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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

A 1972 Roper Poll found that Americans obtain sixty percent of their news information from television news programs. Since 1972 the frequency of news broadcasts have drastically increased. We now have "newsbreaks." They run sixty to one hundred and twenty seconds in length, and are broadcast throughout the day. Most local news stations have increased the length of their local evening broadcast from half an hour, to one full hour.

Is this prolific source of public information being provided by competent, well trained, and educated journalists? Or, are TV journalists being selected according to their attractiveness (an entertainment, rather than journalistic value)? TV news has been accused of having a "preoccupation with style over substance."¹ Some have claimed that broadcast journalism's emphasis on image has permitted competence in journalism to "become secondary to cosmetic qualities and an ability to maintain high ratings."²
One manifestation of this emphasis on image is the alleged preference for attractive aspiring TV newswomen over less attractive journalists. Prominent female television news professionals such as Renee Poussaint, Jane Pauley, Diane Summers and Marlene Saunders have asserted that there are rigorous physical attractiveness requirements for TV newswomen.\(^3\)

The infamous Christine Craft case highlights the possible legal ramifications of this emphasis upon the cosmetic qualities in broadcast journalism. On Camera Presenter (OCP) Craft sued KMBC-TV on the grounds of fraud and sexual discrimination.\(^4\) She claimed that she was hired as a journalist but was forced to try to be a "beauty queen."\(^5\) Thus she was defrauded. Craft also claims that the station practiced sexual discrimination because they did not make similar cosmetic demands upon her male co-anchor.

Initially, she was awarded $325,000 in damages. However, on June 28, 1985, that decision was overturned by an appellate court.\(^6\) Though the story of the Craft case is perhaps over, similar litigation continues. In June 1985, Ms. Pam Golden, a TV newswoman in Deluth, Minnesota, sued her station for making her wear deep-cut blouses (to show cleavage) and sit in suggestive positions.\(^7\)
The primary concern of this dissertation is the relationship between the perceived attractiveness of a TV newswomen and the inclination of a media decision maker (MDM) to hire her. The main question asked is, "How does the correlation between the attractiveness of a TV newswoman and the media decision maker's inclination to hire her compare with the correlation between other journalistic performance qualities and the media decision maker's inclination to hire the TV newswoman?"

In addition to some relevant repertory grid findings with respect to this question, the following contributions are also offered:

A. an initial formulation of a model of the operation of attractiveness within the hiring process of the TV newswoman.

I suggest that media decision makers construe the attractiveness of the TV newswoman from the audio-visual stimuli presented in the audition tape. They attribute positive journalistic qualities to the attractive newswoman and negative qualities to the unattractive newswoman. Therefore they are inclined to hire the attractive newswoman because her attractiveness leads them to believe she is a good journalist.
B. a collection of performance style qualities appropriate for the TV journalist. Heretofore, there has been no systematic effort to gather advice from the experts on how a TV journalist should perform on camera. This dissertation makes such an effort.

C. an interpretation of the combined data regarding the role of women in society and the role of women in television. It is hoped that this will help provide a contextual framework in which to regard the main question. The stereotypic images and qualities of an ideal woman portrayed in dramatic television, are often in direct opposition to the images and qualities associated with the ideal journalist. This dissertation explores the problem of establishing a clear role for the TV newswoman in view of this dichotomy.

D. an operational definition of "beauty" for the TV newswoman. Through repertory grid procedures and in construct relationships, a pattern of correlations is drawn. This pattern may be interpreted as an operational definition of female beauty in the context of TV journalism.

The terms beauty, attractiveness and ideal (physical image) are used interchangably throughout
the dissertation. The Random House American Dictionary defines "attractive" as that which "draws towards," or "invites; allures." It defines "beauty" as a "quality exciting admiring pleasure." Random House defines "ideal" as the "conception or standard of perfection." Roget's Thesaurus cites attractiveness as a synonym for beauty, along with loveliness, seduction and witchery.

Previous studies have used the consensus method of operationalizing beauty or attractiveness. This study provides data from which the reader may begin to draw inferences regarding the operational definition of beauty or attractiveness within the context of the TV newswoman. In this study, the words beauty and attractiveness refer to physical beauty and physical attractiveness rather than the intrinsic and intangible elements which may be associated with each of these terms.
Review of Literature

In order to place this study within a theoretical context, related research from four affinitive fields has been drawn together. Table 2. shows how relevant theories from Communication, Business, Sociology and Psychology are classified within this dissertation.

**Communication**

- Hiring Decision Making in Organizational Settings
- Marketing and Advertising
- Effect of Physical Attractiveness in Hiring Situations

**Business**

- Interpersonal Attraction
- Ethos Studies
- Media Studies
  - content analyzes
  - surveys of news directors
  - functions of the visual image

**Sociology**

- Evolving Roles of:
  - Women in Society
  - Women in the Media
  - Media in Society
  - Concepts of Beauty
  - in Society

**Psychology**

- Stereotype and Prejudice
- Attribution Theory
- Personal Construct Theory
- Social Desirability

Table 2. Theoretical Fields and Topics of Study Relating to the Criteria for Hiring TV Newswomen.
Research from these four fields is presented, where relevant, throughout the dissertation. Communication and psychological studies show that physical attractiveness is an important variable in virtually all communication interchanges (Berman, Onan & Floyd 1981; Berschied and Walster 1972; Blass, Allperstein and Block 1974; Caballer & Solomon 1984; Cash, Gillen, & Burns 1977; Dion, Berscheid & Walster 1972; Dipboye, Fromkin & Wiback 1975; Douty 1963; Joseph 1982 and 1977; Knapp 1972; Krebs & Adinolfi 1975; McCroskey & McCain 1974; Morrow & McElroy 1984; Pogrebin 1983; Rippey 1982; Schwibbe 1981, Shaffer & Johnson 1980, Sigell & Ostrone 1975; Staples 1982; Stephan & Langlois 1981; Wachtler & Couselm 1981 and Walter, et al 1966). In all these cases, physical attractiveness was found to be a stronger predictor of response to female stimulus persons than to male stimulus persons.

In general, physically attractive persons have been found to have an advantage over those who are less attractive. Attractiveness, for instance, is viewed as the single most important predictor of dating success (Berscheid & Walster 1981; Dion, Berscheid & Walster 1972; Krebs & Adinolfi 1975; Jacques 1974; Walster et al 1966). Good-looking people are usually attributed
with numerous good qualities such as intelligence, sociability, pleasantness, competency, etc.

When applying for gender appropriate jobs, attractive women have been shown to be preferred over less attractive women (Dipboye, Fromkin, & Wiback 1975; Gilbert, Deutsch & Strahan 1978; Jones & Frederick 1982; Morrow & McElroy 1984; and Rippey 1982). However when attractive women are applying for non-gender related or managerial jobs, they have been shown to be less preferred than unattractive applicants (Rosen & Judee 1974 and Heilman & Saruwatari 1979).

Attractive women are used to sell virtually every product (Ball 1985 and Goffman 1976). However, positive, demonstrable effect of using physically attractive female models in advertising is questionable. Some studies have shown that the physically attractive female communicator is often not perceived as credible in advertisements (Caballer & Solomon 1984 and Joseph 1977).

The female communicator in television news often finds herself pressured to appear physically attractive. Female journalists have asserted that they must measure up to an overriding standard of physical attractiveness in order to obtain and maintain their jobs as TV newscasters (Blue, 1981; Bombeck 1983;
Callahan 1984; Gelfman 1976; Donahue Show November 1983; Goodman 1983; Henry 1983; and Marzolf 1977). Writers have observed that attractiveness is an all important quality of a TV newswoman (Weisman 1984 and Wisehart 1981).

Few studies have been done to ascertain the important performance qualities for TV journalists (Warner 1981; Tyrell 1981; Blue 1981; CBS News 1958). Of these few studies, only one mentions physical appearance as an important factor and then they only refer to males (Sanders & Pritchard 1971).

This study seeks to begin to fill three major gaps in the literature by offering: 1. data reflecting the role attractiveness plays in the hiring of TV newswomen, 2. a collection of relevant performance style criteria for the OCP, 3. an exploration of the unique role of the TV newswoman within the contexts of society and mass media.
NOTES

CHAPTER I


7 WCHM-TV Channel 4, Columbus, Ohio, Eleven O'Clock News Broadcast, 12 June 1985.
Chapter II

ATTRACTIVENESS STEREOTYPES FOR WOMEN IN SOCIETY,

TELEVISION AND TV NEWS

Perhaps a great deal of the controversy surrounding the emphasis on cosmetic, rather than journalistic qualities of TV newswomen, is an extension of the pressure society has historically placed upon women to conform to a physical attractiveness stereotype. Value placed upon fatness or thinness of the feminine physique has fluctuated over the years,\(^1\) while other stereotypes have remained fairly constant (such as having certain facial features or being blond).\(^2\) Whatever the attractiveness stereotype has been, females have been under inordinate pressure to meet these standards in order to be valued as a woman. Dramatic television roles for women have grown out of this social tradition.

Women have only recently entered the field of television news, a field which is less than fifty years old. In 1970, the FCC amended its equal employment
rule to cover sex discrimination. During the following five years, the percentage of TV newswomen hired reached an all time high. These newcomers face what may be an impossible challenge. The challenge is to combine the role of a broadcast journalist and the role of a woman on television, in a satisfactory manner. However these two roles often demand completely different behaviors. Typical traits we expect of a journalist may include objectivity, aggressiveness, a sense of control, credibility, authoritativeness — stereotypically masculine traits. Whereas typical traits we may expect of women in television roles are sexiness, subjectivity, maternalness, coquetry, dependency — stereotypically feminine traits.

These feminine TV roles are an extension of the roles traditionally established for women in society. In our society, both men and women are trained to judge women according to how well they compare to our physical attractiveness stereotype. "Both sexes are also socialized not to judge men solely on their looks." A physical attractiveness stereotype does exist within our society. The idea that everyone has his own unique and different standard of attractiveness, .. may be more in the eye of the social scientist
researcher than in the real life beholder. In fact, research indicates that the western standard of beauty may be spreading to colonialized countries, as well as those inundated with western media.

Western man's general ideal of feminine attractiveness has been that of a young, slender, blonde, blue eyed woman. For a brief period, during the 1960's, non-European physical characteristics were extolled as attractive. However, some sociologists and fashion executives claim that rather than really breaking the rigid American standards of beauty, the 60's acted as a fad which has since faded.

One historian predicts that as a larger portion of our population reaches their middle and late years, "... the obsessive identification of beauty with youth that has long characterized this nation's standards of physical appearance for women," may end. At least one study shows some evidence that older respondents judge middle aged people to be more attractive than do younger respondents. Yet recent studies still show that men tend to link physical attractiveness with youthfulness.

The last two decades have shown some flexibility in some qualities of the nation's attractiveness stereotypes. Concepts of what constitutes thinness
however have become more stringent. Idealization of thinness as a quality of attractiveness, has grown immensely in America during the past twenty years.

The Western beauty ideal of the young, slim, blond and blue eyed woman may be flexible on some counts. However, it is still a deeply entrenched standard of attractiveness. One of the central stereotypic behaviors expected of women in society has been to attract. Other stereotypically feminine behaviors include being: unambitious, unauthoritative, a failure in responsibility, and a victim.

This collection of stereotypic feminine behaviors has been translated into basically two acceptable female gender related roles in society. These two roles are those of housewife/mother and bunny/seductress.

In general, television roles for women have paralleled these societal stereotypes. Along with the fashion and cosmetics industry, beauty contests and the modeling profession, the media have reinforced these images of women. TV advertising has been credited with emphasizing these roles and portraying women as "...either sex objects or demented housewives obsessed with cleaning."

Charles Kuralt, the roving anchor of CBS's "Sunday
Morning" news program says that the sales background of most station managers causes them to be more concerned with appearances. "They don't know anything about journalism." It appears that most of the newswomen hired reflect the bunny/seductress role present in dramatic TV programming and advertising.

Most TV newswomen are close to, or epitomize, the Western physical attractiveness stereotype. At least at the network level, most female anchors are blond. Visible network TV newswomen such as Jane Pauley, Joan Lunden, Leslie Stahl and Barbara Walters are blond and blue eyed.

"Blond and blue eyed," also insinuates Caucasian. Most TV newswomen, especially on the network level, and in anchoring positions, are caucasian. Connie Chung, an oriental, is one notable exception. Minority newswomen are visible on the local level. In general, blacks, who do not resemble caucasians, have been excluded from the Western physical attractiveness stereotype. Until the height of the civil rights movement, blacks usually appeared on TV news as criminal perpetrators rather than On-Camera Presenters (OCP's). In the 1970's, under social and governmental pressure, more blacks and women began to enter the field.
TV newswomen are almost all slender. One newswoman stated that only "... having a bad case of acne or being obese," would make a woman look unacceptable for a career in TV journalism. All jobs that involve the meeting of the public or projecting a company image are particularly hard for heavier women to obtain.

Most TV newswomen are young. One researcher found that several news directors express a concern that if a woman is too young, she is considered less credible. Yet if she is too old, she is unattractive. In 1976, the average TV newswoman was thirty years old. In 1983 forty-eight percent of the country's local male news anchors were over 40 years old; only three percent of the females were over 40. "None of the female anchors -- compared with 16% of the males were over 50."

Some claim the reason for this disparity lies in the late entry of women, en masse, into the field of TV journalism. However, as some TV newswomen have grown older, they have been allowed diminishing on-camera time and have more voice-over narration reports. There are already some "older" women in TV news such as Barbara Walters (53), Betty Furness (67), Pauline Frederic (in her 70's) and Dorothy Fuldheim (89).
However, these women take great care (in their health care, as well as in the manner in which they are photographed) to retain a young image. They credit their staying power to the fact that they do not look their age.39

The fact remains that most newswomen are relatively young. The most successful newswomen (network fringe anchors) fit the Western physical attractiveness stereotype. The question rises: were these newswomen hired because they fit the physical attractiveness stereotype?

If the affirmative is true, then that may indicate that the role of the newswoman has been developed as a "pink collar" or gender related job. This is clearly distinguishable from the role newsman which carries authority, and at least the image of power. Through the definition of roles, both newsmen and newswomen are being limited in the types of images they project, as well as the types of stories they may deliver. The "hard news" stories, typically covered by male newscasters, are valued more journalistically than the "soft news," or "fluff" stories, typically covered by female newscasters.40

Many studies looking at the relationship between applicant attractiveness and organizational hiring
decisions have found that attractive applicants, both male and female, have a better chance of being hired over equally qualified unattractive applicants. However, for authoritative and typically male staffed positions, unattractive women are actually preferred.

Given the data available, the attractiveness variable may be acting upon the hiring process of TV newswomen in the following manner. It may be that media decision makers are hiring TV newswomen for "pink collar" jobs -- different from the job of a newsman. Thus the usual, positive attributes are attached to the attractive TV newswoman by the media decision maker. The media decision makers view the role of newswoman as feminine and gender related, different from the masculine, authoritative, journalistic role of newsmen. Within this context, media decision makers see attractive newswomen as the best newswomen.

It is upon this hypothesis, that my model of the operation of attractiveness within the hiring process of the TV newswoman is based. The assumption is made that news directors act in a manner similar to personnel decision makers in other organizational settings. Typically, TV newscasters seeking a position, send audition tapes to newscasters in the hopes of being recognized as someone the station might like to hire.
Figure 1. Model of Performance Style Criteria in the Hiring of Television Newswomen
However, if the MDM is selecting a TV newswoman for the typically masculine, authoritative job of a journalist, he would be more inclined to hire the newswoman he construes as unattractive (Vector C). Under these conditions, he would be less inclined to hire the newswoman he construes as attractive (Vector A).

Of course the actual decision to hire would include many other factors. These other factors include: who has the final hiring authority, the quality of the subsequent personal interviews, how much pay the applicant would demand, etc. Therefore, the model looks at the predisposition to hire created by performance styles perceived.

This inquiry uses this model as a manner through which to view the process of hiring TV newswomen inorder to make observations. Data was obtained through the use of repertory grid technique, administered to ten media hiring decision makers.
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The purpose of this study was to explore the role of attractiveness within the hiring process of the TV newswoman. The main question was: "How does the correlation between the attractiveness of a TV newswoman and the media decision maker's inclination to hire her compare with the correlation between other journalistic performance qualities and the media decision maker's inclination to hire the TV newswoman?"

Two other related questions were: "How might the term 'attractiveness' be defined operationally within the context of those who hire TV newswomen?" and "What are the criteria for effective on-camera presentation of the news?"

Stimuli Material

Stimuli samples of actual TV newswomen were sought. Programs which had been entered in a national contest were used. One hundred and thirty-five
videotaped news shows were previewed by the researcher. These news programs were submitted in 1984 to a 1983, national, annual contest. The programs represented the station's best public affairs program. These tapes were not winners in the contest. They were non-network pieces from stations outside of the top twenty markets.

Of the 135 tapes viewed, sixteen different newswomen were found to have reported on-camera. These sixteen news programs were edited, selecting the portions of the program where the women appeared on camera. The programs provided a wide variety of newswomen. The newswomen were of different races, using different styles and representing many different areas of the country. However, since these women were already in the field, it was expected that certain types of women would not be present. For example, none of the women were obese or noticeably past middle age, etc. For a list of all the clips, see Appendix A.

The clips were assigned order through a computer generated random numbers table. Then the clips were separated by chronological, character generated numbers. The edited version of the cumulative clips shown to the respondents ran sixteen minutes and nine seconds.
Photographs of each newswoman were taken from the television screen. These photos were mounted in 2 1/2" x 3" lucite frames and embossed with the corresponding number presented before each clip in the videotape. These photos were used as memory aids later during the session.

**Respondents**

The most obvious media decision maker, who would participate in the hiring decision for news talent, is the news director. News directors of Columbus, Ohio and Baltimore, Maryland were used as respondents. Nine news directors and one station manager participated in the study. This is not intended as a statistically generalizable sample of all the news directors in the nation. No attempt at such a generalization is made.

However, the TV news business is an extraordinarily mobile one, where relocation is a way of life. While we do not know the degree to which the study exist in other samples, we do know that the findings reported here do exist as expressed by these respondents.

All the respondents employed at commercial stations had held positions all over the country. None were indigenous to the city in which they were presently
employed. This is intended as an exploratory study.

**Procedure**

All major commercial and public television stations in Baltimore, Maryland and Columbus, Ohio were contacted, by phone, in November 1984. Potential respondents were told that we were studying the performances styles of television newspeople and that the interview would take approximately forty-five minutes.

Many news directors indicated concern and reticence when they heard the approximate duration of the interview. All did, eventually, agree to cooperate, or named someone on their staff (who also participated in the hiring process of news talent) to participate in lieu of himself. In each city, the news director of a minor station, which had recently entered the market, was unable to fit the meeting into his schedule during the interview period (December 1984 through January 1985). At one of the stations in Columbus, the news director indicated that hiring decisions were made in direct cooperation with the station manager. In this case, the station manager was also interviewed.
After each interview appointment was made, a conformation/informational letter was mailed (see Appendix C). On the working day before the appointment, a confirmation call was made. In all cases the interviews were held, at the request of the respondent, at the station of their employ. Eight of the ten interviews were held during the daytime, two during the evening. One of the interviews was conducted on a Saturday. The rest were conducted during the week. Nine of the ten respondents were male. Of those nine, six were caucasian.

All interviews were done by the same interviewer. The interviewer was a black female, 24 years old. The interviewer was a research professional. She also taught classes on the techniques of interviewing for The Ohio State University for two years. The interviewer had been trained in conducting both highly structured, as well as unstructured interviews in a consistent, non-leading manner.

Upon meeting with the media decision maker, he was queried as to whether he had received the confirmation letter. The purpose and method of the study, as well as his assurance of confidentiality were reviewed. The respondents were given two notesheets. Each notesheet contained the newswomen's numbers, a one line story
slug (in chronological order - See Appendix B) and space for comments between each.

Respondents were told to write on the notesheet anything unique or different about the newswoman that would aid them in remembering the reporter later in the interview. They were instructed that if they knew any of the newswomen personally, to circle her number on the notesheet. Next they viewed the clips of the newswomen. Though several of the news directors remembered (sometimes vaguely) seeing a few of the newswomen's work in the past, only two of the respondents had known one of the newswomen personally. Only one of these two respondents (Media Decision Maker B) knew one of the newswomen well enough to warrant excluding her (Newswoman number six) from the rankings.

After viewing the clips and writing notes, the respondent was presented with the photographs of the reporters he had just seen, as well as the repertory grid form (see Appendix B). He was asked to consider the first construct (self-confident/lacks self-confidence) and to line up the pictures with the newswoman to the extreme left being the one he felt, in his professional opinion, to be the most self-confident. The picture to the right of this one would be the one he thought the next most self-confident,
etc. Ranking the reporters as such, the newswoman on the extreme right would represent the newswoman he saw exhibiting the greatest lack of self-confidence. After he had ranked the reporters, he was asked if he wished to change any of the positions. Once the respondent was certain that the reporters were ranked as he wished, the decision-maker recorded the numbers of the newswoman on his grid in the appropriate box.

The pictures were then shuffled and the process was repeated for each subsequent construct. Constructs nine, ten and eleven have to do with the social desirability and the independence of the decision maker in the hiring process. Three of the respondents (Media Decision Makers B, F, and C) felt themselves to be totally independent in the decision making process and therefore chose to rank the newswomen in the same manner for all three of these constructs.

However, MDM-I ranked the newswomen according to the first construct and then decided he did not want to cooperate. He indiscriminantly ranked all the women in the same exact manner for each construct. This occurred after MDM-I had twice rescheduled the interview by phone and once rescheduled after the interviewer appeared for the appointment.
As the respondents viewed the videotape and ranked the news talent, they were encouraged to make any comments they wished regarding the tape they had seen, TV news reporting in general, or anything that came to mind. If they mentioned any opinions regarding a specific newswoman (e.g.: "This one needs help."), the MDM was queried as to what it was about the newswoman that prompted them to form this opinion (e.g.: "What makes you say that?" or "What quality does she have that makes you feel that way?" or "What does she need help with?"). Two constructs were elicited after the women were ranked on the first eleven given constructs.

At the end of the interview, respondents were asked questions in two areas (the hiring process and recommended change in current performance styles):

1. "What is your hiring process for TV news talented (Are you solely responsible for the hiring? Where does the process begin? Who, if anyone, do you consult when you are making your decision?)?"

2. "Think now about the audition tapes you've seen recently. If you could tell the applicants one thing, give them one bit of advice, before they submitted their audition tapes, what would you tell them (How would you counsel educators and talent coaches to better train TV news talent for on-camera presentation?"
Has there been any one quality you've seen missing from the audition tapes you've seen recently, say in the last year? Has there been one negative characteristic that you see repeated in the audition tapes you've received in the last year?)?"

The interview was then terminated. The repertory grid as well as the notesheets were collected. All interviews were tape recorded and the interviewer took notes.

Ten separate and one averaged correlation matrices and scatter plots were derived using a computer program designed for repertory grid analysis by Peter Higginbotham and Donald Bannister of Leeds University in England. Correlations were used to establish construct constellations (typal relevancies) using a method explained by Louis McQuitty.¹

The Repertory Grid

In order to explore the perceptions of the media decision makers, the repertory grid was chosen as an instrument. The repertory grid had been found to be uniquely useful in discovering the perceptions and world views of individuals.²
The repertory grid technique is an interviewing procedure which is defined in its general structure but can be varied within very wide limits. It resembles the Q-technique, advocated by Stephenson, and Osgood's semantic differential methods. It also has features in common with Moreno's sociometric techniques and Shapero's personal questionnaires. Of these methods, Slater sees the repertory grid as "distinctly the most adaptable and penetrating procedure so far proposed for obtaining scalar systems for measuring microcosmic [internal values] variation.

Repertory grid technique is logically related to personal construct theory. Construct theory addresses the problem of finding some principles which will facilitate predictions about the general direction a man (in this study -- the media decision maker) will take in decisions which face him in life, or the "turnings he will take at the various choice points which confront him." Construct theory argues that space is multi-dimensional. The repertory grid accepts this in that "... all constructs are compared with all other constructs, and they are not matched against any universal axis."
A repertory grid is obtained when a person (in this study, the media decision maker) compares and ranks a set of "elements" (pictures of NW) in terms of an appropriate set of "constructs" (here, performance qualities and appearances); using a consistent procedure throughout. Typically these constructs are elicited from each respondent. This creates a unique, but totally idocyncratic set of constructs. In experiments involving group comparisons, construct supplying seems useful.

Tactics suggested by Bannister and Mair were used to reduce, though not eliminate, the potentially distorting effects in supplied construct grids. These tactics were:

1. An allowance was made for the respondents to provide their own constructs in addition to the constructs supplied by the researcher.

2. Each respondent was invited to make a running commentary on the nature of the grid operations he carried out, so that a better understanding of grid results and construing might be achieved.

3. Pretest interviewing of one TV newswoman, one former TV newswoman, one news director and four university professors in the media field, as well as a literature search, were conducted in order to yield
constructs which might represent a common vocabulary among the respondents.

This pretest interviewing was very informal. I contacted people I had worked with in the past and simply asked them, "What do you think are the important qualities of the on-camera presentation to consider when hiring a TV journalist?"

The pretest interviewing and a literature search yielded twenty-seven constructs. This list was edited down to eleven. Contrasts of the constructs were created by negating the constructs in a manner the researcher perceived to be neutral and logical.

The final eleven constructs and contrasts supplied in the grid were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>construct</th>
<th>contrast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. self-confident</td>
<td>lacks self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. credible</td>
<td>not credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. articulate</td>
<td>inarticulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. attractive</td>
<td>unattractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. relaxed/informal</td>
<td>staid/formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. fits in with my station's style/image</td>
<td>inappropriate for my station's style/image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. youthful</td>
<td>mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. most ideal</td>
<td>least ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the one I'd personally like to hire</td>
<td>the one I'd personally least like to hire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. the one we would in actuality likely hire the one we would in actuality NOT be likely to hire

11. the kind of person we SHOULD hire/good for the public to see
   the kind of person we should NOT hire/ NOT good for the public to see

Validity and Reliability

As far as the grid is concerned, the elements (here, newswomen) are really the examinees’ own acts of perception. Construct theory "... draws a distinction between people's broad structuring of their experience and their ordering of specific events." To ask about the validity of a measure raises the question: "With what is this measure associated?" "It should be noted that a repertory grid intrinsically measures association."

Does the repertory grid actually predict behavior? Some tests have shown that grids do predict some behaviors. In 1965 Knowles and Purves carried out a verbal conditioning experiment. Respondents whose grids showed higher approval needs were found to be more easily conditioned than those who had low approval needs.

Does the repertory grid provide data that are a result of actual subject response, rather than unpredictable chance? Levels of significance can be calculated for the grid correlation coefficients. The
results of these probability calculations are presented with the data.

However, in grid work, there seems no good reason why the conventionally sacred levels of significance should be given particular importance since it seems unlikely that people, when using their construct systems, only make decisions when the probabilities of error are 5 in 100 or less.15

One way of considering reliability is test-retest. Due to the length of the interview used in this study and the limited time availability of TV news directors, the subjects of this study were not retested. However use of the repertory grid in a test-retest manner is similar to Osgood's semantic differential and may be considered as such.16 Information on the reliability of the semantic differential is available.

But constructs change as people's perceptions change. Some elements may be more stationary than others. Subjects have been shown to generally duplicate the same elicited constructs when tested at different times on different elements and on the same elements.17 Studies have found, at the p<.02 level, element consistency (or reoccurrence on retest) of 72 – 77 percent.

The supplied constructs are not a total sample of all the important on-camera performance qualities possible. Nor are they a random sample of all the
important qualities (if indeed, a total sample could be developed). However, grid technique is not designed to elicit, nor supply random samples of constructs or elements. It rather looks at some important constructs and elements in order to establish patterns of relationships.

In the following chapter, results of the grid administration are reported. Chapter V represents some possible interpretations of the construct matrices.
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CHAPTER IV  
RESULTS  

Grid responses from nine news/public affairs directors and one station manager, were transposed to fit the Data Analysis Form (see Appendix B). These data were analyzed using a repertory grid computer analysis program designed by Dr. Peter Higginbotham and Daniel Bannister of the University of Leeds. Construct correlation matrices and scatter plots from this analysis were used to construct "Cluster Constellations." The construct accounting for the most variance in the matrix is accepted as the first axis of a graph. The second axis is the construct with the next highest total variance, which is not significantly related to the construct chosen as the first axis. The two axes are the basis for the major constellations. Constructs most closely related to each axis are said to cluster in that constellation. "This procedure is
termed the Anchor method because the 'factors' are anchored into the specific constructs used as axes.\(^1\)

Mean attractiveness rankings and their probability levels of differences were derived from the information on the Data Analysis Form. Interview data and information from the notesheets were separated into referents of newswomen (by number) and content subject (i.e.: clothing, make-up, training, critique of study, labels given to newswomen, elicited constructs, ideal newscasters presently on air, etc.). These data were indexed by both the person who made the remark (MDM A through MDM J) as well as the newswoman to whom he referred (if any).

For complete correlation matrices see Appendix C. Grid results are presented here in a cluster analysis form. Constructs accounting for the greatest amount of variance and most closely correlated with the greatest number of constructs (referred to as constellations), are drawn out as the strongest predictors of other constructs.\(^2\)

These relationships are often complex and are therefore presented visually. The figures themselves are at times complex. The circles represent constructs. The numbers and words within the circles label the specific construct. The numbers within the
vectors represent the correlation between the constructs connected by the vectors. This is but one way to interpret grid data. The construct correlation matrices are presented in Appendix C should the reader chose to interpret them differently.

Correlation coefficients are referred to as "r = X" (p \leq .05, unless otherwise mentioned). Interview data are given when they provide explanatory information to clarify the grid relationships presented.

An average of all ten grids shows a major constellation of actually hiring those newswomen who are personally preferred by the media decision makers (r = .92).
Fig. 3. Average of All Ten Media Decision Makers - Cluster Constellation. Personal Hiring Preference is the Strongest Predictor of Hiring TV Newswomen.

Appropriateness of the stimulus person to the decision makers' own station is closely connected to his image of the ideal newswoman ($r = .79$). Media
decision makers (MDMs) in this study are keenly aware of, and respond to, being under public scrutiny and would actually hire upon this basis \((r = .89)\). There is a direct, positive, though not overly robust, correlation between attractiveness and the probability of hiring \((r = .57 - .64)\).

These decision makers see attractive newswomen as fitting in with their stations' style and image \((r = .56)\). Unique performance style criteria of the decision makers also correlate with the perceived attractiveness of the applicant \((r = .56)\). Decision makers personally like to hire attractive newswomen \((r = .64)\). Youthfulness/maturity was not seen as connected with the hiring process when the grids were averaged. Four of the ten respondents' (MDM B, C, G, and H) individual grids do show a correlation (sometimes either indirect or with a 50 - 60 percent correlation) between youthfulness and hiring constructs.

In two cases, attractiveness was the overriding predictor of the media decision makers' way of evaluating newswomen (MDM A and B).

Four other cases showed attractiveness as correlating strongly with criteria for hiring (MDM C, E, F, and H) but connected with another attribution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDM</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Contrast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12. Intelligence</td>
<td>Stupidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Knows and Understands the Material</td>
<td>Simply Reciting Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12. Concern</td>
<td>Unconcerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Warmth</td>
<td>Cold/Distant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12. TV Appearance (bad)</td>
<td>TV Appearance (good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sincerity</td>
<td>Sincerity (bad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12. Energetic</td>
<td>Monotonous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sincere</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>12. Camera Presence</td>
<td>Lack of Camera Presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Voice Control</td>
<td>Lack of Voice Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12. Conversational</td>
<td>Stilted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sincere</td>
<td>Go Through the Motions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>12. Believability - Prescence (sic)</td>
<td>Unauthoritative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sincere</td>
<td>Lack of Poise/Carriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>12. Memorability</td>
<td>Least Memorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Charisma</td>
<td>No Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>12. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Boredom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Intelligence</td>
<td>Stupidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>12. Least Dramatic</td>
<td>Most Dramatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. -----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
such as being conversational (F), credible (C), socially desirable (E), and charismatic (H).

MDM G rejected the role of attractiveness in the evaluation of TV newswomen entirely. Two others (MDM D and I) saw attractiveness as linked in an equal manner to their ideal of a newswoman but not showing significant correlations with other performance style attributes.

Interview data corroborates the extremes of the mean attractiveness rankings (MARS) for each newswoman, across all the MDM's. On the average, newswoman number thirteen (NW13) was considered the most attractive (MAR = 3.8). NW13 was referred to as the "most attractive," "has the best body," "the most attractive -- the most youthful," "Miss Sex," "has good presence," "good appearance." She was also criticized as being "too casual," "fakey," having "bad acting." Hers was one of the shorter clips and three of the ten MDMs complained that the clip was too short.

Remarks of the MDMs would also support the second and third runner-ups. NW9 (MAR = 4.7) and NW6 (MAR = 5.88) were the second most "attractive" but were never referred to by any of the MDMs as sexy or alluring. NW6 was referred to as "good communicator," "most at ease," "most in control," "wants to be accepted," "my
favorite," "natural," "gives a sense of intelligence," and authority." NW9 was called "overdressed," "sophisticated," "the actress type," "Nancy Reagan type," "too formal," "had a good voice," "most at ease," and "most in control."

Interview data also strongly support the other extreme of the mean attractiveness rankings. Newswoman number eight (NW8) was seen as the most unattractive (MAR = 13.8). Comments made about NW8 were "dress looks awkward," "bad voice," "cowgirl," "bad costume," "frumpy," "needs makeup badly -- doesn't do herself justice," "looks like her mother dressed her," "her dress was so distracting," "desert setting really hurt her -- looks awkward," and "bad attractiveness -- clothing is important."

Three of the MDMs laughed and shook their heads when they first saw NW8. When asked what amused them, they usually responded with some of the preceding remarks or made a reference to her "tail." The newswoman walked about three yards in the beginning of the clip. Her very noticeable mike cord trailed behind, like a tail.

Other interesting labels given to various newswomen were: NW4 - "Kewpie Doll," NW3 - "Host Type," NW2 - "California-ish," NW14 - "Scared Poodle."
NW3 - "School Teacher", and NW2 "Lady with all the Teeth".

Factors most often mentioned as affecting appearance, in order of frequency, were: clothing, hairstyle, makeup (or lack thereof), camera angle, and lighting.

Table 2 lists the elicited constructs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDM</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Contrast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12. Intelligence</td>
<td>Stupidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Knows and Understands the Material</td>
<td>Simply Reciting Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12. Concern</td>
<td>Unconcerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Warmth</td>
<td>Cold/Distant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12. TV Appearance (bad)</td>
<td>TV Appearance (good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sincerity</td>
<td>Sincerity (bad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12. Energetic</td>
<td>Monotonous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sincere</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>12. Camera Presence</td>
<td>Lack of Camera Presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Voice Control</td>
<td>Lack of Voice Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12. Conversational</td>
<td>Stilted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sincere</td>
<td>Go Through the Motions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>12. Believability</td>
<td>Unauthoritative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Presence (sic)</td>
<td>Lack of Poise/Carriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>12. Memorability</td>
<td>Least Memorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Charisma</td>
<td>No Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>12. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Boredom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Intelligence</td>
<td>Stupidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>12. Least Dramatic</td>
<td>Most Dramatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. --------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Media Decision Maker A

Attractive Ideal (predictor)

Performance Style

Fig. 4. Media Decision Maker A -- Cluster Constellations. Attractiveness is the Strongest Predictor of Hiring TV Newswomen.

There are basically three constellations in this person's way of evaluating newscasters which may be placed into two categories: Attractive Ideal and Performance Style.

The Attractive Ideal has higher correlations, and there are more constructs accounting for a greater
total variance on this constellation than the other. The Attractive Ideal constellation includes: would like to hire, would actually hire, and ideal, along with others. "Attractive" correlates 79% with "would like to hire." This cluster of constructs is the best predictor.

The other cluster is actually comprised of two smaller groups. These are what we might call performance variables, since they include Relaxed, Credible, Self-Confident, and (the third, minor constellation) Articulate and also Youthful. Generally they deal with qualities of a performer, rather than physical attractiveness. "Youthful" would qualify as a member of this cluster because it correlates a -.65 with "self-confident."
Like MDM A, the strongest predictor of MDM B's way of evaluating newscasters is attractiveness. The Attractiveness Ideal has higher correlations and there are more constructs accounting for a greater total variance on this one than the other. The Attractiveness Ideal includes ideal newswoman ($r = .82$), would personally like to hire ($r = .82$), would
actually hire \( (r = .82) \), should hire \( (r = .82) \), warmth \( (r = .82) \), Youthful \( (r = .82) \) and Fits in With My Station's Style/Image \( (r = .72) \). In all these, \( p = .01 \).

Also very closely linked with the tendency to hire \( (r = .99 \) for personally like to hire, actually hire and should hire) is the Concern construct. Though these are near perfect correlations, the Concern subdivision does not account strongly for the constructs of ideal newswoman \( (r = .51) \) or youthfulness \( (r = .41) \) as does the Attractiveness constellation as a whole (where \( r \) for these two constructs are .82 and .71 respectively).

Youthfulness itself accounts for a weak constellation connected with the relaxed construct \( (r = .55) \). Relaxed construction is more strongly related to self-confidence \( (r = .74) \) and articulateness \( (r = .58) \) -- Youthful being related to a more poised performance style.
Media Decision Maker C

Fig. 6. Media Decision Maker C -- Cluster Constellations. Perception of Appropriate Station Image is NOT Connected with the Reality of the Hiring Process of TV Newswomen.

It appears that MDM C has an Appropriate Image constellation versus a Reality of Hiring constellation. There is a strong constellation of construct six, "fits in with my station's image/style." This construct accounts for the most variance and six other constructs
are closely related to it [self-confident \( r = .92 \), credible \( r = .86 \), attractive \( r = .78 \), youthful \( r = .82 \), personally like to hire \( r = .71 \) and should hire \( r = .82 \), where \( p = .01 \) for all]. However this strong constellation is least related to the Reality of Actual Hiring ("the one we would in actuality likely hire").

The actuality of hiring was weakly related to being relaxed \( r = .66 \), good TV appearance \( r = .51 \) and most ideal newswomen \( .47, p > .05 \).

The elicited construct, Sincerity, did not significantly correlate with any other construct.

Fitting in with the station's style would act as the biggest predictor of being favored personally by this MDM but not to actually getting hired. The best predictor of actually getting hired has something to do with being perceived as relaxed and having a good TV performance. A better predictor of actually getting hired was not apparent from the grid data. Interview data would indicate that some component of learning how to dress, and those which MDM C perceived could be easily trained to fit in with the station's image and thus enter his Appropriate Image Constellation, may be operating here. However MDM C's station would likely hire this newswoman before she received this type of training rather than someone "ready made." This may be
related to perceived budget restrictions or a commitment by someone other than the respondent who has more authority in the hiring process, to training news talent.

*Media Decision Maker D*

Fig. 7. Media Decision Maker D -- Cluster Constellations. TV Newswomen Are Evaluated According to This MDM's Own Ideal.
MDM D evaluates newswomen in accordance with his own ideal. The Ideal constellation is so dominant that every construct (except youthfulness) was positively correlated with construct eight - Most Ideal. The most important performance style constructs related to this ideal image are: fitting in with the station's style/image \( (r = .89) \), being perceived as articulate \( (r = .77) \), appearing credible \( (r = .79) \), performing in a self-confident manner \( (r = .76) \), being energetic \( (r = .74) \), emanating sincerity \( (r = .76) \), attractiveness \( (r = .75) \), maturity (Youthfulness construct \( r = -.62 \)) and very weakly related to the Relaxed construct \( (r = .53) \). This indicates that the ideal image which determines MDM D's evaluation process consists of a mature, more formal, attractive newswoman.

Interview data show that the image or style of the station may fluctuate ("Different looks with get hired at different times."), but that certain ideal qualities will always be included in that fluctuating image:

"You [TV newswomen] need to always be articulate, intelligent and have an energy about life . . . Credibility is a function of other factors. I want to know, 'Is there life behind the mascara?"
**Media Decision Maker E**

![Diagram showing the constellation of Ideal Youthful Image and Performance Style]

Fig. 8. Media Decision Maker E -- Cluster Constellations. A Youthful Ideal is the Strongest Predictor of Hiring TV Newswomen.

MDM E is similar to MDM A. There is an Ideal Youthful Image constellation and a Performance Style constellation. The strongest predictor of MDM E's method of evaluating newswomen is his personal preference or inclination to hire. The station is
likely to actually hire the newswomen he personally prefers (r = .84). The MDM will feel that this choice is socially desirable ("the one we should hire/would be good for the public to see," r = .64).

Influencing his personal preference to hire is idealness (r = .86), fitting in with the station's image/style (r = .86), with weaker relationships to youthfulness (r = .56), being perceived as credible (r = .54), attractiveness (r = .49), and camera presence (r = .54).

The strongest predictor of the Performance Style constellation is articulateness. Related to articulateness is self-confidence (r = .74). Being relaxed is perceived by this person as connected with self-confidence also (r = .64). Though this constellation is fairly strongly connected with fitting in with the station's style or image (r = .75), articulateness is not at all connected with "the one we should hire," (r = .05, p > .05) and very weakly connected with the actuality of hiring (r = .35, p > .05).

As with MDM C, the last elicited construct (for MDM E -- "voice control/lack of voice control") was not significantly correlated with any other construct.
**Media Decision Maker F**

Fig. 9. Media Decision Maker F -- Cluster Constellation. Perceived Social Desirability of the TV Newswoman is the Strongest Predictor of Hiring.

The greatest predictor of MDM F's evaluation of newswomen is social desirability [most closely related to articulateness \( r = .63 \) and being conversational \( r = .66 \)]. The construct The One We Should Hire/Good for the Public to See, has higher correlations and accounts for the greatest total variance than any other
construct. The MDM perceives he should hire articulate and conversational newswomen.

Conversationality is most closely related to fitting in with the station's image \( (r = .74) \) and attractiveness \( (r = .55) \). Articulateness is the performance style construct most closely related to all the hiring constructs \( (r = .63 \) for ideal, personally like to hire, the One We Would Actually be Likely to Hire and the One We Should Hire/Good for the Public to See).

Other performance factors were closely related to articulateness. Credibility had a 76% correlation with Articulateness. Self-Confident had a 86% correlation to Most Credible. Sincerity had a 75% correlation with Self-Confident.

Youthful and Relaxed did not significantly correlate with any other constructs.
Media Decision Maker G

Fig. 10. Media Decision Maker G -- Cluster Constellations. Perceived Social Desirability of the TV Newswoman is the Strongest Predictor of Hiring.

Similar to MDM F, this person's overriding predictor for evaluating TV newswomen is the social desirability factor -- what he thinks the public should see rather than his personal hiring preferences. The
construct, the One We Would Hire/Good for the Public to See," accounted for the greatest amount of total variance and has the largest amount of correlated constructs.

This decision maker is also unusual in that Most Attractive had no related constructs. Interview data corroborates the grid, in that person G, desired to make clear to the interviewer that he would not consider attractiveness in the hiring process at all.

The following are excerpts from the interview:

The one I thought was most attractive [NWl3], I wouldn't have hired. It's easy enough to say who's attractive when you're walking down the street but not when you're making a decision that's affecting someone else's career and you're going to be held responsible for their performance. Now the one [newswoman] in the gym -- I thought she was the most attractive -- had the best body [MDM G rated this NW as the most attractive, most relaxed and the second most youthful].

I feel like a male, chauvanist pig, rating them on attractiveness . . . [Everyone may make judgments of others' attractiveness] . . . but they don't write them down for the world to see.

This decision maker saw attractiveness as negatively correlated with self-confidence ($r = -.11, p > .05$), credibility ($r = -.23, p > .05$), Relaxed ($r = -.12, p > .05$), and fitting in with his station's style/image ($r = -.11, p > .05$).

The performance style constructs most strongly
correlated with the predictor of social desirability were Presence (having poise and carriage, \( r = .96 \)), credibility \( (r = .74) \), Believability \( (r = .98) \) and self-confidence \( (r = .64) \). It is interesting to note that this MDM did not see Credible as synonymous with Believable, but rather as a contrast to unauthoritative.
Media Decision Maker H

Charismatic Attractive Ideal

Performance Style

1 self-confident
5 relaxed
3 articulate

9 should hire
10 actually hire
8 ideal

95
68
84
92
72
72
79
67
6
7
2

Fig. 11. Media Decision Maker H -- Cluster Constellations. Charismatic Attractiveness is the Strongest Predictor of Hiring TV Newswomen.

This decision maker is similar to MDM E in that the construct accounting for the greatest amount of variance is number nine, The One I'd Personally Like to Hire. He is similar to MDM A and B in that the physical attractiveness of the applicant is more highly
correlated to his hiring decision than the attributed performance style constructs.

Attractiveness is perceived as being most closely related to charisma (r = .67). Charisma is the performance style criterion most closely related to the image of the ideal newswoman (r = .94) and thus the likelihood of actually being hired (r = .85).

Less strongly related to the inclination to personally hire is a performance style constellation consisting of self-confidence (r = .66), credibility (r = .56), articulateness (r = .53) and Relaxed (r = .56). The strongest predictor here is Charisma -- connected with attractiveness and youthfulness.

**Media Decision Maker I**

As you will recall from Chapter III, this MDM chose not to cooperate by refusing to rank the NWs according to each construct. The constructs of Intelligence/Stupidity and Enthusiasm/Boredom, Going Through the Motions were elicited, though the respondent refused to use the constructs to rank the stimulus newswomen. He did offer some comments such as:

The best newswomen are the ones who are fairly attractive, but not strikingly beautiful.
These women need cosmetic help and delivery help. There's a lot of potential.

It's important that the news talent seem happy to be doing their job.

and

[Newswomen] Nine and ten are the best . . . They have good voices . . . They attracted my attention.
Fig. 12. Media Decision Maker J -- Cluster Constellations. Lack of Dramatic Presentation is the Strongest Predictor of Hiring TV Newswomen.

This person's way of evaluating newswomen is similar to persons E and H in that their best predictor of who they will hire is their personal inclination to hire ($r = .59$). The only performance style criteria connected with this ideal however is avoidance of a
dramatic performance \( (r = .52) \). Totally disconnected with the hiring and evaluation process is articulation, credibility and self-confidence.

This would indicate that the provided constructs, in general, did not mean much to this MDM. However, this was the only MDM who felt that he could not provide more than one elicited construct. Though adequate time was available to complete the rest of the interview, he just could not see any other difference between the performances of the stimulus newswomen.

Youthful women are considered more attractive \( (r = .56) \) but this couplet is negatively correlated with credibility \( (r = -.42, p > .05) \). Credibility alone does not significantly correlate to any of the hiring constructs.
NOTES

CHAPTER IV


2 This method of analysis is fully described in: Louis L. McQuitty, "Elementary Linkage Analysis for Isolating Orthogonal and Oblique Types and Typal Relevancies," Educational and Psychological Measurement 17 2 (Summer 1957): 212-19.
The results of this exploratory study have furnished substantial initial evidence regarding the role of TV newswoman physical attractiveness in the TV news hiring process and the important broadcaster on-camera presentation qualities as perceived by TV news directors. It is perhaps appropriate, before discussing and interpreting the data, to outline the limitations of the study.

Limitations of the Study and Implications for Future Research

Ten media decision makers, from arbitrarily selected, major market cities were interviewed for this study. The TV news business is a very mobile one. Only two of the media decision makers interviewed were indigenous to the areas in which they currently work. It seems reasonable that construct relationship patterns exhibited by the tested decision makers, exist elsewhere in the country among others of the profession. However, this study does not (and can not)
claim generalizability beyond these cases. Yet we do know that these patterns exist among TV news directors who were interviewed.

Total participation of all major stations in each selected city, does make the study particularly useful in Columbus, Ohio and Baltimore, Maryland. There was no great difference in the grid relationships between the MDMs of the two cities. Future research may address the existence and prevalence of these construct relationships by replicating this study on a larger scale, using a national, representative sample.

The newswomen used as stimuli reporters were drawn from a national sample. However this sample was neither representative nor random. Researchers interested in this area might replicate this study, using a stratified random sample of stimuli newswomen, statistically representative of all market areas within the country.
The performance qualities presented as constructs were neither a total sample nor a random selection of all qualities discovered in pre-test interviewing. Yet the repertory grid technique does not necessitate a total or random selection of elements or constructs. Provided and elicited constructs represent an initial contribution of the study to the task of outlining the important parameters of TV news on-camera presentation.

Rather than creating artificial audition tapes to increase control of the audio visual signal, actual on-air newswomen were used in this study to increase validity. Nine of the ten respondents indicated that the general experience of viewing the clips was very close to their actual process of reviewing audition tapes. However using actual newswomen places further limitations upon the study in other ways.

Certain types of women found in ordinary life were obviously missing from the group of newswomen presented. For example, none of the women were obese or noticeably past middle age. I propose several possible explanations for the "missing types":

1. These types of women are not hired as OCPs.
2. These types of women never apply for jobs as OCPs.
3. These types of newswomen are active in the
field but are not perceived by their station managers as being good enough to be entered in a national contest.

4. These types of newswomen are active in the field but are used more often in voice-over reports and did not appear on camera in the programs entered in the contest, or

5. These types of women are active in the field but because the sample was not representative, they did not appear in the sample.

The data provide no implications for these "missing types." It may be significant that these types are missing, but the data do not address this possibility.

Additionally, all the data are based upon the MDMs' perceptions of the newswomen's performance and appearance within the clips presented. That is to say, the perceptions of the newswomen should not be seen as static or beyond manipulation. Under different conditions (of lighting, camera angles, setting, make-up, dress, etc.) these women may have been ranked differently on any or all of these constructs. The effect of these various influences upon these perceptions was not the subject of this study and may well be addressed individually in future research.
Three of the ten respondents addressed the issue that the evaluation of newswomen may differ on the local level versus the network level. Future research should explore this possibility. Six of the respondents indicated that their selection of an anchor would be different from their selection of a reporter. This study asked the respondents to consider their inclination for hiring the stimuli newswomen as reporters. Two of the MDMs indicated that for an anchoring position, they would need more information on the applicant than provided in the study. Two others indicated that none of the newswomen presented were good enough, in their opinion, to be selected for anchor positions. The influence of anchor versus reporter position would be a good area for future research.

The provided constructs seemed adequate and significant according to interview data and grid results. Yet pre-test interviewing, which contributed to the creation of these constructs, was neither random nor representative. Though the danger has been minimized (by methods described in Chapter III), there is still a chance that MDMs have differing definitions of the constructs. The data support that out of 110 possibilities, only once did a MDM see a construct as
unrelated to the evaluative process. Media decision makers agree that the provided constructs, by label, are salient. Yet individuals may, in some cases, mean different qualities while agreeing on the same label. Conversely, different labels elicited from different MDMs may represent the same quality (i.e.: "Simply Reciting Words," from MDM -- A, and "Go Through the Motions," or "Stilted" from MDM -- F).

The running commentary provided by the MDMs provides some basis for the researcher to comfortably equate some elicited constructs and assume shared meanings for others. This still entails researcher involvement and interpretation, subject to the hidden biases of even the most rigorous researcher. This problem is a reoccurring one in communication, psychology and any field in which we attempt to understand the meanings behind the words of others. However, it is worth mentioning. For as the respondent sample sizes increase, in future research, so will the danger of assuming respondents agree on the operational definitions of the terms we use.

The data provide some important implications for discrimination against those who do not fit the operationalized definition of beauty for the TV newswoman (by virtue of race, physical handicap, or
other unmanipulatable characteristics of physical appearance). However, this study does not directly address the issue of sex discrimination against TV newswomen. Some interpretations of the data may have implications regarding the role of the TV newswoman. However this study only used newswomen as stimuli.

The study does not address the possible similarities and contrasts between the qualities looked for in a TV newswoman and those sought in a TV newsman. A specific question might be: "Are TV newsmen subject to the same standards of attractiveness in the hiring process as are TV newswomen?" A replication of this study, using male TV newscasters, may provide some insight relating to this question.

Finally, the inaccessibility and time restrictions of TV news directors make them an extraordinarily difficult group to study. Inaccessibility and time restrictions of the MDM's prevented test-retest. Retesting would have provided greater evidence of reliability (in the traditional sense) of the study. It is a strength of this study that the researcher persuaded the MDMs to participate in an interview which lasted approximately an hour. When this study was discussed with the Director of Research for the Radio-Television News Directors' Association, he insisted
that I would not be able to obtain news directors' participation in the study because of the time requirements. His surveys, which require considerably less time and inconvenience, have a typical return rate of less than ten percent.

Interpretations

Given the limitations, the following interpretations were made of the data. This study sought to:

1. begin to answer the question -- "How does the correlation between the attractiveness of a TV newswoman and the media decision maker's inclination to hire her compare with the correlation between other journalistic performance qualities and the media decision maker's inclination to hire the TV newswoman?"

2. provide an initial formulation of a model of the operation of attractiveness within the hiring process of the TV newswoman,

3. provide a collection of performance style qualities appropriate for the TV journalist.

4. provide an interpretation of the combined data regarding the role of women in television news, and,

5. develop an operational definition of "beauty" for the TV newswoman.
In answer to the first question, these data support the hypothesis that perceived newswoman attractiveness is positively related to these MDMs' inclinations to hire her. Six of the nine grid matrices showed physical attractiveness as the strongest predictor for hiring TV newswomen. In the averaged grid, attractiveness was most closely related to the MDMs personal desire to hire. They saw the attractive newswomen as fitting in with their station's image/style. In the individual grids, attractiveness was more often linked with some other behavioral attribute of the physical attractiveness stereotype, such as being conversational or charismatic.

Some strong sociological evidence, as well as the opinions of some newswomen and commentators, would support the hypothesis that female youthfulness and attractiveness are positively correlated. Surprisingly, among the MDMs tested in this study, Youthfulness/Maturity does not appear to be a significant criteria for hiring TV newswomen. This may indicate that the relative youthfulness of a newswoman does not affect other's perception of her attractiveness. An alternate explanation may be that the sample of stimuli newswomen did not represent older women and thus concepts of "mature" regarding this
sample may maximize at women (approximately) 40 years of age.

Regarding the model of the operation of attractiveness within the hiring process of the TV newswoman, interview data suggest two mutually exclusive constructs under the superordinal construct of attractiveness. As would be expected, the levels of confidence for the Mean Attractiveness Rankings (MARs) are highest at the ends of the scale. Among the newswomen rated most attractive there is, statistically, no significant difference in their positioning. The details of the running commentary given by the MDMs while they completed the grid, show there may be two different types of attractive newswomen in this sample. Both are considered attractive but one type may be considered more appropriate for employment at these MDMs' stations.

These two types have been labeled by the researcher, from words used and suggested in the interviews, as the "Young Sexy Blond" and the "Mature Pretty Brunette." The women termed most attractive, most frequently, both had shoulder length blonde hair. Yet they were referred to, in what some might consider derogatory terms. Two of these referents were "Miss Sex" and "Kewpie Doll." One MDM perceived that these
two newswomen looked as if they were "doing a Playboy layout." The two dark haired women who were in the upper middle range of attractiveness rankings, were spoken of in glowing terms.

These findings may be interpreted to mean that the selected MDNs considered a "mature", "sophisticated" brunette a more appropriate image for the attractive TV newswoman, than the typical media image of the sexy blond. This does not explain the proliferation of blondes on network news. Perhaps the sexy blond stereotype is stronger on the national level, rather than at the local level. Or, possibly, the "right kind of blond" (a Barbara Walters, Diane Sawyer or a Jane Pauley "type") was not present in the sample of stimuli newswomen. Perhaps, local news is seen as more "down to earth," whereas national news meets a wider audience and thus uses the appeal of the mythical ideal of beauty.

The two different types of descriptors assigned by the MDNs to newswomen they consider to be attractive, suggests a revision of the model for the operation of the construing of physical attractiveness within the hiring process of the television newswoman (See Figure 13.). In the "Construction made" section of the model, another construction option should be included -- Sexy.
The Attractive option should be further described as the Demure Attractive. The data support that the newswoman construed as being demurely attractive, is more likely to be hired and is attributed with positive characteristics of TV reportage performance style (vector A). Those construed as unattractive may be attributed with good reportage performance but as inappropriate for the station's image. Thus the unattractive NW still would not be likely to be hired. Newswomen construed as sexy are attributed with poor reportage skills as well as being inappropriate to the station's image and thus also not be likely to be hired either (vector C).
Figure 12. Revised Model of the Operation of Performance Style Criteria in the Hiring of TV Newswomen
Newswoman thirteen (NW13) was rated as the most attractive overall, but she was the one referred to as "sexy." She was also rated as one of the least likely to be hired (ranked relatively low on all three hiring constructs). Newswoman six (NW6) was ranked as the third most attractive of the stimulus sample. Newswoman nine (NW9) was ranked as the second most attractive.

Both NW6 and NW9 ranked very high on all three of the hiring constructs.

One interpretation of these ranking differences is that the media decision makers (MDMs) of Baltimore and Columbus perceived sexy attractiveness as inappropriate for a TV newswoman. Research has shown that attractive women are seen as inappropriate for management jobs, positions of responsibility and authority (Cash, Gillen & Burns, 1977; Heilman & Saruwatari, 1979; Rosen & Judee, 1974; Shaffer & Johnson, 1980). Initially the data may seem to imply that these MDMs also perceive the role of TV newswomen as one of power and authority since the most attractive woman was not seen as very hireable.

However there is no significant statistical difference in the top four attractiveness rankings. The other three women who were seen as equally attractive, but of a different "type" of
attractiveness, were also seen as the most hirable. So though interview data indicate that these MDMs see a 
**sexy** woman as undesirable as a TV newscaster, the grid data indicate that attractive women of both types are more likely to be hired than unattractive newswomen. It may also be worth mentioning here that the newswoman ranked as the least attractive of all by most of the MDMs (NW8) was also ranked very low on all three hiring constructs.

An operationalized definition of beauty within the context of the TV newswoman, may consist of a demurely attractive woman who fits most of the typical qualities of the physical attractiveness stereotype (slender, caucasian features, but not blond) without appearing **sexually** attractive. With this in mind, the data may be interpreted to support the hypothesis that these MDMs perceive the role of TV newswomen as a "pink collar" or gender related, ornamental.

Many studies have found that newswomen in both the print and the electronic media are still more likely to be assigned "soft" news or "fluff" assignments (Flander, 1985; Gelfman, 1976; Kienzle, 1965; Lubin, 1971; Singleton and Cook; 1982). This study could be interpreted to support this theory, if one accepts the possibility that the conclusions of studies which have
found attractive women as unlikely to be hired for authoritative positions, may be extended to TV news. The reader may see Appendix A for a list of the story topics of the sixteen newswomen used in this study. The two women who were considered both very attractive and very hirable, presented stories on infant mortality and adjustment of the handicapped. These might be interpreted as soft news stories. Perhaps if the perception of the role of TV newswoman were changed, attractiveness of the TV newswoman might not be such an important factor in the hiring process.

The findings of this study may be interpreted as supporting the hypothesis that the attractiveness of a TV newswoman, as perceived from her audition tape, may be one of the most influential factors in the hiring decision. In actuality, MDMs view many audition tapes, even when they have no position available. If the MDM is impressed with an audition tape, a review of the resume, an interview and other investigation into the journalistic credentials of the candidate may follow.

In some cases, attractive newswomen, with poor reporting credentials have advanced more quickly than newswomen with more impressive credentials. Two cases in point are those of Kathleen Sullivan and Phyllis
George (both demure looking brunettes). With little reporting experience, Sullivan began anchoring, first at a local station and then at Cable News Network. In 1982 she became coanchor of ABC's "World News This Morning". She also coanchored the network's coverage of the 1984 summer Olympics. Reportedly her colleagues feel she has not "paid her dues."^2

Phyllis George is a former Miss America and a former first lady of Kentucky. With little experience, she costarred in "NFL Today" and has replaced Diane Sawyer on "CBS Morning News." Some broadcasters say CBS, "seemed less interested in finding a serious journalist than an attractive young clotheshorse..."^3

This is not to say that all attractive newswomen have received their kudos because of their looks alone. Former Junior Miss of America, Diane Sawyer, is considered "gorgeous" but also an excellent, "aggressive" reporter.^4

Perhaps an attractive, yet unqualified newswoman, who wins the initial approval of an MDM from her audition tape, may later be considered unsuitable when the information of her poor training is discovered. Yet her attractiveness may have won her the opportunity of consideration. That opportunity may not available to a less attractive (and possibly more qualified)
newswoman.

This study explored the hiring inclinations of ten MDMs from two cities in a hypothetical situation. A personal survey of the actual newswomen these MDMs have already hired, shows a fairly wide range of physical types. Few would fully fit the American physical attractiveness stereotype outlined in this dissertation. Some appear, at least to this researcher, to be unattractive. They are all young. Almost all appear younger than the newsmen working at the same stations. It may be interesting to see if the few who do fit the physical attractiveness stereotype, advance more quickly than those who do not.

TV newscasters at the stations in these two cities usually work at the pleasure of the management, without a written contract. There is no general law which prohibits private employers from discharging employees without good cause. One personnel manager in Columbus told me that in order to avoid possible legal problems, their station is careful not to even enter into any conversation which may be construed as a verbal contract. They have no publically established hiring policy outside of a standard Equal Employment Opportunity statement followed by the FCC. This EEOC statement covers discrimination on the basis of age,
sex, race, religion or national origin.

This study does not support the hypothesis that older TV newswomen are seen as less hirable than younger newswomen. EEOC does not cover discrimination on the basis of attractiveness, an area of great concern to TV newswomen. Dr. Benoy Joseph predicts a day when organizations, such as Uglies Unlimited, will pressure the federal government to include discrimination on the grounds of physical attractiveness in their Equal Opportunity policies. This day may be a long way off, if indeed it ever arrives.

If standards of physical attractiveness are less important when hiring TV newsmen than it has been show to be when hiring TV newswomen, women reporters are being discriminated against on the grounds of sex. Application of the American physical attractiveness stereotype as a hiring criteria for TV newswomen, may violate EEO policies on the basis of race and national origin.
NOTES

CHAPTER V

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY

In recent years the frequency of television news broadcasts has drastically increased. We now have "newsbreaks" broadcast throughout the day. Most local stations have increased the length of their local evening news broadcasts from half an hour to one full hour. Is this prolific source of public information being provided by well trained and educated, competent journalists? Or, are TV journalists being selected according to their attractiveness, an entertainment, rather than a journalistic value?

The infamous Christine Craft case highlights the possible legal ramifications of this emphasis upon cosmetic qualities in broadcast journalism. Ms. Craft claimed that she was hired as a journalist but was forced to try to be a beauty queen and was thus defrauded (Henry, 1983). The primary concern of this dissertation was the
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relationship between the perceived attractiveness of a TV newswoman and the inclination of a media decision maker (MDM) to hire her.

The main question asked was: "How does the correlation between the attractiveness of a TV newswoman and the media decision maker's inclination to hire her compare with the correlation between other journalistic performance qualities and the media decision maker's inclination to hire the TV newswoman? In addition to some relevant repertory grid findings with respect to this question, the following contributions were also offered:

A. an initial formulation of a model of the operation of attractiveness within the hiring process of the TV newswoman,

B. a collection of performance style qualities appropriate for the TV journalist,

C. an interpretation of the combined data regarding the role of women in society and the role of women in television, and

D. an operational definition of "beauty" for the TV newswoman.

Beauty and attractiveness are both spoken of in this study as physical beauty and physical attractiveness. The use of these terms does not refer
to the intrinsic and intangible elements which may be associated with each of these terms.

**Attractiveness Stereotypes for Women in Society, Television and TV News**

I hypothesize that a great deal of the controversy surrounding the emphasis on the cosmetic rather than journalistic qualities of TV newswomen is an extension of the pressure society has historically placed upon women to conform to a physical attractiveness stereotype. Dramatic television roles and the role of the TV newswoman have grown out of this social tradition.

In our society, both men and women are trained to judge women according to how well they compare to our physical attractiveness stereotype (Pogrebin, 1983; Brownmiller, 1984; Staples, 1982; and Rippey, 1982). Though we like to believe that everyone has his own personal beauty and standards, a rather narrow standard of physical attractiveness does exist within our society (Knapp, 1972; Iliffe, 1960; Staples, 1981; Glibert, Deutsch & Strahan, 1978; Martin, 1964; Strothers 1983; Rippey, 1982). Western man's general ideal of feminine attractiveness has been that of a young, slender, blonde, blue eyed woman (Liggett, 1974;
Good-Looking People's Network, 1983; Smart-Grosvenor, 1985; Newmark, 1985). For a brief period during the 1960's, non-European physical characteristics were extolled as attractive. However, some sociologists and fashion executives claim that rather than really breaking the rigid American standards of beauty, the 60's acted as a fad which has since faded (Banner, 1983; Martin 1964; Staples, 1981; Powlis, 1982).

One of the central stereotypic behaviors expected of women has been to attract men (Pogrebin, 1983; Staples, 1981; Rippey, 1982; Brownmiller, 1984). This and other stereotypic feminine behaviors have been translated into two acceptable female gender related roles in society. These two roles are those of housewife/mother and bunny/seductress (Clifton, McGrath & Wick 1976; Banner, 1984). In general, television roles for women have paralleled these societal stereotypes, especially in TV advertising (Clifton, McGrath & Wick 1976; Knapp, 1972; Ball, 1985; Mantabune, 1982; Window Dressing on the Set, 1977; Banner, 1984; Mayer, 1985).

Most of the visible network TV newswomen are close to or epitomize the Western physical attractiveness stereotype (Flander, 1985; Mayer, 1985; TV Gender Gap, 1984; Gelfman, 1976). The question rises: Where these
newswomen hired because they fit the physical attractiveness stereotype? If the affirmative is true, this may indicate that the role of the newswoman has been developed as a "pink collar" or gender related job. This is clearly distinguishable from the role of newsman which carries authority and at least the image of power. The "hard news" stories, typically covered by male newscasters, are journalistically more valuable than the "soft news" or "fluff" stories typically covered by female newscasters (Singleton & Cook, 1982).

Many studies looking at the relationship between applicant attractiveness and organizational hiring decisions have found that attractive applicants, both male and female, have a better chance of being hired over equally qualified unattractive applicants (Berscheid & Walster, 1972; Dipboye, Fromkin and Wiback 1975; Good-Looking People's Network, 1983; Rippey, 1982). However, for positions of authority and typically male staffed positions, unattractive women are actually preferred (Cash, Gillen & Burns, 1977; Columbus Citizen-Journal, 1984; Heilman, & Saruwatari, 1979; Rosen & Judee, 1974).

The media decision makers (MDMs) may view the role of newswoman as feminine and gender related, different from the masculine journalistic role of newsman.
Within this context, MDMs may see attractive newswomen as the best newswomen. It is upon this hypothesis, that my initial model was based. The assumption was made that news directors (MDMs) act in a manner similar to personnel decision makers in other organizational settings. Basically the model (see Figure 1., page 20) provides that if the MDM is selecting a TV newswoman for what he perceives to be a feminine, ornamental job, he would be inclined to hire the newswoman he construes as attractive. Under these conditions, he would be less inclined to hire the newswoman he construes as unattractive.

Of course the actual decision to hire would include many other factors. These factors include: who has the final hiring authority, the quality of subsequent personal interviews, how much pay the applicant would demand, etc. Therefore the study looks at the inclination to hire on the grounds of the perceived competence of a candidate from an audition tape.

Methodology

Stimuli samples of actual TV newswomen from programs which had been entered in a 1983 national contest were used. Of 135 news shows, 16 different newswomen reported on-camera. These 16 programs were
edited, selecting the portions of the program where the women appeared on-camera. For a list of all the clips see Appendix A. The clips were randomly assigned order and then combined into a cumulative series of clips. The series ran approximately 16:09. Photographs of each newswoman were taken from the television screen and mounted in 2 1/2" X 3" lucite frames.

Nine news directors and one station manager were used as respondents. This represented total participation of all major stations in Columbus, Ohio and Baltimore, Maryland. In all cases the interviews were held, at the request of the respondent, at the station of their employ. Nine of the ten respondents were male. All interviews were conducted by the same interviewer. The interviewer had considerable experience in conducting both structured and unstructured interviews.

The MDMs viewed the videotape, taking notes on each performance. After viewing the tape, using the framed photos as reminders they ranked the 16 newswomen according to 11 provided constructs and two elicited constructs. MDMs were asked to provide a running commentary as they ranked the On-Camera Presenters (OCPs). After the MDMs finished ranking the OCPs, they were asked for additional remarks regarding the hiring
process and the audition tapes they had seen in the last year.

The repertory grid technique was used. A repertory grid is obtained when a person (in this study, the media decision maker) compares and ranks a set of "elements" (here, newswomen) in terms of an appropriate set of "constructs" (here, performance qualities and appearances), using a consistent procedure throughout (Watson, 1970). The provided constructs (see pages 38-9) were developed from pretest interviews and a literature search. Informal pre-test interviews of one TV newswoman, one former TV newswoman, one news director and four university professors in the media field were conducted. The purpose of the pre-test interviews was to develop constructs that would better represent a common vocabulary among the respondents.

Grid responses were transposed to fit the Data Analysis Form (see Appendix B). These data were then analyzed using a repertory grid computer analysis program designed by Dr. Peter Higginbotham and Daniel Bannister of the University of Leeds. Construct correlation matrices and scatter plots from this analysis were used to construct "Cluster Constellations." The constructs accounting for the
most variance in the matrix is accepted as the first axis of a graph, or the first constellation. The second axis, or constellation, is the construct with the next highest total variance, which is not significantly related to the construct chosen as the first axis. The constructs most closely related to each axis, is said to cluster in that constellation. "This procedure is termed the Anchor method because the 'factors' are anchored into the specific constructs used as axes (Bannister & Mair, 1968). Mean attractiveness rankings and their probability levels of differences were derived from the information on the Data Analysis Form. Interview data and information from the notesheets were separated by referents of newswomen (by number) and content subject (i.e.: clothing, make-up, training, critique of study, labels given to newswomen, elicited constructs, ideal newscasters presently on air, etc.). These data were indexed by both the person who made the remark (MDM A through MDM J), as well as the newswoman to whom he referred (if any).

Results

An average of all ten grids (see page 47) shows a major constellation of actually hiring those newswomen who are personally preferred by the media decision
makers \( (r=.92) \). Appropriateness of the stimulus person to the MDMs' own station is closely connected to his image of the ideal newswoman \( (r=.79) \). There is a positive, though not overly robust, correlation between attractiveness and the probability of hiring \( (r=.57 - .64) \). These MDMs see attractive newswomen as fitting in with their stations' style and image \( (r=.56) \). The unique performance style criteria (or elicited constructs, see page 52) of the decision makers also correlate with the perceived attractiveness of the applicant \( (r=.56) \). When the grids were averaged, Youthfulness/maturity was not found to be strongly connected with the hiring process. This construct was an important factor in the hiring process for four individual MDMs.

Interview data corroborates the extremes of the mean attractiveness rankings (MARs) for each newswoman across all the MDMs (see Appendix C). On the average, newswoman number 13 (NW13) was considered the most attractive \( (MAR=3.8) \). Newswoman number 13 was referred to as the "most attractive," "has the best body," "the most attractive -- the most youthful," "Miss Sexy," "has good presence," "good appearance." She was also criticized for being "too casual," "fakey," doing "bad acting."
Remarks from the MDMs would also support the other most highly ranked (as attractive) TV newswomen. Newswoman number ten, NW9 and NW6 were also ranked as highly attractive, but were never referred to, by any of the MDMs, as sexy or alluring. Newswoman number six was referred to as a "good communicator," "most at ease," "most in control," "wants to be accepted," "my favorite," "natural," "gives a sense of intelligence and authority." Newswoman number nine was called "overdressed," "sophisticated," "the actress type," "Nancy Reagan type," "too formal," "had a good voice," "most at ease," and "most in control." Factors most often mentioned as affecting appearance, in order of frequency, were: clothing, hairstyle, makeup (or lack thereof), camera angle and lighting.

Limitations of the Study

The MDMs interviewed for this study are an arbitrary sample, neither randomly picked nor representative. The findings can not be generalized past the population of the two cities (Baltimore, Maryland and Columbus, Ohio). However, because TV news is such a mobile field, it is reasonable to assume that decision making patterns found among this group may be found elsewhere. We do know that these patterns exist as expressed by these respondents.
The newswomen used as stimuli were drawn from a national sample but this sample was neither random nor representative. Certain types of women found in ordinary life were obviously missing from the group of newswomen used in this study. For example, none of the women were obese or noticeably past middle age. It may be significant that these types are missing, but the data do not address this possibility.

Interpretations

Given the limitations of the study, the following interpretations were made of the data.

This data supports the hypothesis that perceived newswoman attractiveness is positively related to these MDMs' inclination to hire her. Some strong sociological evidence, as well as the opinions of some newswomen and commentators would support the hypothesis that female youthfulness and attractiveness are positively correlated. Surprisingly, Youthfulness/Maturity does not appear as a significant criterion for hiring TV newswomen. This may indicate that the relative youthfulness of a newswoman does not affect other's perception of her attractiveness. An alternate explanation may be that the sample of stimuli newswomen did not represent older women. Thus concepts
of "mature", regarding this sample, may maximize at (approximately) 40 years of age.

The details of the running commentary given by MDMs while they completed the grid, shows there may be two different types of attractive newswomen in this sample. These two types have been labeled by the researcher, from words used and suggested in the interviews, as "Young Sexy Blond" and the "Mature Pretty Brunette."

The two different types of descriptors, assigned by the MDMs to newswomen they consider to be attractive, suggest a revision of the model for the operation of the construing of physical attractiveness within the hiring process of the television newswoman (See Figure 13.). In the "Construction Made" section of the model, another construction option should be included -- Sexy. The Attractive option should be further described as the Demure Attractive. The data support that the newswomen construed as being demurely attractive, are more likely to be hired and are attributed with positive characteristics of TV reportage performance style (vector A). Those construed as unattractive are considered inappropriate for the station's image and thus would not be likely to be hired. Newswomen construed as sexy are attributed
with poor reportage skills, as well as being inappropriate to the station's image. Therefore, according to interview data, the sexy newswomen are not likely to be hired either (vector C).

Newswoman thirteen was rated as the most attractive overall, but she was the one referred to as "sexy." She was also rated, overall, as one of the least likely to be hired (ranked relatively low on all three hiring constructs). Newswoman six was ranked as the third most attractive of the stimulus sample. Newswoman nine was ranked as the second most attractive newswoman. Both NW6 and NW9 ranked very high on all three of the hiring constructs.

One interpretation of these ranking differences is that MDMs of Baltimore and Columbus perceived sexy attractiveness as inappropriate for a TV newswoman. Research has shown that attractive women are seen as inappropriate for management jobs, positions of responsibility and authority. Initially the data may seem to imply that these MDMs also perceive the role of TV newswomen as one of power and authority since the most attractive woman was not seen as very hirable.

However, there is no statistically significant difference in the top four attractiveness rankings. The other three women who were seen as equally
attractive, but of a different "type" of attractiveness, were also seen as the most hirable. So though interview data indicate that these MDMS see a sexy woman as undesirable as a TV newscaster, the grid data indicate that attractive women (perhaps attractive in a different, more demure manner) are the most desirable to hire. It may also be worth mentioning that the newswoman ranked as the least attractive of all by most of the MDMS (NW8) was also ranked very low on all three hiring constructs.

Many studies have found that newswomen, in both the print and the electronic media, are still more likely to be assigned "soft" news or "fluff" assignments (Flander, 1985; Gelfman, 1976; Kienzel, 1965; Lubin, 1971; Singleton & Cook, 1982). This indicates that the role of the newswoman is a gender related, or pink collar job. This study could be interpreted to support this theory, if one accepts the possibility that the conclusions of studies which have found attractive women as unlikely to be hired for authoritative positions, may be extended to TV news.

The findings of this study may be interpreted as supporting the hypothesis that the attractiveness of a TV newswoman, as perceived from her audition tape, may be one of the most influential factors in influencing
the hiring decision. In actuality, MDMs view many audition tapes, even when they have no position available. If the MDM is impressed with the audition tape, a review of the resume, an interview and other investigation into the *journalistic credentials* of the candidate may follow. Perhaps an attractive, yet unqualified newswoman, who wins the initial approval of an MDM, may later be considered unsuitable. Yet her attractiveness may have won her the opportunity of consideration. That opportunity may not be available to a less attractive (and possibly more qualified) newswoman.
## APPENDIX A

### DESCRIPTIONS

**NEWSWOMEN VIDEO CLIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAG</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>STORYLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW1</td>
<td>1:32</td>
<td>casino gambling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW2</td>
<td>0:49</td>
<td>state tax and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW3</td>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>children of working mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW4</td>
<td>0:40</td>
<td>lives of working mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW5</td>
<td>0:35</td>
<td>tourist attractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW6</td>
<td>0:52</td>
<td>infant mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW7</td>
<td>0:36</td>
<td>farmers' problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW8</td>
<td>1:29</td>
<td>resort development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW9</td>
<td>1:09</td>
<td>adjustment of the handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW10</td>
<td>0:51</td>
<td>herpes disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW11</td>
<td>1:09</td>
<td>child sexual abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW12</td>
<td>1:06</td>
<td>mentally ill vagrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW13</td>
<td>0:23</td>
<td>exercise and alcoholism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW14</td>
<td>0:24</td>
<td>alcoholic doctors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW15</td>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>governor's budget &amp; policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW16</td>
<td>0:22</td>
<td>college tuition raise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DESCRIPTIONS

SOME DESCRIPTORS OF PHYSICAL APPEARANCE OF STIMULUS

NEWSWOMEN

These are observations of the researcher and are provided for the readers information since the actual videotapes will be unavailable to most and the color photos taken from the CRT do not reproduce well. It is not a panel judged or derived description and makes no such claims.

ABBREVIATIONS:

BL = black, W = white, A = asian, EC = eye color, BR = brown, BU = blue, HC = hair color, S = hair style, MD = mode of dress, JW = jewelry, MU = makeup, MAR = mean attractiveness rank, O = other

NW1  
Race: BL  
EC: BR  
HC: BR  
S: afro, approximately 3"  
MD: BU suit jacket, W blouse, short chinese collar, buttoned at throat  
JW: 1/2" gold hoop earrings  
MU: natural look, mocha coral lipstick, touch of brown eye shadow  
MAR: 7.8

NW2  
Race: W  
EC: BU  
HC: blonde  
S: frizzy, shoulder length, parted on right side, layered  
MD: beige jacket with lapels, white blouse open at neck  
JW: single gold chain necklace  
MU: lipstick, medium red  
MAR: 10.7
NW3
Race: W  EC: BR
HC: BL
S: short, straight, parted on left side, blow-dried away from face at sides, bangs sweeping to her right over forehead
MD: red and W polk-a-dot blouse with bow at neck, navy BU knit vest
JW: none
MU: none
MAR: 6.7

NW4
Race: W  EC: BU
HC: blonde
S: shoulder length, full, waves and body curls
MD: dark blue dress, white small pointed collar, red tie bow under collar
JW: pearl stud earrings
MU: bright red lipstick, highly arched brows, lightly applied brown/grey eye shadow
MAR: 7.4

NW5
Race: A
EC: BR
HC: BL
S: straight, 3" below shoulders
MD: W shirt with a 2" chinese collar
JW: none
MU: none
MAR: 10.2

NW6
Race: W
EC: BR
HC: short, curly
MD: brown suit jacket and pants, later white surgical gown
JW: stud earrings (three tiny pearls, forming a triangle)
MU: red lipstick, brown eyeshadow, eyeliner
MAR: 5.88
NW7
Race: W
EC: BR
HC: BR
S: long (7" below shoulders), falls front of shoulders, curled on end, barretted back on each side above ears
MD: heavy black coat, burgundy turtle neck sweater
JW: none
MU: none
MAR: 10.1

NW8
Race: W
EC: 0 (hazel)
HC: light BR
S: short, longer at back of neck, layered
MD: BL pants, silver clasped BL belt, medium BU shirt (which fits too tightly and thus pulls where buttoned), top 3 buttons open. W turtle neck under shirt
JW: none
MU: none
MAR: 13.8

NW9
Race: W
EC: BR
HC: BL
S: short, curled, semi-part on right hand side
MD: burgundy jacket, white blouse with 2" ruffle collar
JW: pearl stud earrings
MU: red lipstick, contour brown/grey shadow, eyeliner
MAR: 4.7

NW10
Race: BL
EC: BR
HC: dark BR
S: short at back of neck, longer on top (angled up away from neck), straight on top, curled on sides
MD: green, shiny silk dress
JW: 10" string of pearls, pearl button earrings (approx. 1/2" diameter)
MU: red lipstick, brown shadow, straight, flat, thin brows, brown lines
MAR: 7.7
NW11
Race: W
EC: BR
hc: dark BR
S: shoulder length, layered, blow dried, parted on right side
MD: red suit jacket with puffed sleeves, white tie blouse, later wears a plaid shirt and jeans
JW: none
MU: none
MAR: 8.2

NW12
Race: W
EC: BR
HC: reddish BR
S: short, long bangs, short on side, blow dried
MD: white coat, grey sweater, white blouse with buttoned collar
JW: pearl stud earrings
MU: none
MAR: 8.6

NW13
Race: W
EC: BU
HC: blonde
S: shoulder length, body wave
MD: belted, form-fitting sweat shirt, arms of rose colored sweater tied loosely around neck
JW: 1/4" gold chain
MU: rose lipstick, blue eyeshadow, liner
MAR: 3.8

NW14
Race: W
EC: BU
HC: blonde
S: short, straight, body wave bangs, parted on right hand side
MD: black jacket, white blouse w/high collar
JW: pearl stud earrings
MU: rose lipstick, brow liner (thinly arched)
NW15
Race: W
EC: BR HC: BL
S: very short on sides and back, longer on top and waved over forehead
MD: purple dress
JW: large purple 12" necklace, gold spiral leaf dangle earrings
MU: heavy, purplish-red lipstick, blue shadow, eyeliner, white highlight near brows, dark arched brows shaped from teardrop form out to points
MAR: 11.6

NW16
Race: BL
EC: BR HC: BR
S: 2" from shoulders, parted on left side, body curled
MD: medium BU dress with round neck, white turtle neck sweater
JW: 1/4" wide gold necklace, gold 1" hoop earrings
MU: none
MAR: 7.3
APPENDIX B

FORMS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Rankings of Newsmen</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lacks Self-Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credible</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inarticulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unattractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed/Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staid/Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits in with my station's style/image</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate for my station's style/image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Ideal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Least Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The one I'd personally like to hire</td>
<td></td>
<td>The one I'd personally least like to hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The one we would in actuality likely hire</td>
<td></td>
<td>The one we would in actuality not be likely to hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kind of person we should hire</td>
<td></td>
<td>The kind of person we should not hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEMS</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>self-confident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>lacks self-confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>credible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>not credible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>articulate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>inarticulate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>unattractive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>informal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>fits in with my station's stl/image</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>inappropriate for my station's stl/image</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>youthful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>mature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>most ideal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>least ideal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>the one I'd personally like to hire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>the one I'd least like to hire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>the one we would in fact hire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>the one we would in fact not hire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>the kind of person we should hire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>the kind of person we should not hire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW1 casino gambling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW2 state tax &amp; budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW3 children of working mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW4 lives of working mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW5 island Guam attractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW6 infant mortality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW7 farmers problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW8 resort development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW9</td>
<td>Adjustment of the handicapped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW10</td>
<td>Herpes disease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW11</td>
<td>Child sexual abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW12</td>
<td>Mentally ill vagrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW13</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; alcoholism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW14</td>
<td>Alcoholic doctors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW15</td>
<td>Governor's budget &amp; policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW16</td>
<td>College tuition raise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 1964

2084 Neil Ave.  o 15
Columbus, Ohio 43210

<name>
<title>
<address>

Dear <name>:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our research project regarding the performance styles and on-camera presentation of TV newscasters. Your responses and comments will be used for research purposes only. Your confidentiality is assured. Your responses will not be identified by either your name or your station.

The interview consists of viewing clips of 16 different newswomen chosen from a national sample. You will be asked to rank these TV journalists according to certain given criterion, as well as according to a few criterion you will suggest. We would also like you to comment on what you feel is needed to improve on-camera journalistic presentation and the general hiring process your station uses. The interview should last approximately 45 minutes.

Your professional judgement and expertise will aid us in our efforts to produce research that will benefit Communication professionals in the field as well as the academicians who seek to train future practitioners.

I look forward to meeting with you on <date>, at <time>.

Sincerely,

Evette Strothers
**APPENDIX C**

**CONSTRUCT ANALYSES**

**CONSTRUCT ANALYSIS:**
AVERAGED FOR 10 GRIDS.
TOP-RIGHT IS CORRELATION MATRIX,
DIAGONAL IS SUMMED ABS. RELATIONSHIPS
BOTTOM-LEFT IS INDIV. RELATIONSHIPS.
2-TAIL $P<.05$, $\alpha=.01$, $NN=DF<1$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Averaged for Ten Grids

Constructs in order of contribution to variance:

9 8 10 11 6 12 13 2 1 3 4 5 7

Component 1 - Principal construct is No. 9
Included in order of importance are constructs: 8 10 11 6 12 13 2 1 3 4

Component 2 - Principal construct is No. 5
Included in order of importance are constructs: 1

Component 3 - Principal construct is No. 7
No related constructs

Construct 5 horizontal, 9 vertical

| 10 9 | 11 |
| 13 | 12 |
| 4 2 | 1 |
| 1 7 |

MDM-A

Construct analysis:
Top-right is correlation matrix.
Diagonal is summed abs. relationships
Bottom-left is indiv. relationships.
2-tail P: *=.05, **=.01, N=DF+1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MDM — A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.65XX</td>
<td>.66XX</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.56X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.51X</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.55X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.61X</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.77XX</td>
<td>.79XX</td>
<td>.79XX</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.52X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.5X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.65XX</td>
<td>.58X</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.68X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.59X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.06XX</td>
<td>.06XX</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33X</td>
<td>.68XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.99XX</td>
<td>.5X</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.59X</td>
<td>.53X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constructs in order of contribution to variance:
8 12 10 9 1 6 13 5 2 4 7 3 11

**Component 1** — Principal construct is No. 8
Included in order of importance are constructs: 12 10 9 1 6 13 2 4

**Component 2** — Principal construct is No. 5
Included in order of importance are constructs: 12 1 6 2 3

**Component 3** — Principal construct is No. 7
Included in order of importance are constructs: 1 6 13 3

**Component 4** — Principal construct is No. 11
Included in order of importance are constructs: 9

Construct 5 Horizontal, 8 Vertical

```
1
1
10 1 9
1
12
1 4
13 1
6 2
11 3
7
```
MDM—B

Top-right is Correlation Matrix.
Diagonal is summed abs. relationships.
Bottom-left is indiv. relationships.
2-Tail P: x=5%, xX=1%, N=n-DF<1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.58X</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.74XX</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.68XX</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.58X</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.72XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.62X</td>
<td>.64X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.55X</td>
<td>.55X</td>
<td>.55X</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td>.55X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.71XX</td>
<td>.82XX</td>
<td>.82XX</td>
<td>.82XX</td>
<td>.8XX</td>
<td>.82XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.8XX</td>
<td>.8XX</td>
<td>.8XX</td>
<td>.79XX</td>
<td>.8XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.99XX</td>
<td>.9X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.99XX</td>
<td>.9X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.99XX</td>
<td>.9X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.99XX</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.99XX</td>
<td>.9X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.99XX</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.9X</td>
<td>.99XX</td>
<td>.9X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MDM—B

CONSTRUCTS IN ORDER OF CONTRIBUTION TO VARIANCE:
13 11 10 9 8 12 4 6 2 3 5 1 7

COMPONENT 1 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 13
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 11 10 9 8 12 4 6

COMPONENT 2 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 5
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 3 1

COMPONENT 3 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 7
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 4.

CONSTRUCT 5 HORIZONTAL, 13 VERTICAL

MDM—C

TOP-RIGHT IS CORRELATION MATRIX.
DIAGONAL IS SUMMED ABS. RELATIONSHIPS
BOTTOM-LEFT IS INDIV. RELATIONSHIPS.
2-TAIL P: XX=5%, XI=1%, N=DF<1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.76XX</td>
<td>.68XX</td>
<td>.87XX</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.92XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.59X</td>
<td>.64XX</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.86XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.73XX</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.61X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.78XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.74X</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.56X</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.63X</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.61X</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.85X</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.79X</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3X</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.57X</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.56X</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.51X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.82X</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.71X</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.62X</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.62X</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.51X</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.63X</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.69X</td>
<td>.52X</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.56X</td>
<td>.51X</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.5X</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTS IN ORDER OF CONTRIBUTION TO VARIANCE:
6 2 1 11 4 9 7 10 3 12 8 5 13

COMPONENT 1 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 6
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 2 1 11 4 9 7 3

COMPONENT 2 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 10
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 11 7 12 8 5

COMPONENT 3 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 13
NO RELATED CONSTRUCTS

CONSTRUCT 10 HORIZONTAL, 6 VERTICAL

| 1 |
| 2 |
| 4 711 |
| 9 |
| 3 |
| 12 5 8 |

-----------------------------------------------
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| 1 |
| 1 |
| 1 |
| 1 |
| 1 |
**MDM-D**

**TOP-RIGHT IS CORRELATION MATRIX.**
**DIAGONAL IS SUMMED ABS. RELATIONSHIPS.**
**BOTTOM-LEFT IS INDIV. RELATIONSHIPS.**

2-Tail P: *=5%, **=1%, N=DF+1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.79XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.76XX</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.56X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.84XX</td>
<td>.51X</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.72XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.71XX</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.62X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td>.58X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.97XX</td>
<td>.76XX</td>
<td>.66XX</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td>.52X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.66XX</td>
<td>.79XX</td>
<td>.69XX</td>
<td>.58X</td>
<td>.66XX</td>
<td>.54X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.85XX</td>
<td>.77XX</td>
<td>.66XX</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td>.58X</td>
<td>.51X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.6XX</td>
<td>.75XX</td>
<td>.73XX</td>
<td>.64XX</td>
<td>.65XX</td>
<td>.58X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.53X</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.69XX</td>
<td>.9XX</td>
<td>.66XX</td>
<td>.64XX</td>
<td>.69XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.62X</td>
<td>-.5X</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.94XX</td>
<td>.89XX</td>
<td>.89XX</td>
<td>.74XX</td>
<td>.79XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.91XX</td>
<td>.92XX</td>
<td>.88XX</td>
<td>.74XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.91XX</td>
<td>.75XX</td>
<td>.71XX</td>
<td>.71XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.79XX</td>
<td>.8XX</td>
<td>.7XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MDM — D
CONSTRUCTS IN ORDER OF CONTRIBUTION TO VARIANCE:
8 9 11 6 10 3 2 1 13 12 4 7 5

COMPONENT 1 — PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 8
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 9 11 6 10 3 2 1 13 12 4 7 5

MDM — E
CONSTRUCT ANALYSIS:
TOP-RIGHT IS CORRELATION MATRIX.
DIAGONAL IS SUMMED ABS. RELATIONSHIPS
BOTTOM-LEFT IS INDIV. RELATIONSHIPS.
2-TAIL P: X=.05, X=.01, N=DF+1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.74X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.49X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.76X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.75X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.49X</td>
<td>.76X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.63X</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.49X</td>
<td>.5X</td>
<td>.61X</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.92X</td>
<td>.86X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.5X</td>
<td>.56X</td>
<td>.56X</td>
<td>.61X</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.93X</td>
<td>.7X</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.84X</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.53X</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.56X</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MDM – E

CONSTRUCTS IN ORDER OF CONTRIBUTION TO VARIANCE:
9 6 8 10 3 2 11 7 12 1 4 5 13

COMPONENT 1 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 9
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 6 8 10 2 11 7 12 4

COMPONENT 2 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 3
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 6 8 2 1

COMPONENT 3 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 5
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 1

COMPONENT 4 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 13
NO RELATED CONSTRUCTS

CONSTRUCT 3 HORIZONTAL, 9 VERTICAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 10 6 11 7 14 12 2 13 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MDM – F

TOP-RIGHT IS CORRELATION MATRIX,
DIAGONAL IS SUMMED ABS. RELATIONSHIPS
BOTTOM-LEFT IS INDIV. RELATIONSHIPS.
2-TAIL P: *=5%, **=1%, NEWDF(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86XX</td>
<td>0.67XX</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.63XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.76XX</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.54X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.7X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7XX</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Constructs in Order of Contribution to Variance:

11 10 9 8 6 12 1 3 13 2 5 4 7

**Component 1 - Principal Construct is No. 11**

Included in order of importance are constructs: 10 9 8 6 12 1 3 13 2

**Component 2 - Principal Construct is No. 5**

Included in order of importance are constructs: 12 4

**Component 3 - Principal Construct is No. 7**

No related constructs

**Construct 5 Horizontal, 11 Vertical**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.59X</td>
<td>.59X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.51X</td>
<td>.51X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
<td>.66X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### MDM - F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO.</th>
<th>INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10 9 8 6 12 1 3 13 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No related constructs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MDM — G

TOPO-RIGHT IS CORRELATION MATRIX. 
DIAGONAL IS SUMMED ASS. RELATIONSHIPS  
BOTTOM-LEFT IS INDIV. RELATIONSHIPS.  
2-TAIL P: X=5%, X=1%, N=DF<1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.64X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.54X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.65X</td>
<td>.79X</td>
<td>.74X</td>
<td>.74X</td>
<td>.74X</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.71X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>.8X</td>
<td>.8X</td>
<td>.8X</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.64X</td>
<td>-.81X</td>
<td>-.85X</td>
<td>-.85X</td>
<td>-.85X</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>-.84X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.62X</td>
<td>.79X</td>
<td>.7X</td>
<td>.7X</td>
<td>.7X</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.67X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.75X</td>
<td>-.66X</td>
<td>-.66X</td>
<td>-.66X</td>
<td>-.69X</td>
<td>-.64X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.92X</td>
<td>.92X</td>
<td>.92X</td>
<td>.95X</td>
<td>.94X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.92X</td>
<td>.92X</td>
<td>.92X</td>
<td>.95X</td>
<td>.94X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.98X</td>
<td>.98X</td>
<td>.96X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.98X</td>
<td>.98X</td>
<td>.96X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.98X</td>
<td>.96X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSTRUCTS IN ORDER OF CONTRIBUTION TO VARIANCE:
11 10 9 12 13 8 5 2 6 3 7 1 4

COMPONENT 1 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 11
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 10 9 12 13 8 5 2 6 3 7 1 4

COMPONENT 2 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 4
NO RELATED CONSTRUCTS

CONSTRUCT 4 HORIZONTAL, 11 VERTICAL
131210 9
1 8
1 3
2 1
6 1 1
1 1 1

---------------------------------------------
1
1 7
1
5 1
1
MDM — H

**TOP-RIGHT IS CORRELATION MATRIX.**
**DIAGONAL IS SUMMED ABS. RELATIONSHIPS**
**BOTTOM-LEFT IS INDIV. RELATIONSHIPS.**
2-TAIL P: \( \alpha=5\%; \ \alpha=1\% \); \( N=DF+1 \)

**CONSTRUCT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72XX</td>
<td>.63XX</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.78XX</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.69XX</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.64XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.66XX</td>
<td>.51X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTRUCT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.59X</td>
<td>.66XX</td>
<td>.64XX</td>
<td>.59X</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.53X</td>
<td>.56X</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td>.71XX</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.54X</td>
<td>.53X</td>
<td>.55X</td>
<td>.58X</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.56X</td>
<td>.61X</td>
<td>.61X</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.62X</td>
<td>.67XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.56X</td>
<td>.56X</td>
<td>.39X</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.79XX</td>
<td>.84XX</td>
<td>.83XX</td>
<td>.82XX</td>
<td>.93XX</td>
<td>.78XX</td>
<td>.87XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.86XX</td>
<td>.87XX</td>
<td>.69XX</td>
<td>.7XX</td>
<td>.94XX</td>
<td>.91XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.98XX</td>
<td>.85XX</td>
<td>.8XX</td>
<td>.92XX</td>
<td>.94XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.87XX</td>
<td>.81XX</td>
<td>.94XX</td>
<td>.95XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.92XX</td>
<td>.76XX</td>
<td>.85XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.72XX</td>
<td>.83XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.92XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MDM — H

CONSTRUCTS IN ORDER OF CONTRIBUTION TO VARIANCE:
9 8 13 12 10 11 6 7 1 2 3 5 4

COMPONENT 1 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 9
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 8 13 12 10 11 6 7 1 2 3 5

MDM — I

CONSTRUCTS IN ORDER OF CONTRIBUTION TO VARIANCE:
13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

COMPONENT 1 - PRINCIPAL CONSTRUCT IS NO. 13
INCLUDED IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ARE CONSTRUCTS: 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

COMPARISON OF GRIDS H AND I
CORRELATION BETWEEN PATTERN OF CONSTRUCTS IS 0 DF=76 P=1

MOST...LEAST SIMILAR RELATIONSHIPS:
6/8 6/9 11/13 6/10
...
4/6 2/13 3/12 5/11 2/12 4/10 5/13 2/5 5/12 2/7 5/6 3/7 3/13 4/11 1/4 1/7 4/5
2/4 3/4

MDM — J

TOP-RIGHT IS CORRELATION MATRIX.
DIAGONAL IS SUMMED ABS. RELATIONSHIPS
BOTTOM-LEFT IS INDIV. RELATIONSHIPS.
2-TAIL P; *=.05, **=1%; NN=DF=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.52X</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.3</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MDM—J**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>BNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>BNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>BNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.56X</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>BNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>BNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.59X</td>
<td>.59X</td>
<td>.59X</td>
<td>.59X</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>BNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>BNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>.52X</td>
<td>BNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>.52X</td>
<td>BNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>.52X</td>
<td>BNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52X</td>
<td>BNN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constructs in Order of Contribution to Variance:**
9 8 11 10 6 12 4 1 3 5 7 2 13

**Component 1** - Principal Construct Is No. 9
Included in Order of Importance Are Constructs: 8 11 10 6 12

**Component 2** - Principal Construct Is No. 4
Included in Order of Importance Are Constructs: 7

**Component 3** - Principal Construct Is No. 1
Included in Order of Importance Are Constructs: 5

**Component 4** - Principal Construct Is No. 3
No Related Constructs

**Component 5** - Principal Construct Is No. 2
No Related Constructs

**Component 6** - Principal Construct Is No. 13
No Related Constructs

**Construct 4 Horizontal, 9 Vertical**

```
11110 8
1111
111
11
6
121
13531 1 7
```

---

2
APPENDIX C

MEAN ATTRACTIVENESS RANKINGS AND PROBABILITIES

1 = most attractive of sixteen newswomen
16 = least attractive of sixteen newswomen (most unattractive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NW1</th>
<th>NW2</th>
<th>NW3</th>
<th>NW4</th>
<th>NW5</th>
<th>NW6</th>
<th>NW7</th>
<th>NW8</th>
<th>NW9</th>
<th>NW10</th>
<th>NW11</th>
<th>NW12</th>
<th>NW13</th>
<th>NW14</th>
<th>NW15</th>
<th>NW16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rankings and Probability levels of Differences of Means

| 13 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 3 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 14 | 15 | 8 |
|---|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|
| 3.8000| 13 | x | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4.7000| 9 | x | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5.8889| 6 | x | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5.9000| 10 | x | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 6.7000| 3 | x | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 7.3000| 16 | x | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 7.4000| 4 | x | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 7.8000| 1 | x | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 8.2000| 11 | x | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 8.6000| 12 | x | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10.1000| 7 | x | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10.2000| 5 | x | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10.7000| 2 | x | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10.9000| 14 | x | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11.6000| 15 | x | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 13.8000| 8 | x | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Probability Levels: *p* < .01, **p** < .05, ***p*** < .08
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