DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 269 CS 506 135

AUTHOR Gaziano, Cecilie
TITLE The Role of Psychographic Analysis in Developing Mass Communication Theory.
PUB DATE 22 Apr 87
NOTE 29p.; Keynote speech, Annual Communications Research Symposium, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, April 22, 1987.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audience Analysis; Individual Characteristics; Mass Media; *Media Research; Models; *Newspapers; Public Opinion; *Research Tools; Theories
IDENTIFIERS Audience Research; *Journalism Research; Journalists; Media Use; *Psychographic Analysis; Readership Analysis; Subscribers (Newspapers)

ABSTRACT

Psychographic analysis--combining demographic and attitudinal characteristics into groups and looking at variations in those characteristics--is useful in newspaper research to expand theories of media publics. One effective segmentation strategy (used at Minnesota Opionion Research Incorporated--MORI) is to divide the population into four groups, based on relevant behavior and apparent likelihood of change in that behavior, and to use discriminant analysis to "predict" individuals who are users and non-users of a product or service. Another useful reader typology is a typology of mobility, showing how people relate to their communities and the role of that relationship to newspaper reading. A third typology measures attitudes toward media, news, and alienation from society, classifying the public into two groups--"sophisticated skeptics" and "less well informed and suspicious." These two subgroups are further defined by the variables of demographics, perceptions of media philosophies, perceptions of bias and opinion in media, and attitudes toward the media. In contrast to these audience groups, groups of journalists represent a typology which can contribute to a theory of people in the media. One such typology divides journalists into subgroups based on their age and relationship to their community. (Two pages of footnotes and 11 tables of data are appended.) (MM)

# THE ROLE OF PSYCHOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS IN DEVELOPING MASS COMMUNICATION THEORY



Cecilie Gaziano
Research Analyst
MORI Research
7901 Xerxes Avenue So., Suite 102
Minneapolis, MN 55431

(612) 881-6909 or 881-2380

Keynote Speech, Annual Communications Research Symposium
College of Communications
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

April 22, 1987

# THE ROLE OF PSYCHOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS IN DEVELOPING MASS COMMUNICATION THEORY

Cecilie Gaziano
Research Analyst
MORI Research
Minneapolis, Minnesota

My topic is on one way to approach the development of theory in mass communication. It concerns theories about the composition of society or communities rather than theories about the media themselves. My suggestions come from the notion of market segmentation or psychographics.

Psychographic pictures of survey respondents are developed by combining demographic and attitudinal characteristics to form groups or segments of a larger whole. In most of the work my company does, the larger whole is a community or a market composed of several communities. We develop a model of this larger whole segmented into meaningful groups. Then we look at how those groups may vary, for example, in their use of media, as well as in other characteristics.

Most mass communication research does not go much beyond looking at variations by age, sex, education, and similar demographics. Frequently, researchers will report little or no variation by these characteristics, yet if something is added to these characteristics, variation does occur. People of similar educational levels or similar ages vary in their attitudes, and they can be described better by creating further subgroups, based for instance, on variations in age, education, and attitudes.

This kind of analysis is rare in the mass communication literature, although it is found more frequently in advertising and marketing journals. It is a mistake to dismiss such analysis as something only marketing people do, because psychological and sociological theory tell us that people do vary in their psychological traits, that such variation is partly linked to

demographic characteristics, and that people who vary in certain ways tend to form groups with others like themselves. Phil Meyer has a good discussion of creating psychographic concepts in his new book, The Newspaper Survival Book.[1]

Although the kind of analysis described relates to creating statistical constructs, there is evidence that these constructs work well enough to approximate reality. We have had a lot of success in repiicating certain psychographic models in a number of different markets. These models have been used for newspaper and non-newspaper clients. Clients have found these constructs useful in developing marketing and advertising campaigns aimed at various social segments -- that is, campaigns with different appeals, designed to reach different groups. Today, I would like to show you examples of some models which have been useful in different kinds of newspaper research.

One of the most interesting models we use was developed by Brent Stahl and Lee Kaplan at MORI Research. Although the data which demonstrate the model belong to clients, not to us, there are some tables which clients have approved for examination by others.

MORI Research often is asked to characterize a market and to identify groups for targeting product development and promotion efforts.[2] A useful segmentation strategy is to divide the population into four groups, based on relevant behavior and apparent likelihood of change in that behavior.

We use discriminant analysis to "predict" individuals who are users and non-users of the product or service -- or readers and non-readers, in the case of newspapers -- as a aid to developing a four-fold typology of users. The newspaper typology includes "loyal readers," "potential readers," "marginal readers," and "unlikely readers." We then look at such things as how they perceive news and newspapers, how they relate to their communities, how they use other media and leisure time, their interest in various news topics, how they vary in other attitudes, and how they vary demographically.

An optimal marketing strategy is to: 1) keep loyal readers happy, 2) strengthen the franchise among marginal readers, 3) attract potential readers, and 4) decrease efforts to recruit poor prospects.

Table 1 shows how the distribution of the four groups can vary across four markets. For instance, the proportion of loyal readers is larger in markets "A" and "B" than in "C" or, especially, "D." Poor prospects comprise one-third of Market "A" but almost half of Market "D."

Table 2 shows how these groups tend to vary in their attachment to print and newspapers. Although the figures are for one market, the relationships are fairly consistent in other markets. Loyal and potential readers tend to have a stronger newspaper orientation than others. Poor prospects have the strongest television orientation.

In general, loyal and potential readers are better educated, have higher incomes, and have higher-status occupations than marginal readers and poor prospects. Table 3 illustrates some demographic characteristics of the reader groups in Market "B."

Loyal and potential readers tend to have high interest in most newspaper topics tested. Marginal readers and poor prospects tend to have lower interest in many "hard news" topics, instead preferring advertising and "soft news." Specific interests vary by market.

For example, in Market "B," loyal readers are very interested in almost all subjects but have below-average interest in television shows, food, and recipes. Potential readers are similar to loyal readers, but they have even greater interest in neighborhood and community news, television shows, and sports. They have high Sunday readership of metro, regional, and business sections of the paper.

Marginal readers have lower interest in national, business, and sports news. Their interests include: advertising and shopping, food and recipes,

TV listings and shows, restaurants, community/neighborhood news, and health and medicine. Poor prospects also tend to be interested in advertising, shopping, television shows, food and recipes, community and neighborhood news, and health and medicine, but their level of interest in most news topics is below average. Table 4 gives examples of variation in news topic interests among the four reader groups in three markets.

Applications to different marketing problems would include analyses which address these questions:

1. What is the potential for gains in certain suburban areas and among those in certain occupational categories, and what kinds of news products can best attract readers among these groups?

2. What is the likely reaction by loyal, marginal, and potential readers to substantial changes contemplated for the newspaper?

3. In strongly competitive markets with substantial overlapping readership, what are the news interests, current readership, and loyalties of marginal and potential readers?

Frequently, when developing the typology of readers, we use a typology of mobility adapted from one which Keith Stamm and his colleagues have developed (Table 5). How people relate to their communities and the role of this relationship to newspaper reading is a very useful topic to pursue in mass communication research. A book highly recommended on this is Keith Stamm's book, Newspaper Use and Community Ties: Toward a Dynamic Theory.[3]

Keith uses some different breaks in the number of years than we do. We usually use five years, depending on what kinds of frequency distributions we get, in order to get enough cases to analyze in the three categories besides "natives."

"Natives" tend to be among the best newspaper readers in most markets. "Settlers" and "relocaters" are the next best readers, at similar levels, and "drifters" are usually the least interested in newspapers. However, each of these groups often has different needs to be satisfied by newspapers because

they are in different stages of connecting to the community. Interestly, in one market, "natives" were not especially interested in the two metropolitan newspapers, and when they read newspapers (they were less likely to read them than others were), they preferred suburban papers. However, if they read the dominant metro paper, they read it more frequently than the other three groups did.

A third example of typologies which help to expand theories of media publics comes from the 1985 ASNE national credibility survey.[4] In this study, SES characteristics and certain kinds of attitudes were combined to define two groups, "sophisticated skeptics" and the "less well informed and suspicious." Attitudes toward media, news, and alienation from society were measured by a series of statements with which respondents were asked to agree or disagree.

Factor analysis indicated that agreement with certain statements tended to be related to agreement or disagreement with others. Attitudes measured by the statements divided into six factors, or groups with a common theme. Three of these seemed to fit best the attitudes expressed by people in five preliminary focus groups in different parts of the country who had the most frequent or the strongest complaints about newspapers and other media. These groups are: 1) media responsibility, 2) news involvement, and 3) social alienation. The purpose of the factor analysis was to aid in describing the two groups, rather than to test hypotheses derived from a theory.

Table 6 shows percentages who strongly or somewhat agreed with each item and the amount of relationship of items as measured by a factor loading (the higher the loading, the greater the relationship).[5]

Respondents received factor scores for each category, and each distribution of factor scores was divided into approximately equal thirds, "high," "medium," and "low." If respondents were low or moderate in news

involvement and also high in social alienation, they were the "less well informed and suspicious" (Table 7). "Sophisticated skeptics" were those high in news involvement and low or medium in scores on media responsibility. Together, these two groups represented almost half the sample.

Analysis of a number of variables helped to fill out a picture of these two subgroups. Some of these variables which are described more fully below were demographics, perceptions of media philosophies, perceptions of bias and opinion in media, and attitudes toward the media.

Demographic Characteristics. Education was related to where people stood on media responsibility, news involvement, and social alienation. More than half "sophisticated skeptics" had attended college, and one-third had college degrees or more education. In contrast, 40% of the "less well informed and suspicious" had high school degrees, and 41% had not finished high school.

Because attitude differences between the "sophisticated skeptics" and the "less well informed and suspicious" might be due merely to differences in education, the rest of the sample was divided into two comparison groups -- one with high school degrees or less education and one with some college or more education.

About half of the "sophisticated skeptics" had household incomes of $25,000 a year or more. More than one-third were in high-status white-collar occupations, while only 16% had blue-collar jobs. Age and sex characteristics were similar to the general population.[6] (Unless stated otherwise, all results reported are for chi-square analyses, $p < .05$.)

"Sophisticated skeptics" were much more likely than the sample in general to identify with political philosophies, and they were much more likely to be conservative than to have other political philosophies (Table 8). They were more likely to be conservative than others with similar education.

"Sophisticated skeptics" were no more likely than other well-educated people to term themselves Republicans.

Slightly more than half of the "less well informed" had household incomes of less than $15,000 annually. Just 12% held high-status white-collar positions; 35% had blue-collar jobs.

The "less well informed and suspicious" overrepresented women ($p = .08$), especially homemakers, as well as blacks (n.s.), and Hispanics. They tended to be slightly younger on the whole than "sophisticated skeptics," as well as to have larger households and children under 18.

The "less well informed and suspicious" were only slightly more likely to be liberals than the low-education group with which they were compared. They were more likely than others to say they do not think of themselves in political terms at all (Table 7). However, the "less well informed" were disproportionately more likely than others with low education to be Democrats.

Both the "sophisticated skeptics" and the "less well informed" were more likely than others to be Protestant, while the "less well informed" overrepresented born-again Christians.

Perceptions of Media Political Philosophies. "Sophisticated skeptics" tended somewhat more than any others to say the political position of their daily paper was more liberal than their personal political philosophies were (Table 8). "Sophisticated skeptics" were especially likely to perceive television news as more liberal than they were.

The "less well informed and suspicious" tended somewhat more than others with lower education to view their daily newspapers as more conservative than themselves, and they tended somewhat less to perceive television news as more liberal than themselves. Less-educated people overall were less likely than the well-educated to discern a philosophy either in their daily newspapers or in television news.

Perceptions of Bias and Opinion in Media. The "less well informed" were less likely than other less-educated people to view their daily newspapers as unbiased, able to separate facts from opinions, and factual. The "less well informed" also tended to be critical of television news on these measures, but the difference between them and others with low education was less than the difference in the two groups' perceptions of daily newspapers.

"Sophisticated skeptics" were significantly more likely than others with high education to criticize both their daily newspapers and television news for being biased, opinionated, and unable to separate opinions and facts. "Sophisticated skeptics" were far more likely than any others interviewed to disagree that "if a newspaper endorses a candidate in an editorial, the news coverage will still be fair to all candidates" and to agree that "the personal biases of reporters often show in their news reports" (Table 8). However, "sophisticated skeptics" were more likely than others to think that ordinary people are responsible for sorting out the facts (Table 8).

Nevertheless, both "sophisticated skeptics" and the "less well informed and suspicious" were more likely than others to agree that "there's so much bias in the news media that it's often difficult to sort out the facts."

Attitudes Toward the Media. Overall, both the "sophisticated skeptics" and the "less well informed" tended to be more critical than others of both television news and newspapers. However, the "less well informed" also viewed television more positively than they viewed newspapers. "Sophisticated skeptics," like the sample as a whole, had a more favorable picture of television news anchors and newspaper editors than of newspaper reporters. They were more negative about "the press" than about "newspapers in general."

However, when forced to choose among media, better-educated people tended to prefer newspapers as sources of different kinds of news and to trust newspapers especially to help them understand complex or controversial news

stories. In general, "sophisticated skeptics" had an even stronger interest in news and newspapers than other well-educated people (Table 9).[7]

Less-educated people tended to prefer television, and the "less well informed" tended even more than other less-educated people to choose television over other media for different kinds of news. When asked how they would feel if they had to do without daily newspapers or television news for quite some time, a larger proportion of the "less well informed" than other less-educated respondents said they would feel lost without television news, and that they could get along easily without newspapers.

Even though less-educated groups were very oriented toward television in general, as Table 10 shows, they were not as likely as the well-educated to attend to television news. "Sophisticated skeptics" had the strongest orientation toward news and newspapers, generally surpassing that of people with comparable educations.

Many of the results reported here were replicated in an in-depth study of a major two-newspaper market in spring 1986.[8] The same two groups emerged when the same attitudes were measured (captured by fewer items), and they made up similar proportions of the populations in that market. The groups had similar correlations with education, and they were the most critical of newspapers. Although "sophisticated skeptics" in that study had great interest in news and newspapers, they had much lower loyalty to the two major newspapers in that market. They appeared to be especially important to target for promotion of steps taken by the newspapers to increase their credibility. For instance, "sophisticated skeptics" were very supportive of press rights in general but not as supportive when asked to balance First Amendment rights of the press with other rights.[9]

"Sophisticated skeptics" represent a group of people with a world view that often contrasts with the world view of journalists. This is because

journalists, including newspaper journalists, tend to be disproportionately more liberal and less religious than the population as a whole, in addition to other differences. This potential clash of perspectives may be partly responsible for the negative stance of "sophisticated skeptics" toward the media.

Standing in contrast to these groups are groups of journalists surveyed in 1985 for the APME.[10] They represent a fourth example of a typology which can contribute to theory, in this case, a theory of people in the media.

Many bimodal distributions in the frequency distributions of the APME data suggested that at least two different groups of journalists were represented. Characteristics of journalists which seemed to differ the most were age and ties to community, so a typology of journalists was developed:[11]

| JOURNALIST TYPE | TIES TO COMMUNITY | AGE | % OF SAMPLE |
|---|---|---|---|
| Younger transients | Weak or moderate | Under 35 | 38% |
| Younger natives | Strong | Under 35 | 15% |
| Older transients | Weak or moderate | 35 or older | 22% |
| Older natives | Strong | 35 or older | 25% |

Two groups contrasted especially in attitudes toward newspaper credibility and news judgment. They were termed "older natives" and "younger transients." The two groups together made up nearly two-thirds of all journalists surveyed.

"Older natives" were more like the general public in demographic characteristics than "younger transients" were, except for being disproportionately male. "Younger transients" were more educated, more liberal, and less religious than "older natives." They were more likely to be Democrats, to be single, and to be female.

The "younger transients" and "older natives" were compared also according to Stamm's typology of mobility. "Younger transients" were

especially likely to be "drifters" (more than 6 in 10) or to be relocaters (25%). Very few were settlers (5%) or settled (6%). In contrast, 8 in 10 "older natives" were settled. Only 1 in 10 were relocaters, and less than 1 in 10 were "drifters" or "settlers."

The great majority of journalists agreed that "it's important for people who work for newspapers to know a lot of people in the community," but they were not very likely to agree that "it's important for people who work for newspapers to be involved in community organizations." However, "older natives" were more likely than the others to belong to community groups. The older group was twice as likely as the younger group to belong to community groups.

Newspaper journalists were asked if they agreed or disagreed (either strongly or somewhat) with a series of statements measuring attitudes. Factor analysis showed that attitudes toward the statements divided into five factors: the media in general, the credibility issue, the role of newspapers in the credibility issue, how reporters do their jobs, and community distance.

First, "older natives" were more likely than "younger transients" to take a critical view of the media. Their stance on these items as a group was more like that of the public. For example, "older natives" were more likely than "younger transients" to agree that "the news media often make people accused of crimes look guilty before they are tried in court" and that "the news media give more coverage to stories that support their own point of view than to those that don't."

Second, "older natives" tended more than the others to regard loss of credibility as a preventable problem. They tended to disagree, for instance, that "loss of credibility is an inevitable result of practicing good journalism."

Third, "older natives" tended more than "younger transients" to believe that newspapers have a bigger stake in addressing the credibility problem than television does. The younger group tended to regard credibility as

television's problem. (They were also more pessimistic than "older natives" about television's ability to lure readers away from newspapers in the future.)

Fourth, "younger transients" tended to take a "hard line" view of the way reporters do their jobs. They were more likely to agree that reporters must sometimes be tough and rude and sometimes must disregard readers' opinions.

Fifth, the "older natives" scored higher than the "younger transients" on closeness to community. For example, they were more likely to believe that newspaper people should be involved in community groups and that readers' values are similar to theirs.

Newspaper journalists' demographic and attitudinal characteristics help to maintain distance between them and the public they serve. This distance may be directly related to the public's perceptions of newspaper credibility.

Demographic differences between journalists and the public suggested that these two groups may operate from different frames of reference. The "younger transients" may contribute disproportionately to newspaper credibility problems because of their greater differences from the public and their sense of distance from their communities.

An important step in developing theories of media audiences, people in the media, and similar theories is replication or verification by some method (such as split half correlations within the same sample). Each of the typologies discussed so far has been replicated.

12

One replication of the typology of journalists extended the concepts. This study of journalists at two newspapers under the same ownership which varied in their management styles found that younger transients were very alienated from both papers. Among their concerns were a sense of being uninformed about newsroom decisions and policies, little dialogue between editors and reporters, lack of voice in news decisions in their departments, and lack of positive criticism offered by editors (Table 11).

These examples help to illustrate my suggestion to combine various characteristics of the people studied to create meaningful subgroups and look for variations in these groups. Often, variations in media independent variables are not highly correlated with variations in audience dependent variables, but subgroups within the dependent variables will show variations. This is true of the ASNE credibility survey of the public. There were only weak relationships between newspaper readership and newspaper credibility scores in the total sample,[13] but the relationship between newspaper readership and newspaper credibility scores was strong for the two critical groups, the "sophisticated skeptics" and the "less well informed and suspicious."

Mass communication researchers focus too much on the media and do not pay attention to the need to develop theories which take variations in media audiences into account. They do not pay enough attention to the context of the larger society, either. There are two main reasons for this.

First, people in the mass communication field originally came from other disciplines, such as sociology, psychology, and social psychology. The work of these people reveals a fuller view of the world. Today, most people in the field have mass communication degrees and much more narrow perspectives.

Second, people in academic mass communication research and theory are too rigid in their view that statistical techniques should be limited to hypothesis testing. Statistical techniques are very useful as tools with which to develop new independent, dependent, and intervening variables.

I began to think this way in graduate school after studying the work of Robert E. Park, an early sociologist who made many contributions to the field of mass communication. Among these contributions was his view of the collective behavior of publics.[14] Publics are a form of social subgroup, and they contain other subgroups.[15] My work on knowledge gap theory also made me aware of variations in publics and media audiences, although what I learned

did not go far enough to satisfy my interest in developing theories of media audiences at that time.

I have a very strong interest in theory, which may seem surprising for a commercial researcher, but many commercial researchers are quite concerned with theory. As a grad student, I attended meetings of several associations interested in communication and came to think that the one whose members were doing work most useful in developing theories about mass media audiences is AAPOR (the American Association for Public Opinion Research). Many of the members of AAPOR are involved in marketing, political, and public opinion research. Their work influenced me to enter marketing research as a way in which I could learn the most about theory development on social subgroups and social change. (A magazine which also is useful for this is American Demographics. Some of you may be familiar with it. Two books on theory development which I have found very useful are Paul Reynolds's A Primer in Theory Construction[16] and Jerald Hage's Techniques and Problems of Theory Construction in Sociology.[17])

My assigned task today was to talk about newspaper research. One of the most useful contributions of newspaper research is a means of developing theories about the audiences for newspapers -- to divide the audiences into different segments and to look at variations in their readership and other characteristics. It is a perspective often lacking in mass communication theory development. Since many people are concerned about the lack of theory development in mass communication, I recommend this perspective to you as a means of beginning to make a contribution to further theory development.

## NOTES

1. (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1985).

2. This section is based on a presentation prepared by Kristin McGrath, president, MORI Research, to the International Newspaper Promotion Association in 1985.

3. (Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1985).

4. American Society of Newspaper Editors, Newspaper Credibility: Building Reader Trust, conducted by MORI Research, P. O. Box 17004, Washington, D.C. 20041. These excerpts are from: Cecilie Gaziano and Kristin McGrath, "Segments of the Public Which Are the Most Critical of Newspapers' Credibility: A Psychographic Analysis," Newspaper Research Journal (in press, 1987).

5. Eigenvalues were: first factor (media responsibility), 3.18; second factor (news involvement), 2.51, and third factor (social alienation), 1.69. The final communality estimate (for a total of six factors) was 10.93. The proportion of total variance explained by these factors was .14, first factor; .11, second factor; and .08, third factor (cumulative total for all three, .34). The proportion of interpreted variance associated with the factors was .29, first factor; .23, second factor; and .15, third factor (cumulative total, .67).

6. "Sophisticated skeptics" were about equally likely to be male or female ($p = .10$). About 31% were aged 18 to 34, 32% were aged 35-54, and 37% were 55 or older. These age distributions were much like those of the general population (n.s.).

7. "Sophisticated skeptics tended to read daily newspapers with smaller circulations more often than other well-educated people did, although the majority (51%) read newspapers with large circulations (more than 100,000). Less-educated people were almost as likely as "sophisticated skeptics" to read newspapers with large circulations, but they were also more likely to read daily newspaper with small circulations (40,000 or less). The "less well informed" were fairly similar to other less-educated people in circulation size of newspapers read most frequently.

8. Proprietary research conducted by MORI Research during April 1986, report to client, August 1986.

9. Gaziano and McGrath, op. cit. (note 4).

10. Associated Press Managing Editors Association, Journalists and Readers: Bridging the Credibility Gap, conducted by MORI Research, Inc., San Bernardino, Cal.: The Sun (October 1985).

11. Excerpted from: Cecilie Gaziano and Kristin McGrath, "Newspaper Credibility and Relationships of Newspaper Journalists to Their Communities," Journalism Quarterly (in press, 1987).

12. Cecilie Gaziano and David C. Coulson, "Effect of Newsroom Management Styles on Journalists: A Case Study of Two Newspapers," unpublished paper.

13. Tony Rimmer and David Weaver, "Different Questions, Different Answers? Media Use and Media Credibility," Journalism Quarterly (in press, 1987).

14. P. Jean Frazier and Cecilie Gaziano, "Robert Ezra Park's Theory of News, Public Opinion and Social Control," Journalism Monographs, No. 64 (November 1979).

15. Cecilie Gaziano, "The Knowledge Gap: An Analytical Review of Media Effects," Communication Research, 10:447-486 (1983).

16. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971).

17. (New York: Wiley, 1972).

TABLE 1: Distribution of the Four Newspaper Market Groups in Four Markets

| | MARKET A | MARKET B | MARKET C | MARKET D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loyal Readers | 42% | 41% | 37% | 29% |
| Marginal Readers | 10 | 15 | 12 | 10 |
| Potential Readers | 15 | 13 | 12 | 14 |
| Poor Prospects | 33 | 32[a] | 40[a] | 47 |

[a] Does not add to 100% because of rounding.

TABLE 2: Print Orientation (Market "A")

QUESTION: Some people prefer to read their news in newspapers or magazines, and some people prefer to have news presented to them, as it is on TV or radio. If you had to choose one way of getting news and information, would you rather read it in newspapers or magazines, or would you rather have it presented to you, as on TV or radio?

| | LOYAL READERS | MARGINAL READERS | POTENTIAL READERS | POOR PROSPECTS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Read news | 48% | 27% | 39% | 10% |
| Have it presented | 9 | 47 | 18 | 76 |
| Both | 42 | 23 | 40 | 11 |

(NOTE: "Don't know" and "no answers" excluded)

TABLE 3: Demographics of Readers in Market "B"

| | LOYAL READERS | MARGINAL READERS | POTENTIAL READERS | POOR PROSPECTS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SEX** | | | | |
| Men | 54% | 43% | 57% | 39% |
| Women | 46 | 57 | 43 | 61 |
| **AGE** | | | | |
| 18-34 | 47 | 37 | 56 | 42 |
| 35-54 | 29 | 30 | 29 | 28 |
| 55 or older | 24 | 33 | 15 | 30 |
| **EDUCATION** | | | | |
| Less than college | 33 | 67 | 46 | 76 |
| Some college or more | 67 | 33 | 54 | 24 |
| **OCCUPATION** | | | | |
| Professional/managerial | 45 | 25 | 31 | 17 |
| Blue collar/homemaker | 26 | 38 | 42 | 54 |
| Other | 29 | 37 | 27 | 29 |
| **MARITAL STATUS** | | | | |
| Married | 51 | 66 | 66 | 56 |
| Single, separated/ divorced, widowed | 49 | 34 | 34 | 44 |
| **RESIDENCE** | | | | |
| Central city residence | 37 | 23 | 20 | 14 |
| Other | 63 | 77 | 80 | 86 |

TABLE 4: News Interests of Newspaper Readers in Market "B"

Those Who Are Strongly/Very Strongly Interested in Topics

| | LOYAL READERS | MARGINAL READERS | POTENTIAL READERS | POOR PROSPECTS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| COLLEGE/PRO SPORTS | | | | |
| Market "A" | 50% | 37% | 37% | 25% |
| Market "B" | 37 | 21 | 46 | 19 |
| Market "C" | 28 | 30 | 26 | 22 |
| WEEKEND ENTERTAINMENT | | | | |
| Market "A" | 42 | 38 | 48 | 35 |
| Market "B" | 36 | 28 | 38 | 20 |
| Market "C" | 28 | 31 | 30 | 34 |
| FASHION | | | | |
| Market "A" | 25 | 25 | 29 | 26 |
| Market "B" | 27 | 24 | 28 | 20 |
| Market "C" | 17 | 20 | 21 | 24 |
| RELIGION | | | | |
| Market "A" | 39 | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| Market "B" | 19 | 14 | 14 | 17 |
| Market "C" | 14 | 20 | 24 | 18 |

TABLE 5: Stamm's Typology of Mobility (Adapted)

| LENGTH OF TIME PEOPLE EXPECT TO REMAIN IN THE AREA | LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN THE AREA: 5 Years or Less | More than 5 Years |
|---|---|---|
| 5 Years or Less | Drifters | Settlers |
| More than 5 Years | Relocaters | Natives |

- "Drifters" have lived in their community for five years or less and plan to move within the next five years.

- "Settlers" have lived in their community for five years or less, and they expect to remain for longer than five years.

- "Natives" have resided in the community for more than five years and intend to remain for more than five years.

- "Relocaters" are long-term residents (more than five years) who anticipate moving within the next five years.

TABLE 6: Attitudes that Define Groups Most Critical of Newspapers

| | Factor Loading | % Who Agree With Item (N = 875) |
|---|---|---|
| **GROUP 1: NEWS INVOLVEMENT** | | |
| It takes a lot of patience for me to sit down and read very much. | .63 | 30% |
| I'm not particularly interested in politics and world affairs because they don't affect me personally. | .68 | 18% |
| I think that people can be adequately informed just by watching the news on TV. | .55 | 40% |
| I'm just too busy with other things to keep up with what's happening in the news. | .70 | 23% |
| I'd like to keep up better with what's happening in the world, but it's just too complicated and confusing. | .48 | 41% |
| The news media try not to emphasize bad news too much. | .34 | 22% |
| **GROUP 2: MEDIA RESPONSIBILITY** | | |
| News reporters usually try to be as objective as they possibly can be. | -.53 [a] | 63% |
| Reporters frequently overdramatize the news. | .61 | 68% |
| The news media put too much emphasis on what is wrong with America and not enough on what is right. | .58 | 63% |
| The news media often make people accused of crimes look guilty before they are tried in court. | .63 | 71% |
| The news media give more coverage to stories that support their own point of view than to those that don't. | .74 | 51% |
| The press often takes advantage of victims of circumstance who are ordinary people. | .57 | 63% |
| **GROUP 3: SOCIAL ALIENATION** | | |
| Most people in public office are not really interested in the problems of the average person. | .68 | 59% |
| Everything is changing too fast these days. | .63 | 58% |
| Most people don't care what happens to the next person. | .71 | 46% |

a Minus sign in Group 2 means people who disagreed with item tended to agree with other items in Group 2, and vice-versa. Also see Note 5.

TABLE 7: Hypothesized Groups

| Group | Scale | Scores | % of Sample |
|---|---|---|---|
| "Sophisticated skeptics" | News involvement | High | 23% |
| | Media responsibility | Low or medium | |
| "Less well informed and suspicious" | News involvement | Low or medium | 21% |
| | Social alienation | High | |

TABLE 8: Opinion and Bias

| | Sophisticated Skeptics (N =191) | Less Well Informed & Suspicious (N = 178) | Others: Less Educated (N =301) | Others: More Educated (N = 168) | Total (N = 838) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Liberal | 13% | 19% | 12% | 17% | 15%* |
| Moderate | 28 | 28 | 32 | 26 | 29 |
| Conservative | 38 | 24 | 22 | 27 | 27 |
| Don't use these terms | 20 | 30 | 34 | 30 | 29 |
| **Compared to respondents, most familiar daily newspaper is:** | | | | | |
| More conservative | 17 | 16 | 9 | 23 | 15** |
| About the same | 29 | 30 | 30 | 31 | 30 |
| More liberal | 26 | 13 | 17 | 20 | 19 |
| Hard to tell | 28 | 41 | 44 | 26 | 36 |
| **Compared to respondents, TV news is:** | | | | | |
| More conservative | 9 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8** |
| About the same | 23 | 30 | 29 | 33 | 28 |
| More liberal | 37 | 15 | 23 | 26 | 25 |
| Hard to tell | 32 | 47 | 40 | 32 | 38 |
| **It's up to individuals to sort out all the biases in the news media and to find out the truth for themselves.** | | | | | |
| Agree (strongly or somewhat) | 60 | 49 | 41 | 50 | 49** |
| Feel neutral | 4 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 10 |
| Disagree (strongly/somewhat) | 37 | 39 | 48 | 38 | 41 |
| **If a newspaper endorses a candidate in an editorial, the news coverage will still be fair to all candidates.** | | | | | |
| Agree (strongly or somewhat) | 26 | 35 | 36 | 40 | 34* |
| Feel neutral | 13 | 22 | 21 | 17 | 19 |
| Disagree (strongly/somewhat) | 61 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 47 |
| **Reporters are trained to keep their personal biases out of their news reports.** | 28 | 53 | 55 | 45 | 46** |
| OR | | | | | |
| **The personal biases of reporters often show in their news reports.** | 72 | 47 | 45 | 55 | 54 |

*$\chi^2$ test significant $< .01$. **$\chi^2$ test significant $< .001$.

TABLE 9: Interest in News and News Media

| | Sophisticated Skeptics (N =191) | Less Well Informed & Suspicious (N = 178) | Others: Less Educated (N =301) | Others: More Educated (N = 168) | Total (N = 838) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Read a daily newspaper almost every day | 72% | 47% | 59% | 56% | 59%** |
| Read news magazines regularly | 44 | 18 | 21 | 40 | 29*** |
| Watched local news on television "yesterday" | 61 | 56 | 53 | 60 | 57 |
| Watched national news on television "yesterday" | 50 | 36 | 46 | 52 | 46** |
| Listened to radio news "yesterday" | 52 | 40 | 46 | 50 | 47* |
| Have cable television | 56 | 45 | 52 | 48 | 51 |
| Follow "what's going on in government and public affairs" most of the time | 64 | 25 | 30 | 38 | 38*** |
| Would choose newspapers/ magazines over TV/radio if limited to just one way of getting news and information | 52 | 27 | 31 | 43 | 37*** |
| Agree: "It is very important to me personally to keep up with what is happening in the news" | 92 | 68 | 73 | 79 | 78*** |
| Agree: "A lot of the facts in newspapers are out of date by the time people receive the paper" | 27 | 43 | 37 | 31 | 35* |
| Would "feel lost" without a daily newspaper if not able to read one for quite some time | 41 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 24*** |
| Would "feel lost" without TV news if not able to watch it for quite some time | 19 | 31 | 23 | 18 | 23* |

*$\underline{X}^2$ test significant $<$ .10.
**$\underline{X}^2$ test significant $<$ .01.
***$\underline{X}^2$ test significant $<$ .001.

TABLE 10: Community Involvement and Attachment

QUESTION: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

| It's important for people who work for newspapers to know a lot of people in the community. | Total Sample (N = 2333) | Younger Transients (N = 489) | Older Natives (N = 327) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Agree (scoring 1 or 2 on 5-point scale) | 88% | 89% | 90% |
| Neutral (scoring 3) | 8 | 7 | 6 |
| Disagree (scoring 4 or 5 on scale) | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| **It's important for people who work for newspapers to be involved in community organizations.** | | | |
| Agree (scoring 1 or 2 on 5-point scale) | 25% | 22% | 30%* |
| Neutral (scoring 3) | 30 | 33 | 29 |
| Disagree (scoring 4 or 5 on scale) | 45 | 44 | 41 |
| **QUESTION: About how many local voluntary organizations do you belong to? Include churches, civic clubs, charitable organizations, veterans groups and the like.** | | | |
| Three or more | 19% | 8% | 35%** |
| One or two | 35 | 33 | 37 |
| None | 46 | 60 | 28 |
| **QUESTION: About how long have you lived in your community?** | | | |
| Five years or less | 39% | 69% | 10%** |
| 6 to 10 years | 16 | 15 | 11 |
| 11 to 20 years | 16 | 6 | 25 |
| More than 20 years | 29 | 10 | 53 |
| **QUESTION: Just your best guess -- about how many more years do you plan to remain in the community in which you live now?** | | | |
| Five years or less | 56% | 89% | 13%** |
| 6 to 10 years | 14 | 7 | 17 |
| 11 to 20 years | 9 | 1 | 20 |
| More than 20 years | 21 | 3 | 49 |

*$\chi^2$ test for differences between the two journalist groups is significant at .05.
**$\chi^2$ test for differences between the two journalist groups is significant at .001.

TABLE 11: Communication at "Mainstreet Newspapers"

| | Younger Transients | Younger Natives | Older Transients | Older Natives | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| How well informed do you feel about newsroom decisions and policies? | | | | | |
| Well informed | 4% | 13% | 22% | 27%** | 19% |
| Somewhat well informed | 33 | 53 | 49 | 46 | 46 |
| Not very well informed | 63 | 33 | 30 | 27 | 35 |
| How much dialogue would you say there is between editors and reporters? | | | | | |
| Little or none (1-2 on scale) | 48 | 27 | 35 | 17 | 31 |
| Moderate amount (3 on scale) | 33 | 47 | 43 | 41 | 40 |
| A great deal (4-5 on scale) | 19 | 27 | 22 | 41 | 28 |
| How much of a voice would you say you have in news decisions in your department? | | | | | |
| Little or none (1-2 on scale) | 70% | 40% | 30% | 29%*** | 40% |
| Moderate (3 on scale) | 19 | 40 | 27 | 31 | 27 |
| A great deal (4-5 on scale) | 11 | 20 | 43 | 40 | 33 |
| How much positive criticism do editors offer? | | | | | |
| Little or none (1-2 on scale) | 59% | 33% | 47% | 43% | 47% |
| Moderate amount (3 on scale) | 37 | 40 | 33 | 33 | 35 |
| A great deal (4-5 on scale) | 4 | 27 | 19 | 24 | 19 |
| BASE: | (27) | (15) | (37) | (42) | (135) |

**p $\leq$ .05 ($\chi^2$ analysis)
***p $\leq$ .01 ($\chi^2$ analysis)