DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 250 CS 208 380

AUTHOR Wyatt, Robert O.; Badger, David P.
TITLE How Reviews Affect Film Interest and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (67th, Gainesville, FL, August 5-8, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; *Attitudes; *Film Criticism; *Films; Higher Education; *Mass Media Effects; Media Research; Public Opinion; Reader Response; Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS *Audience Response; *Film Reviews

ABSTRACT

A study examined the effects of published film reviews on viewers' interest in and evaluation of the reviewed film. In the film interest experiment, 89 undergraduate students were randomly assigned positive, mixed, or negative reviews of a British film. The control group received a review of a different film. Subjects were asked to read the review, and to rate on a five-point scale 10 films, including the film in review. They also indicated the direction of the review they had read. Results indicated that review direction significantly affected interest in the film parallel to the direction of the review. Means of only the positive review group and the negative review group were significant, however. In the film evaluation experiment, 171 undergraduate students were randomly assigned positive, mixed, negative or no review of a film version of John Knowles's novel "A Separate Peace." After reading the assigned review, subjects were shown the film and asked to evaluate it on a set of 11 polar adjectives. The results indicated that review direction significantly affected evaluation of the film parallel with the direction of the review. Also, females rated the film significantly higher than did the males, regardless of the direction of their reviews. (HTH)

How Reviews Affect Film Interest and Evaluation

By Robert O. Wyatt and David P. Badger

Association for Education in Journalism Annual Convention

University of Florida

August 1984

Dr. Wyatt is professor of mass communications at Middle Tennessee State University and book editor of the Nashville *Tennessean*. Mr. Badger is assistant professor of mass communications at MTSU and film critic for WPLN-FM in Nashville.

ABSTRACT

How Reviews Affect Film Interest and Evaluation

By Robert O. Wyatt and David P. Badger
Middle Tennessee State University

The relation between critics and their audiences has received insufficient attention from empirical researchers. To ascertain how review direction (positive, mixed, negative) affects film interest and evaluation, the authors conducted two controlled experiments on students at Middle Tennessee State University.

In the first experiment, 89 Ss indicated their level of interest in seeing a film after random exposure to reviews of each direction. The control group read a placebo review. Only the mean interest level of the groups reading the positive and negative reviews differed significantly.

In the experiment on film evaluation, 171 Ss viewed a film after reading randomly assigned review treatments or no review. Ss then evaluated the film. The negative review group differed significantly from both the control and the positive review groups, and the mixed review group differed significantly from the positive review group. Other variables correlated significantly with higher evaluation of the film, but did not interact with review treatment. Females rated the film significantly higher than males.

Major conclusions are that review direction has a significant effect on film interest and evaluation, but that effects are relative and not proportionate to directional differentiation.

Scientific research about film audiences and film reviewing is, at best, sporadic and inadequate, and the American film industry remains surprisingly "data poor."[1] In the mid-1970s, the president of the National Association of Theater Owners conceded, "We simply do not have hard data on who goes to movies and who doesn't, much less why they go and don't go, and how we motivate more to do so."[2] Film scholars Jowett and Linton echoed that position in 1980, concluding: "Moviemakers establish parameters of choice...based on a set of beliefs that generally lacks empirical support....Movie scholarship has tended to neglect the audience entirely, and there is very little literature which adequately deals with the subject."[3] Between 1935 and 1952, George Gallup's Audience Research, Inc., conducted regular studies for a number of Hollywood and independent producers, but research has been minimal since and reserved chiefly for proprietary purposes.

Yet, in 1983, executives from MGM/United Artists, Universal and Warner Bros. decided to withhold advance-screening privileges from national film critics ordinarily accorded a glimpse of forthcoming features out of fear that negative reviews might cause film attendance to "suffer."[4] As one former studio publicist told *USA TODAY*, "The idea is to make as much money as you can before word gets out."[5]

But do film critics actually affect attendance? More specifically, can a critical review stimulate or discourage audience interest in attending a particular film, and can a review significantly affect the audience's evaluation of a film afterwards? Moviemakers, after all, cherish the belief that recommendations and opinions of audience members—known as "word of mouth" in the trade—are among the most potent influences on the success or failure of a film in general release.[6]

In 1974, Burzynski and Bayer employed a quasi-experimental design to test whether film patrons exposed to positive, negative or no prior information would be affected in their appreciation of a motion picture.[7] To manipulate filmgoers' post-viewing assessment, three independently operating pairs of confederates posed as legitimate theater patrons departing separate performances of a film and made comments audible to subjects awaiting the next showing. After these showings, a rating scale administered to selected viewers indicated that audience appreciation was "altered by prior [negative and positive] information cues."[8]

In one earlier attempt to study the effect of prior information on film audiences, investigators at the Air Force Personnel and Training Center tested the hypothesis that lecture supplements stressing significant scenes and events in a commercial motion picture would have an effect on military trainees' attitudes measured afterwards.[9] The researchers found that subjects hearing lectures before, after, or part before and part after viewing were generally more favorable toward the sequences and subjects emphasized than those who were exposed to the film alone.

That films can exert attitudinal influence on their audiences has previously been established by survey and experimental researchers.[10] That film reviews published or broadcast in mass media channels may exert an influence has not.

Research into the relation between critics and their audiences seems wholly neglected by social scientists, a thorough search of the literature reveals. However, self-report surveys relating critics' perceptions of their own influence abound.[11] Responses to one such survey of 90 major critics in 1963, for example, indicated that critics in general consider themselves "moderately effective in influencing public opinion concerning artistic mass communications."[12] The traditional response to the question of critical influence is perhaps best summed up by writer-critic Stephen Farber's tempered remark: "The critics do have power, but...the actual extent of the critics' power is difficult to calculate."[13]

The present experiment was designed to measure the influence of film reviews on potential and actual film audiences. It was conducted in two stages—as a study of the effect of review direction (positive, mixed, negative) on interest in a film, and as a study of the effect of review direction on post-viewing evaluation of a film. The general directions of positive, mixed and negative reviews were adopted to coincide with customary designations employed by critics and mentioned in studies by film scholars.[14]

Hypotheses

H1: Review direction will significantly affect film-viewing interest compatible with the direction of the review.

H2: Subjects can significantly identify the direction of reviews.

H3: Direction of reviews read before viewing a film will significantly affect post-viewing evaluation compatible with the direction of the reviews.

H4: High importance assigned to reviews and other types of publicity about film will be related significantly and positively to influence by review direction.

H5: Film enthusiasm will be related significantly and positively to film evaluation, regardless of review direction.

Method and Results

Film Interest Experiment. To examine how review direction affects interest in a film, a controlled laboratory experiment was conducted on 89 Middle Tennessee State University students enrolled in an introductory mass media course for non-majors. Ss were randomly assigned questionnaires containing the experimental treatments: positive, mixed and negative reviews of a British film, director Jack Gold's "The National Health, or Nurse Norton's Affair." The control group received a review of "Anne of the Thousand Days." "The National Health" was selected because likelihood of prior acquaintance was minimal.

The authors—both experienced reviewers—carefully constructed the review treatments to match usual critics' preconceptions about review types or directions. Demographic variables were recorded, and Ss were asked to rate their interest in seeing 10 films, including "The National Health," on five-point scales from "not interested at all" to "extremely interested." Ss were also asked to identify whether they had read a positive, mixed or negative review.

Film Interest Results. H1 was accepted: A one-way analysis of variance indicated that review direction significantly affected interest in the film compatible with the direction of the review at the established .05 level of significance. The eta-square statistic indicated that review direction accounted for 10.6% of the variance in interest. The Scheffe multiple-range procedure, however, indicated that the means of only the positive review group and the negative review group were significantly different. Table 1 provides cell means and details of significance tests.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

H2 was accepted. Kendall's taub indicated a moderate but significant association between review direction and identification of review direction (.598, p=.000). The positive review was identified appropriately by 54.5% of those exposed to it, while 82.6% identified the mixed review appropriately and 52.4% identified the negative review appropriately.

Film Evaluation Experiment. A post-test only controlled laboratory experiment was conducted to assess the effect of reviews read before viewing a film on post-viewing evaluation. Ss were 171 MTSU students from two mass media classes—one class of upper-division non-majors and one class of lower-division majors. Ss were randomly assigned positive, mixed, negative or no reviews of director Larry Peerce's film version of John Knowles' novel *A Separate Peace* in each of two administrative sessions.

The film was chosen because it received similar numbers of positive, mixed and negative reviews in national media when it opened in 1972 (five positive, four mixed, six negative, according to one analysis).[15] After screening the film, the authors felt reasonable reviews of each type could be written without straining audience credibility. The film was also old enough that few Ss were likely to have seen or heard of it, and was available in a 47-minute edited version, making its use in short experimental sessions convenient.

Based on the results of the pilot study, in which Ss displayed some difficulty identifying positive and negative reviews, a more systematic procedure was employed to construct experimental treatments. A positive review was first written, then a negative review was produced by substituting polar-opposite adjectives in the evaluative phrases, while holding background detail and plot summary constant. Then a mixed review was compiled by substituting mixed or neutral adjectives.

The treatments were set in type under the fictitious byline of Ben Brown, with these headlines: "Peerce's 'A Separate Peace'/Beautiful, Compelling Film," "Peerce's 'A Separate Peace'/Interesting but Uneven Film," and "Peerce's 'A Separate Peace'/A Tedious, Cliched Movie." Interchanged adjectives were employed in these phrases: The film was called a "beautiful/uneven/poor" adaptation of Knowles' classic novel. Director Peerce was said to bring "great/some/little" vision to the film. Acting was said to be "outstanding/mixed/dreadful." One actor's performance was described as

"excellent/satisfactory/awful," while his co-star's execution was styled "equally fine/equally adequate/equally poor." Cinematography was said to be "gorgeous/conventional/unattractive." Editing was judged "superb/competent/incompetent." The summary called the film "absorbing, convincing/absorbing but unconvincing/boring, unconvincing."

The review treatments were incorporated into a lengthy questionnaire inquiring about the Ss demographic characteristics and media habits and containing a number of attitudinal items unrelated to the present investigation. To further mask the purpose of the study, Ss were told only that the authors were studying how people respond to entertainment. Ss were asked the importance of 11 selected variables (film type, director, cast, etc.) in determining whether they attend a movie in order to test H4. Ss were also asked whether they had seen the film before or read the book and were asked to report approximately how many movies they see per year, or, if more than 12, how many per month.

After reading the review, Ss were then shown the film and afterwards were asked to evaluate it on a set of 11 polar adjectives separated by seven-point scales with poles randomly reversed (boring/interesting, unappealing/appealing, meaningless/meaningful, pleasing/annoying, worthless/valuable, forgettable/unforgettable, bad/good, entertaining/dull, well-made/shoddy, moving/unmoving, unpleasant/pleasant). A 77-point scale was produced by summing the scores of these adjectives and ignoring cases with missing data. Only then were Ss asked to identify the direction of the review they read to avoid exposing the purpose of the study. Finally, Ss were given a seven-item Likert-type scale to measure their enthusiasm for film to test H5.

Film Evaluation Results. H3 was accepted: A one-way ANOVA indicated that review direction significantly affected evaluation of the film compatible with review direction and accounted for 11.1% of the variance in evaluation (eta=.333). The Scheffe procedure indicated that the means of the control group and the negative review group were significantly different, and that the mean of the positive review group was significantly different from the means of both the negative review group and the mixed review group. Table 2 provides cell means and details of significance tests.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

H2 was again accepted: Kendall's taub indicated a strong significant association between review direction and identification of review direction (.717, p=.000). The positive review was identified appropriately by 81.8% of those exposed to it, while the mixed review and the negative review were both identified appropriately by 71.8% of the Ss exposed to them. Improvement in appropriate identification over the pilot study was attributed to the more systematic procedure employed to construct treatments.

In order to test H4, that importance assigned to reviews and other types of publicity will be related significantly and positively to influence by review direction, 11 selected attendance variables were submitted to R-factor analysis employing a principal components solution and varimax rotation. Attendance variables were scored on four-point scales, with higher scores indicating greater importance of the variable in choosing to attend a film.

A scree test suggested the desirability of a three-factor solution. Loadings of each item, as well as means and standard deviations of factor scores, are summarized in Table 3. Factor scores were computed using the complete-estimation method.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Factor 1 was labeled publicity-advertising because of the high loadings of those variables. Recommendations of friends and relatives loaded moderately, and reviews loaded low—suggesting that reviews are not regarded as publicity stories. Factor 2 was labeled director-screenplay, and Factor 3 was labeled location-price.

H4 was rejected: One-way analyses of covariance testing for interaction between attendance variables and review direction revealed no significant interactions. Importance assigned to reviews and other types of publicty was not related significantly and positively to influence by review direction. However, importance assigned to publicity-advertising proved to have a significant main effect, accounting for 4.49% of the variance in evaluation directly (publicity-advertising adjusted for review direction F=8.150, df 1/162, p=.005)..

In order to test H5, that film enthusiasm is related significantly and positively to film evaluation regardless of review direction, the seven-item Likert-type film-enthusiasm scale[16] was also submitted

to R-factor analysis. A scree test suggested a two-factor solution. Loadings and exact phrasing of film-enthusiasm items are contained in Table 4, as are means and standard deviations of factor scores and significant correlations of factors with selected variables.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

The two-factor solution suggested that film enthusiasm—operationally defined as the measurement of this scale—needed further qualification. Factor 1 was labeled film enjoyment because of the moderate loading of the item relating to attending movies even when they are not entertaining and the moderately low loadings of items relating to attending films alone, preferring movies to television and general rating of most movies seen. Significant but weak positive correlations between film enjoyment and the following variables were observed: film attendance, being a mass communications major (dichotomy), reported magazine readership and importance of director-screenplay. Weak but significant negative correlations were observed with importance of publicity-advertising and location-price in choosing to attend.

Factor 2 was labeled film valuation because of the moderately high loading of the item related to substituting filmgoing for reading and the moderate loading of the item suggesting that watching movies is more valuable than reading. Significant but weak positive correlations between film valuation and these variables were observed: importance of publicity-advertising and location-price. Weak but significant negative correlations were observed with reported newspaper readership, magazine readership and importance of director-screenplay.

H5 was accepted with qualification. Film valuation was significantly and positively related to film evaluation regardless of review direction. A one-way ANCOVA testing for interaction between film valuation and review direction indicated that both main effects were significant, but that interaction was not (film valuation adjusted for review direction F=16.503, df 1/159, p=.000). Film valuation alone accounted for 8.88% of the variance in evaluation.

Separate two-way ANOVAs were conducted employing review direction with each demographic variable, amount of film attendance reported, reported newspaper and magazine readership, and

reported previous exposure to the film or book. The main effect of review treatment remained significant, but no interactive effects were present. Of the demographic variables, sex, however, proved to have a significant main effect, accounting alone for 5.29% of the variance in evaluation (sex adjusted for review direction F=9.331, df 1/162, p=.003). T-tests revealed that females also rated importance of publicity-advertising significantly higher (mean F .166, M -.136, p=.028) and scored significantly higher on film enjoyment (mean F .151, M -.115, p=.013).

Reported film attendance did not significantly interact with review direction. Fifty-three Ss (31%) reported seeing more than one film per month in a movie theater—a figure somewhat higher than the 22% of adults 18 and over who reported attending at least one film per month in Gallup's 1981 survey.[17]

Total Variance. A multiple regression equation with restrictive entry requirements removed revealed that review direction (dummy variables), film valuation, sex (dichotomy) and publicity-advertising accounted for 22.9% of the variance in evaluation combined. Examination of a normal probability plot of standardized residuals indicated that relations were linear and additive (S.D.=.982).

Summary and Discussion

The major conclusions of this study are:

1) Review direction has a significant effect on film interest compatible with the direction of the review, but that effect is relative.

2) Review direction has a significant effect on film evaluation compatible with the direction of the review, but that effect, too, is relative.

3) Ss can significantly identify review direction, but identification is improved when direction is clearly distinguished.

4) Film valuation as measured by preference for film over reading correlates significantly and positively with evaluation.

5) Interest in publicity-advertising correlates significantly and positively with evaluation.

6) Female subjects evaluated the film significantly higher than males, were significantly more interested in publicity-advertising, and scored significantly higher on film enjoyment.

The film interest study found that only the positive review group differed significantly from the negative review group, while neither differed significantly from the mixed and control groups (see Table 1). This could be the result of the authors' failure to distinguish review types systematically. However, if we assume that the relative effects of the experiment carry over into the actual world of filmgoing, the study casts doubt on the ability of negative reviews—which may contain some mixed or positive information—to decrease interest significantly over no review or a mixed review. The study also casts doubt on the ability of positive reviews—which may contain some mixed or negative information—to increase interest significantly over a mixed review or no review. This would seem to be the case particularly when unmanipulated audience interest—represented by the control group—is moderate. Effects of review direction may be different when unmanipulated interest is either high or low.

The experiment on film evaluation found that both the mixed and negative reviews significantly decreased level of evaluation in relation to the positive review. Only the negative review, however, significantly decreased the level of evaluation over the control group, while the positive review failed to increase the level of evaluation significantly over the control group (see Table 2). The control group—representing "natural" audience evaluation—rated the film quite high, equivalent to "very good." Thus, the positive review did not make Ss like the film better than they would naturally. The mixed review, on the other hand, did not differ significantly from the negative review—that is, some negative information had almost as much effect as a great deal in decreasing the level of evaluation. (Indeed, the Tukey-HSD test, more liberal than the Scheffe, found the mixed review significantly different from the control.)

It is possible to argue, of course, that the positive and negative treatments were so extreme that they strained the audience's sense of credibility and thus produced little relative effect compared

with no review or a mixed review, respectively. However, such markedly contrasting reviews of the same film are not unusual in the actual world of criticism, and, if the reviews in the experiment strained credibility at all, they did not produce a boomerang effect. Perhaps a better explanation for the observed effect is that reviews are capable of moving audience evaluation only within certain bounds; reviews cannot override natural predispositions completely, particularly when they have pushed those predispositions toward the extremes of positive or negative evaluation.

Future research might well probe the effect of reviews of films which receive mixed or negative evaluations from the control group to discern the magnitude of effects under those conditions. In the meantime, directors and actors may be considerably more jubilant with rave reviews and outraged with pans, but this study suggests that the effects of such reviews are not proportionate to their direction.

The fact that film enthusiasm proved to have at least two dimensions raises intriguing prospects, although the results are based on a convenience sample. The film enjoyment factor, which correlates weakly with increased attendance, did not affect evaluation significantly. Thus, general enjoyment of film and general rate of attendance are not related significantly to higher or lower evaluation of the film under consideration—or to employing film as a substitute for reading.

However, film valuation—measured by assigning prominence to film as a substitute for reading or actual preference of film over reading—was related positively to evaluation and accounted for a relatively high proportion of the variance (8.88%). Film valuation did not correlate significantly with attendance and correlated negatively with importance of director-screenplay (see Table 4), suggesting that it is possible to assign high priority to an activity without attending it more frequently or being more interested in it technically. Since correlation with film enjoyment is, by the nature of orthogonal factors, not significant, it is possible that evaluation and enjoyment represent two separate dimensions of aesthetic experience. It may be possible to evaluate a film highly without enjoying it or without enjoying attending film in general. It may also be possible that the film-valuation factor

measures a general lack of aesthetic experience, since the factor correlates negatively with magazine and newspaper readership as well as film attendance.

The fact that interest in publicity-advertising is correlated positively and significantly with evaluation indicates that those who value publicity and advertising are disposed to evaluate film more highly than those who do not. Thus, reliance on publicity and advertising may indicate a disposition to consume film less critically, as the weak but significant correlation with film valuation also suggests. The weak but negative correlation with film enjoyment may also suggest that those who enjoy and attend film value information about film from sources other than publicity-advertising.

The fact that females in the experimental group evaluated this film significantly higher than males at all treatment levels but were not more affected by review direction opens up several possibilities. "A Separate Peace" is a film about the coming-of-age of young men. It is possible that this subject alone interested females more or, alternately, interested males less. But significant differences in males and females on importance of publicity-advertising and film enjoyment suggest that these females may simply enjoy film more. In the pilot study on interest, however, females did not differ significantly from males.

The generalizability of this experiment is, of course, lower than that of a controlled field experiment. It cannot be concluded that all filmgoers would rate this film as high or that they would be as influenced by reviews, particularly under conditions of natural exposure removed from an academic environment. However, the Ss are, to some degree, representative of the college-age audience, and college students are among the most frequent and heavily courted moviegoers. They are, as well, significantly affected by review direction, regardless of what other categories differentiate them.

FOOTNOTES

1 "Motivational Research in Promotion: Why Folks Go To, Stay From, Pics," *Variety*, June 26, 1974, p. 7.

2 *Ibid.*

3 Garth Jowett and James M. Linton, *Movies as Mass Communication* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980), pp. 30, 80.

4 Jack Mathews, *USA TODAY*, Aug. 12, 1983, p. 1D.

5 *Ibid.*

6 Leo Handel, *Hollywood Looks at Its Audience: A Report on Film Audience Research* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1950), p. 69. See also Jowett and Linton, *op. cit.*, and Won H. Chang, "A Typology Study of Movie Critics," *Journalism Quarterly* 52:721-725 (1975).

7 Michael H. Burzynski and Dewey J. Bayer, "The Effect of Positive and Negative Prior Information on Motion Picture Appreciation," *Journal of Social Psychology* 101:215-218 (1977).

8 *Ibid.*, p. 215.

9 Frank T. Staudohar and Robert G. Smith, Jr., "The Contribution of Lecture Supplements to the Effectiveness of an Attitudinal Film," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 40:109-111 (1956).

10 See, for example, Franklin Fearing, "Influence of Movies on Attitudes and Behavior," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 254:70-79 (1947); Paul G. Cressey, "The Motion Picture Experience as Modified by Social Background and Personality," *American Sociological Review* 3:516-525 (1938); William R. Elliott and William J. Schenck-Hamlin, "Film, Politics and the Press: The Influence of 'All the President's Men,'" *Journalism Quarterly* 56:546-553 (1979). For an excellent bibliography, see Bruce A. Austin, "Film Audience Research, 1960-1980: An Annotated Bibliography," *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 8:53-60 (1980) and Bruce A. Austin, "Film Audience Research, 1969-1980: An Update," *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 8:57-59 (1981).

11 See, for example, John W. English, *Criticizing the Critics* (New York: Hastings House, 1979); Robert S. Albert and Peter Whitelam, "The Role of the Critic in Mass Communications: II. The Critic Speaks," *Journal of Social Psychology* 60:153-156 (1963); Trevor Brown, "Reviewers on Reviewing,"

Journalism Quarterly 55:32-38 (1978); Louis Harris and Associates, Inc., "Critics and Criticism in the Mass Media," Unpublished report prepared for the United Church of Christ, 1969.

12 Albert and Whitelam, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

13 Stephen Farber, "The Power of Movie Critics," *The American Scholar* 45:420-421 (1976).

14 See Chang, *loc. cit.*.

15 "A Separate Peace," *Filmfacts* 15:437 (1972).

16 Several items in this scale are similar to those in L.L. Thurstone, "A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward the Movies," *Journal of Educational Research* 22:84-89 (1930). For a recent application, see Julia Bannerman and Jerry M. Lewis, "College Students' Attitudes Toward Movies," *Journal of Popular Film* 6:126-139 (1977).

17 "Gallup Looks at the Movies," *The Gallup Report*, No. 195, December 1981, pp. 3-23.

Table 1

Significance Tests and Cell Means of Film Interest and Review Direction

Analysis of Variance

Source	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	3.732	3.304	.024
Within Groups	84	1.130		

Scheffe Multiple-Range Procedure
Homogeneous Subsets Underlined ($p<.05$)

	Positive	Mixed	Control	Negative
Means	3.455	2.913	2.727	2.476

Table 2

Significance Tests and Cell Means of Film Evaluation and Review Direction

Analysis of Variance

Source	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	916.643	6.881	.000
Within Groups	166	133.210		

Scheffe Multiple-Range Procedure
Homogeneous Subsets Underlined ($p<.05$)

	Positive	Control	Mixed	Negative
Means	59.022	58.159	51.634	49.700

Table 3

Factor Loadings on Film-Attendance Variables

	Factor 1 (Publicity-Advertising)	Factor 2 (Director-Screenplay)	Factor 3 (Location-Price)
Type of Film	.16519	-.01899	.10338
Director	-.10267	.82416	-.10816
Screenplay	-.01148	.77659	-.09118
Cast	.27777	.31209	.18824
Comment of Friends/Relatives	.37631	.16915	.38859
Reviews Read/Heard	.24134	.39807	.28388
Price	.08062	-.01525	.47466
Convenience of Location	.16185	-.03852	.75444
Advertisements	.85221	-.02355	.03134
Advance Publicity Stories	.72230	.03238	.16420
Awards and Honors	.39867	.31694	.16887
Eigenvalue	2.31053	1.55142	.71222
Percentage of Variance	50.5	33.9	15.6
Factor Score Mean	.000	.000	.000
Factor Score S.D.	.896	.901	.816

Table 4

Factor Loadings and Selected Correlations on Film-Enthusiasm Variables

Likert-Type Item:	Factor 1 (Film Enjoyment)	Factor 2 (Film Valuation)
Most movies I go to see aren't very good.[a]	.37415	.16452
If there's a movie I want to go to see and I can't get someone to go with me, I go by myself.[b]	.39035	-.05553
I don't like to go to movies unless they're entertaining.[a]	.53073	-.01579
I don't have time to read as many books as I would like, so movies provide an effective substitute.[b]	-.02830	.66049
Reading is a more valuable activity than watching movies.[a]	-.09643	.46302
I would rather watch an entertaining program on TV than pay to see a movie.[a]	.38605	-.05123
I enjoy the ritual of going to see a movie.[b]	.17077	.22074
Eigenvalue	.76781	.72690
Percentage of Variance	51.4	48.6
Factor Score Mean	.000	.000
Factor Score S.D.	.696	.736
Correlations ($p<.05$):		
Reported Attendance	.251	N.S.
Importance of Publicity-Advertising	-.129	.326
Importance of Director-Screenplay	.131	-.191
Importance of Location-Price	-.262	.227
Major (Mass Comm/Other Dichotomy)	.134	N.S.
Reported Newspaper Readership	N.S.	-.251
Reported Magazine Readership	.252	-.271

[a]Disagreement receives higher score.
[b]Agreement receives higher score.