

TELEVISION VIEWING AS A FUNCTIONAL ALTERNATIVE

TO SOCIAL INTERACTION:

TELEVISION PREFERENCES AND VIEWING

RELATED TO THE

PERCEIVED SOCIAL USES OF TELEVISION

by

Lawrence D. Greene

Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Psychology

APPROVED:

---

Nickolaus R. Feimer, Chairman

---

Christopher M. Peterson

---

Stephen J. Zaccaro

August, 1983  
Blacksburg, Virginia

TELEVISION VIEWING AS A FUNCTIONAL ALTERNATIVE

TO SOCIAL INTERACTION:

TELEVISION PREFERENCES AND VIEWING

RELATED TO THE

PERCEIVED SOCIAL USES OF TELEVISION

By

Lawrence D. Greene

(ABSTRACT)

The proposition that television viewing may serve as a functional alternative to some forms of face-to-face interaction with other people was investigated. Under such a proposition, the amount of viewing should relate to a person's environmental conditions, i.e., the opportunities provided for social contact with others. People in deprived environments should watch more television than those not so situated, as television viewing may represent an alternative means of achieving the desired ends of unavailable social interaction. Likewise, personality should affect viewing habits; some people may be less competent or comfortable interacting with others directly, hence should have to turn to a medium that may compensate or substitute for direct interaction.

Objective and subjective reports of environmental constraints, social support, and several objective personality measures were obtained from subjects via

questionnaires. In addition, subjects answered questions regarding how and the reasons why they watched television. Logs of all programs viewed over a week period were recorded. Correlational and regression techniques served as the basis of analysis.

Results were supportive of the basic proposition. Less reported social support was significantly related to viewing more television. The personality trait sensation seeking was significantly negatively related to viewing television. The relationship between these results and reported reasons for watching television, and viewing specific program types, was also discussed. Finally, several methodological issues involving stability of uses of television and measures involving preferences versus behaviors were examined.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express appreciation to my committee chairman and members, Dr. Nickolaus Feimer, Dr. Christopher Peterson, and Dr. Stephen Zaccaro, for their support and guidance during this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Donald Schmidt for his assistance during the earlier phases of this project.

Special thanks are also extended to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence A. Greene, Jr., for their general enthusiastic support and patience throughout my education.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	18
Subjects	18
Instruments/Variables	19
Environmental Conditions	19
Personal Characteristics	20
Social Uses of Television (Functional Behaviors)	21
Active Selection Processes	25
Subject Television Viewing Behavior	28
Procedure	28
Television Viewing Classification	30
RESULTS	32
Sample Characteristics and General Descriptive Data	32
Hypotheses concerning Television Viewing related to Environmental Constraints and Personality Characteristics	36
Social Uses of Television	42
Television Viewing Preferences versus Television Viewing Behaviors	53
DISCUSSION	56
REFERENCES	69
APPENDIX A. Group Questionnaire Session Materials	72
APPENDIX B. Television Log Materials	88
APPENDIX C. Classification of Television Programs Viewed	98
VITA	103

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Various social uses of television	8

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Correlation matrix of personality, social support, other environmental, and sex variables	33
2. Descriptive statistics of sample's television viewing behavior: Time spent viewing and number of shows watched for show types	35
3. Correlations of personality, environmental, and social support measures with television viewing	37
4. Descriptive statistics of subjects' self endorsed social uses of television	43
5. Differences between self endorsed social uses of television: Pre television log versus post television log times of data collection	45
6. Correlation matrix of composite endorsed social uses of television with personality, environmental, and social support measures	48
7. Correlations of composite endorsed social uses of television and amount of television viewed	50
8. Correlation matrix of composite endorsed social uses of television and amount of television viewed (time) for each show type	52
9. Correlations of preference ratings and actual amounts of viewing for specific show types	54

One notes the ever expanding presence and availability of various sources of mass media in today's world and the seemingly increased dependence that people have shown upon these sources for news information , consumer tips, entertainment, and the like. One may well wonder what the implications of this exposure are to "modern" humanity--where persons travel no further than their own living room, and a television set in order to find out what has happened that day halfway around the world. Such a realization warrants serious investigation into how the media in general, and television in particular, influence human life-style and interactions.

Early research related to this question usually took an "effects" point of view--that is, what effects may the viewing of behavior depicted on television have upon the viewers' subsequent behavior? Bandura (1962) used filmed models in his research, and found that children who observed models being rewarded after behaving aggressively, imitated such aggressive behaviors later in subsequent analogous play situations. Conversely, aggressive models who were punished were not imitated by the children. Later research (Bandura, Ross, and Ross, 1963) found that vicarious reinforcement was not a necessary condition for the appearance of modeling behavior. Children who had first viewed aggressive models and were then frustrated not only showed more aggression

than control subjects, but specifically modeled their aggression in ways that had been demonstrated by the filmed characters. The authors concluded that "pictorial mass media, particularly television may serve as an important source of social behavior" (p. 9).

Concurrent research utilizing adult subjects (Berkowitz, 1964, 1965; Berkowitz and Green, 1966; Walters, Thomas, and Acker, 1962) also noted that under various viewing conditions, aggressive behavior seemed to be more prevalent after viewing filmed aggression. Berkowitz (1965) did note however that "the present evidence does not unequivocally demonstrate that aggressive scenes can in themselves elicit aggressive responses" (p. 368).

In fact, it is interesting to note that even though much early research related to this topic concentrated on the effect that viewed or "televised" material had on subsequent behavior, a careful analysis of these studies reveals that the final behavior elicited required some individual subject input as well. Subjects' behaviors were not totally dependent upon the viewed material; rather one had to "identify" with a particular character (Berkowitz 1964, 1965), be placed in a situation where "aggression" was deemed appropriate (Walters, Thomas, and Acker, 1962), and/or must have had some predisposition like frustration (Bandura, Ross, and Ross, 1963) in order to act aggressively

in the first place. Thus, it appears that a filmed material does not cause behavior as much as it simply provides information about how one might act, given a person is predisposed to act in the first place.

Such a finding related to the general media may be particularly important to television. People may choose specific programs to watch because they see them as relevant to their own affairs, or in a sense wish to be affected by such specific materials. Adopting such a perspective, Katzman (1972) for example, notes that people may watch soap operas because they may reinforce certain value systems, suggest how one might act in certain situations, and/or remove taboos about discussing various sensitive topics like drug use or sex. The issue thus arises: how much does television actually change a person's attitudes, opinions, values, and behaviors and how much does it merely reinforce them?

While "effects" research endorses the former perspective, a second major approach to these questions adopts the latter viewpoint. This research, often referred to as the "uses and gratifications" approach, adopts the consumer rather than the media messages as its focus. It views members of the audience as actively selecting, choosing, and utilizing media content, rather than simply being passively acted upon by the media (Katz, Blumler, and

Gurevitch, 1974). In this manner, Gutman (1978) proclaimed that in order to understand individuals' viewing behavior (and subsequently media-man relationships), one must attempt to understand the various uses and gratifications that are obtained by individuals from television. This appears to be a more reasonable approach than one that posits viewers as passive bodies that are captured by television, being unconditionally attracted to it, and mesmerized by its content. The general theme here is that actual viewing behavior is a function of what a person wants and what the media has to offer.

The basic assumptions common to all uses and gratifications research (Katz, Blumner, and Gurevitch, 1973, 1974) are that:

- 1) The audience is active--thus media use is self selected and goal directed;
- 2) People use the media to fit their needs rather than being overpowered by them;
- 3) The media compete with other sources of need satisfaction such that various media sources may serve as functional alternatives for the gratification of specific needs; and
- 4) People are conscious of their motives and interests enough that information regarding why they use certain media may be obtained from them directly (by asking

them) rather than having to rely on projective measurement techniques.

Research based upon these assumptions typically focused on what specific uses television fulfills. Although the foregoing assumptions imply that needs (as the basis for such uses) should be the direct focus of such research, "needs" per se have not generally been measured. This is no doubt partly due to the difficulty one would have operationalizing television related "needs". Instead, various correlates of needs have been investigated, like types of use. The reasoning behind this approach was a belief that identified use patterns might later be linked to theoretical needs that motivated people to watch television. Thus, although much of the past research adopting this perspective has been conceptually guided by the need concept as a source of persons' motivations to view television, most of the work has been atheoretical. It appears that a search is still occurring to identify possible needs that are operative by inferring them from identified uses. Thus, Pearlín (1960) spoke of television as a mechanism for dealing with stress. Viewing allows one to temporarily escape and withdraw from unpleasant experiences and everyday pressures. Stephenson (1964) noted that television could be used as a conversation facilitator that fosters and maintains mutual socialization. Katz and Foulkes (1962)

suggested that one might derive compensatory gratifications from television viewing. One might identify with particular television personalities (i.e., introjection) thus compensating for one's own ineffectual social relations. Other studies have approached this problem by identifying basic viewer typologies, proposing different groups relative to their actual viewing behaviors (Monaghan, Plummer, Rarick, and Williams, 1974) or reasons for viewing (Gutman, 1978; Wenner, 1976). Still other studies (Korzenny and Neuendorf, 1980; Rubin, 1977) have attempted to group types of specific uses (reasons people watch television) into larger dimensions (e.g., escape, information, companionship, arousal, relaxation, passing time, etc.).

Interestingly enough, all of the various reported uses of television represent, in a broad sense, a variety of social uses of television. Here viewing serves a function that may represent withdrawal from stressful contacts, a vicarious relationship with television characters, a gaining of social normative and/or behavioral information, or a common ground from which to start conversation.

Recently, Lull (1980) has completed field research in which he attempted to identify and organize the major social uses of television. Developing a taxonomy of uses would allow future researchers to "design studies which would employ "social use types" as predictors of media exposure,

interpersonal communication satisfaction, family harmony, and other relevant dependent measures of theoretical value" (p. 207). In accordance with the uses and gratifications perspective, his basic premise was that television viewing does not occur in a vacuum, and that it is part of a network of complex social behavior patterns occurring in one's home. Mass media and particularly television are an important factor in one's social environment, providing unique opportunities to construct, maintain, and change one's current social relationships. In this respect, people exploit television to serve their social needs. Lull collected his data from multiple sources, using a participant observation strategy, informants, and in depth interviews.

Based on this ethnographic research, Lull derived a system of social uses that television may have. Under two major categories he listed a total of six basic uses (see Figure 1). The two major types Lull identified were: 1) structural and 2) relational. Structural uses could be of the environmental subtype where the television "is employed as an environmental resource in order to create a flow of constant background noise which moves to the foreground when individuals or groups desire" (p. 202). For instance, it may serve as companionship for accomplishing household chores or routines. Television might also serve as a

## SOCIAL USES OF TELEVISION

Structural

Environmental--Background noise, Companionship, Entertainment

Regulative--Punctuation of time and activity, Talk patterns

Relational

Communication Facilitation--Experience illustration, Common ground,  
Conversational entrance, Anxiety reduction, Agenda for talk,  
Value clarification

Affiliation/Avoidance--Physical, Verbal contact/neglect, Family  
solidarity, Family relaxant, Conflict reduction, Relationship  
maintenance

Social Learning--Decision making, Behavior modeling, Problem solving,  
Value transmission, Legitimization, Information dissemination,  
Substitute schooling

Competence/Dominance--Role enactment, Role reinforcement, Substitute  
role portrayal, Intellectual validation, Authority exercise,  
Gatekeeping, Argument facilitation

Figure 1--Various Social Uses of Television, from Lull, 1980, p. 202.

behavior regulator in that it can be a constant environmental source that punctuates time and family activities. Mealtimes, bedtimes, homework periods, and even patterns of talk may be affected by viewing routines.

Lull's relational uses of television refer to ways people use the medium in order to create "practical social arrangements". Hence, television may be used to facilitate communication, by providing common grounds for discussion. The viewing situation may allow one opportunities to affiliate with others or avoid unpleasant duties or responsibilities. The medium provides many opportunities for social learning. Consumer and political information are constantly available through commercials, documentaries, and news shows. Talk shows and dramas may provide useful information on current societal values, or suggest possible alternatives for social interaction. Finally, the medium provides unique opportunities to demonstrate one's competence or dominance. Particular role behavior demonstrated on television may reinforce one's own (similar) role behaviors, and personal opinions may be substantiated on television programs. Parents or elder siblings may demonstrate dominance through control over what younger children view.

Considering these categories were derived through extensive empirical observation, this research seems to

provide a solid basis for subsequent work. In fact, Lull suggested that "the classification of social uses which has been presented here requires further elaboration and validation. Another approach would be to operationalize the constructs proposed in the form of fixed alternative statements for survey research" (p. 207).

This suggestion is in part what the present investigation will do. Specifically it will 1) operationalize Lull's categorical system; 2) examine the empirical validity of the various social uses; and 3) examine the relationships between them and several other variables to be introduced subsequently.

Thus far, literature has been cited concerning the social uses of television. However, it leads to a theoretically important question--that is, from where do the particular social uses come and how do they arise?

Rosengren and Windahl (1972) presented a theoretical orientation which in part addresses this question. Their orientation initially assumes that there are certain needs that serve to motivate behavior. Corresponding to the communications field, the "need for social interaction" was assumed as one type of general need. For any need, Rosengren and Windahl proposed a "natural" way of satisfying it--in this case, simple face to face interaction with others. If, however, a need could not be adequately

fulfilled through one means, a person would attempt to fulfill it through others. These other ways were termed functional alternatives, for they were alternative actions that functioned in a similar way to fulfill a need that could not be adequately met through "normal or standard" channels. In this light, the mass media in general and television specifically might serve as a functional alternative to "normal" social interaction.

Rosengren and Windahl reasoned that dependence upon a particular alternative might vary as a result of two major factors. First, the environment, and the general support it provides supplies opportunities for social contact; second, personal characteristics and habits may enhance or inhibit chances of making or attempting to make social contacts. Thus, a socially competent individual in a supportive environment one would only be expected to use television as a "complementary" functional alternative. The motivation in this instance might simply be to experience a "change" in the type of interaction encountered or to reinforce information already obtained. If, however, an individual had a low opportunity for contact environment or lacked necessary social skills, he or she might have to rely on television to a greater degree, perhaps in a supplementary sense. Finally, an individual who was both socially incompetent and was in a non-supportive environment for

social contact, might have to rely totally on television to fulfill needs for social interaction. Thus, television would be a "substitute" and the medium might provide one with vicarious social experiences.

It is not difficult to see how Rosengren and Windahl's conceptualization fits the general uses and gratifications approach. Both their reliance on the need concept and their strong emphasis on the importance of functionally alternative ways of satisfying "needs" stem directly from such a perspective. The major difference between their research and that which attempts to identify social uses of television seems to be on what each identify as the important variables. Rosengren and Windahl suggested that researchers investigate how environmental and personality variables relate to subsequent viewing behaviors. Lull and others stressed the importance of investigating how people use television (or how they say they use it) if one is to understand television behavior.

The purpose of the present research was to combine the efforts previously put forth by these researchers. Hence, the current study focused on various relationships between several "independent variables" (that may help explain how much television people watch and what particular types of programming they watch), and "dependent variables", that were defined as persons' actual television viewing behaviors.

The independent variables measured included both some environmental and personality variables (as would be advocated by Rosengren and Windahl) and several social use variables (as would be advocated by Lull). A field survey approach was employed. A general uses and gratifications perspective guided this effort, with one major difference. Although "needs" play an important role under such a perspective, their importance was reduced here since no direct measure was made of them. At best, one might infer the presence of a particular need from evidence of environmental decrement, high scores on a particular personality trait, or consistent behavior that would logically be related to fulfilling a need. Since at this time, no formally detailed theory involving needs and standardized means of operationalizing them exists which explains television viewing, it was deemed best to examine relationships between more tangible, less difficult to operationalize variables in a stage of continuing exploratory research.

An initial concern was how well Lull's (1980) scheme of social uses was endorsed by subjects as measured through means of a self-report scale. I wanted to see just what behaviors (social uses) were engaged in with respect to television viewing and which ones were the most common. Exploratory investigations between specific social uses and

types of viewing were carried out in an effort to develop hypotheses that might be investigated in future research.

Another concern dealt with an exploratory analysis of the relationships of several environmental and personality variables to viewing behavior. However, also of interest, was to see if these variables predicted total television viewing time as Rosengren and Windahl expected. Specifically, two hypotheses were examined:

1) As the availability of and opportunity for social contacts and information in one's environment decrease, one's overall usage of television should increase.

2) Likewise, as one's degree of social competence or personal motivation to become directly socially involved with others (personality characteristics) decreases, one's use of television should increase.

Environmental conditions were operationalized by several indices representing the opportunity for and frequency of social contacts. The "opportunity for" questions asked subjects how easily they thought they could find people for purposes of recreation, serious talking, or expert information. It was hypothesized that the less available others were, the more people would be likely to watch television. The "frequency of" questions asked subjects about past social contacts and social opportunities. Thus, questions like the number of times

subjects had gone out, and the number of clubs and organizations to which they belonged were asked. It was hypothesized that the less people had gone out or the less opportunity for social contact they had, the more television they would watch.

Three personality variables were examined in this study. Alienation, a fairly stable psychological state was selected as per Katz and Foulkes's (1962) suggestion about how it might relate to watching television. Since an alienated individual is one who feels detached from his or her social environment (feeling powerless in it, or socially isolated) chances are that he or she might be able to use television as a source of surrogate social interaction, or in a relaxing, entertaining function (for escape from a meaningless "real" world).

Introversion/Extroversion was the second personality variable. Since this characteristic generally relates to one's overall pattern and mode of interacting with other people (i.e., private and retiring versus outgoing and sociable), it was hypothesized that it might have an effect on how likely individuals would be to obtain social information, companionship, and so on from other people versus some functional alternative like television. One would expect that more outgoing people would not need to turn to television for these reasons, since they could

obtain social information, companionship and so on directly from other people. More introverted persons might find that television can fulfill some social interaction needs precluding the necessity for initiating direct social contact.

Sensation Seeking was the third personality measure used in this research. This trait refers to one's preferred level of stimulation and/or arousal. Here one might hypothesize differences in degree of television use dependent upon a person's preferred level of optimal stimulation. Those high in sensation seeking (much like those who are extroverts) may obtain social contact from others directly and engage in numerous activities that are dangerous, unconventional and/or generally "exciting". For these reasons, they may have no time available to spend viewing television or might find viewing relatively boring. Those lower in sensation seeking may find that television viewing can provide stimulation and excitement in a surrogate, less dangerous fashion.

Finally, questions often arise, at least on methodological grounds, concerning the relationship between actual behaviors and stated likelihoods to engage in such behaviors. Both types of measures were collected in this research so that effects due to the choice of selecting one or the other of these conceptually related variables could

be assessed. It was hypothesized that preferences for specific show types would be positively related to one's actual viewing behavior of these same specific show types.

## METHOD

### Subjects

Subjects were 88 students (34 males and 54 females) currently enrolled at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. They were recruited from introductory psychology classes at the school during the fall, 1982 quarter. These subjects were mostly freshmen or sophomores (90%) and ranged in age from 17-21 years ( $\bar{x}=18.5$ ). For participating, students received extra credit points towards their final grades in introductory psychology.

Qualifications for participation were that: 1) each subject have access to a television set that received broadcasts from at least all three major television networks (ABC, CBS, NBC); and 2) subjects were to "be able to exercise a fair amount of control over the actual selection of programs viewed" on television. These requirements were included to insure that all subjects had an equal opportunity to view a variety (both qualitatively and quantitatively) of different programs. Most of those participating lived in dormitories on campus (86%); the remaining 14 per cent lived in apartments.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Discussion with the subjects before handing out surveys, to insure that they met the requirements for participating, indicated that those who lived off campus had television sets in their apartments. Those who lived on campus usually did not have a television set in their private room, but had

Instruments/Variables

Environmental Conditions These conditions were measured with indices assessing the opportunity for and frequency of social contacts that each subject had. A social environment potential questionnaire (see Appendix A) was used to assess the potential of one's environment for allowing one to interact successfully with others; specific items were derived from research previously carried out by Blummer (1979) and Rosengren and Windani (1972) and represent what they label as "social background variables" and "interaction potential", respectively. The questionnaire contained both open ended questions and items utilizing 7-point Likert type scales. Specific variables contained within this questionnaire were:

Organizational Affiliation (the number of clubs, service organizations, social groups, etc. to which one belonged),

Car Ownership (whether or not one owned or had access to relatively unrestricted use of a motor vehicle),

-----

access to television through a TV lounge on their floor. Though it may seem that such a situation would severely limit control over program selection, this was not the case; in fact, dormitory students may have had more control over selection than those living off campus with several roommates. If a particular show was not being watched in a TV lounge on one's own floor, a person could simply go to the lounge on a different floor where the appropriate network was tuned in.

Work/Job Stress (whether or not one was experiencing school/job related stress as measured on a 7-point Likert scale),

Social Contact Frequencies (the number of times one had "gone out" with friends/relatives/neighbors on a recreational/social outing in the past two weeks),

Opportunity for Social Contacts (the ease with which a subject could find people for the purpose of: a) serious talk; a personal problem, a major life decision, discussion of personal values, etc., b) recreating/socializing; to relax, have a good time, etc., c) help in a specific work/job/school related problem; for expert information, advice, tutoring as measured on 7-point Likert scales),

Desire for Social Contact (whether or not one felt a desire for more social contact for any of the following reasons: serious talk, recreation/socializing, or expert information as measured on 7-point Likert scales).

Personal Characteristics As mentioned previously, three personal characteristics were measured in this particular research. Alienation was measured on a 20 item social alienation scale (see Appendix A). The concept and subscales were based upon Seeman's (1959) multi-dimensional conceptualization of alienation. All items on the scale represented an affective-cognitive state of alienation as

measured by attitudes of the subject toward others (rather than self-reported subject's behaviors) on 7-point Likert scales. The reliability (internal consistency) for this scale was .78.

Introversion/Extroversion was measured with a reduced version of Eysenck's Personality Inventory (see Appendix A), using 20 dichotomous items designed specifically to measure introversion/extroversion (Wilson, 1973). The reliability (internal consistency) of this scale using the present sample's data (KR-20) was .61.

Sensation Seeking was measured using Zuckerman's 22 item General Sensation Seeking scale (See Appendix A) (Zuckerman, 1973). The reliability (internal consistency (KR-20)) for this scale using the present sample's data was .75.

Social Uses of Television (Functional Behaviors) The broad concept, social uses of television represents the means and motivations of people for watching the medium. Actually, these uses represent specific behaviors that are seen as functional to those watching or those observing others watch television. The particular function of such behaviors may be identified in two main ways: 1) by observing behaviors that imply a certain use (i.e., seeing one get together with friends to watch television,

indicating affiliation) or 2) by asking people why they have the television on at a particular moment (i.e., asking if one uses television for providing examples of ways one might act in one's own life, indicating behavioral modeling).

A 25 item social uses of television questionnaire (see Appendix A) was used to gather this information. This questionnaire simply required subjects to recall the extent to which they used television for certain information, or in certain way in the past two weeks. Though some of the items included inferences about use (e.g., "how often did you use television to forget about your worries and problems of the day?"), a deliberate attempt was made to have subjects recall specific behaviors (e.g., "how often did you persuade others who were watching television to watch what you wished to watch?"). Since the method for obtaining social use information relies upon subjects' self reports, an attempt was made to ask questions that required subjects to recall past behaviors (from which particular uses could be inferred) rather than recall subjects' past motives for behaving. This is in light of Nisbett and Wilson's (1977) research that suggests that people may have difficulty in recalling the causes for their specific actions. However, certain questions on this questionnaire do ask persons to attempt to recall motives for viewing, as this was the only way possible to extract some social use information.

For every question asked, subjects ranked on a 7-point Likert scale the degree to which they engaged in a behavior or used television in a particular way. Scale endpoints were "never" and "very frequently". The specific item content representing these social uses was based on Lull's (1980) categories of social uses of television. The final scale developed held questions regarding the following functional behaviors (possible social uses):

a) Communication Facilitation: the usefulness of television as an aid in initiating, directing, and maintaining conversations with others.

b) Affiliation/Avoidance

-Affiliation: the context of television viewing as it may provide an opportunity for concurrent social contact with others.

-Relaxant: the usefulness of television viewing as a means to relieve one's tensions and forget about the day's worries.

-Companionship: the possible use of television itself as background noise and pseudocompanionship while engaged in other activities in one's residence.

-Avoidance: the context of television viewing that justifies one not being disturbed as one is occupied in viewing, or the condition in which viewing may allow one to avoid (escape) doing other things.

c) Regulatory: the usefulness of television for punctuating time--as a cue to indicate when certain activities should be done (start meals, go to work, go to sleep).

d) Social Learning

-Conflict Resolution: the usefulness of television for suggesting ways of resolving interpersonal conflicts and arguments.

-Behavioral Modeling: the usefulness of television programming in providing personalities that may be used as role models or sources of social imitation.

-Attitudinal Information: the usefulness of television for providing information regarding current values, opinions, and beliefs useful for the formation of attitudes.

-Consumer Information: the usefulness of television for providing information helpful in consumer decision making.

-News Information: the usefulness of television for providing information about general local, national, and international events.

-Educational: the usefulness of television in providing educational (cultural) material.

e) Competence/Dominance

-Intellectual Validation: the usefulness of specific television programming and the viewing context to allow one to demonstrate (validate) one's knowledge of specific facts or one's general intelligence.

-Role Reinforcement: the extent to which television may provide role models that indicate (validate) appropriate role behaviors relative to congruent roles a person plays in one's life.

-Persuasion: the extent to which the television viewing context allows one an opportunity to successfully control other's behaviors.

-Argument Facilitation: the extent to which television may provide one with information that may serve as evidence to further one's own opinions or substantiate a "fact".

active Selection Processes Preferences that subjects had for specific "types" (contents) of shows were obtained by two separate means. Subjects were first given a descriptive list of "types" of content similar shows. Based upon definitions provided for these show types, subjects rank ordered each type from the one most preferred to the one least preferred. This provided a direct measure of preference for different types of programming. However, this provided only an ordinal level measure, and subsequently was not utilized in most of the analyses involving preferences.

A second task required the subjects to rate each show content type on a 7-point Likert scale that measured one's likelihood of watching a particular type of programming. This measure of preference was both more specific (at an assumed interval level of measurement) and more behaviorally based than the first measure. Here, preference was inferred from one's self-predicted likelihood of actually watching a type of programming rather than an attitude of simply "what one prefers".

The specific show content categories used here were developed in pilot research as a content coding scheme for "types of shows". It was based on data that consisted of the actual names of television shows subjects had viewed over one week periods. These categories were constructed in a way that seemed to best classify (represent) the actual shows reported. Subsequent research utilizing actual records of subject's viewing behaviors (specific shows) showed that this classification scheme could adequately place 97.5% of the shows reported into one of its eleven categories (not including the category "other"). Conceptual integrity of the scheme was supported at that time by high inter-rater reliability of classifying programs (93.5%).

Additional research carried out in an attempt to further validate this classification of show types, investigated the degree to which people naive to the

specific categories used in the scheme would, if presented with a group of relatively current television shows, sort these shows into groups identical to the types of sorts made by a judge who was familiar with the coding scheme. Subjects were given a set of cards containing the names of television shows representing all eleven categories in the scheme. Each card contained one television show title. Subjects were then asked to sort these shows into groups based upon show's similarity to one another. Subjects were also asked to provide a brief description of why they sorted shows into each group (what word or phrase was descriptive of all of the shows they sorted into a group). This provided a rationale for a particular group's (category's) existence that could be compared with the reasoning (content names and definitions) used for the coding scheme's sorts. Results indicated that naive subjects seemed to conceptualize television shows in groups similar to those proposed in the categorization scheme. Agreement in similar category classification was 75.5%.

The eleven show types represented by the scheme were: Drama-Adventure, Drama-Interaction, Comedy, Sports, Information, Cartoon, Talk Show-Variety, Talk Show-Information, Movies, Musical, and Game. (The category "Movies" was not included as one of the ten show content types in the preference ranking and rating tasks described

previously since movie content can vary widely from serious drama to comedy to documentary.) A twelfth category entitled "Other" was provided to handle specific programs that could not adequately be included in one of the regular eleven. Appendix A contains a more detailed explanation of these categories and the format upon which the ranking and rating tasks for estimating category preferences were carried out.

Subject Television Viewing Behaviors Specific subject behaviors were measured by having subjects record their actual television viewing behavior on log sheets (see Appendix B) over a one week period. From this information, both the total viewing time of television and the types of shows watched during that period could be determined.

### Procedure

Information was gathered from subjects in two phases. In the first phase subjects (N=88) participated in a small group questionnaire session. After the researcher checked with subjects making sure they had understood and met the qualifications for participation, subjects individually filled out a series of questionnaires. These included the social environment potential questionnaire, the sensation

seeking, introversion/extroversion, and social alienation scales, a checklist/scale measuring one's social uses of television, and some demographic information questions (see Appendix A). In addition, subjects were given descriptions of 10 television show content categories (from the scheme described earlier). Based on these descriptions they both rank ordered and rated the show types.

After completing the initial questionnaire session subjects were given an option of receiving additional credit for participating in a second phase of data collection. Subjects (N=56) who volunteered were given a television log packet (see Appendix B) in which they were instructed to start filling out the following day, continuing for a total of seven straight days. The log packets consisted of a consent form, a set of instructions, and a series of sheets on which subjects were requested to write down all of the television shows they watched in each of that day's morning, afternoon, and evening time periods. They were also asked to write down when the show was turned (came) on, and when it was over (or they turned it off) so that the time of actual viewing could be assessed.

After a week of recording their television viewing, subjects completed a social uses of television questionnaire. This was identical to the one completed in the first stage of the research and thus represented an

opportunity to examine the stability of the "social uses of television" concept, particularly in light of one's possible change in self reported social uses while recording one's viewing behaviors.

Finally, several questions were included at the end of the log packet (see Appendix B) as a check to assess whether the sample of viewing behavior gathered from the log was typical of the subjects' normal viewing habits. Upon return of all materials to the experimenter subjects received their course extra credit.

#### Television Viewing Classification

Before the data were analyzed the information contained in the television logs was content analyzed. Each program listed was classified into one of the 10 content categories based on the definitions of show types described in Appendix A. In addition two other categories were used: "Movies" and "Other". Programs that were not regular series programs that were billed as movies fell into the movie category. (Television series movies were classified into categories that the series would be classified into.) "Other" was a category that consisted of any show whose content was unknown to the researcher or which failed to adequately fit any other category in the coding scheme.

The total number of shows viewed and the total time in minutes spent viewing were separately recorded for each category. By adding the figures from each category one's total time spent viewing and total number of different shows watched was obtained.

No inter-rater reliability check was made in light of the previously demonstrated high reliability of this scheme. Rather, one content coder blind to other characteristics of the subjects classified all of the shows listed. Appendix C contains a listing of each content category and which specific television programs were classified under its definition.

## RESULTS

### Sample Characteristics & General Descriptive Data

Because the sample was disproportional with regard to sex, there was some concern as to whether sex was related to any of the other variables. Table 1 shows the inter-correlations among most of the environmental and personality variables measured in this study, including sex. As can be seen, sex alone did not correlate highly with the other variables. Only three variables were related to sex at a statistically significant level ( $\alpha=.05$ ). Females found it easier to locate persons for the purpose of serious talking--one of the three "social support" measures. Females were also less likely to live off campus (in apartments) and had fewer roommates than males. The relationship between sex and these last two variables is not surprising, since the number of roommates is significantly related to the type of residence in which one lives ( $r=.57$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Those who lived off campus in apartments were more likely to have more roommates. Since sex did not relate to the variables measured, (i.e., it alone did not account for much variance in these other variables), its effects were not separately assessed in further analyses.

Fifty-six persons participated in both phases of the study. This group constitutes the sample used for analyses that deal with actual viewing. Questions asked of the

Table 1. Correlation Matrix of Personality, Social Support,  
Other Environmental, and Sex Variables

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Social Alienation	-.24**	-.12	-.15	-.31**	-.30**	.12	-.29**	-.29**	-.26**	-.14	-.10	.08	.15	.04	.00
2. Introversiion/Extraversiion		.32**	.08	.17	.22*	.12	.02	.15	.13	.22*	.08	-.04	-.04	-.14	.05
3. Sensation Seeking			.18	.18	.22*	.27**	.09	.26**	.08**	.28**	.01	.06	-.02	.08	.13
4. Serious Talk				.42**	.00	.37**	.16	-.01	.14	.12	-.16	.22*	-.08	-.08	.22*
5. Socializing Recreation					.23*	.32**	.57**	.16	.04	.22*	.00	.13	.01	.04	.02
6. Expert Information						.08	.25**	.77**	.19	.22*	.14	.01	.03	.10	-.11
7. Need Serious Talk							.48**	.28**	.02	.08	-.05	.18	.05	.04	.13
8. Need Socializing Recreation								.38**	-.02	-.03	.00	.12	-.04	.12	-.13
9. Need Expert Information									.25**	.04	.10	-.10	-.11	.17	.01
10. Clubs, Organizations										.10	.01	-.07	-.21	-.03	-.04
11. Gone Out											-.18	.09	-.05	-.05	.09
12. Car												-.08	.17	-.06	-.04
13. Roommates													.16	.06	-.22*
14. Steady Companion														.13	-.01
15. Stress															-.02
16. Sex															

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01

subjects indicating the extent to which they thought the week of log recorded television viewing was representative of their actual viewing habits indicated that their behaviors were fairly typical, with the exception that they did not get to watch as much television as they normally would have. Subjects noted that it was somewhat difficult to watch shows they would have liked to watch ( $X=3.5$ ,  $SD=1.5$  on a 7 point scale: 1-Very Difficult, 7-Very Easy), but that the types of shows they viewed were somewhat typical of their normal viewing patterns ( $X=3.0$ ,  $SD=1.5$  on a 7 point scale: 1-Very Much Typical, 7-Totally Atypical). Also, the amount of television viewed was slightly less than was typical ( $X=4.6$ ,  $SD=1.3$  on a 7 point scale: 1-Much More than is Typical, 4-As Much as is Typical, 7-Much Less than is Typical). Though these figures do not represent an ideal sample of typical viewing behaviors, they were deemed representative enough for further analyses.

Actual figures indicating the television viewing found in this study are presented in Table 2. Statistics representing both dependent variables (total number of shows viewed<sup>2</sup> and total time in minutes spent viewing) are reported for each content category or show type. Note that though these measures are conceptually different, they seemed to be equally good representations of "amount of

-----

<sup>2</sup> Viewing more than five minutes of a particular show was counted as viewing one show.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Sample's Television Viewing Behavior:  
Time Spent Viewing<sup>a</sup> and Number of Shows<sup>b</sup> Watched for Show Types

	$\bar{X}$	SD	Min	Max
Adventure Dramas	47.0 (.9)	76.0 (1.3)	0 (0)	390 (6)
Interaction Dramas	194.8 (4.2)	237.6 (4.9)	0 (0)	830 (17)
Comedies	138.8 (4.0)	121.5 (3.7)	0 (0)	445 (14)
Cartoons	28.8 (1.5)	64.2 (1.9)	0 (0)	276 (9)
Sports	41.5 (.6)	100.7 (1.3)	0 (0)	525 (7)
Information	46.4 (1.5)	60.6 (1.9)	0 (0)	260 (9)
Talk-Variety	27.6 (.7)	49.0 (1.2)	0 (0)	234 (5)
Talk-Information	10.9 (.25)	37.7 (.8)	0 (0)	235 (5)
Musical	5.1 (.2)	14.1 (.4)	0 (0)	60 (2)
Game	13.9 (.6)	32.8 (1.2)	0 (0)	150 (5)
Movies	193.8 (2.1)	198.2 (2.2)	0 (0)	950 (12)
Other	9.6 (.3)	24.6 (.7)	0 (0)	120 (3)

<sup>a</sup>Figures represent time spent viewing in minutes.

<sup>b</sup>Figures in parentheses represent number of shows viewed.

television viewing". Total time viewed correlated highly with total number of different shows viewed ( $r=.96$ ,  $p<.01$ ).

The most popular shows (those watched the most) as indicated by highest mean levels of viewing on both dependent variables were comedies and interaction dramas. The average subject watched approximately four of each of these shows per week though spending more time actually viewing the dramas (3.25 hours versus 2.3 hours); comedies are usually 30 minutes long, while the interaction dramas usually occupy 60 minute time slots. A considerable amount of time was also allotted to viewing various movies ( $\bar{x}=2$ /week or 3.2 hours/week).

#### Hypotheses concerning Television Viewing related to Environmental Constraints and Personality Characteristics

Several analyses were conducted to evaluate Hypotheses 1 and 2. These hypotheses examined the relationship between certain environmental constraints and total amount of television viewing and certain personality characteristics and total amount of television viewing, respectively.

Results of correlational analyses directed at examining these two hypotheses are shown in Table 3. Here, various personality variables and environmental (situational) variables were correlated with two measures of amount of

Table 3. Correlations of Personality, Environmental and  
Social Support Measures with Television Viewing

	<u>Total Time Spent Viewing</u>	<u>Total No. Shows Viewed</u>
Social Alienation	.05 (.06)	.09 (.10)
Introversion/Extroversion	-.17 (-.21)	-.13 (-.17)
Sensation Seeking	-.47** (-.54)	-.46** (-.53)
No. of Clubs, Organizations	-.04	.00
No. of Times Gone Out	-.18	-.14
Car	.11	.09
No. of Roommates	.18	.24*
Steady Companion	-.06	-.03
Stress	-.15	-.17
Serious Talk	-.28*	-.30**
Socializing Recreation	-.13	-.13
Expert Information	-.15	-.16
Need Serious Talk	-.18	-.23*
Need Socializing Recreation	-.16	-.19
Need Expert Information	-.32**	-.36**
Support <sup>a</sup>	-.30** (-.48)	-.32** (-.49)
Need Support <sup>b</sup>	-.30** (-.38)	-.36** (-.45)

Note: Figures in parentheses are disattenuated correlations correcting for unreliability in personality and social support scales.

<sup>a</sup>Represents linear composite of three individual support indices.

<sup>b</sup>Represents linear composite of three individual satisfaction with support (need support) indices.

\*p < .05

\*\*p < .01

television usage: 1) the total number of shows watched, and 2) the total time spent viewing.

Of the three personality variables, only one was significantly related to amount of television usage. Sensation Seeking was highly negatively correlated with watching television ( $r = -.47$ ,  $p < .01$ ). That is, sensation seekers were less likely to watch television than non sensation seekers. When the correlation coefficient was corrected for attenuation due to unreliability in the personality scale, one sees that this relationship may be theoretically quite strong ( $r = -.54$ ). Neither introversion/extroversion nor social alienation were significantly correlated with television viewing ( $\alpha = .05$ ).

Most of the correlations of environmental variables with total viewing (the number of clubs and organizations to which one belonged, the number of times one had "gone out" in the past two weeks, whether one had access to a car, the number of roommates one had, whether one had a steady companion, & general levels of stress) failed to reach statistical significance. Only the number of roommates one had correlated significantly with one of the dependent variables ( $r = .24$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

Of the social support environmental variables, finding someone for purposes of serious talk and the amount of viewing were significantly correlated ( $r = -.30$ ,  $p < .01$ ). The

harder it was to find people for purposes of serious talk the more likely one was to watch television.

Several correlations of satisfaction with present levels of social support and total amount of viewing were also statistically significant (i.e., availability of people for serious talk and the amount of viewing,  $r = -.23$ ,  $p < .05$ ; availability of people to give expert information and the amount of viewing,  $r = -.36$ ,  $p < .01$ ). In other words, the less satisfied one was with present levels of availability of persons for serious talking and expert information, the more one watched television. No significant correlations were found relating availability of those for purposes of general socializing and recreating and amount of television use.

A composite measure of social support was formed by a linear combination of scores on the three separate ease of finding people for support scales (for serious talk, socializing, and expert information). Similarly, a composite measure of the perceived need for more support was formed by combining the scores on the three separate satisfaction with present levels of support scales. Internal consistency (coefficient alphas) for these scales were: support = .42, and need support (satisfaction with support) = .64. These coefficients were used to correct for attenuation, the first order correlations of these scales with the two total amount of viewing variables.

First order correlations were all statistically significant in directions predicted. The disattenuated correlations indicate that the theoretical relationships of these social environmental constraint variables and the use of television may be quite high (i.e.  $r = -.49$ ).

Multiple regression equations were calculated to assess the proportion of variance in the amount of television viewing that could be accounted for by these variables. Since both time viewed and the number of shows watched were so highly correlated (and because results using each of these two dependent variables were quite similar), only the results for the dependent variable "total time viewed" are reported here.

The multiple R for the three personality variables as predictors was .47 ( $R^2 = .22$ ,  $F(3,52) = 4.90$ ,  $p < .05$ ), however a forward stepwise regression procedure (where new variables were added only if they added a significant ( $\alpha = .05$ ) proportion of variance to the equation), revealed that sensation seeking alone accounted for most of the variance ( $R = .47$ ,  $R^2 = .22$ ,  $F(1,54) = 15.0$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

A multiple regression equation of the environmental variables (the number of clubs one belonged to, access to a car, the number of times one had gone out, stress, presence of a steady companion, levels of social support, and satisfaction with present levels of social support

(perceived need for more support) resulted in a non-significant multiple R of .44 ( $R^2=.20$ ,  $F(7,48)=1.68$ ,  $p>.05$ ). Stepwise procedures produced a statistically significant equation ( $R=.42$ ,  $R^2=.18$ ,  $F(4,51)=2.73$ ,  $p<.05$ ) utilizing only four of these variables: satisfaction with social support, the number of times one has gone out in the past two weeks, stress, and the number of clubs and organizations one belongs to. Of these variables however, only one was needed to account for most of the variance. The satisfaction with present support (need for more support) had an  $R=.30$  ( $R^2=.09$ ,  $F(1,54)=5.51$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Subsequent variables did not add statistically significant proportions of variance ( $\alpha=.05$ ) to the equation.

Finally, by combining all variables (excluding introversion/extroversion due to its extremely low entry F score in the equation) to predict total time viewed, an equation was derived with an  $R=.57$  ( $R^2=.32$ ,  $F(9,46)=2.42$ ,  $p<.05$ ). By using a forward stepwise procedure, requiring entry variables to add significant levels of variance accounted for by the equation ( $\alpha=.05$ ), one finds again that the equation is reduced to just one predictor--sensation seeking ( $R=.47$ ,  $R^2=.22$ ,  $F(1,54)=15.01$ ,  $p<.01$ ).

Overall, one can conclude from these equations that environmental constraint and personality variables can explain a moderate amount of variation in total time spent

viewing--almost up to one third of the variance in the sample dependent variable. However, correction for shrinkage reduces this  $R^2$  substantially ( $R^2=.19$ ). Practically speaking, most of the variation in time spent viewing can be explained by just a few highly correlated variables (i.e., sensation seeking, satisfaction with social support). Apparently a high level of multicollinearity exists among the variables selected in this study. As a result, only the first few variables entered added significantly to a regression equation predicting total viewing.

#### Social Uses of Television

Table 4 presents descriptive data of subjects' self-endorsed uses of television. Of initial concern was whether the hypothetical social uses were endorsed as ways the subjects used television. The mean response for many of these social uses questions was close to 5 on the 7-point response scales, indicating infrequent use. However, all of the uses were endorsed by those in the sample as having occurred within the subjects' past two weeks of viewing. In fact, of the 25 questions presented, 20 of them were endorsed by subjects on the full range of the response scale. For most of these uses then, at least a few people

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Subjects' Self-Endorsed  
Social Uses of Television

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>General Description</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math></u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>
1.	Background	5.2	1.7	1	7
2.	Companionship	4.8	1.6	1	7
3.	Entertainment	3.5	1.5	1	7
4.	Escape	5.2	1.8	1	7
5.	Behavior Regulation	5.0	1.9	1	7
6.	Conversation Examples	5.4	1.4	1	7
7.	Conversation Facilitation	5.4	1.4	1	7
8.	Agenda Setting	5.3	1.3	1	7
9.	Conflict Resolution	5.9	1.2	2	7
10.	Behavior Modeling	5.2	1.5	1	7
11.	Role Models	4.8	1.5	1	7
12.	Values	4.3	1.5	1	7
13.	Relaxation	4.3	1.8	1	7
14.	Consumer Information	5.7	1.2	3	7
15.	Information	3.9	1.8	1	7
16.	Educational	5.2	1.7	2	7
17.	Opinions/Attitudes	5.3	1.4	2	7
18.	Affiliation/Conversation	4.8	1.7	1	7
19.	Affiliation/Conformity	4.7	1.6	1	7
20.	Avoidance	6.3	1.1	3	7
21.	Intellectual Validation	4.3	1.8	1	7
22.	Affiliation	4.1	1.8	1	7
23.	Role Reinforcement	4.6	1.5	1	7
24.	Persuasion	4.7	1.8	1	7
25.	Argument Facilitation	5.7	1.4	1	7

Note: Scale Endpoints were 1 = Very Frequently Used  
7 = Never Used

described them as being used "very frequently" in the past two weeks of their television viewing.

The most frequently endorsed social uses of television (those with averages near the midpoint on the response scale) were those related to television viewing as entertainment ( $\bar{x}=3.5$ ), as providing news information ( $\bar{x}=3.9$ ), as providing information about society's values and beliefs ( $\bar{x}=4.3$ ), as allowing one to relax ( $\bar{x}=4.3$ ), as allowing one an opportunity for intellectual validation ( $\bar{x}=4.3$ ), and as a time to get together (affiliate) with friends ( $\bar{x}=4.1$ ).

For those subjects who participated in both phases of the study, intercorrelations between endorsed social uses of television before and after recording their viewing behavior in the logs were computed (see Table 5). These correlations give some indication of stability of social uses over time (a one week period). All of the correlations obtained were statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ) and ranged in magnitude from  $r=.47$  to  $r=.79$ .

An issue of concern was the possibility that the task of recording one's own viewing behaviors may affect one's awareness of what one watches, thus affecting the perceived uses themselves. T-tests for paired samples were calculated for each social use question to see if an endorsed social use of television was significantly different from pre-log

Table 5: Differences Between Self-Endorsed Social Uses of Television  
Pre-Television Log vs. Post-Television Log Times of Data Collection

Item No.	General Description	Time of Data Coll.		Mean Difference Score	SD	t <sup>a</sup>	r <sup>b</sup>
		Pre-Log X(SD)	Post-Log X(SD)				
1.	Background	4.91(1.9)	5.23(1.7)	-.32	1.8	-1.34	.51
2.	Companionship	4.75(1.5)	5.27(1.4)	-.52	1.4	2.79**	.54
3.	Entertainment	3.50(1.5)	3.14(1.5)	.36	1.0	2.68**	.78
4.	Escape	5.32(1.7)	5.45(1.5)	-.12	1.4	-0.66	.61
5.	Behavior Regulation	4.98(1.9)	5.61(1.4)	-.62	1.4	-3.45**	.71
6.	Conversation/Examples	5.61(1.4)	5.79(1.2)	-.18	1.1	1.22	.64
7.	Conversation/Fac.	5.64(1.4)	5.68(1.3)	-.04	1.2	0.23	.64
8.	Agenda Setting	5.45(1.3)	5.59(1.3)	-.14	1.2	0.92	.59
9.	Conflict Resolution	6.04(1.1)	5.62(1.3)	.41	1.2	2.59**	.50
10.	Behavior Modeling	5.41(1.5)	5.64(1.1)	-.23	1.3	1.30	.49
11.	Role Models	4.80(1.6)	5.36(1.3)	-.55	1.4	2.91**	.55
12.	Values	4.25(1.5)	4.71(1.2)	-.46	1.3	2.58**	.54
13.	Relaxation	4.30(1.8)	4.48(1.6)	-.18	1.8	0.75	.47
14.	Consumer Information	5.73(1.1)	5.89(1.2)	-.16	1.1	1.10	.55
15.	Information	3.89(1.7)	4.23(1.6)	-.34	1.7	1.53	.50
16.	Educational	5.00(1.6)	5.41(1.6)	-.41	1.5	2.10*	.57
17.	Opinions/Attitudes	5.34(1.5)	5.46(1.3)	-.12	1.4	0.65	.51
18.	Affiliation/Conversation	5.00(1.7)	5.36(1.5)	-.36	1.3	2.10*	.70
19.	Affiliation/Conformity	4.68(1.6)	5.07(1.5)	-.39	1.5	2.00*	.53
20.	Avoidance	6.29(1.1)	6.48(0.8)	-.20	1.0	1.50	.47
21.	Intellectual Valid.	4.05(1.8)	3.91(1.6)	.14	1.5	0.70	.62
22.	Affiliation	4.09(1.8)	4.11(1.8)	-.02	1.3	0.10	.73
23.	Role Reinforcement	4.64(1.5)	4.91(1.4)	-.27	1.2	1.65	.65
24.	Persuasion	4.62(2.0)	4.86(1.7)	-.23	1.2	1.42	.79
25.	Argument Facilitation	5.77(1.4)	5.84(1.1)	-.07	1.2	0.45	.57

<sup>a</sup>T-Test for Paired Samples, Pre vs. Post Viewing Time Scores.

<sup>b</sup>Pearson r Correlation Between Pre and Post Viewing Time Scores.  
All correlations p < .01.

\*p < .05

to post-log times. Using two-tailed significance tests ( $\alpha = .05$ ), nine of the 25 questions indicated significant change in self endorsed social use levels over time. Subjects reported significantly more television use for entertainment and conflict resolution reasons, and significantly less use of television as a behavioral regulator, for the purposes of companionship, or for role modeling, values information, educational information, or for affiliation facilitation (see Table 5). Again one can conclude that some stability in self endorsed social uses of television over short periods of time exists, though obviously one's uses of the medium do not remain static. Since the pre-log to post-log social uses measured did not differ to large degrees, all subsequent analyses reported here are only those based on the pre-log social use measures collected.

The twenty five questions representing social uses were next collapsed into fourteen conceptually distinct categories. Individual questions were linearly combined to form composite variables if they were both conceptually similar and empirically highly related with one another (correlated at least  $r = .39$ ). Certain questions were deemed conceptually distinct from others on the questionnaire even if they correlated highly with them, and hence stood by themselves in representing a particular endorsed social use. The final fourteen social use variables constructed were:

companionship (items 1 & 2), entertainment (item 3), relaxation (items 4 & 13), structure activities (item 5), conversation facilitation (items 6, 7, & 8), behavioral information (items 9, 10, 11, & 23), values information (items 12 & 17), consumer information (item 14), information (items 15 & 16), affiliation (items 18, 19, & 22), avoidance (item 20), intellectual validation (item 21), persuasion (item 24), and argument facilitation (item 25).

These social use variables were correlated with several of the environmental constraint and personality variables (see Table 6), with the total amount of television viewed (both total number of shows watched and total time spent viewing) (see Table 7), and with the total amounts of television viewed from the specific show content categories (see Table 8). According to the two hypotheses proposed, certain environmental constraints and/or personality types will lead to increased television viewing. Whether any of these types of variables related to specific social uses of television was also of interest.

Certain environmental constraint variables were correlated with certain social uses ( $p < .05$ ). Particularly notable was that persons who generally found it difficult to locate people for various types of social support were more likely to use television for certain social uses than those who found it easy to obtain social support. For example,

Table 6. Correlation Matrix of Composite Endorsed Social Uses of Television  
with Personality, Environmental, and Social Support Measures

	Background/Companion	Entertainment	Relax/Escape	Structure Act.	Combination Fac.	Behavior Info.	Values Info.	Consumer Info.	Information	Affiliation	Avoidance	Intellectual Valid.	Persuasion	Argument Fac.
Social Alienation	-.05	.07	.03	.12	-.01	.09	-.25*	-.05	-.10	-.09	.09	-.09	-.24*	-.22*
Introversion/Extraversion	-.12	-.10	-.12	-.15	-.11	-.06	.18	.04	-.10	-.17	-.07	.18	-.06	-.12
Sensation Seeking	-.27*	-.25*	.04	-.25*	-.14	-.11	-.16	.00	-.08	-.28*	-.04	.18	-.16	-.28*
Serious Talk	-.05	-.20	-.15	-.01	-.20	-.11	-.03	-.24*	-.17	-.15	-.12	.01	-.01	-.18
Socializing Recreation	-.13	-.11	-.21	-.23*	-.29*	-.30**	-.33**	-.14	-.10	-.26*	-.29*	-.10	-.17	-.21
Expert Information	-.18	-.10	-.18	-.04	-.08	-.22*	-.02	-.09	.06	-.11	-.15	.18	-.11	-.08
Need Serious Talk	-.04	-.15	-.11	-.24*	-.11	-.01	-.14	-.03	-.11	-.18	-.06	.01	.23*	-.18
Need Socializing Recreation	-.13	.05	.02	-.27*	-.21	.13	-.20	.09	-.06	-.19	-.08	-.03	.18	-.21
Need Expert Information	-.21	-.17	-.18	-.15	-.13	-.22*	-.05	-.11	.06	-.21	-.26*	.04	.01	-.09
Support	-.18	-.21	-.26*	-.10	-.26*	-.28*	-.13	-.28*	-.11	-.24*	-.25	.07	-.12	-.22*
Need Support	-.18	-.14	-.13	-.29*	-.20	-.07	-.17	-.03	-.04	-.26*	-.19	.01	.18	-.21
Clubs, Organizations	.31**	-.13	-.10	.05	.03	-.20	.17	-.03	.19	-.06	-.24*	-.11	-.21	.16
Gone Out	.02	-.03	.01	-.03	.32**	.00	.12	.18	.09	.10	.13	.22*	.18	.14
Car	.09	.17	.06	.05	-.10	.05	.19	.24*	.23*	.00	.06	-.05	.11	-.04
Roommates	.00	.28*	.06	.16	-.06	.12	.04	-.02	.02	-.03	.14	.15	.23*	-.02
Steady Companion	.18	.00	-.07	.07	.16	.10	-.02	.24*	.07	-.04	.17	-.11	.03	-.22*
Stress	-.08	-.02	.19	.07	-.03	-.01	-.21	-.11	-.40**	-.02	.11	-.14	-.20	-.26*
Sex	.13	-.11	.14	.08	.10	.01	.11	.01	.07	.07	.08	.00	.12	.06

\*p < .05  
\*\*p < .01

those who found it difficult to locate people for the purpose of general socializing used television more to help facilitate conversations they had with others ( $r=.29$ ,  $p<.05$ ), to structure their daily activities ( $r=.23$ ,  $p<.05$ ), to provide them with role models and behavioral information ( $r=.30$ ,  $p<.05$ ), and to obtain information concerning current societal values and beliefs ( $r=.33$ ,  $p<.05$ ). These people also used television to regulate social contact; both as a means of avoiding others ( $r=.29$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and as a way of affiliating with others ( $r=.26$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

Table 6 also indicates that personality characteristics alter the way that one may specifically use television. For instance, those higher in sensation seeking were less likely ( $p <.05$ ) to use television for companionship ( $r= -.27$ ), affiliating with others ( $r= -.28$ ), or for entertainment ( $r= -.25$ ). They did not structure their daily activities around television programming ( $r= -.25$ ). However they were as likely as anyone to use television for other reasons, for instance, to obtain news ( $r= -.08$ ) or consumer information ( $r=0.0$ ) or to relax ( $r=.04$ ).

Table 7 shows which social uses of television related most highly to total amount of television viewing. A multiple regression equation using all fourteen social uses to predict total viewing time in minutes yielded a multiple R of .65 ( $R^2=.43$ , adjusted  $R^2=.23$ ,  $F(14,41)=2.19$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

Table 7. Correlations of Composite Endorsed Social Uses of  
Television and Amount of Television Viewed

	Total Time Spent Viewing	Total No. Shows Viewed
Background/Companionship	.48**	.48**
Entertainment	.42**	.38**
Relaxation/Escapes	.22*	.15
Structure Activities	.30**	.25*
Conversation Facilitation	.08	.04
Behavior Information	.10	.09
Values Information	.25*	.26*
Consumer Information	.22**	.21
Information	.20	.21
Affiliation	.35**	.29*
Avoidance	.04	.02
Intellectual Validation	.06	.07
Persuasion	.17	.14
Argument Facilitation	.28*	.28*

\*p < .05

\*\*p < .01

Forward stepwise regression procedures ( $\alpha=.05$  for new variable inclusion) produced an equation that includes only two social use variables however, indicating that most of this relationship can be accounted for by two uses: companionship and entertainment ( $R=.56$ ,  $R^2=.32$ , adjusted  $R^2=.29$ ,  $F(2,53)=12.20$ ,  $p<.01$ ).

The inter-relationships of specific social uses to the degree of watching any particular television program type in minutes spent viewing are given on Table 8. Here, more specific relationships were investigated by noting which social uses were most strongly related to viewing a specific program type. One immediately notes the large number of statistically significant correlations found in the table, indicating again that television viewing is related to viewing for specific social reasons. One also notes that not all show types were related to the same social uses. For instance, those who watched more adventure dramas also reported using television more for providing them with behavioral/role information ( $r=.34$ ,  $p<.01$ ), opportunities for affiliation ( $r=.23$ ,  $p<.05$ ), as a means of relaxing ( $r=.25$ ,  $p<.05$ ), and simple entertainment ( $r=.32$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Alternatively, watching game shows was linked with watching television for information ( $r=.41$ ,  $p<.01$ ), to facilitate arguments ( $r=.34$ ,  $p<.01$ ), and not for behavioral/role information ( $r= -.22$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

Table 8. Correlation Matrix of Composite Endorsed Social Uses of Television and  
Amount of Television Viewed (Time) for Each Show Type

	Adventure Drama	Interaction Drama	Comedy	Sports	Info	Cartoons	Variety Talk	Info Talk	Music	Game
Background/ Companionship	.21	.46**	.24*	.00	.04	.25*	.00	.21	.11	.14
Entertainment	.32**	.31**	.30**	.12	-.04	.04	.08	-.10	.20	-.11
Relaxation/ Escape	.25*	.38**	.05	-.07	.02	-.18	-.30**	-.09	.12	-.16
Structure Activities	.22*	.28*	.12	.08	.08	-.03	.02	-.05	.09	.01
Conversation Facilitation	.03	.24*	-.02	.00	.08	-.06	-.13	.18	-.17	-.09
Behavioral Information	.34**	.14	.13	-.23*	.01	.00	-.15	-.16	.10	-.22*
Values Information	.06	.31**	.22*	-.10	.11	.10	-.20	.31**	.02	.15
Consumer Information	.19	.16	.23*	.06	-.15	.20	-.04	-.02	.09	.06
Information	-.11	.07	.11	.23*	.24*	.08	-.16	.28*	.10	.41**
Affiliation	.23*	.40**	.25*	-.07	-.03	.06	-.09	.10	-.02	.02
Avoidance	.12	.17	.06	-.10	-.18	-.05	-.08	-.07	-.01	-.03
Intellectual Validation	-.11	-.04	-.11	-.11	-.03	.07	.14	.04	-.08	-.11
Persuasion	.14	.27*	.07	-.04	-.04	-.10	.00	.01	.01	.10
Argument Facilitation	.15	.20	.26*	.22*	.21	.04	-.10	.21	.02	.34**

\*p < .05

\*\*p < .01

Television Viewing Preferences versus Television Viewing Behaviors

An appraisal was made of the degree to which a stated preference for viewing a particular show was related to actual viewing. These cognitions, representing behavioral tendencies (preferences), should be highly positively related to respective actual occurrences of behavior.

Correlations of preferences for specific show types (measured on 7-point scales assessing one's likelihood to watch a particular show type) with actual amount of viewing of that show type are presented in Table 9. Also shown are the correlations of preferences for specific show types with the relative amount of viewing time spent watching these separate program types.<sup>3</sup> Only slightly more than one half of these correlations were statistically significant ( $\alpha = .05$ ).

In addition, the magnitude of the relationship between a specific preference and actual viewing was not generally high. Correlations ranged from a low of  $r = -.11$  ( $p > .05$ ) to a high of only  $r = .49$  ( $p < .01$ ). The average correlation between a specific preference and respective specific viewing behavior was only  $r = .22$ .<sup>4</sup> Correlations between preferences and relative amount of time spent viewing were

-----

<sup>3</sup> Relative viewing is defined as the number of minutes spent watching a particular show type divided by the total number of minutes spent watching television (all show categories totaled).

Table 9. Correlations of Preference Ratings and Actual Amounts  
of Viewing for Specific Show Types

	<u>Amount of Viewing</u> (No. Shows)	<u>Amount of Viewing</u> (Time)	<u>Relative Amt. of Viewing<sup>a</sup></u>
Adventure Drama	.32**	.35**	.30**
Interaction Drama	.50**	.46**	.54**
Comedies	.18	.19	.22*
Cartoons	.34**	.34**	.41**
Sports	.29*	.23*	.27*
Information	.15	.18	.18
Talk-Variety	.12	.10	.27*
Talk-Information	.29*	.31**	.34**
Musical	-.01	.04	.05
Game	-.07	-.11	-.32**

<sup>a</sup>Relative viewing is the amount of viewing a particular show type divided by one's total time spent viewing.

\*p < .05  
\*\*p < .01

slightly higher. They ranged from a low of  $r = -.32$  to a high of  $r = .54$ . The average correlation between a specific preference and the respective relative (proportional) amount of viewing (time) of a specific show type was  $r = .23$ .

---

4. Correlation coefficients were transformed into z score coefficients, averaged, and this result then retransformed back to a correlation coefficient.

## DISCUSSION

Certain environmental and personality variables were significantly related to television viewing. In general, the results confirm the two proposed hypotheses derived from Rosengren and Windahl's (1972) work. As subjects reported that they had less available social support (people available for socializing, serious talking, or providing expert information) they also reported watching more television. Likewise, the more subjects reported that they were satisfied with their present levels of social support, the less television they reported viewing.

These results can be interpreted within the framework of past uses and gratifications research, especially in terms of a functional alternative orientation. When persons are not obtaining enough social interaction and forms of social support through direct interaction with others, they may actively seek out alternative means of achieving the desired ends of such interaction. Increased television viewing may represent an attempt to supplement or substitute for decreased availability of social contact.

Although such an explanation is possible, it is tentative. Evidence should be available to show that television viewing has the potential to serve as an adequate functional alternative. If increased viewing supposedly substitutes for direct "social interaction", are there any

data to suggest that people utilize the medium for purposes that traditionally might only adequately be satisfied through person to person contact? This research supports Lull's (1980) position that people do use television for a variety of purposes that serve similar functions as would direct interaction with other people. Such "social uses" of television were endorsed by subjects in this research sample, indicating that television could, if required, substitute as a way to obtain outcomes one often receives from direct social interaction.

Television usage extends beyond mere passive viewing. It is more than simply a time filler. People use it as a social resource to allow them to be close to other people, to avoid unwanted interaction, to note behavior of role models, to structure their daily activities, and to provide information about society's current values. They also use it as an aid to initiate and maintain conversations with others, and with some people, television even serves as a source of pseudocompanionship. Although the average endorsement for any of these uses was actually quite low (generally in the "infrequently" range on the response scale), one would not expect most people to use television in these various ways at high levels, since these uses may stem from a lack of ability to satisfy one's needs directly.

Some "social uses" were highly endorsed by most of the subjects (a mean response falling in the "sometimes use television in this way" range in the past two weeks). Some of these results are somewhat surprising and again point out that people may use the medium as a social resource. Not surprisingly, people used television for a source of news information (local, national, and international events), but they also noted that it provided realistic information concerning society's current values and standards of behavior. These standards traditionally were only obtainable through actual dialogue with one's family, friends, and other associates. These results indicate that television is more than just a source of entertainment. This does not preclude television being used as entertainment however, since television use for this reason was the most highly endorsed use among the subjects. Television viewing is also often used as a means of relaxing--as a type of diversion or recreation (activities that traditionally involve other people).

Finally, some less obvious yet interesting common uses of television were noted. People often reported using television as a means of affiliation; it could serve as the focus for getting together with friends, rather than some more traditional excuse (i.e., a shopping trip, going out to eat). Also, many people used the television viewing context

as an opportunity to engage in intellectual validation. Here, a major activity undertaken in the act of viewing was the constant interplay between the person and the programming, often within the context of a group of viewers, where one gives running commentary on the programming viewed. Critical comments may be made noting inconsistencies in the plot, infeasible activities, advertising ploys and so on, thus demonstrating the individual's competence or intelligence. This type of viewing is anything but passive.

This evidence, coupled with the empirical relationship of "decreased social support corresponds to increased viewing", lends support to Rosengren and Windahl's position that television viewing may be explained in part by its ability to serve as a functional alternative.

Also hypothesized was that certain personality characteristics would relate to amount of television viewed. As noted, environmental constraints should influence viewing by altering the levels of direct contact opportunities one has, thereby requiring people to seek alternative means of "contact". Personality characteristics however, should also influence overall viewing because they are indicative of individual differences in how much contact people prefer in the first place.

The present results partly confirm the hypothesis that such differences relate to overall levels of television viewing. High sensation seekers watched less television than subjects who were low sensation seekers. A specific interpretation concerning this relationship is suggested from this trait's definition. Sensation seekers are those who lead active lives--mountain climbing, parachuting, traveling, and meeting new people. Their preferred mode of interaction is directed toward doing things and trying new experiences. Such an active lifestyle probably limits the time they have available to allocate for television viewing. Alternatively, they may have no need for television, obtaining excitement and gaining experiences from their worlds through more direct means than viewing.

Thus far, fairly positive conclusions have been proposed regarding the hypotheses set forth. However, not all of the environmental and personality variables measured lend support to these conclusions. Some suggestions as to why these results were not supportive are offered.

One notes a clear conceptual distinction between those environmental variables that seemed to lend support to the hypotheses and those that did not. The social support variables were "direct" measures of environmental constraints and/or opportunities for social contact. The questions operationalizing these variables directly asked

subjects "how easily they could find people for the purpose of socializing, etc." or "how satisfied they were with present levels of contact opportunity". The other questions, though perhaps more objective, were nonetheless "indirect" measures of environmental constraints/opportunities, and as such may not be as likely to relate to amount of television viewing.

One would assume that the amount of contact one has with others is an indication of one's environmental opportunities for meaningful contact with which to satisfy various social needs. Variables measured in this research that relate to this conceptualization included how many clubs one belonged to, how many times one had gone out in the past two weeks, how many roommates one had, and whether or not one had a steady boy/girl friend (or was married). Also, opportunities for contact might be limited if one were not mobile (had access to an automobile). Obviously, however, there are many alternative interpretations of how these variables might or might not relate to more social contact and hence a reduced need for television usage. Roommates, club membership, and so on may or may not mean more contact available for specific reasons that might otherwise be fulfilled by television. One may or may not socialize with roommates, or be able to turn to them as friends to talk about a specific problem. Club membership

may provide a means of interacting as part of a service organization, or obtaining specific information about a hobby, but it may not generally fulfill other socializing needs. In this sense these measures can be seen as indirect operationalizations of one's environmental opportunities, and hence should not be as strongly related to television viewing as the more direct measures should be.

Also, although increased contact with others (as measured by these variables) should lead to a decreased use of television, one may find that some of these measures actually provided an opportunity for increased television viewing. For example, the number of roommates one had was positively related to television viewing. However, more roommates were also encountered in off campus housing situations ( $r=.57$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Here, if one roommate watched television in a small apartment, others might become distracted and join in the viewing. On campus television viewing (where one has fewer roommates) is less likely to be influenced by such situations, since one has to go to a television lounge in order to watch. This may account for the significant relationship between the number of roommates one had and total television viewing counter to what was expected.

Other variables (i.e., introversion/extroversion) also failed to reach levels of statistical significance in

directions predicted. However this may not be surprising considering unreliability of the measuring devices, and the generally low statistical power resulting from the small sample size.

In spite of the difficulties noted, a regression equation using all of the environmental and personality variables accounted for nearly one third of the variance in viewing time ( $r^2=.32$ ). Constructed regression equations using these variables had shrunken  $r^2$ 's as high as .19, indicating that the true theoretical relationship between these conditions and total viewing may be fairly strong.

Besides providing an opportunity to examine relationships between television viewing and personality characteristics, environmental conditions, or social uses separately, this research allowed examination of some of the inter-relationships among these assorted viewing predictors.

Sensation seeking seems to be a powerful predictor of television related behaviors. Those higher in sensation seeking appeared not to use television for any of the more affiliative social reasons--that is, to affiliate with other people, as general entertainment, or as a form of pseudocompanionship. However, sensation seekers were as likely as other people to use television for general relaxing or to obtain news or consumer related information. Thus, one might hypothesize that much of the sensation

seeker's decreased use of television is linked to a specific type of decreased use--general entertainment/affiliative use. Rather than using television as a source of entertainment, these types are more likely to entertain themselves by actually doing things (e.g., parachuting, camping, traveling, visiting people). They will however, still use the medium to obtain news related information, which might be harder to obtain in a direct manner. To conclude, tentative evidence suggests that personality may guide the ways a person uses television.

Also of interest was the relationship between the availability of people for socializing and recreating and several social uses of television. The harder it was to find this type of support (the less people available to recreate with), the more one was likely to use television as an affiliative medium, and the more one used the medium to provide one with social normative information (concerning current values and beliefs of society or role model examples)--information that normally could be obtained through direct interaction with friends or peer groups. Also, low levels of this social support led to greater use of television examples as a means of gaining conversational entrance. The increased reliance on television for these purposes may explain the correspondingly high level of using television to structure activities for these people. This

follows logically since a person's social life would be less governed by social outings, and more centered around specific television shows. This evidence suggests that both specific personality characteristics and environmental constraints may guide the choice of specific uses of television.

Also addressed were relationships between specific social uses and types of program viewing. A glance at the intercorrelation matrix between viewing specific show types and endorsed social uses suggests that different programming types may serve different social functions for the viewer. However, certain social uses were not limited to only a single show type. Overlapping of function between different programming was evident. For instance, adventure dramas, interaction dramas, and comedies all seem related to watching television for pure entertainment. There are noticeable alternative show types related to affiliative uses, television viewing as companionship, as an information source, and as a source of societal values. Future research is required to determine what particular elements of certain show types leads them to be used for similar purposes.

Several methodological issues were also raised during the course of this research: "How stable or reactive to self observation were the self endorsed measures of social use?" and "What is the relationship between preferences for

certain program types and actual viewing of those show types?".

In general, it was concluded that no major change in social use scores resulted from the increased attention given to recording one's viewing behaviors. A few social use items indicated a change in average score at statistically significant levels between the pre log and post log survey periods. However, several of the items showed an increase in use and several a marked decrease in use--hence no stable (uni-directional) change effects were noted.

What is likely the case is that individuals' use of television varies to small degrees in accord with weekly shifts in schedules, times available to allocate to viewing, and so on. The analysis carried out here would seem to support this perspective, for no major differences existed between most average scores over time (indicating general stability), yet correlation coefficients between pre and post scores were only moderate (indicating the likelihood of very small changes in individual's scores both in higher and lower directions).

This result is not at all surprising; one would expect fairly stable yet not completely static behaviors. An active television audience should not be locked into totally unchanging ways of viewing, but should change viewing habits

over time to fit present schedules and needs. College students in particular would be unlikely to report stable viewing behaviors, since their workloads vary considerably from one week to the next.

This research also yielded some interesting data concerning the relationship between television preferences and actual viewing behaviors. Only approximately one half of the correlation coefficients between the amount of viewing a particular show and the stated preference for viewing that show were statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). Of those that were statistically significant, none were of impressive magnitudes. Some of the coefficients found were negative. These results do not give one great confidence in the supposed relationship between cognitive intentions and actual behaviors.

Since the base rates of how much television different persons may watch may have been adversely affecting the magnitude of these obtained coefficients,<sup>5</sup> correlations were computed between one's stated preferences and the relative amount of time spent viewing each show type (the proportion of time spent viewing a specific show type, divided by one's total time spent viewing). In general, this analysis

-----

<sup>5</sup> A person who favors one type of show and who only watches that show type but who watches little television in general, may watch the same amount of that particular show as does a person who is not generally likely to watch that show type, but who watches a lot of television in general. Hence, low correlation coefficients are possibly obtained.

yielded a similar pattern of correlation coefficients of an only slightly greater magnitude.

In general, one might conclude from these analyses that extreme caution should be exercised when dealing with these two concepts--preferences for viewing and actual viewing selections. Although related theoretically, the extent to which they empirically covary has not been determined--in fact, it may be less than one might expect. Apparently, a simple intention or preference for viewing may be overridden by many other influences, one of which may be availability of time to watch television in general.

Until further research provides more conclusive evidence concerning the degree to which these two concepts actually relate to one another, it would be wise to avoid using these two concepts interchangeably. Researchers undertaking further research should be careful when selecting a dependent variable and realize that conclusions about preferences are not necessarily the same as conclusions about actual viewing.

## REFERENCES

- Bandura, Albert. "Social learning through imitation" in Jones, Marshall R. (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation-1962, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1962.
- Bandura, Albert, Ross, Dornthea, and Ross, Sheila A. "Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 3-11.
- Berkowitz, Leonard, "Aggressive cues on aggressive behavior and hostility catharsis", Psychological Review, 1964, 71, 104-122.
- Berkowitz, Leonard. "The effects of observing violence", Scientific American, 1964, 210, 35-41.
- Berkowitz, Leonard. "Some aspects of observed aggression", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 259-369.
- Berkowitz, Leonard, and Green, Russell G. "Film violence and the cue properties of available targets", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 525-530.
- Blumer, Jay G. "The role of theory in uses and gratifications studies", Communication Research, 1979, 6, 9-36.
- Gutman, Jonathan. "Television viewer types: A Q analysis", Journal of Broadcasting, 1978, 22, 505-515.
- Katz, Elinu, Blummer, Jay G., and Gurevitch, Michael. "Uses of mass communication by the individual", in W. Phillips Davidson and Frederick T. C. Yu (Eds.), Mass Communication Research: Major Issues and Future Directions, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.
- Katz, Elinu, Blummer, Jay G., and Gerevitch, Michael. "Uses and Gratifications research", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1973, 37, 509-523.
- Katz, Elinu, and Foulkes, David. "On the use of the mass media as "escape": Clarification of a concept", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1962, 26, 379-388.
- Katzman, Natan. "Television soap operas: what's going on anyway?", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1972, 36, 200-212.

- Korzenny, Felipe, and Neuendorf, Kimberly. "Television viewing and self concept of the elderly", Journal of Communication, 1980, 30, 71-80.
- Lull, James. "The social uses of television", Human Communication Research, 1980, 6, 197-209.
- Monaghan, Robert R., Plummer, Joseph T., Rarick, David L., and Williams, Dwight A. "Predicting viewer preference for new TV program concepts", Journal of Broadcasting, 1974, 18, 131-142.
- Nisbett, Richard E., and Wilson, Timothy DeCamp. "Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes", Psychological Review, 1977, 84, 231-259.
- Pearlin, Leonard I. "Social and personal stress and escape television viewing", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1959-60, 23, 255-259.
- Rosengren, Karl Erik, and Windahl, Swen. "Mass media consumption as a functional alternative" in Denis McQuail (Ed.), Sociology of Mass Communication, Middlesex: England, 1972.
- Rubin, Alan M. "Television usage, attitudes and viewing behaviors of children and adolescents", Journal of Broadcasting, 1977, 21, 355-369.
- Seeman, Melvin. "On the meaning of alienation", American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 783-791.
- Stephenson, William. The Play Theory of Mass Communication, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Walters, Richard H., Thomas, Edward Llewellyn, and Acker, C. William. "Enhancement of punitive behavior by audiovisual displays", Science, 1962, 136, 872-873.
- Wenner, Lawrence. "Functional analysis of TV viewing for older adults", Journal of Broadcasting, 1976, 20, 77-88.

Wilson, Glenn. "Introversion/Extroversion", in John P. Robinson and Phillip R. Shaver (Eds.), Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1973.

Zuckerman, Marvin. "Sensation seeking", in John P. Robinson and Phillip R. Shaver (Eds.), Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1973.

**Appendix A**  
**Group Questionnaire Session Materials**

Appendix A is a copy of the survey packet given to subjects who participated in this research in the initial small group data collection sessions. The pages contained in this packet were in order: A consent form for participation in the research, two pages of descriptions and examples of shows representative of each of the 10 show type categories used in this research, a page with instructions on how to rank order and rate one's likelihood to watch programs from each of the aforementioned show type categories (these ratings served as the "preference" ratings used in this research), two pages of a 25 item questionnaire designed to ascertain what social uses of television the subject would endorse, a one page "social support" questionnaire, two pages of a 20 item social alienation scale, two pages of Zuckerman's 22 item General Sensation Seeking scale (Zuckerman, 1973), two pages of a 20 item reduced version of Eysenck's Personality inventory (used as a measure of introversion/extroversion) (Wilson, 1973), and a final page that served both as part of the "social environment potential" questionnaire (along with the "social support" scale mentioned above) and as a place to collect some demographic data on the subjects.

## CONSENT FORM

The purpose of this research is to investigate various aspects of television viewing habits and preferences for television programming. The pages that follow will measure various aspects of your viewing preferences, how you use television, and ask you some general questions about your living conditions and how you view life generally. By completing these sheets you will have completed your participation in this study and will receive extra credit for your psychology course grade. Any information you provide will be kept strictly confidential, anonymous, and will not be seen by anyone outside of our research staff. We are requesting your name on this consent form in order that we might appropriately assign you your earned extra credit. This consent form will not be tied to your responses. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free at any time to discontinue your participation without penalty. If you have any questions at any point, please feel free to ask us. Please be as accurate as possible when indicating your answers. We appreciate your help on this study.

Lawrence D. Greene  
Research Director  
951-0288

Nickolaus R. Feimer  
Research Advisor  
961-7030

Richard A. Winett  
Human Subjects Coordinator  
961-6275

I have read the above statement and am aware of the conditions of my participation in this study. I understand that all information I provide will be kept strictly confidential and that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time without penalty.

Please Print Your Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Please list the course (and instructor)  
where extra credit will be applied \_\_\_\_\_

As you may know, various television programs can be classified into a variety of general "show types". We are interested in finding out what specific types of shows you prefer in general over other types. For the purpose of this research we have devised a system of different television programming types which we would like you to rate according to your preferences for one type over another.

A brief description/definition of the show categories that will be used here follows:

**COMEDIES:** Shows that are geared to be mainly humorous. Although they may occasionally air themes of a more serious nature (and thus resemble Dramas, (i.e. M\*A\*S\*H), they do so through a "comedy mode" (i.e. program is usually limited to ½ hour in length, the audio contains laugh tracks). Live performance comedies are also included here.

Examples: Happy Days, M\*A\*S\*H, Benson, Three's Company, Saturday Night Live

**SPORTS:** Shows that air individual or team sporting competition. This category includes Pre/Post Game shows and News/Update programs that report only sports related news.

Examples: World Series, College Football, Boxing, ESPN Sports Center

**INFORMATIONAL:** Shows whose main focus is the dissemination of information, usually information that represents current events, investigative reporting, or factual information. Thus, both live news broadcasts, special news magazine shows, and educational documentaries fall into this category.

Examples: Evening News, 60 Minutes, Wild Kingdom, Cosmos

**CARTOONS:** Shows that are animated.

Examples: Bugs Bunny/Roadrunner, Spiderman & Friends, Tom & Jerry

**MUSICAL:** Shows whose focus is musical. These shows may be variety musical shows, shows featuring people dancing, or shows that spotlight various singers or groups performing.

Examples: Solid Gold, Dance Fever, American Bandstand, That Nashville Music

**GAME:** Shows that air non-athletic competition where game contestants win various prize items or money. Shows usually feature a regular host.

Examples: Tic Tac Dough, The Price is Right, Family Feud

(cont.)

**DRAMA:** This category is broken into two subcategories.

**Adventure:** These shows have as their primary focus action and adventure. Personal relationships between show characters are secondary. (Viewers are less likely to see the deeply personal lives and exploits of the major characters.)

Examples: CHiPs, The Fall Guy, Magnum P.I.

**Interaction:** These shows have as their primary focus the interpersonal relationships between the major characters and their worlds. Physical action and adventure are secondary. Viewers are likely to see deeply personal aspects of the characters lives. These series are also more likely to have larger casts (rather than a few major characters) and the story for any given week or day is usually dependent upon the previous show's action. It is less likely a series of independent stories as is the case with those shows in the Adventure Drama category.

Examples: General Hospital, All My Children, Dallas, Hill Street Blue

**TALK SHOWS:** Shows from this category differ from the Informational type shows both in format and in subject matter. Informational shows are more likely to report factual information or information that is as factual as is presently available. Talk shows are likely to cover human interest topics or opinions from various "experts". Also talk shows are more likely to actually involve interviews/talking (in a studio) versus straight reporting, or they approach the show from the TV magazine approach--with regular hosts presenting pre-taped human interest type stories. This category is broken into two subcategories.

**Variety:** These shows feature a host (hosts) who interviews guests or introduces segments of human interest information to the viewers. There are a variety of segments in each broadcast that may focus on general interest stories, personalities, or "pure entertainment".

Examples: The Tonight Show (Johnny Carson), PM Magazine, That's Incredible

**Informational:** These shows are talk shows in that they feature a regular host(s) but the focus of each broadcast is more likely a single topic. Also the topics are more straight informational (political, business, current social issues) discussions rather than human interest/personality reports.

Examples: Donahue, McNeil Lehrer Report

We now ask that you rank each of these show types relative to one another as far as which type you would generally prefer (prefer to watch). Using the list of show types provided below, rank order these show types from your most preferred to least preferred types by placing one of the numbers, 1-10, alongside each show type.

Let #1 represent the show type that you generally would prefer to watch the most, #2 represent your next favorite (preferred) show type, down on through #10--the show type that would be your least favorite (you prefer the least).

Comedies	_____	Informational Shows	_____
Cartoons	_____	Musical Shows	_____
Game Shows	_____	Sports	_____
Dramas:		Talk Shows:	
Adventure	_____	Informational	_____
Interaction	_____	Variety	_____

Now, using the same show type categories, rate each show type on the scale shown below, indicating the degree to which you like that show type, or would be likely to watch it. Simply place a number corresponding with your degree of likelihood towards watching a particular show type in the space provided to the right of each show type.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Would avoid watching this show type at all possible times			Feelings are neutral with respect to this show type, would watch it, but would not deliberately set out to do so			Would watch this show type whenever possible

Comedies	_____	Informational Shows	_____
Cartoons	_____	Musical Shows	_____
Game Shows	_____	Sports	_____
Dramas:		Talk Shows:	
Adventure	_____	Informational	_____
Interaction	_____	Variety	_____

## Television Questionnaire

Think about you own television viewing habits, the times you may watch television, whether you watch it with others or alone, and what things you may do while your television is on. When answering the following questions, consider your viewing behavior over the past two weeks or so. Please use the following response scale in indicating your answers and place the appropriate number in the space provided to the right of each question.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Frequently	Quite Often	Moderate Amount	Sometimes	Infrequently	Rarely	Never

1. How often during the past two weeks did you turn on your television to provide noise in the background when you were doing other things in your residence? \_\_\_\_\_
2. How often during the past two weeks did you use television to provide some companionship when you were alone? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television for simple entertainment? \_\_\_\_\_
4. How often during the past two weeks did you use television to help you forget about your problems and worries of the day? \_\_\_\_\_
5. How often during the past two weeks did you plan your daily activities (e.g. study times, meals, social activities with friends) around television programming? \_\_\_\_\_
6. When you have had conversations with others in the past two weeks how often did you use examples from television programs you have watched as an aid to describing experiences you were discussing? \_\_\_\_\_
7. How often during the past two weeks did you find television useful in providing a common ground for starting and maintaining conversations with others? \_\_\_\_\_
8. How often during the past two weeks did you find that the topics of your conversations with others stemmed from television shows? \_\_\_\_\_
9. How often during the past two weeks did television programming give you examples about how one might resolve arguments and conflicts between people? \_\_\_\_\_
10. How often during the past two weeks did you find that things that people did on television gave you ideas about how you might act in your own life? \_\_\_\_\_
11. How often during the past two weeks did you notice people or characters on television that you would like to be like or model yourself after? \_\_\_\_\_
12. How often during the past two weeks did you find television programs that gave realistic information about the values, beliefs, and standards of behavior in today's society? \_\_\_\_\_
13. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television to help you relax when you were tense? \_\_\_\_\_

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Frequently	Quite Often	Moderate Amount	Sometimes	Infrequently	Rarely	Never

14. How often during the past two weeks did you find that television was useful in helping you make better decisions concerning things you buy? \_\_\_\_\_
15. How often during the past two weeks did you use television as a source of information about local, national, and international events? \_\_\_\_\_
16. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television programs that were "educational"? \_\_\_\_\_
17. During the past two weeks, how often do you recall television programs you watched that gave you information that might have shaped your existing opinions and attitudes? \_\_\_\_\_
18. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television with others as a way of initiating general social contact or conversation? \_\_\_\_\_
19. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television with others because everyone else was watching? \_\_\_\_\_
20. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television as a way to avoid contact and conversations with others? \_\_\_\_\_
21. How often during the past two weeks were you critical when watching television by looking for inconsistencies in the plot, infeasible activities, noting advertising ploys, etc? \_\_\_\_\_
22. How often during the past two weeks did you get together with friends to watch a favorite program? \_\_\_\_\_
23. How often during the past two weeks did you notice that characters or people on television (that you might identify with) acted in the same way you would have had you been in their same situation? \_\_\_\_\_
24. How often during the past two weeks did you persuade others who were watching (or were going to watch) television with you to watch what you wished to watch? \_\_\_\_\_
25. How often during the past two weeks did you use an example from television or information aired on television to support a point you were trying to make or a fact you were attempting to verify? \_\_\_\_\_

There may be times in your life when you feel the need to contact other people for a variety of reasons. However, depending upon your work load, a job, general mobility, etc., you may find it harder or easier than it would be for others like you to find someone to talk to, eat with, get advice from, etc.

How easy is it for you to find people for the purpose of Serious Talk (about a personal problem, a major life decision, discussion of personal values, etc.)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Easy	Moderately Easy	Slightly Easy		Slightly Difficult	Moderately Difficult	Very Difficult

Do you feel the need for more availability or higher levels of this type of social contact? Present levels of contact are:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Unsatisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Slightly Unsatisfactory		Slightly Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Very Satisfactory

How easily can you find people for the purpose of socializing/recreation (to relax, have a good time, etc.)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Easily	Moderately Easily	Slightly Easily		Slightly Difficultly	Moderately Difficultly	Very Difficultly

Do you feel the need for more availability or higher levels of this type of social contact? Present levels of contact are:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Unsatisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Slightly Unsatisfactory		Slightly Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Very Satisfactory

How easy is it for you to locate people who might be able to help you with specific "work" or "skill" related problems (tutoring on one's school work, expert information or advice concerning financial investment, how one might tune up one's automobile, etc.)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Easy	Moderately Easy	Slightly Easy		Slightly Difficult	Moderately Difficult	Very Difficult

Do you feel the need for more availability or higher levels of this type of social contact? Present levels of contact are:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Unsatisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Slightly Unsatisfactory		Slightly Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Very Satisfactory

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Please read each of the items on the following page and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement. We are specifically interested in your personal feelings. There are no right or wrong answers.

Please place the number coinciding with your level of agreement or disagreement in the space provided to the right of each statement. The response scale, which is repeated at the top of the following page is as follows:

- |                         |                      |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 = Strongly Disagree   | 5 = Slightly Agree   |
| 2 = Moderately Disagree | 6 = Moderately Agree |
| 3 = Slightly Disagree   | 7 = Strongly Agree   |
| 4 = Neutral or Unsure   |                      |

PLEASE USE THE SCALE BELOW WHEN RESPONDING TO THE ITEMS

SA-III

- | 1                 | 2                   | 3                 | 4       | 5              | 6                | 7              |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Moderately Agree | Strongly Agree |
1. I have found that it is difficult to influence the way others act. \_\_\_\_\_
  2. I find that I can usually believe others when they tell me about the appropriate way I should act. \_\_\_\_\_
  3. I have found that I have the same general feelings and perceptions about things as most other people I know. \_\_\_\_\_
  4. In order to get what you want, it is often necessary to cut corners and forget about what others tell you is the "right way of doing things". \_\_\_\_\_
  5. I get a lot of satisfaction from my relationships with other people. \_\_\_\_\_
  6. When I am in a group, I feel that I should go along with what others are doing since I can usually get what I want if I do. \_\_\_\_\_
  7. I have found that it is usually easy to get others to do what I want them to do. \_\_\_\_\_
  8. I have found that the things other people find important are unimportant to me. \_\_\_\_\_
  9. In general, I find that the daily encounters I have with other people I meet are enjoyable. \_\_\_\_\_
  10. I feel it is more appropriate to play the games of life rather than go against them, in order to get the things I want. \_\_\_\_\_
  11. It is not too hard to know whether people will really do what they tell you they will do. \_\_\_\_\_
  12. I can usually influence the way others will act. \_\_\_\_\_
  13. It's hard to get straight answers from anyone anymore. \_\_\_\_\_
  14. I find the standard ways of dealing with others don't seem to get me what I want. \_\_\_\_\_
  15. I find that my values are about the same as other people I know. \_\_\_\_\_
  16. It's hard to figure out who you can really believe these days. \_\_\_\_\_
  17. In general, I get little satisfaction in my life from my relationships with other people. \_\_\_\_\_
  18. I have found that it is usually hard to get what I want from other people. \_\_\_\_\_
  19. I often feel that my personal relationships with others are worthless. \_\_\_\_\_
  20. I often feel isolated from everyone else around me. \_\_\_\_\_

## ZUCKERMAN SCALE

Each of the items below contain two choices, A and B. Please indicate by circling the letter in front of each choice the one that better describes your likes or the way you feel. In some cases you may find items in which both choices describe your likes or feelings. Please choose the one which better describes your likes or feelings. In some cases you may find that neither choice describes something you like. In these case circle the choice you dislike least. Do not leave any items unanswered.

Be frank and give your honest appraisal of yourself.

-----

1. A. I would like a job which would require a lot of travelling.  
B. I would prefer a job in one location.
2. A. I can't wait to get into the indoors on a cold day.  
B. I am invigorated by a brisk, cold day.
3. A. I often wish I could be a mountain climber.  
B. I can't understand people who risk their necks climbing mountains.
4. A. I dislike all body odors.  
B. I like some of the earthy body smells.
5. A. I get bored seeing the same old faces.  
B. I like the comfortable familiarity of everyday friends.
6. A. I like to explore a strange city or section of town by myself, even if it means getting lost.  
B. I prefer a guide when I am in a place I don't know well.
7. A. I would not like to try any drug which might produce strange and dangerous effects on me.  
B. I would like to try some of the drugs that produce hallucinations.
8. A. I would prefer living in an ideal society where everyone is safe, secure, and happy.  
B. I would have preferred living in the unsettled days of our history.
9. A. A sensible person avoids activities that are dangerous.  
B. I sometimes like to do things that are a little frightening.
10. A. I would like to take up the sport of water-skiing.  
B. I would not like to take up water skiing.
11. A. I would like to take off on a trip with no pre-planned or definite routes, or timetable.  
B. When I go on a trip I like to plan my route and timetable fairly carefully.

12. A. I would not like to learn to fly an airplane.  
B. I would like to learn to fly an airplane.
13. A. I would like to have the experience of being hypnotized.  
B. I would not like to be hypnotized.
14. A. The most important goal of life is to live it to the fullest and experience as much of it as you can.  
B. The most important goal of life is to find peace and happiness.
15. A. I would like to try parachute jumping.  
B. I would never want to try jumping out of a plane with or without a parachute.
16. A. I enter cold water gradually giving myself time to get used to it.  
B. I like to dive or jump right into the ocean or a cold pool.
17. A. I prefer friends who are excitingly unpredictable.  
B. I prefer friends who are reliable and predictable.
18. A. When I go on a vacation I prefer the comfort of a good room and bed.  
B. When I go on a vacation I would prefer the change of camping out.
19. A. The essence of good art is in its clarity, symmetry of form, and harmony of colors.  
B. I often find beauty in the "clashing" colors and irregular forms of modern paintings.
20. A. A good painting should shock or jolt the senses.  
B. A good painting should give one a feeling of peace and security.
21. A. People who ride motorcycles must have some kind of an unconscious need to hurt themselves.  
B. I would like to drive or ride on a motorcycle.
22. A. I prefer people who are calm and even tempered.  
B. I prefer people who are emotionally expressive even if they are a bit unstable.

## INSTRUCTIONS

Please read each of the items on the following page and respond to each question with a "yes" or "no". We are specifically interested in your personal feelings. There are no right or wrong answers.

Please write a "Y" (Yes) or "N" (No) in the space provided to the right of each statement corresponding to whether you would answer "yes" or "no" to that statement.

PLEASE MARK A "Y" (YES) OR "N" (NO) WHEN RESPONDING TO THE ITEMS

1. Do you often long for excitement? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Are you usually carefree? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Do you stop and think things over before doing anything? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Would you do almost anything for a dare? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Do you often do things on the spur of the moment? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Generally, do you prefer reading to meeting people? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Do you prefer to have few but special friends? \_\_\_\_\_
8. When people shout at you do you shout back? \_\_\_\_\_
9. Do other people think of you as very lively? \_\_\_\_\_
10. Are you mostly quiet when you are with other people? \_\_\_\_\_
11. If there is something you want to know about, would you rather look it up in a book than talk to someone about it? \_\_\_\_\_
12. Do you like the kind of work that you need to pay close attention to? \_\_\_\_\_
13. Do you hate being in a crowd who play jokes on one another? \_\_\_\_\_
14. Do you like doing things in which you have to act quickly? \_\_\_\_\_
15. Are you slow and unhurried in the way you move? \_\_\_\_\_
16. Do you like talking to people so much that you never miss a chance of talking to a stranger? \_\_\_\_\_
17. Would you be unhappy if you could not see lots of people most of the time? \_\_\_\_\_
18. Do you find it hard to enjoy yourself at a lively party? \_\_\_\_\_
19. Would you say that you were fairly self-confident? \_\_\_\_\_
20. Do you like playing pranks on others? \_\_\_\_\_

Please answer the following:

1. How many clubs, service organizations, social groups, etc. are you a member of? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Do you own or have relatively unrestricted use of a motor vehicle?  Yes  No
3. How many times in the past 2 weeks have you "gone out" with friends, relatives, or neighbors on a recreational or social outing? \_\_\_\_\_
4. From your own point of view, how generally stressed (tense, anxious, physically drained) do you feel as a result of your work (school work, job, or both)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Stressed	Moderately Stressed	Slightly Stressed		Slightly Relaxed	Moderately Relaxed	Very Relaxed

5. During a typical week how many hours per day do you watch television? \_\_\_\_\_
6. During a typical week what percentage of your free time do you spend watching television? \_\_\_\_\_%
7. During a typical week what percentage of your free time do you spend socializing with others? \_\_\_\_\_%
8. Do you live in: \_\_\_\_\_
9. Do you live in:  Dorm  Apt.  House  Trailer  Other
9. How many roommates share your Dorm Room, Apartment, House, Trailer, etc? \_\_\_\_\_
10. Do you have a steady girl/boyfriend (or are you married)? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Yes  No
- University Level \_\_\_\_\_  
 Freshman \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sophomore \_\_\_\_\_  
 Junior \_\_\_\_\_  
 Senior \_\_\_\_\_  
 Graduate \_\_\_\_\_
- Sex \_\_\_\_\_  
 Male \_\_\_\_\_  
 Female \_\_\_\_\_
- Age \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix B  
Television Log Materials

Appendix B is a copy of the television log packet given to subjects who decided to participate in the second phase of this research project. The pages contained in this packet were in order: A title page, one page of instructions, seven two-page log sheets for recording the names of television shows watched over the one week period (two sheets for every day), one page of questions asking subjects how typical their recorded week of viewing was, and two final pages of a 25 item questionnaire designed to ascertain how subjects use television according to defined "social uses". (This questionnaire was a duplicate of the one given to subjects in the initial questionnaire session).

TELEVISION LOG:

A Record of your TV Viewing Habits

CONTENTS OF THIS PACKET:

1. Instruction Page
2. Seven days of log sheets
3. Sheet with three questions to be completed last
4. Consent/Credit form

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

## TELEVISION LOG

**INSTRUCTIONS:** We are attempting to determine the television viewing patterns of students at Virginia Tech. To gather this information, we would like to ask that you keep a log of your television viewing for the next seven days. Specifically we ask the following:

- 1) Please start keeping the log on the day you pick up the sheets and continue for a total of seven days. For each day there are two pages: one to log your morning and afternoon viewing and another to log your evening viewing. At the top of each sheet there is room to write in the day (e.g. Monday, Tuesday, etc.) and the date. Please write in these days and dates before you start.
- 2) Place these log sheets near the place where you typically sit to watch television and record the shows you are watching as you watch them. Please record each distinct show even if you continue watching the show following it. In keeping this log, a good rule of thumb is for you to list any shows you watch for more than five minutes. Also we request that you be as specific in naming the show as you can. For example, if you watch a movie or news documentary, we would prefer you give us the title (e.g. Movie: Play it again Sam, or in the case of a documentary, Documentary: Our friend the Bee, etc.). Please indicate the type of show and the title.
- 3) Please note what time you begin watching each specific show and either what time it is over (if you watch the entire show) or what time you turn it off (if you don't watch the entire show). If you switch channels in the middle of the show, please note the time for the new show and the name and type of that show. We are interested not only in what shows you are watching but in how much time you watch as well.
- 4) For each segment of the day (i.e. morning, afternoon, evening), if you have not watched television during the hours indicated write in the word, NONE. For example, if you did not watch television between 6:00 a.m. and 12:00 (noon) you would write the word, none in the top line of the morning log for that day. The same is true of the afternoon and evening blocks if you do not watch television on that day during that time period. If you did not watch any television at all on a given day, there should be a none written in at the top line of the morning, afternoon, and evening logs for that day.
- 5) AFTER you have finished the seven day log, please complete the short list of questions that follow the last day. Also, please fill out and sign the consent form at the end so we can give you appropriate credit.
- 6) Please drop this completed log booklet off in the box provided in front of Derring 4082. We will be sure that appropriate credit is reported to your course instructor.
- 7) **CREDIT ALLOCATION:** You will receive one credit for filling out the initial questionnaire booklet and two additional credits for completing the television log packet.

WE SINCERELY APPRECIATE YOUR HELP ON THIS STUDY!

DAY:

Date:

FOR ALL OF THE TELEVISION SHOWS YOU WATCHED DURING THIS DAY, PLEASE INDICATE THE NAME OF THE SHOW, THE TIME YOU TURNED IT ON, AND THE TIME YOU TURNED IT OFF OR IT WAS OVER.

TIME TURNED ON	SHOW	TIME TURNED OFF OR SHOW OVER
	Morning: 6:00 a.m. - 12:00	
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
	Afternoon: 12:00 - 6:00 p.m.	
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Note: Television log contains seven of these pages.

DAY:

TIME  
TURNED ON

SHOW

TIME  
TURNED OFF  
OR SHOW OVER

Evening: 6:00 -

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Note: Television log contains seven of these pages.

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:

Consider the activities, school demands, etc. that affected you during the seven days you filled out this television log. How much difficulty did you have in finding time to watch the television shows you would have wanted to watch? (circle one number indicating level of difficulty)

Very Difficult			Somewhat Difficult			Somewhat Easy		Very Easy
1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

Considering the amount of television you watched during the period you filled out the television logs, do you feel that you watched less, as much, or more television than you would on a typical week

Much more than is typical		Somewhat More	As much as is Typical		Somewhat Less		Much less than is Typical
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Considering the types of television programs you watched during the seven days when you kept the television logs, do you feel that you watched the same kind of shows that you would watch in a normal week or were the kind of shows you watched atypical of your normal viewing patterns?

Very Much Typical		Somewhat Typical			Somewhat Atypical		Totally Atypical
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

## Television Questionnaire

Think about you own television viewing habits, the times you may watch television, whether you watch it with others or alone, and what things you may do while your television is on. When answering the following questions, consider your viewing behavior over the past two weeks or so. Please use the following response scale in indicating your answers and place the appropriate number in the space provided to the right of each question.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Frequently	Quite Often	Moderate Amount	Sometimes	Infrequently	Rarely	Never

1. How often during the past two weeks did you turn on your television to provide noise in the background when you were doing other things in your residence? \_\_\_\_\_
2. How often during the past two weeks did you use television to provide some companionship when you were alone? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television for simple entertainment? \_\_\_\_\_
4. How often during the past two weeks did you use television to help you forget about your problems and worries of the day? \_\_\_\_\_
5. How often during the past two weeks did you plan your daily activities (e.g. study times, meals, social activities with friends) around television programming? \_\_\_\_\_
6. When you have had conversations with others, in the past two weeks how often did you use examples from television programs you have watched as an aid to describing experiences you were discussing? \_\_\_\_\_
7. How often during the past two weeks did you find television useful in providing a common ground for starting and maintaining conversations with others? \_\_\_\_\_
8. How often during the past two weeks did you find that the topics of your conversations with others stemmed from television shows? \_\_\_\_\_
9. How often during the past two weeks did television programming give you examples about how one might resolve arguments and conflicts between people? \_\_\_\_\_
10. How often during the past two weeks did you find that things that people did on television gave you ideas about how you might act in your own life? \_\_\_\_\_
11. How often during the past two weeks did you notice people or characters on television that you would like to be like or model yourself after? \_\_\_\_\_
12. How often during the past two weeks did you find television programs that gave realistic information about the values, beliefs, and standards of behavior in today's society? \_\_\_\_\_
13. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television to help you relax when you were tense? \_\_\_\_\_

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Frequently	Quite Often	Moderate Amount	Sometimes	Infrequently	Rarely	Never

14. How often during the past two weeks did you find that television was useful in helping you make better decisions concerning things you buy? \_\_\_\_\_
15. How often during the past two weeks did you use television as a source of information about local, national, and international events? \_\_\_\_\_
16. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television programs that were "educational"? \_\_\_\_\_
17. During the past two weeks, how often do you recall television programs you watched that gave you information that might have shaped your existing opinions and attitudes? \_\_\_\_\_
18. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television with others as a way of initiating general social contact or conversation? \_\_\_\_\_
19. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television with others because everyone else was watching? \_\_\_\_\_
20. How often during the past two weeks did you watch television as a way to avoid contact and conversations with others? \_\_\_\_\_
21. How often during the past two weeks were you critical when watching television by looking for inconsistencies in the plot, infeasible activities, noting advertising ploys, etc? \_\_\_\_\_
22. How often during the past two weeks did you get together with friends to watch a favorite program? \_\_\_\_\_
23. How often during the past two weeks did you notice that characters or people on television (that you might identify with) acted in the same way you would have had you been in their same situation? \_\_\_\_\_
24. How often during the past two weeks did you persuade others who were watching (or were going to watch) television with you to watch what you wished to watch? \_\_\_\_\_
25. How often during the past two weeks did you use an example from television or information aired on television to support a point you were trying to make or a fact you were attempting to verify? \_\_\_\_\_

## CONSENT FORM

The purpose of this research is to investigate various aspects of television viewing habits and preferences for television programming. The pages that follow will measure various aspects of your viewing preferences, how you use television, and ask you some general questions about your living conditions and how you view life generally. By completing these sheets you will have completed your participation in this study and will receive extra credit for your psychology course grade. Any information you provide will be kept strictly confidential, anonymous, and will not be seen by anyone outside of our research staff. We are requesting your name on this consent form in order that we might appropriately assign you your earned extra credit. This consent form will not be tied to your responses. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free at any time to discontinue your participation without penalty. If you have any questions at any point, please feel free to ask us. Please be as accurate as possible when indicating your answers. We appreciate your help on this study.

Lawrence D. Greene  
Research Director  
951-0288

Nickolaus R. Feimer  
Research Advisor  
961-7030

Richard A. Winett  
Human Subjects Coordinator  
961-6275

I have read the above statement and am aware of the conditions of my participation in this study. I understand that all information I provide will be kept strictly confidential and that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time without penalty.

Please Print Your Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Please list the course (and instructor)  
where extra credit will be applied \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix C**

**Classification of Television Programs Viewed**

Appendix C is a listing of all of the specific television programs that were recorded as viewed by the subjects in this study. The shows are grouped according to how they were categorized within the context of the show type taxonomy used in this research.

INTERACTION DRAMAS

All My Children  
 Another World  
 As the World Turns  
 Capitol  
 Dallas  
 Days of Our Lives  
 Dynasty

Edge of Night  
 Falcon Crest  
 Fame  
 Father Murphy  
 General Hospital  
 Guiding Light  
 Hill Street Blues

Little House on the Prairie  
 One Life to Live  
 Ryan's Hope  
 St. Elsewhere  
 Search for Tomorrow  
 The Waltons  
 The Young & The Restless

ADVENTURE DRAMAS

Cagney & Lacey  
 Charlie's Angels  
 Devlin Connection  
 Dukes of Hazzard  
 The Fall Guy  
 Fantasy Island  
 Gavilan  
 Greatest American Hero

Hart to Hart  
 Knight Rider  
 Kung Fu  
 Magnum P.I.  
 Powers of Matthew  
 Star  
 The Quest

Quincy  
 Remington Steele  
 Seven Brides for  
 Seven Brothers  
 Star Trek  
 Starsky & Hutch  
 T. J. Hooker  
 Tucker's Witch  
 Voyagers

COMEDIES

Alice  
 All in the Family  
 Andy Griffith Show  
 Archie Bunker's Place  
 Barney Miller  
 Benny Hill  
 Benson  
 Bob Newhart Show  
 Carol Burnett Show  
 Cheers  
 Different Strokes  
 Facts of Life  
 Television's Greatest  
 Commercials---Special  
 Television's Censored  
 Bloopers---Special

Filthy Rich  
 Gilligan's Island  
 Good Times  
 Happy Days  
 Hogan's Heros  
 The Jeffersons  
 I Love Lucy  
 Laugh Trax  
 Laverne & Shirley  
 Leave It To Beaver  
 Love American Style  
 Love Boat  
 M\*A\*S\*H

Mork & Mindy  
 Nine to Five  
 The Odd Couple  
 One Day at a Time  
 Private Benjamin  
 Private Secretary  
 Saturday Night Live  
 SCTV  
 Silver Spoons  
 Soap  
 Square Pegs  
 Taxi  
 Three's Company

CARTOONS

Bugs Bunny/Roadrunner  
Casper  
Flash Gordon  
Flintstones  
Gary Coleman Show

The Jetsons  
Incredible Hulk  
Mighty Mouse  
Popeye & Friends  
Scooby-Doo

Smurfs  
Spaghetti & Meatballs  
Spiderman  
Tom & Jerry  
Woody Woodpecker

SPORTS

Boxing  
College Basketball  
NBA Basketball  
Canadian Football  
College Football

ESPN-Great Games of  
Football  
CBS Sports  
Spectacular-NFL '82  
ESPN-Future Spirit  
Grand Prix Racing  
NCAA Today

HBO Special-  
Muhammad Ali  
Tennis  
Wrestling

INFORMATIONAL PROGRAMS

Evening News - Local  
& World  
Morning  
Presidential Press  
Conference  
Science News

60 Minutes  
Special "Bushmen of  
the Kalahari"  
Special Report -  
Space Shuttle  
Today

World World of Animals  
In Search Of

VARIETY TALK SHOWS

Entertainment Tonight  
Hour Magazine  
Late Night with  
David Lettermen

PM Magazine  
Real People  
Good Morning America

That's Incredible  
Tonight Show with  
Johnny Carson

INFORMATIONAL TALK SHOWS

Donahue

MUSICAL SHOWS

America's Top 10  
Hee Haw

Pop Goes Nashville  
Solid Gold

Soul Train  
Video Jukebox (HBO)

GAME SHOWS

Child's Play	The Price Is Right	Wheel of Fortune
Family Feud	\$25,000 Pyramid	

MOVIES

Abbott & Costello Meet Frankenstein	Ice Castles
Any Which Way You Can	The Incredible Shrinking Woman
The Blue & the Gray	The Land that Time Forgot
The Blue Lagoon	Living It Up
Chitty Chitty Bang Bang	Loophole
Columbo	MacMillan & Wife
The Dallas Cowboy Cheerleaders	M*A*S*H
Death Car on the Freeway	Mecha Godzilla
A Delicate Matter	No Deposit, No Return
I Desire	Paternity
Dressed To Kill	The Pink Panther Strikes Again
Endless Love	Prince of the City
Every Which Way But Loose	Private Benjamin
The First Time	The Scarlett Peppernel
Fooling Around	A Shot in the Dark
Forever After	So Fine
Friday the 13th	Son of Pale Face
Ghost Story	Stranger in the House
Happily Ever After	Superman
The Howling	The Three Musketeers
	Two of Hearts

OTHER

"Blockheads" - 4th Annual Ventriloquism Show	Doug Henning-Magic on Broadway--Special
Fantasy	People's Court
Panorama	Susie

**The two page vita has been  
removed from the scanned  
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been  
removed from the scanned  
document. Page 2 of 2**