DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 054 CS 501 707

AUTHOR Becker, Lee B.
TITLE Methodological Advances in Uses and Gratifications Research.
PUB DATE Jun 77
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Berlin, Germany, June 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audiences; *Information Needs; *Mass Media; *Media Research; Political Attitudes; *Research Methodology; Research Problems; Voting
IDENTIFIERS *Audience Analysis; Gratification

ABSTRACT

One of the most difficult problems facing scholars interested in conducting empirical research concerning the gratification that audience members seek or receive from the media is measurement of gratification itself. This paper outlines the strategies commonly used by researchers and describes some of the limitations of each. Particular attention is given to the following studies, which reflect measurements of audience gratification: a 1974 national voting study conducted by the Center for Political Studies at the University of Michigan; a 1974 survey of voters in Syracuse, New York; a similar study conducted in Madison, Wisconsin, in that same year; a 1975 survey of newspaper audiences in the northeastern part of the United States; and a 1976 study of voters in Onondaga County, New York. Although the data presented in these studies do not address all of the questions which confront researchers in this area, a summary of conclusions which may be drawn from available information is presented. (KS)

Methodological Advances in Uses and Gratifications Research

Lee B. Becker

Communications Research Center

S. I. Newhouse School of Public Communications

Syracuse University

Syracuse, N.Y. 13210

Prepared for presentation to the Political Communication Division of the International Communication Association, Berlin, Germany, June 1977. The author acknowledges the assistance of Idowu Sobowale and Robin Cobbey in preparation of this paper.

Methodological Advances in Uses and Gratifications Research

One of the most difficult problems facing scholars interested in conducting empirical research involving the gratifications audience members seek or receive from the media is measurement of the gratifications themselves (Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch, 1974). Perhaps because of the very nature of the gratifications concept--it is audience rather than researcher oriented--operationalization is a particularly thorny issue.

At least three distinct strategies of operationalization of the gratifications present themselves. First, researchers can infer what gratifications audience members are seeking based on measurement on some separate, yet related variable. The research of Kline, Miller and Morrison (1974) is illustrative of this tactic. Inferences were made about the informational needs of audience members--and gratifications sought--based on locator variables such as age and sex. Adolescents have different informational needs in the area of family planning, the researchers argued, based on their age and sex.

A second, and certainly more common, strategy for measuring gratifications sought is to rely on reports from the audience members as to which of various possible gratifications are relevant in understanding their media behavior. This was the strategy employed by Blumler and McQuail (1969) in their seminal work on political gratifications. Respondents in the 1964 British study were provided a list of gratifications--developed from earlier research sessions--and asked to indicate which of the gratifications applied to them.

A third strategy open to gratifications researchers is to manipulate in field or laboratory settings the gratifications subjects have upon receipt of various communication messages. In a simple experiment, for example, subjects

could be instructed to pay attention to a given message for a specific reason somehow related to the purpose of the experiment. These subjects then could be compared to others having been given different instructions--or gratifications--to learn of the implications of the gratifications on subsequent behavior. Other more sophisticated settings could easily be created, though manipulation of gratifications to date has not been an explicit concern of researchers.

Each of these strategies of operationalization--by inference, by self-report, or by manipulation--has some strengths. But there are problems as well, some of which all three share. For example, each strategy assumes some knowledge on the part of the researcher of the population of gratifications from which audience members sample. Without that knowledge, it is impossible to designate surrogate measures, develop proper gratification lists or otherwise devise methods of soliciting relevant gratifications from audience members, or manipulate the important gratifications in an experimental setting.

Each of these tactics also assumes some understanding on the part of the researchers of the generalizability of any specific gratification. Gratifications may be media specific, for example, or they may cut across media. Similarly, they may be content specific or general in focus. Without knowing which of these possibilities is correct, however, the researcher is forced to devise measures--or manipulations-- which may not adequately tap gratifications controlling specific media behavior. It may be necessary, for example, to distinguish between political gratifications--which are tied to the field of political encounter--and public affairs gratifications, which cut across various social categories. It may also be necessary to differentially measure gratifications sought from specific media events, such as political conventions and political debates--the latter incorporated again into 1976 U.S. presidential campaign.

The inferential, self-report and manipulation strategies also are based on the assumption the researcher adequately understands the relationship between positive gratifications which, presumably, lead audience members to certain media use behaviors, and negative forces, sometimes labeled avoidances, which result in non-use of the media. While it is possible the gratifications and avoidances share some common social antecedent, preliminary evidence presented by McLeod and Becker (1974) suggests they have some distinct implications in terms of eventual impact on audience member behavior. At present, however, relatively little is known about the role of these negative avoidance motivations.

In addition to the problems which the strategies share, each has some peculiar difficulties. To employ the inferential approach, for example, researchers have to be able to identify some surrogate--either a cause, effect or spurious covariate of the gratification. If the surrogate is a cause or effect, the researcher must be prepared to argue the link is strong enough to rule out serious contamination due to problems of multiple causation. If the surrogate is spuriously related to the gratification, the researcher must be willing to argue that the relationship is stable enough to exist without serious variation across situations. In other words, the strategy assumes a rather high level of theorizing about the relationships between gratifications and other variables.

Special problems confront the researcher opting for the self-report strategy as well. It must be assumed that the respondent is capable of providing answers to the questions posed regarding relevant gratifications. Audience members, however, may not know which gratifications are important. And even if they do know, they may not be able to verbalize such answers. While lists of possible gratifications may seem to get around this second problem, unless the items on

the list are worded in the vernacular of the respondents, the items may be rejected prematurely. And while researchers may be able to circumvent difficulties resulting from the capabilities of the respondents, there remain difficulties stemming from the willingness of the respondents to report accurately controlling gratifications. Certain gratifications may well be more socially approved than others, yet researchers must develop tactics which accurately measure all such motivational factors.

Manipulation of the gratifications in experimental settings also has limitations. If the manipulation is through intervention in the causal chain which produces the gratification, a detailed knowledge of the causal chain is necessary. If the manipulation is achieved through role-playing, experimental situations must be devised which avoid some of the problems inherent in the self-report tactic. The subjects, for example, must be able to understand the intricacies of the role-playing experiment, particularly as they related to the gratification involved. But if the gratification is one the subject finds difficult to understand--or is unwilling to adopt--the experimental manipulation will fail. Even if these difficulties can be overcome, the researcher opting for the experimental strategy still must overcome real problems of external validity. Audience orientations would seem to be particularly difficult factors to isolate realistically in any laboratory setting.

The criteria for evaluating the measures of gratifications resulting from the three strategies are the usual ones. The measures must be reliable and they must be valid. While these criteria take on slightly different meanings in each of the three strategies, the overall goal remains rather clear. The measures of the gratifications (through the surrogates or directly via self-

report) must be internally consistent and stable over relatively short periods of time. The manipulations must be ones which are easily replicable. The measures must accurately tap the surrogate or the gratification itself, and the manipulation must be affecting the gratification as prescribed.

For the most part, validation of gratification measures has been of the content sort. Items are critically examined to determine if they logically measure the underlying gratification desired. For the most part, researchers have not used pragmatic validation processes, though several opportunities would seem to present themselves. Persons confronting an important decision on a public issue, for example, ought to be more likely to desire materials from the media to aid them in making that decision than persons not in the decision making mode. Communities confronting major decisions on racial busing to achieve integration, to take a specific case, might be compared with communities not facing that decision to evaluate the power of measuring strategies designed to tape decisional gratifications.

The most powerful technique for validation, of course, results from the hypothesis testing procedure itself. Such construct validation has been slow to develop in the gratifications area, however, because the gratifications have not been well integrated into communications theory. As a result, relatively little strict hypothesis testing has been done. The strategy, however, was illustrated by McLeod and Becker (1974), who integrated the gratification measures into effects analysis.

A variety of data sets available to the author speak to some of the questions raised here, though none of the studies producing the data was designed exclusively to deal with gratification measurement problems. For the most part, the criteria

for measurement examined here is reliability, though pragmatic validity is dealt with at least indirectly. Content validation also can be addressed in passing. Viewed individually, the studies do little to advance the methodologies of gratifications research. Together, they provide at least a preliminary examination of some rather important issues confronting researchers in the area.

1974 U.S. NATIONAL VOTING STUDY.

The 1974 voting study conducted by the Center for Political Studies at the University of Michigan included a list of items designed to measure gratifications audience members seek from the political content of the media. The measures, shown in Table 1 in the order they were included on the interview schedule, were asked separately for television and newspaper users. Respondents indicated the extent to which the listed gratifications applied to them. Over 1500 persons, selected to represent the voting age population of the U.S., were interviewed following the 1974 Congressional elections.

The data in Table 1 are for those individuals who (where television gratifications are concerned) reported watching television programs about the 1974 campaign or (in the case of newspaper gratifications) reported reading about the campaign in the newspapers. The design of the interview schedule did not allow for data on the approximately 40% of the electorate who did not follow the campaign in the media. (The data presented in Table 1 are unweighted; comparisons of the unweighted and weighted responses to the gratifications items showed neglible differences.)

The six items shown in Table 1 had been written to tap the dimensions of gratifications identified in the original Blumler and McQuail (1959) research. The first two items were designed to measure a decisional orientation to the

media predicated on the eventual vote choice. This has been labeled vote guidance seeking. The fourth item is similar, though less oriented to the vote decision itself. It is intended to measure a general surveillance orientation to the political environment. The third item is a spectator orientation, labeled excitement seeking. The fifth item is reinforcement seeking for a decision already made. The final orientation tapped stems from the expected utility of political information in anticipated communications.

The data in Table 1 show that for the respondents who reported actual use of the media for the 1974 campaign surveillance and vote guidance motivations are rather high. Of lesser importance are reinforcement and excitement seeking, as well as use of the media because of their communicatory utility. These last three gratifications probably are less socially acceptable than surveillance and vote guidance, yet their level of endorsement is quite high.

The data in Table 1 also show little evidence gratifications are media specific. Rather, there are few differences of any magnitude of the gratifications reported for political content which is carried on television and political content in the newspapers.

1974 SYRACUSE VOTING STUDY

The six gratifications items in the national study as well as four additional ones were included in a list of gratifications presented a sample of registered voters studied in Syracuse, N.Y., in the fall of 1974. The voters were a probability sample of those registered in a district within the city chosen because of its diverse social makeup. The items are presented in Table 2 in the order they were presented respondents.

Again, the most endorsed items are for surveillance and vote guidance. (The four items with mean scores greater than 2.0 were designed to measure these dimensions.) The two items given the next highest endorsements were intended to measure reinforcement seeking (items 4 and 9). Excitement seeking (items 2 and 8) and the communicatory utility items (5 and 10) also were given significant endorsements, though with less consistency than for the other dimensions. The similarities between the two sets of gratifications shown in Table 2 also is quite marked. Again there is little evidence that gratifications are media specific.

The levels of the gratifications in Table 2 are quite close to those shown in Table 1, indicating the generalizability of the findings. The average absolute deviation for the six items in both tables is .16. Given the different definitions of the two samples (only persons attending to the 1974 campaign through the media were included in Table 1), the findings are quite striking.

Included in the 1974 Syracuse study were a series of items designed to measure negative gratifications or avoidances. While the positive items had been presented to the respondents as "reasons some people have given for watching television programs (reading newspaper stories) which deal with political candidates and events," the avoidance items were presented as reasons for not watching or listening. Again, respondents were asked to indicate to what extent the items applied to them.

In general, the avoidance items shown in Table 3 were less well endorsed than the gratifications items in Table 2. The most common reason for avoiding the political materials was to spend time with other stories. Again, there are few differences between the responses for the television and for the newspaper

items. This conclusion is reinforced by the actual correlations between responses to the items shown in Table 4.

In order to gain some understanding of the dimensionality of the items shown in Tables 2 and 3--and determine if the labels used in describing the items above have any empirical base--a factor analysis was performed on the 16 items. The analysis was designed to determine principal orthogonal components underlying the raw scores. The number of factor extracted was determined to insure that only components accounting for at least the amount of total variance of a single item were considered important. (Varimax rotation was used.)

The procedure produces the three-factor solution shown in Table 5. The first factor is clearly an avoidance cluster, picking up the primary loadings of each of the six avoidance items. Empirically, at least, the avoidance items are quite distinct from the positive gratifications. The second factor picks up the two surveillance items (1 and 6) as well as the vote guidance ones (3 and 8). Also loading strongly on this item is one of the two reinforcement items. The remaining items load primarily on the final factor. This is a pattern repeated almost perfectly in Table 6.

The factor analyses in Tables 5 and 6 suggest the strong empirical tie which exists between the surveillance and vote guidance motivations as well as among the reinforcement, excitement seeking and communicatory utility motivations. The avoidance items, as well, cluster together very strongly. This clustering together of various types of items serves to reinforce the finding from prior research that it is difficult to sort out the separate impact of various gratifications (Becker, 1976; McLeod and Becker, 1974).

1974 MADISON VOTING STUDY

The items used on the Syracuse study were incorporated into a study of voters in Madison, Wisc., that same year. The Madison study actually included two separate samples, one comprised of voters under the age of 27 and the second of older voters. Only the latter group is examined here.

The levels of the gratification and avoidance items were almost identical with those shown for Syracuse voters. In fact, when comparably aged respondents are examined in the two communities, the average absolute deviation between the two samples is only .11.

Despite this similarity, a factor analysis of the 16 items used in the Madison study (presented in Tables 7 and 8), produces results somewhat different from those for Syracuse (Tables 5 and 6). The television items, shown in Table 7, factor into a reinforcement/excitement/communicatory utility dimension somewhat similar to the one shown in Syracuse. One of the communicatory utility items, however, shows a somewhat weakened loading here. A clean surveillance/vote guidance factor also is produced. The avoidance items, however, are broken into two factor in Table 7.

In Table 8, however, which presents the factor analysis of the newspaper items, a clean avoidance factor emerges. Surveillance and vote guidance also load together. But here, the communicatory utility items break out separately, leaving the reinforcement and excitement seeking gratifications loading together.

In some respects, the factors in Table 8 are the cleanest shown so far. The minor discrepancies between the findings in the four tables (5-8), however, indicate the fickle nature of such empirical solutions to the dimensionality problem. (The picture is not improved by examining only older Syracuse voters.) Such

analyses can only go so far in assisting the researcher in identifying the dimensions of gratifications and avoidances.

1975 SYRACUSE VOTING STUDY

The analyses shown so far provide some indication of the levels and dimensionality of the gratifications and avoidances produced by the closed-ended procedure. They do not indicate how exhaustive the list of items is.

Data from a study conducted in the fall of 1975 provide some evidence on this point. Interviews were conducted with a sample of voters drawn from the same Syracuse voting district studied a year earlier. Included in the schedule were two open-ended questions designed to elicit from the sample members reasons why they sometimes "read newspaper stories or watch television or listen to radio news broadcasts dealing with local elections and politics" and reasons why they did not pay attention to such materials. Interviewers were instructed to probe for as many reasons as the respondent could give. (The interviews were conducted in-person.)

The open-ended responses from the 299 respondents are shown in Table 9. Gratification responses were coded into five categories corresponding to the gratification dimensions discussed above. The avoidance responses were coded into three categories identified by McLeod and Becker (1974): relaxation, alienation and partisanship. A fourth type of response, resulting from perceived biases in the media, became obvious once the coding was begun and was added.

The dominance of surveillance/vote guidance types of comments is particularly strong in Table 9. The other gratifications, which were shown in earlier tables to be quite common, surface much less often when the respondents are asked to

volunteer their gratifications. These other types of gratifications--reinforcement, excitement seeking, use because of anticipated utility of the information--are not easily recognized or willingly volunteered by the respondents. While the focus of the question was on local politics for the 1975 study compared with politics in general for the 1974 Syracuse study, that differences hardly seems sufficient to account for the gross differences between tables 9 and 2.

Respondents did seem to be quite able and willing to explain why they did not follow local politics closely. The complaint about bias in the local media, however, was not anticipated. While this type of complaint may be exaggerated in Syracuse because of the poor quality of the media, similar complaints are likely to exist elsewhere in some form. Table 9 suggests they can be quite common.

With that exception, however, the dimensions of gratifications and avoidances used in coding the open-ended data seem to be quite sufficient. Only 5.8% of the responses to the gratifications question could not be coded; only .7% of the avoidance responses could not be coded once the new response was added.

1975 NORTHEASTERN NEWSPAPER AUDIENCE SURVEY

The data presented so far have dealt with gratifications audience members report seeking from the political content of the media. Such content of course, is only a fraction of what the media present. The relationship between gratifications sought from the political content of the media and gratifications sought from the media in general has not been explored.

Indirect inferences regarding this relationship can be made from data gathered as part of a readership study conducted in the fall of 1975 in a metropolitan newspaper market in the northeastern part of the United States.

Included in the interview schedule was the list of gratifications shown in Table 10. Newspaper readers in the probability sample were asked to indicate to what extent the listed reasons applied to them.

The pattern of means shown in the table is somewhat similar to those in Tables 1 and 2. Surveillance and guidance gratifications (items 1-5, 7) received high endorsements comparable to those for similar items in Table 1. Reinforcement and communicatory utility items were endorsed less often. The entertainment items, most similar of those listed to the excitement gratification in the political sphere, also were checked less often than the surveilance/vote guidance items.

A factor analysis of these gratifications, presented in Table 11, does not produce a structure closely matching those shown in earlier tables. The entertainment items, as would be expected, do factor out separately, and the single item on advertisements seems to be somewhat distinct. Every item but one, however, shows a fairly high loading on the primary factor, indicating a great deal of similarity in the way the respondents answered the whole battery of items. It remains somewhat unclear as to how similar the structure of the political and general gratifications may be. The preliminary evidence seems to be that the general gratifications are less well structured.

1976 THREE COMMUNITY STUDY

The final two data sets to be examined a' o deal with the question of specificity of gratifications sought. In the first, produced by a panel study of registered voters in three communities in the U.S., the relationship between reasons for following three distinct events in the 1976 presidential campaign are examined.

The three communities studied were Lebanon, N.H., Indianapolis, Ind., and Evanston, a suburb to Chicago, Ill. Respondents were interviewed nine times during the 1976 campaign, including sessions in July after the Democratic convention, in August after the Republican convention, and in October after the presidential and vice presidential debates. Approximately 125 persons were interviewed throughout the study.

Open-ended questions were asked following the two conventions and the debates to ascertain why the respondents watched or listened to them. These responses were then coded according to whether the first reason given was for surveillance or vote guidance, whether (if the first reason was not of this type) the second reason was for surveillance/vote guidance, or whether neither reason was of this sort. Respondents who did not watch were coded in the final category.

The relationships between the gratifications reported for these three events are shown in Table 12. In general, the correlation coefficients are moderately high, indicating that the same reasons tended to underlie attendance to all three events. The relationships are somewhat exaggerated, however, by the fact that persons who did not watch or listen to one of these events tended not to listen to others. Often this was because the individual did not have the motivation to learn from the event. Sometimes, however, the nonattendance was due to factors unrelated to gratifications, such as working hours and family complications.

1976 ONONDAGA COUNTY VOTING STUDY

A similar open-ended question to the one used in the three community study was used in a study of voters in Onondaga County, N.Y., during the fall of 1976. Onondaga County includes the city of Syracuse and is a highly diversified community of approximately 500,000 persons.

Prior to the first of the televised debates as well as after each of them samples of persons selected from voter registration lists were interviewed by telephone. An open-ended question was included on each of the four post-debate waves to determine reasons for viewing or listening to the most recent encounter. Those responses were coded into the surveillance/vote guidance categories shown in Table 13.

While there is general consistency across the four debates--learning about the issues and stands on the issues is always more frequently given than the other two reasons--there also are some marked differences. The second debate, particularly, was viewed more for non-surveillance reasons (the biggest change was the increase in excitement seeking) than any of the other three. The final debate was viewed more for vote guidance than to learn about the backgrounds and personalities of the candidates. (Non-viewers are not included in Table 13.) In general, there is some indication the motivations for viewing the debates was somewhat different for each of the four encounters.

Included in the second wave of the Onondaga County study were 89 respondents who had been interviewed in the predebate wave. (Of these, 65 had viewed the first presidential debate.) In addition to the question on reasons for watching the first debate, these respondents had been asked in the predebate wave to respond to a set of closed-ended items designed to measure gratifications sought from political materials in general. The correlations between the closed-ended questions and the open-ended responses on reasons for having watched the first debate are shown in Table 14.

Two of the three correlation coefficients shown are quite low, while the third, between the two indicates of personality surveillance, is in the moderate range. The data reinforce the conclusion that gratifications may well be event specific.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The data can be summarized as follows:

1. At least as far as political gratifications are concerned, the items developed by Blumler and McQuail (1969) fairly well exhaust the gratifications which audience members themselves are able to suggest.

2. These gratifications cluster in interpretable ways with some consistency across the data sets examined, but the consistency is not perfect. Empirical techniques for identifying the gratification dimensions may not, in the long run, prove adequate in isolating dimensions of gratifications.

3. Specifically, the surveillance and vote guidance gratifications seem to be highly related in the data sets. While it is possible to differentiate between these two types of gratifications conceptually, it seems unlikely it will be possible to measure them independently in many research settings.

4. The avoidance motivations seem to be empirically, at least, distinct from the gratifications. In other words, the negative items do not surface as mere opposites of the gratifications and therefore must be measured separately. The motivations to avoid media content simply seem to be different from those aimed at media use.

5. The avoidance items used in the studies do not factor into separate dimensions empirically, though it is possible there are conceptually distinct motivations underlying them.

6. The avoidance items used seem to be deficient in not recognizing that some audience members do not use the media for certain content specifically because they distrust the media themselves. Items aimed at tapping this orientation need to be incorporated into lists of avoidances in the future.

7. The data are rather consistent in showing that gratifications are not media specific, at least as far as political content is concerned. In other words, audience members seek the same gratifications from political content of television as they do from the political content of newspapers.

8. Gratifications do seem to be content specific to some extent. The gratifications associated with political content do not appear to be exactly like those associated with newspaper use in general. The relationship between gratifications sought from different political events in the 1976 campaign also were not overly large. And the general gratifications did not predict well to gratifications sought from a specific media event--the first presidential debate.

9. The evidence seems to be that open-ended gratification questions do not produce the same kinds of answers as closed-ended ones. In general, the closed-ended questions seem more likely to guarantee that socially unacceptable gratifications are admitted.

10. In general, however, there is little evidence in any of the studies that respondents were unable to answer the gratification questions. Whether the questions are open- or closed-ended, the respondents seem to be able to deal with the frame of reference established by the specific questions.

These conclusions, of course, are tentative. Each data set discussed here is limited in its own way. The overall picture, as a consequence, becomes flawed once examined closely.

Perhaps the most serious limitation of the data presented, however, is that they address too few of the questions which confront researchers working in the area. The theoretical research that can be done will be somewhat limited until more of these methodological questions are answered.

REFERENCES

BECKER, L.B. Two tests of media gratifications; Watergate and the 1974 elections. Journalism Quarterly, 1976, 53, 26-31.

BECKER, L.B., MCLEOD, J.M. & ZIEMKE, D.A. Correlates of media gratifications. Paper prepared for round-table discussion, American Association for Public Opinion Research conference, Asheville, N.C., 1976.

BLUMLER, J.G. Television in Politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

KATZ, E., GUREVITCH, M., & HAAS, H. On the use of mass media for important things. American Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 164-81.

KLINE, F.G., MILLER, P.V., & MORRISON, A.J. Adolescents and family planning information: an exploration of audience needs and media effects. In J.G. Blumler and E. Katz (Eds.) The Uses of Mass Communications. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1974, 113-136.

MCLEOD, J.M., & BECKER, L.B. Testing the validity of gratification measures through political effects analysis. In J.G. Blumler and E. Katz (Eds.) The Uses of Mass Communications. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1974, 137-166.

Table 1
Levels of Gratifications
1974 U.S. Voting Study

	Television (N=895)	Newspapers (N=975)
To see how the political candidates stand on the issues	2.54 (.60)	2.43 (.62)
To help you decide how to vote in an election	2.33 (.70)	2.30 (.73)
To enjoy the excitement of an election race	1.81 (.77)	1.73 (.73)
To judge what the political candidates are like	2.43 (.67)	2.40 (.63)
To be reminded of your candidate's strong points	2.28 (.73)	2.24 (.70)
To get something to talk about with other people	1.77 (.77)	1.77 (.74)

Entries are means and standard deviations. A high score indicates the reason for watching or reading political stories applies to the respondent. The scores are based on a three point scale.

This table is taken from Becker, McLeod and Ziemke (1976). The data were made available by the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research after original collection by the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Table 2
Levels of Gratifications
1974 Syracuse Voting Study

	Television	Newspapers
To judge what political candidates are like.	2.23 (.70)	2.16 (.68)
To judge which candidates are likely to win an election.	1.83 (.76)	1.95 (.73)
To help me make up my mind how to vote in an election.	2.11 (.77)	2.14 (.79)
To remind me of my candidates' strong points.	2.00 (.74)	2.00 (.74)
To give me something to talk about with other people.	1.64 (.71)	1.68 (.70)
To see what the candidates would do if elected.	2.10 (.77)	2.08 (.79)
To enjoy the excitement of an election race.	1.73 (.79)	1.60 (.74)
To see how the candidates stand on the issues.	2.41 (.68)	2.50 (.63)
To see (read) editorials and commentary about the elections which agree with my positions.	1.90 (.78)	1.96 (.80)
To use what I learn in political discussions.	1.85 (.77)	1.96 (.76)
N=	(339)	

Entries are means and standard deviations. A high score indicates the reason for watching or reading political stories applies to the respondent. The scores are based on a three point scale.

Table 3
Levels of Avoidances
1974 Syracuse Voting Study

	Television	Newspapers
Because I prefer to relax when watching television (reading a newspaper).	1.60 (.75)	1.42 (.67)
Because usually my mind is already made up about whom to vote for.	1.48 (.72)	1.49 (.71)
Because the programs (stories) hardly ever tell me anything new.	1.62 (.73)	1.71 (.74)
Because I'd rather spend my time with (reading) other programs (stories in the paper).	1.74 (.76)	1.64 (.75)
Because I'm not interested in watching (reading about) candidates I don't like.	1.46 (.71)	1.42 (.66)
Because it's hard to figure out what the programs (stories) are all about.	1.41 (.68)	1.47 (.70)
N=	(339)	

Entries are means and standard deviations. A high score indicates the reason for watching or reading political stories applies to the respondent. The scores are based on a three point scale.

Table 4
Correlations Between Gratifications and Avoidances
Across Media Type
1974 Syracuse Voting Study

Gratifications	Pearson's r
To judge candidates	.39
To judge who will win	.54
To help vote	.61
To remind of strong points	.61
To get something to talk about	.67
To see what candidates would do	.67
To enjoy excitement	.65
To see stands on issues	.64
To see editorials, commentary	.59
To use in discussions	.71
Avoidances	
Prefer to relax	.50
Mind made up	.62
Nothing new	.53
Rather view other things	.56
Not interested	.62
Hard to understand	.64

N = 339.

Table 5
Factor Analysis of Television Gratifications and Avoidances
1974 Syracuse Voting Study

Gratifications	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
To judge candidates	-.14	.71	.26
To judge who will win	.06	.42	.56
To help vote	-.15	.80	.17
To remind of strong points	-.06	.59	.43
To get something to talk about	-.05	.15	.78
To see what candidates would do	-.06	.77	.21
To enjoy excitement	-.09	.28	.62
To see stands on issues	-.13	.81	.21
To see editorials, commentary	.06	.20	.70
To use in discussions	-.08	.18	.82
Avoidances			
Prefer to relax	.74	.05	-.14
Mind made up	.72	-.13	.11
Nothing new	.68	-.24	-.01
Rather view other things	.76	-.05	-.15
Not interested	.76	-.09	.07
Hard to understand	.67	-.04	-.03

Entries are correlations of the items with the rotated factors.
N = 339.

Table 6
Factor Analysis of Newspaper Gratifications and Avoidances
1974 Syracuse Voting Study

Gratifications	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
To judge candidates	-.16	.62	.17
To judge who will win	-.08	.24	.55
To help vote	-.15	.79	.12
To remind of strong points	.03	.61	.37
To get something to talk about	.04	.14	.71
To see what candidates would do	.01	.75	.08
To enjoy excitement	.00	.09	.67
To see stands on issues	-.15	.73	.21
To see editorials, commentary	.02	.12	.57
To use in discussions	-.06	.13	.73
Avoidances			
Prefer to relax	.68	-.00	-.11
Mind made up	.63	-.13	.17
Nothing new	.64	-.25	.04
Rather view other things	.77	-.04	-.14
Not interested	.76	-.11	.01
Hard to understand	.69	.03	-.03

Entries are correlations of the items with the rotated factors.
N = 339.

Table 7
Factor Analysis of Television Gratifications and Avoidances
1974 Madison Voting Study

Gratifications	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
To judge candidates	.20	.70	-.03	.07
To judge who will win	.71	.01	.14	-.13
To help vote	.07	.76	.03	-.11
To remind of strong points	.72	.23	.03	-.03
To get something to talk about	.54	.15	-.20	.46
To see what candidates would do	.21	.66	.05	-.19
To enjoy excitement	.61	.07	-.02	.26
To see stands on issues	.03	.80	-.02	-.02
To see editorials, commentary	.71	.16	.10	.01
To use in discussions	.33	.43	-.25	.52
Avoidances				
Prefer to relax	-.06	-.00	.75	.01
Mind made up	.02	.26	.31	.67
Nothing new	-.11	-.37	.35	.58
Rather view other things	-.07	.09	.78	.08
Not interested	.15	-.12	.58	.13
Hard to understand	.14	.03	.61	-.02

Entries are correlations of the items with the rotated factors.
N = 244

Table 8
Factor Analysis of Newspaper Certifications and Avoidances
1974 Madison Voting Study

Gratifications	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
To judge candidates	-.14	.68	.14	.19
To judge who will win	.03	.06	.73	.03
To help vote	-.06	.68	.10	.17
To remind of strong points	.10	.27	.64	.08
To get something to talk about	.01	.05	.21	.83
To see what candidates would do	.00	.59	.36	-.25
To enjoy excitement	.06	.06	.58	.31
To see stands on issues	-.13	.81	.08	.02
To see editorials, commentary	-.01	.16	.66	.22
To use in discussions	-.05	.17	.23	.77
Avoidances				
Prefer to relax	.71	-.17	.15	-.22
Mind made up	.66	-.01	.01	.05
Nothing new	.71	-.03	-.14	.10
Rather view other things	.70	.05	-.15	-.02
Not interested	.63	-.13	.20	-.01
Hard to understand	.62	-.17	.26	-.04

Entries are correlations of the items with the rotated factors.
N = 244.

Table 9
Open-Ended Responses to Gratification and Avoidance Probes
1975 Syracuse Voting Study

Gratification Dimensions	Responses	
Surveillance	46.8%	(153)
Vote guidance	39.4	(129)
Excitement	4.6	(15)
Reinforcement	2.1	(7)
Communication	1.2	(4)
Other	5.8	(19)
Total	99.9	(327)

Advoidance Dimensions		
Relaxation	36.9%	(106)
Alienation	34.8	(100)
Bias of Media	20.6	(59)
Partisanship	7.0	(20)
Other	.7	(2)
Total	100.0	(287)

Each response to the gratification question was coded into one of the gratification dimensions. Avoidance responses were similarly coded. Respondents could give more than one answer. Several respondents gave no response to the avoidance question.

Table 10
Levels of Non-Political Gratifications
1975 Northeastern Newspaper Audience Survey

	Newspaper Readers
To keep up with the latest events	2.70 (.51)
To determine what is important	2.32 (.72)
To obtain useful information for daily life	2.34 (.70)
To help me form opinions about things going on around me	2.38 (.68)
To help me make decisions on issues	2.09 (.75)
Just to pass time	1.63 (.75)
To understand what's going on	2.53 (.59)
To be entertained	2.04 (.75)
To give me something to talk about with other people	2.09 (.76)
To use in discussions with my friends	2.08 (.76)
Because I agree with editorial stands	1.53 (.63)
To strengthen my arguments on issues	1.97 (.74)
To feel I am participating in current events	2.07 (.78)
For information in advertisements	1.71 (.77)
N=	(638)

Entries are means and standard deviations. A high score indicates the reason for reading a newspaper applies to the respondent. The scores are based on a three point scale.

Table 11
Factor Analysis of Non-Political Gratifications
1975 Northeastern Newspaper Audience Survey

Gratifications	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
To keep up with events	.56	-.36	.08
To determine what is important	.65	-.24	.11
To obtain useful information	.62	-.26	.36
To help me form opinions	.70	-.27	.15
To help me make decisions	.65	-.29	.12
Just to pass time	-.02	.60	.52
To understand what's going on	.68	-.25	.11
To be entertained	.40	.45	.38
To get something to talk about	.69	.39	-.24
To use in discussions	.71	.30	-.34
Because I agree with stands	.41	.33	-.13
To strengthen arguments	.67	.19	-.27
To feel I am participating	.66	.13	-.30
For advertisements	.26	.25	.41

Entries are correlations of the items with the rotated factors.
N = 638.

Table 12
Relationships Between Amount of Surveillance/Vote Guidance Seeking from Party Conventions and Debates
1976 Three Community Study

	Gamma	
Democratic by Republican convention viewing	.48	(N=121)
Democratic convention viewing by Debates	.53	(N=117)
Republican convention viewing by Debates	.47	(N=120)

Responses to open-ended questions were coded to indicate the amount of surveillance/vote guidance seeking reported for these events. Persons not watching or listening to the broadcast events were coded as low in this motivation.

Table 13
Open-Ended Responses to Gratification Probes Regarding Debates
1976 Onondaga County Voting Study

Gratifications	First Presidential Debate	Second Presidential Debate	Vice Presidential Debate	Third Presidential Debate
Learn about issues and stands on issues	40.0%	20.3%	34.2%	33.1%
Learn about the candidates--backgrounds and personalities	15.7	9.8	16.5	6.2
Help decide how to vote	7.8	9.2	3.3	12.3
Other	36.5	60.7	46.0	48.4
N=	(230)	(153)	(243)	(130)

The first response given by the respondent was coded into one of the categories. Persons not watching or looking at each debate was eliminated from the table.

Table 14
Relationships Between Closed and Open-Ended Measures
of Selected Gratifications
1976 Onondage County Voting Study

	Gamma
Closed-ended Predebate by Open-ended Post Debate 1: See how candidates stand on issues	.20
Closed-ended Predebate by Open-ended Post Debate 1: Judge personalities of candidates	.43
Closed-ended Predebate by Open-ended Post Debate 1: Help decide how to vote	.10

Responses to the open-ended questions were coded to indicate amount of gratification sought. Persons not watching or listening to debate 1 were eliminated from the analyses. N=65.