

24171784



ATTESIS

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

The Effects of Race and Gender on Newscasters' Believability

presented by

Pauline La-Verne George

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Master of Artdegree in Telecommunication

Gilbert A. Williams Major professor

Date May 17, 1990

O-7639

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

LIBRARY Michigan State University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record. TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

| DATE DUE | DATE DUE | DATE DUE |
|--------------|----------|----------|
| NOV 2 8 1997 | | |
| DEC 09 1833 | | |
| MAR # 1 1999 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | · | |
| | | |

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution c:\circ\datedue.pm3-p.1

_

.

THE EFFECTS OF RACE AND GENDER ON NEWSCASTER BELIEVABILITY

Ву

Pauline La-Verne George

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Telecommunication

ABSTRACT

0 ()

01-070

THE EFFECTS OF RACE AND GENDER ON NEWSCASTER BELIEVABILITY

By

Pauline La-Verne George

This research explored whether race and gender of newscaster affect their believability to their audience. Specifically, this research examined the believability of black and white, male and female newscasters as perceived by black and white college students.

Black and white college students provided the sample for this study. They were randomly assigned to one of four newscaster conditions (black female, black male, white female, white male), in which they were asked to rate each newscaster on believability using a seven-point semantic differential scale. The mean rating was tabulated for each newscaster and used for T-tests analysis.

Race affected newscaster believability for black subjects' assessment of white newscasters. Gender affected newscaster believability for male subjects' assessment of female newscasters. Race, when combined with gender, did affect newscasters' believability. Copyright by PAULINE LA-VERNE GEORGE 1990

.

DEDICATION

In loving memory of Stephanie Redmond George and Christine Antoinette Brown. You have inspired me in ways you may now never know.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Gilbert A. Williams, Associate Professor, Department of Telecommunication, Michigan State University, who served as my thesis advisor. His guidance and encouragement helped me complete this Dr. Thomas Baldwin, Professor, Department of study. Telecommunication, Michigan State University, assisted this research, my academic studies as well as my career choice. Bradley Greenberg, Professor and Chairman, Dr. s. Department of Telecommunication, Michigan State University, facilitated my academic studies and this research. Dr. Alberto O. Lima, Visiting Professor, Department of Marketing and Transportation, Michigan State University, served as an impetus for this study with his adept knowledge of research methods, patience, time and scholarly advice. Dr. Sevgin Eroglu, Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Advertising, Michigan State University, assisted my primary steps of this research.

acknowledgements to all students Special and that participated in this organizations research, especially Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. Delta Zeta, Michigan State University, Joyce Grenga, Louis Rankine and Students, Department Rachel Torgoff, Graduate of Telecommunication, Michigan State University. Darold T. Newton, Graduate Student, Department of Advertising,

V

Michigan State University, was unfaltering in support and Ira Washington, Michigan State University. Most of all, I would like to thank my parents, whose love and support strengthened my every step; my guardian, Darlene L. Peoples, whose love and assistance are forever appreciated, all my family and friends and, to God, who has carried me through life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| LIST OF TABLES | ix |
|--|----------------------------|
| LIST OF FIGURES | x |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Literature Review | |
| Race as Factor of Believability Gender as Factor of Believability Race and Gender as Factors of Believability | |
| 2. METHODOLOGY | 21 |
| Experimental Design Measures of Dependent Variable Hypotheses Development of Questionnaire Conducting the Experiment | |
| 3. RESULTS | 32 |
| Weekday Television Hours Weekend Television Hours Daily Local News Hours Watch News At School Watch News At Home Newscast Preference News More Believable Race Only Gender Only Race and Gender | |
| 4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS | 55 |
| ENDNOTES | 65 |
| APPENDICES | |
| Appendix A:QuestionnaireAppendix B:Demographic SummaryAppendix C:Subjects per Session OneAppendix C:Subjects per Session TwoAppendix D:Subjects per Condition | 70 75 76 76 77 |

| Appendix E: | T-Test Analysis | 78 |
|---------------|-----------------|----|
| BIBLIOGRAPHY. | | 97 |

LIST OF TABLES

| 1. | Watch News A | t School | 35 |
|----|---------------|--------------------------|----|
| 2. | Watch News At | t Home | 36 |
| 3. | Newscast Pres | fer To Watch (Females) | 37 |
| 4. | Newscast Pres | fer To Watch (Males) | 37 |
| 5. | News More Be | lievable (Females) | 38 |
| 6. | News More Be | lievable (Males) | 38 |
| 7. | Appendix C: | Subjects Per Session One | |
| | | Subjects Per Session Two | 76 |
| 8. | Appendix D: | Subjects Per Condition | 77 |
| 9. | Appendix E: | T-Test Analysis | 78 |
| | | | |

LIST OF FIGURES

| 1. | Weekday TV | Hours | 33 |
|----|------------|-------|----|
| 2. | Weekend TV | Hours | 34 |
| 3. | Daily News | Hours | 35 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the mid 1970's, minorities have become more visible on America's television screens. Although the 1960's television programming featured blacks and other minorities, their presence was mostly obscured because of their environment and often were in unrealistic situations. Diahann Carroll, Bill Cosby and others made debuts on network television. And in local cities, minorities became newscasters.

This research study explores issues related to race, and to a lesser extent, gender, and why these two factors have played an important role in the development of America's television landscape. Specifically, this thesis will assess the believability of black and white, male and female newscasters as perceived by college students. The research question asks: Does gender and race of newscasters affect their believability to the audience? То answer this question; this study analyzed the ratings college students gave newscasters. Essentially, the study focused on viewer preferences: Why was one newscaster chosen as more believable than another? The primary goal of this research was to determine if a sample of college students' perceptions of newscaster believability were affected by race or gender of a particular newscaster. In

essence, this experiment assessed: 1) the attitudes of black students in relation to black and white newscasters, and 2) the attitudes of white students in relation to black and white newscasters.

The results of this experiment have both practical and theoretical implications. For instance, from the theoretical perspective, this research advances our knowledge about media credibility and sources. In addition, this study breaks new ground by investigating the combined impact of race and gender on singular and newscaster believability. Previous researchers have failed to adequately investigate these issues, or simply ignored these questions altogether.

This research study has practical applications, as For example, a station manager could use this data, well. along with other relevant information, to help determine a newscaster's image and audience appeal. Moreover, the results of this study could address even wider social It is clear that individuals identify more with issues. persons who have similar characteristics, features, More specifically, blacks identify more backgrounds, etc. with other blacks and, whites identify more with whites than with blacks or with any other race of people.1 What are the implications of these facts? If a newscaster is white and the station's most captive audience is black, the audience could miss the essence of any message delivered.

Conceivably, the audience could downplay the seriousness of an issue of great importance, e.g. news about Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS).

A 1987 study found that women made up 32 percent of radio and television news reporters.2 The study also pointed out that approximately 1,200 black women and 1,400 black men held jobs in broadcast news. The number of black men had dropped from a previous high of 1,700 in 1985.3 Why have the numbers of black male and female news reporters stabilized or dropped? Have audiences turned away from them?

In several local television markets, i.e. Cleveland, Ohio and Detroit, Michigan, black newscasters report the evening, late night and weekend newscasts. With their increased visibility, one might assume that audiences have become comfortable with black and female on-air personalities, thereby enhancing their "face value" believability. This may not be true, however. This research study will seek to find out how and why audiences perceive newscasters as trustworthy, attractive and credible.

In addition to exploring the specific issues of newscaster believability, this research study also examines related issues. These areas include: Mass media consumption and use, the image of minorities in the mass media, program preferences and mass media uses and

gratifications.

LITERATURE REVIEW

USES AND GRATIFICATIONS

The underlying premise of uses and gratifications is that audiences select media that satisfy felt needs.4 Media uses and gratifications theorists contend that people use the media primarily for personal and immediate gratification reasons, followed by utilitarian or practical Individuals select a particular medium because they ones. are seeking some benefit. That benefit or motivation may be guidance, social acceptance, reinforcement, passing the time, relaxation, general information, companionship, and escape. Generally, individuals who exhibit a high level of these characteristics often watch more hours of television. This is especially true if they are motivated to watch television to pass time, for companionship and/or for entertainment.5

Reinforcement, guidance general information and benefits/motivations are directly related to this study and are discussed. Some mass communications researchers have argued that people using reinforcement as benefit/motivation will seek media content/programs that support their ideas and attitudes. Individuals want advice for specific needs and problems they have. They derive the benefit/motivation guidance because they seek it

from the media to help them fulfill needs or manage problems. Clearly individuals want to stay abreast of people and events in the news. They use or survey the media to find out what they need to know. Informational viewers watch a fairly large amount of television and are somewhat attached to television.6 Stroman and Becker found that highly educated blacks used television to be reminded of candidates' strengths as opposed to low socioeconomic status blacks who used television for interpersonal communication, such as topics for discussion Black newspaper readers, as did highly among friends. educated blacks with television, used newspapers to be reminded of their candidates' strengths. Whites used newspapers to learn about candidates and to gain insight on deciding how to vote.7 These benefits/motivations support Greenberg's research findings:

- 1) blacks watch television programs that are closely related to their own experiences, and
- 2) blacks tend to rely heavily on television figures for information, including information about

blacks and the black community.8

PROGRAMMING PREFERENCES

Most network television programming is designed to appeal to a "mass" audience, however, "mass" appeal does not mean that everyone will like the programming. "Mass" attraction programming is based on the assumption that all

audience members are homogeneous. Clearly, however, ethnic groups differ in their choice of programs. Carey noted that television viewing preferences differed among various Specifically, blacks preferred programs ethnic groups. closely reflected and related to their own that experiences, attitudes and values.9 Dates found that black youths selected black shows or those shows that have at least one black character over other television shows.10 Dates contended that such behavior is primarily caused by black fictional black youths identifying more with television characters than white characters.11 Surlin and Dominick have suggested that black teenagers use television for socialization purposes. Low income teenagers and low income blacks use television as a learning device to ascertain information and knowledge needed to understand societal roles and behaviors.12 Greenberg and Heeter found that Hispanic youths also use television for social learning purposes as well as for diversion and news and As for media content preferences, the information.13 youths preferred Hispanic or Spanish related content in newspapers, but not for television.14

A 1978 study found that children's top choices for story topics were crime, murder and disaster, local news and sports.15 The least popular stories were those about the government and the president. Boys favored stories about sports and space, whereas girls favored stories about

doctors helping people and human interest stories. Both boys and girls equally favored crime, murder and disaster stories.16 Greenberg and Dervin found that low income adults' programming preferences were not the same as those of the general population. Of the top twelve shows, only 22 percent of the general population watched six of the top twelve shows, the same as that of low income blacks and whites.17 The authors argued that these findings contradicted Carey's (1966) analysis that black and white viewing preferences were different.18 MINORITIES' IMAGE IN MASS MEDIA

major topics will be: In this section, the in crime dramas and situation comedies stereotypes (sitcoms). First, a look at what the research says about stereotypes. Historically, blacks have not been portrayed in positive roles in television. One of the first stereotypical roles for blacks appeared in 1950 with the program "Amos 'n' Andy." Even though blacks now appear more on television, many of the stereotypes first portrayed in "Amos 'n' Andy" still exist.19 Churchill revealed that roughly 50 percent of television programs included a black person. Blacks were usually shown in glamourous settings and stereotyped in appearance and actions.20 Lemon examined the relationship between inter-race and inter-sex dominance in situation comedy and crime drama programs. Of the major and minor interactions on sitcoms, blacks

participated in 36 percent, whereas they participated in only 7 percent of crime programs. Sitcoms have been more fair in their portrayals of blacks and females than have crime drama programs. Black characters in crime programs were often dominated, appeared less dominant and often portrayed as unequal to whites. The same held true for females. They were more often dominated, less often dominant and portrayed as less than equal to men.21 Black men and women were portrayed about the same in situation comedy and crime drama programs. They had similar portraying roles as being dominant, percentages of dominated and equal to one another. White men and women were also portrayed as equals in sitcoms, but white men were more dominant and white women were more dominated in crime drama programs.22

Stereotypical portrayals of blacks and females are perpetuated by the mass media. Even though sitcoms have been fair in their portrayal of blacks, nonetheless, stereotyping persists. Most shows about blacks are sitcoms. Moses cited Gerbner and Gross' theory that television tests one's reality. Some young blacks pattern their behavior after stereotyped portrayals seen on television, thus making the stereotype into reality.23 Tan and Tan asserted that blacks with heavy television entertainment exposure could be expected to have low selfesteem because of the negative portrayals of blacks in most

programs. This does not hold true for whites with the same type of exposure because they generally have many positive role models.24 Blacks perceive television and black characters on television as more true to life than do whites.25

MEDIA USE/CONSUMPTION

Not only do blacks, Hispanics and whites differ in their media uses and the gratifications derived from it, they also differ in their level and type of consumption of Greenberg and Heeter found that hispanic television. their leisure time watching youths spend most of television and listening to the radio.26 Bogart found that blacks listen to the radio and watch television more often. Whites, on the other hand, read more print, i.e. newspapers and magazines. Durand, Teel and Bearden found that blacks perceive television as the most credible source for obtaining news information, whereas whites perceived magazines as most credible.27 Bogart suggested that the difference in use may be related to socioeconomic factors rather than any conscious attempt by blacks to be different.28 Bales indicated that the median number of hours blacks watched television in a four year period remained above that of whites (a total of 2.8 more hours).29 Greenberg and Dervin compared the media behavior of low-income blacks to that of low-income whites. They found that blacks did not significantly watch more

television than did whites.30 The authors suggested that low-income blacks are more similar than different to low-income whites in terms of television viewing behavior.31 Low-income whites, however, read more of the newspaper than low income blacks. Low-income adults watched on average 5.2 hours of television daily, compared to only 2.0 hours for the general population. Not only did low-income adults watch more television than the general population, they were less likely not to read newspapers.32 Allen and Clarke found that income level, education and sex were predictors of television dependency and viewing patterns, as well as newspaper reading. They found that higher incomes and educational levels are not related. For example, higher income blacks were more dependent on for information about blacks, whereas higher television income Latinos depended less on television for information Blacks with higher education levels about Latinos.33 depended less on television for information about blacks, watched less television, and more often read newspapers.34 The more educated Latinos depended less on television for information about Latinos, but watched more television and more often read newspapers than Latinos with less education.35

Weber revealed that black and white adolescents chose television as their main source of acquiring news information. Both blacks and whites believed television to

be the most accurate source of news.36 Egan's findings agreed with those of Weber. Over 75 percent of the children in grades two through six in San Jose, California. reported television as the first or second best place to get news.37 Sixty-nine percent of the low-income adults in Greenberg and Dervin's study preferred television for world news, nearly twice (38%) that of the general population. Both low-income blacks and whites preferred television for world news. Thirty percent of low-income adults favored television as the medium for obtaining local news. compared to 21 percent of the general population. However, low-income adults preferred radio (34%), then television, followed by newspapers (22%) and people (14%) for obtaining local news. As for the general population, 41 percent chose newspapers as the medium of preference for local news, followed by radio (31%), television and people (7%).38 Thirty-four percent of low-income whites prefer radio for local news, followed by television (33%), newspapers (26%) and people (7%), whereas and 32 percent of low-income blacks preferred radio, then television (27%), people (22%) and newspapers (27%).39 Moreover, blacks reported more exposure to entertainment programs, except for movies, than High television entertainment exposure has did whites. been linked to self-esteem. Tan and Tan revealed that when holding the variables age, education and television public affairs programs constant, blacks with high television entertainment exposure have low self-esteem. Whites with high television entertainment exposure did not indicate low self-esteem. Nonetheless, blacks who watched less television entertainment programs were less likely to indicate low self-esteem.40

RACE AS FACTOR OF BELIEVABILITY

One must examine the effect race has on newscasters believability in light of racial differences in consumption and perceived credibility of the mass media. A relatively small proportion of the literature has focused on newscaster's race and how it affects believability. For example, Johnson found that even though blacks perceived black newscasters as more attractive and more believable than white newscasters, less than half viewed blacks as better performers.41 One explanation for this may be because of an indoctrination process of blacks. Blacks are constantly told, in one way or another, that they are inferior to whites. This indoctrination occurs in many facets of blacks lives including work, school, religious affiliation, and daily routines. The result of this indoctrination may be a self-fulfilling prophecy, thus enabling blacks to take a "white is right" attitude. Johnson argued that this attitude could have a carry-over effect into the evaluation of a black newscaster's believability by audience members.42

GENDER AS FACTOR OF BELIEVABILITY

Gender is another important factor in determining audience's perceptions of newscaster believability. One study examined the "ideal" newscaster concept. Even though males were conceptualized as the "ideal" newscaster, viewers were not more inclined to watch a male or female newscaster. This study did show, for example, that male broadcasters were considered more physically attractive by almost all viewers.43 Tan, Raudy, Huff and Miles looked at children's reactions to male and female broadcasters. They found that a male broadcaster more effectively enabled newscast stories than a female retain subjects to broadcaster. Boys learned just as much from a female newscaster as from a male. Girls, on the other hand, learned less from a female newscaster than from a male.44 The authors argued that children respond both to the sex of the model and the sex-role stereotype depicted in the situation. Girls may not have thought it appropriate for a female to be a newscaster and paid less attention when a female was reading. Boys may deem it appropriate for both males and females to be newscasters.45 Another explanation included the concept of perceived power. Tan, et. al. argued that perceived power and not believability may be a factor in communication source effectiveness for children. The authors also found that the children saw both the male and female newscaster as being equally believable.46

Silverman-Watkins, Levi and Klein found that children recalled equal amounts of information regardless of newscasters' gender. Contrary to the Tan et. al (1980) findings, boys understood male and female newscasters equally, while girls recalled information equally as well from male and female newscasters. The authors pointed out that the content of the story is paramount in assessing the relationship between gender of newscaster and child.47

Whittaker and Whittaker found that newscast material delivered by either male or female newscasters was equally retained by adults. As did the children in the Tan, et. al, study, adults saw no difference in the believability or attractiveness of male or female newscasters.48 Stone assessed directors, university students and news professors, and elementary students and their parents attitudes about newswomen. When asked who their audience would believe more as a reporter, news directors predicted that men would have more credibility than women. About 46 of the 147 news directors surveyed thought their audience would deem male reporters as more believable than female reporters. Only one percent of news directors reported that their audience would think that a female reporter was more believable than a male. Of the university students and professors surveyed, 63 percent and 83 percent, respectively, saw male and female reporters equally believable. Both elementary students and their parents

indicated that presumed believability of reporters depends on the story being covered.49 News directors, despite their overestimation of male reporters supposed greater believability, rated women equal to men as newscasters. Ninety-seven percent of them believed women could do as well as men in editing, news writing and stand up Rossiter found no significant differences in reporting.50 male or female listeners when examining sex of the speaker, of the listener and listening comprehension.51 sex Whittaker and Meade analyzed sex of the speaker and writer in determining credibility in various cultures. Specifically, the authors determined who was perceived as credible, male speakers/writers female most or speakers/writers. Their findings agreed with most of the literature in this area, male writers were not perceived as more credible than female writers. Only in Brazil were male writers deemed as more credible. Nonetheless, as speakers, male sources were perceived as significantly more credible than female sources in three of five countries sampled.52

Women's feelings about one another were examined by Goldberg. College women were asked to rate a set of articles identical in content, except that one set's author was a male, and the other a female. Out of 54 total points, females gave the female author only 7 points, whereas the male author received 47. Contrary to

Rossiter's findings, the female author was consistently found less competent and valuable than the male author, regardless of the author's occupational field. Women were prejudiced against female professionals regardless of the professionals' accomplishments. The female professionals were never recognized as equals of their male counterparts by the women in the sample.53

RACE AND GENDER AS FACTORS OF BELIEVABILITY

Race, when coupled with sex, is yet another important factor in determining the credibility of newscasters. This study addresses, specifically, the issues of race and gender as factors affecting newscasters believability. Balon, Philport and Beadle concluded that sex and race can alter viewer perceptions of newscasters. Nevertheless, only for black male newscasters was sex found to have an effect. Viewer's perceptions of white male, and black and white female newscasters did not vary.54 The authors revealed that respondents believed white male newscasters to be more cheerful, less sympathetic and extroverted than black male newscasters. Moreover, black newscasters were perceived as more anxious and less qualified and reliable than white newscasters when both were considered as In addition, males were perceived as less anchorpersons. verbal and less qualified than females.55 Johnson asserted that black viewers perceive black male broadcasters as the most believable, followed by white male, black female, and white female newscasters. Contrary to Tan, et. al, and Whittaker and Whittaker, Johnson found male newscasters were believed to be more credible than female newscasters.56

NEWSCASTER APPEAL

This topic encompasses all areas of the literature previously discussed, as well as sheds light on current research in the realm of: most and least desired characteristics, nonverbal cues and overall appeal of newscasters. Voice and speech characteristics were deemed very important factors in appealing to viewers, followed by professional attributes, personal appeal and appearance.57

Sanders and Prichett examined the relationship between Of 28 individual nonverbal cues and newscaster appeal. characteristics describing an ideal newscaster, only half of them loaded high enough to be used in the final One important revelation in the findings analysis. concerns the race item Negro. The Negro item was eliminated because the analysis showed that even black respondents indicated they preferred a white newscaster.58 The ideal newscaster composites seemed to be related to what viewers were used to seeing on television, for example, white male, blond hair, medium build, dressed in a dark suit and between the ages of 31-40.59 Tankard, McCleneghan, Ganju, Lee, Olkes and DuBose also examined nonverbal cues, television news and newscasters. Raised

eyebrows by newscasters have been viewed as a biasing non-verbal cue. The authors argue that it is unlikely the cue influences or biases viewers' reactions. Eyebrow raising is seen as a sign or factor influencing viewers' responses only when it is compared to the absence of such a cue.60

Other factors that comprised the overall appeal of newscasters fit the most desired and least desired characteristics category. Newscaster characteristics found to be most desired by viewers include knowledge and expertise, unbiased approach, personal conviction, trustworthiness and honesty. Characteristics least desired include sensationalized delivery, questionable accuracy in reporting, just reading and not presenting the news and partiality when dealing with certain news items.61 Even though these characteristics are somewhat generalizable to all television newscasters, television newscasters do not necessarily have the same appeal for various segments of the audience. Appeal to various segments depends on age, socioeconomic status and sex of the viewer. Older female viewers of low socioeconomic status like newscasters based on appearance and personal appeal, whereas younger male viewers of high SES like newscasters based on professional attributes.62

FEMALES AS REPORTERS

Women are gaining prominence in television news. Α high proportion of new hires, particularly reporters, are In light of this progress, female reporting women.63 assignments have also improved in scope and importance. Despite this apparent progress, differences still exist in reporting assignments between male and female reporters. Women reported less foreign affairs, sports, disasters and feature stories than men. Women did, however, report more stories pertaining to the U.S. government, social problems and "women-related" stories than did men.64 Many stereotypical barriers that theorists allege are career barriers for female television newscasters, in fact are not deemed as such. Some presumed factors that are not barriers include lack of self-confidence, limited training and adverse influences from past experiences.65 The most important obstacle female television newscasters face is the overemphasis on physical appearance, followed by differential application screening, and selection based on (e.g., asking only women applicants if they plan to sex have children), stereotypes regarding women's roles, proving competence/self-worth, wife/career conflicts as well as lack of a professional network.66 Female television newscasters attest that they are more often judged by their appearance, whereas their male counterparts are judged on their skills.67 In assessing attitudes

toward newswomen, Stone revealed two reasons the sample of his study preferred male reporters to female reporters. Plain and simple: the male voice and tradition; it is just what they were used to.

The research presented here sets the stage for the elaboration of the methods, findings and discussion sections which follow. The purpose of the literature review was to familiarize the reader with the complex set of issues that affect the credibility of news anchors. In the sections that follow, the researcher will bring all of the relevant findings to bear on this study. More specifically, the researcher will show how black and white college students rated several black and white newscasters on scales that measure credibility.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

SAMPLE

Black and white students attending Michigan State University provided the data for this research. The sampling unit was subjects that fit the description of: (1) a Michigan State University student, and (2) black or white. A non-random convenience-type sampling was employed. The sample size was based on three criteria: (1) Judgmental. Those people selected had an interest in the subject matter; (2) Minimum cell size of 10; and (3) Budget/Time-constraint.

In spite of these stipulations, with various statistical treatments using Markstat and SPSS/PC+, some empirical results were able to be drawn.

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Two independent variables were employed in this research: race and sex of the newscaster. The independent variables were manipulated by randomly assigning students from the sample to one of four conditions. Here, eight experimental sessions consisting of 25 subjects (either black or white) were employed. Each racial group was exposed to one condition. Each condition consisted of three photographic stimuli of either a black male, a black female, a white male or a white female newscaster.

STIMULI

Slides of newscasters from the Cleveland market was used as stimuli. Because Cleveland had only two black female anchors at the time of this research, one photograph of a black female model was used. Head and shoulder shots were used for female anchors and bust shots were used for male anchors. Only one set of three slides were shown to each group as previously discussed. Each slide was controlled for size, color, and angle of presentation, the only manipulation being the newscaster's race and gender. No personal identification was mentioned about the newscasters.

MEASURES OF DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Believability is the dependent variable for this Subjects rated the believability research. of the semantic differential newscaster using scales. Believability was expressed by means of credibility, attractiveness and preference. The meaning of these words can explain a phenomenon. These words also establish a functional relationship between the dependent and independent variables. Believability is derived from race and sex overall motivations and attitudes. Scales that were used included Osqood, Gaziano and McGrath (1986), Singletary (1976) Markham (1968), Lynch and Sassenrath (1965) and Kjeldergaad (1961). Subjects judged the newscaster on credibility, attractiveness, and preference.

HYPOTHESES

PRIMARY HYPOTHESIS: Race and gender does affect newscasters' believability.

SUBHYPOTHESES

Subhypothesis #1: Race will generate significant differences in the believability of newscasters among subjects.

- A. Black subjects will judge black newscasters as more believable than white newscasters.
- B. White subjects will judge white newscasters as more believable than black newscasters.

Subhypothesis #2: Gender will generate significant differences in the believability of newscasters among subjects.

- A. Female subjects will judge male newscasters as more believable than female newscasters.
- B. Male subjects will judge male newscasters as more believable than female newscasters.

Subhypothesis #3: Race and gender will generate significant differences in the believability of newscasters among subjects.

- A. White subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters.
- B. White subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters.
- C. White subjects will judge white male newscasters as
more believable than white female newscasters.

- D. White subjects will judge white female newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters.
- E. White subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters.
- F. White subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters.
- G. Black subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters.
- H. Black subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters.
- I. Black subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters.
- J. Black subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters.
- K. Black subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters.

L. Black subjects will judge white female newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters.

M. Female subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters.

N. Female subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters.

O. Female subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters.

P. Female subjects will judge black male newscasters as

more believable than white female newscasters.

Q. Female subjects will judge white female newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters.

R. Female subjects will judge black male newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters.

S. Male subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters.

T. Male subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters.

- U. Male subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters.
- V. Male subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters.

W. Male subjects will judge white female newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters.

X. Male subjects will judge black male newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters.

DEVELOPMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE

To obtain information on black and white students' attitudes about the believability of black and white newscasters, a questionnaire was developed to use in the experiment. Survey questions are listed below. A copy of the complete questionnaire can be found in the appendix. Part I

1. On a typical weekday, about how many hours of television do you watch? ____Hours

Hours

- 3. When at school, do you watch local news on television? Yes No
- 4. When at your permanent home, do you watch local news on television?

____Yes ____No

5. About how many hours of local news do you watch daily?

____Hours

6. What time(s) do you usually watch the local news?

___O'Clock

7. Suppose two television newscasts were on at the same time of evening. One of the newscasts had a female anchor; the other had a male anchor. Other things being equal, which newscast do you think you would prefer to watch?

___Female Anchor ____No Preference

8. Do you think news on television would be more believable if delivered by a male or female anchor?

____Female Anchor ____No Preference

Part II

1. Assume Anchor is reading this promotion for the six o'clock newscast: "A young girl is dead and two families devastated. The grim consequences of drunk driving are examined tonight on Newswatch at 6."

Please rate Anchor on each of the following characteristics.

Anchor is very objective $\underline{1}$ $\underline{2}$ $\underline{3}$ $\underline{4}$ $\underline{5}$ $\underline{6}$ $\underline{7}$ very subjective very sincere 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very insincere $\frac{1}{1} \quad \frac{2}{2} \quad \frac{3}{3} \quad \frac{4}{4} \quad \frac{5}{5} \quad \frac{6}{6} \quad \frac{7}{7} \quad \text{very cheerful}$ very gloomy very attractive _____ ___ ___ ___ ___ very unattractive ______ very unattractive very tense $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{2}{3}$ $\frac{3}{4}$ $\frac{3}{5}$ $\frac{3}{6}$ $\frac{3}{7}$ very relaxed very untrustworthy _____ ___ ___ ___ ___ very trustworthy ______ ___ ___ ___ ___ very trustworthy <u>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</u> very uninformed very informed 2. If you got conflicting or different reports of the same news story, which of the three anchors would you believe? Anchor Anchor Anchor 3. Overall, which of the three anchors do you prefer? Anchor Anchor Anchor Part III 1. Sex Female

____Male

2. Race

____Black ____White ____Hispanic ____Other, please specify _____

3. Age _____

The characteristics objective-subjective, sincere-insincere, trustworthy-untrustworthy and informed-uninformed, were used to measure credibility. Gloomy-cheerful, attractive-unattractive, and tense-relaxed were used to measure attractiveness. For part II, questions 3 and 4, a slide was prepared to show the photographs of the three newscasters for that condition on one slide.

OBJECTIVES OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The objectives of each question is as follows.

Part I

Question One classified subjects as light, medium, or heavy television viewers. Question Two helped determine whether blacks or whites watch more television on the weekend. This relates directly to weekend newscasts where blacks are primarily anchors/reporters in some markets. Questions Three, Four, and Five, helped verify the overall differences in the viewing behavior of black and white subjects. Question Six helped establish the time subjects usually watch local news. Question Seven was used to find out whether a preference exists for gender of newscaster. Question Eight determined whether news is more believable based on gender of newscaster.

Part II

Question One ascertained newscasters' credibility and attractiveness. The general believability of newscasters was answered by question two. Question Three was used to attain the overall preference of newscasters.

Part III

Demographic information, for comparison, was supplied by questions one, two and three.

CONDUCTING THE EXPERIMENT

The actual experiment conditions were proctored by two black male graduate assistants and two white female graduate assistants. Each of the black males were randomly assigned to one of the two black conditions (black male newscaster or black female newscaster). The same procedure was done for white female proctors. Demographic information such as sex, race and age were determined from the questionnaire. More information on demographics can be found under Appendix B.

The experiment took place in four adjoining classrooms in the Communication Arts and Sciences Building. This location was chosen because of the nature of the connecting rooms and its central location on campus. One slide projector with slides of each type of newscaster was placed in each room. Each room was arranged to allow 25 students to be seated per session. Actual number of persons seated per session and condition can be found in Appendices C and D under Tables 7, 8 and 9.

Each experimental testing lasted approximately twenty minutes. Ten minutes separated the two sessions to allow preparation for the next testing. Proctors returned the questionnaires to the researcher who separated them into appropriate categories.

There were a total of 169 questionnaires of each race and sex used in the study. Eighty-seven questionnaires were completed by blacks. Eighty-two questionnaires were completed by whites. Females completed 89 questionnaires for the study analysis. Males completed 80 questionnaires for the analysis. Forty questionnaires of black males were used in the analysis. Forty-seven questionnaires of black females were used in the study analysis. Forty-two questionnaires were completed by white females. White males completed 40 questionnaires for the analysis. The results section of this thesis discusses the study findings.

LIMITATIONS

It is clear that the use of a student population weakened the generalizations of this research. Nevertheless, using convenience and student samples are commonly acceptable procedures in experiments (see, for example, Durand, Teel and Bearden 1979). The nature of the story for the attractive scale is rather grim. A more neutral story could have been used to fit this scale. Using slides instead of videotape of newscasters constituted another limitation. Although newscasters' performance and speech are likely to be significant influences of their believability, due to experimental control purposes, slides were used in this study in lieu of videotape.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

This section contains the analysis of the experiment. Chi-square and t-tests were used to test the results. The Chi-square was used to determine whether a systematic relationship exists between: 1) gender of subject and preference of anchor based on gender and 2) gender of subject and believability of news based on gender of anchor. T-test were employed to discover and evaluate significant differences between the effects of: 1) race of newscaster and subject on newscaster's believability, 2) newscasters and subject on newscaster's gender of believability and 3) race and gender of newscaster and race of subject on newscaster's believability.

Weekday Television Hours

Figure 1 shows that subjects watched a minimum of zero and a maximum of 20 hours of television during the weekday. Subjects watched an average of 3.07 weekday television hours. The average television hours for blacks and whites were 4.82 and 2.91 respectively. Male subjects watched an average of 3.47 hours of weekday television, whereas female subjects watched 2.71 hours.



Figure 1 Weekday TV Hours (average per weekday)

Weekend Television Hours

All subjects watched an average of 4.55 hours of weekend television. Figure 2 shows that the amount of television blacks watched on the weekend did not vary much from that of whites. Black subjects watched, on average, 4.82 hours of television, while white subjects watched 4.25 hours. Male subjects watched an average of 5.03 hours of television on the weekend. Female subjects averaged 4.10 hours.



Weekend TV Hours (average per weekend)

Daily Local News Hours

All subjects viewed about 46 minutes of local television news daily. White subjects watched approximately 40 minutes of local news each day, which is 7.02 minutes less than the all subject mean. Blacks watched 51 minutes of news daily. Both female and male subjects viewed nearly 46 minutes of local television news. The actual amount of time subjects watched local television news daily is shown in figure 3.



Figure 3 Daily News Hours (average per day)

Watch News At School

Sixty-two percent (105) of 169 subjects indicated that they do watch news while at school, while 37 percent (63) do not. Table 1 shows the breakdown of those subjects who do and do not watch local television news while at school.

Table 1 Watch News At School

| Value Label | | Value Fre | quency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|----------------------|-----|---------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Yes No Missing | | 1 2 9 | 105 63 1 | 62.1 37.3 .6 | 62.5 37.5 MISSING | 62.5 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 169 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Valid Cases | 168 | Missing Cases | 1 | | | |

Watch News At Home

Table 2 indicates that 30 percent or 50 of 169 subjects do not watch local television news while at home. However, 70 percent or 119 subjects do watch news while at home.

Table 2 Watch News At Home

| Value Label | | Value | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cum Percent |
|-------------|-----|------------|-----------|--------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Yes No | | 1 2 | 119 50 | 70.4 29.6 | 70.4 29.6 | 70.4 100.0 |
| | | TOTAL | 169 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Valid Cases | 169 | Missing Ca | ses O | | | |

Newscast Preference

The Chi-square contingency analysis indicates that no statistically significant relationship exists between gender of the subject and preference of anchor based on gender at the .05 level. Without being faced with an actual situation, most of the subjects had no preference for anchors. Table 3 shows that 72 of 89 females responded that they had no gender preference in anchors for a newscast, while nine of them preferred a female anchor and eight preferred a male anchor.

Similarly, table 4 indicates that 56 of 80 males preferred neither a female nor male anchor, whereas 13 of them preferred a newscast with a male anchor and 11 preferred a newscast with a female anchor.

| | Category | Cases Observed | Expected | Residual |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Female Male No Preference | 1 2 3 | 9 8 72 | 29.67 29.67 29.67 | -20.67 -21.67 42.33 |
| | Total | 89 | | |
| Chi-Square 90.629 | D.F. 2 | | Significance .000 | |

Table 3Newscast Prefer To Watch (Females)

Table 4 Newscast Prefer To Watch (Males)

| | Category | Cases Observed | Expected | Residual |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Female Male No. Preference | 1 2 2 | 11 13 | 26.67 26.67 | -15.67 -13.67 |
| NO Freierence | J Total | 56 80 | 26.67 | 29.33 |
| Chi-Square 48.475 | D | D.F. 2 | | ance O |

News More Believable

No statistically significant relationship exists between gender of the subject and believability of news based on gender of the anchor at the .05 level. As with newscast preference, subjects were not faced with an actual situation and most of them had no preference of anchor. Tables 5 and 6 illustrate that 79 of 89 female subjects and 61 of 80 male subjects reported that news would be more believable if delivered by either a female or male anchor. Four females and three males indicated that news would be more believable if delivered by a female anchor, whereas six females and 16 males noted that news would be more believable if delivered by a male anchor.

Table 5 News More Believable (Females)

| | Category | Cases Observed | Expected | Residual |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Female Male | 1 | 4 | 29.67 29.67 | -25.67 -23.67 |
| No Preference | 3 | 79 | 29.67 | 49.33 |
| | Total | 89 | | |
| Chi-Square 123.124 | D.F. 2 | | Significance .000 | |

Table 6 News More Believable (Males)

| | Category | Cases Observed | Expected | Residual |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|
| Female | 1 | 3 | 26 67 | 02 67 |
| Male | 2 | 16 | 26.67 | -23.67 |
| No Preference | 3 | 61 | 26.67 | 34.33 |
| | Total | 80 | | |
| Chi-Square 69.475 | D.F. 2 | | Significance .000 | |

The following data analyzed newscasters' believability. Believability, as noted in Chapter 2, is comprised of credibility, attractiveness and preference. The 7-point semantic differential scales of objectivesubjective, sincere-insincere, trustworthy-untrustworthy and informed-uninformed measured credibility, while gloomyattractive-unattractive and cheerful. tense-relaxed measured attractiveness. The individual newscaster value and group value ranges were used to tabulate the credibility and attractiveness scale ratings range. However, group scores for appropriate scales were used rather than individual newscaster scores. The individual newscaster value range is the sum of each scale item measuring 1) credibility or 2) attractiveness. The group value range is the sum of the individual newscaster value range multiplied by the number of newscasters shown in each group. Since four scale items with values of 1 through 7 (see above for breakdown) were used for credibility, the scale ratings range is as follows: individual newscaster value range = 4 - 28, group value range = 12 - 84. Three scale items (see above for breakdown) with values of 1 through 7 were used to measure attractiveness. The individual newscaster value range for attractiveness is 3-21, while the group value range is 9 - 63. A low rating indicates a favorable assessment, while a high rating signifies an unfavorable assessment.

T-tests were employed to determine whether any differences existed among newscasters for credibility and Preference analyzed attractiveness. was not since preference of newscasters was not significant in the chisquare test. Credibility and attractiveness had to be significant at the .05 level to confirm the subhypothesis. The pooled variance estimate was used when the F-value observed significance level was large, or greater than .05. Conversely, the separate variance estimate was used when the F-value observed significance level was small, or less than .05. T-Test analysis can be found in the appendix.

Subhypothesis #1: Race will generate significant differences in the believability of newscasters among subjects.

A. Black subjects will judge black newscasters as more believable than white newscasters. Black newscasters obtained a mean of 46.5 for credibility, whereas white newscasters obtained a mean of 50.3. The pooled variance t-value of -2.6 is significant at the .05 level, thus the null hypothesis was rejected for credibility (Table 10). Differences do exist in black subjects' perceptions of black newscasters and white newscasters.

Black subjects gave black newscasters a mean rating of 33.8 for attractiveness and gave white newscasters a mean of 35.6 Table 11 shows the pooled variance t-value of -1.5 is not significant. Therefore, the data failed to reject the null hypothesis for attractiveness.

B. White subjects will judge white newscasters as more believable than black newscasters. White subjects gave white newscasters a mean rating of 46.4 and gave black newscasters a mean of 44.9 for credibility (Table 12). The t-value was .84 (pooled variance) and not significant. Thus, the data failed to reject the null hypothesis for credibility.

Table 13 shows that white subjects gave white newscasters a mean rating of 32.3 for attractiveness, whereas they gave black newscasters a mean rating of 34.9. The separate variance t-value of -2.71 is significant at the level of .05, thus the null was rejected for attractiveness. A difference does exist between the means for black and white newscasters for attractiveness.

Subhypothesis #2: Gender will generate significant differences in the believability of newscasters among subjects.

A. Female subjects will judge male newscasters as more believable than female newscasters. The mean rating male newscasters received for credibility was 47.5, while female newscasters received a 47.5 (Table 14). The pooled variance t-value was .01 and not significant at the .05 level. Thus, the data failed to reject the null for credibility.

Table 15 shows that female subjects gave male newscasters a mean rating of 34.0 for attractiveness. They gave female newscasters a mean of 33.3. The pooled variance t-value of .64 is not significant. Thus, the data failed to reject the null hypothesis for attractiveness.

B. Male subjects will judge male newscasters as more believable than female newscasters. Male newscasters obtained a mean of 45.1 for credibility, while their counterparts received a mean of 48.2. Table 16 indicates that the pooled variance t-value of -2.0 is significant, thus rejecting the null hypothesis for credibility. Differences do exist in male subjects' perceptions of male and female newscasters.

Male newscasters attained a mean of 35.7 for Female newscasters attractiveness from male subjects. attained a mean of 33.7 (Table 17). The pooled variance tvalue was 1.8 and not significant at the .05 level. The failed to data support the null hypothesis for attractiveness.

Subhypothesis #3: Race and gender will generate significant differences in the believability of newscasters among subjects.

A. White subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters. White male newscasters received a mean of 44.9 for credibility, whereas black males received a mean of 45.4. The separate

variance t-value, as shown in Table 18, was -.23 and not significant at the .05 level. The data failed to reject the null hypothesis for credibility.

White male newscasters obtained a mean of 33.0 for attractiveness, while black male newscasters obtained a 34.7 (Table 19). The separate t-value of -1.2 is not significant. The data failed to confirm the null, therefore, no difference exist between the means for attractiveness.

B. White subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters. White subjects gave white male newscasters a mean rating of 45.8 for credibility. They gave black female newscasters a mean rating of 45.1. Table 20 shows the pooled variance t-value of .32 is not significant, thus, failing to reject the null hypothesis for credibility.

Table 21 indicates that white male newscasters received a mean of 33.0 for attractiveness, while black female newscasters received a mean of 35.2. The pooled tvalue was -1.3 and not significant at the .05 level. No statistical support was rendered for attractiveness.

C. White subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters. White male newscasters received a mean of 44.9 for credibility, while white female newscasters received a 47.8. The pooled t-value was -1.1 and not significant (Table 22). The data

failed to reject the null hypothesis for credibility.

For attractiveness, white male newscasters obtained a mean of 33.0, whereas white female newscasters received a mean of 31.5. The pooled t-value of .98 is not significant (Table 23). The data failed to reject the null for attractiveness.

D. White subjects will judge white female newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters. The means received by white female and black male newscasters for credibility were 47.8 and 45.4 (Table 24). The separate variance t-value of 1.1 is not significant at the .05 level. No significant differences exist between white female newscasters and black male newscasters as judged by white subjects.

White female newscasters attained a mean of 31.5 for attractiveness, whereas black male newscasters attained a mean rating of 34.7. Table 25 shows that white subjects deemed white female newscasters significantly more attractive than black male newscasters. The separate tvalue of -2.6 is significant at the .05 level. Differences do exist in white subjects' perceptions of white female and black male newscasters.

E. White subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters. White subjects gave black female newscasters an average rating of 44.5 for credibility. They gave white female newscasters

an average rating of 47.8 (Table 26). The pooled t-value of -1.2 is not significant. The data failed to reject the null hypothesis for credibility.

Black female newscasters attained a mean of 35.2 for attractiveness, while their counterparts received a mean of 31.5. The pooled variance t-value was 2.5 and significant at the .05 level. Contrary to the hypothesis, Table 27 indicates that white subjects judged white female newscasters significantly more attractive than black female newscasters.

F. White subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters. White subjects assessed black female newscasters an average rating of 44.5 for credibility and assessed black male newscasters an average rating of 45.4 (Table 28). The separate variance t-value of -.44 is not significant. No statistical support was rendered for the null hypothesis for credibility.

For attractiveness, white subjects gave black female and male newscasters a mean rating of 35.2 and 34.7. The separate variance t-value of .43 is not significant at the .05 level (Table 29). No significant differences exist between black female and male newscasters for attractiveness.

G. Black subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters. Black subjects assessed black female newscasters a mean of 47.5 for credibility, while black male newscasters received a mean of 45.5 (Table 30). The pooled t-value of .98 is not significant at the .05 level. Thus, no significant differences prevail between black female and male newscasters for credibility as judged by black subjects.

Black female newscasters obtained a mean of 33.7 for attractiveness, while black male newscasters obtained a 33.9. The pooled t-value of -.09 is not significant at the .05 level (Table 31). Thus, the data failed to reject this hypothesis.

H. Black subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters. Black female newscasters received a mean of 47.5 for credibility and white female newscasters received a 51. Table 32 shows that the pooled t-value of -1.8 is not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis for credibility was not supported.

Black female newscasters acquired an average rating of 33.7 for attractiveness, while white female newscasters acquired an average rating of 33.6. The pooled variance t-value was .10 and not significant (Table 33). No statistical support was rendered for the null hypothesis for attractiveness. I. Black subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters. White male newscasters attained a mean of 49.5 for credibility. Black female newscasters received a mean of 47.5 (Table 34). The pooled t-value of 1.1 is not significant at the .05 level. The data failed to reject the null hypothesis for credibility.

Table 35 shows that significant differences exist between black subjects' assessment of white male and black female newscasters for credibility. Black subjects assessed white male newscasters a mean rating of 37.9 for attractiveness, whereas they assessed black female newscasters as mean of 33.7. The pooled t-value of 2.9 is significant at the .05 level, thus, rejecting the null for attractiveness.

J. Black subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters. White male newscasters received a mean of 49.5 for credibility. White female newscasters received a mean of 51.0 (Table 36). The pooled t-value of -.79 is not significant at the .05 level. The data elicited no significant differences between white male and female newscasters for credibility.

Black subjects gave white male and female newscasters a mean of 37.9 and 33.6 for attractiveness (Table 37). The pooled variance t-value of 2.4 is significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis for attractiveness was

rejected.

K. Black subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters. White male newscasters attained a mean rating of 49.5 for credibility, whereas black male newscasters attained a mean of 45.5. Table 38 shows that the pooled value of 1.8 is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the data failed to support the null hypothesis for credibility.

Black subjects deemed black male newscasters more attractive than white male newscasters. Black subjects gave white male newscasters a mean of 37.9 for attractiveness and gave their counterparts a mean of 33.9 (Table 39). The pooled t-value of 2.4 is significant at the .05 level.

L. Black subjects will judge white female newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters. White female newscasters obtained a mean rating of 51.0 for credibility. Black male newscasters obtained a mean rating of 45.5. The pooled variance t-value of 2.5 is significant at the .05 level. Table 40 indicates a significant difference exists between black subjects' perceptions of white female and black male newscasters for credibility.

White female newscasters attained a mean of 33.6, while black male newscasters attained a mean of 33.9 for attractiveness. The pooled variance t-value of -.16 is not significant at .05 (Table 41). The data failed to reject the null for attractiveness.

M. Female subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters. White male newscasters obtained a mean of 48.8 for credibility, while their counterparts obtained a mean of 46.1. The separate variance t-value of 1.3 is not significant at the .05 level (Table 42). The data failed to reject the null for credibility.

White male newscasters received a mean of 35.0, while black male newscasters received a mean of 33.0 for attractiveness. Table 43 shows that the pooled t-value of 1.3 is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the data failed to confirm the null hypothesis for attractiveness.

N. Female subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters. White male newscasters received a mean rating of 48.8 for credibility. Black females received a mean rating of 45.4 (Table 44). The pooled t-value of 1.4 is not significant at the .05 level. No significant differences exist between white male and black female newscasters for credibility as judged by female subjects.

For attractiveness, white male newscasters attained a mean of 35.0, while black females attained a mean of 35.1. The pooled t-value of -.03 is not significant (Table 45). The data failed to reject the null hypothesis for attractiveness. 0. Female subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters. Female subjects gave white male and female newscasters a mean rating of 48.8 and 49.5 for credibility. The pooled tvalue of -.25 is not significant at the .05 level. Table 46 signifies no significant differences exists between white male and female newscasters for credibility.

Female subjects assessed white male and female newscasters mean ratings of 35.0 and 31.7 for attractiveness (Table 47). The pooled t-value of 1.8 is not significant at the .05 level. The data failed to reject the null hypothesis for attractiveness.

P. Female subjects will judge black male newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters. Black male newscasters received a 46.1 mean, while white female newscasters received a 49.5 mean. The separate t-value of-1.5 is not significant at the .05 level (Table 48). The data failed to reject the null hypothesis for credibility.

Black male newscasters received a mean of 33.0 for attractiveness, while white female newscasters received a mean of 31.7. The pooled t-value of .78, shown in Table 49, is not significant. The data failed to reject the null hypothesis for attractiveness.

Q. Female subjects will judge white female newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters. White and black female newscasters received mean ratings of 49.5 and 45.4 for credibility (Table 50). The pooled variance t-value of 1.6 is not significant at the .05 level. No statistical support was rendered for credibility.

Female subjects gave white female newscasters a mean of 31.7 for attractiveness, while they gave black female newscasters a mean of 35.1. The separate t-value of -2.1 is significant at the .05 level (Table 51). Female subjects deemed white female newscasters significantly more attractive than black female newscasters.

R. Female subjects will judge black male newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters. Black male newscasters obtained a mean of 46.4 for credibility. Black female newscasters obtained a mean of 45.6. The separate t-value of .50 is not significant at the .05 level (Table 52). The data failed to reject the null hypothesis for credibility.

Black male newscasters attained a mean of 33.0 for attractiveness, while black female newscasters attained a mean of 35.1. The pooled t-value of -1.6 is not significant at the .05 level (Table 53). No statistical support was rendered for the null hypothesis for attractiveness.

S. Male subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters. For credibility, male subjects gave black female and male

newscasters a mean rating of 46.8 and 44.8. The pooled tvalue of .87 is not significant (Table 54). No significant differences exist between ratings black female and male newscasters received from male subjects for credibility.

Male subjects assessed black female newscasters an average rating of 33.7 for attractiveness. They assessed black male newscasters an average rating of 35.6 (Table 55). The pooled t-value of -1.3 is not significant at the .05 level. The data failed to reject the null for attractiveness.

T. Male subjects will judge black female newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters. Black female newscasters obtained a mean of 46.8 for credibility, whereas their counterparts obtained a mean of 49.6 (Table 56). The pooled t-value of -1.3 is not significant at the .05 level. The data failed to reject the null for credibility.

Male subjects gave both black and white female newscasters a mean of 33.7 for attractiveness (Table 57). The t-value of .00 is not significant at the .05 level. No statistical support was rendered for the null hypothesis for attractiveness.

U. Male subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black female newscasters. White male newscasters attained a mean of 45.4 for credibility, whereas black female newscasters attained a mean of 46.8

(Table 58). The pooled t-value of -.64 is not significant. Male subjects saw no significant differences between white male and black female newscasters.

For attractiveness, white male newscasters received 35.8 and black female newscasters received a mean of 33.7 (Table 59). The pooled t-value of 1.3 is not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the data failed to support the null hypothesis for attractiveness.

V. Male subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters. White male newscasters received a mean rating of 45.4 for credibility, while white female newscasters received a mean rating of 49.6 (Table 60). The pooled variance t-value of -2.0 is significant. Male subjects deemed white male newscasters more credible than white female newscasters.

White male newscasters attained a mean of 35.8 for attractiveness, while white female newscasters attained a mean of 33.7. The pooled t-value of 1.3, shown in Table 61, is not significant. The data elicited no statistical support for the null hypothesis for attractiveness.

W. Male subjects will judge white male newscasters as more believable than black male newscasters. Male subjects gave white male newscasters a mean rating of 45.5 for credibility. They gave black male newscasters a mean rating of 44.8. The pooled t-value of .28 is not significant (Table 62). The data failed to reject the null

for credibility.

White male newscasters received a mean rating of 35.8 for attractiveness, while black male newscasters received a mean of 35.6. The pooled t-value of .19 is not significant (Table 63). Therefore, the data rendered no statistically significant differences for attractiveness.

X. Male subjects will judge black male newscasters as more believable than white female newscasters. Black male newscasters received a mean rating of 44.8 for credibility, while white females received a mean rating of 49.6. The pooled t-value of -2.1, shown in Table 64, is significant at the .05 level. Therefore, male subjects judged black male newscasters significantly more credible than white female newscasters.

For attractiveness, black male newscasters received a mean of 35.6, while white female newscasters received a mean rating of 33.7 (Table 65). The pooled t-value of -1.3 is not significant at the .05 level. The data failed to reject the null for attractiveness.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Most subjects were classified as light viewers for Black subjects watched the most weekday television. weekday television of all subjects, followed by males, whites and females. Black subjects watched slightly more weekday (almost two hours more) television than white subjects. Both black and white subjects in this research watched 1.7 and .5 hours more television than black and white subjects of other studies (see for example Bales, There was not much disparity in the amount of 1985). television male and female subjects watched during the Both males and females were considered light weekday. Male subjects watched .7 hours more weekday viewers. television than female subjects.

Male subjects watched more television on the weekends, followed by black, white and female subjects. Black and white subjects watched approximately the same amount of television on the weekends. Blacks, however, watched roughly one half hour more television than whites. Male subjects watched one hour more weekend television than female subjects. Males generally watch more television on the weekend because more sporting events are televised than during the weekday.

Blacks watched more television news than all subjects. Males and females watched roughly the same amount of local television news, followed by whites. Black subjects watched 11 minutes more of local television news than did white subjects. One reason could be that blacks tend to rely more heavily on television for local news than whites, who generally utilize other media.68

Most subjects usually watched the early and late evening newscasts, however, many reported watching morning news breaks. Most of these subjects probably watch the early and late evening newscasts because it usually does not conflict with their classes.

Subjects reported no preference for gender of newscaster. This could possibly explain why many of the newscasters received neutral ratings on the individual scales. Gender of newscaster was also not a factor in determining whether news is more believable. No one newscaster was preferred overall substantially more than any other newscaster in his/her group (i.e. black male newscasters, white male newscasters, etc.).

Subhypothesis #1 assessed race of subject and newscaster as factors in determining newscaster believability. This hypothesis assumed that subjects would identify more with newscasters of the same ethnicity. As hypothesized, black subjects deemed black newscasters more credible than white newscasters. However, no statistical support was rendered for white subjects' assessment of black and white newscasters for credibility. It was noted that people tend to identify more with those of similar characteristics and ethnicity. Based on this premise, black subjects should have rated black newscasters more credible than white newscasters and white subjects should have rated white newscasters more credible than black newscasters. (But the latter did not occur.)

For attractiveness, white subjects deemed white more attractive than black newscasters. newscasters Attractiveness is a subjective phenomenon, insomuch that individuals unconsciously utilize predisposed perceptions to judge others. Therefore, individuals may find certain since their attractive features, people own characteristics, background, etc. are more similar to certain people. More specifically, whites may find white newscasters more attractive than black newscasters simply because they are white. No significantly statistical support was sustained for black subjects favoring or not favoring black and white newscasters for attractiveness.

Subhypothesis #2 examined gender of subject and newscaster in determining believability. This hypothesis assumed that female subjects would be prejudiced against female newscasters. It also assumed that male subjects would perceive male newscasters more credible than their counterparts. Male subjects, as predicted, rated male

newscasters more credible than female newscasters. These subjects may agree with typical sex-stereotypes regarding men's roles. They may perceive the "ideal" newscaster as being a male, thus rating male newscasters more credible than female newscasters. Society has socialized us to regard females as meek and submissive and males as authoritative and domineering. At present, a slight shift is occurring in sex roles and attitudes toward females. More often, females are being viewed as authoritative and assertive. In prime time, The Cosby Show's Claire Huxtable (Phylicia Rashad), Murphy Brown's Murphy Brown (Candice Bergen) and Dynasty's Alexis Carrington (Joan Collins) and (Diahann Carroll) are specifically Dominique Devereux typecast as very authoritative, articulate, domineering, and even shrewd women. Even though some of these roles are somewhat extreme, i.e. Carrington and Devereux, they are, nonetheless, moving away from typical television portrayals. This research yielded no statistical support for male subjects deeming or not deeming male and female newscasters attractive.

Differences could exist in female subjects' perceptions about credibility and attractiveness of male and female newscasters, however, no statistical support was rendered.

Subhypothesis #3 evaluated race and gender of newscaster and subject and any differences generated. Race, when combined with gender, did produce some differences in

the perception of newscaster attractiveness and credibility. Only four of the 24 subhypotheses pertaining six credibility and of the 24 attractiveness to subhypotheses generated significant differences. Black subhypothesis #3L, deemed black male subjects, in newscasters more credible than white female newscasters. This finding supports Johnson's theory that blacks perceive black male newscasters as the most believable newscaster. Female subjects in subhypothesis #3P judged black male newscasters more credible than white female newscasters. This subhypothesis upholds Goldberg's conjecture that females are biased toward other females and perceive them inferior to males. These subjects, as were the girl as subjects in Tan, et al study (1980), could be predisposed in their perceptions about sex stereotypes of males and females. These females could be conditioned to believe that the ideal newscaster is a male. As a result of these predispositions, they may deem it inappropriate for females to be newscaster, thus buying into and further perpetuating the sex-role stereotype. In subhypothesis #3V, gender definitely altered male subjects' perceptions of newscasters. Male subjects judged white male newscasters credible white female more than newscasters. Not surprising, the same holds true for subhypothesis #3X. Male subjects deemed black male newscasters more credible than white female newscasters.
vielded similar results. Not Attractiveness surprising, white subjects, in subhypothesis #3D, deemed white female newscasters significantly more attractive than black male newscasters. This supports the theory that people tend to identify more with those who are of the same ethnic background and who have similar characteristics. White subjects - in subhypothesis #3E - rated white female newscasters more attractive than their black counterparts. race is a predominant factor in determining Here, newscaster attractiveness. In subhypothesis #31, black subjects judged black female newscasters more attractive than white male newscasters. This supports the notion that attractiveness is a subjective phenomenon. Black subjects deemed white female newscasters more attractive than white male newscasters. Gender, in subhypothesis #3J, is clearly an underlying factor. Ferri and Keller contented that female newscasters are more often judged by their physical male newscasters. As with appearance, than are subhypothesis #3E, race is a dominant factor in both subhypothesis #3K and #3Q. In subhypothesis #3K, black subjects rated black male newscasters more attractive than white male newscasters, while female subjects, in subhypothesis #3Q, deemed white female newscasters more attractive than black female newscasters.

Race and gender affected viewers' perceptions in the believability of newscasters. Black subjects deemed black

newscasters more credible than white newscasters, while white subjects deemed white newscasters more attractive than black newscasters. Male subjects rated male newscasters more credible than female newscasters. Race and gender, when combined, affected viewers' perceptions in the believability of newscasters. Black subjects deemed black white female male newscasters more credible than newscasters. Female subjects judged black male newscasters more credible than female newscasters. Male subjects rated white male newscasters more credible than white female newscasters, while they rated black male newscasters more credible than white female newscasters. Minorities are found in highly visible roles in television news, i.e., anchors, reporters and some talk show hosts, but not as decision-makers (producers, news directors and assignment editors.) Furthermore, the presence of blacks in the broadcasting industry has declined. The number of black female newscasters over the last ten years has remained constant. However, the number of black male newscasters have steadily dropped during this same period. If this trend continues, the presence of blacks in the broadcasting industry will continue to plummet, if not vanish all together.

There is a scarcity of positive black role models with which black viewers can identify. Television, for the most part, is a white-oriented media. Current programs

61

pertaining to minorities, especially blacks, conform to this orientation in the overall compatibility of the substance of story lines and plots. More specifically, programs may show blacks and whites working together in the same environment, however, blacks more often will be subordinates, whereas whites more often will be superiors, i.e., a black homicide detective and white chief of police, or a black lieutenant governor and white governor. It is the underlying premise of these type of programs that ultimately affect viewers' perceptions about blacks. Deeprooted societal perceptions of blacks and females have carried over into broadcasting and have served as a catalyst in perpetuating race and sex stereotypes on television.

Marginal gains, such as few anchors and talk show hosts, are not enough. Station owners, managers, as well as news and program directors must recognize the need to issues of and class. Minorities, in address race particularly black men, must be assigned to rank and file jobs that lead to decision-making positions. Decisionmakers can not continue to relegate black men to underpaid, underutilized positions such as cameramen, ENG editors or stagehands, which ultimately lead to dead-end, nonmanagerial careers. The broadcast industry must actively recruit, retain and recommend blacks and females for visible positions in the media that ultimately can affect

the quality and content of news and entertainment programming.

The concept of believability encompasses an array of dimensions ranging from attractiveness and credibility to appeal. It is apparent that attractiveness is an important determining newscasters' believability. Any factor in differences in subjects' perceptions of attractiveness may have been determined by external factors not measured in this study. Subjects' perceptions of attractiveness should examined more carefully to better gauge have been believability of newscasters. Newscasters' performance should also be accounted for when assessing believability. Studies have indicated that subjects considered voice and speech as the most desirable attributes in measuring newscaster appeal. Future research in this area may consider conjoint analysis of attractiveness а and credibility, evaluating both factors in clusters.

The limitation and generalization of this study results from the use of college students. Some differences in subjects' perceptions might be related to the makeup of the population - college students. College students' perceptions are different than those of the general population. College students know that they should be enlightened, therefore they tend to be more open-minded and accepting of diverse ideologies than the general population. Opportunities for future research merits

63

ENDNOTES

1. Jannette Dates, "Race, Racial Attitudes and Adolescent Perceptions of Black Television Characters," Journal of Broadcasting 24, no. 4 (Fall 1980): 558.

2. Vernon Stone, "Women Gain, Black Men Lose Ground in Newsrooms," RTNDA COMMUNICATOR, (August 1987): 9.

3. Ibid., 10.

4. Alan Rubin, "Uses, Gratifications, and Media Effects Research," in <u>Perspectives on Media Effects</u>, eds. Jennings Bryant and Dolf Zillman (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates 1986), 281.

5. Alan Rubin, "An Examination of Television Viewing Motivations," <u>Communication Research</u>," 8 no. 2 (April 1981): 155.

6. Ibid., 160.

7. Carolyn A. Stroman and Lee B. Becker, "Racial Differences in Gratifications," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u>, 55 (Autumn 1980): 769.

8. Bradley S. Greenberg, "Minorities and the Mass Media," in <u>Perspectives on Media Effects</u>, eds. Jennings Bryant and Dolf Zillman (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates 1986): 166.

9. James W. Carey, "Variations in Negro/White Television Preferences," Journal of Broadcasting 6 (Summer 1966): 206.

10. Dates, "Racial Attitudes," 552.

11. Ibid., 554.

12. Stuart Surlin and Joseph R. Dominick, "Television's Function as a Third Parent for Black and White Teenagers," Journal of Broadcasting 15 (Winter 1970-71): 62.

13. Bradley S. Greenberg and Carrie Heeter, "Mass Media Orientations Among Hispanic Youths," <u>Hispanic Journal of</u> <u>Behavioral Sciences</u> 5, no. 3 (1983): 318.

14. Ibid., 314-315.

15. Lola M. Egan, "Children's Viewing Patterns for Television News," Journalism Quarterly 55, no. 2 (Summer 1978): 340?

16. Ibid., 341?

17. Bradley S. Greenberg and Brenda Dervin, "The Role of the Mass Media for Urban Poor Adults," in <u>Uses of the Mass</u> <u>Media by the Urban Poor</u> eds. Bradley S. Greenberg and Brenda Dervin (New York: Praeger Publishers 1970): 15.

18. Ibid., 17.

19. Paula Poindexter and Carolyn A. Stroman, "Blacks and Television: A Review of the Research Literature," <u>Journal</u> of Broadcasting 25, no.2 (Spring 1981): 104.

20. Churchill Roberts, "The Portrayal of Blacks on Network Televison," Journal of Broadcasting 15, no.1 (Winter 1970-71): 52.

21. Judith Lemon, "Women and Blacks on Prime-time Television," Journal of Communication 27 (Autumn 1977): 73-74.

22. Ibid., 78.

23. Knolly Moses, "The Black Image on Television, Who Controls It?," <u>Black Enterprise</u> 10, no.2 (September 1979): 38.

24. Alexis S. Tan and Gerdean Tan, "Television Use and Self-esteem of Blacks," Journal of Communication 29 (Winter 1979): 134.

25. Dates, "Racial Attitudes," 554.

26. Greenberg and Heeter, "Mass Media Hispanic Youths," 312.

27. Leo Bogart, "Negro and White Media Exposure: New Evidence," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 49 (Spring 1972): 18-20. Richard M. Durand, Jesse E. Teel, Jr. and William O. Bearden, "Racial Differences in Perceptions of Media Advertising Credibility," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 16 (Autumn 1979): 565.

28. Bogart, "Negro and White Media," 20-21.

29. Fred Bales, "Television Use and Confidence in Television by Blacks and Whites in Four Selected Years, Journal of Black Studies 16, no.3 (March 1985): 285-286.

30. Greenberg and Dervin, "Mass Media for Poor," 15.

31. Ibid., 17.

32. Ibid., 14-17.

33. Richard Allen and David E. Clarke, "Ethnicity and Mass Media Behavior: A Study of Blacks and Latinos," Journal of Broadcasting 24, no. 1 (Winter 1980): 27.

34. Ibid., 27-29.

35. Ibid., 28-29.

36. Larry J. Weber and Dan B. Fleming, "Black Adolescent and the News," <u>Journal of Negro Education</u> 53, no.1 (1984): 87-88.

37. Egan, "Children's Viewing Patterns," 340.

38. Greenberg and Dervin, "Mass Media for Poor," 23.

39. Ibid.

40. Tan and Tan, "Self-esteem of Blacks," 134.

41. Elizabeth Johnson, "Credibility of Black and White Newscasters to a Black Audience," <u>Journal of Broadcasting</u> 28, no. 3 (Summer 1984): 367.

42. Elizabeth Johnson, "Believability of Newscasters to Black Television Viewers," <u>Western Journal of Black Studies</u> 11, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 64.

43. Kevin L. Hutchinson, "The Effects of Newscaster Gender and Vocal Quality on Perceptions of Homophily and Interpersonal Attraction," <u>Journal of Broadcasting</u> 26, no.1 (Winter 1982): 465.

44. Alexis Tan, Jack Raudy, Cary Huff and Janet Miles, "Children's Reaction to Male and Female Newscasters: Effectiveness and Believability," <u>Quarterly Journal of</u> Speech 66 (April 1980): 204-205.

45. Ibid., 205.

46. Ibid.

47. L. Theresa Silverman-Watkins, Stephen C. Levi and Meryl A. Klein, "Sex-stereotyping as Factor in Children's Comprehension of Television News," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 63, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 9-10.

48. Susan Whittaker and Ron Whittaker, "Relative Effectiveness of Male and Female Newscasters," <u>Journal of</u> Broadcasting 20, no. 2 (Spring 1976): 182.

49. Vernon A. Stone, "Attitudes Toward Television Newswomen," Journal of Broadcasting 18, no. 1, (Winter 1973-74): 56-57.

50. Ibid., 59.

51. Charles M. Rossiter, Jr., "Sex of the Speaker, Sex of the Listener and Listening Comprehension," Journal of Communication 22 (March 1972): 67.

52. James O. Whittaker and Robert D. Meade, "Sex of the Communicator As a Variable in Source Credibility," <u>Journal</u> of Social Psychology 72 (1967): 33.

53. Phillip Goldberg, "Are Women Prejudiced Against Women?," Trans-Action 5 (April 1968): 30.

54. Robert E. Balon, Joseph C. Philport and Charles F. Beadle, "How Sex and Race Affect Perceptions of Newscasters," Journalism Quarterly 55 (Spring 1978): 163.

55. Ibid., 162.

56. Johnson, "Believability of Newscasters," 67.

57. Herschel Shosteck, "Factors Influencing Appeal of Television News Personalities," <u>Journal of Broadcasting</u> 18, no. 1 (Winter 1973-74): 70.

58. Keith P. Sanders and Michael Prichett, "Some Influences of Appearance on Television Newscaster Appeal," Journal of Broadcasting 15, no. 3 (Summer 1971): 296-297.

59. Ibid., 298.

60. James W. Tankard, Jr., Sean Mccleneghan, Vijay Ganju, Eui Bun Lee, Cheryl Olkes and Diane Dubose, "Nonverbal Cues and Television News," <u>Journal of</u> <u>Communication</u> 27, no. 4 (Autumn 1977): 110-111? 61. William L. Cathcart, "Viewer Needs and Desires in Television Newscasters," Journal of Broadcasting 14, no. 1 (Winter 1969-70): 60.

62. Shosteck, "Appeal of Television News Personalities," 67.

63. Stone, "Women Gain," 11.

64. Loy A. Singleton and Stephanie L. Cook, "Television Network News Reporting by Female Correspondents: An Update," Journal of Broadcasting 26, no. 1 (Winter 1982): 489.

65. Anthony J. Ferri and Jo E. Keller, "Perceived Career Barriers for Female Television News Anchors," <u>Journalism</u> Quarterly 6, no. 3 (Autumn 1986): 465.

66. Ibid., 464-465.

67. Ibid., 467.

68. Leo Bogart, "Negro and White Media Exposure: New Evidence," Journalism Quarterly 49 (Spring 1972): 18-20. Richard M. Durand, Jesse E. Teel, Jr. and William O. Bearden, "Racial Differences in Perceptions of Media Advertising Credibility," Journalism Quarterly 16 (Autumn 1979): 565. APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

| The following questionnaire is part of a research project for Michigan University. Please complete the following questions. All answers we confidential and used only for this study. | vill be |
|---|-------------------------|
| PARTI | |
| 1. On a typical weekday, about how many hours of television do you watch? | (1-2) |
| Hours | |
| 2. On both Saturday and Sunday, about how many hours of television do you watch? | (3-4) |
| Hours | |
| 3. When at school, do you watch local news on television? | (5) |
| YesNo | |
| 4. When at your permanent home, do you watch local news on television? | (6) |
| YesNo | |
| 5. About how many hours of local news do you watch daily? | (7-8) |
| Hours | |
| 6. What time(s) do you usually watch the local news? | (9-11) |
| o'clock | |
| 7. Suppose two television newscasts were on at the same time of evening. the newscasts had a female anchor; the other had a male anchor. Other to being equal, which newscast do you think you would prefer to watch? | One of hings (12) |
| Female AnchorMale AnchorNo Preference | æ |
| 8. Do you think news on television would be more believable if delivered by male or female anchor? | a (13) |
| Female AnchorMale AnchorNo Preferen | CE |

.

PART II

For each question below, the administrator will show you three slides of news anchors. Please answer the following questions regarding your opinions about these anchorpeople.

1. Assume Anchor 1 is reading this promotion for the six o'clock newscast: "A young girl is dead and two families devastated. The grim consequences of drunk driving are examined tonight on Newswatch at 6."

Please rate Anchor 1 on each of the following characteristics.

| very objective | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | very subjective (14) |
|-------------------|----------|---|---|---|----------|---|-----------------------------|
| very sincere | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | very insincere (15) |
| very gloomy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | very cheerful (16) 7 |
| very attractive | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | <u> </u> | 6 | very unattractive (17) 7 |
| very tense | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | very relaxed (18) |
| very untrustworth | y | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | very trustworthy(19) 7 |
| very informed | <u> </u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | very uninformed (20) |

Anchor 1 is

2. Assume Anchor 2 is reading the following promotion for the six o'clock newscast: "A young girl is dead and two families devastated. The grim consequences of drunk driving are examined on Newswatch at 6."

Now please rate Anchor 2 on the same characteristics.

| very sincere | 1 | 2 | | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very insincere | (21) |
|-------------------|----------|---|---|---|-----------|----|---|------------------|---------|
| very subjective | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | б | 6 | 7 | _very objective | (22) |
| very cheerful | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | <u></u> 5 | 6 | 7 | _very gloomy | (23) |
| very unattractive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | -6 | 7 | _very attractive | (24) |
| very relaxed | 1 | 2 | | 4 | -5- | | 7 | _very tense | (25) |
| very untrustworth | y | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | _very trustwort | hy (36) |
| very informed | <u> </u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | 7 | _very uninformed | d (27) |

Anchor 2 is

3. Assume Anchor 3 is reading this promotion for the six o'clock newscast: "A young girl is dead and two families devastated. The grim consequences of drunk driving are examined tonight on Newswatch at 6."

Please rate Anchor 3 on the same characteristics.

| Anchor 3 is | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|----------|--------|--------|------------------|-----------------|
| very gloomy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | ទ | 6 | 7 | very cheerful | (28) |
| very objective | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very subjective | ; (29) |
| very insincere | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | ह | 6 | 7 | very sincere | (80) |
| very attractive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very unattractiv | s (81) |
| very tense | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very relaxed | (82) |
| very trustworthy | <u> </u> | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | ery untrustwort | 1 Y (88) |
| very informed | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | very uninformed | i (34) |
| 4. If you got con the three and | flictin hors v | g or di would y | ifferen: 70u bel | t repor ieve? | ts of ti | he sam | e news | story, which of | (35) |
| Anchor | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Anchor | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Anchor | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Overall, which | h of th | e thre | e anch | ors do | you pr | efer? | | | (36) |
| Anchor | 1 | | | | | | | | |

.

____Anchor 2

____Anchor 3

PART III

Please respond to some demographic questions. All responses will be confidential and used only for this study.

 1. Sex.
 (37)

 ____Female
 ___Male

 2. Race
 (38)

 ____Black
 (39)

 ____Black
 ____Mhite

 ____Hispanic

 ____Other, please specify ______
 (39-40)

Thank you for your time.

1.14

.

APPENDIX B

•

4 m

APPENDIX B

Demographic Summary

More females than males participated in the experiment. There were more blacks than whites. Black females comprised the majority of the subjects, preceded by white females. White and black males were equal in number. The youngest subject was 18 years old and the oldest was 35 years old. The average age was 20 years old. APPENDIX C



.

APPENDIX C

| SUBJECTS | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----|----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| ANCHORS | BM | BF | TOTAL | | | | | |
| BM(1,2,3) | 10 | 11 | 21 | | | | | |
| BF(4,5,6) | 10 | 12 | 22 | | | | | |
| WM(7,8,9) | 10 | 11 | 21 | | | | | |
| WF(10,11,12) | 10 | 13 | 23 | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 40 | 47 | 87 | | | | | |

SUBJECTS PER SESSION ONE Table 7

SUBJECTS PER SESSION TWO Table 8

| | SUBJECTS | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------|----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ANCHORS | WM | WF | TOTAL | | | | | | | |
| BM(1,2,3) | 10 | 10 | 20 | | | | | | | |
| BF(4,5,6) | 10 | 10 | 20 | | | | | | | |
| WM(7,8,9) | 10 | 11 | 21 | | | | | | | |
| WF(10,11,12) | 10 | 11 | 21 | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 40 | 42 | 82 | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

| | | SUBJEC | TS | | |
|--------------|----|--------|----|----|-------|
| ANCHORS | BM | BF | WM | WF | TOTAL |
| BM(1,2,3) | 10 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 41 |
| BF(4,5,6) | 10 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 42 |
| WM(7,8,9) | 10 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 42 |
| WF(10,11,12) | 10 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 44 |
| TOTAL | 40 | 47 | 40 | 42 | 169 |

.

SUBJECTS PER CONDITION Table 9

APPENDIX E

T

.

APPENDIX E

T-TESTS

| | Indepen | dent samples of / | ARACE | Race of anchor | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| | Group 1 | : ARACE EQ 1 | | Group 2: ARACE EQ 2 | | | |
| | t-test | for: CREDIBLE | Credibilit | y | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 43 44 | 46.5814 50.3409 | 6.573 6.534 | 1.002 .985 | | |
| | | Pooled Var | iance Esti | mate | Separate | Variance Estim | ate |
| | | | | A = 11 | | | |
| /alue I.01 | 2-Tail Prob. .969 | Value -2.68 Black and Ident samples of <i>i</i> | Degrees Freedom 85 White New ARACE | Table 11 Scasters/Black Subject | Talue -2.68 ts (Attractive | Degrees of Freedom 84.93 | 2-Tai Prob .009 |
| Value 1.01 | 2-Tail Prob. .969 Indepen Group 1 | t Value -2.68 Black and ident samples of / : ARACE EQ 1 | Degrees Freedom 85 White New ARACE | Table 11 Scasters/Black Subject Race of anchor Group 2: ARACE EQ 2 | Talue -2.68 ts (Attractive | Degrees of Freedom 84.93 | 2-Tai Prob .009 |
| /alue 1.01 | 2-Tail Prob. .969 .969 Indepen Group 1 t-test | T Value -2.68 Black and ident samples of / : ARACE EQ 1 for: ATTRACTI / | Degrees Freedom 85 White New ARACE Attractive | Table 11 Table 11 scasters/Black Subject Race of anchor Group 2: ARACE EQ 2 | Talue -2.68 ts (Attractive | Degrees of Freedom 84.93 | 2-Tai Prob .009 |
| F Value 1.01 | 2-Tail Prob. .969 Indepen Group 1 t-test | T Value -2.68 Black and Ident samples of / : ARACE EQ 1 for: ATTRACTI / Number of Cases | Degrees Freedom 85 White New ARACE Attractive MEAN | Table 11 scasters/Black Subject Race of anchor Group 2: ARACE EQ 2 Standard Deviation | T Value -2.68 ts (Attractive Standard Error | Degrees of Freedom 84.93 | 2-Tai Prob .009 |
| F Value 1.01 Group Group | 2-Tail Prob. .969 Indepen Group 1 t-test 1 2 | T Value -2.68 Black and dent samples of / : ARACE EQ 1 for: ATTRACTI / Number of Cases 43 44 | Degrees Freedom 85 White New ARACE Attractive MEAN 33.8372 35.6279 | Table 11 Prob. .009 Table 11 scasters/Black Subject Race of anchor Group 2: ARACE EQ 2 Standard Deviation 4.889 6.059 | ta (Attractive Standard Error .746 .924 | Degrees of Freedom 84.93 | 2-Tai Prob .009 |
| Group Group | 2-Tail Prob. .969 Indepen Group 1 t-test 1 2 | Talue -2.68 Black and Ident samples of A : ARACE EQ 1 for: ATTRACTI A Number of Cases 43 44 Pooled Var | Degrees Freedom 85 White New ARACE Attractive MEAN 33.8372 35.6279 Fiance Esti | Table 11 Prob. .009 Table 11 scasters/Black Subject Race of anchor Group 2: ARACE EQ 2 | ts (Attractive -2.68 ts (Attractive Standard Error .746 .924 Separate | Degrees of Freedom 84.93 e) Variance Estima | 2-Tai Prob .009 |

.

| | | Black a | nd White News | casters/White Subje | cts (Credible) |) | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indepe | ndent samples of | ARACE Ra | ice of anchor | | | |
| | Group | 1: ARACE EQ 2 | Gr | oup 2: ARACE EQ 1 | | | |
| | t-test | for: CREDIBLE | Credibility | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Grou Grou | p 1 p 2 | 42 40 | 46.4048 44.9750 | 8.577 6.733 | 1.323 1.065 | | |
| | | Pooled Va | riance Estime | ite | Separate \ | /ariance Estima | ate |
| F Value 1.62 | 2-Tail Prob. .132 | t Value .84 | Degrees of Freedom 80 | 2-Tail Prob. .405 | t Value .84 | Degrees of Freedom 77.24 | 2-Tail Prob. .403 |

| | | BL | ack an | d White Ne | Tab wscasters | le 13 s/White Subjec | ts (Attractive | :) | |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indeper | ndent sampi | es of | ARACE | Race of | anchor | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ARACE E | Q 2 | | Group 2 | ARACE EQ 1 | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATTR | ACTI | Attractive | • | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | St andar d Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 42 40 | | 32.3333 34.9500 | | 5.015 3.658 | .774 .578 | | |
| | | Poo | led Va | riance Est | imete | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 1.88 | Prob. .050 | | t Value -2.69 | Degrees Freedom 80 | of 2-Ta Prol .0 | iil 2. 39 | t Value -2.71 | Degrees of Freedom 75.00 | 2-Tail Prob. .008 |
| | | Ma | le and | l Female Ne | Tab | le 14 s/Female Subid | ote (Cradible | N | |
| ••••• | Indeper | vdent samo | es of | ASEX | Sex of | nchor | | , | |
| | Group | : ASEX EG | 2 | | Group 2 | ASEX EQ 1 | | | |
| | t-test | for: CRED | IBLE | Credibilii | | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | • | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 43 46 | | 47.5581 47.5435 | | 6.741 8.458 | 1.028 1.247 | | |
| | | Poo | led Va | riance Est | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ste |
| F 2 Value 1.57 | Prob. .141 | | t Value .01 | Degrees Freedom 87 | of 2-Ta Pro .9 | il 5. 73 | t Value .01 | Degrees of Freedom 84.92 | 2-Tail Prob. .993 |
| | | Mal | e and | Female New | Tab scasters | le 15 /Femmale Subjec | ts (Attractiv | e) | |
| | Indeper | ndent sampl | es of | ASEX | Sex of a | anchor | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ASEX EG | 12 | | Group 2: | : ASEX EQ 1 | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATTE | ACTI | Attractive | • | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 43 46 | | 34.0930 33.3896 | | 5.051 5.567 | .770 .821 | | |
| | | Poo | led Va | riance Est | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estima | ate |
| F 2 Value 1.21 | Prob. .527 | | t Value .64 | Degrees Freedom 87 | of 2-Ta Prol .52 | il 5. 2 3 | t Value .64 | Degrees of Freedom 86.93 | 2-Tail Prob. .522 |

Ľ

.

Ĺ.

| | | Male a | nd Female N | Tabl ewscaster | e 16 s/Male Subject | ts (Credible) | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Independ | lent samples of | ASFY | Sex of a | chor | | | ••••• |
| | Group 1 | | | | ACEY EO 1 | | | |
| | Group 1: | AJEA EY Z | - ··· ··· | Group 2: | ASEX EY I | | | |
| | t-test 1 | Or: CREDIBLE | Credibilit | ;y | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 40 40 | 45.1250 48.2250 | | 7.279 6.585 | 1.151 1.041 | | |
| | | Pooled V | ariance Esti | imate | | Separate \ | Variance Estim | ate |
| F Value 1.22 | 2-Tail Prob. .534 | t Value -2.00 | Degrees Freedom 78 | of 2-Tai Prob .049 | ι 5 | t Value -2.00 | Degrees of Freedom 77.23 | 2-Tail Prob. .049 |
| | | | | Tabl | e 17 | | | |
| | | Male an | d Female Ne | wscasters | /Male Subjects | Attractive |) | |
| | Independ | lent samples of | ASEX | Sex of a | nchor | | | |
| | Group 1: | ASEX EQ 2 | | Group 2: | ASEX EQ 1 | | | |
| | t-test f | OF: ATTRACTI | Attractive | • | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | St andard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 39 40 | 35.7436 33.7000 | | 4.908 4.653 | .786 .736 | | |
| | | Pooled V | ariance Esti | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F a Value 1.11 | 2-Tail Prob. .741 | t Value 1.8 | Degrees Freedom 0 77 | of 2-Tai Prob .06 | ι i | t Value 1.90 | Degrees of Freedom 76.52 | 2-Tail Prob. .061 |
| | | White and | Black Male | Tabl Newscast | e 18 ers/White Subj | iects (Credib | le) | |
| | Independ | lent samples of | ANCHOR | Anchor ty | / De | | | ••••• |
| | Group 1: | ANCHOR EQ 1 | | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 3 | | | |
| | t-test f | or: CREDIBLE | Credibilit | ÿ | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | St anda rd Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 20 | 44.9524 45.4500 | | 8.541 4.947 | 1.864 1.106 | | |
| | | Pooled V | ariance Esti | imate . | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 2.98 | 2-Tail Prob. .021 | t Value 2 | Degrees Freedom 3 39 | of 2-Tai Prob .822 | ι 2 | t Value 23 | Degrees of Freedom 32.35 | 2-Tail Prob. .820 |

•

| | | White | e and B | lack Male I | Table Newscaster | e 19 rs/White Su | bjects (Attract | ive) | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| | Indepen | ident samp | les of | ANCHOR | Anchor ty | /pe | | | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ | 3 | | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATT | RACTI | Attractive | • | | | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | 1 1 | Standard Deviation | St andar d Erro r | | | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 20 | | 33.0952 34.7000 | | 5.309 2.775 | 1.159 .616 | | | | |
| | | Poo | led Va | riance Esti | imate | | Separate | Variance Estim | ate | | |
| F Value 3.71 | 2-Tail Prob. .006 | | t Value -1.21 | Degrees Freedom 39 | of 2-Tai Prob. .235 | ι | t Value -1.22 | Degrees of Freedom 30.35 | 2-Tail Prob. .231 | | |
| | Indeper | White M Ident samp | ale and les of | i Black Fen Anchor | Table male Newsc Anchor ty | e 20 :asters/Whit /pe | te Subjects (Cr | edible) | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ | 4 | | | | |
| | t-test | for: CRE | DIBLE | Credibilit | ;y | | | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | 1 | Standard Deviation | St andard Error | | | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 20 | | 45.8095 45.1000 | | 7.033 7.033 | 1.535 1.573 | | | | |
| | | Poo | led Va | riance Est | imate | | Separate | Separate Variance Estimate | | | |
| F Value 1.00 | 2-Tail Prob. .997 | | t Value .32 | Degrees Freedom 39 | of 2-Tai Prob. .748 | l İ | t Value .32 | Degrees of Freedom 38.90 | 2-Tail Prob. .749 | | |
| | Indeper | White Ma | le and Les of | Black Fema | Table ale Newsca Anchor ty | e 21 sters/White /De | e Subjects (Att | ractive) | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ | 4 | | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATT | RACTI | Attractive | | | - | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 20 | | 33.0952 35.2000 | - | 5.309 4.444 | 1.159 .994 | | | | |
| | | Poo | led Va | riance Est | imate | | Separate | Separate Variance Estimate | | | |
| F Value 1.43 | 2-Tail Prob. .442 | | t Value -1.37 | Degrees Freedom 39 | of 2-Tai Prob. .178 | เ ร | t Value -1.38 | Degrees of Freedom 38.38 | 2-Tail Prob. .176 | | |

| | | Whit | e Male | and Female | Tab e Newscas | le 22 sters/White Su | bjects (Credit | ole) | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| | Independ | lent samp | les of a | ANCHOR | Anchor | :ype | | | ••••• | | |
| | Group 1: | ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group 2 | ANCHOR EQ 2 | 2 | | | | |
| | t-test f | or: CRE | DIBLE | Credibilit | ty | | | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | St andar d Error | | | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 21 | | 44.9524 47.8571 | | 8.541 8.569 | 1.864 1.870 | | | | |
| | | Poo | led Var | iance Est | imete | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate | | |
| F a Value 1.01 | 2-Tail Prob. .988 | | t Value -1.10 | Degrees Freedom 40 | of 2-Ta Pro .2 | il 5. 78 | t Value -1.10 | Degrees of Freedom 40.00 | 2-Tail Prob. .278 | | |
| | Independ | White lent samp | Male a | nd Female | Tab Neuscast Anchor | le 23 ers/White Sub | jects (Attraci | tive) | | | |
| | Group 1: | ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group 2 | ANCHOR EQ 2 | 2 | | | | |
| | t-test f | or: ATT | RACTI | Attractive | | | | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | St andar d Deviation | St anda rd Error | | | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 21 | | 33.0952 31.5714 | | 5.309 4.707 | 1.159 1.027 | | | | |
| | | Poo | led Var | iance Est | imate | | Separate V | Separate Variance Estimate | | | |
| F 7 Value 1.27 | 2-Tail Prob. .595 | | t Value .98 | Degrees Freedom 40 | of 2-Ta Prol .3 | il 5. 51 | t Value .98 | Degrees of Freedom 39.43 | 2-Tail Prob. .331 | | |
| | | White F | emale a | nd Black I | Tab Male News | le 24 scasters/White | subjects (Cro | dible) | | | |
| | Independ | lent samp | les of | ANCHOR | Anchor | type | | | | | |
| | Group 1: | ANCHOR | EQ 2 | | Group 2 | ANCHOR EQ 3 | 5 | | | | |
| | t-test f | or: CRE | DIBLE | Credibili | ty | | | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 20 | | 47.8571 45.4500 | | 8.569 4.947 | 1.870 1.106 | | | | |
| • | | Poo | led Var | iance Est | imate | | Separate | Variance Estim | ste | | |
| F 2 Value 3.00 | 2-Tail Prob. .020 | | t Value 1.09 | Degrees Freedom 39 | of 2-Ta Pro .2 | nil 5. 81 | t Value 1.11 | Degrees of Freedom 32.28 | 2-Tail Prob. .276 | | |

.

| | | Blac | :k F ena | le and Mal | e Newscas | ters/White S | ubjects (Credik | ole) | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indepe | ndent samp | les of | ANCHOR | Anchor t | ype | | | |
| | Group | 1: ANCHOR | EQ 4 | | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ | 3 | | |
| | t-test | for: CRE | DIBLE | Credibilit | ty | | | | |
| | | Number of Caser | 5 | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | St andar d Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 20 | | 44.5000 45.4500 | | 8.256 4.947 | 1.846 1.106 | | |
| | | Po | oled Va | riance Est | imete | | Separate V | Variance Estim | ate |
| F Value 2.79 | 2-Tail Prob. .031 | | t Value 44 | Degrees Freedom 38 | of 2-Tai Prob .66 | i | t Value 44 | Degrees of Freedom 31.09 | 2-Tail Prob. .662 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Black | Femal | e and Male | Tabl Newscast | e 26 ers/White Su | bjects (Attract | tive) | |

ī

| | | | | | Subjects (Attrac | (196) | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indepe | ndent samples of | ANCHOR A | nchor type | | | |
| | Group | 1: ANCHOR EQ 4 | G | roup 2: ANCHOR E | Q 3 | | |
| | t-test | for: ATTRACTI | Attractive | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | Standard Deviation | St andard Error | | |
| Grou Grou | p 1 p 2 | 20 20 | 35.2000 34.7000 | 4.444 2.755 | .994 .616 | | |
| | | Pooled Va | riance Estim | nte | Separate | Variance Estim | ate |
| F Value 2.60 | 2-Tail Prob. .043 | t Value .43 | Degrees of Freedom 38 | f 2-Tail Prob. .671 | t Value .43 | Degrees of Freedom 31.72 | 2-Tail Prob. .672 |

| | | Black Fem | ile and Mal | Table 27 e Newscasters/Black Sub | jects (Credil | ole) | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indeper | ndent samples of | ANCHOR | Anchor type | | | |
| | Group ' | : ANCHOR EQ 4 | | Group 2: ANCHOR EQ 3 | | | |
| | t-test | for: CREDIBLE | Credibilit | ty . | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | Standard Deviation | St andard Error | | |
| Grou Grou | pp 1 pp 2 | 22 21 | 47.5455 45.5714 | 5.535 7.514 | 1.180 1.640 | | |
| | | Pooled Vi | ariance Est | imate | Separate | Variance Estim | ate |
| F Value 1.84 | 2-Tail Prob. .173 | t Value .98 | Degrees Freedom 41 | of 2-Tail Prob. .331 | t Value .98 | Degrees of Freedom 36.71 | 2-Tail Prob. .335 |

Table 25 lack Female and Male Newscasters/White Subjects (Credible)

| | | White Fem | ile and Male N | Tabl | e 28 ers/White Subj | ects (Attraci | tive) | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indepen | dent samples o | f ANCHOR | unchor ty | /pe | | | ••••• |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR EQ 2 | | iroup 2: | ANCHOR EQ 3 | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATTRACTI | Attractive | | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 20 | 31.5714 34.7000 | | 4.707 2.755 | 1.027 .616 | | |
| | | Pooled V | ariance Estin | nate | | Separate V | Variance Estim | ate |
| F Value 2.92 | 2-Tail Prob. .023 | t Valu -2. | Degrees o e Freedom 58 39 | of 2-Tai Prob .014 | il i | t Value -2.61 | Degrees of Freedom 32.54 | 2-Tail Prob. .014 |
| | Indepen Group 1 | Black and dent samples of : ANCHOR EQ 4 | White Female of ANCHOR | Newscas Anchor ty Group 2: | ters/White Sul ype ANCHOR EQ 2 | bjects (Credi | ble) | |
| | t-test | for: CREDIBLE | Credibility | , | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 21 | 44.5000 47.8571 | | 8.256 8.569 | 1.846 1.870 | | |
| | | Pooled | /ariance Estim | nate | | Separate | Variance Estim | ate |
| F Value 1.08 | 2-Tail Prob. .874 | t Valu -1. | Degrees o e Freedom 28 39 | f 2-Tai Prob .20 | i L 9 | t Value -1.28 | Degrees of Freedom 38.99 | 2-Tail Prob. .209 |
| | | Black and | White Female (| Tabl Newscast | e 30 ers/White Sub, | jects (Attrac | tive) | |
| | Indepen | dent samples o | f ANCHOR | Inchor ty | ype | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR EQ 4 | . (| iroup 2: | ANCHOR EQ 2 | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATTRACTI | Attractive | | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | | St andard Deviation | St andard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 21 | 35.2000 31.5714 | | 4.444 4.707 | .994 1.027 | | |
| | | Pooled | /ariance Estim | nate | | Separate | Variance Estim | ate |
| F Value 1.12 | 2-Tail Prob. .805 | t Valu 2.5 | Degrees a e Freedom 4 39 | f 2-Tai Prob | il 5 | t Value 2,54 | Degrees of Freedom 39.00 | 2-Tail Prob. .015 |

| | BL | ack Female a | nd Male Ne | Table wscaste | e 31 ers/Black Subje | cts (Attract | ive) | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Independent s | amples of AN | ICHOR An | chor ty | /pe | | •••••• | |
| | Group 1: ANC | HOR EQ 4 | Gr | oup 2: | ANCHOR EQ 3 | | | |
| | t-test for: | ATTRACTI AT | tractive | | | | | |
| | Num of C a | ber ses | MEAN | : | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 22 2 21 | | 33.7727 33.9048 | ļ | 4.287 5.558 | .914 1.213 | | |
| | | Pooled Varia | ance Estime | te | | Separate \ | /ariance Estima | ite |
| F Value 1.68 | 2-Tail Prob. .246 | t Value 09 | Degrees of Freedom 41 | 2-Tai Prob. .931 | ι | t Value 09 | Degrees of Freedom 37.61 | 2-Tail Prob. .931 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | BL | ack and Whi | te Female M | Tabli Iewscas | e 32 ters/Black Sub | jects (Credi | ble) | |
| ••••• | Independent s | amples of AN | ICHOR An | chor ty | / pe | | | |
| | Group 1: ANC | HOR EQ 4 | Gr | oup 2: | ANCHOR EQ 2 | | | |
| | t-test for: | CREDIBLE Cr | edibility | | | | | |
| | Num of Ca | ber ses | MEAN | : | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 22 2 23 | | 47.5455 51.0870 | | 5.535 6.895 | 1.180 1.438 | | |
| | | Pooled Varia | ance Estime | te | | Separate V | ariance Estime | ite |
| F Value 1.55 | 2-Tail Prob. .319 | t Value -1.89 | Degrees of Freedom 43 | 2-Tai Prob. .0 | l 65 | t Value -1.90 | Degrees of Freedom 41.77 | 2-Tail Prob. .064 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Bla | ick and Whit | e Female No | Table | e 33 ers/White Subi | ects (Attrac | tive) | |
| ••••• | Independent s | amples of AN | ICHOR An | chor ty | /De | | | ••••• |
| | Group 1: ANC | HOR EQ 4 | Gr | oup 2: | ANCHOR EQ 2 | | | |
| | t-test for: | ATTRACTI At | tractive | • | | | | |
| | Num of Ca | ber ses | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 22 2 23 | | 33 <i>.77</i> 27 33.6087 | | 4.287 5.394 | .914 1.333 | | |
| | | Pooled Varia | ance Estime | te | | Separate V | ariance Estime | ite |
| F Value 2.23 | 2-Tail Prob. .072 | t Value .10 | Degrees of Freedom 43 | 2-Tai Prob. .920 | l i | t Value .10 | Degrees of Freedom 38.60 | 2-Tail Prob. .920 |

| | | White M | ale and | l Black Fen | Tabl | e 34 asters/Black | (Subjects (Cre | dible) | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indepen | dent samp | les of | ANCHOR | Anchor ty | /De | | | ••••• |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 4 | 4 | | |
| | t-test | for: CRE | DIBLE | Credibilit | ÿ | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | ł | Standard Deviation | St andard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 22 | | 49.52 38 47.5455 | | 6.178 5.535 | 1.348 1.180 | | |
| | | Poo | led Var | iance Esti | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 1.25 | 2-Tail Prob. .621 | | t Value 1.11 | Degrees Freedom 41 | of 2-Tai Prob .27 | ι ; | t Value 1.10 | Degrees of Freedom 40.02 | 2-Tail Prob. .276 |
| | Indeper Group 1 | White Ma Ident samp : ANCHOR | le and les of EQ 1 | Black Femme ANCHOR | Tabl I Newsca Anchor ty Group 2: | e 35 haters/Black /pe ANCHOR EQ 4 | Subjects (Attr 4 | active) | |
| | t-test | for: ATT | RACTI | Attractive | • | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | ; | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | St andard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 22 | | 37.9500 33.7727 | | 4.817 4.287 | 1.077 .914 | | |
| | | Poc | led Var | iance Esti | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 1.26 | 2-Tail Prob. .601 | | t Value 2.97 | Degrees Freedom 40 | of 2-Tai Prob .0 | เ 05 | t Value 2.96 | Degrees of Freedom 38.26 | 2-Tail Prob. .005 |
| | | Whit | e Male | and Female | Tabl | e 36 :ers/Black Su | bjects (Credit | ble) | |
| | Indeper | voent samp | Les OT | ANCHOK | Anchor ty | /pe | - | | |
| | Group | ANCHUK | | | Group 2: | ANCHUK EY A | 2 | | |
| | t-test | TOP: CKE | DIRFE | Creaibilit | Ϋ́, | | | | |
| | | of Cases | • | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 23 | | 49.5238 51.0870 | | 6.178 6.895 | 1.348 1.438 | | |
| | | Poc | led Va | riance Est | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F 7 Value 1.25 | 2-Tail Prob. .625 | | t Value 79 | Degrees Freedom 42 | of 2-Tai Prob .43 | l L | t Value 79 | Degrees of Freedom 41.99 | 2-Tail Prob. .432 |

| | | White | . Male a | nd Female | Tal Newscas | ble 37 sters/Black Subj | ects (Attract | ive) | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| ••••• | Indeper | ndent samp | les of | ANCHOR | Anchor | type | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group 2 | ANCHOR EQ 2 | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATT | RACTI | Attractive | • | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 23 | | 37.9500 33.6087 | | 4.817 6.394 | 1.077 1.333 | | |
| | | Po | oled Var | iance Est | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F á Value 1.76 | 2-Tail Prob. .217 | | t Value 2.48 | Degrees Freedom 41 | of 2-T Pro | ail xb.)17 | t Value 2.53 | Degrees of Freedom 40.24 | 2-Tail Prob. .015 |
| | | | | | Ta | ble 38 | i | 1 | |
| | | Wn1 | te and I | BLACK Male | Newsca | STEPS/BLACK SUD | Jects (Credib | le) | |
| | Indeper | ndent samp | oles of | ANCHOR | Anchor | | | | |
| | Group | I: ANCHUR | | | Group 2 | C ANCHUR EY S | | | |
| | t-test | TOP: CRE | DIBLE | Credibilit | :y | | | | |
| | | Number of Case | 5 | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 21 | | 49.5 238 45.5714 | | 6.178 7.514 | 1.348 1.640 | | |
| | | Po | ol ed Var | iance Est | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F Value 1.48 | 2-Tail Prob. .389 | | t Value 1.86 | Degrees Freedom 40 | of 2-T Pro | ail b. .070 | t Value 1.86 | Degrees of Freedom 38.56 | 2-Tail Prob. .070 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | White | e and Bl | ack Male | Newscas | iters/Black Subj | ects (Attract | ive) | |
| | Indeper | ndent samp | les of | ANCHOR | Anchor | type | | | |
| | Group ' | 1: ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group a | 2: ANCHOR EQ 3 | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATI | RACTI | Attractive | • | | | | |
| | | Numbe | • | | | Standard | Standard | | |

| | Number of Cases | MEAN | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Group 1 Group 2 | 20 21 | 37.9500 33.9048 | 4.817 5.558 | 1.077 1.213 | | |
| | Pooled V | ariance Estima | te | Separate V | Variance Estim | ate |
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. 1.33 .537 | t Value 2.48 | Degrees of Freedom 39 | 2-Tail Prob. .017 | t Value 2.49 | Degrees of Freedom 38.67 | 2-Tail Prob. .017 |

| | | White Fema | ile and Black M | Table Iale Newsc | e 40 asters/Black | Subjects (Cre | dible) | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--|-------------------------|
| | Indepen | dent samples | of ANCHOR | Anchor ty | | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR EG | 2 | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 3 | | | |
| | t-test | for: CREDIE | LE Credibilit | ÿ | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | i t | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 23 21 | 51.0870 45.5714 | | 5.895 7.514 | 1.438 1.640 | | |
| | | Poole | d Variance Est | imate | | Separate \ | ariance Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 1.19 | 2-Tail Prob. .692 | t Va | Degrees lue Freedom 2.54 42 | of 2-Tai Prob. .015 | l | t Value 2.53 | D egrees of Freedom 40.70 | 2-Tail Prob. .015 |
| ••••• | Indepen Group 1 t-test | dent samples : ANCHOR EG for: ATTRAC | of ANCHOR 2 TI Attractive | Anchor ty Group 2: | pe Anchor Eq 3 | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | : | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 23 21 | 33.6087 33.9048 | | 5.394 5.558 | 1.333 1.213 | | |
| | | Poole | d Variance Est | imate | | Separate V | ariance Estim | ate |
| F 7 Value 1.32 | 2-Tail Prob. .532 | t Va | Degrees lue Freedom .16 42 | of 2-Tai Prob. .8 | เ 71 | t Value 16 | Degrees of Freedom 41.91 | 2-Tail Prob. .870 |
| | Indepen | White a dent samples | nd Black Male | Table Newscaste Anchor ty | e 42 ers/Female Su pe | bjects (Credil | ble) | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR EG | 1 | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 3 | | | |
| | t-test | for: CREDIE | LE Credibilit | τ γ | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | 1 | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 22 21 | 48.8636 46.1905 | 1 | 3.282 .423 | 1.766 .965 | | |
| | | Poole | d Variance Est | imate | | Separate V | ariance Estim | ate |
| F Value 3.51 | 2-Tail Prob. .007 | t Va 1 | Degrees lue Freedom .31 41 | of 2-Tai Prob. .197 | l , | t Value 1.33 | Degrees of Freedom 32.39 | 2-Tail Prob. .193 |

| | | White | and Bla | ack Male N | Tabl Iewscaster | e 43 s/Female Subj | ects (Attract | ive) | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Independ | ent sampl | es of / | NCHOR | Anchor ty | /pe | | | |
| | Group 1: | ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 3 | | | |
| | t-test f | or: ATTR | ACTI | \ttractive | ł | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | St andar d Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 22 21 | | 35.0909 33.0476 | | 5.537 4.376 | 1.180 .955 | | |
| | | Poo | led Var | iance Esti | imate | | Separate \ | /ari <mark>ance</mark> Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 1.60 | 2-Tail Prob. .297 | | t Value 1.34 | Degrees Freedom 41 | of 2-Tai Prob .18 | เ ร | t Value 1.35 | Degrees of Freedom 39.65 | 2-Tail Prob. .186 |
| | Independ | White Ma lent sampl | le and .es of / | Black Fem | Tabl ale Newsc Anchor ty | e 44 asters/Female /pe | Subjects (Cr | edible) | |
| | Group 1: | ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 4 | | | |
| | t-test f | or: CRED | IBLE (| Credibilit | ;y | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | St andard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 22 22 | | 48.8636 45.4091 | | 8.282 7.222 | 1.766 1.540 | | |
| | | Poo | led Var | iance Est | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 1.32 | 2-Tail Prob. .536 | | t Value 1.47 | Degrees Freedom 42 | of 2-Tai Prob .1 | เ 48 | t Value 1.47 | Degrees of Freedom 41.24 | 2-Tail Prob. .148 |
| | Independ | White Mal | e and B .es of / | lack Fema | Tabl le Newsca Anchor ty | e 45 sters/Female S | Subjects (Att | ractive) | |
| | Group 1: | ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 4 | | | |
| | t-test f | or: ATT | ACTI | Attractive | • | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | St andard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 22 22 | | 33.0909 35.1364 | | 5.537 3.919 | 1.180 .836 | | |
| | | Poo | l e d Var | iance Est | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estima | ate |
| F a Value 2.00 | 2-Tail Prob. .121 | | t Value 03 | Degrees Freedom 42 | of 2-Tai Prob .97 | ι ; | t Value 03 | Degrees of Freedom 37.82 | 2-Tail Prob. .975 |

| | | White Male a | nd Female N | Table 46 ewscasters/Female Sub | jects (Credil | ble) | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| ****** | Independent | samples of A | NCHOR A | nchor type | | | |
| | Group 1: Al | ichor eq 1 | G | roup 2: ANCHOR EQ 2 | | | |
| | t-test for: | CREDIBLE C | redibility | | | | |
| | N of | umber Cases | MEAN | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 2 2 | 2 | 48.8636 49.5000 | 8.282 9.165 | 1.766 1.871 | | |
| | | Pooled Var | iance Estim | ate | Separate \ | ariance Estim | ite |
| F 2 Value 1.22 | 2-Tail Prob. .644 | t Value 25 | Degrees of Freedom 44 | 2-Tail Prob. .807 | t Value 25 | D egrees of Freedom 43.99 | 2-Tail Prob. .806 |
| | N Independent Group 1: A | nite Male an samples of A ICHOR EQ 1 | d Formale Ne INCHOR AI Gi | wscasters/Female Subj nchor type roup 2: ANCHOR EQ 2 | ects (Attrac | tive) | ••••• |
| | t-test for: | ATTRACTI A | ttractive | | | | |
| | N of | umber Cases | MEAN | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 22 2 24 | 2 | 35.0909 31.7500 | 5.537 6.395 | 1.180 1.305 | | |
| | | Pooled Var | iance Estim | ate | Separate \ | ariance Estime | ste |
| F a Value 1.33 | 2-Tail Prob. .510 | t Value 1.89 | Degrees of Freedom 44 | 2-Tail Prob. .066 | t Value 1.90 | Degrees of Freedom 43.87 | 2-Tail Prob. .064 |
| | Bla | ck Male and | White Femal | Table 48 e Newscasters/Famale | Subjects (Cr | edible) | |
| | | | Gi | | | | |
| | t-test for: | | redibility | | | | |
| | N of | unber Cases | MEAN | Standard Deviation | St andar d Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 2 2 | 1 | 46.1905 49.5000 | 4.423 9.165 | .965 1.871 | | |
| | | Pooled Var | iance Estim | ate | Separate \ | ariance Estime | ste |
| F 2 Value 4.29 | 2-Tail Prob. .002 | t Value -1.51 | Degrees of Freedom 43 | ^{2-Tail} Prob. .139 | t Value -1.57 | Degrees of Freedom 34.09 | 2-Tail Prob. .125 |
| | | Black Male | and White Fem | Tabl ale Newsca | e 49 sters/Female S | Subjects (Att | ractive) | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indepen | dent sample | s of ANCHOR | Anchor ty | ype | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR E | 2 3 | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 2 | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATTRA | CTI Attractiv | • | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 21 24 | 33.0476 31.7500 | | 4.376 6.395 | .955 1.305 | | |
| | | Poole | d Variance Est | imete | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 2.14 | 2-Tail Prob. .091 | t Va | Degrees Ilue Freedom 78 43 | of 2-Tai Prob .43 | il B | t Value .80 | Degrees of Freedom 40.77 | 2-Tail Prob. .427 |
| | | White a | nd Black Femal | Tabl e Newscast | e 50 ters/Female Su | bjects (Credi | ible) | |
| | Indepen | dent sample | s of ANCHOR | Anchor ty | уре | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR E | 2 | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 4 | | | |
| | t-test | for: CREDI | BLE Credibili | ty | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 24 22 | 49.5000 45.4091 | | 9.165 7.222 | 1.871 1.540 | | |
| | | Poole | d Variance Est | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F Value 1.61 | 2-Tail Prob. .276 | t Va | Degrees Ilue Freedom 1.67 44 | of 2-Tai Prob | 02 | t Value 1.69 | Degrees of Freedom 43.07 | 2-Tail Prob. .099 |
| | | Uhite en | d Black Female | Tabl | e 51 Status Sub | iecte (Attre | | |
| ••••• | Indepen | dent samle | a of ANCHOR | | | | | ••••• |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR F | 2 2 | Group 2: | ANCHOR FQ 4 | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATTRA | CTI Attractiv | • | | | | |
| | | Number | | • | Standard | Standard | | |
| | | of Cases | MEAN | | Deviation | Error | | |
| Group Group | 12 | 24 22 | 31.7500 35.1364 | | 6.395 3.919 | 1.305 .836 | | |
| | | Poole | d Variance Est | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F Value 2.66 | 2-Tail Prob. .028 | t Va | Degrees Ilue Freedom 2.14 44 | of 2-Tai Prob .03 | i l B | t Value -2.18 | Degrees of Freedom 38.61 | 2-Tail Prob. .035 |

.

| | Black | Hale and Femal | Table 52 e Newscasters/Fema | le Subjects (Credi | ble) | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Independent samp | es of ANCHOR | Anchor type | | | |
| | Group 1: ANCHOR | EQ 3 | Group 2: ANCHOR | EQ 4 | | |
| | t-test for: CRE | IBLE Credibili | ty | | | |
| | Number of Cases | MEAN | Standard Deviatio | Standard n Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 21 2 22 | 46.4762 45.6818 | 3.970 6.175 | .866 1.317 | | |
| | Poo | led Variance Est | immate | Separate | Variance Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 2.42 | 2-Tail Prob. .053 | t Degrees Value Freedom .50 41 | of 2-Tail Prob. .620 | t Value .50 | Degrees of Freedom 36.03 | 2-Tail Prob. .617 |
| | Black Independent samp Group 1: ANCHOR t-test for: ATTI | Male and Female les of ANCHOR EQ 3 RACTI Attractiv | Anchor type Group 2: ANCHOR | e Subjects (Attrac EQ 4 | tive) | |
| | Number of Cases | MEAN | St andar d D eviat io | n St andard n Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 21 2 22 | 33.0476 35.1364 | 4.376 3.919 | .955 .836 | | |
| | Poo | led Variance Est | imete | Separate | Variance Estim | ate |
| F Value 1.25 | 2-Tail Prob. .620 | t Degrees Value Freedom -1.65 41 | of 2-Tail Prob. .106 | t Value -1.65 | Degrees of Freedom 40.01 | 2-Tail Prob. .108 |
| | Blac Independent samp Group 1: ANCHOR t-test for: CREI Number of Cases | k Female and Ma Les of ANCHOR EQ 4 DIBLE Credibili MEAN | Table 54 le Newscasters/Mal Anchor type Group 2: ANCHOR ty Standard Deviatio | e Subjects (Credib EQ 3 Standard N Error | le) | |

| | of Cases | MEAN | Deviation | Error | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Group 1 Group 2 | 20 20 | 46.8500 44.8000 | 6.953 7.891 | 1.555 1.765 | | |
| | Pooled | Variance Estima | te | Separate | Variance Estim | ate |
| F 2-Tail Value Prob. 1.29 .587 | t Valu .87 | Degrees of Le Freedom 7 38 | 2-Tail Prob. .389 | t Value .87 | Degrees of Freedom 37.41 | 2-1 Pr .38 |

| oup 2 | 20 | 44.8000 | 7.891 | 1.765 | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Pooled | Variance Estime | ite | Separate | Variance Estim | ate |
| 2-Tail Prob. .587 | t Val .8 | Degrees of ue Freedom 7 38 | 2-Tail Prob. .389 | t Value .87 | Degrees of Freedom 37.41 | 2-Tail Prob. .389 |

| | | Black | Femal | e and Male | Tal Newscar | ole 55 sters/Male Subj | ects (Attract | ive) | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Indepen | dent samp | l es of | ANCHOR | Anchor | type | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR | EQ 4 | | Group 2 | ANCHOR EQ 3 | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATT | RACTI | Attractive | • | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 20 | | 33.7000 35.6000 | | 4.802 4.096 | 1.074 .916 | | |
| | | Poo | led Va | iance Est | imate | | Separate V | ariance Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 1.37 | 2-Tail Prob. .495 | | t Value -1.35 | Degrees Freedom 38 | of 2-T Pro .1 | ail b. 86 | t Value -1.35 | Degrees of Freedom 37.08 | 2-Tail Prob. .186 |
| | | ••••• | | 4. ° | Tal | ble 56 | - 1 | | |
| | | Blac | K and k | | | asters/male Su | DJECTS (Credit |)(e) | |
| | Indepen | dent samp | Les or | ANCHOR | Anchor | type | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR | EQ 4 | | Group 2 | : ANCHOR EQ 2 | | | |
| | t-test | for: CRE | DIBLE | Credibili | ty | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 20 | | 46.8500 49.6000 | | 6.953 6.056 | 1.555 1.354 | | |
| | | Poo | led Va | riance Est | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 1.32 | 2-Tail Prob. .553 | | t Value -1.33 | Degrees Freedom 38 | of 2-T Pro | ail xb. .190 | t Value -1.33 | Degrees of Freedom 37.30 | 2-Tail Prob. .190 |
| | | Black | and W | ite Femal | Tal e Newsca | ble 57 usters/Male Subj | jects (Attract | ive) | |
| | Indepen | dent samp | les of | ANCHOR | Anchor | type | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR | EQ 4 | | Group 2 | : ANCHOR EQ 2 | | | |
| | t-test | for: ATT | RACTI | Attractiv | • | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | • | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 20 | | 33.7000 33.7000 | | 4.802 4.624 | 1.074 1.034 | | |
| | | . Poo | led Va | riance Est | imate | | Separate \ | /ariance Estim | ate |
| F 2 Value 1.08 | 2-Tail Prob. .870 | | t Value .00 | Degrees Freedom 38 | of 2-T Pro 1. | ail xb. .000 | t Value .00 | Degrees of Freedom 37.95 | 2-Tail Prob. 1.000 |

.

| | | White Ma | ale and i | Black Fe | Ta male No | ble 58 wscasters/Mal | e Subjects (Cr | edible) | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Independ | dent sample | es of AN | CHOR | Anchor | type | | | ••••• |
| | Group 1 | ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group | 2: ANCHOR EQ | 4 | | |
| | t-test | for: CRED | IBLE Cr | edibilit | :y | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | St anda rd Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 20 | | 45.4500 46.8500 | | 6.802 6.953 | 1.521 1.555 | | |
| | | Pool | ed Varia | nce Est | imate | | Separate | Variance Estin | nate |
| F Value 1.05 | 2-Tail Prob. .924 | t V | /alue 64 | Degrees Freedom 38 | of 2-1 Pr | fail ob. 524 | t Value 64 | Degrees of Freedom 37.98 | 2-Tail Prob. .524 |
| | Indepen | White Mal | e and B es of AN | lack Fem CHOR | Ta ale New Anchor | ble 59 scasters/Male type | Subjects (Att | ractive) | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR I | EQ 1 | | Group | 2: ANCHOR EQ | 4 | | |
| | t-test | for: ATTR/ | ACTI At | tractive | • | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 19 20 | | 35.8947 33.7000 | | 5.753 4.802 | 1.320 1.074 | | |
| | | Pool | ed Varia | nce Est | imete | | Separate | Variance Estin | nate |
| F Value 1.44 | 2-Tail Prob. .441 | t | : /alue 1.30 | Degrees Freedom 37 | of 2-1 Pr | rail ob. .203 | t Value 1.29 | Degrees of Freedom 35.13 | 2-Tail Prob. .206 |
| | Indepen | White | e Male a | nd Femal | Ta e Newsc Anchor | ble 60 asters/Male S | ubjects (Credil | ble) | |
| | Group 1 | ANCHOR | EQ 1 | | Group | 2: ANCHOR EQ | 2 | | |
| | t-test | for: CRED | IBLE Cr | edibilit | :y | | - | | |
| | | Number of Cases | | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | St anderd Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 20 | | 45.4500 49.6000 | | 6.802 6.056 | 1.521 1.354 | | |
| | | Pool | ed Varia | nce Est | imate | | Separate | Variance Estin | nate |
| F Value 1.26 | 2-Tail Prob. .618 | t | /alue -2.04 | Degrees Freedom 38 | of 2-1 Pr | Tail ob. .049 | t Value -2.04 | Degrees of Freedom 37.50 | 2-Tail Prob. .049 |

ı

| | | White Mal | e and Female | Table Newscast | e 61 ers/Male Subj | jects (Attract | ive) | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indepe | ndent samples o | f ANCHOR | Anchor ty | /pe | | | |
| | Group | I: ANCHOR EQ 1 | | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 2 | 2 | | |
| | t-test | for: ATTRACTI | Attractive | 8 | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 19 20 | 35.8947 33.7000 | | 5.753 4.624 | 1.320 1.034 | | |
| | | Pooled \ | /ariance Est | imete | | Separate V | ariance Estim | ate |
| F Value 1.55 | 2-Tail Prob. .353 | t Valu 1.3 | Degrees e Freedom 2 37 | of 2-Tai Prob .190 | ι 5 | t Value 1.31 | Degrees of Freedom 34.54 | 2-Tail Prob. .199 |

| | | White | and Black Mal | Tabl Newscas | e 62 ters/Male Sub | jects (Credibl | e) | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indepen | dent samples | of ANCHOR | Anchor t | /pe | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR EQ | 1 | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 3 | 5 | | |
| | t-test | for: CREDIB | .E Credibili | ty | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 20 | 45.4500 44.8000 | | 6.802 7.891 | 1.521 1.765 | | |
| | | Pooled | Variance Est | imate | | Separate V | ariance Estima | ate |
| F 2 Value 1.35 | 2-Tail Prob. .523 | t Val | Degrees ue Freedom .28 38 | of 2-Tai Prob .7 | เ 82 | t Value .28 | Degrees of Freedom 37.19 | 2-Tail Prob. .782 |

| | | White and | Black Male | Tabl Newscast | e 63 ers/Male Subj | ects (Attracti | ve) | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indepe | ndent samples of | ANCHOR | Anchor t | /pe | | | |
| | Group | 1: ANCHOR EQ 1 | | Group 2: | ANCHOR EQ 3 | i | | |
| | t-test | for: ATTRACTI | Attractiv | 8 | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 5 1 5 2 | 19 20 | 35.8947 35.6000 | | 5.753 4.096 | 1.320 .916 | | |
| | | Pooled V | ariance Est | imate | | Separate \ | ariance Estima | ite |
| F Value 1.97 | 2-Tail Prob. .151 | t Value 19 | Degrees Freedom 37 | of 2-Tai Prob .8 | 1 54 | t Value .18 | Degrees of Freedom 32.39 | 2-Tail Prob. .856 |

| | | Black Male a | nd White Femal | Table 64 Le Newscaster | s/Male Su | bjects (Cre | dible) | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| •••••• | Independ | dent samples of | ANCHOR An | chor type | | | | • • • • • • • • • • • • |
| | Group 1 | ANCHOR EQ 3 | Gr | oup 2: ANCH | OR EQ 2 | | | |
| | t-test | for: CREDIBLE | Credibility | | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | Standa Deviat | ion | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 20 | 44.8000 49.6000 | 7.891 6.056 | | 1.765 1.354 | | |
| | | Pooled V | ariance Estima | te | | Separate | Variance Estim | ste |
| F 2 Value 1.70 | 2-Tail Prob. .257 | t Value -2.16 | Degrees of Freedom 38 | 2-Tail Prob. .037 | | t Value -2.16 | Degrees of Freedom 35.62 | 2-Tail Prob. .038 |
| | | | | Table 65 | | | | |

| | | Black Male an | d White Fem | Table 65 ale Newscasters/Ma | le Subjects (Attr | active) | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Indepen | dent samples of | ANCHOR | Anchor type | | | |
| | Group 1 | : ANCHOR EQ 3 | | Group 2: ANCHOR | EQ 2 | | |
| | t-test | for: ATTRACTI | Attractive | | | | |
| | | Number of Cases | MEAN | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | | |
| Group Group | 1 2 | 20 20 | 35.6000 33.7000 | 4.096 4.624 | .916 1.034 | | |
| | | Pooled Vi | ariance Esti | mate | Separate | Variance Estim | ate |
| F Value 1.27 | 2-Tail Prob. .603 | t Value 1.3 | Degrees Freedom 38 38 | of 2-Tail Prob. .177 | t Value 1.38 | Degrees of Freedom 37.46 | 2-Tail Prob. .177 |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

•

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Richard L. and David E. Clarke, "Ethnicity and Mass Media Behavior: A Study of Blacks and Latinos," Journal of Broadcasting 24, no. 1 (Winter 1980): pp. 23-24.

Allen, Richard L. and William T. Bielby, "Blacks' Relationship with the Print Media," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 16 (Autumn 1979): pp.488-496.

Avery, Robert K. and Patrick J. McDermott, "Speaker Affiliation and Station Image," <u>Journal of Broadcasting</u> 19, no. 2 (Spring 1975): pp. 211-220.

Bales, Fred, "Television Use and Confidence in Television by Blacks and Whites in Four Selected Years," Journal of Black Studies 16, no. 3 (March 1986): pp. 283-291.

Balon, Robert E., Joseph C. Philport and Charles F. Beadle, "How Sex and Race Affect Perceptions of Newscasters," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 55 (Spring 1978): pp. 160-164.

Bogart, Leo, "Negro and White Media Exposure: New Evidence," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 49 (Spring 1972): pp. 15-21.

Carey, James W., "Variations in Negro/White Television Preferences," Journal of Broadcasting 6 (Summer 1966): pp. 199-212.

Cathcart, William L., "Viewer Needs and Desires in Television Newscasters," Journal of Broadcasting 14, no. 1 (Winter 1969-70): pp. 55-62.

Dates, Jannette, "Race, Racial Attitudes and Adolescent Perceptions of Black Television Characters," Journal of Broadcasting 24, no.4 (Fall 1980): 549-560.

Donohue, Thomas R., "Black Children's Perceptions of Favorite Television Characters as Models of Antisocial Behavior," <u>Journal of Broadcasting</u> 19, no. 2 (Spring, 1975): pp. 153-167.

Durand, Richard M., Jesse E. Teel, Jr. and William O. Bearden, "Racial Differences in Perceptions of Media Advertising Credibility," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 16 (Autumn 1979): pp. 562-566. Egan, Lola M., "Children's Viewing Patterns for Television News," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 55, no. 2 (Summer 1978): pp. 337-342.

Ferri, Anthony J. and Jo E. Keller, "Perceived Career Barriers for Female Television News Anchors," <u>Journalism</u> <u>Quarterly</u> 6, no. 3 (Autumn 1986): pp. 463-467.

Gaziano, Cecilie and Kristin McGrath, "Measuring the Concept of Credibility," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 6, no. 3 (Autumn 1986): pp. 451-462.

Goldberg, Phillip, "Are Women Prejudiced Against Women?," <u>Trans-Action</u> 5 (April 1968): pp. 28-30.

Greenberg, Bradley S., "Minorities and the Mass Media," in <u>Perspectives on Media Effects</u>, eds. Jennings Bryant and Dolf Zillman (New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: 1986): pp. 165-188.

Greenberg, Bradley S. and Brenda Dervin, "The Role of the Mass Media for Urban Poor Adults," in Bradley S. Greenberg and Brenda Dervin, <u>Uses of the Mass Media by the</u> <u>Urban Poor</u> (New York, Praeger Publishers: 1976): pp. 3-29.

Greenberg, Bradley S. and Carrie Heeter, "Mass Media Orientations Among Hispanic Youth," <u>Hispanic Journal of</u> <u>Behavioral Sciences</u> 5, no. 3 (1983): pp. 305-323.

Henke, Lucy L., "Perceptions and Use of News Media by College Students," <u>Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic</u> Media 29, no. 4 (Fall 1985): 431-436.

Hutchinson, Kevin L., "The Effects of Newscaster Gender and Vocal Quality on Perceptions of Homophily and Interpersonal Attraction," Journal of Broadcasting 26, no. 1 (Winter 1982): 457-467.

Jenkins, James J., Wallace A. Russell and George J. Suci, "An Atlas of Semantic Profiles for 360 Words," American Journal of Psychology 71 (1958): pp. 688-699.

Johnson, Elizabeth, "Believability of Newscasters to Black Television Viewers," <u>Western Journal of Black Studies</u> 11, no.2 (Summer 1987): pp. 64-68.

Johnson, Elizabeth, "Credibility of Black and White Newscasters to a Black Audience," Journal of Broadcasting 28, no. 3 (Summer 1984): pp. 365-368. Kassarjian, Waltraud M., "Blacks as Communicators and Interpreters of Mass Communication," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 50 (Summer 1973): pp. 285-291.

Kjeldergaard, Paul M., "Attitudes Towards Newscasters as Measured by the Semantic Differential: A Descriptive Case," Journal of Applied Psychology 45, no. 1 (1961): pp. 35-40.

Lemon, Judith, "Women and Blacks on Prime-Time Television," Journal of Communication 27 (Autumn 1977): pp. 70-79.

Levy, Mark R., "Television News Uses: A Cross-National Comparison," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 55, no. 2 (Summer 1978): pp. 334-337.

Lynch, Mervin D. and Leonard H. Sassenrath, "Dimensions of Personality Association of Television Network Newscasters," Journal of Broadcasting 10, no. 1 (Winter 1965-66): pp. 33-43.

Markham, David, "The Dimensions of Source Credibility of Television Newscaster," <u>Journal of Communication</u> 18 (March 1968): pp. 57-64.

McCroskey, James C. and Thomas A. Jenson, "Image of Mass Media News Sources," <u>Journal of Broadcasting</u> 19, no. 2 (Spring 1975): pp. 169-180.

Moses, Knolly, "The Black Image on Television, Who Controls It?," <u>Black Enterprise</u> 10, no. 2 (September 1979): pp.. 33-40.

Palmgreen, Philip, Lawrence A. Wenner and J.D. Rayburn II, "Relations Between Gratifications Sought and Obtained: A Study of Television News," <u>Communication Research</u> 7, no. 2 (April 1980): pp. 161-192.

Poindexter, Paula M. and Carolyn A. Stroman, "Blacks and Television: A Review of the Research Literature," Journal of Broadcasting 25, no. 2 (Spring 1981): pp. 103-122.

Roberts, Churchill, "The Portrayal of Blacks on Network Television," <u>Journal of Broadcasting</u> 15, no. 1 (Winter 1970-71): pp. 45-53.

Rossiter, Charles M., Jr., "Sex of the Speaker, Sex of the Listener and Listening Comprehension," <u>Journal of</u> <u>Communication</u> 22 (March 1972): pp. 64-69. Rubin, Alan M., "An Examination of Television Viewing Motivations," <u>Communication Research</u> 8, no. 2 (April 1981): pp. 141-165.

Rubin, Alan M., "Television Uses and Gratifications: The Interactions of Viewing Patterns and Motivations," Journal of Broadcasting 27, no. 1 (Winter 1983): pp. 37-51.

Rubin, Alan M., "Uses, Gratifications and Media Effects Research," in <u>Perspectives on Media Effects</u>, eds. Jennings Bryant and Dolf Zillman (New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: 1986): pp. 281-301.

Sanders, Keith P. and Michael Pritchett, "Some Influences of Appearance on Television Newscaster Appeal," Journal of Broadcasting 15, no. 3 (Summer 1971): pp. 293-301.

Shosteck, Herschel, "Factors Influencing Appeal of Television News Personalities," <u>Journal of Broadcasting</u> 18, no. 1 (Winter 1973-74): pp. 63-71.

Silverman-Watkins, L. Theresa, Stephen C. Levi and Meryl A. Klein, "Sex-stereotyping as Factor in Children's Comprehension of Television News," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 63, no. 1 (Spring 1986): pp. 3-11.

Singletary, Michael W., "Components of Credibility of Favorable News Sources," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 53, no. 20 (Summer 1976): pp. 316-319.

Singleton, Loy A. and Stephanie L. Cook, "Television Network News Reporting by Female Correspondents: An Update," <u>Journal of Broadcasting</u> 26, no. 1 (Winter 1982): pp. 487-491.

Stone, Vernon A. "Attitudes Toward Television Newswomen," Journal of Broadcasting 18, no. 1 (Winter 1973-74): pp. 49-61.

Stone, Vernon A. "Trends in the Status of Minorities and Women in Broadcast News," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 65, no. 2 (Summer, 1988): pp. 288-293.

Stone, Vernon A. "Women Gain, Black Men Lose Ground in Newsrooms," <u>RTNDA Communicator</u> (August 1987): pp. 9-11.

Stroman, Carolyn A. and Lee B. Becker, "Racial Differences in Gratifications," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u> 55 (Autumn 1978): pp. 767-771.

Surlin, Stuart H. and Joseph R. Dominick, "Television's Function as a Third Parent for Black and White Teenagers," <u>Journal of Broadcasting</u> 15 (Winter 1970-71): pp. 55-64.

Tan, Alexis, Jack Raudy, Cary Huff and Janet Miles, "Children's Reaction to Male and Female Newscasters: Effectiveness and Beleivability," <u>The Quarterly Journal of</u> <u>Speech</u> 66 (April 1980): 201-205.

Tan, Alexis S. and Gerdean Tan, "Television Use and Self-esteem of Blacks," <u>Journal of Communication</u> 29 (Winter 1979): pp. 129-135.

Tankard, James W., Jr., Sean McCleneghan, Vijay Ganju, Eui Bun Lee, Cheryl Olkes and Diane DuBose, "Nonverbal Cues and Televison News," Journal of Communication 27, no. 4 (Autumn 1977): pp. 106-111.

Van Tubergen, G. Norman and David L. Mahsman, "Unflattering Photos: How People Respond," <u>Journalism</u> <u>Quarterly</u> 51 (Summer 1974): pp. 317-320.

Weber, Larry J. and Dan B. Fleming, "Black Adolescent and the News," <u>Journal of Negro Education</u> 53, no. 1 (1984): pp. 85-90.

Whittaker, James O. and Robert D. Meade, "Sex of the Communicator as a Variable in Source Credibility," <u>Journal</u> of Social Psychology 72 (1967): pp. 27-34.

Whittaker, Susan and Ron Whittaker, "Relative Effectiveness of Male and Female Newscasters," <u>Journal of</u> Broadcasting 20, no. 2 (Spring 1976): pp. 177-183.

Witt, Evans, "News Sources of Americans: Here, There and Everywhere," <u>Current</u> no. 258 (December 1983): pp. 15-22.

