

THESIS



ROOM USE ONLY

132
JAN 7 1970 5
MICRO TO pay
A. B. 11

ABSTRACT

STATE NEWS READERSHIP AND MARKET DATA STUDY OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS, FALL TERM, 1965

by James. W. Thomas

Problem Statement

This study of the Michigan State University student population was designed to answer two basic questions:

1. What media do Michigan State University students depend upon for local, campus, national and international news? What are their attitudes toward and frequency of exposure to particular media?
2. What are students' expenditure patterns, by amounts spent on products and services, and by shopping areas and retail establishments providing these products and services?

This basic problem statement was subdivided into many specific study objectives. Of main interest is the goods and service categories used in tracing student expenditure patterns:

1. Books and School Supplies
2. Laundry and Dry Cleaning Services
3. Barber Services and Beauty Salon Services
4. Movies
5. Restaurant Meals
6. Other Entertainment
7. Groceries
8. Clothing
9. Drugs, Cosmetics, and Toiletries
10. Household Furnishings
11. Automotive and Transportation Services

Methodology

Personal interviews were conducted with 340 randomly selected Michigan State University students during fall term, 1965, on the East Lansing campus. Questionnaire data was machine tabulated and processed through the 3600 computer located at Michigan State University. Findings were cross-tabulated against several student classification variables in order to pinpoint more accurately the basic determinants of various responses given by particular population subsets. The student variables used in analysis were as follows:

1. Marital status
2. Sex
3. Class in school
4. Campus or off-campus residence
5. Car ownership

Study Findings

While the findings are too detailed and dispersed over many different areas to be given mention here, the study did reveal a wealth of information about the University student population. Findings and conclusions are intermixed throughout the various chapters of the study -- resulting in a multitude of information in answer to the detailed questions set by the problem statement and objectives.

STATE NEWS READERSHIP AND MARKET
DATA STUDY OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENTS, FALL TERM, 1965

By

James W. Thomas

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Advertising

1966

Approved 11-66
Kennard R. Allen

PREFACE

The Michigan State University is a distinct community in and of itself. The demographic characteristics of this community are constantly changing due to the annual turnover of nearly one-fourth of the student body. The University student population has a choice of a wide variety of media sources for their entertainment and news information-- including their own newspaper, the State News.

The individual student has attitudes toward and preferences for various media with which to spend his relatively valuable time. Likewise, he has preferences for area retail establishments in which to spend his even more valuable dollars. The University student also has particular shopping patterns and expenditure habits which are dictated by both the student community, of which he is a member, and his own uniqueness as an individual.

This study of the Michigan State University student population is an attempt to find out more about the various demographic characteristics and behavior patterns of its members. It was initiated following a request made by Mr. Louis Berman, advisor to the

State News, for assistance from the 475 Advertising Research class of fall term, 1965, at Michigan State University.

Under the direction of Dr. Kenward L. Atkin, 475 course instructor, the study was launched on October, 15, 1965. The study was designed as a means of providing the State News with needed media, audience, and market data. In addition, it served as a means of giving the class members practical experience in both advertising and marketing research.

As a graduate assistant in the fall advertising research class I helped in formulating and actuating the study. This basically included: the problem definition, questionnaire formulation, sample selection, interviewing, response coding for computer input, analysis of results, and writing of the basic report. Since the termination of the class I have directed and assisted in the steps necessary in bringing this study to its present form. The steps included the development of cross-tabulations of student demographic characteristics for a second computer run and the complete analysis of the combined findings from both the basic and supplementary reports.

My association with this study, from conception to completion, has provided many insights into the many complexities and great

amounts of time demanded by marketing research. The experience has been a valuable one, however, and has added greatly to my bridging the gap between classroom lessons and the practical demands of marketing research.

I would like to extend my appreciation to all those involved in making this study possible. I am grateful to the students enrolled in the fall, 1965, advertising research class for their assistance. I am especially grateful to John Ojala, whose ideas and initiative were very helpful. To the staffs of the Michigan State University State News, Registrar's Office, and the Computer Center I extend my appreciation for their eagerness to assist in every way possible. A special note of thanks is extended to Dr. Kenward L. Atkin for his assistance and direction throughout the course of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement and Objectives	
Background	
Methodology	
II. CLASSIFICATION DATA	15
III. STUDENT NEWS SOURCES	24
National News	
Local and Campus News	
News Sources and Student Characteristics	
VI. STUDENT READERSHIP PATTERNS	29
<u>State News</u> Readership Frequency	
<u>State Journal</u> Readership Frequency	
<u>Towne Courier</u> Readership Frequency	
<u>State News</u> Readership Depth	
V. STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE <u>STATE NEWS</u>	43
VI. STUDENT SHOPPING PATTERNS	51

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter

VII. STUDENT EXPENDITURES AND STORES PATRONIZED	60
Total Student Term Expenditures	
Book and School Supply Expenditures	
Laundry and Dry Cleaning Expenditures	
Barber Shop and Beauty Salon Expenditures	
Movie Expenditures	
Restaurant Meal Expenditures	
Other Entertainment Expenditures	
Grocery Expenditures	
Clothing Expenditures	
Drug, Cosmetic, and Toiletry Expenditures	
Household Furnishing Expenditures	
Automotive and Transportation Expenditures	
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	112
APPENDIX	116
BIBLIOGRAPHY	130

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Comparison of Basic Population Characteristics and Population Estimates	16
2. Population Estimates for Student Classification Data	17
3. Respondent Classification Data by Marital Status	19
4. Respondent Classification Data by Sex	20
5. Respondent Classification Data by Class.	21
6. Respondent Classification Data by Car Registration.	22
7. Respondent Classification Data by Residence.	23
8. Student News Sources for National News.	25
9. Student News Sources for Local and Campus News	26
10. First Student News Source Ratings by Marital Status.	27
11. Student Readership Frequency of the <u>State News</u>	30
12. Comparison of Student Exposure to a Thursday and Friday Edition of the <u>State News</u>	31
13. Frequency of <u>State News</u> Readership by Marital Status	32
14. Frequency of <u>State News</u> Readership by Sex	32
15. Frequency of <u>State News</u> Readership by Residence.	33
16. Frequency of <u>State News</u> Readership by Class.	34
17. Student Readership of the <u>State Journal</u>	35
18. Frequency of <u>State Journal</u> Readership by Marital Status.	36

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

19. Frequency of <u>State Journal</u> Readership by Sex	37
20. Comparison of <u>State News</u> and <u>State Journal</u> Reader- ship Patterns.	38
21. Student Readership Scores for Editorial Matter in the November 18, 1965, Edition of the <u>State News</u>	40
22. Student Readership Scores for Advertisements in the November 18, 1965, Edition of the <u>State News</u>	41
23. Student Ratings of the <u>State News</u>	44
24. <u>State News</u> Ratings by Marital Status	45
25. <u>State News</u> Ratings by Sex.	45
26. <u>State News</u> Ratings by Residence	46
27. <u>State News</u> Ratings by Class	47
28. Reasons Behind Ratings Given the <u>State News</u>	48
29. Student Suggested Changes in the <u>State News</u>	49
30. Student Shopping Patterns	52
31. Shopping Patterns by Marital Status	54
32. Shopping Patterns by Residence.	56
33. Shopping Patterns by Car Ownership	58
34. Total Student Expenditures for Fall Term, 1965.	62
35. Student Expenditures for Particular Goods and Services. .	64
36. Expenditures for Books and School Supplies by Marital Status	68

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

37. Bookstore Preferences by Marital Status	69
38. Expenditures for Laundry and Dry Cleaning by Marital Status	70
39. Expenditures for Laundry and Dry Cleaning by Residence.	71
40. Cleaning Establishment Preferences by Marital Status . . .	73
41. Expenditures for Barber and Beauty Services by Marital Status	76
42. Beauty Salon and Barber Shop Preferences by Marital Status	74
43. Expenditures for Movies by Marital Status	77
44. Expenditures for Movies by Class in School	79
45. Theater Preferences by Marital Status	80
46. Movie Theater Preferences by Class	81
47. Expenditures for Restaurant Meals by Marital Status	82
48. Expenditures for Restaurant Meals by Residence.	84
49. Restaurant Preferences by Marital Status	85
50. Expenditures for "Other Entertainment" by Marital Status	87
51. Expenditures for "Other Entertainment" by Residence . . .	88
52. Expenditures for "Other Entertainment" by Class	89
53. Entertainment Establishment Preferences by Marital Status	91

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

54. Entertainment Establishment Preferences by Class	92
55. Expenditures for Groceries by Marital Status	94
56. Food Store Preferences by Marital Status	97
57. Expenditures for Clothing by Marital Status	98
58. Expenditures for Clothing by Class	99
59. Clothing Store Preferences by Marital Status	101
60. Expenditures on Drugs, Cosmetics, and Toiletries by Marital Status	102
61. Drug Store Preferences by Marital Status	104
62. Expenditures for Household Furnishings by Marital Status	105
63. Furniture Store Preferences by Marital Status	107
64. Expenditures for Automobiles and Transportation by Marital Status	108
65. Automotive and Transportation Preferences by Marital Status	110

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement and Objectives

The following problem statement set the basic framework for the study and determined the main area of information needed from the student population:

From the Michigan State University student population as a whole, and from subsets thereof, what information can be obtained concerning:

1. What media do Michigan State University students depend upon for their campus, local, national and international news? (vehicle exposure, perception and communication)
2. Student expenditure patterns, by amount spent on products and services, and by shopping area and individual retail establishments providing these products and services?

The basic problem statement was broken down into specific objectives which defined the areas of needed investigation in greater detail. The objectives, then, were to determine:

1. Vehicle and message exposure and perception of the campus newspaper, the State News.
2. Vehicle exposure of other area newspapers - the Lansing State Journal and the East Lansing Towne Courier.

3. What attitudes are held by Michigan State University students towards the State News?
4. What are the total student cash expenditures for the fall term, 1965?
5. From this total, how much do Michigan State University students spend per term on:
 - a. Books and School Supplies
 - b. Laundry and Dry Cleaning Services
 - c. Barber Services and Beauty Salon Services
 - d. Movies
 - e. Other Entertainment
 - f. Restaurant Meals
 - g. Groceries
 - h. Clothing
 - i. Drugs, Cosmetics and Toiletries
 - j. Household Furnishings
 - k. Automotive and Transportation Services
6. How often do Michigan State University students visit:
 - a. Downtown Lansing stores
 - b. Frandor stores
 - c. East Lansing - Grand River stores
 - d. Yankee Stadium stores
 - e. Spartan Shopping Center stores

"Vehicle exposure" is used in indicating the availability of the particular medium -- the total audience that can see the message or medium. "Vehicle perception;" however, is the number of people who do see the message or medium -- as determined by recognition and aided-recall measurement methods. Finally, "vehicle communication" describes the attitudes generated or meanings invoked by a message or medium in the reader's mind.

Background

Michigan State University had a total student enrollment at the beginning of the fall term, 1965, of 35,451 at the East Lansing campus. Of this total, approximately 60 per cent were male and 18 per cent were married.¹ For more information on student population characteristics refer to "respondent classification data" on pages 17-23.

The Michigan State University student has easy access to all major news media -- television, radio, magazines, and newspapers. There are two television stations and several radio stations in the Lansing area. Students living in campus dormitories are permitted to have television sets and radios in their rooms and all dormitories have lounge areas with television facilities available.

Area newspapers include the Lansing State Journal, the East Lansing Towne Courier, and the campus newspaper, the State News. The State Journal is published daily (including Sundays) and has a total circulation of over 75,000. The Towne Courier is a weekly publication with a circulation of under 3,000.

¹ Figures courtesy of James V. Stoneman, Assistant Registrar for Evaluation and Research, Michigan State University, September 28, 1966.

The State News is a student newspaper, edited by students, and with editorial policy determined by students. The size of the paper varies between eight and sixteen pages, with a standard format of eight columns in width. Fifty to 60 percent of the paper is composed of advertising. Local advertising is solicited by student salesmen from the State News advertising staff. National advertising, however, comes largely from the National Advertising Service, a company that solicits advertising from the national advertisers and sends it to college newspapers in groups -- such as to the "Big Ten" college newspapers.

The State News has a circulation and daily (Monday through Friday) printing of 31,000. The paper is distributed to all dormitories, sorority and fraternity houses, larger student apartment buildings, class room buildings, each apartment in campus married housing, and to East Lansing merchants. The subscription price (\$1.00) is included in student's tuition as the paper is available to all students.

The Michigan State University campus is served by retail establishments located in downtown East Lansing, nearby Lansing, and several area shopping centers. In addition to these retail

establishments, the University itself operates a campus-located bookstore and the student Union containing a cafeteria, grill, billiards and bowling facilities, and a barber shop. The MSU student also has access to cafeteria, snack bar, and entertainment facilities contained in University-owned dormitories.

Methodology

Two major factors influenced the design of this study: the first being the circumstances under which the research project was to be conducted -- as an educational tool to apply the research concepts and techniques learned in the classroom. Second, the time limitation set by the length of the term (ten weeks) imposed some limitations on the scope of the study. For example, original plans to include MSU faculty and staff in the survey sample were dropped.

Because of the time limitations and the type of information sought, the personal interview survey was selected as the means for collecting the desired data. The following sections disclose the techniques and procedures used in designing and actuating the research study.

Sample Design and Size. --Several necessary requirements and unavoidable limitations dictated the method used in constructing the sample design in this study. They were as follows:

1. To avoid sampling bias, the sampling selection must be done by random sampling procedures.
2. The sample must be large enough to assure relatively accurate and reliable data.
3. The sample must not be so large that it will be impossible to complete interviewing, tabulations and analysis within the somewhat limited time period available.
4. Because of the predicted larger expenditures of married students and the importance of this data to the study, enough married must be included in the sample to make their reported expenditure data reliable.

The above factors were important determinants of the sample design, and, in turn, the final sample size to be used in the study.

The frame selected for the sample was the University telephone directory.² This directory listed all students registered for classes at the beginning of the 1965 academic year. The complete listing of student names, then, was considered as representing the "population" for the study.

²Student Directory, Michigan State University, September, 1965.

The sample was selected from the directory by means of a randomly chosen standard interval. In this study, every fifth name from the top of the first column on each page was selected. Because the resulting sample size was too large, a stratified sampling method was used to reduce the sample size to a more practical number.³ This method involved eliminating every other single student⁴ from the list while keeping the relatively smaller married sub-sample at its original size. The final sample size was approximately 370 of which 340 usable respondents were obtained. Assuming the frequency of population characteristics is as great as possible (50-50), this sample indicates the true population characteristics 95 out of 100 times -- within a confidence band of plus or minus 6 percentage points of error.

Employing the above method of stratified sampling assured that enough married would be included in the final sample to give a higher degree of reliability to the married students' responses than if straight random sampling was used. But, because of the

³For a complete explanation of the advantages of stratification and the method used in weighting the resulting sample data, see: Harper W. Boyd, Jr., and Ralph Westfall, Marketing Research (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1956), pp. 315 - 18.

⁴Student marital status was indicated in the directory by code numbers following each name.

disproportionate number of marrieds (as compared to singles) in the sample, a weighting factor had to be applied to the resulting subsample data to bring the single students' characteristics back to the proportion present in the total student population.⁵ The sample characteristics, therefore, will approximate the true population characteristics whenever a total population figure is given.

Questionnaire Design. -- The questionnaire used in this survey was made up of three basic sections: (1) classification data, (2) student readership data, and (3) students expenditure data. The questionnaire, which utilized both open and closed-end questions and was partially pre-coded, was designed so the respondent could be led through the interview with a minimum loss of interest. This was done by placing questions that were

⁵The weight assigned to each subsample (single and married) was in the same proportion as each appeared in the total population. Registrar's figures indicate that 18.4% of the population were married and 17.6% were single. Therefore, the single subsample characteristics were assigned a weight of 4.5 (82 divided by 18). After converting the 4.5 to one ration into whole numbers, the resulting weighting equation was employed in adjusting the stratified sample data:

$$\text{population estimate} = \frac{\text{single data} \times 9 + \text{married data} \times 2}{11}$$

1

predicted to be of relative interest to the respondent near the beginning of the questionnaire. Classification questions, then, were contained on the last page of the questionnaire.

In addition to the actual questionnaire, "cue" sheets listing coded dollar amount categories and area retail establishments was prepared. This sheet was designed for handing to the respondent during the student expenditures part of the interview as an aid to his memory when asked questions concerning "how much" and "where."

The third item of the interviewing package was a copy of the November 18, 1965, edition of the State News. The paper was shown to each respondent during the readership measurement section of the interview.

Both the questionnaire and "cue" sheets were pretested and re-written several times before a satisfactory interviewing package was assembled. Copies of the questionnaire and "cue" sheets used in the survey are contained in the Appendix.

Specific Interviewing Techniques. -- The thirty-three Advertising 475 students who administered the questionnaire were fully briefed on correct interviewing procedures and each completed a practice interview before going into the field. Interviewers were made aware of the ease with which interviewer bias could be injected

into the interview situation. Accordingly, each was instructed in the proper method of probing for responses to the open-end questions.

In addition to the direct-inquiry and probe type questions, the survey utilized the Starch technique of readership measurement. The Starch technique was used to measure readership of both editorial matter and advertisements in the Thursday, November 18, 1965, issue of the State News. To qualify the respondent as a reader of the paper, this issue was shown (banner side up) to the respondent. Those who indicated they had seen or read this issue were led through the paper, page by page, to determine their depth of readership.

Specific articles and advertisements in the issue were pre-selected and listed on the questionnaire. As the respondent revealed to what extent he had read each page, article, or advertisement his response was recorded within one of the following readership degrees: (1) noted, (2) seen-associated (read lightly), or (3) read most (read heavily).

In the student expenditure section of the interview, the respondent was asked for the amounts he had spent "last week" on the various products and services listed. This technique was used so the respondent could refresh his memory before attempting to answer the next

and more important question on how much he spent (or will spend) on the particular item. Married students were asked to report their total household's expenditures on these products and services.

Data Collection Procedure. --Interviews were conducted at various locations on the Michigan State University campus or at the respondent's home if he lived off campus. To secure the cooperation of the respondent, a telephone call was made prior to the interview explaining the general nature of the study. If cooperation was secured, an appointment was then made for the interview at a time and place convenient to the prospective interviewee. Although the average length of the interview was approximately thirty minutes, very few interviewee terminations resulted. All interviewers were instructed to interview the respondent only if he or she was alone to reduce bias interjected by the respondent's roommates or other on-lookers.

Coding and Tabulation. -- Because portions of the questionnaire were not pre-coded, a code sheet was prepared and the interviewers themselves coded the completed questionnaires. To remove as much coding bias as possible, the coding sessions were arranged so that the interviewer did not code his own questionnaires. Coding instructions were explained both verbally and via a printed coding instruction

sheet containing several coding examples.

In order to have a basis for coding the responses to the open-ended questions, a sample of approximately 25 per cent of the completed questionnaires were reviewed to find answers appearing with the greatest frequency. Once recorded, these answers were assigned a code number and listed in the coding instructions.

The results of the survey were machine tabulated and processed through the 3600 computer at Michigan State University. The first computer "print out" was received on December 6, 1965, and provided enough information to enable the writing of the basic report.

After reviewing this initial report, several areas in need of cross-analyzation by student variables were pin pointed. Accordingly, cross-tabulation tables were set up in preparation for a second computer run. On May 19, 1966, the second computer "print out" was received. It was now possible to look at the data from several points of view and see how various subsets of the sample compared to other subsets. For example, total student responses were now broken down into married versus single responses, male versus female responses, etc.

Cross-Tabulations and Analysis. -- The student demographic characteristics used in cross-tabulation analysis were as follows: marital status, sex, class in school, age, car ownership, and campus or off-campus residence. In programming the second computer run, only the student characteristics that were felt could possibly have significance in determining responses to a particular question were cross-tabulated against the question. Likewise, after reviewing the resulting cross-analyses, cross-tabulations that were not significant for certain questions were dropped from further analysis and are not included in the findings of this paper. For example, it is of little value to report on the per cent of the car-owning students who listed television as their first source for national news. It is important, however, to note that more than twice as many car-owning students claimed to visit downtown Lansing stores "once a week" than non-car-owning students.

In reporting classification data, all questions dealing with demographic characteristics were cross-tabulated against each other. Therefore, it is possible, for example, to tell both what per cent of the married students were freshmen and what per cent of the Freshmen class were married. Aside from the classification

data, there are several cases where only a few cross-tabulations were significant (and therefore, reported on) for particular questions. However, all major questions were cross-tabulated against the marital status variable.

CHAPTER II

CLASSIFICATION DATA

This section of the paper reveals the various demographic characteristics of the Michigan State University student population and of the sample used in this study. The actual survey findings, divided into media and readership data and student expenditure data, are presented in later chapters.

Before listing the various student demographic characteristics, a comparison should be made of the basic sample characteristics and the known population characteristics. This reliability check on the sample data is shown in Table 1. As seen in the table, the sample was a very close estimate of the population sex per cent but it contained 4.7 per cent fewer married students (according to Registrar's figures) than present in the actual population. This slight undersampling of the married population could be due, in part, to sampling variability. However, two other sampling factors would seem to have contributed to this undersampling. They were as follows: (1) a few marrieds, due their distant place of residence from campus, were dropped from the interviewing schedule, and

(2) the interview refusal rate for marrieds (approximately 8 per cent) was relatively high.

TABLE 1. -- Comparison of Basic Population Characteristics and Population Estimates

	<u>Population^a</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Difference</u>
<u>Sex</u>			
Male	60.5%	58.9%	-1.6 pts
Female	39.5	41.1	+1.6
<u>Marital Status</u>			
Single	81.6%	86.3%	+4.7 pts.
Married	18.4	13.7	-4.7

^aSource: Registrar's Office, Michigan State University, Fall quarter, 1965.

While this slight undersampling of the married population subset did, in turn, slightly affect other sample characteristics, it was not considered to be serious enough to affect the basic accuracy of other population estimates to any great extent. Table 2, then, lists the remaining population estimates for student classification data.

TABLE 2. -- Population Estimates for Student Classification Data

<u>Class</u>	
Freshmen	26.0%
Sophomores	24.7
Juniors	19.6
Seniors	11.4
Master's	10.2
Doctoral	7.6
Special	0.5
 <u>Age</u>	
17-18	24.9%
19-20	36.6
21-22	17.9
23-24	6.6
25-26	4.3
27-28	2.5
29-30	3.5
31-35	1.7
36 & over	2.0
 <u>Car Registrations^a</u>	
No response	3.1%
Car	34.4
No car	62.4

^aThe high number of "no responses" here was due, in part, to interviewer oversights. See location of this question in the questionnaire.

Tables 3 through 7 summarize student characteristics across several subsets of the student sample. In each table, one student characteristic (sex, for example) is cross-tabulated against other salient student characteristics. Care must be taken in interpreting this classification data since the data can be read in two distinct fashions. For example, Table 2 points out that 31 per cent of the single students talked to were in the Freshman class. However, to find out what per cent of the freshmen were single, Table 4 would have to be consulted. Table 4 reveals that 96.4 per cent of the Freshmen respondents were single.

It is suggested that these tables be referred to when, in later sections of the paper, mention is made of certain student subsets and their readership and spending habits or patterns. In this way, the reader will realize the approximate size and importance of the student subsets for which data is given.

TABLE 3. --Respondent Classification Data by Marital Status

	<u>% Single</u>	<u>% Married</u>
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	55.0	76.5
Female	45.0	23.5
<u>Class</u>		
Freshmen	31.0	3.7
Sophomores	28.3	8.5
Juniors	20.2	17.1
Seniors	10.9	13.4
Master's	6.2	28.1
Doctoral	3.1	28.1
Special	0.3	1.1
<u>Age</u>		
17-18	30.2	1.2
19-20	42.6	9.8
21-22	18.6	14.6
23-24	5.8	13.4
25-26	1.2	18.3
27-28	1.2	8.5
29-30	0.8	15.9
31-35	0.4	7.3
36 & over	--	11.0
<u>Car Registration</u>		
No response	3.5	1.2
Car	23.6	82.9
No car	72.9	15.9

TABLE 4. -- Respondent Classification Data by Sex

	<u>%</u> <u>Male</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Female</u>
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Single	69.6	85.9
Married	30.4	14.1
<u>Class</u>		
Freshmen	19.1	31.9
Sophomores	22.6	25.2
Juniors	19.1	20.0
Seniors	11.8	11.1
Master's	13.7	8.2
Doctoral	13.2	3.0
Special	0.5	0.3
<u>Age</u>		
17-18	19.1	29.6
19-20	31.4	40.4
21-22	17.7	17.0
23-24	8.8	4.4
25-26	5.9	4.3
27-28	4.9	--
29-30	5.9	2.1
31-35	2.9	0.7
36 & over	3.4	1.5
<u>Car Registrations</u>		
No response	2.5	3.7
Car	52.0	17.0
No car	45.6	79.3

TABLE 5. -- Respondent Classification Data by Class

	<u>% Frosh.</u>	<u>% Soph.</u>	<u>% Jr.</u>	<u>% Sr.</u>	<u>% Mas.</u>	<u>% Doc.</u>
<u>Sex</u>						
Male	57.6	57.5	59.1	61.5	71.8	87.1
Female	42.4	42.5	40.9	38.5	28.2	12.9
<u>Marital Status</u>						
Single	96.4	91.3	78.8	71.8	41.0	25.8
Married	3.6	8.7	21.2	28.2	59.0	74.2
<u>Age</u>						
17-18	85.5	10.0	--	--	--	--
19-20	10.8	80.0	63.6	5.1	2.6	0.0
21-22	3.6	6.3	21.2	76.9	15.4	6.5
23-24	--	1.3	4.6	10.3	28.2	12.9
25-26	--	2.5	1.5	2.6	18.0	22.6
27-28	--	--	1.5	2.6	10.3	12.9
29-30	--	--	6.1	--	10.3	19.4
31-35	--	--	--	--	10.3	9.7
36 & over	--	--	1.5	2.6	5.1	16.1
<u>Car Registrations</u>						
No response	3.6	3.8	1.5	5.1	--	3.2
Car	4.8	27.5	43.9	53.9	74.4	74.2
No car	91.6	68.8	54.6	41.0	25.6	22.6

TABLE 6. --Respondent Classification Data by Car Registration

	<u>% Car</u>	<u>% No Car</u>
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	82.2	46.5
Female	17.8	53.5
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Single	47.3	93.5
Married	52.7	6.5
<u>Class</u>		
Freshmen	3.1	37.8
Sophomores	17.1	27.4
Juniors	22.5	17.9
Seniors	16.3	8.0
Master's	22.5	5.0
Doctoral	17.8	3.5
Special	0.7	0.4
<u>Age</u>		
17-18	3.1	35.8
19-20	22.5	42.8
21-22	24.0	12.9
23-24	14.7	2.5
25-26	11.6	1.5
27-28	6.2	1.0
29-30	9.3	1.5
31-35	3.9	1.0
36 & over	4.7	1.0

TABLE 7.--Respondent Classification Data by Residence

	<u>%</u> <u>Campus</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Off-Campus</u>
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	58.2	64.0
Female	41.8	36.0
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Single	75.9	79.1
Married	24.1	20.9
<u>Class</u>		
Freshmen	24.4	35.1
Sophomores	23.5	27.1
Juniors	19.4	13.8
Seniors	11.5	8.0
Master's	11.5	7.1
Doctoral	9.1	8.4
Special	0.6	0.5
<u>Age</u>		
17-18	23.2	33.8
19-20	34.7	36.4
21-22	17.7	12.4
23-24	7.1	4.4
25-26	5.3	4.9
27-28	2.9	1.8
29-30	4.4	4.0
31-35	2.1	0.9
36 & over	2.7	1.3

CHAPTER III

STUDENT NEWS SOURCES

National News

To find out which news sources for national news were favored by Michigan State University students, respondents were asked to rate the various news media according to their importance. While the choice of one news medium over another is obviously affected by many variables (such as timeliness, convenience, prestige, coverage, and presentation), no specific variables were suggested as a basis for ratings. Therefore, the resulting ratings should be considered as a general evaluation of the relative importance of a particular medium to the individual student.

As seen in Table 8, the broadcast media ranked high as primary sources for national news. Radio received the highest "first source" rating with nearly one-half the students indicating this medium as their first source for this type of news. Print media, however, seemed to be of lesser importance for national news. While magazines, newspapers (including the State News), and "other sources" received relatively low "first source" ratings, newspapers seemed to be of increased importance as second and third sources for national news. The broadcast media also rated relatively high as secondary sources.

TABLE 8. --Student news sources for national news

<u>Medium</u>	<u>Students Rating Each Medium</u>		
	<u>First</u>	<u>Second</u>	<u>Third</u>
Television	21.0%	13.0%	10.7%
Radio	43.5	22.1	12.7
Magazines	10.3	24.7	22.9
<u>State News</u>	9.0	25.6	24.6
<u>State Journal</u>	2.9	5.4	6.4
Other newspapers	12.5	7.2	11.7
Other sources	0.8	1.1	4.4
No response	--	0.1	6.6

These findings would seem to indicate that, while the speed of the broadcast media delivered national news to students first, students still made use of print media sources to round out their national news knowledge.

Local and Campus News

The rating pattern for local and campus news sources was somewhat the reverse of that found for national news. As pointed out in Table 9, the State News was reported to be the primary source of local and campus news for over nine out of ten students. While the State News was the overwhelming first source for this type of news, radio ranked very high as a secondary source.

Over one-half of the students reported this medium as their second source for local and campus news.

TABLE 9. --Student news sources for local and campus news

<u>Medium</u>	<u>Students Rating Each Medium</u>		
	<u>First</u>	<u>Second</u>	<u>Third</u>
Television	0.9%	6.4%	12.6%
Radio	3.6	59.2	14.6
Magazines	--	0.7	2.6
<u>State News</u>	91.1	6.5	0.8
<u>State Journal</u>	3.3	10.8	12.3
Other newspapers	--	1.1	4.2
Other sources	1.1	7.8	14.1
No response	--	7.5	38.8

Table 9 indicates, therefore, that the broadcast media, while ranking quite low as first news sources, are found to be of some importance as secondary sources for information on local news and campus happenings. As with national news, radio was reported to be relatively more important than television for local and campus news. It is interesting to note that a higher percentage of students rated the State Journal as a secondary source for local and campus news than as either a primary or secondary source for national news.

News Sources and Student Characteristics

Perhaps the greatest factor in determining the student's rating of a medium as a news source is his marital status. As shown in Table 10 below, marrieds depended upon television to a much greater extent than singles for national news.

TABLE 10. -- First student news source ratings
by marital status

<u>Medium</u>	<u>National News</u>		<u>Local and Campus News</u>	
	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
Television	14.3%	51.2%	0.8%	1.2%
Radio	49.6	15.9	3.9	2.4
Magazines	10.1	11.0	--	--
<u>State News</u>	10.8	1.2	92.6	84.2
<u>State Journal</u>	0.8	12.2	1.9	9.8
Other newspapers	14.0	6.1	--	--
Other sources	0.4	2.4	0.8	2.4

It can be seen, then, that married students accounted for most of the 21 per cent of the total students (Table 8) who claimed that television was their first source for national news. Singles, in turn, reported a greater dependence upon radio.

As seen from comparing Tables 9 and 10, single students were somewhat more dependent upon the State News for local and campus news. While over 90 per cent of the total students

rated this paper as their primary source for local and campus news, only 84 per cent of the marrieds rated the State News in this way. This is probably due, in part, to the fact that more marrieds than singles indicated a dependence on the State Journal for news of this type.

CHAPTER IV

STUDENT READERSHIP PATTERNS

Having established the Michigan State University student preferences for various news media, the question now arises concerning how often and how thoroughly students read their newspaper, the State News. Since the State News is not the only area newspaper available to students, their exposure to other area newspapers is also of importance. This section of the paper reveals the vehicle exposure of the State News, State Journal and Towne Courier -- including the frequency with which each paper is read by students. After reviewing these readership patterns for the three newspapers, the depth of readership (vehicle and message perception) is reported for the State News. Chapter V, which follows, investigates the attitudes held by students toward the State News (vehicle communication).

State News Readership Frequency

The State News, as indicated by Table 11, enjoys a high level of student readership. Virtually all students read one or more issues a week, and almost 78 per cent of the students claimed to read every issue. The very heavy exposure per issue of the

State News is further substantiated by the fact that almost 90 per cent of the students indicated that they had read at least some of

TABLE 11. --Student readership frequency
of the State News

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>All Students</u>
Never	0.5%
Once or twice a week	4.7
3 or 4 times a week	16.9
5 times a week	77.9

the November 18, 1965, issue tested in this study. This high readership level is also evidenced by the finding that over 80 per cent of the respondents in this study remembered reading a particular article appearing in the test issue.⁶

Table 12 points to an interesting comparison of student exposure to the State News issue and used in the present study (a Thursday edition) and exposure to a Friday edition used in a similar Starch measurement conducted in 1964.⁷ The increased exposure of the

⁶Figures are given later in this chapter (pages 40 and 41) on Starch scores for all articles and advertisements pre-selected for measurement in the test issue.

⁷Media Comparability Study, Michigan State University State News and Time Magazine, Dr. Kenward L. Atkin, April 15, 1965.

Thursday edition could perhaps be due to an increase in readership from November, 1964, to November, 1965. It is more likely, however, due to the difference in actual student exposure between

TABLE 12. -- Comparison of student exposure to a Thursday and Friday edition of the State News

	Nov. 20, 1964 <u>(Friday issue)</u>	Nov. 18, 1965 <u>(Thursday issue)</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Did see	73.3%	89.7%	+16.4 pts.
Did not see	26.7	8.9	-17.8
No response	--	1.4	+1.4

Thursday and Friday editions of the paper. The Friday edition could logically be expected to receive lower student exposure since Friday marks the beginning of the campus weekend activities and trips home for the weekend for many students.

In the next sections, State News readership patterns are broken down by marital status, sex, place of residence (campus or off-campus), and class in school.

Frequency of Readership and Marital Status. -- As shown in Table 13 marital status seems to have little affect upon the frequency of State News readership. Almost eight out of ten

TABLE 13. -- Frequency of State News readership by marital status.

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
Never	0.4%	1.2%
Once or twice a week	3.5	9.8
3 or 4 times a week	17.1	15.8
5 times a week	79.0	73.2

marrieds reported readership of every issue; over seven out of ten singles claimed this same readership level. For marrieds and singles who claimed not to be every-issue readers, the percents at each readership frequency level were also quite similar.

Frequency of Readership and Sex. -- Student exposure to the State News does seem to be determined, in part, by the sex of the potential reader. As shown below, the percentage of males

TABLE 14. -- Frequency of State News readership by sex

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Never	0.5%	0.7%
Once or twice a week	3.4	7.4
3 or 4 times a week	13.7	21.5
5 times a week	82.4	70.3

at each of the less than "every-issue" levels were significantly lower than the percentage of females. A greater proportion of male students claimed readership of five times a week than did their female counterparts.

Frequency of Readership and Residence. -- Whether a student lives on-campus or off-campus seems to affect his reading of the State News to a great extent. This is especially evident at the "every-issue" readership level as shown in Table 15. While off-campus students appear with greater frequencies at the lower readership levels, a significantly larger percentage of on-campus students are every-issue readers. Due to the relatively greater

TABLE 15. -- Frequency of State News readership by residence

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>On-Campus</u>	<u>Off-Campus</u>
Never	--	1.7%
Once or twice a week	2.7%	9.6
3 or 4 times a week	13.3	23.5
5 times a week	84.0	65.2

chances of campus residents being exposed to the State News, the 19 per cent more campus residents who claimed the highest readership level does not come as a surprise. What is signifi-

cant, however, is the relatively high percentage of off-campus dwellers who have access to the campus newspaper.

Frequency of Readership and Class. -- Readership of the State News is relatively constant when broken down by class in school. Table 16 shows that the percentage of students at each readership level varies only slightly from class to class. It can be seen that

TABLE 16. -- Frequency of State News readership by class.

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>% Fr.</u>	<u>% Soph.</u>	<u>% Jr.</u>	<u>% Sen.</u>	<u>% Mst.</u>	<u>% Doc.</u>
Never	--	--	--	--	5.0	--
Once or twice a week	4.8	2.5	1.5	10.3	10.3	6.4
3 or 4 times a week	19.3	17.4	13.7	18.0	15.4	16.1
5 times a week	75.9	80.1	84.8	71.7	69.3	77.5

every-issue readership seems to increase slightly with each class through the undergraduate classes until the Junior level. Then, every-issue readership falls off slightly with seniors and begins another upward trend which continues through the remaining graduate levels. The Junior class reportedly contains the highest percentage of daily readers with almost 85 per cent of the class members claiming this frequency level. The master's candidates

were the only group to report a significant number (5 per cent) of non-readers of the State News.

State Journal Readership Frequency

Only about seven per cent of Michigan State University students reportedly read the Lansing State Journal every day. Table 17 also reveals that only about one-half of the students read the paper

TABLE 17. --Student readership frequency
of the State Journal

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>All Students</u>
Never	50.9%
Once or twice a week	29.8
3 or 4 times a week	6.8
5 times a week	5.7
Over 5 times a week	6.8

at all. In order to help pin point the basic characteristics of the readers and non-readers of the State Journal, the readership patterns of the paper are broken down into four basic population subsets. These subsets are: single and married students, and male and female students.

Frequency of Readership and Marital Status. -- The most important determinant of State Journal exposure was found to

be the marital status variable. Married students are shown (in Table 18) to be much more likely to read the paper. Over one-fourth of the marrieds reported they are steady readers of the paper and almost one-half claimed to read the paper at least three times a week. Only 14 per cent of the single students, however, reported reading the State Journal three or more times a week. While almost one out of three single students read the

TABLE 18. -- Frequency of State Journal readership by marital status

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
Never	54.3%	35.4%
Once or twice a week	31.7	20.7
3 or 4 times a week	7.0	6.1
5 times a week	4.3	12.2
Over 5 times a week	2.7	25.6

paper once or twice a week, less than 15 per cent could be considered as regular readers of the State Journal. This is a relatively small group of students when compared to almost 44 per cent of the marrieds who would qualify as regular readers of the publication.

Frequency of Readership and Sex. --As seen from Table 19, this variable also is a determinate of readership of the State Journal. Here, females are seen to be much less likely to read the paper. While over two-thirds of the women claimed to be non-readers, only about 37 per cent of the men indicated this lowest readership level. While over twice as many males as females reported reading the paper at least three times a week, the percentage of female readers begins to approach that of males at the "over five times a week" level.

TABLE 19. --Frequency of State Journal readership and sex.

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Never	36.8%	69.6%
Once or twice a week	35.3	19.3
3 or 4 times a week	9.8	2.2
5 times a week	8.3	3.0
Over 5 times a week	9.8	5.9

Towne Courier Readership Frequency

The frequency of readership of the East Lansing Towne Courier was found to be extremely low among Michigan State University students. In fact, almost 95 per cent of the respondents reported they never read this publication. The relative unimportance of

1

of this paper to students, then, is obvious and a detailed breakdown by various student subsets would be meaningless.

State News and State Journal Readership Frequencies

This section presents a comparison of the readership patterns of the State News and the State Journal. As seen in Table 20, the readership frequencies of the two papers are quite different. This

TABLE 20. -- Comparison of State News and State Journal readership frequencies.

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>State Journal</u>	<u>State News</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Never	50.9%	0.5%	-50.4pts.
Occasionally ^a	36.6	21.6	-15.0
Heavily ^b	12.5	77.9	+65.4

^a one to four issues a week

^b five issues of the State News per week, five or more issues of the State Journal per week

difference is due mainly to the very low percentage of students who claimed to never read the State News (0.5) compared to the 50.9 per cent who report never reading the State Journal.

As seen in Table 18, married students accounted for a large part of the student readership of the State Journal. Therefore,

while the readership of the State Journal by married students was considerably lower than that of the State News, marital status does seem to be the most important variable influencing student exposure to a second newspaper.

State News Readership Depth

In order to measure the depth of State News readership in this study, both editorial and advertising matter were measured for depth of message perception. This was accomplished through an adoption of the Starch recognition technique contained in the questionnaire. Three degrees of readership (or perception) were used in measuring the depth of readership in the November 18, 1965 issue:

1. Noted -- The reader remembered seeing the article or advertisement shown to him.
2. Read Lightly -- The reader remembered enough of the article or advertisement to know what the story or message was about, but read less than one-half of the actual story or advertising copy.
3. Read Heavily -- The reader read over 50 per cent of the article or advertising message.

Tables 21 and 22 reveal the student readership scores for both editorial matter and advertising in the State News issue tested.

TABLE 21. -- Student readership scores for editorial matter in the November 18,
1965 edition of the State News

<u>Pages and Articles</u>	<u>% Un- Noted</u>	<u>% Noted</u>	<u>% Read</u>		<u>% No Response</u>
			<u>Lightly</u>	<u>Heavily</u>	
Pg. 1 (pg. as whole)	1.2	5.0	29.1	54.1	10.6
"Bowl Trip" story	8.8	10.6	14.4	55.6	10.6
Pg. 2 (pg. as whole)	7.0	14.7	46.8	19.1	12.4
"Help Wanted" ed.	45.7	12.4	7.7	22.7	11.5
Pg. 3 "The Paper" story	57.3	12.4	5.9	13.8	10.6
Pg. 4 (pg. as whole)	17.7	13.2	28.5	30.0	10.6
Pg. 5 "Olin Report"	52.6	9.4	6.2	20.9	10.9
Pg. 7 "Moppets" story	60.2	9.7	6.8	12.7	10.6
Pg. 8 "Birth Control" story	10.9	6.8	9.1	62.9	10.3

TABLE 22. -- Student readership scores for advertisements in the November 18,
1965 edition of the State News

<u>Pages and Ads</u>	<u>% Un- Noted</u>	<u>% Noted</u>	<u>% Read Lightly</u>	<u>% Read Heavily</u>	<u>% No Response</u>
Pg. 2 Student Book Store	26.2	25.6	14.1	23.5	10.6
Pg. 3 Kositchek's Thompson's Jwlry.	63.7 64.7	12.7 15.0	7.1 4.4	5.9 5.3	10.6 10.6
Pg. 4 Sportsmeister	58.2	13.2	9.1	8.5	10.6
Pg. 5 Pub Cologne Flash Cleaners	48.9 85.5	16.8 3.2	12.7 0.3	11.2 0.4	10.6 10.6
Pg. 6 Classified ads	28.3	18.8	33.2	9.1	10.6
Pg. 7 McDonald's State Theater State Drugs	44.4 24.2 53.8	18.5 20.4 9.4	9.4 14.7 7.7	17.1 28.5 18.5	10.6 12.2 10.6
Pg. 8 Big 10 Club Kramer Auto Sprague's	63.8 83.2 78.8	11.5 3.2 4.7	6.2 0.9 1.8	7.9 2.1 3.5	10.6 10.6 11.2

As shown in Table 21, for editorial matter (including whole pages of the paper as well as specific articles) there existed a pattern of increasing percentages of students from "noted" to "read heavily" scores. Every article in the issue rated a higher percentage of students at the "read heavily" level than at the "noted" level. Those reporting only a "noted" score were assumed, therefore, to have little interest in the subject or article. The article receiving the highest readership score was a story concerning an upcoming Rose Bowl trip and was located on the front page. This article was recalled or read partially by over 80 per cent of the respondents.

As would be expected, perception of advertisements followed the exact reverse of the editorial matter perception pattern. As shown in Table 22, in all but two cases the percentage of students claiming to have "noted" the particular advertisement was greater than the percentage reporting "read heavily" scores. Although it would require a minimum of time and effort to read 50 per cent of many of the advertisements containing illustrations and relatively short copy, the "read heavily" scores were noticeably low. In fact, only five of the twelve advertisements tested were reported to be "read heavily" by more than 10 per cent of the readers.

CHAPTER V

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE STATE NEWS

The two basic subjects covered in this chapter are: (1) What students think of the State News as a campus newspaper, and (2) student-suggested changes or areas in need of improvement in the format of the paper.

Student Ratings of the State News

In order to find out what Michigan State University Students think of their campus newspaper, respondents were asked to rate the State News as either excellent, very good, average, or poor. No suggestions were given to interviewees concerning any specific qualities that the paper should or should not have. Interviewers were instructed only to ask the respondents how he or she would rate the State News as compared to his or her own concept of the "ideal college newspaper." Therefore, the ratings should be interpreted as general evaluations of the over-all paper from the student's point of view.

Overall, the State News received very favorable student ratings. As seen in the next table, well over one-half of the student respondents rated their campus newspaper as either an excellent or very good

paper. Only one student in seventeen reported a "poor" rating for the State News.

TABLE 23. --Student ratings of the State News

<u>Rating</u>	<u>All Students</u>
Excellent	10.7%
Very Good	44.7
Average	38.9
Poor	5.7

In the following sections, State News ratings are broken down by marital status, sex, and residence (on-campus or off-campus). In each case, the cross-analysis against the particular population subset was to reveal insights into some of the determinants of student ratings.

Ratings and Marital Status. -- This variable was found to be relatively unimportant as a factor determining ratings given the State News. While a slightly higher percentage of married students gave the paper "excellent" ratings and a few more singles rated the paper as "poor", the overall ratings were quite similar. Table 24 lists the ratings according to the marital status of the respondent.

TABLE 24. -- State News ratings by marital status

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
Excellent	11.2%	8.5%
Very good	43.8	48.8
Average	39.6	35.4
Poor	5.4	7.3

Ratings and Sex. -- Like marital status, the sex of the student rating the State News seemed to be of little importance in determining the rating given. As seen in Table 25, the percentages of men and women at each rating level were quite similar.

TABLE 25. -- State News ratings by sex

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Excellent	11.3%	9.6%
Very good	46.1	43.7
Average	38.2	38.5
Poor	4.1	8.2

The over-all mean ratings given the paper by both male and female students appeared in the "very good" category -- although women rated the paper slightly lower than men. It is interesting to note

that (as indicated in Table 14) women also reported generally lower readership frequencies than men.

Ratings and Residence. -- Students living on-campus tended to rate the State News slightly higher than those living off-campus. However, the over-all mean ratings of both subsets fell within the "very good" category. Table 26, which shows the percentage of each group in each rating category, reveals the slight differences

TABLE 26. -- State News ratings by residence

<u>Rating</u>	<u>On-Campus</u>	<u>Off-Campus</u>
Excellent	11.2%	9.6%
Very good	45.7	43.4
Average	37.8	40.0
Poor	5.3	7.0

in ratings. As in the preceding section, the subset with the relatively higher readership frequency (in this case, on-campus students) also gave the paper relatively higher ratings.

Ratings and Class. -- Aside from the higher ratings accorded by freshmen, very little differences in the rating of the State News across classes in school were found. As disclosed by Table 27, almost 17 per cent of the freshmen rated the paper as "excellent"

while seniors (the class giving the lowest percentage of "excellent" ratings) had only 5 per cent of their class in this category. While the ratings varied somewhat between classes and rating levels, the

TABLE 27. -- State News Ratings by class

<u>Rating</u>	<u>% Fr.</u>	<u>% Soph</u>	<u>% Jr.</u>	<u>% Sen.</u>	<u>% Mst.</u>	<u>% Doc.</u>
Excellent	16.9	8.7	6.1	5.1	7.7	12.9
Very good	45.8	41.2	45.5	53.9	48.7	38.7
Average	34.9	43.8	42.3	35.9	35.9	35.5
Poor	2.4	6.3	6.1	5.1	7.7	12.9

mean ratings for each class fell within the "very good" category -- with freshmen giving the most favorable over-all ratings.

Reasons for Ratings. -- In order to determine more exactly why students chose to rate the State News as they did, respondents were asked to explain exactly why they gave their individual ratings. For tabulation purposes, nine basic categories were constructed to cover most of the respondents' reasons behind their opinions concerning the quality of the paper. Table 28 lists the various reasons and the percentage of students who reported answers fitting each of the opinion categories.

TABLE 28. -- Reasons behind ratings given
the State News

<u>Reason</u>	<u>All Students</u>
Simply like (misc. reasons)	46.5%
Inadequate national/international news	16.5
Biased presentation of information	8.2
Like editorials	6.8
Inadequate campus/local news	5.0
Inaccurate/sloppy	4.4
Simply dislike (misc. reasons)	4.1
Dislike editorials/editorial subjects	3.5
Don't know why	3.5
No response	1.5

For many students, there was no specific reason behind the rating given the State News. As shown in the table above, five out of ten respondents simply liked (or disliked) the paper for miscellaneous reasons. The most frequent reason given for disliking the paper was that it had poor coverage of national or international news. While almost 17 per cent gave this reason for their negative ratings, only one student in twenty judged the paper as having poor coverage of campus or local news. Almost all students (95 per cent) indicated some sort of reasoning behind their opinion

of the paper -- even if this reason was as general as "I simply think it is a good newspaper."

Having established what students think of their campus newspaper and why they hold these opinions, the final attitude measurement was to probe for suggestions for improving the paper. After students revealed their reasons for rating the paper as they did, they were next asked if anything about the paper needed changing or if particular areas in need of improvement existed within the format of the paper.

As seen in Table 29, the changes suggested by students were, for the most part, parallel to the reasons behind their ratings.

TABLE 29. --Student suggested changes in
the State News.

<u>Changes</u>	<u>All Students</u>
No changes needed	26.8%
More national /international news	25.6
More accurate reporting/ coverage	7.9
Better editorial topics	7.1
Less control/censorship by school administration	6.2
More local/campus news	6.2
Should present both sides of controversial issues	5.6
More information on future and local events	4.4
No response	10.2

This is evidenced by the one student out of four who said that the State News should have better national and/or international news coverage -- the most frequent reason behind the previously given negative ratings. Over one-third of the students said either no changes were needed in the paper or simply didn't have a response ready for this probe question. As indicated in the table of suggested changes, no other particular suggestion for improvement in the paper was agreed upon as being needed by more than eight per cent of the students.

CHAPTER VI

STUDENT SHOPPING PATTERNS

In order to find out where students actually shop and which area shopping locations were preferred by the student population (or subsets thereof), respondents were asked to report their shopping patterns. This basically consisted of revealing how frequently they visited the following shopping areas: downtown Lansing, East Lansing, Frandor Shopping Center, Yankee Stadium Shopping Center, and Spartan Shopping Center.

The shopping patterns for the student population as a whole are shown in Table 30, on the next page. Students indicated that East Lansing stores received their most frequent patronage. Over 64 per cent claimed to visit these stores at least once a week; 30 per cent reported visits of more than once a week. While the Frandor Shopping Center establishments placed second according to frequency of visits, only slightly more than 19 per cent of the students claimed to shop there at least once a week. Accordingly, about eight out of ten students reported visiting Frandor only three times a month or less. Students visited the remaining shopping areas rather infrequently. Not more than six per cent of the students reported shopping more than once a week in down-

TABLE 30. --Student shopping patterns

<u>Shopping Frequency</u>	<u>All Students</u>
<u>Downtown Lansing Stores</u>	
Never	40.2%
Once a month or less	36.3
2-3 times a month	15.7
Once a week	6.7
More than once a week	1.1
<u>Frondor Center Stores</u>	
Never	26.1%
Once a month or less	35.1
2-3 times a month	19.5
Once a week	14.2
More than once a week	5.1
<u>East Lansing Stores</u>	
Never	3.3%
Once a month or less	8.1
2-3 times a month	24.4
Once a week	34.2
More than once a week	30.0
<u>Yankee Stadium Stores</u>	
Never	67.2%
Once a month or less	20.3
2-3 times a month	8.5
Once a week	2.4
More than once a week	1.6
<u>Spartan Center Stores</u>	
Never	77.6%
Once a month or less	6.6
2-3 times a month	5.7
Once a week	4.0
More than once a week	6.1

town Lansing, Yankee Stadium, or Spartan Center stores.

On the following pages, student shopping patterns are broken down according to the responses given by various subsets of the population. Tables summerizing each subset's shopping patterns are placed on the page following their mention in the text.

Shopping Patterns and Marital Status

As seen in Table 31, almost one-half of the married students reported visiting downtown Lansing stores at least twice a month. The average single student, however, seldom shops in downtown Lansing. Likewise, nearly one-third of the single students reported "never" shopping in Frandor, while over 50 per cent of the marrieds shop there once a week or more. In East Lansing however, the majority of single students visit retail establishments once a week or more, while less than 50 per cent of the marrieds shop there with that frequency.

This pattern of married students shopping with more frequency than singles in areas located further from campus is also shown in the shopping patterns for Yankee Stadium and Spartan Shopping Center stores. While few single students shop at these locations, Spartan Shopping Center attracts almost 50 per cent of the marrieds

TABLE 31. --Shopping patterns by marital status.

<u>Shopping Frequency</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
<u>Downtown Lansing Stores</u>		
Never	46.9%	9.8%
Once a month or less	34.9	42.7
2-3 times a month	11.6	34.2
Once a week	6.6	7.3
More than once a week	0.0	6.1
<u>Frondor Center Stores</u>		
Never	30.5%	6.1%
Once a month or less	40.7	9.8
2-3 times a month	17.1	30.5
Once a week	10.1	32.9
More than once a week	1.6	20.7
<u>East Lansing Stores</u>		
Never	2.3%	8.5%
Once a month or less	4.7	23.2
2-3 times a month	25.2	20.7
Once a week	35.3	29.3
More than once a week	32.6	18.3
<u>Yankee Stadium Stores</u>		
Never	75.9%	28.1%
Once a month or less	16.7	36.6
2-3 times a month	4.7	25.6
Once a week	1.9	4.8
More than once a week	0.8	4.9
<u>Spartan Center Stores</u>		
Never	84.8%	45.1%
Once a month or less	6.7	6.1
2-3 times a month	4.3	12.2
Once a week	1.9	13.4
More than once a week	2.3	23.2

twice a month or more.⁸ While married students' visits average only once a month or less at Yankee Stadium Shopping Center, single students shop there even more infrequently.

Shopping Patterns and Residence

Table 32 indicates the shopping patterns for students living on and off-campus. Both campus and off-campus residents visit downtown Lansing stores with almost equal frequency. Off-campus students, however, are somewhat more likely to visit Frandor Shopping Center establishments. In fact, a larger percentage of these students reported visiting Frandor at every frequency level than did on-campus residents.

In East Lansing stores almost four off-campus students out of ten reported visits of more than once a week; one-fourth of the campus residents claimed this shopping frequency. The average visit for both groups, however, was approximately two to three times a month. Yankee Stadium Center was found to draw none of the on-campus students more than once a week. Almost 17 per cent of these same students, however, claimed to visit Spartan Center stores once a week or more. For off-

⁸Spartan Shopping Center is in the immediate area of the University's married housing.

TABLE 32. --Shopping patterns by residence

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>On- Campus</u>	<u>Off- Campus</u>
<u>Downtown Lansing Stores</u>		
Never	40.4%	33.0%
Once a month or less	36.9	36.5
2-3 times a month	16.0	19.1
Once a week	5.4	9.6
More than once a week	1.3	1.8
<u>Frondor Center Stores</u>		
Never	30.7%	13.0%
Once a month or less	32.9	33.9
2-3 times a month	16.0	28.7
Once a week	14.6	17.4
More than once a week	5.8	7.0
<u>East Lansing Stores</u>		
Never	3.6%	4.4%
Once a month or less	7.1	13.0
2-3 times a month	29.8	13.0
Once a week	35.5	30.4
More than once a week	24.0	39.2
<u>Yankee Stadium Stores</u>		
Never	72.9%	47.8%
Once a month or less	18.7	27.0
2-3 times a month	7.1	14.7
Once a week	1.3	5.2
More than once a week	--	5.2
<u>Spartan Center Stores</u>		
Never	69.8%	85.2%
Once a month or less	5.3	9.6
2-3 times a month	8.0	2.6
Once a week	6.7	0.9
More than once a week	10.2	1.7

campus students, visits to these two shopping centers were with approximately the same frequency as campus residents -- except that the average off-campus resident visited Yankee Stadium stores a little more often.

Shopping Patterns and Car Ownership

Car ownership was found to be an important determinant of where the Michigan State University student shops frequently. A significantly higher percentage of non-car owners claimed to "never" visit each of the listed shopping areas except East Lansing. In East Lansing, few car owners or non-car owners reported "never" to visit stores, although a slightly higher percentage of car owners answered as such. Almost one-half of the students not owning a car reported "never" visiting Lansing stores (the shopping area most distant from the campus), and none reported visits more often than once a week. Shopping at Spartan Center and Yankee Stadium stores was a rare occasion for the non-car owner. In fact, over 80 per cent of these students claimed "never" to visit these locations.

Both car and non-car owners were frequent shoppers in East Lansing stores. Over 21 per cent of the former and 33.8 per cent

TABLE 33. --Shopping patterns by car ownership

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Car</u>	<u>No Car</u>
<u>Downtown Lansing Stores</u>		
Never	21.7%	48.3%
Once a month or less	39.5	34.8
2-3 times a month	26.4	11.4
Once a week	8.5	5.5
More than once a week	3.9	--
<u>Frondor Center Stores</u>		
Never	7.8	34.3
Once a month or less	21.7	40.8
2-3 times a month	26.4	16.9
Once a week	28.7	7.5
More than once a week	15.4	0.5
<u>East Lansing Stores</u>		
Never	6.2%	2.0%
Once a month or less	20.2	2.5
2-3 times a month	20.2	26.4
Once a week	31.8	35.3
More than once a week	21.6	33.8
<u>Yankee Stadium Stores</u>		
Never	39.5%	80.6%
Once a month or less	33.3	13.9
2-3 times a month	18.6	4.0
Once a week	3.9	1.5
More than once a week	4.7	--
<u>Spartan Center Stores</u>		
Never	57.3%	85.5%
Once a month or less	7.8	6.5
2-3 times a month	8.5	4.5
Once a week	10.1	1.5
More than once a week	16.3	2.0

of the latter shopped in these stores more than once a week. Of the more mobile car owners, almost 16 per cent visited Frandor stores and over 16 per cent visited Spartan Shopping Center more than once a week.

CHAPTER VII

STUDENT EXPENDITURES AND STORES PATRONIZED

Beginning with the total amounts estimated by students as their fall,(1965) term expenditures, the following sections report a variety of student expenditure patterns. To secure this information, students were asked to estimate their total expenses for the fall term on certain categories of goods and services; they were then asked to identify the area retail establishments where these purchases were made. Respondents were instructed to rank the establishments on a first, second, and third choice basis. Thus, a "first" choice means that the student spent the "first most" money in that store, a "second" choice means the student spent "second most" in that store, etc.

The following goods and service categories were used in tracing student shopping patterns:

- Books and School Supplies
- Laundry and Dry Cleaning
- Barber Shops and Beauty Salons
- Movies
- Restaurant Meals
- Other Entertainment
- Groceries
- Clothing
- Drugs, Cosmetics and Toiletries
- Household Furnishings
- Automotive and Transportation

The findings in these expenditure areas have been validated, where possible, with the Registrar for characteristics of the student population, and with the 1962 Shaffer study on Michigan State University student expenses and sources of income.⁹ While there is little overlapping of the Shaffer study and the one at hand, Dr. Shaffer's findings can be assumed to be somewhat more accurate in the few instances when similar information is contained. The reason for this is that, in the Shaffer study, the sample kept a "diary" on their purchases while this study relied on student estimates. The high degree of correspondence of findings in the two studies indicates the findings herein are valid approximations of student expenditures on the specified goods and service items.

Student expenditures (by goods and service category and by retail establishment) have been analyzed across marital status and other salient population subset variables. An approximation of the total dollar market for each population subset was also computed according to the expenditures estimated for each goods and service category.

⁹ James D. Shaffer and Paul L. Dressel, Expenses and Sources of Income of Michigan Resident Michigan State University Students, Office of Institutional Research, Michigan State University, 1963.

Total Student Term Expenditures

Respondents were asked to estimate their expected total expenditures for the fall term, 1965. This estimate was the sum of "cash" expenditures and "equivalent cash" expenditures including amounts spent for tuition and other school fees. Equivalent cash expenditures covered such situations as room and board jobs or other methods by which students were compensated for employment by reducing the amounts that would otherwise be considered their "cash" expenditures.

Table 34 shows the proportions of students reporting their expenditures as falling within the dollar categories listed. As seen from the table, four out of ten students estimated their term

TABLE 34. --Total student expenditures
for fall term, 1965

<u>Amount</u>	<u>All Students</u>
None	--
\$1 - \$100	--
\$101 - \$300	1.3%
\$301 - \$500	21.6
\$501 - \$700	40.6
\$701 - \$900	18.8
\$901 - \$1,100	7.4
\$1,101 - \$1,300	2.1
\$1,301 and Over	7.5
No Response	0.7

expenditures will range from \$501 to \$700. While no students reported spending less than \$100, slightly over one-sixth thought they would spend over \$901 during the term. The mean average fall term expenditure was approximately \$675 per student.

Married students reported spending significantly more during the term than single students. The average term expenditure for married students was around \$1,000 -- as compared to the reported single student's average of approximately \$600. Likewise, car-owning students' mean average expenses for fall term were somewhat higher than non-car owner's estimated amounts. Those who owned cars reported average fall term expenditures of a little over \$800; non-car owners, however, average around \$600 for the term.

By multiplying the above population subset's average term expenditures times the number of students in the particular subset, an estimate of the total dollars spent per group can be made. Overall, the total student dollar market represents student spendings of approximately 25 million dollars per term. Of this total, married students spend around \$8,735,000; single students, \$16,345,000; car-owning students, \$101,300,000; and non-car owners, \$14,000,000.

After establishing how much students spent in total during the fall term, 1965, respondents were also asked to estimate their expenditures for the goods and service categories previously mentioned. Table 35 summarizes the amounts spent by all students for each of the eleven goods and service categories.

TABLE 35.--Student expenditures for particular goods and services

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>% of All Students</u>	<u>Mean Avg. Expenditure</u>
<u>Books & School Supplies</u>		approx. \$30
None	1.1	
Less than \$1	0.4	
\$1 to \$4.99	0.9	
\$5 to \$9.99	2.1	
\$10 to \$14.99	1.2	
\$15 to \$24.99	5.2	
\$25 to \$49.99	42.9	
\$50 to \$100	42.6	
Over \$100	3.6	
Don't know	--	
<u>Laundry & Dry Cleaning</u>		approx. \$9
None	7.6	
Less than \$1	4.3	
\$1 to \$4.99	17.8	
\$5 to \$9.99	19.2	
\$10 to \$14.99	15.3	
\$15 to \$24.99	15.3	
\$25 to \$39.99	9.2	
\$40 to \$55	2.8	
Over \$55	2.8	
Don't know	0.8	

TABLE 35 (continued)

<u>Term Expenditure</u>	<u>% of All Students</u>	<u>Mean Avg. Expenditure</u>
<u>Barber Shops & Beauty Salons</u>		approx. \$3
None	33.4	
Less than \$2.25	6.3	
\$2.25 to \$4.99	16.0	
\$5 to \$9.99	23.5	
\$10 to \$19.99	16.3	
\$20 to \$29.99	2.7	
\$30 to \$39.99	0.4	
\$40 to \$50	0.7	
Over \$50	0.4	
Don't know	0.3	
<u>Movies</u>		approx. \$2
None	33.9	
Less than \$1	4.3	
\$1 to \$4.99	24.9	
\$5 to \$9.99	17.7	
\$10 to \$14.99	13.3	
\$15 to \$19.99	3.9	
\$20 to \$24.99	0.7	
\$25 to \$30	1.0	
Over \$30	--	
Don't know	0.3	
<u>Restaurant Meals</u>		approx. \$25
None	1.3	
Less than \$5	6.3	
\$5 to \$14.99	7.7	
\$15 to \$24.99	20.3	
\$25 to \$49.99	32.0	
\$50 to \$99.99	19.1	
\$100 to \$149	7.9	
\$150 to \$200	3.1	
Over \$200	2.3	
Don't know	--	

TABLE 35 (continued)

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>% of All Students</u>	<u>Mean Avg. Expenditure</u>
<u>Other Entertainment</u>		approx. \$9
None	9.8	
Less than \$5	29.7	
\$5 to \$9.99	15.0	
\$10 to \$19.99	12.4	
\$20 to \$29.99	9.4	
\$30 to \$49.99	8.6	
\$50 to \$99.99	7.8	
\$100 to \$150	4.2	
Over \$150	2.0	
Don't know	1.1	
<u>Groceries</u>		approx. \$24
None	28.3	
Less than \$5	21.7	
\$5 to \$14.99	16.2	
\$15 to \$24.99	4.3	
\$25 to \$49.99	1.9	
\$50 to \$99.99	7.7	
\$100 to \$149	5.6	
\$150 to \$200	6.0	
Over \$200	8.1	
Don't know	0.2	
<u>Clothing</u>		approx. \$35
None	9.8	
Less than \$10	10.9	
\$10 to \$24.99	17.7	
\$25 to \$49.99	20.8	
\$50 to \$74.99	13.5	
\$75 to \$99.99	7.8	
\$100 to \$149.99	9.5	
\$150 to \$200	5.6	
Over \$200	3.9	
Don't know	0.5	

TABLE 35 (continued)

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>% of All Students</u>	<u>Mean Avg. Expenditure</u>
<u>Drugs, Cosmetics, & Toiletries</u>		approx. \$12
None	4.8	
Less than \$5	13.2	
\$5 to \$9.99	19.7	
\$10 to \$14.99	25.6	
\$15 to \$19.99	11.4	
\$20 to \$24.99	10.3	
\$25 to \$49.99	9.9	
\$50 to \$75	2.5	
Over \$75	1.4	
Don't know	1.2	
<u>Household Furnishings</u>		approx. \$4
None	44.9	
Less than \$10	23.4	
\$10 to \$24.99	17.1	
\$25 to \$49.99	6.5	
\$50 to \$74.99	1.5	
\$75 to \$99.99	2.2	
\$100 to \$150	0.9	
Over \$150	3.0	
Don't know	0.5	
<u>Automotive & Transportation</u>		approx. \$16
None	22.0	
Less than \$5	9.3	
\$5 to \$9.99	6.1	
\$10 to \$14.99	9.9	
\$15 to \$19.99	3.1	
\$20 to \$24.99	4.8	
\$25 to \$9.99	15.2	
\$50 to \$100	17.9	
Over \$100	11.0	
Don't know	0.7	

Books and School Supply Expenditures

Table 36 shows the amounts spent per term on books and school supplies according to the marital status of the student. Over-all, single students reported spending relatively more than married students for these items. The average amount spent in the term by singles was approximately \$35. Married students, however, reported expenses averaging around \$21. Taking the mean amount

TABLE 36. --Expenditures for books and school supplies
by marital status

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
None	--	6.1%
Less than \$1	--	2.4
\$1 to \$4.99	1.1%	--
\$5 to \$9.99	1.2	6.1
\$10 to \$14.99	0.4	4.9
\$15 to \$24.99	4.7	7.3
\$25 to \$49.99	44.2	36.6
\$50 to \$100	45.3	30.5
Over \$100	3.1	6.1
Don't know	--	--

spent by single students and multiplying it times the number of single students, the "single students' market" for books and school supplies is seen as approximately \$953,600 per term. This is

roughly four times the married students' expenditures on books and school supplies of around \$183,450 per term. Together, these two population subsets accounted for a total student market for books and school supplies of approximately \$1,137,100 for the term.

Book Store Preferences. --When area book stores are ranked according to the "first most," "second most," and "third most" amounts spent in each (see Table 37), it is seen that slightly more single and married students claimed to spend the most money in the M.S.U. Bookstore than in any other. The Student Bookstore, however, was designated as the store where over one-fourth of the students spent the "first most" money during the term.

TABLE 37. --Bookstore preferences by marital status

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>F i r s t</u>		<u>S e c o n d</u>		<u>T h i r d</u>	
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
	<u>Sing.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sing.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sing.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>
Campus Book	25.2	14.6	28.7	15.9	9.3	13.4
Gibson's	11.2	17.1	10.1	14.6	8.1	3.7
Spartan	2.7	4.9	6.2	1.2	3.5	3.7
S. B. S.	27.9	23.2	19.8	14.6	8.9	4.9
M. S. U.	31.8	31.7	16.7	26.8	8.5	7.3
Paramount	0.4	--	--	--	--	1.2
Marshall Music	--	--	0.4	--	0.4	--
Other	0.4	2.4	0.7	1.3	2.0	2.4
No response	0.4	6.1	17.4	25.6	59.3	63.4

Laundry and Dry Cleaning Expenditures

Table 38 shows the amounts spent on laundry and dry cleaning by percentages of single and married students. Married students appeared in larger proportions in the higher dollar amount categories. This was expected since married students were asked to include their total family expenses in all of these categories. Single students averaged approximately seven dollars per term on laundry and dry cleaning services; married students averaged \$16 for the term. The total dollar markets derived by

TABLE 38.--Expenditures for laundry and dry cleaning by marital status

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
None	8.5%	3.7%
Less than \$1	5.0	1.2
\$1 to \$4.99	20.9	3.7
\$5 to \$9.99	20.5	13.4
\$10 to \$14.99	16.3	11.0
\$15 to \$24.99	13.6	23.2
\$25 to \$39.99	7.0	18.3
\$40 to \$55	5.4	18.3
Over \$55	2.3	4.9
Don't know	0.5	2.3

projecting these amounts were around \$190,700 for single students and approximately \$139,750 for marrieds. In total,

then, the student dollar market for laundry and dry cleaning services approximates \$330,500 per term.

Table 39 reports these expenditures broken down by on-campus and off-campus students. On the average, off-campus residents spend more on laundry and dry cleaning than on-campus students. Off-campus students averaged about \$11 per term for this service; on-campus residents averaged around eight dollars for the term.

TABLE 39. --Expenditures for laundry and dry cleaning by residence

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>On-Campus</u>	<u>Off-Campus</u>
None	6.2%	9.5%
Less than \$1	4.4	3.5
\$1 to \$4.99	20.0	10.4
\$5 to \$9.99	21.3	13.9
\$10 to \$14.99	16.4	12.2
\$15. to \$24.99	14.2	19.1
\$25 to \$39.99	8.4	12.2
\$40 to \$55	6.7	12.2
Over 55	0.9	7.0
Don't know	1.5	--

Cleaning Establishment Preferences. --As shown in Table 40 , approximately one-third of both single and married students indicated that on-campus laundry and cleaning facilities were

where they spend the greatest amounts. Commercial facilities (located in East Lansing, Frandor Shopping Center, and Lansing) were indicated by only small percentages of each subset as the establishments where they spent the most, second most, and third most.

TABLE 40. -- Cleaning establishment preferences by marital status

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>
No Response	10.5	6.1	63.3	62.2	94.8	90.4
<u>East Lansing</u>						
American Cleaners	1.6	--	1.2	--	--	--
Bary Ames	7.0	9.8	2.7	4.9	0.4	--
Campus	7.0	2.4	2.3	--	--	1.2
DeWar	0.8	--	--	1.2	--	--
Crest	4.3	3.7	3.5	1.2	1.2	2.4
Lansing L&DC	0.8	--	--	1.2	0.4	--
Louis	5.4	2.4	2.7	6.1	--	1.2
Savant	2.7	3.7	1.9	--	--	--
Time	1.2	1.2	0.4	1.2	--	--
Sunshine Center	2.7	3.7	0.8	3.7	--	--
Kalamazoo Norge	0.8	--	--	--	0.4	--
On-Campus Facfts.	35.7	32.9	8.1	2.4	1.2	1.2
Off-Campus Apt. Fac.	1.9	1.2	1.9	--	--	--
Brookfield	1.6	--	--	1.2	--	--
College Cleaners	--	--	--	--	0.4	--
Twichells	--	--	0.4	1.2	--	--
Other (not listed)	12.8	24.4	6.6	8.5	0.4	2.4
<u>Frandon</u>						
Flash Cleaners	1.2	1.2	2.3	4.9	--	--
Frandon Laundromat	0.8	--	0.4	--	--	1.2
<u>Lansing</u>						
Capital	--	--	--	--	0.4	--
Cleanwash Center	--	--	0.4	--	0.4	--
Other (not listed)	1.2	7.3	1.2	--	--	--

Barber Shop and Beauty Salon Expenditures

As seen in the table below, married students spend relatively more than singles at barber shops and beauty salons. The average married student expenditure was approximately seven dollars for the term. Single students, with a mean expenditure of about two dollars per term, averaged even less than married students.¹⁰

TABLE 41. --Expenditures for barber and beauty services by marital status

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
None	38.6%	9.7%
Less than \$2.25	6.6	4.9
\$2.25 to \$4.99	17.1	11.0
\$5 to \$9.99	23.3	24.4
\$10 to \$19.99	13.2	30.5
\$20 to \$29.99	0.8	11.0
\$30 to \$39.99	--	2.4
\$40 to \$50	--	3.7
Over \$50	--	2.4
Don't know	0.4	--

¹⁰These relatively low dollar amounts per term are due, in part, to the fact that only expenditures made in the East Lansing area were reported. Therefore, student visits to hometown barber shops or beauty salons over vacations and week-ends home are not accounted for.

The total expenditures for barber shop and beauty salon services for the term were approximately \$115,650. Of this total, single students spent around \$54,500; married students about \$61,150.

Barber Shop and Beauty Salon Preferences. --Although most students make use of barber and beauty facilities in East Lansing, their choice of establishments is widespread. The barber shop with the highest percentage of both subsets indicating they spent the "first most" there (MSU Barber Shop) had only about one student out of ten rate it as such. Table 42, on the next page, shows these diverse barber shop and beauty salon preferences according to the marital status of the student spender.

TABLE 42. -- Beauty salon and barber shop preferences by marital status.

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>
No Response	45.7	17.2	96.8	74.6	99.6	97.6
<u>East Lansing</u>						
Jean Airola	0.8	2.4	--	--	--	--
Flo Anderson	--	2.4	--	--	--	--
Artistic	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Hel. Barresy	0.8	--	--	--	--	--
Betty's	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Don's College Manor	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Sprague's	0.8	3.7	0.4	--	--	--
Elizabeth	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Jacobson's	2.3	4.9	--	1.2	--	--
Patrician Pink Room	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
K-U and Dye	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Martin's	--	2.4	--	1.2	--	--
University Beauty	0.4	1.2	--	--	--	--
Yankee Stadium	--	2.4	--	--	--	--
Spartan Center Salon	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Other Salons	2.3	7.3	--	2.4	--	--
Big Ten Barber	5.0	4.9	1.2	--	--	--
Braun's Barber	1.2	--	--	1.2	--	--
Campus Barber	3.1	3.7	--	1.2	--	--
Ken's Barber	1.9	2.4	0.8	1.2	--	--
Len's Barber	0.4	2.4	--	--	--	--
MSU Barber	11.6	9.8	0.4	3.7	--	1.2
Red Cedar Barber	1.2	6.1	--	2.4	--	--
Ruse's Barber	2.3	--	--	1.2	--	--
Varsity Barber	2.7	3.7	--	--	0.4	--
MSU Union Barger	3.1	2.4	--	2.4	--	--
Other Barbers	9.3	12.2	0.4	3.7	--	1.2
<u>Frondor</u>						
Frondor Beauty	0.8	1.2	--	--	--	--
Frondor Barber	0.8	--	--	1.2	--	--
<u>Lansing</u>						
Lansing Salons and Barbers	1.9	3.7	--	2.4	--	--

Movie Expenditures

Single and married students both indicated relatively low average term expenditures for movies. Term expenditures for this form of entertainment is shown in Table 43 below.

TABLE 43. --Expenditures for movies
by marital status

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
None	35.5%	26.7%
Less than \$1	4.7	2.4
\$1 to \$4.99	25.6	22.0
\$5 to \$9.99	16.3	20.7
\$10 to \$14.99	12.4	17.1
\$15 to \$19.99	3.9	3.7
\$20 to \$24.99	0.0	3.7
\$25 to \$30	0.4	3.7
Over \$30	--	--
Don't know	0.4	--

The single students' rather low term average of approximately one dollar for movies was affected by the over one-third of the singles who claimed to spend nothing for movies during the term. Of the remaining single students, one-fourth reported movie expenses of from one to five dollars per term; over 30 per cent claimed to spend more than five dollars per term. Only

about one single student in twenty reported movie expenditures of over \$20 for the fall term. The projected single students' dollar market for movies was found to approximate \$27,250 for the fall term.

Married students spent, on the average, about two dollars more for movies than single students for the term. Over one-fourth of the married subset, however, reported no expenditures for this type of entertainment. The estimated married students' movie market was around \$26,200 -- slightly under the total for single students. The total student dollar market for movies, then, approaches \$53,500 for the fall term.

Table 44 breaks down these same expenditures by the students' class in school. As seen in this table, class in school does not seem to be a major determinant of the proportions of non-movie goers among all students. The percentages of students spending less than one dollar for movies during the term varies by less than four per cent from class to class.

This variable does, however, seem to affect the proportions of each class appearing in the higher dollar expenditure categories. The following percentages of each class claimed to spend over five dollars per term for movies: freshman, 36 per cent;

sophomores, 43 per cent; juniors, 32 per cent; seniors, 33 per cent; master's, 33 per cent; and doctoral, 26 per cent.

TABLE 44. --Expenditures for movies by class in school

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>% Fr.</u>	<u>% Soph.</u>	<u>% Jr.</u>	<u>% Sr.</u>	<u>% Mst.</u>	<u>% Doc.</u>
None	33.7	36.1	31.8	35.9	28.1	32.2
Less than \$1	6.0	1.3	4.6	--	7.7	6.5
\$1 to \$4.99	24.1	20.0	31.8	30.8	18.0	25.8
\$5 to \$9.99	14.5	21.3	22.7	7.7	23.0	9.7
\$10 to \$14.99	13.3	15.0	6.1	20.5	15.4	16.2
\$15 to \$19.99	6.0	2.5	3.0	5.1	2.6	3.2
\$20 to \$24.99	2.4	1.3	--	--	2.6	3.2
\$25 to \$30	--	2.5	--	--	2.6	3.2

Movie Theater Preferences. --Table 45 and Table 46 reveal the theater preferences by marital status and class in school. It is interesting to note that in all eight of these population subsets, the highest single percentage of students indicated that the Campus Theater was where they spent the "first most" amounts.

TABLE 45. --Theater preferences by marital status

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>
No Response	36.4	27.9	56.0	51.3	77.9	75.6
Campus Theater	29.1	28.1	11.6	14.6	2.3	3.7
Downtown Art	--	--	0.8	--	0.4	--
Lansing Drive-In	1.2	--	1.2	1.2	1.9	1.2
Gladmer Theater	1.9	4.9	4.7	4.9	2.3	4.9
Michigan Theater	5.8	11.0	3.9	12.2	4.7	6.1
Starlite Drive-In	0.8	4.9	4.3	2.4	1.9	2.4
State Theater	15.1	11.0	12.8	4.9	3.1	3.7
Fairchild (MSU)	7.8	11.0	3.9	7.3	4.7	2.4
Crest Drive-In	1.9	1.2	0.8	1.2	0.8	--

TABLE 46. --Movie theater preferences by class

Theater	% <u>Fr.</u>	% <u>Soph.</u>	% <u>Jr.</u>	% <u>Sr.</u>	% <u>Mst.</u>	% <u>Doc.</u>
<u>First Choice</u>						
No Response	36.1	33.6	31.8	38.5	28.1	38.6
Campus Theater	22.9	31.3	31.8	20.5	35.9	32.3
Lansing Drive-In	1.2	2.5	--	--	--	--
Gladmer Theater	2.4	2.5	4.5	5.1	--	--
Michigan Theater	1.2	3.8	7.6	20.5	10.3	9.7
Starlite Drive-In	2.4	2.5	1.5	--	2.6	--
State Theater	18.1	15.0	13.7	7.7	15.4	9.7
Fairchild (MSU)	12.1	6.3	9.1	5.1	7.7	9.7
Crest Drive-In	3.6	2.5	--	--	--	--
<u>Second Choice</u>						
No Response	56.6	54.8	56.0	56.4	46.0	54.8
Campus Theater	15.7	11.3	9.1	15.4	15.4	6.4
Downtown Art	1.2	1.3	--	--	--	--
Lansing Drive-In	--	1.3	3.0	--	2.6	--
Gladmer Theater	2.4	5.0	3.0	5.1	10.3	6.5
Michigan Theater	1.2	5.0	7.6	7.7	10.3	9.7
Starlight Drive-In	4.8	3.8	4.6	2.6	2.6	3.2
State Theater	15.7	10.0	7.6	7.7	5.1	19.4
Fairchild (MSU)	2.4	7.5	6.1	5.1	5.1	--
Crest Drive-In	--	--	3.0	--	2.6	--

Restaurant Meal Expenditures

Here, student respondents were asked to estimate their expenditures for meals purchased in area restaurants during the term. Since many on-campus students have board contracts with their dormitories, this category was designed to cover only those meals actually purchased in restaurants and not those contracted for in dormitory cafeterias. Accordingly, all meals or snacks involving an immediate cash outlay were included -- even if the snack, for example, was purchased in a dormitory snack bar.

The restaurant expenditures estimated by married and single students for the term are shown in Table 47 below.

TABLE 47. -- Expenditures for restaurant meals
by marital status.

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
None	1.4%	1.1%
Less than \$5	6.6	4.9
\$5 to \$14.99	8.1	6.1
\$15 to \$24.99	22.1	12.2
\$25 to \$49.99	32.6	29.3
\$50 to \$99.99	17.1	28.1
\$100 to \$149	7.8	8.5
\$150 to \$200	2.7	4.9
Over \$200	1.6	4.9
Don't know	--	--

Married students seemed to report relatively higher restaurant expenditures than single students; this was especially evident in the higher expense categories. Twenty-nine per cent of the single students claimed expenses of \$50 or more a term. Married students, however, reported over 46 per cent of their subset at the \$50 and over levels.

The average single student spent about \$23 per term on restaurant meals while married students averaged approximately \$35 a term. The total projected restaurant meal market per term is seen as approximately \$932,400. Of this total, single students accounted for around \$626,650; married students spent close to \$305,750.

A similar breakdown of restaurant meal expenses for campus and off-campus students is shown in Table 48. The on-campus resident averages about \$23 per term for restaurant meals; off-campus students spend approximately \$32.50.¹¹ The total projected on-campus market for restaurant meals is close to \$569,200; the off-campus total is approximately \$365,000.

¹¹ This difference is accounted for, in part, by the off-campus students' higher expenditures for groceries. (See section on Grocery Expenditures later in this chapter.)

TABLE 48. -- Expenditures for restaurant meals
by residence

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>On- Campus</u>	<u>Off- Campus</u>
None	1.8%	0.9%
Less than \$5	6.2	6.1
\$5 to \$14.99	8.9	5.2
\$15 to \$24.99	19.1	20.9
\$25 to \$49.99	35.1	25.2
\$50 to \$99.99	20.0	19.1
\$100 to \$149	6.2	11.3
\$150 to \$200	0.9	7.8
Over \$200	1.8	3.5

Restaurant Preferences. -- As shown in Table 49 (on the next page) East Lansing area restaurants are the students' main source for outside meals. Single and married students choice of establishments differ, however. The most noticeable difference occurs with the singles indication of somewhat more dependence on "short-order" type restaurants (Big Boy and McDonald's drive-in, for example). The dormitory snack bars are the single students' largest single response percentage in the "first" category, with over 19 per cent reporting as such. Surprisingly, 7.3 per cent of the married students also reported dormitory snack bars as where they spent the "first most" amount of money. Married students gave the Coral Gables the largest single response percentage in the "first" category, with 11.0 per cent.

TABLE 49. --Restaurant preferences by marital status

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>
No response	6.3	7.8	19.9	25.7	41.6	51.4
<u>East Lansing</u>						
Big Boy	15.5	7.3	15.9	6.1	5.4	7.3
Casa Nova #2	1.6	1.2	2.3	3.7	1.2	1.2
College Inn	0.4	1.2	0.4	--	1.6	1.2
Coral Gables	3.1	11.0	5.0	4.9	1.9	3.7
Ilforno Pizza	1.2	1.2	0.4	--	1.9	1.2
Lenti's	0.4	--	--	--	0.4	1.2
McDonald's	12.4	4.9	17.1	8.5	13.2	7.3
Pizza Pit	3.1	1.2	4.7	6.1	3.5	--
Poplars	1.9	4.9	1.9	--	3.1	--
Red Barn	4.3	4.9	6.2	4.9	3.9	3.7
Kewpee's	2.7	3.7	--	--	1.2	--
Varsity Drive-In	6.2	3.7	3.9	--	3.1	--
MSU Union	5.4	9.8	3.9	7.3	4.3	--
International Center	3.1	8.5	0.4	8.5	0.8	2.4
Dorm Snack Bar	19.4	7.3	9.3	1.2	6.2	--
Baskin-Robbins	--	--	0.4	--	--	--
Dawn Donuts	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Martin-Luther Chapel	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Spudnut Shop	--	--	--	1.2	--	--
St. Johns Student Ctr.	--	--	--	--	0.4	--
Other (not listed)	4.3	4.9	2.3	12.2	1.6	3.7
<u>Frondor</u>						
Howard Johnson	1.2	2.4	1.6	4.9	2.3	6.1
Homade Food	--	--	0.4	--	--	1.2
Hamburger Heaven	--	1.2	--	--	0.8	--
Kwast Bakery	0.4	--	0.4	--	--	--
Ziegler's Charcoal	0.4	--	0.4	--	--	1.2
Big Boy	0.4	--	--	1.2	--	--
Bill Knapp's	0.8	1.2	0.4	--	0.4	1.2
Holiday Inn	0.4	--	0.4	--	0.4	--
Other (not listed)	0.4	--	0.4	--	--	2.4
<u>Lansing</u>						
Casa Nova #1	0.4	1.2	--	1.2	--	1.2
Colonel Sanders	--	1.2	0.4	--	--	--
Fred Eyer's	--	1.2	--	--	0.4	--
Green Door	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Italian Village	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Jack's Chinese	0.4	--	0.4	--	--	--
Uncle John's	0.4	2.4	--	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	2.3	4.9	1.2	2.4	0.4	2.4

Other Entertainment Expenditures

The "other entertainment" category excludes expenditures for movies and restaurant meals, both of which are covered separately in their own categories. Admittedly, this category is somewhat crude, since students could classify a variety of expenditures as "other entertainment" expenses.¹² However, it was included to cover this important area of the total student dollar outflow.

Table 50 shows the term expenditures for "other entertainment" according to the marital status of the student spender. Married students do not differ markedly from single students in their term expenditures for this goods and service category. The proportion of married students spending over \$50 during the term was 13.4 per cent; single students' comparative per cent was 15.5. While single students' term expenditures averaged around nine dollars, the average married student spent closer to \$9.50. Both percentage patterns resembled each other in that there were no extremely high or low

¹²The crudeness of this category is also somewhat evident by the large percentage of "no responses" and "other" responses appearing in Tables 53 and 54. However, total dollar expenditures by students for forms of entertainment other than movies and restaurant dining approximate the dollar volume of this market, even though it was impossible to cover all the various establishments where these dollars were spent.

TABLE 50. -- Expenditures for "other entertainment"
by marital status.

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
None	10.1%	8.4%
Less than \$5	29.5	30.5
\$5 to \$9.99	15.9	11.0
\$10 to \$19.99	11.6	15.9
\$20 to \$29.99	9.3	9.8
\$30 to \$49.99	8.1	11.0
\$50 to \$99.99	8.5	4.9
\$100 to \$150	4.3	3.7
Over \$150	1.9	2.4
Don't know	0.8	2.4

percentages peculiar to one subset that would affect the accuracy of the means as comparable measures of central tendency.

Projecting these subsets' average expenditures results in an approximate total dollar market of \$328,200 for "other entertainment." Single students' expenditures accounted for approximately \$245,200 of this total; married students' share was about \$83,000.

To see how the expenditure breakdown for "other entertainment" by campus and off-campus students would appear, the expenditure data for this category was also analyzed across the student residence variable. Table 51 shows the results of this breakdown.

Here, it is seen that off-campus residents spend significantly more on "other entertainment" than campus residents. In fact, the mean averages for the two subsets show the average off-campus student spending almost twice as much as the campus resident. On-campus students averaged approximately \$7.50 a term and off-campus students averaged close to \$14 per term. Projected, the total off-campus student market is approximately \$157,00; on-campus students account for about \$185,600 per term.

TABLE 51. -- Expenditures for "other entertainment"
by residence

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>On- Campus</u>	<u>Off- Campus</u>
None	11.2%	7.0%
Less than \$5	32.4	24.4
\$5 to \$9.99	15.1	13.9
\$10 to \$19.99	11.6	14.8
\$20 to \$29.99	11.1	6.1
\$30 to \$49.99	8.4	9.6
\$50 to \$99.99	6.2	10.4
\$100 to \$150	2.7	7.0
Over \$150	0.4	5.2
Don't know	0.9	1.6

The expenditure pattern for "other entertainment" according to class in school follows an increasing curve up to the seniors,

then swings downward at the doctoral level. The mean average dollar amounts for each class were as follows: freshmen, \$8; sophomores, \$8.50; juniors, \$10; seniors, \$12; master's, \$11; and doctoral, \$6.50. This breakdown shows that the largest class in numbers (freshmen) is spending the second-lowest amount per term on this goods and service category. Table 52 shows the complete breakdown of "other entertainment" expenditures by class in school.

TABLE 52. -- Expenditures for "other entertainment" by class

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>% Fr.</u>	<u>% Soph.</u>	<u>% Jr.</u>	<u>% Sr.</u>	<u>% Mst.</u>	<u>% Doc.</u>
None	15.7	10.0	4.6	2.4	7.7	12.9
Less than \$5	22.9	31.3	31.8	33.3	23.0	45.2
\$5 to \$9.99	18.0	15.0	13.6	10.3	15.4	9.7
\$10 to \$19.99	14.5	13.8	13.6	10.3	12.8	6.5
\$20 to \$29.99	7.2	11.3	9.0	10.3	10.3	9.7
\$30 to \$49.99	8.4	3.8	7.6	15.4	18.0	6.5
\$50 to \$99.99	8.4	5.0	10.6	12.8	5.1	3.2
\$100 to \$150	1.2	5.0	9.0	2.6	5.1	--
Over \$150	1.2	3.8	--	2.6	2.6	3.2
Don't know	2.5	1.0	0.2	--	--	3.1

Other Entertainment Preferences. -- A look at Tables 53 and 54 on the following pages reveals the diversity of both the marital status and residence subsets' choice of establishments receiving

their entertainment dollars. The Coral Gables (tavern and nightclub) was given the largest single response percentage in the "first most" amount spent category by both married and single students. (Over 18 per cent of the married students and over 11 per cent of the single students picked the Coral Gables as such.) In looking at the breakdown by class, the Coral Gables also scored highest with students who were at or past the legal drinking age.¹³

It is interesting to note that the largest single response percentages in the "first most" expenditure category for classes containing mostly students under 21 (freshman and sophomore) was given to the campus Union bowling center. Single students, in turn, indicated this establishment as its second largest "first most" amount spent percentage.

¹³From Table 5 (Classification data by class) it is seen that the approximate percentages of each class who were under 21 years old were as follows: freshmen, 96 per cent; sophomores, 90 per cent; juniors, 64 per cent; seniors, 5 per cent; and master's, 3 per cent. (All doctoral students reported their age as 21 or over.)

TABLE 53. -- Entertainment establishment preferences by marital status

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>
No Response	41.2	40.4	71.2	61.3	86.5	84.2
<u>East Lansing</u>						
MSU Union Bowling	10.5	1.2	2.3	3.7	0.4	--
Golden 8 Ball	3.5	--	1.2	1.2	0.8	1.2
The Dells	2.3	2.4	1.6	4.9	1.2	2.4
Mayfair	0.4	--	0.8	--	--	1.2
Coral Gables	11.6	18.3	3.9	3.7	1.2	3.7
Paul Revere's	0.8	--	1.2	2.4	0.8	--
ASMSU Entertainment	3.9	--	0.4	1.2	0.4	--
Forrest Akers Golf	0.8	1.2	0.4	--	--	--
Monte's	--	1.2	0.8	--	--	--
MSU Union Billiards	1.2	--	0.4	--	0.4	--
MSU Ice Arena	0.4	1.2	0.8	--	--	--
MSU Swimming	0.4	--	0.4	1.2	0.4	--
Tom's Party Store	1.9	--	1.2	--	1.9	--
Fudd's Party Store	0.4	--	0.4	1.2	--	--
Fat Blk. Pussy Cat	--	1.2	1.2	--	0.8	--
Other (not listed)	12.8	13.4	3.1	3.7	1.6	3.7
<u>Frandon</u>						
Boom Boom Room	--	--	--	1.2	--	--
Big Ten Club	0.4	--	0.4	--	--	--
<u>Lansing</u>						
Marvelanes Bowl	--	1.2	0.4	1.2	--	--
Holiday Lanes Bowl	1.2	2.4	0.4	--	0.4	--
Joe Joseph's	--	3.7	--	1.2	--	1.2
Cedarway Bowl	--	--	0.4	--	--	--
Amadeo's Show Club	--	1.2	0.4	1.2	--	--
Tarpoff's	0.4	3.7	--	1.2	0.4	1.2
Dines	2.3	3.7	0.4	1.2	1.2	--
Gas Buggy Room	--	1.2	--	2.4	--	--
Green Door	--	--	0.4	--	0.4	--
Dagwood's	0.4	--	3.9	3.7	--	--
Sportsman's	0.4	--	0.4	1.2	--	--
Eagles Restaurant	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
KoKo Bar	0.4	1.2	0.4	--	--	--
Civic Center	0.4	--	--	--	0.4	--
Mac's Bar	--	--	0.4	--	--	--
Metro Bowl	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	1.6	--	0.8	--	0.8	1.2

TABLE 54. -- Entertainment establishment preferences by class

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First Choice</u>					
	<u>%</u> <u>Fr.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Soph.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Jr.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Sr.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Mst.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Doc.</u>
No Response	44.6	39.3	42.4	32.9	25.6	54.9
<u>East Lansing</u>						
MSU Union Bowling	14.5	8.8	9.1	2.6	5.1	--
Golden 8 Ball	3.6	5.0	3.0	--	--	--
Dells	--	1.3	--	10.3	5.1	3.2
Mayfair	--	--	--	2.5	--	--
Coral Gables	3.6	5.0	24.2	23.1	20.5	16.1
Paul Revere's	--	1.3	--	--	2.6	--
ASMSU Entertainment	4.8	6.3	--	2.6	--	--
Forrest Akers Golf	1.2	--	1.5	--	2.6	--
Monte's	--	1.3	--	--	--	--
MSU Union Billiard	2.4	1.3	--	--	--	--
MSU Ice Arena	--	2.5	--	--	--	--
MSU Swimming	--	1.3	--	--	--	--
Tom's Party Store	--	1.3	1.6	--	7.7	--
Uncle Fudd's	--	1.3	--	--	--	--
Fat Blk. Pussy Cat	--	--	1.5	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	18.1	13.8	6.1	15.4	12.8	6.5
<u>Frondor</u>						
Big Ten Club	--	--	1.5	--	--	--
<u>Lansing</u>						
Marvelanes Bowl	--	--	--	--	2.6	--
Holiday Lanes	1.2	--	1.5	--	--	9.7
Joe Joseph's	1.2	--	1.5	2.7	--	--
Amadeo's	--	1.3	--	--	--	--
Tarpoff's	--	--	--	2.7	5.1	3.2
Dines	--	3.8	4.6	--	5.1	3.2
Gas Buggy Room	--	--	--	--	2.6	--
Dagwood's	--	--	--	2.6	--	--
Sportsman's	--	--	--	--	2.6	--
Eagles Restaurant	1.2	--	1.5	--	--	--
KoKo Bar	1.2	1.3	--	--	--	3.2
Civic Center	--	1.3	--	--	--	--
Metro Bowl	--	--	--	2.6	--	--
Other (not listed)	2.4	2.5	--	--	--	--

TABLE 54. --(continued)

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>Second Choice</u>					
	<u>%</u> <u>Fr.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Soph.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Jr.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Sr.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Mst.</u>	<u>%</u> <u>Doc.</u>
No Response	83.1	73.1	59.1	53.4	56.1	77.4
<u>East Lansing</u>						
MSU Union Bowling	2.4	2.5	4.5	2.6	2.6	--
Golden 8 Ball	1.2	2.5	1.5	--	--	--
The Dells	--	1.3	6.1	2.6	5.1	--
Mayfair	--	1.3	1.6	--	--	--
Coral Gables	1.2	1.3	1.5	18.0	5.1	3.2
Paul Revere's	1.2	1.3	--	--	2.6	6.5
ASMSU Entertainment	--	1.3	--	2.6	--	--
Forrest Akers Golf	1.2	--	--	--	--	--
Monte's	1.2	--	1.5	--	--	--
MSU Union Billiard	1.2	--	--	--	--	--
MSU Ice Arena	--	2.5	--	--	--	--
MSU Swimming	--	--	--	--	5.1	--
Tom's Party Store	--	1.3	3.0	--	--	--
Uncle Fudd's	--	2.5	--	--	--	--
Fat Blk. Pussy Cat	--	1.3	--	2.6	2.6	--
Other (not listed)	6.1	1.3	3.1	--	2.6	6.5
<u>Frondor</u>						
Boom Boom Room	--	--	--	--	2.6	--
Big Ten Club	--	1.3	--	--	--	--
<u>Lansing</u>						
Marvelanes Bowl	1.2	--	--	--	--	3.2
Holiday Lanes	--	1.3	--	--	--	--
Joe Joseph's	--	--	--	2.6	--	--
Cedarway Bowl	--	--	--	--	2.6	--
Amadeo's	--	--	1.5	2.6	--	--
Tarpoff's	--	--	--	--	2.6	--
Dines	--	--	1.5	2.6	--	--
Gas Buggy Room	--	1.3	--	--	--	3.2
Green Door	--	--	1.5	--	--	--
Dagwood's	--	1.3	9.1	7.8	7.8	--
Sportsman's	--	1.3	--	2.6	--	--
KoKo Bar	--	--	--	--	2.6	--
Mac's Bar	--	--	1.5	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	--	--	3.0	--	--	--

Grocery Expenditures

As seen in the table below, married students spent significantly higher amounts for groceries per term than single students. In fact, one out of three single students claimed not to spend anything, and only about 20 per cent reported spending over \$15 for

TABLE 55. -- Expenditures for groceries by marital status

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
None	33.8%	3.7%
Less than \$5	26.0	2.4
\$5 to \$14.99	19.4	1.2
\$15 to \$24.99	5.0	1.2
\$25 to \$49.99	2.3	--
\$50 to \$99.99	8.1	6.1
\$100 to \$149	3.1	17.1
\$150 to \$199	1.9	24.4
Over \$200	0.4	42.7
Don't know	--	1.2

groceries for the whole fall term. Eighty-four per cent of the married students, however, reported term grocery expenses of over \$100. The mean average amount spent by single students on groceries for the term was about \$3.50. Married students, on the other hand, averaged approximately \$135 per term for groceries.¹⁴

¹⁴ This projected estimate is no doubt quite conservative due to the 42.7 per cent of the marrieds who indicated they spent over \$200.

The projected single students' term expenditures for groceries approximated \$95,350. Married students' total amount was at least \$1,179,250. Therefore, the total student dollar market for groceries for the fall term is seen as over \$1,274,600.

Grocery Store Preferences. -- Table 56, at the end of this section, reveals the grocery stores where single and married students spend the "first most," "second most," and "third most" amounts. This table shows that married students reported that one of the Frandor area supermarkets was where they spent the most money during the fall term. (Eberhardt's market was indicated as the store where marrieds spent the "first most" by almost 16 per cent of this subset--the highest single percentage of any supermarket listed.) The high scores for other Frandor supermarkets (Packer's and Kroger's) confirms the married students' high shopping frequency in this shopping center.¹⁵

In East Lansing, the highest single percentage of single students (14.7 percent) reported Shaheen's was where they spent the "first most." For marrieds, however, the Spartan Shoprite market rated highest. All the East Lansing food stores

¹⁵

See Table 31, in Chapter VI (Shopping patterns by marital status).

were rated lower (on a "first most" spent basis) by married students than the three popular Frandor supermarkets,

In total then, the 46.3 per cent of the marrieds who indicated Frandor markets received their "first most" dollars spent reveals the great importance of this shopping area to the high-volume married student grocery market. In fact, after subtracting the married "first most" percentages given the supermarkets previously mentioned, only 36 per cent of the married students' grocery market is left to be divided among the remaining seven East Lansing food stores.

TABLE 56. -- Food store preferences by marital status

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>
No Response	37.1	3.8	78.0	21.7	92.4	62.3
<u>East Lansing</u>						
Kroger's	4.7	4.8	1.9	7.3	0.8	3.7
Prince Brothers	9.3	3.7	2.3	4.9	0.4	1.2
Shaheen's	14.7	4.9	4.7	7.3	1.2	7.3
Super Shoprite	1.9	2.4	0.8	3.7	0.4	--
Spartan Shoprite	5.0	9.8	0.8	13.4	--	6.1
A & P Store	8.9	4.9	4.3	3.7	--	1.3
Schmidt's	0.8	2.4	0.8	3.7	0.4	--
Min-a-Mart	3.9	--	0.8	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	4.7	7.3	1.2	6.1	0.8	1.2
<u>Frondor</u>						
Packer's	0.8	14.6	1.6	8.5	1.2	2.4
Kroger's	3.9	1.0	0.8	4.9	0.4	6.1
National	0.4	2.4	0.4	1.2	0.4	2.4
Eberhardts	3.1	15.9	1.6	4.9	1.2	2.4
Food Fair	--	--	--	1.2	--	--
Other (not listed)	0.4	2.4	--	3.7	0.4	2.4
<u>Lansing</u>						
Denstead's	--	2.4	--	--	--	--
Logan Center Kroger	--	4.9	--	--	--	--
Jolly-Cedar Packers	--	--	--	2.4	--	--
Other (not listed)	0.4	2.4	--	1.2	--	1.2

Clothing Expenditures

As seen in Table 57 below, married students generally reported higher clothing expenses for fall term than did single students. In fact, 61 per cent of the married respondents reported spending \$50 or more for clothing during the term.¹⁶

TABLE 57. -- Expenditures for clothing by marital status

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
None	10.4%	7.3%
Less than \$10	12.0	6.1
\$10 to \$24.99	19.8	8.5
\$25 to \$49.99	21.3	17.1
\$50 to \$74.99	11.6	22.0
\$75 to \$99.99	7.4	9.8
\$100 to \$149.99	7.8	17.1
\$150 to \$200	5.0	8.5
More than \$200	4.3	2.4
Don't know	0.4	1.2

Single students averaged about \$30 per term on clothing; married students averaged approximately \$50. The projected total student clothing market amounts to approximately \$1,254,100.

¹⁶It should be remembered that married students' expenditures include expenses for spouses and children (where applicable).

Married students accounted for about \$436,750 of the total;
single students' approximate share was \$817,350.

TABLE 58. -- Expenditures for clothing by class

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>% Fr.</u>	<u>% Soph.</u>	<u>% Jr.</u>	<u>% Sr.</u>	<u>% Mst.</u>	<u>% Doc.</u>
None	8.4	8.6	13.5	10.2	7.6	9.7
Less than \$10	20.5	10.0	7.6	7.7	5.1	3.2
\$10 to \$24.99	19.3	22.5	12.1	12.8	18.0	9.7
\$25 to \$49.99	19.3	18.8	18.2	28.2	23.0	20.4
\$50 to \$74.99	13.3	15.0	10.6	18.0	15.4	16.1
\$75 to \$99.99	4.8	6.3	15.2	7.7	7.7	6.5
\$100 to \$149.99	3.6	8.8	13.6	10.3	10.3	22.6
\$150 to \$200	4.8	7.5	4.6	--	10.3	6.5
Over \$200	4.8	2.5	4.6	5.1	2.6	3.2
Don't know	1.2	--	--	--	--	2.1

Table 58 reveals the amounts spent on this goods category according to students' class in school. The mean average amounts spent per class on clothing were found to vary somewhat from class to class. The averages for each class were as follows: freshmen, \$25; sophomores, \$32.50; juniors, \$40; seniors, \$32.50; master's, \$40; and doctoral, \$52.50.

Clothing Store Preferences. -- Table 59 reveals the wide variety and large number of establishments receiving student clothing dollars. While percentages are fairly well distributed

throughout the table, Knapp's and Jacobson's are seen to claim relatively high percentages of both subsets' "first most" amounts spent on clothing.

TABLE 59. -- Clothing store preferences by marital status

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>
No Response	25.4	12.4	41.7	24.4	69.1	53.0
<u>East Lansing</u>						
Campbell's Suburban	6.2	1.2	2.7	1.2	--	1.2
J. W. Knapps	15.5	24.4	9.3	7.3	3.9	4.9
Kositchek	0.4	--	0.4	1.2	0.4	--
Ramsey's	1.9	1.2	1.6	--	0.4	1.2
Redwood & Ross	7.8	2.4	6.6	2.4	1.9	2.4
Tog Shop	3.5	--	0.8	--	1.9	--
Canterbury Shop	1.9	--	1.6	--	0.4	--
Sportsmeister	2.7	--	1.9	1.2	2.3	1.2
Yankee Stadium	1.2	4.9	0.8	4.9	--	2.4
Wanda Hancock	1.2	--	1.9	--	1.6	--
Jacobson's	12.0	11.0	8.9	11.0	5.0	2.4
Marie's	--	--	--	--	0.4	--
Scotch House	2.7	--	4.3	1.2	3.1	1.2
Style Shop	1.6	1.2	2.7	1.2	1.6	--
Cartwright Shoes	--	--	--	--	--	1.2
Shepard's Shoes	--	--	1.2	3.7	1.2	2.4
Ray Leffler's	1.6	1.2	0.4	--	0.8	--
Polachek's	--	--	--	--	--	1.2
Bookstores	1.2	1.2	--	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	5.0	6.1	3.1	--	1.2	--
<u>Frondor</u>						
Holden-Reid	--	3.7	1.9	3.7	--	3.7
Federals	0.8	6.1	1.9	3.7	1.6	2.4
Sears Roebuck	2.7	13.4	1.9	17.1	1.2	6.1
Roger Stuart	--	2.4	0.4	1.2	0.4	1.2
Tie Rack	--	--	--	--	--	1.2
Green's	0.4	1.2	0.4	2.4	0.4	2.4
Three Sisters	--	--	--	--	0.4	--
Winkelman's	0.4	1.2	1.6	3.7	0.4	1.2
Harryman's	--	--	--	1.2	--	--
Modern Youth Shoes	--	--	--	--	--	1.2
Thom McAn	0.4	--	0.4	--	--	--
<u>Lansing</u>						
J. W. Knapp	0.8	2.4	--	--	--	2.4
Penney's	0.4	1.2	0.4	1.2	--	--
Kositchek's	--	--	--	2.4	--	--
Small's	0.4	1.2	--	1.2	--	1.2
Other (not listed)	1.9	--	0.8	2.4	0.4	1.2

Drug, Cosmetic, and Toiletry Expenditures

Married students, as shown by Table 60 below, spend more per term on drugs, cosmetics, and toiletries than single students. Almost 50 per cent of the married respondents reported spending

TABLE 60. -- Expenditures on drugs, cosmetics, and toiletries by marital status

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
None	5.3%	2.5%
Less than \$5	14.3	8.5
\$5 to \$9.99	22.5	7.3
\$10 to \$14.99	27.5	17.1
\$15 to \$19.99	10.1	17.1
\$20 to \$24.99	9.3	14.6
\$25 to \$49.99	7.8	19.5
\$50 to \$75	0.8	9.8
Over \$75	1.2	2.4
Don't know	1.2	1.2

\$20 or more for these items per term; only 20.3 per cent of the single students were at this expenditure level. The percentage of singles spending less than five dollars per term was twice the percentage of married students appearing at this low expenditure level.

Married students averaged approximately \$16.50 per term for drugs, cosmetics, and toiletries; the average single student about \$10. Projected, the total single students' dollar market for these

items was around \$272,450. The married subset accounted for close to \$144,150 of the total drug, cosmetic and toiletry market of approximately \$416,600.

Drug Store Preferences. -- Table 61, on the next page, shows that both single and married students spent the most amounts of money in drugs stores located in the East Lansing area. The two subsets, however, differed in their choice of establishments where they spent the "first most" amounts. The highest single percentage of single students (19.0 per cent) chose the Campus Drug Store as "first." Over one out of five married respondents indicated that the Dot Drug Store was where they spent the "first most" amount of money. Both Frandor and Lansing area drug stores are shown to receive comparatively small student drug, cosmetic and toiletry dollars.

TABLE 61. -- Drug store preferences by marital status.

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>	<u>% Sin.</u>	<u>% Mar.</u>
No Response	14.2	7.1	53.7	44.1	86.8	79.5
<u>East Lansing</u>						
Alexander Drug	4.3	4.9	0.8	3.7	0.8	--
Allen's Drug	0.4	3.7	2.3	2.4	0.4	1.2
Campus Drug	19.0	9.8	9.3	8.5	0.4	1.2
College Drug	15.1	6.1	9.3	3.7	1.9	2.4
E. L. Pharmacy	1.2	--	--	--	--	--
Gulliver's Drug	0.8	2.4	1.2	1.2	0.4	--
Muir's Drug	3.9	6.1	1.9	1.2	1.2	2.4
Dot Drug	3.1	22.0	1.6	7.3	--	3.7
Olin	3.1	--	3.9	1.2	1.9	1.2
Food Stores	--	1.2	--	3.7	0.4	--
Bookstores	--	--	0.4	--	--	--
Department Stores	1.2	--	--	--	--	1.2
State Discount	12.0	6.1	3.1	3.7	2.3	1.2
Other (not listed)	15.9	11.0	7.4	7.3	2.3	1.2
<u>Frondor</u>						
Cunningham's	1.9	3.7	3.9	7.3	0.8	2.4
State Discount	--	3.7	0.8	1.2	--	1.2
Food Stores	0.4	--	--	2.4	--	--
Department Stores	0.8	--	--	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	0.8	3.7	0.8	2.4	0.4	1.2
<u>Lansing</u>						
Colonial Village	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Curtis Cut-Rate	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Rouser's Drug	--	2.4	--	--	--	--
Department Stores	--	--	0.4	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	1.9	4.9	--	2.4	--	--

Household Furnishing Expenditures

As expected, married students reported much higher household furnishing expenditures per term than did single students.

Table 62 reveals that, while only 24 per cent of the single students spent over \$10 on these items, almost 66 per cent of the marrieds

TABLE 62. -- Expenditures for household furnishings
by marital status

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
None	49.4%	24.3%
Less than \$10	26.4	9.8
\$10 to \$24.99	16.3	20.7
\$25 to \$49.99	3.9	18.3
\$50 to \$74.99	0.8	4.9
\$75 to \$99.99	1.6	4.9
\$100 to \$150	--	4.9
Over \$150	1.2	11.0
Don't know	0.4	1.2

spent \$10 or more for household furnishings during the term.

Almost one-half of the single students claimed no expenditures on this goods category for fall term.

Single students' term expenditures for household furnishings were estimated at roughly one dollar. However, married students averaged a minimum of \$20.50 for the fall term. The total

married students' projected market for these items comes to around \$179,100; single students' expenses total only about \$27,250. Together, these two subsets projected dollar markets total approximately \$206,300.

Furniture and Department Store Preferences. -- Table 63, on the next page, reveals the diverse preferences of both single and married students for stores selling household furnishings. Of particular interest is the 26.8 per cent of the married students who listed Sears Roebuck (Frondor Shopping Center) as the store receiving their "first most" and "second most" amounts spent. Only 3.7 per cent of the single students rated this department store as their "first" choice. As seen from the table, the student percentages are fairly well dispersed -- with Lansing area stores generally lacking heavy student expenditures for household furnishing items.

TABLE 63. -- Furniture store preferences by marital status

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>
No Response	59.7	33.2	84.7	54.8	94.0	81.9
<u>East Lansing</u>						
Tony Coates	0.4	--	0.4	--	--	--
Builders' Hardware	--	--	--	1.2	--	--
Ace Hardware	8.5	3.7	2.7	3.7	0.4	2.4
Polachek's	4.3	1.2	0.4	2.4	--	1.2
Stevenson Decor.	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Yankee Stadium	3.9	15.9	1.6	9.8	0.4	1.2
E. L. Electric	--	1.2	--	--	--	1.2
Art's TV	--	1.2	--	--	--	1.2
Knapp's	1.2	2.4	1.2	--	0.4	--
Kresge	1.2	--	0.4	--	--	--
Bookstores	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Music Stores	--	--	0.8	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	6.6	2.4	2.3	3.7	0.4	--
<u>Frandon</u>						
Sears Roebuck	3.5	26.8	3.1	15.9	1.6	2.4
Federals	3.9	1.2	1.6	3.7	0.8	4.9
Sew 'n Save	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Grinnell's	--	1.2	--	1.2	--	--
Cunningham's	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Shopper's Fair	1.2	1.2	--	1.2	1.2	1.2
Kresge	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	1.6	--	0.4	--	0.4	1.2
<u>Lansing</u>						
Arlan's	0.4	1.2	--	--	--	--
Bundys	--	--	--	1.2	--	--
Barker-Fowler	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Jury-Rowe	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Knapp's	0.4	1.2	--	1.2	--	1.2
Robinson's Super City	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	1.2	2.4	0.4	--	0.4	--

Automotive and Transportation Expenditures

Married students reported much higher expenditures for fuel and maintenance of their cars (and other transportation expenses) than did single students.¹⁷ Table 64 below, shows the amounts spent for this goods and service category according to

TABLE 64. -- Expenditures for automobiles and transportation by marital status

<u>Term Expenditures</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>
None	26.1%	3.7%
Less than \$5	10.5	3.7
\$5 to \$9.99	7.4	--
\$10 to \$14.99	11.0	4.9
\$15 to \$19.99	3.5	1.2
\$20 to \$24.99	5.0	3.7
\$25 to \$49.99	14.3	19.5
\$50 to \$100	14.0	35.4
Over \$100	7.8	25.6
Don't know	0.4	2.3

the marital status of the student spender. From the table it is seen that only about 37 per cent of the single students reported expenses in this area of over \$25 for the term. However, over

¹⁷ As seen in Table 3 (Classification data by marital status), approximately 83 per cent of the marrieds owned cars -- as compared to about 24 per cent of the single respondents.

eight out of ten married students claimed this level of automotive expenses. Furthermore, over 25 per cent of the married subset claimed to spend more than \$100 during the fall term for these items.

The average single student reportedly spent about \$12.50 per term on automotive and transportation needs; married students averaged approximately \$32.50 each for the term. Projected, these expenses came to about \$340,550 for single students, and at least \$283,900 for married students for the fall term. The total student dollar market, then, approaches \$624,500.

Automotive and Transportation Preferences. -- As seen from Table 65 on the next two pages, over 46 per cent of the single students reported spending their "first most" amounts of money in the "transportation" category rather than in the "automotive" categories. Married students, on the other hand, appear with relatively higher percentages in the "East Lansing automotive" section -- but are well dispersed throughout the list of area gas stations. The East Lansing and campus bus lines were indicated by one out of five single students as where they spent their "first most" amount of money.

TABLE 65. --Automotive and transportation preferences by marital status

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>
No Response	30.4	7.4	74.1	39.6	94.8	74.7
<u>East Lansing Automotive</u>						
University Standard	2.7	3.7	1.2	1.2	--	1.2
Fuller's Standard	1.2	3.7	0.4	--	0.4	--
Nelson's Standard	--	1.2	0.4	1.2	--	1.2
Spartan Standard	0.4	--	0.4	2.4	--	1.2
Sellers Standard	0.4	6.1	0.4	1.2	--	2.4
E. Lansing Standard	1.6	1.2	1.9	2.4	--	--
Red's Shell	0.8	--	--	--	--	--
Campus Texaco	0.8	6.1	0.4	2.4	--	--
Swan's Texaco	0.4	--	--	1.2	--	--
Bud's Mobil	0.8	1.2	0.8	1.2	0.4	--
Fedewa's Mobil	1.2	15.9	0.4	4.9	--	1.2
Len's Citgo	0.8	1.2	0.8	--	0.4	1.2
Larry's Gulf	1.2	3.7	0.4	2.4	--	1.2
Meridian Gulf	--	1.2	--	2.4	0.4	--
Jake's Sinclair	--	--	--	--	0.4	--
Mel's Sinclair	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Duke's Sunoco	1.6	1.2	0.4	--	--	1.2
John Lewis Sunoco	--	--	0.4	1.2	0.4	--
Frank Krauss Sunoco	1.6	1.2	0.4	1.2	--	1.2
Clark	1.2	--	0.4	3.7	--	--
Drake Refinery	--	--	--	1.2	--	--
Lathrop's Pure	0.4	2.4	--	1.2	--	--
Trowbridge Enco	--	3.7	--	1.2	--	2.4
Gr. River Zephyr	--	1.2	0.8	2.4	0.4	--
Al Mikulich Pontiac	--	1.2	--	1.2	--	--
Bob's Garage	0.4	--	--	--	--	--
Bob Baker Rambler	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Other (not listed)	3.5	4.9	1.9	9.8	1.2	6.1

TABLE 65(continued)

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>First</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>Sin.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>
<u>Frandon Automotive</u>						
Sears Roebuck	0.4	--	--	1.2	--	1.2
Story Olds	--	--	--	--	0.4	1.2
Other (not listed)	--	--	--	--	0.4	--
<u>Lansing Automotive</u>						
Bud Kouts	--	--	--	1.2	--	--
Lorenz Buick	--	1.2	--	--	--	--
Phil Gordon Imports	0.4	2.4	--	2.4	--	--
Other (not listed)	3.5	7.3	1.2	2.4	--	--
<u>Transportation Estab.</u>						
Train	4.3	--	1.6	--	--	--
Bus	19.8	8.5	4.3	2.4	0.4	1.2
Airline	4.7	3.7	1.6	1.2	--	--
College Travel	1.2	--	--	1.2	--	--
Campus Bus Line	4.3	1.2	2.3	2.4	--	--
Other (not listed)	12.0	4.9	3.1	--	--	1.2

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As seen from the information contained in this study, the Michigan State University student population is a distinct community in and of itself. Students have their own individual preferences for news sources and have individual readership patterns. While the State News was seen as a major student medium, the broadcast media (and especially radio) were surprisingly rated as very important student news sources for national news. The State News seems to enjoy very high student exposure and perception. In fact, this medium is practically the only news source for many students. Accordingly, many students indicated they would like to see more national and international news contained in their campus newspaper. In general, however, the State News received very favorable student ratings as an "ideal" campus newspaper.

It is evident that many variables contribute to the reasons for actions and preferences in the area of student shopping and expenditure patterns. These patterns are important for they determine where the often-underestimated student dollar out-flow goes. In the period covered by this study (fall term, 1965), for example,

single students reportedly spent around \$600; the average married student spent approximately \$1,000. The total student dollar outflow in the East Lansing area for the over 35,000 students at the University was estimated to be at least 25 million dollars during this period. This, then, is indeed a large market.

It is hoped that this study of the foregoing student characteristics and readership and expenditure patterns has been useful in explaining the complex student market make-up. Additional studies of this type are recommended to provide further insights into these areas. The present study, in fact, could serve as a basic format for future studies of the Michigan State University student population. It is not recommended, however, that the format used in this study be followed exactly in designing future studies -- several areas stand in need of improvement.

While the present study looked only at the behavior of the University student, there is also another important subset of the University population -- the faculty and staff. These employees of the University, for the most part, actually make their home in the East Lansing area and would no doubt have relatively different readership and expenditure patterns. A comparison, therefore, of the staff and faculty characteristics with the student characteristics would prove interesting.

Overall, the sections on student readership were easily administered and the data received proved quite revealing. Perhaps the only major limitation realized in this area was in the method used for securing information concerning student attitudes toward the State News. In future studies it is recommended that these questions be of the closed-end type. This would serve to stimulate more detailed responses and make tabulations of the information received more meaningful. An "other" category, however, would also have to be included to cover responses not listed on the questionnaire -- thus allowing for recording and tabulating frequent responses not anticipated in the questionnaire design.

While detailed information concerning magazine readership, radio listening, and television viewing was not sought in this study, these areas could be sources of valuable information. It is recommended, therefore, that these areas be considered when designing future studies.

In this study it was difficult to compare expenditures across different product categories since each individual category had different dollar breakdowns listed on the questionnaire. This oversight early in the questionnaire design stages made tabulations more difficult and limited the analysis of expenditure patterns to

some degree. Therefore, it is recommended that, in future studies of this type, the same dollar expenditure categories be listed for each of the goods and service items to be measured.

Additional studies could also contain expenditure categories not included in this study. Student automobile purchases, for example, was an expenditure category overlooked when listing goods and service items in the present study. Because of the expected high dollar out-flow connected with automobile purchases, the inclusion of this category would have made the present study more meaningful. Other student expenditure areas deserving possible exploration would include sports equipment, jewelry, and alcoholic beverage expenditures.

A critical review of the basic design of this study and the foregoing suggestions for improvements should be of assistance in planning future study designs. With parts of the data contained in this study as a benchmark it would be interesting to see if and how student readership and expenditure habits vary over time.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE AND CUE SHEETS

STATE NEWS READERSHIP AND MARKET DATA SURVEY

November 19-22, 1965

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Sex: 1-Male
2-Female

Marital Status: 1-Single
2-Married

Class: 1-Freshman
2-Sophomore
3-Junior
4-Senior
5-Special
6-Masters
7-Doctoral

PART I. Newspaper Readership

1. How often do you read the State News?

1-Never
2-Once or twice
a week
3-Three or four
times a week
4-Five times a week
5-Over 5 times a week

How often do you read the State Journal?

How often do you read the East Lansing Towne Courier?

2. Would you rate the State News as:

1-Excellent
2-Very Good
3-Average
4-Poor

Why do you rate the State News this way?
(PROBE)

2.

3. Please rate the following media as sources for your national news:

First _____ Second _____ Third _____

For local and campus news:

First _____ Second _____ Third _____

1-Television

2-Radio

3-Magazines

4-State News

5-State Journal

6-Other newspapers

7-Others

4. Would you like to see any changes made in the State News ?

How strongly do you feel about each change? (PROBE)

5. Did you read this (Thursday's) edition of the State News?

1-Yes

2-No

(SKIP THE FOLLOWING SECTION IF THE RESPONDENT
HAS NOT READ THURSDAY'S EDITION OF THE STATE NEWS)

3.

6. As I show you the following pages, please indicate the articles or advertisements which you have read:

Page			3		4	
	1	2	Read Lightly (1/4 to 1/2 of unit)	Read Heavily (1/2 or more of unit)		
	Unnoted	Noted				
1. Page as Whole						
Bowl Trip Story						
2. Page as Whole						
Editorial-Help Needed						
Adv-SBS						
3. Story-The Paper						
Adv-Thompson Jewelry						
Adv-Kositchek's						
4. Page-Except Adv						
Adv-Sportsmeister						
5. Olin Report						
Adv-Pub						
Adv-Flash						
6. Classified-Whole Page						
7. Story-Moppets Dance						
Adv-McDonalds						
Adv-State Theater						
Adv-State Discount						
8. Story-Birth Control						
Adv-Big 10 Club						
Adv-Kramer Auto Parts						
Adv-Sprague's						

PART II. Student Expenditure Data

1. About how much did you spend on books and school supplies this past week?

What do you estimate your expenditures will be on books and school supplies for this term?

In which stores did you buy them? (If more than one, rank them by amount spent in each one.)

(REPEAT FOR EACH EXPENDITURE CATEGORY)

		<u>Last Week</u>	<u>Term</u>	<u>First</u>	<u>Second</u>	<u>Third</u>	<u>Other</u>
	Books & School Supplies	\$ _____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.	Laundry & Dry Cleaning	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3.	Barber Shops & Beauty Salons	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	Movies	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	Other Entertainment	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	Restaurant Meals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7.	Groceries	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8.	Clothing	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9.	Drugs, Cosmetics & Toiletries	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10.	Household Furnishings	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11.	Automotive & Transportation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

12. Do you have a car registered in your name?

1-Yes

2-No

5.

14. How often have you visited the following since the start of the term?

1 - Never	1 _____ Downtown Lansing stores
2 - Once a month or less	
3 - Two or three times a month	2 _____ Frandor stores
4 - Once a week	3 _____ East Lansing - Grand River stores
5 - More than once a week	
	4 _____ Yankee Stadium stores
	5 _____ Spartan Shopping Center stores

PART III. Classification Data

1. Please estimate your total expenditures for the term. Include all your expenses, including room, board, tuition, etc.

1 _____ Cash Expenditures	2 _____ Equivalent Cash Expenditures. (Room and board as wages for jobs, etc.)
---------------------------	---

2. What is your age?

1. BOOKS AND SCHOOL SUPPLIES

Expenditures

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| 0 - None | 01 _____ Campus Bookstore |
| 1 - less than \$1 | 02 _____ Gibson's Bookstore |
| 2 - \$1 to 4.99 | 03 _____ Spartan Bookstore |
| 3 - \$5 to 9.99 | 04 _____ Student Bookstore |
| 4 - \$10 to 14.99 | 05 _____ MSU Bookstore |
| 5 - \$15 to 24.99 | 06 _____ Other (Specify) |
| 6 - \$25 to 49 | |
| 7 - \$50 to 100 | |
| 8 - over \$100 | |
| 9 - don't know | |

2. LAUNDRY AND DRY CLEANING

Expenditures

- 0 - None
- 1 - less than \$1
- 2 - \$1 to 4.99
- 3 - \$5 to 9.99
- 4 - \$10 to 14.99
- 5 - \$15 to 24.99
- 6 - \$25 to 39.99
- 7 - \$40 to 55
- 8 - over \$55
- 9 - don't know

East Lansing

- 01 _____ American Dry Cleaners
- 02 _____ Bary Ames
- 03 _____ Campus Cleaners
- 04 _____ Dewar Cleaners
- 05 _____ Crest Laundry & Cleaners
- 06 _____ Lansing Laundry & Cleaners
- 07 _____ Louis Shirt Laundry & Cleaners
- 08 _____ Savant Cleaners
- 09 _____ Time Cleaners
- 10 _____ University Sunshine Center (Laundromat)
- 11 _____ Kalamazoo Norge Village
- 12 _____ On-campus facilities
- 13 _____ Other (Specify)

Frondor

- 41 _____ Flash Cleaners
- 42 _____ Frondor Laundromat
- 43 _____ Other (Specify)

Lansing

- 61 _____ (Specify)

3. BARBER SHOPS AND BEAUTY SALONS

Expenditures

- 0 - None
- 1 - less than \$2.25
- 2 - \$2.25 to 4.99
- 3 - \$5 to 9.99
- 4 - \$10 to 19.99
- 5 - \$20 to 29.99
- 6 - \$30 to 39.99
- 7 - \$40 to 50
- 8 - over \$50
- 9 - don't know

East Lansing

- 01 _____ Jean Airola Hair Stylists
- 02 _____ Florence Anderson Style Salon
- 03 _____ Artistic Hair Styles
- 04 _____ Helen Barresy Beauty Salon
- 05 _____ Betty's Hair Fashions
- 06 _____ Creative Hair Styles
- 07 _____ Don Schulte's College Manor Stylists
- 08 _____ Elda-Diane Beauty Salon
- 09 _____ Sprague's Salons
- 10 _____ Elizabeth Beauty Shop
- 11 _____ Jacobson's Beauty Salon
- 12 _____ Lucille's Beauty Shop
- 13 _____ Patrician's Hair Fashions
- 14 _____ Kurl-Up & Dye Beauty Salon
- 15 _____ Martin's Hair Fashions
- 16 _____ University Beauty Salon
- 17 _____ Yankee Stadium Stores
- 18 _____ Other (Specify)
- 19 _____ Big 10 Barber Shop
- 20 _____ Braun's Barber Shop
- 21 _____ Campus Barber Shop
- 22 _____ Ken's Barber Shop
- 23 _____ Len's Barber Shop
- 24 _____ MSU Barber Shop
- 25 _____ Red Cedar Barber Shop
- 26 _____ Ruse's Barber Shop
- 27 _____ Tallarico Barber Shop
- 28 _____ Varsity Barber Shop
- 29 _____ Other (Specify)

Frandon

- 41 _____ Frandon Beauty Shop
- 42 _____ Frandon Barber Shop
- 43 _____ Other (Specify)

Lansing

- 61 _____ (Specify)

4. MOVIES

Expenditures

- 0 - None
- 1 - less than \$1
- 2 - \$1 to 4.99
- 3 - \$5 to 9.99
- 4 - \$10 to 14.99
- 5 - \$15 to 19.99
- 6 - \$20 to 24.99
- 7 - \$25 to 30
- 8 - more than \$30
- 9 - don't know

- 01 _____ Campus Theatre
- 02 _____ Downtown Art
- 03 _____ Lansing Drive-In
- 04 _____ Gladmer Theatre
- 05 _____ Michigan Theatre
- 06 _____ Starlite Drive-In
- 07 _____ State Theatre
- 08 _____ Fairchild Auditorium
(MSU)
- 09 _____ Other (Specify)

5. OTHER ENTERTAINMENT

Expenditures

- 0 - None
- 1 - less than \$5
- 2 - \$5 to 9.99
- 3 - \$10 to 19.99
- 4 - \$20 to 29.99
- 5 - \$30 to 49.99
- 6 - \$50 to 99
- 7 - \$100 to 150
- 8 - over \$150
- 9 - don't know

East Lansing

- 01 _____ MSU Union Lanes
- 02 _____ Golden 8 Ball (Abbott Rd.)
- 03 _____ The Dell's
- 04 _____ The Mayfair
- 05 _____ Coral Gables
- 06 _____ Paul Revere's
- 07 _____ Other (Specify)

Frondor

- 41 _____ Ziegler's Boom-Boom Room
- 42 _____ Big 10 (Golf-O-Tron)
- 43 _____ Other (Specify)

Lansing

- 61 _____ Marvelanes Bowl
- 62 _____ Holiday Lanes
- 63 _____ Joe Joseph's Pro Bowl
- 64 _____ Lansing Recreation Center
- 65 _____ Timberlanes
- 66 _____ Westlawn Lanes
- 67 _____ Cedarway Recreation
Bowling

- 68 _____ Amadeo's Show Club
- 69 _____ Archie Tarpoff's
- 70 _____ Dines
- 71 _____ Gas Buggy Room
- 72 _____ The Green Door
- 73 _____ Dagwood's
- 74 _____ The Sportsman's
- 75 _____ Other (Specify)

6. RESTAURANT MEALS

Expenditures

- 0 - None
- 1 - less than \$1
- 2 - \$1 to 4.99
- 3 - \$5 to 9.99
- 4 - \$10 to 24.99
- 5 - \$25 to 49
- 6 - \$50 to 99
- 7 - \$100 to 150
- 8 - over \$150
- 9 - don't know

East Lansing

- 01 _____ Big Boy
- 02 _____ Casa Nova No. 2
- 03 _____ College Inn
- 04 _____ Coral Gables
- 05 _____ Il Forno Pizza
- 06 _____ Lenti's
- 07 _____ McDonald's
- 08 _____ Pizza Pit
- 09 _____ The Poplars
- 10 _____ Red Barn
- 11 _____ Kewpee's
- 12 _____ Varsity Drive-In
- 13 _____ MSU Union
- 14 _____ International Center
- 15 _____ Dorm Snack Bar
- 16 _____ Other (Specify)

Frondor

- 41 _____ Howard Johnson
- 42 _____ Homade Food Shop
- 43 _____ Hamburger Heaven
- 44 _____ Kwast Bakery
- 45 _____ Ziegler's Charcoal Room
- 46 _____ Other (Specify)

Lansing

- 61 _____ (Specify)

7. GROCERIES

Expenditures

- 0 - None
- 1 - less than \$5
- 2 - \$5 to 14.99
- 3 - \$15 to 24.99
- 4 - \$25 to 49.99
- 5 - \$50 to 99.99
- 6 - \$100 to 149
- 7 - \$150 to 200
- 8 - over \$200
- 9 - don't know

East Lansing

- 01 _____ Kroger's
- 02 _____ Prince Bros. Shop-Rite
- 03 _____ Shaheen's
- 04 _____ Super Shop-Rite
- 05 _____ Spartan Shop-Rite
- 06 _____ A & P
- 07 _____ Schmidt's
- 08 _____ Other (Specify)

Frondor

- 41 _____ Packer's
- 42 _____ Kroger's
- 43 _____ National
- 44 _____ Other (Specify)

Lansing

- 61 _____ Specify

8. CLOTHING

Expenditures

- 0 - None
- 1 - less than \$10
- 2 - \$10 to 24.99
- 3 - \$25 to 49.99
- 4 - \$50 to 74.99
- 5 - \$75 to 99
- 6 - \$100 to 149
- 7 - \$150 to 200
- 8 - more than \$200
- 9 - don't know

East Lansing

- 01 _____ Campbell's Suburban Shop
- 02 _____ J. W. Knapp
- 03 _____ Lon Kositchek's
- 04 _____ Ramsey's University Shop
- 05 _____ Redwood and Ross
- 06 _____ Tog Shop
- 07 _____ Canterbury Shop
- 08 _____ Sportsmeister
- 09 _____ Yankee Stadium
- 10 _____ Wanda Hancock Smartwear
- 11 _____ Jacobson's
- 12 _____ Marie's Fashions
- 13 _____ Scotch House
- 14 _____ Style Shop
- 15 _____ Cartwright's Shoes
- 16 _____ Shepard's Shoes
- 17 _____ Other (Specify)

(Continued on next page)

8. CLOTHING (Continued)

Frander

41 _____ Holden-Reid
42 _____ Federal
43 _____ Sears
44 _____ Roger Stuart Ltd.
45 _____ Tie Rak
46 _____ Green's Apparel
47 _____ LaMode Millinery
48 _____ Three Sisters
49 _____ Trudy's
50 _____ Winkelman's
51 _____ Beaux "N" Belles
52 _____ Harryman's Shoes
53 _____ G. R. Kinney Shoes
54 _____ Modern Youth Shoes
55 _____ Rackley Shoes
56 _____ Thom McCan Shoes
57 _____ Other (Specify)

Lansing

61 _____ (Specify)

9. DRUGS, COSMETICS AND TOILETRIES

Expenditures

0 - None
1 - less than \$5
2 - \$5 to 9.99
3 - \$10 to 14.99
4 - \$15 to 19.99
5 - \$20 to 24.99
6 - \$25 to 49
7 - \$50 to 75
8 - over \$75
9 - don't know

East Lansing

01 _____ Alexander Drug
02 _____ Allen's Drug
03 _____ Campus Drug
04 _____ College Drug
05 _____ East Lansing Pharmacy
06 _____ Gulliver's Drug
07 _____ Muir's Drug
08 _____ Dot Drug
09 _____ Olin Health Center
10 _____ Other (Specify)

Lansing

61 _____ (Specify)

Frander

41 _____ Cunningham's
42 _____ Other (Specify)

10. HOUSEHOLD FURNISHINGS

Expenditures

0 - None
1 - less than \$10
2 - \$10 to 24.99
3 - \$25 to 49.99
4 - \$50 to 74.99
5 - \$75 to 99.99
6 - \$100 to 150
7 - \$150 or over
8 - don't know

East Lansing

01 _____ Tony Coats
02 _____ Builder's Hdwre.
03 _____ Ace Hdwre.
04 _____ Polachek's Fabrics
05 _____ Stevenson's Decorators
06 _____ Yankee Stadium
07 _____ East Lansing Electric
08 _____ Art's TV
09 _____ Hanes TV
10 _____ Hank's TV
11 _____ Other (Specify)

Frondor

41 _____ Sears
42 _____ Federal
43 _____ Sew "N" Save Fabrics
44 _____ Singer Company
45 _____ Grinnell Bros.
46 _____ Other (Specify)

Lansing

61 _____ (Specify)

11. AUTOMOTIVE AND TRANSPORTATION

Expenditures

0 - None
1 - less than \$5
2 - \$5 to 9.99
3 - \$10 to 14.99
4 - \$15 to 19.99
5 - \$20 to 24.99
6 - \$25 to 49
7 - \$50 to 100
8 - over \$100
9 - don't know

East Lansing Transportation

01 _____ Train
02 _____ Bus
03 _____ Airline
04 _____ College Travel Office
05 _____ Other (Specify)

11. AUTOMOTIVE AND TRANSPORTATION (Continued)

East Lansing Automotive

- 06 _____ University Standard
- 07 _____ Fuller's Standard
- 08 _____ Nelson's Standard
- 09 _____ Spartan Standard
- 10 _____ Sellers Standard
- 11 _____ East Lansing Shell
- 12 _____ Red's Shell
- 13 _____ Campus Texaco
- 14 _____ Swan's Spartan Texaco
- 15 _____ Bud's Mobil
- 16 _____ Fedewa's Campus Mobil
- 17 _____ Len's Cities Service (Citgo)
- 18 _____ Larry's Gulf
- 19 _____ Meridian Gulf
- 20 _____ Jake's Sinclair
- 21 _____ Mel's Sinclair
- 22 _____ Duke's Sunoco
- 23 _____ John Lewis Sunoco
- 24 _____ Frank Krauss Sunoco
- 25 _____ Clark
- 26 _____ Drake's Refinery Station
- 27 _____ Forest Hills Phillips 66
- 28 _____ Lathrop's Pure Service
- 29 _____ Trowbridge Road Enco
- 30 _____ Grand River Zephyr
- 31 _____ Al Mikulich Pontiac
- 32 _____ Bob's Garage
- 33 _____ Goedert's Garage
- 34 _____ Magee's Service Garage
- 35 _____ Otis Garage
- 36 _____ Bob Baker Rambler
- 37 _____ Saradi
- 38 _____ Other (Specify)

Frandon

- 41 _____ (Specify)

Lansing

- 61 _____ (Specify)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Boyd, Harper W., and Westfall, Ralph. Marketing Research. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1956.

Lucas, Darrell Blaine, and Britt, Steuart Henderson. Measuring Advertising Effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1963.

Luck, David J., Wales, Hugh G., and Taylor, Donald A. Marketing Research. 2nd ed. revised. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

Reports and Periodicals

Atkin, Kenward L. Media Comparability Study, Michigan State University State News and Time Magazine. East Lansing, Michigan: Department of Advertising, Michigan State University, 1965.

Shaffer, James D., and Dressel, Paul L. Expenses and Sources of Income of Michigan Resident Michigan State University Students. East Lansing, Michigan: Office of Institutional Research, Michigan State University, 1963.

MacManus, John and Adams, Inc. A Glossary of Advertising and Market Research Terms. Bloomfield Hills, Michigan: Marketing Research Department, MacManus, John and Adams, Inc., 1963.

Michigan State University. Student Directory. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, September, 1965.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03177 3512