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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Television news is the major information source about daily events for millions of Americans. In his well-known 1969 attack on network television news, Vice President Spiro Agnew put the number of daily television news viewers at 40 million. Agnew went on to comment, "What they [the viewers] know is what they see and hear on their television sets" (Berger, 1976, p. 19). With an estimate of 65 million in the daily audience, Altheide claimed in 1976, "we run our lives according to the pictures in our heads," (Altheide, 1976, p. 11) given us by television news. Calling television news the "pre-eminent source of persuasion in America," Smith (1977, p. 147) estimated the 1977 nightly news audience at 64 million. The results of a nationwide 1980 survey indicated 7 out of 10 Americans get their daily diet of news from television (Barrett and Sklar, 1980) and television news was found to be the source of most news for an increasingly larger percentage of respondents in nine national surveys done by the Roper Organization (1979) between 1963 and 1978. The importance of television news to Americans is indicated by the size of the daily audiences.

Recent surveys also indicate Americans not only consume large amounts of television news, they also choose television news as the most believable of the available mass media news sources. The periodic Roper Organization reports found television news is the most believed
source followed by newspapers, radio and then magazines (Roper Organization, 1979). Bower (1973) found television the "fairest and least biased" for a national sample with television news being selected by 33% of the sample, newspapers gathering 23% of those responding, and radio being chosen by 19%. The National Association of Broadcasters reported in a 1980 national survey that television is the most believed source of news for 67% of the American public (National Association of Broadcasters, 1981). Several books concerning the use of television in America have highlighted the large number of Americans who watch and believe television news (see Steiner, 1963; Bower, 1973; and Frank and Greenberg, 1980).

These findings concerning television news have been questioned regarding the way data were gathered or interpreted. For example, Stone (1969) questioned the Roper Organization finding that "the majority of Americans get most of their news from television" (Stone, 1969, p. 2). According to Stone, it is correct to infer from the Roper data that respondents rely on television as one of their major sources of news but incorrect to make the inference that television is the major source. The problem arises "when single answer inferences are made from multiple-answer evidence," (Stone, 1969, p. 1) since the question concerning where the respondents get most of their news allowed for multiple responses. The multiple responses do not, according to Stone, give an accurate picture of the respondents' news consuming behavior and are biased against newspapers and in favor of television.
Carter and Greenberg (1965) not only raised the same issues as Stone (1969) but they also replicated the research with a Roper-like set of questions in telephone and personal interviews. While the authors felt they adequately showed an anti-newspaper bias is probably operating in the Roper surveys, their results only served to confirm the Roper findings indicating television is the most believed news source. Other replication studies have also found results similar to those published by Roper (see Chang and Lemert, 1968; Abel and Worth, 1977; Reagan and Zenaty, 1979).

As part of their study, Carter and Greenberg (1965) asked their sample for reasons why they felt television news was more believable than other sources. The most frequent reason given by respondents was that television news had better personnel than newspaper or radio. Intrigued with that finding, Chang and Lemert (1968) searched for the reasons behind these responses. Using telephone interviews, these authors found a wide "believability lead" for television news over newspapers but the "better personnel response" came from a lack of acquaintance with newspaper reporters and not with greater perceived quality of the television journalists.

Chang and Lemert's (1968) findings are similar to those of other researchers concerned with the prominence of the communicator in mediated communication processes. Van Tubergen and Mahsman (1974) used still pictures of the head and shoulders of four well-known and four unknown people to ask their sample to rate the pictured individuals on the emotional scales of gentle-harsh, disagreeable-agreeable, fair-unfair, honest-dishonest, sincere-insincere, and ethical-unethical. The well-known people pictured were Illinois Secretary of State Paul
Powell, author C. P. Snow, unionist George Meany, and former Israel Prime Minister Gold Meir. The unknown individuals were university staff members. Van Tubergen and Mahsman found the more well-known individuals were judged more positively (ethical, honest, sincere, agreeable, and fair) than the unknown people.

In a similar study, Sargeant (1965) compared newspaper, magazine and television stores on how ethically the content was presented. Half of the respondents received stories which identified the specific journalist, the other half received the same stories with only the news organization identified. For example, one story was presented from "NBC News," while the other half of the sample got the same story from "Huntley-Brinkley, NBC News." The more specifically identified stories were judged more accurate, sincere, responsible and impartial. Moreover, the television stories were found to have the "most marked difference between the personal and impersonal presentation" (Sargeant, 1965, p. 42).

As indicated in the findings of Sargeant (1965), Van Tubergen and Mahsman (1974) and Chang and Lemert (1968), television newscasters differ from other types of journalists. For largely unexplored reasons the sight and sound of television newscasters give more credibility and believability to the news they are presenting. Indeed, the on-air image of television news anchors is the most important consideration when news directors are hiring new personnel. One veteran local television news director summed up his experience in TV Guide with: "Since there is rarely a dime's worth of difference in the editorial content of local news programs, the anchor man bears the responsibility for attracting and holding the audience" (Townley, 1971, pp. 43-44).
Newscasters are also touted the most important aspect of national television news. Don Meany, Managing Director of NBC television News, summed up his belief of the prevailing network level approach to on-air television news anchor personnel by saying, "The anchor person, the face on the screen, more than any other factor determines the news ratings" (Meany, 1981).

Television news managers are joined by prominent on-air news personnel with regard to the newscaster's visibility and importance in the news delivery process. As early as 1966, David Brinkley complained about the "star system" which had developed around national television news anchor people. Brinkley, who became known in most American households while anchoring the NBC national news in the 1960's with Chet Huntley, went on to propose the elimination of the "anchor" by having the reporter who gathered the information present that story on the air. Perhaps the most famous newscaster, Walter Cronkite, has also pondered the position and effect of the national news anchor. While commending the anchors for being able to "think on their feet" and for having the special talents to "present our material through the spoken word on a visual medium" (Cronkite, 1976, p. 24), Cronkite went on to call a US News and World Report finding that he was the sixth most powerful man in America and the most trusted, a "perfectly ridiculous assessment" (Cronkite, 1976, p. 51).

Television news audience surveys, news managers and prominent on-air personnel all find the on-air news anchor an important aspect of television news. For the audience, some evidence indicates the anchor is the most important element in the news delivery process. For example, Levy (1978) in a study of a television news audience found that the
newscaster was the single most important reason why active respondents chose a particular local newscast and the overwhelming reason for selecting a national newscast to watch. Levy's respondents, who indicated they make a daily appointment to watch the news, stated their deliberate decision to watch a particular newscast was most often based on the newscasters on that program. Similar findings are indicated in the results of a 1981 national study of factors prompting viewers to watch a particular local television newscast. In this survey, the news "personality or personalities" was the single most important factor in the audience decision of which newscast to watch (Broadcasting, 1981). Writing in 1969, Cathcart remarked on the importance of the newscasters for his respondents:

The television newscaster has been transformed from an on-camera radio script reader to the dominant figure around whom the entire newscast turns. On both the national and local levels, the newscasting 'person' has been replaced by today's newscasting 'personality' (Cathcart, 1969, p. 55).

As research reviewed later will indicate, attempts have been made to explain the importance of the television newscaster. Past studies have investigated the newscaster's on-air image by asking questions concerning such physical attributes as sex, clothing, and hair; and by asking about professional attributes highlighted by terms such as reliability, knowledge and believability. Some studies have even attempted a more integrated approach by asking for responses concerning the total image combining both professional and physical attributes.

The research done for this dissertation is an attempt to include items concerning the professional and physical attributes of the on-air television news anchor personnel, in addition to what has been called a
"para-social" interaction between the audience and the newscaster.
Discussed at some length later, the "para-social" interaction between
the television newscaster and the audience appears in past theoretical
literature but has had little systematic research investigation.

Including the investigation of the "para-social" interaction is an
indication of the structuring of this dissertation with as few
researcher based assumptions as possible built into the data gathering.
Despite the findings that the newscaster is the most important element
for the audience in a television newscast, the importance of the on-air
anchor personnel will be assessed in this study. Other elements in the
news delivery process such as story content and the broadcast station
will also be investigated as to their relevance to the news viewing
audience. When the on-air anchor is the focus, questions will be
directed at physical, professional and para-social considerations in an
attempt to include all newscaster items which might be important to the
television news audience. A more detailed discussion of the various
on-air anchor personnel attributes is contained in the following litera-
ture review.

Review of Newscaster Studies

For the most part, published research concerning the on-air image
of television newscasters falls into three categories: (1) Studies
which have investigated the physical attributes of the newscaster's
image, (2) studies which have investigated the professional attributes
of the image, and (3) studies which have included both professional and
physical attributes of the newscaster's image in attempts to describe
the total image. In addition, literature which assesses a para-social
interaction between the viewer and the newscaster will also be discussed.
Physical Attributes

Studies attempting to isolate and define the important physical elements of the television newscaster include investigations into the effect of his/her sex. Stone (1973) was interested in the effect of the newscaster's sex on the audience perceptions. Using four different audience groups (children, their parents, university professors, and university students), Stone used personal interviews to ask his sample whether or not the sex of the newscaster would make any difference in several areas of news reporting (news about the United Nations, city hall, Vietnam, football, and being a program anchor). With the exception of the football and Vietnam War reporting, Stone's respondents reported they had no preference whether the news came from a man or a woman.

Balon, Philport and Beadle (1978) were interested in the effect of the sex and race of the newscaster on the audience’s perceptions of news credibility. Using four video tapes, the same material was presented in the same style by a black woman, a white woman, a black male and a white male. Even the name assigned all newscasters was the same. Using a semantic differential form of paired adjectives (such as reliable-unreliable and believable-unbelievable), these authors found race had some effect on the audience perceptions but sex did not significantly change the respondents' evaluations.

Sanders and Pritchett (1971) developed a composite of how viewers thought their "ideal" newscaster would look by asking subjects to react to the physical characteristics of age, build, height, hair color, clothing, race, glasses, beard, watch and wedding band. Using mail questionnaires containing a 5-point Likert scale, the researchers concluded the ideal newscaster is a "man who is 31-55 years old, blond
or brunette, of medium height and build" (Sanders and Pritchett, 1971, p. 298). In the discussion the authors note that even though certain physical characteristics are preferred over others, it would be "naive" to assume physical appearance can be used alone to explain a newscaster's appeal.

Taken as a group, the physical attribute studies concerning a newscaster's on-air image are not very revealing. Sanders and Pritchett's (1971) ideal newscaster is physically average, while Stone (1973) and Balon, Philport and Beadle (1978) found most of their respondents did not care whether the news was presented by a man or a woman.

**Professional Attributes**

More studies have investigated the professional aspects of the newscaster's image than have been aimed at explaining the physical attributes. Using several differing approaches to the investigations, the studies of professional attributes have found terms such as knowledge, reliability and competence lead the list when the audience is asked about the newscaster's image.

Lynch and Sassenrath (1965) selected specific prominent national network television newscasters for their study of the personality dimensions of newscasters. Using Cronkite and Reasoner of CBS, and Huntley and Brinkley of NBC, these authors found several common dimensions. Using semantic differential scales from prior research and free association responses from broadcast journalism graduate students, the authors labeled the first factor "presentation." Accounting for 28% of the factor variance, presentation was characterized by the terms reliable, clear, accurate, meaningful and articulate. Presentation was
followed by "appearance" which accounted for 20% of the factor variance and was highlighted by the terms healthy, refined, smooth and coherent. "Humanism" was the third factor found, accounting for 15% of the factor variance; it consisted of scales with terms such as warm, friendly, personal, intimate, and emotional.

Markham (1968) had his subjects view three kinescopes (a recording made by filming the images on a television screen) of local television newscasters and found three major dimensions of source credibility. Using semantic differential scales from previous research, the three factors (which accounted for 39%, 5% and 4% of the factor variance respectively) were: "reliable-logical or validity of the message factor, a showmanship or dynamism, or entertainment factor; and a trustworthi­ness dimension" (Markham, 1968, p. 37). The first factor included scale terms such as logical, rational, reliable, consistent and believable; the entertainment factor was characterized by impressive, interesting, cheerful, original, good and active; the trustworthiness factor was composed of terms like kind, sympathetic and friendly.

Cathcart (1969) in his study of viewer needs and desires with respect to television newscasters used Stephenson's Q-methodology to find the most and least desired newscaster characteristics. Most desired by his subjects was that the newscasters be knowledgeable, experienced, know the news, speak with conviction, be unbiased, honest, trustworthy, factual and smooth.

McCroskey and Jenson (1975) investigated magazines, radio and television as news sources in their study. Semantic differential scales from previous research were used in personal interviews which led
these authors to a five factor analysis result accounting for 63% of the variance. The factors were: (1) competence—qualified, expert, reliable, believable, and competent; (2) character—kind, sympathetic, unselfish; (3) sociability—friendly, cheerful, good natured; (4) composure—calm, relaxed; and (5) extroversion—aggressive, bold, verbal. The authors concluded that the first three factors are the most important in perceiving from which medium and personality the audience get their daily news.

Three major functions were found by Singletary (1976) in his study of credibility of a news source. He asked his subjects to use a real news person as an image and to write down all the words which describe the newscaster's credibility. A second group of subjects were presented the terms in a semantic differential format and the results were factor analyzed. He found important the factors of: (1) Knowledgeability—27% of the factor variance and characterized by the terms educated, intelligent, and informed; (2) attraction—6% of the variance and characterized by the terms amusing, pleasant, warm, and humorous; and (3) trustworthiness—6% of the variance and defined by the terms truthful, reliable, objective, and reasonable.

The studies of professional characters are somewhat more revealing than the studies of physical characteristics in that similar findings point toward common terms which can be used to explain the newscaster's image. For example, Cathcart (1969) and Singletary (1976) found "knowledgeable" as an important newscaster descriptor, while those authors and Markham (1968) found the term "reliable" as helpful in describing the importance of the newscaster. Several of the commonly occurring
findings of the previous publications were used in the construction of the instrument for this research.

**Combined Physical and Professional Attributes**

The third, and smallest category of newscaster studies includes those which combined both physical and professional attributes of the newscaster's image. These studies attempt to describe more about the newscaster than is possible when either category is isolated. Using several different data gathering methods, these studies have investigated physical, professional and other attributes of the on-air television newscaster.

Reanalysis of viewer surveys completed by personal interviews in five major American television markets led Shosteck (1973) to classify reactions to television journalists into four broad categories. Listed in order of their importance to the respondents, the categories are: (1) Voice and speech—sounds good, pleasant voice; (2) professional attributes—knowledgeability, intelligence, and awareness; (3) personal appeal—nice and appealing personality, warm, good-hearted; and (4) appearance—dresses well and looks nice. Shosteck speculated that the newscasters who appeal most to the audience are ones who excel in one or more of the categories and are more than just good.

The Levy (1978) study mentioned earlier is an example of the research in this category. Employing the results of focus group interviews, Levy developed a personal interview questionnaire to gather quantitative data about respondents' news consuming behavior. Levy found half (53.2%) of his subjects could be classified as passive viewers because "their exposure was not actively chosen and represented a more or less accidental feature of their lives, demanding and
receiving no extra involvement" (Levy, 1978, p. 6). While passive viewers watched the news primarily because the newscast came on the channel they were watching or out of habit, Levy's active viewers watched because of the particular newscaster(s), the program format, or the quality of the news being presented. As discussed earlier, the newscaster was the most important single element in deciding which newscast to watch at both the local and national levels. The active and passive viewers were found to be similar in age and sex, but the active viewers had more education.

Levy (1978) measured viewing attention by asking his respondents if they engaged in other activities while watching the news. One-quarter of the sample watched the news and did nothing else, 41% also ate dinner, 26% read a newspaper or a book, 23% talked to others in the room, 22% snacked, 19% worked in the kitchen, 17% sewed, 15% cared for children and 14% did housework. Even the very distracted viewers reported in the preliminary focus group interview sessions that they selectively monitored the news by watching for a type of story or a special segment such as weather or sports.

Not surprisingly, the Levy (1978) and Shosteck (1973) findings are similar to many of the findings in the physical and professional attribute studies. Levy's study does more, however, than just investigate the professional and physical aspects of the newscaster. His work also examined the relationship between the newscaster and the audience member. This research focus falls into the classification of parasocial interaction.
Para-Social Interaction

In 1956, Horton and Wohl outlined what they call the "illusion of face-to-face relationships with the performer" (Horton and Wohl, 1956, p. 215) by the audience. These authors coined the term "para-social interaction" to describe the situation. Horton and Wohl theorized the seeming face-to-face exchange is encouraged, indeed sought after, by the media performer, but it is the invention of the audience as they come to look on the performer as they do their actual friends. By studying the performer's gestures, voice, conversation and appearance, the audience member comes to know the performer better than if the viewing were just casual. Horton and Wohl used early television performers such as Dave Garroway and the "lonesome Gal" as examples of media personalities who are successful in blurring the lines of the everyday physical and television worlds. The authors conclude the relationship between the audience member and the media performer is experienced as "of the same order as, and related to, the network of actual social relations" (Horton and Wohl, 1956, p. 231).

For most of the audience Horton and Wohl (1956) believed the para-social involvement with the media performer is complementary to the normal social interactions or as an extension of the audience member's primary social group. Some audience members, however, who are cut off from primary group interactions may manifest an extreme form of para-social involvement which Horton and Wohl termed compensatory. Serving as a substitute or surrogate for normal social interactions, these authors concluded compensatory para-social involvement would be more often found in the behavior of the "socially isolated, the socially
Inept, and aged and invalided, the timid and rejected" (Horton and Wohl, 1956, p. 233).

Horton and Wohl's (1956) discussion of the para-social interaction centered on entertainment performers in the media. With the growth in the past few years of interest in describing the television newscaster's image appeal, the para-social involvement concept is now being applied to on-air journalists. Levy's (1978) study is, however, one of the few available attempts at gathering data concerning the para-social involvement with regard to newscasters.

Levy (1979) hypothesized that the greater the potential for social interaction which the respondent possessed, the less likely that individual would be to develop a para-social bond with the television newscasters. While finding more than half (52%) of his respondents agreed that television newscasters are almost like friends one sees everyday, Levy did not find statistically significant evidence of the existence of a para-social bond between the respondents and the newscasters.

Levy's (1979) inability to find evidence of the para-social interaction may have been due to the oblique nature of the five items he used in assessing the construct outlined by Horton and Wohl (1956). Only the one item about being almost like everyday friends seems at face value to directly apply to the para-social concept. The other four items Levy used to try and tap a para-social involvement asked the sample to respond to:

(1) When the newscaster shows how he feels about the news, it helps me make up my mind about that news item.
(2) I like to compare my ideas to what the commentators say.
(3) When the newscasters joke around with each other, it makes the news easier to take.
(4) I like hearing the voices of the newscasters in my house (Levy, 1978, pp. 17-19).

In addition to the items, Levy's (1979) concept of the para-social involvement as a compensatory activity may have thrown his investigation off the track. As conceptualized by Horton and Wohl (1956), the para-social construct applies in either a compensatory or complementary manner, with the compensatory form only present for the socially isolated. If the complementary form is working for most of the television news audience, Levy's attempt at finding the compensatory form may have missed assessing the most commonly found para-social activity. Even though Levy did not find the statistical evidence he sought, his discussion and search for the para-social interaction is an indication of the interest in this concept with regard to television newscasters.

**Audience Viewpoint Research**

Levy's (1978, 1979) attempt to find the para-social interaction and his use of focus group interviewing as a data gathering method point to current interest in describing the news audience's behavior from their viewpoint. Respondent or audience based studies are new to the published literature on news viewing behavior:

> Recently, and somewhat belatedly, social scientists have begun to study the institutions and processes of broadcast journalism . . . Nevertheless, to date little research has been directed toward what Lazarsfeld called 'the audience experience,' that is, the subjective meaning of newswatching for the average American (Levy, 1978, p. 1).

Smith (1977) found little evidence of audience based research in the studies of television news published during the two decades prior
to 1975. He investigated articles published in several scholarly journals (Journal of Broadcasting, Journal of Communication, Journalism Quarterly, and Public Opinion Quarterly) for the period 1955 through 1975 and found few attempts to "operationalize concepts in terms of receiver perceptions" (Smith, 1977, p. 111). Instead he found most studies concentrated on source, message and channel considerations, while minimizing the perceptions of the receiver or audience.

The audience viewpoint was a constant consideration while designing the research for this dissertation. The major problem in incorporating the audience viewpoint is how to assess that viewpoint; that is, how to determine importance from the respondents' viewpoint. As discussed by Levy (1978) and Smith (1977), past research is not particularly helpful since audience viewpoint based research is almost nonexistent.

In addition to the lack of previous research, many of the available research methods which could be used to maximize the respondent's input are impractical for the needs of this dissertation. The high respondent input methods concentrate on the behavior of very few respondents, presenting a problem for research that attempts to generalize from results. Methods such as participant observation and content analysis of conversations or documents require a great amount of time and provide information about the behavior of very few people.

To maximize both respondents' freedom in providing input and the number of respondents investigated, two data gathering methods were employed in this research. Focus group interviewing was used to provide in-depth data about the news viewing habits from a small number of people.
The results of this high-respondent input methodology were then used to help construct items for a telephone interview questionnaire. The development of the two data gathering techniques will be discussed fully in Chapter Two.

Summary

Television news managers (Townley, 1971; Meany, 1981), prominent on-air newscasters (Brinkley, 1966; Cronkite, 1976), news audience surveys (Bower, 1973; Roper Organization, 1979; and National Association of Broadcasters, 1981) all indicate the importance of the on-air anchor personnel in the news delivery process. Several studies even indicate the on-air personnel are the most important element of the television newscast for the viewing audience (Levy, 1978; Cathcart, 1969; and Broadcasting, 1981).

The literature reviewed in this chapter focused on the newscaster's relevance by outlining results pertaining to the on-air anchor's physical and professional attributes, as well as the few studies which combined the two sets of attributes. The newscaster's sex was determined to not be a statistically significant factor for respondents (Stone, 1971; Balon, Philport and Beadle, 1978), while the ideal physical appearance of a television newscaster was found to be an average appearing male (Sanders and Pritchett, 1971). Taken as a whole, the published literature on the newscaster's physical attributes leave the impression that these operate in conjunction with other attributes.

The professional attribute studies found common terms such as knowledge, reliability and competence as important to their respondents when describing the television newscaster. Some studies indicate the appeal of combining both physical and professional attributes in studying
the on-air television newscaster. For example, Levy's (1978) study is a recent attempt to find the existence of a para-social interaction between the audience and the newscaster. As conceived by Horton and Wohl (1956), the pitfall in Levy's measurement of a para-social bond with the newscaster may have followed from the assumption such an activity would only be found to operate for a few, socially isolated members of the audience.

The lack of the audience viewpoint in past research was outlined. Levy (1978) and Smith (1977) suggest the audience viewpoint is an important, but missing consideration in past television news studies. In this research, two different data gathering techniques will be combined in an effort to increase the importance of the audience viewpoint in the research process.
CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

In any systematic social science investigation, several activities must be ordered in the overall formal research planning. First, the human behavior in which there is interest must be set off from other activities. A statement of the research questions must be created next, followed by the decision of which methods are to be used to gather data. Chapter One has already set off television news viewing as the human behavior in which there is interest. This chapter will outline the research questions and the data gathering methods to be used to answer those questions. Subsequent chapters will present the results and a discussion of those results.

Focus Group Interviewing

Focus group interviewing was selected for this research because of its ability to gather information which is primarily respondent based. Stempel and Westley (1981) discuss unstructured interviewing in their discussion of qualitative data gathering:

Open-ended, unstructured interviewing plays a prominent role in discovering how people define their realities. The voluntary character of the interview process is considered paramount, so that the interaction occurs as freely and in as nonstandardized a fashion as interviewing can permit, given the inevitable awkwardness in the relationship of strangers (Stempel and Westley, 1981, p. 365).

Under the heading of "less structured interviews," Sellitz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook (1959) mention focus group interviewing in their book
on social science research. These authors commend this method for its flexibility which helps bring out the affective and value-laden aspects of the respondents' answers. The authors maintain the subjects' responses in focus group interviewing are spontaneous, highly specific and concrete, self-revealing and personal.

Possibly the first discussion of focus group interviewing as a social science research method was written by Merton, Fiske and Kendall (1952). They conducted research during World War II for the Bureau of Applied Social Research and they undertook to outline the two main functions of focus group interviewing for data gathering: (1) heuristic—serving as a pre-test to find the significant aspects of the communication with which to construct questionnaires; and (2) interpretive—helping to clarify the psychological meanings of the results.

Focus Group Literature

Focus group interviewing has been extensively used and reported in marketing research. A fairly complete explanation of the background and uses of this method is available in the marketing literature (see Higginbotham and Cox, 1979).

Focus group interviewing was originally developed by psychiatrists for use in the therapy of emotionally disturbed individuals. The technique is based on the assumption that individuals who share an emotional problem will be more willing to talk about their problem with others who also have the same problem (Bellenger, Bernhardt and Goldstucker, 1976, p. 13). In the 1950's, focus group interviewing became a "qualitative" research technique because marketing researchers were using large sample polls which provided lots of numbers but little
insight into the affective meanings of those numbers for the respondents (Bellenger, Bernhardt and Goldstucker, 1976, p. 13).

According to marketing literature, focus group interviewing has several advantages which make it particularly suited for use in this dissertation. As already mentioned, focus group interviewing is a qualitative data gathering methodology which deals with the research subject from the respondent's viewpoint. In addition, the method is excellent for generating information where little previous research has been done and little is known. Some authors claim focus group interviewing has real value in generating hypotheses when little is known about the subject under investigation (Goldman, 1962, p. 44; Wells, 1974, p. 2; Biel, 1978, p. 117). As noted by Merton, Fiske and Kendall (1952), focus group interviewing is particularly suited to being the first step in larger research projects such as the one planned in this dissertation.

Because of the qualitative nature of this technique, focus groups are most successful when they allow the researcher to design a better subsequent research study using experimental design or other quantitative techniques (Bellenger, Bernhardt and Goldstucker, 1976, p. 22).

Indeed, much of the marketing literature warns of relying on focus group interviewing as the final step in a research investigation. Wells (1974) suggests that all group interview studies be followed by "carefully designed, precisely executed, large-scale survey research" (Wells, 1974, p. 10). Goldman (1962) stated focus group interviewing does not permit broad generalizations and it should be followed by a probability sample to confirm any hypotheses. Axelrod (1975) warns of not using this technique as means for circumventing quantitative research.
Focus group interviewing also offers the advantage for this research as the discussion moderator works from a list of topics and not a set of questions and the resulting information is, thereby, more from the respondents' viewpoint than is possible in most other data gathering techniques (Goldman, 1962, p. 38; Wells, 1974, p. 3; Bellenger, Bernhardt and Goldstucker, 1976, p. 13).

A final advantage of focus group interviewing in this investigation is that the respondents are stimulated and supported by each other and the interaction produces information which is more comprehensive than is possible from most other data gathering techniques (Wells, 1974, p. 3; Bellenger, Bernhardt and Goldstucker, 1976, p. 13 and p. 20; Templeton, 1976, p. 66; Rosentein, 1976, p. 113; S. Levy, 1979, p. 34; and Goldman, 1962, p. 38).

Focus Group Administration

Following the advice of marketing researchers (Goldman, 1962; Wells, 1974), four groups of participants were recruited for this research by contacts known to the author. Four groups were used because of the need for some indication of respondent differences by sex and since most of what is to be said has been said several times in four groups and "it is obvious" little will be gained from more groups (Wells, 1974, p. 6).

Three interview groups were constituted by individuals known to two contacts who were graduate students at The Ohio State University. These two female student contacts were married and lived in suburban areas of the Columbus Ohio community which brought them into contact with fairly typical residents. Utilizing social and business friends or acquaintances of the contacts helped to keep the group members
somewhat similar concerning social or life statuses. Marketing researchers warn about having widely varying respondents with respect to social demographics which is likely to lead to the more educated, more articulate members monopolizing the discussion (Wells, 1974, p. 4; Bellenger, Bernhardt and Goldstucker, 1976, p. 14). The fourth group was recruited by a third graduate student at The Ohio State University from her undergraduate classes.

One contact recruited two groups, one all female and one mixed sexes, from among her neighbors, friends, acquaintances, and Avon customers. The second contact recruited, through her and her husband's interest in ham radio operation, an all male group. The student group was also mixed sexes. Among the four groups, two were mixed sexes, one all male and one all female respondents. The purpose of the single sex groups was to see if any sex specific responses would occur in the interviews. Although few marketing researchers ban the idea of mixed sex groups as a cause of biased results, there was enough concern to warrant some control (Caruso, 1976, p. 55; Axelrod, 1975, p. 50).

The three nonstudent groups met in the early evening in the contacts' homes. The home setting was used because it would be easier to get the respondents to the site (Wells, 1974, p. 5) and the home represented a place the respondents would find familiar, friendly, relaxed and natural (Wells, 1974, p. 5; Axelrod, 1975, p. 51). The student group met in an Ohio State University building during an evening. Coffee, soft drinks and light food refreshments were made available to the participants in an effort to put them at ease and to try and insure their continued cooperation. Each participant
was offered and received a small payment ($5.00) for their cooperation.

The four discussions were held during July and August, 1980, each lasted approximately one and one-half hours and all were audio taped for later analysis. According to marketing researchers, if the audio taping is treated as a normal part of the proceedings, the respondents tend to forget the machine is operating (Wells, 1974, p. 5; Peterson, 1975, p. 89; S. Levy, 1979, p. 32). Each respondent filled out a short demographic questionnaire at the conclusion of their session (a copy of the demographic questionnaire is included as Appendix A).

The author acted as a moderator for each group. The author has had interviewing experience during several years of radio and television station work. An outline of topics was used to help insure all the important points were covered but no attempt was made to guide the discussion. Several suggestions contained in the marketing research literature concerning the role of the moderator were used to guide the author's role in the discussions. As discussed by Goldman (1962), the author attempted to keep the discussion within "fruitful bounds" but did not participate himself. The author also tried to keep the discussion on track (Wells, 1974, p. 7); tried to balance the participation by getting all members to contribute (Wells, 1974, p. 8); and, perhaps most importantly, tried to be a good listener (Axelrod, 1976, p. 75; Langer, 1978, p. 81).

Focus Group Sample

Thirty-two adults (over 18 years of age) were recruited for the interview groups. The all female group numbered eight, the all male group numbered nine, one group of mixed sexes numbered eight, and the
mixed sexes group of university students numbered seven. Group size was closely aligned with marketing researchers' recommendations. Wells (1974) recommended six to ten members per group; Bellenger, Bernhardt, and Goldstucker (1976) put the ideal group size at eight to twelve; and S. Levy (1979) recommended eight people.

The contacts were directed to recruit group members who stated they watched at least one local or national newscast per week and seemed willing to discuss their viewing experiences. Diversity was insured by not allowing any more than two members of any one household or immediate family across all groups. Non-television news watchers were excluded, as were individuals with an inordinate amount of information about or contact with television news (for example, reporters, camera operators, television news researchers, and working journalists). This last control came from warnings about "pests" in the discussions who know, or think they know, everything about the topic under discussion (Wells, 1974, p. 8).

Focus Group Sample Demographics

According to self reports on the demographic questionnaire, the 17 men and 15 women had an average age of 29.6 years and ranged in age from 18 to 50. Exactly half (50%) characterized their home dwelling as located in an urban area and the other half as suburban (no rural). The average household income came to $30,000 per year and ranged from $7,000 to $60,000. Each household averaged just over two cars (2.2) and over four (4.1) working radio sets. The average for television sets per household was just under three (2.8) with half the sets color (52%). Cable penetration in the participants' homes was 40%.
Various occupations were represented by the respondents. The largest group were university students (9) which wasn't surprising since one group of seven was made up only of students. The next largest employment category was management/professional (7), followed by skilled labor (6), sales (4), teachers (2), and homemakers (2). One person indicated employment as a sculptor and one as a mathematics research scientist.

The interviewees stated they watched television news on a fairly regular schedule. Over two-thirds (69%) watched an average of 4.3 early evening local newscasts per week; four-fifths (84%) watched an average of 3.7 weekly late evening local newscasts; and over two-thirds (69%) watched an average of 3.7 early evening national newscasts per week. ABC's Nightline, the only available national late evening newscast was watched by one-third (37.5%) of the subjects an average of about twice (1.7) per week. Only a third (28%) watched television news on a regular basis in the morning, with three-quarters of those watching the reports on Good Morning America. In addition, one in five (22%) caught "newsbreaks" during the evening prime time viewing and half (50%) regularly tuned into some type of special news program or report.

Focus Group Tape Analysis

The audio tapes used to record the discussions were analyzed in a three step process:

(1) Each interview was reviewed totally and notes made on the general topics and conversational trends with special notes on all topics first introduced by the respondents.
(2) Each discussion was then played and stopped every ten seconds while extensive notes were taken on all responses and specific words and terms used by the respondents.

(3) The notes from steps (1) and (2) were reviewed for respondents' ideas and comments concerning the television newswatching experiences.

Focus Group Results

Analysis of the focus group interview tapes indicated the respondents' comments about television newscasters could be grouped into two main subject areas which were labeled "physical" and "professional." The comments which fell into the physical category were further subgrouped and labeled "overall attractiveness" and "voice." The comments which fell into the professional category were further subgrouped and labeled "subject-audience affinity," "warmth," and "trust."

During the discussion of the focused group interview results, the all male group will be referred to as "male;" the all female group as "female;" the mixed sex, nonstudent group as "mixed;" and the mixed sex, university student group as "students." When comments pertain to specific national and local television on-air newscasters, their names will be used and local (Columbus, Ohio) broadcast station affiliations will appear in parentheses after the names of local broadcast journalists: WBNS-TV, Channel 10 will be designated by a "10" in parentheses; WCMH-TV, Channel 4 will be designated by a "4;" and WTVN-TV, Channel 6 will be designated by a "6."

Physical. The largest group of comments under the physical category concerning the newscasters was grouped into a subcategory labeled "overall attractiveness." All four groups mentioned the concept of
overall attractiveness when discussing the newscasters. The newsteam on Channel 10 was characterized by the female and mixed groups as "all attractive men" and "attractive and professional looking people on the set." The female group criticized Channel 10 for not following the lead of the other two local stations and putting a female co-anchor on the program, while the student group commented favorably on the physical look of the newsteam and set on Channel 10.

The female and mixed groups had critical comments for Channel 4's male newscasters with comments such as: "I don't like the way he looks," concerning Jym Ganahl; "he looks like he's been on a four-day drunk," about Vic Mason; and "he looks like a little kid, like he was in preschool and they should have someone more mature looking," about Terry Jessup. Channel 4's younger sportscaster, Marty Reid, was criticized by the female, mixed and male groups for his "silly looking mustache" which, all agreed, made the journalist look as though he were trying to appear older and more mature to offset the contrast with that station's older sportscaster, Jimmy Crumm. Channel 4 anchor Hugh DeMoss was criticized by the male group as looking like "a dog with droopy eyes" and "appears to be falling asleep on the set."

Local and national female newscasters generally fared better concerning comments about overall attractiveness. Jane Pauley, Sandy Hill and Jessica Savitch were chosen by several in the male group when asked which newscaster they would choose if they could have only one from which to get all their news. When asked why, the general reply was that those women "looked good." Beauty queen turned national sportscaster Jayne Kennedy was criticized by the student group for looking good but not having the necessary background for sportscasting.
Local female newscasters were discussed in various groups. The mixed group split their comments on Terrie Blair (6) with some liking her looks and others commenting on how the "cute little weather girl" looked better when she first came on the air but gradually lost her physical appeal as she tried to become a "sophisticated lady." The female group thought Blair used "too much makeup" on the air and "lost too much weight" after her growing popularity "went to her head."

Michelle Gailiun (4) got compliments from the students on her overall physical appearance, while the female group thought Gailiun's co-anchor Vic Mason (4) would not "make it" on physical attractiveness if not for Gailiun. As a general comment, the student group felt the trend for on-air news talent is toward "younger, good looking people."

The second subcategory concerning comments about newscasters' physical attributes was labeled "voice." Comments about newscasters' voices were mixed and cut across all the four groups. Most of the negative comments were directed toward local newscasters. Lou Forrest (10) received criticism from the female, student and mixed groups for having "no emotion in his voice," and the students criticized Meredith Paul (6) for not "moving her lips" which made it difficult for her to be understood.

Nationally, Barbara Walters was the only newscaster receiving more than one negative comment concerning voice. Characterized as "a terrible voice, whiney" by the students, and "surprised she got this far with a speech impediment" by the female group, Walters' voice elicited several negative reactions. Charles Osgood, Jessica Savitch, Ted Koppel, Max Robinson and Geraldo Rivera received compliments on their voices from members of each of the four groups.
Professional. The largest group of comments under the professional category was grouped into a subcategory labeled "subject-audience affinity." "Subject" affinity describes a quality some newscasters communicate to their audience which indicates they really enjoy the work they are doing. These newscasters appear as if they would talk about their areas of reporting as a hobby if they weren't being paid to communicate that same information on the air. Geraldo Rivera was the only national newscaster mentioned in this category and by the female group. Joe Holbrook (10), a local weathercaster, was mentioned by all four groups with remarks falling in this subcategory. Holbrook is an airplane pilot and an avid gardener (he gives gardening tips during his weathercast) and both these activities were seen as excellent reasons for his tremendous interest in the weather. Michelle Gailiun (4) was given high marks in subject affinity by the mixed group with comments such as "likes what she is doing and knows what she is talking about," and "you feel she is into it and this is her thing."

"Audience" affinity comments applied to newscasters who made some type of contact with their audience. Holbrook (10) appears not only interested in his subject matter, but also seems to make contact with his audience while discussing the weather. With comments such as "he is talking to you, not just reading," and "puts himself in his weather report," Holbrook was praised by both the mixed and student groups. Lou Forrest (10) was criticized by both the male and student groups as seemingly disinterested and distant.

The second subcategory designation under professional was labeled "warmth." Once again, local newscasters seemed to generate most of the negative comments. Characterizing the banter between anchor
Hugh DeMoss (4) and sportscaster Jimmy Crumm (4) as a "dog and pony show" and between anchor Vic Mason (4) and Crumm as "like a Chevy Chase scene," Channel 4's on-air personnel got critical comments about their attempts at creating a feeling of warmth on the set. The female group thought Channel 10's newsteam was successful at presenting a relaxed atmosphere and would have added to that appearance by having the group work in their shirt sleeves. The women also thought sportscaster Crumm (4), who doesn't wear a tie while on the air, looks relaxed and the "way a sports reporter should look." Frank Reynolds was the only national newscaster complimented for an easy-going and warm on-air style.

The third professional subcategory was labeled "trust." Walter Cronkite was noted by all groups concerning trust: Female group—"Walter isn't going to lie to you," "you know what's coming out of his mouth is true," and "daddy's going to tell us the news;" the male group—"if Walter tells you the news, it is all right," and "a person you can trust;" the mixed group—"his years in the business give him the necessary experience;" the students—"Walter has been around so long everyone trusts him. He could say the world is flat and everyone would believe him." Habit seems to play some role in the development of Cronkite's aura of trust as, in addition to the mixed group's comments about years of experience, the male group commented on Walter becoming a habit in the 1960's when, "If you didn't watch Huntley and Brinkley and turned the dial, there was Walter."

On the local level, weathercaster Joe Holbrook (10) and anchor Michelle Gaiiun (4) received favorable comments concerning the concept of trust. The students' comments about Holbrook included: "he knows
what he is talking about and sounds positive," and "you believe him."
The female group commented on GailJun with "she acts like she could be
me, a normal lady."

Other findings. In addition to the newscaster comments, the focus
group interviews also produced some information about the respondents'
news viewing behavior. Of interest in this discussion was that "habit"
and "because the set was on that channel for another program" were the
two most frequently mentioned reasons for watching a certain station
for both national and local news. Respondents from the female, male
and mixed groups all said they watched a specific national newscast
because their parents had passed along that habit. Walter Cronkite
and CBS national news became a habit and a point of discussion for many
respondents. Other comments indicated the respondents watched whatever
newscast was on the channel before or after the program they wanted to
watch.

Taken as a whole, the results collected by the focus group inter-
views indicate elements of the on-air newscasters' image which seem
important to the respondents. The newscaster attributes which were
important to the respondents also appear in many of the studies out-
lined in Chapter One. This confirmation was helpful in the construction
of several of the items created for the telephone questionnaire.

Research Questions

As indicated in the previous literature and by the need for focus
group interviewing, the research in this dissertation is primarily
exploratory in nature in that it "seeks what is rather than predicts
relations to be found" (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 406). As discussed in
Chapter One, the investigation is focused on explaining the meaning of
television news and newscasters to the viewing audience. As outlined in the previous research, little is known about either overall viewing behavior or the use of on-air anchor personnel from the audience standpoint. For that reason, the research and research questions for this investigation must be general in nature.

The search for "what is" can be guided by a statement of the research interests in an interrogative question and criteria can be established concerning what is a good problem statement (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 17). Kerlinger believes the problem should be stated clearly and unambiguously in a question form and the statement should imply the possibility of empirical testing. The first question for this investigation concerns the local stations from which the audience member gets his/her television news and the second concerns the on-air anchor personnel who deliver local news. Both main questions have subquestions:

1. What is the relevance to the television news viewing audience of the local station and the attributes of the newscast?
   a. What is the relevance to the local television news viewing audience of program sequencing and channel habit of the local broadcast station?
   b. What is the relevance to the local television news viewing audience of the newscasters, the news content and the program format?
   c. What is the relevance to the local television news viewing audience of the physical reception of the broadcast station?

2. What is the relevance to the television news viewing audience of the local on-air anchor personnel?
a. What is the relevance to the television news viewing audience of the physical attributes of the local on-air anchor personnel?

b. What is the relevance to the television news viewing audience of the professional attributes of the local on-air anchor personnel?

c. What is the relevance to the television news viewing audience of a para-social interaction with the local on-air anchor personnel?

Telephone Interviewing

Telephone interviewing is usually discussed in the literature under the general heading of survey research (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 414; Babble, 1979, p. 343; Comstock and McCombs, 1981, p. 144). According to Kerlinger (1973) the purpose of survey research is to select and study samples taken from the population or universe. Studying the samples is directed at the discovery of the distributions, incidence and interrelationships among the investigated variables which are characteristic of the sample's psychological and sociological makeup.

Telephone interviewing was selected for the research needs of this dissertation for several reasons: (1) Telephone interviewing is a relatively fast and inexpensive method of gathering large numbers of responses (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 414). (2) The findings of previous literature, which are primarily researcher based, could be used in conjunction with the focus group interview findings, which came from a primarily respondent based methodology, to construct items for the interview questionnaire. (3) The telephone interview questionnaire could easily be constructed to flow from items asking about general
television viewing to specific segments about the local broadcast station and local on-air television newscasters. Respondents could be funneled through the questionnaire to gather both general and specific answers. (4) The questionnaire could be constructed so as to minimize the problem of respondent candor concerning the social desirability of the responses while utilizing a methodology which can maximize the number of respondents reached.

**Telephone Interview Questionnaire Construction**

The questionnaire (a copy of which is attached as Appendix B) opened with a greeting stating the call was from the Department of Communication at Ohio State University and this short survey concerned local television news. The interviewees were told their telephone numbers were selected randomly from homes in the Columbus area and all answers would be kept strictly confidential. If the respondent agreed to help, they were told the survey concerned television news broadcast on the Columbus stations and that each question should be given careful thought but that the interviewer was interested in the respondent's opinions and there were no right or wrong answers to the questions.

Questionnaire items 1, 2, and 3 asked the respondent how many local newscasts they had watched in the previous week. If the respondent said they had not watched a local newscast in the previous week, the interview was terminated. The purpose was to include respondents who watched local television newscasts with some regularity.

**Viewing attentiveness.** Viewing attentiveness was the focus of questionnaire items 4 through 10. The respondent reported whether or not local newscasts were watched from the start and how they managed to tune in at the right time. The respondent was then asked if they
watched for parts or particular stories in the newscast and if they engaged in other activities while watching the news.

Station importance. The respondent was asked in questionnaire items 11 through 14 about the local broadcast station from which they got their news. First they were asked if they normally watched one of the three available stations rather than the other two, or did they switch between all three. If the respondent expressed no interest in choosing one station over the other two choices, the interview moved to item 15 and started a series of questions about the local on-air newscasters. If one broadcast station was selected, item 13 asked the respondent to answer a group of scale items on the various attributes which might be reasons one station was selected rather than the other available choices. The interviewee answered on a five-point scale with choices of strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, and strongly agree. The scales were phrased: I watch **(station selected)** because of ____________ with the various attributes placed after the because. The attributes which made up the scales came from three areas of reasons why that station might be selected: the viewing behavior, the program content, and physical reception.

Concerning viewing behavior, the respondent was asked about the importance of the program which came on before the local newscast (Levy, 1978; focus group interviews); the program which came on after the local newscast (Levy, 1978; focus group interviews); and the channel habit of watching "because the TV set is normally tuned to that channel" (Levy, 1978; focus group interviews). Concerning program content, the respondent was asked about the importance of the program's overall appearance, "the program looks good;" the newscasters or
"people who present the news, weather and sports" (Levy, 1978, *Broadcasting*, 1981; focus group interviews); and the news stories (Levy, 1978). Concerning physical reception, the respondents were asked about the importance that the news "comes in clearer than on the other channels." Item 14 finished the section on local stations by asking the respondents how long they had regularly watched the news on the station they had selected (in years and months).

**Newscaster importance.** Questionnaire items 15 through 36 asked for responses concerning local on-air newscasters. The respondent was asked to think about "local newscasters—the people you see every day who do the news, weather and sports on the Columbus station." The respondents were then asked for a name of a newscaster they were more interested in than the others. "More interested" was selected to avoid terms which would indicate a direction for the respondent's interest. For example, asking about the newscaster which the respondent liked more or knew more about might suggest the kind of answers the interviewer wanted to gather. If the respondent could not name a specific local on-air newscaster but could describe a journalist, the interviewer was directed to probe the response with the help of a sheet which described the local on-air anchor personnel (news, weather and sports, weekday and weekend). A copy of the description-assistance sheet is attached as Appendix C. If the respondent could not or would not name a specific local newscaster, the interview continued with item 37 which started the respondent demographic section.

If a local newscaster was named by the respondent, an imaginary thermometer was used to get a rating on that newscaster. This item (number 16) was used to help focus the respondent's thinking about their
selected newscaster. The relationship between the respondent and their selected newscaster was placed by the respondent on a scale which ran seven steps from extremely warm to extremely cool.

With a specific newscaster firmly in mind from items 15 and 16, items 17 through 34 were designed to explore the relationship between the respondent and that newscaster. These items asked for responses on a five-point scale of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. The items were phrased: I think

____ (selected newscaster's name) __________ is ________________

with various newscaster elements placed in the second position. The 18 elements were derived from the findings of previous literature, the preliminary focus group interviews, and items created to try and tap any existence of a para-social interaction between the respondent and the newscaster. Six of the 18 items were directed at responses concerning the physical attributes of the newscaster, six items were directed at the professional attributes of the newscaster, six were designed to probe the possibility of a para-social interaction between the respondent and the newscaster. The elements, which were presented in a series order to the respondent, are listed in Table 1 with the references from which the attribute was extracted.

The three final items (27, 30, and 33) under para-social were created by the author to try and bridge the gap between social and para-social interactions. Talking to the newscaster (item 27) comes from the often discussed habit that viewers have of talking back to the performers. Item 27 takes that concept one step further by asking about the similarity between real and television conversations. Knowing more about the newscaster's activities off the air (item 30)
comes from the tremendous popularity of media coverage of various
types of on-air personalities as they go about their nonworking lives.
The idea for helping to "make the day's problems easier" (item 33)
comes from the use of interpersonal friends for that purpose in the
author's life and the lives of those the author has observed.

Funneling Procedures

Before outlining the questionnaire administration, the issue of
the funneling of responses deserves discussion. As mentioned during
the introduction to telephone interviewing, the respondent was asked
about their viewing frequency and those who had not watched at least
one local newscast in the previous week were not interviewed further.
The second funneling point separated the sample into those who watched
one of the three available local broadcast stations and those who made
no distinction as to where they got their local Columbus television
news. Items 11 and 12 made that determination and those who made no
distinction were not asked to respond to the several parts of item 13.
This separation was made to split the sample into two groups and, with
statistical analyses performed later, to see if these two groups were
different and how they were different. The third, and final, funnel
point was item 15 for which the respondent indicated whether or not
they were more interested in one or more local newscasters than in the
other on-air news personnel. As with items 11 and 12, item 15 was
designed to split the sample into those interested in specific newscasters
and those not interested in any particular on-air journalist.
These two groups would be compared on their demographics to determine
if they are different and on what measures. In addition, the number of
respondents interested in either the local station or local newscasters
would give some indication of the overall importance of these functions of the newscast.

Telephone Questionnaire Administration

The telephone interviews were conducted during August 1981. Five paid telephonists were used to gather the responses. Three of the interviewers were experienced in this type of telephone survey through work for the Polimetrics Laboratory of Ohio State University, while the remaining two interviewers were trained in graduate courses at The Ohio State University. A training session for all telephonists was conducted by the author on August 11, 1981. During training, the questionnaire items were discussed, as was the need for accuracy, acceptable methods of probing (particularly at the important funnel points), and the use of periodic statements which were written into the questionnaire to try to continually encourage the respondents to finish the interview.

The interviews took place on August 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24 and 25. Calling times on weekdays were 4:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m., with noon to 6:00 p.m. as calling times on Saturday. As one of the graduate students acting as an interviewer was also the survey manager and was present during all data collection, no call-backs were made to check the honesty of the other interviewers.

Telephone Interview Sample

The primary disadvantage of using telephone interviewing in early social science research was the exclusion of respondents who did not have telephones or who had unlisted numbers. As late as 1965, 19% of the American households still did not have a telephone (Lucas and Adams, 1977, p. 2). Particularly underrepresented were lower income families.
By the start of the 1970's, however, "the proportion of the population with telephones had come to reflect substantially the demography of the entire population" (Lucas and Adams, 1977, p. 2). As telephones have become even more common to all Americans since 1970, telephone surveys cannot be faulted for excluding respondents on the basis of no telephone access (Klecka and Tuchfarber, 1978, p. 106).

The second problem with telephone interviewing is the people with unlisted numbers. As this group tends to be more affluent, excluding these potential respondents is as great a source of bias as excluding the nontelephone owners. The solution to this problem has been the development of random digit and added digit dialing methods (Lucas and Adams, 1977; Babble, 1979; National Association of Broadcasters 1980a and 1980b).

Random digit dialing "makes it possible to ignore directories" (Comstock and McCombs, 1981, p. 147) and can be easily accomplished through several available computer programs. Added digit dialing starts with the current telephone directories in the selected communities and changes the final digit in each selected number to include the representation of unlisted telephone numbers (Karkoff, 1980). The only possible systematic source of error for added digit dialing is the grouping of all unlisted numbers in specific exchanges. The unlisted numbers in Columbus, Ohio are not grouped in exchanges but are scattered throughout the rest of the normal exchanges (Karkoff, 1980, p. 9).

The sample selected for this research was accomplished with the aid of a computer program developed by the Polimetrics Laboratory, Ohio State University. The program was based on existing telephone
directories but structured to include unlisted numbers through adding a digit to the last digit of the selected telephone number (Karkoff, 1980, p. 9). The program was designed to generate call sheets which had spaces for the selected telephone number and for a code to describe the interaction between the respondent and the interviewer for unreached numbers or incompleted responses. In addition, three blank columns were provided for making up to three attempts to reach the selected number. The program generated spaces for 2000 telephone numbers as it was hoped this research would gather information from 400 respondents and the program is based on a 20% completion rate (Karkoff, 1980, p. 8). Folders for filing the completed call sheets were also generated and the number of male and female respondents was listed on each folder heading to help balance respondents by sex.

Completed interviews were accomplished with only 258 respondents and not the 400 respondents originally planned. The financial support necessary to pay the interviewers was not sufficient to allow the total number of respondents to reach 400. There were 110 male respondents, 148 female respondents, and all but 15 respondents answered the various parts of item 13 concerning elements of the respondent's choice of which local broadcast station was used to get the news. Respondents who could not or would not identify a specific newscaster numbered 111, while 147 identified a particular newscaster and answered the 18 items concerning the newscaster's professional and physical attributes and whether or not a para-social bond existed between the audience member and the newscaster.
Chapter Two has outlined the methods used to collect the data reported for this investigation. As Chapter One set television news viewing as the human behavior to be investigated, Chapter Two has reviewed the process of gathering information about that behavior.

Focus group interviewing was discussed first and its worth as a nonresearcher based methodology, as a preliminary research tool, and as a method which gathers affective answers from respondents was outlined. The literature which relates to the use of focus group interviewing was discussed and the administration and results of the interviews which were part of this investigation were detailed.

The research goals of this dissertation were presented in question form and broken down into the local television station and the local on-air anchor personnel areas.

The chapter continued with a discussion of the telephone interviews. The reasons for using this method were followed by the explanation of the questionnaire construction. The questionnaire administration was discussed including the preparation of the interviewers and the calling process. The chapter ended with a discussion of the selection of the telephone interview sample.

Chapter Three will discuss the results of the telephone questionnaire interviews and the statistical findings of those results.
CHAPTER THREE
RESULTS

This chapter presents the statistical analyses of the data collected through telephone interviews of a random sample of Columbus, Ohio and Franklin County residents. The research questions for this investigation articulated in Chapter Two will be used to guide this chapter. After presenting questionnaire completion rates, sample demographics and sample viewing behavior, the research questions will be used to outline the data which pertain to that question. The discussion of the findings is contained in Chapter Four.

Both univariate and multivariate statistical analyses are reported in this chapter. Univariate analyses were employed to explore differences between the groups of viewers who watched the three newscasts and the groups of viewers who reported "interest" in a particular newscaster. Multivariate analyses, specifically factor analysis and discriminant analysis, were employed to analyze combinations of the variables in relation to the research questions. Factor analysis was employed on the 18 newscaster perception items contained in items 17 through 34 (see Appendix B). The purpose was to see if any underlying patterns existed among the items. Discriminant analyses were performed on questionnaire items in an effort to describe what combinations of variables might be useful in explaining how a respondent selects a specific local station from which to receive the news and how a respondent comes to be "interested" in a specific newscaster.
Completion Rates

Complete telephone interview questionnaires were gathered for 258 respondents. As mentioned in Chapter Two, financial problems prevented the collection of the proposed 400 respondents. With an average interview time of approximately 11 minutes, 110 males and 148 females completed the interview process. Attempts were made to contact 700 telephones in the Columbus area but 290 telephones were either 1) not answered after three attempts, 2) were disconnected, 3) were business or government phones, or 4) were answered by a recording machine. Forty-three ineligible respondents did answer and were disqualified because they were not 18 years old or because the household lacked a television news watcher. Since male respondents were more difficult to contact and question, the interviewers had to exclude some potential respondents because of the over abundance of women who answered and were the only news watchers available in that household. Due to early termination of the interviews and the greater availability of females the quota control for sex failed to produce an even number of males and females.

Of the 410 potential respondents contacted, 152 refused to help either initially or later in the interview. The 258 completed interviews represents a completion rate of 63%. As requested at the funnel point set up by items 11 and 12, 243 respondents reported they watched one of the three Columbus stations for local news more often than the other two. Responses to the funnel point in item 15 indicated 147 respondents named or described a specific local newscaster in which they were "more interested" than the other available on-air news personnel.
Sample Demographics

A full spectrum of ages were represented in the sample (see Table 2), with the average age in the 35 to 39 year-old category and 54% of the respondents in the 18 to 39 year-old categories. Occupations (see Table 3) also covered a wide range of job types with the largest category being housewives (18%), followed by middle to lower white collar workers (13%), and a tie in the number of respondents reporting they were retired or fulltime students (11% each).

The largest educational category contained the respondents who reported they were high school graduates (36%), while about one-third (30.2%) reported they had some college, and one respondent in ten (10.9%) reported they were college graduates (see Table 4).

One-third of the respondents (32.6%) reported they lived in households with two occupants (see Table 5), while the overall average number of persons per household was about 3 (mean = 2.98). Regarding marital status (see Table 6), most of the respondents (55.4%) indicated they were married at the time of the interview. Income per household covered a wide range (see Table 7) with the average income in the $15,000 to $20,000 a year category. About two-thirds of the sample (62.4%) reported they did not belong to organizations which hold regular meetings. A comparison of the sample demographics to Columbus area population parameters will be presented in the following chapter.

Sample Viewing Behavior

The first interview questionnaire items asked the 258 respondents about the number of local television newscasts they watched each week (see Table 8). For the overall sample, the average respondent watched about one local newscast per day (mean = 7.28).
The vast majority of respondents (88.8%) indicated in item 4 that they watched the newscast from the start. These respondents said in item 5 they used a clock to make sure they did not miss the beginning of the program, or they reported the television set was on and they watched the program broadcast just before the local news.

A majority of the sample (68.6%) stated in item 6 that they watched the entire newscast, while 16.3% indicated in item 7 that they only watched the news and weather sections of the newscast. Also indicated in item 7, a few (5%) respondents choose to watch only the news and about the same number (5%) watched only the sports and weather.

When asked about specific story types in item 8, 26.7% of the respondents indicated that they watched for one specific type of story, 13.6% watched for two story types, 7% indicated that they watched for three types of stories, while 2% watched for four or more types of stories. For this item, 50% of the respondents indicated they didn't watch for specific story types while watching the news.

When asked in item 9 about how much attention they paid to the newscast, .8% respondents reported that they only watched the news, while 77.9% said they watched the news and did one other activity at the same time, 18.2% accomplished two other activities in addition to news viewing, and 3.1% reported they carried on three activities while watching the news. The most often reported other activities were eating dinner and reading the newspaper, while some did housework, dishes and sewing. While doing other activities and watching the news, 4.2% reported in item 10 that they paid close attention to the news all the time, 60.5% paid attention most of the time, 30.2% paid attention half the time, and 4.2% paid attention once in a while.
Together, the sample viewing behavior responses in items 1 through 9 indicate most respondents watch about one newscast a day, from the start, and all the way through the news, weather, and sports. Half the respondents watch for at least one specific type of story in the newscast and almost the entire sample does some other activity in addition to their viewing. Although less than 1% only watched the news and most respondents ate dinner or read the newspaper while watching, a majority of the respondents paid attention to the newscast "most of the time."

Station Selection Groups

As discussed in Chapter Two, this investigation is exploratory. Accordingly, an effort was made to minimize the number of assumptions built into the data gathering process. Despite a main focus of the dissertation on newscasters, it could not be assumed that the station from which an audience member receives local news is unimportant to the perception or selection of the newscaster.

The first primary research question is: What is the relevance to the television news viewing audience of the local station and the attributes of the newscast?

Questionnaire items 11 and 12 were included to find out if the respondents would indicate they received their local news from a specific local broadcast station. When the responses to both items are summed, Channel 10, WBNS-TV was selected by over half the 258 respondents (56.6%); Channel 6, WTVN-TV was selected by about one-third of the respondents (36.4%); and Channel 4, WCMH-TV was selected by one respondent in ten (11.2%). Few respondents (5.8%) said they continually switched between the three Columbus stations and had no consistent performance.
Since few respondents (5.8%) said they continually switched between stations, no comparisons were done on the differences between those respondents indicating they watched one of the stations and those respondents who continually switched. Demographic responses were compared by chi-square tests on the groups formed by respondents selecting Channels 10, 6, and 4. No statistically significant differences were found in the demographic makeup of the respondents as compared by the selected stations. A similar result was found when the three station groups were compared on viewing behavior variables contained in items 1 through 9. These two sets of analyses were accomplished to pinpoint respondent differences which might appear in demographic or viewing variable responses.

A final station related question (item 14) asked respondents how long they had been watching their selected station (see Table 9). This set of frequencies was compared across the three station groups by chi-square analysis. Viewing length was found to be statistically significant (chi-square = 92.45, 66 DF, p < .02) when compared across the three station groups. Channel 10 viewers watched that channel significantly longer than Channel 6 viewers, and Channel 6 news viewers viewed that channel's newscasts longer than Channel 4 viewers. The importance of viewing length will appear in other analyses discussed later in this chapter.

As noted in Chapter Two, the newscast attributes contained in research questions 1a, 1b, and 1c were built into seven Likert scales as part of item 13 (see Appendix B). The three subquestions under the first primary research question are:
la. What is the relevance to the local television news viewing audience of program sequencing and channel habit of the local broadcast station?

lb. What is the relevance to the local television news viewing audience of the newscaster, the news content and the program format?

lc. What is the relevance to the local television news viewing audience of the physical reception of the broadcast station?

The 95% of the respondents who indicated in items 11 and 12 that they received their local news from a specific station were asked to complete the seven Likert scales in item 13. Answering on a five-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, the distribution of the 243 respondents' answers to the scales in item 13 are presented in Table 10. Analyses of variance across the three station groupings did not reveal any significant differences on the seven scales. For this sample of respondents, the newscast attributes do not differentiate according to the respondent groups formed by the station from which they report receiving their news.

**Discriminant Analyses**

In this investigation, discriminant analyses were used to go beyond the statistical comparisons which can be made by univariate statistical tests. Discriminant analyses were performed to determine what, if any, combinations of questionnaire items would be helpful in deciding on the relevance of local stations or newscasters to the respondents.

Discriminant analysis is used to study the differences between two or more groups (the three station selection groups, for example) with
respect to several variables simultaneously (Klecka, 1980, p. 7) and used in conjunction with classification analysis is a way to tell to which group a respondent probably "belongs" (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973, p. 337).

All questionnaire items, with one exception noted later, were allowed to enter at the start of the computer runs for discriminant analysis done on station selection and newscaster identification. All questionnaire items were allowed to enter due to the research logic which attempted to keep prior assumptions to a minimum. It was not assumed, for example, that a questionnaire item which pertained to the station would not be valuable in the analysis of the newscaster. Likewise, it was not assumed a newscaster attribute would not be valuable to the analysis concerning station selection. Newscaster attributes might be helpful in determining the relevance of the station selection to the respondents and station or newscast attributes might be helpful in describing the relevance of the newscaster.

The one exception to allowing all questionnaire items to enter at the start of the individual analysis concerned the 18 newscaster perception items contained in items 17 through 34 (see Appendix B). These items were entered into the discriminant analyses as principal component factor scores created through factor analysis of the 18 items. As will be discussed under the factor analysis results pertaining to the newscasters, the factor scores represented a three-factor solution composed of a para-social factor, a professional factor, and a physical factor.

Since all questionnaire items might potentially be good discriminating variables, a forward stepwise inclusion was utilized to determine the
best variables for use in forming a discriminant function (Klecka, 1980, p. 52). Several computer runs were accomplished with discriminant programs available through the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (Nie et al., 1975). Only variables which entered the analysis as statistically significant at the .05 level were allowed to remain through the various runs. A forward stepwise procedure first selects the individual variable which provide the greatest univariate discrimination and then pairs this variable with each of the remaining potential variables (other questionnaire items or factor scores) to locate the one combination which produces the greatest discrimination (Klecka, 1980, p. 53). This procedure is repeated until any remaining items do not contribute significantly as discriminating variables in the analysis.

The forward stepwise inclusion of questionnaire items and factor scores reached the final best solution for station selection which contained one discriminant function (see Table 11). The three questionnaire items and one factor score which survived the previous runs and compose the one function solution for this analysis are displayed as discriminant function coefficients in Table 12. The function is labeled "viewing length" because the strongest loading (1.06) is questionnaire item 14 concerning the length of time a respondent reported watching the local station from which they received their news. Also important to this function as evidenced by their loadings are the respondent's age (-.64) and the physical factor (.62). As a check of the contribution of the discriminating variables to the function, pooled within-groups correlations between the discriminant function and discriminating variables were determined. Table 13 displays the results of this
analysis and confirms the importance of viewing length and the physical factor, while the respondent's age shows less importance in this analysis than that item's loading on the discriminant function would indicate. Utilizing these results to predict group membership found correct classification rather low (55.64%).

Newscaster Identification

While the first questionnaire funnel point at items 11 and 12 separated the sample respondents into three station groups, the second funnel point at item 15 separated the sample respondents into a group who identified a local newscaster (147) and a group who could not or would not name or describe a local newscaster (111 respondents).

The second primary research question is: What is the relevance to the television news viewing audience of the local on-air anchor personnel?

The relevance of local newscasters becomes an important question when, even with interviewer probing, 43.2% of the sample respondents did not supply a name or description of a local newscaster in which they were "more interested" than the other available local on-air journalists. The distribution of respondents identifying local newscasters is displayed in Table 14.

Comparisons were made on respondent demographics for those identifying a local newscaster with respondents who did not provide a name or description of a newscaster. Only education (chi-square = 17.77, 6 DF, p < .0068) showed any statistically significant difference between the two groups. The respondents who named a newscaster tended to have more education than those who did not.
When the respondent group naming a local newscaster is compared with respondents not naming a newscaster on viewing behavior items 1 through 9, no significant differences were found. The two groups were also compared on their responses to station attribute variables in items 13a through 13g (see Appendix B). The only statistically significant finding was on item 13c. Not surprisingly, those who selected a newscaster scored higher on a rating of the importance of the "newscasters, the people who present the news, weather and sports" (chi-square = 14.52, 4 DF, p < .005).

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was employed to determine the relevance of the newscaster attributes contained in questionnaire items 17 through 34 (see Appendix B) for the 147 respondents who named a local journalist. These items were created to answer the subquestions under the second primary research question. Those subquestions are:

2a. What is the relevance to the television news viewing audience of the physical attributes of the local on-air anchor personnel?

2b. What is the relevance to the television news viewing audience of the professional attributes of the local on-air anchor personnel?

2c. What is the relevance to the television news viewing audience of a para-social interaction with the local on-air anchor personnel?

The 18 newscaster perception items (six from each of questions 2a, 2b, and 2c) were submitted to principal components factor analysis using oblique rotation and leaving unspecified the number of factors to be extracted. The purpose was to explore any possible underlying relationships among the 18 items (Kim and Mueller, 1978, p. 11).
The initial 18 factor solution produced by the first analysis was examined by a scree test (Kim and Mueller, 1978, p. 44) of the factor eigenvalues (see Figure 1). If an eigenvalue graph displays more than one discontinuity, the appropriateness of a scree test comes into question. The eigenvalue graph (Figure 1) for the results in this investigation indicate only one point at which the eigenvalues level off into a straight line. This result points to a three-factor solution as appropriate for these data.

Another indication of the appropriateness of a three-factor solution comes from the use of factor analysis as a confirmatory test (Kim and Mueller, 1978, p. 55). Three categories of newscaster perception items were constructed to gather data for each of the three subquestions under the second primary research question. Using the findings of previous research and preliminary focus group interviewing, the three category system was created. If the questionnaire items reflected the three categories, and if the three categories do actually represent three dimensions of newscaster perception attributes, using factor analysis as a confirmatory test would predict the three-factor solution.

Because of the confirmatory nature of the factor analysis and the results of the scree test, a second principal components analysis was performed specifying a three-factor limit and an orthogonal varimax rotation. This analysis displayed the presence of an interpretable three-factor solution consisting of para-social, professional, and physical dimensions (see Table 15). With four exceptions, the 18 newscaster perception items loaded on the factors for which they were intended. One para-social item (warm and friendly) and one physical attribute item (voice quality) loaded on the professional dimension,
and two physical attribute items (newscaster's age and sex) did not load significantly on any of the three factors. Even the misloadings of the four exceptions can be explained with respect to past research, the focus group interviews, and the telephone interview data. That explanation is contained in the discussion in Chapter Four.

As indicated in Table 15, the first factor to emerge was a para-social factor with an eigenvalue of 4.8 and explaining 26.7% of the total factor variance. The second factor is composed of professional items and has an eigenvalue of 2.27 and explains 12.7% of the factor variance. The third factor is composed of physical items and has an eigenvalue of 1.47 and explains 8.2% of the total factor variance. The emergence and structure of the three-factor solution in this investigation gives evidence of the importance of the newscaster dimensions contained in subquestions 2a, 2b, and 2c.

**Discriminant Analysis**

In this analysis, only groups formed when ten or more respondents identified the same newscaster were used. These groups contained 84% of the respondents who identified a specific newscaster (see Table 14). The eight newscasters who were identified by less than ten respondents were excluded so five newscaster groups could be studied with respect to the best combinations of discriminating variables. It was felt that the inclusion of all 13 groups while utilizing data from few respondents might result in statistical and interpretation problems.

Univariate statistical analyses were computed on the five newscaster groups before submitting them to discriminant analysis. The 18 newscaster perception items (items 17 through 34) were compared across the five groups. These items, it should be remembered, will enter into
the discriminant analysis as component factor scores from the factor
analysis. The results of the oneway analysis of variance (see Table
16) indicates four of the eighteen items differ significantly across
the five newscaster groups. Two items which loaded on the physical
factor (hairstyle and physically attractive), one item which loaded on
the professional factor (objective and fair), and one item which loaded
on the para-social factor (almost like an everyday friend) differ
across the five groups at a statistically significant level.

A second univariate statistical test compared the five newscaster
groups by the three factors derived from the factor analysis. The
results (see Table 17) indicate that the para-social factor (p < .02)
and the physical factor (p < .002) are statistically significant in
the oneway analysis of variance, while the professional factor (p > .25)
does not differ across the five groups at a significant level. Table
18 displays the newscaster group means across the three factors and
the results of multiple range tests in oneway analysis of variance.

The discriminant analyses on the newscaster groups was performed
in the same manner as the analyses for the station groups. Several
runs were made to find which questionnaire items and component factor
scores would enter the analyses at a significant level of at least .05.
Five questionnaire items and all three factor scores survived the
process and were included in the final run which resulted in two func-
tions as the best solution (see Table 19). The discriminant function
coefficients of the questionnaire items and factors scores are displayed
in Table 20.

The first function is labeled "viewing length" by virtue of the
strongest loading (-1.06) for questionnaire item 14. This item, it
might be remembered, was the strongest loading item for the one
discriminant function derived from the analyses pertaining to station
groups. The other two highly loading variables on function one are
the para-social factor (-.64) and viewing frequency (.59).

Function two in this analysis is labeled "physical factor" because
that loaded strongest (-.87). Two other data categories which became
discriminant variables with strong loadings were the respondent's age
(.63) and the professional factor (.52).

Pooled within-group correlations between the discriminating func­
tions and discriminating variables were determined to check the contri­
bution of each variable to its function. The correlations displayed
in Table 21 indicate viewing frequency does not seem to contribute
strongly to Function 1, while all the other strong discriminating
variables just mentioned do contribute substantially to Function 1 and
Function 2.

Utilizing the function variables as the basis for classification
of the groups identifying specific newscasters provided a rather low
percentage of correct classification (51.22%).

Summary

Chapter Three has presented the results of several statistical
analyses which were performed on the data collected from the telephone
interviews. The interview completion rates, sample demographics and
sample viewing behavior, were followed by analyses on the data pertaining
to local station selection. Univariate statistical and discriminant
analyses were presented as evidence concerning the relevance of the
local station and newscast attributes to the respondents.
Newscaster relevance for the sample was discussed in the results of univariate statistical tests on respondent demographics and viewing behavior. In addition, the results of the factor analysis of the 18 newscaster perception items were outlined as evidence of the relevance of the three newscaster perception dimensions of physical and professional attributes and the presence of a para-social interaction between the respondent and the newscaster. The chapter ended with univariate statistical and discriminant analyses of the five newscaster groups formed by ten or more respondents selecting the same local journalist.

A discussion and interpretation of the results is contained in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents a discussion of the results reported in Chapter Three. After opening remarks about the demographic and viewing behavior characteristics of the respondents, the discussion will concentrate first on the station selection results, followed by the newscaster identification results, and then the relationships between the two sets of results. The chapter ends with comments about future research implications.

The 258 respondents who completed the telephone interviews is below the originally projected number of 400. Because of sample size, generalizations cannot be made to the Columbus area television viewing audience and responses cannot be broken down by respondents' sex. As discussed in Chapter Three, the difficulty of financial support for gathering 400 interviews was compounded by the difficulty in getting interviews with news-viewing males.

Demographics

With regard to demographic responses, the sample for this investigation resembles the demographic characteristics of Columbus residents. Table 22 displays comparisons of the respondents' demographic data and census data for Columbus residents reported by the United States Department of Commerce (1980). The comparisons in Table 22 are the only ones which could be made between the two data sets.
Close similarities were found with regard to some age categories of the sample respondents and Columbus residents. While the sample contains a substantially larger percentage of people 18 to 34 than does the Columbus population (54% versus 38.9%), the percentages for the two groups are similar in the age groups above 35. Similarities are also found between the Columbus residents and the respondents in some occupational categories. Similar percentages of both groups reported they were students and laborers. In addition, the percentage of respondents in the combined categories of White Collar I, White Collar II, and Supervisors is close to the percentage reporting those work categories for Columbus residents. Other demographic similarities were found with regard to the number of sample respondents and Columbus residents reporting they are high school graduates, the number of people living in each household, the average income per household, and the percentage in each group stating they were married. Overall the telephone interview respondents exhibit many similar demographic characteristics to the residents of Columbus suggesting that the sample of respondents is reasonably representative at least on demographic variables.

**Viewing Behavior**

Respondent viewing behavior measures indicate a fairly regular pattern of news consumption. The respondents averaged one local newscast per day (mean 7.28 local newscasts per week) and nine out of ten (88.8%) watch the local news from the start. About two-thirds of the sample (68.6%) report they watch all newscast content segments. This finding is similar to Levy (1978) who found 70.4% of his Albany New York television news watchers also watched all the content segments. Although virtually all the respondents (99.2%) reported they engaged in
other activities while watching the news, three out of five (60.2%) claim they pay close attention "most of the time" even while engaging in other activities.

Station Selection

Only a few respondents (5%) reported they continually switched between the three Columbus broadcast stations for their news viewing, as the responses to questionnaire items 11 and 12 (see Appendix B) indicate 95% of the respondents have a specific station from which they receive the news. Comparisons across the three station groups concerning their demographic makeup and viewing behavior (items 1 through 9) did not indicate any statistically significant differences between the three respondent groups. Comparisons of the seven station and newscast attribute items contained in item 13 (see Appendix B and Table 9) also do not differ across the three station groups. Only the length of time a respondent has been viewing a station results in a statistically significant difference among the three groups.

Respondents who have been watching Channel 10 (average of 9.63 years) differ significantly from Channel 6 viewers (who average 5.11 years of viewing) and Channel 4 viewers (who average 4.17 years of viewing). This finding fits the Columbus television ratings history. Channel 10 has been the news ratings leader for the past twenty years followed by Channel 4 with Channel 6 perennially third (Tennebaum, 1980). After these interviews were completed, Channel 6 moved into second place ahead of Channel 4. While spending more on its news operation than either of the two other Columbus stations (currently about $250,000 more per year), Channel 10 has consistently had at least a third more viewers for its news than its closest market rival.
Using the size of the news staff as an indicator, in 1979 Channel 10 had 50 news personnel which was one-third more than the size of Channel 4's staff and twice the size of Channel 6's staff (Osborne, 1979). The president of Outlet Company, the parent company of the usually second place Channel 4, has discussed publicly the community relations problem his station has encountered in that Columbus residents have for years perceived Channel 10 as "far superior to the rest of us" (Tennenbaum, 1980).

The results of the discriminant analysis concerning station selection are interesting in that the strongest loading for any questionnaire item or factor analysis component factor score was the length of time the respondents have been viewing their selected station (see Tables 11, 12, and 13). The importance of viewing length will be discussed more later in this chapter.

Newscaster Relevance

The responses to questionnaire item 15 are surprising in that a large portion of the respondents did not or could not identify a specific local television newscaster. Almost half the respondents (43.2%) did not have a name or description of the local newscaster in which they were "more interested" than other on-air personnel. The use of "more interested" in item 15 instead of "favorite" or "watch more" or "choose" was an intentionally weak measure of interest and, even with interviewer probing, 111 respondents were funneled out of the sample at this point by not naming or even describing a local newscaster.

The finding that half the sample could not name or describe a newscaster is surprising with respect to the apparent importance of the newscaster in the news delivery process. As discussed in Chapter One,
news managers, prominent newscasters, and mass media researchers all believe the newscaster is an extremely important aspect of television news. For news directors such as Townley (1971) and Meany (1981) the newscaster is the most important aspect as they believe the face on the screen determines the ratings. Of course, it seems normal that prominent newscasters would tend to find their jobs extremely important, while mass media researchers might find the newscaster important because of the prominence of this aspect of television news in past research. It might be remembered that Smith’s (1977) findings outlined in Chapter One (p. 17) indicate almost all research on television news published in four scholarly journals (Journal of Broadcasting, Journal of Communication, Journalism Quarterly, and Public Opinion Quarterly) from 1955 to 1975 concentrated on the news aspects of source (read newscaster), message, and channel. The Levy (1978) study did find the newscaster important to his respondents but that importance was found in relation to only his "active" respondents and was more prominent for national newscasters than for the local on-air news personnel which are the focus of this investigation.

If the results found in this investigation of only half the respondents identifying a specific local newscaster are not due to some sampling quirk and if the respondents are even somewhat representative of the typical Columbus news viewing audience, one may conclude that the newscaster may be less important in the news delivery process than previously thought. It is germane to this discussion that the respondents for this investigation averaged about one local newscast per day and thereby could be considered fairly regular local television news watchers.
When comparisons are made according to the demographics and viewing behavior responses (items 1 through 9) of the respondents who identified a newscaster and those who did not, the only statistically significant difference is education. As reported in Chapter Three, respondents who identified a newscaster tended to have more education than those who did not name or describe a local on-air journalist. This finding is not unexpected as people with more education would tend, it is suspected, to be more interested in the news and therefore might be better able to identify a specific newscaster.

Newscaster interest is also indicated by the results of the data collected concerning station attributes (items 13a through 13g, see Appendix B). The only statistically significant difference between the respondents who named a newscaster and those who did not was on item 13c, which asked for the importance of the newscaster as one of the newscast attributes.

Factor Analysis

After the finding that 43.2% of the sample did not or could not identify a newscaster, the next most striking result is found in the factor analysis of the newscaster perception items (items 17 through 34, see Appendix B). Clearly, the most important aspect of the respondents' perception of local newscasters is measured by the para-social factor. The first and strongest factor to emerge from the factor analysis was named the para-social factor since five of the six proposed para-social items loaded significantly on this factor, while no professional or physical newscaster attribute items loaded significantly on factor one.

Professional and physical newscaster attribute items did load in a highly interpretable manner on factors two and three. For the
respondents in this investigation, the perceptions of their local newscaster seem to chunk into three distinct categories. The rather clear loadings for para-social, professional, and physical items on three distinct factors gives evidence of the separation and number of newscaster perception dimensions which are important to these respondents. With factor one being all para-social items, factor two primarily professional items and factor three being only physical items, the presence of a highly interpretable three-factor solution gives credence to the three-factor structure which was predicted at the start of this investigation.

As outlined in Chapter Three, four of the 18 perceptual items did not load on the predicted factor. When scrutinized these misloadings are understandable. One predicted para-social item (warm and friendly) and one predicted physical item (voice quality) loaded not on the para-social or physical factors but on the professional factor (number two). Given the on-going public discussions in the recent past concerning the importance of the warmth and friendliness of television newscasters, it is not difficult to understand how an item asking respondents about those aspects of a television newscaster's on-air image might be considered by those respondents to be part of the professional dimension and not part of the para-social dimension. The public discussion of warmth probably reached the most absurd with the issue of "warmth" in Dan Rather's donning a sweater under his coat and the subsequent rise in ratings for the CBS Evening News. Voice quality was meant as a physical attribute item but since the voice is used to present the content "through the spoken word on a visual medium" (Cronkite, 1976,
p. 51), it could easily be perceived as an aspect of the newscaster's professional and not physical dimension.

Two of the 18 items did not load on any of the three factors. These items were expected to be part of the physical dimension and asked the respondents about the newscaster's sex and age. As was found by Stone (1973) and Balon, Philport and Beadle (1978), the newscaster's sex does not seem to effect greatly the audience's perception of the newscaster they are watching. With steady and continual growth in the past few years of the number of women as reporters and co-anchor persons, the audience is probably becoming less and less affected by the newscaster's sex. The only exceptions, as reported by Balon et al., probably still remain for women reporting sports and war news. The newscaster's age has not been the primary focus of any reported past social science studies. Sanders and Pritchett's (1971) study indicated the ideal newscaster is between 31 and 55 years old, a large age range. As indicated by responses to the focus group interviews reported in Chapter Two, news viewers probably do not consider age an important issue except when it becomes a problem for the viewer, as when the newscaster appears to be too young to command the necessary credibility. Another possibility is that direct questions about the newscaster's sex and age might force some respondents to answer in a socially acceptable manner. As ageism and sexism are topics of current debate, a respondent may minimize the importance of sex and age as physical newscaster attributes because of current attitudes toward these characteristics. Respondents may not state publicly what they would say in private about these aspects of newscaster's image.
As striking as the factor analysis results are, the fact remains that this analysis only accounted for 47.6% of the total variance of respondents' perception of newscasters. Over half the variance is not explained by the three-factor structure found in this investigation. Two comments might be made concerning this finding. First, the number of respondents included in the factor analysis was about half (56.8%) an already small sample. The potential for sampling or statistical error due to the small number of responses grows in proportion to the small number of respondents included in this analysis. The problem of sample size discussed at the start of this chapter is even more important when half the sample has been funneled out before the factor analysis of newscaster perception items was done. The second issue concerns the missing dimension or dimensions of the perception of the newscaster's on-air image which are not accounted for by the results in this investigation. One potential dimension which was found in the preliminary focus group interview results reported in Chapter Two. As discussed in that chapter (pages 28 through 33), the focus group interviews yielded results which were grouped under the major category headings of physical and professional. While the physical results are probably adequately represented by the items included in the factor analysis, some professional results may not have been included. While items were included concerning the professional categories of "trust" and "warmth," missing are items which directed tap "subject-audience affinity" (see pages 31 and 32). If these focus group interview findings are not unique to the individuals who took part in this investigation, the need seems apparent to tap some sort of dimension represented by the affinity findings. Newscaster perception items need to be developed which
measure how the newscaster "gets into" his or her material and how those feelings are conveyed to the audience. It is possible measures of this dynamic relationship in the news delivery might be helpful in explaining the variance not accounted for in this investigation.

Newscaster Selection

The factor analysis results are revealing with respect to the respondents' perceptions of local television newscasters but do not necessarily indicate how, or if, the respondents deliberately choose to watch a specific newscaster. Evidence concerning the newscaster choice comes in this investigation from the discriminant analysis results.

Two univariate analyses will be discussed first as their results will be helpful in interpreting the discriminant analysis results.

As mentioned in Chapter Three, only 5 of the 13 local newscasters were identified by ten or more of the respondents in this investigation. This group of 5 newscasters (see Table 14) was identified by 84% of the respondents. The other 8 newscasters, who were identified by only 16% of the respondents, were not included in the univariate and discriminant analyses. The decision to use only newscasters identified by ten or more respondents was based on the need to maintain a minimum sample size for purposes of statistical analysis.

The first univariate analysis results are reported in Table 16. Four of the 18 newscaster perception items were found to differ at a statistically significant level across the five respondent groups. Two physical attribute items (hairstyle and physically attractive) differentiate the groups at a significant level. An inspection of the five group means (Table 16) reveals that the most significant difference is between Michelle Gailiun and Joe Holbrook with regard to
hairstyle and physical attractiveness. Disregarding the three other male newscasters whose group means fall between Gailiun and Holbrook, the differences for the two newscasters anchoring the ends of this analysis are understandable. Gailiun is a young, slim, attractive woman who has co-anchored the news on both Channels 4 and 6. In contrast, Holbrook is an older, silver-haired weathercaster of long standing at Channel 10. That Gailiun's viewers indicate her physical attractiveness and hairstyle are important, while these attributes are significantly less important to the viewers who selected Holbrook, is a finding which is understandable at face value.

The other two newscaster perception attribute items which separate the five newscaster respondent groups are one professional (objective and fair) and one para-social (almost like an everyday friend). It is interesting that Gailiun seems least like an everyday friend, while Tom Ryan, Gailiun's current co-anchor at Channel 6, is considered most like an everyday friend. Gailiun is the second newest of the five newscasters in this analysis with regard to the amount of air time in Columbus (Klitenic is the newest) while Tom Ryan has more than 15 years on-air news experience in Columbus. Gailiun's respondents are young in comparison to Ryan's. Gailiun's respondents are almost all (90%) under 40 years old while only half Ryan's respondents are under 40. Perhaps for an audience to consider a newscaster "almost like an everyday friend" it is necessary to view him/her over several years. Since the "almost like an everyday friend" item may be indicative of the para-social involvement between the respondent and newscaster, the issue of viewing length seems to be again strongly implicated in the discussion.
The final item (objective and fair) which was found to be statistically significant in this analysis most separates Stu Klitenic's respondents from the other four groups. Klitenic was at the time of the interviews a weekend sportscaster for Channel 10. Noted for a frenetic delivery with an excessive use of hands, Klitenic appears to his viewers to be least impressive on the objectiveness and fairness.

To further investigate the relationship of the five newscaster respondent groups, a second univariate oneway analysis of variance was performed. As discussed under the factor analysis results, three factors were found and named para-social, professional and physical. Component factor scores derived from this three-factor solution were compared by oneway analysis of variance across the five newscaster groups. The results are displayed in Tables 17 and 18.

As indicated in Table 17, the professional factor does not separate the five newscaster groups at a statistically significant level. While this finding might be taken to indicate that the professional newscaster attributes are not important to the respondents, the emergence of the professional factor in the factor analysis would seem to give evidence against this interpretation. Another possibility is that the audience expects all television newscasters to exhibit strong professional attributes so those expectations become a baseline standard expected by the viewing audience do not enter into their newscaster perception and choice activities except when acceptable professional attributes are missing during on-air delivery. For example, Klitenic's viewers found him the least objective and fair of the five newscasters included in Table 18. Perhaps his unusually delivery places his professional qualifications in question for some viewers. Certainly from the point
of view of the news directors, acceptable professional attributes are a standard which must be exhibited by potential on-air talent before they will be hired. The nonsignificance of the professional factor component score in this analysis may reflect a standard which a newscaster must exhibit to a hiring news director and the viewing audience and is only brought into prominence when it is missing. This explanation brings up the issue of respondent dissatisfaction with television newscasters which will be discussed later under the heading of future research.

The para-social and the physical factor component scores differ significantly across the five newscaster groups. The findings with regard to the physical factor are in the same direction and involve the same newscasters as did the two physical attribute items (hairstyle and physically attractive) discussed earlier. Michelle Gailiun anchors one end of the continuum with Joe Holbrook at the other end. It seems Holbrook's respondents do not find his physical attributes important in their perception of his on-air image, while Gailiun's respondents find her physical attributes fairly prominent. Gailiun's respondents, as noted earlier, are fairly young (90% younger than 40). In addition, two-thirds of her respondents are females. These younger females deem to find prominence in Gailiun's physical attributes. Like Ryan in the last discussion, Holbrook's respondents have a full range of ages (only half are under 40 years old) and they are evenly divided between males and females. For these viewers, Holbrook's physical attributes do not hold as much importance as for the viewers of other newscasters.

One of the most interesting, and perplexing, findings concerns the results of the five newscaster groups by the para-social factor
component score. In this analysis, Gailiun is the lowest on the para-social factor, while Stu Klitenic is the highest (see Table 18). As Gailiun was mentioned often in the preliminary focus group interviews as being "alot like me" for several female interviewees, it is interesting that para-social items are not very important to her respondents who are primarily young females. One possible answer is the effect of viewing length on the para-social involvement. If, as suggested in the discussion so far, para-social involvement comes only after a period of years of viewing a specific newscaster, then Gailiun might develop a para-social bond with her viewers when she has been on the air in Columbus longer. It is also possible that this finding is a result of the extremely small number of respondents per newscaster ratio in this analysis. The reactions of a larger group of respondents represented in the focus group interviews, a group that also had more time to explain and explore their feelings about Gailiun, might actually be more representative.

The most perplexing aspect of this analysis is that Stu Klitenic's respondents rank him highest on the para-social factor score and significantly different than the other four newscaster groups ranked their newscaster. Klitenic has been on the air the least amount of time of any of the five newscasters included in this discussion. If a para-social bond is formed only after viewers have had time to watch their newscaster, why is Klitenic rated so highly on this factor? Two possible explanations might be helpful in this discussion. First, Klitenic's respondents are young (80% under 34 years of age) and most are students (40%). Perhaps his young appearance and frenetic delivery is appealing to and can be identified with by his young, student viewers.
It should be remembered this same group of respondents found Klitenic the least impressive on the objective and fair attribute item. The other potential explanation is that this finding is an anomaly caused by analyzing a very small number of respondents. The ten respondents who identified Klitenic in this investigation comprise a small number for any type of statistical analysis confidence.

**Discriminant Analysis**

The results of the discriminant analysis concerning newscaster selection are reported in Tables 19, 20, and 21. Of particular interest with respect to previous analyses are the function loadings reported in Table 20. The first discriminant function to emerge in this analysis was labeled viewing length due to the strongest coefficient (-1.06) on that item. The other two strongest coefficients also indicated on this function (viewing frequency at .59 and the para-social factor score at -.64). Investigation of Table 21 concerning the correlations of the items to the function indicates the viewing length and para-social items are important to function one, while the importance of viewing frequency is minimal.

As the viewing length and para-social factor score have different signs on function one, the argument for the growth of a para-social involvement over a period of time is strengthened. It appears the longer a viewer watches, the more important the para-social involvement with a newscaster becomes. If the results found in the last univariate analysis concerning Klitenic are a chance happening due to the small number of respondents or because of a high degree of similarity between those few viewers and Klitenic, than all the evidence so far indicates that for both the perception and selection of a newscaster, the
para-social involvement comes only after long periods of viewing of that particular newscaster.

The viewing length argument seems to be also somewhat strengthened by the findings of the second function in this analysis. Called the "physical factor" function because of the loading of the physical factor component score (-.87), this function indicates a relationship between the physical factor and the respondent's age. These two items differ in direction with respect to the function. It could be these results point to the physical attributes of a newscaster being more important to younger viewers (Gailiun's viewers, for example) while these attributes become less important as the respondent becomes older (Holbrook's viewers, for example). Once again, a word of caution is necessary as this function is of borderline statistical significance and comes from an analysis involving 123 respondents. Certainly the strength and direction of the findings for the first function can be discussed with more confidence than the findings for function two.

Station and Newscaster

Length of viewing seems to be consistently important in the analyses concerning perceiving and selecting the station and the newscaster from which to receive news. In all the analyses, viewing length was found to be important. Concerning a newscaster, viewing length (or, possibly, high similarity between viewer and newscaster) seems to be necessary for the development of a para-social involvement. In addition, it should be noted that four of the five newscasters identified by ten or more respondents are Channel 10 newscasters. Holbrook, Forrest, Klitenic and Ryan were, at the time of the interviews, members of the Channel 10 news staff. Ryan subsequently moved to
Channel 6 to co-anchor the news with Gailiun. Gailiun was the only newscaster in this group who had no affiliation with Channel 10. As Channel 10 has been perceived by Columbus residents as the superior news operation (Tennebaum, 1980), and as Channel 10 viewers have been watching that station significantly longer than the other two stations, the viewing length variable seems to take on special significance. Given that the ratings for Channel 10 have been better than the other stations for years, more people have been viewing that station and those newscasters for a longer period of time than the other newscasters and stations available in Columbus.

The long exposure to Channel 10 news and newscasters and the findings concerning the station and the news staff (objectivity, parasocial involvement, selection), fit the research findings reporting the relationship between affective feeling for a stimulus and the repeated exposure to that stimulus. As reported by Zajonc (1968) and Zajonc and Rajecki (1969) concerning the attitudinal effects of mere exposure, the more a respondent is exposed to a stimulus, the higher the affective ratings assigned to that stimulus. These results were found in field and laboratory experiments with such varied stimuli as Turkish adjectives, nonsense words, and Chinese-like characters. In all variations, the more a subject was exposed to the test stimulus, even though that stimulus had no definable meaning to that subject, the higher the affective rating assigned to that stimulus. In this research, the effect of exposure on the ratings of local news station and newscasters also seem apparent. The longer a viewer has watched Channel 10 and Channel 10 newscasters, the more highly rated these aspects of the news delivery process become. In addition, the development of a
para-social involvement with a newscaster seems to come with viewing that newscaster over a long period of time.

**Future Research**

This research should be replicated because of the need to have a larger sample from which to explain the findings in this investigation. The surprise finding that half the sample did not name or describe a specific newscaster cut an already small sample in half. The lack of respondents also caused the newscaster analyses to be limited to the five newscasters who had been identified by ten or more respondents. If enough respondents had been available, all thirteen newscasters may have entered into the analyses and the findings may have been more complete. If the proportion of respondents who identify a newscaster is the same for future studies, the need to oversample and enlarge the number of potential respondents is paramount. For example, no analysis could be made in this investigation with regard to respondents' sex. As some literature indicates that males and females are socialized to perceive others differently (see Tagiuri, 1968), a large enough sample needs to be assembled to allow the examination of responses by respondent gender.

Future research should also be done to find out more about the details of how the viewer perceives the newscaster. The findings of the para-social factor as the first to emerge when para-social, professional, and physical attribute items are factor analyzed is valuable, but incomplete when only 50% of the variance is being explained. What is the importance of an activity of dynamic dimension of the newscaster's on-air image? What other dimensions of the newscaster's image are not accounted for by the results of this and other research?
Another question is the place of dissaffections with a newscaster and their effect on the perception and selection of a newscaster. In this investigation, a final open-ended question (item 35) asked respondents which newscaster they did not like and why (item 36, see Appendix B). The Channel 10 sportscasters Stu Klitenic and Lee Vlisides were frequently mentioned in this item for their bizarre, affected and "arrogant" on-air delivery. If a viewer is forced away from a newscaster and settles on a less offensive alternative, some newscasters will have viewers not because of their appeal but because of the offensiveness of other newscaster's on-air image.

The relationship of exposure over time and the affective ratings of the station and newscaster also needs more investigation. While this research seems to indicate the longer a newscaster is viewed the higher the affective ratings assigned that journalist the greater the development of some type of para-social involvement, the nuances of that relationship need to be clarified beyond the scope of this exploratory research. Why, for example, did the responses to Stu Klitenic's on-air image appear prominently in this investigation? Were these responses a statistical quirk or do they implicate the presence of other, unexplored relationships between the audience and the newscaster which need to be researched? The question of the growth of a para-social involvement depending on the length of exposure or some similarity in cohort characteristics between the audience member and newscaster needs to be clarified.

Another issue suggested by this study and the results reported in previous research concerns viewer involvement with the news. If almost all (99%) respondents engage in some other activity while also
consuming television news, how involved can these respondents be?
Studying the effect of viewing length (a mere exposure?) and level of
involvement might shed some light on the way viewers actually consume
television news and what is important in that process. The issues of
involvement and exposure will have to be included in future research if
the audience viewpoint is to be fully understood.

Within the limited sample collected for this research, several
significant findings might prove the basis for future studies. The
television newscaster's importance will probably not diminish in a
technological future filled with more news outlets such as all-news
cable television channels. The trend of Americans continuing to
rely and believe television news makes necessary the clear understanding
of the roles of the television newscaster as an important part of the
news delivery process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attributes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Style</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sanders and Pritchett, 1971; focus group interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice quality</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Shosteck, 1973; focus group interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Stone, 1973; Balon, Philpport and Beadle, 1978; focus group interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sanders and Pritchett, 1971; focus group interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sanders and Pritchett, 1971; focus group interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attractiveness</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Shosteck, 1973; focus group interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Attributes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Markham, 1968; Cathcart, 1969; Singletary, 1976; focus group interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective and fair reporting</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cathcart, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows local market (Columbus)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cathcart, 1969; focus group interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable information</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lynch and Sassenrath, 1965; Markham, 1968; Cathcart, 1969; McCroskey and Jenson, 1975; Singletary, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent and educated</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cathcart, 1969; Shosteck, 1973; Singletary, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Questionnaire Item</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified and competent</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Cathcart, 1969; McCroskey and Jenson, 1975; focus group interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para-social Interaction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm and friendly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lynch and Sassenrath, 1965; Shosteck, 1973; McCroskey and Jenson, 1975; Singletary, 1976; focus group interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost like an everyday friend</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Levy, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday visit brings contentment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Levy, 1978; Horton and Wohl, 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to newscaster as if that person were in the respondent's home</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Author created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to know more about newscaster off the job</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Author created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newscaster's daily visit helps make the day's problems easier to handle</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Author created</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2

Distribution of Respondents' Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and above</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar II - Middle to Lower Level</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Labor - Craftspeople</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory - Managerial</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator, guidance counselor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar I - Professional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Sales</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Service Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4

**Distribution of Respondents' Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Post-graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5

**Distribution of Number in Respondents' Household**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Person</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two People</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three People</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four People</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five People</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six People</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Six People</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6
Distribution of Respondents' Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formerly Married</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow, Widower</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-15,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-20,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-25,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-30,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-40,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-50,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time/week</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two times/week</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times/week</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four times/week</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five times/week</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six times/week</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven times/week</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight times/week</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine times/week</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten times/week</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven times/week</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve times/week</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen times/week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteen or more times/week</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Years</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Attribute</td>
<td>Scale Alternatives</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13a: News stories</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13b: Following Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13c: Newscasters</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13d: Program Looks good</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13e: Channel habit</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13f: Preceding program</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13g: Channel reception</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>Percent of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>85.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After Function</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-Squared</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.0732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12

**Discriminant Function Coefficients for Station Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 13d:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13
Pooled Within-Groups Correlations Between Discriminant Function
and Discriminating Variables for Station Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 13d:</td>
<td>Following Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14:</td>
<td>Viewing Length of Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37:</td>
<td>Respondent's Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3:</td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 14

Distribution of Newscaster Identifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newscaster</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Ryan</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Gailin</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Forrest</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Holbrook</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu Klitenic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Greiner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jym Ganahl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Crumm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Carson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Kayler</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Vlisides</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Korancki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No name</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 15
Rotated Varimax Factor Matrix (N = 258)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para-social</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17: Honesty</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18: Warm and friendly</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19: Hairstyle</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20: Objective and fair reporting</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21: Everyday visit helps to feel contended</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22: Physically attractive</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23: Knows Columbus</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24: Almost like an everyday friend</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25: Voice quality</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 26: Reliable information</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27: Talk to as if actually in the home</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28: Newscaster sex</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29: Intelligent and educated</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 30: Like to know more about off the job</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 31: Newscaster's age</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 32: Qualified and competent</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 15 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Factor 1 (Para-social)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (Professional)</th>
<th>Factor 3 (Physical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 33: Daily visit helps make problems easier to handle</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 34: Newscaster's clothing</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of variance</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Tom Ryan</td>
<td>Michelle Galliun</td>
<td>Lou Forrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19: Hairstyle</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20: Objective</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22: Physically</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24: Almost</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like an everyday friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17

Oneway Analysis of Variance of Three Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para-social</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Gailiun</td>
<td>Forrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para-social</td>
<td>-.01a</td>
<td>-.66a</td>
<td>-.09a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>.17a</td>
<td>-.17a</td>
<td>-.06a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>-.17a</td>
<td>.57a</td>
<td>.41a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Within a row mean with different letter subscript is statistically significant at p ≤ .05, utilizing the analysis of variance multiple range Scheffe and Duncan statistics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>51.64</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>27.40</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After Function</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-Squared</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>89.45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.0564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 20

**Discriminant Function Coefficients for Newscaster Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 4:</th>
<th>Viewing Frequency</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 13b:</td>
<td>Following program</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14:</td>
<td>Viewing length of station</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16:</td>
<td>Thermometer rating of newscaster</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37:</td>
<td>Respondent's age</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1:</td>
<td>Para-social</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2:</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3:</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 21

Pooled Within-Groups Correlations Between Discriminant Functions and Discriminating Variables for Newscaster Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 4: Viewing Frequency</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13b: Following Program</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14: Viewing Length of Station</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16: Thermometer rating of newscaster</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37: Respondent's Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Para-social</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Professional</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Physical</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Columbus*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-39</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-69</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar I and II and Supervisors</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37.8% of 25+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in Household:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two People Per Household</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Per Household:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$21,180</td>
<td>$20,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married:</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Graph of Eigenvalues
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APPENDIX A

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW

HOME: URBAN _________ SUBURBAN _________ RURAL _________

FAMILY INCOME:

NUMBER OF CARS IN HOME:

NUMBER OF WORKING RADIO SETS:

NUMBER OF WORKING TV SETS: COLOR _________ BLACK AND WHITE _________

AGE:

OCCUPATION:

CABLE INTO HOME: YES _______ NO _______ IF YES, WHICH COMPANY:

TV WATCHING:

NUMBER OF HALF-HOUR newscasts you watch: (INCLUDING WEEKENDS)

LOCAL EARLY:

LOCAL LATE:

NATIONAL EARLY:

NATIONAL LATE (ABC NIGHTLINE):

OTHER NEWSCASTS:

MORNING NEWS (WHICH PROGRAM OR CHANNEL)

NEWSBREAKS:

SPECIAL REPORTS:

Received from Rick Houlberg, $5.00 for research;

________________________________________
SIGNATURE AND DATE
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APPENDIX B

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE:

LOCAL TELEVISION NEWS AND NEWSCASTERS

Rick Houlberg, Department of Communication, Ohio State University

August, 1981

DO NOT COMPLETE THIS INFORMATION UNTIL INTERVIEW IS COMPLETED

_________________________________________ Interviewer name

_________________________________________ Respondent code

_________________________________________ Date of interview

_________________________________________ Start and end time of interview

Hello, my name is _________________________ and I'm calling for the Department of Communication at Ohio State University. We're conducting a short survey about local television news. Your phone number was selected randomly from homes in the Columbus area. All your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Would you agree to help us for a few minutes?

(IF UNWILLING, ATTEMPT TO RESCHEDULE)

(IF YES) Very good. We're asking people about local Columbus television news; the news you get from the local newscasts on Channels 4, 6, and 10 (WCMH-TV, WTVN-TV, and WBNS-TV). We're interested in your opinions and there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Please think carefully about each question and if any question is unclear, be sure to ask me to repeat it.

1. First, we'd like to know how many early evening Columbus newscasts you watched last week; that is, from Monday through Friday on Channel 4, 6, and 10? These are the local newscasts between 5:30 and 7:30 p.m.

_______________________ (RECORD NUMBER)
2. How many late evening or 11:00 p.m. Columbus newscasts did you watch last week—Monday through Friday?

_______________________(RECORD NUMBER)

3. How many local Columbus newscasts did you watch on Channels 4, 6, and 10 last weekend (Saturday and Sunday)?

_______________________(RECORD NUMBER)

_______________________(IF THERE ARE NO NEWSCASTS INDICATED IN QUESTIONS 1, 2, and 3, TERMINATE THE INTERVIEW)

4. (This is the kind of information we are after.) Next, do you watch the news from the start of the program?

1. ____Yes (GO TO QUESTION 5)

2. ____No (GO TO QUESTION 6)

5. How do you manage to tune in at the right time so you don't miss the first part of the news?

6. Do you normally watch the whole newscast or parts like weather and sports?

1. ____Whole newscast (GO TO QUESTION 8)

2. ____Parts (GO TO QUESTION 7)

7. Which parts of the newscast do you normally watch?

RECORD UP TO THREE

1. ______________________

2. ______________________

3. ______________________
8. Are there any specific types of stories you watch for closely?

RECORD UP TO THREE

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________

9. When you watch the Columbus news on television, do you sometimes do something else like reading, working, eating dinner, or things like that?

(RECORD UP TO THREE ACTIVITIES AND GO TO QUESTION 10)

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________

4. ___No other activity (GO TO QUESTION 11)

10. When you are watching the news and doing something else, do you pay close attention to the news all the time, most of the time, about half the time, only once in a while, or not at all? The list once again is (REPEAT LIST)

1. ____All the time
2. ____Most of the time
3. ____Half of the time
4. ____Once in a while
5. ____Not at all

11. This is going very well. Do you normally watch one of the three Columbus stations; Channels 4, 6, and 10; or do you switch between the three?

1. ____Channel 4, WCMH-TV, Newswatch 4 (GO TO QUESTION 13)
2. ____Channel 6, WTVN-TV, Action 6 News (GO TO QUESTION 13)
3. ____Channel 10, WBNS-TV, Eyewitness News (GO TO QUESTION 13)
4. ____Switch between three (GO TO QUESTION 12)
12. When you switch between the three stations, is there one station you watch more than the other two?

1. _____ Channel 4
2. _____ Channel 6
3. _____ Channel 10
4. ____ No (GO TO QUESTION 15)

13. We are interested in the reasons that you watch _________.
I'm now going to read a list of reasons that people have given for watching a certain station. After each statement you'll be given the opportunity to respond to the reason in five ways. You can strongly agree the reason reflects what you feel, you can agree, you can be undecided, you can disagree, or can strongly disagree. I'll repeat the options after each statement (DO THIS UNTIL THE RESPONDENT HAS THE SCALES IN MIND).

Are you ready? Good.

a. I watch _______ because I like the news stories they present.
   1. _____ Strongly Agree
   2. _____ Agree
   3. _____ Undecided
   4. _____ Disagree
   5. _____ Strongly Disagree

b. I watch _______ because of the program that comes on after the news.
   1. _____ Strongly Agree
   2. _____ Agree
   3. _____ Undecided
   4. _____ Disagree
   5. _____ Strongly Disagree
c. I watch ________ because of the newscasters, the people who present the news, weather, and sports.

1. _____ Strongly Agree
2. _____ Agree
3. _____ Undecided
4. _____ Disagree
5. _____ Strongly Disagree

d. I watch ________ because the program looks good.

1. _____ Strongly Agree
2. _____ Agree
3. _____ Undecided
4. _____ Disagree
5. _____ Strongly Disagree

e. I watch ________ because the TV set is normally tuned to that channel.

1. _____ Strongly Agree
2. _____ Agree
3. _____ Undecided
4. _____ Disagree
5. _____ Strongly Disagree

f. I watch ________ because I was watching the program that was on before the news.

1. _____ Strongly Agree
2. _____ Agree
3. _____ Undecided
4. _____ Disagree
5. _____ Strongly Disagree
g. I watch ______ news because it comes in clearer than the other channels.

1. ______ Strongly Agree
2. ______ Agree
3. ______ Undecided
4. ______ Disagree
5. ______ Strongly Disagree

14. How long have you regularly watched the news on (THE STATION INDICATED IN QUESTION 11 or 12)?

Years and Months

15. Very good. Let's talk about local newscasters—the people you see every day who do the news, weather, and sports on the Columbus stations. Are there any local Columbus newscasters you are more interested in than the others?

(IF THEY MENTION MORE THAN ONE NAME, RECORD UP TO THREE BUT USE THE FIRST NAME FOR THE SERIES OF QUESTIONS STARTING WITH QUESTION 16)

1. _______________________ (IF RESPONDENT NAMES MORE THAN 1 ASK IF THIS IS IN ORDER OF INTEREST. USE EXTRA LIKERT SCALES FOR SECOND PERSON BUT ONLY SECOND)
2. _______________________  
3. _______________________  

(IF THEY SAY ALL THE NEWSCASTERS ON ONE OF THE STATIONS, INDICATE THE STATION BELOW AND PROBE FOR A SPECIFIC NAME TO RECORD ABOVE)

4. _____ Channel 4
5. _____ Channel 6
6. _____ Channel 10

(IF THEY ARE UNSURE, PROBE TO BRING UP A NAME. IF A PROBE DOESN'T WORK, GO TO QUESTION 37)

7. _____ Don't know any newscasters (GO TO QUESTION 37)
16. I would like you now to imagine a thermometer similar to the type found in homes. This thermometer indicates how strong your feeling about (NEWSCASTER FROM QUESTION 15) is right now. Your feeling for (NEWSCASTER FROM QUESTION 15) can be extremely warm, very warm, warm, lukewarm, cool, very cool, or extremely cool. Where would you place your feeling for him (her) on this imaginary thermometer? Those choices, once again are (READ LIST OF CHOICES AGAIN).

1. _____Extremely Warm
2. _____Very Warm
3. _____Warm
4. _____Lukewarm
5. _____Cool
6. _____Very Cool
7. _____Extremely Cool

17. Only a few more questions. This is the kind of information we are after.

I'm now going to read a list of statements about (FIRST NEWSCASTER LISTED UNDER QUESTION 15). After each statement you'll be given the opportunity to respond to the statement in five ways. You can strongly agree the statement reflects what you feel, you can agree, you can be undecided, you can disagree, or can strongly disagree. I'll repeat the options after each statement (DO THIS UNTIL THE RESPONDENT HAS THE SCALES IN MIND).

Are you ready? Good.

First, I think ________________________________ is honest.

1. _____Strongly Agree
2. _____Agree
3. _____Undecided
4. _____Disagree
5. _____Strongly Disagree
18. I believe ___________________ is a warm and friendly person.

   1. _____Strongly Agree
   2. _____Agree
   3. _____Undecided
   4. _____Disagree
   5. _____Strongly Disagree

19. ___________________'s hair style is attractive.

   1. _____Strongly Agree
   2. _____Agree
   3. _____Undecided
   4. _____Disagree
   5. _____Strongly Disagree

20. I believe ___________________ is objective and fair when reporting the news and doesn't take sides.

   1. _____Strongly Agree
   2. _____Agree
   3. _____Undecided
   4. _____Disagree
   5. _____Strongly Disagree

21. Seeing __________________ every day helps me feel contented.

   1. _____Strongly Agree
   2. _____Agree
   3. _____Undecided
   4. _____Disagree
   5. _____Strongly Disagree
22. I think ____________________ is physically attractive.
   1. _____ Strongly Agree
   2. _____ Agree
   3. _____ Undecided
   4. _____ Disagree
   5. _____ Strongly Disagree

23. __________________________ seems to know a lot about Columbus.
   1. _____ Strongly Agree
   2. _____ Agree
   3. _____ Undecided
   4. _____ Disagree
   5. _____ Strongly Disagree

24. __________________________ is almost like one of my everyday friends.
   1. _____ Strongly Agree
   2. _____ Agree
   3. _____ Undecided
   4. _____ Disagree
   5. _____ Strongly Disagree

25. __________________________'s voice quality is pleasing.
   1. _____ Strongly Agree
   2. _____ Agree
   3. _____ Undecided
   4. _____ Disagree
   5. _____ Strongly Disagree
26. I believe the information I get from ______________________ because it is reliable information.
   1. _____Strongly Agree
   2. ____Agree
   3. _____Undecided
   4. _____Disagree
   5. _____Strongly Disagree

27. I sometimes talk to ______________________ as if he (she) were actually in my home.
   1. _____Strongly Agree
   2. ____Agree
   3. _____Undecided
   4. _____Disagree
   5. _____Strongly Disagree

28. I'm glad ________________________ is a male (female) because I prefer to get my Columbus news from a male (female).
   1. _____Strongly Agree
   2. ____Agree
   3. _____Undecided
   4. _____Disagree
   5. _____Strongly Disagree

29. From watching ______________________ on the news, I can tell he (she) is intelligent and educated.
   1. _____Strongly Agree
   2. ____Agree
   3. _____Undecided
   4. _____Disagree
   5. _____Strongly Disagree
30. I would like to know more about what_________________________ does when he (she) isn't working on the news.

1. _____Strongly Agree
2. _____Agree
3. _____Undecided
4. _____Disagree
5. _____Strongly Disagree

31. ____________________________'s age is important.

1. _____Strongly Agree
2. _____Agree
3. _____Undecided
4. _____Disagree
5. _____Strongly Disagree

32. ____________________________ is a very qualified and competent newscaster.

1. _____Strongly Agree
2. _____Agree
3. _____Undecided
4. _____Disagree
5. _____Strongly Disagree

33. ____________________________'s daily visit in my home helps to make the day's problems easier to handle.

1. _____Strongly Agree
2. _____Agree
3. _____Undecided
4. _____Disagree
5. _____Strongly Disagree
34. I think ___________________________'s clothing is important.

   1. _____Strongly Agree
   2. _____Agree
   3. _____Undecided
   4. _____Disagree
   5. _____Strongly Disagree

35. We've been asking about your most watched Columbus newscaster. Are there any Columbus newscasters you won't watch because you don't like them? If so, who?

   1. _____Yes (INDICATE UP TO THREE NAMES. GO TO QUESTION 36)
      1. ________________________________
      2. ________________________________
      3. ________________________________
   2. _____No (GO TO QUESTION 37)

36. Why don't you like the newscasters mentioned?

   (RECORD UP TO FOUR REASONS. TRY AND PUT THE NEWSCASTERS' NAME WITH THE REASONS GIVEN FOR DISLIKING HIM OR HER)

   1. ______________________________________________________
   2. ______________________________________________________
   3. ______________________________________________________
   4. ______________________________________________________

37. To finish the survey, we need to know some information about you. Remember all your answers are for use in this survey only. Your honest answers to these last few questions will help us process the other information you've given us.

   What is your age please?

   (IF NO IMMEDIATE RESPONSE, READ THE CATEGORIES)
1. ____18-24
2. ____25-34
3. ____35-39
4. ____40-49
5. ____50-59
6. ____60-69
7. ____70 or above
9. ____No answer

38. What is your occupation?
1. ______________________________________________________
9. ____No answer

39. What was the last grade you completed in school?
1. ____Grade school (grades 1 through 8)
2. ____Some high school (grades 9 through 11)
3. ____High school graduate (includes short trade schools)
4. ____Some college (includes 2-year Associate or Arts Degrees)
5. ____College graduate
6. ____Some post graduate work
7. ____Graduate degree (MS, MA, Ph.D., etc.)
9. ____No answer

40. How many people, including yourself, live in your household?
1. _____________
9. _____________No answer
41. Which of the following best describes your marital status?

1. _____Single  
2. _____Married  
3. _____Formerly married (divorced, dissolution, etc.)  
4. _____Widow, widower  
5. _____Separated  
6. _____Other______________________________________________  
9. _____No answer  

42. I'm going to list a series of income categories. Would you please tell me which category best fits your last year household income of all the major wage earners.

1. _____Under $10,000  
2. _____$10,000-15,000  
3. _____$15,000-20,000  
4. _____$20,000-25,000  
5. _____$25,000-30,000  
6. _____$30,000-40,000  
7. _____$40,000-50,000  
8. _____Over $50,000  
9. _____No answer  

43. Do you belong to any organizations which hold regular meetings?

1. _____Yes (GO TO QUESTION 44)  
2. _____No (GO TO QUESTION 45)
44. Would you please name those organizations?

RECORD UP TO FIVE

1. ______________________________
2. ______________________________
3. ______________________________
4. ______________________________
5. ______________________________

45. (DO NOT ASK THIS QUESTION UNLESS YOU CAN'T DETERMINE BY THEIR VOICE)

Sex:

1. ____ Male
2. ____ Female

This completes this survey. We really appreciate the time you've taken to help us. Your answers have been extremely helpful. Good bye.

FILL OUT QUESTIONNAIRE DATA ON FIRST PAGE
APPENDIX C
NEWSCASTER INFORMATION SHEET

Channel 4: WCMH-TV, Newswatch 4, NBC
Schedule: Monday–Friday 6, 11 p.m.; Saturday–Sunday 6, 11 p.m.
Anchors: Larry Roberts: 6 p.m. weekday
          Dennis Shreefer: 6 p.m., weekday, dark curly hair, grey at temples.
          Jon Greiner: 6 and 11 p.m. weekend
Weather:  Jym Ganahl: weekday
          Ben Gelbert: weekend
Sports:  Jimmy Crumm: Balding, open shirt, around a long time.
         Marty Reid: Youngish, weekend

Channel 6: WTVN-TV, Action 6 News, ABC
Schedule: Monday–Friday 5:30, 11 p.m.; Saturday–Sunday 6:30, 11 p.m.
Anchors: Tom Ryan: Grey hair, used to be at Channel 10
          **Michelle Gailum: Young female, used to be at Channel 4.
          **Pat Lalama: Young female, weekend
Weather:  Don Carson: Weekday
          **Wendy Craver: Female, weekend, stocky
Sports:  John Gordon: Started weekdays August 1, 1981
         Steve Minnich: Weekdays until August 1, 1981, then weekends;
                       young, tan, black hair

Channel 10: WBNS-TV, Eyewitness News, CBS
Schedule: Monday–Friday 6, 7, 11 p.m.; Saturday–Sunday 6, 11 p.m.
Anchors: Lou Forrest: 6 p.m. weekday, brown hair, sleepy eyes
         Dave Kaylor: 6 and 7 p.m. weekday; stocky, glasses
         Bruce Kirk: 6 and 11 p.m. weekend
Weather:  Joe Holbrook: White hair, been around a long time
          **Janet Watkins: Female, weekend
Sports:  Lee Vlisides: Stocky, black curly hair
         Stew Klitenic: Weekend
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