

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 222

CS 209 005

AUTHOR Culbertson, Hugh M.; Stempel, Guido H., III
TITLE Media Use and Reliance--How Do They Interact in Affecting Knowledge Level.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (18th, Memphis, TN, August 3-6, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Journalism; *Knowledge Level; *Media Research; *News Media; *Newspapers; Orientation; Political Issues; Public Opinion; *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS *Media Reliance; *Media Use

ABSTRACT

A phone survey of 450 Ohioans was completed over the three-week period before a state-wide election on November 8, 1983, to examine three types of orientation to newspapers and television. The types were frequency of media use focusing on state and local politics, frequency of media use for news in general, and the presence or absence of primary reliance on a given medium. Respondents were asked to summarize pro and con arguments relating to a pair of referenda on state revenues and taxes. Major dependent variables were the number of arguments reported as favoring a respondent's own pro or con position, the number of arguments opposing that position, and total arguments given. Each of these factors was interpreted as indexing a type of knowledge level. Results revealed that focused television news use correlated more positively with knowledge of the issues than did general news use; however, newspaper use showed positive correlation for both types of news consumption. In addition, focused media use correlated with knowledge of arguments against one's own position for newspaper dependent respondents but not for television dependent respondents. Finally, it was found that focused media use correlated with knowledge of arguments, but that media reliance did not. (HOD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

ED258222

Media Use and Reliance--How Do They Interact
In Affecting Knowledge Level

By

Hugh M. Culbertson and Guido H. Stempel III

E. W. Scripps School of Journalism, Ohio University

Division on Communication Theory and Methodology

Association for Education in Journalism

and Mass Communication Convention

Memphis, Tennessee -- August 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hugh M. Culbertson

500 608 005



Media Use and Reliance--How Do They Interact
in Affecting Knowledge Level

Hugh M. Culbertson and Guido H. Stempel III, Ohio University

Considerable mass communication research has dealt with trying to show a relationship between media use and knowledge of political issues. Some studies have used media reliance as the independent variable, while others have used media use. This study looks at those two variables and adds a third--focused media use. We defined focused media use as reading or viewing news about state and local politics. The dependent variable was knowledge of the issues in two state tax referenda.

The study was made during October 1983. Ohio had two tax issues on the ballot that November. We interviewed 450 Ohioans by telephone. We asked about media reliance, media use and focused media use. We also asked respondents to list arguments they could recall in favor of the tax referenda and then to list arguments they could recall against the tax referenda. Finally, we asked respondents how they intended to vote on the two ballot issues.

We hypothesized that focused TV news use would be positively related to knowledge of the issues and found that to be true. We hypothesized that focused media use would correlate with knowledge of arguments against one's position for newspaper dependent respondents but not for TV dependent respondents. We found that hypothesis correct for newspaper dependent respondents. We hypothesized that focused media use would correlate with knowledge of arguments, but that media reliance would not, and that hypothesis was confirmed.

Many researchers have probed the possible impact of media use and reliance on people's knowledge of public affairs, their inclinations to participate in community and political activity, and their level of trust in leaders, the political system, and society as a whole.

Obviously use and reliance are two different things. One can watch and listen to a revered network anchorperson or read a prestigious columnist only briefly and rarely, but still rely heavily on that experience when making a decision or drawing a conclusion. However, the relationship between and role of these two factors have seldom been examined clearly. Some scholars have lumped the two in an overall dependency index. Others have treated them as separate, parallel predictor variables.

The present research looks at inter-relationships between use and reliance--and investigates ways in which the latter may serve as a contingent condition for possible impact of use. Further, it is proposed that the two variables may interact in different ways when applied to television and newspapers.

Michael Robinson's "videomalaise" hypothesis suggests that television news leads people to regard their leaders--and the American political system--as remote, non-responsive, and perhaps evil. All of this is said to hinge in part on television's high credibility, its focus on remote national government (especially the White House), its appeal to a mass audience with least-common-denominator programming, and its felt need to keep ratings up by stressing action (hence often conflict).¹

In this formulation, Robinson appears to focus largely on TV reliance while saying little directly about use. However, several studies have focused separately on the two types of predictors with somewhat different results. Support for "videomalaise" has been mixed with reliance or overall dependency has been the primary independent variable.² Furthermore, the hypothesis has often been contradicted, at least in part, where use was clearly the predictor.³

Certainly the distinction between use of and reliance on television could help account for two oft-quoted, seemingly contradictory findings.

In a study spanning 25 years, Burns Roper has found a marked and growing tendency to name television often when asked to choose media which have high believability, importance as a source of national and world news, and salience in the sense that people "hate to give the medium up." In recent years, television has appeared to outstrip newspapers, sometimes by large margins, in these and other subjective ratings which appear to bear on media reliance.⁴

At the same time, John Robinson has gotten very different results when using diary and survey data to focus upon media use. For example, in a nation-wide study, only 46 percent of those contacted had watched a news program or documentary on TV "that day," while 78 percent reported reading a newspaper. Also, respondents estimated about 20 minutes of TV-news viewing per day on the average, compared with 33 minutes of newspaper reading.⁵

But if reliance and use are not the same thing, there also are at least two distinctly different kinds of use. Danielson and Stempel

found that a significant amount of radio news listening and television news watching was by coincidence. In a study on two college campuses, they asked those who reported hearing radio news or seeing television news whether they tuned in especially to get the news or just happened to have the set on. A slight majority of the television viewers indicated that they had tuned in especially to get the news, but a clear majority of those who heard radio news indicated they just happened to have the set on. Having turned in especially to get either TV or radio news was related positively to the individual's score on a test of news knowledge.⁶

Becker and colleagues have lumped items on use and reliance in overall dependency indices. They have provided some evidence that, in predicting knowledge of, approval of and willingness to participate in local government, dependency performs better than exposure viewed alone.⁷ Other research suggests that media exposure or reliance, taken separately, relates to knowledge and approval much as does a combined dependency index.⁸

Miller and Reese took this line of research a step further, hypothesizing and finding that use of a given medium correlates with political activity and perceived political efficacy primarily when one relies on that medium. This appeared to hold with both television and newspapers.⁹ McLeod and McDonald¹⁰ have reported comparable findings with knowledge and reported political participation as dependent variables.

The present study seeks to extend the Miller-Reese research by focusing on knowledge level as a dependent variable. Two other departures from much past research are also pursued here.

First, measurement of knowledge was based on the number of pro and anti arguments generated about two state-wide political referenda. Much research on knowledge has dealt with simple awareness of officials' names, job titles, political affiliations, etc.¹¹ Knowledge of arguments should represent a step beyond awareness of personalities and parties involved as one moves toward a conclusion or voting decision.

Separate analyses were run here on total arguments, arguments supporting a respondent's own stand on two state referenda, and arguments opposed to that stand. Opposed arguments have been studied by Blood, et al.¹², Culbertson¹³ and Edelstein¹⁴ as indicators of breadth of perspective, active information seeking and integrative thinking.

Second, we distinguished between focused media use--reading or viewing about a given topic area such as state-local politics--and general media use without regard to topic. As noted below, we expect indices in these two areas to perform differently with television and newspapers.

Hypotheses and Literature Review

Hypothesis 1. In regard to television, focused use correlates positively and more strongly with knowledge than does general or non-focused use. In the case of newspapers, however, both focused and general use correlate positively with knowledge.

Several studies have shown that regularity and amount of newspaper readership correlate positively with public affairs and other types of knowledge. At the same time, television consumption has appeared to correlate very slightly if at all--and perhaps even negatively--with knowledge.¹⁵

Also underlying this hypothesis are certain built-in defects of television as an information source. TV news flies by quickly, with consumers having no opportunity (unless they happen to own VCRs) to replay it or control its pace.¹⁶ The tube often serves as a "background" medium, with people spending up to one-half of their viewing time doing something else as they watch.¹⁷ And TV news seldom shows indexes of the type newspapers often present. Thus TV-news viewers have little chance to plan ahead and pay especially close attention when a particular topic comes up at a given time.¹⁸

In line with these factors, recent research suggests simple awareness of what's on, program availability and inertia govern television viewing at least as much as do planning and attempts to arrange program selection so as to meet personal needs.¹⁹ Behavior carried out in such a way may lack the thought and effort needed to bring about learning.²⁰ However, viewing geared to a certain topic area seems apt to be more purposive and informative.

Newspapers, on the other hand, afford greater opportunity for planned search. And they require effort to scan, choose, decode and interpret words in linear rather than holistic-impressionistic fashion.²¹ Such effort and planning seem more or less built into the reading process--whether governed by searching geared to a particular

topic area or not. These factors surely exist some but not all of the time with TV viewing.

This line of argument squares with recent work by McLeod, et al.²² and Garramone²³ developing two distinct motivational models relating uses and gratifications to media use. Basically they argue that:

1. Since the newspaper is a high-involving medium, use of it is apt to be in line with an exposure-learning model. Here media exposure is presumed to correlate primarily with gratifications received, not with those which are sought. As an active information processor apt to consider ramifications of what is encountered, a newspaper reader will form ideas about gratifications to be sought as a result of, not as a prerequisite to, those which are received.

2. TV viewing, on the other hand, is thought to require little effort or involvement.²⁴ Under such conditions, a person might gain information and advice only when she/he seeks such content purposefully as postulated by a drive-reduction model. Here gratifications sought are presumed to determine largely those which may be received.

Hypothesis 2. Focused media use correlates with knowledge of arguments opposed to one's own stand on an issue among newspaper--dependent respondents, but not with those dependent on television for information about the topic area under consideration.

As noted earlier, research has suggested that newspaper use correlates more uniformly and strongly with knowledge of public affairs, health care, and other areas than does television use.²⁵

Assuming such knowledge comes largely from active information processing of a type needed to overcome selective avoidance and at least consider opposing views,²⁶ use (perhaps of any medium) should correlate consistently with knowledge of opposing arguments among those oriented toward newspapers.

Hypothesis 3. Focused media use correlates with knowledge of arguments while media reliance--whatever the medium relied upon--does not.

The basis here is simple. Listening, viewing and reading are media-use behaviors which at least may provide information. Reliance, on the other hand, is a "state of mind" which, by itself, brings in no information. As noted earlier, reliance may or may not go along with media use.

We now turn to two research questions relevant to untangling the nature and possible impact of media use and reliance. The literature provides little basis--or conflicting bases--for hypothesizing a particular outcome in each case.

Research question 1. To what extent does use of a given medium correlate with reliance on that medium as a source of news about a given political issue? And do such correlations differ as one moves from television to newspapers?

Research question 2. Does focused media use correlate more highly and uniformly with knowledge level when the medium in question is the one relied upon most by the audience member, or when the medium is not the one relied upon in learning about a particular topic area?

The Miller-Reese study suggests the first of the options listed in question 2 might hold. In that research, use of either television or newspapers correlated with public-affairs activity and perceived political efficacy when that medium was reported to be the one relied upon. Certainly it makes sense to attend to a medium which one trusts and relies on when making decisions.

However, where knowledge level is the dependent variable, there is reason to doubt the Miller-Reese findings would hold. Use of a medium other than that which one relies on as a primary source seems apt to provide certain advantages. Print and electronic media are said to serve different functions--all perhaps important if one is to be truly well-informed. For example:

1. Television-campaign coverage tends to focus somewhat more on campaign events, personalities, strategies and hoop-la--and somewhat less on issues and candidate stands--than do newspapers.²⁷ Both areas may relate to full understanding of people, issues, and how they inter-relate.

2. Viewing of television campaign coverage correlates less than does newspaper reading with awareness of candidate stands on issues.²⁸ That's true even though television presumably has lots to do with putting new candidates on the map as personalities.²⁹

3. News-diffusion research has indicated that people often gain first awareness of a breaking story from the electronic media but soon seek supplementary and confirmatory detail from newspapers.³⁰

Given such findings, one might expect a person to be very well informed if that individual relies on one medium as primary but also

takes the time to use other media in a focused way. Such a multi-media user might very well hold, with some intensity, a civic attitude emphasizing the need to become well-informed about public affairs. The McCombs-Poindexter civic attitude scale allegedly taps such a set of beliefs and has been shown to predict media use.³¹

Methodology

Data Collection

In total, 450 Ohioans were interviewed by phone over a three-week period leading right up to the state election of November 8, 1983. Random digit dialing was used. A minimum of at least two call-backs, 24 hours apart, was completed before discarding any working number not identified as non-residential. The response rate was approximately 60 percent.

Interviewers were three graduate students and two select undergrads in the E. W. Scripps School of Journalism at Ohio University. All five received training and practiced prior to the survey.

The interviews, lasting about 8 to 10 minutes on the average, focused primarily on two controversial, widely publicized state issues which appeared on the ballot. One state issue would have repealed a 90% boost in the state income tax passed by the Ohio Legislature and supported strongly by a Democratic governor several months earlier. Opponents of the issue claimed the added revenue was needed to provide adequate education and other services--and to give needed revenue stability for government planning. Supporters claimed the tax boost

had passed too quickly because of strong pressure-group support--and that a state-budget surplus seemed likely to develop with the tax increase unless one accepted unrealistically gloomy administration predictions about unemployment.

The second revenue issue would have required a 60% majority in each house of the legislature to pass future revenue bills. The two tax issues were packaged together, with most leaders but by no means all voters assuming a vote for or against one issue would go along with a similar vote on the other.

Several weeks before interviewing, the researchers obtained campaign literature from the two interest groups spearheading campaigns for and against these issues. Prior to data collection, each interviewer became familiar with the 13 pro and 14 anti arguments, all gleaned from the literature and news coverage, which were listed on the interview schedule.

Arguments were sought via unaided recall, in response to the following question:

Now we will consider issues 2 and 3 taken together. Issue 2 would require a three-fifths majority in the Ohio legislature for revenue and tax bills. Issue 3 would repeal the 1983 increase in Ohio's income tax. Many arguments cited in connection with one of these issues are also thought to apply to the other. I'd like you to give me arguments which apply to issue 2, issue 3 or both. Please mention any arguments which come to mind as supporting issues 2 and 3.

Interviewers checked arguments given which were on the prepared list and jotted down others (rarely offered, as it turned out) in a miscellaneous category. Probing continued until a respondent could

produce no additional points. Then a request was made for arguments opposing issue 2, issue 3 or both.

Earlier in the interview, each respondent had been asked whether he/she favored, opposed or neither favored nor opposed each issue defined as in the above wording. A separate question was provided at this point for each of the two issues. About 50% of all respondents favored or opposed both issues. The researchers and a graduate assistant later counted the number of arguments which each of these people advanced in support of or opposition to his/her own stand.

Seventeen percent of all respondents claimed not to have an opinion on at least one of the issues, while another 22% had opinions on both issues but claimed to be neutral on at least one. The remaining 11% voted for one issue but against the other. These subgroups were included when computing total arguments offered but not when looking at arguments for and against one's own stand.

Media-related variables analyzed here were of three types:

Reliance. A single item described the two tax-related issues and then offered the following wording:

Would you say you have gotten the most information about issues 2 and 3 from newspapers? Radio? Television? Magazines? Other people you have talked with? Public meetings? Or where?

In all, 37% of those answering named more than one medium, with no one or a few media-combinations being dominant. About 7% focused simply on other people, 1% on magazines, and 0.5% on public meetings. These subgroups were not defined as reliant on either of the two media analyzed here. Those claiming to rely primarily on television included 27% of all respondents, the newspaper-dependent group 28%.

Focused use. One question dealt with newspapers, one with television. Wording was as follows:

How often would you say you view (read) local and state political news on television (one or more newspapers about state and local politics)? Would you say you view (read) frequently? Sometimes? Seldom? Or never?

General use. In separate items, people indicated how many days during the past week they had read at least one daily newspaper, watched an early-evening TV-news show aired around 6 to 8 p.m., and watched a late-evening local TV-news show aired around 10 or 11 p.m. Values on each of the three general-use variables ranged from 0 to 7. Also, data were collected on a number of daily newspapers one subscribed to or read regularly.

In data analysis, dummy variables were constructed for newspaper and TV reliance based on the reliance item noted earlier. Newspaper reliance was coded at 1 for those naming only newspapers, 0 for everyone else. TV reliance was coded at 1 for those naming only television, 0 for everyone else. Point-biserial correlations were reported when analyzing these variables.

Results

As shown in table 1, hypothesis 1 gained basic support.

Looking at television use, focused viewing correlated positively at the zero-order level with each argument-generation variable, while general viewing did not (except for the marginal $r=.10$ between early-evening viewing and total arguments). Furthermore, with respect to total arguments and own arguments, each zero-order focused-viewing

association exceeded the corresponding general-viewing correlation by a statistically significant amount.³²

Turning to newspaper use, general as well as focused reading correlated positively with total arguments and arguments supporting one's own view. Furthermore, focused-viewing correlations exceeded general-viewing measures only by small, non-significant amounts.

Somewhat surprisingly, focused television-viewing and focused newspaper reading correlations were of almost identical magnitude (see right-hand column of table 1).

Apparently, then, learning can occur when watching television news, but primarily when the watching is geared to specific content areas such as state and local politics. Such constraints do not appear to apply as clearly with newspaper reading.

Put table 1 about here.

Hypothesis 2 specifies that focused media use correlates with knowledge of arguments opposed to one's own view among newspaper-dependent respondents, but not among the TV-dependent. Table 2 gives partial support here. Focused TV viewing correlated significantly with number of opposed arguments among the newspaper-dependent--and the association held with level of education controlled. As expected, neither focused TV nor focused newspaper use correlated with opposed arguments among the TV-dependent. However, contrary to expectation, newspaper use does not yield a significant association among the newspaper-dependent.

Put table 2 about here.

Thus the data provide partial support for the idea that newspaper-dependent people attend to the media more than do others in a way which makes them open-minded--and sensitive to arguments opposing their own views. This tendency appeared to hold even with level of education partialled out.

Hypothesis 3 suggests that focused media use correlates positively with argument generation while media reliance does not. Table 3 yields clear support here. Both newspaper and TV-news consumption correlated significantly with each of the three argument-generation variables, with or without controlling for education. However, as hypothesized, reliance on newspapers correlated with none of the knowledge measures.

Somewhat surprisingly, reliance on television correlated negatively with all three knowledge variables. This makes some sense in light of the rationale advanced earlier for hypothesis 1. Perhaps reliance on television, with little attention to other media, works against knowledge gain. It's been noted, after all, that TV is simply ill-equipped to provide a large volume of information.³³

Put table 3 about here.

Research question 1 asks how strongly, and in what way, reliance on a given medium correlates with use of that medium. Table 4 provides some intriguing answers.

Put table 4 about here.

Reliance on television correlated almost not at all with TV-news viewing. Also, interestingly, the more one relied on television, the less he or she read newspapers in either a focused or general way.

Newspaper reliance, on the other hand, yields a different picture. The newspaper-reliant tended more than others to read newspapers, though the association between number of papers subscribed to and newspaper reliance became non-significant when education was controlled. What's more, these people neither avoided nor viewed TV news more than did other respondents. At least, it would appear, they showed no particular tendency to avoid the "other" major medium as did TV-reliants.

Research question 2 asks whether focused media use correlates most strongly and uniformly with knowledge level when the medium under study is the one which a respondent relies on most strongly for information about the topic. Table 2 shows that TV use correlated more strongly with knowledge measures than did newspaper use among the newspaper-dependent. Also, newspaper use correlated more strongly with own arguments and total arguments than did newspaper use among the television-dependent. While small subgroups ruled out significant differences with dependent variables analyzed one at a time, the constant trend over all six comparisons did achieve significance (sign test, $p < .05$). Apparently, then, as suggested earlier, paying close attention to a second medium paid off in learning about public affairs.

Table 5 sheds additional light on possible differences between newspaper-and TV-dependents. Here, unlike with previous analyses, newspaper-dependents were compared with TV-dependents and not simply with "non-newspaper" dependents. On the whole, newspaper-dependents

exceeded their TV counterparts in total arguments generated, focused newspaper reading, and general newspaper use. At the same time, newspaper-oriented folks watched about as much television news as did those who rely on TV! This suggests, as noted earlier, that newspaper-orientation appears to carry with it a multi-media orientation associated with active information seeking.

Put table 5 about here.

Table 6 pits predictors against each other with multiple-regression analyses generated by the "enter" procedure of the SPSS-X computer package.

Education, used as a control, correlated more strongly and positively with all three knowledge variables than did any media-use or-reliance variable. Apparently active information seeking and open-mindedness stemmed more from 12 to 20 years of educational experience than from media use. In fact, education was the only variable analyzed which correlated positively with generation of arguments opposing one's own view.

Put table 6 about here.

Furthermore, reliance on television was a negative correlate of knowledge, even with additional controls. And focused media use correlated with marshalling of arguments favoring one's view--but not of those opposed to one's own position.

Summary and Conclusions

This study examined three types of orientation to newspapers and television, with each medium viewed separately. The types were

frequency of media use focusing on state and local politics, frequency of media use for news in general, and the presence or absence of primary reliance on a given medium.

A phone survey of 450 Ohioans, chosen with random digit dialing, was completed over a three-week period leading up to a state-wide election on November 8, 1983. Respondents summarized pro and con arguments relating to a pair of referenda on state revenues and taxes. Major dependent variables were the number of arguments reported as favoring a respondent's own pro or con position, the number of arguments opposing that position, and total arguments given. Each of these factors was interpreted as indexing a type of knowledge level.

As hypothesized, focused television use correlated more positively and strongly with knowledge, in general, than did general TV-news consumption. This had been predicted on the assumption that TV is often viewed as escapist, relaxing fare--and that it offers little "indexing" to facilitate planned search for salient items within a newscast. Further, a TV news item appears on the screen for only a few seconds, with the viewer having no control over pace or chance to "re-view." Under these conditions, it was believed, television news might contribute to knowledge only where a viewer focuses on and looks for a certain type of news.

However, newspaper use presented a different picture. Here both focused and general use correlated positively--and with almost equal strength--with knowledge measures. This had been predicted on the assumption that item-by-item search is facilitated, even for the casual reader, by headlines, indexes and other newspaper elements.

Furthermore, even the casual "scanner" has a chance to go back over a story and learn from it. With print, then, reading may aid learning whether it focuses on a certain topic area or not.

Other findings were as follows:

1. Focused television use correlated significantly with knowledge of arguments opposed to one's own view among newspaper-dependent respondents, but not among those relying on TV. This had been predicted on the assumption that newspaper-dependent respondents, being active news seekers and processors, would tend more than others to overcome selectivity and attend to arguments opposing their own views.

2. Overall, focused newspaper and television use correlated positively with knowledge. However, reliance on newspapers correlated almost not at all with knowledge, while reliance on television news correlated negatively with all knowledge measures. The latter finding squared with a good deal of prior research. And reliance's overall lack of positive association with knowledge had been expected. After all, a state of mind vis-a-vis the media does not, by itself, expose one to information.

3. Reliance measures behaved differently for the two media. Reliance on television for news about state revenue issues correlated negatively with focused and general newspaper use--and only very mildly and sporadically with television use. However, reliance on newspapers correlated positively with newspaper use--and not at all with television use. These results squared with a good deal of prior research suggesting that reliance and use are quite different matters

and need separate analysis. Furthermore, as a practical matter, widespread ignorance seems likely where a fair number of people rely on television news but do not, in fact, use it very much!

4. In general, focused television use correlated most strongly and uniformly with knowledge measures among the newspaper-dependent respondents. Also, focused newspaper use predicted knowledge level most clearly among the TV-dependent respondents.

These last results appear at first glance to contradict prior research by Miller and Reese (1982) and McLeod and McDonald (1984) suggesting use of a given medium predicts knowledge level best primarily where a person reports reliance on that particular medium.

Perhaps the discrepancy stems partly from differences between this study and the other two in measurement of knowledge level. Miller and Reese (1982) and McLeod and McDonald (1984) both examined factual awareness and recall. The current research called for pro and con arguments relevant to state referenda. Such specification might require active cognitive activity of a type which one would expect of those scoring high on the McCombs-Poindexter (1984) civic-attitude scale. And it's reasonable to predict such activity where a person takes the trouble to attend fairly heavily to a medium other than the one which he or she sees as a primary news source.

In any event, associations among reliance, exposures, and news-consumer predispositions warrants further study.

TABLE 1

Product Moment Correlations Between Focused and General Media Use and
Argument Generation

Argument- Generation Variables	Media-Use Variables (Newspaper)		
	Number of newspapers subscribed to or read regularly	Number of days newspapers read last week	Frequency of reading on state-local politics (focused newspaper use)
Total arguments	.23**(.16**)	.26**(.13*)	.35**(.25**)
Arguments opposing one's own view	.04(.05)	.08(.10)	.15**(.11*)
Arguments supporting one's own view	.18**(.16**)	.15**(.11*)	.27**(.25**)

Argument- Generation Variables	Media-Use Variables (Television)		
	Frequency of viewing early-evening television news	Frequency of viewing late- evening TV news	Frequency of viewing on state-local politics (focused TV use)
Total arguments	.10*(.12*)	.05(-.09*)	.32**(.30**) ^a
Arguments opposing one's own view	.06(.09)	.02(.00)	.16**(.12*)
Arguments supporting one's own view	.09(.09)	-.07(-.11*)	.32**(.30**) ^a

n=437 for total argument computations, 251 for arguments opposing one's view, and 244 for arguments supporting one's view

*p<.05

**p<.01

^aThis correlation, based on focused TV viewing, exceeds the general-viewing correlations in the same row by statistically significant amounts with p<.01.

Coefficients in parentheses are first-order partial correlations with education controlled.

TABLE 2

Product Moment Correlations Between Media-Use and Argument-Generation
by Newspaper-Dependent and TV-Dependent Respondents Viewed Separately

<u>Argument-Generation Variable</u>	<u>Media Use Variable</u>	
	<u>Frequency of reading newspapers on state, local politics</u>	<u>Frequency of listening to television news on state, local politics</u>
<u>Television-dependent respondents (n=52)</u>		
Total arguments	.27*(.35**)	.11(.12)
Arguments opposing one's own view	.11(.15)	-.06(-.06)
Arguments supporting one's own view	.25*(.33**)	.16(.18)
<u>Newspaper-dependent respondents (n=69)</u>		
Total arguments	.26*(.25*)	.55**(.54**)
Arguments opposing one's own view	.14(.12)	.31**(.29**)
Arguments supporting one's own view	.22*(.21*)	.51**(.50**)

Coefficients in parentheses are first-order partial correlations with education controlled.

*p<.05

**p<.01

TABLE 3

Product Moment Correlations of Media Reliance and Focused Media Use
with Argument Generation

<u>Argument-Generation Variable</u>	<u>Reliance on television news</u>	<u>Reliance on newspapers</u>	<u>Frequency of reading papers on state-local politics</u>	<u>Frequency of viewing TV news on state-local politics</u>
Total arguments	-.23**(-.21**)	.07(-.07)	.35**(.25**)	.32**(.30**)
Arguments opposing one's own view	-.18**(-.13*)	.00(.02)	.15**(.11*)	.16**(.12*)
Arguments supporting one's own view	-.22**(-.18*)	-.09(-.11*)	.27**(.25**)	.32**(.30**)

*p<.05

**p<.01

n=430 with total arguments, 246 with arguments opposing one's own view, and 239 with arguments supporting one's own view

Coefficients in parentheses are first-order partial correlations with education controlled.

TABLE 4

Point Biserial Correlations Between Media-Reliance Variables and Both Focused
and General Media Use

	<u>Reliance on television news</u>	<u>Reliance on newspapers for news</u>
<u>Television use</u>		
Frequency of viewing early-evening news (general use)	.10*(.08)	.03(.03)
Frequency of viewing late-evening news (general use)	.09*(.12*)	.00(.04)
Frequency of viewing news on state-local politics (focused use)	-.05(-.01)	.06(.01)
<u>Newspaper use</u>		
Number of newspapers subscribed to or read regularly (general use)	-.17**(-.17**)	.16**(.07)
Days newspaper was read last week (general use)	-.19**(-.23**)	.29**(.22**)
Frequency of reading newspaper on state-local politics (focused use)	-.22**(-.20**)	.21**(.14*)

*p<.05

**p<.01

n=431 for all analyses.

Coefficients in parentheses are first-order partial correlations with education controlled.

TABLE 5

Mean Scores on Argument Generation, Focused Media Use and General Media Use
for Newspaper-Dependent and TV-Dependent Respondents

<u>Dependent variable</u>	<u>Newspaper-dependents^a</u>	<u>Television-dependents^b</u>	<u>t</u>
<u>Argument-Generation</u>			
Total	2.06	1.23	4.06**
Opposed to own view	0.80	0.49	1.12
Supporting own view	1.59	1.23	1.56
<u>Focused Media Use</u>			
Frequency of reading newspaper on state-local politics	3.31	2.65	5.51**
Frequency of viewing TV news on state-local politics	3.15	2.98	1.39
<u>General Media Use</u>			
Days newspaper read last week	5.87	3.84	6.49**
Days viewed early-evening TV news last week	4.35	4.63	0.79
Days viewed late-evening TV news last week	2.54	2.95	1.20

**p<.01

n=119 on all media-use variables with TV-dependents, 114 for total arguments by newspaper-dependents, 76 for opposed arguments by newspaper dependents, 73 for own arguments by newspaper-dependents. n=118 on all media-use variables for newspaper-dependents, 116 for total arguments by newspaper-dependents, 56 for own arguments by newspaper-dependents.

TABLE 6
 Standardized Regression Coefficients in Three Multiple Regression Analyses
 with Education, Media-Use Variables and Media-Reliance Factors as
 Predictors of Argument Generation

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable		
	Total Arguments	Arguments opposed to own view	Arguments supporting own view
Education	.29**	.19**	.23**
Frequency of viewing television on state-local politics	.18**	.09	.23**
Frequency of reading newspapers on state-local politics	.17**	.06	.13*
Reliance on television news	-.18**	-.16*	-.23**
Reliance on newspaper	-.09	-.08	-.22**
	F=27.70 p<.01 df=5,410	F=5.17 p<.01 df=5,238	F=15.70 p<.01 df=5,231
Multiple r ²	.25	.10	.25

Footnotes

¹Michael J. Robinson, "Public Affairs TV and the Growth of Political Malaise: The Selling of the Pentagon," American Political Science Review, 70:409-432 (June 1976); "Television and American Politics: 1956-1976," in Morris Janowitz and Paul Hirsch, eds., Reader in Public Opinion and Mass Communication (New York: The Free Press, 1981), pp. 98-116.

²Lee B. Becker, I. A. Sobawale and W. E. Casey, "Newspaper and Television Dependencies: Their Effects on Evaluation of Public Officials," Journal of Broadcasting, 23:465-476 (1979); Lee B. Becker and D. Charles Whitney, "Effects of Media Dependencies: Audience Assessment of Government," Communication Research, 7:95-120 (January 1980); M. Mark Miller and Stephen D. Reese, "Media Dependency as Interaction: Effects of Exposure and Reliance on Political Activity and Efficacy," Communication Research, 9:227-248 (April 1982); Garrett J. O'Keefe, "Political Malaise and Reliance on Media," Journalism Quarterly, 57:122-128 (Spring 1980).

³Jack Dennis and Steven H. Chaffee, "Legitimation in the 1976 U.S. Election Campaign," Communication Research, 5:371-394 (October 1978); Lee B. Becker and Sharon Dunwoody, "Media Use, Public Affairs Knowledge and Voting in a Local Election," Journalism Quarterly, 59:212-218 (Summer 1982); Jack M. McLeod, Jane D. Brown, Lee B. Becker and Dean A. Ziemke, "Decline and Fall at the White House: A Longitudinal Analysis of Communication Effects," Communication Research, 4:3-22 (January 1977); Jack M. McLeod and Donald G. McDonald, "Beyond Simple Exposure: Media Orientations and Their Impact on Political Processes," Communication Research, 12:3-33 (January 1985); Miller and Reese, op. cit.; Leslie W. Sargent and Guido H. Stempel III, "Poverty, Alienation and Media Use," Journalism Quarterly, 45:324-326 (Summer 1968).

⁴The Roper Organization, "Public Perceptions of Television and Other Media: A Twenty-Year Review, 1959-1978," Television Information Office, 1979.

⁵John P. Robinson, How Americans Use Time: A Social Psychological Analysis of Everyday Behavior (New York: Praeger, 1977).

⁶Wayne A. Danielson and Guido H. Stempel III, "News-Seeking Behavior on Two College Campuses," paper presented at AEJ Convention, Columbia, Missouri, August 1958.

⁷Becker and Whitney, op. cit.

⁸Becker, Sobowale and Casey, op. cit.

⁹Miller and Reese, op. cit.

¹⁰McLeod and McDonald, op. cit.

¹¹Becker, Sobowale and Casey, op. cit.; Hugh M. Culbertson and Nancy Somerick, "Cloaked Attribution--What Does It Mean to News Readers?" ANPA News Research Bulletin, 1976; McLeod and McDonald, op. cit.; John P. Robinson, "Mass Communication and Information Diffusion," in F. Gerald Kline and Phillip U. Tichenor, eds., Current Perspectives in Mass Communication Research (Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing, 1972), pp. 71-93; Serena Wade and Wilbur Schramm, "The Mass Media as Sources of Public Affairs, Science and Health Knowledge," Public Opinion Quarterly, 33:197-209 (1969).

¹²R. Warwick Blood, Lee B. Becker and Cathleen M. Carey, "Electoral Knowledge and Uncertainty," paper presented to Communication Theory and Methodology Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication convention, Gainesville, Fla., August 1984.

¹³Hugh M. Culbertson, "Breadth of Perspective--An Important Concept for Public Relations," paper presented to Public Relations Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication convention, Gainesville, Fla., August 1984.

¹⁴Alex S. Edelstein, "Decision-Making and Mass Communication: A Conceptual and Methodological Approach to Public Opinion," in Peter Clarke, ed., New Models for Mass Communication Research (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1973), pp. 81-118.

¹⁵Becker and Dunwoody, op. cit.; Becker, Sobowale and Casey, op.; Robinson, 1972 op. cit.; McLeod and McDonald, op. cit.; Wade and Schramm, op. cit.

¹⁶Alexis S. Tan, Mass Communication Theories and Research (Columbus: Grid Publishing, Inc., 1981).

¹⁷Robinson, 1977 op. cit.

¹⁸Charles K. Atkin, "Effects of Campaign Advertising and Newscasts on Children," Journalism Quarterly, 54:503-508 (Autumn 1977).

¹⁹James G. Webster and Jacob J. Wakshlag, "A Theory of Television Program Choice," Communication Research, 10:430-446 (October 1983); Serena Wade Stanford, "Predicting Favorite TV Program Gratifications from General Orientations," Communication Research, 11:519-536 (October 1984).

²⁰Gerhard Wiebe, "The Social Effects of Broadcasting," in Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White, eds., Mass Culture Revisited (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1971), pp. 154-168; _____ "Mass Media and Man's Relationship to His Environment," Journalism Quarterly, 50:426-432, 446 (Autumn 1973).

- ²¹Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man (New York: McGraw-Hill Paperbacks, 1964), pp. 309-337; Tan, op. cit., pp. 157-165.
- ²²Jack M. McLeod, Carl R. Bybee and Jean A. Durall, "Evaluating Media Performance by Gratifications Sought and Received," Journalism Quarterly, 59:3-12, 59 (Spring 1982).
- ²³Gina M. Garramone, "Motivational Models: Replication Across Media for Political Campaign Content," Journalism Quarterly, 61:537-549, 741 (Autumn 1984).
- ²⁴Herbert E. Krugman, "The Impact of Television Advertising: Learning Without Involvement," Public Opinion Quarterly, 29-349-356 (1965).
- ²⁵Becker and Dunwoody, op. cit.; Becker, Sobowale and Casey, op. cit.; Robinson, 1972 op. cit.
- ²⁶James E. Grunig, "Organizations and Public Relations: Testing a Communication Theory," Journalism Monographs No. 46, 1976.
- ²⁷Doris A. Graber, Mass Media and American Politics (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1980), p. 186.
- ²⁸Thomas E. Patterson, The Mass Media Election: How Americans Choose Their President (New York: Praeger, 1980), pp. 156-159.
- ²⁹Ibid. pp. 142-152.
- ³⁰Wayne Danielson, "Eisenhower's February Decision: A Study of News Impact," Journalism Quarterly, 33:433-441 (Fall 1956); Paul Deutschmann and Wayne Danielson, "Diffusion of Knowledge of the Major News Story," Journalism Quarterly, 37:345-355 (Summer 1960).
- ³¹Orjan Olsen, "Measuring Civic Attitudes: Replications and Extensions," Newspaper Research Journal, Summer 1983, pp. 19-36; David Weaver and Virginia Dodge Fielder, "Civic Attitudes and Newspaper Readership in Chicago," Newspaper Research Journal, Summer 1983, pp. 11-18.
- ³²Quinn McNemar, Psychological Statistics (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1963), p. 140.
- ³³Tan, op. cit., pp. 157-165.