

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

ABSTRACT

TELEVISION PREFERENCE AND VIEWING BEHAVIOR

by Robert Richard Monaghan

This thesis determines patterns of preference and viewing for various types of persons in terms of content and style facets of television programs. The study focuses on the dynamics in the relationship between programs and the viewer's processes in his preference and selection of these programs.

The question which gave rise to this study came out of research evidence indicating a low correlation between what people say they like and what they actually watch. Given that the purpose of television is to maximize the satisfaction for the viewer, a high correlation would be expected between preference and viewing.

Program rating services usually measure audience size. Audience size represents the viewer's choice from among alternatives available to him at the time. An assessment of preference is aided by a free choice from among a wide range of various kinds of programs simultaneously available. Rather than examining a large number of viewers in terms of a few programs, this thesis examines a few viewers in terms of a wide range of programs.

However, it is not assumed that conditions for a perfectly "free" choice are possible. Various forces are assumed to be operating. In order to work toward a full picture of the viewer's decision-making processes, it is necessary that at least some of these be taken into account. Such dimensions accounted for in the thesis include:

1. Personal Preference. These are the programs which the viewer finds most enjoyable, and which he considers most fun and entertaining.
2. Social Desirability. These are the programs he feels people "ought" to watch. They are the kinds of programs which are "good" for people. There are others which he feels are not good for people, and such programs ought not to be watched.
3. Perceptions of Spouse. He anticipates that his wife (or husband) personally likes or dislikes these programs more than others.
4. Familiarity. Expression of preference or actual viewing presumes an awareness of alternatives.
5. Actual Viewing. The viewer estimates how many times he has seen a program out of the last ten times it has been provided.
6. Orientation to Television. The viewer has a general orientation to television beyond his responses to the content and style in specific programs.

Guttman's facet analysis and Stephenson's Q-methodology were used to structure a sample of 50 programs representing a variety of combinations of elements of content and style in currently available television programs. The instruments were administered to twenty-six persons, the members of nine families. The two dimensions under focus of attention--personal preference and actual viewing--were separately submitted to factor analysis with persons as variables and items as observations.

The personal preference factor analysis provided three types A, B, and C. Type A rejects factual and fantasy content but strongly clings to fictional-representational stories. She likes moral issues in her drama, and she decidedly rejects comedy and light entertainment. Type B is a child's type who likes simple, non-complex, non-moral fantasy and comedy. Type C enjoys factual programs, especially those with a moral element, but he does not watch many of the programs he says he enjoys.

The actual viewing dimension also produced three factors, X, Y, and Z. Type X watches comedy programs with female role support. She enjoys these very much, she says, but she can either take television or leave it alone. Type Y prefers programs depicting realism, but he likes his heroes to be idealistic. He watches these kinds of programs, plus

Robert Richard Monaghan

most of his wife's favorite programs. Type Z represents a thirteen year old boy and two adults. He still likes cartoons, but feels uneasy about it. He also watches factual programs, but does not enjoy them as much as simpler programs.

TELEVISION PREFERENCE AND

VIEWING BEHAVIOR

By

Robert Richard Monaghan

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Communication

1964

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indeed fortunate to have the experience of working with Professor Malcolm S. MacLean, Jr. as advisor of this thesis. I deeply appreciate his intellectual leadership which made this thesis possible, and gladly express my gratitude to him. It was through my associations with him and my other colleagues in the Communications Research Center that the research became really fun and enjoyable, and I wish to extend my thanks to him and all those who contributed their thoughts and energies and shared this pleasant and intellectually stimulating experience.

It is also a pleasure to express my sincere thanks and appreciation for each of the other members of my guidance committee. I gratefully acknowledge the contributions of Professor Eugene H. Jacobson, Dr. Duncan E. Littlefair, Professor Leo A. Martin, and Professor Fred S. Siebert.

I am greatly indebted to Mr. Albert D. Talbott for his many helpful contributions in the early planning of this thesis, and for his fine and able cooperation in the processing of the data.

Finally, my fullest and most abundant appreciation is expressed to my wife Lois Leaf Monaghan for the depths of her loving patience, and for her unfailing devotion and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF APPENDICES	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	
Viewer Decision-Making	
II. NATURE OF THE STUDY	
The Purpose of the Study	
Method	
Scope of Inquiry	
The Dimensions	
III. METHODOLOGY	30
First Stage Interview	
An Illustration	
Program Analysis	
Actual Procedures	
Facet Definitions	
Interview Schedule	49
Familiarity	
Viewing Habits	
Social Desirability	
Personal Preference	
Perceptions of Significant Other	
Orientations to Television	
Analytic Procedures	
IV. RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION: THREE PERSONAL PREFERENCE TYPES	59
Introduction	
Personal Preference Type A	

	Page
IV. <u>Continued</u>	
Personal Preference Type B	
Personal Preference Type C	
Consensus Items	86
Personal Preference	
Social Desirability	
Perceptions of Significant Other	
Viewing Habits	
Familiarity	
Orientations and Summary	
Summary of Personal Preference Types	
V. RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION: THREE ACTUAL	
VIEWING TYPES	97
Introduction	
Actual Viewing Type X	
Actual Viewing Type Y	
Actual Viewing Type Z	
Consensus Items	125
Personal Preference	
Social Desirability	
Perceptions of Significant Other	
Familiarity	
Summary of Actual Viewing Types	
VI. CONCLUSIONS	137
Implications for Further Research	144
The Decision-Maker	
Extension of this Study	
Program Writing and Production	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	152

LIST OF TABLES

Personal Preference Types

Type A

Table		Page
1.	Personal Preference Arrays	63
2.	Social Desirability Arrays	65
3.	Prediction of Significant Other Arrays	66
4.	Familiarity Arrays	67
5.	Actual Viewing Arrays	67
6.	Orientation to Television Arrays	69

Type B

7.	Personal Preference Arrays	72
8.	Social Desirability Arrays	73
9.	Prediction of Significant Other Arrays	74
10.	Familiarity Arrays	75
11.	Actual Viewing Arrays	76
12.	Orientation to Television Arrays	77

Type C

13.	Personal Preference Arrays	80
14.	Social Desirability Arrays	81
15.	Prediction of Significant Other Arrays	82
16.	Familiarity Arrays	82
17.	Actual Viewing Arrays	83

Table		Page
18.	Orientation to Television Arrays	85
19.	General Orientations to Television Consensus Items of Types A, B, and C	95

Actual Viewing Types

Type X

20.	Actual Viewing Array	99
21.	Personal Preference Array	100
22.	Social Desirability Array	102
23.	Prediction of Significant Other Array	103
24.	Familiarity Array	104
25.	Orientation to Television Array	105

Type Y

26.	Actual Viewing Array	107
27.	Personal Preference Array	108
28.	Social Desirability Array	109
29.	Prediction of Significant Other Array	111
30.	Familiarity Array	113
31.	Orientation to Television Array	115
32.	Actual Viewing Array	118

Type Z

33.	Personal Preference Array	119
34.	Social Desirability Array	119
35.	Prediction of Significant Other Array	121
36.	Familiarity Array	122
37.	Orientation to Television Array	123

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
I. Part I. Description of Program Factor Array Data for Personal Preference Types A, B, C	159
Part II. Description of General Orientation Factor Array Data for Personal Preference Types A, B, C	163
II. Part I. Description of Program Factor Array Data for Actual Viewing Types X, Y, Z	168
Part II. Description of General Orientation Factor Array Data for Actual Viewing Types X, Y, Z	172
III. Correlation Matrix from which Factor Analysis was Derived for Personal Preference Types A, B, C	177
Correlation Matrix from which Factor Analysis was Derived for Actual Viewing Types X, Y, Z	178
IV. Means and Standard Deviations of Facet Elements for Personal Preference Types A, B, C and Actual Viewing Types X, Y, Z	180
V. Instructions	182
VI. Q-Sample of Television Programs	189
VII. Q-Sample of General Orientations to Television	194

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Since the beginning of television in this country conflicts have arisen about the content and style of the programs, about what programs people want, and about what programs people ought to want. There has been an almost uninterrupted tossing of brickbats between various groups such as the broadcaster, the FCC, the advertiser, the educator, the public, and others. The broadcasters have been described as moneyhungry pagans who appeal to the lowest common denominator of public taste. The public has been described as dull telewits who slouch slack-jawed in front of their boob-tubes indolently gaping into a vast wasteland. Some people have even organized themselves into "citizen's committees," attempting to alter the programs, the viewer, or both.

The program preferences of the American television viewer are a matter of great significance to many people. Networks and stations compete with each other for the attention of the viewer. Presumably their success in business depends largely upon how effectively they can appeal to the viewer and hold his interest. The advertising agencies, in their efforts to encourage distribution of consumer products

and services for their clients, try to outdo each other in keeping the viewer interested. The FCC, guardian of the public interest, is expected to be aware of what the viewer's preferences are.

Each of these has a different purpose behind his concern. The network executive often must show evidence that he appeals to the largest possible number of persons when he seeks potential advertising. The sponsor, too, usually wants to draw the largest possible audience. He does not worry about the network's profits as long as he can sell his products. The director of the advertising agency concerns himself chiefly with his client's satisfaction with the writing and production of the commercial and whether he plans to renew his contact. Their knowledge of what the viewer likes is crucially important to them. Further, as a legal matter, the broadcast licensee must operate "in the public interest." The minimal, bed-rock requirement for this is "giving-the-public-what-it-wants," which many broadcasters purport to do.

The entire system of American television broadcasting has so far managed to function within this general framework of "different" but compatible purposes. There is one common ground shared by all those who influence the content and style of television programs: to know what the viewer's preferences are.

Although many appear concerned about this, relatively

few persons actually make programming decisions. In each network, for example, there is just one master control-point. The stations affiliated with that network (even those owned and operated by the network) seldom control output. They function largely to re-transmit programs (they are sometimes called "pumping stations") sent to them by the center, or by some program packager or film distributor, or other source. They rarely exercise more than veto power, if that. Even when the point of network origination is temporarily placed locally, such as on some news programs, the decision is made at the center and is revokable at any time.

The total number of centers--in proportion to the total number of stations--is small,* and the number of those within these centers who could properly be called "key" decision-makers is, of course, also small. In some cases it might be just one man, such as a board chairman, who exerts the determining amount of influence.

The key decision-makers must take a great deal into account. They must coordinate efforts to procure scripts or materials and get them into productions which will appeal to the viewer. At the same time these programs must be designed to serve as vehicles for other purposes (such as advertising) working through the viewer's preferences. Consequently, it

*In fact, the total "size" of broadcasting in this sense is very small compared to education, medicine, law, etc.

is no small part of their job to find out what these preferences are so that they can produce the program accordingly.

How much do they know about viewer preferences? What kind of knowledge is it? Where do they get their information? How do they know this information is valid?

Most of the available information comes from various rating services. Some services measure in sample homes whether the set is on, and to which channel it is tuned, often with a mechanical device attached to the set. Other rating agencies record what viewers say they watch through personal or telephone interviews or self-administered dairies. These provide the primary data which TV decision-makers use to infer which television programs appeal, and how much they appeal, to viewers. How do these kinds of data relate to what the viewer "really" likes?

Rating data may be very useful, but one can seriously question whether they represent all that the people want. The size of an audience depends, at least in part, upon what programs are being offered at a particular hour on other channels and other kinds of competition from other sources. Size depends, too, on when the program is offered. The same program at two different times might have two different ratings.

Some programs may be considered as higher in social prestige than others. For social reasons some persons might claim to prefer the much-talked about programs. It has been

suggested that on those occasions when cross-sections of the public have been asked about their preferences the results have indicated program popularity rather than actual preference (3). Popularity or prestige could be important factors where reactions are sought to groups of programs categorized by labels, such as "western," and "educational." Not only are the definitions of these labels sometimes weak and confusing, but there is the additional possibility of the social prestige factor.

Large sums of money have been spent on surveys of television audiences. Those which assessed liking for kinds of television programs have not provided sharp predictive indices of viewing behavior. One survey of the research literature in this area reports:

The extent to which people say they like programs of a type bears no particular relation to their actual viewing habits, as measured by the program rating services (3).

To the degree that this remains the case, those who determine the nature of programs which shall and shall not be seen have reason to question the information which is the basis of their decision-making.

Viewer Decision-Making

In terms of preference it must be emphasized that the viewer's actual selection of a program represents what is, to him, the most favorable alternative at the time from his own possible alternatives. These are limited to the

alternatives of which he is aware at the time. He has a choice between "watching television" and "other alternatives." He may anticipate that it would be a more desirable alternative for him to let the children have their favorite program than to watch his own favorite on another channel. Or, his most favorable alternative may be seen as a choice from among the programs offered at the time. If his past experience has led him to expect that television is generally a gratifying and useful pastime compared with other alternatives, and he is free to watch it, his choice will be of the first order.

In such a case he focuses down to choices from among the programs offered at the time. Let us suppose there are three of these, programs A, B, and C. A and B both have certain qualities, or elements, in terms of content and style which reflect his preference. Program C has content and style also, of course, but not the particular elements he happens to prefer. Since he responds more favorably to the elements in programs A and B, he will make his decision to watch either program A or B, but not C.

Suppose program A portrayed a romantic relationship between a young couple such that neither sex role was dominant. Our viewer may not object to romance, but let us say he likes to see a strong, masculine lead. Both programs A and B have predominately male roles strongly supported in them. Our viewer also likes lots of aggression, action,

even violence. Let us suppose both programs A and B have this element, as opposed to the quiet tranquility and calm of some other programs. It would appear at this point that it is a toss-up between programs A and B. However, our viewer happens to like serious programs, as opposed to comedy, and program A is serious in nature while program B is light entertainment. Consequently, he selects program A over program B.

Let us postulate that our viewer has a favorite of all favorite programs. Call it program X. This is the program which provides, to him, the best possible combination of all of the elements which appeal to his own particular preferences. It cannot be "known" that X is his ultimate favorite, of course, for he has not seen all possible programs. All such programs do not exist. Nevertheless, program X, would, if seen, more closely reflect the elements of what we shall regard as his "true" preference (36) than any other program.

Another way of looking at "true" preference is in terms of the viewer's selective behavior, as though all possible programs did exist, and were all equally available at a given time. Given a perfectly free choice (i.e., he can select any one program from the total at any time) we would expect that he would select program X first, and there would be a rank-order selection of specific programs to follow. If the order of component qualities (i.e., combinations of

elements) in his perceptions were known, we could predict a pattern for him for each program in the universe of programs.

Since our viewer lives and functions in the natural, social context of a dynamic society of interdependent members, we cannot expect such "ideal" conditions. (We would want to establish conditions which would estimate "true" preference as closely as possible, within the limits of his social environment, in order that we could use the estimate for prediction by comparing it with other indices.) The natural conditions which do exist require us to ask: What dimensions of influence would we expect to be operating which would tend to deter him from watching program X?

It is possible that program X could be re-scheduled at a time convenient for him, but without his knowledge. Or there could be programs similar to it available. If he is not familiar with the program schedule, he is likely to miss them. Some persons watch whatever happens to be on television at a given time simply because they feel like watching television at the moment. It would not even be surprising to find some watching a less appealing program on one channel while program X was on the other. Not everyone systematically plans viewing ahead. Let us assume it is the case where program X is on, but he knows nothing of it, and in fact has never heard of it, although he has recently seen programs A, B, and C. In fact, he happens to remember them rather vividly. He is then asked by an interviewer to name

his favorite program. What is he likely to say?

Suppose he comes home from a hard day at work and sits down with the paper just before dinner. The children are watching a cartoon. Program X is on the other channel. He finishes the paper. The telephone rings. An interviewer asks whether the set is on, and what program he is watching.

Such interpersonal relations could strongly influence much viewing behavior. So can mutual expectations. Take the conditions where program X is on at the time he is free to watch, and he is aware that it is on, but so is his wife's favorite program. He might now anticipate the consequences of watching program X as against the consequences of leaving the set alone so his wife can watch her favorite program. This decision will be based, at least in part, upon how important he thinks her program is to her, as against how important he feels his program is to himself. It is assumed that this will depend largely upon how much he knows about what she likes.

Everything which has been said about him could be applied to her as well. She has expectations for him, as he does for her. In both cases they would anticipate the other's enjoyment of the respective programs. And in both cases this anticipation would be based upon their knowledge of the other's preferences. If she is less aware of his favorites than he is of hers, it would not be surprising to find that her preferences were more often reflected in actual

selection than his.

The viewer's behavior is determined by his expectations of subsequent events. These expectations evolve out of his observations of patterns in past experience. He constructs a pattern of expectations, which, to him, is meaningful. Behavior based upon these patterns allows him to seek an extended relationship with his world, and he finds this useful and gratifying. This decision process applies not only to television, but in all his relationships, even in his relationship with himself. He observes patterns of how one variable affects another, and as he anticipates such patterns he finds himself less separated from his environment.

It is assumed here that the processes described above, although not directly observable, reflect "reality" for the individual which may be inferred from certain observable behavior. Such inferences are one way of formulating a basis for prediction. Such reality remains "real" for him regardless of how distorted it may appear to the observer.

As he perceives himself in his environment, continuously relating himself by structuring patterns of expectation, he develops a larger system of anticipations. This may be called an "ideal self," or an "ideal self image." This greater construction represents the kind of person he would like to be, for he expects that as this "ideal" person he could extend his orientation to the world still further.

Knowledge of his self image, such as in his general orientation toward television, might aid in the prediction of his viewing behavior. For example, if he feels he "ought not" to watch television as much as he does because his ideal concept of himself suggests that he, let us say, should attend the Wednesday evening church services, this might influence his behavior. It might also influence the way he answers specific questions about his actual viewing behavior. Or, it might explain certain attitudes about television, such as having an "uneasy feeling" about watching it.

We have seen that he has expectations of specific kinds of programs, expectations of other's preferences, and expectations of himself. We have also stated that two people can share mutual expectations of each other which are based largely upon their mutual knowledge of each other's preferences. This has implications which have not been acknowledged. Since he has expectations of her, and she of him, it would also follow that he has expectations of her expectations of him, and she has expectations of his expectations of her. Although this series of "continuous reflections" could be carried on to maddening excess, it is not our intention to press this further. The notion is simply represented in the concept of the "significant other." If he knows what expectations she has of his preferences, this may not only influence his actual selections; it might also be reflected in his expressions of what he says he likes,

especially if these expressions are made in her presence (or alone, to the extent that he has her in mind while responding to questions). The presence of the interviewer should be considered in much the same way. Answers to questions might, at least in part, represent what he expects is being expected of him.

These mutual expectations may be more broadly considered. The viewer predicts others. They predict him. And they each anticipate each other's predictions of themselves. Since we are concerned with the individual viewer, we will ignore what others might "really" expect of him, and focus specifically upon what he perceives to be broadly expected of himself by others. This might be called what he perceives to be "socially desirable," and "socially undesirable." He may, for example, enjoy reading adventure or detective magazines at home, but avoid carrying one of these under his arm to church to read while waiting for the children to get out of Sunday school. This does not suggest that he "really" likes these magazines, and hides this fact from the Sunday school teacher. He behaves differently under different sets of conditions. Previous studies (36,8) have strongly suggested that a viewer might express something other than his actual preference by saying he likes what he thinks he "ought" to say he likes. This is not necessarily a "false" report, or dishonesty in the usual meaning of the word. At the time he says he will watch one kind

of program, in the presence of an interviewer, he may sincerely mean what he says. He may envision the future situation as being very different than it turns out to be. His decisions are based upon outcomes he expects to be gratifying or useful in his orientation to the world.

Confusion may result when we try to pretend that he is composed of a given number of separate, independent entities--such as a "socially expressed self" and an "inner real self"--and that he would fit into a single mold if we could only find the right one. Each change has, for him, its own reality, including the various dimensions of influence imposing themselves upon him as well as his ways of responding to them. We perceive him in the same way. He is the swiftly flowing succession of many images, each representing a different reality, and each superimposing itself upon the last to form a total composite picture in our perceptions and in our investigation.

CHAPTER II

NATURE OF THE STUDY

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this thesis is to determine patterns of viewing and preference for various types of persons in terms of content and style facets of television programs. The study focuses on the dynamics in the relationship between programs and the viewer's processes in his preference and selection of these programs. Some of the difficulties of television program decision-making leading to this problem have been pointed out. To the extent that the key decision-makers are not aware of these problems it is unlikely that maximum satisfaction will be provided to the viewer. It is assumed here that the purpose of television is to provide maximum satisfaction to the consumer or viewer. It follows that a worthy direction for research is to attempt to find out what these satisfactions are. One way of doing this is to find out what elements are most satisfying from within those programs currently available for various types of persons. Such information should lead to improvements in program planning and production. When the currently available elements of content and style which appeal to various types of persons can be determined, it is

expected that this may be projected into future programs and tend to increase viewer satisfaction.

It follows from the problem and this rationale that this study is seriously concerned with problem-oriented theory. The task here is the development, rather than the demonstration, of theory, and the study is exploratory. While analysis will be guided by theory and implicit hypotheses, no formal a priori hypotheses will be tested.

Method

The problem suggests that we closely examine the preferences of a few persons rather than to tally the selections, by program, of large samples from the population. It would be difficult to explore the dynamics in the relationship between the individual consumer and the content and style of television programs by broad correlational elaboration. This thesis is not a survey of television audiences, and no large sample is required. It is not the purpose of this study to observe the way in which many persons respond to a few programs, but rather to observe how single types of persons respond to a variety of programs under various conditions of instruction. Stephenson's Q-methodology (51) was selected to best serve this purpose. Given the assumptions in Q for developing viewing and preference types, we would expect to find such types in other samples of the public.

Typologies are developed from factor analysis.

Factor analysis, as it is used here, is such that when we have a cluster of persons who are similar, they are represented as a factor. The particular use of factor analysis in this study is described more fully in Chapter III. Basically, it is used here as a method of theory development. Each factor represents a hypothetical type of person. Persons are asked to behave under various sets of instruction, and the method is a way of summarizing relationships among the events of their behavior. Such a summary is not presumed to exhaust the universe of types. Although the types reported will be mutually exclusive, they are not necessarily comprehensive.

In this study a modification of Guttman's facet analysis (18,19) is used to order the content and style of television programs. This method of analysis is illustrated in the chapter on methodology. The more specific use of this method as it is applied in this study is also described there. Essentially, it is a form of content analysis. As in Stephenson's dimensionalities, combinations may be factorially generated. In this case these are program element combinations. Enumeration of such combinations from presently available programs reveals that only a fraction of possible combinations are available to the viewer.

While these forms of analysis are ways of imposing orderliness, there are other ways not used in this study. Populations could be divided up into persons having high and

low intelligence, open or closed minds, male or female, rich or poor. Further divisions could be made, such as rich, average, and poor. Combinations of demographic characteristics could be used as indices and given the label of "socio-economic status."

However, this study is not particularly concerned with such characteristics. It is concerned with individual types of persons and the way they respond to television under various conditions of instruction. Given different conditions of instruction, we would expect them to behave differently. As a first step, it is suggested that a reasonable approximation of the most important influences which may be operating on the viewer in his natural decision-making environment be estimated. These are outlined generally later in this chapter, and such dimensions are more fully and operationally defined in Chapter III.

Scope of Inquiry

Since this is an exploratory study, and not a survey intended to generalize to a specific population, the persons interviewed were purposively selected. They might be classified mainly as middle class. In only one case is the husband's income more than \$10,000. Most are high school graduates. Four have B.A. degrees, and one has legal training in addition to this. Two of the adults graduated from high school, and one never attended high school. Twenty-six

members of nine families are interviewed in all. The interviews were individually conducted in the late winter and early spring of 1963. The time required for each interview was about four hours per person. There was an attempt to represent general age, occupational, and socio-economic categories rather broadly. For example, the husband's occupations include: a university instructor, a painter, a boy scout executive, a factory foreman, a civil service office worker, a minister, a legal aid attorney, an engineering executive in a motor factory, and a graduate student. The ages of the youngest couple are 21 and 26. The oldest couple are both 53. Husband-wife members of the same families are interviewed in all cases. Children interviewed were generally between the ages of 17 and 20, although three were as young as 13 and 11. The primary criteria for selection were that person interviewed represent family members in their natural household settings (as compared, for example, with a classroom of college sophomores), and that they have one working television set. The requirements for this thesis are met by these persons.

The Dimensions

These persons were interviewed under the following conditions of instruction: (1) what programs they like, (2) what programs they feel they should like, (3) what programs they think their spouses like, (4) what programs they are familiar with, (5) what programs they actually watch, and (6) their general orientation toward television. The operations of these instructions are called dimensions, and have been selected as important forces on a viewer's behavior.

The literature may be seen as split into two parts. The first is represented by specific studies conducted by MacLean and others (34,37,38). These tend to focus on response patterns of persons to content and style in a variety of mass media, and on the decision-making processes in the selection of such media. Various researchers in the Department of Communications at Michigan State University are working in areas of responses to advertising, music, pictures, and photographs. This may be seen as the context for this study. A team of researchers, of which this investigator was a part, tackled the problem of predicting television viewing. This study evolved out of that team effort, and focuses on behavior in regard to television under the various conditions mentioned above. The second part of the literature is represented by studies which, together,

consider responses to television very broadly, even though the individual studies may be highly specific. These are found in the section on orientations to television.

The various dimensions may now be described more fully. The literature is cited primarily to indicate where other work, which may be considered related to these dimensions, is found. In some cases the literature review also suggests substantive relevance to this study.

Social Desirability

A respondent may say he likes something because he thinks it is expected of him to say this. The viewer anticipates what others perceive as socially acceptable or socially desirable. This might be expressed as behavior which he perceives to be generally "good" for people. Pearlin (45) discovered that preference for serious programs increases with social class. Winthrop (60) obtained a positive correlation between rank values for programs according to "high-brow" status and scale values of preference. David Riesman (46) and others have hypothesized that the media present an accompanying set of social values along with the more explicit content. Even the notion of "television" seems to be perceived as existing within some such "hierarchy" among different kinds of messages. When open-ended questions were presented to persons in one study (17) some persons perceived television to be generally associated with social level, and almost all with "the poor class," "ordinary people," "the

average working person," and "people without too much money."

Systematic studies have discovered an increasing linear function of the judged socially desirable scale value of an item (personality trait) and the probability of endorsement. That a person often expresses what he anticipates to be socially acceptable, rather than what he believes applicable to himself, is not a new or isolated finding (10). Independently conducted studies (29,20,59,13) in which persons have individually judged items (such as personality traits) have shown high correlations between the items and other characteristics expected to be socially desirable (e.g., "well-adjusted," "emotional health"). Danbury and Talbott (8), in an investigation of television viewer types, found consensus items very much reminiscent of Allen Edward's social desirability factor. The data strongly suggest ". . . that viewers might be agreeing upon what they think they ought to agree--that such serious programs as How Governments Work deserve attention, and that Local Talent and Wrestling are in poor taste." The strength of social desirability was demonstrated by Hanley (20). In two separate experiments, personality trait items were rated by students on a scale of social desirability, i.e., opinions on how "people in general" felt about the attitudes expressed by the items. Social desirability was represented by the median rating given the items by the judges. Different samples of judges were used in each of the experiments. A

comparison of judgments of eleven items common to both groups was taken as an index of the social desirability rating stability. The median social desirability rating for the eleven items common to both sets of judges in the respective experiments are as follows:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Experiment I</u>	<u>Experiment II</u>
1	5.0	4.8
2	7.6	6.5
3	2.6	2.6
4	4.4	4.7
5	3.8	3.3
6	4.0	2.6
7	8.6	8.5
8	8.8	8.8
9	2.5	2.2
10	4.3	4.0
11	1.2	1.1

Generally, the judgments of the items by the two groups tends to hold quite stable, as can be seen in the figures.

Following the earlier social desirability study (10) mentioned above, Allen Edwards wanted to know if this factor operated in the research projects employing Stephenson's Q-technique (51) as it had in responses to personality inventory. He subsequently administered 135 weighted Q-sort items to 50 male, and 50 female college students (9). The main weight assigned to each item was found for each group. These were then correlated with the social desirability scale values which had been previously established. The product-moment correlation for the male group was .84 and for the female group it was .87.

In the preliminary analysis of data from which the present study developed (38) correlations between social desirability and personal preference ranged from .87 to .43 with a median of .69.

"True" or Expressed Preference

"True" preference is a postulate which could be considered somewhat analogous to other such notions, such as the concept of "ideal" self (48). Although the idea of "true" preference serves a useful function, the application of the notion will be in terms of "personal" preference, since personal satisfaction is emphasized in the instructions.

Interpersonal Perceptions

Social forces operate in media selection. There is evidence that organized listening groups, for example, increase actual selection (30), and that primary groups are likely to share similar attitudes (43). It is not necessary for the other members of the group to be present to influence the individual. His views tend to be very like those persons who are significant to him, quite independently of whether they watch the programs together or even discuss them (47).

One area where Q-technique has been used quite extensively in ways similar to the use of this study is in clinical psychology. Carl Rogers, for example, conducted an

entire program of research which included perceptions of a client by a therapist, perceptions of therapist by client, perceptions of the therapist by his supervisor, and so forth. Prediction of the significant other's television preferences may be closely compared to some of these uses.

Actual Viewing Conditions

Although it may not be necessary for significant other persons to be present in the room in order to influence the viewer, they are present about 90 per cent of the time (38). Any two persons in the viewing situation would not be expected to share exactly the same preferences. Also, an individual who enters a room for a specific purpose, such as to rest, or read a magazine or book, might find himself viewing a program someone else had selected. What one gets out of the program might be influenced accordingly. It has been pointed out that a person behaves differently in different situations because he feels different. The immediate social forces may influence behavior.

Familiarity

Decision implies a knowledge of alternatives. If a viewer is unaware that a program is available, the likelihood of his selection of the program would be expected to be reduced. Preliminary analysis for this study--correlations of various dimensions with actual viewing--indicated that familiarity is most highly associated with viewing.

Orientation to Television

Focused interviews conducted during the early part of this study suggested that there are a variety of orientations to television. That is, various persons related themselves to television in general very differently. Much of this orientation could be classified as "uses and gratifications" derived from television. Joseph Klapper very recently indicated that research in this area is badly needed. In fact, he says: "I do not personally know of a single use and gratification study that focuses on the adult audience" (27). Some of the focused interviews suggested statements which were included in a set of Q-items. Other statements were suggested by various members of the research team mentioned earlier. Some of these came indirectly from the limited literature in this area. These statements may be found in the appendix. Although this literature is not specifically related to television, a knowledge of the relationships between consumers and other mass media may help place this dimension into a broader theoretical context. This context may be seen in the three divisions of anxiety-reducing function, means of escape, and role identification.

One of the early studies focused on the psychological effects of not having a newspaper (2). Bernard Berelson conducted 60 intensive interviews of a stratified sample by rental districts during the 1945 newspaper delivery strike in New York. He found some subjects who used the medium to

relate themselves to their broader environment, and for others it provided social prestige. He also developed the hypothesis that there is a kind of value in reading per se in American culture, and daily newspapers were most convenient for this purpose. The study suggested that newspapers serve an anxiety-reducing function. Some persons seemed to perceive the world as somehow threatening to them, and the daily ritual or ceremony of newspaper reading was an almost compulsive way of seeking reassurance. Herta Herzog's early study (21) seems to suggest a kind of tension-reducing function of radio serials by those listeners who felt burdened by their own problems and were relieved to be reminded that "other people have troubles, too."

The concept of anxiety was taken more centrally into account in a study which indicates a relationship between "motivation" and anxiety (24). Findings from thirty-five questioned respondents suggest the greater one's anxiety the less enjoyment he perceives in news stories, and the less he reads. It is suggested that persons who repress anxiety tend to read less, generally, and that highly anxious people complain most vociferously about sensationalism. A report of a recent study of the relationship between anxiety and the media (40) found, among other things, that a large majority of radio listeners claimed they would not switch off a news broadcast in order to hear something else they enjoyed in spite of the fact that they had already heard the newscast.

Although the concept of escape, like the concept of anxiety and many others, is fuzzy and in need of clarification, it must be recognized that something one might call the escape function exists for some viewers. It has been suggested (23) that the context within which media exposure takes place may encourage its use as an escape mechanism, and that this is not necessarily dysfunctional. It has been indicated elsewhere (44) that television sometimes functions to remove the viewer temporarily from whatever stresses might be imposed upon him. It has been suggested, (11) for example, that a child who is limited socially and physically can find escape and vicarious vent for his desire for freedom in a Hollywood western. The function of escape, however, can be carried to pathological extremes. A case study (39) reports a schizophrenic girl who refused to relate to her environment as most persons do, but instead had completely surrendered herself to a fantasy life. Psychiatrists were unable to communicate with her until an interview in which they discussed television programs. Clinical purposes with the girl were aided by this one area of fantasy which provided a common frame of reference between patient and therapist, and from which the distinction between social reality and fantasy addiction could be pointed out.

A third category of these two dimensions may be seen as role identification and role interest. Early interview probings have shown that some persons enjoy a program because

they identify themselves with a certain personality, or are attracted to the program because of a characterization which they find appeals to them. One of the earlier studies (55) found that female daytime radio serial listeners identify themselves with various characters in the dramas. These programs also served as miniature morality plays, reflecting a model of the idealized behavior and values of the contemporary life style. Another study (32) of children exposed to motion pictures found that subjects identified themselves with leading characters of their own sex. It was also found that they were most likely to choose those characters whose social class represented the person's aspiration, or ideal class, rather than his actual socio-economic status.

An investigation (33) which assumed that males and females would identify with the respective leads in motion pictures found that persons tend to focus most of their attention, as measure by eye-movement, on the character they perceived as the subject of action in the drama. Males, particularly, spent more time watching the male lead. Recently, a Q-study (28) of role identification with advertising pictures found that persons identify closely to those corresponding to themselves in terms of sex and age. An interesting finding of this study was that persons tend to identify their ideal-self concepts more closely when exposure objects were presented in color.

While some find tension-reducing functions, others

find gratification by identifying themselves with certain characters. Still others find more socially-oriented uses of the media. For example, the media provide some non-controversial, or "safe" topics of conversation, something like the weather. One study (4) illustrates such uses of newspaper cartoon strips.

Another article (22) suggests that the media serve as a substitute for social interaction. The performer, speaking directly to the camera, creates the illusion of direct, intimate, and informal interaction. The receiver reciprocates in much the same way as he does with "real" people.

There is also good reason to believe that the subject matter--that is, what the program is about--should be considered important (34) in relating program preference to persons. This will be dealt with more fully in the next chapter. So far, many studies concerned with responses to programs have used broad and poorly-defined categories of programs. Although these have provided some interesting and informal analyses, research is needed which can clarify the relation between the way a viewer responds and the content and style of the programs with more systematic precision.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The relationship between various kinds of television program content and style and viewer preference and behavior may be observed in at least two ways. One way is to focus first upon a viewer's personal preference, and compare observations of him on other dimensions such as those described in the last chapter. Another way is to focus first upon his actual viewing habits and compare the other dimensions, including personal preference, with what he actually watches. In one case we are asking: In what ways are these various dimensions associated with his personal preference? In the other case we are asking: In what ways are these dimensions, including personal preference, associated with his actual viewing habits? Both ways are used in this study.

First-Stage Interviews

This thesis focuses in the direction of the problem outlined above. This area of interest grew out of discussions among members of the research team previously mentioned regarding the problems in predicting viewing behavior. The team was using Q-technique, which serves as an appropriate method for this particular kind of study. Q allows

individual persons to describe their perceptions under various conditions.

Prior to the systematic Q-interviews focused interviews (41) were conducted. There were twenty-five focused interviews and twenty-six Q-sort interviews.

The focused interviews were conducted in such a way that the interviewee did not become immediately aware of the specific intention of the interviews. During this orientation period of investigation it was considered desirable to observe the viewer broadly, following the natural patterns of his own natural context.

Focused interviews began with descriptions of time use patterns by persons, starting with the time they awoke in the morning. They were told the purpose of the interview was to study leisure time activities, and daily time use patterns in general. Usually the persons themselves introduced television into the interviews, and as they did the particular programs they watched were noted only as though these were equally important with other activities. As the interviewee described his typical day various other conditions were introduced, first by himself, and later re-introduced by the interviewer. For example, a wife might mention that at a certain time her husband usually returns home from work after she had previously mentioned that the television set was turned to a particular program. Later in the interview she was asked about a comparison between television

program preferences of herself and her husband, particularly in regard to, let us say, the actual selection subsequent to his return from work. After the person had completed a description of, say, the previous day, the interviewer returned to the specific programs selected under the various conditions of viewing (i.e., husband home, husband not home) and compared the program actually watched with the others available at the time. In fact, such comparisons were made even more broadly with other activities in general. If the person watched program A instead of programs B or C the interviewer probed into what elements of content and style seemed to appeal to the person which may have determined the decision to watch one program over the other two. Other considerations were introduced also, such as probes into what the person's friends thought of the program, and whether he discussed it with them. Any area in any way relevant to the problem which might be mentioned by the interviewee was picked up by the interviewer for further probing. The early portions of the interviews were typically factual and casual. The interviewer attempted to create a permissive, non-judgmental relationship between himself and the person being interviewed. The "why" questions behind preferences and behavior were explored as deeply as possible. What is there, for example, about a certain element in program A which makes it more appealing than a "similar" element available in another channel?

The focused interviews usually required between one and two hours. Persons interviewed were selected in such a way that there was some range in terms of demographic characteristics, particularly in age, sex, occupation, and education. The entire approach at that time--the late fall of 1962--was very general. Many areas, such as the dimensions previously described in this paper, were explored. At that time many quasi-focused interviews were also conducted in brief meetings with bus drivers, grocers, barbers, and others. It was a period of broad exploration and orientation.

An Illustration

The focused interview data were extremely useful, both in terms of substance and method, in developing the interview schedule and in constructing the instruments for subsequent systematic interviews. These early interviews--and discussions about them among various researchers--provided many statements regarding the way in which persons responded to television in general, and more specifically to the content and style of various programs.

The relationship between content and style, including responses of various kinds of persons to these, lies at the heart of the study. To get an understanding of this relationship it was necessary to infer what elements of appeal were working within programs which were perceived and responded to by various persons. Combinations of these

appeal elements were coded and placed on Q cards. Sorting of these cards into a modified-normal distribution provided the viewer with much more freedom than usually available to him under normal viewing conditions where he has only a choice from among three programs at a given time. It should be pointed out that the items are not the programs themselves. Q-technique is useful, however, when one wishes to talk about the perceptions of one person because it gives him a broad range of choices. It is especially useful in small-sample studies. The Q-sorting procedures would be highly expensive for survey type studies. In order to illustrate how facet analysis and Q-technique were used, a miniature example of the procedures is provided.

Let us suppose that on the basis of focused interviews we find that some people like noise and violence in their television shows, while others prefer tranquility and peace. Some like light entertainment and humor. Others prefer heavily serious programs. Some prefer a mixture of interaction between male and female roles, where neither sex is dominant. Others like a strong, commanding male lead. There are many elements, but let us illustrate the kind of procedures used in this study.

Such elements may be substructured by means of facet techniques similar to those which have been suggested by Guttman (18,19). In this study we are not arriving at a single dimension of facet combinations. We are taking the

complete matrix similar to William Stephenson's approach, as in his example using Jung's theory, but Stephenson does not provide the culling procedures which Guttman does.

The elements mentioned above may be reduced to three facet levels by such procedures with two levels in each, as follows:

- a) Aggressions: A_1 Violence, vigorous action, a lack of concern for others, noisy.
 A_2 Non-violent, calm and quiet, peaceful.
- b) Humor: B_1 Programs designated by the investigator as comedy.
 B_2 Programs designated by the investigator as non-comedy.
- c) Sex roles: C_1 Both male and female roles are about equally supported, or are presented in such a way as to complement each other.
 C_2 There is a strong, dominant male role.

By culling out facet elements in this way, a more parsimonious and systematic structure of the programs is established. This substructure of programs, as the elements within them relate to responses expressed by viewers who had been interviewed, may be hypothetically expressed in the following model:

Some viewers prefer $(A_1 \text{ high aggressive})$
 $(A_2 \text{ low aggressive})$ programs which this
 investigator has coded as $(B_1 \text{ comedy})$
 $(B_2 \text{ non-comedy})$ and in which

$\left. \begin{matrix} (C_1 \text{ mixed}) \\ (C_2 \text{ male}) \end{matrix} \right\}$ sex roles are supported.

We desire to assure ourselves that an equal proportion of each of these elements is represented in our sample of items. These may then be placed in a factorial design as follows:

	A_1		A_2	
	B_1	B_2	B_1	B_2
C_1	$A_1B_1C_1$	$A_1B_2C_1$	$A_2B_1C_1$	$A_2B_2C_1$
C_2	$A_1B_1C_2$	$A_1B_2C_2$	$A_2B_1C_2$	$A_2B_2C_2$

Now that the total combinations of the facet elements are isolated and defined, we can represent each combination by television programs which are representative of them. We first examine, let us say, the entire evening program schedule. Since the evening period is generally a period of leisure for most persons, these are the programs which we may assume persons have had an opportunity to select more uniformly than any other pool of programs. These are the programs most likely to have been seen by most persons interviewed. We can designate a time period from, say, 6:30 to 11:00 P.M. A group of researchers, who are familiar with both the facet elements and the program schedule, then code the programs according to the criteria designated by each facet element combination. In some cases programs are found to be so accurately a reflection of the facet element combinations that they serve as definitions of those particular

combinations.

Let us suppose that this is done for the eight combinations provided out of the factorial illustration above. This might provide eight television program Q-items as follows, accepting the parenthetical explanations of facet combinations found in verbal form under each.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Facet Elements</u>	<u>Television Program Q-Items</u>
(1)	$A_1B_1C_1$	<u>Michigan Polka Party</u> (7:00 Saturday) Polka music and dancing with a polka dance orchestra. (Program contains "loud" music and much physical action; is light-hearted in nature; supports both male and female role equally)
(2)	$A_1B_1C_2$	<u>Jackie Gleason's American Scene Magazine</u> (7:30 Saturday) Music, dance, comedy skits, and jokes with comedian Jackie Gleason as performer and master of ceremonies. (Loudness, sometimes violent slapstick comedy; designated a comedy; male role dominant)
(3)	$A_1B_2C_1$	<u>Dick Powell Theater</u> (9:30 Tuesday) Guest stars are featured in series of action, adventure, mystery-suspense stories, and an occasional light comedy. (Although the series contains a mixture of elements, there is often physical violence, seriousness, and often mixed role support)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Facet Elements</u>	<u>Television Program Q-Items</u>
(4)	$A_1 B_2 C_2$	<u>Combat</u> (7:00 Tuesday) Action-packed war adventure portraying combat soldiers under fire. (Heavily violent, extremely serious strongly in support of male role)
(5)	$A_2 B_1 C_1$	<u>Ozzie and Harriet</u> (7:30 Thursday) The Nelsons portray themselves in lighthearted family-comedy series. (Calm and peaceful, light comedy, mixed sex roles)
(6)	$A_2 B_1 C_2$	<u>Perry Como</u> (9:00 Wednesday) A musical variety program starring Perry Como, and featuring Peter Genero dancers, Ray Charles chorus, and celebrity guests. (Non-violent and tranquil, light and/or comedy, support of male star)
(7)	$A_2 B_2 C_1$	<u>Walt Disney</u> (7:30 Sunday) Walt Disney presents a wide range of his own productions designed for both children and adults. Features include nature films, biographies, classic young people's literature and cartoons. (Generally non-violent, mostly serious productions in series, mixed sex roles, or at least not strongly supporting the male role.)
(8)	$A_2 B_2 C_2$	<u>Len Stuttman</u> (7:00 Monday) Local world-traveler Len Stuttman interviews guests and shows semi-documentary film of nature's many elements and creatures. (Usually non-violent, serious, generally supporting the male role)

Each of these items is then printed on IBM cards and coded according to the facet element combinations. The title of the program, the program description, and the time the program is scheduled are all included to aid subjects in relating each card item to the specific program it represents. The descriptions are also provided to increase the common frame of reference among subjects, for some subjects may be expected to have seen some programs more than other subjects.

These Q-items are then handed to a person with instructions to sort them into a modified normal distribution. For this illustration let us suppose the subject is simply asked to sort the items he likes most on the right end of the distribution, and the items he likes least at the left. Before him we have placed, in this case, only five ranks. The number of items to be sorted into each rank is noted on the pile card. With only eight items to be sorted into five ranks the distribution might appear as follows:

		Least Like			Most Like	
Pile		1	2	3	4	5
No. of Items		1	2	2	2	1

Since the instructions and items are identical for each person, a constant frame of reference is provided in the event the researcher wants to administer the instrument to others and compare the sorting of one subject with the sortings of others. The fixed distribution offers the

advantage of yielding data for which the means and standard deviations of all sorts are identical, thus simplifying correlational procedures a great deal.

Just for the moment, let us suppose we have none of the methodology just described. All we have is the conglomeration of the following eight programs without even a rationale for the selection of these: The Michigan Polka Party, Jackie Gleason's American Scene Magazine, Dick Powell Theater, Combat, Ozzie and Harriet, Perry Como, Walt Disney, and Len Stutzman. Given a choice of these, the viewer would place them in a hierarchy of preference. If he were free to select any one of them first, and then the second in order of his preference, and so on through the entire set of program there would be $8! = 40,320$ possible rank orders of selection. When the total number of all available programs during the entire program schedule is considered in view of the tremendous incremental expansions of factorial multiplication with the introduction of each additional program item, the overwhelmingly chaotic conditions for assessing preference may be readily seen. Furthermore, even if the subject's specific rank-order of all the available programs were known, it would be extremely difficult to make any meaningful systematic inferences about his preference without a theory. Such a confused state of affairs clearly suggests that some system is required which will reduce the problem to a more amenable size.

Program Analysis

Fortunately, such conditions as those described above do not have to exist. Stephenson's Q-technique of sample structuring and Guttman's facet analysis--both having their roots in Fisher's basic notion of factorial design--are available to help us bring order out of chaos.

Let us now return to our illustration. Our subject is handed eight items, each representing the eight television programs previously described. Before him are the five rank cards, each representing a portion of the distribution illustrated in the previous section. Each of the five piles are assigned values corresponding to their respective numbers. He is asked to sort the eight items into the five piles, with the number of items per pile as indicated by the distribution, according to whether he likes or dislikes the item. He is asked to place the item he likes most in the extreme right-hand pile, and the item he likes least in the extreme left-hand pile. He is asked to continue sorting the cards into the distribution in this way, working back and forth toward the middle. The middle pile represents the items he does not care very strongly about one way or the other. Our subject sorts the cards into the distribution in the following way:

	Least Like			Most Like	
File	1	2	3	4	5
Items	5	7,3	6,1	8,2	4

This distribution of the items represents the expression of his preference in terms of facet elements as follows:

$A_2B_1C_1$	$A_2B_2C_1$	$A_1B_1C_1$	$A_1B_1C_2$	$A_1B_2C_2$
	$A_1B_2C_1$	$A_2B_1C_2$	$A_2B_2C_2$	

Looking at facet element C_2 it can be seen that it would have a score of 16, as compared with a score of 8 for element C_1 . Similar scores may be computed not only for other single elements, but also for various combinations of elements up to the total number of elements used. For example we could take the B and C facet combinations enumerated as B_1C_1 , B_2C_1 , B_1C_2 , B_2C_2 and compute their scores by dividing the number of facets into the total scores of each respective combination of elements. In this case the scores are:

	B_1	B_2
C_1	2	2
C_2	3.5	4.5

Each single element, or combinations of facets taken n at a time, will be weighted according to the particular approximation of the normal distribution used.

Remembering that B_1 and B_2 represent comedy and serious, and C_1 and C_2 represent mixed and male roles, it is possible to observe a pattern in our viewer's expression of preference in terms of facet elements. One might infer, for example, that his highest preference is a strong, dominant male role. He not only has the highest positive score on this element, but the mixed role element is decidedly rejected as well. We can observe that the B and C combinations indicate that his hierarchy of preference is highest for the male-serious facet element combination, while male-comedy ranks next, and mixed-comedy and mixed serious are the lowest of the order. Similar inferences may be made for other combinations in such a way as to establish his rank-order of preference more fully in terms of facet elements.

The facets need a good deal of refinement. There is evidence that they are "working," however, and are more promising than previous methods of relating program types to audience response. The facet analytic approach brings system and precision toward understanding and predicting this relationship. There is also the highly interesting possibility of program development through this technique.

In this study:

- a. The number of facets is larger
- b. There are more Q-items representing the combinations of facet elements
- c. The size and range of the distribution is expanded
- d. The number of persons interviewed is increased.

Six facets were selected which factorially generated 216 combinations. These were used to structure a sample of fifty television program items which had been selected from the evening schedule available in the Lansing, Michigan area during the winter of 1963. A list of these programs, and their schedule times, is in the appendix. Only a portion of the facet elements were represented by existing evening programs. At least one Q-item was included in the sample for each available program represented by these combinations. While structuring the sample it was found that some facet element combinations were represented by as many as twenty programs. In other words, the factorial combinations generated out of the actual focused interview data indicate that there is a great deal of program duplication, and at the same time there are many "empty" areas. It is possible that a wider range of facet element combinations would provide a greater number of types of responses to the programs.

There were only a fraction of the facet element combinations represented by currently available programs. Because of the vacuum areas heterogeneity was maximized in the present study by representing thirty-two of the combinations available by one program each, and the remainder by more than one. The remaining eighteen items were replicated from additional programs on the currently available schedule.

In addition to the six facets mentioned, three new facets of two elements each emerged out of preliminary analysis of the data (38) providing nine facets in all. The working definitions of facet elements in this study were established in essentially the same way as was described in the illustration.

Facet Definitions

A. Value:

1. Moral. Those programs where moral values are intellectualized--where all is not white or black, but there are shades of gray. Differing views of morality are presented in conflict, a resolution is not necessarily involved. The Defenders is an excellent example of this type of program.
2. Moral-Sentimental. In these programs there are clearly "good" guys and "bad" guys, and a singular "right" that triumphs. It might be called a "cliche morality," as illustrated by The Loretta Young Show.

3. Amoral. In these programs moral issues are not considered. Password is an example.

B. Seriousness:

1. Comedy. These are comedy, light entertainment, and even musical shows, usually self-designated by the program format such as The Ed Sullivan Show.
2. Non-Comedy. Serious programs, also indicated by the format or in the introduction of the show.

C. Sex Role:

1. Male. These are strong, dominant role support, such as in Ben Casey, or Have Gun, Will Travel.
2. Mixed. Neither role is dominant over the other, as on Password and Stump the Stars.
3. Female. Emphasis is on the female role, or it is supported as in The Nurses.

D. Complexity:

1. High. Given a flow of circumstances, it is difficult to predict subsequent events or outcomes in a high complexity program. Alfred Hitchcock, Naked City, The Defenders, and Twilight Zone are examples.
2. Low. The so-called formula programs, such as Lassie, Dennis the Menace, and Ozzie and Harriet are low.

E. Reality:

1. Factual. The presentation of events as they actually are, or were; or persons being presented as themselves, such as Jack Parr, Candid Camera, CBS News,

or Hootenanny.

2. Fictional-Representational. Actors play roles of characters other than themselves, but portraying "possible" persons in "possible" circumstances. Examples are True, Armstrong Circle Theater, and Dr. Kildare.
3. Fictional Non-Representational. These programs may present improbable, fantastic, or cartoon characters in "believable" circumstances; or "believable" characters in unlikely situations; or it may be a combination of both "unreal" conditions. The Flintstones, Twilight Zone, and Yogi Bear are examples of this element.

F. Aggressive:

1. High. Violence, general "loudness" of the program, and perhaps a lack of consideration of one party for another. Combat and Danny Thomas are examples.
2. Low. Non-violent, more "quiet" programs, and perhaps some expression of kindness or gentleness. Dr. Kildare, Perry Como, and The Lawrence Welk Show are examples.

G. Scripted:

1. Semi-Scripted. The format is flexible, non-rigid. Some comedy shows like Red Skelton and Jackie Gleason--and most game shows such as Stump the Stars and Password--are semi-scripted, or not fully scripted.

2. Fully Scripted. The format is rigid, non-flexible. Cartoons, most dramatic programs, documentaries, and news programs are generally fully scripted.

H. Gentility:

1. Genteel. Some programs reflect what some consider "polite," "proper," or "genteel" characteristics of content and style. For example, Father Knows Best depicts "nice" people.
2. Non-Genteel. Other programs reflect behavior which is to some, considered crude, not "nice." The Untouchables, Combat, and Jackie Gleason are examples.

I. Variability:

1. High. There is much variation within a series. Examples are The Dick Powell Theater, Walt Disney, Chet Huntley Reporting.
2. Low. There is very little variation of content and style within a series. Ben Casey and Lassie do not vary greatly within their series of programs.

These are the definitions for the sample available in the appendix, and serve as codes for the facet elements for each item.

Interview Schedule

This study began with the focus of attention on television preference and viewing behavior and the dimensions which may intervene. In the paragraphs below the operational definitions of these dimensions, and some rationale for them, will be described. The entire set of instructions may be found in the appendix.

Familiarity

A five-point Likert type scale was used to assess familiarity with individual programs. Each person was given a list of the entire weekly evening program schedule, and told:

Here is a list of some of the programs available on Channels 6, 10, and 12 during the evening hours. I'll go through this list with you, and for each program I'll ask . . . you to give me an estimate of how familiar you are with the program. Our only concern here is whether you know what the program is about, not what you think of it, or whether you watch it. If you are very familiar with it on the whole, we'll call it a five. If you are familiar with it on the whole, we'll call it four. If you are somewhat familiar with it, we'll call it a three. If you are only vaguely familiar with it, we'll say it is two. If you know nothing at all about the program, we'll call it a one.

The subject was given a card during this portion of the interview containing the following:

- 5--Very familiar
- 4--Familiar on the whole
- 3--Somewhat familiar
- 2--Only vaguely familiar
- 1--Don't know anything about it.

Viewing Habits

The same program schedule used above also contained a similar scale with values from 0 to 10. The subject was then told:

The next thing I'll want to ask you is how often you have seen the program out of the past ten times it has been on. If it is a weekly program, and you've seen it each week for the past ten weeks, say "ten." If you've seen it only three times out of the last ten weeks, say "three." Always consider the number of times you've seen it out of the total, remembering that some programs are on daily, some weekly, some twice a month, and so on. You will have to make rather broad estimates, of course. We don't expect you to remember exactly. Just do your best to make your estimate as accurate as possible.

Social Desirability

The research evidence indicates that a social desirability factor may be strongly operating and the possibility that some persons perceive TV programs along such a dimension suggests that respondents be interviewed to find what they think people are supposed to like. The Q-sort consisted of the fifty items of programs to be found in the appendix.

Each person was given the cards with the following instructions:

Each of these cards has the title and brief description of a television program. I want you to judge each program on how desirable or undesirable you think it is for television to present such a program. Is the program good for people to watch or not good for them to watch? I want you for the moment to forget about which programs you personally enjoy or do not enjoy and which programs you have or have not the chance to watch. Please think only of how desirable or undesirable it is for it to be on television.

Here is a deck of cards. (Cards are handed to respondent.) You can tell me your judgments by sorting these TV programs from those which are the most desirable for people to watch to those which are most undesirable for people to watch.

Personal Preference

As has been illustrated the notion of "true" preference is a hypothetical construct, and is more accurately considered as "personal" preference operationally analogous to notions such as the "ideal" self image. Q-technique has been employed in a large number of studies which have attempted to reach as closely as possible to similarly hypothetical concepts, such as the "ideal self," the "ordinary person," the "remembered self," and others (48). The technique has also been used in regard to the "projected self" (14), "needs" (58), "mood" (49), and even for descriptions of God (42).

Identical items were handed to respondents to sort into the same distribution with the following instructions:

Each one of us has individual and unique tastes which are not necessarily similar to anyone else's likes or dislikes. Certain TV programs have a special delight for us, regardless of what anyone else thinks of them. To us, individually, privately, and personally, such programs are good entertainment, satisfying, just plain fun. We all enjoy having a good time once in a while, and these would be the TV programs which we would find personally satisfying and enjoyable.

Whether or not you have the opportunity to watch some of the programs on the cards is not important. The important thing is whether you think it is the kind of program you would find enjoyable or satisfying if you could watch it. Base your estimates on what knowledge you have of the program and on the brief description of it.

Certain other programs don't provide us with any fun, enjoyment or similar satisfactions. They may be depressing, take the fun out of life. They may be boring or actually annoying or at least they give you no fun and enjoyment.

Here are the same programs you judged before on whether they were good or bad for people. Now, I want you to sort these programs on how much each one is the kind of TV program which gives you personally fun, enjoyment, excitement, good entertainment, relaxation, a good time. . . .

Perceptions of Significant Other

The notion of the significant other, as it is used in this paper, has been described in Chapter I. Various applications of Q-technique in the operations of similar dimensions have been described in Chapter II. As used in this study the use of Q is relatively straightforward. The measurement of this dimension is primarily concerned with A's prediction of B's relation to object X, i.e., television

programs. In this study A and B are interchangeable.

The same distribution as before is used, and the interviewee is instructed:

While you've been doing this last sort, your wife has been doing the same thing. That is, she has been using these same cards to describe the programs she enjoys most. How do you suppose she sorted the cards? I'd like you to sort these same cards again, only this time I'd like you to sort them as you think your wife would have sorted them.

These same instructions are re-phrased when given to the wife, of course.

Orientation to Television

We begin with the notion that a viewer orients himself to his environment by selecting messages which he anticipates will be useful or gratifying, or both. The viewer has also been described as a person behaving differently under various conditions and various ways of perceiving the world. Our way of observing him is much the same. We are interested in more than just one dimension of him because we want to approximate a full-blown picture of him.

Although the way he responds to content and style of specific programs under various conditions greatly contributes toward this picture, it is not enough. We need to expand our view of him toward his orientations to television in general. This added dimension may offer greater insight into him as a whole person.

The literature helps us to place this dimension of him in a broad theoretical context, and some of the findings regarding anxiety reduction, escape, and role identification may relate specifically to certain types of viewers. However, the statements used for this dimension generally came only indirectly from the literature through the team of researchers previously mentioned. Some of the statements came directly from the focused interviews, but all came out of the early discussions during the early exploratory period. According to Stephenson it is not necessary for a sample of items to be structured, and these are not.

The basic procedures for this measure are essentially the same as in the previous sorting. The primary difference is that the person is asked to express his orientation toward television in general rather than to specific programs. Persons were instructed to sort the forty-three item Q-sort of statements (which may be found in the appendix) into the following distributions:

		"Least"						"Most"				
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Rank												
Number of cards		2	3	4	5	5	7	5	4	4	3	2

The instructions were as follows:

Here are some new cards you've not seen before. I'd like you to use them just the way you did the others. Look at each one, and decide whether it describes the way you yourself feel. Put the cards that describe the way you feel in a pile on the right. Put the ones which describe the way you

do not feel in a pile on the left. And the ones which fall into neither category, or that you're not sure about, in a pile in the middle. Then pick out the two cards that best describe the way you feel in the extreme right hand pile, number 11. Then go to the left hand pile and pick out the two cards which are the most different from your feelings about television on the extreme left hand pile card, number 1. And so on, working back and forth, toward the middle.

Analytic Procedures

Two possible ways of observing the problem have been suggested. One was to focus upon personal preference as the other dimensions (e.g., social desirability, actual viewing, et cetera) are associated with it. The other was to focus upon actual viewing habits as the other dimensions--including personal preference--are similarly associated. These data for each of the dimensions described have been collected by Q-sorts, and the other two ranking procedures. The method of analysis for these data is factor analysis.

The analytical model indicated the following statistical operations:

1. Factor analysis of personal preference using the fifty item Q-sort of television program items.
2. Factor analysis of actual viewing habit scale.

The variables in each matrix were persons. Distribution of the items, or responses to the scales, represented observations on that dimension for that person. The inter-

correlations within each matrix were obtained by correlating the distribution of each person's responses with the responses of each other person in the sample. The intercorrelational matrices, which were symmetrical across the diagonal, showed the correlation of the array of each person with the array of every other person. From these matrices principal-axes solutions were calculated. The principal-axes solutions were submitted to Varimax rotation. These are orthogonal factors. That is, the procedure produced three separate factors, or hypothetical type persons. A factor represented a cluster, or grouping, around a common pattern of responses.

The selection of the three factor solution was determined by the principle of parsimony, as just suggested, by selecting the solution which best accounts for the variance.

Individual persons on a given dimension were associated with a hypothetical type according to the extent to which they load on one of these factors. Those persons who were most closely associated with each type were used in the weighting system for establishing the arrays. The sorting arrays, and other response patterns, of those persons who had the highest loadings on a given type were weighted on that type according to the following formula:

Where r is the loading

$$\text{weight} = \frac{r}{1 - r^2}$$

The product of each of these weights and the scores of each item were added for all the other persons who loaded highly on that type. This produced an array of scores weighted by item, as in the case of Q-sorts and by rank in the case of scales, for each type. This provided item arrays for each factor indexed by Z-scores.

Once these arrays were established for personal preference and for actual viewing the persons who weighted highest on each of three types for both dimensions were used as foci for establishing such arrays on each of the other dimensions. This is a very recently developed method (35) of analysis and is particularly useful for the purpose of this study.

The method provided basically two kinds of factor analytic data. On the first set of data there are three types each represented according to Z-score indices on the personal preference dimension. The arrays of those persons loading highest on each type were used as foci in the weighting, just as described above for producing the types, except that the arrays of each type are represented on each of the other dimensions. On the other set of data the procedure is the same, except the focus was on three types for actual viewing habits, and the arrays of the other dimensions represent these three types.

We have the expression of personal preference for three types of hypothetical persons represented by Z-score

arrays. We also have Z-score arrays of these same items, but on each of the other dimensions, as weighted by these first three types. The data say: Here are three types of persons on the dimension of personal preference, and here are the ways these same types of persons responded to the other dimensions.

We also have the estimate of actual viewing for three types of hypothetical persons represented by Z-score arrays. And we have Z-score arrays of all the other dimensions--including personal preference--as weighted by these three types. These data say: Here are the estimated viewing habits of three hypothetical types of viewers, and here is the way these same types responded to the other dimensions, including personal preference.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION: THREE
PERSONAL PREFERENCE TYPES

Introduction

Viewers were given television Q-items with instructions to sort them according to their own private enjoyment and personal satisfaction. Factor analysis of these data provided three factors. Each factor represents a hypothetical type of person. These three types--identified by the letters A, B, and C--are described in this chapter. The factor arrays of each personal preference type were weighted by the persons loading highest on that type to provide additional arrays for each of the respective types as they behaved under five other conditions of instruction. Each of these personal preference types are described as they appear under personal preference. Each of these same types are also described as they behave under instructions of the other five dimensions: social desirability, prediction of significant other, familiarity, actual viewing habits, and general orientations to television. This design may be graphically outlined as follows:

<u>Personal Preference</u>	<u>Socially Desirable</u>	<u>Predict S.O.</u>	<u>Familiar</u>	<u>Actual Viewing</u>	<u>Orientation To Television</u>
<u>Type A</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
<u>Type B</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
<u>Type C</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

There are some programs and some kinds of orientation upon which there are varying degrees of consensus among the three types. These are excluded from the individual type descriptions in order to bring the distinctions between types into clearer relief. That is, since there are some programs and some statement items upon which there is consensus among all three types there is little point in describing these three times over. The consensus items are those in which the difference of the Z-scores between types is less than 1.0. This could mean the item was rejected or accepted or placed in the middle by all three types, but all three types behaved similarly.

The table presented first for each type represents the programs that type of viewer personally enjoys most and least. These tables are presented in the form of the arrays as distributed by each type. The highest and lowest items correspond to the most accepted and rejected items by that type of viewer. Generally, the cut-off points of these arrays are 1.0 standard deviation above or below the mean.

The Z-scores indicate the strength of acceptance or rejection in relation to the other items in the array for that type. There is no need for tests of significance in these scores, since no hypothesis is being tested. Generally, the items designated by an asterisk are those which have a score for that type which is 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other two types. That is, it is an item which distinguishes that type in relation to the other two types.

The other tables are similarly represented except that they represent how a given type of viewer with a particular hierarchical pattern of preference responds under other conditions.

It is not assumed here that a hierarchy of preference for a type of person represents what he "really" likes, and that the other conditions of instruction represent some kind of contamination or distortion of his "true" inner taste. All six dimensions, or ways of looking at the person, are considered together with the focus on personal preference. The three types of persons on personal preference are the ones which came out of the factor analysis and we are describing the same three types of persons all through this chapter. The other five dimensions are considered in relation to the personal preference type in order to add to the total view of that type of person. Each type of person is expected to behave somewhat differently under different

conditions. Each additional condition of instruction contributes to the total picture of him. This is why the various conditions of instruction are called "dimensions." Each represents another way of looking at the behavior patterns of the same set of persons under different conditions. If all possible dimensions of a given person were superimposed together, it would provide a total view of that person. This, of course, is not possible. Here we begin by focusing upon his personal preference, and observe how the other dimensions of him relate to this. This is done for all three types of viewers.

Personal Preference Type A

All but one person who loaded high on this factor were female. Type A tends to strongly prefer serious and dramatic programs, and rejects comedy. The only preferred comedy program is Dick Van Dyke, which is not a program which discriminates Type A from the other types. One person said she liked the Dick Van Dyke program because it depicted light and pleasant domestic relations, and indicated that she wished the relations within her own family were more like those in the program.

Although Dick Van Dyke is a comedy program, there are occasional "flashback" stories of their period of courtship which contain at least a suggestion of romantic drama. All the other programs most enjoyed by Type A are heavily

dramatic, often highly emotional, sometimes powerfully so. Yet they consistently depict possible persons in possible situations.

One of the most interesting features of this type of viewer is the preference for strong support of the female role, such as in The Nurses. The nurses, in The Nurses, are not just supported. They are consistently predominate over the male roles, even though it is in a hospital setting. The leads in The Nurses tend to be strong and "right" in much the same way Dr. Ben Casey is strong and right on his program.

Table 1. Personal Preference for Personal Preference Type A:
Array of Most Accepted to Most Rejected (Consensus
Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.89	Dick Van Dyke	-2.08	Fight of the Week
1.68	The Defenders*	-2.04	Make that Spare*
1.50	Dick Powell*	-1.49	International Show-
1.49	The Nurses*		time*
1.41	Combat	-1.47	Len Stuttman*
1.24	Route 66*	-1.24	Lantern to the Stars
1.21	Naked City*	-1.15	Lawrence Welk Show
1.12	Ben Casey*	-1.14	Jackie Gleason
1.08	Armstrong Circle	-1.10	Great Composers
	Theater	-1.09	The Flintstones
1.04	Bonanza	-1.00	The Lucy Show*

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

The Nurses is a discriminating item for this type, and it may be seen as unique in the sample. There are two other programs which support the female role. These are The Lucy Show and Donna Reed. "Lucy" plays a clown-like role, and Donna Reed plays the wife and mother. The Lucy Show is rejected because it is not enjoyable for Type A. Donna Reed is neither rejected or accepted. The Nurses, which is serious and heavily dramatic, is the only program of its kind strongly embraced by Type A.

All of the discriminating items accepted as most personally enjoyable contain both moral-sentimental and fictional-representational elements. Also, none of the discriminating rejected items, except The Lucy Show, contain either of these two elements.

Type A considers Chet Huntley Reporting to be good for people, or socially desirable, even though it is not one of her own favorites. Yet she claims to watch it a high proportion of the time. A similar situation exists in her behavior toward Close-up, The Defenders, and Armstrong Circle Theater. They are the kinds of programs everybody "should" watch, but not the ones she actually selects for herself. The only program this type seems consistently sure about on the social desirability dimension is Dick Van Dyke, which came out strongly as a discriminating item. It appears that this is not only an enjoyable program, but also important as the kind people should watch.

According to Type A Combat is great fun, but not the kind of thing other people ought to see. It is possible that "others" in this case means children. Combat, Bonanza, Route 66, and Naked City are all low for this type on the social desirability dimension. The rejected items under the personal preference and social desirability dimensions for Type A are somewhat stable. Most of the programs which Type A dislikes are also not good for other people to watch. Dobie Gillis is only mildly positive as an enjoyable program, but considered a program which is not really good for people. Dennis the Menace is not enjoyable for Type A, but even more strongly rejected under social desirability.

Table 2. Social Desirability for Personal Preference Type A: Array of Most Accepted to Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.95	Chet Huntley Reporting	-2.18	Fight of the Week
		-1.71	Make That Spare*
1.65	Close-Up*	-1.65	Jackie Gleason
1.56	Armstrong Circle Theater	-1.61	Stump the Stars
		-1.40	The Flintstones
1.53	The Defenders*	-1.35	The Lucy Show*
1.41	Dick Van Dyke*	-1.08	Dobie Gillis
1.12	The Nurses*	-1.07	Dennis the Menace
.99	Dick Powell		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Type A predicts many of the same programs most personally enjoyable as also preferred by the husband. Added to these are CBS News, Alfred Hitchcock, and Candid Camera. Although Ben Casey is highly enjoyable for Type A, the husband is perceived as almost neutral regarding it. The significant other is predicted to somewhat enjoy Bonanza, Armstrong Circle Theater, and Naked City. The Defenders is predicted as enjoyable for the husband person, but this is a consensus item described later. The rejected programs tend to hold considerable consistency on these dimensions.

Prediction of Spouse Type A

Table 3. Prediction of Significant Other (Spouse or Parent) for Personal Preference Type A: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.87	Dick Powell	-2.08	Make That Spare
1.61	Dick Van Dyke	-1.85	Fight of the Week*
1.16	CBS News	-1.31	Lassie*
1.10	Alfred Hitchcock	-1.26	Len Stuttman
1.09	The Nurses*	-1.18	Great Composers
1.08	Combat	-1.01	International Show-
1.06	Candid Camera		time
.99	Route 66		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Familiarity Type ATable 4. Familiarity for Personal Preference Type A: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected by Z-Score (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.17	Dick Van Dyke*	-2.27	Make That Spare
.89	The Nurses	-1.88	True
.89	Perry Mason	-1.52	Fight of the Week
.86	Combat	-1.47	Jazz Casual
.83	Yogi Bear	-1.29	Stump the Stars*
.69	Dick Powell	-1.19	Len Stuttman
.68	Perry Como Show	-1.13	International Show-time*

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Actual Viewing Type ATable 5. Actual Viewing for Personal Preference Type A: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
2.74	Dick Van Dyke*	-1.25	Ozzie and Harriet
2.29	Combat	-1.25	Lawrence Welk Show
1.73	Route 66*	-1.21	Fight of the Week
1.62	Dick Powell*	-1.05	Jack Benny
1.49	The Nurses*	-1.05	Perry Como Show
1.28	Candid Camera	-1.03	The Flintstones
1.23	The Andy Griffith Show	- .99	Jackie Gleason
1.01	Chet Huntley Reporting*		
1.00	Perry Mason		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Most of the programs which offer the most personal satisfaction are also viewed by this type. Candid Camera is added to the list of actually viewed programs, and this is predicted as enjoyable for her husband.

Yogi Bear is rejected rather strongly on the personal enjoyment dimension, and yet it is fairly high on familiarity. It would appear that the children select it, and mother is quite familiar with it for this reason. She is also slightly familiar with Perry Mason, and she watches Perry Mason. She predicted her husband as enjoying this show at 1.68. In general, she is familiar with the programs she prefers, and these are the ones she watches, to a large extent.

Orientation to Television of Type A

Type A's orientation to television indicates that it is seen as most desirable to visit with friends, attend a theater presentation of some kind, or a movie than stay home and watch television. Type A appears to be the kind of person who wants to get out of the house more often. The arrays of items also suggest a tendency to watch more television than intended, and then feel uneasy about it. There is also a strong expression of dislike for television commercials. She appears to neither strongly embrace nor reject television in general.

Table 6. Orientations to Television for Personal Preference
 Type A: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected
 (Consensus Statements Excluded)

Accepts	
Z-Score	Statement
1.66	I would rather visit with friends than watch TV.
1.48	I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television when I know there are other things I should be doing.
1.30	I'm generally pretty easy-going about television programs. I'll usually watch whatever the rest of the family likes.
1.30	I find many programs on TV stimulating and highly enjoyable.
1.27	*I think lectures, concerts, plays, and other things like these are much more enjoyable than TV shows.
1.14	*I'd rather go out to a movie than to watch television.
1.13	I can and often do other things while watching television.
1.12	Once I start watching television I find it hard to turn it off. Sometimes I watch it longer than I really want to.
Rejects	
Z-Score	Statement
-1.76	*I enjoy watching most TV commercials.
-1.71	I'm afraid too much television could cause a person to become involved in the play-acting world and lose touch with reality.
-1.60	Television helps us to have a closer and more satisfying family life.
-1.31	It bothers me a lot when I have to miss my favorite TV program.
-1.22	Watching television is what I best like to do in my leisure time.

*Statements which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

The facet element means and standard deviations indicate that Type A is more entertained by fictional-representational programs than by any other single element. Type A not only enjoys this element, but strongly rejects both factual and fictional-non-representational, especially factual. The only element Type A rejects more decidedly as personally unsatisfying is non-scripted found in many of the rejected items on all dimensions. Type A likes fully scripted programs like Route 66, The Nurses, and the Dick Powell Theater. Within the value facet there is an order of preference for Type A which follows moral, moral-sentimental, and amoral. Amoral is sharply rejected more than either of the other two types, although they also reject it somewhat. Type A also rejects comedy consistently. Serious shows are more enjoyed, more socially desirable, and more often viewed than are comedy shows. Finally, Type A enjoys programs which support the female role, as long as this support idealizes it, and does not use it for humor.

Summary

Type A prefers programs which are seriously dramatic, fully scripted, and contain a moral or moral-sentimental quality. She does not enjoy programs which are non-scripted, factual, and amoral. She wants heavy drama, and this is what she watches more than anything else. Although she tends to watch her own favorite programs, she sees herself

as being flexible and adaptable to the preferences of others in the family. She is not a strong critic of television, but neither is she a strong supporter of it. Television is not considered dangerous or harmful, but she often starts watching a program and becomes involved in it, and then feels uneasy about watching it as much as she does. Being confined to the home more than she prefers limits her alternatives, and television viewing is one of these. She would prefer to get out of the house more than she does. She does not regret missing even her favorite program for an opportunity to engage in social activities with friends, or attend a play or a movie with her husband.

Personal Preference Type B

Type B most enjoys simple comedy shows. He rejects serious, highly complex programs, or programs which attempt to struggle with moral problems. His own preference programs suggest that he likes to watch television just for the fun of it, although it is not quite that simple. It would appear from the most enjoyed list of programs that this might be a children's type, and this is largely the case. Most of those who loaded highest on this factor are children, but not all. Perhaps there is a bit of child-likeness in many adults. One woman of thirty-four, the mother of four, placed Yogi Bear as the highest ranking of all the fifty

programs as most enjoyable and entertaining. She is an ardent bridge player and a fairly heavy reader. When probed regarding this choice she said:

It gives me a pure release from my everyday problems. The program is light and amusing, and the characters are appealing.

Table 7. Personal Preference for Personal Preference Type B: Array of Most Accepted to Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.95	The Flintstones*	-1.70	Alfred Hitchcock*
1.64	Yogi Bear*	-1.64	Fight of the Week
1.56	Candid Camera	-1.52	Armstrong Circle
1.48	Beverly Hillbillies*		Theater*
1.26	Jack Benny	-1.40	Great Composers
1.25	Combat	-1.37	The Defenders*
1.22	Red Skelton*	-1.31	Naked City
1.07	Danny Thomas	-1.21	Lantern to the Stars
		-1.17	Jazz Casual

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Regardless of who loaded high and who did not, however, this type best represents a child-like array of preferences. All of the programs except Combat are presented in fun and are defined as comedy. None of the rejected programs contain this element. Perhaps the lightest of the rejected programs is Jazz Casual, and this is the least strongly rejected of all in terms of personal satisfaction.

Table 8. Social Desirability for Personal Preference Type B:
Most Accepted to Most Rejected (Consensus Programs
Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.79	Len Stuttman*	-2.00	Fight of the Week
1.50	The Andy Griffith Show	-1.91	Alfred Hitchcock
		-1.82	Naked City
1.41	Ozzie and Harriet*	-1.69	Jazz Casual
1.27	True	-1.44	Twilight Zone
1.24	Candid Camera*	-1.30	Jack Parr
1.20	Beverly Hillbillies*	-1.10	Armstrong Circle Theater*
1.13	Jack Benny*		
1.08	Password*		
1.02	Yogi Bear*		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Type B not only prefers simple, low complexity programs as the most entertaining, he also strongly rejects high complexity programs which have unpredictable outcomes.

Although he clearly enjoys the Beverly Hillbillies he does not watch it as much as his preference score might indicate. This may be accounted for by the fact that he predicts the significant other (one of his parents) as rejecting it decidedly. Perry Como, which was predicted as highly enjoyable for the parent, was scheduled opposite the Beverly Hillbillies. He also enjoys Red Skelton a great deal, but seldom watches it. This program is quite neutral for this type of person on the social desirability dimension, and is also quite neutral in his predictions for the significant

other. Danny Thomas has a low score on the social desirability dimension, and an almost neutral prediction for the parent, and Type B rarely watches the program.

Table 9. Prediction of Significant Other (Spouse or Parent) for Personal Preference Type B: Array of Most Accepted to Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.77	Alfred Hitchcock	-1.77	Michigan Polka Party*
1.77	CBS News	-1.77	Lawrence Welk Show*
1.77	True*	-1.77	Dobbie Gillis
1.41	Combat	-1.41	The Nurses*
1.41	Dick Powell	-1.41	Dick Van Dyke*
1.06	Close-Up*	-1.41	Candid Camera*
1.06	Jack Benny	-1.41	Beverly Hillbillies
1.06	Jack Parr*	-1.06	Perry Como Show*
1.06	Stump the Stars*		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

In general the programs considered to be socially desirable by Type B contain much less fantasy than those he prefers. He sticks to his humor and light entertainment when asked to express the program he considers good for people, but the programs he considers socially desirable are more factual than those he enjoys.

As Type B predicts the programs most enjoyed by his parent the level of complexity increases above his own preference, and he also sees his parent as enjoying more serious

programs. It is interesting that his own most rejected program, in terms of personal satisfaction, is Alfred Hitchcock because this is also one of the highest programs predicted for the parent's entertainment. He happens to consider it bad for people, also. However, this situation apparently does not force him to watch the program. His actual viewing and familiarity for Alfred Hitchcock are both low.

Table 10. Familiarity for Personal Preference Type B:
Array of Most Accepted to Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.62	The Flintstones*	-2.24	Jazz Casual
1.46	Yogi Bear	-2.08	Make That Spare
1.29	Combat	-1.69	Voice of Firestone
1.21	Bonanza	-1.69	Fight of the Week
1.07	Walt Disney	-1.36	Perry Como Show
1.04	Len Stuttman		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

He likes The Flintstones, Yogi Bear, and Combat, and he gets to watch these programs. He appears to be influenced to watch certain other programs which are less enjoyable to him, but none of his strongly rejected programs seem to be forced upon him. He apparently gets his own way at least part of the time. The strongest forces operating on his actual viewing of Password and True are social

desirability and the preferences of his parents.

Table 11. Actual Viewing for Personal Preference Type B:
Array of Most Accepted (Consensus Programs
Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
3.29	Candid Camera*	-.85	The Ed Sullivan Show
3.05	The Flintstones*	-.85	Perry Como Show
1.94	Yogi Bear	-.85	Michigan Polka Party
1.63	Combat	-.85	Jackie Gleason
1.34	Password*	-.85	Fight of the Week
1.34	True*	-.85	Dick Powell
1.32	Len Stuttman*	-.85	Dennis the Menace

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Walt Disney is high on the familiarity dimension, and this would also be represented as a discriminating item on actual viewing, except that it is a consensus program, and was excluded. Type B actually views this program a great deal more than either A or C. Type B actually views it about as often as he wishes.

It was mentioned earlier that Type B seems to like to watch his programs just for the fun of it, but that it is not quite as simple as this. The highest general orientation statement, and a discriminating one for this type, expresses an uneasiness about watching television. Perhaps he feels he should be doing his homework instead of watching TV.

Table 12. Orientation to Television for Personal Preference
 Type B: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected
 (Consensus Items Excluded)

Accepts	
Z-Score	Statement
2.11	*I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television when I know there are other things I should be doing.
2.02	*Sometimes I like to just drift away into the fantasy world of a television program for a while and forget all about my own concerns and the things around me.
1.88	*Sometimes when I feel worried about something or I'm tense, I watch television to help me forget my problems.
1.41	I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television as much as I do. There are other things I really want to do more.
1.41	I can and often do other things while watching television.
1.36	No matter what I do in my spare time, I like to plan how I'll spend it ahead of time.
Rejects	
Z-Score	Statement
-1.40	Television helps us to have a closer and more satisfying family life.
-1.36	*I think lectures, concerts, plays, and other things like these are much more enjoyable than TV shows.
-1.29	*I consider television a real friend and companion.
-1.17	Watching television is what I best like to do in my leisure time.
-1.16	Sometimes I like to have the set on, even though I may not be watching, just to have the feeling that someone is around.
-1.15	I'm afraid too much television could cause a person to become involved in the play-acting world and lose touch with reality.

*Statements which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

The third statement suggests that television programs have some use or gratification as a kind of escape device, and the second statement strongly supports the gratification notion suggested for fantasy under personal preference. All three of these statements are very high, and the fourth statement re-affirms the guilt, or uneasy feelings. When these general orientations are placed in juxtaposition to Type B's own preference, it seems to suggest that his favorite programs are not, to him, as simple and carefree as they might appear to others. There also seems to be an interesting paradox here. Type B feels uneasy about watching television, and yet uses it as a means of drifting away from tension associated with the problems he sees in the world about him. He also rejects the notion that television serves as a form of companionship, yet likes to have the set on just for the feeling that someone is around.

Summary

Type B very strongly rejects high complexity programs, and has a high personal preference for very simple, low complexity programs. He finds gratification in fantasy. Fictional-non-representational not only ranks high on B's own hierarchy of preference in terms of facet elements, but he is also the distinct embracer of this element when compared to the other two types. He also stands out in clear relief as one who grasps just about all the comedy he can get, and

seems to exert sufficient influence over actual selection to get it at least part of the time. Although he misses some of his favorite programs, he does not watch many programs which he actually dislikes. The two influences which appear to deter him from watching his favorite programs are other members of the family who may "outrank" him, and his own concept of what he should watch. In addition to having a preference for low complexity within the content and style of a given program, he also tends to enjoy those which have low variability. That is, he likes programs which follow similar format patterns week after week.

Personal Preference Type C

This type of person likes to see nice people on good clean factual shows. He enjoys programs like The Perry Como Show, Lawrence Welk, and Dick Van Dyke. There is seldom anything crude or improper about these programs.

He rejects programs like Jack Parr, where a questionable joke may be heard; The Beverly Hillbillies, where the characters fail to observe certain prim proprieties; and Danny Thomas and Ben Casey where the leads are often obstreperous. He accepts Perry Mason, which depicts some undesirable elements, but Perry Mason himself is a nice gentleman.

Table 13. Personal Preference for Personal Preference Type C:
Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus
Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
2.02	CBS News*	-2.23	Twilight Zone*
1.69	Perry Mason	-1.73	Jack Parr*
1.62	The Ed Sullivan Show*	-1.50	Combat*
		-1.16	Stump the Stars
1.60	Perry Como Show*	-1.15	Danny Thomas*
1.60	Lawrence Welk Show*	-1.10	The Flintstones
1.55	Chet Huntley Reporting*	-1.07	Ben Casey
1.34	Dick Van Dyke		
1.14	The Lucy Show		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

He enjoys factual programs, and rejects fantasy strongly. He wants to see CBS News and Chet Huntley Reporting, where the facts are reported. He also enjoys The Ed Sullivan Show and Lawrence Welk, where what one sees is "real." He rejects Twilight Zone which presents real persons in unreal situations, and he rejects The Flintstones which presents cartoon characters in reasonably real situations.

The programs he considers socially desirable are even "cleaner" than those he enjoys in some instances. Lassie, The Andy Griffith Show, Lawrence Welk, Walt Disney, Perry Como, and The Voice of Firestone all usually present nice people in nice situations. The programs he considers

bad for people to watch are very like his own personal rejections.

Table 14. Social Desirability for Personal Preference Type C: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.65	Lassie	-2.05	Twilight Zone
1.55	The Andy Griffith Show	-1.91	Combat*
		-1.71	Naked City
1.46	Lawrence Welk Show*	-1.48	Jack Parr
1.44	Chet Huntley Reporting	-1.44	Stump the Stars
		-1.33	Jazz Casual
1.42	Armstrong Circle Theater	-1.02	Fight of the Week
		-1.01	Ozzie and Harriet*
1.36	Walt Disney	-1.00	Beverly Hillbillies
1.30	The Ed Sullivan Show*		
1.25	Perry Como Show*		
1.21	Voice of Firestone		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Although CBS News is very high as his own personal favorite, he does not watch it. The actual viewing score is very low, and his familiarity with it is even lower. This is in sharp contrast to his own preference score. He also places it as a very strong program on social desirability; he places it higher than do either of the other two types and all three types place it high.

Table 15. Prediction of Significant Other (Spouse) for Personal Preference Type C: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.88	The Ed Sullivan Show*	-2.00	Jack Parr*
1.70	The Andy Griffith Show	-1.57	Combat*
1.69	Candid Camera	-1.53	Dobie Gillis
1.51	Jackie Gleason*	-1.29	Beverly Hillbillies
1.51	The Lucy Show*	-1.27	Yogi Bear
1.45	Perry Mason		
1.45	Perry Como Show		
1.21	Jack Benny		
1.20	Lawrence Welk Show*		
1.16	Dick Van Dyke		
1.09	Red Skelton Show		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Table 16. Familiarity for Personal Preference Type C: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.34	The Defenders	-2.49	Jazz Casual
1.34	Perry Mason	-2.49	Hootenanny*
		-1.89	Donna Reed*
		-1.30	Walt Disney*
		-1.30	True
		-1.30	Len Stuttman
		-1.09	CBS News

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

An explanation for this situation is offered in his prediction of his wife's enjoyment of the program. She rejects it. A similar situation exists in regard to Chet Huntley Reporting. His own preference for the program is very strong, and his social desirability rating of the program is almost as high. Yet he does not watch it. His perceptions of his wife's enjoyment of the program is that she is not at all impressed by this program.

Table 17. Actual Viewing for Personal Preference Type C: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
2.77	Perry Mason*	-1.15	Walt Disney
1.76	The Andy Griffith Show	-1.14	Ozzie and Harriet
		-1.07	Michigan Polka Party
1.70	The Defenders*	-1.03	Len Stuttman
1.69	The Lucy Show*	- .99	Combat*
1.45	Lassie*		
1.34	The Ed Sullivan Show*		
1.33	Jackie Gleason		
1.20	Dick Van Dyke		
1.03	Stump the Stars		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

His own satisfaction with The Defenders is somewhat mild, and he considers it only weakly as the kind of program which is good for people. Yet it is third from the highest on his actual viewing, and he is very familiar with it. It

would appear that he is more familiar with The Defenders than he wants to be, although he does like moral programs in general. His predictions of his wife's preference for the program is decidedly strong.

Jackie Gleason is not the kind of show this person would like. Jackie Gleason does not fit the gentleman role. Some of his jokes and skits are crude. Jackie Gleason is often noisy much in the manner of Danny Thomas who is strongly rejected as not enjoyable. So it is not surprising that his own preference score for Jackie Gleason is neutral or low. Nor does he consider the show very good for people. The social desirability score for Jackie Gleason is quite low. Again, however, it is one of his most frequently viewed programs; and again we find his prediction of his spouse's preference very high for this program.

Stump the Stars is very strongly rejected by Type C as a decidedly unenjoyable program. Yet we find it among those he most often watches. In this case it is not perceived as enjoyable to his wife, but it is possible that someone else in the home does like it. His second highest orientation to television statement tends to agree with this pattern of viewing behavior. He sees himself as generally yielding to the preferences of others. He places social intercourse with friends higher in his general preference hierarchy than watching television, but he reverses the order when the choice is altered from just watching

television to watching a specific favorite.

Table 18. Orientations to Television for Personal Preference
Type C: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected
(Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts	
Z-Score	Statement
1.84	I find many programs on TV stimulating and highly enjoyable.
1.70	I'm generally pretty easy-going about television programs. I'll usually watch whatever the rest of the family likes.
1.32	I would rather visit with friends than watch TV.
Rejects	
Z-Score	Statement
-1.68	I actually resent television because it often interferes with more important things.
-1.31	*When I am with friends, and I know my favorite television program is coming on soon, I'm tempted to suggest that we all watch it.
-1.09	I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television as much as I do. There are other things I really want to do more.
-1.09	It bothers me a lot when I have to miss my favorite TV program.

*Statements which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Summary

It appears that Type C's favorites are important to him, but that there are significant others who influence his actual viewing behavior very strongly. He emerges more strongly as a person who appreciates factual programs more

than either of the other two types, and he rejects fantasy more than any other element within his own hierarchy of preference.

Both A and C decidedly reject fictional-non-representational in contrast to B. While A rejects comedy and B heartily enjoys it and uses it, C seems not particularly affected by it one way or the other. Type C also likes the facts. This is in contrast to A, who enjoys fictional-representational. It also contrasts with B who loves fantasy. C also enjoys moral shows, rejects amoral, and to a lesser extent rejects moral-sentimental. Type C also prefers programs which portray "nice" people, or genteel situations. Type A seems to get her own way in regard to actual selection a good deal of the time. Type B appears influenced by others who may be older, and perhaps physically stronger, but he manages fairly well. Type C, it appears, is just influenced by others.

Consensus Items

Personal Preference

When persons were given the fifty television items with instructions to sort them on the basis of personal preference and enjoyment, only two items--one high and one low--clearly emerged among all three types. There were other items all three types shared relatively weak feelings about.

For their own personal enjoyment all three types PREFER--

<u>Mean Z-Score</u>	<u>Item</u>
1.46	3. <u>The Andy Griffith Show</u>
Do NOT Prefer--	
-1.01	27. <u>Jazz Casual</u>
And are UNSURE about--	
.83	4. <u>Walt Disney</u>
.16	44. <u>True</u>
.10	36. <u>Ozzie and Harriet</u>
-.52	9. <u>Close-Up</u>
-.88	33. <u>Michigan Polka Party</u>

It will be noticed that The Andy Griffith Show is particularly high. It is in very clear relief above the items which fall beneath it in the hierarchy of preference. It stands out boldly alone by a wide margin. Some of the probe data, comments made by persons interviewed, might be interesting and enlightening in terms of the facets elements. The low aggression, moral-sentimental, comedy, and sex role elements appear particularly reflected. The first two of these seem to be operating in the following comment by a female respondent:

It's slow-paced, and I like that because I was raised on a farm where the pace of life was slow, like that. It makes me feel at home, and it's clean morally. He's down-to-earth, solid, dependable.

Although the sex-role appears to be operating strongly in the following woman's comment, it seems to suggest a slight distinction between nondominance and mixed which was not part of our definition. Perhaps the other elements--such as moral-sentimental--are operating in close mixture with sex role:

Andy Griffith has an innate intelligence. You can feel strength in the man . . . and I like the family relations he has with the boy and his aunt. He has depth. He's lost his wife. He's quiet, and moral, and strong. He's devoted to his family, and wholesome. He's like a father ought to be, even when the boy comes into his office.

Another subject almost defined some of our facets, and more concisely than we did, in the following comment:

It's light, true-to-life . . . full of happy situations, relaxing. No problems are ever left unsolved.

An interesting comment by a male subject, a factory foreman, points out the comedy element. It also suggests other feelings which may be associated with comedy for future study. He said:

I like the little deputy. He tries to give everybody the impression that he knows what's going on, but everybody else really knows, except him. He seems true-to-life. That's the way some people are. He's like some people in small towns. He thinks he's something, but he's just a hick cop.

It almost suggests that the "clown" or "fool" had to be perceived as somehow inferior in order to be funny.

Social Desirability

The strongest consensus of all came out on this dimension. Although all three types agree that Andy Griffith is most enjoyable, it is not necessarily the kind of program one ought to watch. This distinction is most predominantly reserved for two programs.

All three types consider socially DESIRABLE--

<u>Mean Z-Score</u>	<u>Item</u>
2.15	7. <u>CBS News</u>
1.51	47. <u>Walt Disney</u>

All three types consider socially UNDESIRABLE--

None

All three types are UNSURE about--

.39	21. <u>Great Composers</u>
-.29	11. <u>Danny Thomas</u>
-.85	33. <u>Michigan Polka Party</u>

The probe data regarding CBS News tended toward the theme of man's orientation to the world quite consistently.

Two fairly typical comments are:

It provides basic information on what's going on in the world; our lives are affected by these events.

Everybody should keep up on news because we have to live in this world and we should know what's going on in it so we can be prepared to meet problems such as epidemics and serve weather warnings.

The other item to share the social desirability status by all three types was Walt Disney. Although some of the comments reflect the fictional-representational element, the probes suggest that the nearer the program gets on this spectrum toward factual the more socially desirable it becomes. The cartoons, for example, were considered the least desirable by one person. This suggestion would also be supported by the comments regarding the highest social desirability program.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of consensus on this dimension is the fact that no programs were considered strongly undesirable by all three types. Apparently none of the programs, even the worst, are perceived as dangerous or harmful by all types. One probe comment by a male respondent includes the following observations about Walt Disney:

. . . it doesn't offend anyone . . . none of the programs in the series are really good for people, but (the socially undesirable programs) could not change the morals of the public.

Another comment regarding the program which comes the closest to being socially undesirable--the Michigan Polka Party--was commented upon by a subject who expressed similar feelings that the program was not a potential danger. Even though it was a strongly rejected item, he said: "It's not really

undesirable, it just doesn't contribute anything."

Perceptions of Significant Other

All three types predicted significant other would PREFER--

<u>Mean Z-Score</u>	<u>Item</u>
1.56	12. <u>The Defenders</u>
1.52	39. <u>Perry Mason</u>

All three types predicted significant other would NOT prefer--

-1.28	27. <u>Jazz Casual</u>
-------	------------------------

Both of these highest two programs were defined as moral, serious, masculine, and highly complex. In a search of the data for possible explanation for these particular programs being placed highest by all three types it was observed that in every case the predictor was female, and the significant other was male. In most cases wives were predicting their husbands. However, even in those instances where children predicted their parents it was the daughters who predicted these programs for their fathers. No such evidence was found in the reverse. Furthermore, only two males expressed either of these two programs as their own personal preference, and one of these is a legal aid lawyer.

Jazz Casual is amoral, non-complex, serious, and supports both sex roles.

Viewing Habits

All three types estimated that they DID view--

<u>Mean Z-Score</u>	<u>Item</u>
1.11	4. <u>Beverly Hillbillies</u>

All three types estimated they did NOT view--

-1.17	28. <u>Lantern to the Stars</u>
-1.07	27. <u>Jazz Casual</u>
-1.00	18. <u>Donna Reed</u>

Familiarity

All three types are FAMILIAR with--

<u>Mean Z-Score</u>	<u>Item</u>
1.00	6. <u>Candid Camera</u>

All three types are NOT familiar with--

-2.54	28. <u>Lantern to the Stars</u>
-1.90	9. <u>Close-Up</u>
-1.63	33. <u>Michigan Polka Party</u>

Orientations and Summary

It will be noticed that the single consensus item indexed by all three types on the actual viewing dimension is Beverly Hillbillies. It is now possible to observe some differences--particularly in terms of complexity, value, and

reality facets--along the various dimensions for all three types. The sharpest distinctions appear between social desirability and perceptions of significant others on one hand, and personal preference and actual viewing on the other.

An examination of the general orientations to television array for all three types suggests a pattern which appear relative to the responses of all subjects under the various conditions of instruction. The highest item indicates that all three types consider themselves justified in watching television. They seem to feel they have earned it, and they seem to feel it keeps them informed and up-to-date, to some extent. It is possible that these two highest items suggest their rationale for actually watching the Beverly Hillbillies more than any other program. That is, perhaps the Beverly Hillbillies does not keep them up-to-date, but it appears that there are other programs which do. At least television in general is perceived as somewhat useful in this regard, even if such programs are not the ones which they watch most of the time.

Following on down the order of Z-scores a further pattern may be observed. Although the items are not individually strong they are positive, and they are quite consistent on at least one point: There are a good many "better" things all three types would rather do than sit in front of a television set, primarily social activities. The very next item

mildly suggests at one possible explanation. Perhaps it is just easier to watch television.

There is very high agreement among all three types that television is not considered domestically or personally harmful. This appears highly consistent with the absence of any consensus programs which are "bad for people." These three types all seem to feel that there is nothing particularly "bad" about television--it is generally embraced--but that it is not considered a particularly desirable alternative either, even though they watch it instead of engaging in whatever social activities they might enjoy more.

Summary of Personal Preference Types

Type A represents a woman who enjoys fictional-representational, serious, and heavily dramatic programs, and she tends to watch what she likes. Her high preferences for fully scripted programs may be seen as closely associated with this. Also intimately related to these is her strong attraction for moral, and moral-sentiment facet elements, and her rejection of amoral. She also enjoys the support of the female role.

Type B is a children's type who enjoys simple fantasy programs in which he can lose himself and forget his daily problems. Fictional-non-representational is not only his own favorite, but he is distinctly clear on this element in

Table 19. General Orientations to Television Consensus
Items of Types A, B, and C

Mean Z-Score	Statement
1.23	After I've had a hard day and I'm tired, I find watching TV is one of the best ways to relax.
.90	I find that I'm a better person, more informed and up-to-date on things, because of television.
.55	I can think of lots of things I'd rather do than watch television.
.47	When I have free time, I don't like to hang around the house and watch TV. I much prefer to do things that take me out of the house where I can be around people.
.42	I'd much rather be active in the clubs or organizations I belong to than to watch much TV.
.32	Television requires too much sitting around, doing nothing. I'd rather do more active things.
.22	In my leisure time, I don't plan very far ahead. I like to do things on the spur of the moment.
.16	I don't like to have the TV set on unless I can give it my full attention.
-.25	When company drops in unexpectedly while I'm watching television, I usually want them to sit down and share the program with me.
-.74	Most TV programs bore me. I much prefer to do things that are more challenging and stimulating to the mind.
-.80	I get more relaxation and enjoyment from the radio or a record player than I do from television.
-.92	Television actually dictates too much of what I do with my time.
-1.20	My life is usually pretty dull and uneventful. Television helps me to pass the time.
-1.36	Television is too noisy and it makes me nervous to have it on very much.
-2.41	TV is just about the worst thing that ever happened to our family.

comparison to the other two types. He likes his fantasy light, gay, and funny. He watches all the comedy he can get. The strongest forces which appear to deter him from watching more of these kinds of programs than he does are his predictions of a parental preference and his concept of social desirability. For a child it may not be easy to make a clear distinction between what is good for a person to watch, and what one's parent wants to watch.

Type C enjoys factual programs with a moral very much, but his preferences are not always a predictor of his actual viewing. In fact, he watches some programs which he clearly and strongly dislikes, but which he predicts as enjoyable for his spouse.

The consensus items may be seen to be operating somewhat in all three types, but in some more than in others as has been observed.

CHAPTER V
RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION: THREE
ACTUAL VIEWING TYPES

Introduction

The last chapter presented three hypothetical types of persons based on factor analysis of Q-sort data under instructions which emphasized enjoyment, fun, entertainment and personal satisfaction. The factor arrays of the persons loading highest on each factor were used in the weighting procedure for determining the arrays of the same types under the five other conditions of instruction.

One of these five conditions is actual viewing. Individuals were asked to estimate how many times they had seen television program out of the last ten times it was available. Factor analysis of these data provide three factors. Again, each factor represents a hypothetical type of person. The factor arrays of those persons most representative of each type were used to determine how these same types of persons behaved under the remaining five conditions of instruction. Altogether there are six conditions of instruction, or dimensions, of each type. In the last chapter the focus was on three types which emerged from factor analysis of personal preference instructions. In this chapter

the focus is on three types which emerged from factor analysis of actual viewing instructions. These three types--identified by the letters X, Y, and Z--are described in this chapter. The factor arrays of each actual viewing type were weighted by the persons loading highest on that type in order to provide additional arrays for each of the respective types as they behaved under the other five conditions of instruction, including personal preference. The procedure is the same as in the last chapter except that the focus is on actual viewing types instead of personal preference types. The design of this chapter may be graphically outlined as follows:

<u>Actual Viewing</u>	<u>Personal Preference</u>	<u>Socially Desirable</u>	<u>Predict S.O.</u>	<u>Familiar</u>	<u>Orientation To Television</u>
<u>Type X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
<u>Type Y</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
<u>Type Z</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Actual Viewing Type X

Viewer Type X is a woman's type. All those persons loading highest on this factor, and who represent this type from the weighting procedures, are female. Most of the programs she watches are comedy and light entertainment, and most of the programs she rejects are heavily serious and dramatic. Her most frequently viewed program is The Lucy

Show. This is very high, and it is also a program which distinguishes her from the other two actual viewing types.

Table 20. Actual Viewing for Actual Viewing Type X: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
2.34	The Lucy Show*	-1.10	Ozzie and Harriet
2.24	Beverly Hillbillies	-1.05	Dick Powell
1.90	The Andy Griffith Show	- .95	Ben Casey
1.86	Perry Mason	- .87	Bonanza
1.55	The Ed Sullivan Show*	- .82	Combat
1.51	Dick Van Dyke		
1.16	Danny Thomas		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Her actual viewing is almost a mirror-image of her own preferences. She has a very high preference for comedy and light entertainment, and she enjoys support of the female role. At the same time she tends to reject serious drama in her preference dimension just as she does in her actual viewing. Her preference level of complexity is very low, yet she does not necessarily reject high complexity programs. She also finds fictional-representational programs entertaining, but not fantasy or factual. She rejects factual more decidedly than fantasy. She also enjoys high aggression programs, and rejects low aggression. Type X's strongest personal preferences are for comedy, and for female role support.

Table 21. Personal Preference for Actual Viewing Type X:
Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Con-
sensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.80	Perry Mason*	-2.15	Jack Parr*
1.78	Dick Van Dyke	-2.09	Combat*
1.43	The Defenders	-1.62	Ben Casey*
1.42	The Lucy Show*	-1.38	Naked City*
1.29	Beverly Hillbillies	-1.17	Bonanza*
1.13	The Ed Sullivan Show*		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Type X watches what she likes. The only program in the personal preference table which is not in her actual viewing table is The Defenders, and this would be in the table were it not a consensus item among all three actual viewing types. There is one program--The Andy Griffith Show--which she watches, but is not listed as a preference. This is also a consensus item. There is only one program which she watches often, but does not enjoy very much. In spite of her high preference for comedy this is Danny Thomas, a comedy program. This program is only mildly favored as personally satisfying. However, she also enjoys a strong female lead. Marjorie Lord, who plays the wife of Danny Thomas, did not have a strong part in the program at the time of the interviews. Danny Thomas has the spotlight on this show, and her function is to support him as the lead and male comedian.

The domination of Danny Thomas over Marjorie Lord on the Danny Thomas Show stands out in sharp contrast to Lucy on The Lucy Show, Mary Tyler Moore on Dick Van Dyke, or Granny of the Beverly Hillbillies.

The programs she does not enjoy tend to be serious and heavy drama containing a great amount of violence. Combat, Naked City, and Bonanza are among them. Although she enjoys aggression in the form of lively action and movement within a program, she dislikes physical violence in the form of human destruction.

These are essentially the same programs she considers socially undesirable. Jack Parr is a comedy program which is very strongly rejected by Type X. It is not fun to watch, and it is also high on the list of programs she considers bad for people. One woman who loaded high on this factor commented that Jack Parr's jokes are too often "off-color." This type of person considers Chet Huntley Reporting as the kind of program people ought to watch, but is mild in her own enjoyment of it. CBS News, on the other hand, is enjoyed very much, and is extremely good for people, and is not often actually seen. Her predictions of her husband's enjoyment of the program is low, close to neutral. Other programs people ought to watch are more factual in nature. Armstrong Circle Theater's documentaries, and the direct coverage of the Voice of Firestone and The Ed Sullivan Show tend toward this. Although the kinds of programs which people ought to watch do

not contain the amount of comedy that personal preference programs do, it appears that some light entertainment is good for people.

Table 22. Social Desirability for Actual Viewing Type X:
Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.64	Chet Huntley Report-	-2.37	Combat
	ing	-1.99	Jack Parr
1.43	Armstrong Circle	-1.67	Naked City
	Theater	-1.47	Twilight Zone
1.19	Voice of Firestone	-1.05	Bonanza
1.15	Lassie*		
1.14	The Ed Sullivan Show*		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Type X predicts as enjoyable for her husband essentially the same programs which she herself prefers. Candid Camera would appear on her own enjoyment list as well as on actual viewing, but it is a consensus program on this dimension. The relationship between her own preference and actual viewing of Alfred Hitchcock are both relatively low, and about the same. She watches it almost as often as she wishes. Her social desirability rating of the program is slightly negative. However, she sees that her husband enjoys the program very much, and it is a discriminating item for this type. It

appears that his preference has little influence on her viewing of this program. Since her familiarity with the program is slightly higher than her enjoyment or actual viewing it is possible that he watches it while she is busy with something else. The program was scheduled at 6:30 P.M. Saturday, and perhaps she is occupied with other activities during that time.

Table 23. Prediction of Significant Other (Spouse or Parent) for Actual Viewing Type X: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.82	The Ed Sullivan Show*	-1.92	Jack Parr*
1.79	Candid Camera*	-1.61	Combat*
1.58	Alfred Hitchcock*	-1.33	Yogi Bear
1.52	The Lucy Show*	-1.17	Naked City*
1.30	Dick Van Dyke		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

While Type A prefers The Nurses and rejects The Lucy Show, Type X does almost the opposite with these two programs. The Lucy Show is very high as a personally satisfying program, and The Nurses is neutral. The Lucy Show is also very familiar and frequently viewed by Type X.

Table 24. Familiarity for Actual Viewing Type X: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.07	The Lucy Show	-1.60	Hootenanny*
.93	Jack Benny	-1.16	Voice of Firestone
		-1.05	Naked City
		-1.03	Combat*
		-.97	Walt Disney
		-.90	Dick Powell*
		-.80	Donna Reed

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Summary

It appears that Type X simply watches what she likes and enjoys it when she has the opportunity and inclination. She seems to enjoy her favorite programs without any particular tension or uneasiness associated with them. She is most likely a mother, since most of those loading on this factor are, and she likely has other things to do besides watch television. The small number of programs she is familiar with might tend to support the suggestion that she is not a strong embracer of television. Nor does she appear particularly critical of it. She seems to take what she enjoys of it and leaves the rest alone. She does not see herself "hooked," or particularly dependent on it. It would appear

Table 25. Orientation to Television for Actual Viewing Type
X: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected
(Consensus Statements Excluded)

Accepts	
Z-Score	Statement
1.85	*I'd much rather be active in the clubs or organizations I belong to than to watch much TV.
1.80	*I'm so busy with other things I have little time to watch television.
1.51	I'm generally pretty easy-going about television programs. I'll usually watch whatever the rest of the family likes to watch.
1.25	I think lectures, concerts, plays, and other things like these are much more enjoyable than TV shows.
Rejects	
Z-Score	Statement
-1.93	My life is usually pretty dull and uneventful. Television helps me to pass the time.
-1.68	Television actually dictates too much of what I do with my time.
-1.68	TV is just about the worst thing that ever happened to our family.
-1.58	It bothers me a lot when I have to miss my favorite TV program.
-1.59	There are so many good TV programs offered that I'm glad to give up some other things to watch them.
-1.06	When I am with friends, and I know my favorite television program is coming on soon, I'm tempted to suggest that we all watch it.

*Statements which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

that she is the kind of person who has established a natural pattern of orderliness which fits her role in life, and television fits into this pattern along with other alternative forms of behavior. She may even have established such a pattern beyond her own realization. She considers herself easy-going and flexible in regard to the preferences of others in the household. Yet it seems quite apparent that she watches the programs she prefers, and the stability of the relationship between her own favorites and programs actually viewed is not particularly upset by what she perceives that her husband prefers.

Actual Viewing Type Y

The programs selected by Type Y strongly tend toward fictional-representational, moral and moral-sentimental, either masculine or feminine role support, aggressive, and fully scripted. His rejected programs, also in terms of facet elements, further attest to the strength of these tendencies.

Type Y selects highly stylized kinds of moralistic programs which are tightly written, easy to follow, and believable. His strongest facet element is moral, and his next strongest is fictional-representational. He watches moral-sentimental, but not amoral. He rejects factual and fantasy.

Table 26. Actual Viewing for Actual Viewing Type Y: Arrays of the Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accept		Reject	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
2.41	Dick Powell*	-1.03	Ozzie and Harriet
2.21	Dick Van Dyke	- .96	True*
2.08	Combat*	- .92	Password
1.88	Route 66*	- .92	Lassie
1.47	Ben Casey	- .91	The Lucy Show
1.40	The Nurses		
1.35	Dr. Kildare*		
1.26	Perry Mason		
1.14	Bonanza*		
1.14	Naked City*		
1.09	Candid Camera		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

His satisfaction with Ben Casey, Bonanza, Naked City, Combat, Route 66, and The Defenders suggests a preference for the stylized pattern of outcome. In these programs the hero usually emerges with a decided victory over his antagonist, who falls to a thunderous and sometimes violent defeat.

The programs he does not enjoy generally fail to contain these qualities. These programs do not tell an engrossing story in a believable way. They are not heavily dramatic, and they are comedy or light entertainment. He watches serious drama. In this respect he is similar to Type A. There are about an equal number of males and females

representing Type Y, while A consisted chiefly of women.

The stories he watches contain more than just predictable outcomes. The dramatic events tend to be neatly revealed throughout. The body of his stories tend to synchronize smoothly through patterns of successive events within the program toward the final outcome. The good guy always wins; the bad guy always loses; and the expected outcomes are often associated with blatant appeals to the emotions with almost stereotyped consistency.

Table 27. Personal Preference for Actual Viewing Type Y:
Arrays of Most Accepted and Most Rejected
(Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Programs	Z-Score	Programs
2.14	Dick Van Dyke	-1.67	Michigan Polka Party
1.68	The Defenders	-1.44	Lassie*
1.58	Dick Powell*	-1.11	Dennis the Menace
1.53	Ben Casey*	-1.09	Yogi Bear
1.46	Bonanza	-1.07	The Lucy Show
1.39	Naked City*	- .99	Beverly Hillbillies
1.31	Combat	- .93	The Flintstones*
1.20	Route 66*		
1.12	Armstrong Circle Theater		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Table 28. Social Desirability for Actual Viewing Type Y:
Arrays of Most Accepted and Most Rejected
(Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Programs	Z-Score	Programs
2.17	Chet Huntley Reporting*	-1.57	Beverly Billbillies*
		-1.51	Dennis the Menace*
1.93	Close-Up**	-1.48	Dobie Gillis*
1.86	Voice of Firestone	-1.24	The Lucy Show*
1.05	Naked City*	-1.07	International Show- time
		-1.00	The Flintstones

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

**Program which discriminates between types within .95 standard deviation higher than each of the other types.

The programs he rejects as not good for people to watch are very similar to those which fail to offer him these satisfactions. Some of the programs he considers good for people reflect his own tastes. The others tend toward the factual, the non-aggressive, and the genteel.

So far other types--particularly the woman's Type A --have indicated preference for aggression. Type Y, however, seems to have a very high preference for this facet. His most watched programs are not only associated with heavily conclusive and emotionally-packed endings, but also with a great deal of action and adventure. The action is moving and often violent. It is at times sensational. Combat, an

action-packed war drama provides abundant blasts of fire power. Route 66 portrays two rugged young men traveling the western highways in a high-powered sports car in deliberate search for adventure. The dynamic Dr. Ben Casey is high for this type.

This type watches most programs depicting realism. The persons portrayed on his most viewed programs have a disposition to think and act in some degree of conformity to the expected patterns of "real life." At the same time the hero is idealistic. At least two of the males loading high on this factor commented that they use the hero as a model by which they tend to pattern their own life styles. While this type prefers fictional-representational, his heroes often border very close to what some might call exaggerated emotionalism, or theatrics. This is the kind of behavior which might be considered inappropriate in real life. The person who loaded highest on this factor actually views four programs which were not in the sample, but are interesting comparisons. These are Have Gun, Will Travel, Gunsmoke, Stoney Burke, and McHale's Navy. He considers Paladin a model man. In an earlier focused interview this same person cited six characteristics which he admired about Paladin, and said: "This is the kind of guy I would like to be."

Table 29. Prediction of Significant Other (Spouse or Parent) for Actual Viewing Type Y: Arrays of the Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.95	Dick Powell	-1.83	Make That Spare
1.76	Bonanza*	-1.26	Len Stuttman
1.75	Dick Van Dyke	-1.18	The Lucy Show
1.72	Naked City*	-1.15	Lassie
1.54	Route 66*	-1.11	Ozzie and Harriet
1.14	Ben Casey*	-1.03	International Show-time

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Armstrong Circle Theater is high on Type Y's personal preference, but his actual viewing of it is only infrequent. This program happened to be scheduled opposite Naked City at the time of the interviews, and Naked City offers more of the elements of content and style discussed above than does Armstrong Circle Theater. However, if the two programs were not in direct competition, it would not be surprising for this type to select Armstrong Circle Theater. His personal preferences are largely reflected in his actual viewing.

They are also reflected in his perceptions of his wife's favorite programs to a large extent. In fact, every one of the highest programs predicted as her favorite are on

the list of programs he most enjoys. This suggests another similarity between this type and the woman's Type A. He usually watches the programs he wants to watch. He predicts closely the same programs for his wife. They are serious, heavily dramatic programs. He tends to use the programs for some purpose other than what one might call immediate entertainment. Finally, he considers himself quite flexible about adapting to the preferences of the other members of the family, and there are at least two general orientation items which suggest feelings of uneasiness about watching television.

However, Type Y watches more programs than he prefers. His preference for The Nurses is weakly favorable, and he watches it a great deal. His perception of his wife's enjoyment of the program does not correspond in intensity with his of viewing, but it is high, and considerably higher than his own enjoyment of the same program. His own satisfaction with Perry Mason is weakly favorable, and his wife's enjoyment of this consensus program is predicted to be very high. It is frequently viewed by him. These do not appear to be program selections pre-empted by his wife's preferences, but rather programs which he watches in addition to his own favorites.

His familiarity with these programs indicates that he does in fact view them, and supports the suggestions above. Also, his own favorites and his perceptions of the programs

his wife considers most entertaining tend to blend together into a composite picture in the familiarity pattern which is somewhat similar to that suggested in his actual viewing.

In general, Type Y's rejected programs follow a somewhat similar pattern on all dimensions. In fact, some of the identical programs, such as Len Stuttman, The Lucy Show, and others are represented repeatedly in his rejected arrays. These are generally comedy and light entertainment, and the opposites of the other elements often represented on the acceptance arrays.

Table 30. Familiarity for Actual Viewing Type Y: Arrays of the Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.04	Dick Powell*	-2.70	True*
1.04	Naked City*	-1.86	Make That Spare
.93	Bonanza	-1.50	Len Stuttman*
.93	Dr. Kildare	-1.45	Stump the Stars*
.84	Armstrong Circle Theater	-1.11	Fight of the Week
		-.85	Voice of Firestone

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Summary

Type Y appears to have a problem in regard to his television viewing. He follows a consistent pattern in his preference, and he watches the programs he enjoys most. He also watches some programs which his wife apparently enjoys. Generally her favorites do not conflict with the kinds of programs one might expect him to like. The Nurses, for example, is opposite Andy Williams and Alcoa Premiere. Yet he seems highly uneasy about watching television. His orientation to television statements seem to indicate that he watches television more than he feels that he should. If he watches all the programs he likes, plus a sufficient number of others that his wife likes, it is understandable that he might feel this way.

Unlike Type B he does not drift off into a ready-made dream world of fantasy created by television, and unlike Type A he does appear to be "hooked" from one program to the next. The statements might be considered to suggest that he recognizes a choice available to himself, but which he does not take. The only alternative suggested in the statements are "lectures, concerts, plays, and other things like these," and the persons loading highest on this type simply do not engage in any such activities very much. Type Y seems to find gratifications in his own programs. He gets a high level of emotional stimulation with a minimal energy expenditure. He gets lively, absorbing heavily dramatic programs

which seems to provide him with adventure, excitement, and sensation.

Table 31. Orientation to Television for Actual Viewing Type Y: Arrays of the Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts	
Z-Score	Statement
1.78	I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television when I know there are other things I should be doing.
1.67	I'm generally pretty easy-going about television programs. I'll usually watch whatever the rest of the family likes.
1.34	I find that I'm a better person, more informed and up-to-date on things because of television.
1.06	I think lectures, concerts, plays, and other things like these are much more enjoyable than TV shows.
1.05	I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television as much as I do. There are other things I really want to do more.
Rejects	
Z-Score	Statement
-2.24	TV is just about the worst thing that ever happened to our family.
-1.52	Television helps us to have a closer and more satisfying family life.
-1.34	It bothers me a lot when I have to miss my favorite TV program.
-1.32	I'm afraid too much television could cause a person to become involved in the play-acting world and lose touch with reality.
-1.27	I'm so busy with other things I have little time to watch television.
-1.27	There are so many good TV programs offered that I'm glad to give up some other things to watch them.

Most of those representing this type are college graduates, one is a full-time college teacher. These persons do not read books, generally. Their magazine subscription list consists of typically two or three from the following: Time, Look, Saturday Evening Post, Sports Illustrated, Field and Stream, TV Guide, and Ladies Home Journal. The person who loaded highest on this type is a college graduate who enrolled in a correspondence course over six months ago and has not returned the first lesson yet. The college teacher who represents this factor had not read a single book or journal in the past six months. When asked if he had attended any lectures during the previous six month period he replied, "Just my own." The person loading third highest on this factor is the wife of a university graduate student. She said she had read three books during the past six months. One was Call Girl, and she could not remember the other two.

It appears that this type represents the kind of person who is more highly educated than some, and realizes he has potential for extending himself further than he does, but he does not.

Actual Viewing Type Z

Type Z watches programs which contain a great deal of fantasy, comedy, and low complexity elements. He particularly rejects high complexity programs in his viewing habits. In the main, he does not watch moral or amoral programs. Although this may be considered a children's type, there is only one teen-age boy who highly loaded on this factor. The others are adults. In addition to reflecting children's taste, it is possible that some adults are represented on this type who watch these programs because the children select them. This suggestion may be seen in dimensions other than just actual viewing.

Some of these same combinations of "children's" and "adult's" programs may be seen in the personal preference arrays of Type Z. It is possible that certain child-like joys have not vanished in all adults. It is also possible that the parents tend to perceive the personal preference dimension as a choice from among a given number of programs designed for children. This rationale might apply to the extent that the children in the home monopolized the set and influenced program selection. The arrays may be seen as a compromise, also, between what could be considered child and adult preference. Although the programs most enjoyed are primarily simple and playful, Jack Benny, The Flintstones, The Beverly Hillbillies, and True could hardly be considered

children's programs in the same sense as Yogi Bear. As might be expected from this type, the programs which are not enjoyable are generally serious, heavy drama.

Table 32. Actual Viewing for Actual Viewing Type Z: Array of the Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
3.22	Candid Camera*	-1.00	Dick Powell
2.32	Password*	- .93	Alfred Hitchcock
2.10	The Andy Griffith Show	- .90	The Ed Sullivan Show
		- .85	Lassie
1.92	True*	- .84	Jackie Gleason
1.53	Beverly Hillbillies	- .80	Route 66
1.24	The Flintstones*		
1.23	Yogi Bear*		
1.21	Jack Benny*		
1.00	Combat		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

An interesting comparison may be made along these lines between Walt Disney and The Flintstones. Walt Disney features nature films, low complexity biographies, children's literature, and cartoons. Although the intended audience may not be limited to children, Walt Disney's productions are often perceived as such. The Flintstones is a cartoon presentation of adult family relationships featuring two pre-historic, cavemen-type couples who become involved in situations which are exaggeratedly typical of modern-day suburbia.

Table 33. Personal Preference for Actual Viewing Type Z:
Array of the Most Accepted and Most Rejected
(Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.62	Walt Disney	-1.92	Michigan Polka Party
1.42	Jack Benny*	-1.57	Great Composers
1.35	Yogi Bear*	-1.23	Alfred Hitchcock*
1.34	The Flintstones*	- .95	Route 66
1.22	Beverly Hillbillies		
1.13	True*		

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

Table 34. Social Desirability for Actual Viewing Type Z:
Array of the Most Accepted and Most Rejected
(Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.44	Len Stuttman	-1.61	Alfred Hitchcock*
1.32	True	-1.56	Twilight Zone
1.10	Chet Huntley	-1.56	Naked City
	Reporting	-1.53	Jackie Gleason
1.07	Jack Benny	-1.41	Jack Parr
		-1.39	Route 66*
		-1.25	The Ed Sullivan Show

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

The visual presentation is cartoon fantasy, but the situations might be considered comical facsimile of some couples in American culture. So among the preferences of Type Z there are at least two programs which might be considered to have mixed appeal between children and adults.

Most of the factual emphasis begins to emerge for Type Z on the social desirability dimension. Also, the highest three programs are of a more serious nature on this dimension for Type Z than they were under personal enjoyment conditions of instruction. While the factual programs begin to emerge on the array of programs which are considered good for people, more programs on the rejected arrays contain light entertainment and comedy elements when sorted in terms of social desirability than under own preference conditions. The highly fictional-non-representational programs, such as Alfred Hitchcock and Twilight Zone begin to emerge more strongly rejected on this dimension. This could be interpreted as endorsement of factual kinds of programs as being socially desirable to Type Z. Chet Huntley Reporting seems to particularly emphasize this facet element, since this series usually deals with issues of social importance.

It is interesting that the two programs previously suggested as having cross-appeal between children and adults --Walt Disney and The Flintstones--are found in the prediction of the significant other's preference array. In this case significant other represents a combination of predictions

between child and parent, since both are represented on Type Z. The fact that they are found here might suggest that they represent an area of shared interest for both child and parent.

Table 35. Prediction of Significant Other for Actual Viewing Type Z: Array of the Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.62	True*	-1.52	Donna Reed
1.41	Walt Disney	-1.42	Twilight Zone*
1.10	The Flintstones*	-1.39	The Nurses*
1.09	Combat	-1.19	Hootenanny
1.06	Dick Powell	-1.08	Jackie Gleason
		-1.08	Make That Spare

*Programs which discriminate between types by more than 1.0 standard deviation higher or lower than each of the other types.

The number of programs on the familiarity arrays is small. Only one program--Jack Benny--is strongly high, and only two are clearly unfamiliar. Jack Benny, somewhat in the manner of Walt Disney and The Flintstones, is a program which could reach both children and adults. Also, Jack Benny has been on the air many more years than any of the other programs actually viewed, and this program may be familiar for this reason. The small number of programs on the familiarity arrays, when compared to the relatively large number of programs actually viewed, further suggests a

compromise in program selections by various members of the household. It might indicate that the combination of preferences within a household expand the range of programs actually viewed, but that these programs are viewed with less regularity than where similarity preferences are operating harmoniously. If all the members of the household had highly similar preferences, it might be expected that the familiarity arrays would more closely resemble the actual viewing arrays. This is not the case for Type Z.

Table 36. Familiarity for Actual Viewing Type Z: Array of the Most Accepted and Most Rejected (Consensus Programs Excluded)

Accepts		Rejects	
Z-Score	Program	Z-Score	Program
1.19	Jack Benny	-2.29	Make That Spare
.97	Password	-2.13	Voice of Firestone*
.89	Combat		

*Program which discriminates between types by more than .95 standard deviation than each of the other types.

Summary

The three orientation statements suggest some avenues of insight into Type Z. The first statement, which is a discriminating item, indicates that this type of person uses television to distract him from his problems. The second statement, viewed in the context of the programs he

actually watches, might even suggest one possible source of such problems.

Table 37. Orientation to Television for Actual Viewing
Type Z: Array of Most Accepted and Most Rejected
(Consensus Statements Excluded)

Accepts	
Z-Score	Statement
1.42	*Sometimes when I feel worried about something or I'm tense, I watch television to help me forget my problems.
1.37	I find that I'm a better person, more informed and up-to-date on things, because of television.
1.19	I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television when I know there are other things I should be doing.
Rejects	
Z-Score	Statement
-2.80	TV is just about the worst thing that ever happened to our family.
-1.86	I'm afraid too much television could cause a person to become involved in the play-acting world and lose touch with reality.
-1.36	I get more relaxation and enjoyment from the radio or a record player than I do from television.
-1.01	My life is usually pretty dull and uneventful. Television helps me to pass the time.

*Statement which discriminates between types by .95 standard deviation than each of the other types.

It is possible that an adult might have difficulty justifying to himself just how the programs he actually views make him a better person, and helps keep him informed and up-to-date. To the extent that Type Z represents a compromise between what might be considered child and adult preferences, this is understandable. Such a compromise situation might also be exemplified in the statement reflecting uneasiness about watching television when other tasks are perceived to need attention. Such a statement could apply to an adult who is watching television he considers beneath his intellectual level, or it could apply to a school boy who enjoys watching Yogi Bear but has not finished his homework.

These results suggest that members of a family watch each other's favorite programs, and perhaps even come to like them. They emphasize that a "type" of person is not necessarily limited to demographic characteristics, such as age. They suggest that conflict and compromise are operating in the decision-making process of program selection; and they further indicate that intra-family influence does not flow just one-way from the parent to the child, but that the child (or children) exert influence upon the adults as well. In spite of possible interpersonal influences operating in the decision-making process Type Z generally watches the programs he enjoys most. In fact, he watches all except one, plus others he does not enjoy as much.

Consensus Items

Actual Viewing

All three actual viewing types estimated that they DID view--

<u>Mean Z-Score</u>	<u>Item</u>
1.22	<u>The Defenders</u>

All three types estimated that they did NOT view--

-1.09	<u>Lantern to the Stars</u>
-1.03	<u>Jazz Casual</u>

The Defenders is defined as a moral, serious, masculine role support, high complexity, fictional-representational, low aggression, fully scripted, genteel, and low variability program. This series usually dramatizes conflict situations between two or more sides of a moral question which has social implications.

Lantern to the Stars is a documentary style educational program on the history of film. Although it is spiced with film clips of historical popular movies, it begins in lecture format which includes discussions of the history of motion pictures. Jazz Casual is somewhat similar in format. The program begins with interviews of various jazz music performers, and subsequently points in the interview are demonstrated by live presentations of jazz combo groups. The two programs offered opposite Lantern to the Stars are Combat and Ripcord. Opposite Jazz Casual is Michigan Out-

doors (a hunting and fishing program) and Huckleberry Hound.

Personal Preference

The consensus items for the personal preference dimension of the three actual viewing types emerge more clearly than the consensus programs for this dimension in the previous chapter. The consensus results are stronger. The single item of consensus which stands out overall, however, is still the same here as on the three personal preference types.

For their own personal enjoyment all three viewing types
PREFER--

<u>Mean Z-Score</u>	<u>Item</u>
1.76	<u>The Andy Griffith Show</u>
.89	<u>Candid Camera</u>
For their own personal enjoyment all three types REJECT--	
-2.08	<u>Fight of the Week</u>
-1.59	<u>Jazz Casual</u>
-1.38	<u>Make That Spare</u>
-1.01	<u>Lantern to the Stars</u>

The probe comments regarding Candid Camera suggest that it offers curiosity satisfaction regarding human reactions under various conditions, and it offers comedy.

Typical comments from various persons include the following:

I enjoy seeing people react. . . . I like to watch it for the same reason I go down town in the car and watch people. I wonder how I would react. . . . It is funny. It shows people in different situations and their reactions. . . . It is hilarious the way it catches people off guard. . . . I love to watch people.

A number of comments also include the appeal of children on the program. They are described in such terms as "fun to watch," and "delightful."

Comments regarding the most rejected item varied. They seem closely related to concepts of right and wrong, and social desirability. For example, one person said:

I used to like the fights, but I don't think there are any good fights anymore. I wonder about the nature of the fight game.

Jazz Casual is disliked apparently because of the music, although some commented on the appearance and demeanor of jazz performers in general. A fairly typical comment about the program is:

I just don't like jazz. It's not music. You can't pick out a tune from that. Me, I like tunes. I like popular tunes with good tunes.

Social Desirability

The first two programs on this dimension for all three actual viewing types are the same as for all three personal preference types. CBS News and Walt Disney are considered more highly socially desirable by more types of

persons than any other of the sample of programs.

All three types consider social DESIRABLE--

<u>Mean Z-Score</u>	<u>Item</u>
2.34	<u>CBS News</u>
1.51	<u>Walt Disney</u>
1.29	<u>The Andy Griffith Show</u>
1.17	<u>The Defenders</u>

All three types consider socially UNDESIRABLE--

-1.93	<u>Fight of the Week</u>
-1.31	<u>Michigan Polka Party</u>
-1.16	<u>Jazz Casual</u>
-1.04	<u>Stump the Stars</u>

Comments concerning the most rejected item on this dimension--television boxing--tend to be based upon some kind of moral ground. One person described this program as "sadistic," and therefore wrong. One woman said:

To harm the body is wrong. It says in the Bible "Thou shalt not kill," and I believe this. The body is a temple, and should not be damaged.

Perceptions of Significant Other

All three types predicted significant other would PREFER--

<u>Mean Z-Score</u>	<u>Item</u>
2.05	<u>The Defenders</u>
1.65	<u>Perry Mason</u>
1.45	<u>The Andy Griffith Show</u>

All three types predicted significant other would NOT prefer--

-1.86	<u>Jazz Casual</u>
-1.55	<u>Michigan Polka Party</u>
-1.22	<u>Lantern to the Stars</u>
-1.22	<u>Fight of the Week</u>

The two highest programs were defined as moral, serious, masculine, and highly complex. Although most of the predictors were females describing their perceptions of a husband's or father's favorite program, this is not as consistent as in the three personal preference types. The two highest programs remain the same for these actual viewing types, and are predicted in the same order. The Defenders is a considerably higher consensus program for these three types than it is for the other three types. One daughter who predicted her mother's preference for The Defenders said:

She gets a great thrill out of the problems presented. She tries to figure out the answers, and she likes the personalities of the leads. She likes some sort of mystery, and the courtroom, and the battle of wits.

A woman who predicted her husband's preference for Perry Mason said:

He likes suspense and mystery, the who-done-it element. He likes to have me read mystery stories to him on vacations. I think it takes him out of his world, and he likes that.

A relatively young husband predicted his wife would enjoy The Andy Griffith Show because:

It's funny. Maybe because there's a little kid in there. It's an escape, and yet it's like real.

Familiarity

All three types are FAMILIAR with--

<u>Mean Z-Score</u>	<u>Item</u>
1.08	<u>The Andy Griffith Show</u>
1.06	<u>The Ed Sullivan Show</u>
.99	<u>The Defenders</u>

All three types are NOT familiar with--

-2.43	<u>Lantern to the Stars</u>
-2.35	<u>Jazz Casual</u>
-2.04	<u>Close-Up</u>
-1.85	<u>Michigan Polka Party</u>

All three types tend to consider the most often viewed and most familiar programs as socially desirable and enjoyed by other members of the household. Also, programs with which they are not familiar--such as Jazz Casual--tend

to score very low on social desirability, as well as the other dimensions. It is interesting that a program which is not familiar can be so decidedly judged as bad for people to watch.

All three types DO feel--

<u>Mean Z-Score</u>	<u>Statement</u>
1.76	I would rather visit with friends than watch TV.
1.26	I can and often do other things while watching television.
1.21	After I've had a hard day and I'm tired, I find watching TV is one of the best ways to relax.
1.04	I can think of lots of things I'd rather do than watch television.

All three types do NOT feel--

-1.19	I actually resent television because it often interferes with more important things.
-1.10	Television is too noisy and it makes me nervous to have it on very much.
-1.04	I enjoy watching most TV commercials.
-1.00	Watching television is what I best like to do in my leisure time.

All three types appear to accept television as a secondary alternative to other choices. If the previous arrays had not indicated strong preference for certain programs, these statements would suggest that television is unimportant to all three types. One interpretation of this is that television in general is perceived as unimportant, but only certain programs are highly enjoyed. The feeling that one can and often does other things while watching television suggests that in general it requires insufficient attention to fully distract the viewer from other activities.

It appears that television is not highly regarded as a leisure time activity, but is watched anyway. Since it is not considered a favorite activity in general, but is watched, it is understandable that some uneasy feelings might be associated with this combination. At least all three types find it necessary to justify their viewing on the grounds that they have earned an opportunity to "relax," even though it is not an esteemed form of relaxation.

The rejected statements indicate that television is not perceived as imposing itself upon the viewer, or in control of his life style. Since there are strong accepted and rejected programs on all dimensions by all three types, this might further explain the attempt to justify television viewing. The viewer who watches various programs with relative frequency and a high degree of preference, but who also regards watching television as a secondary kind of behavior,

might feel it necessary to attempt to justify his behavior. He might feel it even more necessary to justify his tendency to watch and enjoy certain programs when he expresses a rejection of the notion that television interferes with more important activities.

Summary of Actual Viewing Types

Type X generally watches what she enjoys, and seems to select her favorites somewhat casually. She seems to gracefully accept television, but does not see herself as dependent on it. Her perceptions may be accurate. She is most likely a busy mother, and may select her favorites when she has the opportunity, but perhaps has come to ignore it when her daily life pattern requires that she engage herself in other activities. When she does have the opportunity to watch television, her preferences are highly reflected in her actual viewing. It appears that she influences the selection decisions with her own preferences a great deal. These tend to be strongly comedy or light entertainment, and fictional-representational. She also enjoys support of the female role, and much more than any of the other three types. She appears to be the kind of person who establishes orderliness in her own household, and can appreciate the feminine strength she may find in Granny of The Beverly Hillbillies, or Laura on the Dick Van Dyke show. Even though some of her highest programs on personal preference support the male

role according to facet element definitions, the support is not the same as it is on programs like Ben Casey, which she rejects very strongly. The male supported roles on her favorite programs tend to either respect womanhood, or recognize femininity as having strength in its weakness. At the same time she can highly enjoy the exaggerated portrayal of the unsophisticated feminine role as it is presented on The Lucy Show.

Type Y most frequently selects programs which are serious in nature, and they are higher in complexity than the programs selected by either X or Z. Yet they appear to be lower in complexity than Y might consider desirable, or as high as he feels he should watch. While X accepts television quite naturally and gracefully--or leaves it alone with equal ease--Y seems to have some inner conflicts regarding it. His highest item on the orientation dimension indicates uneasiness regarding his television viewing. The programs he selects are very like those his wife likes, and very like his own preferences. It appears that he watches what he likes, but he also watches what his wife likes. He likes his programs highly stylized morally, and he prefers fictional-representational presentations. Although his viewing reflects higher complexity than the other two types, he enjoys programs which are quite predictable in their outcomes. He enjoys seeing the good guy win and the bad guy lose. He has

some notions of what programs are good for people, but these are not strongly reflected in either his own viewing or his own preference. His role as a television viewer may be further complicated by the fact that he is generally more highly educated than the other two types. At least he has attended school longer. He appears to be a heavy viewer, and his programs might be considered beneath his educational level. Perhaps this accounts for some of his discomfort regarding his relation to television.

Type Z watches a great deal of fantasy, comedy, and low complexity programs. Although it is basically a children's type, the factor is also represented by adults who may watch the children's programs and come to enjoy them. Type Z might be seen as a mid-way type, or combination, of a child and an adult. The teen age boy who loaded highest on this type commented that he still likes some of the children's programs which some of his friends consider he should have outgrown. At the same time he watches and enjoys programs which his mother selects, and which might be considered adult in nature. Type Z may also be seen as an adult who is influenced by young preferences still operating in the home. The influences appear to flow both ways, and Type Z represents a combination of these two viewpoints. Regardless of whether one observes the type as a child becomes an adult in his preference, or an adult still clinging to some

child-like joys, it is the same type. Type Z shows evidence of inner conflict regarding television viewing, which is not surprising. Type Z is at a mid-way point between two fundamental orientations in terms of taste. He is like a child who is still too small to fit comfortably in an adult world, and like an adult who is too large to fit comfortably in the world of a child. He is somewhere in between these two orientations at a mid-way point of evolving from one point of orientation to another.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

The typical rating service measures audience size. The service is concerned with whether the set is on, or whether anyone is watching. If a member of the household is watching television, it indicates that he considers watching that particular program the best choice available at the time. His choice should be considered within the context of other programs available.

If there are, let us say, three programs on at the same time, he might prefer program A over program B, and program B over program C. He detects certain elements within the content and style of one program which he does not find in others. For example, he might enjoy aggression or noisy action. Given that programs A and B were very similar, except for the fact that program A provided aggression and program B did not, we would expect him to prefer program A. If he were perfectly free to watch any of a large number of programs, he would have a first choice, a second choice, and so on and could place them in a hierarchical order according to his preference for such elements within the program.

The relationships between facet elements and content and style of programs, and viewer preference and viewing,

have been observed in basically two ways. One observation was focused on the respondent's personal preference, and this was compared to his behavior along the other dimensions. Another observation was focused on his actual viewing habits, and this was compared to the other dimensions, including personal preference. The dimensions were: personal preference, social desirability, prediction of the significant other, program familiarity, actual viewing habits, and general orientations to television.

The two dimensions under focus of attention--personal preference and actual viewing--were separately submitted to factor analysis with persons as variables and items as observations. There were three factors for each dimension, each representing a hypothetical type of person. For each dimension, the scores of those persons loading highest on each factor were used to estimate the descriptive arrays.

Each of the three personal preference types and each of the three actual viewing types have been described also in terms of program familiarity, program desirability, perception of spouse's preference and orientation to television viewing. The descriptions have focused on the relationships between actual viewing and personal preference for each type.

Three different ways of direct comparison between viewing and preference will now be presented. The first of these consists of correlations of personal preference and

actual viewing among types. The second is a scatter plot of persons according to which factor of viewing and preference on which they loaded highest. The third consists of the correlation between actual viewing and personal preference separately and individually for each person.

The correlations among types indicate that they are generally separate and distinct from each other. The relationships between all types may be seen in the following three tables.

Intercorrelations of Personal Preference
Types A, B, and C

		<u>Personal Preference</u>		
		A	B	C
<u>Personal Preference</u>	A	1.0000		
	B	.0734	1.0000	
	C	.0390	-.0466	1.0000

Intercorrelations of Actual Viewing
Types X, Y, and Z

		<u>Actual Viewing</u>		
		X	Y	Z
<u>Actual Viewing</u>	X	1.0000		
	Y	.1619	1.0000	
	Z	.3513	.0986	1.0000

Intercorrelations of Personal Preference
Types A, B, C, and Actual Viewing
Types X, Y, Z

		<u>Personal Preference</u>		
		A	B	C
<u>Actual Viewing</u>	X	.2422	.2089	.3836
	Y	.8207	-.0547	.0142
	Z	.2242	.5941	.0484

The highest coefficient of correlation between preference and viewing types was personal preference Type A and actual viewing Type Y. Type A is the woman's type who enjoys and apparently watches serious, heavily dramatic, fully-scripted programs which contain moral or moral-sentimental elements. The Type A preference array correlated .8207 with the Type Y viewing array. Both these types indicate some uneasiness about their viewing of television. The next highest correlation was .5941 between personal preference Type B and viewing Type Z. Both watch and enjoy comedy and light entertainment and reject high complexity programs. The third highest correlation is between personal preference Type C and actual viewing Type X, which is positive, but not high.

To the extent that a household contained persons representing Types A and Y, a minimum of conflict might be expected in the decision-making processes which go into television program selection. On the other hand, differences

would probably be emphasized where there are low or essentially zero correlations such as those between Types B and Y, and Y and C. It can also be seen that some types have more difficulty watching favorite programs than do others. Type B, for example, has been previously described as a youngster who likes fun and fantasy, but who has some difficulty watching his favorite programs.

The second way of examining the relation between personal preference and viewing is to cross-index individual persons according to their locations on one of the three respective factors for each of the two dimensions. Twenty-six persons were interviewed on the personal preference dimension. Each person is at least somewhat more highly loaded on one of the three factors than he is on either of the other two. In many cases the strength of such loading is very slight. Regardless of how slight the loading of each individual on one factor over the other two, he is represented as that type in the table below. There were twenty-five persons in the factor analysis of actual viewing (respondent number 8, a young girl, was not interviewed for actual viewing). The individual persons may be graphically cross-indexed according to their loadings on one of the three factors for each of the two dimensions in the following way (numbers in the cells represent total number of persons):

		A	B	C
Actual Viewing	X	1	1	6
	Y	8	0	1
	Z	2	5	1

It was pointed out in Chapter II that the overall correlation between viewing and preference was lower than the correlations between viewing and other dimensions. The range in the correlation between actual viewing and personal preference was reported between .75 and .25 and the median was reported at .54.

A third way of following the relation between personal preference and actual viewing is to observe the correlations of these two dimensions for each individual person separately. These correlations represent this relationship for each person interviewed:

Mrs. A	.691	Mrs. F	.752
Mr. A	.751	Mr. F	.488
Mrs. B	.751	Mrs. G	.470
Mr. B	.575	Mr. G	.395
Mrs. C	.657	Girl G	.700 (17)
Mr. C	.646	Girl G	.537 (20)
Son C	.606	Mrs. H	.248
Mrs. D	.376	Mr. H	.540
Mr. D	.476	Girl H	.447
Mrs. E	.560	Mrs. I	.536
Mr. E	.472	Mr. I	.620
Son E	.518	Girl I	.278 (17)
		Girl I	.425 (20)

While these correlations are all positive, and some are high, they are not perfect. As was observed in the last two chapters, there are various forces influencing persons to avoid programs they enjoy and to watch programs they do not particularly care about. In some cases, as may be seen above, such forces appear to be operating very strongly.

The nature of the dynamics of preference has been examined in terms of the method described. Factor analysis of Q-sort interviews and factorial-type design of content and style in television programs has led to certain kinds of data with regard to preference. Three personal preference types and three actual viewing types were found in strength

among the twenty-six persons who were interviewed. A study with a considerably expanded sample of persons would undoubtedly pick up other important types. How many, or what kind, cannot be determined from the data here. But given the nature of Q we can be reasonably certain the types we found here would be found in an expanded sample. This means that until the enlarged study is conducted the present results can be of value practically and theoretically (if one wishes to treat these differently), but that they should not be treated as comprehensive.

Implications for Further Research

This study began with a problem, specifically with regard to television, about the confusion between audience size measurements and viewer preference. It is expected that the results of this study will also be useful in other public media. That is, since there are certain elements of content and style which appeal to various types of persons in one medium, it is expected that similar elements will appeal to these same types persons through other media as well. If our viewer likes serious and strongly active masculine leads in his television programs, for example, he might also enjoy books, movies, and magazines along these lines. Greater insight into the relation between preference and selection in television should lead generally toward maximization of consumer satisfaction.

However, much work remains to be done specifically in television. More should be known about the program decision-makers themselves if results of studies such as this one are to be applied toward maximizing the satisfaction of the viewer. The theoretical implications of this study into broader populations also needs to be extended.

The Decision-Maker

Even if the decision-maker were provided with further information about why certain programs appeal to certain types of persons, however, difficulties in providing such programs would still remain. Just as the viewer is not free, in the sense that he does not function in a vacuum, neither is the producer. There are many pressures exerted upon him to behave in ways which might be called expedient, as compared to his own ideal concept of public service. It would provide insight into his decision-making processes to know kinds of pressures he is sensitive to. He could, for example, be given a set of Q-items somewhat similar to those used in this study and asked to describe:

1. The "ideal" array of programs in terms of what he himself feels is of public service or public interest. These are the programs which he feels he "should" provide.
2. The array of programs which he thinks his "most important" sponsors want him to schedule.

3. The array of programs which he thinks the "most powerful" special interest groups want him to schedule.
4. The array of programs he feels best represents the preferences of viewers "who count."
5. The array of programs he feels the FCC wants him to schedule.
6. His own general orientations toward television. Does he see it as a profit-making enterprise, a social information agency, a source of personal power, or what?
7. His own personal preferences.
8. His wife's personal preferences.

Such arrays could be compared to his actual program schedule, and might provide an index of which influences, or combinations of forces, are operating most strongly on his decision-making. Such indices might even serve as assessments of his effectiveness as a licensee. All this investigation would, of course, be in terms of facet elements.

Extension of this Study

Another natural investigation evolving out of this thesis is an extended search for other possible types of persons in terms of their respective responses to elements of content and style, and refinement of the facets. Given

a wider range of facet element combinations we would expect additional factors to emerge, each representing a type of person. In this study the three factor solutions are most parsimonious. They were selected because they best account for the variance with the fewest possible factors. A wider range of facets would provide more combinations, and more combinations should lead to additional types of persons. Such expansion could perhaps be factorially developed from content and style elements from another culture, or perhaps from other media in this culture. This would expand the number of choices, and expansion of the number of choices would allow further distinctions among preference types.

Suppose a larger number of persons were interviewed, using refined facet elements. Given a larger number of persons we would expect many to load on some of the factors described in this thesis. Perhaps some would even represent these types more strongly than those described here. Still others might cluster into new types. In either case such persons could be identified as individuals and indexed according to type. Meanwhile, various pilot television programs (or some other media) could be written and produced to contain combinations of facet elements such that each presentation represented controlled amounts of the facet elements under study. Prior to exposure, individual persons could be predicted according to various dimensions. Following exposure, such persons could be systematically interviewed

so that we could observe the relative success or failure of the predictions. Clusters of persons representing types might be similarly predicted. Such persons and types of persons could even be predicted under various conditions of instruction, and such predictions could then be compared to actual viewing behavior followed over a period of time in the natural setting of their homes.

There are a number of possible implications of such a study. For example, it appears that there are a number of programs upon which there is considerable consensus. Perhaps such programs could be scheduled at times when most viewers are free to view television. Then there are perhaps smaller numbers of types of persons who might enjoy an entirely different set of facet elements. Program promotions might be useful to notify such types of persons of the time their favorite programs are scheduled.

Clusters of persons who represent types might ultimately be identified more conveniently. It might be found, for example, that a certain type of person tends to subscribe to certain magazines, or engage in certain kinds of work, or hobbies. If such types were identified more directly it might be possible for a sponsor to buy advertising less broadly, and focus his sales message on the specific type of person he desires to reach. He would also know more about how to appeal to such a type, given that he knew more

about preferences regarding content and style.

Present practices in deciding strategies for reaching audiences seem to be relatively casual and informal. Decisions are based, among other things, on trial and error. That is, a program is often produced and sent over the air, and then the producer waits to see what the rating services have to say about the program. If the rating is high compared to the other programs offered at that time, the program is likely to remain on the air. This approach has some limitations. Even a single program is very expensive to produce. Although a pilot film may be used as a trial-run preliminary to a series, it is not unusual for new programs to be scheduled for thirteen weeks. Some are scheduled for even longer. The total cost of such productions is considerable, especially when it is considered as largely a speculative investment to determine whether the program will gain a high rating. If it should have a low rating, it is assumed that this damages the subsequent programs on the schedule, and this increases the costs even more. Even if the series is successful by these standards--and, of course, many are--the producer has little information regarding why the program does what he wants it to do. Insight into this question might not only improve strategies for reaching audiences for the decision-makers and advertisers, but might also increase consumer satisfaction through the development of new programs.

Program Writing and Production

Procedures previously described for developing the sample of items indicated that the total possible number of programs which could be factorially generated out of the original facet elements were not represented on the air. This study has further indicated that certain types of persons respond to certain combinations of facet elements favorably, and to others unfavorably. The actual range of available programs--in terms of elements which we have reason to suspect would appeal to some members of the audience--is dwarfed by the total potential range of possible programs. This opens another possible direction for further research and suggests an application for such research.

It leads toward the possibility of employing methodological techniques in the development of new programs. Evidence of the kind provided in this thesis, and which could be refined in future studies as suggested, could lead to specific suggestions to the writers and producers and others who design the programs and determine whether they shall be available to the public. On the basis of such suggestions it might be possible to provide programs which appeal more fully to various types of persons by creating programs which do not now exist. That is, knowledge provided by such studies may be useful to creative persons as they develop the content and style of new programs. Application

of such methods might aid the creative persons and the key decision-makers to provide such programs, making them more effective in their respective functions, and could perhaps also increase the value of the program product to the consumer.

Such knowledge might also be applied for longer-ranged purposes than just for immediate consumer satisfaction. For example, to the extent that we know what kinds of elements appeal to various types of persons it might be possible for producers to package information, let us say, in educational television programs, in such a way that each type of person reaches his optimum learning and enjoyment capacity simultaneously. This indicates some systematic ways of being creative, and suggests application of such systems. Such knowledge would have direct relation to audience preference, and should serve the most constructive purposes for all concerned.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Banks, Seymour. "The Relationship Between Preference and Purchase Brands," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 15, 2 (October 1950), pp. 145-157.
2. Berelson, Bernard. "What Missing the Newspaper Means," In Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Frank Stanton (eds.), Communication Research 1948-1949. New York: Harper, 1949.
3. Bogart, Leo. The Age of Television. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1958.
4. _____. "Adult Talk About Newspaper Comics," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 61 (1955), pp. 26-30.
5. Borgatta, E. F. "Analysis of Social Interaction and Sociometric Perception," Sociometry, Vol. 17 (1954), pp. 7-32.
6. Corsini, R. J. "Understanding and Similarity in Marriage," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 52 (1956), pp. 327-332.
7. Crane, E., Talbott, A., and Hume, R. "A Study of Television Program Preferences." East Lansing: Michigan State University, August 1961 (Mimeo).
8. Danbury, Thomas, and Talbott, Albert. "Segmenting the Television Audience." East Lansing: Michigan State University, August, 1962 (Mimeo).
9. Edwards, Allen L. "Social Desirability and Q Sorts," Journal of Consulting Psychology. Vol. 19, 6 (1955), p. 462.
10. Edwards, Allen L. "The Relationship Between the Judged Desirability of a Trait and the Probability That the Trait Will Be Endorsed," The Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 37 (1953), pp. 90-93.

11. Elkin, Frederick. "The Psychological Appeal of the Hollywood Western," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 24 (1950), pp. 72-86.
12. Foa, Uriel G. "The Contiguity Principle in the Structure of Interpersonal Relations," Human Relations, Vol. 11 (August 1958), pp. 229-238.
13. Fordyce, W. E. "Social Desirability in the MMPI," Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 20 (1956), pp. 171-175.
14. Friedman, I. "Phenomenal, Ideal, and Projected Conceptions of Self," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 51 (1955), pp. 611-615.
15. Frisch, P., and Cranston, R. "Q-Technique Applied to a Patient and the Therapist in a Child Guidance Setting," Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 12 (1956), pp. 178-182.
16. Fruchter, B. Introduction to Factor Analysis. New York: VonNostrand, 1954.
17. Geiger, Kent, and Sokol, Robert. "Social Norms in Television Watching," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 65 (1959), pp. 174-181.
18. Guttman, Louis, "A Structural Theory for Intergroup Beliefs and Action," American Sociological Review, Vol. 24, 3 (June 1959), pp. 318-328.
19. _____. "The Structuring of Sociological Spaces," The Hebrew University and the Israel Institute of Applied Social Research, Technical note no. 3, contract no. AF 61 (052) - 121, December 1961 (Mimeo).
20. Hanley, C. "Social Desirability and Responses to Items from Three MMPI Scales: D, Sc, and K," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 40 (1956), pp. 324-328.
21. Herzog, Herta. "Motivations and Gratifications of Daily Serial Listeners," In Schramm, W. (ed.), The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1955, pp. 50-55.

22. Horton, Donald, and Wohl, R. Richard. "Mass Communications and Para-Social Interaction," Psychiatry, Vol. 19 (1956), pp. 215-230.
23. Katz, Elihu, and Foulkes, David. "On the Use of the Mass Media as 'Escape,'" Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 26, No. 3 (1962), pp. 377-388.
24. Kay, Herbert. "Toward An Understanding of News-Reading Behavior," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 31 (1954), pp. 15-32.
25. Kelly, George A. The Psychology of Personal Constructs. New York: W. W. Norton Company, Vol. I, 1955.
26. Klapper, Joseph T. The Effects of Mass Communication. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.
27. ———. "Mass Communication Research: An Old Road Resurveyed," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 27, 4, Winter (1963), pp. 515-527.
28. Koch-Weser, E. "A Q-Study in Role Identification Using a Sample of Advertising Photographs." M.A. Thesis, Michigan State University, 1961.
29. Kogan, W. S., Quinn, R., As, A. F., and Ripley, H. S. "Some Methodological Problems in the Quantification of Clinical Assessment by Q-Array," Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 21 (1957), pp. 57-62.
30. Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "Audience Building in Educational Broadcasts," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 14 (1941), pp. 533-542.
31. Maccoby, Eleanor E. "Why Do Children Watch Television?" Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 18 (1954), pp. 239-244.
32. Maccoby, Eleanor E., and Wilson, William Cody. "Identification and Observational Learning from Films," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 55 (1957), pp. 76-87.
33. Maccoby, Eleanor, Wilson, M. C., and Burton, R. V. "Differential Movie-Viewing Behavior of Male and Female Viewers," Journal of Personality, Vol. 26 (1958), pp. 259-267.

34. MacLean, Malcolm S., Jr., Crane, Edgar, and Kiel, Donald F. "What Makes an ETV Program Interesting?" In Schramm, W. (ed.), The Impact of Educational Television. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960, pp. 77-113.
35. MacLean, Malcolm S., Jr., Danbury, T., Talbott, A. "Civil Defense Belief Patterns," Communications Research Center, Michigan State University, Sept. 1963.
36. MacLean, Malcolm S., Jr., Danbury, T., and Prather, J. G. "Varieties of Public Images of WOOD-TV in Grand Rapids," Communications Research Center, Michigan State University, October, 1962.
37. MacLean, Malcolm S., Jr., and Hazard, William R. "Women's Interest in Pictures: The Badger Village Study," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 30, Spring (1953), pp. 139-162.
38. MacLean, Malcolm S., Jr., and Talbott, Albert D. "Prediction of Individual Patterns of Television Viewing," Presented at the August, 1963 American Sociological Association Convention, Los Angeles, California.
39. Meerloo, Joost A. M. "Television Addiction and Reactive Apathy," Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, Vol. 120 (1954), pp. 290-291.
40. Mendelsohn, Harold. "Socio-Psychological Perspectives on the Mass Media and Public Anxiety," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 40, 4, Autumn (1963), pp. 511-516.
41. Merton, Robert K., Fiske, Marjorie, and Kendall, Patricia L. The Focused Interview. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956.
42. Nelson, Marven O., and Jones, Edward Morris. "An Application of the Q-Technique to the Study of Religious Concepts," Psychological Reports, Vol. 3 (1957), pp. 293-297.
43. Newcomb, Theodore M., and Suehla, G. "Intra-Family Relationships in Attitude," Sociometry, Vol. 1 (1937), pp. 180-205.

44. Pearlin, L. I. "Social and Personal Stress and Escape Television Viewing," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 23 (1959), pp. 255-259.
45. _____. "The Social and Psychological Setting of Communication Behavior: An Analysis of Television Viewing," Columbia University, 1956, An Abstract--Ph.D. Dissertation.
46. Riesman, David, et al. The Lonely Crowd. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1953.
47. Riley, John W., Jr., and Riley, Matilda White. "Mass Communication and the Social System," In Merton, R. K., et al. (eds.), Sociology Today. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.
48. Rogers, E. R., and Dymond, Rosaland F. Psychotherapy and Personality Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
49. Schaie, K. W. "A Q-Sort Study of Color-Mood Association," Journal of Projective Techniques, Vol. 25 (1961), pp. 341-346.
50. Scott, E. M. "Personality and Movie Preference," Psychological Reports, Vol. 3 (1957), pp. 17-18.
51. Stephenson, William. The Study of Behavior. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
52. Stewart, L. H. "Manifest Anxiety and Mother-Son Identification," Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 14 (1958), pp. 382-384.
53. Turner, Mary Alice. "News-Reading Behavior and Social Adjustment," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 35, Spring (1958), pp. 199-204.
54. Vroom, V. H. "Projection, Negation and the Self-Concept," Human Relations, Vol. 12 (1959), pp. 335-344.
55. Warner, W. Lloyd, and Henry, William E. "The Radio Time Serial: A Symbolic Analysis," Genetic Psychology Monographs, Vol. 37 (1948), pp. 3-71.
56. Warshaw, Leon, and Bailey, Nattox A. "Person Perception in Relation to Personality Projection," Journal of Projective Techniques, Vol. 25 (1961), pp. 216-220.

57. Westley, Bruce H., and MacLean, Malcolm S., Jr.
"A Conceptual Model for Communications Research,"
Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 34, Winter (1957),
pp. 31-38.
58. Whiting, J. F. "Needs, Values, Perceptions, and the
Nurse-Patient Relationship," Journal of Clinical
Psychology, Vol. 15 (1959), pp. 146-150.
59. Wiener, Morton, et al. "Judgement of Adjustment by
Psychologists, Psychiatric Social Workers, and
College Students, and Its Relationship to Social
Desirability," Journal of Abnormal and Social
Psychology, Vol. 59 (1959), pp. 315-321.
60. Winthrop, H. "Relation Between Appeal Value and High-
brow Status of Some Radio and Television Programs,"
Psychological Reports, Vol. 4 (1958), pp. 53-54.

APPENDIX I

PART I

Description of Program Factor Array Data for Personal Preference Types A, B, C

Program	Personal Preference			Social Desirability			Perception Significant Other		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
Alfred Hitchcock	.82	-1.70	.09	.17	-1.91	-.38	1.10	1.77	.67
Armstrong Circle Theater	1.08	-1.52	.58	1.56	-1.10	1.42	.91	.00	.53
The Andy Griffith Show	1.08	1.32	1.97	.47	1.50	1.55	.78	.35	1.70
Beverly Hillbillies	.23	1.48	.01	-.54	1.20	-1.00	.54	-1.41	-1.29
Bonanza	1.04	.81	-.68	.27	-.73	-.63	.97	-1.06	-.58
Candid Camera	.81	1.56	.01	-.16	1.24	-.45	1.06	-1.41	1.69
CBS News	.36	-.83	2.02	1.98	2.20	2.25	1.16	1.77	-.12
Chet Huntley Reporting	.15	-.83	1.55	1.95	.52	1.44	.93	.35	.03
Close-Up	-.89	-.54	-.14	1.65	.09	.37	-.23	1.06	.03
Combat	1.41	1.25	-1.50	.22	-.47	-1.91	1.08	1.41	-1.57
Danny Thomas	-.07	1.07	-1.15	-.43	.18	-.61	-.46	.00	-.85
The Defenders	1.68	-1.37	.74	1.53	-.17	.48	1.83	1.41	1.45
Dennis the Menace	-.27	.86	-.13	-1.07	.06	-.41	-.75	.00	-.88
Dick Powell	1.50	-.66	.28	.99	-.37	.54	1.87	1.41	-.12
Dick Van Dyke	1.89	.73	1.34	1.41	-.33	.52	1.61	-1.41	1.16
Dobie Gillis	.25	.89	-.89	-1.08	-.37	.24	-.32	-1.77	-1.53
Dr. Kildare	.89	-.01	-.81	.78	-.23	-.14	.66	-.35	-.80
Donna Reed	.11	.91	-.79	-.34	.94	-.61	-.63	.00	-.54
Fight of the Week	-2.08	-1.64	-.47	-2.18	-2.00	-1.02	-1.85	.35	-.54
The Flintstones	-1.09	1.95	-1.10	-1.40	.69	-.84	-.75	.71	-.78
Great Composers	-1.10	-1.40	-.06	.80	-.02	.40	-1.18	-.71	-.06
Hootenanny	.47	.61	-.71	.75	.46	-.39	.35	-.35	.04
International Showtime	-1.49	.38	.57	-.79	.13	.78	-1.01	.00	.38
Jack Benny	-.12	1.26	.37	-.37	1.13	-.24	.02	1.06	1.21
Jackie Gleason	-1.14	-.64	.03	-1.65	-.94	.43	-.90	-1.06	1.51

PART I. Description of Program Factor Array Data Continued

Program	Personal Preference			Social Desirability			Perception Significant Other		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
Jack Parr	- .49	- .50	-1.73	- .31	-1.30	-1.48	- .11	1.06	-2.00
Jazz Casual	- .86	-1.17	-1.00	- .48	-1.69	-1.33	-1.46	- .71	-1.66
Lantern to the Stars	-1.24	-1.21	- .12	- .10	- .22	.16	-1.32	- .35	- .86
Lassie	- .76	.11	.39	- .79	.68	1.65	-1.31	.35	- .13
Lawrence Welk Show	-1.15	- .54	1.60	- .67	.09	1.46	- .40	-1.77	1.20
Len Stuttmann	-1.47	.37	- .15	- .59	1.79	.42	-1.24	.71	- .36
The Lucy Show	-1.00	.59	1.14	-1.35	.85	.05	-1.26	- .71	1.51
Michigan Polka Party	- .76	-1.35	- .51	- .96	- .91	- .67	- .68	-1.77	- .75
Naked City	1.21	-1.31	- .94	.44	-1.82	-1.71	.86	.71	- .42
The Nurses	1.49	- .61	- .91	1.12	- .33	- .55	1.09	-1.41	- .33
Ozzie and Harriet	- .08	.60	- .22	- .41	1.41	-1.01	-1.08	-1.06	- .18
Password	- .48	.77	- .40	- .33	1.08	- .46	- .43	.71	- .88
Perry Como Show	- .16	- .07	1.60	.04	- .31	1.25	.51	-1.06	1.45
Perry Mason	.89	- .75	1.69	.53	- .32	.73	1.68	1.41	1.45
Red Skelton Show	.07	1.22	.88	- .15	- .03	.19	.44	.00	1.09
Route 66	1.24	- .56	- .56	.31	- .90	- .01	.99	- .35	.06
Stump the Stars	- .68	- .12	-1.16	-1.61	- .43	-1.44	- .95	1.06	- .90
The Ed Sullivan Show	- .09	.21	1.62	.28	- .59	1.30	.24	- .00	1.88
True	.49	- .28	.26	.02	1.27	.44	.18	1.77	.36
Twilight Zone	.33	- .81	-2.23	- .35	-1.44	-2.05	.52	.35	- .43
Voice of Firestone	- .69	- .57	.56	.74	- .11	1.21	- .54	- .71	- .12
Walt Disney	.51	1.30	.68	1.59	1.59	1.36	.12	.71	.28
Yogi Bear	- .88	1.64	- .77	- .62	1.02	- .61	- .56	.00	-1.27
Make That Spare	-2.04	- .79	.21	-1.71	- .61	- .49	-2.08	- .71	.94
Ben Casey	1.12	- .12	-1.07	.84	- .46	- .19	.02	- .35	- .66

PART I

Description of Program Factor Array Data for Personal Preference Types A, B, C

Program	Familiarity			Actual Viewing		
	A	B	C	A	B	C
Alfred Hitchcock	.57	-.81	.45	.18	-.85	.20
Armstrong Circle Theater	.19	-.81	.45	-.07	-.77	.32
The Andy Griffith Show	1.00	.63	1.04	1.23	.23	1.76
Beverly Hillbillies	1.04	.88	1.04	.76	1.13	1.44
Bonanza	.42	1.21	-.50	.12	.21	-.62
Candid Camera	.79	1.46	.75	1.28	3.29	.34
CBS News	.51	-.23	-1.09	.70	-.57	-.55
Chet Huntley Reporting	.57	-.97	.46	1.01	-.85	-.32
Close-Up	-2.11	-1.69	-1.89	-.64	-.85	-1.40
Combat	.86	1.29	-.80	2.29	1.63	-.99
Danny Thomas	.72	.08	.75	-.67	.23	.40
The Defenders	.20	.30	1.34	.66	-.34	1.70
Dennis the Menace	.39	.14	.46	-.41	-.85	.82
Dick Powell	.69	-.81	.46	1.62	-.85	-.90
Dick Van Dyke	1.17	.14	.46	2.74	.08	1.20
Dobie Gillis	.77	.58	.09	.08	.31	-.56
Dr. Kildare	.90	.14	.16	.88	.00	-.15
Donna Reed	-.46	.46	-1.89	-.75	-.85	-1.40
Fight of the Week	-1.52	-1.69	.16	-1.21	-.85	-.08
The Flintstones	.51	1.62	.46	-1.03	3.05	-.81
Great Composers	-.06	-.25	-.21	.07	-.07	.05
Hootenanny	-.36	.88	-2.49	-.42	-.46	-1.40
International Showtime	-1.13	.90	.16	-.84	.43	.45
Jack Benny	.59	.63	.75	-1.05	.23	-.05
Jackie Gleason	-.24	-.42	.75	-.99	-.85	1.33

PART I. Description of Program Factor Array Data Continued

Program	Familiarity			Actual Viewing		
	A	B	C	A	B	C
Jack Parr	-.03	-.48	.46	-.81	-.36	-.71
Jazz Casual	-1.47	-2.24	-2.49	-.96	-.85	-1.40
Lantern to the Stars	-2.90	-2.24	-2.49	-1.25	-.85	-1.40
Lassie	.35	.66	.46	-.62	-.77	1.45
Lawrence Welk Show	-.32	.30	.75	-1.25	-.43	-.08
Lenn Stuttman	-1.19	1.04	-1.30	-.38	1.32	-1.03
The Lucy Show	.51	.63	.75	-.74	.66	1.69
Michigan Polka Party	-1.81	-1.69	-1.39	.17	-.85	-1.07
Naked City	-.10	.08	.16	.12	-.66	.04
The Nurses	.89	.14	.46	1.49	.00	.44
Ozzie and Harriet	-.09	.14	.75	-1.25	.00	-1.14
Password	.26	.63	.38	-.73	1.34	.23
Perry Como Show	.68	-1.36	.46	-1.05	-.85	.79
Perry Mason	.89	.14	1.34	1.00	-.43	2.77
Red Skelton Show	.90	-.09	.46	.56	-.43	.34
Route 66	.78	.88	.75	1.73	-.46	.40
Stump the Stars	-1.29	.08	.16	-.55	.23	1.03
The Ed Sullivan Show	.39	.46	1.34	.44	-.85	1.34
True	-1.88	.63	-1.30	-.34	1.34	-.66
Twilight Zone	.40	.25	.46	.63	-.69	-.23
Voice of Firestone	-.91	-1.69	-.21	-.82	-.85	-.74
Walt Disney	.58	1.07	-1.30	-.90	1.10	-1.15
Yogi Bear	.83	1.46	.09	1.18	1.94	-.48
Make That Spare	-2.27	-2.08	.16	-1.25	-.85	-.41
Ben Casey	.79	.14	-.21	.08	.43	-.81

PART II

Description of General Orientation Factor Array Data
for Personal Preference Types A, B, C

Statement	A	B	C
I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television when I know there are other things I should be doing.	1.48	2.11	.47
TV is just about the worst thing that ever happened to our family.	-2.60	-2.05	-2.57
I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television as much as I do. There are other things I really want to do more .	.70	1.41	-1.09
I find many programs on TV stimulating and highly enjoyable.	1.30	-.05	1.84
When I have free time, I don't like to hang around the house and watch TV. I much prefer to do things that take me out of the house where I can be around people.	.38	.82	.20
Sometimes I like to have the set on. even though I may not be watching, just to have the feeling that someone is around.	.26	-1.16	-.20
Television helps to have a closer and more satisfying family life.. . . .	-1.60	-1.40	.88
I can think of lots of things I'd rather do than watch television	.79	.45	.42
I'm afraid too much television could cause a person to become involved in the play-acting world and lose touch with reality	-1.71	-1.15	-.18
Once I start watching television I find it hard to turn it off. Sometimes I watch it longer than I really want to	1.12	.26	1.65

PART II. Continued

Statement	A	B	C
After I've had a hard day and I'm tired, I find watching TV is one of the best ways to relax	1.27	1.07	1.34
Television actually dictates too much what I do with my time.	-.51	-.75	-1.50
I consider myself to be a discriminating viewer. I choose carefully the pro- grams I watch	-.36	.67	.21
Too many people are too eager to crit- icize television. I think it is actually very good.	.35	-.53	.52
When I'm watching a television program, I prefer not to be disturbed or dis- tracted from it	.30	-.97	.83
Watching television is what I best like to do in my leisure time	-1.22	-1.17	.30
Most TV programs bore me; I much prefer to do things that are more challeng- ing and stimulating to the mind	-.44	-.76	-1.02
Sometimes when I feel worried about something or I'm tense, I watch tele- vision to help me forget my problems. .	.30	1.88	-.98
In my leisure time, I don't plan very far ahead. I like to do things on the spur of the moment.	.19	.44	.04
I'm generally pretty easy-going about television programs. I'll usually watch whatever the rest of the fam- ily likes to watch.	1.30	.67	1.70
Television is too noisy and it makes me nervous to have it on very much	-1.52	-.88	-1.69
Television requires too much sitting around, doing nothing. I'd rather do more active things	.65	.58	-.28

PART II. Continued

Statement	A	B	C
My life is usually pretty dull and un- eventful. Television helps me to pass the time	-1.04	-1.16	-1.40
I get more relaxation and enjoyment from the radio or a record player than I do from television.. . . .	-.51	-1.14	-.76
I enjoy watching most TV commercials . .	-1.76	-.07	-.52
When company drops in unexpectedly while I'm watching television, I usually want them to sit down and share the program with me	-.45	.21	-.51
I think lectures, concerts, plays, and other things like these are much more enjoyable than TV shows	1.27	-1.36	.13
I'm so busy with other things I have little time to watch television	-.27	-.51	.87
No matter what I do in my spare time, I like to plan how I'll spend it ahead of time	-.06	1.36	.71
I can and often do other things while watching television	1.13	1.41	.35
I consider television a real friend and companion	.14	-1.29	-.04
I actually resent television because it often interferes with more important things	-.85	-.26	-1.68
When I am with friends, and I know my favorite television program is coming on soon, I'm tempted to suggest that we all watch it	.08	.56	-1.31
It bothers me a lot when I have to miss my favorite TV program	-1.31	-.07	-1.09

PART II. Continued

Statement	A	B	C
I don't like to have the TV set on unless I can give it my full attention	-.16	.11	.51
I'd much rather be active in the clubs or organizations I belong to than to watch much TV.	-.01	.63	.65
Sometimes I like to just drift away into the fantasy world of a television pro- gram for a while and forget all about my own concerns and the things around me.	.08	2.02	-.01
I'd rather go out to a movie than to watch television.	1.14	.37	-.10
I find that I'm a better person, more informed and up-to-date on things, because of television	.80	.63	1.26
I'd much rather read a magazine or a book than watch TV.	.55	-.46	.10
I find myself too busy doing things around the house to watch much TV . . .	-.00	-.32	.75
I would rather visit with friends than watch TV	1.66	-.36	1.32
There are so many good TV programs offered that I'm glad to give up some other things to watch them	-.89	.21	-.13

APPENDIX II

PART I

Description of Program Factor Array Data for Actual Viewing Types X, Y, Z

Program	Personal Preference			Social Desirability			Perception Significant Other		
	X	Y	Z	X	Y	Z	X	Y	Z
Alfred Hitchcock	.40	.95	-1.23	-.19	-.01	-1.61	1.58	.55	-.83
Armstrong Circle Theater	.73	1.12	.11	1.43	.86	.28	.28	.86	.53
The Andy Griffith Show	1.90	1.33	2.04	1.18	1.07	1.61	1.60	.94	1.81
Beverly Hillbillies	1.29	-.99	1.22	.72	-1.57	.53	.80	-.24	-.08
Bonanza	-1.17	1.46	.79	-1.05	.36	-.18	-.87	1.76	.69
Candid Camera	1.00	.51	1.15	.53	-.64	.62	1.79	.76	.21
CBS News	1.08	.56	.61	2.40	2.18	2.43	.18	.61	.92
Chet Huntley Reporting	.67	.50	-.08	1.64	2.17	1.10	.22	.08	.82
Close Up	-.57	-.23	-.05	.81	1.93	.95	-.13	-.38	-.22
Combat	-2.09	1.31	.37	-2.37	.04	-.67	-1.61	.95	1.09
Danny Thomas	.16	.01	.98	.20	-.50	.29	.45	-.36	-.29
The Defenders	1.43	1.68	.55	1.47	1.45	.60	2.20	1.90	2.04
Dennis the Menace	.39	-1.11	.26	-.09	-1.51	-.00	-.60	-.48	-.54
Dick Powell	.29	1.58	-.12	.03	.67	.06	.02	1.95	1.06
Dick Van Dyke	1.78	2.14	.97	.46	.84	.05	1.30	1.75	.15
Dobie Gillis	.47	-.93	.15	.34	-1.48	-.36	-.01	-.50	-.39
Dr. Kildare	-.51	.83	.19	.20	.22	.39	-.47	.72	-.20
Donna Reed	.09	-.13	.49	-.17	-.38	.76	-.26	-.19	-1.52
Fight of the Week	-1.93	-1.81	-2.51	-1.92	-1.58	-2.28	-1.55	-1.17	-.93
The Flintstones	-.55	-.93	1.34	-.85	-1.00	.47	-.40	-.78	1.10
Great Composers	-.30	-.74	-1.57	.22	1.08	.91	-.13	-.96	-.06
Hootenanny	.53	.37	-.17	-.49	.56	-.19	-.28	-.04	-1.19
International Showtime	.61	-.89	-.67	.42	-1.07	-.17	.17	-1.03	.07
Jack Benny	-.02	.02	1.42	-.92	.15	1.07	.27	-.04	.91
Jackie Gleason	-.26	-.19	-1.11	-.42	-.60	-1.53	.51	-.38	-1.08

PART I. Description of Program Factor Array Data Continued

Program	Personal Preference			Social Desirability			Perception Significant Other		
	X	Y	Z	X	Y	Z	X	Y	Z
Jack Parr	-2.15	-.35	-.70	-1.99	-.77	-1.41	-1.92	-.20	-.50
Jazz Casual	-1.76	-1.05	-1.95	-.95	-.86	-1.66	-2.03	-1.46	-2.10
Lantern to the Stars	-1.03	-.78	-1.22	-.55	-.17	.07	-1.18	-1.04	-1.45
Lassie	-.06	-1.44	-.15	1.15	-.89	.05	-.54	-1.15	.00
Lawrence Welk Show	.81	-.92	-.61	.29	-.46	-.29	.66	-.69	.92
Len Stuttmann	-.26	-.88	.15	.60	-.06	1.44	-.26	-1.26	.33
The Lucy Show	1.42	-1.07	.16	.27	-1.24	.24	1.52	-1.18	-.54
Michigan Polka Party	-.58	-1.67	-1.92	-.96	-1.48	-1.49	-1.22	-1.69	-1.74
Naked City	-1.38	1.39	-.36	-1.67	1.05	-1.56	-1.17	1.72	.55
The Nurses	.06	.53	-.16	-.05	.21	.00	-.19	.80	-1.39
Ozzie and Harriet	-.17	-.30	.66	-.41	-.60	.82	.21	-1.11	-.66
Password	-.40	-.30	.87	-.09	-.33	.68	-.93	-.55	.73
Perry Como Show	.86	-.07	.03	.48	.24	.17	.65	.52	.63
Perry Mason	1.80	.61	.31	.84	.39	.23	1.85	1.16	1.94
Red Skelton Show	.22	.13	.69	.43	.04	.37	.24	.38	.37
Route 66	-.03	1.20	.95	.22	.19	-1.39	.34	1.54	-.77
Stump the Stars	-.67	-.69	-.66	-.94	-1.28	-.89	-.40	-.46	-.49
The Ed Sullivan Show	1.13	-.21	-.68	1.14	.11	-1.25	1.82	.06	-.53
True	-.27	-.63	1.13	.72	-.87	1.32	.19	-.92	1.62
Twilight Zone	-.99	.69	-.75	-1.47	.25	-1.56	.42	.46	-1.42
Voice of Firestone	.30	-.28	-.65	1.19	1.86	.34	-.69	-.55	.49
Walt Disney	.55	.86	1.62	1.37	1.60	1.57	.25	.61	1.41
Yogi Bear	-.40	-1.09	1.35	-.47	-.05	.31	-1.33	-.59	.53
Make That Spare	-.76	-1.61	-1.75	-.59	-.66	-.58	-.43	-1.83	-1.08
Ben Casey	-1.62	1.53	.39	-.81	.58	.07	-.90	1.14	-.92

PART I

Description of Program Factor Array Data for Actual Viewing Types X, Y, Z

Program	Familiarity			Actual Viewing		
	X	Y	Z	X	Y	Z
Alfred Hitchcock	.56	.52	-.16	.30	-.21	-.93
Armstrong Circle Theater	-.01	.84	-.31	.05	.42	-.54
The Andy Griffith Show	1.10	.93	1.19	1.90	.38	2.10
Beverly Hillbillies	1.29	.33	.46	2.24	-.24	1.53
Bonanza	-.58	.93	.40	-.87	1.14	-.41
Candid Camera	.94	.58	1.03	.87	1.09	3.22
CBS News	-.41	.76	-.43	.26	.52	-.15
Chet Huntley Reporting	.22	.04	-.68	-.66	.31	-.32
Close-Up	-2.17	-1.71	-2.24	-1.21	-.35	-1.04
Combat	-1.03	.65	.89	-.82	2.08	1.00
Danny Thomas	.97	.51	.59	1.16	-.74	.28
The Defenders	1.32	.92	.74	1.41	1.46	.78
Dennis the Menace	.92	.58	.51	.65	-.52	-.43
Dick Powell	-.90	1.04	-.05	-1.05	2.41	-1.00
Dick Van Dyke	.89	1.04	.72	1.51	2.21	.66
Dobie Gillis	.88	.06	.23	.72	-.73	-.55
Dr. Kildare	-.18	.93	.59	-.65	1.35	.14
Donna Reed	-.80	.11	.34	-1.21	.29	-.55
Fight of the Week	-.24	-1.11	-1.63	-.77	-.86	-1.04
The Flintstones	.48	.76	1.02	-.66	-1.03	1.24
Great Composers	-.13	-.01	-.10	.07	-.11	-.03
Hootenanny	-1.60	-.43	-.43	-1.21	-.48	-.76
International Showtime	-.67	-1.08	-.63	-.29	-.84	-.60
Jack Benny	.93	.08	1.19	-.46	-.69	1.21
Jackie Gleason	.67	.23	-.33	.67	-.63	-.84

PART I. Description of Program Factor Array Data Continued

Program	Familiarity			Actual Viewing		
	X	Y	Z	X	Y	Z
Jack Parr	-.23	-.01	-.31	-.93	-.74	-.40
Jazz Casual	-2.54	-1.95	-2.56	-1.21	-.85	-1.04
Lantern to the Stars	-2.54	-2.18	-2.56	-1.21	-1.03	-1.04
Lassie	.92	.69	.54	.97	-.92	-.85
Lawrence Welk Show	.65	-.01	.70	-.71	-1.03	-.12
Lenn Stuttman	-.26	-1.50	.48	-.45	-.78	.75
The Lucy Show	1.07	-.17	.63	2.34	-.91	.58
Michigan Polka Party	-1.60	-2.09	-1.85	-1.10	-.89	-.71
Naked City	-1.05	1.04	-.13	-.51	1.14	-.67
The Nurses	.07	.53	.05	.46	1.40	.12
Ozzie and Harriet	.46	-.09	.29	-1.10	-1.03	.03
Password	-.07	-.65	.97	-.10	-.92	2.32
Perry Como Show	.51	.26	-.37	-.08	-.92	-.74
Perry Mason	1.39	.78	.66	1.86	1.26	-.31
Red Skelton Show	.94	.44	.52	.33	-.03	.00
Route 66	.84	.92	.38	.68	1.88	-.80
Stump the Stars	.06	-1.45	.18	.81	-.37	.00
The Ed Sullivan Show	1.39	1.04	.73	1.55	.29	-.90
True	-.21	-2.70	.65	.13	-.96	1.92
Twilight Zone	.50	.58	.38	-.03	.10	-.80
Voice of Firestone	-1.16	-.85	-2.13	-.99	-.55	-1.04
Walt Disney	-.97	.55	.66	-.89	-.45	.00
Yogi Bear	.30	.43	.81	.09	-.37	1.23
Make That Spare	-.78	-1.86	-2.29	-.88	-.98	-1.04
Ben Casey	-.15	.74	.68	-.95	1.47	.57

PART II

Description of General Orientation Factor Array Data
for Actual Viewing Types X, Y, Z

Statement	X	Y	Z
I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television when I know there are other things I should be doing . .	.33	1.78	1.19
TV is just about the worst thing that ever happened to our family	-1.68	-2.24	-2.80
I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television as much as I do. There are other things I really want to do more .	-.65	1.05	.65
I find many programs on TV stimulating and highly enjoyable	.95	1.01	.44
When I have free time, I don't like to hang around the house and watch TV. I much prefer to do things that take me out of the house where I can be around people.	.66	-.12	.63
Sometimes I like to have the set on, even though I may not be watching, just to have the feeling that someone is around	-.46	.08	-.81
Television helps us to have a closer and more satisfying family life	-.06	-1.52	-.93
I can think of lots of things I'd rather do than watch television	.89	.69	1.54
I'm afraid too much television could cause a person to become involved in the play-acting world and lose touch with reality.	-.12	-1.32	-1.86
Once I start watching television I find it hard to turn it off. Sometimes I watch it longer than I really want to .	.51	1.23	.59

PART II. Continued

Statement	X	Y	Z
After I've had a hard day and I'm tired, I find watching TV is one of the best ways to relax	.74	1.25	1.66
Television actually dictates too much of what I do with my time.	-1.68	-.80	-.36
I consider myself to be a discriminat- ing viewer. I choose carefully the programs I watch	.57	-.38	.47
Too many people are too eager to crit- icize television. I think it is actually very good.	-.07	.08	.33
When I'm watching a television program, I prefer not to be disturbed or dis- tracted from it	.13	.27	-.77
Watching television is what I best like to do in my leisure time	-1.24	-.87	-.90
Most TV programs bore me. I much pre- fer to do things that are more chal- lenging and stimulating to the mind	.14	-.17	-.34
Sometimes when I feel worried about something or I'm tense, I watch television to help me forget my problems.	-.23	.47	1.42
In my leisure time, I don't plan very far ahead. I like to do things on the spur of the moment.	.18	.05	.50
I'm generally pretty easy-going about television programs. I'll usually watch whatever the rest of the fam- ily likes to watch.	1.51	1.67	.66
Television is too noisy and it makes me nervous to have it on very much	-1.08	-1.04	-1.18

PART II. Continued

Statement	X	Y	Z
Television requires too much sitting around, doing nothing. I'd rather do more active things	.07	.24	.60
My life is usually pretty dull and uneventful. Television helps me to pass the time.	-1.93	-.60	-1.01
I get more relaxation and enjoyment from the radio or a record player than I do from television	.15	-.56	-1.36
I enjoy watching most TV commercials	-.94	-1.46	-.72
When company drops in unexpectedly while I'm watching television, I usually want them to sit down and share the program with me	-.95	-.48	-.58
I think lectures, concerts, plays, and other things like these are much more enjoyable than TV shows	1.25	1.06	.07
I'm so busy with other things I have little time to watch television	1.80	-1.27	-.82
No matter what I do in my spare time, I like to plan how I'll spend it ahead of time	.31	.22	.85
I can and often do other things while watching television	1.17	1.24	1.37
I consider television a real friend and companion	-.38	.07	.79
I actually resent television because it often interferes with more important things	-1.26	-1.01	-1.30
When I am with friends, and I know my favorite television program is coming on soon, I'm tempted to suggest that we all watch it.	-1.06	.77	-.02

PART II. Continued

Statement	X	Y	Z
It bothers me a lot when I have to miss my favorite TV program	-1.59	-1.34	-.50
I don't like to have the TV set on unless I can give it my full attention	-.07	-.39	-.80
I'd much rather be active in the clubs or organizations I belong to than to watch much TV	1.85	-.90	.26
Sometimes I like to just drift away into the fantasy world of a television pro- gram for a while and forget all about my own concerns and the things around me.	-.04	.41	.53
I'd rather go out to a movie than to watch television.	.37	.78	-.89
I find that I'm a better person, more informed and up-to-date on things, because of television	.32	1.34	1.37
I'd much rather read a magazine or a book than watch TV.	.36	.27	.48
I find myself too busy doing things around the house to watch much TV . . .	.77	-.10	.40
I would rather visit with friends than watch TV.	2.03	1.80	1.45
There are so many good TV programs offered that I'm glad to give up some other things to watch them	-1.59	-1.27	-.28

APPENDIX III

Correlation Matrix from which Factor Analysis was Derived
for Personal Preference Types A, B, C

	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
01												
02	+298											
03	+438	+015										
04	+355	+085	+703									
05	-007	-010	-137	+047								
06	-032	-015	-045	+048	+665							
07	-155	+023	-203	-050	+332	+238						
08	-373	-077	-152	+028	+425	+290	+570					
09	-043	-258	-245	-083	+368	+160	+380	+383				
10	+179	-105	+022	+052	+356	+247	+289	+242	+725			
11	+495	+005	+285	+345	+310	+218	+108	+020	+122	+184		
12	+133	-233	-273	-160	+378	+045	+390	+232	+490	+414	+415	
13	-060	-053	+030	+060	+453	+175	+720	+543	+570	+404	+162	+438
14	+385	+280	+350	+490	+247	+288	+007	-037	-050	+025	+440	-058
15	+490	+190	+448	+565	+050	+293	-040	-075	-163	+045	+408	-197
16	+155	-035	+223	+217	+017	-092	+138	+097	+302	+294	+155	+200
17	+117	-130	-148	-027	+125	+257	-007	-113	+228	+314	+293	+337
18	+338	+012	+612	+428	+058	+028	+123	+067	+085	+187	+388	+087
19	+185	-112	+250	+365	+138	+070	+018	+093	+343	+299	+348	+117
20	+118	-002	-175	-037	+173	+258	+008	-077	+360	+309	+010	-002
21	+045	-075	+030	-010	+088	+220	-123	+075	+333	+426	+072	-012
22	-420	-207	-523	-440	+220	+232	+218	+140	+392	+149	-143	+175
23	+105	-093	+178	+130	-120	+150	-085	-052	+093	+105	+210	-093
24	+213	+105	+333	+345	+085	+312	-085	-007	+012	+092	+283	-193
25	+415	+149	+605	+535	+189	+269	-015	-027	-095	-005	+440	-147
26	+233	-065	+473	+410	+115	+135	+148	+010	-062	-065	+358	+005

Correlation Matrix from which Factor Analysis was Derived
for Actual Viewing Types X, Y, Z

	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
01												
02	+754											
03	+314	+244										
04	+445	+283	+710									
05	-057	-058	-273	-245								
06	-036	+047	-106	-133	+679							
07	-065	-037	+045	+048	+146	+137						
08	+002	+073	+020	+123	-027	+059	+085					
09	+025	+116	-000	+167	+080	+157	+139	+167				
10	+140	+141	-074	-003	+352	+420	+123	+240	+508			
11	+037	+095	+042	+105	+350	+169	+254	+151	+148	+500		
12	-054	-023	-137	+023	+263	+255	+247	+114	+659	+628	+483	
13	+566	+650	+383	+521	-201	-030	-016	+043	+171	+126	+287	+066
14	+554	+512	+500	+520	-269	-153	+088	+005	+333	+221	+191	+219
15	-062	+006	+009	+168	+257	-106	-134	+235	+171	+164	+369	+061
16	-020	+121	+150	+193	+140	+043	-185	+273	+093	+213	+421	+083
17	+068	+053	+335	+419	+216	+142	-027	+137	+293	+326	+381	+374
18	+006	+012	+150	+288	+275	+137	-050	+245	+397	+339	+245	+341
19	+031	+152	+112	+138	+283	+212	-168	+415	-037	+146	+259	+020
20	+011	+134	+141	+177	-004	+034	-279	+399	+249	+098	+062	+030
21	-308	-020	+051	-013	-056	+004	+286	+325	+039	-095	+219	+088
22	+216	+361	+458	+440	-007	+209	-045	+248	+344	+372	+326	+262
23	+237	+245	+432	+336	-175	+128	+169	+164	+112	+091	-035	+107
24	+220	+174	+117	+158	+027	+049	+172	+095	+267	+381	+316	+418
25	-058	-022	+247	+260	-216	-185	+145	+308	+137	+204	+248	+189

APPENDIX IV

Means and Standard Deviations of Facet Elements for Personal Preference Types A, B, C
(See Facet Definitions Page 45)

Control Var.	Codes	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs.
1	1	.4754	.8706	5	-1.0162	.3700	5	.9518	.7581	5
	2	.3885	.9102	25	.3717	.8747	25	-.0561	1.0765	25
	3	-.6046	.8152	20	-.2107	1.0167	20	-.1679	.8057	20
2	1	-.1857	.7962	20	.7663	.7741	20	.0410	.9274	20
	2	.1237	1.0981	30	-.5109	.7838	30	-.0274	1.0446	30
3	1	.0267	1.0944	23	-.2983	.8929	23	-.2588	1.1165	23
	2	-.0506	.8931	24	.2487	1.0523	24	.2717	.7974	24
	3	.1993	1.0191	3	.2967	.6542	3	-.1897	.9394	3
4	1	.2147	.9416	12	-1.0686	.3763	12	.3130	1.1284	12
	2	-.0678	1.0083	38	.3374	.8924	38	-.0989	.9343	38
5	1	-.6950	.7722	20	-.3820	.8155	20	.1645	1.0228	20
	2	.5755	.8031	27	.1797	.9766	27	.0298	.8974	27
	3	-.5463	.6228	3	.9287	1.2330	3	-1.3653	.6248	3
6	1	.1917	.9900	26	.1631	1.1155	26	-.2979	.9164	26
	2	-.2078	.9689	24	-.1767	.8216	24	.3227	.9865	24
7	1	-.7380	.7653	19	-.1605	.9526	19	.0304	.9041	19
	2	.4523	.8460	31	.0983	1.0154	31	-.0187	1.0540	31
8	1	-.0069	.9265	17	-.2172	.8175	17	.5671	.9016	17
	2	.0035	1.0358	33	.1119	1.0648	33	-.2922	.9194	33
9	1	.1528	.9387	16	-.3976	.9162	16	.1984	1.0991	16
	2	-.0719	1.0197	34	.1871	.9828	34	-.0934	.9353	34

Means and Standard Deviations of Facet Elements for Actual Viewing Types X, Y, Z
(See Facet Definitions Page 45)

Control Var.	Codes	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs.
1	1	-.0300	.8882	5	.4714	.5805	5	-.2558	.5976	5
	2	.0869	1.0617	25	.3387	1.1930	25	.2716	1.0221	25
	3	-.1011	.9349	20	-.5412	.3810	20	-.2758	.9592	20
2	1	.4954	1.0663	20	-.2850	.7945	20	.4913	1.1431	20
	2	-.3302	.7976	30	.1900	1.0751	30	-.3277	.7261	30
3	1	-.1333	.8526	23	.1352	1.0666	23	-.1524	.8190	23
	2	.0612	1.0333	24	-.1623	.9111	24	.1395	1.1711	24
	3	.5327	1.4501	3	.2620	.9413	3	.0507	.4632	3
4	1	-.0550	.9197	12	.2462	.7300	12	-.5092	.5187	12
	2	.0174	1.0235	38	-.0777	1.0595	38	.1607	1.0598	38
5	1	-.4129	.7745	20	-.4756	.5850	20	-.2346	1.1137	20
	2	.3282	1.0756	27	.4005	1.1071	27	.1120	.8623	27
	3	-.2013	.3297	3	-.4337	.4662	3	.5537	.9586	3
6	1	.2104	1.0393	26	.1910	1.1193	26	.1032	1.0565	26
	2	-.2279	.9019	24	-.2070	.8026	24	-.1120	.9219	24
7	1	-.2691	.7896	19	-.5680	.5292	19	-.0930	1.1609	19
	2	.1649	1.0767	31	.3481	1.0595	31	.0568	.8822	31
8	1	-.1618	1.0002	17	.0039	1.0070	17	-.1334	.8124	17
	2	.0833	.9896	33	-.0020	.9965	33	.0685	1.0776	33
9	1	-.1348	.8451	16	.0887	.9202	16	-.0660	1.1610	16
	2	.0634	1.0592	34	-.0417	1.0392	34	.0309	.9128	34

APPENDIX V

D

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY

Conditions of instruction used for the social desirability dimension Q-sort consisting of the fifty-item television program sample:

Each of these cards had the title and brief description of a television program. I want you to judge each program on how desirable or undesirable you think it is for television to present such a program. Is the program good for people to watch or not good for them to watch? I want you for the moment to forget about which programs you personally enjoy or do not enjoy and which programs you have or have not the chance to watch. Please think only of how desirable or undesirable it is for it to be on television.

Here is a deck of cards. (HAND RESPONDENT THE Q DECK WITH THE YELLOW BASE CARDS) You can tell me your judgments by sorting these TV programs from those which are the most desirable for people to watch to those which are most undesirable for people to watch. Initially, sort the cards into three piles.

Into a pile on the right, please put the TV programs which you think are desirable for others to watch, the ones you approve of watching, the ones it would be good for people to watch, the ones people should watch, for their own good.

Into a pile on the left, please put the TV programs which you think are undesirable for others to watch, the ones you disapprove of people watching, the ones it would be bad for people to watch, the ones people should not watch.

Into a pile in the middle, put the programs which fall in between or ones that you are not sure about.

(PICK UP RIGHT HAND PILE AND HAND TO SUBJECT) Fine! Now, from these cards I'd like you to pick out the three programs which are the most desirable for people to watch. Put these three cards on top of the yellow card over here on the right, number 11.

(AFTER SUBJECT HAS DONE THIS, PICK UP LEFT HAND PILE AND HAND TO SUBJECT) Very good! Now, I'd like you to select from these cards the three programs which are most undesirable for people to watch. Put these on the card at the left, number 1.

(AFTER SUBJECT HAS FINISHED WITH THIS) That's fine! Now, I'd like you to go back to the right hand pile and pick out the four programs which would be the next most desirable for people to watch, and put those four cards on number 10.

(AFTER SUBJECT HAS FINISHED WITH THIS) Good! Now I'd like you to do the same thing with the left hand pile, picking out the four programs which you feel are next most undesirable for people to watch. Put them on card 2.

(AFTER SUBJECT HAS FINISHED WITH THIS) That's good! Now you see how it works. You just keep working on one end, and then the other end, working toward the middle, putting the correct number of cards as indicated here (POINT TO THE BASE CARD) as you have been doing.

(AFTER SUBJECT HAS COMPLETED SORTING ALL OF THE CARDS, SPREAD OUT THE CARDS SO HE CAN LOOK AT THE WAY HE HAS SORTED THE ENTIRE DECK) Fine! Now that you are through, take one final look at the way you have sorted the TV programs. These over here are the ones you feel are best for people. On this other end are those programs you feel are the worst--or at least not so good--for people.

Q-Sort Distribution

		"least"										"most"	
Number of cards	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
		3	4	4	5	5	8	5	5	4	4	3	

Total number of cards = 50

PERSONAL PREFERENCE

Conditions of instruction used for the personal preference dimension Q-sort consisting of the fifty-item television program sample:

Each one of us has individual and unique tastes which are not necessarily similar to anyone else's likes or dislikes. Certain TV programs have a special delight for us, regardless of what anyone else thinks of them. To us, individually, privately, and personally, such programs are good entertainment, satisfying, just plain fun. We all enjoy having a good time once in a while, and these would be the TV programs which we would find personally satisfying and enjoyable.

Whether or not you have the opportunity to watch some of the programs on the cards is not important. The important thing is whether you think it is the kind of program you would find enjoyable or satisfying if you could watch it. Base your estimates on what knowledge you have of the program and on the brief description of it.

Certain other TV programs don't provide us with any fun, enjoyment or similar satisfactions. They may be depressing, take the fun out of life. They may be boring or actually annoying or at least they give you no fun and enjoyment.

Here are the same programs you judged before on whether they were good or bad for people. Now, I want you to sort these programs on how much each one is the kind of TV program which gives you personally fun, enjoyment, excitement, good entertainment, relaxation, a good time. . . .

First, I want you to sort the cards into three piles. In a pile on the right, please put the TV programs which you yourself consider to be the most enjoyable programs, the ones most fun to watch, the ones most personally satisfying, or the most entertaining TV programs for just you.

In a pile on the left, put the programs which you yourself consider to be the least enjoyable TV programs, the ones least fun to watch, the ones least personally satisfying, the TV programs that bore or annoy you.

(AFTER SUBJECT HAS DONE THIS, SPREAD OUT BLUE RANK CARDS) Very good! Now, from these cards (HAND RIGHT-HAND PILE TO SUBJECT) I'd like you to pick out the three programs which are the kind most satisfying for you yourself. (AFTER SUBJECT HAS DONE THIS). Excellent! (HAND LEFT-HAND PILE TO SUBJECT) Now, I'd like you to pick out the three programs from this pile that are least satisfying to you personally. (AFTER SUBJECT HAS DONE THIS) Fine! Now, I'd like you to go back to the right-hand pile and pick out the next four cards that represent programs you would most enjoy watching personally, and just wanted to have a good time. (AFTER SUBJECT IS FINISHED) Good! Now, I'd like you to return to the left-hand pile and pick out the four that are the least enjoyable to you personally, or that you dislike for your own personal entertainment. (AFTER SUBJECT IS DONE WITH INSTRUCTIONS THUS FAR) Very good! Now you see how it goes, just as before, you just keep working first one end, and then the other end, toward the middle. Remember, you are selecting these programs only on the basis of how much fun or satisfaction they give you.

Q-Sort Distribution

		"least"							"most"			
Rank		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Number of cards		3	4	4	5	5	8	5	5	4	4	3

Total number of cards = 50

PERCEPTIONS OF SIGNIFICANT OTHER

(Follows personal preference on schedule)

Conditions of instruction used for the perception of significant other Q-sort consisting of the fifty-item television program sample:

While you've been doing this last sort, your wife has been doing the same thing. That is, she has been using these same cards to describe the programs she enjoys most. How do you suppose she sorted the cards? I'd like you to sort these same cards again, only this time I'd like you to sort them as you think your wife would have sorted them.

Q-Sort Distribution

		"least"									"most"	
Rank		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Number of cards		3	4	4	5	5	8	5	5	4	4	3

Total number of cards = 50

ORIENTATION TO TELEVISION

Conditions of instruction used for the orientation to television dimension Q-sort consisting of the forty-three item statement sample:

You've been doing very well with the interview questions and card sorting, and we're now coming toward the end. This will be the last card sorting we will ask you to do, and you'll find it very easy.

Here are some new cards you've not seen before. I'd like you to use them just the way you did the others. Look at each one, and decide whether it describes the way you yourself feel. Put the cards that describe the way you feel in a pile on the right. Put the ones which describe the way you do not feel in a pile on the left. And the ones which fall into neither category, or that you're not sure about, in a pile in the middle. Then pick out the TWO cards that best describe the way you feel in the extreme right hand pile, number 11. Then go to the left hand pile and pick out the TWO cards which are the most different from your feelings about television on the extreme left hand pile card, number 1. And so on, working back and forth, toward the middle. (HAND CARDS TO SUBJECT).

Q-Sort Distribution

Rank	"least"												"most"	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11			
Number of cards	2	3	4	5	5	7	5	4	4	3	2			

Total number of cards = 43

APPENDIX VI

Q SAMPLE OF TV PROGRAMS

1. Alfred Hitchcock
322121221 (6:30 Sat.)
Suspense-filled, tongue-in cheek murder mysteries.
2. Armstrong Circle Theater
122122221 (10:00 Weds.)
Dramatized documentaries on such timely subjects as juvenile delinquency, divorce, drinking, adoption, etc.
3. Andy Griffith Show
212222222 (9:30 Mon.)
A situation comedy of the life of a small-town sheriff with Andy Griffith and Don Knotts.
4. Beverly Hillbillies
312221222 (9:00 Weds.)
An Ozark family found oil, sold their homestead, and moved to a mansion in Beverly Hills, where their folkways help create comedy episodes.
5. Bonanza
221221222 (9:00 Sun.)
Western with paw Cartwright, his three sons, and their sprawling ranch.
6. Candid Camera
212211121 (10:00 Sun.)
Hidden movies of unsuspecting people reacting to unconventional situations.
7. CBS News
121112211 (6:45 wk. days)
A daily round-up of world and national news with Walter Cronkite.
8. Chet Huntley Reporting
121112211 (10:30 Tues.)
Chet Huntley's commentary dealing with matters of social importance and human interest. Documentary.
9. Close-Up
122112211 (10:30 Tues.)
Documentary coverage and conversation regarding important social issues of our time.
10. Combat
221221222 (7:00 Tues.)
Action-packed war adventures portraying combat soldiers under fire.
11. Danny Thomas
211221222 (9:00 Mon.)
Show business father in a variety of comic family situations.
12. The Defenders
121122211 (8:30 Sat.)
Robert Reed and E.G. Marshall as a father-son law partnership involved in courtroom dramas about moral and ethical problems usually related to support of the law and an earnest attempt to defend their client.
13. Dennis the Menace
212221222 (7:30 Sun.)
Episodes of a small boy prone to pranks and accidents.

Q Sample of TV Programs Continued

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>14. <u>Dick Powell</u>
 222221221 (9:30 Tues.)
 Guest stars are featured in series of light comedy, mystery-suspense, and action-adventure stories.</p> | <p>19. <u>Fight of the Week</u>
 321211122 (10:00 Sat.)
 Boxing match, from various locations each week.</p> |
| <p>15. <u>Dick Van Dyke</u>
 212221212 (9:30 Wed.)
 The professional and domestic comedy situations of a TV writer and his friends.</p> | <p>20. <u>The Flintstones</u>
 212231222 (8:30 Fri.)
 Cartoon featuring two caveman couples, Fred and Wilma, Barney and Betty, and in a prehistoric-modern atmosphere.</p> |
| <p>16. <u>Dobie Gillis</u>
 311221222 (7:00 Weds.)
 The wacky misfortunes of a young college student. Comic situations usually revolve around his beatnik friend, Maynard, and rich snob, Chatsworth Osborne, Jr., or one of many girls (Dobie's romantic experiences usually backfire before they begin).</p> | <p>21. <u>Great Composers</u>
 322112112
 Associate professor of music at Michigan State, Henry Harris, presents piano recitals of music by the world's great composers.</p> |
| <p>17. <u>Dr. Kildare</u>
 221222212 (8:30 Thurs.)
 Young Dr. Kildare, who is interning at Blair Hospital under the firm, but kindly supervision of hospital director, Dr. Gillispie, finds himself in a variety of dramatic situations.</p> | <p>22. <u>Hootenanny</u>
 322212122 (8:30 Sat.)
 Jack Linkletter M.C.'s programs presented by leading folk singing groups before college campuses.</p> |
| <p>18. <u>Donna Reed</u>
 213222212 (8:00 Thurs.)
 Episodes in the daily life of a doctor's family featuring Donna Reed as the mother.</p> | <p>23. <u>International Showtime</u>
 312212121 (7:30 Fri.)
 Don Ameche presents "on-location" coverage of world circus acts and other entertainment from foreign countries.</p> |
| | <p>24. <u>Jack Benny</u>
 312222122 (9:30 Tues.)
 Long-time comedian Jack Benny and his cast with Rochester, Don Wilson, Dennis Day, and frequent guest stars with sketches around Jack in his usual pansy, tight-wad role.</p> |

Q Sample of TV Programs Continued

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>25. <u>Jackie Gleason's American Scene Magazine</u>
311221122 (7:30 Sat.)
Music, dance, comedy, skits and jokes with comedian Jackie Gleason as performer and master of ceremonies.</p> | <p>31. <u>Len Stuttman</u>
321212121 (7:00 Mon.)
Local world-traveler Len Stuttman interviews guests and shows semi-documentary film of nature's many elements and creatures.</p> |
| <p>26. <u>Jack Parr</u>
221212121 (10:00 Fri.)
Personality Jack Parr hosts celebrities, including show business stars, who perform and engage in lively conversational banter.</p> | <p>32. <u>The Lucy Show</u>
213221222 (8:30 Mon.)
Lucille Ball is featured and becomes involved in comedy situation series.</p> |
| <p>27. <u>Jazz Casual</u>
321211121 (7:00 Thurs.)
Small jazz groups play and discuss jazz music with Ralph J. Gleason.</p> | <p>33. <u>Michigan Polka Party</u>
312211122 (7:00 Sat.)
Polka music and dancing with a polka dance orchestra.</p> |
| <p>28. <u>Lantern to the Stars</u>
321112112 (7:00 Tues.)
Series on film as a public art, fully illustrated by movie excerpts from the historical era or new movie style under discussion.</p> | <p>34. <u>Naked City</u>
221121222 (10:00 Weds.)
Highly dramatic stories of human problems encountered by police force in a large city.</p> |
| <p>29. <u>Lassie</u>
222222212 (7:00 Sun.)
Domestic farm series of a boy hero, his wise and loyal collie dog, and their mutual adventures.</p> | <p>35. <u>The Nurses</u>
223222222 (10:00 Thurs.)
Dramatic series about romance and adventure of nurses in city hospital.</p> |
| <p>30. <u>Lawrence Welk Show</u>
222212112 (9:00 Sat.)
Live features of American popular and novelty music presented in the Lawrence Welk style with various regular vocalists.</p> | <p>36. <u>Ozzie and Harriet</u>
212222212 (7:30 Thurs.)
The Nelsons portray themselves in lighthearted, family-comedy series.</p> |
| | <p>37. <u>Password</u>
312212112 (10:00 Mon.)
Show business guest stars play word-guessing game with audience volunteers.</p> |

Q Sample of TV Programs Continued

38. Perry Como Show
221221112 (9:00 Weds.)
A musical variety program starring Perry Como, and featuring Peter Genero dancers, Ray Charles chorus, and celebrity guests.
39. Perry Mason
221121212 (8:00 Thurs.)
Master criminal lawyer unfolds intricate murder mysteries in defense of his falsely-accused clients.
40. Red Skelton Show
312221122 (8:30 Tues.)
Comedian Red Skelton in monologue, pantomime, and guest star skits plays one of his many role characters each week. Also dance and musical presentations.
41. Route 66
221221222 (8:30 Fri.)
Two young adventurers roam the country in a souped-up sports car in search of jobs, action, and girls.
42. Stump the Stars
312211122 (10:30 Mon.)
Panel-quiz show featuring well-known stars.
43. The Ed Sullivan Show
312212121 (8:00 Sun.)
Variety show features guest stars, circus acts, novelties, comics, music and dance, international talent, and athletes in the news presented by Ed Sullivan.
44. True
221221221 (9:30 Sun.)
Realistic dramatic adventures based upon actual events and situations.
45. Twilight Zone
321131221
Fantasy and science fiction stories with unpredictable outcomes.
46. Voice of Firestone
322112212 (8:30 Fri.)
Full chorus semi-popular and light opera music.
47. Walt Disney
222221211 (7:30 Sun.)
Walt Disney presents a wide range of his own productions designed for both children and adults. Features include nature films, biographies, classic young people's literature, and cartoons.
48. Yogi Bear
211231222 (7:00 Mon.)
Talking cartoon bear's escapades in Jellystone Park. Yogi Bear is often chased by park ranger for disobeying park rules against such things as theft of visitor's picnic baskets.
49. Make That Spare 321212122
(10:45 Sat.) The nation's leading bowlers competing for cash prizes.
50. Ben Casey 221221222 (10:00 Mon.)
Dr. Casey, a resident in neurosurgery at a big city hospital, vigorously asserts his rugged individualism.

APPENDIX VII



GENERAL ORIENTATIONS OF TELEVISION

1. I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television when I know there are other things I should be doing.
2. TV is just about the worst thing that ever happened to our family.
3. I sometimes feel uneasy about watching television as much as I do. There are other things I really want to do more.
4. I find many programs on TV stimulating and highly enjoyable.
5. When I have free time, I don't like to hang around the house and watch TV. I much prefer to do things that take me out of the house where I can be around people.
6. Sometimes I like to have the set on, even though I may not be watching, just to have the feeling that someone's around.
7. Television helps us to have a closer and more satisfying family life.
8. I can think of lots of things I'd rather do than watch television.
9. I'm afraid too much television could cause a person to become involved in the play-acting world and lose touch with reality.
10. Once I start watching television I find it hard to turn it off. Sometimes I watch it longer than I really want to.
11. After I've had a hard day and I'm tired, I find watching TV is one of the best ways to relax.
12. Television actually dictates too much of what I do with my time.
13. I consider myself to be a discriminating viewer. I choose carefully the programs I watch.
14. Too many people are too eager to criticize television. I think it is actually very good.
15. When I'm watching a television program, I prefer not to be disturbed or distracted from it.
16. Watching television is what I best like to do in my leisure time.
17. Most TV programs bore me. I much prefer to do things that are more challenging and stimulating to the mind.
18. Sometimes when I feel worried about something or I'm tense, I watch television to help me forget my problems.

General Orientations of Television Continued

19. In my leisure time, I don't plan very far ahead. I like to do things on the spur of the moment.
20. I'm generally pretty easy-going about television programs. I'll usually watch whatever the rest of the family likes to watch.
21. Television is too noisy and it makes me nervous to have it on very much.
22. Television requires too much sitting around, doing nothing. I'd rather do more active things.
23. My life is usually pretty dull and uneventful. Television helps me to pass the time.
24. I get more relaxation and enjoyment from the radio or a record player than I do from television.
25. I enjoy watching most TV commercials.
26. When company drops in unexpectedly while I'm watching television, I usually want them to sit down and share the program with me.
27. I think lectures, concerts, plays, and other things like these are much more enjoyable than TV shows.
28. I'm so busy with other things I have little time to watch television.
29. No matter what I do in my spare time, I like to plan how I'll spend it ahead of time.
30. I can and often do other things while watching television.
31. I consider television a real friend and companion.
32. I actually resent television because it often interferes with more important things.
33. When I am with friends, and I know my favorite television program is coming on soon, I'm tempted to suggest that we all watch it.
34. It bothers me a lot when I have to miss my favorite TV program.
35. I don't like to have the TV set on unless I can give it my full attention.
36. I'd much rather be active in the clubs or organizations I belong to than to watch much TV.
37. Sometimes I like to just drift away into the fantasy world of a television program for a while and forget all about my own concerns and the things around me.

General Orientations of Television Continued

- | | |
|---|--|
| 38. I'd rather go out to a movie than to watch television. | 41. I find myself too busy doing things around the house to watch much TV. |
| 39. I find that I'm a better person, more informed and up-to-date on things, because of television. | 42. I would rather visit with friends than watch TV. |
| 40. I'd much rather read a magazine or a book than watch TV. | 43. There are so many good TV programs offered that I'm glad to give up some other things to watch them. |

VITA

The candidate accepted a position as Associate Professor in the Department of Speech at The Ohio State University at Columbus, Ohio, beginning the academic year 1964-65. His graduate research work was headquartered in the Communications Research Center of the College of Communication Arts at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. He previously held the dual position of Assistant Professor in the School of Journalism at the University of Oregon, and General Manager of the Oregon Association of Broadcasters at Eugene, Oregon from 1959 to 1961.

He has six years professional broadcast experience. His last commercial position was producer for the National Broadcasting Company in San Francisco in 1958 where he regularly produced for "Monitor," "NBC News," and other network programs. Prior to this his work included news gathering-reporting at KSUE, Susanville, California, and sales and technical engineering at KSON, San Diego, California.

He was at Stanford University in 1957 where he earned the Master of Arts degree in the Speech and Drama Department, with emphasis in radio, television, and film. He earned the Bachelor of Arts degree at Olivet College, Olivet, Michigan where he studied in a liberal arts program with emphasis in sociology, anthropology and philosophy from 1948 to 1952. He has also held the First Class Federal Communications Commission Radio-Telephonic License since 1953.

He is a member of the Association for Education in Journalism, the American Association for Public Opinion Research, the Speech Association of America, the Association for Professional Broadcast Education, and is a former Associate of the Danforth Foundation. He published a book, the Pronunciation Guide of Oregon Place Names, in 1961.

He is a veteran of World War II (USMC), and attended high school in Dowagiac, Michigan, where he was born 13 March 1928.