 percent have two or more television sets, and 66 percent of American children have a television set in their bedrooms.
- Children spend about 28 hours per week watching television. Over the course of a year, this is twice as much time as they spend in school.
- Sixty-three percent of kids aged 9-17 say that seeing the latest movies is important. 62 percent say that they watch a video at least once a week.
- Between the 7th and 12th grades, American teenagers listen to an estimated 10,500 hours of rock music. More than three-quarters of American youth between the ages of 9-14 watch music videos.
- Eighty-nine percent of teenagers use computers several times per week. 71 percent of young people use computers to play computer games, compared to 47 percent who use them for homework, and 31 percent for education. Teens spend an average of two and one-half hours per day on a home computer.

¹ Brown, Childers, & Waszak, 1990; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, & Signorelli, 1986; Marc, 1984.

² Williams and Frith, 1993.

³ *Mediascope Issue Brief*, "Popular Culture and the American Child," Brief Number 199G3d, January 1999.

Unfortunately, popular culture (including media programming and advertising content) too often portrays drug use as common, something to be expected, or even humorous. For example, by his or her 18th birthday, an average adolescent will have seen 100,000 television commercials for beer,⁴ and will have watched 65,000 scenes on television depicting beer drinking.⁵ The ONDCP-sponsored Mediascope study *Substance Use in Popular Movies and Music* examined popular movie rentals and songs to determine the frequency and nature of depictions of substance use (illicit drugs, alcohol, tobacco, and over-the-counter and prescription medicines).⁶

The Mediascope study found that 98 percent of movies studied depicted substance use. Illicit drugs appeared in 22 percent. About one-quarter (26 percent) of the movies that depicted illicit drugs contained explicit, graphic portrayals of their preparation and/or ingestion. Less than one half (49 percent) of the movies portrayed short-term consequences of substance use, and about 12 percent depicted long-term consequences. All movies in which illegal drugs appeared received restricted ratings (PG-13 or R). However, 45 percent of the movies in which illicit drugs were used did not receive specific remarks identifying drug-related content from the Motion Picture Association of America. The major finding from the study's song analysis is the dramatic difference among music categories, with substance reference being particularly common in Rap. Illicit drugs were mentioned in 63 percent of Rap songs versus about 10 percent of the lyrics in the other categories. Neither movies nor music provided much information about motives for substance use.

II. The Media Campaign's Communication Strategy

The undisputed influence of popular culture on attitude formation and the manner in which it depicts illegal drugs and substance abuse are recognized by the communication strategy that is being implemented by designing the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. Nearly a year of research went into developing this communication strategy.⁷ Hundreds of individuals and organizations were consulted, including experts in teen marketing, advertising, and communication; behavior change experts; drug prevention practitioners and representatives from professional, civic, and community organizations. These findings resulted in a comprehensive communication strategy that uses a variety of media and messages to reach young people, their parents, and other youth-influential adults.

Specific conclusions that make the case that the entertainment industry must be involved in drug prevention follow:

- The Campaign should encourage action on the part of other people who influence the lives of youth.

⁴ Monroe, 1994.

⁵ Coombs, Paulson, & Palley, 1988.

⁶ Office of National Drug Control Policy, *Substance Use in Popular Movies & Music*, Donald F. Roberts, Ph.D., Lisa Henriksen, Ph.D., Peter G. Christenson, Ph.D., April 1999.

⁷ ONDCP, *The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign: Communications Strategy Statement*, 1997.

- Consistent messages conveyed through a variety of channels and in different contexts are necessary to produce an effect.
- Professional groups.....must incorporate the communication strategy into their new and on-going programs.
- To achieve the maximum effect, the Campaign should use a full range of media mechanisms and formats in an integrated fashion.
- Effective message tailoring involves....working with communications professional who specialize in creating content for particular audiences.

Congress (through the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (P.L. 105-277, October 21, 1998)) supports ONDCP's conclusion that the entertainment industry must be partners in the national drug-prevention effort. This legislation authorizes uses of funds for "partnerships with...professional groups...[and for] entertainment industry collaborations to fashion anti-drug messages in motion pictures, television programming, popular music, interactive (Internet and new) media projects and activities, public information, news media outreach, and corporate sponsorship and participation."

The challenge is great. Given the pervasive influence of popular culture, which takes many forms, we are delivering prevention messages in a multitude of unusual and unexpected ways. We certainly recognize we cannot get the job done alone. We are encouraging professional groups to incorporate this strategy into their new and on-going programs. The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is harnessing a diverse media mix including television, video, radio, print, and Internet, as well as other forms of new media to deliver both general and tailored messages. Within the media mix, messages are being delivered through the full range of media content including paid and public service advertising, news, public affairs programming, and entertainment programming. The Campaign is further extending its reach and opportunity by tailoring messages and developing partnerships with a broad range of community and civic groups, professional associations, government agencies, and corporations. We are working with organizations such as the YMCA, Council of Black Churches, and Council de la Raza to promote our strategic messages wherever youth and parents are – not just when they are in front of the TV or listening to the radio.

Part III. The Campaign's Entertainment Initiative

The Media Campaign's Entertainment Initiative has several major components, all of which are guided by a fundamental philosophy: the entertainment community is a crucial player in addressing substance abuse among teens. They are our partners, and we firmly believe they are part of the solution. We do not subscribe to the widely held view that popular culture is inevitably a destructive force in the area of drugs, and you will not hear this campaign attacking the entertainment community. What you will hear instead is a call for dialogue. We offer information, materials, experts, and a commitment to working together over the long haul. We do not proselytize. We realize that you cannot "shoe horn" a drug message in a script where it does not belong. It must appear organically, and the only way that can be done is if the creative community is aware of the issues and facts. We want true partnerships with key creative people and organizations in order to increase support for the Campaign's fundamental strategic messages. Parent denial, risk perception, peer refusal skills and other message strategies are most effectively communicated by creative talent that is aware of and sensitized to the issues.

The Media Campaign's entertainment outreach goals follow:

- Encourage accurate depictions of drug use issues – including the consequences of drug abuse in programming popular with teens and parents.
- Incorporate strategic drug prevention messages and themes into popular culture, and dispel myths and misconceptions about drug abuse.
- De-normalize the image of drug use on TV, and in popular music and film.
- Use entertainment media to provide accurate drug information and resources on substance abuse to parents, caregivers, faith community leaders, and policymakers.

To help us accomplish these goals, we work directly with many of the key entertainment industry organizations, particularly those on the creative side of the business. We also have retained expert counsel in New York and Los Angeles, the capitals of the entertainment world, to work with the Campaign to develop our core strategies. Collectively, we work on the following activities:

- **Providing resources and information** on substance abuse to industry leaders and the creative community through briefings, script reviews, special events, collateral materials and access to experts.

We are working with and engaging writers, producers, directors, network executives, and musicians in dialogue and forming creative partnerships to encourage America's young people to reject illegal drugs. By showing the range of negative consequences of substance abuse, by depicting drugged behavior as unglamorous and socially unacceptable, we can discourage drug use. The creative community is in a unique and powerful position to communicate that drug use is neither normal nor mainstream; it is undesirable.

Since the Campaign began, ONDCP has maintained dialogue with a number of writers, producers, directors, and studio executives. They are an extraordinarily talented and creative group of people who have consistently demonstrated their ability to combine positive messages with compelling entertainment. Popular shows like *The Practice*, *Home Improvement*, *7th Heaven*, *ER*, *Cosby*, *Beverly Hills 90210*, and *Hang Time* have featured realistic, fact-based depictions about substance use in their storylines. All are award-winning programs watched by teens and parents. None of these shows saw declines in either quality or ratings because of their choice to both depict the negative consequences of substance use and show positive examples of families dealing with drugs. In short, entertainment and responsibility are not mutually exclusive, and we are privileged to be working with the some of this country's most creative, talented, and committed individuals on this groundbreaking effort. We believe our outreach to the television industry has helped to make this past year one of the best ones for accurate depiction of drug use and drug use issues on network television.

- **Engaging celebrities** who are positive role models in extending the reach of Campaign messages through participation in such activities as personal appearances and on-line chats.

Advertisers and marketers have long used celebrities to make their messages more appealing. The technique is particularly effective with young people, who frequently try to emulate the looks, behavior, and attitude of their favorite stars. The Media Campaign is using support from popular public entertainment figures to enhance the campaign's credibility and visibility among youth; increase potential media coverage of illegal drug use and its consequences; and help campaign messages reach key target audiences in a compelling and effective manner by featuring celebrities in a setting more accessible than advertising. In order to appeal to the broadest audiences, we are using a diverse group of celebrities in a variety of ways.

An impressive range of celebrities have spoken publicly about campaign themes and goals. Youth and parents nationwide have heard celebrity voices from many of the entertainment genres, including: TV (e.g., Eriq La Salle of NBC's *ER*, Jenna Elfman of ABC's *Dharma & Greg*, Ken Olin of CBS's *LA Doctors*, Lisa Nicole Carter of Fox's *Ally McBeal*); film; popular music (e.g., Lauryn Hill, The Dixie Chicks); amateur and professional sports (e.g., U.S. Women's World Cup champion soccer team; Olympic Gold Medallist Tara Lipinski, Mike Modano of the National Hockey League champion Dallas Stars), comedy (e.g., Howie Mandel); and pop culture (e.g., Miss America 1999 Nicole Johnson, Marvel Comics' Spider-Man). All have generously donated their services to the American taxpayer – **no fees have been or will be paid to celebrities to take part in Media Campaign activities.**

- **Developing public service messages** in collaboration with major media outlets.

Seven networks have produced public service announcements using celebrities from their most popular shows. We do not pay for talent – which could amount to millions – but credit the cost of the time. These messages are reviewed by ONDCP to ensure they are supportive of the campaign's communication strategy. Indeed, considerable public service time and

space has been generated by the media match requirement. According to Ad Age, the ONDCP campaign is a factor in increasing the public service time on prime time network TV. ONDCP retains all magazine, print and out of home space and uses it for Campaign messages. The radio and TV time is shared with other organizations that have drug -related messages (e.g. under-aged drinking or tobacco use, drug-related crime, building self-esteem, after-school activities, etc.). More than 191,000 radio and TV public service messages have been played for thirty-seven organizations. The Ad Council oversees the process for national ads. The American Advertising Federation plays a similar coordinating role in 102 local media markets. In the coming year, we will see a much larger number of local organizations benefiting from the pro-bono match component of the Media Campaign.

- Recognizing and commending **accurate portrayals of drug issues** on TV, film and in other entertainment media, and honoring the creative efforts of writers, directors, producers, actors and studio executives.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) has long worked with the Entertainment Industry Council (EIC) to bring science-based information about alcohol, drugs and tobacco to creators of entertainment products. In 1996, NIDA and EIC developed the PRISM awards for accurate depiction of alcohol, drugs and tobacco. We expect that the Media Campaign's entertainment outreach initiative will result in a considerable increase in the number of candidates for PRISM awards at the March 2000 ceremony.

- **Conducting content analysis and other research** to determine how entertainment media depict substance abuse issues.

Careful examination of media content is a crucial first step in determining what role media may play in promoting substance use and abuse. The Mediascope study *Substance Use in Popular Movies and Music* (whose principal findings were summarized in Section II of this statement) is an example of the factual way ONDCP is addressing the issue of the entertainment industry's depiction of illegal drugs.

The logic for content analysis is explained by the study's researchers: "if it is true that substance use appears frequently and is portrayed positively in movies and music, then it is reasonable to hypothesize that these portrayals may be influencing young people to use alcohol, tobacco and illicit drugs."⁸ And, "if movies and music do contribute to the problem, then, logically, they could also help solve the problem by depicting substance use realistically with consequences, or as deviant, unglamorous, and socially unacceptable."⁹

ONDCP is conducting a similar content analysis of the 25 most watched teen shows (for Hispanic, African American, and general market audiences). Results of this study will be announced in January. We will use this study to take the discussion of the influence of TV programming out of the realm of subjective judgement and into the domain of verifiable and quantifiable data that can be tracked over time.

⁸ Roberts, Henriksen, Christenson, "Substance Use in Popular Movies and Music," April 1999, p.5.

⁹ IBID.

Working with Filmmakers

As powerful as television is, some experts believe that movies have an even stronger impact on young people. However, the creative process for producing a film is dramatically different than that for television. Scripts are often years in development with no certainty that they will ever get made. As a result, the Campaign takes a long-term view on working with filmmakers and understands that we may not see concrete results for several years.

To influence messages within film, ONDCP will work closely with major studios as well as the individual writers and directors whom are the driving forces behind what is seen on the screen. Getting campaign messages in front of these individuals requires working with the organizations that represent them, such as the Writers and Directors Guilds, as well as having a campaign presence at key industry events, such as film festivals and trade conventions. We have begun this process in Phase III (fully integrated campaign) of the media campaign, and will continue our efforts through workshops, briefings, roundtables, and one-on-one conversations with industry leaders. Through continuous dialogue we believe we can raise awareness about how images of substance abuse in the movies impact audiences, particularly young audiences. We have shared, for example, the results of the Mediascope study of *Substance Use in Popular Movies & Music* to the creative community to reinforce our messages with facts, and encourage thoughtful deliberation about what material is produced. Finally, we believe there will be opportunities to leverage popular movies and videos that responsibly communicate campaign messages, after they have been released. We are now pursuing promotional activities and special events that capitalize on the visibility of these films in the marketplace.

Cross-Marketing: Beyond Movies and Television

To ensure that campaign messages reach teens and parents through as many outlets as possible, ONDCP's Entertainment Team is extending its activities beyond music and television, and focusing attention on the fashion and retail industries, home video, and motion pictures.

Our fashion initiative, for example, is identifying clothing, footwear and cosmetic manufacturers as well as designers, retail outlets and teen magazines to partner with the Campaign. We want to utilize the high visibility of the fashion world and use its influence and creativity to deliver campaign messages in unexpected and attention-getting ways. We have begun contacting leading companies in the fashion industry. These companies reach millions of consumers, and their marketing and advertising campaigns make repeated impressions on hundreds of millions of individuals, including parents and teenagers. They have built-in brand identity, which can give the Campaign instant access to a broad audience.

We are also exploring partnering with home video distributors and retailers in the promotion of campaign messages via inserts in new home video releases and retail store promotions. This initiative is in its nascent stage, but initial outreach has begun with studio marketing executives and home video distributors.

IV. Programming and Leveraging the Creative Process

A key component to this strategy is programming and how we affect programming content. Programming is a crucial part of any campaign that will effectively reach young people today. Programming is mainly perceived as having a single agenda – storytelling – and is therefore a more credible, neutral source of drug information than advertising.

This generation of adolescents is the most marketed-to generation ever. They are savvy and discriminating about any attempt to persuade them, and could tell you from as early as the age of three which fast food chain has which toy offer, which product is "a rip-off," and which advertising claims over-promise. Anti-drug messages need to be embedded in the social context of kids' popular media culture, through mediums such as programming, in order to complement and authenticate formal ad and education messages. This practice is common to those of other public health campaigns such as efforts to reduce drunk driving accidents (designated driver) and reduce traffic crash injuries (seat belt use). Indeed, scores of government agencies, non-profit organizations, and foundations attempt to influence program content for a range of issues.

One of our key strategies is to inform the creative process through a series of briefings, roundtables, and workshops in New York and Hollywood. These events are a cost-effective way to educate and inspire television writers, film screenwriters, and executives to portray realistic substance abuse consequences and to spur ideas for future storylines or scenes. Sometimes only a one-second frown or wave of the hand when someone is offered marijuana is all that is needed. The payoff can be substantial. Campaign messages are incorporated into dramatic storylines that are conveyed on valuable airtime, via top-rated shows seen by millions of viewers. In fact, if the campaign were to rely exclusively on purchasing ad time, reaching audiences of this size would be prohibitively expensive.

Some of the sessions we've conducted this year include briefings for network executives at ABC and Fox Television and a roundtable for creative executives involved in programming that targets children and teens. We have met with a broad array of entertainment industry organizations and their leaders including the Writers Guild, Caucus of Producers, Writers and Directors, Entertainment Industry Council, Screen Actors Guild, Directors Guild, Producers Guild, Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, and other organizations. We have met with industry leaders in Hollywood including Rob Reiner, Richard Dreyfuss, Barry Diller, Frank Biondi, and senior executives of major networks.

We have participated in entertainment industry events and briefed executives from Hollywood talent agencies, and publicity and management firms. And we've provided information and subject matter experts to writers and producers of individual shows, including *Cosby*, *Chicago Hope*, *ER*, and *Beverly Hills 90210*.

As a result of these activities, we have captured the attention of key creative and programming executives at, among others, all six broadcast television networks (ABC, CBS, NBC, Fox, The WB, UPN), The Fox Family Channel, Warner Bros. Television, Disney Television, Universal Television, The Writers Guild, The Directors Guild, and The Screen Actors Guild. We will also partner with entertainment industry organizations, other federal

agencies, and nonprofit organizations whose goals complement ours. For example, we are excited about a new partnership with *The Hollywood Reporter* -- a daily newspaper that delivers news coverage and in-depth stories to industry professionals around the world; it is one of the "must read" publications in the entertainment industry. They have agreed to work with the campaign to develop a series of workshops that will support our education efforts on the topic of substance abuse.

To support its outreach strategy, the ONDCP Entertainment Team identifies and provides experts and resources to the entertainment community, particularly writers who may have questions concerning substance abuse. This expertise is specifically tailored to meet the needs of the television industry, particularly the time constraints under which writers work. Experts are prepped carefully so that they can work effectively with television writers and producers, but remain true to the messages of the Campaign. As a result writers gain a deeper understanding of how to depict substance abuse accurately

The pro-bono match requirement

One of the foundations of our strategy is the pro-bono match requirement outlined in Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (P.L. 105-277, October 21, 1998). The act stipulated that federal funds must spent on advertising must be **must be matched with in-kind contributions of the same value**. Because some networks were unable to provide a 100 percent match in the form of public service advertisements, we allow public affairs and programming to count as part of a network's public service contributions. As a result, Zenith Media (our advertising purchasing company last year), created a formula for valuing programming content similar to those used by product sponsors for a program episode. The formula is based, conservatively, on requirements for a product advertiser to officially sponsor a program. For example, an on-strategy storyline that is the main plot of a half-hour show can be valued at three thirty-second ads. If there is an end-tag with an 800 number or more information at the end of a half-hour show, it is valued at an additional fifteen-second ad. A main storyline in an hour-long prime-time show is valued at five thirty-second ads, while such a storyline in a one-hour daytime show is valued at four thirty-second ads.

V. A Proven Strategy

We are confident that our entertainment strategy is effective, and we are not alone in our belief that parents and children can learn from the behavior of characters they see on television and in the movies. Television in particular has always reflected society and the issues of the day—art does imitate life. From Paddy Chayefsky in the 1950s to Norman Lear in the 1970s, to “ER” today, television’s most creative talents have recognized the power of the medium to dramatize social and political issues.

In the 1980s, activists and advocates began to harness television programming to promote their own causes. The idea was to use television to introduce public health, safety, or social messages not via the typical public service announcement, but instead by incorporating scenes and dialogue into actual programs. Today there are a number of national organizations working within the existing structures of the entertainment industry, attempting to have a positive influence on programming. They include the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the Population Communications Institute, the American Lung Association, and the Campaign’s own partner, Mediascope. Their efforts are complemented by those of federal agencies like ONDCP, NASA, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, as well as all of the branches of our armed forces, who work to ensure that entertainment portrays issues and situations realistically and accurately.

Given the amount of time writers need to fill, most are receptive to the overtures of public interest groups, especially those who understand how writers work. It is a symbiotic partnership—writers get story ideas and advocates get their messages heard. And in the end, society is the true beneficiary.

Conclusion

Adolescent drug use takes a great toll on our young people and society. Most of the leading causes of death among adolescents – motor vehicle crashes, homicide, suicide and HIV infection – are more likely to occur under the influence of illegal drugs. ONDCP’s National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign has the potential over the next five years to dramatically affect adolescent attitudes towards illegal drugs and to reduce juvenile drug use. To succeed in this ambitious undertaking, we need everyone’s help – including the resources and influence of the entertainment industry.

The entertainment industry is one of the most powerful and influential mediums for communicating to teens and adolescents. The Media Campaign’s communication strategy recognizes the influence of the entertainment industry and concludes that we must secure the entertainment industry’s support in order to communicate anti-drug messages effectively and comprehensively to youth.

We have demonstrated that we can increase accurate depiction of drug use and abuse in television and films by working with and providing experts to industry writers, producers, and organizations. Our meetings with producers, writers, and studio executives have contributed to: anti drug messages being included “in-program,” more accurate/fact based depictions of

substance abuse; and inclusion of campaign-related themes in shows such as *Cosby*, *ER*, *Chicago Hope*, *NYPD Blue*, *Home Improvement*, *7th Heaven*. These programs are conservatively estimated to have generated more than 100 million teen impressions and 250 million adult impressions. At the same time, we are helping broadcast companies satisfy the pro-bono match requirements of the media campaign by providing "credits" for programming that supports the Campaign's strategic messages.

Our integrated campaign is reaching nearly every single American child on a regular basis with anti-drug information. We are putting this information in front of them at a rate of roughly twice our goal of ninety percent of the target audience receiving four messages a week. We are buying advertising in 2,250 media outlets nationwide (newspaper, TV, radio, magazines, billboards, movie theaters, and others). From the start of the anti-drug campaign through September 1999, we project roughly 25 billion teen and adult anti-drug message impressions.

The Campaign is getting the nation's attention and getting a response. Based on expert analysis of drug-use trends and media campaign impacts, we do not expect to see appreciable impacts on drug use until two years into the campaign. However, we are already seeing some behavioral impacts. We are already seeing changes in certain more easily tracked behaviors, such as the demand for anti-drug information. For example, the number of calls to the National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information has increased by 318 percent since the anti-drug campaign's inception – even though the Clearinghouse's number is not on all our ads. Some local coalitions are experiencing fourfold increases in the number of calls for anti-drug information they are getting since the Campaign started.

In less than two years, drug prevention has become extremely visible in the lives of America's youngsters and their parents. From network television advertisements to school-based educational materials, from youth soccer tournaments to Internet websites, and from community coalition activities to the YMCA and Boys and Girls Clubs, the Campaign's messages reach Americans wherever they are.

During the national test phase (Phase II) of the Media Campaign, we succeeded in increasing awareness of anti-drug messages among youth and adults at the national level. Among youth and teens, the paid ads resulted in significant increases in awareness between baseline and follow-up with increases of up to 15 percentage points for individual ads. The ads are providing youth with key information about the dangers of drugs and are making them stay away from drugs. There was a 12-percent increase in the percentage of youth that agreed that the ads make them stay away from drugs (an increase from 61 to 69 percent). The percentage of youth reporting they learned a lot from television commercials about the dangers of drugs increased from 44 to 52 percent. Phase II also resulted in some small but statistically significant attitudinal shifts in the intended direction.

All of us at the Office of National Drug Control Policy appreciate this opportunity to provide the Congress additional information about the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. As you know, this anti-drug campaign was created in 1997 with broad bipartisan support. ONDCP appreciates the brilliant leadership of Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Senator Byron Dorgan, Representative Jim Kolbe, Representative Steny Hoyer, and all the

members of Congress who have provided continuous oversight for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. The commitment of Congress to this anti-drug campaign has made possible a seamless transition from a twelve-city test phase, to a year of nationwide testing and evaluation, and now a fully integrated media communications effort. We are grateful to all subcommittee members for your support of the Campaign and our broader efforts to reduce drug use and its consequences in America. We appreciate Congress' continued confidence in ONDCP's stewardship of this important prevention initiative. Indeed, we view the FY2000 appropriations bill and accompanying instructions to ONDCP as another endorsement of the communications strategy that guides the Campaign.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you very much, General McCaffrey, and I think some of what you said is very helpful here.

If I could, I would just like to go back first to a couple—I have several specific questions I wanted to get to, but a couple things on the charts that you showed there. I think it was really the first one dealing with the graph showing drug use. Yes, that one there. Two things that strike me about that is the almost precise and direct correlation between the actual—the drug use, the red line, and the other two, as the other two is the perception of the risk and the disapproval—as the perception goes up and the disapproval goes up, the drug use begins to come down.

The second point I would make is that by 1997, when you are at use, at levels of 90 percent, there really was not much place else for it to go at that point, but down. I mean, you could not really get up much higher than where we were, could we? It was really pretty staggered.

General MCCAFFREY. Remember, we have changed the scales so you can see the slope and the change more easily, but even though drug use among eighth-graders tripled between 1992 and 1995, and overall population use doubled, it never got worse than half as bad as it was in the early 1980s. So we could have gotten worse by far.

Mr. KOLBE. It is the right-hand level there.

General MCCAFFREY. Right.

Mr. KOLBE. But there does seem to be a direct correlation. I guess the other point I would make there is that while we are seeing certainly some improvement here, it would, would you not agree, that it is awfully early to make any kind of definitive judgments about our success at this point?

General MCCAFFREY. No question. No question.

Mr. KOLBE. That goes to the other one about whether or not we can really tie it directly to the program that we have.

General MCCAFFREY. I think we do know the answer to that one. We cannot, because that 13 percent reduction last year was only influenced—six months of that data was even possibly influenced by the national—

Mr. KOLBE. So there are other factors at work at this point.

General MCCAFFREY. Right.

Mr. KOLBE. You referred also to alcohol and tobacco. We have had some discussion. You know, that has been a major issue in this Subcommittee, as to whether or not this ought to include alcohol and tobacco. We have a massive campaign now—funded thanks to tobacco settlements in states—a massive campaign going on on tobacco use among young people. In my state certainly it is a huge campaign, far bigger than any drug campaign is. I have some concerns about whether or not we are diluting what I think is a very important message on drugs by trying—I know it is gateway, I know the gateway issue—but since we have little enough funds here to spend on this campaign, how do you make a decision about whether or not we focus on the alcohol, tobacco, as opposed to the hard drugs?

General MCCAFFREY. Well, of course, Mr. Chairman, our viewpoint has been that by law we should not spend appropriated dollars on anti-alcohol and tobacco underage ads, and we are not. It is part of the matching component. And it has been significant. As

an example, in the last year it was about a \$13 million impact, more than 11,000 PSAs were devoted to underage alcohol use.

The challenges, as we discussed before—and I am enormously sympathetic not only to the gateway notion about underage alcohol abuse, but the flat statement that the biggest problem right now an adolescent will probably encounter is underage drinking, in terms of vulnerability to drunk driving, sexually being exploited, and being involved in youth crime. It is a huge problem in and of itself.

The challenge to us would be if we try it—first of all, if we took the existing \$195 million and tried to counter underage drinking, we do not yet have a research base upon which to move forward. In addition, we would be running directly into a multi-billion dollar advertising campaign that correctly portrays adult use of alcohol as being legally and socially acceptable behavior. This is a behavior with which most of us do not have a problem, and do not encounter behavioral and legal and social problems. So if we are going to do that in coming years, and I would not argue against it, I think many of us feel it would be better to situate that approach in an agency like the CDC or SAMHSA, and to have a campaign based on research: how do we talk to young people about a behavior that is legal and acceptable for their mom and dad to engage in? It has got to be a different approach.

Mr. KOLBE. Well, that leads me right into the specific questions that I wanted to ask.

So that in terms of your soft matching, than alcohol/tobacco messages are included and get the same rating, same credit, the same degree of credit?

General MCCAFFREY. Absolutely, sure. And also, messages that are helpful to creating a no-drug-use environment for children, and parent-effectiveness ads. Some of the messages that are validating—I think there are 37 organizations if I remember correctly, including 100 Black Men, YMCA, et cetera, where you have got somebody communicating with young people or with their adult mentors. The message persuaded by the evidence, helps create a no-drug-use environment.

Mr. KOLBE. And I have a series of other questions I will come back to in my second round. I think before we break for what I believe is just a general vote, and I think we will have quite some time after that before we have any other votes, so we will be able to complete the rest of this hearing. Let me call on Mr. Hoyer for some questions.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, at this point in time I am going to pass. I do not know whether any of my colleagues have—I am coming back. I do not know whether they will be able to come back.

Mr. KOLBE. Okay. Let us see. The next one here is Mr. Price.

Mr. PRICE. Well, let me just quickly ask a question, and then we will try to come back. I need some clarification as to the complementary campaigns that you were describing, and the extent to which the message of those campaigns is actively coordinated through your office or elsewhere, to what extent is there an attempt to achieve some kind of consistent complementary message. I understand that the ancillary campaigns do involve questions of alcohol use, for example, and you do not do that with the appro-

priated funds. But to what extent is this a coordinated complementary message? And are those ancillary campaigns included in your message delivery rates, the figures you gave us in your initial presentation, in terms of figuring out what the exposure is and the extent of these ads being seen by young people? Are those figures inclusive of the ancillary campaigns?

General McCaffrey. Well, I think part of the last question is the easiest one to respond to. I think we got excellent data, tracking what is played by who, when, and what market. So whether it is an appropriated dollar or a non-appropriated dollar, there are corporations out there that electronically track this sort of thing. Stations do have to turn in affidavits, for example, on appropriated funds, or for that matter, for the matching credit. They cannot get away with playing it at 2 o'clock in the morning, and saying, "Well, that is your match for prime-time TV." So we do have pretty good data, and we do include that.

For the target audience, it does not matter whether you heard something from the YMCA youth program with materials included in their youth outreach, or you heard it on a paid national TV Ad.

Mr. PRICE. But the message delivery rates that you gave us for Phase II—

General McCaffrey. We pull them apart. We disaggregate them, and then—but we will show you the total impact on target includes both aspects, but we can show—

Mr. PRICE. The figures you gave in your presentation; the National Test Phase II figures, are just the ads from the appropriated funds; is that right?

General McCaffrey. Well, I think that chart had both of them, if I remember. It has both the—

Mr. PRICE. That is my question. Is it a combined figure or is it—

General McCaffrey. I think we show both of them separately, do we not? No, we wrap them up. That is both the appropriated and matching component ads. But we can disaggregate it, and then disaggregate that data and try and show you the contributions of each component.

The place you get into difficulty is when you go to a "Cosby" program content ad, you can say who watched it, but now it gets a little more difficult. We give him credit, let us say, on that one, probably for one 30-second ad at the market rate for that show. But had we actually made that ad, he might have charged us a million dollars for his personal involvement in it. So I would suspect this is a very conservative accounting method by which to determine how much impact on your audience are you getting.

Mr. PRICE. Right. I see in your longer statement you do have a more explicit breakdown.

General McCaffrey. Yes.

Mr. PRICE. I am sure your accounting method is conservative and responsible. What I am trying to get at here is the impact and the extent to which these messages really are reinforcing each other.

General McCaffrey. Absolutely. And there is a coordination system. In the paid component, of course, it is easiest, in the sense that Ogilvy-Mather, working through Partnership for a Drug Free America, there is a creative review committee. There is a Behav-

ioral Science Expert Panel. There is a focus group for ads before they go final. They are tracked in their impact. They are modified or pulled, as we see their effect on the target audience. Pretty decent following of how the creative process works.

But again, for the matching component, the American Advertising Federation, in all of our 102 different media markets, has to pull together a committee. So if you submit a PSA as 100 Black Men or YMCA or Boys & Girls Clubs, a message, and produce one then submit it, it has to pass scrutiny for being on-target in the strategy. You have to be able to explain the issue you are addressing, and they have to be scientifically valid messages.

Mr. HOYER. Will you yield a minute?

Mr. PRICE. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. Following up on that, in your statement on page 12, you have "Paid in Anti-Drug Match" and then "Paid All Match." Does "All Match" include alcohol and other substances? Is that what you are talking about?

General McCaffrey. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. Okay. Excuse me. This is a former statement, your October 14th, 1999 statement. That is last week's statement before the Mica Subcommittee. I am not disaggregating your statements quickly enough. [Laughter.]

But I presume last week's statement is still valid.

General McCaffrey. They had better match up.

Mr. PRICE. I know we need to go vote, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

General McCaffrey. Let me also offer, Mr. Congressman, I will give you a copy of "Procedural Guidelines for Broadcast and Cable Network Branded PSAs," and there are ten criteria. You have to say you are targeting one of the ten eligible messages. There is a review process, and we will track when and how their message is played.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you, General. We are going to recess briefly for this one vote, and we will come back immediately afterwards, and we will begin with Ms. Northup.

[Recess.]

Mr. KOLBE. We will resume the hearing, and we will begin with questions by Ms. Northup.

Ms. NORTHUP. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome, General McCaffrey.

As the mother who has a sixth child, who has six more months till he graduates from high school, then I will be over that hump. I think having teenagers, I can tell you, I thought until now was a great thrill, especially around the age of 13—it was like being the piper. They wanted my approval. They followed behind me. It was fabulous. But from that point on, the fear of what was going on with their peers, the messages they were getting, the music they were listening to, the arguments over whether we were going to have this tape in our house or not, it just wears you out.

And I have to say that drugs are a huge concern. But everything you see on these charts is exactly my experience. I remember when my freshman and sophomore boys, number three and four boys, came home from my college after their freshman and sophomore year, and said, "What is going on? The drugs in this city, you can-

not go to a party, you cannot go any place. My friends that I was sure never, ever, ever would touch it, are," and it was heart wrenching. And we had so many conversations at the dinner table. And the youngest child then was going into his eighth grade, and I will never forget, he spoke up one night and said, "And you will never guess what happened at the church picnic Saturday night. So-and-so was arrested for marijuana." This is a kid going into eighth grade. And it was like the whole world was crumbling.

Now, he says drugs are not so prevalent. It is not so cool. All of my kids are telling me the same thing, that there is just not the general acceptance, and I think we are making progress. I realize it is just a slight blurb on there, but it does sort of reflect my experience.

But drinking is another huge, enormous problem, and I guess my question is: how do we fashion the messages here? Because at least my kids were hearing from everybody but their peers, drugs are always bad. It is wrong, it is bad at any age, at any time, at any place. It is not something you can do next year, in two years. Drinking is something that they expect they will do. And even though, knock on wood, I think this high schooler is really a good kid, he has gone now to three college weekends, being recruited for a team, and at every one he was taken to parties where everybody there, by his estimation, had a drink in their hand. I have always fought with my high schoolers, because we do not give any drinks to our kids, nor do we ever let anybody in our house that has a drink. I say, "That is the end of the party if that ever happens." But they routinely have parents that say, "Oh, we know your friends are going to drink, so when you come over, they can have some beer, but we are going to take their keys, and they have to spend the night."

You see MADD, who sends home the contracts, sign a contract with your high schooler, saying, "If you ever cannot drive home from a party, you can call us. We will come get you. No questions asked, no repercussions." You know, and I say to my kids, "I am sorry. There will be repercussions. There will be questions asked, and you are going to stand here and talk to me every night when you come in, and kiss me goodnight, and I am going to do the best I can to enforce a no-drinking policy."

So how do you fashion a drinking message? Have we done the research? What works? Will anything work when it is on television? When every single person in this room knows that 19-year-olds that are at college have it going on every minute all around them, and nobody intervenes? I mean, if parents are saying, "Oh, it is Christmas, have a glass of wine," is anything we put on TV, is that going to be effective?

General McCaffrey. Well, your general line of discussion, Madam Congresswoman, really warms my heart, because at the end of the day, it seems to me it is what mom, the homeroom teacher, pediatricians and a minister says that counts much more than any other influence on youth attitude. So if you are hearing consistently "in our family", "in our school", "we do not drive drunk, we do not use drugs", I think it shapes attitudes more so than anything we put in the media.

Having said that, at the end of the day, alcohol abuse by underage drinkers is a huge problem. You listen to Secretary Shalala, who is temporarily serving as a Government official, she is essentially a teacher, a college president, and she will argue, hands down, the principal problem she faced as an educator throughout her career, was the abuse of beer and in combination with marijuana, and that that is the dominant reason why kids do not learn, drop out of school, do not play sports, end up pregnant, end up vulnerable to physical assault. It is a huge problem.

If there is one group of people in America that I have enormous angst about, it is university leadership, who allow kids to go to school in an environment, where if we acted like that in the armed forces, they would relieve us from command. They have abdicated their responsibility to create safe, responsible environments for young people under their charge. And I think it is starting to change, but that is a target that many of us have——

Ms. NORTHUP. But how do we advertise when two of my kids have gone to school, Miami of Ohio in Ohio and the state law is, if you are out for dinner with your parents, you can legally have a drink when you are 18.

General MCCAFFREY. Well, we do need a better research base. You make a good point. We have to have the market, do the studies to understand better what arguments will affect attitudes. You cannot use the same argument as the one devised against methamphetamines. Meth is an easy target. Pot for a 12-year-old is a tough target. And we are more worried about inhalant abuse and marijuana and beer among middle-school kids than we are methamphetamines among 35-year-olds. We do need better research, and then we need to make sure we are talking to kids in terms they can understand. You cannot equate dad having a six-pack and watching football with smoking marijuana. You can tell a youngster, "You will look stupid if you consume alcohol under age." You can suggest to parents that the environment is, "If you are going to drink, you are not driving our car." So you need to find a message that is relevant to young people, and certainly it would not be on categorically saying that alcohol is bad, because we know it is legal and it is acceptable, and most people do not encounter a problem.

But I guess I would sign up for research along the lines of what are the most effective ways of crafting messages to young people about not drinking?

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you. Mr. Peterson.

Mr. PETERSON. To just sort of follow along here, I come from a very rural setting, and I think in rural areas we have sort of peaked. I mean, I think there is no community now in rural America that does not have complete drug availability, no matter what it is, and that was not true a few years ago. The pipeline has reached everywhere. Part of our problem is, I think the feeling out there is that all the narc units that are very successful, do not work out there. They work in the suburban areas. I think the sellers realize they are a little bit enforcement-free out there, and so it is a safer place to sell drugs. And so, in my view, it has intensified the availability of drugs.

I had 200 young people together two weeks ago, and I had a panel of experts, DEA people, drug and alcohol rehab people, who spoke to them, and we have been doing this for a number of years. They literally attacked them about legalization, selling legally. I mean, it was contrived. These kids had organized, but it was an aggressive debate about drugs should be legal, and of course, that is an assumption that they are not harmful.

And so I think one of the messages we have got to really hone in on is the harmfulness. You know, people assume that marijuana is not harmful, that it is really no different than smoking a cigarette. And, of course, that is very harmful too. I mean, more people die of tobacco than anything.

But I guess I would be interested in your comments on that, but I have found that in a couple settings now, where young people are arguing for legalization because drugs really are not harmful.

General McCaffrey. Well, it is very disturbing. I talk to young people all the time, and there is a very active minority who have that feeling. I would argue a greater problem, and one that we are addressing in this media campaign, is that many young people, more than half, in my view, strongly believe that although they are not using drugs, most other youngsters are. So I think the whole notion of normalization of drug use is the heart and soul of one of our concerns.

Part of countering that is to make the argument that these drugs are harmful. I agree. We have not adequately done that, particularly with marijuana, which is widely argued by some to be a benign substance, when in fact—and you should ask our NIDA panelist—Dr. Alan Leshner, Secretary Shalala can document that we think marijuana is a harmful drug. We do not agree. We think it causes cancer, that it is harmful to the brain, that it causes all sorts of social problems, learning problems. We are vehemently opposed to it. We think particularly when it is done more so by adolescents, that we see enormous statistical correlation between expansive use of marijuana in early years of development and later on compulsory drug use problems. We can make those arguments on scientifically sound bases, and provide them to adult mentors to use in shaping youth attitudes. That is a big contribution of this media campaign.

But to give the message, not in a moralistic lecturing tone, but to make sure it comes across the Internet, or in this wonderful classroom television environment, and to get to them, not in the twelfth grade year, but in the ninth grade year. So I think a couple years down the line, you are going to see some major impact out of this campaign.

Mr. PETERSON. Another area I guess I am interested in, I think sports figures are still the idol of our young men. And I guess the one I will pick on the most, and I am an avid football fan, I think the National Football League has been a disgrace. Every year prominent players have drug altercations and continue to play football. In fact, the Steelers had one suspended last year who took an over-the-counter drug that was illegal, and he got suspended for four months. There was a player for another team, who had actually been in a drug issue, and because he had not been convicted yet, continued to play all year. Has there been any effort to get the

sports world to make a strategy of putting up with much less? It seems to me you can have two, three, four incidents, and you can still play football and other sports. And I think that is a terrible message to young people, that you can be a professional and excel, and be a drug addict.

General McCaffrey. Well, I certainly could not agree with your view more strongly. The enforcement piece of it, the sanctions, if you have sanctions and drug testing in the hands of the same people who are running the league, it will not work. I mean, I do not know why we are surprised at that. It is counter-intuitive to think that somebody who benefits economically from the players can possibly sanction them. And so we are arguing very strongly, and I think with increasing effectiveness, you have got to have an independent drug-testing agency, and that we need to apply drug free workplace laws to professional sports. And we are making progress. In the NBA, as you remember, we got into the contract "no marijuana use."

Surprisingly, and I almost hate to tell you this, the NFL is doing pretty well compared to many. They do have a decent code. They do test. I still think your point is a good one. When you have public figures who are clearly compulsively using drugs and not sanctioned, that is a huge problem.

We have gotten a great feedback. We conducted a National Coach-a-thon last year. We have gone after kids who deal—are in organized sports, soccer, swimming, baseball. We have provided material to their coaches. We are very heavily engaged in professional leagues—and they are being very supportive—to include Major League Baseball. Major League Soccer has been incredibly responsive to the issue. We are now working with trying to affect the international olympic movement. We are at the point now where if you are a national competitor or an international competitor, it is widely believed that you cannot win unless you are using performance-enhancing drugs. That is the deal.

And I just testified at Senator McCain's committee yesterday, that in the space of five years we ended up with 3 percent of the youth population using steroids. We have more girls than boys using steroids today. You can get on the Internet and order this stuff, and it comes through the mail to your house. We have a huge problem in the athletic setting, and yet, that is also a solution to us. I think we are moving in the right direction. We are getting tremendous help out of U.S. Olympic Committee, NCAA and others.

Mr. PETERSON. Do you have any printed material on the hazards of marijuana use that is available, readily available?

General McCaffrey. Absolutely. And we have got it out all over America, particularly in the school systems. Secretary Dick Reilly has some good material, and Donna Shalala has also produced, through SAMHSA and NIDA, some more material, which we get out through the great civic associations. If you are in the YMCA youth program now, you are seeing our youth anti-drug media campaign in your activities, as are the Boys & Girls Clubs, scouting movement. We are now working with the Girl Scouts.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you very much, Mr. Peterson.

General, I want to bring us back to the focus of this hearing, which is the media, the entertainment industry, the media cam-

paign, the use of the match and how we define that, measure that, and measure its effectiveness. I have a number of questions here on the nuts and bolts of that.

The law provides for the money to be either the cash or in-kind contributions. So I take it that is the way in which this whole concept of the media match or the soft match and the content match evolved. But could you perhaps tell us just a bit more about how this concept evolved of using this match?

General MCCAFFREY. The history of it is interesting. When we actually started it, we did not have the match in there. We knew we wanted to leverage the investment. We were very concerned. There were things we were worried about. We did not want to dry up PSAs, not only that existed through Partnership for Drug Free America, but also for other related issues. We did not want to dry up teen pregnancy, anti-AIDS ads, et cetera. So we got into it with working with the Ad Council and the American Advertising Federation, how do we make sure we protect public service in the media?

But the first law did not have match in there. Zenith did some very creative work, got in there and said, "Let us do just that. Let us negotiate some kind of a match."

Mr. KOLBE. Let me clarify that. Are you telling me the word "match" was added into the legislation? And when was that?

General MCCAFFREY. Yeah. I think the second year we got the match mandated by law and we—

Mr. KOLBE. In our appropriation?

General MCCAFFREY. right.

Mr. KOLBE. Not the underlying authorization of this program. Okay. When match came about then, that is what you were thinking about, not match of time, but you were thinking of match through content?

General MCCAFFREY. Well, I think what we were thinking about, we wanted to, first of all, not just think in terms of television, we wanted to see this as the full spectrum of communicating with young people, and we wanted to leverage the investment. And it turned out there were industry standards on how you do that. It turned out there was a body of knowledge out there already on how to do that.

Mr. KOLBE. And I want to come to that. The idea of using program content match, does the idea for it initiate with your agency, with the program, with Ogilvy & Mather? Who initiates this?

General MCCAFFREY. Well, of course, the concept was out there already.

Mr. KOLBE. No. I mean specific. Now I am talking about a specific program, a specific message that is going to be there.

General MCCAFFREY. Well, the process, first of all, is run by Ogilvy-Mather, not me. I have got a dozen lawyers and creative people quarterbacked by Alan Levitt, Ogilvy-Mather for media buying and Fleishman Hillard, when it comes to interactive and other areas. But Ogilvy-Mather media buying, that is where this is getting run. So they are looking out 18 months. They are buying well out in front. If I remember the figures, we dropped sort of dollar per output function by almost 30 percent the second year because we were out in front of the marketplace. And when they go for the

media buy, they are also negotiating the match. And part of that is, we have got to tell them about the match program, that you cannot just ring up a message and play; it has to be on one of these 10 message themes, it has to get vetted to get credit, and here are the ways you can——

Mr. KOLBE. You said 18 months in advance, but most of these programs are not written and filmed 18 months in advance.

General McCAFFREY. Well, TV, you are right. You have a much shorter time. But we are buying access time that far out.

Mr. KOLBE. So if I understand it then, it is a joint thing where Ogilvy & Mather goes to the producer and says, "This is what is available to you. Do you want to use this?"

General McCAFFREY. The people that are putting the material on the air, that is who they are buying access with. They are saying, "If you have got a television station or radio station, if you are a firm that rents billboards, we are going to spend X hundred thousand dollars with you. You have got to develop at least 100 percent match." Now, where the material come from? It can be our nationally produced Partnership for Drug Free America material, or it could be 100 Black Men, YMCA, a corporate sponsor. And if you do other material, here is how you get it cleared for use through the American Advertising Federation locally. So it could be standing up for the Boys & Girls Club in Detroit, an anti-drug message, "Get involved in their programs and your kids will use less drugs." True. So that message then has to get checked off as being adequate by a local council, American Advertising Federation.

Mr. KOLBE. But I am talking about the messages that we saw, or some of the messages that we saw. Some we saw here were explicit kinds of ad or messages. I am talking about the messages that are embedded into the program itself.

General McCAFFREY. Right. So Warner Brothers or CBS or Fox would say—first of all, most of it is paid access. I mean, most of it is matching television or radio ads, 85 percent.

Mr. KOLBE. 85 percent, I understand.

General McCAFFREY. But go to the 13 percent that is, quote, "soft match", we——

Mr. KOLBE. That is what I am really trying to focus on here.

General McCAFFREY. That 13 percent, there are some 50 odd shows. That was the creative content of the people writing and producing those shows.

Now, they will get an idea. We have done seminars, part of this media research, so they have been educated scientifically about drug abuse. They will write in a content, voluntarily send a script in, and we will look at it for them, and say, "No, that is right. It is on-message. It is scientifically accurate."

Mr. KOLBE. Okay. Now, that gets to my next question, and I do not want to take up too much of my time here. They send the script in, so it is ONDCP then that says, "This meets our test. It is eligible for the soft match?"

General McCAFFREY. Well, I almost hate to say ONDCP. Since I am accountable, I will, but basically it is a behavioral science expert panel. It is a NIDA-based review.

Mr. KOLBE. It is a panel that you have that is——

General McCaffrey. Ogilvy-Mather provide categories of what is acceptable, and the scripts, essentially, scripts or other content will be vetted, depending on where it started. If it is locally, it will be vetted by a local board.

Mr. Kolbe. Okay. I am just trying to understand the process. Who then finally does sign off, and says, "Yes, this meets the"—

General McCaffrey. Well, if it is one of the 102 media markets, it is a local ad on a local radio station—

Mr. Kolbe. No, one of these national, like "Cosby Show", when something has been vetted into the—

General McCaffrey. Well, one of the seven major networks producing their own PSAs or program content, it would probably end up coming to us and—

Mr. Kolbe. And you are going to say it is eligible for the credit?

General McCaffrey. Based on—

Mr. Kolbe. Your agency.

General McCaffrey. Based on a NIDA behavioral science, review.

Mr. Kolbe. Okay. So this NIDA behavioral review says, "We think it is eligible." You have the final sign-off. Is that a fair—

General McCaffrey. Paid or non-paid? Presumably at the end of the day, I am accountable for all of it.

Mr. Kolbe. I understand. I am just trying to get an understanding of how this process works. Have there been times when somebody has—and I have really gone beyond my time, but I just want to follow this through here. Have there been times when a script was submitted, and you said, "Well, it is close, but it is not on target, but if you make some changes here, it will work for the soft match?"

General McCaffrey. Well, I think there is clearly feedback, but interestingly enough, the creative person, the writer-producer who works with us, has no concept of media match. They do not know anything about this. They do not know about the accounting techniques. Their purpose is to get good quality—

Mr. Kolbe. Entertainment.

General McCaffrey. Entertainment—

Mr. Kolbe. Assuming it is communicated to—

General McCaffrey. What?

Mr. Kolbe. Somebody has to communicate to that writer.

General McCaffrey. Yes. And many of them will come up on the net and talk to us. There are web pages now they can go to, and they are using them. We have conducted seminars for all these groups, all the TV writers and producers, movie people. So there is an interaction back and forth. But there is feedback, and for example, if something was scientifically inaccurate, we would point that out. If humor, if being drunk was made to appear amusing, we might note that there was no consequence to drug using behavior.

Mr. Kolbe. One last question. This whole idea you have described in your opening statement of counting an hour-long program that is entirely on-message, I think you said counts for three—

General McCaffrey. Would be five.

Mr. KOLBE. Five 30-second spots. Is this unique or is this done elsewhere? Is there any other—

General McCAFFREY. Well, I think there is an industry standard to do this kind of thing. The only thing I would suggest is that we are not paying anything but production costs for the appropriated side. We pay nothing for the matching side at all. So when you get credit for a "Cosby" ad, you may have gotten it at a fraction of the cost, that if I was trying to get Subaru Autos into that "Cosby" section, I might have had to pay a lot more to do it.

Mr. KOLBE. Well, that was my question. Is it comparable to the product placement?

General McCAFFREY. It is absolutely a fraction of the cost, because we are not paying Actors Guild fees. I am trying to think. Everyone involved in this process has waived their fees, which is a tremendous gift to us, and that is not the case for other public health campaigns necessarily.

Mr. KOLBE. Okay. Mr. Hoyer.

Mr. HOYER. I want to hear our next witness. So I am not going to ask questions, other than to observe that it would be, I think, very useful for our members to know and for the Nation to know the value of the contribution. In other words, not only are we investing from the public sector, but we are also not only getting the match, and the contribution of the services to which you just referred.

Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General McCAFFREY. Mr. Hoyer, you know I am just looking at January 1998 and October 1999, \$199 million pro-bono match. And that is quality access to these audiences, a huge amount of access.

Mr. HOYER. So more than a one-to-one match.

General McCAFFREY. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Peterson.

Mr. PETERSON. Yes, could you elaborate further on the entertainment industry and particular time slots you are targeting.

General McCAFFREY. Well, the last time it was explained to me semi-adequately, it took Shona Siefert from Ogilvy and her people, they came in around 4 o'clock, and they got out of there at close to midnight.

Mr. KOLBE. No, that will not work. [Laughter.]

General McCAFFREY. But it is worth your staffer getting an hour briefing on this. It is wonderful to see how they do this. But on the other hand, they have got a lot of experience selling products using the media. And so we have given them requirements. I mean, this is not do as good as you can. You have got to communicate to certain age groups and their adult mentors. You have got to get to the ethnic minority population. You have to talk to African-American kids, Hispanic kids, et cetera, and their parents. So to get to those audiences, you have got to know where they are in the marketplace. If you want to talk to Native Americans on a reservation, you have to go to radio. You cannot go to the New York Times.

Some of it is obvious, some of it is not. Chinese language radio stations in San Francisco. So when they have done that, and we give them sort of output function guidelines, they devise a strategy and come back and explain it to me. And then we have got to

evaluate it and see if it's working, are you getting to the market you are after. And if you get to them, are your ads credible or is the communication credible? Do they see it happen, hear it, are they influenced by it? And all of that, of course, is being evaluated by NIDA and Westat Corporation.

Mr. PETERSON. You are targeting the times when those young people are watching television.

General McCaffrey. Absolutely. Or were not, or were on the Internet. And we have got eight Web pages now that are linked to 21 other Web pages. So if you come up on the Net and type in "drugs," you may end up on freevibe.com, which was done for free, I might add, by Disney-ABC. I think Disney has got a representative here, and here is color, interactive, scientifically accurate, exciting information about drugs. And by the way, while you are using freevibe.com, you may have a chat with Steve Young of the San Francisco 49ers, three million kids in an interview last week or you are talking to World Cup soccer champion players, the Women's World Cup or the Williams Sisters or Andy MacDowell or Tara Lipinski or whoever. We are trying to attract you in to listen to the message.

Mr. PETERSON. Thank you.

Mr. KOLBE. General, thank you very, very much. I know there are still questions that we could have, but I think they will hopefully get resolved as we hear next from Susan David, who is the research coordinator at the National Institute of Drug Abuse. And we thank you very much, General McCaffrey, for your participation today. And the members here and in the audience this afternoon will also be hearing from the media industry itself.

Thank you very much, General.

General McCaffrey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1999.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DRUG ABUSE [NIDA]

WITNESS

SUSAN DAVID, RESEARCH COORDINATOR, DIVISION OF EPIDEMIOLOGY, SERVICES, AND PREVENTION RESEARCH

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you very much, Ms. David. We welcome you to the table here. And as I have already noted, you are the research coordinator in the Division of Epidemiology and Prevention Research at NIDA. And you have the responsibility for evaluating the impact of our anti-drug youth media campaign.

We have a statement from you which, of course, as is normal, we will place the full statement in the record. If you would like to make some opening remarks, we will then go to questions afterwards.

Welcome.

Ms. DAVID. Thank you.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you very much.

Ms. DAVID. I will take the opportunity to make some opening remarks, with your permission.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to be here on behalf of the National Institute on Drug Abuse and Dr. Alan Leshner, of course, who is our director, who testified here about six months ago about the campaign. I am accompanied today by my deputy project officer, Mr. Arthur Hughes, who is a mathematical statistician and knows a lot about surveys and other intricacies of this project.

Also present in the audience, I would like to introduce Dr. David Maklan, who is a vice president of Westat, which is our evaluation contractor, and Dr. Robert Hornik, who is from the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania. These gentlemen are obviously heavily involved in helping us do this evaluation project.

As you know, NIDA was asked by ONDCP to conduct an independent and scientifically based evaluation on the outcomes and impact of the campaign on parents and their children. Briefly, the evaluation includes two surveys: the National Survey of Parents and Youth, which will provide a national picture every six months, and the Community Longitudinal Survey of Parents and Youth, which will provide insight into the effects of the campaign on family and the community.

I would like to directly address your interest about issues involved in evaluating the effectiveness of the use of television programming in the campaign. Let me first describe our general evaluation approach. Our science-based strategy for the evaluation focuses on two primary facets of the campaign: the paid advertising,

which ensures a certain level of media exposure and frequency for each target audience—that was just discussed. Director McCaffrey just talked about that—and the general message content that evolved from the most effective prevention research.

The evaluation design captures effects that are cumulative over multiple exposure to messages from many sources on representative samples of youth and their parents. Specifically, approximately 8,000 youth and parents are interviewed in each six-month wave from our national survey. The measures are designed to assess changes in knowledge, beliefs, attitudes and behaviors brought about by messages in the campaign ads.

Despite the primary focus on the paid advertising portion of the campaign, the evaluation tries to capture, in a general way, whether audiences are aware of anti-drug messages in television programming. We have the following set of questions that will appear in both parent and teen questionnaires: We ask people, "In recent months, how often have you noticed stories that dealt with drug use among young people in—" primarily the concept we are looking at here is TV movies, sitcoms or dramas. So we ask specifically those variety of opportunities that we saw that Director McCaffrey showed this morning. "What kinds of programs might you have seen?"

Then we also ask about TV news or radio news, about TV talk shows, movies watched in movie theaters and on rental videos. And we ask is it not at all, one to three times a month or more than three times a month. So we are asking people about the frequency. "Did you see these things?" And then "How often did you see them?"

We would expect that if the campaign efforts are successful, they will produce a large number of placements of anti-drug messages in normal television programming, and many respondents will recall these recent exposures. As Director McCaffrey described this morning, the campaign has already succeeded in placing anti-drug messages in entertainment programs and expects to expand these efforts later on in the campaign.

Thus, the evaluation will provide some picture of the extent to which audiences are aware of anti-drug messages and whether this level of awareness changes over time. We would also be able to examine the association between recall of exposure to such stories and relevant beliefs, attitudes and behaviors.

The evaluation, however, is not designed to be able to measure the effect of a single episode of a television program. There are several reasons for this. Number one, the evaluation is designed to capture the cumulative and multiple exposure to campaign messages, as I described before.

The second thing is it is likely that only a minority of the people interviewed in our survey will have actually seen the episode. Even in very popular programs on a particular night, less than 25 percent of viewers are seeing a specific program. So in our survey it is unlikely that enough people in our sample will see it.

And third, the short-term impact of a single exposure means that most people are unlikely to recall the episode three to four weeks later after the program has aired. Consequently, we expect that only a small portion of our six-month sample, those 8,000 people

we are interviewing, would have viewed the program, remembered it and experienced the potential effects of that single exposure. This small portion is likely to be too small to produce statistically reliable outcomes. Despite the fact that we are unable to capture the effects of a single program, we expect that if the campaign succeeds at placing messages in many programs over time, our broad measure will provide some evidence that such repeated and cumulative exposure will contribute to the overall effects of the campaign.

As to the status of the evaluation, NIDA and Westat are in the final preparation stages. We are conducting interviewer training next week and will initiate the first interviews the following week. Our first semi-annual report, which will serve as a baseline for the study, will be released in June of 2000.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning, and I would be happy to answer questions.

[The information follows:]

Hearing on Television Programming and the Anti-Drug Campaign

Before the

**Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee of the
House Appropriations Committee**

October 21, 1999

Rayburn House Office Building

Room 2359

10 a.m.

Statement by

Susan David, M.P.H.

National Institute on Drug Abuse

National Institutes of Health

Department of Health and Human Services

**Statement by the
National Institute on Drug Abuse
October 21, 1999**

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Susan David, Research Coordinator, Division of Epidemiology, Services, and Prevention Research, at the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). I am pleased to be here on behalf of NIDA to discuss some technical issues associated with the evaluation of the effectiveness of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. I am accompanied by my Deputy Project Officer on the evaluation contract, Mr. Arthur Hughes. Our Director, Dr. Alan Leshner, spoke before this committee on March 25th and described the role that NIDA has played since the inception of the Campaign.

As Dr. Leshner said in his testimony, what makes this Campaign unique is the fact that it is based on principles and objectives that have been derived from decades of behavioral research. At the request of ONDCP, NIDA was pleased to contribute input to assist in the development of a strong scientific foundation for the whole Campaign. The other unique aspect of the campaign is the availability of paid advertising, which maintains control over the placement and reach of messages in the Campaign. These two factors played a role in the development of the evaluation design, methodology and procedures.

As you know, NIDA was asked by ONDCP to conduct an independent and scientifically-based evaluation on the outcomes and impact of the Campaign. This evaluation will measure the campaign's impact on parents and their children concerning attitudes, knowledge and behaviors with regard to illegal drug use among youths and to measure the Campaign's impact at the community level. In September 1998, NIDA awarded a contract to the nationally known health survey research company, Westat, Inc., and its subcontractors, the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania, and the National Development and Research Institute (NDRI).

From the beginning, the evaluation design related closely to the ONDCP Communications Strategy and the message briefs and platforms, developed by Campaign planners to further refine and frame the message content. The message content derived principally from effective drug abuse

prevention research directed toward youth and families. The evaluation is based on models established in communications and behavioral research that try to explain how the Campaign might interact with its target audiences. The evaluation will measure the extent to which changes in drug abuse-related knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors among parents and their children can be attributed to exposure to this media Campaign. Among other things, the evaluation will measure exposure and changes over time.

To ensure that the evaluation remains current with any changes in the direction and focus of the Campaign, NIDA and the evaluation team meet regularly with the Campaign planners. Also, the Campaign planners provide copies of the specific ads that are being broadcast, and lists of television, radio, and print media where the ad space has been purchased. These are critical to assessing the impact of the most current wave of messages in the Campaign.

Briefly, the evaluation includes two major data collection activities, the National Survey of Parents & Youth, which will capture and provide data at six-month intervals to show how the Nation as a whole is reacting to the Campaign; and the Community Longitudinal Survey of Parents & Youth, which will provide insight into potential changes among families who are exposed to the Campaign over time, and the effects of the Campaign at the community level.

Now I would like to address your interest in the methodological and implementation issues involved in evaluating the effectiveness of the use of programming content to achieve measurable outcomes in terms of reduced drug use. When we designed our science-based strategy for the evaluation, we tried to take into account as many facets of the Campaign design and implementation that were likely to remain constant over the four years. First, we knew that the paid advertising would place ads in time slots that were the most likely to reach the primary target audiences so that a certain level of exposure to the advertising would be achieved. Secondly, the Campaign strategy and subsequent refinements of the strategy presented the specific content to be communicated to the prime target audiences. Consequently, the evaluation design incorporates these known facets of the Campaign—high levels of exposure and specific message content.

The primary focus then for the evaluation strategy is the paid advertising portion of the Campaign. The measures are designed to assess changes in knowledge, beliefs, attitudes and behaviors brought about by the messages in the Campaign ads. These messages are quite specific so the questions in the survey try to capture that specificity. For instance, the questions address whether parents monitor their children's behavior, whether children's attitudes about marijuana are positive or negative, or whether teens think their friends approve or disapprove of drug use.

While the primary focus of the evaluation remains on the paid advertising portion of the campaign, we recognize that increased efforts with the entertainment community constitute an important element in the Campaign effort. The evaluation will be able to capture in a general way whether the Campaign target audiences notice increases in the number of anti-drug messages in television programming, as well as other media outlets. We have one set of questions that will appear in both parent and teen questionnaires, which asks respondents to recall whether, and how often they have seen anti-drug content in various media.

D9. In recent months, how often have you noticed stories that dealt with drug use among young people in:

		1 to 3 times a month	More than 3 times a month
	Not at all		
a. TV news or radio news?	1	2	3
b. TV movies, sitcoms, or dramas?	1	2	3
c. TV talk shows?	1	2	3
d. Movies watched in movie theaters or on rental videos?	1	2	3
e. Magazines?	1	2	3

We would expect that if Campaign efforts are successful, they will produce a large number of

placements of anti-drug messages in normal television programming; and many respondents will recall these recent exposures. Also, if the Campaign's non-advertising/media outreach efforts succeed, there would be increased messages in the other media listed above, and we would see an increasing frequency with which people report awareness of such stories.

Thus, the evaluation will provide some picture of the extent to which anti-drug messages are noticed by the audience, and whether the degree of notice changes over time. In addition, the evaluation will address the effects of such exposure on outcomes. The evaluation would be able to examine the association between recall of exposure to such stories, and relevant beliefs, attitudes and behaviors. We would need to employ statistical controls to reduce concerns about other non-Campaign influences which might also affect this association.

These approaches will be helpful in capturing the audience's broad impressions about exposure to anti-drug stories that appear in the general media whether stimulated by the Campaign or for other reasons, and provide some tentative evidence about associations of such recalled exposures with a variety of outcomes.

The evaluation, however, is not designed to be able to measure the effect of a single episode of a television program. The evaluation design captures effects that are cumulative over multiple exposures to messages from many sources on representative samples of youth and their parents. This requires the careful development of questionnaires that remain relatively constant for a six month period so that the same data are collected from complete samples of respondents. Since a single program episode is only seen by a minority of the population—even the most popular program generally captures less than 25% of potential viewers for any specific episode—we would be concerned that not enough people in our sample will have viewed the program. In addition, the effects of any single program are likely to be brief. We would be surprised if a respondent remembered seeing an episode more than a few weeks after it has aired. Therefore, even if we were able to incorporate a question in our survey about a single program, we expect that only a small portion of those interviewed in any six month period would have viewed the program and experienced the potential effects of the exposure on their attitudes and behavior. This small portion

is likely to be too small to produce statistically reliable outcomes. So, we do not believe we can detect the effects of a specific episode with this evaluation approach, which is designed to measure the cumulative impact of messages on large populations.

Despite the fact that we are unable to capture the effects of a specific program episode, we certainly recognize the value of such efforts with the entertainment community for reaching the general public with Campaign messages. If the Campaign succeeds at placing messages in many programs over time, we expect that our broad measure will indicate the level to which people recall such repeated and cumulative exposure. We would expect that it is such cumulative exposure to similar messages on multiple channels which will actually affect the population.

NIDA and Westat are in the final preparation stages for implementing the evaluation of the campaign. Since Dr. Leshner spoke before the committee in March, we have completed the development and programming of the questionnaires for the computers, obtained clearance from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), pilot tested the complete survey, and modified the training and implementation procedures, all in preparation for entering the field. We will be training 200 interviewers the last week of October. The first interviews will take place in homes across the U.S. in the first week of November.

Our first Semiannual Report, which will serve as the baseline for this four-year time series evaluation, is planned for June 2000. Future reports will be released every six months until 2003.

As Dr. Leshner said in his testimony, the evaluation will not be a pass or fail report card for the Campaign; rather we expect it will, among other things, help measure and explain changes in drug-related knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors in both children and parents of children at the community level. Not only will we be able to look at outcome data to measure and assess changes, but we will have an improved understanding of the critical factors involved in changing people's behaviors.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify at this hearing. I am happy to answer any questions.

Mr. KOLBE. I think your testimony really comes to the heart of what we are trying to get at here this morning, and that is how we measure the effectiveness of what we are doing. I have been harping on this all along on this media program, that it needs to make sure that we have a good evaluation component to it, and you have certainly outlined I think the elements of that.

Let me ask just a few questions to clarify some of this. Are you aware of any other studies that have been done either by agencies such as yours or independently in the entertainment industry or the advertising industry that measures the effectiveness of media campaigns? And I am thinking more specifically of products, where it seems to me that in the end you have got the bottom line of how many of the products are bought. But I am thinking more in terms of behavioral changes. Are there any other peer-reviewed studies that you know of that deal with this?

Ms. DAVID. Well, to clarify, there are important studies that look at behavior change and have done this in communitywide studies that have looked at campaigns and their impact. But if you are saying to compare it to a PSA compared to television programming, that is another matter. I think one of the unique things that we see here is a major campaign with paid advertising; the idea of being able to control the placement of socially responsible awareness ads and be able to put them in the right place at the right time to reach the right audiences and with a very heavy focus on exposure, to have that and then to have a combination.

We feel very privileged to have been able to design a science-based study that is based on the Commit Project, which is a study of smoking and heart disease and other studies. So that we have used a model like that, but our primary focus is looking at the ads themselves because the ads contain messages that are designed carefully and are focused for a particular audience, and they will be repeated. And it is that cumulation of that.

Mr. KOLBE. We can go all of the way back to 1965 or 1963, when the first anti-smoking message was put on cigarettes, and so we have a long history—we can get longitudinal data—a long history of this in that area alone. But it is hard, is it not? And more recently you have had the massive advertising campaigns funded by the tobacco settlements that have appeared on television. But it is a little hard to isolate, and we have seen the decline in smoking through the years, at least up until recently, it is a little hard to isolate what is responsible for what in all of this, is it not?

Ms. DAVID. Yes, it is difficult. One of the things we have done in our study, Dr. Hornik, who is the real designer of the approach we have taken, is that we try to identify as many sources of influence as we can. So in the case of this particular question about television, "Have you noticed any stories in television programming?" We ask about television programs specifically, we ask about news accounts, we ask about the media, different media, we ask about movies. So we try to discern, if we can, the influences. We also ask people, "Have you participated in a drug education program recently either sponsored by schools or sponsored by your religious organization?"

We ask about other involvements that help us discern those influences. But pulling them apart will be very difficult, even with

sophisticated analytical approaches. On the other hand, let us face it, the most successful programs have been those that have been communitywide, wraparound, any message that is positive and consistent in producing a social message and that reinforces each other, that is all to the good from our point of view.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you. I am going to allow time for questions from our other two members that are here.

Mr. Hoyer.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you.

Ms. David, in General McCaffrey's presentation, we note that in 1991, apparently, for some reason, there was a spike-up in terms of use and perception of the harmfulness or, conversely, a spike-down in not harmful, a spike-up in use.

If we knew why that has spiked up, we can deal with it and try to spike it down. Why did that happen in that time frame, do we know?

Ms. DAVID. Well, some of the scientists, Dr. Lloyd Johnston and others, have conceptualized that suddenly there was a tremendous absence of anti-drug messages in the media that occurred. And I, myself, was the Public Affairs director for NIDA at the time, and it was difficult to get newspapers and others interested in talking about marijuana and to get a message out there. So many of us thought that there was an absence of messages, and with that absence grew a, I guess, a strength of the opposite of an anti-drug absence message. And so that is what people have talked about, but to say we do not have definitive research that says absolutely.

One of the keys that we have built into the evaluation is that we have used those basic, those same kind of measures that Dr. Johnston uses, but we also ask lots more questions about attitudes, beliefs and behaviors so we can learn more about what is underneath those things, and maybe we will be in a position to explain more the next time.

Mr. HOYER. Let me ask you something about tobacco. The chairman observed that it was down. I used the statement, and it was correct at some point in time, and I wonder if it is still correct. I have three daughters, neither their mother, nor their father, ever smoked, but they all three smoked at one time. Luckily, my oldest daughter, who now has had a child, quit at that time. The two younger daughters still smoke, notwithstanding their father's serving on the Labor and Health Subcommittee and bringing them home a lot of information all of the time. It is very disconcerting to me, and I talk to them about it regularly. They say it is very hard to stop.

At some period of time, the only group in America that was smoking more were young women between the ages of 18 and 35. Is that still the case?

Ms. DAVID. Mr. Hoyer, I have to plead, I am not guilty on this, I am not an expert on it. But I will go back to the Institute and do that for the record.

Mr. HOYER. The reason I say that is my presumption was that the reason that was the case is because smoking was an indication of equality and status. "You've come a long way, baby." A direct appeal to have women smoke. So that if they had a Virginia Slim in their hand, they would look really cool.

Ms. DAVID. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. It is insidious. And that is our concern with the public media. Twenty-six percent or twenty-two percent displaying normal drug use.

Ms. DAVID. Sure.

Mr. HOYER. As General McCaffrey saying, you want to "unnormalize" the use of drugs.

Ms. DAVID. That is right. Right. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. It seems to me that if there is a correlation between that sort of incentive, it is obviously from a market standpoint. The other way you impact it is the way we have been talking about and General McCaffrey has been talking about. But it seems to me it is critical to have young people think it is not cool.

Ms. DAVID. That is true.

Mr. HOYER. And if the 1991-1992 spikeup was an absence of information that it is not cool, the general premise is that they were not getting that repeated message, therefore, it spiked up.

Ms. DAVID. Well, one of the things we are very excited about at NIDA is that we have just, in fact, it just got announced, that the NCI, the National Cancer Institute, and NIDA are co-funding seven new centers to look at tobacco issues. And one center that I am associated with is looking at marketing and other issues in regard to youth. And so that just got funded I guess two days ago it got announced. And so we are really hopeful that they will have some significant, that these are large-scale grants, they are interdisciplinary, and they will be looking at lots of issues and, hopefully, we will be in a better position to answer that more directly.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Peterson.

Mr. PETERSON. Is one of the major deterrents, fear that it is harmful to your health, that you are going to have some negative health concepts from using a drug? Is that part of the message that should be out there?

Ms. DAVID. I think it always needs to be part of the message. There is no question that there needs to be an environment in which drugs are viewed as harmful, because they are. But the issue has to do with recognizing the social environment that young people are in. And the social environment does not always lead to their operating on that kind of information.

So what you need to look at are, in fact, as I understand it, the campaign and our model, our evaluation model, are looking at social consequences, problems. Some young people might think that their peers will not like them if they do not do drugs. I think the focus of the campaign is to change that norm and say it is a positive thing not to do drugs. There are good things to do and so on.

So I think there always has to be a backdrop of the harmful effects of these drugs, and then within that, the things that matter more to young people when they make decisions about drugs.

Mr. PETERSON. We have the legalization debate, we have the medical discussion that marijuana is a good medical—we should be using it medically, which really deters from it being a harmful product. I think marijuana is the one that has kind of slipped right by us. I think marijuana, and I have family members who got

heavily into marijuana when they were young, I think it is going to impact them the rest of their life. I just do not think they are the person they would have been if they had not got involved in marijuana.

I do not think that message is out there. I mean, they tell me it is less impacting than alcohol, you know, it is better, you do not have a hangover. And I want to tell you they are down into our middle schools starting them on marijuana, giving it to them first. It is pretty cheap today. And I guess I think the one that is the gateway to most drug use is marijuana, and of course alcohol is another one. But marijuana is the one that I think has just gotten right by us on the radar screen.

Young people are not afraid of marijuana. They are just not frightened by it. They do not think there is anything harmful. It is less harmful than their parents taking a glass of wine. I mean, that is what they tell me. And they are fighting for legalization, and that is an ongoing discussion publicly. And so when you are legalizing something, you are saying it is okay.

Would you like to comment on that?

Ms. DAVID. Well, I think that the one terrific thing about this campaign, which is just kicking off in its full bloom, if you will, is that it has a comprehensive message. Bottom line, looking at consequences and trying to present to young people consequences that matter to them in a context of other kinds of messages, better ways to be, things that can interfere with your hopes and dreams, those Williams sisters, those kind of neat-looking young people, very young people, who can succeed and be role models and say, "Drugs do not mean anything to me. I do not need them."

So from that point of view, I think the campaign, which was designed with a science-based strategy, is working on the right messages and the appropriate things. Now, as an evaluator, I am not supposed to say that, of course. I am supposed to be totally independent. But basically our model is based on the same model that the campaign is trying to accomplish. It is a model of trying to deal with things that matter to young people, matter to their parents, "How can I talk to my kids? What are the messages I should use?" and putting that into a model. And we are evaluating it using the same model, saying, "Are these things changing? Will they change? What is the long-term impact?"

Mr. PETERSON. Thank you.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you. We only have five minutes left in this vote. And I have a whole series of other questions, but I do not think it would be fair to have you come back or to have us come back, since we have a hearing scheduled this afternoon. I will submit mine for the record for you. I apologize that we are shortening this just a little bit, but our schedule is determined by what happens on the floor also.

We thank you very much for appearing with us today. Thank you so much.

We will resume at 2 o'clock.



THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1999.

YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN

WITNESSES

MARCY KELLY, BOARD MEMBER, MEDIASCOPE
ROBBY LONDON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, DIC ENTERTAINMENT
LAWRENCE FRIED, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, MARKETING, ABC
PATRICIA GOODRICH, DIRECTOR, CORPORATE INITIATIVE, ABC

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. KOLBE. Good afternoon, and thank you very much. We will resume the subcommittee hearing. My distinguished, Mr. Hoyer, has another subcommittee meeting going on now, and he may or may not join us later, and other members may join us for this afternoon. But I do want to go ahead, particularly inasmuch as we are going to be interrupted here in about 25 or 30 minutes by votes here and a series of votes. Many of you have been around Capitol Hill enough to know that our life depends on these bells and things that go on here. So we will try to work around that, and there may be a period that you will have some time for conversation among yourselves, but we will get back as quickly as we can afterwards.

We began this morning, for those of you that were here, by exploring the role that is played by the entertainment media and the National Youth Anti-Drug Campaign. And so this afternoon we want to focus on the entertainment industry itself, and we welcome four witnesses and experts that come from the entertainment industry and our media experts. And you are all here agreeing to lend us your expertise and experience.

You come from both bicoastal worlds there, California and New York, the capitals of our entertainment world, and we are very appreciative for your coming and participating in this hearing.

Our witnesses this afternoon include, and we will go in the order from right to left, include Marcy Kelly, who is founder of Mediascope and a member of its board of directors. This organization has a lot of experience in the area of portrayal of public health and social issues in the entertainment industry.

We have Robby London, vice president of DIC Entertainment, who has an impressive portfolio of children's entertainment programming to his credit.

Patricia Goodrich is director of Corporate Initiatives for ABC. And I hope that she will be able to give us her perspective as network executive on the workings of the match requirement, as well as the campaign's outreach initiative.

And lastly, doing the same, is Lawrence Fried, executive vice president for Marketing and general sales manager for ABC.

So we look forward very much to the testimony this afternoon and what we can glean from you about this media campaign. Let

me just add, parenthetically, as my own personal view, this is something that I have a great personal interest in, and there are many in Congress that feel a kind of parental responsibility for this program and helping to not only get it off the ground, but to keep it moving forward. And so the purpose of our hearing today is certainly not in any way to find fault with the program, but rather to understand it and hopefully to try to make sure that, as members of Congress who have a responsibility for funding for this program, that we are making the right decisions and directing this in the right way.

And so with that thought in mind, and if he is able to be here later, I certainly would call on Mr. Hoyer for his own statement. But let us begin with Ms. Kelly.

Ms. Kelly.

Ms. KELLY. Thank you.

Mr. KOLBE. And may I add for all of you, your full statements can be placed in the record if you would prefer to summarize the statements or just discuss the comments that you want to make.

Ms. Kelly.

Ms. KELLY. Good afternoon, Chairman Kolbe, and Mr. Peterson and staff. My name is Marcy Kelly, and I am the founder, past president and current member of the board of directors of Mediascope, a nonprofit organization that is based in Studio City, California. I am very pleased to be here today to speak about incorporating pro-social content into entertainment media so that audience reach for public health information can be maximized.

We are very pleased to be part of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, which has been designed to extend its audience penetration beyond the traditional methods, to incorporate the use of popular culture so central to the lives of young people. We know today that media is a primary source of information for most people in this country. The October 18th edition of Newsweek lists television and movies as the most influential sources in the lives of 10- to 15-year-olds, the so-called "tweens." And so it is imperative that those who work in entertainment media have access to the most up-to-date information about high-risk health issues so that responsible and accurate portrayals can be incorporated into programming. Some of the topics that we have addressed to date include violence, AIDS, teen pregnancy prevention, media ratings and substance abuse.

Our work is focused primarily on promoting constructive depictions of social and health issues in film, television and music. We accomplish this by bringing public policy issues to the attention of professionals working in the entertainment industry, and this is often accomplished by brokering information before the public health and academic communities and the creative communities.

Typically, we will bring one or more leading experts in a particular field together with interested entertainment professionals. The resulting dialogue often provokes interest that may eventually be integrated into a line of dialogue or accurate character development, a background visual, such as an anti-drug poster or a full story line. Mediascope provides, when asked, access to whatever expertise may be requested, including consultation with the creative team.

Examples of our collaborative efforts with the creative community can be found in recent projects relating to children and teens. Building Blocks, a guide for creating children's educational television was the culmination of a year-long series of meetings with development executives, writers, producers and network representatives to create a resource for those seeking to fulfill Federal Communication Commission requirements on program content.

Through the Eyes of Children was a full-day conference last March at the Academy of Television, Arts and Sciences, which dealt with such issues as on-screen diversity and quality programming. And last month, with DIC Entertainment, a leader in children's production, Mediascope co-sponsored the Children's Media Summit, which focused on developing voluntary guidelines for creative professionals in the field and details of all of these projects have been provided to the subcommittee.

In addition to these kinds of activities, we also strive, through research and publications, to objectively report on media content. This allows us to study how topics are depicted, to identify the kinds of portrayals that may be misleading or have the potential to cause harm and to use that information to help educate the creative community. The National Television Violence Study in 1996 revealed that most programs and feature films aired on television contain violence and that consequences to violent behavior are too rarely shown. While recognizing the importance of conflict and story telling, this information has enabled us to focus our educational efforts on the media risk factors that may lead to the learning of aggressive attitudes and behaviors, the desensitization to real-world violence or fear of victimization. And by media factors here, I am referring to things such as who commits the act of violence, whether it is trivialized by humor or whether an act is rewarded or punished.

Earlier this year we released another study, Substance Use in Popular Movies and Music. You have a copy of it. It was sponsored by the Office of National Drug Control Policy and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. It was authored by leading researchers at Stanford University and Lewis and Clark College. It is a content analysis of two years of the 1,200 most popular film and recording titles. This study revealed, as you learned this morning, that 98 percent of movies and 27 percent of music recordings included depictions of alcohol, tobacco or illicit drugs.

One of the major concerns raised, aside from the sheer amount of substance use found, was the fact that consequences to use are rarely depicted. Research shows that if negative consequences are not shown, young people will interpret and internalize the behavior as positive. Clear negative consequences are essential.

The results of this study provide an opportunity to educate the creative community about ways to portray drug use that is consistent with the messages of the campaign. We expect to release in January 2000 a similar study supported by ONDCP that will report on about 170 episodes of the most popular prime time shows among African-American, white and Hispanic teens. An additional important benefit of these studies is that they provide a benchmark for potential evaluation in the future.

As leaders here in Congress and in Hollywood agree, popular entertainment is significant to the lives of America's young people. The campaign's congressional mandate requires that its anti-drug messages be delivered through a full range of media. Our goal then is to utilize the visibility and credibility of popular media with young audiences to convey accurate information that you will reinforce the messages they are receiving from campaign ads that drug use is not the norm, it is unglamorous and socially unacceptable.

We have provided you with a detailed summary about the entertainment program of the campaign, but I'd like to take a moment to just identify a couple of areas of effort. One is that we have been, and will continue to host forums and dialogues for members of the entertainment industry. Information about drug prevention messages has now been presented to all of the television networks, members of the industry professional guilds, the Writers' Guild, Producers' Guild, Screen Actors' Guild, et cetera, trade publications, as well as writers, producers, directors that may be involved with specific shows or films, as well as development executives.

Providing resources and information on substance abuse to the creative community is also an ongoing activity. This is accomplished by offering access to experts in drug abuse and related fields, such as child psychology, providing support for the development of stories or characters, script reviews, creation of specialized materials, mailings, handouts and a website designed specifically for the creative community.

We are also engaging celebrities, such as Lauryn Hill, the Los Angeles Lakers, Venus and Serena Williams, the Dixie Chicks, as well as cast members from top shows like "Felicity," "Jessie" and "Cosby," who are willing to volunteer their time to promote campaign messages. They do this in a variety of ways, including Public Service Announcements, on-line chats and participation in special community events.

To help guide program strategy and execution, Mediascope staff members frequently rely on members of its National Advisory Committee, which is comprised of leaders in entertainment. That includes film, television, and music, prevention, public policy, health and academia. This committee provides a valuable sounding board, which reinforces our direction and the potential effectiveness of our approach to this special audience. And I should add that this committee is also serving as an advisor to the campaign.

We are pleased to report that thus far the entertainment industry has been receptive and responsive to our outreach efforts. It is a unique culture integrating both business and art and fiercely protective of its creative freedom. We recognize that our role is to bring the campaign and its purpose to their attention to serve as a conduit for information, facilitate discussion and encourage them to use the information as they wish in the context of their particular situation.

We are pleased to note that accurate and responsible depictions of drug abuse, addressing myths, misconceptions and the consequences of use have now been included in a number of high-rated broadcast television shows, including "ER," "Chicago Hope," "Sports Night," "NYPD Blue," and "The Practice."

As you know, the campaign's entertainment outreach activities are still in their first year, and we have many challenges ahead. The reception we have had thus far, however, makes us confident that we can fulfill your mandate to incorporate a full-scale media outreach in order to maximize the campaign's effectiveness. We feel privileged to be part of one of the most important public health campaigns in the Nation's history.

Thank you for this opportunity, and I am happy to answer any questions.

[The information follows:]

Testimony of

Marcy Kelly, Founder

MEDIASCOPE

Studio City, California

before the

House Appropriations Committee

**Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General
Government**

October 21, 1999

Good afternoon Chairman Kolbe, Congressman Hoyer and members of the Subcommittee. My name is Marcy Kelly and I am the Founder, past President and current member of the Board of Directors of MEDIASCOPE, a nonprofit organization based in Studio City, California. I am very pleased to be here today to speak about incorporating pro-social content into entertainment media so that the audience reach for public health information can be maximized.

MEDIASCOPE, founded in 1992 with a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, is primarily focused on promoting constructive depictions of social and health issues in film, television and music. We accomplish this by bringing public policy issues to the attention of professionals working in the entertainment industry. This is often accomplished by brokering information between the public health and academic communities and the creative community.

We are pleased to be part of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign which has been designed to extend its audience penetration beyond the traditional methods to incorporate the use of popular culture, so central to the lives of young people. We know today that media is the primary source of information for most people in this country. The October 18th edition of *Newsweek* lists television and movies as the most influential sources in the lives of ten to fifteen year olds, the so-called 'tweens.' And so it is imperative that those who work in the entertainment media have access to the most up-to-date information about high-risk health issues so that responsible and accurate portrayals can be incorporated into programming. Some of the topics we have addressed to date include violence, AIDS, teen pregnancy prevention, media ratings and substance abuse.

Typically, we will bring one or more leading experts in a particular field together with interested entertainment professionals. The resulting dialogue often provokes interest that may eventually be integrated into a line of

dialogue, more accurate character development, a background visual such as an anti-drug poster, or a full story line. MEDIASCOPE provides, when asked, access to whatever expertise may be requested including consultation with the creative team.

Examples of our collaborative efforts with the entertainment industry can be found in recent projects relating to children and teens. *Building Blocks: A Guide for Creating Children's Educational Television*, was the culmination of a year long series of meetings with development executives, writers, producers and network representatives to create a resource for those seeking to fulfill Federal Communication Commission requirements on program content. *Through the Eyes of Children*, a full day conference last March at the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, co-sponsored by MEDIASCOPE, dealt with such issues as on-screen diversity and quality programming. And last month, MEDIASCOPE co-sponsored with DIC Entertainment, a leader in children's television production, *The Children's Media Summit* which focused on developing voluntary guidelines for creative professionals in the field. (Details of these projects have been provided to the Subcommittee.)

In addition to these kinds of activities, we also strive, through research and publications, to objectively report on media content. This allows us to study how topics are depicted, to identify the kinds of portrayals that may be misleading or have the potential to cause harm, and use that information to help educate the creative community. The *National Television Violence Study* in 1996 revealed that most programs and feature films aired on television contain violence and that consequences to violent behavior are too rarely shown. While recognizing the importance of conflict in storytelling, this information has enabled us to focus our educational efforts on the media risk factors that may lead to learning aggressive attitudes and behaviors, desensitization to real world violence, or fear of victimization. By media risk factors, I am referring to concerns such as who commits the act of violence, whether it is trivialized by humor or whether the act is rewarded or punished.

Earlier this year we released another study, *Substance Use in Popular Movies and Music*, sponsored by the Office on National Drug Control Policy and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Authored by leading researchers at Stanford University and Lewis and Clark College (Drs. Donald Roberts, Lisa Henriksen and Peter Christenson), it is a content analysis of two years of the 1200 most popular film and recording titles. This study revealed that 98% of movies and 27% of music recordings included depictions of alcohol, tobacco or an illicit drug. One of the major concerns raised, aside from the sheer amount of substance use found, was the fact that consequences to use are rarely depicted. Research shows that if negative consequences are not shown, young people will interpret and internalize a behavior as positive. Clear negative consequences are essential. The results of this study provide an opportunity to educate the creative community about ways to portray drug use that is consistent with the messages of the Campaign.

We expect to release, in January 2000, a similar study supported by ONDCP that will report on about 170 episodes the most popular prime time television shows among African-American, white and Hispanic teens. An additional important benefit of these studies is that they provide a benchmark for potential evaluation in the future.

As leaders here in Congress and in Hollywood agree, popular entertainment is significant to the lives of America's young people. The Campaign's Congressional mandate requires that its anti-drug messages be delivered through a full range of media. Our goal then is to utilize the visibility and credibility of popular media with young audiences to convey accurate information that will reinforce the messages they are receiving from Campaign ads: that drug use is not the norm, it is unglamorous and socially unacceptable.

We have provided the Subcommittee with a detailed summary of the Entertainment Program of the Campaign but I would like to take a moment to identify a few general areas of our effort. These include:

- Hosting forums and dialogues for members of the entertainment industry. Information about drug prevention messages have been presented to all of the television networks, members of some of the industry's professional guilds, trade publications and writers, producers, directors and development executives;
- Providing resources and information on substance abuse to the creative community is also an ongoing activity. This is accomplished by offering access to experts in drug abuse and related fields such as child psychology; providing support for the development of stories or characters; script reviews; creation of specialized materials; mailings; handouts; and a web site designed for this unique audience;
- Engaging celebrities—such as Lauryn Hill, the Los Angeles Lakers, Venus and Serena Williams, the Dixie Chicks, Carroll O'Connor, and Howie Mandel, as well as cast members from top shows like *Felicity*, *Jesse* and *Cosby*—who volunteer their time to promote Campaign messages. They do this in a variety of ways including Public Service Announcements, on-line chats and participation in special community events.

To help guide program strategy and execution, Mediascope staff frequently rely on members of its National Advisory Committee comprised of leaders in entertainment (film, television and music), prevention, public policy, health and academia. They provide a valuable sounding board which reinforces our direction and the potential effectiveness of our approach to this special audience.

We are pleased to report that thus far the entertainment industry has been receptive and responsive to our outreach efforts. It has a unique culture integrating both business and art, and fiercely protective of its creative freedom.

We recognize that our role is to bring the Campaign and its purpose to their attention, serve as a conduit for information, facilitate discussion and

encourage them to use the information as they wish in the context of their particular situation. We are pleased to note that accurate and responsible depictions of drug abuse, addressing myths, misconceptions and the consequences of use, have now been included in a number of high-rated broadcast television shows including *ER*, *Chicago Hope*, *Sports Night*, *NYPD Blue* and *The Practice*.

As you know, the Campaign's entertainment outreach activities are still in their first year and we have many challenges ahead. The reception we have had thus far, however, makes us confident that we can fulfill your mandate to incorporate the full scale media outreach in order to maximize the Campaign's effectiveness. We feel privileged to be a part of one of the most important public health campaigns in the nation's history.

Thank you for this opportunity. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Ms. Kelly, and we will go through all of the statements before we take questions.

Mr. London.

Mr. LONDON. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Peterson, assorted staff.

I am Robby London. I am executive vice president, Creative Affairs, for DIC Entertainment. I have been a writer and producer of children's television for over 20 years. And for the last 14 years, I have been in charge of Creative Affairs for DIC, which has produced over 3,000 episodes of children's programs, which have been shown in virtually every outlet in the U.S. and around the world. Our shows include such things as "Inspector Gadget," "Captain Planet and the Planetiers," "Where on Earth is Carmen San Diego?" and "Madeleine." Our programs have won Emmy, Cable Ace, Humonotous, and environmental media awards, and we have been recognized by the National Education Association.

I can add sort of a perspective from a writer-creator specifically of programs targeted to 2- to 11-year-olds, which have kind of a very unique challenge in terms of the audience we are trying to reach. Because children are so impressionable, special skill and sensitivity are required when media broaches subjects such as substance abuse. One must walk a very fine line between presenting children information that will be beneficial to them and frightening him or her in an unhealthy or inappropriate manner.

There is a desire to be age appropriate in our messages, and yet our audience is comprised of such a wide range of ages and associated developmental capacities that it is all but impossible for us to service one age without doing a disservice to the others. Furthermore, in trying to portray the drawbacks of certain behaviors, we risk actually introducing a young person to a behavior to which they might not otherwise have been exposed. And lastly, we prefer neither to offend nor certainly to supplant parents who have their own ideas about what their children should or should not be told.

These are just but some of the challenges faced on a daily basis by creators of children's programs. And make no mistake, producers, creators, and broadcasters acknowledge the power we yield, and we take our responsibilities very, very seriously.

But there is another fine line that we have to walk, and that is of being story tellers versus being instruments of propaganda. We welcome accurate information, and yet we share a deep concern about our freedom of creative expression. We insist on free speech, and we can be highly sensitive to being co-opted or made pawns of political or social agendas with which we may or may not agree.

We see ourselves largely, first and foremost, as story tellers, which is not to say that we object to being conveyors of accurate, objective information when it is appropriate to our stories. We welcome the advice of experts. We welcome practical, accurate information on children's behavior and the problems and dangers they face.

That is where the entertainment outreach component of the campaign comes in. It is an extremely cost-effective way to reach the audience at large simply by passing the information along to the creators and gatekeepers of that program to that audience. And if

such information does wind up in an episode, you have reached millions of people, and you have reached them in a way that is more likely to have impact because it is part of the stories and characters they love to watch. And I think there is a real danger in trying to quantify simply these exposures because I think it is the nature of the impact that is equally important as the amount of them.

It is also far less likely than Public Service Announcements or commercials to elicit a sort of backlash response. Kids from about 9 on, in my experience, are very, very sensitive to overt efforts to manipulate them or preach to them. And I think doing it within the shows stands a far better chance of getting that reaction than does a commercial.

So how does one go about providing accurate information to the creative community in a manner that is most likely to produce results and end up in the programs? I feel the most effective way has been the meetings or roundtables in which experts come to the media and present research findings and are available to discuss and answer questions. Invariably, this type of an event, to me, makes a stronger and more lasting impression in the creators and will be more likely to have an impact on the programs. These workshops or meetings can be supplemented with written materials and funded consulting services which are cost-free to the users and websites, et cetera.

But the reality is that most of us are too rushed and pressured to research these things proactively. Most writers work on a freelance basis, paid per script, they are not given research funds, they work under intense deadlines. Producers and executives face similarly daunting pressures. That is why I find these meetings, and lunch and roundtables to be the most effective tool.

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the role of organizations such as Mediascope in getting the message out to creative professionals. Mediascope is an organization I am personally familiar with, and their philosophy of sort of presenting information in a nonpejorative manner and not really being an advocacy group, not really being an arm of the Government, but really just trying to encourage straightforward dialogue and information I think is very valuable. I think the source of this information, in terms of speaking from the creative community, it is really the source of the information that is equally important as the information because it has to be a credible source.

It is for that reason that DIC recently sought out Mediascope to co-sponsor a summit that we held, which Marcy just mentioned, in which we gathered together members of the creative community, the National Education Association, the National PTA, professors from Stanford and UCLA, and all seven of the broadcast networks were represented, the Writers' Guild of America and representatives of some of the new largest new media outlets.

Their purpose was to draft some guidelines, and I want to emphasize they were voluntary guidelines, and they will always be voluntary guidelines to help creators of children's media. And the guidelines fall into three broad categories: character and values, conflict and violence, and diversity and stereotypes. We hope these

guidelines will be widely distributed to creators and gatekeepers of children's media and ultimately impact that which children see.

As an example of the power of the informational roundtables I referenced earlier, there were special guidelines that we came up with regarding bullying. And this came directly out of a presentation under the auspices of Mediascope by Dr. Tony Bigeland, who was mentioned earlier this morning, on the role that bullying has played in the recent incidents of school violence. And upon having been exposed to this information in this research, we made a point to create special guidelines about bullying. And so that came specifically out of a Mediascope roundtable.

DIC's and Mediascope's summit, and I think the guidelines that will come out of it, represent a perfect example of how representatives of the various disciplines which care about our children can work collectively on our children's behalf.

So quickly to summarize the points. Content creators have the potential to reach millions of kids in a very influential way, programming for kids constitutes a unique challenge, most creators are willing, if not eager, to receive accurate information concerning issues of relevance to kids. To be effective, the source of that information, however, must be credible and nonpolitical. Outreach roundtables provided by credible, nonthreatening sources, such as Mediascope, are an excellent and effective means to communicate such information to media professionals.

I would be happy to answer questions after the others have made their statements. Thank you very much.

[The information follows:]

Testimony of

Robby London

Executive Vice President Creative Affairs, DIC Entertainment. L.P.

Before the House Appropriations Committee

Sub-Committee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government.

October 21, 1999

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

I'm Robby London, Executive Vice President Creative Affairs for DIC Entertainment. I am here to offer my perspective on the entertainment industry outreach component of the ONDCP National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

I've been a writer and producer of children's television for over 20 years. For the past 14 years I have been in charge of creative affairs for DIC, which has produced over 3000 episodes of children's programs shown on virtually every outlet in U.S. and around the world. I have been one of the Executive Producers of about 75% of those episodes. DIC's programs include such series as "INSPECTOR GADGET," "CAPTAIN PLANET AND THE PLANETEERS," "WHERE ON EARTH IS CARMEN SANDIEGO?" and "MADELINE." Our programs have won Emmy, Cable Ace, Humanitas and Environmental Media Awards and we have been recognized by the National Education Association.

Americans spend significant portions of their lives being exposed to entertainment media. The reality that we are influenced to some degree by media content is both intuitively obvious and supported by research. This is particularly true of children, who constitute a special audience by virtue of their singular propensity to form values, attitudes and behavior modeled on what they see.

Because children are so impressionable, special skill and sensitivity are required when media broaches subjects such as substance abuse. One must walk a very fine line between providing information that will benefit a child -- and frightening him or her in an unhealthy and inappropriate manner. There is a desire to be age-appropriate and yet our audience is comprised of such a wide

range of ages and associated developmental capacities that it is all but impossible to service one age without doing a disservice to others. Furthermore, in trying to portray the drawbacks or dangers of certain behaviors, we risk introducing a young person to behavior to which they might not otherwise have been exposed. And lastly, we'd prefer neither to offend nor, certainly, to supplant parents who have their own ideas about what their children should or shouldn't be told.

These are but some of the challenges faced on a daily basis by creators of media targeted to – or viewed by – children. And make no mistake – most producers, creators and broadcasters acknowledge the power we wield and we take our responsibilities very, very seriously.

But there is another fine line we must walk in our professional lives: that of being storytellers versus that of being instruments of propaganda. Just as most creators welcome accurate information, we share a deep concern regarding our freedom of creative expression. Not only do creators insist on "free speech," but we can be highly suspect of – and sensitive to – being co-opted and made pawns of political or social agendas with which we may or may not agree. Many of us see ourselves, first and foremost, as storytellers.

That is not to say that we object to being the conveyors of accurate, objective information told in age-appropriate ways – when it is appropriate to our stories. Nor do most of us object to hearing the advice of experts. We welcome practical, accurate information on children, children's behavior and the problems and dangers that they face. We want to portray the truth and, most importantly, we want to try to avoid content that has been demonstrated to be harmful to children or which will contribute to dangerous or unhealthy behaviors.

That is where the entertainment outreach component of the Campaign comes in. It is an extremely cost-effective way to pass information and messages along to

the audience-at-large simply by making them known to a limited number of creators and gatekeepers. If such information winds up in an episode, then suddenly that information (or message) has been delivered to millions of people. And, delivered in a way that is organic to the stories and characters that we all like to watch. As such, it is far less likely than a public service announcement or a commercial to illicit a "backlash" response in some members of the audience who resent being "preached to" or overtly manipulated. In my experience, kids from about 9 years old, in particular, are extremely perceptive and intuitive in sensing attempts to manipulate their behavior.

So, how does one go about providing accurate information to the creative community in a manner that is most likely to produce results? I feel the most effective means of communicating the information is meetings or roundtables in which experts make presentations to content creators and decision-makers, answer our questions and encourage discussion. Invariably, this makes a stronger and more lasting impact on the creators and results in a greater likelihood that it will ultimately impact their programs.

These workshops can be supplemented with written materials, funded consulting services (cost free to the users) and websites, etc. But the reality is that most of us are too rushed and pressured to research proactively. Many, many writers work on a freelance basis, paid per script, under intense deadlines and without research funds. Producers and executives face similarly daunting time and budget pressures. That is why I find the meetings and luncheon roundtables to be the most effective tool.

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the Campaign's selection of an organization such as Mediascope as its liaison to the entertainment industry.

Mediascope's philosophy of presenting objective information and research and encouraging non-pejorative, constructive dialogue between producers, academics, advocacy groups and regulators has proven quite effective. I believe Mediascope has established strong credibility within the children's programming creative community as an organization which is not politically motivated, not an advocacy group seeking to regulate the way we do our business and not operating with a hidden agenda. Its industry roundtables have been well-attended by key players.

It was for that reason that DIC recently sought out Mediascope to co-sponsor with us a Children's Media Summit to create a simple, "user-friendly" set of voluntary guidelines for creators of children's media. Participants included representatives of the National Education Association (NEA), the PTA, children's media experts from UCLA and Stanford University, all 7 of the broadcast networks, the Writers Guild of America and fellow producers, as well representatives from some of the largest new media outlets. The guidelines are currently being finalized and, once complete, will include 15 specific guidelines grouped into three broad categories: Character and Values; Conflict and Violence; and Diversity and Stereotypes. While they are strictly voluntary, we nonetheless hope these guidelines will be widely distributed to creators and gatekeepers of children's media and ultimately impact that which children see.

And as an example of the power of informational roundtables directed to media professionals, there were special guidelines regarding portrayals of bullying. This resulted specifically from a research presentation made to the creative community under the auspices of Mediascope in which the significant role of bullying in the recent incidents of school violence was articulated.

DIC and Mediascope's Summit – and the resultant guidelines – represent a perfect example of how representatives of the various disciplines which care about our children and our future can work collectively on children's behalf.

So, to summarize:

Content creators have the potential to reach millions of kids in a very influential way.

Programming for kids constitutes a unique challenge.

Most creators are willing, if not eager, to receive accurate information concerning issues of relevance to kids.

To be most effective, the source of that information must be credible and non-political.

Outreach roundtables provided by credible, non-threatening sources such as Mediascope are an excellent and effective means to communicate such information.

I would be pleased to try to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you. A most interesting statement. I have got lots of thoughts for questions here, too.

Ms. Goodrich.

Ms. GOODRICH. Mr. Chairman, thank you for inviting me here today. I am going to give you a brief overview of ABC's public service efforts, specifically our involvement in the war against drugs, and I want to tell you why we think this program is so vitally important. Then my colleague, Larry Fried, will give you further detail and discuss the results we have achieved together. At the end, we would be happy to try to answer any questions you may have.

First, the Office of National Drug Control Policy—

Mr. KOLBE. You do not have to stop quite in mid-sentence. We have 15 minutes to get over there for the vote. That should give you plenty of time to finish your statement, and then we will pause and go to the votes and return.

Please go ahead.

Ms. GOODRICH. Thank you.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy's media campaign is by no means ABC's first foray into the war against drugs. It is, however, our most powerful. In fact, the project we are here to discuss today is what we believe to be the farthest reaching public service campaign in television history. I would like to start with some background on ABC's involvement in public service.

The focal point for campaigns has been the use of our airwaves to educate and inform viewers about specific issues. While we do not make a point of publicizing it, ABC has traditionally broadcast far more PSAs than anyone else. Why have we made it such a priority? Because we are a family-oriented company serving audiences comprised of all age groups, kids, teens and adults and because we understand how influential television is in this country, and we appreciate that with that influence comes responsibility. The fact that my job, head of public service, and my department exists is a measure of how important the company thinks it is to fulfill our obligation on the national level. It is a responsibility we try to fulfill locally as well with the ABC-owned radio and television stations having a long history of service to their individual communities. Our other principal national commitment has been Our Children First public service campaign, which focuses on mentoring as a way to, among other things, keep kids off drugs.

ABC's public service commitment to the anti-drug effort preceded the ONDCP campaign by about ten years. Our management first became aware of disturbing statistics showing an increase in drug use among America's youth in the 1980s. In April of 1987, we entered into an alliance with the Partnership for Drug Free America. We committed to devote fully one-third of our on-air public service time, transferring long-term into hundreds of millions of dollars of ad time to the Partnerships' anti-drug message. That relationship, which continues today, created a new model for cooperation between a media company and a public service organization.

We built on our alliance with the Partnership by launching our own initiative in the war against drugs. In March of 1997, we devoted a month of programming to the ABC march against drugs. During that time, the ABC television network ran drug-related PSAs hourly and integrated drug-related themes into our program-

ming. Research shows that the campaign was successful in achieving our goal to encourage parents and their children to talk about drugs. We were pleased by the supportive phone calls and letters we got from teachers and parents thanking us for our commitment to fight drug use. But we wanted to do more, which is why, when we heard about the ONDCP's anti-drug media project, we jumped at the chance to be its partner.

Why is the ONDCP effort so important? Because it has changed for the better the way TV is able to spread the word about important issues. The ONDCP project provides a much increased and sustained level of exposure for anti-drug messages. Simply put, the financial resources committed have allowed us to significantly increase the amount of time we are able to devote to warning our viewers against drugs, and that repetition and increased level of exposure have allowed us to successfully hammer home our anti-drug message.

Thank you, and I would now turn to my colleague, Larry Fried, to provide further detail or after the pause.

Mr. KOLBE. I am looking here to see Mr. Fried's statement here. We have 11 minutes. Do you want to give it all here or do you want us to hold off here?

Mr. FRIED. Do you want a couple minutes of it?

Mr. KOLBE. Certainly.

Mr. FRIED. There is a film that will take a few minutes, but I can go through the statement quickly.

Mr. KOLBE. Go through the statement, and then we will have show and tell when we come back.

Mr. FRIED. Okay.

Mr. KOLBE. That will be an incentive for members who like to see visual things here when we come back.

Mr. FRIED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to speak to you about ABC's relationship and interaction with the ONDCP.

In 1997, when we first learned of the ONDCP's initiative, we felt right from the start that ABC was a perfect fit. We were already involved in an anti-drug campaign as an effort, as Patricia just mentioned. We are a family-based company, family oriented in programming, and we have a multi-faceted platform from which to really launch a terrific effort in reaching people with our platforms of television network, radio networks, ESPN, cable properties and our Internet activities. We really did have a perfect platform for the ONDCP.

So we formulated a plan that we felt met the ONDCP's objective of getting out the anti-drug message and getting substantial reach and frequency against the key demographics of kids, teens and parents. And we won a contract from the ONDCP across our platforms of \$61 million, with the idea that we would give back at least a one-for-one match in public service commitment above and beyond what we have done before. And I am pleased to report that during that contract period, we returned \$167 million worth of match for that \$61 million-dollar expenditure. That is nearly three times more or 173 percent more than just a one-for-one match would have been.

We matched with a number of different program elements. One was public service ads, two was creative and three were outreach kinds of programs. But basically speaking, when it came to PSAs, we were running the public service ads in our top-rated programs, prime time shows, sports programs, and we took extreme care with our standards and practices to match up the PSAs that were part of the qualifying match pool to the appropriate programming that they were airing in. So if we were running a kids' program, we put a kids'-oriented PSA, and an adult program, an adult-oriented PSA. We even went so far as to create some PSAs where we used all of our own resources and our chairman, Michael Eisner, was also an important contributor to making a PSA for the ONDCP and the anti-drug effort.

We also worked very hard with the ONDCP and the creative community. We had a meeting in March with a lot of our executives, a tremendous number of creative talent in our industry, and we stressed three things there. One, that the issues of the ONDCP were important issues to our company; two, that we would be open to story lines along the lines that the ONDCP was looking for that stressed anti-drug, anti-addiction kinds of story lines that we would be receptive to putting those on the air; and, three, that the ONDCP should be thought of as a resource for our creative community in the presentation of materials about addiction.

Now, ABC has always had strong anti-drug themed programming on the air. We have always had a certain quantity of it. But we believe that the encouragement that we gave our creatives right from the very beginning, from all of our creative executives, helped to really ramp up this effort in this 1998-1999 season.

And what I would do is, at this point, is tell you that I would show you the tape and then have about one paragraph's worth of closing remarks after the tape. But I leave that to you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KOLBE. In the interest of time, we will watch the tape when we come back, and then you can close your remarks, and then we will go to questions. We have, unfortunately, a total of four votes here, plus final passage. When the fifth vote starts, we can leave and come back, even though they will be, after the first one, five-minute votes, it will take us a little time to get through these votes. So we ask you to indulge us here while we go do what the voters elected us to do here.

The committee will stand in recess temporarily.

[Recess.]

Mr. KOLBE. The subcommittee will resume its hearing, and my apologies to the witnesses for the long delay here with the number of votes that we had. But I think that should take us through the rest of this hearing.

I think we were about to begin showing some clips; is that right, Mr. Fried?

Mr. FRIED. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

If I could just say one thing. The clips you are about to see are just some of the episodes that ABC produced that we felt really fit into the mode on the matching opportunity that we had with the ONDCP. We also did a lot of other kinds of matches for the ONDCP that involved creativity, one of which we were especially

proud was our freevibe site that we created for the ONDCP on the Internet, which has had over 6 million page views with an average visit of about nine minutes, and we have children and teens going to that ONDCP freevibe site.

So I think we can now go to the videotape and take a look at creativity of ABC.

[Video played.]

Mr. FRIED. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Fried.

Mr. FRIED. Our partnership with the ONDCP, we are very proud of it. We have reached millions of viewers, millions of listeners, millions of Web surfers. We have incented our executives and our creative community to the cause of the anti-drug and anti-addiction effort, and we look forward to working with the ONDCP in the future.

Thank you very much for this opportunity.

[The information follows:]

Testimony of

*Larry Fried, Executive Vice President
Marketing and General Sales Manager
ABC Television Network*

And

*Patricia Goodrich, Director of Corporate Initiatives
ABC, Inc.*

*House Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury,
Postal Service and General Government*

October 21, 1999

**Statement of Patricia Goodrich, Director of Corporate Initiatives, ABC, Inc.
Before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury,
Postal Service and General Government
October 21, 1999**

Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for inviting me here today. I am going to give you a brief overview of ABC's public service efforts, specifically our involvement in the war against drugs... and I want to tell you why we think this program is so vitally important. Then my colleague, Larry Fried, will give you further detail and discuss the results we've achieved together. At the end, we would be happy to try to answer any questions you may have.

First, the ONDCP's anti-drug media campaign is by no means ABC's first foray into the war against drugs. It is, however, our most powerful. In fact, the project we're here to discuss today is what we believe to be **the furthest reaching public service campaign in television history.**

I'd like to start today with some background on ABC's involvement in public service. The focal point for campaigns has been the use of our airwaves to educate and inform viewers about specific issues. While we don't make a point of publicizing it, ABC has traditionally broadcast far more PSAs than anyone else.

Why have we made this such a priority? Because we're a family oriented company, serving audiences comprised of all age groups... kids, teens and adults. And because we understand how influential television is in the country... and we appreciate that with that influence comes responsibility. The fact that my job -- head of public service -- and my department exist is a measure of how important the company thinks it is to fulfill our public service obligation on the national level. It's a responsibility we try to fulfill locally, as well, with the ABC owned television stations having a long history of service to their individual communities. Our other principal national commitment has been our Children First public service campaign, which focuses on mentoring as a way to, among other things, keep kids off drugs.

ABC's interest in the drug problem preceded the ONDCP campaign by about 10 years. Our management became aware of disturbing statistics showing a sharp increase in drug use among America's youth in the 80's. In April of 1987, we entered into an alliance with Partnership for a Drug Free America. We committed to devote fully one third of our on-air public service time -- Again, translating into hundreds of millions of dollars of ad time -- to the Partnership's anti-drug message.

That relationship, which continues today, created a new model for cooperation between a media company and a public service organization. In fact, Dick Bonnette, the President and CEO of the Partnership, called ABC, "the media organization that has provided the highest level of support by a wide margin." He adds, "We're proud to be their partner."

We coupled our alliance with the Partnership by launching our own initiative in the war against drugs. In March of 1997, we devoted a month of programming to the ABC March Against Drugs. During that time, the ABC Television Network ran drug-related PSAs and integrated drug-related themes in our programming. Research shows that the campaign was successful in achieving our goal: to encourage parents and their children to talk about drugs. We were pleased by the supportive phone calls from teachers and parents, thanking us for our commitment to fight drug use.

But we also wanted to do more. Which is why when we heard about the ONDCP's anti-drug media project, we jumped at the chance to be its partner.

Why is the ONDCP effort so important? Because it has changed for the better the way TV is able to spread the word about important issues. The ONDCP project provides a much increased and sustained level of exposure for anti-drug messages. Simply put, the financial resources committed have allowed us to significantly increase the amount of time we're able to devote to warning our viewers about drugs... And that repetition and increased level of exposure have allowed us to successfully hammer home our anti-drug message. That's a message we hope you'll continue to support in upcoming years.

Larry Fried will now provide further detail... But before I close, I want to read you excerpts from two letters we received in response to our anti-drug initiatives. I think it clearly shows the power and impact that TV can have in the war against drugs:

"My husband and I, and thousands of other parents who have lost children to drugs, thank ABC for giving a truthful account of the terrible tragedy of drug use... Please do not back off this issue."

And...

"As a youth who has had her own war with drugs, I can say that knowing there are adults out there who care enough about us to do something really warms my heart... maybe if we can all work together as a team, we can win this war."

Our thoughts, exactly. Thank you.

**Statement of Larry Fried, Executive Vice President, Marketing and
General Sales Manager, ABC Television Network
Before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury,
Postal Service and General Government
October 21, 1999**

Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for inviting me to speak today. My colleague, Ms. Goodrich, just gave you a broad overview of the history of ABC's public service campaigns, and of the initiative with ONDCP, in particular. Now, I'd like to spend a few minutes talking about what this unique and unprecedented partnership was able to accomplish...

I'd like to start with some background about how the partnership was formed... As Ms. Goodrich mentioned, ABC has a long history of involvement in the effort to warn kids and parents about the dangers of drugs. We first learned about the ONDCP's plans to look for a partner for its groundbreaking media initiative in 1997. We knew then that ABC was the perfect fit. First, we were already deeply involved in the anti-drug effort. Second, we are a family-orientated company, serving children, teens and parents with programming like Wonderful World of Disney; One Saturday Morning, our education/entertainment programming block on Saturday mornings; and a Friday night line-up geared toward kids and teens. We are also a diverse and vertically-integrated company. ABC has outlets ranging from the ABC Television Network to ESPN to our radio networks to our owned and operated TV stations to our Internet ventures. We knew when it came to reaching as many people as possible, in as many different ways as possible... we were unmatched. We were very excited about the project and felt that we were the best bet for them. So we formulated a plan for the campaign based on reach and frequency. That plan was accepted, and in July of 1998, the first ad went on the air... launching what has been called the most far-reaching public service campaign of its type ever.

The goal was... to work with the ONDCP to do all that we could to get the message to kids and teens - Don't do drugs. In reaching that goal, we also wanted to ensure that the government and taxpayers got the most value out of the money spent. We believe we achieved our goal of getting the message out... and delivered even more value for the money spent than anyone could have expected... Now, I want to talk about some of the exciting results we've seen.

First, in terms of financial figures, ABC not only matched the ONDCP's commitment of \$61 million, we gave back nearly three times that amount. A brief breakdown: The Office committed \$45 million for the ABC TV Network... the Network returned more than \$145 million in targeted, matched audience value... that's 224% above and beyond the match. The Office committed \$5 million for the ABC Radio Networks... the Radio Networks returned \$9 million... that's 81% above and beyond the match. The Office committed \$600,000 for ABC Online... ABC online returned \$875,000... 46% above and beyond. The Office committed \$5.5 million for ESPN... ESPN

returned \$6.2 million... 14% above and beyond the match. The Office committed nearly \$5 million for the ABC Owned TV stations... the Owned TV stations returned \$5.4 million... 9% above and beyond the match. Overall, the commitment the Office made - approved by Congress - was for \$61 million. The return you got from ABC was \$167 million... a 173% more than match. As anyone can see... from a business sense, that's a very good deal.

Now let me turn to the creative part of this partnership. We believe -- as a result of ONDCP's commitment -- that we were able to create and broadcast programming that was both educational and exciting.

First, a look at where the public service announcements included in the buy ran. As I mentioned before, the government buy ensured that these PSAs were broadcast during key programming hours... and ensured that our match ran in equally valuable positions. These PSAs ran during the most popular of our primetime shows and during our major sports programs.

It should also be noted that we worked with our broadcast standards and practices department to make sure that each PSA ran in the time slot best suited to reach its individual, demographically-targeted audience... whether kids, teens or adults.

An indication of how seriously we took this campaign... we even created a PSA using the head of The Walt Disney Company, Michael Eisner, as a spokesperson for the anti-drug cause.

Overall -- during the year between July 1998 and August 1999 -- we ran 1,143 PSAs as part of this campaign. That's 1,143 times we reached out to viewers with the message - Don't do drugs.

We also worked with the creative community... the people who write, direct and produce programming...

We did what we could to introduce them to the ONDCP and its efforts against drugs. Last March, we invited writers, producers, directors and management to ABC to meet with representatives from ONDCP and other public policy experts. These were creative professionals not only from ABC, but from many of the companies that work with ABC. We knew that these companies, in turn, work with other studios and networks... and we wanted them to spread the word. At that summit, we had three objectives: We wanted to let the creative community know how important we felt this issue was. We wanted to let them know we were very open to story-lines with an anti-drug message. And, finally, we wanted to introduce them to the ONDCP to let them know the group is there as a resource for them. Our understanding is the ONDCP was contacted following the session...

We were very pleased with that meeting... and we remain very committed to broadcasting programming with an anti-drug theme. In the recent past, ABC has

aired numerous shows that warn about the dangers of drugs. Here are a few examples:

- Home Improvement - We aired an episode when parents Tim and Jill find a bag of marijuana that belonged to their son. The discovery sparked an important conversation about the dangers of drugs.
- Boy Meets World - Teenagers Corey and Sean take up drinking, but Sean soon becomes an alcohol abuser. The program focuses on the pain and suffering Sean causes to himself and his loved ones, and the difficult journey he faces battling his problem drinking.
- Sports Night - Dan, a leading sportscaster, states publicly he supports the legalization of marijuana... prompting a public outcry. Dan reveals on-air that despite this opinion, he is strongly against drugs... and reveals his own brother died as a result of them.
- The Drew Carey Show - Drew discovers that Mr. Wick, a popular character on the program, is using cocaine. Drew convinces him he needs to get help, before he loses his job and destroys his life.
- Sabrina, the Teenage Witch - Sabrina gets hooked on pancakes, and, in doing so, learns how powerful addictions can be. The episode showed younger viewers that anyone can be a victim of addiction, at any age.
- Brother's Keeper - Bobby, a star professional athlete, fails a drug test after mistakenly eating poppy seeds. He must prove his innocence and regain the respect of his disappointed family and friends.
- NYPD Blue - Andy Sipowicz, played by Emmy-winning actor Dennis Franz, must deal with his ex-wife's alcohol addiction. Himself a recovering alcoholic, Andy agrees to go with her to program meetings.
- The Practice - Eugene's son, Kendell, is arrested for dealing marijuana at school. Though he wants to believe his son is innocent, Eugene discovers his son has been using and selling drugs... Eugene then must face the painful and difficult task of addressing his son's problems.
- Disney's One Saturday Morning - On Disney's Doug, Doug discovers his friends are becoming addicted to a dangerous snack... and he's forced to go public to get them help. This episode, by the way, won a coveted Prism award. [get info. about this]
- General Hospital - Dr. Alan Quartermaine becomes addicted to pain medication. Alan finds himself arrested and jailed before he's able to turn his life around.
- The View - The daytime talk show hosted a forum between teens and parents about nicotine addiction.
- Port Charles - Frank Scanlon suffers a near-fatal accident. During his recovery, he finds himself hooked on an experimental drug that only compounds his problems.

To give you an idea of how many people we reached with these episodes...The Drew Carey episode we mentioned reached more than 24 million viewers. The Home Improvement show on teen drug use... watched by more than 15 million people. The Sabrina the Teenage Witch "pancake" episode reached more than 2 ½ million

teenagers... more than 17 million viewers overall, if you count kids under 12 and adults. That's what you call... having an impact... getting your message out.

And that was just on the ABC Television Network. In addition, public service programming aired on our Radio Networks-- which reach more than 147 million listeners; on ESPN- which reaches 76 million viewers; at our owned and operated TV stations; and on our websites.

A few examples... At ESPN, the show Outside the Lines focused on the dangers of Andro, the steroid used by Mark Maguire. Our owned TV stations did their own grassroots outreach in their communities. We also created a website for ONDCP, called Free Vibe, which provided teens and adults with a forum to listen, learn and make their own educated decisions about the negative impact of drugs. Since its launch, Free Vibe has had more than 6 million page visits... averaging 9 minutes per visit.

Millions of viewers.... Millions of listeners.... Millions of web surfers. Through this partnership, we have reached countless kids, teens and parents with our message -- Don't do drugs. We are very proud of what we've accomplished with the ONDCP... we believe we've not only changed lives, we've saved lives. We're also very grateful that two years ago... when this project was first introduced to you... you recognized its value. It's helped us go beyond our traditional efforts, by providing us with the expertise and the incentive to better warn our viewers about the dangers of drugs.

We hope you'll continue to recognize the power of this partnership. We want to keep moving forward, keep reaching more kids, more teens and more parents with our anti-drug message... so we can increase the numbers of lives we help save. Thank you very much.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you very much, and thank all of you very much again for being here and for your patience this afternoon. I will ask a few questions, see if Mr. Peterson has some, and then we will see if we have any final questions before we let you go.

This has been very interesting, and the information that has been presented has been very helpful. Let me just, before I get into the line of questioning that I wanted to follow here, let me just ask a couple about what we saw there.

I was interested in the couple of programs that were targeted to young people that do not specify drugs, using instead pancakes and snacks. What is the age group of the audience that we are targeting there? Is it high school, middle school, high school? What is the age group?

Mr. FRIED. Well, I think if you are talking about Doug, the episode with Nick Nax—

Mr. KOLBE. Nick Nax, the cartoon, yes, and the pancake one.

Mr. FRIED. The cartoon is a Saturday morning program, and that would be aimed at children.

Mr. KOLBE. And the other one?

Mr. FRIED. The "Sabrina" is our TGIF line-up. It has the highest reach of teens. It also has the highest reach of kids of any network programming. It is also very strong on women 18 to 49, men 18 to 49, but it is also the most popular show for teen and young adults, and young children—

Mr. KOLBE. Let me ask any of you, but perhaps Ms. Kelly might be the one to answer this, do we have any research data which shows the effectiveness of a message that uses a surrogate thing for the message; a surrogate product, a surrogate, in this case, pancakes or snacks? Do we know that it works as transference to giving kids any message about the behavior they should have? Are you following? Do you understand my question, what I am trying to get?

Ms. KELLY. I think I do. Offhand, I cannot specify particular research. However, I am happy to go back and see if I can identify some. As Mr. London mentioned in his testimony, reaching young children with this issue is very problematic because you do not want to introduce something to them that they are not ready for.

Mr. KOLBE. They are not ready for.

Ms. KELLY. Or their parents may not appreciate them being introduced to. So it is a very sensitive issue. So I think what the entertainment industry tries to do sometimes is to—

Mr. KOLBE. It is building values.

Ms. KELLY. Yes. And to lay the groundwork—

Mr. KOLBE. Being able to say no, et cetera.

Ms. KELLY. Exactly—for problems that will arise later.

Mr. KOLBE. Now, that would not be true, though, of "Sabrina," which is teenagers. And certainly they are old enough to have the drug issue addressed to them. So I am trying to understand why we think that using a surrogate message, a surrogate evil, works here when it comes to drugs or alcohol or whatever.

Mr. LONDON. Could I respond, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. KOLBE. Sure. Yes, absolutely, Mr. London.

Mr. LONDON. Two responses. One is I am not aware of any research, but over the years I have been advised by many experts,

credentialed experts in children's programs that this was an appropriate and certainly potentially effective way to get at some of these issues without introducing children to a behavior which was either too frightening to them, which they could not understand, or which might serve as an example or educate them about a behavior that they did not already know about. So that is one answer to your question.

In terms of "Sabrina," the prime time series, as Larry mentioned, the highest rating of kids 2 to 11 watching prime time shows watch "Sabrina." So even though that may not—

Mr. KOLBE. I am sorry. Two to eleven?

Mr. LONDON. Uh-huh. I believe that is correct, is it not?

Mr. FRIED. Yes. It is aimed at basically a very young target audience. It is also 18 to 49, but, also, our TGIF line-up early on Friday is basically kids and teens.

Mr. LONDON. And more to the point as to whether it is aimed there, the point is kids are watching it. And so, speaking personally, that seems to be a very appropriate way to try to communicate that message to an audience that is comprised of such a large amount of 2- to 11-year-olds.

Mr. KOLBE. About addictive behavior.

Mr. LONDON. Correct.

Mr. KOLBE. Clearly, the message there is about addictive behavior.

Mr. LONDON. Correct.

Mr. KOLBE. But you do not, and I am not challenging whether it is a good idea to do it, but you do not know of any empirical evidence that says that kind of message on addictive behavior that has nothing to do with the addiction we are talking about works.

Mr. LONDON. I do not.

Mr. KOLBE. For our two ABC people, I was interested in the one on the sports one, the Preakness. Can you just tell me whether that, I mean, that is clearly just not an entertainment program. That is, well, I guess the Preakness might be entertainment, but it is sports. It comes under sports news coverage. Did that qualify for, that particular little story on Chris Antley qualify for a match?

Mr. FRIED. Yes, it did. We count it as qualifying for the match, that is correct. And I believe the ONDCP counted it also as qualifying for the match.

Mr. KOLBE. That raises a question. The match is not program-by-program; is that right? Or did you have some—

Mr. FRIED. Let me explain. We had an obligation, the way we broke down the obligation is the obligation was twofold; one was to deliver Public Service Ads and, in fact, ABC virtually matched its dollar-for-dollar value in Public Service Announcements. Anything above and beyond the Public Service Announcements was extra. So if we had just done Public Service Announcements and done no more, we would have virtually been at our match level on a one-for-one basis, which is what we were trying to achieve. We added all of these theme programs to what we considered the value that we returned, to give an example of how the company participated in this effort. But on a one-for-one basis, we would have virtually qualified on the basis of PSA match alone.

Mr. KOLBE. Let me just ask you, if there was not any match program, would that be a story you would run?

Mr. FRIED. Actually, the answer is yes because our ground rules were that these would be above and beyond, for the most part, what we had done the previous year. ABC is, I do not want to misquote these figures, Mr. Chairman, but in the year prior to our relationship with the ONDCP we ran about 55 percent of all of the PSAs on the broadcast networks—

Mr. KOLBE. On your own network.

Mr. FRIED. On ABC. And in the year that we had the partnership, we ran 60 percent. And the incremental was even more than the amount that we just ran as match for PSAs for the ONDCP. So we actually ramped up our entire PSAs, in addition to the amount that we did for the ONDCP.

Mr. KOLBE. I salute you for that. That is obviously very, very commendable. But it seems to me that story is a news story that has merit in and of itself, regardless of the message that we are trying to convey. It, at the same time, does convey a message without question. But that is a real news story, is it not, about a very successful jockey who has successfully beaten back addiction?

Mr. FRIED. You said that is a news story?

Mr. KOLBE. A news/human interest.

Mr. FRIED. We actually never count any news program. Well, that is a news story, but it told a story about a person who had a problem with addiction.

Mr. KOLBE. Right.

Mr. FRIED. There was a lesson to be learned from it. And I think—

Mr. KOLBE. You just started to say “we never count.”

Mr. FRIED. We do not count news programming in our qualifying at all. So if we did any stories, that would not be news, that would be sports.

Mr. KOLBE. Oh, okay. Okay. Sports is in the entertainment category.

Mr. FRIED. Sports is more in the entertainment property. A news program, if it had a story line about drugs or addiction, we would be—

Mr. KOLBE. If that had been on the evening news, when it came to the sports part of it, that would not have been part of the qualifying match.

Mr. FRIED. That is correct.

Mr. KOLBE. Do you have some more questions, Mr. Peterson?

Mr. PETERSON. First, I would like to commend you on the efforts you are making and how you are participating. But as I was listening to those, if we are going to effectively deal with this issue, I think parents today—now, I am speaking again from rural. I come from rural, and rural is different than suburban, urban. Rural parents do not know how available drugs are, and they would be shocked if they knew that probably within a block of their house their kids could buy drugs from seventh grade on, maybe even younger.

And I guess that is a message. Helping educate parents, are there any efforts to educate parents on what to look for? What happens when your children start using? Educating them on being

aware that there is a pretty good likelihood that if their kids just get with the wrong friend, they are going to have drugs given to them. Is that a part of the programming, to educate parents?

Ms. KELLY. Well, I think that even in the examples of the clips that we have seen today, we have seen some very important role modeling of parents, of communicating with their children and responding to exactly what to do if you discover that your child is using. Also, I would like to mention that with ONDCP—I think you have this—this is a guide that we have put out for parents, and it deals with, for parents, how to use the media as a tool, how to use it, when you see something on television or the Internet or in a film that you may have some concerns about, how to communicate with your children, what to look for, and what at different ages they understand and what they are comprehending.

Ms. GOODRICH. And, also, ABC has put together guides that we have sent out to our stations to distribute in their communities in whatever form they thought most appropriate. We have also done guides that have gone into the schools so that teachers could watch these programs with their students and then perhaps better talk with them about what the repercussions were and try to give them direction on how we felt it was best to approach that.

Mr. PETERSON. But, see, I guess the fear I have is that parents are not as suspecting as they need to be. They are just not as aware of the drug culture as they should be. They just do not think it is in their town yet. They think that little, small town, it is down the road, it is at the bigger city, but it is everywhere. In fact, I think it has been growing. It is my opinion it has been growing faster in rural America than it is in urban America. It is easier there. I think the drug culture has found out that is a ready market. There is not as much enforcement.

I have talked with lots of parents, and they would then go and corner their youngsters, and over a period of time come back to me and say, "You know, my son told me he can, but he never told me that, he could buy it anywhere. He can buy anything he wants."

Of course, then we have the large number of children that are being raised by sort of a family. I mean, not a real family, and maybe somebody cares whether they do drugs, maybe somebody does not. And then we have that whole audience to work with that I guess I worry a lot about, too, because I have a granddaughter who tells me an awful lot of her girlfriends are raising themselves. They do not have any guidelines, they are allowed to go and do what they want at 14/15. They just do not have any parent supervision. They have a mother, and maybe she works a lot or a couple of jobs, but there is not really a family, and they do not really live under many rules. And I guess that is a whole new phenomenon we have, that we try to think about the traditional family. Well, the traditional family is not raising over half of our kids, in my view.

Ms. GOODRICH. Agreed.

Mr. PETERSON. That is an audience, too. How do we get parents aware of what their kids are exposed to out there?

Ms. GOODRICH. One of the things that ABC has done in the past is, when we did the March Against Drugs, for instance, the big message was talk to your kids about drugs. Because we recognize

that in the suburbs, for instance, a lot of the parents do not think that it can happen to them. And so we were advocating strongly talk to them, at least open the discussion, and it will be, as you found out, there will be all kinds of things that come out of that. But you can advocate that as strongly as possible, and that is what we have tried to do.

I do not know if you all are familiar with it, but there is a Partnership for a Drug Free America spot where there is a kid on a skateboard on a big, wide beautiful street, and he is skating around, and they give out some really startling statistics about the fact that the drug culture is growing much more rapidly right now outside of the urban areas than it is within them.

Mr. PETERSON. I have not seen that.

Ms. GOODRICH. So the information is out there, and we just try to disseminate it as often and as regularly as possible.

Mr. PETERSON. Thank you.

Mr. KOLBE. Ms. Kelly, this morning General McCaffrey spoke about the process that is used to decide about the match and how it qualifies. Is that the way you understand that it works? I guess what I am trying to understand is who makes the decision as to whether or not a particular editorial—we are talking now about the soft content, well, and also about the messages that might be put on, the direct messages—who gives the final approval on that and decides they qualify for the match?

Ms. KELLY. As I think you know, there are two major contracts that are part of this campaign. And one is what we call the advertising portion of it, which is led by Ogilvy & Mather, and they deal with that aspect. My contract is through the nonadvertising side, and we do not directly deal with the match at all.

Mr. KOLBE. Explain to me a little bit more about your contract, if it is on the nonadvertising side, does it have to do with the soft match?

Ms. KELLY. Yes, it would have to do with—

Mr. KOLBE. So it does have to do with the soft match.

Ms. KELLY. Yes, except that the way we approach is not—in other words, the contract I have is through Fleishman Hillard, and the work that we are doing is targeted toward trying to educate and inform people who work in the entertainment industry about the issues and to encourage them to incorporate those into their story lines. But we do not actually purchase any of the time or have that connection. Most of the people we work with on the creative side are not even particularly aware of the match. They take on the issue because they think it is important and because it can be incorporated into their shows. They have characters that are the right ages and so forth.

Mr. KOLBE. Well, that leads me into the next area that I wanted to talk about, and that is I think it—maybe it was you, Mr. London, I forget which one of you said you thought the outreach program, the forums and seminars that you were doing with the creative people, was the most effective way.

Mr. LONDON. Yes. That was me.

Mr. KOLBE. More effective than my simply giving them a piece of paper saying, "You put this kind of message in, you are going to get this many dollars credit for it here?"

Mr. LONDON. Just speaking solely from the creative community, which is not necessarily to speak from the business side, but there is a sort of strong demarcation in the entertainment industry between the creative side and the business side.

Mr. KOLBE. I am sure there must be.

Mr. LONDON. But speaking from the creative side of that desk, we get deluged with paper, brochures, reports, we get a lot of information sent to us, and we just do not have time to look at it. And the reason I support the roundtables and the meetings is because I feel, as a general statement of principle, person-to-person contact and dialogue is always a more impactful and more important—

Mr. KOLBE. I can believe what you just said. Because as one who gets deluged with reports, and studies, and so forth and pieces of paper that never see the light of day or that I do not, at least, get to read a lot of it, but then I also face the same thing of an overwhelming number of meetings that I have to sit down and attend, go to. Why would, if you are a creative person, you would be any more interested in sitting down in a roundtable just to discuss this than looking at some report about it?

Mr. LONDON. Let me give you two answers. The first answer is many of these meetings are held over a meal, either breakfast or lunch, and we have to do that, and that helps. I do not mean to imply that the food is the incentive, but it does not take time out of your working day. You have that time anyway.

Mr. KOLBE. It helps to make a more casual, informal setting.

Mr. LONDON. But the larger reason, and I would not underestimate the value of this, there is a tremendous desire on the part of creative professionals to network and to hear what each other are doing, to share information and anecdotes, and very frankly, in some cases, to meet people that you feel can offer you an opportunity, in some way, in the future. So I think if you can get a certain level of attendee at these events and make it known to other attendees that these people will be there, I think there is an incentive for a lot of people to come. And, again, judging by the things I have attended, that system works.

Mr. KOLBE. When you sit down at one of those meetings, who are you representing?

Mr. LONDON. Me, personally? I represent DIC Entertainment, which is a producer.

Mr. KOLBE. You would be at the same meeting, Ms. Kelly?

Ms. KELLY. Chances are I would have organized it.

Mr. KOLBE. You would have organized it.

Ms. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. KOLBE. Do they know, when they sit down with you, who you represent?

Ms. KELLY. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. KOLBE. Other than Mediascope. I mean, that you have a contract with ONDCP?

Ms. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. KOLBE. Or does this never come up? Do we try not to talk about that?

Ms. KELLY. I do not know that we make a particularly big issue about it, but generally we will announce who has funded the event or what it is about, why we are bringing people together. And, also,

we would be giving out some materials from ONDCP. So it is not hidden information.

Mr. KOLBE. So it is not hidden. Have you run into resistance at these meetings, of people saying, "You know, stop getting over in my turf. I am the creative person. I know what is needed here, what I want to do"?

Mr. LONDON. Surprisingly not. Because as I mention in my statement, creative people are extremely sensitive to that and want no part of it.

Mr. KOLBE. I am just trying to understand how you tread that fine line there.

Mr. LONDON. It is a fine line. There is no question about it. But I think very much the nature of Mediascope, and I keep saying Mediascope because they have produced the most number of events that I have attended, and the nature of the organization, the way these events are publicized, explained and actually executed, have a real sense about them of not having an agenda and simply, "Here is some information for you to use or not use as you choose." And that is not offensive to creative people.

Ms. GOODRICH. A lot of them are going to—

Mr. KOLBE. Yes.

Ms. GOODRICH. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KOLBE. Sure. Please, please, any of you any time here.

Ms. GOODRICH. A lot of these people are going to be dealing with these issues anyway because they are real-life issues. They want to know how to deal with them appropriately, and that is what the ONDCP and the organizations that represent anti-drug initiatives can tell them. So they are looking for information, what Mr. London is talking about. They are thirsty, and this affords them the opportunity to ask questions and get the kind of information that they can then parlay into some wonderful, creative thing that we will see on the screen.

Mr. LONDON. And it is very important that these meetings are nonthreatening, perceived as such and, in fact, are. Because all of us in Hollywood are aware of certain aspects of the Government trying to regulate us, trying to point fingers at us, trying to blame us for every ill the world knows. We are familiar with hearing that litany.

Mr. KOLBE. Really? That has happened? I am shocked. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONDON. And so it is, for us, in a way refreshing to attend an event, where that is not what the event is about and where—

Mr. KOLBE. And they truly are perceived that way, then, as nonthreatening, as that I am here from Washington to tell you what is good messages you should be doing? They are really perceived in that nonthreatening way?

Mr. LONDON. Well, I cannot speak for every creator. I am sure there are creators out there that are just absolutely dead set against hearing anything that has anything to do with Government, period. But by and large, certainly speaking for the children's programming community, yes, they are perceived as nonthreatening. Because, for example, Mediascope is not considered to be an arm of the Government. Mediascope, I understand to be a conveyor of information and nothing more, not a regulator.

Mr. KOLBE. I am just getting warmed up here, but before I see if Mr. Peterson has some more, let me just ask one more question here.

As I listened to your testimony earlier, a thought occurred to me. Is there a fundamental difference between the creativity that we do for programming for children as opposed to adults? Adults is truly entertainment, and you want to find out what they like, what hits their hot buttons and what they are going to watch. That is not quite the way we do it for children, is it? It is not purely entertainment.

Mr. LONDON. No, au contraire.

Mr. KOLBE. It is?

Mr. LONDON. It has to be. It must work first as entertainment, A, because we function in a business environment that must bring us ratings, and B, even putting the ratings and the business aside, if your goal is to communicate to children, the first necessity is they have to be watching, and they have the same remote control that adults have, and the same other interests in the Internet and all sorts of things. So we are in a very, very, perhaps, more competitive environment for children's time and attention. So our programs must work first and foremost as entertainment, or no one will see them. It does no good to do a wonderfully do-good program and have nobody see it, and children do very much control their own viewing after about age, probably 3 or 4, they control their own viewing.

Mr. KOLBE. Pure entertainment for children would be something like cartoons perhaps, or "Sesame Street" is something that has a lot of educational content.

Mr. LONDON. Correct. "Sesame Street"—

Mr. KOLBE. Is "Sesame Street" geared to the parent whose going to make the kid watch the—

Mr. LONDON. It is geared to very young children. What happens is after about age 6, there is a divergence in the way kids watch TV and their ability to sort of perceive and sense educational programs. So shows like "Sesame Street" and other preschool shows can have a lot of educational content in them, and young children find that entertaining. It is older kids, it is the 6 to 11s that is really the challenge to try to educate and entertain at the same time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Peterson.

Mr. PETERSON. Yes. I was just thinking here, since I have been listening, as we watched the films, I mean, I commend you for some pretty good work there. Is there anybody that could show me a film of where young people have had the wrong message on ABC or NBC or CBS or the movies? I cannot give you an example, but I know there have been many times my wife and I have been sitting there, and suddenly say, "Boy, that is a terrible message for kids to see. That is a terrible example." You know, it is 7:30 at night or it is 8:00 o'clock, and that is a bad message.

Is there somebody who rates, monitors and does film clips like that that—because you have picked out the ones you are proudest of, right? You give us the things you think have been very positive. Is there somebody who is watching regular programming, where people have really sent the wrong message?

Ms. KELLY. Well, if I could speak to that, there is a study that you have, which was released last, I believe, March or April, "Substance Abuse in Popular Movies and Music", and this is a study that we did with ONDCP funding, and we looked at two years of the most popular movies, and we looked at two years of the most popular recordings, five different genres of music. And some of the statistics, I believe, that the General reported this morning, some of the media statistics come from here.

There is no question that in here we saw a number of films and music recordings that just have a lot of depictions, lot of use, with absolutely no consequences. A lot of scenes of young people, say, drinking, but no consequences to it, or smoking in particular. Those were the two biggest problems that we saw.

In January 2000 we will release a study that will look at prime-time television, about 170 episodes, and that will address the most popular shows among African-American, Hispanic and white teens.

In the main, without that study, without having the data, I can say that the broadcast network we find in general is the most responsible area of media.

Mr. PETERSON. You made a statement that intrigued me, Robby, that you said you have been blamed for all the ills as a creator. I do not think any of us ever envisioned that young people would get as much of their education from television as they do, especially those that do not have a family structure. You know, the TV is turned on, and that is the baby-sitter. Television is their life. And I continue to meet young people, some of the smartest young people in the country today, but then I also meet young people that do not know anything about anything. I mean, they have not been schooled. They have not paid much attention to the educational process. They have just attended. They do not really have a family structure, and the television has really been a major part of their life, and I think that is why you have had more impact than you probably want to have. But when you have the balance in a life, you can watch some of that stuff, and it does not really bother you, because you have somebody reinforcing the other side. There are young people who have nobody reinforcing the other side. I guess that is the ones I worry about. How do we deal with that?

Mr. LONDON. Well, I absolutely agree with you, and I would say that in the years I have been doing children's television, I think 20 years ago creators were a lot more cavalier about what they did, and I think one of the biggest arguments that has helped to cause us to take our responsibilities more seriously and why you see so many more of us in Washington and you see voluntary guidelines such as I discussed, and the kinds of spots that ABC produced, I think the reason for that is very simple, and that is the acknowledgement that there are a lot of so-called latch-key kids out there that are watching television unsupervised. In the perfect world parents supervise their viewing, and I think with proper parental supervision or familial supervision, you could put almost anything on television, and I think a child would survive it, and would probably not lead to horrible behaviors. Without that supervision, you are absolutely right, and I think that is why all of us are more concerned about it. But I would say still I think there are other influences besides television, even in those homes without appropriate

parental supervision. There are still schools. There are still communities. There are still the neighborhoods. There is peer pressure. There is other media besides television, frankly. So we are a little bit defensive about television being singled out as the cause of such things as the school violence recently, certainly that has been so—

Mr. PETERSON. You are just one of many contributing factors in my view.

Mr. LONDON. Certainly in my opinion, yes.

Mr. FRIED. If I could just add, at ABC we are very proud of the fact that we have a very stringent standards and practices operation, that reviews everything that goes on the air. I think I am correct in saying that our programming tries to be time-period appropriate. So that if it is early in the evening, it is aimed at a family audience, and we scrutinize programs for where they are going to run and the kind of content that we are going to put on the air, and we are always looking to compete, but we are not looking to push the envelope beyond what we think society is willing to accept.

So I think when it comes to ABC, we are very careful about the kinds of programming that we put on the air. And if you are looking for the other side of those programs, you might be able to find them on occasion, but we think you would find them maybe when they were running in a more adult time frame, and not in a kids' frame, not in an 8:00 o'clock time frame, or an 8:30 time frame or a children's program.

Mr. PETERSON. Would it be a positive thing to have a positive rating, like, you know, when you excelled, you know, "This network has done the most to send the right message?"

Mr. FRIED. Well, you know what we find? I am an advertising guy, so I can tell you what we found. When we put programming on that is unacceptable to society, we get no support for it. We may get a high rating because it attracted a lot of people for whatever the topic was, but you cannot get—advertisers who bail out of it right and left, so they are not very profitable for us.

Mr. PETERSON. That is good to hear.

Mr. LONDON. I would love to respond to the rating question if I could.

Mr. PETERSON. Sure.

Mr. LONDON. I think the value of ratings, unfortunately, is somewhat overstated, because the reality is, is that in households where there is somebody there to pay attention to the ratings and try to enforce them, those are the lowest risk households, as we just discussed. That is a family with parents that care and understand and are educated, and try to do the same for their children. The kids that are most at risk are those most likely not to pay any attention at all to the ratings.

Mr. PETERSON. Well, I meant like we would rate the networks and the movies as wholesome, give them a high score if they were—

Mr. LONDON. But who would pay attention? Who would that rating be directed to and who would pay attention to it is my question?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes, you are probably right. Thank you.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you, Mr. Peterson.

Ms. Kelly, you said that you thought the broadcast industry was the most responsible. That is an interesting comment. I mean there is lots of stuff that appears in print today, but I guess not very many kids read it. Is that what you meant, or do you think they are actually more responsible?

Ms. KELLY. No. I was really referring to more electronic media. I was thinking of films, television, cable and broadcast television. Of all of those groups broadcast television is the only one that consistently has broadcast standards.

Mr. KOLBE. We do not have anybody here today representing the music industry. It seems to me that that is one that is particularly difficult to reach. MTV does not use a soft match. They would only take the hard dollars. And I am wondering if you agree, and is that a significant way in which kids get messages about behavior, any kind of behavior if their music—personally, I can never understand the words anyhow, and to me it is like listening to opera. I love listening to opera, but I never understand the words.

Ms. KELLY. The music industry is a particularly difficult industry to try to reach with pro-social information. In the study that we did, we found that the biggest problem was in rap music. One of the things that we are doing now is actually strategizing about how to reach the music industry. The researchers that we had working on this study felt, from some of the focus group work that was done, that for a lot of young people, in music, more than any other area of the media, young people identify with the artist. And so if the artist has a problem with drugs or is known to use them, or has that kind of a reputation, that young people project drug use into their lyrics, even if it is not actually there. So it is a very complex area, and as I said, we are strategizing now about how to reach into that community.

Mr. KOLBE. That is interesting. Your research suggested that 98 percent of the most popular movies—I do not know whether this was just movies or movies and broadcast TV——

Ms. KELLY. No, that was movies.

Mr. KOLBE. Just movies. Show some sort of substance use.

Ms. KELLY. Correct.

Mr. KOLBE. Do you define substance use as drugs, alcohol and tobacco?

Ms. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. KOLBE. Because—and I do not mean this laughingly, but there are serious food addiction problems, but since it is also necessary for life to sustain life, you do not include that, obviously.

Ms. KELLY. No. And included in that number is both use and appearance.

Mr. KOLBE. Use and appearance.

Ms. KELLY. In other words, a bottle of beer could be on the bar in a film. That would be coded as an appearance.

Mr. KOLBE. Appearance.

Ms. KELLY. Then if somebody actually swallows it, that becomes use. So we differentiate between appearance and use.

Mr. KOLBE. So a scene with a couple at dinner and a glass of wine in front of them, that is appearance and use, presumably, if they are drinking it.

Ms. KELLY. Exactly.

Mr. KOLBE. And yet, research also shows that only 22 percent of the most popular movies depict illicit drug use. So there is a huge difference between the total amount of where we see some kind of use and those that have illicit—

Ms. KELLY. Exactly.

Mr. KOLBE. So how do we make the kinds of distinctions that we need to make between the legal substances, while they still may be bad, certainly in the case of tobacco. Nobody suggests there is anything that is redeeming there. In the case of alcohol, there is some evidence that there can be medicinal value to that in certain circumstances. So how do we make a distinction between those kinds of things that are legal, even if they are not necessarily good for you, and the illicit behavior where it is illegal?

Ms. KELLY. Well, the way we approach the entertainment industry on these kinds of issues, is that we recognize that tobacco, alcohol and drugs are part of life, and that sometimes a story line or a particular character, that usage may be important to help define that character. It might be a story about somebody going through a substance abuse problem, or a character who is an alcoholic. So we do not in any way request people not include substances in their story lines. What we try to do is encourage them, when they include those substances, to provide some balancing information, perhaps consequences to that use, to somebody smoking a cigarette, or using a particular drug.

And that was our concern with the study's findings, we saw an awful lot of use with absolutely no mention of any kind of consequences, and sometimes when the consequences were there, it was very difficult to tell if they were positive or they were negative.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. London, I think you made the comment that the evidence shows that children over 9 are adverse to getting their message from preaching. Can you expand a little bit on that?

Mr. LONDON. I hope I did not say evidence, because for me it was just in my experience and—

Mr. KOLBE. I think you did say your experience, and that was going to be my question. Is there evidence? Do we have any evidence of that?

Mr. LONDON. You know, I am always the wrong person to ask about evidence because I am basically a writer. My job is to create and not to research.

Mr. KOLBE. So your statement then is based on your own perceptions, anecdotal information, that kind of thing?

Mr. LONDON. Yes. And also, I have spent a lot of time consulting with experts over the years, psychologists, developmental experts, educators, and I have sort of synthesized a lot of the information I have gotten over the years, but I could not point in most cases to specific research.

Mr. KOLBE. Ms. Kelly, would you agree with that statement?

Ms. KELLY. Yes, I would agree. As a matter of fact, a conference we just did at the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, we had somebody from the advertising side of things who actually did a report for the conference. One of the things he noted was the high percentage of young people that are watching shows not made for

them, that do have control of that remote and do surf and watch programs not made for their age group.

Mr. KOLBE. So the message has to be a much more subtle one that you get with that age group?

Ms. KELLY. Very subtle.

Mr. LONDON. I will tell you one thing that sort of intuitively and indirectly has been demonstrated, and that is, kids are really into things that are cool. Kids tend to differentiate this is cool, this is not. And whatever message you are trying to get across, it is really important that kids believe that the message and the conveyor of that message is cool. And for whatever reason that it is, it is very hard to put your finger on what makes something cool and what does not, but when it is not cool, it is very hard to be effective. And, again, this is not based on research. This is based on sort of anecdotal experience and ratings and seeing how kids respond to television shows for 20 years.

Mr. KOLBE. Your use of the word "kids" here means pre-teen and teenager?

Mr. LONDON. I am pretty much referring to 2 to 11 from my specific experience. However, I have some experience with "tweens" going up to about 14.

Mr. KOLBE. A 5-year-old is into what is cool and not cool?

Mr. LONDON. Well, 5-year-olds less so; a 7-year-old is starting to get there, and by 8, yes, at least in the urban environment in which I deal.

Mr. KOLBE. There was one other line along there that I wanted to ask, but now it slipped my mind. It may come back to me. Just a couple of last questions here for Ms. Goodrich and Mr. Fried here.

Can you describe a little bit about the decision process you go into at the network on trying to decide whether you are going to try to satisfy your content, satisfy your match I guess, through a media buy or through the programming content?

Mr. FRIED. I will try and answer that for you. I think at ABC we first had to look at what the match would be in terms of PSAs, because the content is more of a questionable thing about how much content we have, particularly going in the first year, knowing what we would be able to put on the air in that way. So we really had to go back and examine our inventory and what the company wanted to do, and we came up with the conclusion that we could afford to do the kind of—for the kind of commitment we would get, we would be willing to take more inventory and put it into public service match. And we committed to making that match on an equal basis with the hard match, I think you called it before.

And then we did everything we could to ramp up the company, and sent the company to do the other. But the first commitment had to be—in our second year, it operated the same way. We first had to determine whether we could cover the dollar commitment in PSAs, and then if we could assure ourselves that we had the inventory put aside, that we could cover that, we would then move to incent the community to do more. But we cover internally basically the idea that we are going to first match with PSAs. So that is how we go about doing it.

Mr. KOLBE. Are most of your entertainment programs, the sitcoms and other entertainment shows now, bought independently? Are the scriptwriters, the people writing them independent or are they within ABC? We have freelancing, I guess is what I am trying to say.

Mr. FRIED. We have a lot of owned product now, and we have a lot of product that still we get from outside buyers, but the creative community is the creative community. They are not owned by ABC or the Walt Disney Company.

Mr. KOLBE. No, I understand. I guess where I was going with that question is, at your conferences, it includes both independent scriptwriters and people that work for networks; is that correct?

Ms. KELLY. Absolutely, yes.

Mr. KOLBE. Is there any difference in the kinds of reactions that you are finding between those that are within the—that are working for somebody, getting a paycheck from ABC as opposed to somebody that is a freelance?

Ms. KELLY. No, not at all. As a matter of fact, they switch all the time too, so one season they could be independent, and one season they would be on staff.

Mr. KOLBE. I see, yeah.

Mr. FRIED. I think we were—when we held our big conference with General McCaffrey, we were surprised at the participation that we got. We sent out invitations. We wanted the creative people to come, and I can tell you that everybody from ABC that was in the room was surprised at the turnout that we got because these people just do not show up just because we say so. But they showed up because they were interested, and I do not think they felt any obligation to do it just because it was us. So I think they wanted to be there.

Mr. KOLBE. That was going to be my next question. you have not experienced any kind of negative feedback then from your creative people saying, "What are you doing telling us about conferences to talk about content?"

Mr. FRIED. If anything, I think we received feedback that they wished it would have been more targeted about this or more targeted about some different way, and maybe less of this research stuff, and more telling us a better way to tell the story than was executed in this first meeting, not telling them what to do.

Mr. KOLBE. Go ahead.

Mr. LONDON. I would just say it is important to remember there is no compulsion to use the information we are given, so it is a pretty unreasonable position to say we do not want information.

Mr. KOLBE. And you make that very clear, that nobody is being told to use this.

Ms. KELLY. And also, as the person who organizes some of these events, they typically run maybe two hours. They are not long. TV people are very busy. They have very busy days, and as Mr. London stated, generally we can get them in the morning before they go to work or when they take a midday break. And we will bring in experts who can talk about a whole variety of issues, because every show has something different that they might be interested in tackling. If you are a medical show, you have one area of interest. If you are a law and order show, you have another. If you are

a family sitcom and you have a couple of teenagers in the show, your interest is something else.

And so what we try to do and what we are now focusing on is creating some forums for the staffs of shows that work in particular genres of television.

Mr. KOLBE. Okay. So this is follow-up to what Mr. Fried was saying, is they want more targeted kind of information.

Ms. KELLY. That is right. That is right.

Mr. KOLBE. Obviously, your conferences are much more structured than a congressional hearing, which tend to drag on. I can tell that.

It sounds to me like all of you agree that the system that we have got in place here with ONDCP and both the system of the match and the way in which we impart the information to the creative people is working. Is that correct? Would you all agree with that?

Mr. FRIED. Right.

Ms. GOODRICH. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Ms. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. KOLBE. You are satisfied with the way it is working.

And, finally, back to ABC. We are constantly hearing on the floor of the House in Congress, politicians talking to executives and to media people about the bad messages that are being conveyed through the media to kids, whether it is violence, drugs, substance abuse of one sort or another. Is this a bad rap the networks and the media is getting here?

Mr. FRIED. I will be happy to say I think it is a bad rap for ABC. I do not want to speak for anybody else, but I think all of—

Mr. KOLBE. Would you like to separate yourself from the others?

Mr. FRIED. No, but the broadcast networks all have standards and practices operations. They all scrutinize their programming, and they all come up with positions for themselves.

I think our position has been that we are very careful about what we put on the air, and we are very careful about what time things go on the air that reach the audiences that we reach, and I think it would be unfair to categorize that we are just willy-nilly programming things that are inappropriate for the people that are watching. I think that is exactly what we are doing. We are time period appropriate, and we are appropriate to the kind of audience that we think watches ABC, which is family and teens, and the kind of audience that we want to reach.

Mr. KOLBE. Ms. Goodrich.

Ms. GOODRICH. It is pretty much the same thing. I mean, there are watchdog groups. Mr. Peterson was asking earlier about who judges these things. There are watchdog groups who keep an eye in whether or not we are doing what we say we are supposed to do. And ABC generally comes up smelling pretty good out of those. There is the Kids Nets from down here. I cannot think of the names of a bunch of them right now, but we feel very strongly from our internal structure, as well as the external people, we do what we are supposed to be doing.

Mr. KOLBE. Yes. There are a bunch of the watchdog group, and I guess that is why I was going with that, because they have

been—and I cannot tell you because I have not seen their data recently, how specifically ABC ranks there, and I will take your word for it that you come out better on that. But they have been generally fairly critical of the entertainment industry. And I am wondering if any of the others of you, Mr. London, Ms. Kelly, would agree that there is a change taking place. One of the things that is most critical again—now, let us leave aside purely the drugs and even substance abuse—is that TV generally has depicted what society regards as bad behavior, violence, drug abuse, substance abuse of one sort or another, without consequences to it. Is that changing in the way our media now is beginning to show that there are consequences? Are there more consequences being shown now?

Mr. LONDON. I think this panel is heavily weighted towards television, and I think it absolutely is true in television. I think in general television has, I would say, taken more responsibility perhaps than other media. I think I can only speak for television.

Mr. KOLBE. Just let me clarify that. Has always taken more responsibility or is taking more responsibility? There is a change going about.

Mr. LONDON. Yes. I think it has absolutely been increased in the last ten years, just because of more awareness of television's impact and more research coming to bear, and it is become—frankly, we used to argue that television could not be blamed for things, and there was no evidence that people got behaviors from watching television, particularly kids, but frankly, evidence has come to light in recent years, that it has been fairly irrefutable, and it is difficult to deny any more our role, that we have a role in people's behavior.

Mr. KOLBE. Thank you. I want to thank all of our panelists today. This has been, for me, a fascinating hearing, and I wish all of my colleagues could have been here today, but I can assure you, we are going to share this information with them, and I think it helps us a great deal as we go into the next regular budget cycle as we talk about this issue. You have been extraordinarily I think frank, candid, forthcoming, using all those words that we use in "diplomatic-ese." But, it really has been very, very helpful to us today. And I know you have extremely busy schedules, and I appreciate very much your taking time out of your day to be here, and traveling the distance that most of you did to be with us here today. So I am very grateful to you for your participation in this hearing.

And I thank you again very much, and since there is no one else here to make a further comment, the Subcommittee will stand adjourned.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

NUTS AND BOLTS OF THE PROGRAMMING 'MATCH'

QUESTION:

1. WHAT IS THE PROCEDURE FOR PROPOSING A PROGRAMMING CONTENT MATCH? DO BROADCASTERS OFFER PROGRAMS FOR ONDCP APPROVAL OR DOES ONDCP APPROACH THE NETWORK WITH SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS?

ANSWER:

Broadcasters and other media outlets are briefed on the Media Campaign and the kinds of activities that qualify for a match. The media outlets then propose specific ways they will meet the match. Some offer all PSAs, while others do a combination of activities. The breakdown of the media match for broadcast network television shows 85% in PSAs, 14% in programming, and 1% in community affairs efforts. For all media (radio, television, Internet, outdoor, magazines and newspapers), PSAs account for 84% of the match, programming 13%, and community affairs efforts 3%.

In order to protect the autonomy and voluntary collaboration that is critical to the success of the Media Campaign over time, ONDCP does not approach networks with specific suggestions for match programs. Rather, after the broadcasters and media outlets are briefed on the campaign, they decide how much of their match will be fulfilled with programming content. They then approach ONDCP one of two ways: either by proposing a script for the match, or by submitting it for ONDCP review after the show has been aired.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

NUTS AND BOLTS OF THE PROGRAMMING "MATCH"

QUESTION:

2. WHO DETERMINES THAT A MATCH IS ACCEPTABLE? ONDCP? OGILVY & MATHER? WHAT FACTORS GO INTO MAKING THAT DETERMINATION? ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY SITUATIONS WHERE SCRIPTS OR CONTENT HAVE BEEN CHANGED SPECIFICALLY TO QUALIFY FOR THE MATCH? ARE YOU AWARE OF SITUATIONS WHERE PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN DISQUALIFIED FOR A "MATCH" BECAUSE THE CONTENT WAS DETERMINED UNACCEPTABLE?

ANSWER:

The entire media campaign is structured on a communications strategy that was developed during an eight-month process that involved expert panels, review of successful public health campaigns, input from researchers, and others. Scripts/programs are vetted according to message strategies (e.g. peer refusal skills, de-normalization, negative consequences, parent efficacy, parent skills, your child at risk) which are spelled out in the overall communications strategy. In concert with its Behavior Change Experts, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP), ONDCP/Office of Demand Reduction (ODR) staff determines whether messages are on strategy. We also ensure scientific accuracy with the National Institute of Drug Abuse.

Some areas such as news, editorials, programming exclusively about subjects such as interdiction, money laundering, or which have only passing mention of drug prevention issues are not qualified and thus do not count as the match..

We are not aware of instances where programs have been changed to qualify for the match, but we would not normally be in position to know. Networks retain ultimate control over their programming. ONDCP's input has been requested on several occasions to improve programming and increase accurate or strategically on message. It is not ONDCP's intent to exert undue pressure on the creative process with the match concept.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

QUESTION:

3. YOU HAVE DESCRIBED THE CURRENT MATCH AS APPROACHING 109% OF THE MEDIA BUYS. IN TERMS OF PERCENTAGES AND DOLLARS, HOW MUCH OF THE MATCH COMPONENT OF THE ONDCP PROGRAM IS MADE UP OF THE "SOFT MATCH" OF PROGRAMMING CONTENT? I UNDERSTAND THAT ONDCP AND ITS CONTRACTORS TRACK THE MATCHES USED, INCLUDING REPORTS ON EXECUTION OF THE MATCHES. ASSUMING THIS INCLUDES A RECORD OF PROGRAMMING USED TO MATCH AND THE CORRESPONDING VALUE ASSOCIATED WITH THE MATCH, PLEASE PROVIDE THIS INFORMATION TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE.

ANSWER:

Approximately 84 percent of total match is in the form of time or space ("hard match"), 16 percent of the total is a "soft match," of which the overwhelming majority (13 percent) in terms of media value is attributed to programming. This translates to approximately \$25 million in the time period July 1998 - September 1999.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

EFFECTIVENESS OF NETWORK PROGRAMMING IN ACHIEVING MEDIA CAMPAIGN GOALS – PERFORMANCE/EVALUATION

QUESTION:

1. WE HAVE SEEN A FEW EXAMPLES OF NETWORK PROGRAMMING WHICH CONTAIN AN ANTI-DRUG MESSAGE AS EXAMPLES OF THE "MATCH". IS IT POSSIBLE OR LIKELY THAT THESE SHOWS MIGHT HAVE BEEN PRODUCED EVEN WITHOUT THE EXISTENCE OF THE MEDIA CAMPAIGN OR INFLUENCE BY ONDCP? THERE HAVE BEEN AND CONTINUE TO BE MANY EFFORTS BY OTHER GROUPS OVER THE YEARS TO INFLUENCE THE CONTENT OF MEDIA AND TO SANCTION OR REWARD WHAT IS SEEN AS BENEFICIAL PROGRAMMING. HOW CAN ONDCP DISTINGUISH ITS OWN IMPACT IN THIS REGARD? IS IT POSSIBLE THAT ONDCP MAY BE SEEKING TO GET CREDIT FOR PROGRAMS THAT ARE REALLY DUE TO INITIATIVES BY THE ARTISTS OR PRODUCERS INVOLVED?

ANSWER:

It is quite possible that some of these shows may have been produced without the influence of the media campaign. It is ONDCP's intent to reward both the development and airing of on-strategy anti-drug and other related programming. In support of the over reaching objective and mission of the Media Campaign, ONDCP seeks to 1) foster scientific and behavioral accuracy in the depiction drug use issues and 2) give credit to voluntary anti-drug creative initiatives by assigning some "match value" to on-strategy programming.

In fact, the draft scripts for programming are often submitted to ONDCP by the writers, directors and producers after the programming has been created. ONDCP then comments on accuracy in depiction and provides feedback on whether it could be considered as part of a match, but does not (and will not) demand that changes be made to better conform to the Government strategy. ONDCP believes it would chafe against the creative freedom of the industry and would be detrimental to the ONDCP efforts of educating the creative community if we were to demand changes in content.

ONDCP has embarked on a vigorous entertainment outreach program to educate the creative community about youth drug use issues and the strategic message strategies that form the core of the media campaign. It seeks to use films, television and music to "de-normalize" drug use in the eyes of America's youth and demonstrate peer refusal skills, negative consequences and other key messages that are important in changing youth attitudes.

ONDCP distinguishes its impact by many factors, including: 1) the number of workshops and meetings with writers, producers and directors that ONDCP is asked to hold; 2) the number of requests by networks and studios for input on depiction and qualifying for match credit; or 3) the number of on-strategy movies and programs that are produced or broadcast in any given period.

ONDCP does not seek to get credit for on-strategy programming. Rather, ONDCP seeks to change behavior by giving credit, directly or indirectly, to the Hollywood creative community when they produce or air on-strategy entertainment content that are the voluntary result of artists' and producers' initiatives.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

EFFECTIVENESS OF NETWORK PROGRAMMING IN ACHIEVING MEDIA CAMPAIGN
GOALS - PERFORMANCE/EVALUATION

QUESTION:

2. WHAT FACTORS GO INTO MAKING THE DETERMINATION THAT SUCH PROGRAMMING MERITS CAMPAIGN INVOLVEMENT, CREDIT, OR SUPPORT? IS THE EMPHASIS PRIMARILY ON ACCURACY IN DEPICTIONS OF DRUG USE AND INFORMATION, RATHER THAN SUPPORTING THE NORMATIVE VALUES OF THE MEDIA CAMPAIGN?

ANSWER:

For credit to be given, the programming must conform to one or more of the youth or parent/influencer communications objectives set forth in the formal Communications Strategy Statement. This document, which the Subcommittee has copies of, was developed by the Campaign Design Expert Panel and refined by the Behavioral Change Expert Panel that convened in late 1997. Supporting normative values, or the communication that "most kids don't do drugs", is just one of these science-based strategic tenets of ONDCP's fully integrated social marketing communications efforts. Others include peer refusal skills, negative consequences, parental efficacy, and perception of a child at risk.

Accuracy in depiction is paramount. One of ONDCP's roles, together with prevention and drug use experts (e.g., National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), the Behavior Change Expert Panel), is to consult with the entertainment community on issues regarding the accurate portrayal of the consequences of drug use, on an individual level as well as the impact of drug use in society.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

EFFECTIVENESS OF NETWORK PROGRAMMING IN ACHIEVING MEDIA CAMPAIGN GOALS - PERFORMANCE/EVALUATION

QUESTION:

3. GIVEN THAT ONDCP IS TAKING AN ACTIVE ROLE IN HELPING THE ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY MORE ACCURATELY DEPICT DRUG USE, AND TO ADDRESS SO-CALLED "NORMALIZING" THAT MAKES USE SEEM INEVITABLE OR COMMONPLACE, HOW DO YOU ASSESS THE BENEFITS AND IMPACT OF SUCH EFFORTS IN THE SHORT AND LONG TERM?

ANSWER:

In the long term, National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) evaluation will determine the success of these efforts. In the short term, we have a number of anecdotal and qualitative markers of success. Content analyses, number of briefings requesting calls to drug information clearinghouse's phone numbers given at the end of programs, reactions from creative community, requests for briefings, etc. all provide a measure of the interest generated by the campaign. The past year has been very encouraging in terms of highly responsible network programming with accurate and on-message episodes. We believe the Media Campaign has had some small but genuine impact on achieving these successes. Because we expend funds on network programs we get an ear, an entrée we might not otherwise have to educate writers, producers and network executives. Scores of worthy causes intensively attempt to influence Hollywood on a regular basis. Our media buy allows us unprecedented access to that creative community - to brief them, provide materials, and make our case.

The relationships Campaign staff and contractors have forged with key creative people in the entertainment industry who create and shape content for music, television and motion pictures are contributing to the effectiveness of the Campaign now and will have even greater long run impact. ONDCP meetings with producers, writers, and studio executives have contributed to "in-program" anti-drug messages, more accurate depictions of substance abuse and the inclusion of campaign-related themes in shows such as *Cosby*, *ER*, *Chicago Hope*, *NYPD Blue*, *Home Improvement* and *7th Heaven*. This enables the Campaign to leverage its advertising campaign with programming that appeals to a large and diverse audience. As a result, this integrated campaign reaches the vast majority of Americans on a regular basis.

As there is no single "entertainment industry," measures of success vary greatly. The creative process for producing a film is dramatically different than that for television. Movie scripts are often years in development, and may or may not ultimately get made. Television shows may be canceled after only a few weeks – scenes you advised a writer about may never make it to the air. Consequently, in the short-term it is difficult to quantify success with numbers alone.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

EFFECTIVENESS OF NETWORK PROGRAMMING IN ACHIEVING MEDIA CAMPAIGN GOALS - PERFORMANCE/EVALUATION

QUESTION:

4. ONDCP'S STRATEGY CALLS FOR THE USE OF REPETITION. ARE USE OF MEDIA CONTENT TO MEET MATCH REQUIREMENTS, OR OUTREACH EFFORTS TO INFLUENCE CONTENT, MORE OR LESS EFFECTIVE THAN SIMPLY REPEATING A MESSAGE - SUCH AS THROUGH REPETITION OF THE SAME PAID ADVERTISEMENT OR IN BRANDING?

ANSWER:

We need both. Advertising provides some of the direct messaging. Programming however can go farther and provide both content and context. In general, strategic messages craftily woven into programming, especially if the audience is involved in the show (i.e. they have loyalty to the show) can have a lasting impact with a single exposure. Discussions sparked the next day ("Did you see...?") can be effective tools in spreading the anti-drug message on a peer-to-peer basis.

The Congressional mandate for the Campaign requires that its anti-drug messages be delivered through the full-range of media targeting young people: music, television, movies, the Internet, etc. The goal is to leverage the central role popular culture plays in the lives of youth, and utilize the full range of its visibility and credibility with young audiences. Success lies in not limiting Campaign messaging to a single vehicle (e.g. advertisements). As any business does the Campaign is leveraging its advertising with a variety of marketing techniques, including outreach to the entertainment industry. Successful public health campaigns have always included an array of strategies and delivery vehicles to ensure messages and images will have an impact on behavior.

Forging partnerships and alliances with the creative community has enabled the Campaign to harness the artistry, creativity, and inventiveness of all sectors of the entertainment industry, rather than limiting its resources to the talents of a single creative advertising team. Even the most creative advertising executives in the country will tell you that no ad, no matter how effective, or how endlessly repeated, can have the dramatic impact of one scene in a popular television show. As an example, compare a scene written by the writers of *Cosby*, and acted by Bill Cosby, and an advertisement of equal length and content. The paid commercial would cost the Campaign millions of dollars in production and placement, plus the cost to retain the services of a celebrity like Bill Cosby. But the goal is not simply to be cost-effective; impact is our priority, as it is yours. There is no question that a dramatic or comedic scene, featuring a

character the audience cares about, has more impact-- and keeps the audience more engaged-- than the message addressed in a commercial break. Consequently, we believe that television programming provides an invaluable vehicle for the dissemination of Campaign messages.

The total budget for the Campaign's entertainment outreach is a modest \$1.5 million per year. That investment has yielded invaluable results. The Campaign's anti-drug messages have already been heard by the creative communities at ABC, NBC, CBS, The WB, UPN, Fox, Disney, Sony, Warner Bros., the Writers Guild, the Screen Actors Guild, major entertainment trade associations and trade publications. Our outreach in the community continues.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

NETWORK PROGRAM CHOICES

QUESTION:

1. SHOWS LIKE "HOME IMPROVEMENT" AND "ER" ARE TARGETED FOR VERY DIFFERENT AUDIENCES AND PROGRAMMING CONTENT MAKES A SHOW LIKE "ER" MORE APPROPRIATE FOR A 10PM ADULT AUDIENCE, WHILE "HOME IMPROVEMENT" IS SHOWN AT 8PM POSSIBLY REACHING A YOUNGER AUDIENCE. ARE THE SHOWS ALWAYS SHOWN AT THE APPROPRIATE TIMES TO REACH THE TARGET AUDIENCE?

ANSWER:

The scheduling of programs is the sole responsibility of each individual network. Ogilvy & Mather and ONDCP have no control over the appropriateness of program content relative to the time period in which it runs. The broadcast networks seem to be sensitive to the type of content they air in the 8pm-9pm time period, acknowledging many more younger viewers tune in during these hours.

Many of the shows that air between 8pm and 9pm are situation comedies, which tend to provide more "all-family" environments. The exception to this is teen-targeted dramas, such as "7th Heaven" and "Dawson's Creek," which air at 8pm but provide content appropriate for older audiences, but are watched by many teens. The 9-10pm hour is a transitional time period, in which the networks air a combination of situation comedies and dramas. Some of these programs, such as "Chicago Hope," are adult-targeted, while others, like "Popular" are youth targeted. The 10pm hour generally features adult targeted programming, such as news shows and dramas like "ER."

Ogilvy & Mather insures that ONDCP messages reach the correct audience in an appropriate environment via our media purchases and advertising copy rotations. Ogilvy & Mather first establishes communication goals for youth and adult segments. Plan options are then developed that contain the appropriate media mix necessary to reach the goals. A separate budget is then established for youth vs. adult television buys to further ensure ONDCP reaches the established communications goals. Finally, the appropriate creative message is selected for youth and adult-targeted shows. For example, a program with adult-focused content, such as "ER," will receive a parent-directed message, while a program with youth-focused content, such as "Dawson's Creek," will receive a youth-directed message. These decisions are made using both quantitative criteria (Nielsen ratings) and qualitative criteria (consideration of themes, storylines and characters on each program). All of the youth-directed messages on the current media buy air prior to 10PM.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

NETWORK PROGRAM CHOICES

QUESTION:

2. SOME OF THE SHOWS WE REVIEWED ARE TARGETED AT BEHAVIOR RELATING TO ABUSE OF A SPECIFIC ILLICIT DRUG OR OTHER SUBSTANCE. ROUGHLY, WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THAT PROGRAMMING BEING COORDINATED WITH THE CAMPAIGN IS TARGETED AS A SPECIFIC DRUG OR CATEGORY OF DRUGS, SUCH AS MARIJUANA? COCAINE? HEROIN? METHAMPHETAMINE OR OTHER SYNTHETIC DRUGS? PRESCRIPTION DRUGS OR INHALANTS? AND SO FORTH. CONVERSELY, WHAT PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAMMING IN WHICH THE CAMPAIGN IS INVOLVED ARE TARGETED AT ISSUES NOT DIRECTLY RELATED BUT COMPLEMENTARY TO DRUG ABUSE, SUCH AS "GATEWAY BEHAVIOR", INCLUDING ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO USE BY MINORS, PARENT/CHILD RELATIONSHIPS, EDUCATION, AND PEER RELATIONSHIPS?

ANSWER:

The following provides estimates of programming being coordinated with the campaign targeted at specific drugs or categories, as well as "gateway" behavior:

Estimated Programming by Subject Matter Being Coordinated with the Campaign
July 1998-September 1999

3 rd Quarter 98 – 3 rd Quarter 99 Pro Bono Programming Storylines				
Category	# of Programs aired	% of Total	Value	
Drugs & Alcohol	36	7.3%	\$6,199,738	
Marijuana and General Drugs	456	92.7%	\$19,471,131	
Totals	492	100%	\$25,670,869	

Less than 3 percent have been on cigarettes or cigar smoking.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

FUNDING LEVELS

QUESTION:

1. WHAT IS THE TOTAL FIGURE THAT ONDCP HAS EXPENDED TO DATE, AND WILL EXPEND IN FISCAL YEAR 2000, TO PROMOTE MESSAGES AND CONTENT IN ENTERTAINMENT MEDIA THAT FUTHER THE GOALS OF THE CAMPAIGN?

ANSWER:

The total budget for the Campaign's entertainment outreach is \$1.5 million per year. This is less than the cost of three ads on the NBC program "ER".

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

FUNDING LEVELS

QUESTION:

2. WHAT ARE THE DIRECT COSTS TO THE ONDCP CAMPAIGN SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO INFLUENCING NETWORK PROGRAMMING; I.E., EITHER VALIDATING MATCH PROPOSALS OR IN INDUSTRY OUTREACH AND COLLABORATIONS?

ANSWER:

The costs of validating match proposals either on the part of the contractor or by ONDCP staff are not tracked separately, but are thought to be minimal. They are part and parcel of the labor hours of ONDCP and contractor staff working on this initiative.

As discussed in the previous question, total budget for the Campaign's entertainment outreach (to television programs, music, films, etc.) is \$1.5 million. This budget supports the costs to organize briefings, workshops, and related events and our contractor labor and materials costs.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN ROYBAL-ALLARD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

OUTREACH TO MINORITY COMMUNITIES

QUESTION:

1. THIS HEARING IS ABOUT ONDCP'S EFFORTS, THROUGH THE MEDIA CAMPAIGN, TO ENCOURAGE TELEVISION AND OTHER ENTERTAINMENT MEDIA TO INCLUDE ANTI-DRUG MESSAGES IN THEIR PROGRAMMING. I AM CURIOUS TO LEARN WHAT ONDCP IS DOING IN THE WAY OF OUTREACH TO HISPANIC AND OTHER MINORITY MEDIA, PARTICULARLY THE MAJOR SPANISH LANGUAGE TELEVISION AND CABLE STATIONS. UNIVISION, TELMUNDO, AND GALAVISION. ARE THESE OUTLETS WORKING WITH YOU TO INCLUDE ANTI-DRUG MESSAGES IN THEIR PROGRAMMING? IF NOT, WHY NOT?

ANSWER:

The Media Campaign's Hispanic Behavior Change Expert Panel (BCEP) member Amelie Ramirez has briefed writers and producers in the creative community who develop entertainment content for Univision about key message strategies that are the foundation of the Media Campaign. Behavioral science briefs on Hispanic teens are shared with all these networks and with the advertising agencies that develop messages for the Media Campaign.

Univision, Telemundo and Galavision did not offer programming (or "soft match") opportunities in their negotiations with the Media Campaign. Univision specifically will not offer celebrities in the public service component of their match. They do not have access to many of the celebrities who star in their programs because a number of those shows are produced by outside entities, not Univision. All these networks chose to provide "hard match" of public service time as this type of match is easier for a network to implement and control.

The Gems Cable Network (which is Hispanic-targeted) has produced several parenting vignettes focused around the ONDCP messaging platforms. While these vignettes are not considered programming, they do represent efforts by this network to allocate time beyond commercial announcements to disseminate the anti-drug message.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN ROYBAL-ALLARD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

OUTREACH TO MINORITY COMMUNITIES

QUESTION:

2. IN YOUR STATEMENT YOU ADDRESS ONDCP'S EFFORTS TO ENGAGE CELEBRITIES AS POSITIVE ROLE MODELS TO MAKE THE ANTI-DRUG MESSAGE MORE APPEALING. HAS ONDCP ENGAGED HISPANIC AND OTHER MINORITY CELEBRITIES IN THIS EFFORT?

ANSWER:

Since the Campaign began, it has benefited from the participation of a wide range of celebrities. They have participated in on-line chats, satellite down-links, appeared at special events, and are featured in PSAs. The Campaign has made a concerted effort across the board to engage Americans of all ethnic groups in its messages. To date, minority celebrities participating in the Campaign have included Bill Cosby, Lauryn Hill, Chuck D., Bruno Campos, Tangi Miller, Eric LaSalle, Tia and Tamera Mowry, Raven Symone, the Wayans Brothers, and Venus and Serena Williams.

ONDCP and Ogilvy & Mather are working with Bill Cosby to produce a video focusing on Effective Parenting Skills and Parental Efficacy, which is consistent with our campaign messaging platforms. These celebrities and others lend an enormous amount of credibility to the campaign, as the nation's youth already views these individuals as positive role models. None of these celebrities are paid for their time.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN ROYBAL-ALLARD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

UNDERAGE DRINKING AND PRO-BONO MATCH ADS

QUESTION:

1. PLEASE PROVIDE, FOR THE RECORD, THE MOST RECENT ESTIMATES OF THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PRO-BONO MATCH ADS THAT HAVE ADDRESSED THE PROBLEM OF UNDERAGE DRINKING.

ANSWER :

About 13,000 radio and television ads valued at \$12 million - about six percent of the total value of PSA's negotiated as part of the ONDCP pro bono match - addressed the problem of underage drinking for the first 18 months of the campaign.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN ROYBAL-ALLARD
 HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
 SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
 OCTOBER 21, 1999

UNDERAGE DRINKING AND PRO-BONO MATCH ADS

QUESTION:

2. ADDITIONALLY, PLEASE PROVIDE THIS BREAKDOWN WITH RESPECT TO TELEVISION PROGRAMS CONTAINING ANTI-DRUG AND ANTI-UNDERAGE DRINKING MESSAGES THAT COUNT TOWARDS THE PRO-BONO MATCH.

ANSWER:

Television Programs Containing Anti-Drug and Anti-Underage Drinking Messages
July 1998-September 1999

3 rd Quarter 98 – 3 rd Quarter 99 Pro Bono Programming Storylines				
Category	# of Programs aired	% of Total	Value	
Drugs & Alcohol	36	7.3%	\$6,199,738	
Marijuana and General Drugs	456	92.7%	\$19,471,131	
Totals	492	100%	\$25,670,869	

Less than 3 percent have been on cigarettes or cigar smoking.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN ROYBAL-ALLARD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

UNDERAGE DRINKING AND PRO-BONO MATCH

QUESTION:

3. ARE THEIR ENOUGH QUALITY PSAs AVAILABLE THAT ADDRESS THE PROBLEM OF UNDERAGE DRINKING?

ANSWER:

No. One of the biggest obstacles in increasing the number of pro bono match PSA's relating to underage drinking has been the lack of suitable PSA's from governmental and non-governmental organizations. The Department of Health and Human Services is now developing underage drinking messages which will be included in the ONDCP match.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN ROYBAL-ALLARD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

UNDERAGE DRINKING AND PRO-BONO MATCH

QUESTION:

4. HOW CAN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MORE QUALITY UNDERAGE DRINKING PSAS BE ENCOURAGED?

ANSWER:

ONDCP supports the inclusion in budgets of other federal agencies (Department of Health and Human Services or Department of Transportation) of funds for the production of underage drinking messages. These messages, if produced, could be played as part of the pro bono match. Since the campaign began, the match has generated 265,000 radio and television time slots for messages pertaining to drug-related and gateway behavior issues such as underage drinking. However, only about 12,000 of these have been underage drinking PSAs. ONDCP has contracted with the Ad Council, which is managing the pro bono match selection process, to promote awareness of the existence of this public service resource to non-governmental organizations throughout the country. We are hopeful that this will generate more submissions on underage drinking.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN ROYBAL-ALLARD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

PLANS FOR ADDRESSING UNDERAGE DRINKING

QUESTION

1. DO YOU STILL INTEND TO ENGAGE IN PLANNING FOR AN UNDERAGE DRINKING PREVENTION CAMPAIGN?

ANSWER:

ONDCP has, through the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, engaged in a number of initiative through its pro bono match to discourage underage drinking valued at over \$10 million dollars. Current funding does not permit ONDCP to develop for HHS an underage drinking prevention strategy with the use of its media campaign funds. However, ONDCP is working with HHS, including NIAAA, CSAP and other organizations such as National Council on Alcohol and Drug Dependents (NCADD) to more effectively include underage drinking in the pro bono match portion of the campaign. For example, the pro bono match is being used to develop a video program for children of substance abusers, including alcoholics, and will also develop a web site and other materials for this important target audience. We have also assured NIAAA that the underage drinking ads it is now developing will be included in our pro bono match.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN ROYBAL-ALLARD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

PLANS FOR ADDRESSING UNDERAGE DRINKING

QUESTION:

2. WHAT WILL THIS CAMPAIGN ENTAIL AND WHO WOULD CONDUCT THE CAMPAIGN?

ANSWER:

As indicated above, ONDCP has engaged and partnered with HHS and organizations such as NCADD to address underage drinking. Research based messages will be developed and serve as the foundation for such a campaign.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN ROYBAL-ALLARD
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

PLANS FOR ADDRESSING UNDERAGE DRINKING

QUESTION:

3. WOULD THIS CAMPAIGN BE MODELED ON ONDCP'S CURRENT MEDIA CAMPAIGN?

ANSWER:

To be successful, any campaign for underage drinking must go through the same development process as the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. This would include extensive research, expert panels, development of a communications strategy, and a totally integrated campaign as well as the development of evaluation tools to measure the effectiveness and impact of the campaign. In addition, a paid underage drinking campaign would have to address a broader range of issues such as binge drinking, availability of alcohol (liquor stores, bars, etc.), potential mixed messages from parents who drink socially, and others than faced by the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN NORTHUP
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

QUESTION:

1. WHAT AMOUNT OF TIME MUST BE DEDICATED IN A PROGRAM TO THE ANTI-DRUG MESSAGE FOR A PROGRAM TO REACH ITS MARK AS A SOFT MATCH OF ONDCP FUNDS?

ANSWER:

To be considered as a soft match of ONDCP funds, a network program must first request it. Second, a complete program, final or in-progress scripts must be reviewed as it pertains to the target audience strategic message platforms.

To determine the amount of time dedicated in a program to the anti-drug message for that program to qualify as a soft match, Zenith Media (our advertising purchasing company during Phases I and II of the campaign) created a formula for valuing programming content similar to that used by product sponsors for a program episode. The formula is based, conservatively, on requirements for a product advertiser to officially sponsor a program. For example, an on-strategy storyline that is the main plot of a half-hour show can be valued at three thirty-second ads. If there is an end-tag line with an 800 number provided more information at the end of a half-hour show, it is valued at an additional fifteen-second ad. A main storyline in a hour-long prime-time show is valued at five thirty-second ads, while such a storyline in a one-hour daytime show is valued at four thirty-second ads. It should also be noted that often, as little as the display of an emotion (e.g. a frown) may be all that it takes in a scene to convey an important on-strategy message.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN NORTHUP
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

QUESTION:

2. DO MOST TELEVISION PROGRAMMERS PREFER HARD OR SOFT MATCHES? WHAT ARE THE RATIOS? HOW DO YOU KEEP TRACK OF WHEN A STATION MEETS ITS COMMITMENT TO THE ONDCP MATCH?

ANSWER:

Most television programmers prefer hard matches (time or space), as these are the easiest for a network to allocate, monitor and track. Approximately 85% of the match was a hard match, with 15% allocated to the soft match for the July 1998 – September 1999 period. Ogilvy & Mather monitors the match by establishing separate estimate numbers for all paid and match activity within our billing and paying system. The broadcast portion of the hard match is also electronically monitored via CMR/BVS monthly tracking reports, which list the time, network/station, number of units and dollar value for all television match activity. Ogilvy & Mather is establishing an additional database management system to track the pro-bono match.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN NORTHUP
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

QUESTION:

3. CAN YOU TALK ABOUT THE GUIDELINES CURRENTLY IN PLACE TO GOVERN THIS PROGRAM? WHAT HAS BEEN THE INDUSTRY'S RESPONSE?

ANSWER:

Summarized below are top-line guidelines for fulfilling the ONDCP media match.

1. The pro bono match is done on a one-for-one dollar basis.
2. The majority of the match (minimum 51%) must be in PSA time.
3. Of these PSAs, no more than 15% can be vendor-produced during the quarter.
4. The balance should be in other activities, such as ONDCP-approved:
 - programming
 - in-school programs
 - public affairs
 - internet content and other contributions
5. The Ad Council has assisted ONDCP in developing criteria for topics that could quality for the match. Examples of these drug-related messages include underage drinking and smoking, parenting, drug-related crime, after-school programs, and messages promoting self confidence.

In FY 2000, ONDCP will also consider other contributions such as "stand alone" programs for schools or community organizations on youth drug use issues or community events like town hall meetings.

The industry's response has been extremely positive, with over \$181 million of total pro bono match time and space negotiated for the July 1998 through September 1999 time period. The industry has been proactively working with Ogilvy & Mather to fulfill the above guidelines for the 1999/2000 program year.

**QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN NORTHUP
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999**

QUESTION:

4. DOES THERE NEED TO BE A GOVERNMENT-ENFORCED STANDARD TO DIRECT THE ENTERTAINMENT MEDIA'S MESSAGE DURING THIS EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING? IF NOT, HOW DO YOU ENSURE THAT CHILDREN ARE GETTING THE SAME MESSAGE FROM THE VARIOUS MEDIA ENTITIES? HOW CAN WE MAKE SURE THAT PARENTS ARE ALSO AWARE OF THE UNIFIED MESSAGE?

ANSWER:

The estimated cost to society of drug abuse and dependence is \$110 billion, including health care, crime, incarceration, and lost productivity. At less than \$200 million per year, the ONDCP Media Campaign is an extremely cost-efficient means of lowering these costs.

By wide implementation of the strategic message platforms contained in the Campaign strategy statement across a range of media and communications vehicles, ONDCP seeks to ensure that all youth, parents and influencers receive a unified and consistent message. This approach, known as Integrated Marketing Communication, is based on research and the proven concept that communications plans are more effective when they evaluate and strategically coordinate elements from a variety of communications disciplines (e.g. advertising, public relations, direct communications) in a clear, consistent and audience-driven manner.

With this approach the advertising, match elements and the non-advertising component of the anti-drug campaign work together to deliver messages through radio, television, print media, the Internet, faith communities, health professionals, community coalitions, schools, parents, coaches, and organized sports. The drug prevention campaign also includes the entertainment industry component to ensure that drug use is depicted accurately on television, film and music. ONDCP employs state-of-the-art analysis and expertise to deliver advertising to maximum numbers of the appropriate target audience at the lowest possible per capita cost in all traditional and non-traditional vehicles. In addition to demographic targeting, ONDCP targets by psychographic parameters as well. There are different message platforms for different targets – whether they are kids, tweens, teens, or adults – and a vehicle that primarily reaches the precise target, not others, delivers each message. It is necessary to use all these techniques and media vehicles to influence the message about drugs in a young person's environment.

Certainly, the processes of review and approval that are followed for the paid and match advertising campaign guarantees that all such communication to both youth and adults will be on strategy. As the Subcommittee knows, fully half of the ONDCP Campaign targets parents and adult influences. For more information on this, please see the new fulfillment brochure for easy reference on some of the precepts that ONDCP seeks to impart.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN NORTHUP
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

QUESTION:

5. HOW EFFECTIVE ARE THESE ADVERTISEMENTS IF PARENTS ARE NOT ALSO INVOLVED IN REINFORCING THE MESSAGE? BY WHAT MEANS DO YOU JUDGE THE ADVERTISEMENT'S EFFECTIVENESS?

ANSWER:

For the advertising messages directed at youth to be effective, parents and other youth influencers must echo them. About 50% of the advertising creative and media effort is targeted to parents (please see Communications Strategy Statement on file with the Subcommittee). The message strategies for these efforts are based on input from a range of parenting and prevention experts. Advertising and other materials, including a recently published parenting brochure, are:

- 1) developed with insights from extensive research among parents and youth,
- 2) evaluated in finished form by parents and youth and copy-tested by an independent advertising research firm and,
- 3) tracked for their role in effecting changes in key measures – such as awareness, attitudes, beliefs, and intentions to use drugs – in the marketplace by an independent market research firm.

Additionally, our evaluation tools, including The National Survey of Parents and Youth, and the Community Longitudinal Survey of Parents and Youth will measure the effectiveness of the Campaign, including advertisements targeted at parents. Dr. Tony Biglan, a nationally known parenting expert on youth substance abuse is a member of on ONDCP's Behavior Change Expert Panel. He does extensive work with the entertainment industry briefing writers, producers and other members of the creative community.

**QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN NORTHUP
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999**

QUESTION:

6. HAS THE ONDCP (OR ENTERTAINMENT MEDIA) CONDUCTED RESEARCH TO DETERMINE WHAT MESSAGE IS THE MOST EFFECTIVE TO COMBAT DRUGS AND ALCOHOL? WHAT TYPE OF COMMITMENT WILL THIS TAKE? HOW EFFECTIVE CAN YOU BE IN FINDING RESULTS THAT CAN BE BENEFICIAL TO CHILDREN OVER THE LONG RUN?

ANSWER:

ONDCP and the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) have conducted more research to determine the most effective message, both preliminary and ongoing, than any current social marketing and advertising effort. The foundation of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign and all of its integrated marketing efforts is the Communications Strategy Statement (on file with the Subcommittee). This document, and the manner in which it was developed, is indicative of the care and rigor with which ONDCP approached its mission to educate and enable youth to reject illicit drugs.

The sources for this communication strategy included a review of published studies on etiology and prevention of adolescent drug use, smoking prevention campaigns, other public health communication campaigns, general consumer marketing campaigns and various other communications efforts targeting parents and youth. Results of unpublished research and comprehensive focus groups among the targets were also used.

In addition, this research evidence was supplemented by an extensive expert consultation process that included input from over 200 experts in academic, civic and community organizations, government agencies and the private sector and the establishment of a Campaign Design Expert Panel. The Campaign Design Expert Panel included experts in the fields of drug use and prevention, public health communication, advertising, market research, consumer marketing and public policy.

The commitment has been made and continues via the Behavior Change Expert Panel, comprised of experts in the fields of drug use and prevention, public health communication and research. This group reviews all new creative to ensure that the messages are on strategy for the respective target audiences. Any new, relevant information or studies pertaining to youth substance abuse prevention and public health communication is considered and recommendations made to ONDCP so that the Communication Strategy Statement and communication platforms can be revised, as appropriate.

The results will become evident over the next two to three years. Typically, social marketing efforts require two to three years to truly take hold, though preliminary evidence – already submitted to the Subcommittee – is promising. This evidence of the Campaign's "benefits to children" is being gathered by a massive, rigorous scientific study conducted by WESTAT under the auspices of NIDA.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM CONGRESSWOMAN NORTHUP
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
OCTOBER 21, 1999

QUESTION:

7. WHAT IS THE RATIO OF THE EDUCATIONAL MESSAGES PRODUCED BY TELEVISION PROGRAMMING AS IT PERTAINS TO BEING EITHER AN ANTI-DRUG, ANTI-ALCOHOL, OR ANTI-TOBACCO MESSAGE?

ANSWER:

Programming by Subject Matter Being Coordinated with the Campaign
July 1998-September 1999

3rd Quarter 98 – 3rd Quarter 99 Pro Bono Programming Storylines				
<u>Category</u>	<u># of Programs aired</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Value</u>	
Drugs & Alcohol	36	7.3%	\$6,199,738	
Marijuana and General Drugs	456	92.7%	\$19,471,131	
Totals	492	100%	\$25,670,869	

Less than 3 percent have been on cigarettes or cigar smoking.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM NIH
 "ONDCP OVERSIGHT--YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN" HEARING
 HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON
 TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
 OCTOBER 21, 1999

Has your organization done any peer reviewed studies on the effectiveness of advertising campaigns vs. messages carried in or through entertainment media? Are you aware of any studies that other organizations have conducted?

Answered at the hearing.

ONDCP and others have described the scientific evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of messages delivered through network programming and other media content in changing attitudes on social issues. Given that NIDA will evaluate the impact of the media campaign on behavior and attitudes of children and adults, can you identify any particular age groups more likely to be influenced by network programming? Pre-teens? Teens? Adults?

The Campaign planners and media buyers are the most knowledgeable about the viewing patterns of different audiences in terms of their favorite programs and when they watch television. The Campaign media buy plans attempt to reach each of the primary target audiences through their favorite programs, which seems to be a practical and appropriate approach to trying to influence them with messages. While NIDA-supported research has not directly addressed the ability of television programs to influence specific age groups, our prevention intervention research has conducted extensive research into the receptiveness of middle school children to school curricula with messages on social skills, norms education, and information about social, psychological and physical consequences of drug use [Botvin, et al., 1995, Pentz, et al., 1989]. These messages are quite similar to the prevention messages in the ONDCP campaign. This age group, which is the primary age group for the Campaign, was considered to be the most appropriate for reaching youth before they have had significant involvement with substance abuse. In addition, they are still quite responsive to parental guidance and monitoring [Dishion, 1998, Spoth, 1998] so efforts in entertainment programs that encourage parents to communicate strong anti-drug messages are likely to be successful.

One important communications grant on smoking prevention also looked at middle school students, both in the classroom and through the media, [Flynn, et al., 1994] and was successful at lowering smoking rates compared to the control group.

Botvin, G.J.; Baker, E.; Dusenbury, L.; Botvin, E.M.; and Diaz, T. Long-term followup results of a randomized drug abuse prevention trial in a white middle-class population. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 273(14):1106-1112, 1995a.

Botvin, G.J.; Schinke, S.P.; Epstein, J.A.; Diaz, T.; et al. Effectiveness of culturally focused and generic skills training approaches to alcohol and drug abuse prevention among minority adolescents: Two-year followup results. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 9(3):183-194, 1995b.

Dishion, T.J.; Kavanagh, K.; and Kiesner, J. Prevention of early substance use among high-risk youth: A multiple gating approach to parent intervention. In: *NIDA Research Monograph #177, Drug Abuse Prevention Through Family Intervention*, 1998, p. 229.

Flynn, B.S.; Worden, J.K.; Secker-Walker, R.H., et al. Mass media and school interventions for cigarette smoking prevention: Effects 2 years after completion. *American Journal of Public Health*, 84(7):1148-1150, July 1994.

Pentz, M.A.; Dwyer, J.H.; MacKinnon, D.P.; Flay, B.R.; Hansen, W.B.; Wang, E.Y.; and Johnson, C.A. A multi-community trial for primary prevention of adolescent drug abuse: Effects on drug use prevalence. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 261:3259-3266; 1989.

Spoth, R. Family-focused prevention interventions: a pragmatic perspective. In: *NIDA Research Monograph #177, Drug Abuse Prevention Through Family Intervention*, 1998, p. 459.

As you collect data on changing drug attitudes and drug use patterns, will you be able to determine whether these changes are due to the impact of the content of entertainment programs, as opposed to PSAs, other activities, or external factors? If so, how?

In the evaluation, we include several sets of questions that attempt to distinguish the various sources of information and influence on respondents' beliefs, attitudes and behaviors. As I said in my testimony, the exposure to TV programming is measured by asking whether and how often parents and teens notice the presence of anti-drug messages in specific media, e.g., TV movies, sitcoms, or dramas; TV or radio news; TV talk shows; movies in theaters or on video; magazines; and newspapers [parents only]. For advertising influences, we ask a series of questions about whether and how often they have seen anti-drug ads in general, e.g., on TV, radio, newspapers, billboards, etc. We also present the advertisements from the Campaign and ask whether they recall seeing them over the past 30 days. For other potential influences, we ask whether they have attended drug education classes, presentations, or activities, inside or outside of school, in the past six months. Despite our ability to measure these influences, we may still find it difficult to discern the dominant source of influence if the Campaign is successful at reaching its target audiences through all of these sources. The respondents themselves may not know which source has influenced them the most. We will try, however, to control for these other influences through statistical analytic techniques.

Is NIDA doing any baseline analysis that could be used to evaluate the effect of the "program content" component of the Campaign? If so, will this permit NIDA to link the contribution of such efforts to the behavioral outcomes that NIDA will assess?

Our first wave of data collection begins the first week of November and will continue through April. This first wave will serve as the baseline against which future waves of data collection will be compared. We will be interviewing respondents about TV programs and advertising as described above and how that exposure may be associated

with beliefs, attitudes and behavior. It is likely as the Campaign efforts succeed in expanding the presence of anti-drug stories on television that parents and teens who answer these questions will report more awareness of such stories over the next four years. We can then try to make some linkages to outcomes by examining the association between recall of exposure and relevant beliefs, attitudes and behaviors; and compare each succeeding wave of respondents against the first wave of data collection.

ONDCP's strategy calls for message repetition. Will the NIDA methodology for campaign evaluation distinguish between the impact of repetition, such as in public service announcements or branding, for example, as opposed to entertainment programs that may convey a message that has been assisted or influenced through campaign efforts, but which may not be repeated?

Our evaluation is also based on message repetition and the cumulative effects of multiple exposures to messages over time. The evaluation is not designed to be able to measure the effect of a single episode of a television program for several important reasons: 1) our basic research model calls for a high level of message exposure to influence the outcomes—a single exposure is not likely to be sufficient; 2) with the most popular programs capturing less than a quarter of potential viewers, we are concerned that most people in our sample will not have seen the program; and 3) we are concerned that most people are unlikely to recall the episode even 3 to 4 weeks after it has aired. Consequently that means that only a small portion of our six-month sample would have viewed the program, remembered it, and experienced the potential effects of the exposure. This small portion is likely to be too small to produce statistically reliable outcomes. But we expect that if the Campaign succeeds at placing messages in many programs over time, our broad measure will provide some evidence that such repeated and cumulative exposure will contribute to the overall effects of the Campaign.

TESTIMONY OF

Brian L. Dyak
President & CEO

on behalf of

THE ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRIES COUNCIL, INC.

before the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE AND
GENERAL GOVERNMENT

on

ONDCP NATIONAL YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN

October 21, 1999

Statement of Brian Dyak

My name is Brian Dyak and I am the co-founder, President and CEO of the Entertainment industries Council, Inc. (EIC). I supervise the development and production of all EIC programs that address a variety of health and social issues. I appreciate the opportunity to provide information that clarifies our industry's concern about substance abuse. We feel our efforts compliment the ONDCP National Youth Anti-Drug Campaign.

Chairman Kolbe, I am also the parent of an eleven year old son and thirteen year old daughter. My wife is an associate with me at EIC responsible for directing the PRISM Awards and Spotlight on Depiction publication, projects in partnership with The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the National Institute on Drug Abuse. (I will inform the committee a little later about these two important programs.) We both understand that today's entertainment product is vastly different than what we watched or related to when we were growing up. Our children are exposed to a barrage of media messages through television, feature films, music and music videos and interactive games. What concerns us as parents is the exploitation of issues such as drug use, violence, alcohol abuse and that depiction of these issues may not be accurately presented in entertainment product.

We have accepted a challenge to bring accurate, ideally scientific based, information to the entertainment industries creative community. My organization relies on basic principles in our approach that take into consideration our foundation within the entertainment community. These principles are:

Basic Principles

1. The entertainment industry is one small piece of the societal puzzle;
2. Recognize that members of the entertainment industry make positive contributions addressing health and social issues;
3. Action emanates from within the industry;
4. Utilize a non-judgmental process respecting creative integrity;
5. All action is voluntary and case-by-case...no hard and fast rules;
6. Entertainment industry sets and implements its own agenda.

Given these principles, I would like to share with you a little more of our foundation and current activities.

The Entertainment Industries Council, Inc. was formed by leaders of the entertainment industry who assembled sixteen years ago to discuss how the industry could mobilize its power and influence to address the issue of drug abuse and addiction. The conclusion of this group was that influence needed to come from within the industry, that the industry could be proactive rather than reactive, and that partnerships with the public and private sector interest groups were important to long term change. This group of leaders launched the Entertainment Industries Council, Inc. (EIC).

EIC is a non-profit organization established to bridge health and social issues to the entertainment industries and their audiences at large. EIC has been instrumental in affecting social change through its position within the entertainment community and through its attention to

national policy initiatives and implementation of legislative mandates since 1983.

EIC was founded with the purpose of serving members of the industry. Key to the success of the EIC is the importance placed on its constituency as the primary audience for EIC products, events, and other activities. To fully appreciate the constituency as a target audience, EIC positions members of the entertainment industry in the development process of the various products and events. Our constituencies are members of the entertainment community.

For 16 years, EIC has operated an office in Los Angeles in the heart of the media district, currently at Walt Disney Studios, for its ongoing liaison with the entertainment community. Additionally, EIC maintains operation in the Washington, D.C. metro area with emphasis on liaison with national special interest groups, federal agencies, and public policy forums. Given the breadth of the entertainment industry, EIC outreach to the entertainment community has also included liaison activities in the entertainment hubs of New York, Orlando, Nashville, and Las Vegas.

EIC is the only entertainment industry-based organization devoted solely to the entertainment industry's impact and involvement in health and social issues. EIC has no other primary agenda. This is the EIC enterprise - prosocial work in the industry is not a sideline. As an inside-the-industry organization, EIC is highly experienced in facilitating and partnering with entertainment companies, trade unions and associations to further a positive health and social issue agenda. Virtually the

entire EIC organizational structure is comprised of people from all facets of the entertainment industry.

With top entertainment industry executives representing major studios, broadcast and cable networks, production and distribution companies, record labels, and talent agencies among its Board of Trustees, EIC has successfully influenced the industries' representation and involvement in growing areas of social concern. Since the birth of EIC, numerous programs have been implemented that target depiction, public service messages and community service. While the organization developed around the drug issue, the entertainment industry work has expanded over the years to include issues such as alcohol and tobacco use and addiction, violence, HIV/AIDS, and safety belt awareness, and the overall depiction of healthy life styles through entertainment products.

In addition to the entertainment industry backbone of this organization, EIC has a history of partnerships with various Federal and state government agencies as well as private sector public interest groups and public sector corporations and philanthropic organizations. EIC's capability to represent the pro-social contributions of the entertainment industry is key to the promotion of accurate depiction of social and health issues. Our historical and evolving knowledge of the day-to-day workings of the entertainment industry permits us access and the capability to develop long-term relationships. This is complimented by a long-term relationship with NIDA, CSAP, and other federal agencies.

In 1995 EIC hosted then Drug Czar, Dr. Lee Brown, at our symposium "Youth, Drugs and Violence: Tragedies and Truths". Again in 1997, EIC hosted General McCaffrey's

first official trip to meet with "Hollywood". We organized the event, sponsored the event, and turned out press for this landmark visit. Why? Because we feel it is important and only logical to foster partnerships and encourage proactive strategies. By the way, Director McCaffrey was well received and made an impressive first step with our constituency.

The question at hand was how "heavy handed" the government might become to try and influence productions and the creative process. All were assured that ONDCP as well as other federal agencies were a resource. I believe he has made great strides towards perhaps creating one of the most coordinated federal efforts in the history of our country.

The realities of strategies employed by the ONDCP National Media Campaign must still stand the test of time and rightfully so, serious considerations should always be given to the management, spending patterns, and relationships established by such a massive investment of public resources. I commend you for taking the time to look at the "nuts and bolts" of the campaign.

In the private sector, outside of the ONDCP Campaign, sincere efforts are underway. For you to better understand our role, beyond the principles that direct us, I would like to share with you some of the specific functions/activities we conduct.

Generally speaking, EIC...

- ◆ Educates key members of the entertainment industry workforce about social concerns and trends;

- ◆ Provides scientific consultation to writers, directors, and producers to encourage accurate, responsible depiction;
- ◆ Publishes issue papers, newsletters, and depiction suggestions;
- ◆ Hosts meetings and symposiums of entertainment industry leaders to aid in the development of the industry's agenda as it relates to specific issues;
- ◆ Serves as a bridge between public interest groups and the entertainment field to clarify public interest concerns to entertainment industry groups as they develop, produce and distribute specific products; and to present the entertainment industries' strengths and limitations to public interest organizations;
- ◆ Fosters the partnership between scientists and creatives in order to maintain scientific accuracy and creative integrity in productions in an effort to mainstream the idea of accurate depiction and portrayal in entertainment product.

The Entertainment Industries Council stands side by side with a significant majority of entertainment organizations, association, and guilds to address the issue of substance abuse. Current cosponsors for EIC activities include: Academy of Television Arts and Sciences (ATAS), American Federation of Television and Radio Artists (AFTRA), American Film Marketing Association (AFMA), American Women in Radio and Television (AWRT), Association of Local Television Studios (ALTV), Caucus for Producers, Writers and Directors, Directors Guild of America (DGA), Entertainment Publicists Professional Society (EPPS), Music Video Producers Association (MVPA), MusiCares

Foundation/National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences (NARAS), National Association of Television Program Executives (NATPE), National Cable Television Association (NCTA), PROMAX International, Publicists Guild of America, Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA), Screen Actors Guild (SAG).

In fact, on November 8, 1999, these cosponsors will be gathering to set an action agenda for the industry to continue responsive activities addressing alcohol, drug, and tobacco use and addiction for the year 2000.

At this point, I would like to share with you some of our recent activities. In all of these projects, we serve as an entertainment industry resource, assisting creators with accurate information to be utilized for storylines and character development. I would like to introduce you to the three-element model we utilize in promoting accurate depiction in entertainment product.



We believe that to create accuracy in depiction, it requires projects that combine resources, education, and recognition. Providing technical and scientific resources educates the creative community, enabling the story and character development that can present accurate information via entertainment products to the viewing public at large. By then recognizing and rewarding these accurate

portrayals, we are continuing to encourage this creative initiative. We are currently engaged in a variety of activities in each of the areas of resources, recognition, and education.

Resources

- ◆ "First Draft"[™], Technical Assistance: "First Draft" is committed to providing exceptional educational outreach programs to members of the entertainment industry's creative community. Creators who take advantage of this program find the services effective in meeting their needs; efficient in use of time and resources; an enhancement to their own creative process; and pleasant and friendly to use.

First Draft is designed to reach out to the creative community during the pre-production phase primarily. This is a time of story line development and character portrayal concepts. It affords the most flexible and cost effective opportunity to offer suggestions and information about accurate depiction. The questions that arise during this period can be as specific as "does behavior X accurately depict the consequences from abuse of drug A?" It can also be as complex as consultation about a story arc of addiction, intervention, and treatment. To adequately respond to the requests for technical assistance, EIC works with alcohol, tobacco and drug abuse and addiction experts.

- ◆ *Spotlight on Depiction*: In 1993, EIC published its depiction resource encyclopedia, *Spotlight on Depiction of Health and Social Issues*, which was distributed to 2,500 members of the entertainment industry creative community. Subsequent to this publishing, various

advances in the science of addiction, as well as the need to more specifically address certain aspects of drug, alcohol and tobacco use not previously addressed in the book, led to a revised book which focused solely on drug, alcohol and tobacco use. A third edition of *Spotlight on Depiction* is currently in production.

- ◆ *PROFILE* Infoletter: Industry and issue updates published 6 times per year and distributed to industry database of 3500 members.
- ◆ *Program Talk News Brief*: *Program Talk* is a 4 to 8 page news brief that EIC publishes on an as-needed basis. The purpose of this publication is to address particular aspects of a subject in a more in-depth and editorial manner than can be accomplished in the more factual *Spotlight on Depiction* book. Rather than focusing on facts or specific suggestions for ways to consider depicting a subject, *Program Talk* examines a new or interesting aspect of the subject in a way that might cause creators to explore ways to address this new angle on the subject in dramatic terms. Three news briefs are currently in production, topics being alcohol, tobacco, and drugs and addiction.
- ◆ *EIC Online*: EIC's website, located at <http://www.eiconline.org>, includes access to chapters from the *Spotlight on Depiction* book, as well as issues of *Profile*, *Program Talk*, *Spotlight*, and news releases. It also carries the PRISM Awards call for entries and recipients. EIC has recently partnered with Join Together (www.jointogether.org) to add an information plug-in to [eiconline.org](http://www.eiconline.org). This plug-in is updated daily with news,

facts, and current events relevant to substance abuse and gun violence.

Education

- ◆ *Entertainment Industry Briefings:* A mainstay of EIC's current outreach effort is a series of 60 and/or 90-minute briefings for the creative, programming, and standards and practices staffs of production companies, studios, networks, music companies, and so on. On occasion, special customized presentations are created for specific productions, especially productions having benefited from previous briefings. EIC, using Technical Advisors or other appropriate individuals conducts these briefings where and when requested by each company. In the 1999 summer production season, briefings with the following companies have taken place:

Fox Broadcasting Co., WB Television Network, "King of the Hill", Tribune Entertainment, "Freaks & Geeks", Imagine Television, Paramount Network TV, "Sports Night", "West Wing", Warner Bros. Television, "The Pretender", ABC Network, "Touched by an Angel", MTV Networks, Comedy Central, "Dawson's Creek", Studios USA, The Disney Channel, "It's Like, You Know", Lifetime Television, E! Entertainment, Fox Family Worldwide

- ◆ *PRISM Generation Next:* EIC has initiated a program to reach the next generation of entertainment industry creatives through colleges of Communications, Television, and Film. A 2-hour seminar in responsive depiction is presented in the classroom, with presenters including respected film or television creators and experts in the substance abuse field. The goal is to mainstream the concept of accurate depiction and to encourage the

students to be more responsible creators once they begin their post-college careers. Schools currently participating include: Emerson College, American Film Institute (AFI), Cal State - Northridge, University of Southern California (USC), University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), and Loyola University.

Recognition

- ♦ **PRISM Awards:** Much discussion over the years has surrounded the importance of positive feedback to the creative community to counter-balance the volume of negative feedback the industry receives on a wide variety of issues. The industry has been made such an easy target for blame over the years, that it is rare that anyone ever stops to acknowledge the role the industry frequently plays in making a positive contribution to society. It was in this atmosphere that the *PRISM Awards*™ were born.

The PRISM Awards were launched in May 1997 as the entertainment industry's official annual recognition of outstanding contributions for the accurate depiction of drugs, alcohol and tobacco abuse and addiction. Sponsored by EIC and NIDA, in its initial year the PRISMs also recognized efforts that addressed violence as well. Over 40 PRISM Awards and PRISM Commendations were presented in each of six categories for entertainment productions, individual volunteerism, and community service.

Since that time, the PRISM Awards have grown significantly. We have entered into a significant partnership with The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to further evolve the PRISM Awards. Entries for the 1999 PRISM Awards totaled 104, continuing a pattern of growth that started with 40 entries in 1997 and 60 entries in

1998. The initial gross impressions of the productions recognized at the 1999 PRISM Awards, in all categories, totaled over 350 million.

1999 PRISM Award Winners

Initial Gross Impressions of Accurate Depiction

Additional PRISM Winners included: Pinky and the Brain, The E! True Hollywood Story, Showtime's "Floating Away", NBC's The More You Know, and 'Carol's Story' for Comic Book Issue.

The initial gross impression data represent only first run network-viewing audience, and does not account for reruns, syndication, non-household viewing, VCR recording for repeated viewing or promotional clips. Combined impressions totals were calculated by adding the available impression data for the specific commendation winning episodes of the shows listed in each category.

The Fourth Annual PRISM Awards are scheduled to take place on March 7, 2000 at the Beverly Hills Hotel in Beverly Hills, California. Call for Entries have been distributed and PRISM recognition will spotlight creative contributions that best exemplify the entertainment industry's sincere efforts to use its unique platform and access to audiences to present accurate information and depictions of drug, alcohol and tobacco use and addiction. Awards will be presented in the following categories: *Theatrical Feature Films, Direct-To-Video Productions, Comedy Series Episodes for Television, Drama Series Episodes for Television, Prime Time Drama Series Continuing Storyline for Television, Daytime Drama Series Continuing Storyline for Television, Children's Liveaction Series Episodes/Specials for Television, Children's Animated Series Episodes/Specials for Television, Movies, Mini-Series/Dramatic Specials for Television, Reality Series Episodes/Specials for Television, Talk Show Series Episodes for Television, Music Recordings or Music Videos, Interactive Software or Games, Comic Book Issue or Continuing Storyline, Community Service, Individual Volunteerism, Larry Stewart Leadership and Inspiration Awards, and PRISM Heritage Award.*

There are many advocacy groups who wish to and even attempt to work with and influence the entertainment industry—researchers, health organizations, government agencies, and policy groups. I commend the work of General McCaffrey, the Partnership for a Drug Free America, the Advertising Council, Media Scope, and others formally associated with the ONCDP National Media Campaign. In most instances efforts are reinforcing the notion that the media is a viable partner in curbing substance abuse. EIC further commits our organization for the long haul in

challenging and encouraging our industry to take a leadership role in addressing drug abuse.

I appreciate the opportunity to present this testimony. It is always a pleasure to report on the resources, education, and recognition that have been undertaken to "encourage the art of making a difference".

WITNESSES

	Page
David, Susan	37
Dyak, B.L	131
Fried, Lawrence	51
Goodrich, Patricia	51
Kelly, Marcy	51
London, Robby	51
McCaffrey, Gen. Barry	1

○

f

f

1000

ISBN 0-16-060048-0



90000

9 780160 600487

