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INTRODUCTION

There is no lack of research into the various dimensions of newspaper reading: why people begin to read, why many do so regularly each day while others start and stop their subscriptions quite casually, and why other people never read a newspaper at all. Such research generally has taken one of two approaches. Either the emphasis has been on the demographics of newspaper reading (or, occasionally, non-reading) or it has been on the gratifications obtained from newspaper use. There have been fewer attempts to date to synthesize the two approaches, and none which has added the additional dimension of childhood exposure to news media. That is the approach that has been taken in this study.

Despite the large quantity of readership research existing, many myths about why people do or do not use newspapers persist, and much of what has been learned has not yet been applied in any systematic way by the industry.

Research sponsored by the American Newspaper
Publishers Association during the past six or seven years represents a large stride in making available to the industry the work of the scholarly community, and it is the hope that this study will contribute to the literature of readership research in a useful way, as a starting point for a new and promising research program.

The early chapters of this dissertation provide a background for the study of the acquisition of the newspaper reading habit, its salience for the newspaper industry, and a review of the major studies which have already focused on the subject. This will be followed by the design and methodology of the study, and then by its results in detail and a discussion of the implications of the results of this study as well as other research findings for the industry.

The first two of the five chapters of this dissertation provide the background and framework for the study which is reported in the last three chapters. Chapter One will trace the decline in newspaper reading, particularly in younger age groups, presenting evidence that the habit of newspaper reading is now less pervasive than it has been in the past, and discussing the newspaper industry's reaction to this changing trend. Chapter Two will present in some
detail three frequently-used approaches to explaining the newspaper reading habit: lifestyle and demographic factors, the extent of childhood exposure to news media, and the sociopsychological gratifications of newspaper use. In each case, major previous studies of newspaper readership will be reviewed, and salient factors incorporated into the study.

The last three chapters report in detail the original research undertaken for the dissertation. Chapter Three will identify the key research questions underlying the study and will describe the procedure used in designing the questionnaire used in the study. This chapter also includes a full description of the procedures employed in administering the instrument. Chapter Four will describe the way in which the resulting data were analyzed and will present the results of the study in detail. Chapter Five is devoted to a discussion of the implications of the results of the study, both for the newspaper industry and for the scholarly community, and will suggest ways in which the research program begun here can contribute still more effectively to the body of knowledge on the use of the mass media.
CHAPTER ONE

The Decline in Newspaper Reading

Until the last ten or fifteen years, newspaper executives have never worried overmuch about the readership of their product by youth. The daily paper was something that people just naturally grew into, publishers believed, as they took on adult responsibilities in an adult world. Children grew up, married, found homes, acquired mortgages, and began having children of their own. Thus possessed of a considerable stake in a community in which they were probably born and would live out their lives, young adults almost inevitably turned to newspaper as the principal means of finding out about their world -- or so most publishers believed.

It is easy now to be critical of this complacency. But because newspapers were for so many years the only true mass medium, editors long failed to realize that newer forms of communication could compete for the attention of the public. In 1920 only magazines and
cinema had any claim as rivals, and they dealt not so much with news as with entertainment and, by their natures, were not easily localized. By 1930 radio was beginning to attract large numbers of followers, but there were then only 612 stations on the air.\(^1\)

The 1940s were times of growth for all media. The public was hungry for war news and read and listened to whatever was available. It was not until after 1960 that newspaper editors began to notice their readers slipping away and publishers realized that henceforth they would have to compete for the time -- and money -- of their audience. But Schramm and Huffer (1946) had already found that those in younger age groups were placing less faith in newspapers, and could give them up sooner than they would abandon radio.

In just 20 years, editors would see the incredible growth of television, from 111 stations in 1950 to 1038 in 1970,\(^2\) the decline and resurgence of radio, especially the popularization of the FM band, and the emergence of countless special interest magazines, which targeted such specialized audiences as pest control company owners, knife collectors, and

---


\(^2\) Ibid.
self-professed witches.

In 1950 more than half the adults in the country were buying and reading daily newspapers. But from that peak, daily newspaper penetration has spiraled steadily downward. Table 1 shows the extent to which, since 1960, daily newspapers have circulated to a smaller percentage of adults: that, although newspaper circulation has risen, it has not increased as rapidly as the adult population, resulting in fewer newspaper sales per adult. (See Table 1.)

Newspaper circulation exhibits little fluctuation on a day-to-day basis; trends become evident only over a prolonged period of time. Readership declined gradually as the depression of the 1930s deepened; circulation actually dropped 3.6 per cent between 1930 and 1935, a phenomenon that would not be repeated until the 1970s. But as the economy improved and people became hungry for news of the war, newspaper circulation jumped. Between 1940 and 1945, circulation rose 17.6 per cent.3

But newspapers did not remain long at the pinnacle; competition and changing lifestyles were eating rapidly into their success. Bogart (1981)

---

**TABLE 1**

Daily Newspapers Circulated Per Adult Aged 20 and Over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pop 20+ (a)</th>
<th>Circulation (b)</th>
<th>Papers per Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>62,580,690</td>
<td>27,790,656</td>
<td>0.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>75,138,340</td>
<td>39,589,172</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>86,375,050</td>
<td>41,131,611</td>
<td>0.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>99,610,960</td>
<td>53,829,072</td>
<td>0.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>110,463,080</td>
<td>58,881,746</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>126,412,360</td>
<td>62,107,527</td>
<td>0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>154,023,290</td>
<td>62,201,840</td>
<td>0.404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) U.S. Census Bureau
(b) American Newspaper Publishers Association.
reports a steady decline since 1960 in the number of newspapers per household. In that year, 111 newspapers were sold for every 100 households in the United States; in 1979, only 81 were sold.

Newspaper publishers were, naturally enough, disturbed. Editors and publishers count on readers captured by events of the times eventually to become long-term readers of the paper. If potential readers do not pick up the paper occasionally, they will never become permanent readers. But beyond simple exposure, publishers' ideas of why people read newspapers were murky and intuitive. It is the task of this dissertation to make a contribution to the literature which seeks to learn the reasons why people do -- or do not -- make newspapers a part of their daily lives.

Two specific concerns confront newspaper executives today. First, where have all the newspaper readers gone? Second, what are the prospects for newspaper subscriptions in the future? The standard answer in the industry to the first question is that instead of subscribing to newspapers as they once did, people are turning to television. Research, however, does not appear to support that idea; quite the reverse may be true, in fact. Bush (1966) cites a study of children which demonstrates a positive correlation between newspaper reading and television viewing. In a
study done for Harte-Hanks Newspapers, the research firm of Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1976) reports a study of young adults done for the American Sociological Association which shows that the heaviest TV viewers are only slightly less likely to read the newspaper daily than are the lightest viewers.

The second question, the future of the newspaper industry itself, is still more complicated. Its answer, besides resting in part with the answer to the first question, is also bound up with demographic factors, economic trends, and a host of other variables.

Perhaps the most effective way to deal with these problems is to work backward from them to the one question which is even more fundamental: Why do people subscribe to newspapers in the first place? If we can learn that, we should also be able, to first draw conclusions about why some people stop subscribing and why others never begin, and second to develop a plan for attracting more subscribers in the future.

Table 1 traced the path of newspaper circulation and population growth and suggested that, allowing for fluctuation in depressed economic times, newspaper readership has remained strong throughout the century. But beginning sometime after 1960, the newspaper market began to soften seriously, particularly among younger
readers — that group already reading least. Davis and Watkins (1960) assured editors, however, that they had no real cause for worry. They found that young people respected newspapers and said, "If this respect... is maintained and carried over into adulthood, newspapers can look forward to a growing number of interested and serious readers."

That optimism was misplaced. The American Newspaper Publishers Association (1982) reports that circulation grew less than two per cent between 1960 and 1970, and in 1974 actually declined -- something that had not happened since the 1930s. Despite a substantial increase in the population since then, daily circulation did not regain its 1973 peak until 1982.

Worse, from the standpoint of the newspaper industry, was the news from the Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1976) study. The study pointed out that not only had readership dropped among 18 to 24-year-olds, but that those lost readers were not turning to newspapers as they became older, a trend which had always been taken for granted by the entire industry. Table 2, reported in their study, shows no maturing effect present in newspaper readership when it is read on the cohort diagonal. (See Table 2.)

A first glance at these figures was dismaying:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>71 pct.</td>
<td>76 pct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
readership among 18- to 24-year-olds had dropped ten percentage points in seven years. A second glance was more encouraging: yes, readership had dropped. However, the 1974 figures showed young people moving toward newspaper reading twice as fast as they were in 1967. But a third, more analytical look was devastating: there had been no increase at all. Members of the 18-24 age group in 1967 had aged in the seven years between studies and by 1974 were members of the 25-34 group -- and their reading had not increased. And the age group that had come after them was demonstrating even less commitment to the newspaper.

The study presented 51 hypotheses which might contribute to the phenomenon, and was based on open-ended interviews with young people and industry representatives. Their comments were distilled into the hypotheses, which dealt with demographic, lifestyle, and attitudinal variables. While the report gathered no statistical data and performed no analysis in attempt to confirm or disconfirm the hypotheses, it remains the best catalogue yet published of possible reasons for recent changes in the newspaper-reading behavior of younger adults.

Clearly alarmed by the implications of the trend, the American Newspaper Publishers Association organized its Newspaper Readership Project in 1977. The Project
publishes serially the ANPA News Research Reports, which deal with research findings of consequence to the industry. Of the 33 reports published between 1977 and the end of 1981, 23 dealt wholly or in part with readership and circulation figures and trends.

In addition, the Project has, through the Newspaper Advertising Bureau, undertaken more than a dozen studies analyzing the newspaper market and readership trends. Several of these studies focused on newspaper use by children. One such report, "Young Adults and the Newspaper" (1978), confirmed the lower readership figures among youth and the lack of a maturing effect in reading: that is, that the tendency to read a newspaper does not increase with age. This point was further corroborated by Stone and Wetherington (1979) and in a cohort study by Robinson and Jeffres (1979). Thus, one of the newspaper industry's most cherished beliefs -- in the steady advance of newspaper reading with increasing age -- was debunked and the readership decline took on a new urgency.

It seems clear, then, that there has been a serious falling-off in the commitment of Americans to their daily newspapers, and worse, from the standpoint of the industry, the tendency has been most pronounced among younger persons, the very group on which the
long-term health of the industry depends. The evidence that readers lost in youth are lost forever has caused enormous concern in the industry, and has created great interest among scholars and in the industry in exploring the conditions which may have contributed to the decline. The research summarized in the next chapter is, to a great extent, a product of that interest and concern, and provides sound underpinnings for additional study of the factors which may contribute to the acquisition of the newspaper reading habit.
CHAPTER TWO

The Origins of the Newspaper
Reading Habit

It has been well established that much newspaper use is simple habit, but if the habitual nature of newspaper reading is widely acknowledged, the conditions which foster the habit are less frequently agreed upon.

Generally researchers and industry experts, in seeking the whys of readership, have focused on one of three approaches. Some studies have concentrated on the role of exposure to news media during childhood in forming patterns of media use, and this will comprise the first principal area of inquiry into the origins of newspaper reading. Some research -- for example, Stone and Wetherington (1979), and Newspaper Advertising Bureau (1977) -- has pointed out the greater tendency for the children of newspaper readers to become readers themselves in later life, so such literature must carefully be considered in the design of any study.
dealing with the whys of newspaper reading.

Another often-used approach in the study of newspaper reading is an analysis of the demographic or lifestyle characteristics of a potential audience. However, demographic variables which are good predictors of readership, such as age and education, are closely related to many lifestyle variables, like mobility or home ownership. Consequently, both demographic and lifestyle considerations will be treated in this study as a single category of readership predictors, called Life Situation.

There is a third predictor of media use: sociopsychological needs, which perhaps play a pivotal role in determining if and how media are to be used. These needs appear themselves to be at least partly the products of the interplay between life situation and childhood exposure to media. Some research has been successful in linking certain categories of needs with the use of particular media, and it will be useful to try to relate these needs with life situation and exposure factors which serve as the best predictors of newspaper use.

The principal contribution of this study, and the element which distinguishes it from those that have come before, is that it uses all three types of
variables: exposure, life situation, and needs, to attempt to explain newspaper use. Each of the components of the study, as described above and in the Introduction, is discussed in some detail in the remaining sections of this chapter. In outlining previous research, it will be useful to remain within the structure suggested above. Studies dealing largely with childhood media exposure as a predictor of later media use will be treated first, followed by life situation as a predictor of newspaper reading, and then by research into sociopsychological needs.

The number of studies bearing directly or tangentially on media use in general and newspaper use in particular is enormous. Cited below are those studies which seem to relate most directly to the problem at hand, although a great deal of additional reading which has contributed to the development of the dissertation is listed in the bibliography.

CHILDHOOD NEWS EXPOSURE AND NEWSPAPER READERSHIP

The earliest influences on each person are those present in childhood. There is a body of research which as attempted to explain elements of the way people use media by examining the influences to which
children are subject, or to which adult media users were subject while they were children. Some of this research deals specifically with newspapers, but more concerns the broadcast media, particularly television. Both are discussed in this section, for the work done to this point on broadcast media is much more extensive than that done on newspapers, and we can learn much from it.

Several studies have made important points about the relationship of newspaper use in the home to subsequent newspaper use by children, and much of this work suggest the importance of parental influence. A study by the Newspaper Advertising Bureau (1977) points out that people who had newspapers in their homes as children were more likely to become subscribers as adults, and that this greater commitment to newspapers cuts across social and demographic lines. Of several demographic variables, only education appeared to be a better predictor of adult newspaper reading than the presence of a paper in the home during childhood.

A report by the Newspaper Readership Project (1978) noted that to a great extent, children experience media in the context of the family, and that the newspaper needs to try to promote itself as a family-oriented medium. The study tracks children's attitudes toward various mass media over time, and
notes a greater affinity for newspapers and magazines with age, and a decline in liking for television. Stone and Wetherington (1979), in confirming the habitual nature of much newspaper reading, found that newspaper use was closely tied to newspaper use by one's parents, even to the point that the offspring's time and place of reading the newspaper are closely associated with the time and place his or her parents read the paper. The study found little or no maturing effect; the newspaper-reading patterns of those in the study appeared to have been largely formed in youth.

A study by Mauro (1979) shows that the most important predictor of newspaper use by children is the availability of the paper in the home. He points out that children seldom seek out newspapers if they are not obtainable in the home and stresses that, if adults provide children with newspapers, the children will come to rely on the papers as adults do. Another study by the Newspaper Readership Project (1980) makes the same point:

Availability offers the most direct means of fostering or actually encouraging children's reading of newspapers in the home. But their parent's [sic] reading habits can provide them with powerful models of appropriate or desirable adult behavior.

The impact on newspaper use in school has also been examined. Benedict, Weaver and Altschull (1976)
found that newspaper use in the classroom promoted understanding of the paper but not its independent use, while DeRoche (1981) found a transfer effect — newspaper use in school predisposing newspaper use in adulthood.

A distinction should be drawn here between the general sort of acclimatization to a particular medium, as described above in connection with the newspaper, and a more rigorous modeling point of view, in which children actually imitate the activities of their parents or others, adopting the same behaviors. Studies of modeling behavior have formed the basis for some research into media use by children.

But it is not possible to claim with authority that children strictly model their reading behavior after that of adults. That would suggest, for example, that children tend to read the same things in the newspaper that their parents read. Clarke (1965) points out that children's interest in topics cannot be directly correlated with their parents' interest, something that would have to be demonstrated if modeling behavior were an important factor in readership. But Clarke acknowledges that the exposure of children by their parents to the newspaper may be important: the idea that children might read because their parents, by example, place a value on reading —
what Clarke calls the "social visibility of parental interests." Modeling, which implies the development of behavior nearly identical to that of the model, must be viewed as a special case of media socialization, which implies a more general orientation to a particular pattern of behavior, e.g. the tendency to use a newspaper more than television.

The literature appears to favor this more conservative approach, rather than a strict modeling view. Chaffee, McLeod, and Atkin (1971), in fact, suggest that a sort of reverse modeling may take place with regard to television viewing, with children exerting some influence over the types of programs their parents watch. Children and adults use media in similar ways, they argue, because of socioeconomic factors, i.e. life situation. If children were modeling the viewing behavior of their parents, their content preferences would grow more alike as the children aged. Quite the reverse is true, however. Viewing preferences of younger children more closely resemble those of their parents than do preferences of older children, perhaps because older children are exposed to more out-of-home influences, such as peer socialization, than are their younger brothers and sisters.

Avery (1978) also offers evidence that children
influence their parents' choices of television programs, and found no evidence that children's magazine preferences mimicked those of their parents, something that would have to be demonstrated under any sort of modeling view.

Wartella et al. (1979) point out that studies which show correlations between media behavior of children and their parents, and so seem to promote the idea of modeling, fall short of proving the idea, since the direction of causation cannot be determined or, indeed, whether some third phenomenon is accounting for the behavior of both children and their parents.

Gross and Walsh (1980) report that most parents exercise little deliberate control over what their children watch on television, and that children become less likely to discuss with their parents what they had seen on television as they become older; there is little evidence of modeling here. Nevertheless, the study does report a significant correlation between the amount of viewing by the parent and the amount of viewing by the child, which suggests that some sort of sensitization process may be at work. It may be that children do not consume the same sort of content as their parents, but learn to place a premium on certain sorts of general media behavior.

There is support for that view. Freidson (1953)
shows that early media exposure is family-dominated, shifting later to peers; children draw their media use patterns from those they are closest to. As new social settings and pressures present themselves, children alter the ways in which they expose themselves to media. Himmelweit, Oppenheim, and Vince (1958) found that the amount of time a child spends in front of the television depended not so much on his social background (or what we call life situation) as on parental example. Their study showed that while viewing was, on the whole, lighter among older children than younger, children of any age whose parents were heavy viewers were more likely to be relatively heavy viewers themselves, and that children whose parents were light viewers were themselves more likely to be light viewers. Schramm, Lyle, and Parker (1961) are more positive about the possibility of children modeling their program preferences after those of their parents, although they acknowledge that this was largely due to the fact that program choices were made by parents and those were the programs to which children were exposed. Furu (1971) described how independent television viewing increased among children in families in which television was considered an important family activity. The children did not necessarily watch the same programs as their parents,
but they adopted the same sorts of media behavior. Because television was a valued activity in their homes, they learned to value it also.

A distinction has been made here between modeling and parental influence. There is little evidence that the former plays a significant role in media use, since examples of children, as they age, adopting specific media behavior of their parents is altogether lacking. But there is enough evidence apparent for the influence of childhood exposure to news media to warrant its inclusion as an important component of this study.

LIFE SITUATION AND NEWSPAPER READERSHIP

A second principal approach to readership research is the focus on lifestyle and demographic variables. Because of their tangled interrelationships, these are being treated in a single category of variables, called Life Situation.

Few studies deal with only one dimension of Life Situation; consequently, most of the research discussed below reports findings in more than one aspect of the question, and sometimes in five or six or more. But it may clarify the components of the life situation group of variables to briefly discuss each element.
separately, despite the repetition that becomes necessary, to see why each has included in the final questionnaire.

Place and Length of Residence

Bogart (1981) presents vast amounts of life situation data, circulation trends, and results of readership studies by the ANPA which, among other things, emphasizes the importance to newspaper reading of community commitment. Mobility adversely affects readership, he says. Sixty-nine per cent of those who have lived in the same place for five years are frequent readers, Bogart says, while only 56 per cent of those who have moved in from elsewhere during that time read often.

Stamm, Jackson, and Bowen (1977) investigated one element of lifestyle, mobility, and found both problems and possibilities for newspapers. While newspapers lose subscribers who move away, new residents can be an attractive potential audience. The study found that people who experience the greatest anxiety about moving are the best potential customers for the newspaper, and that the group which exhibits the greatest anxiety is the most mobile group: young adults. Newspapers which target these new residents by persuading them that the
newspaper can be used to orient them to their new communities are more likely to be successful in attracting them as subscribers than are most other papers, they maintain.

Stevenson (1979) also found differences in the ways long-time and new community members use newspapers. Long-time residents in the study displayed a greater need for information and hard news, while newer residents used the paper more for entertainment and as a guide to leisure activities.

Dwelling Type

Stone and Trotter (1981) found the number of single-family homes in a market, along with population and number of residences, to account for almost two-thirds of the variance in the total circulations of 195 daily newspapers, but that the combination was ineffective as predicting circulation for individual newspapers. Bogart (1981) pointed out that deliveries to multi-family residences pose more problems for newspapers than delivery to single homes, and that delivery problems are cited as main reason offered by subscribers who cancel.
Ownership of Dwelling

Many studies have pointed out the much greater newspaper penetration among residents who own their homes. Bagdikian (1971) reported that owner-occupied dwellings were more than half again as likely to receive a newspaper than were renter-occupied homes. Stamm and Fortini-Campbell (1981) found significant mid-range correlations between newspaper use and residents' orientations toward their communities, manifested particularly by home ownership and voting in recent elections.

Occupation

Bagdikian (1971) reported that a clear positive relationship exists between newspaper reading and type of employment, income, and education. "The Daily Diet of News," one of a series of studies by the Newspaper Readership Project (1978), noted the much greater use of the newspaper by those in professional or managerial positions than by those in other types of occupations. Schweitzer (1975) found that the combination of occupation, education, and income -- taken together -- was the best predictor of newspaper readership among young adults. People with professional or technical
occupations were significantly more likely to subscribe than those in other occupational categories. Sobal and Jackson-Beeck (1981) found newspaper nonreaders to be significantly less likely to have professional or managerial jobs, and to be significantly more likely than readers to rank themselves as members of the lower and working classes rather than of the middle or upper classes.

Education

Many studies have linked education with newspaper use — or lack of education with newspaper non-use. Bogdikian (1971), Schweitzer (1975), and the Newspaper Readership Project (1978) all reported positive relationships between newspaper use and education. Westley and Severin (1964), Penrose et al. (1974), and Sobal and Jackson-Beeck (1981), however, studied non-readers, and all reported that lower educational attainment was associated with lower newspaper use.

Marital Status

Schweitzer (1976) found that married persons were significantly more likely to subscribe to a newspaper than unmarried persons, and that marital status was a
better predictor of subscribership than either education or occupation. McLeod and Choe (1978) found marital status to be among the strongest correlates from a long list of variables, a relationship that retained its strength even after all other variables were controlled. Sobal and Jackson-Beeck (1981) found significantly more non-readers than readers to be widowed, divorced, or separated.

Race

Newspaper use by blacks has generally been found to be lower than among whites, but Bogart (1981) reports that readership levels among blacks have been relatively stable compared to that among whites. He cites a Simmons Market Research report showing that reading "yesterday" among whites dropped from 80 per cent to 72 per cent from 1970 to 1979, while the corresponding figures for blacks were 61 per cent to 59 per cent. Blacks and whites spend the same amount of time with the newspaper (34 minutes), he reports. His 13 percentage point difference between blacks and whites is close to the 12-point difference between blacks and whites found by Sobal and Jackson-Beeck (1981).
We have already seen how newspaper readership traditionally has been linked closely with age, a relationship that continues to appear in more recent research. The link is more suspect that it once was. Larkin, Grotta and Stout (1977) found that young adults are far less newspaper-oriented than older adults, an attitude more apathetic than hostile, seeing the newspaper largely as an information-only medium. Data from the Newspaper Readership Project (1978) and from Sobal and Jackson-Beeck (1981) found a positive association between newspaper reading and age, Burgoon and Burgoon (1980), found that the relationship between readership and any single variable was slim. Age, they said, was a strong predictor when used in association with other variables, particularly satisfaction with the paper and income.

Virtually every study using income as a variable has found a positive relationship between income, alone or in combination with other variables, and newspaper use. Westley and Severin (1964) and Penrose et al. (1974) found that lower income was associated with
non-reading, and the Newspaper Readership Project (1978) found that newspaper and radio use appear to increase with educational and income levels, while television use declines.

Sex

Large differences in sex and newspaper readership have not generally been found, in part because among married couples, who compose the majority of respondents in virtually all studies, newspaper subscribing is a household characteristic. Either both husband and wife take the paper, or both do not. The Newspaper Readership Project (1978) did, however, find a greater tendency among women to use newspapers over radio.

Community Integration

Many studies have reported on variables called community identification or community integration, and although these have been operationalized differently, they have often been good predictors of newspaper use. Jackson and Stamm (1979), for example, discussed community integration from the standpoint of length of residence, but found that new residents' becoming
stable subscribers was also due to such factors as having children in school, political activity, and membership in local organizations. McLeod and Choe (1981) also found moderate to strong correlations between newspaper use and community integration, which in this case included length of residence and level of political participation. Stamm and Fortini-Campbell (1981) analyzed a number of integration factors and found significant mid-range correlations between readership and residents' orientations toward their communities, manifested particularly by home ownership and voting in recent elections. Bogart (1981) stresses the importance of community attachment and identifies a number of variables which could be a part of it, including location of residence, mobility, and membership in organizations.

It is clear that the relationships among life situation variables are many and complex. But such factors as age, education, mobility, community integration, and others turn up so often in the literature that an investigation of the correlates of newspaper readership must include them.
It appears clear that both life situation and childhood exposure must, to some extent, influence the approaches people take to the media. But neither of these factors, singly or in combination, is an altogether satisfactory predictor of newspaper reading. By probing the sociopsychological needs which may be generated by combinations of life situation and childhood news media exposure, however, it may be possible to reach a greater understanding of the conditions which lead to differing patterns of newspaper use.

For more than thirty years researchers have sought to define the psychological roots of media use, and to relate those to the tendency to use certain media. This approach to ascertaining the sociopsychological needs of audience, and the ways they gratify those needs through media and other sources, is represented by Lasswell (1948), who described four fundamental needs which could be satisfied by media use: surveillance of the environment, correlation of the parts of society with the environment, cultural transmission from generation to generation, and entertainment. However, Lasswell made no effort to tie
specific needs to the use of specific media.

Since Lasswell, many schemata have been devised to account for the different categories of needs that people have reported. Often this has been done by asking people to report their needs and content analyzing their reports, or having them respond to questions about the intensity of many specific needs and factor analyzing the answers to look for patterns of response. In studies of the influence of needs on media use, researchers can use the schema thus generated in looking for different sorts of media behavior.

Questions about respondents' need to keep up with events, or to keep tabs on what is going on, for example, often elicit the same kinds of responses, and are frequently classified together in a more general category of need, which in many studies is called the Surveillance need. A strong need to keep informed has frequently been found to be a good predictor of newspaper use. Discussed below are a number of studies which have examined the predictive powers of certain types of needs on media use, and which formed the basis for many of the questions asked in this study.
Surveillance

Most studies of the ways in which people use media have included some sort of surveillance dimension, although questions have been asked and needs expressed in many different ways. In his study of the effects on audience members during a New York City newspaper strike, Berelson (1949) identified what he called rational and non-rational ways in which people use daily papers. He points out that although people are quick to claim a rational basis for their newspaper use, i.e. information about and interpretation of public affairs, only about a third of the subjects studied actually used the paper in that way; far more numerous were the non-rational gratifications they received from their papers, some of which will be discussed later in the chapter. Kimball (1959) studied another New York City newspaper strike, and found similar results, including the presence of the surveillance function and the greater number of other gratifications obtained by newspaper readers.

McQuail, Blumler and Brown (1972) found surveillance to be one of four types of gratifications their subjects obtained from media, saying that their work "shows it to have an important place in news viewing dispositions." They found this type of media
use to be directed toward obtaining information and opinions about events more concerned with the world in general than with oneself. Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) identified four general classes of needs, one of which — cognitive needs — they defined as the need to strengthen information, knowledge, and understanding. This need they found strongly related to satisfaction with the newspaper in particular and print media in general. Participants in this study did not find broadcast media particularly helpful in satisfying this need.

In a study of children's television viewing, Greenberg (1974) hypothesized two sorts of learning gratifications: to learn about "things," and to learn about "myself." In fact, Greenberg collapsed the categories in the final analysis, having found that learning itself, subject notwithstanding, was the gratification.

Weaver, Wilhoit and Riede (1979) found that the newspaper was the preferred medium to "keep tabs on what's going on" among adults 21-34 and males 35-87, although women 35-87 preferred television for that purpose. Weaver, Wilhoit and deBock (1979) found that respondents rated keeping tabs as the most important need and the need to which they most often turned to the mass media to satisfy. Newspapers were the medium
most often used to satisfy this need in this study. However, Weaver and Buddenbaum (1979) found in reviewing a number of other studies, that television news was most often used for overall surveillance, while the newspaper was most often used for seeking specific information, for local news, and for advertising.

McCombs and Einsiedel (1980) described a process wherein the newspaper content that a person reads is shaped by his attitudes about how well that paper performs its jobs. These attitudes and the reader's perceptions of what sort of job the paper should be doing are shaped by his motivations for reading. Persons in whom the motivation to keep up with current events is strong are most likely to read the paper daily; those who have a strong motivation to determine what is important are even more likely to do so. In general people who place a high value on keeping themselves informed about events score high in newspaper readership.

Becker, Collins and Fruit (1980) found significant differences among the means of frequent readers, infrequent readers, and nonreaders in need to know about merchandise and sales, keeping up with local and national events, and knowing about local and national government.
Some operationalization of a surveillance need appears in almost every media gratifications study in the literature. This suggests at least that some needs play an important role in influencing how and why some media -- including newspapers -- are used some of the time. This is not the only need dealt with in most studies, however, and several others are worthy of some attention here.

**Diversion**

There is a large class of need types in which the subject uses media in a way almost directly opposite from surveillance uses. Whereas in surveillance, media are used to strengthen the contact between user and the world outside, in this type of need -- called escape, diversion, entertainment, relaxation, or something else -- media are often used, at least in part, to weaken contact between the user and the world. While some studies do make distinctions between, for example, entertainment and escape, we will treat together all the needs which pertain to the release of tension.

Among the "non-rational" reasons why people read newspapers, Berelson (1949) found that some use of the medium was for respite from the ordinary activities of life, or to fill a void -- something to do when there
was nothing better to spend time with, something Kimball (1959) called occupation -- killing time. Berelson concluded that much newspaper reading was a ritualistic, near compulsive act, that the act itself of reading was inherently pleasurable and prestigious, perhaps because of association with rewards for reading received from parents or teachers during childhood. Schramm and White (1949) argued that all reading is done with the expectation of reward. The immediate reward of drive reduction leads to reading entertaining or stimulating materials, while reading for delayed reward, the more sophisticated sort of reading, produces a more general preparedness for reality. Kay (1954), however, asserted that all reading must offer immediate reward, although the promise of delayed reward will be absent if the reader does not plan to make use of the material at a later date.

Katz and Foulkes (1962), in an examination of escapism, asserted that no particular mass medium was associated with that gratification. Escape, they maintained, is not self-evident. A person who appears -- from the position of the observer -- to be using media for escape may be getting radically different gratifications from the exposure. They found unwarranted the assumption of an association between the elements of the escape function and dysfunctional
consequences.

McQuail, Blumler and Brown (1972) identified diversion as one of the four principal types of gratifications obtained from media, and found that subject used media to escape from the constraints of routine, to escape from the burdens of problems, and for emotional release. They found a greater tendency for the participants in their study to use television and radio drama for this purpose, and related some TV news viewing to an escape from one's own problems, perhaps by seeing someone else's greater problems instead. Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) found that no one medium was used principally for escape, which they defined as tension release or weakening contact with self and with one's social role. However, they reported that respondents found nothing more useful than mass media in gratifying the need for escape.

Greenberg (1974) found that older children used television viewing to satisfy the need to pass time far more than younger children did. This was the most frequent gratification among the oldest children in his study, although habit was the most common reason for viewing among younger children. The need "to forget" ranked last among all age groups. Murray and Kippax (1978) studied children's perceptions of various media in three Australian towns of differing levels of
television availability. Children in all three perceived newspapers as being more informational than entertaining, something that was true to a lesser extent with radio. Television was seen as being both informational and entertaining, although children without access to TV perceived it as somewhat more entertaining. Cinema was seen almost exclusively as entertainment.

Weaver, Wilhoit and Riede (1979) and Weaver, Wilhoit and deBock (1979) found television to be the preferred medium to gratify the needs to be entertained, to kill time, and to relax. Weaver, Wilhoit and deBock also found that only the need to keep tabs on what's going on was gratified through use of the mass media more frequently than these three, and that respondents expressed a high level of satisfaction with the media to satisfy these needs.

Social Contact

Another need frequently identified in studies of the gratifications of media use is some sort of substitute companionship dimension, two aspects of which are evident in Berelson (1949). He found that people used newspapers to enhance their contact with other people by providing useful information which can
be shared with friends or from the basis for conversation. The newspaper also provided people with indirect contact with people, Berelson found, through columnists, human interest stories, advice and gossip columns, and insight into the private lives of other people.

McQuail, Blumer and Brown (1972) reported similar findings, designating one of their basic categories of needs as Personal Relationships, a category which included media use for both social utility and companionship. Participants in their study found television quiz programs highly satisfying for social utility needs, and reported radio and television serials as most often satisfying the latter. Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) found integrative needs which served to strengthen contact with family and friends, and found newspapers to be the most helpful medium for the purpose, with radio and television also relatively helpful. They found the need for substitute companionship to be relatively unimportant to the participants in their study.

Weaver, Wilhoit and deBock (1979) found companionship to rank eighth of nine needs asked about in their study, and respondents ranked as sixth both the frequency of their media use to satisfy the need, and their satisfaction with the ability of mass media
to gratify the need. Becker, Collins and Fruit (1980) found that the need to have current events information for conversation was a good motivation for people to read newspapers, and was associated with higher levels of reading about local and national government news and stories about "ordinary people."

Excitement and Arousal

Several studies have dealt in part with the use of the mass media to provide excitement or stimulation. Kimball (1959), who confirmed Berelson's assessment of rational and non-rational gratifications in newspaper reading, added the need for stimulation to Berelson's list. Even though many readers expressed disapproval of stories about tragedy, murder, and violence, many others admitted seeking them out.

Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) found affective needs in their respondents, which they defined as strengthening aesthetic, pleasurable, and emotional experiences. But they found few strong ties to specific media, although the newspaper seemed not to be often used for gratification of the need, and a greater variety of non-media sources were cited as most helpful. Greenberg (1974) found that the importance of television to gratify the arousal need in children fell
off sharply after age 9, dropping from the second most important gratification obtained to the sixth in a list of eight.

Palmgreen, Wenner and Rayburn (1980) found the entertainment factor to be an important gratification sought by viewers of television news, and an important part of their factor structure on the item came from responses to the statements "TV news is often dramatic," and "TV news is often exciting."

The dimensions of surveillance, diversion, social contact, and stimulation are frequent themes in the uses and gratifications literature, and although some other studies touch on some other categories of uses as well, incorporation of questions pertaining to these common dimensions into this study is appropriate. It may be possible to gain additional understanding of why people use newspapers by examining the relationship between certain needs and use of the newspaper. It is general patterns that are important here, not the specific behaviors or gratifications of individual respondents, for those tend to vary with time. Dimmick, McCain and Bolton (1979) have pointed out the changing salience of needs through the life cycle and how the difference between, for example, informational and chronological aging affects media use. As need salience changes, the way in which media are used can
be expected to change, although this does not necessarily imply the use of different media, for media which a person is in the habit of using may simply be used for different purposes.

We have examined literature pertaining to three often-cited categories of influences on newspaper readership: exposure to news media during childhood, the combination of demographics and lifestyle we are calling life situation, and the role of sociopsychological needs. From these three components we will try to build a model for the study, which is illustrated in Figure 1. (See Figure 1.)

Exposure to news media during childhood and such demographic considerations as age, sex, and race logically precede the development of sociopsychological needs during adulthood. It also seems reasonable that other life situation considerations influence such needs, rather than the other way around, so the first question to be addressed in the study will be the ways in which exposure and life situation variables contribute to the development of sociopsychological needs. The second stage of the study will be to use media use — in this case newspaper subscription — as the dependent variable and examine the ways exposure, life situation, and needs influence media use. Therefore, the basic question being confronted in
Figure 1
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this study can be put:

Are demographic and lifestyle characteristics, and the degree of childhood exposure to news media, related to sociopsychological needs which may influence the use of the newspaper?

The next chapter describes in detail the design of the study created to attempt to trace the relationships outlined in the model and research question described above.
CHAPTER THREE

Design and Methodology

In the previous chapter, studies were reviewed which approached the question of newspaper readership in three ways: as a function of one's exposure to the news media during childhood, as influenced by one's life situation, and as related to the sociopsychological needs possessed by the individual. Two avenues of inquiry were suggested by the studies reviewed in that chapter. The first sought the influences of exposure and life situation on the development of needs, while the second asked about the ways in which all three types of variables -- exposure, life situation, and needs -- affect media use, in this case operationalized as newspaper subscribership.

This study, then, was designed first, to investigate the types and origins of needs characteristic of newspaper subscribers, and second, to try to ascertain the roles played by those needs and the other factors outlined in influencing newspaper
subscribership. This chapter will describe how these categories of variables were operationalized in the questionnaire, the population that was studied and the way in which it was sampled, and the procedures used in the administration of the instrument to the sample.

VARIABLES

Four categories of variables are considered in this study. They are:

1. EXPOSURE of the respondents, largely by parents and teachers, to various news media during their childhood years. These variables serve as independent variables both in helping to determine needs and in seeking influences on subscribership.

2. LIFE SITUATION of the respondents, drawn from a combination of demographic and lifestyle information. These are also used as independent variables in both stages of the analysis.

3. SOCIOPSYCHOLOGICAL NEEDS reported by the respondents, based on a series of questions rating the
relative importance of certain types of activities and information. Needs are the dependent variable in the first stage of the analysis and, with exposure and life situation, are independent variables in the second stage.

4. GRATIFICATIONS of these needs through particular patterns of use of the mass media, operationalized particularly as newspaper subscribership in this study. It is the dependent variable in the second phase of the analysis.

Table 3 presents each major variable type together with some of the ways in which it has been operationalized, the studies which suggested its inclusion in this study, its location in the questionnaire, and the variables which were derived from it, or from which it was derived. Reference to this table will simplify following the explanation of the questionnaire construction later in this chapter and the way in which the data were analyzed in the following chapter. The complete instrument is contained in Appendix A. (See Table 3.)

The reports of the influence of childhood exposure to newspapers reported by the Newspaper Advertising
### TABLE 3

**Questionnaire Construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE TYPE</th>
<th>RELATED STUDIES</th>
<th>QUESTIONS IN INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DERIVED MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDHOOD EXPOSURE</strong></td>
<td>Benedict, et al. (1976)</td>
<td>V 21-27</td>
<td>New Variable EXPOSURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO NEWS MEDIA</td>
<td>Newspaper Advert. Bureau (1977)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newsp. Readership Proj. (1980b)</td>
<td>TV V 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stone &amp; Wetherington (1979)</td>
<td>Radio V 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarke (1965)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avery (1978)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wartella et al. (1979)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Himmelweit et al. (1958)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mauro (1979)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DeRoche (1981)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPOSURE</strong></td>
<td>derived</td>
<td>V21+V23+V25+V26+V27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIFE SITUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of Residence</td>
<td>Stamm, Jackson &amp; Bowen (1977)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stevenson (1979)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson &amp; Stamm (1979)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwelling Type</strong></td>
<td>Stone &amp; Trotter (1981)</td>
<td>V139</td>
<td>new variable INTEGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogart (1981)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## TABLE 3 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE TYPE</th>
<th>RELATED STUDIES</th>
<th>QUESTIONS IN INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DERIVED MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIFE SITUATION</strong> (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy/Rent Dwelling</td>
<td>Bagdikian (1971)</td>
<td>V140</td>
<td>new variable INTEGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stamm &amp; Fortini-Campbell (1981)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stone (1978)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Bagdikian (1971)</td>
<td>V141</td>
<td>converted to Occupational Status level on NORC scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newsp. R'ship Proj. (1978)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schweitzer (1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Bagdikian (1971)</td>
<td>V142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newsp. R'ship Proj. (1978)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westley &amp; Severin (1964)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Penrose et al. (1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schweitzer (1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>McLeod &amp; Choe (1978)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schweitzer (1976)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Newsp. R'ship Proj. (1978)</td>
<td>V144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bogart (1981)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Bagdikian (1971)</td>
<td>V145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newsp. R'ship Proj. (1978)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larkin et al. (1977)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burgoon &amp; Burgoon (1980)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE TYPE</th>
<th>RELATED STUDIES</th>
<th>QUESTIONS IN INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DERIVED MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### LIFE SITUATION (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V140+V143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Companionship</td>
<td>Weaver et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Weaver et al. (1979b)</td>
<td>Greenberg (1974)</td>
<td>V64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE TYPE</td>
<td>RELATED STUDIES</td>
<td>QUESTIONS IN INSTRUMENT DERIVED MEASURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan &amp; organize the day</td>
<td>Berelson (1949), Katz et al. (1973)</td>
<td>V71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relax</td>
<td>Berelson (1949), McQuail et al. (1973), Greenberg (1974), Weaver et al. (1979), Weaver et al. (1979b)</td>
<td>V78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcome Loneliness</td>
<td>Weaver et al. (1979), Weaver et al. (1979b)</td>
<td>V85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn Dramatic, Exciting Things</td>
<td>Palmgreet et al. (1980)</td>
<td>V92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up with world events</td>
<td>Becker et al.</td>
<td>V99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See &amp; hear arguments supporting your ideas</td>
<td>Katz et al. (1973), Becker et al. (1980)</td>
<td>V106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know about sales and products</td>
<td>Becker et al. (1980)</td>
<td>V113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up with Ohio events</td>
<td>Becker et al. (1980)</td>
<td>V120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE TYPE</td>
<td>RELATED STUDIES</td>
<td>QUESTIONS IN INSTRUMENT</td>
<td>DERIVED MEASURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEEDS (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill Time</td>
<td>Kimball (1959)</td>
<td>V127</td>
<td>new variable COMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenberg (1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weaver et al. (1979)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weaver et al. (1979b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katz et al. (1973)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURV (Surveillance)</td>
<td>derived</td>
<td>derived from factor analysis scores: V48+V99+V113+V120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP (Companionship)</td>
<td>derived</td>
<td>derived from factor analysis scores: V64+V85+V127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIM (Stimulation)</td>
<td>derived</td>
<td>derived from factor analysis scores: V55+V92+V106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE TYPE</td>
<td>RELATED STUDIES</td>
<td>QUESTIONS IN INSTRUMENT</td>
<td>DERIVED MEASURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWS MEDIA USE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td>V7-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td></td>
<td>V28-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td>V36-38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Mags</td>
<td></td>
<td>V39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable TV</td>
<td></td>
<td>V40-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>V45-47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bureau (1977) and by Stone and Wetherington (1979) formed the basis for the inclusion of questions about such exposure for the respondents. Studies by Benedict et al. (1976) and DeRoche (1981) suggested the inclusion of classroom exposure. Numerous articles dealt with the influence of childhood exposure to electronic media, and respondents were asked whether, during their pre-teen years, their parents subscribed to a daily newspaper, regularly listened to TV or radio news programs, or subscribed to a news magazine. They were also asked if they recalled having had any teacher who regularly used newspapers regularly in class. During the data analysis, a new variable was created to incorporate into a single measure levels of childhood exposure to news media. Creation of that variable is dealt with later in the next chapter.

Life Situation variables were also suggested by results of earlier studies. Education has been found to be an important predictor of newspaper reading -- Bagdikian (1971), Schweitzer (1975), Newspaper Readership Project (1978), and elsewhere -- and non-reading in Westley and Severin (1964) and Penrose et al. (1974).

Bagdikian (1971), Schweitzer (1975), and the Newspaper Readership Project (1978) have found that occupation may be a predictor of newspaper reading
behavior, and several studies, including Sobal and Jackson-Beeck (1981) and Bogart (1981), have found a relationship between newspaper reading and race.

Age and income are among the most often used predictors of readership, and many studies cited earlier use one or both of these variables, including the Westley and Severin (1964), Bagdikian (1971), Penrose et al. (1974), Schweitzer (1975), Larkin et al. (1977), Newspaer Research Project (1978), Burgoon and Burgoon (1980), and Sobal and Jackson-Beeck (1981).

Many researchers have found that respondents' level of integration into the community in which the newspaper is published is an important factor in readership, with the community integration variable being a composite of a number of individual measures. Bogart (1977, 1981) has used length of residence in the community and length of time in the present dwelling, measures also used by Stamm, Jackson and Bowen (1977), Stone (1978) and others. Stamm and Fortini-Campbell (1981) and Stone and Trotter (1981) have added home ownership to the community integration measure, and McLeod and Choe (1978) have included marital status. Becker, Collins and Fruit (1980) found that those with low motivation to read were characterized by being short-term residents of the area, unmarried, and renters. During the data analysis, a new variable was
created to incorporate into a single measure respondents' integration into the community. Creation of that variable, also, is dealt with later in the next chapter.

Respondents were asked to indicate the level of importance each of twelve selected types of needs had for them. Like exposure and life situation questions, needs questions were suggested by results of other studies and which, from results outlined in Chapter 2, appeared to hold the promise of some applicability to the present study.

The need to keep up with local, state, national, or world events has been asked in some form in most media uses and gratifications studies, and the form of the questions were suggested by Becker, Collins and Fruit (1980) and Alperstein (1980). Use of media to obtain current events information for conversation, and to see or hear arguments supporting one's ideas were questions asked in some fashion by Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) and Becker, Collins and Fruit (1980).

Many studies have examined companionship or relaxation needs, including Berelson (1949), Kimball (1959), McQuail, Blumler and Brown (1973), Greenberg (1974), Weaver, Wilhoit and Riede (1979), and Weaver, Wilhoit and deBock (1979). Most of those studies, along with Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) have asked
about the time-filling function of media, and about its use in overcoming loneliness.

Several studies have investigated the media's use as a tool for daily living, or in planning one's day. Those studies include Berelson (1949), Kimball (1959), Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973), Weaver, Wilhoit and Riede (1979), and Weaver, Wilhoit and deBock (1979). Both Kimball (1959) and Palmgreen, Wenner and Rayburn (1980) asked about the degree to which media allowed respondents to learn about dramatic, exciting things. Becker, Collins and Fruit asked about their utility in knowing about products and sales.

THE POPULATION

Adult residents of Montgomery County, Ohio, an industrial area in the southwestern part of the state, were the population sampled in this study, which was conducted by telephone from July 19 to July 23, 1983. Adult population (18 years of age or more) of the county according to the 1980 census was 412,000, about one-third of whom lived in Dayton, the county seat. A goal of 400 completions was established, which would place the probability of sampling error below the five per cent level.
THE SAMPLE

The sample was a stratified proportional sample based on telephone exchanges. A list of all telephone prefixes in use in the county, and the number of residential phones assigned to each, was obtained from the Ohio Bell and General Telephone companies, the only telephone companies which serve the county. There were 43 exchanges in use, accounting for 135,000 residential phones. Each exchange was assigned a percentage of the 400 desired completions which corresponded with that exchange's percentage of all residential phones in use. The exchange list, percentages, and desired and actual completions are contained in Table 4. (See Table 4.)

Four-digit random numbers were computer generated for each exchange; the numbers fell within the limits of residential numbers actually assigned in each exchange. For example, one exchange assigned only numbers between 8000 and 8999 for residences; only numbers falling within that range were produced for that exchange. At least five times as many numbers as completions needed were generated for each exchange, to allow for non-working numbers, business phones, refusals, and residences in which a proper respondent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCHANGE</th>
<th>RES. PHONES</th>
<th>PCT.</th>
<th>COMP NEEDED</th>
<th>COMP OBTAINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>10,130</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>859</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was not available. It was anticipated that assigning completion sample proportions to the exchanges would help insure a sample corresponding closely with the population, since exchanges are assigned rather rigidly to geographic areas.

The target number of 400 questionnaires was completed during the five-day period described above. Two of the 43 exchanges were slightly overrepresented and two slightly underrepresented in the sample, but 394 completions, or 98.5 per cent, were present in the same proportion for the sample as in the population. The completion rate was 66.3 per cent among eligible respondents reached.

Table 5 compares results from the sample with known data from the population on several benchmark variables. (See Table 5.)

Respondents had lived in the country for a median of 24.7 years, and in their present dwellings for a median of 6 years; 74 per cent of respondents lived in single-family homes, and 68.2 per cent were buying or owned their homes. Occupation status was coded according to the NORC Scale, developed at the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. Fifty per cent of respondents had some education beyond high school, and 24.9 per cent had at least undergraduate degrees; 18.8 per cent had not finished
TABLE 5
Comparison of Sample with Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.0 pct.</td>
<td>46.8 pct. (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.0 pct.</td>
<td>53.2 pct. (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>80.0 pct.</td>
<td>82.4 pct. (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18.5 pct.</td>
<td>16.5 pct. (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Residents</td>
<td>33.9 pct.</td>
<td>34.9 pct. (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now Married</td>
<td>61.7 pct.</td>
<td>61.7 pct. (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age (18+)</td>
<td>44.2 yrs.</td>
<td>45.9 yrs. (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATV Penetration</td>
<td>48.7 pct.</td>
<td>48.9 pct. (b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(b) Broadcasting Magazine 105, No. 10: 90 (September 5, 1983).
Eleven interviewers were hired to do the calling for the study. The interviewers, three undergraduate students, three graduate students, and five older adults, attended a 1 1/2-hour training session, and were assigned to calling shifts, eight at a time, for the next five days. Each interviewer received samples of all forms and questionnaires, a training manual, and identical instructions, all of which are contained in the Appendix. Supplemental instructions, clarification of procedures, and encouragement was given to all interviewers simultaneously by means of a nightly newsletter.

Respondents were asked first about their newspaper reading behavior (V7-20): whether they subscribed to a daily paper, which one, at what time they read, and the first three parts of the paper they read. They were next asked about the types of news media to which they were exposed in their pre-teenage years (V21-27), and then about their frequency of use of television and radio news (V28-33). Respondents were also asked about any news magazines to which they subscribed (V38) and,
for CATV subscribers, the type and frequency of news viewing on cable television channels (V40-44).

Finally, respondents were asked about other sources of news they might have had, and their frequency of use (V45-47).

In the next section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of twelve types of needs on a four-point scale, then for each need to indicate on a three-point scale how helpful in meeting each need respondents found newspapers, TV news, radio news, news magazines, cable TV news, and any other news source mentioned by the respondent (V48-135). Finally, respondents were asked about the life situation characteristics identified earlier (V136-147).

While the number of variables was large for a telephone survey, numerous filter questions made it unnecessary to ask all questions of all respondents; minor modifications were made in the questionnaire as a result of pretesting. Completion time for the instrument was intended to be ten to twelve minutes, but in practice was close to 15. Interviewers encountered only 11 terminations (2.7 per cent) from among those who began the survey. A copy of the questionnaire is contained in the Appendix.

During the first four days of calling -- Tuesday
through Friday -- interviewers began work at 5 p.m. and finished at 9:30 p.m. The last day -- Saturday -- calling went from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Each interviewer was assigned an exchange and was given a set of telephone number cards and a packet of 20 questionnaires. Ten completions with members of each sex were stipulated for every 20 questionnaires. When calling a number ending with an even digit, interviewers were instructed to seek to administer the instrument to the male head of household. When the last digit was odd, the female head of household was the designated respondent.

Substitutions were permitted only in specific cases, described in detail below.

1. The number reached was a non-working number;

2. The number reached was a business phone;

3. A number was unanswered or busy at five times on three separate days;

4. The respondent of the required sex was unavailable on three different days;

5. A potential respondent refused to participate
6. No potential respondent of the required sex lived at the residence reached, as would be the case for a number ending with an even digit at a residence occupied by a single woman. In this situation, interviewers were permitted to accept an interview with the only respondent at the number, provided the quota for that sex had not yet been met in the interviewer's packet of 20 questionnaires.

Each interviewer was instructed to record the results of every telephone call on the numer card. These were filed upon completion or disqualification to allow progress to be charted. A total of 1,286 calls were made, distributed as shown in Table 6. (See Table 6.)

Interviewers received a daily printout listing their total completions and current male-female ratio.

Chapter 4 describes in detail the ways in which the data obtained from the respondents were analyzed and describes the results from each stage of the analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Calls Attempted</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Working Numbers</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusals</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Subj. of Required Sex</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the data collected in the study took place in three stages. First, scores were tabulated for all items and means and standard deviations were computed. At this point also, some additional scales were created and responses to the twelve questions concerning the strength of needs often associated with media use were factor analyzed, with the resulting factors used in subsequent analytical stages. See Table 3 for a complete list of variables used.

In the second stage, each need factor generated in the previous analysis was used as a dependent variable in a multiple regression analysis; independent variables at this stage were life situation and childhood media exposure variables. Results of the regression analyses were intended to isolate those variables which made the greatest contribution to the development of the need factors generated by the factor analysis.
Stage three analysis made use of a multiple discriminant analysis using newspaper subscribership as the dependent variable. Independent variables included childhood news media exposure, life situation variables, and the sociopsychological need factors. Each of the three stages of analysis is discussed in detail in the following pages.

STAGE ONE: SCALES AND SCORES

Using a sub-sample of questionnaires, coding schemes were developed for all open-ended questions in the instrument. All such questions were then coded, and inter-coder reliability exceeded 98 per cent. After coding, questionnaires were keypunched at the data preparation center at the University of Dayton computer center. All cards were verified and the data set was cleaned before analysis.

Two additional variables were created at this point, as indicated in Table 3. The first, a summed score of five variables asking for respondents' recollection of use by their parents of newspapers, radio and TV news, and news magazines, and of newspaper use by teachers, was used as a measure of childhood exposure to news media. A score of 5 on this scale indicated exposure to all the media from which the
variable was derived, while a score of 0 indicated little or no exposure.

The second derived variable was a measure of respondents' levels of integration into the community in which the daily newspaper was published, and which had been shown in previous research to related community attachment. (See Table 3.) The variables used included place of residence and length of time in the county and in the present dwelling, type of dwelling, home ownership, and marital status. All six items which made up the new community integration scale were converted to binary measures to create a scale on which a person could accumulate a maximum score of six, indicating a high level of community attachment, or a minimum of zero, indicating a low level of community attachment.

The first major analytical task was to factor analyze the responses to the needs questions to simplify later stages of the analysis by reducing the number of variables. Twelve questions pertaining to certain sociopsychological needs were suggested by previous research, and were asked of respondents. It was anticipated that a three-factor solution would be obtained, containing surveillance, parasocial, and diversion factors. Previous research reviewed in Chapter 2 suggested that need for knowledge of local
state and national events, along with news of products and sales, and help with organizing the day would comprise the surveillance factor. The needs for relaxation, overcoming loneliness, learning about exciting things, and filling time were expected to form a diversion factor, and the remaining items would comprise the remaining factor. The factor structure obtained is reported in Table 8. The questions are itemized in Table 3.

Responses were factor analyzed with the SPSS Factor subprogram by method PA 2, the principal-factor method, and subjected to an oblique rotation. This method, which does not assume the variables are necessarily unrelated to each other, produced the cleanest factor solution. The three-factor solution obtained is illustrated in Tables 7 and 8. (See Tables 7 and 8.) Three factors had Eigenvalues of more than 1.0, which had been established as the cutoff point for the number of factors to be used. In addition, it was at the third factor that the scree began a noticeable leveling-out. A factor loading of at least .40 was the criterion for retaining any variable as a component in a factor. Consequently, three factors were used in later analyses. (See Table 3.) Factor 1 was called Surveillance, defined by the general need to keep up with events in the Dayton area, in Ohio, in the nation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Pct of Var</th>
<th>Cum Pct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.71595</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44493</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.15125</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.90901</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.80469</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.73068</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.69497</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.60694</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.51430</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.42724</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 8**  
Factor Loadings: Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48-know Dayton events</td>
<td>.79 *</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-info for conversation</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.43 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-companionship</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.72 *</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-plan, organize day</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-relax</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-overcome loneliness</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.70 *</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-learn dramatic things</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.75 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-nat'l, world events</td>
<td>.61 *</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-see, hear own ideas</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.69 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113-know about sales, etc.</td>
<td>.53 *</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-follow Ohio events</td>
<td>.73 *</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-fill time</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.47 *</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* variables defining each factor
and world, and with products and sales. The use of the term implies an orientation to broad geographic chunks of the world, a rather specific event-centeredness. Factor 2 was named for the most heavily-loading variable, Companionship, and included the needs to overcome loneliness and to fill time. Factor 3 was called Stimulation and included the needs for current events information for conversational purposes, the desire to learn about dramatic, exciting things, and exposure to ideas corresponding to one's own. Two variables, relaxation and the planning of one's day, did not load strongly on any factor and were dropped from later stages of the analysis.

The factor solution was tested for reliability using the SPSS Reliability subprogram which makes use of Cronbach's Alpha. Factor 1 produced an alpha of .65, Factor 2 an alpha of .50, and Factor 3 an alpha of .52.

Pearson Product-Moment correlations were done on all items being used as independent variables in later stages of analysis to discover highly correlated variable pairs which could cloud later results. Correlations (Table 9) ranged from .00 to .47, far enough below the danger level of about .7 or .8 to minimize potential problems with multicollinearity. The most highly correlated variables were education with
occupational status (.47) and with income (.36); community integration with age (.42), which can be attributed to the fact that older persons have generally lived in their dwellings for a longer period of time and are more likely to own their homes, measures from which the community integration variable was in part derived; and surveillance need with stimulation need (.40). (See Table 9.)

STAGE TWO: MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

The next step in the data analysis was to attempt, through a multiple regression program, to ascertain the characteristics which promoted the development of the needs identified through the factor analysis.

All variables relating to childhood news media exposure and respondents' life situation, including community integration, were entered in chronologically-based stepwise fashion into an SPSS New Regression subprogram for each of the three need factors. All data are converted to standarized scores in this program. This stepwise method of inclusion was selected because, as was explained earlier, some variables were logically present before others, a fact of which the analysis should take note. Age, race, and sex were entered first, those characteristics having been established at conception. Exposure to Media and
### Correlation Matrix of Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OccStat</th>
<th>Educ</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Surv</th>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>Stim</th>
<th>Expos</th>
<th>Comm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OccStat</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surv</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stim</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expos</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComInt</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the variables were nominal items. V144 (Race) was coded as 0 = nonwhite, 1 = white; V147 (Sex) was coded as 0 = female, 1 = male. While this violates the assumptions of interval-level data for the Pearson correlation, the statistic is robust. Guidelines from the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan (Andrews et al., 1981) remark that dichotomous variables which are not a collapsing of continuous variables can be treated as interval data, and the Pearson's R is mathematically equivalent to a Point Biserial R; the tests are almost equivalent.
education were entered next, the former having occurred by questionnaire definition in the pre-teen years, and the latter having been largely completed by the end of adolescence.

The last variables to enter the analysis were the remaining life situation variables, items which reflected respondents' current status in the community and in life. They were occupational status, income, and community integration. Although multiple regression analysis normally requires that data be at least interval level, it is possible to incorporate nominal-level data into the analysis through the use of 'dummy' variables. Two dummies were used in the regressions -- race (nonwhite-white) and sex (female-male).

The results, illustrated in Tables 10 through 12, provide a slightly different profile for each need factor, and although the percentage of variance explained is relatively low, the results provide at least some indications of the kinds of things which influence the formation of each need. A discussion of the implications of the regression results on the research question is contained in the next chapter. An additional run in which all variables were entered simultaneously was used to allow for order of entry and produced similar results, as did runs in which
variables were entered stepwise in reverse order. In the latter case, less education also served as a predictor of stimulation, significant at .05. Such an order of entry prevents the intervening needs variables from being drained of the variance for which they are responsible by associated variables entered earlier into the analysis. (See Tables 10 through 12.)

Table 10 indicates that the sort of surveillance needs being measured here, those which relate principally to news and shopping information, are most strongly influenced by age, race, and sex; other variables appear relatively unimportant. The entire variable list accounts for 14.6 per cent of the variance in the Surveillance factor. Race produced a beta weight of .307, more than twice the weight of any other variable in the analysis. Its F-ratio of 24.82 is significant at less than .001. Both sex and age account for most of the rest of the variance in this regression, with sex significant at the .01 level and age at .05.

Since the sign of $R$ indicates the direction of the relationship, the table indicates that whites in the study displayed a greater surveillance need than nonwhites, that males displayed a greater surveillance need than females, and that younger respondents displayed a greater surveillance need than older
### TABLE 10
Regression Summary Table: Surveillance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>24.82</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Integ.</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup. Stat.</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom: 8, 234
### TABLE 11
Regression Summary Table: Companionship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Integ.</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup. Stat.</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom: 8, 234
TABLE 12
Regression Summary Table: Stimulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Integ.</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup. Stat.</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom: 8, 234
respondents.

Three variables were significant at at least .05 on the companionship regression, although the heaviest beta weight was for Exposure at -.128; the F-ratio of 3.44 was significant at .01 (Table 11). The negative R on this variable indicates that respondents with less exposure to news media during childhood display a greater need for companionship than respondents with more such exposure.

Two other variables were significant, both at the .05 level. Females (beta = .103) and whites (beta = .096) exhibited greater companionship needs than other respondents. The variable list for the regression on the companionship need factor accounted for 5.9 per cent of the variance in the factor.

Only one variable was significant on the stimulation need factor (Table 12). Less exposure to news media in childhood was the sole predictor on this factor. Its beta of -.128 produced an F-ratio of 3.38, significant at the .01 level. However, the entire variable list accounted for only 3.4 per cent of the variance. The next chapter will discuss the application of the multiple regression analyses to the research questions.
STAGE THREE: MULTIPLE DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

The third major analytical step was to examine the influences of newspaper subscribership -- the second principal research question -- through the use of the SPSS Discriminant subprogram. The purpose of this analysis was to attempt to isolate those variables which played the greatest role in influencing newspaper subscribership. Variable 7, whether or not the respondent subscribed to a newspaper, was the dependent variable in this analysis, while childhood news media exposure, life situation, and sociopsychological needs were the independent variables.

As in the multiple regression analyses, all independent variables listed in the intercorrelation table (Table 9) were entered in a chronologically-determined stepwise fashion. Age, race, and sex were entered first, followed by exposure to news media during childhood and education. The remaining life situation variables of occupational status, income, and community integration were entered next, and the three sociopsychological need factors -- surveillance, companionship, and stimulation -- were entered last. Second stage analysis had already determined that these needs were at least partly a function of the other variables in the analysis and therefore should come last chronologically. F-to-enter
was set at 1.0 and the stepwise method WILKS was selected to obtain the largest overall multivariate F. A run was also made using childhood exposure to newspapers at home and in school in place of exposure to news media, thereby allowing for newspaper-specific influences. A third run was made, in which all variables were entered at the same time to allow for influences caused by order of entry. All three runs produced the same discriminating variables significant at the same levels.

Since only two groups were used in the analysis, subscribers and nonsubscribers, a maximum of one discriminant function was possible in the analysis. That function is reported in Table 13. (See Table 13.)

The square of the canonical correlation is a measure of the amount of variance in the dependant variable accounted for by the function; thus, the canonical correlation of .366 for the function contributes 13.4 percent of the variance in newspaper subscribing-nonsubscribing. Four variables were identified in the analysis as loading on the function: age, surveillance need, community integration, and education. Tables 14 and 15 report the unstandardized and standardized discriminant function coefficients. The standardized coefficients in Table 16 are similar to beta weights in that they represent the relative
TABLE 13
Discriminant Function for Variable 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Wilks' Chi Correlation</th>
<th>Lambda Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Signif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>34.43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contribution of each variable to the function, and the
sign of each coefficient indicates the direction of
influence. (See Tables 14 and 15.)

Four variables were identified in the analysis as
composing the function: community integration, which
weighted most heavily, age, education level, and
surveillance need. Since the signs of all four
coefficients are positive, the characteristics
determined by the analysis to be the strongest
predictors of newspaper subscribership are

— more integrated into the community in which
newspaper is published,
— older,
— more highly educated
— greater surveillance need

The implications of this profile of the most likely
newspaper subscriber will be discussed fully in Chapter
5.

Using this function, the program then attempts to
predict the group — subscriber or nonsubscriber —
into which each case will fall. In this case, the
actual size of the groups was known: 72.4 per cent of
the sample in the analysis were subscribers, and 27.6
per cent were not. Since the size of the groups was
known, the classification analysis was set to reflect
actual group size. The per cent of cases correctly
classified on the basis of this function was 73.25.
### TABLE 14

Unstandardized Function Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Integration</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Integration</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The discriminating variables were better at predicting subscribers than nonsubscribers: more than 93 per cent of subscribers were predicted correctly. Although the variance accounted for by the discriminant function is not large, the percentage of cases correctly classified is good, suggesting that while there are clearly variables which have not been tapped in this study, those which have contributed to the discriminant function are fairly successful at accounting for the variance within the study.

Box's M was computed in the analysis and produced an F of 1.18, and a level of significance of .301, indicating that the covariance matrices of the discriminating variables were not significantly related. Box's M actually tests the null hypothesis, i.e. that there are no differences between groups. The non-significant F allows the null hypothesis to be accepted.

Discussion and implications of these results comprise Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

There are many possible ways to organize the final chapter of a dissertation while touching on the necessary questions of implications, limitations, and future research. In this case, the chapter will be organized in five parts, dealing with the limitations of the study, its applicability, an interpretation of its results, its implications for the industry, and suggestions for future work.

First, the limitations of the study will be discussed, a necessary step in interpreting the work and understanding its implications.

The second topic to be addressed in this chapter, the social significance of the results presented in Chapter Four and their applicability to the newspaper industry, is especially important in light of the relatively low amount of variance in newspaper subscribership explained by the measures used in the study and in previous research.

Third, this chapter will review and interpret the
results of the study, especially in the context of other recent work, and in light of what this study shows about users of media competing with newspapers. Results will be placed in the context of other studies, material not available when this study was designed. This more recent literature is described throughout the chapter, and its implications for this study discussed. Some measures, for example, would have been handled differently under the influence of some recent work.

The fourth task of this chapter is to present the implications of the study for the newspaper business, a final summing up of what the results here mean to the industry -- an explanation of the idea of media niches and the suggestion that newspapers seek to limit themselves to the things they do best, rather that to seek to compete in areas in which they are less well-equipped to attract an audience.

Finally, this chapter suggests additional research which can build upon the study presented here to become an important part of research programs into mass media behavior. This study made use of a broader design with a wider range of variables than has been used in earlier media use research, and the approach shows considerable promise. The final section of the paper makes suggestions for modifications in the design based
on what was learned in this study, and ways in which it could be applied fruitfully to further research into mass media use.

LIMITATIONS

Before discussing the results of this study, it is necessary to note three types of limitations present — first, the limitations of the measurement instrument itself; second, the limitations of cross-sectional data; and third, the limitations inherent in telephone surveys. Each of these will be discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

There were some limitations present in each of the three major categories of independent variables used in the study. Certainly the retrospective questions, those which asked about respondents' exposure to news media during childhood, were subject to some recall error. Furthermore, while respondents were asked about the presence of a newspaper at one point in time only, i.e. when they were of about junior high school age, the exposure influence, if it exists, may be greatest either earlier or later than that. A panel design, with all the time and expense that implies, may ultimately be the only way to get at the influence of childhood exposure.

Reliability of the needs factors constructed from
the twelve needs questions was modest. The number of such questions was purposely kept small, a tradeoff to keep the questionnaire from becoming too lengthy, but a larger number of items might have presented a more clearly defined factor structure, or a structure with additional dimensions as well as higher reliability. Note that two of the twelve items asked did not load with any of the three factors obtained.

Among the life situation items, community integration showed considerable predictive strength, despite its limitations, principally the fact that the variable itself was relatively insensitive to length of residence. Each component of the derived variable COMINTEG (see Table 3) had been collapsed to a two-point scale, meaning that, for example, recent arrivals in Montgomery County were scored the same as residents of up to five years on that variable component. A more complicated means of creating this variable might have resulted in a more sensitive measure. In addition, greater discriminating power would have been given to the variable if the instrument had included Stamm's question regarding length of future anticipated residence discussed later in this chapter. These additions, however, would also increase the length of the instrument.

The limitations of cross-sectional data are well
known. All measurement is being done at a single point in time, and all participants in the study are subject to specific environmental influences which may affect the results. Nevertheless, most media use research makes use of cross-sectional designs because of the different problems associated with time-based designs. Panel or cohort studies, beginning while subjects were in early childhood and following them through the life cycle, would produce a richer understanding of their developing patterns of media use, but such designs are time-consuming and expensive, and involve methodological problems of their own. That such a study would be a valuable undertaking, however, is certainly an important conclusion of this study.

The other primary limitations are those inherent in the data collection itself. Telephone surveys are limited in the length of time they can take because of the difficulty of getting respondents to agree to a lengthy interview with a disembodied voice. The length of the instrument used in this study, 147 variables, must surely have come close to the maximum practical length for such a design, and interviews lasted an average of about fifteen minutes. But the completion rate of about 66 per cent was fairly typical of such designs, which certainly make possible comparisons between this study and similar research from the past,
and the results of this study appear consistent with other work using similar methodology.

APPLICABILITY

The results in Chapter Four must be read in the light of the fact that the amount of variance explained among the need factors by the variables listed in Table 3 ranges from 3.4 per cent to 14.6 per cent, an indication that there are variables still untapped. But most previous researchers have been principally concerned with finding simple relationships, and been less concerned with their strength and social significance, something about which they must become more consciously aware. The social significance of this study can be judged most appropriately by the percentage of cases of newspaper subscribing and nonsubscribing correctly classified by the discriminant analysis. The discriminating variables are themselves reliable enough to correctly classify subscribers — correctly classifying 93 per cent of those cases. Few studies of this nature contained in the literature report these figures. Burgoon and Burgoon (1980), for example, in a study using a series of four samples and many of the same independent variables used in this study, reported variance explained ranging from 9 to 14 per cent. Their chief statistical tool was multiple
regression analysis, however, which does not permit classification of cases. Certainly among the implications for future research suggested by this project would be an investigation of other possible sources of variance in newspaper subscribership, suggestions which are treated in the final section of this chapter. Part of the reason for the low variance explained in this and similar studies may be attributable to measurement error, but there are clearly variables which have not been tapped in readership research heretofore.

The challenge for future research projects will be to find the variables which have not been covered by this and other studies.

In view of the close correspondence of the sample to known population data, it would seem that the results should be generalizable at least to the extent that the population of Montgomery County, Ohio is characteristic of larger populations. Moreover, the results of this study appear to correspond to a large extent with other readership research, and the implications of the results, as discussed in the next section, may have value for the industry and for other researchers in at least clarifying some present readership trends and in evaluating some current industry practices. While conclusions apply directly
only to the population studied, i.e. Montgomery County adults, they may at least suggest broader trends or research questions which could be applied to larger population. The search for the variables explaining more of the variance in newspaper subscribership must await future research projects.

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

This section of the chapter has two parts, which correspond to the two components of the research question. It first takes up a discussion of the regression analyses, which identified one or more population characteristics associated with each of the three sociopsychological need factors isolated in the factor analysis phase of the data analysis. The second part of this section comprises a discussion of the second part of the research question -- identification of the key discriminating variables in newspaper subscribership from among the exposure, life situation, and needs variables in the analysis.

I. Exposure and Life Situation as Predictors of Needs

The first principal area of inquiry suggested at the end of Chapter Two and the beginning of Chapter Three asked about the ways that childhood exposure to news media and life situation characteristics
contribute to the development of certain sociopsychological needs. The three need factors -- surveillance, companionship, and stimulation -- produced by the factor analysis were used in later analyses. Most prior research into the needs of media users has focused on television viewers. Factor analysis applied to newspaper reading has for the most part been limited to an analysis of types of content or reading patterns: that is, the behavior, not the conditions which precede the behavior. Factor and cluster analysis have also been used occasionally as a component in studies of media use in general -- Katz et al. is the best-known example -- but is applied here in a study concerned solely with news media use. Results of the regression analyses performed on the three needs factors (Tables 10-12) permit some conclusions to be drawn about the operation of these needs.

A. Surveillance

The Surveillance factor is defined almost entirely here as a need to keep up with events: local, state, national, world, and, to an extent, economic. The key predicting variables of race, sex, and age suggest that those respondents with the highest surveillance needs are white, male, and younger. These first two variables are very much in keeping with traditional
views of high surveillance need, while the third variable, age, represents members of the key "problem" group for newspaper publishers -- the group of potential readers they are not reaching to the extent they wish, but that which represents the future of the industry.

Younger segments of the population are better-educated than the older segments ($r = .15$) -- a plus for newspapers, since education has always been associated with of newspaper use. But this group is the most mobile, too, a factor which most studies have found to run counter to heavier newspaper use. This study, too, found age positively related to length of residence in the county ($r = .33$) and in the present dwelling ($r = .46$). However, Stamm, Jackson and Bowen (1977) found that those persons who experience the greatest anxiety about moving are the best potential customers for the newspaper, and that the group which exhibits the most anxiety is also the most mobile group: young adults. A recent study by Stamm and Fortini-Campbell (1983), published after the data for this study were collected, points out that mere length of residence is inadequate to explain the strength of the community ties which help to predict newspaper reading, that length of anticipated future residence plays a critical role in many manifestations of
community involvement, including newspaper use.

The Surveillance need, then, appears to be fostered by a person's being a younger white male. It is easy to conceive of race and sex being, in large part, culturally-bound, since white males have traditionally been the most active participants in the economic system, and have consequently had the greatest need for information. But younger respondents displayed a greater need for surveillance in this study than did older respondents. The suggestion by Stamm, Jackson and Bowen described above appears to have merit, i.e. members of the younger, more mobile group may perceive a greater need for surveillance in part to reduce some of the anxiety resulting from dislocation. Indeed, in this study there is a low but significant negative correlation (r=-.16) between age and surveillance need, which appears to support that view. The presence of a relatively strong surveillance need among problem subscribers presents opportunities for newspapers which promote their information content.

B. Companionship

The Companionship factor is defined in this study as the needs for companionship, to overcome loneliness, and to fill time. This factor is also predicted by race and sex, specifically white and female, but more
significantly by the degree of exposure to news media during the childhoods of the respondents: stronger Companionship needs are associated with lower levels of childhood news media exposure.

Less interest in events and greater need for companionship appear in responses from those who were not exposed to high levels of news while they were children. While the exposure level did not appear to positively affect the need for information about events, its absence apparently helped to foster a less event-centered orientation. Again, it seems clear that to attract the younger readers they so want and need, newspapers need to focus more on promoting themselves as information resources, thus helping satisfy the surveillance need among young adults, the group which feels the need most strongly. At the same time, the presence of the newspaper in the homes of these young adults removes one of the influences from their children which seems to foster the development of needs which do not seem to be well satisfied by newspapers in later life, the needs for companionship and stimulation.

C. Stimulation

The Stimulation need factor, defined by the needs to learn dramatic and exciting things, to see and hear
arguments supporting one's own ideas, and to have current information for conversation, had but a single predictor, a lower level of news media exposure in childhood. The need for stimulation, in a stepwise regression reported more fully later in the chapter, turned out to be the strongest predictor of the frequency of television news viewing (F=9.51). It was clear from the results of the discriminant analysis presented in the previous chapter that the Stimulation need had little to do with newspaper readership; this is the first bit of evidence in this study that very different sets of needs influence consumption of newspapers and TV news. Thus, whether or not the presence of a newspaper in the home serves as a positive influence on children to subscribe when they themselves become adults, its absence contributes to needs not associated with newspaper use. It is becoming clear that if the Surveillance need does not develop strongly, other needs will, and these other needs will be better served by other media.

II. Exposure, Life Situation, and Needs as Predictors of Media Use.

The second principal area of inquiry related in Chapters Two and Three to the research question -- indeed, the root of the question itself -- addresses
the issue of the ways in which childhood exposure to news media, life situation characteristics, and sociopsychological needs contribute to the tendency to subscribe to a newspaper. This section of the chapter discusses each of these three types of independent variables, and examines in greater detail the four variables which were found in this study to contribute most strongly to the tendency to subscribe to a newspaper: age, surveillance need, level of community integration, and education.

A. Exposure and Newspaper Subscribership

Contrary to expectations, the study showed that the presence of a newspaper in the home displayed little correlation with respondents' later subscription practices (r=.003). (See Table 16.) There is almost no difference between groups. Among subscribers, 79.3 per cent had parents who subscribed, among nonsubscribers the figure was 79.2. As was discussed above, the lack of results here is open to several interpretations — a true lack of influence by this variable, retrospective error by the respondents, lack of sensitivity by the instrument, or the influence of a third variable. More background work needs to be done on the question of the influence of exposure of newspaper use.
TABLE 16
Subscribing by Parent Subscribing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P Sub</th>
<th>P Nonsub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.4 pct</td>
<td>24.6 pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.3 pct</td>
<td>79.2 pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsub</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.3 pct</td>
<td>24.7 pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.7 pct</td>
<td>20.8 pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 0.0029 \hspace{1cm} d.f. = 1$
B. Life Situation and Newspaper Subscribership

Age

Three of the life situation variables were statistically significant as predictors of newspaper subscribing: age, education, and community integration. Age, of course, shows up consistently in the literature as a major predictor of newspaper use. But since most studies are cross-sectional, it is usually difficult to ascertain whether use is really an age effect or a cohort effect. Some evidence for the latter was presented in Table 2. Regardless of its origin, however, the age difference persists, and is present in this study. (Table 17) Subscribership increases steadily with age until the drop usually associated with sensory deterioration occurs above age 65. The big jump in newspaper subscribing in this study happens above age 34. (See Table 17.)

Community Integration

An increasing number of studies are drawing clear lines from community attachment levels to newspaper use. Weaver and Fielder (1983) found a positive relationship between civic attitude and frequency of newspaper reading. Olsen (1983) found age, civic
### TABLE 17

**Age by Subscribership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Subscriber</th>
<th>Nonsubscriber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>57.7 pct</td>
<td>42.3 pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 18.88 \quad d.f. = 4 \]

\[ p = .001 \]
attitude, and income the most consistent predictors for exposure to various media. Olien, Donohue and Tichenor (1982) found that media use for non-local news is strongly related to the level of local employment and community identification. Einsiedel (1983) cites a variety of community integration factors which positively influence subscribership. There is support in this study for the view of Stamm, Jackson and Bowen (1977) that less well-integrated residents are a good potential market for newspapers. Table 18 shows a fairly steady climb with level of community integration (r= .25) -- except for the least-integrated group, the outlying, newly-arrived, unmarried renters, who display one of the highest newspaper subscription rates. Many members of this group could fall into Stamm's "Settlers" category of residents: recent arrivals who expect to remain for some time and who therefore have incentive to become quickly integrated into the community. But additional questions would have been needed to determine the extent to which this was true. The N for this category was very small, comprising only 5.3 per cent of the sample, and it dangerous to generalize too much from such a group. (See Table 18.)
TABLE 18
Community Integration by Subscribership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Integ.</th>
<th>Subscribers</th>
<th>Nonsubscribers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>76.9 pct</td>
<td>23.1 pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Integ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 27.36\quad d.f. = 6$

$p = .0001$
Education

Education, too, has often been tied to use, although McCombs (1983) points out its ambiguity as a predictor, since, between 1960 and 1982 the proportion of the population with high school diplomas rose from 40 to 70 per cent while the percentage of adults reading a newspaper each day dropped from 80 to 67. But Olien et al. found that as education goes up, use of the newspaper for non-local news increases ($r = .79$) and television use for that purpose goes down ($r = -.83$). Education alone in this study was not strongly associated with newspaper use ($r = .11$, $X^2 = 5.19$ with 6 d.f.) but when entered with other variables, its predictive power was enhanced.

C. Sociopsychological Needs and Newspaper Subscribership

There is also more recent evidence for the importance of the surveillance need, the event orientation discussed earlier, as being important to newspaper use. Einsiedel (1983) found that subscribers have a much stronger orientation to news of all sorts than do nonsubscribers. Blood, Keir and Kang (1983) reported that keeping informed about events is a major reason for newspaper reading in Hawaii, and found a negative relationship between the desire for diversion
and attitudes consistent with newspaper use.

In this study, respondents who recorded high surveillance needs were far more likely to find newspapers useful in meeting their needs than were respondents who recorded high companionship or stimulation needs, although respondents who sought stimulation were more likely to find the newspaper useful than were those who sought companionship. (Table 19) Stimulation-seekers found the newspaper somewhat more satisfying for their purposes than did companionship-seekers, but the stimulation need itself was not a predictor of newspaper readership. Correlations between needs and the helpfulness of newspapers in satisfying those needs ranged from .26 to .32 for surveillance, from .01 to .06 for companionship, and from .19 to .24 for stimulation. (See Table 19.)

IMPLICATIONS

Competition with Television

What does this mean for the newspaper industry? Newspapers for many years have seen themselves in competition with television. Despite some evidence that the time children spend with television and the time they spend with newspapers are positively related,
### TABLE 19
Helpfulness of Newspapers in Meeting Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pct. finding Newsp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;very useful&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEILLANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know Dayton area events</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know nat'l, world events</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know about sales, etc.</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know Ohio events</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPANIONSHIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companionship</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcome loneliness</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill time</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIMULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info for conversation</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn dramatic things</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See, hear own ideas</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Harte-Hanks study done by Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1976) found that it is an article of faith among newspaper editors that attrition among young readers is due chiefly to competition from TV. Young people themselves, in this study, placed television seventh among ten possible causes of lower newspaper use. Bush (1967) cites proprietary research which finds that, except for children who use no television at all, time spent with TV and with newspapers are related positively. A Newspaper Readership Project study (1978) reported similar results and found that it extended to all age groups.

Despite such findings, newspaper editors have persisted in trying to compete with television on its own ground. Newspapers in the past twenty years have become more visual and have relied more on softer news and shorter items than in years past -- things which are the staples of television news. Bogart (1975) studied the issue of newspaper-television competition and remarked

It might be expected that in adjusting to the changed news communication environment, newspapers would be placing increased stress on content of specialized reader interest, since such segmented areas of appeal can be handled in print far more readily than on television. . . . [P]apers that have been gaining circulation have added both news and advertising pages at a faster rate than those that have stood still or retreated. It would be cheerful to
conclude (though the case is by no means proven) that those newspapers whose editorial content provides the greatest value to the reader have shown the best ability to prosper in both circulation and advertising in the face of the growing strength of television news.

Bogart's point is that newspapers are most successful when they best serve readers' needs. And there is clear evidence that emphasizing news and satisfying the surveillance need described earlier are what the public wants from newspapers.

Weaver and Mullins (1975) examined nineteen two-paper markets and found that the trailing papers in the markets had news holes averaging more than 8 percent larger than the leading papers. But the leading papers on the average devoted more space to six of the seven types of news and information items recorded. Trailing papers led only in amount of space allotted to news photos and in several feature and soft news categories. The more visual papers in the study, those using larger photographs and more color, tended to be the trailing papers.

In the Burgoon, Burgoon and Wilkinson (1983) study of reader content preferences, eight of the ten top content categories dealt with news and information items, the sorts of items which comprise the essence of the surveillance need factor isolated in the factor analysis. Readers want, first of all, information from
their newspapers.

There is good reason to believe that it is most beneficial for newspapers to emphasize their own strengths and worry less about competing with other media. Dimmick and Rotnenbuhler (1984) propose a theory of social organization based on the idea of ecological niches. They explain that when two populations compete strongly for the same limited resources, the superior competitor may force the other into extinction or into alteration of the characteristics which promote competition. Applied to media competition, the model suggests that the more directly two media try to draw from the same economic base, or the more intensively two media attempt to serve the same clientele in the same ways, the higher will be the level of competition and the greater will be the need for one of the competitors to alter its niche or face extinction.

Media Market Niches

While most studies examine usage characteristics of only one medium, the present study also collected data which would allow profiling of users of media other than the newspaper, allowing the extent of market overlap or distinct competitive niche to be weighed. A examination of the characteristics which predict use of
television news, radio news, news magazines, and cable television news show clearly that consumers of these media differ in several important respects from newspaper subscribers. There is some overlap, of course, the groups are hardly discrete. Many respondents make use of all the media measured, while a few reported using none at all. But the points of difference are telling.

Tables 20-23 show the results of a series of stepwise multiple regression runs used to identify the best predictors of various sorts of media use. All independent variables used in the isolation of newspaper use predictors were used as independent variables in these analyses; dependent variables were use of TV news, radio news, news magazines, and Cable News Network. The tables show only variables in which p=.05 or less. Although subscribing-nonsubscribing was used as the dependent variable in these analyses. Virtually everyone makes use of television; the non-use group in this analysis would be too small to permit any sort of generalization. The viewing of CNN is, of course, dependent first on whether the respondent subscribes to cable television.

Recall that four variables were identified as predictors of newspaper use. They were:

- age (older)
-surveillance need (greater need)
-community integration (greater)
-education (higher levels)

Four variables from Table 3 also predict frequency of TV news use, but only greater community integration is the same. The strongest predictor in this case is Stimulation: the need to see or hear dramatic, exciting things, to have current events information for conversation, or to see or hear support for one's ideas. Education is related to TV news use, but negatively this time. Income is also a predictor of this dependent variable, and it, too, is negative.

Radio news listeners are more likely to be white had have higher levels of integration into the community while readers of news magazines are characterized by a number of variables. Key predictors of news magazine use are more education, higher occupational status, greater need for stimulation, higher income, less media exposure in childhood, and, to a lesser extent, being female. Viewers of Cable News Network are more likely to be better-educated whites.

Such results, particularly with respect to television, support the notion that factors other than content and presentation influence newspaper readership, and that, perhaps, newspapers should worry
less about competing with media that have less impact on them than they realize, and should put more effort into capitalizing on the strengths they already possess in the marketplace. (See Tables 20 through 23.)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has made use of a more complex model than is usually used in newspaper readership research, combining the ideas of childhood exposure to news media, life situation, and sociopsychological needs as predictors of newspaper use. Results of the study are consistent with those of other research, both in terms of the types of predictors of newspaper readership isolated and the amount of variance explained by the independent variables.

The focus should be on the social significance of these results: the discriminating variables allowed correct classification of nearly three-quarters of all cases, and classified more than nine out of ten subscribers correctly. Persons who are older, better-educated, have a higher degree of integration into the community, and have a higher surveillance need are those most likely to read a newspaper -- and the U.S. population is getting older and better-educated, which would seem to offer encouragement to newspapers. On the other hand, the population is far more mobile


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Integ.</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom: 11, 231
## TABLE 21
Regression Summary Table: Radio News Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Integ.</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom: 9, 233
TABLE 22
Regression Summary Table: News Magazine Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ. Status</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom: 11, 231
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Signif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom: 10, 123
than it once was, a fact which Stamm, Jackson and Bowen found works against subscribership. Younger adults account for the greatest share of that mobility.

The question which confronts the newspaper industry now is how to tap into the reading potential presented by increasing age and education levels while offsetting the effects of increased mobility which are detrimental to reading. It may be the surveillance variable which holds the key.

While older persons are more likely to read, results of this study show that it is in younger persons that the surveillance need is the greatest. This would appear to suggest that newspapers ought to return to doing the job they do best -- presenting news and analysis in depth, and eschewing the broader, perhaps more superficial, approach which may be more typical of television. Furthermore, newspapers must do a better job of promoting the information content of their medium, not their entertainment features or "people" packages. Although respondents were not asked for what reasons they had read specific types of material, more than four-fifths of the newspaper readers in the study reported reading a news or information item first on the previous day (See Table 24). It is unwise to assume that information content is necessarily being used exclusively to satisfy the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Read First</th>
<th>Journal (N=90)</th>
<th>Daily News (N=126)</th>
<th>Total (N=216)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News and Information</td>
<td>83.3 pct</td>
<td>78.5 pct</td>
<td>80.6 pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment and Opinion</td>
<td>16.7 pct</td>
<td>21.5 pct</td>
<td>19.4 pct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sorts of surveillance needs discussed earlier, but it is not unreasonable to speculate that a large share of this material is being used in that way.

As was suggested earlier, white males have traditionally been the most active participants in the American economic system and have therefore had the greatest need for information. However, females and nonwhites have in recent years become increasingly important members of the system, and newspapers now have the opportunity to try to stimulate the surveillance need in these groups, where the need has been less strong.

But newspapers must stimulate this need by capitalizing on their strengths. A significant portion of newspapers' circulation problems may be traceable to their insistence on competing with television. Alperstein (1980) remarks that "local newspapers should be content to realize their own market limitations. . . [A] strategy for market growth should consider local information key in such an expansion."

Local information is the niche in the media ecology which newspapers have always filled best. Newspapers will never win the numbers game by competing with television in TV's areas of strength; newspapers are not essentially companions or entertainers, but information machines, which can best maintain their
position in the marketplace by emphasizing their own strengths, not by attempting to compete unnecessarily against the strengths of other media.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The premise on which this study was built has demonstrated the usefulness of an approach in which exposure, life situation, and needs — predictors of readership which are often studied piecemeal but seldom in a single design — are all used as components of newspaper subscribership. This approach makes it possible to begin to see the influence of each sort of variable on the others, something not possible in more limited designs.

But the relatively low amount of variance explained by the independent variables in the formulation of needs, and for that matter in newspaper subscribership, in this and similar studies suggests that there are additional questions to be asked and that more complex models with more variables are needed. Identification of the influences on media use is an applied problem and researchers have to be concerned about how well their results predict that use.

A comprehensive agenda of media use research could profit from more complex derivatives of the design used
in this study. But it is clear that, for a major agenda of that sort, the question of newspaper readership is too narrow; research must be placed in the larger context of the influences on overall patterns of media use, because of the tangled interrelationships among the variables.

One example will serve to illustrate this complexity. While exposure to the newspaper or to other news media in childhood did not predict adult newspaper subscription nor development of the surveillance need (which is itself a predictor of newspaper use) in this study, low levels of such exposure did predict other needs, namely companionship and stimulation. And the stimulation need was found to be a good predictor of television news use. Relationships exist, but they are not necessarily the simple direct-causal relationships sought in most studies. It will take a significant commitment of both time and money to execute a design of sufficient complexity to untangle the many individual threads in the fabric of media use.

A research program of such complexity would probably have to be approached on two levels. 1) A series of cross-sectional telephone studies should be conducted which would refine the measures and seek the most parsimonious means at getting the greatest amount
of information. 2) This would be followed by longitudinal designs using personal interviews to collect data from a broader population, using the results of the cross-sectional studies to design the measures.

On a short-term basis, refinement of the measurement of the influences of the principal types of independent variables used in this study should employ cross-sectional telephone survey data. Better measures of the type and quantity of childhood news media exposure might add to that variable's predictive power. The search must continue, too, for other variables related to life situation, to the antecedents of needs, and to the ways in which they are gratified by media use.

For example, this study did not approach the question of attitude toward media or toward specific newspapers. Palmgreen, Wenner and Rayburn (1980), in their study of gratifications sought and gratifications obtained from television news, point to the need for more such studies in the area of choice of medium. Such work might be useful in helping to explain newspaper use, a point made by McLeod, Bybe and Durall (1982), who noted a "surprising lack of separate measurement of gratifications sought and received within the same study." Only one newspaper market was
measured in this study, and the two newspapers, both owned by the same company, may do a better- or poorer-than-average job of gratifying the needs sought by subscribers in their market.

Fuller treatments of patterns of community integration and reader needs should be a part of any overall program of research based on this model. The strength of community attatchment as a discriminating variable suggests that a more intricately designed measure could reveal much more about the role this variable plays in newspaper use. Stamm and Fortini-Campbell's question on future anticipated residence, and Stamm, Jackson and Bowen's finding of the way mobility can enhance newspaper readership could be effectively integrated into such a measure.

Refinement in the isolation of need functions should be undertaken, making use of more variables to attempt to devise a more complete catalogue of needs which could become part of the larger model. At the same time it should be useful to examine more closely the surveillance function, particularly in regard to its strength among women and nonwhites, perhaps discerning whether members of those groups who are more integrated into the country's economic system display stronger needs of this sort, something that would allow newspapers to direct special attention to selling
themselves to those groups.

Results of such cross-sectional studies into media exposure, life situation variables, and needs can then be used in more complex and extensive designs which would use longitudinal data collected by personal interviews, ideally administered to a national sample, or at least in multiple markets. Such a design would avoid the limitations of cross-sectional telephone surveys noted earlier in this chapter, and provide information in considerable depth about patterns of media use throughout the life cycle.

The successes of this study have laid the groundwork for a potentially promising and highly comprehensive approach to media use research. Future work along these lines must, however, have sufficient commitment in both time and money for the use of time-based designs and personal interviewing, which could overcome two principal methodological shortcomings of this work. But it is this sort of fully-integrated approach which can do the most to explain the influences on the newspaper reading habit, and which can be extended to other media use research agendas. It is a research program worth undertaking.
APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE AND CODE BOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>TELEPHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>1--1</th>
<th>CARD NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2--4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RESPONDENT CODE</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INTERVIEWER CODE</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7--8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DATE OF INTERVIEW</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9--12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TIME OF INTERVIEW</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TELEPHONE PREFIX</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hello. My name is ____________ from the University of Dayton. I'm helping to conduct a study about the ways people use mass media. Your phone number was selected at random from all phones in Montgomery County for this survey. May I please speak with the male/female head of the household?

IF RESPONDENT IS NOT AVAILABLE, BEST TIME TO CALL BACK: __________

WHEN RESPONDENT COMES TO PHONE: REPEAT INTRODUCTION, CONCLUDING WITH:

The questionnaire will take about ten minutes to complete. All results will be treated anonymously, and your answers will be kept confidential. Would you help us out, please, by answering a few questions?

NOTES:
6. Thank you. First of all, I'd like to begin with a few questions about newspapers. Do you subscribe to a daily newspaper?

7  16
01-Yes
02-No (GO TO QUESTION 9)

7. Which daily papers do you subscribe to? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

8  17
01-Dayton Journal-Herald
02-Dayton Daily News
03-Both

8. When your paper hasn't been delivered by the time you're ready for it, what do you usually do instead of reading the paper? (PROBE FOR SPECIFIC BEHAVIOR)

9  18-19 BEHAVIOR WHEN PAPER IS LATE
01-watch TV
02-listen to radio
03-read magazine
04-read book
05-read old newspaper
06-buy, borrow paper elsewhere
07-household chores
08-go to work
09-recreational activities
10-find anything else to read
11-eat or drink
12-do nothing
13-go back to bed
14-family activities
15-paper is never late
16-talk on telephone
20-call to complain
22-cancel subscription
97-paper delivered elsewhere, not at home
98-nonsuscriber
99-NA-DK
9. How many days per week do you usually read a newspaper, whether you subscribe or not?

10. Did you read a newspaper yesterday?

11. What daily papers did you read yesterday? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

12. When did you read the Journal Herald?

13. Can you recall what were the first three parts of the Journal Herald you read yesterday?
15 26-27 Second thing you read in JH (see list after V 14)

16 28-29 Third thing you read in JH (see list after V14)

14. When did you read the Daily News?

17 30  
01-morning (before mid-day meal)  
02-afternoon (with mid-day meal or between mid-day and evening meals)  
03-evening (with or after evening meal)

15. Can you recall what were the first three parts of the Daily News you read yesterday?

18 31-32  
01-first thing you read in DN (see list after V 16)  

19 33-34  
02-second thing you read in DN (see list after V 16)  

20 35-36  
03-third thing you read in DN (see list after V 16)  
04-don't remember

16. Do you happen to remember if your parents subscribed to a daily newspaper when you were about junior high age?

21 37  
01-yes, parents did subscribe  
02-no, parents did not subscribe (GO TO QUESTION 18)  
03-don't remember (GO TO QUESTION 18)

17. Do you recall if your parents subscribed to a morning paper, an afternoon paper, or perhaps to both morning and afternoon newspapers?

22 38  
01-morning  
02-afternoon  
03-both morning and afternoon  
04-don't remember
18. When you were growing up, did you have any teachers who regularly used a newspaper in class as part of the lessons?

23 39
01-yes
02-no (GO TO QUESTION 20)

19. What grades were you in then?

24 40
01-primary (1-3)
02-intermediate (4-6)
03-junior high school (7-9)
04-high school (10-12)
05-various elementary (1-6)
06-various secondary (7-12)
07-both elementary and secondary

20. Do you recall whether your parents subscribed to a news magazine when you were about junior high age?

25 41
01-yes, subscribed
02-no, did not subscribe
03-don't remember

21. Do you remember if your parents often watched the news on TV when you were about junior high age?

26 42
01-yes, watched
02-no, did not watch
03-don't remember

22. Do you recall if your parents often listened to the news on the radio when you were about junior high age?

27 43
01-yes, listened
02-no, did not listen
03-don't remember
23. That's helpful information. Now, do you ever watch the news on local TV channels?

28 44
01-yes
02-no (GO TO QUESTION 31)

24. About how many days per week do you watch the news on television— I mean where you actually watch the program, not just have it on in the background.

29 45 ________ days per week

Would you tell me, please, about how many days per week you watch each of the following types of news programs:

25. Morning newscasts like those on Today, Good Morning, America, and CBS Morning News:

30 46 ________ days per week

26. Noon news on local stations:

31 47 ________ days per week

27. Early evening local news, at about 6 p.m.:

32 48 ________ days per week

28. Early evening national news from CBS, NBC, OR ABC:

33 49 ________ days per week

29. Late evening local news programs, at about 11 p.m.:

34 50 ________ days per week
30. Late night national news like ABC News Nightline, that comes on at midnight or later:

35  51  _______ days per week

31. That's fine. Do you ever listen to the news on the radio?

36  52  01-yes
     02-no (GO TO QUESTION 34)

32. Fine. Will you tell me now about how many days per week you listen to the news on the radio—I mean where you actually listen to the program, not just have it on in the background.

37  53  _______ days per week

33. What times of the day do you most often listen to news on the radio? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

38  54  01-6 a.m. to 9 a.m.
     02-9 a.m. to 3 p.m.
     03-3 p.m. to 6 p.m.
     04-6 p.m. to midnight
     05-midnight to 6 a.m.
     06-two dayparts
     07-three dayparts
     08-four or five dayparts

34. Do you subscribe to any of the following news magazines? (READ LIST)

39  55  01-Newsweek
     02-Time
     03-U.S. News & World Report
     04-None
     05-two of above
     06-three of above
35. Do you subscribe to cable TV?

40 56  
01-yes  
02-no (GO TO QUESTION 40)

36. Do you ever watch Cable News Network?

41 57  
01-yes  
02-no (GO TO QUESTION 38)

37. About how many days per week?

42 58  
_________ days per week

38. Do you ever watch the news wire ticker on cable TV?

43 59  
01-yes  
02-no (GO TO QUESTION 40)

39. About how many days per week?

44 60  
_________ days per week

40. Do you have any other sources of news:

45 61  
00-public meetings  
01-Yes __________________(SPECIFY)  
02-NO other sources(GO TO QUESTION 42)  
03-other magazines  
04-word of mouth  
05-other newspapers  
06-police scanner  
07-short wave radio  
08-conventions

41. About how many days per week do you (NAME SOURCE FROM QUESTION 40)?

46 62  
_________ days per week
42. Do you have any other kind of TV service: ON-TV, satellite dish, home computer information retrieval services, or something else?

01-yes (not specified) 02-no 03-ON-TV 04-computer database 05-satellite dish

You've been a big help so far. Now I'd like to ask you some questions about the kinds of things that some people have told us are important to them. I'd also like to know how helpful you find the news media for doing each of these things. Now you've told me that you sometimes use

(READ ALL THAT APPLY) newspapers TV news on local stations radio news magazines cable TV (OTHER FROM QUESTION 40)

to keep up with the news, so I'll ask you about each of those.

43. First of all, how important to you is it to keep up with events in the Dayton area? Is it (READ LIST)

01-very important 02-somewhat important 03-not very important 04-not at all important

44. In keeping you up-to-date with events in the Dayton area, do you find (READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)

A. Newspapers to be
01-very helpful 02-somewhat helpful 03-only a little helpful
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>COL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. TV news on local stations**
- 01-very helpful
- 02-somewhat helpful
- 03-only a little helpful

**C. Radio news**
- 01-very helpful
- 02-somewhat helpful
- 03-only a little helpful

**D. News magazines**
- 01-very helpful
- 02-somewhat helpful
- 03-only a little helpful

**E. Cable TV news**
- 01-very helpful
- 02-somewhat helpful
- 03-only a little helpful

**F. (OTHER, IF APPLICABLE)**
- 01-very helpful
- 02-somewhat helpful
- 03-only a little helpful

45. **How important to you is it to have current events information for conversation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55</th>
<th>71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 01-very important
| 02-somewhat important
| 03-not very important
| 04-not at all important

46. **How helpful do you find the news media in providing current events information for conversation? (READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>56</th>
<th>72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Newspapers to be
| 01-very helpful
| 02-somewhat helpful
| 03-only a little helpful |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>57</th>
<th>73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B. TV news on local stations
| 01-very helpful
| 02-somewhat helpful
| 03-only a little helpful |
C. Radio news
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

D. News magazines
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

E. Cable TV news
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

F. (OTHER, IF APPLICABLE)
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

47. How important to you is it to have companionship most of the time?
01-very important
02-somewhat important
03-not very important
04-not at all important

48. How helpful do you find the news media in providing companionship? (READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)

A. Newspapers to be
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

B. TV news on local stations
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful
49. How important to you is it to plan and organize your day ahead of time?

71 12  

01-very important  
02-somewhat important  
03-not very important  
04-not at all important

50. How helpful do you find the news media in planning and organizing your day?  
(READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)

A. Newspapers to be

72 13  

01-very helpful  
02-somewhat helpful  
03-only a little helpful

B. TV news on local stations

73 14  

01-very helpful  
02-somewhat helpful  
03-only a little helpful

C. Radio news

74 15  

01-very helpful  
02-somewhat helpful  
03-only a little helpful
51. How important to you is it to relax?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>01-very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02-somewhat important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03-not very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04-not at all important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. How helpful do you find the news media in relaxing? (READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A. Newspapers to be</td>
<td>01-very helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02-somewhat helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03-only a little helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>B. TV news on local stations</td>
<td>01-very helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02-somewhat helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03-only a little helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>C. Radio news</td>
<td>01-very helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02-somewhat helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03-only a little helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>D. News magazines</td>
<td>01-very helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02-somewhat helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03-only a little helpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VAR     COL

E. Cable TV news
   01-very helpful
   02-somewhat helpful
   03-only a little helpful

F. (OTHER, IF APPLICABLE)
   01-very helpful
   02-somewhat helpful
   03-only a little helpful

53. How important to you is it to overcome loneliness when you're alone?

   01-very important
   02-somewhat important
   03-not very important
   04-not at all important

54. How helpful do you find the news media in overcoming loneliness? (READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)

   A. Newspapers to be
      01-very helpful
      02-somewhat helpful
      03-only a little helpful

   B. TV news on local stations
      01-very helpful
      02-somewhat helpful
      03-only a little helpful

   C. Radio news
      01-very helpful
      02-somewhat helpful
      03-only a little helpful

   D. News magazines
      01-very helpful
      02-somewhat helpful
      03-only a little helpful

   E. Cable TV news
      01-very helpful
      02-somewhat helpful
      03-only a little helpful
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>COL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. (OTHER, IF APPLICABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01-very helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02-somewhat helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03-only a little helpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. How important to you is it to learn about dramatic, exciting things?

| 92  | 33  |
|     | 01-very important |
|     | 02-somewhat important |
|     | 03-not very important |
|     | 04-not at all important |

56. How helpful do you find the news media in telling you about dramatic and exciting things? (READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)

| 93  | 34  |
| A. Newspapers to be |
|     | 01-very helpful |
|     | 02-somewhat helpful |
|     | 03-only a little helpful |

| 94  | 35  |
| B. TV news on local stations |
|     | 01-very helpful |
|     | 02-somewhat helpful |
|     | 03-only a little helpful |

| 95  | 36  |
| C. Radio news |
|     | 01-very helpful |
|     | 02-somewhat helpful |
|     | 03-only a little helpful |

| 96  | 37  |
| D. News magazines |
|     | 01-very helpful |
|     | 02-somewhat helpful |
|     | 03-only a little helpful |

| 97  | 38  |
| E. Cable TV news |
|     | 01-very helpful |
|     | 02-somewhat helpful |
|     | 03-only a little helpful |

| 98  | 39  |
| F. (OTHER, IF APPLICABLE) |
|     | 01-very helpful |
|     | 02-somewhat helpful |
|     | 03-only a little helpful |
57. How important to you is it to keep up with national and world events?

99 40
01-very important
02-somewhat important
03-not very important
04-not at all important

58. How helpful do you find the news media in keeping up with national and world events? (READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)

A. Newspapers to be
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

B. TV news on local stations
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

C. Radio news
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

D. News magazines
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

E. Cable TV news
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

F. (OTHER, IF APPLICABLE)
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful
59. How important to you is it to see and hear arguments supporting your ideas?

   01-very important
   02-somewhat important
   03-not very important
   04-not at all important

60. How helpful do you find the news media in seeing and hearing arguments supporting your ideas? (READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)

A. Newspapers to be
   01-very helpful
   02-somewhat helpful
   03-only a little helpful

B. TV news on local stations
   01-very helpful
   02-somewhat helpful
   03-only a little helpful

C. Radio news
   01-very helpful
   02-somewhat helpful
   03-only a little helpful

D. News magazines
   01-very helpful
   02-somewhat helpful
   03-only a little helpful

E. Cable TV news
   01-very helpful
   02-somewhat helpful
   03-only a little helpful

F. (OTHER, IF APPLICABLE)
   01-very helpful
   02-somewhat helpful
   03-only a little helpful
VAR  COL

61. How important to you is it to know about products and sales in stores and shops?

113  54
01-very important
02-somewhat important
03-not very important
04-not at all important

62. How helpful do you find the news media in finding out about products and sales? (READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)

114  55
A. Newspapers to be
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

115  56
B. TV news on local stations
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

116  57
C. Radio news
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

117  58
D. News magazines
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

118  59
E. Cable TV news
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

119  60
F. (OTHER, IF APPLICABLE)
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful
63. This is going well; we're nearly finished now. How important to you is it to keep up with events in Ohio?

120 61
01-very important
02-somewhat important
03-not very important
04-not at all important

64. How helpful do you find the news media in keeping up with Ohio events? (READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)

A. Newspapers to be
121 62
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

B. TV news on local stations
122 63
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

C. Radio news
123 64
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

D. News magazines
124 65
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

E. Cable TV news
125 66
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

F. (OTHER, IF APPLICABLE)
126 67
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful
VAR COL

65. How important to you is it just to fill time?

127 68
01-very important
02-somewhat important
03-not very important
04-not at all important

66. How helpful do you find the news media in just filling time? (READ ONLY THE ONES THAT APPLY)

A. Newspapers to be
128 69
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

B. TV news on local stations
129 70
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

C. Radio news
130 71
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

D. News magazines
131 72
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

E. Cable TV news
132 73
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

F. (OTHER, IF APPLICABLE)
133 74
01-very helpful
02-somewhat helpful
03-only a little helpful

134 1 ---------------------CARD NO. 3
135 2-4 RESPONDENT NUMBER
Fine. We're nearly finished. Now I have just a few questions that will allow us to process the information you've just given us. Remember, all results will be treated anonymously and all answers will be kept confidential.

67. First of all, what is your zip code?

136 5-6 Zip code __________

68. How long have you lived in Montgomery county?

137 7-8 _________ years in county

69. How long have you lived in your present dwelling?

138 9-10 _________ years in present dwelling

70. What sort of dwelling do you live in now? Is it a single-family house, an apartment, a duplex, a mobile home, a condominium, or what?

139 11 01-single-family house
       02-duplex
       03-apartment
       04-mobile home
       05-condo
       06-military
       07-institutional
       08-other _______________(SPECIFY)

71. Are you buying or renting your home?

140 12 01-buy
       02-rent
       03-transient, don't pay
       04-provided by employer
       05-other _______________(SPECIFY)
72. What is your occupation?

141 13-14 occupational prestige (ranked 01 to 90 on NORC scale)

73. What was the last year of school you completed?

142 15 01-grade 1-8
       02-some high school
       03-high school graduate
       04-some college or trade school
       05-college graduate
       06-post graduate work
       07-graduate degree

74. What is your marital status? Are you (READ LIST)

143 16 01-never married
       02-married
       03-separated
       04-divorced
       05-widowed

75. Are you white, black, or a member of another racial group?

144 17 01-white
       02-black
       03-other (unspecified)
       04-Hispanic
       05-Oriental

76. What is your age?

145 18-19 __________ years old
77. What would you estimate was the total income for your household last year? (IF NO IMMEDIATE RESPONSE, READ CATEGORIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>under $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>$5,000 to $9,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>$15,000 to $19,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>$20,000 to $24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>$25,000 to $29,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>$30,000 to $39,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>$40,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That's all. You've been very helpful and we appreciate your time very much. Thank you!

78. DO NOT ASK THIS QUESTION. MARK AFTER COMPLETION OF INTERVIEW.

SEX OF RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
APPENDIX B
INTERVIEWER TRAINING MANUAL

1. Please read this handbook thoroughly and take notes here and on the sample questionnaire you have been given. By all means ASK about anything you do not find perfectly clear. It is far easier to get difficulties resolved now than when you're in the middle of a call.

2. Before you begin calling, please read through this questionnaire — aloud! The best approach is to practice on a friend or spouse two or three times, having that person answer the questions just as the real respondents will, so you can become accustomed to the wording and pacing of the questionnaire, and can spot any problems you believe you might have. This instrument has been pretested and most of the bugs should have been worked out. But if you spot something you think might be a problem, say so!

3. At the beginning of the calling session, you will be given a folder with 20 questionnaires and several cover sheets with phone numbers. Begin with the first phone sheet. If the last digit of the number is even, you should ask for the male head of household. If the last digit is odd, ask for the female head of household. However, if you reach a household where there is no head of the sex required, you may substitute the opposite sex. (Example: If your assigned number is 252-5237, you should interview the female head of household. If she is not available at that time, you must call back. But if there is no female head in that household, you should interview the male head, except as indicated in #4.)
4. After you have completed interviews with ten members of a single sex, you should ignore the last digit of the phone number and seek interviews only with members of the other sex, regardless of the last digit. You must complete interviews with ten men and ten women for each folder of 20 questionnaires you receive.

5. Record each call you make on a cover sheet. If the first call reveals that the number assigned is not a residential phone, mark it accordingly and go on to the next number. Some phones will be business numbers. Apologize to the person answering, write "business" on the cover sheet, and try the next number. Some numbers will have been changed, and you'll get a recording telling you so. Do not call the new number. Just record the number you called with NW (non-working) and go to the next number on the list. Do the same for any other non-working number. As soon as you hear the recording, hang up, record the call, and go to the next number.

6. Some numbers will ring, but no one will answer. We will continue to try these numbers. These phones will require five calls on three different days before they can be eliminated from our list. Except as noted in #3-5, no numbers may be substituted until five tries have been made.

FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE

7. For each successful contact where the designated respondent agrees to cooperate, write the respondent's phone number on the top line of the questionnaire. Do this only for cooperating respondents.

8. Line 1, Respondent code: Leave blank. I will fill this in later.

9. Line 2, Interviewer code. You have been assigned a two-digit number that will identify all the questionnaires you have done. That number goes here. Use the number as it is given below. Your interviewer number is
10. Line 3, Date: record date the interview took place.

11. Line 4: Time: record the time the interview began. Include a.m. or p.m.

12. Line 5, Prefix: record the first three digits of the phone number, as in 229-2742.

13. Read the questions exactly as they are written, in a cheerful, neutral tone of voice. You should be relaxed and natural -- almost conversational -- in speaking; it should not sound like you are reading the questionnaire to the respondent. This is a lengthy instrument, and you'll have fewer terminations if your approach is upbeat and friendly. A bored, wooden monotone is highly counterproductive in telephone surveying.

14. Stick to the questionnaire. First, do not elaborate on the questions and do not suggest answers. Do not explain questions. If the respondent is not clear about the question, read it again, more slowly. But the results of the study will lack validity unless all respondents are asked exactly the same questions in exactly the same way.

15. Second, please don't chat with the respondent. Some of the people you call will be lonely or bored and want to keep you on the phone. It is surprisingly easy (and all too common!) for an interviewer to spend an hour administering a 10-minute telephone questionnaire. You must steer the respondent back to the business at hand.

16. Sometimes respondents will ask you questions about your thoughts on certain questionnaire items. Parry these with a neutral response or say frankly, "I'm not allowed to express any opinion about these while I'm working." It's true: you're not.

17. Many respondents will ask about the purpose of the study or the use to which the data will be put. It is their right to know this. You can explain briefly that the study is being done by a professor
at U.D. who is interested in learning about why people use the mass media the way they do. All data (their answers) will be fed into a computer and totaled up. We are not interested in what any one person's answers are, only by classifying answers in large groups. Confidentially of all answers is absolutely guaranteed and will be put to no commercial uses whatsoever.

18. We have no record of the name or address of any respondent. Not even the project director knows who these people are.

19. People may wish to know how they were selected -- and some people with unlisted phone numbers may get a bit hostile about being called. You can explain that no directory was used (See #18: we have no names.). A computer was asked to provide a random list from all possible telephone numbers in Montgomery County. Those are the numbers we are calling.

20. If people give you a bad time, admit that you're just an employee making minimum wage. They can call the project director, Professor Larry Lain, Department of Communication Arts during the day at 229-2742 or 229-2028. I'll be glad to talk to them.

21. You may have one or two people who ask to know about the results. We will be happy to provide those people with a report on our findings, which should be available in late Fall or early Winter. There is a place for notes on the first and last pages of the questionnaire. Indicate in one of those places that the respondent would like to see the results, and then get the respondent's name and address. Record it next to your notation.

22. Most of the situations described in #16-21 will never come up, however, and your work will go pretty smoothly. Try not to get bogged down; you are expected to complete three questionnaires per hour.
23. On precoded questions, circle the number (not the answer) of the response. Follow carefully the directions in CAPITAL letters. Never read aloud to the respondent anything that appears in CAPS, but you must always follow the directions given. In Q6, for example, if the respondent answers "No" you must skip Q7&8 -- they simply don't apply to that respondent and you'll sound foolish if you ask them.

24. Q8: Answers of "I feel angry," or "I call to complain" don't answer this Q. You may have to probe for specific behaviors by asking "What else do you do?" or "Well, how do you spend the time you'd usually spend reading the paper?" Some may simply say "Nothing." Record that. But we're looking for substitute behavior here. You may not in any way suggest possibilities, however. You MAY NOT say, "Well, do you listen to the radio or look at yesterday's paper?" The respondent must make up his or her own answer. This is important.

25. Q9 and similar Qs: Just record the number. If the response is "every day" write 7. If the response is "almost every day" probe for a number. If the response is something like "3 or 4 days a week" probe for a number or ask about last week.

26. Note carefully the sets of directions after Q11 and Q13.

27. If a person is unwilling or unable to answer a Q, repeat the Q to him or her, but more slowly. Don't change the wording. If the respondent is still unable and you don't believe further prompting is likely to change the situation, leave the Q blank and go on.

28. An outright refusal to answer a Q -- "That's none of your business!" -- should be met with politeness by you but with a request that the Q please be answered. If the respondent is adamant, however, go on to the next Q rather than risk a termination.
29. Terminations -- cases where a respondent begins to answer the questionnaire but quits in the middle -- are tragic. Do everything in your power to avoid terminations; the data is useless and the time spent is totally wasted.

30. We are asking about several kinds of media behavior...use of:

newspapers
radio
broadcast TV news
cable TV news
news magazines
other media news sources.

You must keep track of which of these each respondent makes use of so you know how to treat the odd-numbered Qs between 44 and 66. A tally sheet will be provided for each respondent, and the training session will cover the method of asking these Qs.

31. Notice the reinforcers in Q23, 32, after Q42, in Q63, and after Q66. Make these sound natural and sincere; they do help keep people on the phone by providing some nice feedback. Feel free to use more of them if you think necessary and can do it sincerely. Notice that all the prompters are neutral; never say "Those are good answers," or something like that, but comments like "Okay" or "I see" or "That's fine" or whatever comes naturally to you are okay to use.

32. Q67: If you get someone who's not sure, write that in.

33. Q68: Write in an exact number. If a person answers "all my life" ask how long. If the answer is "11 or 12 years," ask whether it's 11 or 12. An answer with a fraction should be written to the lowest whole year, thus 3 1/2 years should be recorded as 3; seven months should be recorded as 0. Treat Q69 the same way.
34. Q76: Exact number. Rarely a person won't want to give you an age. In that event, first reassure the respondent that we are not interested in him or her personally, but we need to have the information so we can classify the data. Remind the respondent that we don't even have his or her name. If you still get a refusal, try asking for the year of birth. Just write that down and we'll figure it out later. As a last resort, you can ask, "Are you over 60? Over 50?" etc. Put down whatever you get. But if the respondent is adamant, don't create hostility; better to drop the question.

35. Q77: Here's the Q that gets the most refusals. You can try some of the same strategies suggested in #34, or read the categories to the respondent and ask him or her to just stop you at whichever applies.

36. Q78: no need to ask this. Just mark it when the interview is over.

37. At the end of the interview, remember to thank the respondent politely and sincerely. You may sometimes have trouble getting off the phone with a lonely person who wants to chat, but it is important to move on.

38. Most people will want to be helpful. Very few will be hostile or uncooperative. Let the respondent know you appreciate his or her help as you go through the instrument and at the conclusion of the contact. Remember, if it weren't for these people, you wouldn't be making all these fantastic dollars and I wouldn't have such an important study.

39. A random sample of your questionnaires will be verified after the study has been concluded. That is, someone will make follow-up calls to several of your contacts, asking a few of the questions from the instrument, just to arrive at some measure of reliability among subjects. Please don't be insulted by this. It's not that you're not trusted; it is standard procedure in all
survey work, and if I didn't do it, nobody would take the results seriously.

40. When in doubt, ASK!
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