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Approximately 1,200 adults were interviewed in a study designed to determine the identity of the nonviewers of television news, the differences between local and network news nonviewers, the sources of news used by nonviewers, and the attitudes of nonviewers toward keeping informed of the news. The findings revealed that about one-third of the respondents fell into one of three nonviewer categories: nonviewers of both local and network news, nonviewers of local news only, and nonviewers of network news only. A socioeconomic analysis of the nonviewers showed that young adults were more likely than older adults to be nonviewers. Adults with high education levels and income were more likely found in the nonviewer of both local and network news and nonviewer of local news only categories, while poor and uneducated adults were found in the nonviewer of network news only group. No differences were found between men and women in their attention to televised news. The findings also revealed that nonviewers did not avoid other news sources; only the nonviewers of network news tended to avoid radio and daily newspapers. (FL)
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Non-News Users: An Analysis of a Non-Viewing Population

The first study to identify non-news users was conducted 15 years ago when Westley and Severin analyzed non-newspaper readers. Non-newspaper readers, though, represent only one of four types of non-news users in the general population. Also, in the population are non-news magazine readers; non-radio news listeners; non-television news users. Even though there are four types of non-news users, the picture presented in the literature is, unfortunately unbalanced. Most of what we know -- and even that is limited -- is confined to only one segment of the non-user community.

Little attention has been devoted to understanding and explaining the existence of non-television news viewers. This is particularly surprising since approximately 50 per cent of the general population has been identified as non-television news viewers.

This study, then, is a beginning effort to understand this neglected but significant segment of the population in general and of the non-news user community in particular. It is felt that by studying the non-news viewer, communication scientists and news practitioners can better understand the complete non-news user phenomenon; in addition to the individual non-viewer who for, perhaps, an untold number of reasons does not bother to watch television news. In order to present a refined picture of non-viewers, this study will distinguish three types of non-viewers: (1) non-viewers of network news; (2) non-viewers of local news; (3) non-viewers of both network and local news.

Previous Research

While none of the published studies in the communications journals are
specifically devoted to non-viewers of news, there have been several studies which have tangentially referred to non-viewers. Almost 20 years ago, Westley and Mobius studied the non-television household. While one could probably correctly assume that persons who do not own television sets are also non-news viewers, it would be presumptuous to say that non-television owners are turned off to news. In fact, in this 1960 study, Westley and Mobius found that non-TV-owning respondents were more likely to favor radio as a source of news and less likely to use newspapers.

In a 1971 secondary analysis of the W.R. Simmons national data, Robinson specifically addressed the non-viewer problem. He found that there was indeed a non-network news viewing segment. Over the two week period examined, Robinson found that the majority of the population did not watch one national news program.

In their 1978 book, Television and Human Behavior, Comstock et al. reviewed four studies on the audience and non-audience for news. The authors concluded from these four studies that network evening news reaches far fewer persons than one would suppose from the public's acclaim of television as a news source.

Robinson again looked at non-viewers of network news in a recently published ANPA Report. In this 1978 study, he found that younger adults were less likely than their elders to read newspapers and watch television news. Overall, Robinson found that almost half of the population had not watched any television news on the previous day.

Overall, very little is known about non-users of television news. We do know that there are a lot of non-viewers "out there" and that most are young and do not read newspapers. But we don't know their complete socio-economic profile. We also don't know whether there is a difference between
those who avoid network news, such as Robinson studied, and those who ignore local news. We don't even know what kind of person the hard core non-viewer is -- the person who is turned off to both network and local news.

Therefore, to learn more about non-users of television news, a secondary analysis of data on non-news viewers was done. Four specific research questions guided the analysis:

1) Who are the non-viewers?
2) What are the differences between local news non-viewers and network non-viewers?
3. What, if any, sources do non-viewers use for news?
4. What are non-viewers' normative attitudes about the news? Do they feel an obligation to keep informed?

Methodology

A secondary analysis was done on data collected by the Communications Research Center at Syracuse University. Approximately 1200 adults, 18 years and older, were personally interviewed in three waves of interviewing during the summer of 1978. The respondents who were interviewed in a large Northeastern United States rural county were randomly selected from the telephone directory. The telephone penetration rate in this area was above 90 per cent.

This Northeastern county has two major dailies, five weeklies, one major local television station, one non-local television station, and five major radio stations. Most news viewers reported watching the local station rather than the non-local for news.

Non-viewers were queried about their media use, socio-economic background and attitudes toward keeping informed of the news. Specific information was collected in the following areas:

1) Media Use. Respondents were asked: How often do you watch the local
six o'clock news on television? How often do you watch the national news at 6:30 on television? Response categories were:

"never or seldom"
"one or two days a week"
"nearly every day"
"everyday"

Respondents replying "never or seldom" were classified as non-viewers and analyzed in this study. Respondents were also asked about their frequency of attention to daily newspapers, local weeklies and radio news.

2) Socio-Economic background. Respondents were asked the length of time they had lived in the county, their education, income and age. Sex of the respondent was also indicated on the questionnaire.

3) Attitude toward keeping informed. Respondents were asked the McCombs and Poindexter News Norm Scale. The scale, composed of four items, measured the strength of a civic attitude to keep informed of news and current events. The four items which formed a Guttman scale were:

A. We all have a duty to keep ourselves informed about news and current events.

B. It is important to be informed about news and current events.

C. So many other people follow the news and keep informed about it that it doesn't matter much whether I do or not.

D. A good deal of news about current events isn't important enough to keep informed about.

Three perspectives were used in the analysis of the data. First, the data were combined to produce four mutually exclusive subgroups:

1) non-viewers of both network and local news (Non-viewers)
2) non-viewers of network news only (Non-network)
3) non-viewers of local news only (Non-local)
4) viewers of both local and network news (Viewer)
The non-viewers were then compared with the non-network and non-local groups to determine if there were differences in age, education, income, length of residence and sex.

The second set of analyses compared the three non-news groups to determine which, if any, media were used for news.

The final set of analyses tried to determine whether the individual in the non-news sub-group held strong or weak attitudes about keeping informed of news and current events.

Findings

Table 1 shows that one-third of the respondents in this Northeastern county could be classified as a member of one of the three non-viewer groups. Twenty-one per cent did not view any kind of news on television. Seven per cent did not watch news and five per cent did not view local news. Two-thirds of the sample viewed both local and network news.

Socio-economic background - Age

Table 2 examines non-viewers of both network and local television by age. The pattern for non-viewers, non-network and non-local viewers is the same; a negative relationship exists between age and non-viewing. Looking first at non-viewers of both local and network news, it can be seen that over one-third of the youngest adults (18-25) and over a quarter of the 26-35 year old group are non-viewers. On the opposite end of the age continuum, only nine per cent acknowledge being non-news-viewers.

A much smaller percentage of adults reported not watching local television news. Again, the youngest age group was most likely to not watch local news. The monotonic decline which was evident in the non-viewer of local and network
news group was not found in this non-viewer of local news only group. As was evident in the other two non-viewing subgroups, 18-25 year olds were also most likely to not watch network news.

**Socio-economic background - Education**

The influence of education is different for each non-viewer subgroup. High school graduates and adults with technical degrees are in the group most likely to not watch both network and local news. Education increases the likelihood of non-viewing until the college years, at which time non-viewing drops off slightly.

College educated adults (9%) are most likely to be non-viewers of local news only while adults without a high school degree are least likely to be among this non-local group (See Table 3).

A reverse pattern is found among non-viewers of network news. Adults with the least amount of education are most likely to not watch network news.

**Socio-economic background - Income**

The influence of income on non-viewing, while significant, is not a clearly defined pattern. Looking first at non-viewers of both network and local news, it can be seen that the greatest difference between groups is in the poorest and second highest income groups. Poor people are least likely to be non-viewers while wealthier people are most likely to be non-viewers. (See Table 4)

Among the non-local group, it can be seen that as income increases, non-viewing increases up to the $15 to 25,000 income group. At that point non-viewing drops to five percent and then increases again.

The influence of income is unstable in the non-network group. The data
suggest that poorer adults are more likely than higher income adults to be non-viewers of national news except for those in the $15,000 to 25,000 income group. The $15,000 to 25,000 income group is just as likely to not watch network news as the lower income adults.

Socio-Economic background - Length of Residence

Table 5 shows the influence of three non-mutually exclusive length of residence categories on non-viewing. The three categories are "fewer than 10 years", "more than 10 years", "all my life".

Two types of adults are most likely to not watch television news: adults who have lived in the area for fewer than 10 years and adults who have lived there all of their lives. Table 5 shows approximately one-quarter of the respondents in each group reported being non-news viewers.

A different pattern emerges among non-viewers of local news. As length of time in the area decreases, non-viewing increases. In other words, newer residents are more likely to avoid local news than older residents.

An opposite pattern emerges for non-viewing of network news. As length of time lived in the community increases, so does non-viewing of network news.

Even though the patterns between non-viewing of local and non-viewing of network news are reversed, in actuality, the patterns are intuitively consistent. People who have long residential ties to the community in which they live are more likely to pay attention to the local news and less likely to watch national news. The data suggest it is also the case that new residents, not feeling a sense of belonging to the local community, are least likely to pay attention to the local news.

Use of Other News Media

Do non-viewers of television news pay attention to other news media? Are there differences among the sub-groups of non-news users and their attention to radio news, daily and weekly newspapers? To answer these
questions, the non-television news groups were compared on their use and non-use of other media.

Table 6 shows that overall, more non-viewers can be found among everyday radio news listeners than among non-listeners. This suggests, of course, that non-news viewers are turned off to the medium for news rather than the news itself.

The first row in Table 6 compares the three non-viewing groups' non-use of radio news. It can be seen that non-viewers of network news are also most likely to be radio news non-listeners. The non-viewers of local news are least likely to fall into this category.

Table 7 shows the relationship between non-viewing of news and daily newspaper reading. The last row shows that most non-viewers of news can be found reading daily newspapers. Looking along the first row of the table, again differences among the non-viewer groups are evident. The non-viewer of network and local news group and the non-viewer of network news only group are both more likely to be among daily newspaper non-readers. Adults in the non-local news group are least likely to avoid daily newspapers. There were no significant differences among the non-viewing groups and the frequency with which they read weekly newspapers.

Non-viewers' Attitude Toward Keeping Informed of the News

In order to begin to develop some indicators as to why some people use or avoid news, the sample of respondents was also asked the McCombs and Poindexter News Norm Scale which measured respondents' attitude toward keeping informed of news and current events. Did the respondents feel an obligation to keep informed or not? The four questions which were used to tap this sense of civic obligation had, in an earlier study, formed a
Guttman scale and successfully predicted newspaper reading. If the newsnorm scale has an influence on non-viewers' avoidance of news, then persons scoring high on the scale should be the least likely candidates for non-viewing. And of course, those scoring low should most likely be non-viewers. Table 8 shows this is exactly the case for non-viewers of all news.

Almost one-third of the low scorers are non-viewers of both network and local news compared to only one-fifth of the high scorers who are non-viewers.

The pattern is not as clear for non-viewers of network news and non-viewers of local news only. There is a suggestion of curvilinearity for non-viewers. Adults with both a strong and weak sense of obligation to keep informed of the news do not watch local news. For non-viewers, the trend is slightly more in line with the expectation that low scorers are non-viewers of network news.

The influence of the scale within age groups was also examined. The 18-25 year old group was of particular interest in this study since this is the age group that appears to be most turned off to all kinds of news.

It can be seen in Table 9 that the influence of the news norm is magnified in the youngest subgroups. In the 18-25 year old group, the percentage of adults who have a weak sense of obligation to keep informed and do not watch television news almost doubles. In fact, there are more than two and a half times as many persons scoring low on the news norm scale as scoring high. The news norm partially explains why there are so many young people turning off to television news (and also newspapers). This group not only does not feel an obligation to be informed,
it also does not keep informed of news via television.

The pattern is somewhat different for the network non-viewer and local non-news viewer. Among the 18-25 year olds, there is an inverted-U relation between the news norm and non-viewing of network news. Young adults who have both a very weak and a very strong sense of duty to keep informed are least likely to be non-viewers of news. People who have a moderate sense of duty are most likely to be non-viewers of news.

The pattern is reversed for 18-25 year old non-local viewers. Young adults who are very strong and very weak are most likely to not pay attention to local news while those who have a moderate sense of duty are least likely to not watch network news.

It should be noted from looking at the viewers of television news in Table 9 that a greater proportion of viewers who have a weak attitude about keeping informed are among the viewers. Apparently, other variables are keeping them tuned in to television news.

For the 35-45, 46-55, and above 65 groups, there was little or no significant influence of a person's sense of duty to keep informed and non-viewing of news. But in the 55-65 age groups, there was some influence of the norm. In this older age group, adults scoring the lowest on the norm are most likely to be among non-viewers. As the strength of the norm increases, there is a suggestion that non-viewing increases among those who avoid both network and local news. It is evident from Table 9, that a larger proportion of adults with a weak sense of obligation to keep informed are among the viewers. Again, some other variable must be operative.

Summary

This study examined four specific research questions:
1. What are the non-viewers of television news?

2. What are the differences between local news non-viewers and network news non-viewers?

3. What sources do non-viewers use for news?

4. Do non-viewers feel an obligation to keep informed of the news?

To answer these questions, a secondary analysis was done on data collected during the summer of 1978 by the Communications Research Center at Syracuse University. The data were collected through personal interviews with approximately 1200 randomly selected adults in a Northeastern United States rural county.

For the analysis, the data were first combined to produce four mutually exclusive sub-groups:

1. non-viewers of both network and local news (Non-viewers)
2. non-viewers of network news only (Non-network)
3. non-viewers of local news only (Non-local)
4. viewers of both local and network news (Viewer)

The non-viewer subgroups were then compared to determine socio-economic, media use, and attitudinal differences.

Tables 10 and 11 summarize the socio-economic and media use differences of the three non-viewer groups. The analysis showed that young adults were more likely than older adults to be non-viewers. Adults with high education and income were more likely to be non-viewers of all news programs or just local news while poor and uneducated adults were more likely to not watch network news programs. New residents and lifetime residents in the community were more likely to be non-viewers of television news programs. New residents did not watch local news and long-time residents did not
watch network news. Women and men were about equally likely to be non-viewers of local and network television news.

Two major findings emerged from the analysis of non-viewers' use of other media. First, all non-viewers are not turned off to news from other sources. Secondly, the three non-viewer groups differed in their use and non-use of radio news and daily newspapers.

Non-viewers of both local and network news were most likely to be found among daily listeners of radio news. Non-viewers of local news only were most likely to be found in the daily newspaper reading group and least likely to be among non-readers and non-listeners of radio news. Non-viewers of network news only were most likely to be among the non-listeners of radio news and non-readers of daily newspapers. The non-network news viewer was in the one group most turned off to news.

Non-viewers of network and local news were also analyzed by a set of questions which tapped a cultural norm that people feel they have a duty to keep informed of news and current events. When the influence of this citizen duty was examined on non-viewers, it was found to partially explain why some people do not watch television news. People with a weak sense of obligation to keep informed were more likely to not watch news. This was particularly true for the two non-viewer groups: the network and local non-viewers and the network only non-viewers. The data indicated that for local non-viewers when the strength of the norm was highest, non-viewing was highest.

When the norm was examined among various age groups, it was apparent that its influence was strongest in the youngest age groups. Within the 18-25 year old age group, the percentage of adults who had a weak sense of
obligation to keep informed and did not watch television news was almost three fifths of the sample.

Implications

This study has been an attempt to understand a large but neglected segment of the non-news user community. The large percentage of non-news viewers underscores the importance of analyzing this group of people. In this study, for example, one-third of the sample was classified as non-viewers. And Robinson found non-news viewers represented as much as half of the adult population in two studies on the network evening news audience.

Two very important findings emerged from this study. First, young adults were more likely than their older counterparts to not view local and national evening news. Secondly, adults with high incomes and educations were more likely to avoid local news while adults with low incomes and poor educations were more likely to not view network news.

Of course, the natural question to ask of these findings is why? Why are young adults disproportionately avoiding local and network news? Why is it that educated, high income adults are not turning on local news while poorly educated, low income adults are not turning on network news? Unfortunately, these questions can not be answered with the present data. It is speculated, though, that the content and quality of the local and network news programs are related to the educational and income differences of the non-viewers. The network news, filled with coverage of world events, may not have much relevance to a blue collar worker worried about making ends meet. It may also be true that local coverage of city hall proceedings, fires and accidents may be too provincial for some of the more
educated members of the non-viewer community. Of course, these are only speculations. Local and network news must be content analyzed and non-viewers must be asked how they feel about viewing the news before we can answer why the education-rich and education poor do not view television news.

These data only measured non-viewing of evening local and evening network news. Subsequent studies should also measure non-viewing of the late evening local news, morning national news and lunch-time news. Only when all news programs are considered, can we truly begin to draw a complete picture of non-news viewers.

Future studies should also determine whether this non-viewing behavior is active or passive avoidance. Are non-viewers purposely not turning on the news or is it the case that the news does not happen to be on so non-viewers don’t happen to watch it. An examination of the activeness or passiveness of non-viewing would be enormously beneficial in understanding this group of the population.

The McCombs and Poindexter News Norm Scale\(^{12}\), which measured respondents' attitudes toward keeping informed of news and current events, was used in an effort to develop some indicators which explain non-viewing behavior. This scale was helpful because it suggested that non-viewers, for the most part, are less likely to value the cultural norm of keeping informed. Again, to get a complete picture, other socio-psychological variables such as attitudes and normative beliefs must be examined if we are to truly understand the non-viewing phenomenon.

Also, the differences which were found among the three non-viewer groups suggest that future research should not analyze all non-viewers as one
homogeneous mass, but should use refined categories, such as those in this study, in order to accurately analyze and characterize non-news consumers.

Finally, non-viewers should be studied in all types of media markets--large and small, urban and rural. Non-viewers should also be studied in locations in which local news varies in quantity, quality, and format. Only when non-viewers have been examined across all media settings can we truly bring to grasp what non-news viewing really means.
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Marilyn Jackson-Beeck ("The Non-viewers: Who are They?" Journal of Communication 27:65-72, (Summer 1977)) recently examined the socio-economic profile of non-television viewers. Since she defined non-viewers as persons viewing fewer than 30 minutes per day, her respondents cannot be classified as non-viewers of news nor non-television owners. She did not specify whether this "fewer than 30 minutes" of television viewing was of news viewing.

5Robinson, op. cit., 1978.


9Ibid.


FOOTNOTES (Contd)

11 Robinson, op. cit., 1978 also found that young adults were more likely to be non-viewers of news but Robinson only looked at network evening news.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Viewers of Both</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Network</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewers of Both Local and Network</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 99%  
(N=1221)
Table 2

Non-Viewing by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>18-25 (N=192)</th>
<th>26-35 (N=205)</th>
<th>36-45 (N=209)</th>
<th>46-55 (N=218)</th>
<th>56-65 (N=202)</th>
<th>Over 65 (N=171)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Viewers of Both</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Network</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewers of Both Local &amp; Network News</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .88.05, 15 \text{ df, } p \leq .001 \]

Gamma = .32
Table 3
Non-Viewing by Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Some High School (N=320) %</th>
<th>High School+ Technical (N=488) %</th>
<th>Some College+ (N=400) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Viewers of Both</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Network</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewers of Both Local and Network News</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 28.71, \text{ 6 df, } p.001 \]

Gamma = -0.08
Table 4

Non-Viewing by Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under $5,000 (N=188)</th>
<th>$5,000-$10,000 (N=247)</th>
<th>$10,000-$15,000 (N=231)</th>
<th>$15,000-$25,000 (N=284)</th>
<th>Over $25,000 (N=112)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Viewers of Both</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Network</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewers of Both Local and Network News</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 22.11, \text{ 12 df, } p < .05 \]

Gamma = -.08
Table 5

Non-Viewing by Length of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fewer than 10 years</th>
<th>More than 10 years</th>
<th>All my life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Viewers of Both</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Network</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewers of Both Local &amp; Network News</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 20.0, 6 \text{ df}, p < .01 \]
Table 6
Non-Viewers and Radio News Listening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radio News Listening Frequency</th>
<th>Non-Viewers of Both (N=260) %</th>
<th>Non-Local (N=66) %</th>
<th>Non-Network (N=89) %</th>
<th>Viewers of Both Local &amp; Network News (N=800) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never or Seldom</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or Two Days</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly Everyday</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 19.31, 9 \text{ df}, p \leq .01 \]

Gamma = .09
Table 7

Non-Viewers and Daily Newspaper Reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper Reading Frequency</th>
<th>Non-Viewers of Both (N=260) %</th>
<th>Non-Local (N=66) %</th>
<th>Non-Network (N=89) %</th>
<th>Viewers of Both Local &amp; Network News (N=800) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never or Seldom</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or Two Days</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly Everyday</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 25.13, 9 \text{ df, } p < .001 \]

Gamma = .15
Table 8

Non-Viewing by the News-Norm Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low (N=173)</th>
<th>Low (N=292)</th>
<th>Med. (N=393)</th>
<th>High (N=303)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Viewers of Both</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Network</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewers of Both</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 21.97, 9 \text{ df, } p < .01 \]

Gamma = .10
Table 9

Non-Viewing by the News Norm Scale Controlling for Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low (N=28)</th>
<th>Low (N=54)</th>
<th>Med. (N=65)</th>
<th>High (N=46)</th>
<th>Very Low (N=34)</th>
<th>Low (N=66)</th>
<th>Med. (N=45)</th>
<th>High (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Viewers of Both</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Network</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewers of Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &amp; Network News</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 19.71, 9 df, p < .05

Gamma = .24

N.S.
Table 10

Summary of Socio-Economic Characteristics of Non-Viewers of News

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF NON-VIEWER</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Viewers of Both</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Viewers of Local News Only</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Viewers of Network News Only</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adults who have lived in the area more than 10 years but who are not lifetime residents are excluded.

** The trend for the influence of income on non-viewing is not clearly defined. The data suggest that income groups above $5,000 are more likely to be non-viewers than groups under $5,000.
Table II

Summary of Non-Viewers' Use of Other Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Viewer of Both</th>
<th>Non-Viewer of Local Only</th>
<th>Non-Viewer of Network Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least Likely</td>
<td>Most Likely</td>
<td>Most Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Listener of Radio News</td>
<td>Most Likely</td>
<td>Least Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Readers of Daily Newspaper</td>
<td>Least Likely</td>
<td>Most Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Reader of Daily Newspaper</td>
<td>Most Likely</td>
<td>Least Likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actually there is only one percentage point difference between this group and the non-viewers of network news only group.*