

Minority Media and Telecommunications Council

3636 16th Street N.W., Suite B-366
Washington, D.C. 20010
Phone: 202-332-0500 Fax: 202-332-7511
www.mmtconline.org

ERRATUM

August 1, 2013

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: MB Docket No. 09-182; MB Docket No. 07-294
Erratum: Responses to Requests For Additional Cross-Ownership Study Data

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On July 25, 2013 we filed responses to the Commission's request for additional information about our cross-ownership study performed by BIA/Kelsey.¹ Please accept the attached expanded response to the Commission's question regarding peer review.

Please contact me should you have any questions or concerns regarding this letter.

Sincerely,



David Honig
President

Attachment

¹ See MMTC Supplemental Filing (July 25, 2013), MB Docket No.09-182, MB Docket No. 07-294, available at <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6017460470> (last visited Aug. 1, 2013).

Expanded Response to FCC Request for Additional Information Regarding MMTC Sponsored Study –
Expanded Response to Peer Review Question

[FCC Q:] A copy of each peer review, whether provided at the design stage or after review of a draft report. If any such reviews were provided orally, a detailed summary of the content of each such peer review.

[Expanded] Answer: Peer reviewer input was obtained in conference calls among the three peer reviewers, Dr. Fratrick and David Honig and in subsequent emails. The calls took place at the design stage to consider the draft instrument and sampling methodology, and at the pre-publication stage to consider the draft final report. The reviewers were not contacted or consulted during the actual interview process. On the design stage call, peer reviewers asked questions concerning the proposed methodology including: interviewee selection, sample size and the use of open ended questions, and ultimately expressed comfort with the study going forward using the draft instrument and sampling methodology given the time constraints. On the pre-publication call, the peer reviewers concurred that the study should be characterized as useful albeit it not reliably definitive primarily because of sample composition and the modest number of interviews.