DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 775 CS 207 518

AUTHOR Roberts, Churchill L.; Dickson, Sandra H.
TITLE The News Quality Index: An Instrument for Assessing Local TV News.
PUB DATE Jan 83
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Comunication (66th, Corvallis, OR, August 6-9, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; College Students; *Content Analysis; *News Reporting; *Programing (Broadcast); Rating Scales; *Television Research; *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS *Audience Analysis; Audience Response

ABSTRACT

To assess the quality of local news programs, a News Quality Index was develped for a study that consisted of three parts: a content analysis of local television news, an audience analysis of the kinds of news stories that are most important, and an outside the market viewer analysis of the way in which anchors for news, sports, and weather are perceived. A recording was made during the week of May 24-28, 1982 of the half-hour, early evening newscasts of the three network affiliates in the Mobile, Alabama-Pensacola, Florida market. One videotape for each station, with three minutes of news anchor reporting followed by three minutes of sports anchor reporting and three minutes of weather reporting, were presented to 37 students from a vocational school and community college outside the Mobile-Pensacola viewing area. Results showed that only one measure, the average number of minutes of commercials, revealed significant differences across stations. Concerning the technical quality of the newscast, analysis showed that the station that scored highest in the rankings contained more techniques per video tape recordings, more slides and stills accompanying the news anchor reporting, and a greater amount of video accompanying the sports reporter. Audience preferences revealed almost no relationship or a negative one between audience ratings of the relative importance of different kinds of news stories and the station's attention to these stories. Four categories were ranked as important in determining news quality, in the following order: news substance, technical quality, the association between public preference for news stories and the amount of time stations devoted to them, and the ratings of news, sports, and weather anchors. (HOD)

THE NEWS QUALITY INDEX: AN INSTRUMENT FOR ASSESSING LOCAL TV NEWS

Churchill L. Roberts, Associate Professor
Sandra H. Dickson, Instructor
Department of Communication Arts

The University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida
January, 1983

Introduction

The amount of news on television has increased considerably in the past few years. At the network level there has been an expansion of early morning news programs, an addition of late night news programs, more frequent "news breaks" throughout the day, and the development of all-news networks.[1] At the local level there has also been considerable growth, as new technologies along with the public's thirst for news have fostered fierce competition among stations for viewers' attention.[2] In commercial broadcasting, the purpose of the news program is to attract the most or right kind of viewers, for revenues derived from the sale of advertisements which accompany the newscast depend upon audience size and composition. The number one station, or best station, or quality news station is thus synonymous with the station with the highest rating. But as Wulfemeyer points out, "ratings are more of a popularity contest . . . than a real measure of quality."[3]

Communication researchers have sought to define quality in a somewhat different manner from that of the commercial broadcaster, using both audience likes and dislikes as well as conventional journalistic standards to gauge a station's performance. In the present study, we have expanded upon past efforts to assess the quality of news programs, or more specifically, local news programs, and have developed the News Quality Index (NQI). We believe this instrument provides an accurate measure of news quality and that it has heuristic value to both aspiring and practicing journalists.

Prior Research

Prior research on the quality of television news has focused primarily on three factors: the content of news programs, the appeal or credibility of newscasters and newscasts, and the accuracy of news reporting, although to date most of this latter research has been confined to print journalism.

In a content analysis of the three network affiliates in New York, Dominick, Wurtzel, and Lometti found that despite WABC's "happy talk" format, the station's hour-long evening newscast contained slightly more hard news than those of WNBC and WCBS but also more human interest stories and more stories about violence.[4] Rhu analyzed local news over a four-year period to determine what accounted for differences in the ratio of public affairs stories to stories of a sensational or human interest nature.[5] He concluded that the main factor was the degree to which a story was likely to appeal to the audience at the moment. During periods of crisis, when the public's attention was focused on a particular issue, that issue dominated the news. At other times, when public affairs stories were of less concern to the public, more sensational and human interest stories appeared.

Numerous studies have been conducted on newscaster appeal: dimensions of personality or qualities of the ideal newscaster. Shosteck, for example, identified four clusters of characteristics

which influence the popularity of television news personalities.[6] In order of overall importance, they were: 1) voice and speech, 2) professional attributes, 3) personal appeal, and 4) appearance. In a study of the needs and desires of viewers, Cathcart identified the most desirable and least desirable characteristics of television newscasters as perceived by the audience.[7] Among the most desirable traits were knowledge and experience, and being more than a reader; while inaccuracy in news reporting, being perceived as merely a reader, and trying to sensationalize the news were regarded as least desirable traits. Finally, in a study limited to newscaster appearance, Sanders and Pritchett surveyed adults in Columbia, Missouri and found that the perceived ideal newscaster would be white, clean-shaven, 31-55 years old, and would wear a dark coat and white shirt.[8]

Few attempts have been made to determine the accuracy of television news reporting. Singletary and Lipsky surveyed individuals who were identified as sources of local and state news stories aired over three television stations and asked their perception of the accuracy of the stories.[9] About two-thirds of the respondents said the stories were entirely correct, while about 30 percent of them said the stories were generally correct. Gantz monitored television weather reports of the three network affiliates in Indianapolis and found that next day forecasts were generally accurate when the prediction was for rain but less accurate for longer range forecasts and precise temperature predictions.[10]

In one of the few attempts to develop an instrument for gauging quality in television newscasts, Wulfemeyer combined a content analysis of local news programs with an audience survey of the perceived relative importance of news categories.[11] The content analysis yielded eight categories: commercials, issues, entertainment, banter, weather, unexpected events, and sports. Survey participants then rank ordered the categories from most important to least important, and the rankings were used as weighting factors to be multiplied by the percentage of time devoted to each category. (As might have been expected, issues ranked highest and commercials and banter lowest.) The station with the highest score was judged as having the highest quality.

In our study, we employed a modifed version of the Wulfemeyer methodology but refined the category system and used other content criteria to assess quality. Also, we included an additional study of audience perception of news anchors, sports anchors, and weather anchors as part of our news quality index. Our study, therefore, consisted of three parts: a content analysis of local television news, an audience analysis of the kinds of news stories which are most important, and finally, an outside the market viewer analysis of the way in which anchors for news, sports, and weather are perceived. The various measures derived from these analyses provided the basis for developing the NQI.

Methodology

For the content analysis, a recording was made during the week of May 24-28, 1982 of the half-hour, early evening newscasts of the three network affiliates in the Mobile, Alabama-Pensacola, Florida market. These newscasts were analyzed several different ways. First, each one was coded by topic (the subject of the news story or segment) and length.[12] For news stories, a further determination was made of the type of news (hard news or feature).[13] This category scheme allowed us to assess the amount of time spent in hard news, banter, and commercials--three factors which we believe provide an index of the amount of substance in a newscast.[14]

Next, we analyzed the news anchor reporting, sports and weather segments, and news reporter videotapes (VTRs). In these analyses, we were trying to determine how much was "put into" the newscast in the form of slides and other visuals, and how many techniques and shots were used in the VTRs, and also how much time was devoted to them. We also noted the number of different newscasters (other than anchors) who appeared in the newscast and the number of technical flaws such as poor audio or glitches in videotapes. These various measures enabled us to assess the technical quality of the newscast.

The content analysis also provided a means of determining the kinds of stories covered by the three stations in their newscasts.

These included stories about local and state government, crime or crime-related issues, fires and accidents, sports, weather, the local economy, education, and politics and political campaigns.[15] To determine the relative importance of these stories, we asked a random sample of 200 residents in the Mobile-Pensacola Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) whether each category or kind of story was very important, somewhat important, or not important to them when they watched local television news.[16] The average ranking for each category was then correlated with the amount of time each station devoted to that category, thereby providing a measure of the degree to which audience preferences for various kinds of news stories coincided with the amount of time devoted to those stories by the station.

The final part of our study consisted of a measure of attitude toward news, sports, and weather anchors. The instrument for assessing this aspect of quality in local television news was based on the work of Shosteck who identified four general characteristics which related to newscaster popularity. As was mentioned earlier, these included voice and speech, professional attributes, personal appeal, and appearance.[17] Using these four categories and the narrative descriptions which pertained to them (e.g., "dresses well," "has a nice personality," "uses good grammar"), we developed eight statements, two per category, to which responses were made along a six-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The statements were randomly ordered, and half of them

were worded negatively to prevent a response bias. We then edited the videotapes which were used for the content analysis so that we had approximately three minutes of reporting by each anchor. The final product consisted of three videotapes, one for each station, with three minutes of news anchor reporting, followed by three minutes of sports anchor reporting and three minutes of weather reporting. Subjects who viewed the videotapes and noted their impressions of the various anchors were selected from a vocational school and community college outside the Mobile-Pensacola viewing area. Three classes containing a total of 37 students participated in the study.[18] Each time the tapes were shown to a class, the order was changed to prevent an order effect. Also, subjects were handed questionnaires prior to viewing and thus were aware initially of the traits which were being assessed.

Results

Each of the measures of the various aspects of news was analyzed separately and then transformed into a single index of news quality.[19] Table 1 shows the results of the analyses of news substance, one part of the NQI. Only one of the measures, the average number of minutes of commercials, revealed significant differences. In this instance, WKRG devoted significantly more time to commercials than did the other two stations. While WALA's newscasts contained the most hard news and WKRG's the least banter,

these amounts were not significantly different from those of the other stations.

(Place Table 1 about here.)

The next set of measures had to do with the technical quality of the newscast, the degree to which videotapes, slides, and electronic graphics were incorporated into the program, and the skill with which they were handled. Along with these measures was an additional one noting the number of different news reporters who appeared in the program.[20] As Table 2 suggests, the stations varied greatly in technical quality. Of the eight measures for which significant differences were found, WALA scored highest on three of them as did WEAR, and WKRG scored highest on two of the measures. WALA's programs contained more techniques per VTR, more slides and stills accompanying the news anchor reporting, and a greater amount of video accompanying the sports report. WEAR's newscasts had more camera shots or edits per VTR, a greater amount of time devoted to reporter-generated VTRs, and more slides and stills accompanying the sports segment. WKRG had a greater amount of video accompanying the news anchor reporting and more visuals accompanying the weather report.

(Place Table 2 about here.)

In the next part of our study, we measured the degree to which audience preferences for news stories corresponded to the amount of time stations devoted to them. Surprisingly, we found that

there was almost no relationship or a negative one between audience ratings of the relative importance of different kinds of news stories and the station's attention to these stories (Table 3). The main reason for the absence of a positive relationship was that while respondents rated sports as least important to them when they watched local news, stations devoted more time to sports than they did to most other issues. When sports was removed from the list of issues, the picture changed considerably.[21] As can be seen at the bottom of Table 3, relatively high and positive correlations were obtained when sports was omitted from the analysis.[22]

(Place Table 3 about here.)

In the final set of analyses, we compared respondents' ratings of the four news anchors, the three sports anchors, and the three weather anchors using a treatment by subjects design (Tables 4, 5, and 6).[23] No clear pattern emerged from these analyses, although a number of significant differences were found, especially in the assessment of sports anchors. Of the five measures which discriminated significantly between sports anchors, WEAR's anchor scored highest on three of them and WKRG's on the other two. Conversely, on the two weather anchor items which showed significant differences, WALA's anchor was rated highest on both. Only one measure, attractiveness, produced significant differences among news anchors. In this case, one of the co-anchors of WALA, the only female among the anchors, was rated significantly more attractive than the other three.[24] Also, the anchor from WKRG

was judged as significantly more attractive than the anchor for WEAR.[25]

(Place Tables 4, 5, & 6 about here.)

While the four aspects or categories of news which we have analyzed so far provide some insight into the relative quality of the local news programs of the three stations, they do not render an overall assessment or global judgment of which newscast is best in quality. In order to answer this question, we combined the four categories into a single index and performed an additional analysis of variance. Our first step was to weight the categories according to their perceived relative importance in determining quality in news programming. We therefore asked 100 communication students at the university and a nearby community college to rank order the four categories which were defined by the items comprising them or, in the case of the correlation between audience and station preference for news stories, by a brief explanation of what the category meant. The average rankings were then used as weighting factors. As one might expect, news substance ranked first (2.02), followed by technical quality (1.48), the association between public preference for news stories and the amount of time stations devoted to them (1.30), and the ratings of news anchors, sports anchors, and weather anchors (1.20). Our next step was to cast the data into a treatment (stations) by blocks (news categories) design. Raw scores were summed for each category or rank ordered and then

summed for those categories in which scales differed.[26] Next, scores were normalized across stations within categories and weighted to form a new raw score which was comparable across categories.

The two-way analysis of variance revealed a significant difference among stations ($F_{2, 45} = 3.03$, $p < .05$). A post-hoc analysis showed that WALA's newscast had a significantly higher score than that of WEAR. Mean scores of the standarized and weighted data were 15.59 (WALA), 14.73 (WKRG), and 14.53 (WEAR).

Discussion

The NQI analysis suggested that when all factors were taken into account and weighted according to relative importance, WALA ranked highest in quality and significantly higher than that of another station, WEAR. These results are understandable if one looks carefully at the scores for the individual categories. For example, for news substance, which carried the highest weighting factor, WALA scored first on two of the items--hard news and the absence of commercials. A simple counting procedure assigning first place a 3, second place a 2, and third place a 1 (the procedure which was used in constructing portions of the NQI) would give WALA a total score of 7, compared to WEAR's 6, and WKRG's 5. Using the same procedure for scoring technical quality, which had the second highest weighting factor, WALA would have

had a total score of 23, while WEAR would have had 20 and WKRG 19. While WALA placed second on the category which determined the relationship between the public's preference for news stories and the station's time devoted to those stories, its score was only a hundredth of a point behind that of WKRG. Finally, for the measures of attitude toward news anchors, sports anchors, and weather anchors, WALA would have again placed second with a total score of 49. WKRG would have placed first with a score of 54 and WEAR last with a score of 43.

WKRG scored first on the two audience-determined measures. It should not be surprising, then, that Nielsen ratings for May, 1982 showed that WKRG had the highest rating of any of the six o'clock news programs. Ironically, WALA scored lowest in the ratings, but its standing was more likely a result of following NBC's network news and of the peculiarities of the Mobile-Pensacola market.[27]

Conclusions

The development of the news quality index represents an attempt to combine journalistic criteria for assessing news with audience tastes in news stories and audience impressions of the various kinds of news anchors. Undoubtedly, other factors besides the ones included in this study pertain to quality. One such factor is accuracy in news reporting, which is just beginning to receive attention from scholars of broadcast journalism. Another factor

which obviously has some bearing on quality is the funding provided for the news department. The amount of money a station allocates for its news programming determines to a great extent its news gathering capability and the quality of its personnel.

Despite the fact that the NQI does not include these factors in its index, it nevertheless provides a fairly accurate assessment of overall quality. It does so by incorporating an array of measures into four aspects of news weighted according to their perceived importance in determining quality. Further research should seek to refine the NQI by incorporating additional factors into the index or by testing its construction against other means or methodologies for assessing news quality.

Footnotes

[1]"State of the Art: Journalism, "Broadcasting, 103: 43-60 (September 27, 1982).

[2]"Local TV Journalism," Broadcasting, 103: 37-91 (July 26, 1982).

[3]K. Tim Wulfemeyer, "Developing and Testing Method for Assessing Local TV Newscasts," Journalism Quarterly, 59: 79 (1982).

[4]Joseph R. Dominick, Alan Wurtzel, and Guy Lometti, "Television Journalism vs. Show Business: A Content Analysis of Eyewitness News," Journalism Quarterly, 52: 213-8 (1975).

[5]Jung S. Ryu, "Public Affairs and Sensationalism in Local TV News Programs," Journalism Quarterly, 59: 74-8, 137 (1982).

[6]Herbert Shosteck, "Factors Influencing Appeal of TV News Personalities," Journal of Broadcasting, 18: 63-71 (1973-74).

[7]William L. Cathcart, "Viewer Needs and Desires in Television Newscasters," Journal of Broadcasting, 14: 55-62 (1969-70).

[8]Keith P. Sanders and Michael Pritchett, "Some Influences of Appearance on Television Newscaster Appeal," Journal of Broadcasting, 15: 293-301 (1971).

[9]Michael W. Singletary and Richard Lipsky, "Accuracy in Local TV News," Journalism Quarterly, 54: 362-4 (1977).

[10]Walter B. Gantz, "Redundancy and Accuracy of Television Station Weather Forecasts," Journalism Quarterly, 59: 440-6 (1982).

[11]Wulfemeyer, op. cit.

[12]For most segments, the topic was the name of the story, e.g., "Distribution of Surplus Cheese" or "Legislative Redistricting." Other segments were labelled either "tease," "banter," "commercials," "sports," "weather," or "close." Whenever a segment contained two topics (banter and tease, for example), half the length of the segment was allocated to one topic and half to the other.

[13]The distinction between hard news and features is best summarized by Rivers. While hard news is a straight, factual account of recent events, features go beyond a mere presentation of fact and do not depend on timeliness. William Rivers, Mass Media (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), pp. 185-90. Shook and Lattimore's description of features is also useful. "Features are 'soft news,' stories about people and things that interest people." Frederick Shook and Dan Lattimore, The Broadcast News Process, 2nd edition, (Englewood, Col.: Morton Publishing Co., 1982), p. 111.

[14]The rationale was that the more hard news in a newscast, and the fewer commercials, and the less time spent in banter allowed for a more substantive newscast. This notion

is consistent with Wulfemeyer's finding that issues were ranked most important in a newscast, while banter and commercials were ranked least important. Wulfemeyer, op. cit.

[15]In six instances stories overlapped. For example, a story about recent city elections related to both politics and local government. Likewise, a story about hand gun control touched upon local government as well as crime. In these cases the procedure was to allocate half the length of time to one issue and half to the other.

[16]To determine whether the sample data were representative of the Mobile-Pensacola market, we made a comparison of respondents' preference for news viewing and the May, 1982 Nielson data.

	Nielsen metro share	Nielsen metro share based on whether respondent watches six o'clock news on WALA, WEAR, or WKRG	Sample share based on whether respondent watches six o'clock news on WALA, WEAR, or WKRG
WALA	22	28	28 (n = 51)
WEAR	27	34	34 (n = 64)
WKRG	31	39	38 (n = 71)

[17]Shosteck, op. cit.

[18]A high proportion of the subjects (81 percent) were female. Also, the majority of subjects had some college education and were between the ages of 18 and 24.

[19]The accepted level of significance for all analyses was .05. Also, for post-hoc comparisons we used Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

[20]Although the number of different reporters may not appear to be directly related to technical quality, we believe that an overall assessment of the spectacle of a newscast, the largely visual elements which we have labeled technical quality, would include the size of the news staff. Indeed, one station's promotional ads boast of having "the largest news team on the Gulf Coast."

[21]Because the low ranking of sports might have been attributable to a sex bias, we performed separate analyses of news preferences for males and females. In each analysis, sports was still ranked as the least important news issue.

[22]Interestingly, the three stations allocated time to news stories in much the same way. Correlations of the amount of time devoted to the various issues were .75 for WEAR and WKRG, .96 for WEAR and WALA, and .76 for WKRG and WALA.

[23]Before carrying out the analyses of variance for individual items, we performed a principal components factor analysis on the data of each anchor to determine whether an underlying factor structure existed. However, we found no items which had consistently high loadings across anchors.

[24]As footnote 18 indicates, 81 percent of the subjects were female as was one of the news anchors. To test whether the ratings of the female anchor, or indeed, of any of the anchors, might have been influenced by the high proportion of females in the sample, we analyzed the items for each anchor by sex.

Of the 80 analyses of variance, only six or 7.5 percent resulted in significant differences. This figure is roughly what one would expect to find by chance. Also, no significant differences occurred on the items pertaining to the female anchor.

[25]In another analysis, we collapsed anchors across stations to compare attitudes toward the three kinds of anchors. We found that news anchors ($\bar{X}$ =4.57) were rated significantly higher than either sports ($\bar{X}$ =4.10) or weather anchors ($\bar{X}$ =4.17). Keep in mind, however, that each time the videotapes were shown, news anchors appeared first. Respondents, therefore, may have become more critical of anchors as they became more familiar with the evaluation criteria.

[26]The procedure for transforming data into the NQI can best be understood by seeing the raw data and the transformation process. Below are the data for one category of the NQI, news substance. We first ranked stations on each item for each day, giving the highest ranking (3) to the station with the most hard news and the least amount of banter and commercials. Next, we added the three items scores of each day so that we had five scores (Monday through Friday) for each station. Our next step was to standardize the data to reduce between block variability and then to weight the data according to the category's relative importance in determining quality. A similar procedure was followed for the other three categories, although ranking wasn't necessary for the measures of public and station preference for news stories and attitude toward anchors. These transformations enabled us to perform the analysis of variance using a station by blocks (categories) design.

Raw data prior to being standardized and weighted

	WALA	WEAR	WKRG
Monday	7*	7	4
Tuesday	8.5	6.5	3
Wednesday	5	7	6
Thursday	7	4	7
Friday	7	5	6

* This figure represents the summed rankings of hard news, banter, and commercials for Monday.

[27] In a survey of 845 area residents conducted in 1979, the senior author discovered that 85 percent of those who watched WKRG's local news at 6 watched CBS's network news at 5:30, while 79 percent of the ones who watched WEAR's news program watched ABC 5:30 news and 70 of the ones who watched WALA news at 6 reported watching NBC's network news program. Also, two of the stations, WALA and WEAR are located in Mobile, Alabama. In 1979 and 1980 WALA won the wire services Pacemaker Award for having the outstanding television news operation in Alabama.

TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF NEWS SUBSTANCE

ITEM	WALA	WEAR	WKRG	F value	p
AVERAGE NUMBER OF MINUTES OF HARD NEWS	7.60	6.53	6.22	.82	NS
AVERAGE NUMBER OF MINUTES OF BANTER	.52	.40	.38	.60	NS
AVERAGE NUMBER OF MINUTES OF COMMERCIALS	7.37	7.90	8.60	12.39	.001+

+ The significant difference is between WKRG and the other two stations.

TABLE 2: COMPARISON OF TECHNICAL QUALITY OF NEWSCASTS

ITEM	WALA (1)	WEAR (2)	WKRG (3)	F	p	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IS BETWEEN
AVERAGE NUMBER OF SHOTS PER VTR	12.8	14.8	11.7	4.47	.04	2 & 3
AVERAGE NUMBER OF TECHNIQUES PER VTR	2.7	2.5	2.1	4.21	.04	1 & 3
AVERAGE NUMBER OF TECHNICAL FLAWS	2.2	3.0	2.8	.19	NS	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF MINUTES OF NEWS REPORTER VTRs	9.06	11.83	9.28	7.56	.008	2 & 3 1 & 2
AVERAGE NUMBER OF NEWSCASTERS APPEARING IN NEWSCAST (NOT INCLUDING ANCHORS)	5.8	6.6	6.6	.74	NS	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF SLIDES/STILLS ACCOMPANYING NEWS ANCHOR REPORTING	6.4	3.8	4.6	5.02	.03	1 & 2
AVERAGE NUMBER OF MINUTES OF VIDEO ACCOMPANYING NEWS ANCHOR REPORTING	2.0	1.1	2.9	5.72	.02	2 & 3
AVERAGE NUMBER OF SLIDES/STILLS ACCOMPANYING SPORTS ANCHOR REPORTING	3.4	4.4	.2	13.62	.001	2 & 3 1 & 3
AVERAGE NUMBER OF MINUTES OF VIDEO ACCOMPANYING SPORTS ANCHOR REPORTING	1.8	.5	.1	18.68	.001	1 & 2 1 & 3
AVERAGE NUMBER OF VISUALS ACCOMPANYING WEATHER ANCHOR REPORTING	6.8	5.6	8.0	14.40	.001	1 & 2 1 & 3 2 & 3

TABLE 3: CORRELATION BETWEEN PUBLIC'S PREFERENCE FOR NEWS STORIES AND THE AMOUNT OF TIME STATIONS DEVOTED TO THEM

ISSUE	SAMPLE N = 201	WEAR	WKRG	WALA
	(AVERAGE RATING)	(NUMBER OF MINUTES DEVOTED TO THE ISSUE DURING THE WEEK OF MAY 24-28)		
LOCAL ECONOMY	2.69	7	3	7
WEATHER	2.64	18	15	18
EDUCATION	2.64	4	15	5
LOCAL & STATE GOVERNMENT	2.57	7	10	9
CRIME (OR CRIME RELATED)	2.40	7	13	7
FIRES & ACCIDENTS	2.25	2	0	0
POLITICS & POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS	2.19	0	2	3
SPORTS	1.83	22	19	17
		r = -.28	r = -.09	r = -.10
(with sports removed)		r = .63	r = .58	r = .63

TABLE 4: COMPARISON OF NEWSCASTERS

ITEM	WEAR (1)	WKRG (2)	WALA (3)	(4)	F VALUE & PROBABILITY LEVEL (df=3,103-8)	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IS BETWEEN
	(AVERAGE RATINGS)					
THE NEWCASTER DOES NOT KNOW WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT	4.59*	4.84	4.68	4.75	.42 (NS)	
THE NEWSCASTER IS TRUSTWORTHY	4.53	4.32	4.46	4.47	.46 (NS)	
THE NEWSCASTER DOES NOT HAVE A PLEASANT VOICE	4.92	5.03	4.65	4.84	.99 (NS)	
THE NEWSCASTER DOES NOT SEEM TO BE A NICE PERSON	4.83	4.68	4.83	5.03	.87 (NS)	
THE NEWSCASTER SELDOM MAKES A GRAMMATICAL ERROR	4.00	4.22	4.27	4.57	1.68 (NS)	
THE NEWSCASTER DOES NOT DRESS APPROPRIATELY	4.61	5.03	5.05	4.97	1.71 (NS)	
THE NEWSCASTER MAKES DIFFICULT INFORMATION UNDERSTANDABLE FOR THE AVERAGE VIEWER	3.83	4.46	4.05	4.14	2.19 (NS)	
THE NEWSCASTER IS ATTRACTIVE	3.92	4.50	4.09	5.03	10.43 (.0001)	(1) & (2) (1) & (4) (3) & (4) (2) & (4)

*FOR ALL ITEMS, A HIGHER MEAN SCORE REPRESENTS A MORE FAVORABLE RATING.

TABLE 5: COMPARISON OF SPORTSCASTERS

ITEM	WEAR	WKRG	WALA	F VALUE & PROBABILITY LEVEL (df=2,68-72)	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IS BETWEEN
THE SPORTSCASTER DOES NOT KNOW WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT	4.43*	4.24	4.24	.44 (NS)	
THE SPORTSCASTER IS TRUSTWORTHY	4.00	4.31	4.22	.94 (NS)	
THE SPORTSCASTER DOES NOT HAVE A PLEASANT VOICE	4.46	3.49	4.14	6.35 (.003)	(1) & (2) (3) & (2)
THE SPORTSCASTER DOES NOT SEEM TO BE A NICE PERSON	4.36	4.92	4.66	3.51 (.04)	(2) & (1) (3) & (1)
THE SPORTSCASTER SELDOM MAKES A GRAMMATICAL ERROR	4.32	3.81	3.42	8.43 (.0005)	(1) & (2) (1) & (3)
THE SPORTSCASTER DOES NOT DRESS APPROPRIATELY	4.22	4.97	4.22	7.72 (.0009)	(2) & (1) (2) & (3)
THE SPORTSCASTER MAKES DIFFICULT INFORMATION UNDERSTANDABLE FOR THE AVERAGE VIEWER	3.73	3.89	3.57	1.03 (NS)	
THE SPORTSCASTER IS ATTRACTIVE	3.75	3.09	3.72	5.76 (.0049)	(1) & (2) (3) & (2)

*FOR ALL ITEMS, A HIGHER MEAN SCORE REPRESENTS A MORE FAVORABLE RATING.

TABLE 6: COMPARISON OF WEATHERCASTERS

ITEM	WEAR (1)	WKRG (2)	WALA (3)	F VALUE & PROBABILITY LEVEL (df=2,65-9)	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IS BETWEEN
	(AVERAGE RATINGS)				
THE WEATHERCASTER DOES NOT KNOW WHAT HE IS TALKING ABOUT	4.51*	4.57	4.16	1.78 (NS)	
THE WEATHERCASTER IS TRUSTWORTHY	3.92	4.17	3.94	.72 (NS)	
THE WEATHERCASTER DOES NOT HAVE A PLEASANT VOICE	4.14	4.17	4.46	1.06 (NS)	
THE WEATHERCASTER DOES NOT SEEM TO BE A NICE PERSON	4.78	4.63	4.61	.76 (NS)	
THE WEATHERCASTER SELDOM MAKES A GRAMMATICAL ERROR	3.92	4.06	3.73	1.21 (NS)	
THE WEATHERCASTER DOES NOT DRESS APPROPRIATELY	4.36	4.77	4.92	4.48 (.0149)	(3)&(1) (2)&(1)
THE WEATHERCASTER MAKES DIFFICULT INFORMATION UNDERSTANDABLE FOR THE AVERAGE VIEWER	3.58	3.77	3.86	.55 (NS)	
THE WEATHERCASTER IS ATTRACTIVE	3.34	3.06	4.49	17.94 (.0001)	(3)&(1) (1)&(2) (3)&(2)

*FOR ALL ITEMS, A HIGHER MEAN SCORE REPRESENTS A MORE FAVORABLE RATING.