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ABSTRACT

The present study was designed to integrate the life span developmental concepts with the uses and gratifications paradigm. The objective of the study was to investigate the relationships among the experiencing of life events and changes in psychological structure, television viewing habits and television satisfaction in TV audiences.

The study used McCain's data collected by telephone interviews in 1981 and 1982 randomly selected respondents in Columbus and Franklin County, Ohio. Respondents were male or female heads of the households (n=218) who participated in both the 1981 and 1982 interviews.

The variables measured in the study were (1) the number of life events; (2) the perceived impact of life events; (3) sociopsychological need structure; (4) TV viewing habits and (5) TV satisfaction.

Two dimensions of life events, the total number of life events a person experienced and perceived life event impact were hypothesized as independent factors which induced the changes in audience need structure from time 1 to time 2. The need structure, after being impacted, would bring about
the change of TV viewing habits and TV satisfaction from time 1 to time 2.

Factor analysis was performed to reclassify the need structure and TV satisfaction items. As a result of factor analysis, two need factors—self oriented needs and socio-environmental needs—were reconstructed. One factor—TV satisfaction—was derived from the TV satisfaction items. Three types of models, the cumulative, the remote and the proximate—the first being a test of cumulative number of life events and their effect upon respondents, the second being a test of long-standing life events, and the third being a test of immediate life events—were used for this study. Path analysis, a technique based on multivariate regression analysis, was then applied to test the hypotheses.

Findings suggest that immediate total life events change socio-environmental needs in audience members. The change of such needs also influenced their TV viewing.

According to these findings, a parsimonious model was built in which a specification of time factor is included. It appears that life events immediately affect those who experience them. However, only their socio-environmental needs are impacted, and these needs, in turn, affect the habits of TV viewing in TV audiences.
In conclusion, the attempt to add the life event variable into the uses and gratifications paradigm contributes to the improvement of the original model which indicates only the need structure is an indicator of media use behaviors. This study is also useful for the reconstruction of the parsimonious model in which specifications of time factor and need structure are included.
Chapter I

INTRODUCTION: USES AND GRATIFICATIONS OF MASS COMMUNICATION

The present chapter focuses upon the theoretical position of the uses and gratifications paradigm and its criticisms. However, the first part of the chapter is devoted to the scope of this study in which the theoretical propositions and areas of study are specified. Following this, the uses and gratifications research findings will be reviewed. Criticisms of the model will also be discussed to suggest why theoretical integration is necessary for this research tradition.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The focus of uses and gratifications research is upon the notion of an active audience—that the initiative for the selection of mass media content exists within the receiver, not simply in the media or the content. Although there are many different interpretations of the underlying theory, each attempts to establish a system of conducting research which explains an audience's use of mass communication.
Social and psychological needs as well as need gratifications are believed to be the factors which generate the pattern of media consuming behavior (McQuail, 1983).

Uses and gratifications research has been criticized for many of its shortcomings. One of the criticisms is that there is not enough clarification on the concept of need that has been used in most uses and gratifications studies. Elliot (1974) put forward the idea that other social and psychological factors should be taken into account and be considered as important as an audience's needs in explaining its media use behaviors. Other mass communication scholars (Blumler, 1979; Weaver, 1980) also suggested that future studies in the uses and gratifications paradigm switch their attention from gratification obtained as the indicator of media use to audience motives or gratification sought and other antecedents of media use.

As one means of theoretical integration, Dimmick, McCain and Bolton (1979) proposed the integration of life span developmental psychology with the uses and gratifications paradigm. They argued that sociopsychological and biophysical changes in a life course affect the individuals' need structure and consequently change individual media use.

Among children and adolescents, biophysical changes are so dramatic that many of their social behaviors can be explained by these developments. However, biophysical
changes become less important during the period of adulthood. In the past, most developmental psychologists regarded the stage of adulthood as a stable period where changes could hardly occur (Rosenfeld, 1977; Neugarten, 1977). Recently, there are more studies on changes, labelled life events, which take place during adulthood. Research on the effect of such life events as getting or losing a job, divorce, moving, illness, untimely death in the family, etc. have received much more attention from developmental psychologists (Rogers, 1983).

Dimmick et al. (1979) argued that life events which occur during the life course will affect individuals' psychological states resulting in their changing of behavior, including media use, across the life span. The subject investigated here is the relationship between life span changes in adulthood and television use.

Television was introduced into American society at the end of the 1940's and ever since has become a "ubiquitous, highly influential element of our social, cultural, and intellectual environment" (Esslin, 1982, p.2). By 1960, most American households already had at least one television set in their living rooms. Then came color television in the 1970s. Nowadays, having more than one television set in a household is not unusual (Esslin, 1982).
Television technology has also expanded on a parallel basis during the last 15 years. The number of commercial broadcasting stations on the air increased greatly from six at the end of World War II to 752 stations today. There are also 268 noncommercial television stations all over the country (Pember, 1983). The cable television system was invented to solve the problem of remote areas with poor reception. Later on, cable television has been largely used in metropolitan areas and medium sized cities where the need for a variety of TV channels is high. Special cable channels, such as Home Box Office (HBO) which presented only movies and special shows or Music Television (MTV) where video music is the main base, have been offered in many cities and towns in the United States.

Television is an increasingly popular medium. Its high degree of accessibility and variety in programming can partially substitute for the use of other media, such as movies, radio, and newspapers. During the period of the television "boom" in the United States, movie attendance drastically dropped. It was estimated that between 1967 and 1971, the movie industry lost over $400 million (Pember, 1983). Television's local and national news which covers at least two hours every day on all network channels attract audiences who are not newspaper readers but who also like to gain local and world information. Soap operas
started as radio programs but now television is the better medium for such entertainment.

Mass communication scholars view television as a highly influential medium. Television audiences need no skill, literacy, intellectual ability, or even high concentration. It is, therefore, very popular among young audiences. For this reason, earlier researchers paid more attention to television viewing in children. What worried parents and educators most was the impact of television on learning and social behaviors of young viewers. The issue of violence portrayal on popular TV programs became one of the main topics for television research. The Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service was asked to appoint a committee to "conduct a study to establish scientifically what effects these kinds of programs have on children" (National Institute of Mental Health, 1982). Various theoretical frameworks were formulated and the findings in this research area are still in controversy. Nevertheless, the earlier studies only investigated television under the context of the "media effect" model. When the uses and gratifications perspective was put forward by some mass communication researchers, television was consequently studied under this new perspective.
USES AND GRATIFICATIONS CONCEPTUALIZATIONS

Overview of Uses and Gratifications Research

The study of audience uses and gratifications has set itself against the media effects approach, which often treats the audience as a passive receiver.

Uses and gratifications research started in the early 1940's when Herzog (1944) studied the gratification that housewives gained when they listened to the daytime drama series. In the same time period, some effect studies found that the media are not as powerful as previously believed. For example, Lazarsfeld (1950) investigated the voting in Erie county, Ohio, and found that during the presidential campaign in 1948, people who voted in the primary seldom changed their votes in the election. He concluded that a political campaign did not persuade people to change their minds; at best it reconfirmed their status quo. This finding suggested the concept that audiences are not "affected" by mass media, but rather, they choose to use media to reinforce their own predisposition. Therefore, the theoretical assumption of the uses and gratification paradigm—that audiences' media use is predominantly determined by their internal state—was supported by findings from this research.

Uses and Gratifications research gained attention again when Katz et al. (1973) used data from a study conducted in
Israel to investigate the possibility of social and psychological needs believed to be gratified by exposure to the mass media. They listed thirty-five need statements and asked respondents to rate the importance of these different needs and how they perceived the usefulness of media and non-media sources in gratifying those needs.

Although non-media sources were rated in this study as being more important in serving audiences' needs than media sources, Katz et al. (1973) found that the media were perceived by the Israelis to be moderately important in serving needs. For those who maintained physical, social, and psychological distance from their society, their perceived importance of media in serving needs was relatively higher than people who had close contact with their family, peers, and society. Mass media were also found to be better in serving needs such as escape. Those who highly valued the importance of the state's and society's stability rated media usefulness in serving this need very high.

Subsequently, empirical methodology for this tradition of research was formulated with different versions of the approach and different underlying assumptions, but all uses and gratifications studies share some major characteristics. According to Katz et al. (1974), uses and gratifications studies "are concerned with (1) the social and psychological origins of (2) needs, which generate (3)
expectations of (4) the mass media or other sources, which lead to (5) differential patterns of mass media exposure (or engagement in other activities), resulting in (6) need gratifications and (7) other consequences, perhaps mostly unintended ones" (p.20).

Wright (1959) argued that this approach to mass communications was functional since the move away from the notion of a passive audience implied the uses of mass media by audiences and the functions that media served them. Klapper (1963) suggested that functional analysis focusing on both motivations and consequences of media uses should be very useful to the study of mass communication. Several researchers (McQuail et al., 1972; Katz et al., 1973; Greenberg, 1974; Rubin, 1979) attempted to formulate the functions of mass media that serve audience members' social and psychological needs. For example, Greenberg (1974) used factor analysis to identify the pattern of television viewing of British children. He found that six factors, social and formal learning, habit, relaxation, arousal, forgetfulness, and companionship, emerged clearly as major reasons why children watch television. Similarly, McQuail et al. (1972) proposed a typology consisting of four media functions. They are:

1. information—the need to gain information about one's environment;
2. personal identity—the need to have personal reference and value;
3. integration and social interaction—the need for companionship and social contacts; and
4. entertainment—the need to escape, diverted from burdens of routine, to relax, enjoy and experience emotional release.

Criticisms of Uses and Gratifications Research

Uses and gratifications research has been thoroughly criticized on a number of grounds. Elliot (1974) points out that the approach is atheoretical and suffers from both theoretical and methodological drawbacks. Swanson (1979) identified several conceptual problems within this approach. He noted that besides the difficulties derived from ambiguities in the meaning of major concepts and terms (such as, need and gratifications), uses and gratifications researchers failed to clarify the "necessary components" for this approach and how these components provide an explanation which are different from that of other media use approaches when used to explain the same behavior. Consequently, there have been several attempts to reverse or modify the emphasis on the uses and gratifications perspective in favor of other theories.

In summing up the perspectives on media use research, Morrison (1979) categorized them into four different areas.
First, the demographic perspective, which intends to explain media consuming behavior by using different aggregates of consumers, is used by researchers of mass communication. The next approach is the cultural/lifestyle perspective which contends that similarities in media consuming activities, for example, reading the same type of magazine, should be found in social groups who share a symbolic identity and definition of reality. Among scholars who support this perspective are, for example, Carey and Kreiling (1974) and Tigert (1974) whose research focuses on the lifestyle or taste of media consumers who prefer the same type of media content.

The third perspective, the action/motivation approach, holds that conscious goals and goal-oriented actions lead to some future behaviors. Galloway and Meek (1979) and Van Leuven (1979) support this approach by using expectancy theory to explain the likelihood of selection of media use which tends to be indicated by the audience's anticipation of media messages. Paisley (1965) also argued that individuals are media users with the ability to anticipate their rewarding outcomes and to choose media alternatives that provide the most favorable choice. This approach, although viewed by Morrison (1979) as an alternative approach to uses and gratifications theory, appears to be the extension of the latter rather than a competitive model.
The uses and gratifications perspective is the last approach to media use described by Morrison (1979). As mentioned earlier, the intention of media consumption, according to this perspective, predominantly resides in mass media audiences. Mass media use behavior, according to this theoretical approach, is indicated by individuals' socio-psychological need structure. The selection of media also results in their media gratifications—the perception that media satisfy their socio-psychological needs.

Uses and gratifications research is not only attacked on the basis of lacking theoretical assumption, but also criticized as being conceptually ambiguous. There has been an attempt to modify the theoretical model and suggest gratification obtained which, according to Katz et al. (1974), refers to satisfaction "subsequently secured from the consumption of the media" as the indicator of media use behavior. In a study of audience exposure to public television, Palmgreen and Rayburn (1979) measured the degree of discrepancy between gratification sought and gratification obtained and found that the best predictor of television viewing is gratifications which respondents perceived they obtained (or would obtain) from public television.

Many studies in the uses and gratifications approach are devoted to the studying of audience gratifications (Palmgreen and Rayburn, 1978; Kippax and Murray, 1980; Palmgreen
et al., 1981; Palmgreen and Rayburn, 1982; Lichtenstein and Rosenfeld, 1983). However, some scholars, for example Blumler (1979), argued that in uses and gratifications studies audience motives, or gratification sought—"expectations about content focused in advance of exposure to mass media" (Katz et al., 1974, cited in Palmgreen et al., 1980)—should be considered a major media influence processes. Weaver (1980), using data from a political campaign, tested Blumler's argument and found that an audience's need for orientation "is a better predictor of media exposure and media effect relationships than are individual political gratifications, particularly the surveillance gratifications" (p.361). He suggested that, in future study, audiences' motivations rather than gratification should be considered major predictors of media selection.

Another reason why the emphasis of uses and gratifications research should switch from gratifications obtained as the indicator of media to the antecedents of media selection is that there are still some ambiguities in the conceptualization of the notion of need in previous research. Swanson (1979) states that:

"A persistent problem in uses and gratifications research to data (sic) has been inability to convincingly link gratifications to antecedent needs (either directly measured or inferred) in the absence of any concept meaning, with the result that research literature is often taken as demonstrating that almost any need can give rise to almost any media behavior which
can, in turn, produce almost any conceivable gratification" (p.48).

Swanson's criticism that the problem of uses and gratifications approach is the inability to link gratification to antecedent needs was weakened by findings in uses and gratifications studies (Katz et al., 1973; Kippax and Murray, 1980). However, the criticism implies that some other concepts may also be the factors that affect media use behavior and media gratification. Elliot (1974) also notes the problem of the uses and gratifications approach in this area. He stated that the concept of need appeared in the studies as if it was the only explanation for all accounts of individuals' media consuming behavior. He argued that it was illogical to claim that human needs, by themselves, will totally explain differences in human behavior. Elliot also encourages researchers in this field to consider other social and psychological factors as direct explanations of human behavior.

Katz et al. (1974) outlined the uses and gratifications paradigm and indicated the "social and psychological origins of needs" as the antecedents of the need salience concept. However, most uses and gratifications research overlook this concept. It, therefore, has rarely been seriously investigated in uses and gratifications research.
In conclusion, there are three reasons why the uses and gratifications model needs to be strengthened. First is an attempt to state gratifications obtained as the antecedents of audiences' media use habits which is the reversed order of the uses and gratifications logic stated by Katz et al. (1974). The second reason is the criticism of the need concept that it has been used as the sole antecedent of media use behavior. The final reason is the need to explore the "social and psychological origins of needs" which was indicated in the Katz et al.'s model but has rarely been investigated in media use research. This study, therefore, is an attempt to investigate the areas in uses and gratifications model that are still ambiguous or rarely investigated. It focuses on the investigation of the social and psychological antecedents to need salience and of the need salience as the antecedents of audiences' television viewing habits.

In the following section, findings from the uses and gratifications studies emphasizing the uses of television will be presented. Most of them support the notion of needs as the concomitants of television use habits.
TELEVISION IN USES AND GRATIFICATIONS RESEARCH

In the Katz et al.'s study (1973), television was also investigated in terms of its function, and was found to be the least specialized of all the media. In other words, audiences did not perceive TV as useful in serving a specific need, such as giving information or entertainment. They viewed TV as in serving several functions at the same time.

Greenberg (1974) investigated motives and gratifications of television viewing among British children. A pilot study was conducted by asking students in a school district in London to write an essay on the topic "Why I like to watch television." This essay was used as a way to learn how children described their television viewing and their motives for watching it. The information from this essay was very useful for the preparation of a self-scaled questionnaire that Greenberg used in a larger study of British children. The essays were analyzed and eight factors of television viewing motives were derived: to pass time; to forget; to learn about things; to learn about self; for arousal; for relaxation; for companionship; and as a habit. Greenberg also found that learning seemed to be the major reason that children watched television. However, viewing television as a habit, arousal, companionship, relaxation, and forgetfulness "are very similar in terms of the amount of variance each accounts for" (p. 87).
An expansion of television viewing motivations research was done by Rubin (1981). He investigated the relationships between television viewing motivations and audiences' age, the amount of their television viewing, their attitudes toward television, and their program preferences. From a sample of 626 respondents ranging in ages from 4 to 89 years, Rubin found nine factors of audience motivations: for passing time, companionship, arousal, content, relaxation, information, escape, entertainment, and social interaction. Findings showed a significant negative correlation between age and viewing to escape, to pass time and to become aroused. This means that for younger audiences the uses of television to serve needs such as relieving boredom, seeking excitement, and forgetting about problems appear to be greater than among the older viewers.

Rubin (1981) also reported the consistency of findings from this study and those of previous research in uses and gratifications. There were positive relationships between salience of television viewing motivations and amount of television viewing. Moreover, significant correlations between program preferences and audience viewing motivations were also found. The results of this study revealed the positive relationship between such viewing motivations as informational viewing and the preference for viewing talk shows and arousal viewing and the preference for view-
ing sport programs. In a similar manner, some negative correlations were found between such motivations as pastime viewing and news program preference. These findings are very helpful in clarifying the notion of using television by purposeful audiences in order to serve their individual needs. Rubin and Rubin (1982) examined the pattern of television viewing and audience motivations among the aging and aged persons. From a sample of 340 respondents, findings revealed close similarities to previous research. Viewing motivations, such as companionship, habit, relaxation, arousal, escape, and pastime, were found to be interrelated and associated with the amount of game show and daytime serial program viewing. Informational and entertainment motivations of the older viewers were correlated with their viewing of news, documentaries, and talk-interview programs. These findings show how program preferences among older persons can be influenced by their television viewing motivations.

Findings from past research, therefore, strongly supported the relationship between television viewing and audiences psychological structure.
Summary

In conclusion, there are criticisms of uses and gratifications research that attack its drawbacks and inadequacies and several attempts have been made to replace the model in favor of other theories. However, there are many studies that support the uses and gratifications concept and confirm the relationship between the intention of audiences in choosing media content to serve their needs (see the topic of Television in Uses and Gratifications Research.) It is, therefore, not appropriate to discard the theory because of some minor drawbacks and inadequacies. This study bases its theoretical assumptions upon the uses and gratifications paradigm that attempts to explain audiences' use of mass media and also upon the life span developmental concept that life events impact individuals' psychological state resulting in changes in their behaviors. It follows Dimmick et al.'s proposition that integrates uses and gratifications and life span developmental concepts together. This proposition states that life events that occur during the life course will affect individuals' psychological structures. As a result, they will adjust their behavioral patterns, including their media use habits. It is expected that the uses and gratifications model can be improved if some connections are found between this additional concept—which is one of the
"origins of psychological needs" according to Katz et al.'s paradigm and also one of Elliot's social and psychological factors which is the antecedent of media use behavior-- and the original model. In this study, only one stage in the life course--adulthood--is investigated. Since childhood and adolescence are the stages where biophysical states dominate most of the youngsters' behavior, adulthood is probably the period that best exhibits how environmental changes or life events explain human psychological states and social behaviors. This study also investigates only the use of television, the medium most widely used by the Americans.

In order to integrate the concept of life span developmental psychology into this model, it is necessary that some theoretical background be discussed. The following chapter focuses upon some crucial theoretical issues in that area.
Chapter II
LIFE SPAN DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY AND MEDIA USE IN THE LIFE SPAN

The first section of this chapter is the specification of theoretical concepts in life span developmental psychology. Some theoretical issues that are essential for this study will be discussed. The second part of this chapter is devoted to a report of past research on audiences' media use, especially television use, in different stages of their lives. The final section is the presentation of an integrated theoretical model and statements of the objectives of the study.

THEORETICAL ISSUES REGARDING LIFE SPAN DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

Studies of human motivations and their changes along the life span have been conducted by life-span developmental psychologists. Baltes and Brim (1982) stated that traditionally the term "developmental" referred to age-related change, and study in this area was done strictly in child and adolescent development. Nevertheless, new orientations
of life span developmental psychology suggest that changes do not end with the period of adolescence. Baltes et al. (1977) stated that:

"Developmental psychology is now studied over the entire life span, but usually not by any one researcher. Most researchers in developmental psychology deal with small segments of the life span—infancy, childhood, adolescence, adulthood and old age—which most psychologists agree are related but functionally separate" (p. 86).

Pressey and Kuhlen (1957) argued that the changing of motivation in a life span can be a function of increasing age. They described the development of motivation as the process that started as soon as a person was born. The newborn infant becomes active when he/she is disturbed by such discomforts as those caused by hunger, thirst, or pressures in the bladder and rectum. External stimuli, such as heat or cold or uncomfortable clothes, will also create discomforts and reactive movements to notify the mother. These biological pressures seem to exclusively dominate behavioral patterns of an infant from the very beginning of his/her life. Pressey and Kuhlen (1957) identified biological drives as the need for food, water, oxygen, sleep, rest, sexual relief, and the needs to avoid such discomforts as extreme temperature and pain. At this early stage of life, an infant begins to associate with his/her mother who can provide him/her all those biological needs.
However, as the baby grows, this state of affairs changes. In infancy, their behaviors are asocial. Through conditioning and interaction with the environment, the child's social needs gradually evolve. Influences upon children's social development are experiences with family and social as well as cultural structure (Rogers, 1982). To a high degree, social motives are

"...a reproduction of the values of a particular subculture, but are at the same time highly personalized and are somewhat unique to the person, since they include various individualized habits of living and reflect the relatively unique meanings various experiences have to the person" (Pressey and Kuhlen, 1957, p.316).

Normally, basic social needs include the need for social acceptance and affiliation, the need for defenses against losses and the need for achievement. Buhler (1951) uses the term "need for expansion" for the generic basic motive of human life. It is not only the need for achievement but also for a sense of "on-goingness," for a position as a significant person in one's own world.

Traditionally, life span developmental psychologists argued that human basic needs are a function of increasing age (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1936; Pressey and Kuhlen, 1957). Frenkel-Brunswik explained that:

"Up to a certain point we can observe that new spheres and new fields of activity are added. In all fields of life, expansion, ascent and increase, can be noticed. The period in the middle of life, called the culmination period, includes the largest and most complete number of dimensions. In this period we find stability also, since losses are replaced by new
acquisitions. Beginning with a(sic) certain activities are given up and external losses, such as a case of death, are not compensated for anymore" (p.30).

Rogers (1982) argued against this traditional concept of change as a function of chronological age. She summarized a new perspective of life span developmental psychology presented by Rosenfeld (1977) and Neugarten (1977). These scholars generally agree with the idea that growth and development should not be determined solely by the age variable. Changing from childhood into adolescence or from adolescence to adulthood should also be indicated "by events in family cycle and career, changes in health, changes in social responsibilities..., and changes in psychological characteristics" (Neugarten, 1977, cited in Rogers, 1982, p.6). Neugarten referred to development as the processes which are not only "biologically programmed but also to those in which the organism is changed over time by interaction with the environment" (Neugarten, 1977, p.630).

Rogers (1982) indicated that the traditional life span developmental perspective always portrays stages in human life as marked by chronological age. Growth is the stage of life from birth to adulthood and at about age 65 to death a person is in the declining stage. This idea portrays adulthood as a "sort of 'functional plateau' between adolescence and old age" (p.4). Until recently, adulthood was perceived as a smooth period of life where accidents or
events are barely taken into account. A new perspective on life span developmental psychology, on the other hand, views the whole period of life as the "multidimensional continuum" which can be split into stages. These stages are marked by normative or nonnormative life events, such as marriage, divorce, and retirement (Rosenfeld, 1977).

Callahan and McCluskey (1983) use the terms "normative" and "nonnormative" to categorize human life events. They argue that there are some ambiguities in the two terms. Normative life events may refer to normal, usual, or average situations, or it can be interpreted as events which are the norms of the society. Therefore, normative life events can be the ones that usually occur to most people or they can hold "prescriptive" meanings referring to events which are socially desirable. However, in general, most developmental psychologists refer to life events, for example, getting one's job, marriage, and childbirth, as the normative events, while accidents, divorce, untimely death, etc. are considered nonnormative life events.

Usually, normative life events lead to appropriate reactions from the individuals. Hurlock (1980) describes how people in different stages of the life course adjust themselves to social situations. She states that factors that affect the changes of personality in childhood, adolescence, adulthood, and old age are changes in environment
and changes of personal interest across the life span. For example, peers are very important in influencing adolescents' interests and values. These values are based largely on peer-group values which are used to judge members of the group. Young adults also experience many changes in social situations, for example, having to support one's self may create an interest in career launching, having a new baby can change the whole lifestyle of the new parents. Hurlock (1980) stated that the conditions that affect the changes of interest in adulthood can be in the areas of health, economic status, marital status, parental status, and other cultural and environmental pressures. Similarly, changing of life patterns in old age, such as retirement and loss of a spouse, also lead to changes of interests among the aged. Thus, at different stages in the life course, social and environmental situations will pressure individuals into different circumstances so that they will need to adjust their focuses of interest in order to cope with the new situation.

Gail Sheehy (1974) described the life of her interviewees who were at various stages of adult life, and stipulated that life events were inevitable; moreover, they were, at a certain level, predictable. She agreed with the idea that changes still occurred during the period of adulthood. Nevertheless, changes in this stage are quite different
from those of the earlier period of life (termed the developmental stage). They are not any longer change started from within a person such as biological or psychological pressure, but rather the external changes. These predictable life events in adulthood are such normative life events as marriage, childbirth etc. Some life events are less predictable (using Callahan and McCluskey's term, they are nonnormative), namely, separation, divorce, losing a job, having an accident, etc. Life events, argued Sheehy, have always been labelled "crisis" which caused us to have the misleading notion of the inability to cope with the situation at times. Crisis, according to Sheehy, should refer to critical events which characterize a turning point in an individual's life. Therefore, an adult's life is marked by such activities mentioned earlier. These marker events signify the move from one stage of life to the next. Sheehy terms these different stages "passages."

Although Sheehy did not state that chronological age was the indicator of life events, she specified the periods where certain life events and particular psychological states would occur. She suggests that the transition from adolescence to adulthood starts approximately between the ages of 18 and 22. People at this transition age, argued Sheehy, are searching for their identities and trying to set goals for their future lives. When they enter their
twenties, it is the time they try out their social roles. Sheehy calls this passage "the tryin' twenties" during which most people are trying out to see which roles they would prefer to take in the society. For example, those who prefer family life would like to take the role of housewife and husband or mother and father while those who want a successful career would pay more attention to the job that offers more advancement and achievement.

After the trying stage, people usually find it necessary to reorient and readjust their identity and goals in order to stabilize themselves in their changing social situations. Many of Sheehy's interviewees (in their thirties) revealed how the changing of life in their thirties affected their psychological states which resulted in the dramatic changing of their interpersonal and social behavior. Therefore, the term "midlife crisis" is always used to explain what people at this stage experience.

The forties and the fifties are the ages usually perceived as the most stable and settled period. However, life events, such as divorce, job loss, children leaving home and birth of grandchildren, typically occur during these ages. In the sixties, such changes as physical appearance and effectiveness, retirement, health problems, and death of a spouse strongly affect a person's perception of him/herself (Sheehy, 1974).
Some developmental psychologists have investigated extreme nonnormative cases and their impact upon those who experience them. McCluskey et al. (1983) review the issue of adolescent pregnancy and parenthood and conclude that there would be great negative impact upon children who are born to teenage parents. There would also be "more negative obstetric outcome, reduced parental education, financial insecurity and marital instability" (p.107). Veronen and Kilpatrick (1983) also describe the negative effect of sexual assault upon victims of rape.

"In the weeks and months following a sexual assault, victims may exhaust their support system. Family members, who are initially very supportive of the victim, gradually become frustrated because the victim does not resume her previous level of independence within the family. She may no longer presume household duties and tasks if they require her to go places alone. Due to her increased fearfulness, she wants more attention, concern, and companionship from her spouse and other family members...Another concern that arises for victims following an assault is trust. Many victims stop dating and avoid any situations in which they will be alone with a man. Some complain that they are afraid of someone walking up behind them, afraid of being touched. For many victims, there is a confusion between affection and sexual contact" (p.175).

Bloom et al. (1983) report emotional distress that a couple may experience during the first eight months of marital separation. During this period, they describe a high level of stress and intensity in physical as well as psychological symptoms. There are major disruptions in work performance reported which may be followed by an attempt to change
their career objectives or switch jobs. Impact upon children of divorced parents is also tremendous although there are reports of some positive changes.

In conclusion, the incidents of both normative and non-normative life events reveal a close association with the psychological status of those who experience them. This instability of psychological conditions, argued by developmental psychologists, is closely associated with the alteration of individuals' behavior. Presumably, their media consuming habits will also be affected by these changes of psychological and behavioral characteristics. Examples can be seen in the changes which result from the birth of a child in a family. As a result, activities such as viewing television may be decreased because of the increased responsibility. Experiencing a divorce may be so emotionally disturbing that a person needs more support from children (if any) or he/she may start going out again in order to begin a new life and seeing new people. In either case, television viewing rates tend to be affected by the change of social activities.

Changes in television viewing are not only indicated by the amount of exposure, but also marked by the changes of preference in programs selected. For example, experiencing a divorce may lead a person to be more interested in talk shows or variety shows where family conflicts and solutions
are discussed. Losing one's job may lead to an interest in news and public affairs programs which offer information bearing on the problems of this kind.

**STAGE IN THE LIFE CYCLE AND THE USES OF MASS MEDIA**

Life span developmental concepts have been used in mass communication research for some time. Such demographic variables as chronological age are nearly always employed in studies of the mass media audience. Later some mass communication researchers started the tradition of investigating the uses of mass media and gratification derived from the media by audience at different stages in the life cycle. These studies were originally focused upon the uses of mass media by audience at different positions of the life course (Dimmick, McCain and Bolton 1979).

Dimmick et al. (1979) argued that development along the life span is generally explained by stage theories which emphasize "qualitative differences" found among people at different positions in the life course. The major characteristic of stage theories is change which occurs when a person moves from one stage to the next. Based on stage theories, media consuming behavior among people in different positions of the life span will be different due to biophysical, sociological, and psychological situations of an individual at a time. For example, childhood's biophy-
sical, sociological, and psychological characteristic is the dependency upon parental protection. Consequently, media use among children reflects this characteristic.

**Media Use in Childhood**

Dimmick et al. (1979) argue that young children prefer watching television to using other media because television viewing takes place in a family contact situation within which children feel secure. Therefore, children are using television to serve their needs for physical, social, and psychological security. Wartella et al. (1979) summarize research conducted in media use by children and state that children start to use media as early as when they first develop their basic symbolic ability of language use (around the age of two). As estimated by Schramm et al. (1961), children start using television regularly from age two to four but there are very few reports on using other media. They argue that television is the medium dominantly used by children since, on the average, they spend more time watching television than they do in school. Comstock et al. (1978) used Nielsen data to show that preschool children spend more time with TV than school children do. Preschoolers enjoy watching animals, animated characters, and puppets and love programs that are full of action and laughter while school aged children prefer situation comedies. It is noticed that children's preference for dramas
and variety shows increase with age. The older they become, the more adult dramas, news, and talk shows they view.

Some researchers investigated the relationships between children's television exposure and their program preference and demographic variables, such as sex, social class, ethnic group, and intelligence. Schramm et al. (1961) found that boys and girls did not appear to be different in terms of time spent for TV but there were some differences in program preferences which appeared as early as first grade. Lyle and Hoffman (1972) found that, at a very young age, boys tended to enjoy cartoons more than girls did, and when they got older, their favorite programs are westerns, crime, and adventure programs while girls favored situation comedies and programs that included music. Children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, according to Schramm et al. (1961), used print media less than children of higher socioeconomic classes but tended to watch TV more. Greenberg and Dervinn (1970) also found that Black children across all income levels viewed more television than did their White counterparts.
Media Use in Adolescence

Erikson (1968) described adolescents as those who are "trying to understand and gain control of their environment while at the same time struggling to separate themselves from their surroundings in an attempt to develop a unique identity" (p. 306). Piaget (1972) noted that adolescence starts when a person develops the abilities to conduct serious mental operations about abstract concepts without the assistance of a concrete referent. Kohberg (1976) stated that an adolescent will lose the strong egocentric aspect of childhood and develop the ability of value judgement and moral reasoning. Most authors, however, refer to adolescence as the age between twelve and eighteen since chronological age is still a fair indicator of maturity at this stage of the life course.

Dimmick et al. (1979) stipulated that when children entered adolescence, the social and psychological needs of family protection became less important than needs to learn about the world and society. Social milieu such as peer groups became more important in the stage of adolescence. This explains why the amount of television viewing decreases in adolescent stage. The increases of social interest, such as group leadership, attractiveness, and sex, induce different types of need and consequently media use habits change. For example, movie attendance is very popular
among teenagers since it provides them with social contact and a chance to interact with members of the opposite sex. At this stage, therefore, the use of media other than television increases because they are regarded as better in serving adolescent needs.

Studies on adolescents' use of media have concentrated on television viewing. Comstock et al. (1978), using a Nielsen Survey, found that adolescents on the average watch less TV than either young children or adults. Lyle and Hoffman (1972) reported that at the beginning of adolescence (about age 12), the time spent with TV reached its peak, but it declined afterwards and reached the lowest point around age 18. Adolescents' viewing patterns become increasingly close to those of adults as they become older (Schramm et al., 1961).

There are slight sex differences in terms of TV program preference among adolescents. While girls prefer watching comedies, teenage boys tend to watch more adventure dramas, sports, and public affairs. The overall popular programs among them are situation comedies and feature films. Older adolescents are much more likely to be interested in news programs and public affairs information (Chaffee and McLeod, 1972). Schramm et al. (1961) and Lyle and Hoffman (1972) state that adolescents pay more attention to political and public information from newspapers. Their partici-
pation in readership of newspapers, books, and magazines increases and movies received more attention from adolescents. Music is rated by adolescents as a major source of entertainment and diversion. It is used by both boys and girls in their teens as a way of expressing their feelings and coping with emotional outrage (Lyle and Hoffman, 1972).

**Media Use in Adulthood**

While there are a number of research studies on children and adolescents' media consumption activities, very little has been done on the study of adults' media use (Dimmick and McCain, 1979). Morrison (1979) stated that the ages between 18 and 64 may be considered fair chronological markers for adulthood since this is the period of life where most people move into legal and economic independence. There are many characteristics of lifestyle that people within this stage share, namely, responsibility for making a living for self, family, etc.

Adulthood, however, has been regarded as "a smooth plateau of maturity that goes on and on" (Rosenfeld, 1977). Rogers (1982) also stated that adulthood had been perceived as the static period with no more "cultivation of growth." Until recently, developmental psychologists hardly recognized that developing changes were still processed in adults' life. Troll (1975, cited in Rogers, 1982) argued that the idea of static adulthood was not applicable, espe-
cially in a modern society where alternative forms of lifestyle can be chosen. Rosenfeld (1977) also indicates that adults' lives change through time and that there are stages in adult lives which are demarcated by life events, such as marriage, parenthood, retirement, and death in the family.

Dimmick et al. (1979) suggested that the area of media use by adults should be investigated more by mass communication researchers. They argued that life events or changes which operate to change need salience should be considered one set of "antecedents of need satisfaction" and these changes can affect media consuming behaviors in adult audiences.

**Media Use in Old Age**

Old age is the period of life when "sensory deterioration" arises and the use of media, such as books, magazines, and newspapers, declines (Young, 1979). Comstock et al. (1978) also reported a decline in film attendance. This decline may result from limited economic resources. However, for the aged, the amount of leisure time is the greatest. Comstock et al. (1978) found that the elderly were the heaviest viewers of television. Harris (1974) indicated that age 70 was the time when an individual spent more time watching television than any other age in the life span. After age 70, TV viewing amount declines a little, but is still greater than at any other stages of life.
According to Comstock et al. (1978), news and public affairs are the most preferred programs among the aged. The viewing of action and adventure dramas among the aged is decreased. There are also some sex differences in media use among elderly. Elderly women usually spend more time with TV, and they watch more soap operas and game shows than do elderly men.

Young (1979) argued that mass media, especially television, help substitute for financial, social, and physical loss that the elderly gradually perceive. Viewing television, therefore, compensates for previous interpersonal contacts that become very rare and allow the elderly to be in touch with activities that take place in the world. There is strong agreement that elderly people use television for companionship as well as for gaining information, such as public and health policy, and other financial information. Entertainment is less important to them (Schramm, 1969; Davis et al., 1976; and Hess, 1974, cited in Young, 1979) as a motive than to younger people. All of the above explains why the elderly tend to watch television more than at any other stage of life.
THEORETICAL MODEL AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

In the first chapter, the theoretical positions and criticisms of the uses and gratifications paradigm were discussed. One of the criticisms was the inadequacy of sociopsychological need structure as the only explanation of media use habits and media gratification. The present chapter discussed life span developmental concepts in the context of media use by audiences in different stages of their lives. It shows how stages of the life course are related to the way audiences use media and since different life events occur to people in different stages of their lives, findings of these past research appear to support Dimmick et al.'s (1979) proposition which states that life events affect individual's psychological structure and consequently his/her media use habits will be adjusted. The theoretical model for this study follows Dimmick et al.'s (1979) proposition. It also includes the concept of gratification obtained by respondents who rated television in terms of its helpfulness in serving different needs (TV satisfaction—not suggested by Dimmick et al. but was included in most uses and gratification studies). This study emphasizes the investigation of television used by adult audiences, that stage of the life span which in the past has received the least theoretical and empirical attention from mass communication researchers. In specific
terms, the theoretical model for this study proposes that people who experience life events in different domains or experience and perceive life event impact, or experience life events in either a positive or negative direction may undergo change of their need structure, their television viewing and their perception of how television satisfies their needs. (See Figure 1.)

**Figure 1: Theoretical Model**
The purpose of this study is to merge concepts from life span developmental theories with the uses and gratifications paradigm. As stated earlier, uses and gratifications research has been appropriately criticized by many mass communication scholars because of its conceptual shortcomings. Such a merger, therefore, may provide an improved model for research. With the concept of life events, the uses and gratifications framework can be applied to investigate the factor of "social and psychological origins of needs" which, in turn, affect the individual's media consumption activities.

The objectives of the study may be stated as follows.

1. To integrate the concepts from life span developmental theory with the uses and gratifications paradigm to strengthen the theoretical model of this research tradition.

2. To investigate the relationship between experiencing of life events and the change of individuals' need salience and their television viewing patterns.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

The proposition that life events or changes in the life span are associated with changes in the individual's sociopsychological need structure which, in turn, induces changes in media use is suggested by Dimmick et al. (1979). Research strategies and designs for this theoretical framework, consequently, should include the investigation of life events experienced in the life span, sociopsychological need structure, and media consuming behavior.

This chapter focuses on the explication of the theoretical framework and the operationalization of these concepts. First, the theoretical model exhibited in the last chapter is transformed into the conceptual framework where essential concepts are defined and explained. Research questions are then identified. The second part of the present chapter focuses upon the description of the data used in this study and the explication and operationalization of major variables. The inadequacy of the available data in answering some parts of the research question and the adjustment of the research question are also discussed in
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this section. The final section is devoted to the planning for analysis and the statistical procedure used in this study.

THEORETICAL EXPLICATION AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

At the end of Chapter two, a theoretical model for this study was proposed. It suggests a pattern of relationships between the experiencing of life events and their effect upon psychological and behavioral change of media users. The theoretical model proposes that people who either experience more life events, or any of the different life event domains, or perceive higher impact of life events on their lives, or experience life events in a positive or negative directions will undergo change(s) in their psychological structure or perceived need salience. As a result of changes in need salience, respondents' TV viewing habits and perceived satisfaction from television in serving their needs would be adjusted accordingly.

According to this theoretical framework, major theoretical concepts are derived which consist of life event variables, need salience concepts, the measurements of television viewing habits and audiences' satisfaction (or gratifications obtained) with TV in serving different needs.
Life events are conceptualized in four different ways: 1) **total life events**—the actual number of life events one experiences in a period of time; 2) the different areas in which life events occur are termed **life event domains**; 3) the perception of the respondents' life event effect on their lives is termed **life event impact**; and 4) experiencing positive or negative life events is termed **life event direction**. Psychological structure in this study is measured in terms of **need salience** or the perception of importance one attaches to each media-related need. The amount of television viewing and the tendency to select specific programs to view are labelled **the amount of television viewing and program preference** and their perception of how well TV can serve respondents' needs are termed **perceived TV need satisfaction**. Figure 2 is a more specific version of the general model shown in Figure 1.

The time factor also receives attention in this study. The conceptual model (Figure 2) implies a time-based context (changes in psychological characteristics and behavior). Life events in the two waves of data (1981 and 1982) represent the long-standing and the immediate life events. The question is whether long-standing or immediate life events, or both together, affect need salience and TV viewing and satisfaction.
Figure 2: Conceptual Framework

This conceptual framework is the basis for the analysis of the television audience in this study. In response to the conceptual framework which poses four different aspects of life events as having impact upon the adjustment of need salience and television viewing habits, two research questions, therefore, are obtained.

1. Do people who experience more life events or either of the life event in different domains, or experience and perceive more impact of life events, or experience life events in either direction undergo more change of need salience, TV viewing habits and TV need satisfaction than those who do not have such experiences?
2. *Is it immediate or long-standing life events which have a greater effect on need salience, TV viewing and TV satisfaction?*

**DESCRIPTION OF DATA COLLECTION**

The study analyzes two-waves of panel data collected in May 1981 and May 1982. In Spring 1981, undergraduate and graduate students who enrolled in Communication 626 in the Department of Communication at The Ohio State University were trained under the supervision of Professor Thomas A. McCain to perform telephone interviews. Telephone numbers were selected at random, using the telephone directory for Columbus, and Franklin County, Ohio. The male head of the household was asked to respond to the interview when the last digit of the phone number was even, and the female head of the household was asked to answer when the last digit of the telephone number was odd. The head of the household was chosen as a unit of analysis since the population was defined as adults between the ages of 18 and 60, and adulthood is the stage of life under investigation. The interview took approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

Respondents were asked to report on the amount of time they spent in the average week watching television for each of eight specific types of programs. These eight types of
programs as well as the other measures are included in the questionnaire (see Appendix A). From this report, the amount of television exposure and the program preference of each respondent was determined. Then respondents were asked to rate the level of importance for media-related needs. Twelve media-related need statements were used to measure how respondents perceived the significance of these sociopsychological needs. The next topic of the interview included measurement of life events and their significance to respondents. The last part of the questionnaire included questions about how respondents perceived the usefulness of television in satisfying each need mentioned earlier. This first wave questionnaire (1981) contained 11 questions on television viewing habits, 12 need salience rating-scales, 28 questions on current status, life event experience within the last year, the level of importance respondents attached to those life events, 12 items on how television satisfied needs, and 3 questions on demographic characteristics. At the end of the interview, respondents were asked whether they were willing to cooperate again in the same interview for the following year. The total number of respondents for the first wave was 561.

The second wave of panel data was collected in Spring 1982, also by students enrolled in Communication 626 under the direction of Professor Thomas A. McCain. The contents
of the questionnaire were the same except some questions were added about the use of media other than television, and the adoption of television technologies and innovation. There were 617 respondents in this survey. Among these were 218 respondents who were respondents in the first wave who had agreed to be reinterviewed a year later. The data used in this study represent the 218 respondents who were interviewed in both 1981 and 1982 surveys.

It is important to report the demographic aggregates of the 1981 and 1982 sub-samples (n=218) so they can be compared to the demographics for the larger samples in the surveys. This is to assure that the sub-samples of panel-respondents retain the same proportion of demographic groups as the respondents in the larger samples. Since this sub-sample group consisted of the "cooperative" respondents, demographic proportion of respondents would show whether those who participated in the second interview were heavily loaded on any one of the demographic groups and perhaps, unrepresentative of the larger samples. (See Table 1.)

Evidently, the sub-samples did not deviate much in terms of their demographic proportion from the larger samples. There is some indication that the proportion of older, higher income and higher educated respondents were increased, and that those of the younger, the lower educat-
Table 1
Comparisons of Demographic Proportions
Sub-Sample and the Larger Sample 1981

Spring 1981 (n=561, n=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
<th>46-50</th>
<th>50-60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=561</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=218</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>0-11</th>
<th>Hi-Sch</th>
<th>Some Grad</th>
<th>College Grad</th>
<th>Graduate Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=561</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=218</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Under $6,000</th>
<th>$6,000-12,000</th>
<th>$12,000-18,000</th>
<th>$18,000-24,000</th>
<th>$24,000-30,000</th>
<th>$30,000-36,000</th>
<th>$36,000-42,000</th>
<th>Above $42,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=561</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=218</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ed, and the lower income respondents were decreased in the second interview. However, the discrepancies between these demographic proportions are small. Therefore, it is clear that the sub-sample of panel respondents used for this study do not deviate a great deal from the larger samples.
Table 2
Comparisons of Demographic Proportions
Sub-Sample and the Larger Sample 1982

Spring 1982 (n=617, n=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years 18-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
<th>46-50</th>
<th>50-60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=617</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=218</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>0-11 Grds</th>
<th>Hi-Sch. Grads</th>
<th>Some College Grads.</th>
<th>College Degree Work*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=617</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=218</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under $6,000</th>
<th>$6,000-12,000</th>
<th>$12,000-18,000</th>
<th>$18,000-24,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=617</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=218</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$24,000-30,000</th>
<th>$30,000-36,000</th>
<th>$36,000-42,000</th>
<th>Above $42,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=617</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=218</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*only the 1982 wave contains this item

In order to show the most common life events, the percentage of life events experienced is reported in Table 3. The percentages of life events reported in the 1981 and 1982 waves are similar. In both waves, employment changes
Table 3

Percentage of Life Events Reported
in Both Larger and Sub-Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 1981 (n=561, n=218)</th>
<th>Spring 1982 (n=617, n=218)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Events Change</td>
<td>n=561 9.6% Change 34.6%</td>
<td>n=617 7.6% Change 37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=218 7.3% Change 39.4%</td>
<td>n=218 4.6% Change 33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Illness&amp;Death</td>
<td>n=561 31.7% Change 24.4%</td>
<td>n=617 14.3% Change 31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=218 32.1% Change 20.6%</td>
<td>n=218 12.8% Change 31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse Employment</td>
<td>n=561 16.4% Change</td>
<td>n=617 14.3% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=218 18.8% Change</td>
<td>n=218 12.8% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Change</td>
<td>n=561 11.8%</td>
<td>n=617 16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=218 9.2%</td>
<td>n=218 11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size Change</td>
<td>n=561 16.6%</td>
<td>n=617 11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=218 18.8%</td>
<td>n=218 12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household** Duty Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the 1982 sub-sample, there was no moving among respondents.

**Household duty data for the second interview were lost in the recording procedure.

were the most common life events experienced by respondents (34.6% and 37.1%). The experiencing of illness and death of family and close friends was the second most experienced type of life event in both waves (31.1% and 31.0%). In the 1981 survey, household responsibility changes were the next most frequently experienced life events (22.1%), followed
by moving (24.4%), family size change (16.6%), spouse employment change (16.4%), health change (11.8%), and marital change (9.6%). The 1982 survey also shows similarities in percentage of life event experienced by respondents. They reported experience of spouse employment change as the third most frequent life event (15.4%). Health change (14.3%), family size change (11.5%) and marital change (7.6%) are the three least common life events in the 1982 survey. The sub-samples of panel respondents from the 1981 and 1982 waves deviate much from the larger samples. (See Table 3.)

In order to show the average impact rating of each life event, the mean scores of each life event impact rating are reported in Table 4.

The mean scores of life event ratings for the 1981 and the 1982 surveys are similar. In the 1981 survey, marital change was rated the highest in terms of its impact upon respondents' lives (3.40 on the basis of 1-4 scale of importance—recoded scale, very important = 4, not at all important = 1). Other changes rated high were household duty change, family size change, health change, and employment change. All of these were rated above 3.00 in the survey. Spouse employment change and illness and death experience were not rated very high (2.84 and 2.53 respectively). In the 1982 survey, data on the ratings of mov-
Table 4
Mean Scores of Life Event Impact Ratings in Both Larger and Sub-Samples

Mean scores were calculated only for those who reported experiencing of specific life events.

Spring 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Larger</th>
<th>Sub.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Change</td>
<td>n=52</td>
<td>n=16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Change</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>n=196</td>
<td>n=86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>n=68</td>
<td>n=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness &amp; Death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>n=174</td>
<td>n=70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>n=137</td>
<td>n=45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>n=87</td>
<td>n=41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Duty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Ratings</td>
<td>n=124</td>
<td>n=50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Ratings</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Larger</th>
<th>Sub.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Change</td>
<td>n=44</td>
<td>n=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Change</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>n=227</td>
<td>n=74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>n=92</td>
<td>n=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness &amp; Death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>n=184</td>
<td>n=69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the 1982 sub-sample, there was no moving among respondents.
** Household duty and Family size ratings for the second interview were lost in the recording procedure.

...
this survey (3.35), followed by marital change impact (3.27). Employment change impact, spouse employment change impact and illness and death impact were again rated moderately high (2.98, 2.83 and 2.72 respectively). The subsample of panel respondents from the 1981 and 1982 waves do not deviate a great deal from the larger samples. (See Table 4.)

In the following section, each concept contained in the theoretical model (see Figure 2) will be individually defined and operationalized. The independent factors will be operationalized first, followed by the dependent variables.

The Measurement of Life Event Variables

Concept: Total life events

Total life events is the actual number of life events that a person experienced during a given period of time. For McCain's data, nine questions (one question was open-ended) were used to ascertain whether respondents had experienced any of the different areas of life events during the period of one year before the interview took place. These answers are then summed to obtain the total number of life events each respondent experienced. (See Table 5.) This total may range from no major life event to as many as five life events during one year.

Concept: Domains of life events
Table 5

Questionnaire for Total Life Event and Life Event Domains

Questions used to collect information on life event amount and life event domains.

1. What major changes have occurred in your life in the last year that you feel were important to you?
   a. _______________________________
   
   b. _______________________________

2. Have you had a change in your marital status in the last year?
3. Have you had a change in your job status or job responsibilities in the last year?
4. Have your spouse had a major or significant change in his/her job status in the last year?
5. Has there been a major or significant change in your health in the past year?
6. Have there been any serious illnesses or deaths among your family members or close friends during the last year?
7. Have you moved from one residence to another in the past year?
8. Has there been a change in your family size in the last year?
9. Have there been any major or significant changes in your household duties and family responsibilities in the last year?

_____ Yes  ________ No  ________ No Answer

(Questions no. 2-9 represent each domain of reported life events, total life events derive from the accumulation of life events in all domains.)

Life event domains refer to the areas in which life events occur (Reese and Smyer, 1983). McCain included eight domains of life events in the data collection. (See Table 5.) These are change in marital status, employment
conditions, spouse employment conditions, health of respondent, experiencing illness and death of family members and close friends, moving, change of family size, and change of household responsibilities.

Marital status change includes the singles who decide to cohabit or to marry, and married persons who separate, divorce, or become widowed. Change of marital status definitely calls for great readjustment in the individual's lifestyle. In the same manner, changing the employment situation also affects one's life. Getting a job or a promotion, changing job and responsibility, losing one's job, and retiring are very important for most people. Working has become the most crucial part of modern life, and changes in the work situation often signify the success and failure of one's life.

A health problem or illness is another domain of life event that concerns most people. Living the life of a sick person or experiencing a death in the family, especially an untimely one, enormously affects the atmosphere of the family. Moving, a common experience for many Americans, is caused by several reasons, such as going to school, getting a new job, etc. No matter what the reason, adaptation to a totally new neighborhood and new friends is needed, and many aspects of lifestyle will be changed.
The increasing and reducing of family size may stem from the birth of a new baby, grown up children leaving home, or even death. Each occasion, be it happy or sad, always brings the family into another stage where alteration and adjustment are necessary. New parents need to be more economical as well as psychologically responsible for the new baby. Parents whose children are leaving home may suffer psychologically from the middle-aged feeling of emptiness often referred to as "the emptiness syndrome." Retirement from parenthood forces them to think of new activities through which to fill their lives with new meaning.

The last domain of change investigated in this study is the change of household responsibilities. In modern society, women are no longer tied to the housewife role. Nowadays, many housewives find their places in the working world. One reason for this change of sex roles is economic pressure, and another is the awareness among modern women of their ability to fulfill the need for self-actualization. Moreover, the recent economic recession has forced many men out of their jobs while their wives have had the opportunity to fulfill the money maker role. This switching of sex roles can be commonly found among midwestern families during the years 1980-1984.

Other reasons for the switching of sex roles among men and women in American society stem from the increasing rate
of divorce and numbers of single parents. Men and women who had gone through such experiences need to adjust themselves to both the mother and father roles. All at one time each may be the head of the household, a working parent, and a homemaker. This is not an easy job, and both the parent and the children in such a family obviously need to tolerate both physical and emotional distress.

**Concept**: Life event impact

The ratings of life events impact show how much each specific domain of life event is perceived, by respondents as inducing change in their daily living habits and important things in their lives. The rating is used to indicate, first, whether changes in a life situation actually induced changes in their social and interpersonal behaviors, and, second, how much each specific domain of change is perceived by the respondents as inducing change in their behaviors. (See Table 6.)

**Concept**: Life event direction

The direction of life events refers to the evaluative meaning a person attaches to a certain life event due to societal norms. For example, losing a job would be normally perceived as a bad situation to just about anybody and therefore should have negative meaning. Other negative life events are separation, divorce, illness, and death. Positive changes include getting married, getting a job,
Table 6

Questionnaire for Life Event Impact

Questions used to collect information on life event impact

How much of this change in _________________ changed your daily living habits and what you think is important in your life? Would you say it was very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not very much of a change or no change at all?

a. marital status
b. employment status or responsibilities
c. spouse employment status or job responsibilities
d. your health
e. any serious illnesses or death among family members or close friends
f. residence
g. your family size
h. household duties and family responsibilities

________________ Very much (1)
________________ Somewhat (2)
________________ Not very much (3)
________________ No change (4)
________________ No answer (9)

(asked only of respondents who reported specific life events.)

receiving a promotion, having a new baby, etc. (See Table 7.) However, some events have their own evaluative meanings that are beyond the knowledge of an outsider. For example, retirement may be a happy occasion for some but a sad one for others. Moving because of a new job is a positive change, but moving after a divorce would not generally be considered a happy event. Such situations, therefore,
cannot be interpreted unambiguously as either positive or negative and cannot be included in the analysis.
Table 7

Questionnaire for Life Event Directions

Questions used to collect information on life event directions

1. What is your present marital status?
   _____ single      _____ married       _____ remarried
   _____ divorced   _____ separated     _____ widowed
   No answer

2. Which of the following describes any changes in your job status or job responsibilities in the last year.
   _____ getting first job _____ getting new job
   _____ losing job   _____ being laid off
   _____ getting a promotion _____ getting new responsibilities
   _____ retiring   No answer

3. Which of the following describes any changes in your spouse job status or responsibilities in the last year.
   _____ getting first _____ getting new job
   _____ losing job   _____ being laid off
   _____ getting a promotion _____ getting new responsibilities
   _____ retiring   No answer

4. Has your health improved or has it gotten worse?
   _____ improved       _____ worsened      No answer

5. Was this illness or death one of the following?
   _____ ill spouse     _____ ill child
   _____ ill family/friends _____ death of spouse
   _____ death of child   _____ death of family/friends
   _____ other          No answer

6. Was this change in residence a move
   _____ within city   _____ within Ohio
   _____ another state _____ another country
   No answer

7. Which of the following describes the change in family size?
   _____ birth         _____ child leaving
   _____ child returning _____ spouse leaving
   _____ relative in    _____ relative out
   _____ other         No answer

8. Which of the following describes your change in household duties?
   _____ increase duties _____ decrease duties
   _____ increase parenting _____ decrease parenting
   _____ increase decisions _____ decrease decisions
   _____ other (specify)   No answer

(all questions above were used to asked only of respondents who had reported specific life events.)
Dimmick et al. (1979) suggested that in order to understand the sociopsychological need structure, the concept of need salience is potentially very important. Need salience, according to Dimmick et al. (1979), is the indicator of how an individual regards each of his/her needs as important to him/her. For example, the need to be entertained might be very important for one but not so important for the others. The information on an individual's need salience is useful to mass communication researchers seeking to understand how an audience uses media to serve its needs. Need salience, argued Dimmick et al. (1979), is the concept that will connect life events to media use habits. In other words, life events will impact individual need salience first and the latter will, in turn, affect media use behavior.

In order to collect the information on need salience, McCain adopted Katz et al.'s (1973) methods used in the study of the Israelis' perception and uses of media to serve their social and psychological needs. In that study, Katz et al. used a list of thirty-five need statements in the form of "How important is it for you to...?" to investigate how their respondents rate the importance of each of these needs. Each statement was rated as being very important, somewhat important, not very important, and not at
all important. These thirty five media-related needs were social and psychological needs believed to be satisfied by exposure to mass media. Katz et al. (1973) formulated these need statements on the basis of three facets: (a) mode, (b) connection, and (c) referent. The modes of needs are: "(1) to strengthen; (2) to weaken; and (3) to acquire." The connections of media-related needs include: "(1) information, knowledge, understanding; (2) gratifications, emotional experience; (3) credibility, confidence, stability, status; and (4) contact." And the referents are "(1) self (2) family (3) friends (4) state, society (5) tradition, culture (6) world (7) other negative reference groups" (Katz et al., 1973, p.166).

The combinations of these three facets, for example alb4c2, reads to strengthen contact with family, such as the need to spend time with the family. Katz et al. (1973) formulated thirty five media-related needs from nineteen of the three dimensional combinations (some of them contain two or more items of need statement).

Kippax and Murray (1980) replicated Katz et al. ' s study using only 30 need statements to investigate media users in Australia. Most statements used here were identical to those of Katz et al. except for some specific items on national and cultural identification which were modified for the Australian background, and some inappropriate items were eliminated.
In order to make the list of need statements appropriate for the process of data collection by telephone interview, McCain selected only 11 out of 35 items from Katz et al.'s list of thirty five need statements. Items selected are those rated relatively important by the Israeli respondents. For example, "need to understand what goes on in Israel and in the world" was rated as "very important" by 87 per cent of the respondents. All of the items selected by McCain were rated as being "very important" by more than 50 per cent of the Israeli respondents (except for "need to overcome loneliness"—the only item chosen by McCain which was rated as "very important" by less than 50 per cent of the respondents (37 per cent)—but the lowest rated items from Katz et al.'s study were rated as being "very important" by only 16 per cent of the respondents).

McCain also modified some of the statements selected from Katz et al.'s (1973) list of need statements. He put "need to spend time with the family and "need to spend time with friends" into one item. Some of the statements about national affairs were reworded to suit American respondents. Also, two more need statements—"need to learn own likes and dislikes" and "need to relieve boredom"—were added to the list of media-related needs. In all, twelve need statements were included in the interview schedule for wave 1 and 2. (See Table 8.)
Table 8

Questionnaire for Need Structure

Questions used to collect information on need salience

How important is it for you to _______________?
1. know what's going on in the world
2. release tension
3. feel that you are using your time well
4. overcome loneliness
5. spend time with family and friends
6. learn about your likes and dislikes
7. be entertained
8. strive for a higher living standard
9. relieve boredom
10. participate in discussions with family and friends
11. keep up with the way the government performs its functions
12. understand yourself

________ Very important (1)
________ Somewhat important (2)
________ Not very important (3)
________ Not at all important (4)
________ Don't know (8)
________ No answer (9)

Television Viewing Patterns

Two measures of television use are utilized in this study. One is the amount of television exposure and the other is the type of program the audience views on television. These two variables of television viewing patterns are measured at the same time by asking respondents to report the amount of time they spent watching television for eight different program types during the average week. (See Table 9.)
Table 9

Questionnaire for Television Viewing

Questions used to collect information on TV viewing habits.

Would you watch none of, 1-5 shows, 5-10 shows, 10-15 or more than 15 shows of _______________ during an average week?

1. news and public affairs
2. drama and detective shows
3. situation comedies
4. soap operas (2 items)
   a. How many soap operas do you watch during an average week?
   b. How many soap opera episodes do you watch during an average week?
5. movies
6. religious programs
7. game shows
8. talk and variety shows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Show Options</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 show</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 shows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 shows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ shows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ shows (only for soap opera item)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Television Need Satisfaction

A portion of the interview questionnaire was devoted to investigating how respondents perceived the usefulness of television in satisfying twelve needs referred to in the need statements. Katz et al. (1973) asked the Israeli respondents to rate the usefulness of media to measure their perceived gratification on each medium. Kippax and Murray (1980) referred to Elliot (1974) and McGuire's
(1974) reviews that questioned the validity of the relationship between audiences' selections of media and their psychological needs. Kippax and Murray (1980) subsequently created the "perceived functions of the media" statements in order to link the two concepts together and give evidence that those who choose to use media to serve their needs actually perceive the usefulness of each medium in satisfying particular needs. In this study, television need satisfaction statements were used for the same purpose as Katz et al.'s (1973) "media's helpfulness for satisfying needs" and Kippax and Murray's (1980) "perceived functions of the media": to link the concept of needs and media use as evidence that the audience actually realizes the usefulness of television in satisfying needs. The level of perceived gratification obtained or satisfaction from viewing television, therefore, was determined by respondents' answer. Twelve television satisfying need statements, each matching with twelve need statements mentioned earlier, are shown in Table 10.
Table 10

Questionnaire for Television Satisfaction

Questions used to collect information on TV satisfaction.

How helpful is television in ______________________________?
1. keeping you informed about the world
2. aiding you to release tension
3. making you feel that you are using time well
4. aiding you to overcome loneliness
5. aiding you to spend time with family and friends
6. learning your likes and dislikes
7. keeping you entertained
8. aiding you to strive for a higher living standard
9. as a way to relieve boredom
10. aiding you to participate in discussions with family and friends
11. keeping up with the way the government performs its functions
12. aiding you to understand yourself

_______Very helpful (1)
_______Somewhat helpful (2)
_______Not very helpful (3)
_______Not at all helpful (4)
_______Don't know (8)
_______No answer (9)

Demographic Variables

Television viewing patterns are sometimes claimed to be a function of the demographic characteristics of audience members. A number of mass communication researchers have used this perspective to explain media use behavior among people from different demographic groups (Greenberg and Dominick, 1969; Kline, 1971; and Robinson, 1977). It is hypothesized that audiences can be grouped by their demographic characteristics and that there are differences in
media consuming behavior among audiences from different demographic groups. For example, audiences from the lower socioeconomic class tend to be heavy TV viewers. Women, the lower educated, and the lower income audiences are also classified as heavy viewers (Davison et al., 1976).

In this study, the relationship between demographic aggregates and their television viewing is not the issue. Nevertheless, including the report of the audience's demographic characteristics can be useful as controlling variables to test whether or not relationships among life events, need salience, and television viewing persist across demographic groups. Demographic aggregates measured in this study are marital status, employment status, sex, income, level of formal education.

Some Problems in Data Analysis

Unfortunately, after studying the frequencies of the data, some problems were detected. Due to some mistakes in the data recording procedure of the 1982 interview, some life event variables were lost. Those variables are household responsibility change and the ratings of family size change impact. Moreover, moving, which is one of the life event variables, was recorded in the 1982 interview but the sub-sample used for this study contains only respondents who did not move in the previous year. This means two life event variables and one variable of life event impact for
the 1982 sub-sample are missing. It is, therefore, appropriate that the items on household duty change, family size change and moving and the ratings of their impact be deleted from the analysis in order that the 1981 and the 1982 waves contain the same items of life events and ratings of life event impact.

As a result, life events considered in this study are marital change, employment change, spouse employment change, health change and illness and death experience. Ratings of life event impact used in the analysis will, therefore, be only of those life events mentioned.

Another problem is the small number of respondents in some groups under investigation. Apparently, not all respondents experienced major life events during the one year period prior to the interview. Approximately 80 per cent of the respondents in the 1981 wave and 69 per cent of those in the 1982 wave reported they had had at least one major life event during the previous time. These numbers are sufficient for the analysis when total life events (all domains) are considered. However, when each specific life event is considered and respondents are divided into eight groups (for eight different domains), the number of subjects in many groups becomes too small to be statistically reliable. For example, in the 1981 survey, the number of respondents who experienced marital change was only 7.3 per
cent of all respondents and the percentage of this group went down to 4.6 in the 1982 wave. Therefore, an attempt to answer about different life event domains for which a considerable number of subjects is required, is unlikely to be reliable with the available data.

Similarly, questions about life event directions are subject to the same problem. The number of positive and negative life events in each domain, obviously are smaller than that of the life event domain groups since only those who reported life events in each domain were asked to indicate which life event direction they experienced. Therefore, the number of respondents in the positive and negative groups are not sufficient to be statistically reliable. Moreover, there were many respondents who experienced both positive and negative major life events during the same period of time. The analysis that had been planned, therefore, became impossible.

Due to this shortcoming, the concept of life event domain and life event direction were deleted from further analysis and only the total life events and life event impact of five items—namely marital change, employment change, spouse employment change, health change and illness and death experience are retained in the analysis.

As a result, research questions were modified as follows
1. Do people who experience more life events or experience and perceive more life event impact undergo more change in their need structure, their TV viewing habits and their TV need satisfaction than those who do not have such experiences?

2. Is it the immediate or the long-standing life events, or both together, which have a greater effect on change in need salience, TV viewing and TV satisfaction?

**METHODS**

The major advantage of having panel data collected at two points in time is that it gives us the opportunity to conduct a study in which antecedent conditions at time 1 are related to other variables at time 2.

However, when two data sets instead of one are used, the analysis becomes more complicated than the analysis of cross-sectional data. Before moving to the explication of data analysis technique for this study, it is necessary that the logic of the sequential or time-based aspect of the research design be clarified. The sequential character of the model is shown in Figure 3.

Four groups of variables are in the theoretical model. The first group is the life event variables, encompassing total life events—the actual number of life events happened to respondents during the period of one year before
the interviews took place and life event impact—the ratings of how respondents who experienced life events perceived them to impact their lives. These life event variables, as mentioned in the theoretical model earlier, are hypothesized as the independent variables, since they are supposed to be determined by factors outside the model.

The three remaining groups of variables are the dependent variable groups. According to the conceptual framework, these three groups of variables vary due to the impact of life events. However, not all of them are hypothesized as the immediate consequence of life events. The theoretical model shows that the need salience group is supposed to be the first area in which respondents show some changes subsequent to their experiencing of major life events. Television viewing habits, then, will be affected by the change of respondents' need salience. Finally, any alteration in TV viewing patterns would result in respondents' change of satisfaction in television.

![Figure 3: Sequential Characteristic of Theoretical Model](image-url)
Note that all of the three dependent groups are referred to as the "change of" in the model. This is one merit of having two sets of data collected at two points in time since the comparison between time 1 and time 2 will reveal how each respondent has changed in any of his/her characteristics and behaviors. The absolute value of difference in respondent score on these three dependent variables—need salience, TV viewing and TV satisfaction—between the 1981 and 1982 waves will be the score used in the model for further analysis.

As for the independent variables themselves, total life events and life event impact were considered in a cumulative mode. The number and the ratings of life events in both surveys were summed separately to test whether those who experienced more life events during the period of two years would undergo more changes in their need salience, TV viewing and TV satisfaction. In one survey, respondents usually reported that they experienced only one or two major life events in one year; therefore, the number of major life events experienced by respondents in a single year did not vary greatly—two or one as opposed to none. When the cumulative analysis is applied, the number of life events reported in two years for some respondents may increase to four or five major life events. These respondents were compared, in the cumulative analysis, to those
who had not experienced major life events at all in two years, to show the difference in their changes in need salience, TV viewing and TV satisfaction. Figure 4 is a diagram of the cumulative analyses. However, this cumulative mode of analysis will be useful only when the time factor—the fact that changes in dependent variables occurred within specific time range—is not essential for such changes.

We are not only interested in whether or not life events induce changes in the need structure but also in whether life events affect such changes in the long run or if such impact occurs immediately. The remote and proximate analysis is designed for this purpose. It will compare the effect of immediate and long-standing life events to test which one has more impact upon the dependent group.

Since cumulative analysis is planned to test the impact of life events in cumulation on the change of dependent variables, life events in both of the 1981 and the 1982 data are summed for each respondents before entering the analysis to test whether or not they affect the change of psychological structure and media use behaviors of respondents who experienced them. The analysis of life event impact also follows the same procedure. Therefore, cumulative life events is the term for total life events of the 1981 survey plus total life events of the 1982 survey. In
the same manner, cumulative life event impact refers to the summation of life event impact ratings of the 1981 and the 1982 surveys. Figure 4 shows the model of cumulative analysis.

Cumulative life event = the summation of total life events in year preceding 1981 survey and total life events in year preceding 1982 survey

Cumulative life event impact = the summation of life event impact ratings of the 1981 and the 1982 surveys

Change in need salience = the absolute value of differences between need salience ratings of 1981 and those of 1982 waves

Change in TV viewing = the absolute value of differences between TV viewing amount of 1981 and 1982 waves

Change in TV satisfaction = the absolute value of difference between TV satisfaction ratings of 1981 and those of 1982 waves

Figure 4: Diagram for Cumulative Analysis

Remote and proximate analysis is used to investigate whether the impact of life events upon the change of need structure and TV viewing habits and satisfaction is the long-term or immediate. Therefore, life events reported in
the 1981 and 1982 data are analyzed separately. (See Figure 5.)

Figure 5: Diagrams for Proximate versus Remote Analysis

The comparison between the two methods in terms of time ordering is shown in Figure 6.

Model A is the cumulative analysis which considers the total number of life events and life event impact of two waves together (summation of two-wave life events and life event ratings). (Arrows represent the impact of life event variables upon changes in the dependent variables.) Model B is the remote analysis where life events occurred within one year before the first interview were hypothesized as
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Figure 6: Comparison of Cumulative, Remote and Proximate Time Chart
affecting changes in need salience, TV viewing and TV satisfaction. Model C is the proximate analysis where only life events occurring within one year before the second interview (between the first and the second interview) were hypothesized as affecting changes in the dependent variables. These three models are actually the three possible ways that total life events and life event impact may affect changes in respondents' need structure, their TV viewing habits and TV satisfaction. They will be analyzed in the following chapter in two types of diagrams—the cumulative diagrams where model A is tested for both total life events and life event impact, and the remote and proximate diagrams where both model B and C are tested simultaneously.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
Statistical analyses of the data proceeded in two stages. The first stage is the use of factor analysis of the need salience and the TV satisfaction variables. The factor analysis will establish the dimensions underlying the need items and the satisfaction measures.

In the second stage of the study, path analysis, a statistical technique using the fundamental concept of correlation and regression analysis, will be applied to obtain the relationships among the variables in the conceptual
model. The factor analyses and path analyses will be presented in the following chapter.
Chapter IV
FINDINGS

This chapter focuses on the statistical analyses and their results. First, the rationale for using factor analysis to reconceptualize the need salience and TV satisfaction variables will be discussed. Subsequently, the results of the factor analysis will be reported. Since path analysis is not a familiar technique to many social science students, a brief overview of its rationale and procedure is offered prior to the report of the results of the path analysis which is the final stage of this study.

THE CLASSIFICATION OF NEED SALIENCE
McCain selected twelve need statements from the thirty-five media-related needs used by Katz et al. (1973) in the Israeli study. The twelve selected items were chosen on the basis of higher ratings rather than on their representation of basic need concepts. The concept of need salience, which is operationalized as twelve different elements of need, requires reclassification since many of the need items obviously overlap. For example, need to be informed
about the world and need to be informed about the government are parallel items. In addition, the need to relieve boredom and need to overcome loneliness, are almost indistinguishable for some people. An intuitive attempt to classify these items would be risky. There are some guidelines in previous studies of uses and gratifications of mass media that we can follow. Katz et al. (1973) used factor analysis to classify their thirty-five need statements, but they did not report their results. Generally, they attempted to classify them by using the three facets of need characteristics, and reported the results of a cluster analysis (Guttman's Smallest Space Analysis). The results of this analysis by Katz et al. will be discussed in comparison to this study's results from the factor analysis later in the chapter. Factor analysis, the statistical method routinely used in uses and gratifications studies for analysing need and gratification dimensions, is applied for the reclassification of the raw need salience variables. The application of factor analysis to need statements is to systematically rearrange these need items into the more basic constructs of need which are more theoretically meaningful.

Four factor analyses were performed on the need salience ratings. The first analysis was on the need items rated in
the 1981 survey (n=561). The second was on the 1982 wave (n=617). The data used in this study are the respondents who participated in both interviews (n=218). The need salience ratings of both the 1981 and 1982 panel respondents were individually factor analyzed to determine whether or not they yield the same results as the larger samples using data from all respondents. The four factor analyses are reasonably consistent. (See Table 11.)

**Factor Methods**

Factor analysis proceeded in two stages. The principal axis method was used initially to estimate factor loadings, and eigenvalues (variance explained by each factor) and the scree test was used to determine the number of factors. Results of the scree test on the four factor analyses consistently indicate that two factors can be presumed to underly the 12 need items. The promax solution for oblique rotation was first applied in the computation of factor loadings. However, the correlation found between the two factors was only .29, which was considered low. Therefore, the orthogonal rotation method should be more appropriate for this analysis. The varimax solution was then selected for the orthogonal rotation procedure. The factor loadings and eigenvalues are reported in Table 11. The minimum level of loadings for those items retained on factors was .272.
### Table 11

**Results of Factor Analysis on Need Salience**

Comparison of factor pattern loadings of need salience items from four data sets: rotated orthogonal factor pattern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Items</th>
<th>Data 1981, n=561</th>
<th>Data 1982, n=617</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>-.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12**</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigen Values</th>
<th>Data 1981, n=218</th>
<th>Data 1982, n=218 ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.697</td>
<td>1.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>1.544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Items</th>
<th>Data 1981, n=218</th>
<th>Data 1982, n=218 ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>-.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12**</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item number follows the number of need items in the questionnaire. (See Table 7.)

** Double-loads, deleted.

*** The results of factor pattern in the 1982 data, n=218 show factor 1 and factor 2 in a switching order from the other data sets.
The results of the factor analyses from all four data sets are highly consistent. All need items fall on two factors—a factor of needs items related to self and a factor composed of needs items related to others or the environment. Only one item, the "need to understand self" (item 12) appears to double-load or load inconsistently. The others eleven items show a very consistent pattern.

In the study by Katz et al. (1973), thirty-five need statements were factor analyzed and categorized accordingly. Katz et al. did not report the results of factor analysis in detail, but emphasized the result of cluster analysis using Guttmann’s method of Smallest Space Analysis. This study showed that all thirty-five needs can be classified on the basis of three facets: the mode, the connection and the frame of reference. However, these researchers concluded that the frame of reference (parties to which a person is related) "constitutes the most important division of the plot of intercorrelations" (p.168). Katz et al. stated that the first two facets of need may be used to classify these needs but that the frame of reference, when added to the characteristics of needs plays a strong role in narrowing the need items into "two frames of reference—the self and the socio-political collectivity" (p. 167). They summarized that "most functions served by the media
for the audience member are related either to the self or his relations with his social environment and society" (p. 167).

It is interesting that the results of the factor analyses from the four waves and sub-waves confirm what Katz et al. (1973) specified in their study. Need items in factor 1 share one common attribute: all of them ("need to release tension", "need to overcome loneliness", "need to learn own likes and dislikes", "need to be entertained", "need to strive for a higher living standard", and "need to relieve boredom") are related to individual self as opposed to the items in factor 2. The latter group— including "need to be informed about the world", "need to feel that one is using time well", "need to spend time with family and friends", "need to participate in discussions with family and friends", and "need to be informed about the government"— reflects what can be called "socio-political collectivity," according to Katz et al. Factor 2 includes needs related to others or entities outside the self. Consequently, the concept of need salience in further analyses will be referred to as needs related to self (or self-oriented needs) and needs related to others (or socio-environmental needs).

Need item 12 the "need to understand self" is included in neither factor one nor two because of double loading and
inconsistencies in loading. Table 12 shows the factors and the need items which will be used in further analyses.

Table 12

List of Variables on Need Factors: Factor Analysis Results

Factor 1: Self-Oriented Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Item</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Need to release tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Need to overcome loneliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Need to learn own likes and dislikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Need to be entertained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Need to strive for a higher living standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Need to relieve boredom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2: Socio-Environmental Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Item</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Need to know what's going on in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Need to feel that one is using time well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Need to spend time with family and friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Need to participate in discussions with family and friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Need to keep up with the way the government performs its function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Estimation of Need Salience Factors

The Internal consistency method was selected as a reliability measure because researchers have noted that it is an effective measure of a scale's reliability (Carmines and Zeller, 1979).

The estimation of Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used on both the 1981 and 1982 waves of panel data (n=218).
Reliability measures were separately computed for both of the obtained factors. Correlation matrices were used for the calculation of alpha coefficients for each need factor. The 1981 wave shows the alpha coefficient of self-oriented needs to be .63. For the socio-environmental needs it is .54. The 1982 survey yielded very similar results. The alpha coefficients is .62 for the self-oriented needs, and .58 for socio-environmental needs. Usually, reliability of .80 is commonly accepted as sufficient. However, in early stages of research, .50 to .60 may suffice when determining the dimensions of a construct.

THE CLASSIFICATION OF TV NEED SATISFACTION

The television need satisfaction rating scale is comprised of twelve items matching the need salience items. It was necessary to factor analyze ratings on the TV satisfaction items to obtain a more parsimonious structure of audiences' perception of how TV satisfies their needs. In the same manner as the need salience variables, factor analyses were performed on all four sets of data for the 1981 (n=561, n=218) and 1982 (n=617, n=218). The scree test was again used as the technique to determine the number of factors, and the principal axis procedure was selected to estimate factor loadings. Results of the factor analyses on TV satisfaction for the four data sets are reported in Table 13.
### Table 13

**Results of Factor Analysis on TV Satisfaction**

Comparison of factor pattern loadings of TV satisfaction items from four data sets: rotated orthogonal factor pattern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TV Sat Items*</th>
<th>Data 1981, n=561</th>
<th>Data 1982, n=617</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.145, .690</td>
<td>! .122, .702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.599, .097</td>
<td>! .575, .194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.577, .159</td>
<td>! .449, .272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.566, .150</td>
<td>! .576, .018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.588, .023</td>
<td>! .487, .139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.635, .121</td>
<td>! .549, .233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.577, .191</td>
<td>! .507, .282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.694, .108</td>
<td>! .535, .179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.515, .187</td>
<td>! .626, .063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.410, .233</td>
<td>! .427, .330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.142, .800</td>
<td>! .174, .716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.723, .165</td>
<td>! .642, .221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eigen Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1981</th>
<th>3.645, 1.355</th>
<th>! 2.981, 1.467</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 1982          | 3.528, 1.423     | ! 2.374, 2.167   |

* Item number follows the number of TV satisfaction items in the questionnaire. (See Table 9.)
Results of one of the four factor analyses show some inconsistencies with the other three factor solutions. The 1982 sub-wave (n=218) does not yield results consistent with the factor analyses of the other three data sets. The 1981 wave (n=561, n=218) and the 1982 wave (n=617) have similar patterns of factor loadings on the 10 TV satisfaction items on factor 1. Only two items of TV satisfaction are loaded on factor 2.

The 1982 wave (n=218) is the only set of data for which factor analysis results are inconsistent with the others. However, when these results are thoroughly considered, figures in the factor loading matrix for this data set show many items as being double loaded rather than as clear-cut loadings on either factor. Only two items, TV satisfying "needs to be informed about the world" and "about the government" (item 1, factor loading=.562; item 11, factor loading=.649), are highly loaded on factor two (consistent with the results of the other data sets). Other items in this data set tend to be double loaded. For example, "TV satisfying need to spend time with family and friends" loaded .378 on factor 1, and .335 on factor 2. Also "TV satisfying need to strive for a higher standard of living" loaded .364 on factor one and .348 on factor two, and "TV satisfying need to understand self" loaded .426 on factor one and .527 on factor two. Because of these inconsistен-
cies and ambiguities and the fact that both sets of the original data yielded the same result, it seems reasonable to consider the 10 items of TV satisfaction as the first factor, and the other two items (1 and 11) as the second factor.

Since only two items of the TV satisfaction variables show explicit loadings on factor two—both items obviously addressing TV as serving needs to be informed—it is not feasible to form a second factor on the basis of two variables. Most researchers generally agree that at least three to four variables are required to construct a factor. Gorsuch (1974) argues that at least four-to-six variables should be included in a factor in order for replication in future studies to be possible. He also states that exceptions to the four-to-six variables per factor rule should be allowed only when the factor has already been well-defined in earlier research. Whichever criterion is used to reconstruct a new factor, it is clear that the two items of TV satisfaction in factor two found in this study are not enough to form another factor. Therefore, these two items on TV satisfaction (1 & 11) will be deleted from the analysis and TV satisfaction variables will be treated as one factor in further analysis. While two clear factors were obtained from the factor analyses of need salience variables, TV satisfaction items can only form one factor.
(See Table 14.) Consequently, it is clear that need salience and TV satisfaction are not the same constructs for these groups of TV audiences. A possible explanation of why only one factor is derived from the TV satisfaction items is the wording of the interview questionnaire. When respondents were asked to rate twelve need salience items, the emphasis was on different needs (i.e., "to be entertained" or "to release tension"). In contrast, when asked about TV satisfaction, every question began with the phrase "How helpful is television in__". Therefore, it is much more likely that respondents were referring to TV when rating the TV satisfaction items than to the individual needs that are served.

Table 14

List of Variables in TV Satisfaction Factor: Factor Analysis

| Results |
| Factor 1: TV Satisfaction |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TV Sat.Item</th>
<th>TV Satisfaction Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TV's helpfulness in release tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TV's helpfulness in using time well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TV's helpfulness in overcoming loneliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TV's helpfulness in spending time with family and friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TV's helpfulness in learning own likes and dislikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TV's helpfulness in keeping one entertained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TV's helpfulness in striving for a higher standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TV's helpfulness in relieving tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TV's helpfulness in participating in discussions with family and friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>TV's helpfulness in understanding self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability Estimation of TV Satisfaction Factor

Cronbach's alpha coefficient of internal consistency was estimated for both the 1981 and the 1982 sub-waves of data \((n=218)\). The alpha coefficient for the 10 TV satisfaction items (in one factor) in the 1981 survey is .84. It is .82 for the 1982 survey. Both coefficients are higher than those for the need salience factors. One reason for this may be the number of items in each factor. The need factors have fewer items per factor than the TV satisfaction factor.

Score Computation for Need Salience and TV Satisfaction Factors

To avoid complication, scores for each respondent for both the need salience factors and the TV satisfaction factor were obtained by summation of the original ratings on the factors. This method is simple and the scores obtained are more practical for further application than factor scores, which are usually very complicated to estimate and more appropriate for an oblique rotation factor pattern. Since orthogonal assumption is applied for this study (i.e., no relationship between factors are assumed), scores for each factor are calculated by summing the raw scores of items in each factor. For example, scores of respondents' self-oriented needs were derived from the summation of their ratings of need items on the self-oriented factor. (See
Table 12.) Socio-environmental factor scores and TV satisfaction scores were estimated by the same method. (See Table 12 and 14.)

RESULTS OF CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS

Correlations among all variables were computed. (See Table 15.) There are very high correlations among some of the independent variables. This is expected because they are the alternative aspects of life events. However, since life events and life event impact will not be used in the same model in the path analysis, multi-collinearity between them will not be a problem in further analysis. The correlation between total life events in the 1981 and 1982 sub-waves is only moderate, and so is that of life event impact 1981 and life event impact 1982 (r=.246 and .259 respectively). The correlations among the dependent variables are very low. The only significant correlation coefficients found are those between change in socio-environmental needs and change in the amount of TV viewing (r=.202, p<.01), between change in socio-environmental needs and total life events 1982 (r=.139, p<.05), and between the two need factors (r=.139, p<.05). These correlation coefficients, albeit significant, cannot be used to show the actual relationships among variables since other variables in the model might impact the relationship.
Therefore, further analysis using partial regression coefficients (to look at the relationship between two variables when all other influences are ruled out) will be applied.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TTLE81</th>
<th>TTLE82</th>
<th>CIM</th>
<th>IM81</th>
<th>IM82</th>
<th>DFND1</th>
<th>DFND2</th>
<th>DFTV</th>
<th>DFTVST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLE</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTLE81</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTLE82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFND1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFND2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFTV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFTVST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p<.05  ** p<.01

CLE = Cumulative Life Events
TTLE81 = Total Life Events in 1981 Wave
TTLE82 = Total Life Events in 1982 Wave
CIM = Cumulative Life Event Impact
IM81 = Life Event Impact in 1981 Wave
IM82 = Life Event Impact in 1982 Wave
DFND1 = Change in Self-Oriented Needs
DFND2 = Change in Socio-Environmental Needs
DFTV = Change in Television Viewing Amount
DFTVST = Change in Television Satisfaction
PATH ANALYSIS: TECHNIQUE AND RATIONALE

Path analysis is a statistical technique developed by Sewall Wright, the geneticist (Li, 1975; Asher, 1976), to test the direct and indirect effects of variables in a causal model. Kerlinger (1973) argued that although the concept of causation in research, especially survey research, has been strongly opposed by many scientists, the implication of causal relationships always occurs to researchers. Many types of studies, such as effect analysis, and other theoretical models imply causality (of independent variable affecting dependent variables). Path analysis, he concluded, is not a method to discover the cause of variables under investigation. Rather it is more of a technique to systematically test the directions in which causality may operate in a theoretical model. However, Asher (1976) argues that using path analysis researchers are able to draw causal conclusions, but only under a restrictive set of conditions. Three conditions for determining inferential causality have been specified (Selltiz et al., 1959 cited in Asher, 1976). The first is "concomitant variation or correlation" (Asher, 1976, p.11) between independent and dependent variables. The second is the condition of time ordering between the two variables. The third is the control of spurious relationship (i.e., ruling out other factor that may be the cause of both variables). Since the
available panel data meet only the first two criteria, causality cannot be claimed in this analysis. However, path analysis was utilized because of its ability to analyze the direct and indirect relationships among variables in a model with sequential characteristics such as the theoretical outlined in previous chapter.

Because many social scientists are not familiar with path analysis, an overview of the technique is offered. The analysis of path usually starts with the diagram of the theoretical model under investigation. Researchers usually set the model according to their theoretical expectations and then all hypothesized connections are indicated. Each of these connections is labelled as a "path." The path coefficient, therefore, indicates the direct effect of an independent on a dependent variable. It also indicates the fraction of standard deviation in the dependent variable for which each independent variable is directly responsible while all other variables in the model are controlled (Li, 1975). The path coefficient is calculated by means of standardized regression coefficients (Kerlinger, 1973). Li (1975) also states that the estimation of path coefficients is the same as that of the multiple regression coefficients except that "the variables involved have been standardized first." (p.48)
These path coefficients, when plugged into the path diagram, will indicate which path (or direct impact) is meaningful and which is not. Kerlinger (1973) suggests that all meaningless paths be dropped from the model. This method is usually referred to as "theory trimming" (Heise, 1969, cited in Kerlinger, 1973). It is the technique of recreating the parsimonious model for the theory. Usually, path coefficients which are less than .05 are considered not meaningful (Land, 1969, cited in Kerlinger, 1973) and the path should be dropped from the model. Kerlinger states that many researchers use the significance level of the regression coefficients as a criterion for dropping the path from the model. He argues that the significance of regression coefficients can be affected by the size of the sample. Therefore, the criterion of meaningfulness should be used instead.

It is suggested by Kerlinger (1973) that a new set of coefficients be calculated subsequently to the deletion of the meaningless path. This new correlation matrix will be compared to the original one to test whether or not the deletion of specific variables has caused any change in the new correlation matrix. If the new set of correlations does not show drastic changes (for example, the dropping of the path coefficients value), then the reproduced model is considered a tenable one. Kerlinger also specified that
the discrepancy of the new correlation matrix and the original should not be higher than .05 (Kerlinger, 1973).

However, some statisticians argue that there is no rationale behind the criterion of .05 as the indicator of meaningfulness or consistency of the model (Asher, 1976). They support the significance level of the regression coefficient as a method to justify the path coefficient. Nevertheless, either the .05 for meaningfulness or the significance level of regression coefficient has to be used as a criterion. The author of this study decided that the significance test of regression coefficients should be more appropriate for the deletion of the path in this theoretical model since the criterion has the rationale of probability of type I error which can be set at the .05 or .01 level. In contrast, there is no specific reason that the .05 level should be accepted as the meaningfulness of the path coefficient. Moreover, the issue of large sample size is not a problem for this study because of the relatively small sample size (n=218). However, for the goodness of fit test, both the criteria of discrepancy between the original and the reproduced coefficients of .05 and the statistical significant of regression coefficients will be used. That is, the reproduced coefficients should not be more than .05 different from the original, and they should be statistically significant.
PATH DIAGRAMS AND RESULTS OF PATH ANALYSIS

Two diagrams will be used in the cumulative analysis. The first one is prepared to analyze the cumulative mode of the total life events and their effect upon the change of need structure, TV viewing and TV satisfaction. The second diagram is for analyzing the cumulative mode of the perceived life event impact and change in dependent variables. In this study, the path diagrams show only the recursive or unidirectional path. That is, only a one-way path is expected in the relationship between two variables. For example, total life events are expected to have impact upon the change of need salience, and not vice versa. In the same manner, change in need salience is expected to influence change in TV viewing amount and so on. There will be no expectation of reciprocal impact between the two variables.

Using these path diagrams as the pattern of analysis, path coefficients were calculated by the same procedure as the calculation of standardized partial regression coefficients as suggested by Kerlinger (1973) and Li (1975) and the symbol $P$ is used to denote the coefficient.
Results of Cumulative Analysis

The diagrams for cumulative analyses are shown in Figure 7.

Before discussing the path analysis results, it is necessary to clarify that there are two types of relationship referred to in the path analysis. The first is the direct relationship between two variables (without passing through any other factors), and the second is the indirect relationship between two variables (connected through the third variable). The heavy lines are those paths hypothesized to be significantly related according to the theoretical model. The dashed lines are the direct relationships between variables—which means they are related without the impact of intervening variables (alternative hypotheses to the theoretical model). In short, we are trying to test the indirect impact of independent variables upon the change of TV viewing amount and TV satisfaction to show that it has to come through the change of need salience against the alternative hypotheses or direct impact of independent variables on dependent groups (direct impact upon the change of need salience from independent variables is expected). Therefore, the path coefficients of the heavy-lined paths will be expected to be statistically significant and the path coefficients of the dashed paths (alternative hypotheses) are not expected to depart significantly from zero.
Cumulative Life Events = Sum of total life events 1981 and total life events 1982

Need1 = Self-oriented needs
Need2 = Socio-environmental needs

* Relationship between self-oriented needs and socio-environmental needs are not indicated in theoretical model, however the correlation coefficient of these two factors will be shown in path analysis results.

Figure 7: Hypothesized Model and Path Analysis Diagram: Cumulative Analysis of Total Life Events

Figure 7 shows that cumulative model of life events does
not support the theory of life event effects upon the dependent variables. Only two significant relationships are found in the model, and one is the correlation between the need salience factors themselves. The only high path coefficient is the relationship between the change of socio-environmental needs and the change of TV viewing amount. The cumulative life events shows no significant relationship with either self-oriented needs or socio-environmental needs. It appears that when life events are put together into the model without consideration of their proximity to the dependent variables, there is no relationship between life events as a whole and the change of need salience and other dependent variables through any paths. Although the impact of socio-environmental needs on TV viewing amount is significant, the connection between cumulative life events and socio-environmental needs is weak (P=.064). It is doubtful that the impact of socio-environmental needs on TV viewing is influenced by cumulative life events. Apparently, the expectation of cumulative life events and their connections with dependent variables is not supported by the data.

The next model of cumulative analysis is the cumulative ratings of life event impact that respondents perceived. In the same manner as the total life events, the cumulative life event impact is hypothesized as influencing the
Figure 8: Hypothesized Model and Path Analysis Diagrams: Cumulative Analysis of Life Event Impact

dependent groups of variables. Figure 8 shows the cumulative analysis on life event impact, which has roughly the same results as the cumulative life event model. All path coefficients are similar to those of the total life event model. Even the two significant paths are almost identical. Therefore, according to the data, the model which
does not take into account remoteness and proximity of life events to the dependent measures is not supported.

**Results of Remote and Proximate Analysis**

The remote and proximate analyses are planned to test models B and C on long-standing against the immediate life events. It will clarify whether or not there is any effect of life events or perceived life event impact on the change of dependent variables, and whether or not the effect is from the long-term or immediate life events. (See Figure 9.)

Results from remote and proximate analysis show a pattern of path coefficients which is different from those of cumulative analysis. It appears that remote analysis does not show a significant relationship between the long-standing life events and the dependent measures. The proximate analysis shows the significant path coefficient of total life events 1982 and the change of socio-environmental needs ($P=.170$, $p<.05$) which is expected according to the theoretical model. Another significant direct relationship is that of socio-environmental needs and the change of TV viewing amount ($P=.212$, $p<.01$), which is also expected in the theoretical model. (See Figure 9.) There is no significant connection to the self-oriented needs from any direction. It seems that self-oriented needs are not affected by life events, nor do they
Figure 9: Hypothesized Model and Path Analysis Diagram: Remote and Proximate Analysis of Total Life Events

influence changes in the amount of TV viewing. The only significant relationship between this factor and the other variables concerns the socio-environmental needs ($P = .153$, $p < .05$). However, these two factors are not indicated in the theoretical model therefore empirical support is not required.
The relationships between TV satisfaction and other factors do not support the theory. The TV satisfaction factor also appears to be a function of both TV viewing (P=.093) and the socio-environmental needs (P=.096). Consequently, it is suggested that the long-standing life events, socio-oriented needs and the TV satisfaction factors be dropped from the model.

The remote and proximate analysis of life event impact and the change of need salience and TV viewing and satisfaction shows similar results to that of the total life event model. (See Figure 10.) The immediate life event impact shows a smaller path coefficient with the socio-environmental needs (P=.149, p < .05) than that in the total life event model. Therefore, the same procedure will be used for this model. That is, the long-standing life event impact, the self-oriented need and TV satisfaction factors will be deleted from the model.
Figure 10: Hypothesized Model and Path Analysis Diagram: Remote and Proximate Analysis of Life Event Impact

Controlling Procedure Using Demographic Variables

As mentioned earlier, this theoretical model does not include demographic variables. Nevertheless, the demographic characteristics reported by respondents are useful
as the alternative hypotheses. Demographic aggregates, then, were also put into the path diagram to estimate the relationship between them and the dependent group of variables. If a significant relationship is found, it may show that changes in need structure and other variables are actually affected by demographic variables and not by life events.

Three demographic aggregates—age, formal education, and income level—were used in the path diagrams and the path coefficients were calculated by the same procedure as for the life event analysis.

Results of this controlling procedure show very low relationships between the demographic group and the dependent group (mostly between $P = .02$ to $-.02$ which are certainly not significant and not even meaningful according to Kerlinger (1973)). The only significant relationship found is between educational level and change in TV viewing. It is a negative one ($P = -.188, p < .05$) indicating that respondents with higher education tend to change the amount of their TV viewing less than those in the lower educated group. Although this finding may explain something about demographic groups and their television viewing behavior, it does not affect the results of this study. It is apparent that the negative path coefficient found does not explain the model as opposed to those of the impact of life
events through need structure change to TV viewing change. Therefore, the possibility that education level is the factor that actually affects changes in dependent variables can be ruled out.

**Parsimonious Models for Proximate Analysis of Life**

As mentioned earlier, path analysis is also used as a means of theory trimming. Therefore, the insignificant paths found earlier were dropped from the model. The parsimonious model in which only significant paths are retained was formulated. Although some of the path coefficients are low, the significant coefficients are found in the expected direct relationships between immediate life events and the change of socio-environmental needs and between socio-environmental needs and change in the amount of TV viewing. The explicit pattern of relationships of immediate life events through the change of socio-environmental needs and the change of TV viewing supports the theoretical framework specified earlier with the exception of TV satisfaction. The results of the theory trimming for the total life event model are in Figure 11.

The parsimonious model was also recalculated for its path coefficients to test whether the deletion of the long-standing life events and self-oriented needs affects other paths in the model. Although no relationship was found between the 1981 total life events, self-oriented needs and
Figure 11: Parsimonious Path Diagram and the Reproduced Path Coefficients for Proximate Analysis of Total Life Events

other dependent variables in the model, the path coefficient of .246 between the 1981 total life events and the 1982 total life events, and the .153 path coefficient between self-oriented needs and socio-environmental needs may affect the relationship of those factors with other variables if they are removed from the model.

In this model, the deletion affects the relationships between total life events of 1982 and the remaining dependent variables. The path coefficients of life events 1982 and the socio-environmental needs decreases by .031 (from P=.170 to P=.139) which is not more than .05, and is still statistically significant at p < .05. The path coefficient between the socio-environmental needs and the TV viewing amount decreases by .008 (from P=.220 to P=.212). The reproduced path coefficients for total life events model show a significant relationship between total life events
1982 and change in socio-environmental needs and significant relationship between the latter and change in the amount of TV viewing. This model is, therefore, supported by the data and is tenable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Events</th>
<th>Change in Socio-Environ. Needs</th>
<th>Change in Amount of TV Viewing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R = .044 \]

Figure 12: Parsimonious Path Diagram and Reproduced Path Coefficients for Proximate Analysis of Life Event Impact

The reproduced path coefficients between life event impact 1982 and change in socio-environmental needs, and that between the latter and change in the amount of TV viewing decreased from .149 to .102 for the former, and from .220 to .209 for the latter. (See Figure 12.) The reproduced path coefficient for the life event impact 1982 and the change of socio-environmental needs dropped by .047 (almost .05), very close to the limit that Kerlinger (1973) specified. This path coefficient, moreover, is not any longer significant. Therefore, there is no significant relationship from life event impact 1982 through change in need salience to change in the amount of TV viewing. This
life event impact model, therefore, is not supported by the empirical data and is not tenable.

Findings from TV Audiences' Program Preferences

The amount of television viewing used in the earlier analysis is a cumulative variable combining many programs selected by respondents. However, when just the amount of TV viewing is investigated, the impact of life events or need salience on TV program selection is overlooked. The information on which program is impacted more by life events and the change of need salience, consequently, is missing.

Television viewing habits include eight different types of programs but the fact that TV viewing amount is found to be related to life events and the change of need salience does not mean that all programs are significantly related to those factors. Nevertheless, the models that are used earlier can be applied here for the TV program preferences. That is, all eight program types are put into the model instead of the amount of TV viewing and path coefficients are calculated to test exactly which program is related to the independent factors. There is no need to report the cumulative models since they are not applicable for this theoretical framework. Only the proximate analysis of total life events 1982 through the change of socio-environmental needs will be reported since only these fac-
Tors are significantly correlated with TV viewing amount. Figure 13 shows the relationships of TV program preference in the proximate life event model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Change of Viewing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>.139*</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>--------&gt; Socio-environ-</td>
<td>--------&gt; Situation Comedies!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>--------&gt; Soap Operas</td>
<td>! 1.165*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>--------&gt; Religious Shows</td>
<td>! 0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--------&gt; Game Shows</td>
<td>! 0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--------&gt; Talk-Variety Shows</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

* Note: Only path coefficients higher than .05 are reported.

Figure 13: TV Program Preferences in Proximate Analysis of Total Life Events

Only some of these path coefficients are significantly related to life event impact and change of need salience. Results show that viewing Soap Operas is significantly impacted by life events and change of need salience. Viewing of situation comedies, religious shows, games shows, and talk-variety shows is not significantly correlated to the independent factors.
Variance accounted for in the dependent variables by the independent factors is one of the most important topics in multivariate regression analysis. It usually indicates the strength of each theoretical framework.

Kerlinger (1974) suggested two approaches for determining the proportion of variance in the dependent variables accounted for by the independent variables in the path model. The first approach is the forward solution where the independent measure most remote from the dependent variable enters the model first, then we move closer to the dependent variable. The increments in the proportion of variance accounted for by each variable when entered into the model will be determined accordingly.

The other approach is the backward solution where one starts at the variable closest to the dependent variable. Then the next closest will be added, and so on. Kerlinger also stated that either of these approaches can be selected for use according to the nature of each theoretical framework and the research question set by the researcher. For example, researchers who are interested in adding the new variable into the model may try using the backward model to find out whether adding the more remote variables accounts for some of the variance in the dependent variable.
As mentioned in an earlier chapter, one objective of this study is to wed the life span developmental concept with the uses and gratification paradigm. Consequently, we are more interested in adding the factor of life events into the uses and gratification model to see whether such an addition will increase the strength of this theoretical concept. According to the theoretical model, the life event variables should receive more attention with respect to the percent of variance they add to that of the need structure in explaining TV viewing habits.

Findings from this study are not very impressive when it comes to the variance accounted for in the dependent variable by the independent factors. The highest path coefficients is only .207, and the best $R^2$ from proximate analysis of total life events 1982 and the change of need salience and TV viewing is 4.7 per cent.

In the model, socio-environmental needs alone explain about 2 per cent of the variance in the TV viewing habits. Adding the life event variables only increase this with approximately 2.6 per cent more of the variance being accounted for by the independent variables. Nevertheless, the level of $R^2$ in this model is statistically significant at $p < .01$.

However, as indicated earlier, path analysis was applied in this study not to test causal modeling, but to test the
sequential characteristic of this theoretical model. The main purpose of this theoretical framework is to find a connection between life event variables and uses and gratifications of TV audiences. Therefore, the level of variance explained by the independent factors is not the most important issue. We are more interested in the significant relationship between life events and the change of TV audiences' need structure, and other dependent variables.
Chapter V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The most important findings from this study are:

1. The connection between life events and the uses and gratifications model indicates that life events affect individuals' socio-environmental need structure which, in turn, has an impact upon their TV viewing habits.

2. Life events affect the socio-environmental need structure immediately (within the same year life events occur), and the amount of TV viewing is changed due to the change in socio-environmental needs.

Findings from this study can be summarized as follows:

1. The number of life events reported in 1982 (immediate life events) is related significantly to change in socio-environmental needs, and the latter also shows a significant relationship to change in the amount of TV viewing.

2. The ratings of life event impact in 1982 are not significantly related to change in socio-environmental...
needs (after the reproduction of path coefficients for the parsimonious model) while the latter shows a significant relationship with change in the amount of TV viewing.

3. Total life events and life event impact reported in 1981 (long-standing life events) are not significantly related to the change of need salience and TV viewing. They were, therefore, deleted from further analysis and the theoretical model.

4. Self-oriented needs (needs related to self, such as "to overcome loneliness", "to release tension", "to be entertained," etc.) are not related to experiencing of life events or to the ratings of life event impact, nor do they affect the change of TV viewing behavior and TV satisfaction. This factor, therefore, was deleted from the model due to the results of path analysis.

5. Change in TV satisfaction does not show a significant relationship with change in the amount of TV viewing as expected in the theoretical framework. The path coefficient between this factor and the change of TV viewing amount, however, is .090 in the total life events model and .093 in the life event impact model which are meaningful, according to Kerlinger, but not significant. It is worth noting that this TV satis-
faction factor seems to be a function of both TV viewing amount and the socio-environmental needs. Nevertheless, neither path coefficients is high enough (P=.090 and P=.097 in the total life event model, and P=.093 and P=.095 in the life event impact model). Therefore, the relationships of TV satisfaction and other factors in the model are not tenable. This factor, consequently, was deleted from the model.

6. The cumulative analysis mode is not empirically supported in this study. Also, the fact that results from proximate analysis are significant shows that the time factor plays an important role in the impact of life events on the change of psychological structure and TV viewing habits.

7. Soap operas is the type of TV program influenced the most by life events. Viewing of soap operas is found to be changed with the experiencing of life events, and with changes in socio-environmental needs.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

In general, the crucial result of this study is that the pattern of relationships within the theoretical framework is supported with the exception of TV satisfaction. Since there were no empirical findings that supported the relationship between life events and the uses and gratifica-
tions model, this study is considered to be an exploratory research. There was no basis, for example, for predicting how many people would experience life events or the kind of life events they would experience. This resulted in unanticipated problems, and consequently some information, such as life event domain became useless. The significant relationship found between the concept of life events and the uses and gratifications model is satisfactory. Although not all of the relationships in the model are statistically significant, the findings are quite promising for the general idea that experiencing life events induces changes in need salience and TV viewing habits in media users.

However, these results seem to indicate that such a general idea as life events and their impact on audiences' psychological structure and their TV viewing habits could be reconstructed into a more parsimonious, or more specific theory, in which the specification of the time factor and of psychological structure are required.

The results shown in the previous chapter point out that a time factor should be included in the model. With the remote and proximate analysis, where life events reported at time 1 are compared with those reported at time 2, only the latter show a significant effect upon the change of need structure. In other words, life events start working
immediately on respondents experiencing them. At least, we can say that in this study the changes in need structure occur during the same year as the life events.

The next area in which our theoretical framework needs to be reconstructed is the need salience structure. We owe this to the reclassification of the need salience statements by factor analysis. This theoretical framework was originally formed on the basis of prior knowledge in uses and gratifications research. Theoretical concepts and previous empirical supports create logical patterns as explanation. Variables such as need salience statements were viewed as one group of twelve variables until the reclassification was done. The factor analysis rearranged variables into more basic constructs. These results were also consistent with the Katz et al.'s (1973) findings. Their argument on the interrelationships of need salience emphasized that human need structure is formed from the two most important characteristics—the "self" and the "others" as referents of the need structure. Not only do the findings from the factor analysis in this study confirm Katz et al.'s statements, but we also obtained a difference between these two types of needs in relation to life events and the use of television. Findings show that only the socio-environmental needs are related to life event experiences and TV viewing habits. Evidently, this means that people
who experience life events adjust only their socio-environmental needs. Moreover, their TV viewing habits only change as a result of socio-environmental needs. On the other hand, self-oriented needs (such as "need to release tension", "to overcome loneliness", "to be entertained", etc.) did not show any change as a result of life events nor, did they show any impact upon the change of TV viewing habits. Table 15 shows the mean scores for changes in socio-environmental need salience.

Table 16

Mean Scores for Changes in Socio-Environmental Need Salience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Item</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to be informed about the world</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to feel that one is using time well</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to spend time with family and friends</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to participate in discussions with family</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to keep up with the government's functions</td>
<td>.459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in the need salience ratings (both increase or decrease) for the needs "to keep up with the government's function", "to feel that one is using time well" and "to participate in discussions with family and friends" are high (mean scores of .459, .458 and .456 respectively). Changes in needs to "know what's going on in the world" and "to spend time with family and friends, on the other hand, are only moderate (mean scores of .239 and .266).
The proportions of respondents who experienced particular life events were similar in both the 1981 and the 1982 surveys. (See Table 3.) Employment change was the most frequent life events in both surveys, followed by illness and death experience, spouse employment change, and health change. Marital change was the least frequent life event in both surveys.

Since all life events were considered together in the total life event concept, it is difficult to indicate which life event leads to changes in which socio-environmental needs. However, one may speculate that change in employment status or responsibility definitely affects the socio-environmental needs. For example, getting a new job makes people aware of their job advancement therefore, "needs to be informed", "need to spend time with family and friends" and "need to participate in discussions with family and friends" may change in their salience. Meanwhile, the salience of "need to feel that one is using time well" may be increased because of this life event. Illness and death experiences, similarly, may change the salience of socio-environmental needs. For example, "needs to be informed", "need to feel that one is using time well" may become less salient but the salience of "need to spend time with family and friends" and "need to participate in discussions with family and friends" may increase.
As for the change of TV viewing habits, the highest path coefficient in the data was between changes in the socio-environmental needs and change in the amount of TV viewing. It indicates that respondents whose salience of such needs as "to be informed", "to spend time with family and friends", "to participate in discussions with family and friends" and "to feel that one is using time well" were affected by the experiencing of life events and adjusted the amount of their TV viewing. Table 16 shows the mean score of changes in TV program preferences.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TV Programs</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News Programs</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama and Detective Shows</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation Comedies</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap Operas</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Programs</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Shows</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk-Variety Shows</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest mean score for changes in TV program viewing is the viewing of soap operas (1.11), followed by news programs, situation comedies, and movies (.701, .541 and .518 respectively). Other programs do not show high changes in terms of audiences' amount of viewing (below .50). At this stage, it is impossible to say in what direction the
TV viewing change occurs (i.e., respondents view TV more or less than the previous year). However, we have reason to believe that changes in TV viewing habits occur probably in the direction of increasing when the "needs to be informed" become more salient, and also when "need to spend time with family and friends" and "need to participate in discussions with family and friends" become more salient since TV seems to be the medium generally used for information and mostly used in family context. Nevertheless, if "need to feel that one is using time well" becomes more salient, respondents' TV viewing may be decreased.

It is also impossible, at this stage, to indicate which item of socio-environmental need salience affects changes in viewing which TV programs. The only significant finding about changes in TV program preference is the viewing of soap opera which was affected the most by the experiencing of life events and changes in socio-environmental need salience. This may perhaps be explained in that it is the program considered to be the least necessary to view; therefore, whenever a life event occurs the first thing one will cut off is the viewing of soap opera. It is also possible that change in soap opera viewing serves needs "to spend time with" or "to participate in discussions with family and friends."
In conclusion, the experiencing of marriage or divorce (or other marital changes), changes in employment status or responsibilities (of self or spouse), health changes, and illnesses or death in the family or of close friends tend to make people adjust their socio-environmental needs (such as "needs to be informed", "to feel that they are using their time well", and to spend time or participate in discussions with their family and friends"). At this stage, it is still difficult to tell in which direction such adjustment occurs. For example, is it an increase or decrease of socio-environmental needs after experiencing change in employment. Nevertheless, we have enough evidence to believe that the adjustment of such needs occurs after the experience of the mentioned life events and the alteration of TV viewing habits also occurs to those who have shown changes in these needs.

However, findings from this study support the theoretical model that life events induce changes in audiences' socio-environmental needs, and that the latter affect changes in the amount of their TV viewing. At this stage, it is not possible to say which life events lead to changes in salience of which socio-environmental need. It is also not clear which socio-environmental need leads to the changes in viewing which TV program. It is apparent that more investigation in this area needs to be done. Findings
from this study concerning the most frequent life events, the highest changes in socio-environmental need salience ratings and the highest changes in viewing TV programs provide clues for planning future studies in this area.

One topic in need of clarification at this point is the level of $R^2$, or variance accounted for in the dependent variable by the independent group. It has already been stated that the level of $R^2$ in this study is not very impressive for the multivariate regression technique, in which the level of $R^2$ is usually used to indicate the strength of each theoretical model. The level of variance in the dependent variable—TV viewing habits—explained by the independent variables is only 4.7 per cent in the total life event model. Findings also show that adding the life event concept into the model only increases the level of $R^2$ from approximately 2 per cent to about 4.7 per cent which means the addition of the life event concept only increases by 2.6 per cent of the variance originally explained by the need structure. This is not at all impressive since it shows a very high level of error.

Blalock (1968) states that we always encounter difficulties with substantial amount of unexplained variation like this in most research. He also states that there are at least three explanations for this. First, this could mean that we are dealing with the wrong set of independent vari-
ables, and the right ones need to be found. Secondly, we need an adequate theoretical explanation. Therefore, a number of other variables should be included into the model. Thirdly, we are dealing with the error of measurement.

The case in this study, the author believes, is not the first explanation. The second and the third reasons are probably closer to our situation. As a matter of fact, the reason why the life event concept is added into the model in the first place is because of the awareness of this theoretical inadequacy. However, this study is exploratory research designed to enhance the uses and gratifications paradigm, which has been originally criticized as atheoretical because of its lack of hypothesis testing and other methodological shortcomings. It is an attempt to add to the original paradigm something that will help explain more about media user behaviors. This addition, which does not look impressive, actually increases the explanation by twice the amount explained by the original model (i.e., from 2 per cent of the need salience factor to approximately 4.7 per cent after adding life event variables). This means that the uses and gratifications paradigm is improved by the inclusion of the life event concept and the strength of the model is therefore increased.

Another reason for the relatively low level of variance accounted for in the model by life events and need factor
is the low reliability of the instrument caused by the small number of items in each need factor. The alpha coefficients for the socio-environmental need factor are only .53 and .56 in the 1981 and 1982 waves of data. Since no empirical support was available, questionnaire items were prepared for general needs and not for any particular needs thought to be related to life events. The results of the factor analyses gave only 5 items of need in socio-environmental needs, which caused the low reliability coefficients. This limited reliability, therefore, is partially responsible for the low level of variance accounted for in TV viewing habits by life events and socio-environmental needs. This addresses the third explanation indicated by Blalock (1968) concerning measurement error. Obviously, if the study had been planned with sufficient empirical supports, we would be able to deal with variables that are essential for the theoretical model, and a sufficient number of items for those variables would be included in the data collection.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

It appears that many things have been learned from this exploratory study, and future research in this area can benefit from its findings and be performed more effectively. Results from the present study can help in the prepa-
ration of the theoretical framework and the instruments for data collection. Recall that three of the life events, moving, household duty change, and family size change were deleted from the analysis due to some problems in data recording procedure. In future studies, this problem can be overcome and more items on life events can be included. For example, we have reason to believe that significant relationships can be found between immediate life event impact, and changes in dependent variables if more life event variables are included in the analysis. Moreover, the concept of life event domains and life event directions, which were also deleted from the analysis because of the low number of respondents in each life event group, may be reconsidered in any future study. For example, a study may focus only on respondents who report the experiencing of major life events in the previous year so that a sufficient number of respondents are included in groups under investigation. This may help solve the problem resulting from the inadequate empirical background of the present study, and may also solve the problem of the low variance explained in the model.

The problem of reliability is another limitation for this study. It is mainly the result of the exploratory nature of the study. Only five items of needs were included in the socio-environmental need factor. This obviously
lowers the reliability of this concept's measurement and partly is responsible for the low variance accounted for the change in the amount of TV viewing by total life events and changes in the socio-environmental needs. However, in any future study, reliability problems can be solved when more items measuring the same construct are added, and the level of variance accounted for will be raised if the reliability level becomes higher.

Another suggestion for a future study is to look at the factor of media affiliation, or media preference. For example, this study deals with TV viewing habits as the major point of interest. One factor that may add more meaningful explanation to this model is the fact that respondents are TV users or affiliated to other types of media. This may explain why the variance accounted for in the viewing of TV by life events and socio-environmental needs appears to be low. If the information on the respondents' exposure to TV or preference for using TV to other media is taken into account, results could be that respondents who affiliate more to TV change more of their need structure and TV viewing habits after experiencing major life events.

The concept of media affiliation is not limited to the study of TV viewing habits. It can also be applied to studies of uses and gratifications of other media, such as newspapers or in some other areas of the world where radio is still the major type of media use.
Appendix A

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE: SPRING 1981

The Ohio State University
Department of Communication
Communication 626: Spring 1981

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE: TV USE AND LIFE CYCLE
INTERVIEW INFORMATION (DO NOT COMPLETE UNTIL INTERVIEW IS
FINISHED)
INTERVIEWER NAME __________________________________________(PRINT)
RESPONDENT CODE ____________________________________________
INTERVIEWER CODE __________________________________________
DATE OF INTERVIEW (DAY ONLY _____________________________
TIME OF INTERVIEW __________________________________________

Hello, my name is __________ and I am a student in the
department of communication at Ohio State University.
We're conducting a short survey about how people use about
teachlevision. Today we are only talking with people between
18 and 60 years old.
(IF LAST DIGIT OF PHONE NUMBER IS EVEN) Could I speak to
the male head of your household?
(REPEAT INTRODUCTION TO NEW PERSON IF NECESSARY)
(IF LAST DIGIT OF PHONE NUMBER IS ODD) Could I speak to
the female head of your household?
(REPEAT INTRODUCTION TO NEW PERSON IF NECESSARY)

Your phone number has been randomly selected. All your
answer will be confidential. Would you agree to help us for
a few minutes? (PAUSE)
(IF ANSWER IS NO) --Would there be another time we could call
(GET SPECIFIC DAY AND TIME IF POSSIBLE)
(IF ANSWER IS YES) --Very good. I will be asking you a series
of questions about how much you watch television, about how
teachlevision satisfies some of your daily needs and about some
changes which have occurred in your life. Please think
carefully about to answer each question: if any questions
are unclear to you, be sure to ask me to repeat them. There
are no right or wrong to these questions. Please answer as honestly as you can.

The first few questions deal with types of television shows and how many of each type you watch during an average week.

1. The first type of television show is news and public affairs. Would you say you watch none of these shows, 1 to 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 15, or more than 15 of these shows during an average week?
   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 5-10
   - 10-15
   - 15+
   - DK/NA

2. How about drama and detective shows? Do you watch none, 1 to 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 15, or more than 15 of these shows on an average week?
   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 5-10
   - 10-15
   - 15+
   - DK/NA

3. Now would you think about situation comedy shows? Do you watch none, 1 to 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 15, or more than 15 during an average week?
   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 5-10
   - 10-15
   - 15+
   - DK/NA

4. How many different daytime soap operas do you watch during an average week?
   (IF NONE GO TO QUESTION 6)
   - 1-5
   - 5-10
   - 10-15
   - 15-20
   - 20+
   - DK/NA

5. How many soap operas episodes do you watch during an average week? 1 to 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 15, 15 to 20, or more than 20?
   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 5-10
   - 10-15
   - 15+
   - DK/NA

6. How many movies on television do you watch?
   (REREAD CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)
   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 5-10
   - 10-15
   - 15+
   - DK/NA

7. (This is going well) Now, how many religious programs do you watch on an average week?
   (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)
   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 5-10
   - 10-15
   - 15+
   - DK/NA

8. How about game shows? Do you watch none, 1 to 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 15, or more than 15 during an average week?
   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 5-10
   - 10-15
   - 15+
   - DK/NA
9. And how many variety shows do you watch on an average week?
   (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)

   (Very good, this is useful information.) Now I'd like you to think about your television viewing over the last year for a moment. Some people have told us that they are watching more television now than before, other said they were watching less, and some have not changed the amount they watch. How about you?

10. Would you say that you are watching a lot more a little more, a little less, or a lot less?

11. Think for a moment about the attention to television now and a year ago. Are you watching television a lot more closely, somewhat more closely, somewhat less closely, or a lot less closely than a year ago?

We know that people differ quite a bit in what things are important to them. In the next series of questions I am going to list a number of needs other people have mentioned that are important to them. As I read the questions would you tell me whether each need is very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not at all important to you personally.

12. Let’s begin with the need to know what’s going on in the world. How important is it for you to know what’s going on in the world? Is it very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not at all important?

13. How about to release tension. How important is it for you to release tension? Is it very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not at all important?

14. How important is it for you to 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>NO ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. How important is it for you to overcome loneliness?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. And how important is it for you to spend time with your family and friends?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How important is it for you to learn about your likes and dislikes?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How about to be entertained? How important is it for you to be entertained?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How important is it for you to strive for a higher standard of living?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. How important is it to you to relieve boredom?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. And how important is it for you to participate in discussions with your family and friends?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. How important is it for you to keep up with the way the government performs its functions?

- Very important 1
- Somewhat important 2
- Not very important 3
- Not at all important 4
- DON'T KNOW 8
- NO ANSWER 9

23. How important is it for you to understand yourself?

- Very important 1
- Somewhat important 2
- Not very important 3
- Not at all important 4
- DON'T KNOW 8
- NO ANSWER 9

(Very good, this is going well.) Now let's go on to some other questions. We have found that the way people use television is affected by changes in their lives. The next series of questions will deal with any major changes in your life during the last year. Many things happen to people in a year. Some things are significant or viewed as major changes; most are not.

24. For you personally, what major changes have occurred in your life in the last year that you feel were important to you? (PROB FOR A MAXIMUM OF TWO CHANGES) (RECORD RESPONSES AS ACCURATELY AS YOU CAN)

1. 

2. 

(IF RESPONDENT IS UNSURE OF WHAT WE MEAN BY MAJOR CHANGE)--What we mean by major change is a change that you feel has had a great effect on the way you go about your daily life. Now I am going to read you a list of changes other people have told us they have gone through. Would you tell me whether you have had any of these changes in the past year? (Some of these changes may be ones you have already mentioned.)

25. Have you had a change in your marital status in the last year?

- Yes _______ 1
- No _______ 2
- NO ANSWER _____ 9
(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 26)  
(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 27)

26. How much has your change in marital status changed your daily living habits and what you think is important in your life? Would you say it was very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not much of a change, or no change at all?

27. What is your present marital status? Are you single, married, remarried, divorced, separated or widowed?

28. How would you describe your present employment status? Are you employed full time, employed part time, unemployed, laid off, retired, a student, or a homemaker?

SPECIFY OTHER

29. Have you had a change in your job status or job responsibilities in the last year?

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 30)  
(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 32)

30. Which of the following describes any changes in your job status or job responsibilities in the last year? Was it getting your first job, getting another job, losing your job, getting laid off your job, getting a promotion, getting new responsibilities without a promotion, retiring, or was it something else?

SPECIFY OTHER

31. How much has this major change in your employment changed your daily living habits and what you think is important in your life? Would you say it was very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not much of a change, or no change at all?
life? Would you say it was very NO ANSWER 9
much of a change, somewhat of a
change, not much of a change, or
no change at all?
32. (DO NOT ASK IF RESPONDENT IS NOT MARRIED. GO TO
QUESTION 35)
Has your spouse had a major or
significant change in (his/her)
job status in the last year? NO ANSWER 9
(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 33)
(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 35)
33. Was that change getting a first
job, getting another job, losing
a job, getting laid off, getting
a promotion, getting new respon-
sibilities without a promotion,
retiring, or was it something
else?
SPECIFY OTHER _____________________________ other 8
NO ANSWER 9
34. How much has this change in your
spouse's job status changed your
own personal daily living habits
and what you think is important
in your life? Was it very much
of a change, somewhat of a change,
not much of a change, or no change
at all?
35. Has there been a major or signi-
ficant change in your health in
the past year?
(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 36)
(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 38)
36. Has your health improved or has
your health gotten worse?
37. How much has this change in your
health changed your daily living
habits and what you think is im-
portant in your life? Was it very
much of a change, somewhat of a
change, not very much of a change,
or no change at all?
38. Have there been any serious ill-
nesses or deaths among your family
members or close friends during the last year?  

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 39)  
(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 41)

39. Was this serious illness of 
your spouse, a serious illness of 
a child, a serious illness of 
another family member or close 
friend, the death of your spouse, 
the death of a child, the death 
of another family member or close 
friends, or was it something else? 
SPECIFY OTHER NO ANSWER 9

40. How much has this changed your 
daily habits and what you think 
is important in your own life? 
Was it very much of a change, 
somewhat of a change, not much 
of a change or no change at all?

41. Have you moved from one residence 
to another in the past year?  

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 42)  
(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 44)

42. Was this change in residence a 
move within the same city, a move 
from a different city in Ohio, a 
move from a different state, or 
a move from a different country? 

43. How much has this move changed 
your daily living habits and 
what you think is important in 
your life? Was it very much of 
a change, somewhat of a change, 
not very much of a change or no 
change at all?

44. Has there been a change in your 
family size in the last year?  

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 45)  
(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 47)

45. Which of the following describes 
the change in family size? Was 

(Birth 1  
Child leaving 2)
it the birth of a child, a child leaving home, a child returning home, a spouse leaving the residence, a close relative moving in, a close relative moving out, or was it something else?

SPECIFY OTHER ___________________________

46. How much has this change in family size changed your daily living habits and what you think is important in your own life? Was it very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not very much of a change, or no change at all?

Very much 1
Somewhat 2
Not very much 3
No change 4
NO ANSWER 9

47. How many people are now living in your home? (LIST EXACT NUMBER)

(IF ! PERSON GO TO QUESTION 49)

48. And how many of those living with you are children? (LIST EXACT NUMBER)

49. Have there been any major or significant changes in your household duties and family responsibilities in the last year?

Yes 1
No 2
NO ANSWER 9

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 50)
(IF NO GO TO INTRODUCTION TO QUESTION 52)

50. Which of the following describe those major changes? Was it an increase in household duties, a decrease in household duties, an increase in parenting responsibilities, a decrease in parenting responsibilities, an increase in family decision-making, a decrease in family decision-making, or was it something else?

increase duties 1
decrease duties 2
increase parenting 3
decrease parenting 4
increase decisions 5
decrease decisions 6
Other 7
SPECIFY OTHER ___________________________

51. How much has this change in duties and responsibilities changed your daily living habits and what you think is important in your own life? Was it very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not very much of a change, or no

Very much 1
Somewhat 2
Not very much 3
No change 4
NO ANSWER 9
change at all?

(Very good, we're almost finished) A few minutes ago we talked about certain needs people have. I'd like to talk about them again but this time we will deal with how important television is in satisfying those needs for you personally. As I read this list of needs, would you tell me whether television is very helpful, somewhat helpful, not very helpful or not at all helpful to you in satisfying each need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52. How helpful is television in keeping you informed about what is going on in the world?</td>
<td>Very helpful 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat helpful 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very helpful 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not helpful 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ANSWER 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. How helpful is television in aiding you to release tension? (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)</td>
<td>Very helpful 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat helpful 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very helpful 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not helpful 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ANSWER 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. How helpful is television in making you feel that you are using your time well? (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)</td>
<td>Very helpful 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat helpful 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very helpful 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not helpful 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ANSWER 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Now what about overcoming loneliness? How helpful is television in overcoming loneliness? (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)</td>
<td>Very helpful 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat helpful 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very helpful 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all helpful 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ANSWER 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. And how important is television in aiding you to spend time with your family and friends?</td>
<td>Very helpful 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat helpful 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very helpful 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all helpful 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ANSWER 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. How helpful is television for you in learning about your likes and dislikes?</td>
<td>Very helpful 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat helpful 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very helpful 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all helpful 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON'T KNOW 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ANSWER 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
58. How helpful is television to keep you entertained?  
- Very helpful 1  
- Somewhat helpful 2  
- Not very helpful 3  
- Not at all helpful 4  
- DON'T KNOW 8  
- NO ANSWER 9

59. And how helpful is television in aiding you to strive for a higher standard of living?  
- Very helpful 1  
- Somewhat helpful 2  
- Not very helpful 3  
- Not at all helpful 4  
- DON'T KNOW 8  
- NO ANSWER 9

60. How helpful is television as a way to relieve boredom?  
- Very helpful 1  
- Somewhat helpful 2  
- Not very helpful 3  
- Not at all helpful 4  
- DON'T KNOW 8  
- NO ANSWER 9

61. How helpful is television in aiding you to participate in discussions with your family and friends?  
- Very helpful 1  
- Somewhat helpful 2  
- Not very helpful 3  
- Not at all helpful 4  
- DON'T KNOW 8  
- NO ANSWER 9

62. How helpful is television for you in keeping up with the way the government performs its functions?  
- Very helpful 1  
- Somewhat helpful 2  
- Not very helpful 3  
- Not at all helpful 4  
- DON'T KNOW 8  
- NO ANSWER 9

63. And finally, how helpful is television aiding you to understand your self?  
- Very helpful 1  
- Somewhat helpful 2  
- Not very helpful 3  
- Not at all helpful 4  
- DON'T KNOW 8  
- NO ANSWER 9

(This has gone very well.) We just have a few more questions which will help us process the information you have given us.

64. What is your age?  
(IF RESPONDENTS HESITATES OR REFUSES READ THE CATEGORIES BELOW)  
- Are you between:  
  - 18 and 25 1  
  - 26 and 30 2  
  - 31 and 35 3
65. What was the last grade you completed in school?
   - 0-11
   - High school grad
   - Some college
   - College grad
   - Graduate Degree

66. I am going to read a list of incomes. When I read the income which best describes your household income for last year, please tell me to stop.
   - Under $6000
   - 6000 to 12000
   - 12000 to 18000
   - 18000 to 24000
   - 24000 to 30000
   - 30000 to 36000
   - 36000 to 42000
   - Above $42000
   - NO ANSWER OR DON'T KNOW

This complete our questionnaire. Thank you so much for your help. We are interested in finding out if people's television habits change over time. Would it be all right with you if we called you back about the same time next year and asked some other questions about your use of television?

1. YES 2. NO

(IF NO) Thank you for helping us with this survey. Have a good day/evening.

(IF YES) Very good. What is your name?

______________________________ (PRINT CLEARLY)

And what is your address?

______________________________ (STREET ADDRESS)

______________________________ (CITY, ZIP CODE)

And finally, for verification purposes, would you give me your phone number?

Thank you for helping with this survey. Have a good day/ evening.

SEX OF RESPONDENT DO NOT ASK, DETERMINE BY VOICE

   MALE 1
   FEMALE 2
   COULD NOT TELL 9
Appendix B

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE: SPRING 1982

The Ohio State University
Department of Communication
Communication 626: Spring 1982

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE (CYCLE II):
TV USE AND LIFE CYCLE
INTERVIEW INFORMATION
INTERVIEWER NAME ________________________________________ (PRINT)
RESPONDENT CODE _________________________________________
INTERVIEWER CODE _________________________________________
DATE OF INTERVIEW (DAY ONLY) ___________________________
TIME OF INTERVIEW ______________________________________

Hello, may I speak to ____________________________________.
Hello, my name is_________________ and I'm a student in the
department of Communication at Ohio State University.
We are conducting a short survey about how people between
ages of 18 and 60 use television. We contacted you about
this time last year and at that time you agreed to help
us again. All of your answers will be anonymous and
confidential. (PAUSE) Could we ask you some questions now?
(IF ANSWER IS NO)—Would there be another time we could
call you back? (GET SPECIFIC DAY AND TIME IF POSSIBLE)
(IF ANSWER IS YES)—Very good. I will be asking you a
series of questions about how much you watch television,
about how television satisfies some of your daily needs
and about some changes that have occurred in your life.
Please think carefully about each question: if any quest-
tions are unclear to you be sure to ask me to repeat them.
There are no right or wrong to these questions. Please
answer as honestly as you can.

The first few questions deal with types of television shows
and how many of each type you watch during an average week.
1. The first type of television show is news 0 -1
and public affairs. Would you say you watch 1-5  -2

- 145 -
2. How many movies on television do you watch? (REREAD CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)

3. Now would you think about situation comedy shows? Do you watch none, 1 to 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 15, or more than 15 during an average week?

4. How many different daytime soap operas do you watch during an average week? (IF NONE GO TO QUESTION 6)

5. How many soap operas episodes do you watch during an average week? 1 to 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 15, 15 to 20, or more than 20?

6. How about drama and detective shows? Do you watch none, 1 to 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 15, or more than 15 of these shows on an average week?

7. (This is going well) Now, how many religious programs do you watch on an average week? (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)

8. How about game shows? Do you watch none, 1 to 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 15, or more than 15 during an average week?

9. And how many variety shows do you watch on an average week? (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)
10. How many hours of television do you watch during the following time period?
    7-9 AM
    9-12
    12-4
    4-7
    7-11
    after 11
    DON'T KNOW
    NO ANSWER

11. When watching television, how often do you watch alone?
    all of the time
    most of the time
    some of the time
    hardly ever
    never
    DON'T KNOW
    NO ANSWER

12. Approximately how many hours of radio do you listen to on an average weekday?
    less than 1 hour
    1-2 hours
    3-4 hours
    5-6 hours
    7-8 hours
    9 or more hours of radio a day
    DON'T KNOW
    NO ANSWER

13. How many different magazines do you regularly read in any given month?

14. How many days per week do you read a daily newspaper?

15. Do you own any of the following items?

   A. Home video game system
      yes
      no
      DON'T KNOW
      NO ANSWER

   B. Home computer?
      yes
      no
      DON'T KNOW
      NO ANSWER

   C. Home video cassette recorder or disc player?
D. Stereo system?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Many people in Central Ohio can subscribe to cable television and receive programs not offered by local stations. Do you subscribe to a cable television system?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 17)
(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 18)

17. How many days per week do you watch a premium channel? (such as HBO, star channel, movie channel, pay-per-view)

(Very good, this is useful information.) Now I'd like you to think about your television viewing over the last year for a moment. Some people have told us that they are watching more television now than before, other said they were watching less, and some have not changed the amount they watch. How about you?

18. Would you say that you are watching a lot more 1 a lot more television than a year ago, a little more, a little less, or a lot less? a little less 3 a little more 2 a lot less 4 same 5 DK/NA 9

19. Think for a moment about the attention a lot more 1 you pay to television now and a year ago. Are you watching television a lot more closely, somewhat more closely, somewhat less closely, or a lot less closely than a year ago? a lot less 4 somewhat more closely 2 some less 3 same 5 DK/NA 9

We know that people differ quite a bit in what things are important to them. In the next series of questions I am going to list a number of needs other people have mentioned that are important to them. As I read the questions would you tell me whether each need is very important, some-
what important, not very important, or not at all important to you personally.

20. Let's begin with the need to know what's going on in the world. How important is it to you to know what's going on in the world? Is it very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not at all important?

21. How about to release tension. How important is it for you to release tension? Is it very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not at all important?

22. How important is it for you to feel that you are using your time well? (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)

23. How important is it for you to overcome loneliness? (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)

24. And how important is it for you to spend time with your family and friends? (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)

25. How important is it for you to learn about your likes and dislikes?

26. How about to be entertained? How important is it for you to be entertained?
27. How important is it for you to strive for a higher standard of living?

- **Very important**
- **Somewhat important**
- **Not very important**
- **Not at all important**
- **DON'T KNOW**
- **NO ANSWER**

28. How important is it to you to relieve boredom?

- **Very important**
- **Somewhat important**
- **Not very important**
- **Not at all important**
- **DON'T KNOW**
- **NO ANSWER**

29. And how important is it for you to participate in discussions with your family and friends?

- **Very important**
- **Somewhat important**
- **Not very important**
- **Not at all important**
- **DON'T KNOW**
- **NO ANSWER**

30. How important is it for you to keep up with the way the government performs its functions?

- **Very important**
- **Somewhat important**
- **Not very important**
- **Not at all important**
- **DON'T KNOW**
- **NO ANSWER**

31. And how important is it for you to understand yourself?

- **Very important**
- **Somewhat important**
- **Not very important**
- **Not at all important**
- **DON'T KNOW**
- **NO ANSWER**

(Very good, this is going well.) Now let's go on to some other questions. We have found that the way people use television is affected by changes in their lives. The next series of questions will deal with any major changes in your life during the last year. Many things happen to people in a year. Some things are significant or viewed as major changes; most are not.

32. For you personally, what major changes have occurred in your life in the last year that you feel were important to you? (PROBE FOR A MAXIMUM OF TWO CHANGES) (RECORD RESPONSES AS ACCURATELY AS YOU CAN)

1. 

2. 
(IF RESPONDENT IS UNSURE OF WHAT WE MEAN BY MAJOR CHANGE)
What we mean by major change is a change that you feel has had a great effect on the way you go about your daily life.
Now I am going to read you a list of changes other people have told us they have gone through. Would you tell me whether or not you have had any of these changes in the past year (Some of these changes may be ones you have already mentioned)
33. Have you had a change in your marital status in the last year? Yes__________1
 No____________2
 NO ANSWER______9

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 34)
(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 35)

34. How much has your change in marital status changed your daily living habits and what you think is important in your life? Would you say it was very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not much of a change, or no change at all?
 Very much 1
 Somewhat 2
 Not very much 3
 No change 4
 NO ANSWER 9

35. What is your present marital status? Are you single, married, remarried, divorced, separated or widowed?
 Single 1
 Married 2
 Remarried 3
 Divorced 4
 Separated 5
 Widowed 6
 NO ANSWER 9

36. How would you describe your present employment status? Are you employed full time, employed part time, unemployed, laid off, retired, a student, or a homemaker?
 Full time 1
 Part time 2
 Unemployed 3
 Laid off 4
 Retired 5
 Student 6
 Homemaker 7
 OTHER 8
 NO ANSWER 9

37. Have you had a change in your job status or job responsibilities in the last year?
 Yes__________1
 No____________2
 NO ANSWER______9

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 38)
(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 40)

38. Which of the following describes any changes in your job status or job responsibilities in the last year?
 1st job 1
 New job 2
 Lost job 3
last year? Was it getting your first job, getting another job, losing your job, getting laid off, getting a promotion, getting new responsibilities without a promotion, retiring, or was it something else?
SPECIFY OTHER _________________________

39. How much has this major change in your employment changed your daily living habits and what you think is important in your life? Would you say it was very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not much of a change, or no change at all?

40. (DO NOT ASK IF RESPONDENT IS NOT MARRIED. GO TO QUESTION 43)
Has your spouse had a major or significant change in (his/her) job status in the last year?

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 41)

(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 43)

41. Was that change getting a first job, getting another job, losing a job, getting laid off, getting a promotion, getting new responsibilities without a promotion, retiring, or was it something else?
SPECIFY OTHER _________________________

42. How much has this change in your spouse's job status changed your own personal daily living habits and what you think is important in your life? Was it very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not much of a change, or no change at all?

43. Has there been a major or significant change in your health in the past year?

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 44)
44. Has your health improved or has your health gotten worse?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Worsened</th>
<th>NO ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. How much has this change in your health changed your daily living habits and what you think is important in your life? Was it very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not very much of a change, or no change at all?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>NO ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. Have there been any serious illnesses or deaths among your family members or close friends during the last year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NO ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. Was this serious illness of your spouse, a serious illness of a child, a serious illness of another family member or close friend, the death of your spouse, the death of a child, the death of another family member or close friend, or was it something else? Specify other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ill spouse</th>
<th>Ill child</th>
<th>Ill/family/friend</th>
<th>Death of spouse</th>
<th>Death of child</th>
<th>Death of family/friend</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>NO ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. How much has this changed your daily habits and what you think is important in your own life? Was it very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not much of a change or no change at all?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>NO ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. Have you moved from one residence to another in the past year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NO ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. Was this change in residence a move within the same city, a move from a different city in Ohio, a move from a different state, or a move from a different country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within city</th>
<th>Within Ohio</th>
<th>Another state</th>
<th>Another country</th>
<th>NO ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. How much has this move changed your daily living habits and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
what you think is important in your life? Was it very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not very much of a change or no change at all?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>NO ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. How many different cities have you lived in? _________

53. Has there been a change in your family size in the last year?
   - Yes 1
   - No 2
   - NO ANSWER 9

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 54)
(IF NO GO TO QUESTION 56)

54. Which of the following describes the change in family size? Was it the birth of a child, a child leaving home, a child returning home, a spouse leaving the residence, a close relative moving in, a close relative moving out, or was it something else?
   - Birth 1
   - Child leaving 2
   - Child returning 3
   - Spouse leaving the residence 4
   - Relative in residence 5
   - Relative out 6
   - Other 7
   - NO ANSWER 9

55. How much has this change in family size changed your daily living habits and what you think is important in your own life? Was it very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not very much of a change, or no change at all?
   - Very much 1
   - Somewhat 2
   - Not very much 3
   - No change 4
   - NO ANSWER 9

56. How many people are now living in your home? (LIST EXACT NUMBER)

(IF 1 PERSON GO TO QUESTION 58)

57. And how many of those living with you are children? (LIST EXACT NUMBER)

58. Have there been any major or significant changes in your household duties and family responsibilities in the last year?
   - Yes 1
   - No 2
   - NO ANSWER 9

(IF YES GO TO QUESTION 59)
(IF NO GO TO INTRODUCTION TO QUESTION 61)

59. Which of the following describe increase duties 1
those major changes? Was it an increase in household duties, a decrease in household duties, an increase in parenting responsibilities, a decrease in parenting responsibilities, an increase in family decision-making, a decrease in family decision-making, or was it something else?

60. How much has this change in duties and responsibilities changed your daily living habits and what you think is important in your own life? was it very much of a change, somewhat of a change, not very much of a change, or no change at all?

(Very good, we’re almost finished) A few minutes ago we talked about certain needs people have. I’d like to talk about them again but this time we will deal with how important television is in satisfying those needs for you personally. As I read this list of needs, would you tell me whether television is very helpful, somewhat helpful, not very helpful or not at all helpful to you in satisfying each need.

61. How helpful is television in keeping you informed about what is going on in the world? Is it very helpful, somewhat helpful, not very helpful, or not at all helpful?

62. How helpful is television in aiding you to release tension? (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)

63. How helpful is television in making you feel that you are using your time well? (REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)

64. Now what about overcoming loneliness? How helpful is television in overcoming loneliness?
65. And how important is television in aiding you to spend time with your family and friends?

(REPEAT CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY)

Not at all helpful 4
DON'T KNOW 8
NO ANSWER 9

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not very helpful 3
Not at all helpful 4
DON'T KNOW 8
NO ANSWER 9

66. How helpful is television for you in learning about your likes and dislikes?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not very helpful 3
Not at all helpful 4
DON'T KNOW 8
NO ANSWER 9

67. How helpful is television to keep you entertained?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not very helpful 3
Not at all helpful 4
DON'T KNOW 8
NO ANSWER 9

68. And how helpful is television in aiding you to strive for a higher standard of living?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not very helpful 3
Not at all helpful 4
DON'T KNOW 8
NO ANSWER 9

69. How helpful is television as a way to relieve boredom?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not very helpful 3
Not at all helpful 4
DON'T KNOW 8
NO ANSWER 9

70. How helpful is television in aiding you to participate in discussions with your family and friends?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not very helpful 3
Not at all helpful 4
DON'T KNOW 8
NO ANSWER 9

71. How helpful is television for you in keeping up with the way the government performs its functions?

Very helpful 1
Somewhat helpful 2
Not very helpful 3
Not at all helpful 4
DON'T KNOW 8
NO ANSWER 9
72. And finally, how helpful is television aiding you to understand your self?  

| Very helpful | 1 |
| Somewhat helpful | 2 |
| Not very helpful | 3 |
| Not at all helpful | 4 |
| DON'T KNOW | 8 |
| NO ANSWER | 9 |

(This has gone very well.) We just have a few more questions which will help us process the information you have given us.

73. What is your age?  

(IF RESPONDENTS HESITATES OR REFUSES READ THE CATEGORIES BELOW)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you between:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 and 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 and 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and 35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 and 40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and 45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 and 50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or between 50 and 60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74. What was the last grade you completed in school?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(TRADE SCHOOLS SHOULD BE LISTED AS HIGH SCHOOL GRAD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school grad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75. I am going to read a list of incomes. When I read the income which best describes your household income for last year, please tell me to stop.  

(READ CATEGORIES)  

| Under $6000 | 1 |
| 6000 to 12000 | 2 |
| 12000 to 18000 | 3 |
| 18000 to 24000 | 4 |
| 24000 to 30000 | 5 |
| 30000 to 36000 | 6 |
| 36000 to 42000 | 7 |
| Above $42000 | 8 |
| NO ANSWER | 9 |

76. What is your race please?  

| Black | 1 |
| White | 2 |
| Hispanic | 3 |
| Asian | 4 |
| OTHER | 5 |
| DON'T KNOW | 8 |
| NO ANSWER | 9 |

This complete our questionnaire. Thank you so much for your help. We are interested in finding out if people's television habits change over time. Would it be all right with you if we called you back next year and asked some other questions about your use of television? (PAUSE)
(IF NO) Thank you for helping us with this survey. Have a good day/evening.
(IF YES) Very good. What is your name?

___________________________________(PRINT CLEARLY )
And what is your address?

___________________________________(STREET ADDRESS)
___________________________________(CITY, ZIP CODE)
And finally, for verification purposes, would you give me your phone number?

Thank you for helping with this survey. Have a good day/evening.
SEX OF RESPONDENT DO NOT ASK, DETERMINE BY VOICE

MALE 1
FEMALE 2
COULD NOT TELL 9
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