

PHOTOCHRONOGRAPHIC MEASUREMENT OF AUDIENCES
OF TELEVISION NEWS SHOWS

By

JOHN WARREN PARRISH,

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1961

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1964

FEB 23 1966

PHOTOCHRONOGRAPHIC MEASUREMENT OF AUDIENCES
OF TELEVISION NEWS SHOWS

Thesis Approved:

Charles L. Allen

Thesis Adviser
Henry E. Henth

J. M. Boyce

Dean of the Graduate School

573984

PREFACE

Television news has become an important part of life in the United States. More and more people are depending upon television to bring them instantaneous visual accounts of the news, and the evening or night-time newscast has become a daily fixture in many homes. This thesis seeks to explore the nature of audiences of television news programs. Who watches TV news? What do they watch? When do they watch? How do they watch?

This thesis also explores the use of a new methodology for television audience measurement, photochronographic technique. Unlike the measurement techniques now used on a national scale, this method provides extremely accurate information.

The research is based on the viewing habits of fifty-five families in three different cities. These families tuned more than 3,000 hours of television programming during two-week studies.

Acknowledgements are due to the Oklahoma State University Research Foundation and to the national magazine organizations which financed the four audience studies upon which this thesis is based; to Dr. Charles L. Allen, who directed these studies and who also is the inventor of the photochronographic technique employed; to my fellow-students who helped conduct the research in two of the studies; to Dr. Harry Heath, whose advice and guidance greatly aided my work; and to Miss Dorothy Rickstrew, who provided invaluable technical assistance.

I would like to make a special acknowledgement to the memory of the late Professor Maurice Haag. His encouragement and interest greatly

influenced my decision to enter the journalistic profession, and his advice was an important factor in my decision to enter graduate study. He read a portion of this thesis and prepared advisory remarks for my assistance during the weeks just before his death.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PREVIOUS WORK IN THE AREA	8
III. METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE OF STUDY	25
Photochronographic Methodology	28
Terminology	32
Time Periods	34
Data Sheets	35
Technique Advantages	35
Technique Disadvantages	36
IV. STUDY CHARACTERISTICS	38
Family Characteristics, Stillwater Study, 1961	39
Family Characteristics, Stillwater Study, 1962	41
Family Characteristics, Wichita Study, 1963	42
Family Characteristics, Tulsa Study, 1963	43
Seasonal Factors	43
News Occurrences	44
News Diet	45
Commercials	50
V. HOW REGULAR NEWS SHOWS WERE VIEWED	51
Minutes of News	52
Audience Size	53
Audience Attention	54
No Audience Time	56
Viewer Results	58
Family Member Viewing	59
Viewer Minutes	62
Attentive Viewer Minutes	64
Men's Attentive Viewing	65
Women's Attentive Viewing	65
Children's Attentive Viewing	67
Inattentive Viewing	68
Audience By Day Parts	69
Inattentive Minutes	73
Station Selection	74
News Selection	78

Chapter	Page
Network Evening Shows	81
5-Minute Network Shows	83
VI. HOW SPECIAL NEWS SHOWS ARE VIEWED	85
Family Averages	85
Average Audience	88
Audience Attention	89
Viewer Results	89
Audience Composition	91
Program Selection by Day	95
VII. NEWS SHOWS AND NEWS SPECIALS, COMBINED	97
Family Member Viewing	100
Commercial Minutes	101
Co-ordinate Activities	103
VIII. NEWS SHOW VIEWING HABITS AND OVERALL VIEWING BEHAVIOR . . .	106
IX. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	109
Conclusions	112
Comparisons	116
BIBLIOGRAPHY	119
APPENDIX A	120
APPENDIX B	157
APPENDIX C	173

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Per Cent of Adults at Home Watching TV - All Channels on an Average Evening, Tuesday - Saturday	12
II. Number of News Shows Tuned Per Week, Per Viewer by Educational Level of Viewer	17
III. Homes Using Television Yearly Average: May, 1961, Through April, 1962	21
IV. Sets-In-Use Time and Number of Individual DynaScope Pictures	38
V. Family Characteristics and Averages	39
VI. Family Characteristics in Each of the Four Studies . . .	40
VII. Listing of Regular News Shows as Scheduled During Week Per Station Stillwater, 1961	46
VIII. Listing of Regular News Shows as Scheduled During Week Per Station Stillwater, 1962	47
IX. Listing of Regular News Shows as Scheduled During Week Per Station Wichita, 1963	48
X. Listing of Regular News Shows as Scheduled During Week Per Station Tulsa, 1963	49
XI. Number of News Shows by Day Parts	51
XII. Total Minutes of News by Day Parts	52
XIII. Average Total Audience Per Minute for News by Day Part .	53
XIV. Average Attentive Audience Per minute for News by Day Parts	54
XV. Average Inattentive Audience Per Minute for News by Day Part	55
XVI. Average Attentive, Inattentive, and Total Audience Per Minute for News by Day Part	55

Table	Page
XVII. Per Cent of Total Viewers, Attentive and Inattentive, for News	56
XVIII. Total No Audience Minutes for News by Day Parts	57
XIX. Percentage of No Audience Minutes During News	57
XX. Per Cent of Minutes of News, No Audience Present by Day Part	58
XXI. Per Cent of Minutes of News, Attentive and Inattentive, When Viewers Were Present, and No Audience Time	59
XXII. Average Total Audience Per Minute for News by Family Members	60
XXIII. Average Attentive Audience Per Minute for News by Family Members	61
XXIV. Average Inattentive Audience Per Minute for News by Family Members	61
XXV. Average Attentive, Inattentive and Total Audience for News Per Minute, by Family Members	61
XXVI. Per Cent of Total Viewers, by Family Members	62
XXVII. Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Part	63
XXVIII. Attentive Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Part	64
XXIX. Men's Attentive Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Part	65
XXX. Women's Attentive Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Part	66
XXXI. Children's Attentive Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Part	67
XXXII. Inattentive Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Parts	68
XXXIII. Morning Audience (Viewer Minutes) for News, By Family Members	69
XXXIV. Noon Audience (Viewer Minutes) for News, by Family Members	69
XXXV. Afternoon Audience (Viewer Minutes) for News, by Family Members	70
XXXVI. Evening Audience (Viewer Minutes) for News, by Family Members	70

Table	Page
XXXVII. Night Audience (Viewer Minutes) for News, by Family Members	71
XXXVIII. Attentive Minutes During News, by Day Parts	72
XXXIX. Inattentive Minutes During News, by Day Parts	73
XL. Number and Per Cent of News Shows Per Station Stillwater, 1961	74
XLI. Number and Per Cent of News Shows Per Station Stillwater, 1962	74
XLII. Number and Per Cent of Minutes of News Shows Per Station Stillwater, 1961	75
XLIII. Number and Per Cent of Minutes of News Per Station, Stillwater, 1962	76
XLIV. Number and Per Cent of Minutes of News Per Station, Wichita, 1963	77
XLV. Number and Per Cent of Minutes of News Per Station	77
XLVI. Number and Per Cent of News Shows Per Station, Tulsa, 1963	77
XLVII. Number and Per Cent of Minutes of News Per Station, Tulsa, 1963	78
XLVIII. Number of Local and Network News Shows	79
XLIX. Minutes of Local and Network News	79
L. Number of News Shows by Network	80
LI. Minutes of News by Network	81
LII. Number of 15-Minute Evening News Shows by Network	82
LIII. Minutes of 15-Minute Evening News Shows by Network	83
LIV. Number of 5-Minute News Shows by Network	84
LV. Minutes of 5-Minute News Shows by Network	84
LVI. Special News Programs - Combined Studies	86
LVII. Average Audience for Special News	88
LVIII. Audience Attention to Special News	89

Table	Page
LIX. Per Cent of Time Attentive and Inattentive Viewers Were Present and No Audience Time During Special News Shows	90
LX. Per Cent of Total Viewers Who Were Attentive or Inattentive During Special News	90
LXI. Audience Composition for Special News, by Per Cent of Family Members	91
LXII. Average Audience for Special News, by Family Members . .	92
LXIII. Average Audience for Special News Per Study, by Family Members	92
LXIV. Average Attentive Audience for Special News Per Study by Family Members	93
LXV. Average Inattentive Audience for Special News Per Study by Family Members	94
LXVI. Number of Special News Shows, by Days Programs Appeared	95
LXVII. Minutes of Special News, by Days Programs Appeared . . .	96
LXVIII. Total News Shows, Regular and Special	97
LXIX. Total Minutes of Regular and Special News	97
LXX. Total Viewer Minutes, Regular and Special News	97
LXXI. Average Total Audience Per Minute for All News	98
LXXII. Average Attentive Audience Per Minute for All News . . .	98
LXXIII. Average Inattentive Audience Per Minute for All News . .	98
LXXIV. Attentive Minutes for Regular and Special News	98
LXXV. Per Cent of Time News Was Tuned When Attentive Viewer Was Present	99
LXXVI. Inattentive Minutes for Regular and Special News	99
LXXVII. Per Cent of Time News Was Tuned When Inattentive Viewer Was Present	99
LXXVIII. No Audience Minutes for Regular and Special News	99
LXXIX. Per Cent of Time News Was Tuned When No Audience Was Present	99

Table	Page
LXXX. Average Male Audience for Regular and Special News Per Minute	100
LXXXI. Average Female Audience Per Minute for Regular and Special News	100
LXXXII. Average Children's Audience Per Minute for Regular and Special News	100
LXXXIII. Per Cent of Total Audience, Male Viewers, For Regular and Special News	100
LXXXIV. Per Cent of Total Audience, Female Viewers, for Regular and Special News	101
LXXXV. Per Cent of Total Audience, Children Viewers, for Regular and Special News	101
LXXXVI. Commercial Minutes During Regular and Special News . . .	102
LXXXVII. Average Commercial Audience Per Minute During Regular and Special News	102
LXXXVIII. Per Cent of Commercial Minutes, No Audience Present, All News	102
LXXXIX. Commercial Minutes During Regular News Shows	103
XC. Commercial Minutes During Special News Shows	103
XCI. Activity Viewer Minutes During All News	104
XCII. Per Cent of Viewer Minutes During All News in Which Activity Was Performed	104
XCIII. Activity Viewer Minutes By Activity During All News . .	105
XCIV. Per Cent of Total Sets-In-Use Time News Was Tuned (Minutes)	106
XCV. Per Cent of Total Sets-In-Use Time News Was Tuned, By Study	106
XCVI. Average Total, Attentive, and Inattentive Audiences Per Minute	107
XCVII. Per Cent of Time No Audience Was Present	108
XCVIII. Summary of Findings of News Show Viewing	111

Table	Page
XCIX. Summary for All Families in All Studies for Regular News Viewing	120
C. Summary of Regular News Viewing 1961 Stillwater Study .	122
CI. Summary of Regular News Viewing in 1962 Stillwater Study	126
CII. Summary of Regular News Viewing in Wichita Study	131
CIII. Summary of Regular News Viewing in Tulsa Study	132
CIV. Summary for 1961 Stillwater Study by Day Part	134
CV. Summary for 1962 Stillwater Study by Day Part	135
CVI. Summary for Wichita Study by Day Part	136
CVII. Summary for Tulsa Study by Day Part	137
CVIII. Summary of 1961 Stillwater Study by TV Station	138
CIX. Summary of 1962 Stillwater Study by TV Station	139
CX. Summary of Wichita Study by Station	140
CXI. Summary of Tulsa Study by Station	141
CXII. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Local and Network News (Stillwater, 1961)	142
CXIII. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Local and Network News (Stillwater, 1962)	143
CXIV. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Local and Network News (Wichita)	144
CXV. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Local and Network News (Tulsa)	145
CXVI. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Network News in 1961 Stillwater Study	146
CXVII. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Network News in 1962 Stillwater Study	147
CXVIII. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Network News in Wichita Study	148
CXIX. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Network News in Tulsa Study	148

Table	Page
CXX. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Evening Network News (15-Minute Programs) in 1961 Stillwater Study . . .	149
CXXI. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Evening Network News (15-Minute Programs) in 1962 Stillwater Study	150
CXXII. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Evening Network News (15-Minute Programs) in Wichita Study	151
CXXIII. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Evening Network News (15-Minute Programs) in Tulsa Study	152
CXXIV. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Five-Minute Network News Programs in the 1961 Stillwater Study	153
CXXV. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Five-Minute Network News Programs in the 1962 Stillwater Study	154
CXXVI. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Five-Minute Network News Programs in Wichita Study	155
CXXVII. Number of Shows and Minutes Tuned, Five-Minute Network News Programs in Tulsa Study	156
CXXVIII. Summary of Special News Viewing for All Families in All Studies	157
CXXIX. Summary of Special News Viewing in 1961 Stillwater Study	159
CXXX. Summary of Special News Viewing in 1962 Stillwater Study	162
CXXXI. Summary of Special News Viewing in Wichita Study	165
CXXXII. Summary of Special News Viewing in Tulsa Study	167
CXXXIII. Summary of Special News by Program in 1961 Stillwater Study	169
CXXXIV. Summary of Special News by Program in 1962 Stillwater Study	170
CXXXV. Summary of Special News by Program in Wichita Study . . .	171
CXXXVI. Summary of Special News by Program in Tulsa Study . . .	172
CXXXVII. Summary of Total Sets-In-Use Compared to Minutes-Tuned-To-News in 1961 Stillwater Study	173
CXXXVIII. Summary of Total Sets-In-Use Compared to Minutes-Tuned-To-News in 1962 Stillwater Study	174

Table	Page
CXXXIX. Summary of Total Sets-In-Use Compared To Minutes-Tuned-To-News in Wichita Study	175
CXL. Summary of Total Sets-In-Use Compared to Minutes-Tuned-To-News in Tulsa Study	176

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Television audience research is big business. The television industry, itself, is of immense proportions. In 1961 alone, television advertisers spent \$1.6 billion --- 13.6 per cent of all advertising expenditures in the United States.¹ In the same year, the TV industry reported income (before taxes) of \$237 million.²

Today, more than 91 per cent of the families in this country have television sets, and many of these families have more than one set.³ In order to find out what these viewers watch and how much they watch, considerable money is spent for television audience measurement.

In 1962, the country's three big networks, American Broadcasting Company, Columbia Broadcasting System, and National Broadcasting Company, spent \$1,475,043 on rating information.⁴ Of this total, \$1,258,437 went to one company.⁵

In 1963, the television rating services underwent a thorough investigation conducted by a subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee. While testifying before this subcommittee, James T. Aubrey, Jr., president

¹"Total U.S. Advertising at \$12.5 Billion Peak; \$20 Billion Seen as Economy Grows," Advertising Age, Jan. 15, 1963, p. 8.

²Ibid., p. 82.

³Broadcasting, Dec. 24, 1962, p. 85.

⁴Advertising Age, March 25, 1963, p. 12.

⁵Ibid.

of the CBS television network, explained the industry's use of ratings and audience measurement:⁶

Our use of ratings is based on our need for a measure of audience behavior to enable us to meet our obligation to furnish programs that interest and entertain the public. Since our service is free, we lack newsstand figures or box-office information to aid us.

The subcommittee charged that too much weight is placed on ratings by networks and advertisers.⁷ But Aubrey's testimony defended the network's use of ratings:⁸

...We recognize that ratings are useful only as estimates... In using the available information, we are mindful that it falls short of the ideal... Despite the limitations of ratings, we believe they serve a useful purpose. No one to our knowledge has come forward with a more practical method of estimating audience size.

The subcommittee charged that rating services were guilty of "sample-size deception" and presentation of fraudulent results.⁹ In one case, a rating service was charged with failure to use any sample at all.¹⁰

As a result, the National Association of Broadcasters presented a plan to the subcommittee which called for a broadcaster-sponsored organization "to certify and audit radio-TV rating services."¹¹ In nature, it would be similar to newspapers' Audit Bureau of Circulations.

⁶"How'll Radio-TV Ratings Fare With Harris?," Printers' Ink, March 22, 1963, p. 7.

⁷Ibid., p. 8.

⁸Ibid., p. 7.

⁹"Nielsen Accused of Sample-Size Deception," Advertising Age, March 3, 1963, p. 1.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹"Nielsen Accused of Sample-Size Deception," p. 1.

The investigations have revealed many flaws and short-comings in the methods of audience measurement currently used, and changes have been demanded. Much work remains to be done in developing adequate techniques for audience measurement. No one as yet has found a method which will satisfy the television industry, the advertisers, and the government.

At best, rating services provide an "estimate" of audience size and nature.¹² David J. Mahoney, executive vice president of Colgate-Palmolive Company, television's largest dollar-volume advertiser, told the House subcommittee that "advertisers are being sold 'an implied audience' based on a rating."¹³

This thesis examines the use of an audience measurement technique which can provide exact and precise measures of audience size. The technique uses a photochronographic methodology and is relatively new. It could conceivably play an important role in future audience research methods.

The purpose of this thesis is to demonstrate the photochronographic methodology in the measurement of television news show audiences. To examine news show viewers, it is necessary to find more information about them than the usual "how many watch" and "what do they watch." It is essential also to find out "who watches" and "how they watch." Through the use of photochronographic technique, these areas can be accurately recorded on film.

There are two primary aspects of TV programming --- entertainment and news. Although the main function of TV is entertainment, the medium

¹²"How'll Radio-TV Ratings Fare With Harris?", p. 7.

¹³Advertising Age, March 25, 1963, p. 12.

does play an important role in the dissemination of information. The current trend in programming appears to be toward more and more news and informational shows. Richard S. Salant, president of CBS News, says, "In three to five years, 20 to 25 per cent of prime evening time will be devoted to information."¹⁴

During the 1961-62 television season, the three networks, budgeted \$43 million for news shows alone.¹⁵ The news division of NBC, as a unit, is the largest manufacturer (producer) of television programming in the world.¹⁶

Thomas B. Morgan has said that television now "is entering what might be called a journalism phase."¹⁷ And Arthur M. Barnes, journalism professor at the State University of Iowa, has said:¹⁸

The essential function of broadcast news is the communication of information to listeners and viewers. The central problem of broadcast news, then, is its effectiveness as a mode of information communication.

This research does not seek to judge the effectiveness of television news as a medium of information. Nor is it designed to "rate" programs, stations or news personalities. It attempts to explore the behavior of individuals in 55 families in four separate studies in relation to their news show viewing habits.

Even with the current trend toward more news, television appears

¹⁴Morgan, Thomas B., "Crisis, Conflict and Change in TV News," Look, Nov. 7, 1961, p. 51.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶"Sponsor-Scope," Sponsor, Oct. 15, 1962, p. 19.

¹⁷Morgan, p. 51.

¹⁸Barnes, Arthur M., "Research in Radio and Television News, 1947-57," Journalism Quarterly, Summer, 1957, p. 323.

to be in no immediate danger of over-programming this type of material --- at least from a quantity standpoint. A realistic view of TV news points out the fact that "news is an adjunct to TV's entertainment side."¹⁹

In the Vastness of Televisionland, a visitor finds that TV newsmen actually hold only a slender enclave, roughly comparable to Goa wedged into the subcontinent of India. Their industry spent approximately one billion dollars last year and earned before taxes over \$200 million --- but it earmarked less than five per cent of its gross revenues for gathering and presenting news and information. Altogether, journalists had a hand in less than 15 per cent of the programs televised by the three networks --- ABC, CBS, and NBC --- and in less than 10 per cent of the network shows broadcast in the prime evening hours (between 7:30 and 11, when most of American's 45,500,000 set owners and their families do most of their watching.)²⁰

Nearly all signs point to a bright future for news and informational programming.²¹ There appears to be a growing audience demand for this type material. The Federal Communications Commission has taken a stiffer attitude toward broadcasters in relation to "public interest" broadcasting.²² Networks both want and need TV journalism at this moment in history (that is, corporate as well as world history.)²³

For the TV industry, news now serves as a means to an end and performs a two-fold purpose. It serves the public interest and in turn builds the industry's image.²⁴

¹⁹Morgan, pp. 48-51.

²⁰Ibid., p. 48.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid., p. 51.

As an end in itself, TV news has had the purpose of instructing, uplifting, and alerting viewers. It may not do enough, but that is the purpose.²⁵

The future of news programming depends upon the profit potential. Networks have two possibilities: produce more informational programs at a loss, or produce entertainment programs at a profit.²⁶

Since they usually choose to make a profit, much informational programming that could be produced just isn't.²⁷

Some advertisers are investing their dollars in news programming. Some of these advertisers feel that "prestige" advertising is good. For example, an executive of Kenyon and Eckhart Advertising Agency explains the sponsorship of documentaries:²⁸

The sophisticated advertiser has come to realize more and more the value attached to such prestige programming and has come to accept programs on critical subjects that they might have avoided a few years ago. Advertisers in general have come a long way in overcoming their timidity regarding sponsorship of documentaries, but this attitude is by no means unanimous.

As for regular news shows, Texaco for several years spent some \$8 million annually on the Huntley-Brinkley Report.²⁹ In the fall of 1963, the Huntly-Brinkley show and CBS's competing Walter Cronkite show expanded to 30-minute programs from the previous 15-minute format.

The real power of news programming and coverage was most

²⁵Morgan, p. 51.

²⁶Ibid., p. 62.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Broadcasting, Dec. 24, 1963, p. 22.

²⁹Morgan, p. 51.

dramatically exemplified during the three days of news broadcasting following the assassination of President John Kennedy in November, 1963.

A closer examination of audiences of news shows is important to sponsors. From audience response, the advertiser can tell whether or not the program is popular. In selecting the right program to convey the advertising message, the advertiser needs to know the composition of the audience for each particular program. This is where audience research plays an important role.

CHAPTER II

PREVIOUS WORK IN THE AREA

One of the prominent subjects of television audience research has been the housewife and her daytime viewing habits. Don Crawmer Smith, in a dissertation entitled "Levels of Attention Given to Television by Housewives of Tuscaloosa, Alabama, in 1955," explores in some depth the homemaker's viewing traits.¹ Smith's work, done by personal interview and questionnaire technique, resulted in this conclusion:²

Attention given to television is not subject to precise measurement because of the intangible nature of attention and because of the difficulty involved in measuring precisely any intangible.

The present thesis will attempt to show that attention to TV news shows can be precisely measured. Degrees of attention can be measured by photochronographic technique, and the apparent "eyes-on-the-set" attention can be accurately recorded.

Smith used three indices of measurement in his study:³

1. The activities performed by the housewife while the set was turned on.

¹Smith, Don Crawmer, "Levels of Attention Given to Television by Housewives of Tuscaloosa, Alabama, in 1955," (unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1955), p. 1.

²Ibid., p. 247.

³Ibid., p. 248.

2. The ability of the housewife to identify sponsors of particular daytime programs.

3. Subjective estimates of attention levels gained by interviewing the housewife.

Smith found the most accurate of the measures he employed was the "subjective estimate."⁴ This technique yielded results which were nearest the average attention levels.⁵

Smith also concluded that levels of attention given to television shows in the evening "are likely to be moderately higher than are levels of attention given to TV programs in the daytime."⁶ And he found that age, schooling, race, size of family, and standard of living are related to the levels of attention of the housewife.⁷

Smith discussed another interesting aspect of television audience research --- that aspect called "listenership."⁸ Listenership occurs when the TV set is turned on and there is no audience, but there is someone who is listening to the program.⁹

Smith discussed a study which had been conducted in Atlanta, Georgia, where 275 television homes were sampled through the use of personal interviews.¹⁰ Of these homes, 55 per cent said that they sometimes

⁴Smith, p. 248.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 249.

⁷Ibid., p. 256.

⁸Ibid., p. 4.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

listened to, but did not watch, television programs.¹¹ Of this group, 17 per cent reported news and weather as the type of program they listened to, but did not watch.¹² Smith further explained that in 19 per cent of the cases where housewives listened but did not watch, they were engaged in some other activity.¹³ Of those who did something other than watch while the set was on, 54 per cent performed active household duties, 29 per cent inactive household duties, and 25 per cent read.¹⁴

Smith also explained that the lowest average level of attention for women is between 4 and 6 p.m.¹⁵ This is important to this study of news show audiences, for much of television's news programming is directed toward the 5:30 to 6:30 p.m. (C.S.T.) audiences.

Forest L. Whan's "Daytime Use of TV by Iowa Housewives," a portion of The Iowa Radio Audience Survey of 1957, shows that such programs as information and news drew almost no attention from housewives in the morning and afternoon hours.¹⁶ Whan used a sample of 1,425 television homes in which housewives kept diary records of personal daytime use of the television set for one day, from 5 a.m. to 6 p.m.¹⁷ The chances of getting typical viewing response in only one day seem rather limited, and the method used is subject to certain biases which will be discussed

¹¹Smith, p. 4.

¹²Ibid., p. 2.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 6.

¹⁶Whan, Forest L., "Daytime Use of TV by Iowa Housewives," The Iowa Radio Audience Survey of 1957 (Manhattan, Kansas State University, 1957), p. 7.

¹⁷Ibid.

in Chapter III.

Another primary area of interest has been children's viewing. Many books have been devoted to this subject and many studies have been conducted. The general conclusions of most researchers in regard to the child and news programs is typically stated in this manner:¹⁸

Audience measurement studies have repeatedly shown that adult listeners and viewers like broadcast news and that news shows rank relatively low as program types among children.

The broad scope of audience measurement has probably received most attention. Several extensive studies have been conducted, but these have not been broken down into specific areas such as news.

Profile of the Millions is a comprehensive study of family television viewing in New York City. It was conducted by W. R. Simmons and Associates Research, Inc., and sponsored by the New York News.¹⁹ It deals exclusively with adults (defined as persons over 15 years of age), who lived within a 50-mile radius of Manhattan.²⁰ It involves a listed probability sample of 10,147 adults living in separate households.²¹

Respondents were questioned about their TV viewing habits. First they were asked if the set was on, and if so, the program and channel tuned.²² Then they were interviewed about their activities during and

¹⁸Barnes, p. 326.

¹⁹Profiles of the Millions (3rd Edition: New York, 1962), p. ix.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid.

after each station break.²³ Emphasis of the study was on evening viewing (6 p.m. to 10 p.m. E.S.T.).²⁴ Interviewing was done evenings, Tuesday through Saturday.²⁵

Results of the study which affect the study of news audiences are the conclusions drawn for the evening hours 6 to 8 p.m., when evening news shows are scheduled. Between 6 and 10 p.m., 64 per cent of all TV home adults were at home.²⁶ Of these, 33.2 per cent watched TV.²⁷ The study showed:²⁸

TABLE I
PER CENT OF ADULTS AT HOME WATCHING TV - ALL CHANNELS
ON AN AVERAGE EVENING, TUESDAY - SATURDAY

<u>Time</u>	<u>Percent Adults at Home</u>	<u>Percent Watching TV</u>
6:00 - 7:00 p.m.	63.5	25.3
6:30 - 7:30 p.m.	66.5	29.8
7:00 - 8:00 p.m.	65.6	32.7
7:30 - 8:30 p.m.	65.5	35.6
8:00 - 9:00 p.m.	64.9	36.7
8:30 - 9:30 p.m.	62.6	35.9
9:00 - 10:00 p.m.	59.3	36.7

²³Profiles of the Millions (3rd Edition: New York, 1962), p. ix.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid., p. xi.

²⁶Ibid., p. 2.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Ibid., pp. 3-9.

The number of adults at home decreased slightly over the evening, but the percent watching increased over the evening. During news time, 6:30-7:30 and 7:00-8:00, 29.8 per cent and 32.7 per cent of the adults at home were watching television. This does not mean that they were watching news, but the principal programming at that time is news in nature.

Probably the most important and most recent of these TV studies is one conducted by Dr. Gary A. Steiner, and published as The People Look at Television: A Study of Audience Attitudes. The book is a report of a study at the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, sponsored by the Columbia Broadcasting System.²⁹ The purpose of the study was to explore viewers' attitudes towards television.³⁰

The emphasis in this study is on the attitudes and feelings associated with the television set and what is on it. We accept the general findings of the rating services with respect to the incidence of viewing and its temporal and geographic distribution. By and large, this study speaks not to such specifics, of who, when, and how much, but to underlying questions of why.

The study attempts to "measure and describe the public's reactions to television."³¹ It is based on the belief that "an empirical reading on such feelings and attitudes is of intrinsic interest to the student of mass communications."³²

²⁹Steiner, Gary A., The People Look at Television: A Study of Audience Attitudes (New York, 1963), p. iii.

³⁰Ibid., p. 5.

³¹Ibid., p. 6.

³²Ibid.

Thus, the study approaches audience behavior from a sociological point of view --- examining attitude and reaction. It does not delineate news audiences, as such, but it does supply some interesting information about news programming offered and the news shows which were viewed, and about the nature of news audiences.

Information for the study came from two basic sources: A national survey with a base of 2,427 principal informants who answered interview questionnaires;³³ and a follow-up study of 300 persons in New York who were part of the American Research Bureau (ARB) rating sample.³⁴ The field work for the national survey was conducted by Elmo Roper and Associates in April, 1960, with results combined to provide the total sample.³⁵ Interviewing was concentrated on weekday evenings and on week-ends.³⁶

On the assumption that there would probably be a strong relationship between attitudes toward television and the amount of time spent at home, we restricted all interviews with men, and half of those with women, to hours when a large percentage of the population is normally at home.

Interviews were conducted in the homes using a questionnaire form which employed "open-ended" and "pre-coded" questions, rating scales, word lists and other sampling instruments.³⁷ These interviews usually lasted about two hours each.³⁸

³³Steiner, p. 6.

³⁴Ibid., p. 11.

³⁵Ibid., p. 7.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid., p. 8.

³⁸Ibid., p. 9.

ARB's ratings are based on a "rating panel," which consists of a group of individuals in TV homes who keep detailed records of their television viewing in a "diary."³⁹ These diaries are collected periodically and the information is tabulated.⁴⁰ ARB then determines which programs had the largest percentage of audience.⁴¹

The 300 diaries used in the Steiner study were part of an ARB metropolitan New York rating panel.⁴² Six months after the respondents were on this panel, they were interviewed with essentially the same questionnaire as was used in Steiner's national survey.⁴³ The objective was to compare verbal responses about television with actual viewing patterns.⁴⁴ It is in this diary-study that information exists which is of primary interest to this study of news audiences.

Steiner's study showed that news programs accounted for 20 per cent of all the programs offered on New York stations during the study.⁴⁵ Because these programs were short in nature, they accounted for only 5 per cent of total broadcast minutes.⁴⁶

More than one-third of all week-end daytime programs (before 6 p.m.

³⁹Steiner, p. 11.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 164.

E.S.T.) was informational-public affairs type programming.⁴⁷ Only 10 per cent of evening programming was of this nature.⁴⁸ Informational-public affairs programs is a rather broad term, including regular newscasts, special news shows, documentaries, public service material, and religious programs.⁴⁹

The study showed that of the programs watched, 29 per cent of these shows were news only and 5 per cent of other informational material.⁵⁰ Of the programs actually available, 20 per cent were news and 15 per cent in programs of other informational material.⁵¹ Thus, regular news shows were tuned much more often than were specials and informational shows.

The explanation for the heavy selection of news, assuming there is no bias in the diary recording, may be found in the habitual, daily viewing of one or more short newscasts, perhaps analogous to newspaper reading. Some people who 'don't watch television' on a given evening may still tune to one or more news and weather reports. Viewing for information may be a more deliberate, if possibly routine, use of the set, whereas the specific type of entertainment taken is a more passive 'decision', depending largely on what is there.⁵²

As to the nature of the viewers, the study found that with higher education (college), viewers devote less of their viewing to action-type programming, and more to news, public affairs, and heavy drama.⁵³

⁴⁷Steiner, p. 165

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 166.

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 167-168.

⁵³Ibid., p. 168.

The difference is not large, however, and is found only in the sense that these viewers watched a larger percentage of news in comparison to their total viewing.⁵⁴ Actually the least educated were the most exposed to news, as they tuned in more news shows.⁵⁵ The average number of news programs tuned per week, per viewer, ranged from 12.5 to 7.5:⁵⁶

TABLE II
NUMBER OF NEWS SHOWS TUNED PER WEEK, PER VIEWER
BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF VIEWER

<u>Education</u>	<u>Number of Programs</u>
0-8 Years of school	12.5
1-3 Years high school	10.4
4 Years of high school	8.1
1-2 Years college	7.5
3-4 Years college	9.0
College and beyond	9.5

Of the total number of programs which men watched, 31 per cent were news, and 6 per cent were informational.⁵⁷ Women watched 28 per cent news and 4 per cent of other informational broadcasts.⁵⁸ Parents who had children 15 years old and younger watched 25 per cent

⁵⁴Steiner, p. 170

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 171.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 173.

⁵⁸Ibid.

news and 3 per cent other informational programs, as compared to other parents who watched 33 per cent news and 6 per cent informational programs.⁵⁹

Persons under 35 years of age watched 26 per cent news and 3 per cent other informational programs.⁶⁰ Those 35 to 54 watched 28 per cent news and 5 per cent other informational shows.⁶¹ Those 55 and over watched 37 per cent news and 8 per cent other informational programs.⁶²

While the pattern is roughly progressive throughout the range, the biggest jump in the absolute and relative consumption of news occurs after fifty years of age. Perhaps increasing reading difficulties turn some of these people to TV as their principal source of news; or possibly older viewers, on a less active schedule, become more habituated to tuning to their favorite daily newscast. But whatever the reason, they average over twice as many news shows per week as those under thirty-five.⁶³

During the average week, between 6:30 and 7:30 p.m. each day, six of the seven New York channels broadcast at least one newscast.⁶⁴ Each viewer had five chances during his rating week to watch some news at this particular time; to watch some other program; or to not watch at all.⁶⁵ The average viewer saw at least some news in the time period, the average being 1.2 times per week.⁶⁶ But he only watched television

⁵⁹Steiner, p. 175.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 176.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 189.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶Ibid.

a total of 1.6 times per week during these hours, so news selection was quite high during this period.⁶⁷ If the viewer had any exposure during the week to television in the time period 6:30 to 7:30 p.m., odds were three out of four that some news would be seen.⁶⁸

Of the respondents, 23 per cent actually watched daily newscasts during the 6:30 to 7:30 hour.⁶⁹ Some 9 per cent watched something else, and 68 per cent saw no television at all during that time.⁷⁰ By education, 25 per cent of those with a high school education or less watched daily newscasts.⁷¹ Only 21 per cent of those with a college education watched daily newscasts.⁷²

The average week also offered 33 different occasions for the audience to select informational broadcasts.⁷³ The average viewer watched television during nine of these opportunities, but selected informational programs only 1.4 times.⁷⁴ Thus, the average viewer selected only 16 per cent of the informational programs offered.⁷⁵

In conclusion, it appears that viewers develop regular habits about news show viewing. They watch more regular news programming than other informational-type shows. These viewers are exposed to

⁶⁷Steiner, p. 189.

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹Ibid.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 176.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 189.

⁷²Ibid.

⁷³Ibid., p. 185.

⁷⁴Ibid.

⁷⁵Ibid.

a large number of news shows, especially in the early evening. But they will rarely choose an informational-type program over an entertainment program when they are offered at the same time of day. The Steiner study thus supplies some important information about viewer traits, but it must be remembered that the research was conducted from a sociological standpoint. The "why" was examined more closely than "who", "how", or "what".

The percentages used in the study are based only upon the number of programs tuned, not on the total minutes of viewing time. This photochronographic study will measure audiences by the number of news shows tuned and the total minutes news programs were tuned.

Rating services also do considerable work in audience research, but usually their information is concerned with program popularity. One field of exploration which is helpful in this study of news is A. C. Nielsen's "Homes Using Television" information:⁷⁶

⁷⁶Advertising Age, Jan. 15, 1963, p.1.

TABLE III
 HOMES USING TELEVISION
 YEARLY AVERAGE: MAY, 1961, THROUGH APRIL, 1962

<u>Time</u>	<u>Per Cent of TV Homes Tuning Programs</u>
7-8 a.m.	4.8
8-9 a.m.	11.0
9-10 a.m.	13.6
10-11 a.m.	15.9
11-12 noon	18.8
12-1 p.m.	23.7
1-2 p.m.	23.3
2-3 p.m.	20.7
3-4 p.m.	21.5
4-5 p.m.	24.5
5-6 p.m.	29.2
6-7 p.m.	38.4
7-8 p.m.	49.1
8-9 p.m.	57.0
9-10 p.m.	59.0
10-11 p.m.	50.2
11-12 midnight	28.2
12-1 a.m.	15.9

Nielsen's researchers show that the peak TV viewing time is from 9 to 10 p.m.⁷⁷ At that time 59 per cent of all television homes have

⁷⁷Advertising Age, Jan. 15, 1963, p. 1.

their sets turned on.⁷⁸ At that time, "someone is watching TV in 26,671,000 homes."⁷⁹

Morning news programs are usually in the 7-8 a.m. time period. That time period drew only 4.8 per cent of all TV homes.⁸⁰ Noon drew 23.7 per cent of the TV homes.⁸¹ The evening news time period had 38.4 per cent of the TV homes, and the night news period about 50 per cent of the homes.⁸²

By use of an almost totally different technique of audience research, Dr. Charles L. Allen, director of the School of Journalism of Oklahoma State University, has provided some precise measurements of audience size and descriptions of viewing habits. Dr. Allen's television research involved a total of 95 families in three different cities.⁸³ The families in his studies had their TV sets tuned more than 6,000 hours.⁸⁴ The studies are based on film records of actual television audience behavior. This type of research was accomplished by photochronographic technique, which will be explained in Chapter III.

The Allen TV studies showed that the average viewing family had

⁷⁸Advertising Age, Jan 15, 1963, p. 1.

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Ibid.

⁸¹Ibid.

⁸²Ibid.

⁸³Cornish, Rita P., "Four Allen TV Audience Studies: A Research Report" (unpub. report, Oklahoma State University, 1963), un-numbered.

⁸⁴Ibid.

its television set turned on 31.8 hours per week.⁸⁵ Thus, the average family tuned in 4.5 hours of television each day.⁸⁶ Of the weekly total, 58.5 per cent was night (6 p.m. - sign-off) programming.⁸⁷ The respondents tuned 9.7 hours per week in the afternoon (noon - 6 p.m.), and only 3.5 hours per week in the forenoon.⁸⁸ Afternoon tuning amounted to 30.5 per cent of the total, and forenoon tuning was 11 per cent of the total.⁸⁹

The Allen TV studies consisted of four surveys: Two in Stillwater, Oklahoma --- 15 families in 1961 and 20 families in 1962; and surveys of 30 families each in Wichita and Tulsa in 1963.⁹⁰ These surveys showed average family tuning ranging from 26.5 hours per week to 38.6 hours.⁹¹

The average audience was 1.42 viewers per minute.⁹² Of this average, .90 viewers were watching the program, while .52 viewers were in the room with the TV set but had their eyes directed away from the set.⁹³ The forenoon had an average audience of 1.14 viewers per minute, afternoon had 1.22 viewers per minute, and night had 1.58 viewers per

⁸⁵Cornish.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷Ibid.

⁸⁸Ibid.

⁸⁹Ibid.

⁹⁰Ibid.

⁹¹Ibid.

⁹²Ibid.

⁹³Ibid.

minute.⁹⁴

While the set was on in the average home, there was no audience 19 per cent of the time.⁹⁵ In the forenoon, there was no audience 30 per cent of the time the set was on.⁹⁶ Fourteen per cent of the time the set was on at night, there was no audience, and 24.6 per cent of the time it was on in the afternoon there was no audience.⁹⁷

It is upon the findings of the Allen TV study, that this thesis is based.

⁹⁴Cornish.

⁹⁵Ibid.

⁹⁶Ibid.

⁹⁷Ibid.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE OF STUDY

Television audience research is usually done by one of four methods, or by a combination of these techniques:¹ Personal Interview; Telephone Survey; Diary; or Mechanical Recording Device.

Interviews always employ the recall method.² The respondent is given a questionnaire to complete, or the interviewer asks questions and fills out the questionnaire with the respondent's answers.³ The respondent is required to remember details of programs he has seen previous to the interview, usually within the past 24 hours.⁴ If program listings are provided to prompt the respondent's memory, the technique is called "aided recall."⁵

The personal interview method can be used to obtain detailed information, and it is valuable in gaining opinions and other qualitative information about programming and commercials.⁶ But it also

¹Seehafer, Gene F., and Laemmar, Jack W., Successful Television and Radio Advertising (New York, 1959), pp. 268-272.

²Ibid., p. 271.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

has certain disadvantages:⁷

Where respondents must rely on unaided recall for their response, memory lapse may affect the accuracy of results.

The use of the roster method, however, may introduce a different bias --- in favor of listed stations and programs as opposed to nonlisted ones.

To some extent respondents may inadvertently telescope data, reporting not only for the time period requested but also for the same period for prior days.

Telephone surveys are conducted to gain "coincidental" data on viewing at the time calls are made.⁸ Random selection of homes is an "extremely rapid" and comparatively inexpensive means of gathering information.⁹ Some researchers feel that the telephone survey is restricted to short conversations, but it is possible for a skilled interviewer to get detailed information.¹⁰

Trendex, for example, obtains not only basic rating facts, but also information on sponsor identification, audience composition, and the person who actually selected the program.¹¹

(Trendex's rating methods were greatly discredited by the congressional investigation of rating services in 1963.)¹²

The telephone survey cannot sample non-telephone homes, and it is impractical to sample rural homes because of toll charges.¹³ Coincidental

⁷Seehafer and Laemmar, p. 271.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Advertising Age, March 25, 1963, p. 12.

¹³Seehafer and Laemmar, p. 270.

calls must be made during daytime hours or early evening for respondents resent calls at inconvenient hours.¹⁴ Coincidental interviews are also made on a "shifting, random-sample basis."¹⁵ And the respondent again must remember what he has seen.

The diary method involves placing a "viewing log" in a home and requesting that each man, woman, and child make a written record of viewing.¹⁶ The data are supposed to be recorded on a "round-the-clock" basis, but the method suffers from recall bias, because the subjects often forget to record the program watched at the time it was watched.¹⁷ Respondents are also apt to become "extremely conscious of their broadcast usage activity" and therefore do not select the programs they ordinarily would.¹⁸

The diary method is used by the American Research Bureau and Videodex in television audience research.¹⁹ Nielsen uses a diary (although somewhat different than the others) along with a mechanical recording device.²⁰

The primary mechanical recording techniques are Nielsen's Audimeter and Recordimeter and ARB's Arbitron.²¹ These mechanical devices are

¹⁴Seehafer and Laemmar, p. 270.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 271.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid., p. 269.

wired into the TV set to measure tuning --- not viewing.²²

Data recorded by the recorder provide the basis for complete information on ratings, sets in use, homes reached, and share of audience. Set usage can also be analyzed in relation to detailed characteristics of viewing-listening homes, such as income, location, and size of family.²³

The mechanical method coupled with the diary technique is probably the most widely-employed method of TV audience research currently used. But there are certain disadvantages to both types of methodology, and the systems are quite expensive.²⁴ It does not provide data about audience composition.²⁵ Tabulation of data is usually slow.²⁶ The results are based on tuning, not on viewing.²⁷

Photochronographic Methodology

The television audience research upon which this thesis is based was done by means of a precise photochronographic instrument which was installed in the individual homes in such a manner that a sequence of still pictures was taken of viewers at pre-selected intervals. This instrument is known as the DynaScope.²⁸

The DynaScope utilizes the carcass of a motion picture camera connected with one or more timing mechanisms and is mounted in a steel

²²Seehafer and Laemmar, p. 269.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸The DynaScope was invented by Dr. Charles L. Allen, Director of the School of Journalism, Oklahoma State University.

cabinet. It can use 8-mm, 16-mm, or 35-mm film. It records on film the actual activity in front of the television set. The pre-selected time interval for all the studies upon which this thesis is based was 15 seconds, thus producing four pictures per minute while the television set was in use.

Usually the DynaScope was placed on a small table next to the TV set, so that the lens was about level with the center of the set's picture, and in certain instances, the DynaScope was placed on top of the set. The set was then hooked synchronously with the DynaScope, so that both were turned on by the same switch. Sometimes in especially dark homes, a 100-watt light was also hooked in the same power line so it would come on whenever the set was turned on.

Wide angle lenses were employed to give a complete picture of the normal viewing situation. The 10-mm lens will give a 58-degree angle which usually covers the viewing area sufficiently.

The members of the families in the studies were instructed to leave at least one light on in the room at night, which was sufficient illumination for DynaScope pictures. A standing or hanging mirror was placed in front of the set within camera range, so that the image reflection could be picked up on film at the same time the audience was photographed.

In addition to this film record, the family kept a diary. Actually, a current TV Guide was supplied each week, and the respondents marked the programs they watched. The diary plus the mirror image reduced errors in program identification by researchers.

Also in the background was a clock-calendar system which made clear the exact day and time. Another electric clock was plugged into

the power supply line for the set and DynaScope so that it would also go on and off with the set. This clock was actually a film-use meter, telling the number of hours the set was in use. When the time on the clock indicated that the roll of film was about completed, someone in the family called a researcher who changed the roll. There was a time period of about one hour during which the film could be changed.

The first DynaScope study was conducted in Stillwater, Oklahoma, from October 15, to November 25, 1961. It involved 15 families who volunteered their homes for research without promise of monetary reward. These families were solicited by students in a graduate journalism seminar at Oklahoma State University.

The second study also was done in Stillwater, from September 13, to November 10, 1962. Students again conducted the research, soliciting 20 families who volunteered for the study without payment. Both these studies were partially financed by the Oklahoma State University Research Foundation. The two Stillwater studies and two later studies were completed in about six weeks. The DynaScopes were left in each home for two weeks.

The third and fourth studies differed slightly from the first two in that they were supported largely by magazine publishing associations. No Oklahoma State University funds were used in these studies. The families, 30 in Wichita, and 30 in Tulsa, were paid \$5 per week per family. The researchers who conducted the studies were all paid professionals. The study in Wichita was done from December 29, 1962, to February 9, 1963, while the Tulsa study was from February 9, to March 23, 1963.

In the first two studies, the student researchers contacted subject

families by knocking on doors and working through friends. In the Wichita and Tulsa studies, the cities were first divided by a grid into six parts. One-sixth of the total families needed in the sample was obtained in each of these areas. Within these locations, the field workers obtained homes by approaching the first home on a designated street, explaining the purpose and method of the research, and requesting the family's cooperation. If the family would not cooperate, the field worker went to the next house, and so on, until he obtained a cooperating family. When one family was obtained, the field worker did not approach the next house, but moved on to the next block. In the Tulsa study, no home was selected which was closer than five blocks to any other home in which the DynaScope was then installed.

The rate of acceptance by Stillwater families was 80 per cent. In the beginning of the Wichita study, the rate of acceptance was only 20 per cent, but for the selection of the last ten homes, it was 80 per cent. Tulsa averaged 60 percent acceptance.

When the film had been processed it was analyzed on electronic micro-film viewers. In the first two studies, the scanning was done by students. In the last two studies, paid scanners conducted the film viewing.

Since a picture had been made every 15 seconds, four pictures constituted one minute of viewing. It was on this basis, four frames per minute, that tabulation was done. The scanners recorded on a tabulation sheet the time, the name of the show, the number of "attentive" and "inattentive" viewers (broken down by men, women, teenagers, grade-schoolers, and preschoolers), commercial minutes, and minutes of coordinate activities.

The tabulating sheets were combined by week and by family for further processing. In the first Stillwater study, totalling of the tabulation sheets was done manually. The results of the second study were found by data processing in Oklahoma State University's computing center. The programming and direction of this work was done by a graduate journalism student with considerable data processing experience. Tabulation of the results of the Tulsa and Wichita studies was done by the IBM Service in Tulsa.

Terminology

The following terminology is quite important in interpreting the results of this study:

Sets-in-Use time is the time the television set was turned on and tuned to a program. It does not mean necessarily that anyone was in front of the set watching.

Minutes-Tuned-to-News means that specific sets-in-use time when only news programs were tuned.

Attentive Minutes are those minutes in which a viewer had his eyes directed toward the television screen for at least two of the four pictures taken during that minute.

Attentive Viewer Minutes are found by multiplying the number of attentive viewers by the number of minutes:

$$1 \text{ Attentive Viewer Minute} = 1 \text{ Attentive Viewer} \times 1 \text{ Minute}$$

Attentive viewer minutes are used to measure the size of the attentive audience. Attentive minutes are used to determine the percentage of sets-in-use time when attentive viewers were present. Attentive minutes differs from attentive viewer minutes, because the former

measures time and the latter measures audience.

An attentive minute may have one or more attentive viewers in the audience during that minute.

Inattentive Minutes are those in which no viewer's eyes were directed toward the television screen during any two of the four pictures taken in that minute.

Inattentive Viewer Minutes are found by multiplying the number of inattentive viewers by the number of minutes:

1 Inattentive Viewer Minute = 1 Inattentive Viewer X 1 Minute

Viewer Minutes are found by combining attentive viewer and inattentive viewer minutes --- or by combining family member viewing minutes.

Family Members include the men, women, and children of each family. "Children" included those boys and girls under 18 years of age. In the Allen TV audience studies, those under 18 were broken down further into teen-age, grade-school and pre-school classifications.

Family Member Viewing Minutes are the attentive and inattentive viewing minutes of the men, women, and children in the study.

No Audience time is that time in which there was no one in the picture. The TV set was turned on but no one was in the room with the set. No attempt was made to measure the amount of "listenership" by those outside the room who could not see the TV screen, but may have heard some of the sound.

Average Audience is the average number of viewers in front of the TV set during a typical minute. This figure was determined by dividing the total viewer minutes by the number of minutes tuned to news.

Average Attentive Audience is the average number of attentive viewers in front of the TV set during a typical minute. This figure

was determined by dividing attentive viewer minutes by the minutes tuned to news.

Average Inattentive Audience was found by dividing inattentive viewer minutes by the number of minutes tuned to news. The figure represents the average number of inattentive viewers in front of the set during a typical minute.

Coordinate Activities are those activities other than viewing which are performed in conjunction with viewing. The viewer can be either attentive or inattentive while performing a coordinate activity.

To find detailed information about news programming a system was developed for extracting the needed information about specific programs. First, news shows were divided into two classifications: regular and special.

Regular News Shows are those scheduled news shows of local or network origin which deal with current news or weekly recaps. Weather and sports are not included in this definition of news.

Special News Shows consist of documentaries, news analyses, news panels, and live special broadcasts. Shows such as Today and Calendar, even though they contained news broadcasts, were not considered in this study because news is only a small part of the content and it was too difficult to discern the news portions.

Time Periods

The Allen TV audience studies have been constructed so as to reveal viewing information for three periods during the day. These time periods --- called "day parts" --- are forenoon, afternoon, and evening.

Because regular news shows fall more naturally into five distinct

time patterns, this news study employs five day parts: Morning, sign-on to 11:29 a.m.; Noon, 11:30 a.m. to 12:59 p.m.; Afternoon, 1 p.m. to 4:59 p.m.; Evening, 5 p.m. to 6:29 p.m.; and Night, 6:30 p.m. to sign-off.

Data Sheets

Data sheets were prepared which could record information on family; program selection; station selection; time selected; day; attentive minutes; attentive viewer minutes (men, women, and children); inattentive minutes; inattentive viewer minutes (men, women, and children); attentive only minutes; inattentive only minutes; no audience minutes; total viewer minutes; sets in use minutes; commercial minutes; and co-ordinate activity minutes. These data were taken from the original tabulation sheets for all viewing in the Allen studies. From these news data sheets, information was transferred to family summary sheets, then compiled in tabular form for each study.

Technique Advantages

The advantages of employing the photochronographic research technique, as revealed by this study include:

1. Detailed audience composition data. This technique tells who watched, what they watched, when they watched, and how they watched.
2. Actual proof of audience. This technique is not subject to recall bias. It tells exactly what was watched and who watched. It is the only method which tells whether the viewers were attentive or inattentive.
3. Positive program identification. With the film record and the diary, near-perfect identification of programs is possible. The measure-

ment of time the set was on and tuned to specific programs is very accurate.

4. Coordinate Activities. The camera catches all the activities which are performed while viewers are present. The camera remembers when the human mind does not.

5. Filmed records. Film can be stored and referred to readily for accuracy checks. All other methods which depend upon human memory are subject to the errors of forgetfulness.

6. Convenient equipment. Installing the equipment for this methodology takes only a short time, and its appearance is not objectionable to the family.

Technique Disadvantages

Disadvantages of photochronographic methodology include:

1. Expense. Cost of conducting this type research is relatively great.

2. Length of tabulation. Film scanning and data tabulation is tedious and time consuming, but it is the most accurate method yet devised for determining the actual audience.

3. Commercial identification. Correctly identifying commercial images is extremely difficult.

4. Human failures. This methodology, like any other, depends for its accuracy upon its researchers. As the researchers in the Allen studies gained greater knowledge of the technique, the accuracy of the research increased.

5. Viewer bias. It is conceivable that the viewers would be aware of the presence of the camera in the room, thus affecting normal viewing.

However, after considerable research, the Allen studies have revealed that if viewer bias exists, it exists only in the first day or two of DynaScope presence. Family films indicate that the viewers soon forget that they are being photographed.

CHAPTER IV

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS

This research is based on the television viewing of 55 families for a period of two weeks each. It includes all 35 families in both Stillwater studies and a representative sample of 10 families from each of the two other studies. The entire sample includes 195,796 minutes of sets-in-use time --- or 3,513 hours. The study is based upon 783,184 individual pictures, each a sample of human behavior in television viewing situations.

TABLE IV
SETS-IN-USE TIME AND NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL DYNASCOPE PICTURES

<u>Study</u>	<u>Minutes</u>	<u>Pictures</u>
Stillwater, 1961	49,111	196,444
Stillwater, 1962	63,566	254,264
Wichita, 1963	45,258	181,032
<u>Tulsa, 1963</u>	<u>37,861</u>	<u>151,444</u>
55 Families	195,796	783,184

Family Size

The average family consisted of 3.72 persons in this 55-family study. The average family had 2.16 adults and 1.56 children. In total, the study was based on the TV viewing of 205 persons --- 119 adults and

86 children.

The first Stillwater study had an average family size of 3.93 persons. The second study had an average family size of 3.55. The Wichita study average 4.00 persons per family and Tulsa had 3.50 persons per family. The first Stillwater study had an average of 1.67 children, and the second Stillwater study had 1.35. The Wichita study had an average of 2.00 children and Tulsa had 1.40.

TABLE V

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS AND AVERAGES

Total Number of Persons in 55 Families:	205	Average Per Family 3.72
Total Number of Adults:	119	2.16
Men	60	
Women	59	
Total Number of Children	86	1.56
Teen-age	26	
Grade-School	36	
Pre-School	24	

Family Characteristics, Stillwater Study, 1961

1. Man, 25, stock clerk at grocery store. Wife, homemaker. One boy, $2\frac{1}{2}$. Two girls, $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, 17 months.
2. Woman, 35, grocery clerk. Three boys, 14, 12, 11.
3. Man, 35, insurance sales. Wife, 29 homemaker. One boy, 3. One girl, 6 months.
4. Man, 44, newspaper advertising salesman. Wife, 39, registered nurse (works only 25 days per year). One boy, 7.
5. Man, 27 assistant manager department store. Wife, 28, homemaker. One boy, 5. One girl $2\frac{1}{2}$.

TABLE VI

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS IN EACH OF THE FOUR STUDIES

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Total Adults</u>	<u>Pre-School</u>	<u>Grade School</u>	<u>Teen</u>	<u>Total Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	17	17	34	9	11	5	25	59
Stillwater, 1962	23	21	44	7	7	13	27	71
Wichita, 1963	10	10	20	3	14	3	20	40
Tulsa, 1963	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>35</u>
55 Families:	60	59	119	24	36	26	86	205
Average Per Family:			2.16				1.56	3.72

6. Man, 50, mail carrier. Wife, homemaker and manager of photography studio in home. One son, 22 (adult), college student.
7. Man, 50, owner of cleaning establishment. Wife works at establishment in evening.
8. Man, 48, real estate. Wife, homemaker. Four girls, 19 (adult), college student, 14, 8, and 7.
9. Man, 29, newspaper linotype operator. Wife, homemaker. One girl, 8.
10. Man, 44, university employed printer. Wife, registered nurse. One girl, 16. Two boys, 11½, 11½.
11. Woman, 46, consultant school lunch workshop and student. Four boys: 20, 19 (adults), college students, boys, 17, 16 away in school. One girl, 14.
12. Man, 41, manager university bookstore. Wife, university employed secretary. Two girls, 13, 8.
13. Man, 39, university dean. Wife, homemaker. Two boys, 12, 9. One girl, 7 months.
14. Man, 55, university agronomist. Wife, 50, teacher. One girl, 20 (adult), college student.
15. Man, 51, editor of university magazine. Wife, 49, homemaker. One boy, 19 (adult), college student. One girl, 5.

Family Characteristics, Stillwater, 1962

1. Man, 38, co-owner mens store. Wife, 38, homemaker. Two girls, 15, 11.
2. Man, 55, state engineer. Wife, 45, owner-manager of floral shop. One boy, 23 (adult), owner-manager of floral shop. One girl, 15.
3. Man, 29, credit manager lumber company and part-time rancher. Wife, 24, homemaker. Girl, 13 months.
4. Man, 45, tool pusher. Wife, 42, owner-manager of liquor store.
5. Man, 22, part-time university employee and student. Wife, 21, homemaker. One boy, 5 months.
6. Man, 52, postal employee. Wife, 46, homemaker. Two girls, 15, 10.
7. Man, 29, owner-manager buildings materials store. Wife, 25, homemaker. Two girls, 2½ years, 4 months.

8. Man, 50, railroad employee. Wife, 39, clerk at department store. One girl, 16.
9. Man, 60, carpenter. Wife, homemaker. One son, 26 (adult), mechanic. One girl, 17.
10. Man, 49, court reporter. Wife, 41, court clerk. Two girls, 15, 13.
11. Man, 30, driller. Wife, 30, beautician. Two boys, 7, 3.
12. Man, 38, owner-operator of radiator shop. Wife, 36, homemaker. Five boys: 18 (adult), college student, 17, 12, 8, 6. Two girls, 15, 2 $\frac{1}{2}$.
13. Man, 65, retired school teacher. Wife, 66, homemaker.
14. Man, 28, assistant county agent. Wife, 27, homemaker. One boy, 4.
15. Man, 52, driller. Wife, 52, waitress. One girl, 15.
16. Man, 44, optometrist. Wife, 42, homemaker. One girl, 14. One boy, 10.
17. Man, 38, electric foreman for plumbing company. Wife, 37 runs day nursery in home for 15 pre-school children. Two boys, 16, 14.
18. Woman, 64, widow, property owner. (Two roomers in home). One adult male student. One adult female student.
19. Man, 66, retired contractor. Wife, 60, homemaker.
20. Man, 65, executive secretary pharmaceutical association. Wife, 65, homemaker.

Family Characteristics, Wichita Study, 1963

1. Man, 32, attorney. Wife, 35, registered nurse. One boy, 6 $\frac{1}{2}$. Two girls, 14 years, 11 months.
2. Man, 36, grocery store owner. Wife, 35, homemaker. Two boys, 12, 9.
3. Man, 45, production manager pulley company. Wife, 41, homemaker. Three girls, 16, 10, 10.
4. Man, 19, printer and college student. Wife, 18, homemaker.
5. Man, 44, bond house cashier. Wife, 45, homemaker. Two girls, 13, 6.
6. Man, 37, missile electric maintenance. Wife, 37, homemaker. Two boys, 12, 10. Two girls, 9, 7.

7. Man, 56, pressman. Woman, 58, teacher.
8. Man, 50, university custodian. Woman, 50, homemaker. One boy, 12.
9. Man, 46, heavy equipment operator. Wife, 36, part-time waitress. one girl, 8.
10. Man, 35, heating engineer. Wife, 34, homemaker. Two boys, 12, 5. Two girls, 10, 2 $\frac{1}{2}$.

Family Characteristics, Tulsa Study, 1963

1. Man, 52, owner car wash. Wife, 48, teacher. One girl, 18 (adult), college student.
2. Man, welder. Wife, 37, school cafeteria worker. One girl, 15.
3. Man, 31, jet mechanic. Wife, 29 homemaker. Two girls, 11, 8.
4. Man, 31, assistant manager water plant. Wife, 31, homemaker. One girl, 3. One boy, 20 months.
5. Man, 40, aircraft mechanic. Wife, 38, school lunch worker. One girl, 17. One boy, 14.
6. Man, 48, civil engineer. Wife, 42, newcomer hostess. One girl, 19 (adult), away at college.
7. Man, 28, salesman. Wife, 28, homemaker. One girl, 3. One boy, 1.
8. Man, 33, purchasing agent. Wife, 32 homemaker. Two girls, 11, 8. One boy, 3.
9. Man, 55, stillman, oil refinery. Wife, 49, part-time general office worker. One girl, 17. One boy, 13.
10. Man, 71, retired teacher. Wife, 64, retired cateress.

Seasonal Factors

Seasonal variations are important in television viewing. The Stillwater studies were conducted in early fall when temperatures were relatively mild. The Wichita and Tulsa studies were done in the winter, with the Wichita study in late December, January, and early February. The Tulsa study was conducted in February and March. While the Wichita

study was conducted temperatures varied from 40 above zero to 12 degrees below zero.

Naturally, the average family stays home more during cold weather. Thus, the viewing figures for the Wichita and Tulsa studies were influenced by this factor.

News Occurrences

Another influence on this study was the occurrence of news events. When spectacular news events take place, or moments of world crisis approach, television news departments devote considerable time to special coverage. This increases the number of news shows offered the public, and could conceivably increase the interest of the viewing public.

Three of the studies were conducted during periods of time when there were few unusual new events. But the second Stillwater study, during the September through November, 1962, period, caught enough special news happenings to make it an abnormal news period.

In late September and early October, 1962, for example, the United States was at the brink of war with Cuba. Military power was bolstered, and world attention was focused on the situation. Much television coverage was devoted to United Nations sessions and to special analyses of the crisis.

During the fall of 1962, Oklahoma and the nation were holding elections. In Oklahoma, extensive coverage was given the governor's race, and after Oklahoma had elected its first Republican governor in history, considerable programming was devoted to the "why" of the election.

And while all this was happening, an American astronaut was launched into space with full television coverage.

News Diet

There are many variations in programming, so it is difficult to list daily news shows, and especially week-end news programs. It is almost impossible to chart specials.

In order to present a "menu" of news programs for the four studies, TV Guides which served as family diaries were used to prepare listings of regular news programs. These listings are shown in Tables VII through X. These lists are not hard and fast schedules, for many, many changes take place in television programming.

Where news and weather were listed in the same program, the weather portion was assumed to be five minutes in length. Thus if a news and weather program was 15 minutes, the first 10 minutes were tabulated for the purposes of this thesis. The last five minutes being weather, were not tabulated.

TABLE VII

LISTING OF REGULAR NEWS SHOWS AS SCHEDULED DURING WEEK PER STATION
STILLWATER, 1961

<u>Station</u>	<u>Saturday</u>	<u>Sunday</u>	<u>Weekdays</u>
<u>KVCO-TV</u>	1200-1209 p.m. *0500-0514 p.m. 0600-0614 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.	1000-1009 p.m.	*1155-1159 a.m. 1200-1214 p.m. *0355-0359 p.m. 0610-0614 p.m. *0615-0629 p.m. 1000-1009 p.m.
<u>WKY-TV</u>	0600-0619 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.	1000-1014 p.m.	*1155-1159 a.m. 1200-1214 p.m. 0355-0359 p.m. *0545-9559 p.m. 0600-0619 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.
<u>KOCO-TV</u>			*0125-0129 p.m. 0530-0544 p.m. 1000-1009 p.m. *1015-1029 p.m.
<u>KOTV</u>	1000-1009 p.m.	1000-1009 p.m. *1015-1029 p.m.	**0800-0814 a.m. 1200-1214 p.m. *0255-0259 p.m. *0545-0559 p.m. 0605-0609 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m. News after late movie
<u>KTUL-TV</u>			0755-0759 a.m. 1200-1214 p.m. 0125-0129 p.m. 0545-0559 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.
<u>KWTV</u>	0530-0539 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.	*1055-1059 a.m. 1000-1014 p.m.	0730-0744 a.m. ***0845-0859 a.m. *1055-1059 a.m. 1200-1209 p.m. *0255-0259 p.m. *0545-0559 p.m. 0600-0614 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.

* Network Show
** Not carried throughout
*** Only on Friday

TABLE VIII

LISTING OF REGULAR NEWS SHOWS AS SCHEDULED DURING WEEK PER STATION
STILLWATER, 1962

<u>Station</u>	<u>Saturday</u>	<u>Sunday</u>	<u>Weekdays</u>
<u>KVOC-TV</u>	0615-0629 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.	1000-1009 p.m.	**0925-0929 a.m. *1155-1159 a.m. 1230-1244 p.m. *0125-0129 p.m. *0355-0359 p.m. 0610-0614 p.m. *0615-0629 p.m. 1000-1009 p.m.
<u>WKY-TV</u>	*0500-0514 p.m. 0600-0619 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.	1000-1014 p.m.	**0925-0920 a.m. *1155-1159 a.m. 1200-1214 p.m. *0125-0129 p.m. 0355-0359 p.m. *0545-0559 p.m. 0600-0619 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.
<u>KOCO-TV</u>			*1255-1259 p.m. *0530-0544 p.m. 0625-0629 p.m. 1000-1009 p.m. *1015-1024 p.m. News after late movie
<u>KOTV</u>	0600-0614 p.m. 1000-1009 p.m.	1000-1009 p.m. *1015-1029 p.m.	1200-1209 p.m. *0255-0259 p.m. 0600-0609 p.m. *0615-0629 p.m. 1000-1009 p.m. News after late movie
<u>KTUL-TV</u>			1200-1209 p.m. *0155-0159 p.m. 0530-0539 p.m. *0545-0559 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m. News after late movie
<u>KWTV</u>	0530-0539 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.	*1055-1059 a.m. 1000-1014 p.m.	0655-0659 a.m. 0730-0744 a.m. *1055-1059 a.m. 1200-1209 p.m. *0255-0259 p.m. *0545-0559 p.m. 0600-0614 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.

* Network news
** Not carried throughout

TABLE IX

LISTING OF REGULAR NEWS SHOWS AS SCHEDULED DURING WEEK PER STATION
WICHITA, 1963

<u>Station</u>	<u>Saturday</u>	<u>Sunday</u>	<u>Weekdays</u>
<u>KARD-TV</u>	1000-1009 p.m.	1000-1009 p.m.	*0925-0929 a.m. *1155-1159 a.m. 1200-1209 p.m. *0155-0159 p.m. *0325-0339 p.m. 0600-0609 p.m. *0615-0629 p.m. 1000-1009 p.m.
<u>KAKE-TV</u>	1000-1014 p.m. News after late movie	1000-1014 p.m. News after late movie	1200-1214 p.m. *0225-0229 p.m. 0530-0544 p.m. 0545-0554 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m. News after late movie
<u>KTVH</u>	1200-1214 p.m. 0600-0614 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m. News after late movie	1230-1244 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m. News after late movie	0745-0759 a.m. 0945-0959 a.m. *1125-1129 a.m. 1200-1209 p.m. *0225-0229 p.m. *0545-0559 p.m. 0600-0614 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m. News after late movie

* Network news

TABLE X

LISTING OF REGULAR NEWS SHOWS AS SCHEDULED DURING WEEK PER STATION
TULSA, 1963

<u>Station</u>	<u>Saturday</u>	<u>Sunday</u>	<u>Weekdays</u>
<u>KVOO-TV</u>	**0600-0614 p.m. ***1000-1014 p.m.	1000-1009 p.m.	*0925-0929 a.m. *1155-1159 a.m. 1200-1209 p.m. *0155-0159 p.m. *0325-0329 p.m. 0610-0614 p.m. *0615-0629 p.m. 1000-1009 p.m.
<u>KOTV</u>	*1200-1229 p.m. 0600-0614 p.m. 1000-1009 p.m.	1000-1009 p.m. *1014-1029 p.m.	1200-1209 p.m. *0225-0229 p.m. 0600-0609 p.m. *0615-0629 p.m. 1000-1009 p.m. News after late movie
<u>KTUL-TV</u>		0600-0614 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m.	1200-1214 p.m. *0225-0229 p.m. 0600-0609 p.m. *0615-0629 p.m. 1000-1014 p.m. News after late movie

-
- * Network news
 - ** Varied from Saturday to Saturday
 - *** Varied with Saturday night movie

Commercials

The methodology used in this study cannot give data on all TV commercials for several reasons:

1. Many commercials are "integrated" with the program; i.e. the commercial is done by talent on the program in such a manner as to make it impossible for the film scanner to tell when the commercial starts or stops.

2. Pictures taken at intervals of 15 seconds, will miss some 5- and 10-second commercials.

3. Persons tuning a new program will sometimes stand in the way of the lens when a commercial is on the air.

4. The picture tube and the set adjustments may be so imperfect that a commercial cannot be positively identified.

5. In certain instances poor lighting and distant mirrors caused problems with commercial identification.

Commercial minutes were identified whenever possible. When impossible to identify the commercials, no mark was made on the tabulation sheet. Therefore, in this study some commercials have been assumed. If the show was 5 to 10 minutes in length and no commercials were identified, one commercial was assumed. Two commercials were assumed for 10 to 20 minute shows. If anything, this was an under-estimation. Commercials were assumed in about 20 per cent of the shows.

CHAPTER V

HOW REGULAR NEWS SHOWS WERE VIEWED

The 55 families in these four studies tuned to nearly 1,000 regular news shows. The average family during the two-week study period dialed 17.8 news programs, an average of 1.28 shows per day. Most of these shows were after 5 p.m., in the evening and night day parts.

TABLE XI

NUMBER OF NEWS SHOWS BY DAY PARTS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	10	31	8	66	106	221
Stillwater, 1962	20	39	33	140	123	355
Wichita, 1963	23	31	28	55	68	205
Tulsa, 1963	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>197</u>
55 Families	56	116	94	339	373	978
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	1.0	2.1	1.7	6.2	6.8	17.8
1 Day:	.07	.16	.12	.44	.49	1.28

Per Cent of Number of News Shows by Day Parts

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
5.6	11.8	9.7	34.8	38.1	100.0

Morning news programs were the least tuned, with only 56 dialed throughout the four studies. The two-week average was only one per family, a mere .07 programs per day. Noon and afternoon news shows fared a little better, with 21.5 per cent of the number of news shows tuned. But evening and night news programs totaled 73 per cent of the shows tuned.

Although the heaviest emphasis is now being placed on the evening (5:30-6:30 p.m. C.S.T.) news hour by TV networks, the viewers in these studies dialed more night (10 p.m. C.S.T.) news than evening programs.

Minutes of News

The average family dialed 199.9 minutes of regular news during the two-week period, an average of 14.27 minutes of regular news each day. Of that daily amount, 11.64 minutes were tuned after 5 p.m., 81.5 per cent.

TABLE XII

TOTAL MINUTES OF NEWS BY DAY PARTS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	121	318	40	764	1,465	2,708
Stillwater, 1962	113	350	165	1,951	1,526	4,105
Wichita, 1963	113	349	140	666	919	2,187
Tulsa, 1963	<u>15</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>800</u>	<u>874</u>	<u>1,994</u>
55 Families	362	1,167	500	4,181	4,784	10,994
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	6.6	21.2	9.1	76.0	87.0	199.9
1 Day:	.47	1.51	.65	5.43	6.21	14.27

Per Cent of Minutes of News by Day Parts

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
3.3	10.6	4.6	38.0	43.5	100.0

Audience Size

The average-audience figures (total viewer minutes divided by total minutes tuned to news) tell how many persons were in front of the set during a typical minute when the set was tuned to news. The average audience for regular news shows was 1.088 viewers per minute.

TABLE XIII

AVERAGE TOTAL AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR NEWS BY DAY PART

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	.421	.704	.950	1.123	.945	.943
Stillwater, 1962	1.168	.774	.976	1.071	1.364	1.153
Wichita, 1963	.796	.728	.850	1.161	1.536	1.211
Tulsa, 1963	<u>.867</u>	<u>1.140</u>	<u>.716</u>	<u>.946</u>	<u>1.111</u>	<u>1.015</u>
55 Families	.790	.788	.858	1.071	1.222	1.088

The day part with the smallest audience was noon with only .788 viewers per minute. This in contrast to the number of noon shows having been tuned was more than either morning or afternoon shows. Morning, with the lowest number of news shows tuned, had almost as small an audience as did noon, with only .790 viewers.

The largest audience was at night with 1.222 viewers per minute. The evening audience had 1.071 viewers per minute.

The Wichita study had the largest average audience for an individual

study with 1.211 viewers per minute. The first Stillwater study had the smallest total average audience with .943 viewers. There was only a .268 difference between the high and low audience figures for individual studies, while there was a difference of .434 between the high and low average audience figures by day parts.

Audience Attention

The average attentive audience is the number of attentive viewers watching the set during the typical minute news is on TV. The average inattentive audience is the number of inattentive viewers in front of the set during the typical minute of a news show. The average attentive audience per minute for regular news was .562 viewers, and the average inattentive audience was .526 viewers.

TABLE XIV

AVERAGE ATTENTIVE AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR NEWS BY DAY PARTS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	.099	.421	.575	.686	.474	.513
Stillwater, 1962	.380	.343	.430	.516	.773	.588
Wichita, 1963	.292	.364	.436	.692	.919	.698
Tulsa, 1963	<u>.200</u>	<u>.413</u>	<u>.155</u>	<u>.321</u>	<u>.573</u>	<u>.425</u>
55 Families	.251	.380	.358	.537	.673	.562

TABLE XV

AVERAGE INATTENTIVE AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR NEWS BY DAY PART

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	.322	.283	.375	.437	.470	.431
Stillwater, 1962	.788	.431	.545	.558	.591	.565
Wichita, 1963	.504	.364	.414	.468	.617	.513
Tulsa, 1963	<u>.667</u>	<u>.727</u>	<u>.561</u>	<u>.625</u>	<u>.538</u>	<u>.590</u>
55 Families	.539	.408	.500	.534	.549	.526

TABLE XVI

AVERAGE ATTENTIVE, INATTENTIVE, AND TOTAL AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR NEWS BY DAY PART

<u>Audience</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total	.790	.788	.858	1.071	1.222	1.088
Attentive	.251	.380	.358	.537	.673	.562
Inattentive	.539	.408	.500	.534	.549	.526

The Wichita study had the largest attentive audience average for individual studies with .698 viewers. The Tulsa study had the lowest attentive audience average with .425 viewers. Tulsa had the largest inattentive audience, though, indicating that Tulsa viewers busied themselves with other things while watching and listening to TV news.

The smallest average attentive audience was in the morning with .251 average viewers per minute. The largest average attentive audience was at night with .673 viewers. The average inattentive audiences did not differ greatly. The smallest audience was at noon with .408 viewers and the largest at night with .549 viewers. The difference between the morning average inattentive audience and the night inattentive audience

was only one one-hundredth of a viewer.

The average inattentive audience was larger than the average attentive audience for the first three day parts. The inattentive audience and the attentive audience were about the same during the evening period. The average attentive audience was considerably larger than the inattentive audience during the night period.

Inattentive viewing was greatest (by percentage) during the morning, noon, and afternoon, when the audiences were smallest. Attentive viewing was greatest during the evening and night time periods when audiences were largest. But, in overall viewing, about half of all viewers were attentive and about half were inattentive.

TABLE XVII

PER CENT OF TOTAL VIEWERS, ATTENTIVE AND INATTENTIVE, FOR NEWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Per Cent Attentive</u>	<u>Per Cent Inattentive</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	54.32	45.68	100.0
Stillwater, 1962	51.00	49.00	100.0
Wichita, 1963	57.67	42.33	100.0
Tulsa, 1963	<u>41.87</u>	<u>58.13</u>	<u>100.0</u>
55 Families	51.64	48.36	100.0

No Audience Time

A no audience minute is a minute in which the set was tuned to news, but no one was in the room watching or performing other activities. The average no audience time per day during news shows was 4.04 minutes. Thus, 28.23 per cent of the time the set was tuned to news, there was no one in the TV room.

TABLE XVIII

TOTAL NO AUDIENCE MINUTES FOR NEWS BY DAY PARTS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	72	145	17	199	526	959
Stillwater, 1962	60	151	47	570	180	1,008
Wichita, 1963	46	155	51	201	141	594
Tulsa, 1963	<u>8</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>543</u>
55 Families	186	490	174	1,252	1,001	3,104
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	3.4	8.9	3.2	22.8	18.2	56.5
1 Day:	.24	.64	.23	1.63	1.30	4.04

TABLE XIX

PERCENTAGE OF NO AUDIENCE MINUTES DURING NEWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Minutes Tuned to News</u>	<u>Per Cent No Audience</u>
Stillwater, 1961	959	2,708	35.41
Stillwater, 1962	1,008	4,105	24.56
Wichita, 1963	594	2,187	27.16
Tulsa, 1963	<u>543</u>	<u>1,994</u>	<u>27.23</u>
55 Families	3,104	10,994	28.23

TABLE XX

PER CENT OF MINUTES OF NEWS, NO AUDIENCE PRESENT BY DAY PART

	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Minutes No Audience	186	490	174	1,252	1,001	3,104
Minutes News Tuned	362	1,167	500	4,181	4,784	10,994
Per Cent No Audience	51.38	41.99	34.80	29.94	20.92	28.23

Most of the no-audience minutes were after 5 p.m., because the greatest amount of sets-in-use time was after 5 p.m. By comparing no-audience minutes per day part against minutes tuned to news per day part, it can be seen that the first three day parts have the largest percentage of no-audience time. Morning news shows had 51.38 per cent no-audience time. Noon shows had 41.99 per cent and afternoon had 34.8 per cent. Evening news shows had the largest quantity of minutes of no-audience time, but percentage-wise had only 29.94 per cent no-audience. Night shows had 20.92 per cent no-audience.

The first Stillwater study had the greatest overall percentage of no-audience time with 35.41 per cent. The second Stillwater study had the lowest percentage, 24.56 per cent.

Viewer Results

While the set was tuned to news, an attentive viewer was present 43.89 per cent of the time. An inattentive viewer was in front of the set 39.74 per cent of the time. There was no audience 28.23 per cent of the time.

TABLE XXI

PER CENT OF MINUTES OF NEWS, ATTENTIVE AND INATTENTIVE,
WHEN VIEWERS WERE PRESENT, AND NO AUDIENCE TIME

<u>Study</u>	<u>Attentive Viewers Present</u>	<u>Inattentive Viewers Present</u>	<u>No Audience</u>
Stillwater, 1961	38.81	35.30	35.41
Stillwater, 1962	47.04	42.89	24.56
Wichita, 1963	50.52	35.57	27.16
Tulsa, 1963	<u>37.06</u>	<u>43.83</u>	<u>27.23</u>
55 Families	43.89	39.74	28.23

The Wichita study had the highest percentage of time with attentive viewers present, 50.52 per cent. Tulsa had the lowest with 37.06 per cent. In turn, Tulsa had the highest percentage of time with inattentive viewers present, with 43.83 per cent. The 1961 Stillwater study had the lowest percentage of inattentive viewers with 35.30 per cent.

Thus, a little more than 70 per cent of the time news was tuned, a viewer was present. Nearly 44 per cent of this time news was tuned, an attentive viewer was present. Nearly 30 per cent of the time, no one was present.

Family Member Viewing

Men viewed the most news each day, and they were the most attentive viewers. The average male audience per minute for regular news shows was .442 viewers. The average attentive male audience was .286 viewers per minute, and the average inattentive male audience was .156 viewers. The average attentive female audience was .171 viewers, and the average

inattentive female audience was .208 viewers per minute. The average children's audience was .267 viewers per minute, with .105 attentive and .162 inattentive viewers.

TABLE XXII

AVERAGE TOTAL AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR NEWS BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	.420	.299	.224	.943
Stillwater, 1962	.490	.472	.191	1.153
Wichita, 1963	.363	.378	.470	1.121
Tulsa, 1963	.457	.296	.262	1.015
55 Families	.442	.379	.267	1.088

The largest average male audience per survey was in the 1962 Stillwater study, with .490 male viewers. The smallest average male audience was in the Wichita study with .363 viewers per minute. The largest female audience was also in the 1962 Stillwater study with .472 viewers per minute. The largest children's audience was in the Wichita study with .470 viewers per minute. Children's viewing of news shows was only .191 viewers per minute in the 1962 Stillwater study.

TABLE XXIII

AVERAGE ATTENTIVE AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR NEWS BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	.270	.131	.111	.512
Stillwater, 1962	.323	.219	.046	.588
Wichita, 1963	.262	.193	.243	.698
Tulsa, 1963	.254	.103	.068	.425
55 Families	.286	.171	.105	.562

TABLE XXIV

AVERAGE INATTENTIVE AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR NEWS BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	.150	.168	.113	.431
Stillwater, 1962	.167	.253	.145	.565
Wichita, 1963	.101	.185	.227	.513
Tulsa, 1963	.203	.193	.194	.590
55 Families	.156	.208	.162	.526

TABLE XXV

AVERAGE ATTENTIVE, INATTENTIVE AND TOTAL AUDIENCE FOR NEWS
PER MINUTE, BY FAMILY MEMBERS

	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total	.442	.379	.267	1.088
Attentive	.286	.171	.105	.562
Inattentive	.156	.208	.162	.526

TABLE XXVI
PER CENT OF TOTAL VIEWERS, BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	44.58	31.74	23.68	100.0
Stillwater, 1962	42.49	40.93	16.58	100.0
Wichita, 1963	29.95	31.23	38.82	100.0
Tulsa, 1963	45.08	29.12	25.80	100.0
55 Families	40.60	34.82	24.58	100.0

Of total viewers, 40.60 per cent were men, 34.82 per cent were women, and 24.58 per cent were children. The Tulsa study had the highest percentage of male viewers, 45.08 per cent. The 1962 Stillwater study had the highest percentage of female viewers, 40.93 per cent. The Wichita study had the highest percentage of children viewers, 38.82 per cent. The Wichita study also had the lowest percentage of male viewers, 29.95 per cent. The lowest percentage of female viewers was in the Tulsa study, 29.12 per cent. The lowest percentage of children viewers was in the 1962 Stillwater study, 16.58 per cent.

Viewer Minutes

There were nearly 12,000 viewer minutes during the combined studies. These viewer minutes are used to determine the audience size. The average family had 15.53 viewer minutes per day, with 13.40 of these viewer minutes after 5 p.m. Morning and afternoon shows had less than one viewer minute per day.

Nearly half the total viewer minutes (48.8 per cent) were at night. Some 37.5 per cent were in the evening, leaving only 13.7 per cent for

the other three day parts.

TABLE XXVII
VIEWER MINUTES DURING NEWS, BY DAY PART

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	51	224	38	858	1,384	2,555
Stillwater, 1962	132	271	161	2,090	2,081	4,735
Wichita, 1963	90	254	119	773	1,412	2,648
Tulsa, 1963	<u>13</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>757</u>	<u>971</u>	<u>2,023</u>
55 Families	286	920	429	4,478	5,848	11,961
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	5.2	16.7	7.8	81.4	106.3	217.4
1 Day:	.37	1.20	.56	5.81	7.59	15.53

Per Cent of Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Part

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
2.4	7.7	3.6	37.5	48.8	100.0

Attentive Viewer Minutes

TABLE XXVIII

ATTENTIVE VIEWER MINUTES DURING NEWS, BY DAY PART

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	12	134	23	524	695	1,388
Stillwater, 1962	43	120	71	1,002	1,179	2,415
Wichita, 1963	33	127	61	461	845	1,527
Tulsa, 1963	<u>3</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>257</u>	<u>501</u>	<u>847</u>
55 Families	91	443	179	2,244	3,220	6,177
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	1.6	8.1	3.3	40.8	58.5	112.3
1 Day:	.12	.58	.24	2.91	4.18	8.03

Per Cent Attentive Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Part

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
1.5	7.2	2.7	36.5	52.1	100.0

Of the nearly 12,000 viewer minutes, slightly more than half were attentive. More than half of these were at night. Evening shows had more than one-third of the attentive viewer minutes. Morning, noon and afternoon news had a scant 11.4 per cent of the attentive viewer minutes.

The average family had 8.03 attentive viewer minutes each day. Of these, 4.07 were men's, 2.46 women's, and 1.50 children's. The average family tuned in a little more than four minutes of news each night, and a little less than three minutes of news each evening.

Men's Attentive Viewing

Ninety-four per cent of men's attentive viewing was done after 5 p.m. Nearly 60 per cent was done during the night period. Noon news drew about five per cent of men's attentive viewing, but morning and afternoon news viewing combined was but one and one-half per cent.

TABLE XXIX

MEN'S ATTENTIVE VIEWER MINUTES DURING NEWS, BY DAY PART

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	0	75	0	238	419	732
Stillwater, 1962	0	46	18	564	699	1,327
Wichita, 1963	17	7	6	200	342	572
Tulsa, 1963	<u>0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>389</u>	<u>507</u>
55 Families	17	139	33	1,100	1,849	3,138
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	.3	2.5	.6	20.0	33.6	57.0
1 Day:	.02	.18	.04	1.43	2.40	4.07

Per Cent of Men's Attentive Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Part

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
.5	4.4	1.1	35.1	58.9	100.0

Women's Attentive Viewing

Eighty-eight per cent of women's attentive viewing was done after 5 p.m. Only 12 per cent was done during the morning, noon, and afternoon period. Night attentive viewing was 56 per cent of the total. Evening viewing was considerably lighter for women than for men. Where

men had an average of 1.43 attentive minutes per day during the evening period, women had only .79 minutes.

TABLE XXX

WOMEN'S ATTENTIVE VIEWER MINUTES DURING NEWS, BY DAY PART

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	0	30	5	117	203	355
Stillwater, 1962	7	59	51	347	436	900
Wichita, 1963	4	10	34	65	310	423
Tulsa, 1963	<u>0</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>205</u>
55 Families	11	112	99	606	1,055	1,883
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	.2	2.0	1.8	11.0	19.2	34.2
1 Day:	.01	.14	.13	.79	1.37	2.46

Per Cent of Women's Attentive Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Part

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
.6	6.0	5.3	32.1	56.0	100.0

Children's Attentive Viewing

TABLE XXXI

CHILDREN'S ATTENTIVE VIEWER MINUTES DURING NEWS, BY DAY PART

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	12	29	18	169	73	301
Stillwater, 1962	36	15	2	91	44	188
Wichita, 1963	12	110	21	196	193	532
Tulsa, 1963	<u>3</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>135</u>
55 Families	63	192	47	538	316	1,156
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	1.1	3.5	.9	9.8	5.7	21.0
1 Day:	.08	.25	.06	.70	.41	1.50

Per Cent of Children's Attentive Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Part

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
5.5	16.6	4.1	46.5	27.3	100.0

Children did considerably more viewing than adults during the morning, noon and afternoon periods. The evening day part had the largest amount of children's attentive viewer minutes, but the three earlier day parts collectively had 26.2 per cent of the attentive viewer minutes. Children's viewing dropped off sharply in the night period, when most of the younger children were in bed.

Inattentive Viewing

TABLE XXXII

INATTENTIVE VIEWER MINUTES DURING NEWS, BY DAY PARTS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	39	90	15	334	689	1,167
Stillwater, 1962	89	151	90	1,088	902	2,320
Wichita, 1963	57	127	58	312	567	1,121
Tulsa, 1963	<u>10</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>470</u>	<u>1,176</u>
55 Families	195	477	250	2,234	2,628	5,784
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	3.5	8.7	4.5	20.6	47.8	105.1
1 Day:	.25	.62	.32	2.90	3.41	7.50

Per Cent of Inattentive Viewer Minutes During News, by Day Parts

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
3.3	8.2	4.3	38.6	45.6	100.0

The average family had 7.50 inattentive viewer minutes each day for regular news shows. The breakdown for inattentive viewer minutes was much more evenly distributed than was the breakdown for viewer minutes.

Average Inattentive Viewer Minutes Per Day During News,
by Family Members

<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
2.23	2.96	2.31	7.50

Audience By Day Parts

The morning news show audience was composed of children. The noon audience was more closely divided by percentage, but children were in the majority. Women were in the largest percentage in the afternoon, and men were in the majority in both the evening and night day parts.

TABLE XXXIII

MORNING AUDIENCE (VIEWER MINUTES) FOR NEWS, BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	0	0	51	51
Stillwater, 1962	1	19	112	132
Wichita, 1963	25	32	33	90
Tulsa, 1963	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>13</u>
55 Families	26	51	209	286
Per Cent of Morning Audience	9.1	17.8	73.1	100.0

TABLE XXXIV

NOON AUDIENCE (VIEWER MINUTES) FOR NEWS, BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	94	73	57	224
Stillwater, 1962	85	120	66	271
Wichita, 1963	20	64	170	254
Tulsa, 1963	<u>18</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>171</u>
55 Families	217	314	389	920
Per Cent of Noon Audience	23.6	34.1	42.3	100.0

TABLE XXXV

AFTERNOON AUDIENCE (VIEWER MINUTES) FOR NEWS, BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	0	16	22	38
Stillwater, 1962	30	94	37	161
Wichita, 1963	11	71	37	119
Tulsa, 1963	<u>40</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>111</u>
55 Families	81	207	141	429
Per Cent of Afternoon Audience	18.9	48.3	32.8	100.0

TABLE XXXVI

EVENING AUDIENCE (VIEWER MINUTES) FOR NEWS, BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	370	208	280	858
Stillwater, 1962	881	767	442	2,090
Wichita, 1963	255	127	391	773
Tulsa, 1963	<u>325</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>242</u>	<u>757</u>
55 Families	1,831	1,292	1,355	4,478
Per Cent of Evening Audience	40.9	28.9	30.2	100.0

TABLE XXXVII

NIGHT AUDIENCE (VIEWER MINUTES) FOR NEWS, BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	675	514	195	1,384
Stillwater, 1962	1,015	938	128	2,081
Wichita, 1963	482	533	397	1,412
Tulsa, 1963	<u>529</u>	<u>316</u>	<u>126</u>	<u>971</u>
55 Families	2,701	2,301	846	5,848
Per Cent of Night Audience	46.2	39.3	14.5	100.0

The percentage of men in the audience increased steadily throughout the day, with only one exception. The noon audience had slightly more men than the afternoon audience. The percentage of women in the audience increased through the first three day parts, then dropped off sharply during the evening. The percentage of children in the audience decreased throughout the day.

Men's Percentage of Audience for News, by Day Parts

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>
9.1	23.6	18.9	40.9	46.2

Women's Per Cent of Audience for News, by Day Parts

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>
17.8	34.1	48.3	28.9	39.3

Children's Per Cent of Audience for News, by Day Parts

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>
73.1	42.3	32.8	30.2	14.5

Attentive Minutes

TABLE XXXVIII

ATTENTIVE MINUTES DURING NEWS, BY DAY PARTS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	12	115	15	377	532	1,051
Stillwater, 1962	33	95	64	831	908	1,931
Wichita, 1963	30	111	53	340	571	1,105
Tulsa, 1963	<u>3</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>431</u>	<u>739</u>
55 Families	78	375	152	1,779	2,442	4,826
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	1.4	6.8	2.8	32.3	44.4	87.7
1 Day:	.10	.49	.20	2.30	3.17	6.26

Per Cent of Attentive Minutes During News, by Day Parts

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
1.6	7.7	3.2	36.9	50.6	100.0

An attentive minute is a minute in which there was at least one attentive viewer present. An attentive minute can have more than one attentive viewer present. There were 4,826 minutes in which there was at least one attentive viewer during these studies --- as compared with 6,177 attentive viewer minutes. Nearly 44 per cent of the time the set was tuned to news, an attentive viewer was present. Most of these atten-

tive minutes were after 5 p.m., with only 12.5 per cent of the attentive minutes during the three earlier time periods.

Inattentive Minutes

TABLE XXXIX

INATTENTIVE MINUTES DURING NEWS, BY DAY PARTS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	37	75	14	267	563	956
Stillwater, 1962	39	130	63	831	698	1,761
Wichita, 1963	47	102	43	196	390	778
Tulsa, 1963	<u>5</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>363</u>	<u>363</u>	<u>874</u>
55 Families	128	368	202	1,657	2,014	4,369
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	2.3	6.7	3.7	30.1	36.6	79.4
1 Day:	.17	.48	.26	2.15	2.61	5.67

Per Cent of Inattentive Minutes During News, by Day Parts

<u>Morning</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>Afternoon</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Total</u>
3.0	8.4	4.6	38.0	46.0	100.0

Inattentive minutes (those minutes in which at least one inattentive viewer was in front of the set) totalled 4,369, as compared with 5,784 inattentive viewer minutes. There was at least one inattentive viewer in front of the set 39.74 per cent of the time news was tuned. There was an inattentive viewer present only four per cent less time than an attentive viewer was present. Night shows had slightly less inattentive viewers percentage-wise than attentive viewers. Evening

shows, however, had a higher percentage of inattentive viewers.

Station Selection

Stillwater is a fringe-area city. At times, it is possible to receive six stations --- three from Oklahoma City and three from Tulsa. Since Tulsa is farther from Stillwater than Oklahoma City, the Tulsa stations are not received with good picture quality. Thus, most of the stations viewed in the Stillwater studies were Oklahoma City stations.

TABLE XL

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF NEWS SHOWS PER STATION
STILLWATER, 1961

	<u>KVOO-TV</u>	<u>WKY-TV</u>	<u>KOCO-TV</u>	<u>KOTV</u>	<u>KWTV</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number	2	121	50	2	46	221
Per Cent	.9	54.8	22.6	.9	20.8	100.0

TABLE XLI

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF NEWS SHOWS PER STATION
STILLWATER, 1962

	<u>KVOO-TV</u>	<u>WKY-TV</u>	<u>KOCO-TV</u>	<u>KOTV</u>	<u>KWTV</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number	23	172	42	13	105	355
Per Cent	6.5	48.4	11.8	3.7	29.6	100.0

In the 1961 study, WKY-TV, of Oklahoma City, was tuned in by Stillwater families more than half of the times regular news programs were selected. In the 1962 study, WKY had slightly less than half the number of shows tuned.

KWTV, of Oklahoma City, was selected for news shows about one-fifth of the number of times regular news was tuned in the first study. In the second study, nearly one-third of the number of news shows tuned came from KWTV. The number of regular news shows selected from KWTV increased nearly nine per cent from 1961 to 1962.

KOCO-TV, of Oklahoma City, was tuned in more than one-fifth the times the families selected news programs in the first study. In 1962, the percentage of KOCO-TV news shows selected was only 11.8 per cent, a decrease of more than 10 per cent.

The Tulsa stations had about two per cent of the number of regular news shows selected in the 1961 study. Both KVOO-TV and KOTV had about one per cent each. In the second study, KVOO-TV had 6.5 per cent of the number of regular news shows selected, and KOTV had 3.7 per cent. In neither study was Tulsa's KTUL-TV received, because the transmission tower of the station is located near Muskogee, too far from Stillwater to provide a strong signal.

TABLE XLII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF MINUTES OF NEWS SHOWS
PER STATION, STILLWATER, 1961

	<u>KVOO-TV</u>	<u>WKY-TV</u>	<u>KOCO-TV</u>	<u>KOTV</u>	<u>KWTV</u>	<u>Total</u>
Minutes	34	1,519	521	31	603	2,708
Per Cent	1.3	56.1	19.2	1.1	22.3	100.0

TABLE XLIII
 NUMBER AND PER CENT OF MINUTES OF NEWS
 PER STATION, STILLWATER, 1962

	<u>KVOO-TV</u>	<u>WKY-TV</u>	<u>KOCO-TV</u>	<u>KOTV</u>	<u>KWTV</u>	<u>Total</u>
Minutes	170	2,209	335	109	1,282	4,105
Per Cent	4.1	53.8	8.2	2.7	31.2	100.0

WKY-TV dominated both Stillwater studies in terms of percentages of the amount of time news was selected. In both studies, WKY-TV was received more minutes than all the other stations added together. Although, WKY-TV's percentage of the number of news programs decreased by 6.4 per cent from 1961 to 1962, the percentage of minutes of news was only 2.3 per cent less.

KWTV was selected nearly nine per cent more in 1962 than in 1961. KOCO dropped from 19.2 per cent of the minutes tuned in the first study to 8.2 per cent in the second study. And the Tulsa stations each increased, with KVOO-TV having the largest gain.

In combining the two Stillwater studies, WKY-TV was dialed 50.9 per cent of the time, and 54.7 per cent of the minutes of regular news selected was WKY-TV news. KWTV was dialed 26.2 per cent of the time news programs were tuned, and 27.7 per cent of the minutes of news were KWTV news. KOCO was selected 15.8 per cent of the time news shows were chosen, and 12.4 per cent of the minutes of news were KOCO news. The two Tulsa stations were dialed 7.1 per cent of the time news was selected, and 5.2 per cent of the minutes of news were from the Tulsa stations.

TABLE XLIV
 NUMBER AND PER CENT OF NEWS SHOWS PER STATION
 WICHITA, 1963

	<u>KARD-TV</u>	<u>KAKE-TV</u>	<u>KTVH-TV</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number	97	66	42	205
Per Cent	47.3	32.2	20.5	100.0

TABLE XLV
 NUMBER AND PER CENT OF MINUTES OF NEWS PER STATION

	<u>KARD-TV</u>	<u>KAKE-TV</u>	<u>KTVH-TV</u>	<u>Total</u>
Minutes	942	820	425	2,187
Per Cent	43.1	37.5	19.4	100.0

Wichita stations, KARD-TV and KAKE-TV, were tuned for about 80 per cent of the news shows in the Wichita study. But a Hutchinson station, KTVH-TV, was dialed for about one-fifth of the news show time.

KARD-TV was dialed 47.3 per cent of the time news shows were selected, and 43.1 per cent of the minutes of news were from KARD. KAKE-TV was selected for 32.2 per cent of the number of news shows, but 37.5 per cent of the minutes were KAKE news.

TABLE XLVI
 NUMBER AND PER CENT OF NEWS SHOWS PER STATION
 TULSA, 1963

	<u>KVOO-TV</u>	<u>KOTV</u>	<u>KIUL-TV</u>	<u>KIEN-TV</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number	93	65	38	1	197
Per Cent	47.2	33.0	19.3	.5	100.0

TABLE XLVII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF MINUTES OF NEWS PER STATION
TULSA, 1963

	<u>KVOO-TV</u>	<u>KOTV</u>	<u>KTUL-TV</u>	<u>KTEN-TV</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number	830	714	435	15	1,994
Per Cent	41.6	35.8	21.8	.8	100.0

KVOO-TV was the leader in the Tulsa study with 47.2 per cent of the number of news programs selected and 41.6 per cent of the minutes of news. KOTV had 33 per cent of the number of programs selected and 35.8 per cent of the minutes of news. KTUL-TV had 19.3 per cent of the number of news shows dialed, and 21.8 per cent of the minutes of news selected were KTUL news.

News Selection

Local news was chosen about 70 per cent of the time news shows were dialed. The average family tuned in 10.37 minutes of local news each day and 3.90 minutes of network news. The average family watched .87 shows of local origin each day and .41 network shows.

TABLE XLVIII
NUMBER OF LOCAL AND NETWORK NEWS SHOWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>Network</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	165	56	221
Stillwater, 1962	249	106	355
Wichita, 1963	121	84	205
Tulsa, 1963	<u>132</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>197</u>
55 Families	667	311	978
Family Averages:			
2 Weeks:	12.1	5.7	17.8
1 Day:	.87	.41	1.28

Per Cent of News Shows - Local and Network

<u>Local</u>	<u>Network</u>	<u>Total</u>
68.2	31.8	100.0

TABLE XLIX
MINUTES OF LOCAL AND NETWORK NEWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>Network</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	2,090	618	2,708
Stillwater, 1962	3,066	1,039	4,105
Wichita, 1963	1,506	681	2,187
Tulsa, 1963	<u>1,322</u>	<u>672</u>	<u>1,994</u>
55 Families	7,984	3,010	10,994
Family Averages:			
2 Weeks:	145.2	54.7	199.9
1 Day:	10.37	3.90	14.27

Per Cent of Minutes of Local and Network News

<u>Local</u>	<u>Network</u>	<u>Total</u>
72.7	27.3	100.0

Network Selection

Of the network shows tuned, more than half the number were NBC shows. CBS regular news programs totalled about one-fourth of the number, and ABC news shows were slightly less than one-fifth of the network shows.

TABLE L

NUMBER OF NEWS SHOWS BY NETWORK

<u>Study</u>	<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	28	7	21	56
Stillwater, 1962	58	29	19	106
Wichita, 1963	52	15	17	84
Tulsa, 1963	<u>36</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>65</u>
55 Families	174	79	58	311

Per Cent of News Shows by Network

<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
55.9	25.4	18.7	100.0

TABLE LI
MINUTES OF NEWS BY NETWORK

<u>Study</u>	<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	274	58	286	618
Stillwater, 1962	586	274	179	1,039
Wichita, 1963	410	95	176	681
Tulsa, 1963	<u>333</u>	<u>324</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>672</u>
55 Families	1,603	751	656	3,010

Per Cent of Minutes of News by Network

<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
53.2	25.0	21.8	100.0

ABC had a slightly higher percentage of minutes of news tuned than of news shows selected. Both NBC and CBS had lower percentages of minutes of news tuned than number of shows selected.

Network Evening Shows

The evening news program is the network's big show. At the times of these studies, all three networks had 15-minute evening shows featuring top-notch-newsmen. Now, both NBC and CBS have expanded these evening shows to 30-minute programs.

Of the evening network shows selected in the four studies, more than 61 per cent of the number of programs and some 60.5 per cent of the minutes tuned were NBC's Huntley-Brinkley Report. An accurate survey of how the featured evening shows compare by audience popularity could not be determined because of several factors: (1) CBS and ABC

have changed newscasters on their evening programs since 1961; and (2) Wichita's CBS station (KTVH-TV, actually in Hutchinson) is not a strong-signal station for all Wichita receivers.

Another factor which would affect network news selection is the factor of length of radio service of a particular station to an area prior to the advent of television, and the order in which these radio stations expanded into television broadcasting.

TABLE LII

NUMBER OF 15-MINUTE EVENING NEWS SHOWS BY NETWORK

<u>Study</u>	<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	14	3	7	24
Stillwater, 1962	37	14	6	57
Wichita, 1963	18	2	10	30
Tulsa, 1963	<u>19</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>33</u>
55 Families	88	32	24	144

Per Cent of Number of 15-Minute Evening News Shows by Network

<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
61.1	22.3	16.6	100.0

TABLE LIII

MINUTES OF 15-MINUTE EVENING NEWS SHOWS BY NETWORK

<u>Study</u>	<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	206	38	93	337
Stillwater, 1962	481	199	82	762
Wichita, 1963	242	30	141	413
Tulsa, 1963	<u>248</u>	<u>169</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>432</u>
55 Families	1,177	436	331	1,944

Per Cent of Minutes of 15-Minute Evening News Shows by Network

<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
60.5	22.5	17.0	100.0

Walter Cronkite took over the CBS evening news program in 1962 from Douglas Edwards. In 1961 the Stillwater families selected CBS evening news only 11.2 per cent of the time. In 1962 they tuned CBS news 24.8 per cent of the time. In the Tulsa study, CBS news was chosen 39.1 per cent of the time. The Wichita study offers little information about CBS news popularity since there is no CBS station in the city.

5-Minute Network Shows

The three networks schedule various 5-minute news shows throughout the morning and afternoon. Of the 5-minute shows selected, nearly 60 per cent were of NBC origin. About one-third were CBS shows. ABC, which does not schedule as many 5-minute shows as the other networks, was tuned only 7 per cent of the time.

TABLE LIV

NUMBER OF 5-MINUTE NEWS SHOWS BY NETWORK

<u>Study</u>	<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	14	4	1	19
Stillwater, 1962	16	19	2	37
Wichita, 1963	34	13	7	54
Tulsa, 1963	<u>17</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>27</u>
55 Families	81	46	10	137

Per Cent of Number of 5-Minute News Shows by Network

<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
59.1	33.6	7.3	100.0

TABLE LV

MINUTES OF 5-MINUTE NEWS SHOWS BY NETWORK

<u>Study</u>	<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	68	20	5	93
Stillwater, 1962	75	95	8	178
Wichita, 1963	168	65	35	268
Tulsa, 1963	<u>85</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>135</u>
55 Families	396	230	48	674

Per Cent of Minutes of 5-Minute News Shows by Network

<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>Total</u>
58.7	34.1	7.2	100.0

CHAPTER VI

HOW SPECIAL NEWS SHOWS ARE VIEWED

Special news programs include documentaries, news analyses, panel discussions, and live broadcasts of news events. A total of 102 special news shows were received by the families in these studies, totalling 3,435 minutes. In total minutes, this was equal to about one-third the amount of regular news shows selected.

The most popular of the special news programs were CBS's Eye-witness, Twentieth Century and CBS Reports, and NBC's Brinkley's Journal and Chet Huntley Reporting. Other frequently selected specials were NBC's White Paper, CBS's Biography and ABC's Closeup.

Individual family viewing of special news ranged from none to 325 minutes in the 1962 Stillwater study. The 1962 study had an extremely high amount of live special broadcasts received --- a total of 24, amounting to 1,078 minutes. It was during this time, that the Cuban "crisis" occurred, and elections were held.

Family Averages

The average family tuned in one 30-minute news special each week. The average for two weeks was 1.85 shows and 62.45 minutes. Of these minutes, 36.73 had an attentive viewer present, 20.45 had an inattentive viewer present, and 12.25 had no audience at all. Attentive minutes for special news programs were considerably higher in proportion

TABLE LVI

SPECIAL NEWS PROGRAMS - COMBINED STUDIES

<u>Program</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Minutes</u>	<u>Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>
Brinkley's Journal	9	216	332	132	120	15
Chet Huntley Reporting	9	268	325	177	57	48
Meet The Press	3	90	74	19	35	41
NBC White Paper	5	188	369	158	44	17
Project 20	1	60	155	55	7	0
CBS Reports	7	317	276	103	113	108
Eyewitness	11	247	233	153	51	68
Twentieth Century	7	138	173	72	61	32
Biography	4	94	78	42	27	26
Washington Report	2	60	72	60	12	0
Closeup	3	72	83	42	33	23
Howard K. Smith	1	30	24	11	11	15

TABLE LVI (Continued)

<u>Program</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Minutes</u>	<u>Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>
Issues and Answers	2	42	42	13	29	0
Editor's Choice	1	4	4	0	4	0
Other Broadcasts	<u>37</u>	<u>1,609</u>	<u>2,151</u>	<u>983</u>	<u>521</u>	<u>281</u>
55 Families	102	3,435	4,390	2,020	1,125	674
Family Averages:						
2 Weeks:	1.85	62.45	79.82	36.73	20.45	12.25

to inattentive minutes for specials, than attentive minutes for regular news shows compared to inattentive minutes for regular news.

Average Audience

Special news programs had an average audience of 1.278 viewers per minute. Regular news shows had an average audience of 1.088 viewer per minute. Thus, specials received more attention than did regular news.

TABLE LVII

AVERAGE AUDIENCE FOR SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Minutes-Tuned-to-News</u>	<u>Average Audience Per Minute</u>
Stillwater, 1961	556	487	1.142
Stillwater, 1962	1,978	1,715	1.153
Wichita, 1963	804	518	1.552
Tulsa, 1963	<u>1,052</u>	<u>715</u>	<u>1.471</u>
55 Families	4,390	3,435	1.278

A marked distinction exists between average audience figures for the two Stillwater studies and those done in Wichita and Tulsa. The first two were made in early fall, and the latter two in winter. Average audience figures for the winter studies were considerably higher than for the early fall studies.

Audience Attention

TABLE LVIII

AUDIENCE ATTENTION TO SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Attentive Viewers</u>	<u>Inattentive Viewers</u>	<u>Average Audience</u>
Stillwater, 1961	.747	.395	1.142
Stillwater, 1962	.749	.404	1.153
Wichita, 1963	1.222	.330	1.552
Tulsa, 1963	<u>.944</u>	<u>.527</u>	<u>1.471</u>
55 Families	.861	.417	1.278

The average attentive audience for specials was .861 viewers, as compared to .562 for regular news shows. The average inattentive audience for specials was .417 viewers as compared to .526 for regular news shows. So, the average attentive viewing was higher for specials, and average inattentive viewing was lower.

Wichita had the highest average attentive audience with 1.222 viewers per minute. The lowest average attentive audience was .747 in the 1961 Stillwater study. The Wichita study also had the lowest inattentive audience average, .330 viewers. Tulsa had the highest inattentive average audience, .527 viewers.

Viewer Results

While the TV sets were tuned to special news, at least one attentive viewer was present 58.8 per cent of the time. There was an inattentive viewer present 32.75 per cent of the time, and there was no audience 19.62 per cent of the time.

TABLE LIX

PER CENT OF TIME ATTENTIVE AND INATTENTIVE VIEWERS
WERE PRESENT AND NO AUDIENCE TIME DURING SPECIAL
NEWS SHOWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Attentive Viewer Present</u>	<u>Inattentive Viewer Present</u>	<u>No Audience</u>
Stillwater, 1961	58.93	34.90	20.12
Stillwater, 1962	53.64	33.23	21.16
Wichita, 1963	66.80	24.33	20.85
Tulsa, 1963	<u>65.31</u>	<u>36.22</u>	<u>14.68</u>
55 Families	58.80	32.75	19.68

TABLE LX

PER CENT OF TOTAL VIEWERS WHO WERE ATTENTIVE OR INATTENTIVE
DURING SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Attentive</u>	<u>Inattentive</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	65.47	34.33	100.0
Stillwater, 1962	65.02	34.98	100.0
Wichita, 1963	78.73	21.27	100.0
Tulsa, 1963	<u>64.16</u>	<u>35.84</u>	<u>100.0</u>
55 Families	67.38	32.62	100.0

By dividing total viewer minutes for special news shows into attentive viewer minutes and into inattentive viewer minutes, the percentage of attentive and inattentive viewers for special news can be determined. Viewers were more attentive to specials than to regular news. Nearly 70 per cent of the viewers for special news were attentive. For regular news shows, only 51.64 per cent were attentive.

Audience Composition

Men were the major regular news viewers, and they also watched the most special news. Men comprised 43.59 per cent of the special news audience, as compared to 40.60 per cent of the regular news audience. Women totalled 38.10 per cent of the special news audience, as compared to 34.82 per cent of the regular news audience. Children watched special news shows even less than regular news, as they comprised only 18.31 per cent of the special news audience. Children made up 24.58 per cent of the regular news audience.

TABLE LXI

AUDIENCE COMPOSITION FOR SPECIAL NEWS, BY PER CENT
OF FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	50.36	37.23	12.41	100.0
Stillwater, 1962	46.06	42.21	11.73	100.0
Wichita, 1963	32.83	39.68	27.49	100.0
Tulsa, 1963	<u>43.63</u>	<u>29.57</u>	<u>26.80</u>	<u>100.0</u>
55 Families	43.59	38.10	18.31	100.0

Men did their least viewing in the Wichita study. Children did their most viewing in the Wichita study. The two Stillwater studies had the smallest children's audience. Again, weather conditions could have played an important role, for the percentage of special news viewing by children in the Tulsa and Wichita studies is twice that for children in the Stillwater studies. Much special news is at night, during prime time, which would not be affected by weather as much as daytime shows would be. But much special news also is on Saturday and

Sunday during day hours when children are at home --- inside or out --- depending on the weather.

TABLE LXII
AVERAGE AUDIENCE FOR SPECIAL NEWS, BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Audience</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Attentive	.458	.290	.113	.861
Inattentive	<u>.099</u>	<u>.197</u>	<u>.121</u>	<u>.417</u>
Total	.557	.487	.234	1.278

When men watched special news, they were almost always attentive. When women watched special news, they were attentive three out of five minutes. Children were attentive and inattentive about the same amount of time. Men were much more attentive for special news than for regular news. The average attentive male audience was .458 viewers for specials, and only .286 for regular news.

TABLE LXIII
AVERAGE AUDIENCE FOR SPECIAL NEWS PER STUDY,
BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	.575	.425	.142	1.142
Stillwater, 1962	.531	.487	.135	1.153
Wichita, 1963	.510	.616	.426	1.552
Tulsa, 1963	<u>.642</u>	<u>.435</u>	<u>.394</u>	<u>1.471</u>
55 Families	.557	.487	.234	1.278

The highest average audience for men was in the Tulsa study, .642 viewers per minute. The smallest average for men was in Wichita, .510 viewers. Women's highest average audience was in the Wichita study, .616 viewers per minute. The smallest average audience for women was in the 1961 Stillwater study, .425 viewers. The smallest children's audience was in the 1962 Stillwater study, .135 viewers per minute, and largest audience of children was in the Wichita study, .426 viewers per minute.

TABLE LXIV

AVERAGE ATTENTIVE AUDIENCE FOR SPECIAL NEWS PER STUDY
BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	.456	.248	.043	.747
Stillwater, 1962	.423	.281	.045	.749
Wichita, 1963	.458	.481	.283	1.222
Tulsa, 1963	<u>.544</u>	<u>.200</u>	<u>.200</u>	<u>.944</u>
55 Families	.458	.290	.113	.861

The highest average attentive audience for men was also in the Tulsa study, .544 viewers per minute. The smallest average attentive audience for men was not much smaller, .423 viewers, in the 1962 Stillwater study. Women's largest average attentive audience was .481 viewers per minute in the Wichita study. The smallest average for women was .200 in the Tulsa study. Children had an average audience of .283 viewers per minute in the Wichita study for the largest attentive children's audience. The smallest audience for children was .043 viewers per minute in the 1961 Stillwater study. The second Stillwater study had only a

slightly larger children's audience, .045 viewers per minute.

TABLE LXV

AVERAGE INATTENTIVE AUDIENCE FOR SPECIAL NEWS PER STUDY
BY FAMILY MEMBERS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	.119	.177	.099	.395
Stillwater, 1962	.108	.206	.090	.404
Wichita, 1963	.052	.135	.143	.330
Tulsa, 1963	<u>.098</u>	<u>.235</u>	<u>.194</u>	<u>.527</u>
55 Families	.099	.197	.121	.417

Men did not spend much time in front of the television set doing something other than watching. The largest inattentive audience for men was only .119 viewers per minute in the first Stillwater study. The smallest inattentive average for men was .052 viewers in the Wichita study.

Women did more inattentive viewing than any of the family members, with an average of .197 viewers per minute. The largest average was .235 in the Tulsa study, and the smallest was .135 in the Wichita study. The average inattentive children's audience was .121 viewers per minute, with the largest average audience in the Tulsa study, .194, and the smallest in the second Stillwater study, .090 viewers.

Program Selection by Day

TABLE LXVI

NUMBER OF SPECIAL NEWS SHOWS, BY DAYS PROGRAMS APPEARED

<u>Study</u>	<u>Sat.</u>	<u>Sun.</u>	<u>Mon.</u>	<u>Tue.</u>	<u>Wed.</u>	<u>Thur.</u>	<u>Fri.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	1	2	0	3	4	1	6	17
Stillwater, 1962	1	12	7	10	8	4	6	48
Wichita, 1963	0	8	1	5	2	0	0	16
Tulsa, 1963	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>21</u>
55 Families	3	29	10	21	17	7	15	102

Per Cent of Special News Shows by Days Programs Appeared

<u>Sat.</u>	<u>Sun.</u>	<u>Mon.</u>	<u>Tue.</u>	<u>Wed.</u>	<u>Thur.</u>	<u>Fri.</u>	<u>Total</u>
2.94	28.43	9.80	20.59	16.67	6.87	14.70	100.0

The day on which the largest number of special news programs was tuned was Sunday. Some 28.43 per cent of the specials selected were Sunday programs. The days when the smallest number of specials were tuned were Saturday, Monday, and Thursday. The largest amount of minutes tuned to special news was on Tuesday.

TABLE LXVII

MINUTES OF SPECIAL NEWS, BY DAYS PROGRAMS APPEARED

<u>Study</u>	<u>Sat.</u>	<u>Sun.</u>	<u>Mon.</u>	<u>Tue.</u>	<u>Wed.</u>	<u>Thur.</u>	<u>Fri.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	11	40	0	72	101	50	213	487
Stillwater, 1962	30	246	173	549	419	124	174	1,715
Wichita, 1963	0	253	30	150	85	0	0	518
Tulsa, 1963	<u>60</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>145</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>715</u>
55 Families	101	770	263	859	750	234	458	3,435

Per Cent of Minutes of Special News, by Days Programs Appeared

<u>Sat.</u>	<u>Sun.</u>	<u>Mon.</u>	<u>Tue.</u>	<u>Wed.</u>	<u>Thur.</u>	<u>Fri.</u>	<u>Total</u>
2.94	22.42	7.66	25.01	21.83	6.81	13.33	100.0

CHAPTER VII

NEWS SHOWS AND NEWS SPECIALS, COMBINED

Combining the results of regular and special news viewing shows audience size and nature in relation to all news programming. The total number of news shows selected, both regular and special, was 1,080. The 55 subject families tuned 14,429 minutes of news, an average of 18.74 minutes of news per day per family.

TABLE LXVIII

TOTAL NEWS SHOWS, REGULAR AND SPECIAL

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
978	102	1,080

TABLE LXIX

TOTAL MINUTES OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
10,994	3,435	14,429

TABLE LXX

TOTAL VIEWER MINUTES, REGULAR AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
11,961	4,390	16,351

The average audience for all news programs consisted of 1.133 viewers per minute. This average audience had .633 attentive viewers and .500 inattentive viewers.

TABLE LXXI

AVERAGE TOTAL AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR ALL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
1.088	1.278	1.133

TABLE LXXII

AVERAGE ATTENTIVE AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR ALL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
.562	.861	.633

TABLE LXXIII

AVERAGE INATTENTIVE AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR ALL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
.526	.417	.500

Some 47.45 per cent of the time news was on the TV set, at least one attentive viewer was present. At least one inattentive viewer was in front of the set 38.08 per cent of the time news was tuned. There was no audience at all for news shows 26.18 per cent of the time.

TABLE LXXIV

ATTENTIVE MINUTES FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
4,826	2,020	6,846

TABLE LXXV

PER CENT OF TIME NEWS WAS TUNED WHEN ATTENTIVE VIEWER WAS PRESENT

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
43.89	58.80	47.45

TABLE LXXVI

INATTENTIVE MINUTES FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
4,369	1,125	5,494

TABLE LXXVII

PER CENT OF TIME NEWS WAS TUNED WHEN INATTENTIVE VIEWER WAS PRESENT

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
39.74	32.75	38.08

TABLE LXXVIII

NO AUDIENCE MINUTES FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
3,104	674	3,778

TABLE LXXIX

PER CENT OF TIME NEWS WAS TUNED WHEN NO AUDIENCE WAS PRESENT

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
28.23	19.62	26.18

Family Member Viewing

The average male audience was .469 viewers. The average female audience for all news was .405 viewers. The average children's audience was .259 viewers.

TABLE LXXX

AVERAGE MALE AUDIENCE FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL NEWS PER MINUTE

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
.442	.557	.469

TABLE LXXXI

AVERAGE FEMALE AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
.379	.487	.405

TABLE LXXXII

AVERAGE CHILDREN'S AUDIENCE PER MINUTE FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
.267	.234	.259

Of total viewers for all news, 41.4 per cent were men, 35.7 per cent women, and 22.9 per cent children.

TABLE LXXXIII

PER CENT OF TOTAL AUDIENCE, MALE VIEWERS, FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
40.60	43.59	41.40

TABLE LXXXIV

PER CENT OF TOTAL AUDIENCE, FEMALE VIEWERS, FOR REGULAR
AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
34.82	38.10	35.70

TABLE LXXXV

PER CENT OF TOTAL AUDIENCE, CHILDREN VIEWERS, FOR REGULAR
AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Regular</u>	<u>Special</u>	<u>Total</u>
24.58	18.31	22.90

Commercial Minutes

A total of 2,499 commercial minutes were recorded in these studies. On the average, there was a commercial every 5.77 minutes. The average audience for a commercial was 1.114 viewers, very close to the overall audience average for news shows. The average commercial audience consisted of .548 attentive viewers and .566 inattentive viewers per minute. Twenty-seven per cent of the time a commercial was on, there was no audience.

TABLE LXXXVI

COMMERCIAL MINUTES DURING REGULAR AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Commercial Minutes</u>	<u>Attentive Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Inattentive Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>
Stillwater, 1961	566	302	257	189
Stillwater, 1962	1,073	592	629	262
Wichita, 1963	406	281	242	98
Tulsa, 1963	<u>454</u>	<u>195</u>	<u>287</u>	<u>129</u>
55 Families	2,499	1,370	1,415	678

TABLE LXXXVII

AVERAGE COMMERCIAL AUDIENCE PER MINUTE DURING REGULAR AND SPECIAL NEWS

<u>Attentive Viewers</u>	<u>Inattentive Viewers</u>	<u>Total</u>
.548	.566	1.114

TABLE LXXXVIII

PER CENT OF COMMERCIAL MINUTES, NO AUDIENCE PRESENT, ALL NEWS

<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Commercial Minutes</u>	<u>Per Cent No Audience</u>
678	2,499	27.13

TABLE LXXXIX

COMMERCIAL MINUTES DURING REGULAR NEWS SHOWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Commercial Minutes</u>	<u>Attentive Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Inattentive Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>
Stillwater, 1961	503	255	231	173
Stillwater, 1962	926	471	541	244
Wichita, 1963	365	235	214	92
Tulsa, 1963	<u>393</u>	<u>151</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>116</u>
55 Families	2,187	1,112	1,231	625

TABLE XC

COMMERCIAL MINUTES DURING SPECIAL NEWS SHOWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Commercial Minutes</u>	<u>Attentive Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Inattentive Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>
Stillwater, 1961	63	47	26	16
Stillwater, 1962	147	121	88	18
Wichita, 1963	41	46	28	6
Tulsa, 1963	<u>61</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>13</u>
55 Families	312	258	184	53

Co-ordinate Activities

During news shows, 24 per cent of the time the viewers were performing activities other than viewing. These activities were divided into eight categories: reading newspapers; reading magazines; reading other material; eating; playing; sleeping; performing household chores; and miscellaneous.

Under the miscellaneous category went such items as talking on the telephone; writing letters; studying; rolling hair; applying makeup;

and talking.

The most frequent co-ordinate activity was newspaper reading, which totalled 26.66 per cent of all activity viewer minutes. The miscellaneous category was second with 23.44 per cent of all activity viewer minutes, and reading other material was third with 15.57 per cent. The three reading categories, newspapers, magazines, and other material, combined totalled more than half of all activities, 52.06 per cent.

TABLE XCI

ACTIVITY VIEWER MINUTES DURING ALL NEWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Activity Viewer Minutes Regular News</u>	<u>Activity Viewer Minutes Special News</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	924	135	1,059
Stillwater, 1962	1,113	291	1,404
Wichita, 1963	538	63	601
Tulsa, 1963	<u>728</u>	<u>236</u>	<u>964</u>
55 Families	3,303	725	4,028

TABLE XCII

PER CENT OF VIEWER MINUTES DURING ALL NEWS IN WHICH
ACTIVITY WAS PERFORMED

	<u>Activity Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Total	4,028	16,731	24.08
Regular	3,303	11,961	27.61
Special	725	4,390	16.51

TABLE XCIII

ACTIVITY VIEWER MINUTES BY ACTIVITY DURING ALL NEWS

<u>Study</u>	<u>Reading Newspaper</u>	<u>Reading Magazine</u>	<u>Reading Other</u>	<u>Eating</u>	<u>Playing</u>	<u>Sleeping</u>	<u>House- Work</u>	<u>Misc.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stillwater, 1961	260	179	141	142	0	103	74	160	1,059
Stillwater, 1962	440	189	217	135	29	163	47	184	1,404
Wichita, 1963	112	5	74	32	94	33	38	213	601
Tulsa, 1963	<u>262</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>195</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>387</u>	<u>964</u>
55 Families	1,074	396	627	334	171	313	169	944	4,028
Per Cent of all Activities:	26.66	9.83	15.57	8.29	4.25	7.77	4.19	23.44	100.0

CHAPTER VIII

NEWS SHOW VIEWING HABITS AND OVERALL VIEWING BEHAVIOR

The 55 families in this study had their TV sets on nearly 200,000 minutes.¹ Of this total sets-in-use time, 7.37 per cent was news.

TABLE XCIV

PER CENT OF TOTAL SETS-IN-USE TIME NEWS WAS TUNED (MINUTES)

<u>Sets-In-Use</u>	<u>News</u>	<u>Per Cent News</u>
195,796	14,429	7.37

The average family had the TV set on 254.3 minutes each day --- 4.3 hours. Of this amount, 18.7 minutes were news. The average family tuned 29.7 hours of television each week. Of this 2.2 hours were news.

TABLE XCV

PER CENT OF TOTAL SETS-IN-USE TIME NEWS WAS TUNED, BY STUDY

<u>Study</u>	<u>Sets-In-Use</u>	<u>News</u>	<u>Per Cent News</u>
Stillwater, 1961	49,111	3,195	6.51
Stillwater, 1962	63,566	5,820	9.16
Wichita, 1963	45,258	2,705	5.98
Tulsa, 1963	<u>37,861</u>	<u>2,709</u>	<u>7.16</u>
55 Families	195,796	14,429	7.37

¹Figures for overall viewing time are for 55 families used in this study of news, not for 95 families reviewed in Chapter II.

News shows had a slightly smaller audience than all programs combined.² News shows had an average audience of 1.133 viewers per minute, .287 viewers less than for all programs. The average attentive audience per minute was .267 greater for all programs, and the average inattentive audience was .20 greater for all programs.

TABLE XCVI

AVERAGE TOTAL, ATTENTIVE, AND INATTENTIVE AUDIENCES PER MINUTE

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Attentive</u>	<u>Inattentive</u>
All Programs (95 Families)	1.42	.90	.52
News (55 Families)	1.133	.633	.500

The average attentive audience for the combined 95-family Allen study revealed a slightly different viewing pattern for all programs than for news shows. The average attentive audience for all shows consisted of .26 men, .26 women, and .39 children.

The average attentive audience for news shows was .327 men, .199 women, and .107 children. The average attentive male audience for news shows was higher than for all programs. The average attentive audiences for women and children were smaller. The average attentive children's audience took a severe plunge for news programming.

For all programs and all sets-in-use time, there was no audience 19.0 per cent of the time.³ For news shows, there was no audience 26.18 per cent of the time.

²Audience figures for all programs based on figures for 95-family study.

³No audience time for all programs based on figures for 95-family study.

TABLE XCVII

PER CENT OF TIME NO AUDIENCE WAS PRESENT

All Programs
(95 Families)

19.0

News Shows
(55 Families)

26.18

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The average family tuned one regular news show per day and one special news program per week. The average audience for all news was 1.133 viewers per minute, a seemingly small number, and smaller than the 1.42 viewers per minute for all programs. Attention was less for news than for other programming, and news had a larger percentage of no audience time.

Men comprised a greater percentage of the news audience than they did for all programs, indicating that news is more popular with men than other family members. The children's audience was quite small, indicating that news is not very popular among the youngsters.

Seventy-three per cent of the regular news shows were tuned after 5 p.m. The largest percentage of the minutes of news was at night. Of the total viewer minutes, nearly half were at night, and of the attentive viewer minutes, more than half were at night.

Sixty-eight per cent of the regular news tuned was of local origin, and 32 per cent were network shows. Of all the network shows, more than half of those tuned were NBC programs.

The most popular special news shows were depth-reporting programs: Eyewitness, Twentieth Century, CBS Reports, Brinkley's Journal, Chet Huntley Reporting, and NBC's White Paper.

Specials drew about the same number of viewers as entertainment

shows, but the audience composition was different. Men and women did twice as much viewing of special news as did children. Only 18 per cent of the time special news was tuned, was a child present.

TABLE XCVIII
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF NEWS SHOW VIEWING

Per Cent News Selected of All Tuning	7.37 %
Regular News Shows Tuned Per Day Per Family	1.28 Shows
Minutes of Regular News Tuned Per Day Per Family	14.27 Minutes
Special News Shows Tuned Per Week Per Family	.93 Shows
Minutes of Special News Tuned Per Week Per Family	31.23 Minutes
Average Audience Per Minute for All News	1.133 Viewers
Average Audience Per Minute for Regular News	1.088 Viewers
Average Audience Per Minute for Special News	1.278 Viewers
Average Male Audience Per Minute for All News	.469 Viewers
Average Female Audience Per Minute for All News	.405 Viewers
Average Children's Audience Per Minute for All News	.259 Viewers
Percentage of Men in Total Audience for All News	41.40 %
Percentage of Women in Total Audience for All News	35.70 %
Percentage of Children in Total Audience for All News	22.90 %
Percentage of No Audience Time	26.18 %
Average Audience Per Commercial Minute During News	1.114 Viewers
Percentage of No Audience Time for Commercials	27.13 %
Percentage of Time News Was Tuned When Co-ordinate Activities Were Performed	24.0 %
Percentage of Minutes of News of Network Origin	27.3 %
Percentage of Minutes of News of Local Origin	72.7 %

TABLE XCVIII (Continued)

Percentage of Minutes of Network News Tuned By Network

ABC	21.8 %
CBS	25.0 %
NBC	53.2 %

Conclusions

1. News show audiences are not as large as audiences for entertainment programs.

2. Men are the most devoted news watchers. Men watch more news and watch more attentively than do other family members.

3. Children watch very small amounts of news. The child audience is much smaller for news than for other programs. Only in Wichita, during extreme cold weather, were child audiences comparable to adult audiences for news.

4. Women do more inattentive viewing than other family members because they perform more co-ordinate activities.

5. The audience for news consists of about 50 per cent attentive viewers and 50 per cent inattentive viewers. News is a program-type which can be listened to without missing much of the integral material. Thus, a great amount of the time news is on, an audience is present but involved in some activity other than viewing.

6. Special news shows are watched more attentively than regular news shows. Special news viewing closely resembles the pattern for viewing of all programs. The average attentive audience for special news is much larger than for regular news. The nature of the program accounts for this. The video portion is heavily emphasized,

thus demanding the visual attention of the viewer more than regular news does.

7. Most families tune to at least one regular news show each day and one special news program each week. The average family selected 14.27 minutes of regular news each day and 31.23 minutes of special news per week.

8. Most news show viewing is done after 5 p.m., and the 10 p.m. newscasts has the largest audience and is selected the most. Seventy-three per cent of the regular news shows tuned in the study were after 5 p.m., with 38.1 per cent during the night time period and 34.8 per cent during the evening time period. Of the minutes of regular news tuned, 43.5 per cent were during the night time period. The evening audience is somewhat smaller than the night audience, primarily because women do much less viewing during that time period, as they are usually busy preparing dinner. Also many men miss the evening news period because they do not arrive home from work in time. The size of the night audience presents an interesting question. Why have the networks devoted so much attention to evening programming, expanding from 15- to 30-minute formats, when they are not reaching the peak audience?

9. Children are the morning viewers; women the afternoon viewers; and men the late viewers. By percentage of audience children do almost all the morning news viewing. However, by actual viewer minutes, the largest amount of children's viewing is done in the evening. Women make up the largest portion of the afternoon audience, but they do their greatest amount of viewing at night.

Men comprise more than 40 per cent of both the evening and night audiences, but they do very little viewing at any other time of day.

10. Viewers watch more news shows of local origin than network news programs. Two-thirds of the regular news shows tuned are local programs. The offering of local news shows is often greater in quantity by total minutes, but rarely in the number of programs. Networks usually offer several 5-minute shows each day plus the featured evening program and some night shows. The local station usually offers four news shows per day. Local news shows generally have the best time spots, since they have almost exclusive rights to the 10 p.m. news. The networks have a large number of daytime shows which draw little or no audience. The conclusion could be drawn that viewers prefer local news to national news. However, most shows of local origin offer some national news coverage, so the time element is probably the greatest factor in news selection.

11. The weather is an important influence on viewing habits. When the weather was bad (during the Wichita and Tulsa studies), the TV set was turned on more and the families watched more. Children's viewing was especially high during bad weather. More news was tuned, and more news was watched during the severe cold. Even children watched more news.

12. Times of crisis and international interest drew especially large audiences to the television sets for news. The 1962 Stillwater study demonstrates that viewers tune many more special and regular news shows during times when important news events occur.

13. The audience for commercials during news programs is less attentive than the audience for the news show itself. The average audience for commercials was only slightly less than the average audience for news, but there was considerably more inattentive viewing during the commercial minutes.

14. The most common co-ordinate activity for television viewers is reading. More than half the activity time was devoted to reading newspapers, magazines, or other material. About one-fourth the time the set was on, some co-ordinate activity was performed.

15. No audience time for news is considerably greater than for all programs. There was no audience present 27.13 per cent of the time news was tuned. There was no audience 19.0 per cent of all programming. No audience time for special news was less than for regular news, with specials having no audience 19.62 per cent of the time compared to 28.23 per cent for regular newscasts. Again, the fact that regular news is a listener-type program, while special news requires more visual attention, explains the difference in attention.

Comparisons

Don Crammer Smith concluded in his study that attention given to television could not be measured precisely.¹ The methodology used in this study of news audiences reveals that attention levels can be determined --- in terms of attentive and inattentive viewers per minute.

This thesis agrees with Smith's conclusion that attention levels are highest during the evening hours (6-10 p.m.)²

This study does not agree with the findings which showed that the lowest average level of attention for women is between 4 and 6 p.m.³ The highest level of inattention for women in this study of news was between 4 and 6 p.m., but the lowest level of attention came during the morning hours.

¹Smith, p. 1.

²Ibid., p. 249.

³Smith, p. 6.

The results of this research agree with Whan's conclusion that morning and afternoon news shows draw few viewers.⁴ And this study agrees with Whan's in reporting that more than half of the afternoon audience is composed of women.⁵

This study of news audiences also agrees with those studies which have revealed that children watch very little news programming.⁶

The findings of Profile of the Millions show that there is a progressive increase in the number of television viewers from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m.⁷ This study of news audiences agrees with this conclusion. There is even a larger audience for 10 p.m. news than for 6 p.m. news.

This study also agrees with Steiner's average number of shows tuned per week.⁸ Steiner's work was with individuals in separate households, while this study was of family viewing. But the results for both should include entire family viewing. His study revealed that the average viewer tuned from 7.5 to 12.5 news shows per week.⁹ This study of news showed that the average family tuned nine news shows per week.

⁴Whan, p. 13.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Barnes, p. 326.

⁷Profile of the Millions, pp. 3-9.

⁸Steiner, p. 171

⁹Ibid.

This study agrees also with Steiner's conclusion that men select more news than women.¹⁰ Men comprised 41.40 per cent of all news audiences in this study.

¹⁰Steiner, p. 173.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barnes, Arthur M., "Research in Radio and Television News, 1947-57," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Summer, 1957), p. 323.
- Cornish, Rita P., "Four Allen TV Audience Studies: A Research Report." Unpub. Report, Oklahoma State University, 1963.
- _____, Advertising Age, Vol. 34, No. 13 (March 25, 1963), p.12.
- _____, Advertising Age, Vol. 34, No. 3 (January 15, 1963).
- Morgan, Thomas B., "Crisis, Conflict and Change in TV News," Look, Vol. 25, No. 23 (November 7, 1961), pp. 48-51.
- _____, Profiles of the Millions (3rd Edition). New York: News Syndicate Co., Inc., 1962.
- Seehafer, Gene F., and Laemmar, Jack W., Successful Television and Radio Advertising. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- _____, "Total U.S. Advertising at \$12.5 Billion Peak; \$20 Billion Seen as Economy Grows," Advertising Age, Vol. 34, No. 3 (January 15, 1963), p. 8, 82.
- _____, "Nielsen Accused of Sample-Size Deception," Advertising Age, Vol. 34, No. 14 (April 3, 1963), p. 1.
- Smith, Don Crammer, "Levels of Attention Given to Television by Housewives of Tuscaloosa, Alabama, in 1955," Unpub. Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1955.
- _____, Broadcasting, Vol. 63, Pt. 2 (December 24, 1962) pp. 22-85.
- _____, "How'll Radio-TV Ratings Fare With Harris?," Printers' Ink, Vol. 282, No. 12 (March 22, 1963), pp. 7-8.
- Steiner, Gary A., The People Look at Television: A Study of Audience Attitudes. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
- _____, "Sponsor-Scope," Sponsor, Vol. 16, No. 42 (October 15, 1962), p. 19.
- Whan, Forest L., "Daytime Use of TV by Iowa Housewives," The Iowa Radio Audience Survey of 1957. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1957.

APPENDIX A

VIEWING OF REGULAR NEWS PROGRAMS

TABLE XCIX

SUMMARY FOR ALL FAMILIES IN ALL STUDIES
FOR REGULAR NEWS VIEWING

	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
Stillwater, 1961 (15)	732	355	301	1,051	793
Stillwater, 1962 (20)	1,327	900	188	1,931	1,336
Wichita, 1963 (10)	572	423	532	1,105	815
Tulsa, 1963 (10)	<u>507</u>	<u>205</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>739</u>	<u>577</u>
55 Families	3,138	1,883	1,156	4,826	3,521

TABLE XCIX (Continued)

	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
Stillwater, 1961 (15)	407	456	304	956	698
Stillwater, 1962 (20)	685	1,038	597	1,761	1,166
Wichita, 1963 (10)	221	404	496	778	488
Tulsa, 1963 (10)	<u>405</u>	<u>384</u>	<u>387</u>	<u>874</u>	<u>712</u>
55 Families	1,718	2,282	1,784	4,369	3,064

	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewers Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
Stillwater, 1961 (15)	959	2,555	2,708
Stillwater, 1962 (20)	1,008	4,735	4,105
Wichita, 1963 (10)	594	2,648	2,187
Tulsa, 1963 (10)	<u>543</u>	<u>2,023</u>	<u>1,994</u>
55 Families	3,104	11,961	10,994

TABLE C
 SUMMARY OF REGULAR NEWS VIEWING
 1961 STILLWATER STUDY

<u>Family</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	5	0	28	32	29
2	42	0	32	59	59
3	59	1	13	66	45
4	136	58	0	132	97
5	18	49	0	53	40
6	4	12	19	31	19
7	92	15	10	104	49
8	128	77	3	154	120
9	30	6	0	34	25
10	80	6	0	80	80
11	0	0	19	19	19

TABLE C (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
12	47	59	54	115	96
13	16	13	44	43	36
14	0	0	0	0	0
<u>15</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>129</u>	<u>79</u>
Totals	732	355	301	1,051	793

<u>Family</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	18	1	49	50	47
2	31	0	30	49	49
3	44	16	62	77	56
4	83	10	0	85	50
5	13	62	0	52	39
6	14	10	21	38	26
7	7	69	31	100	45
8	34	109	13	124	90

TABLE C (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
9	67	41	14	104	95
10	26	3	0	29	29
11	0	0	8	8	8
12	23	80	10	107	88
13	0	5	9	14	7
14	0	0	21	21	21
<u>15</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>48</u>
Totals	407	456	304	956	698

<u>Family</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewers Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
1	161	101	240
2	142	135	250
3	34	195	156
4	66	287	248
5	52	142	144

TABLE C (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewers Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
6	97	80	154
7	64	224	213
8	43	364	287
9	41	158	170
10	34	115	143
11	22	27	49
12	77	273	280
13	26	87	76
14	14	21	35
<u>15</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>346</u>	<u>263</u>
Totals	959	2,555	2,708

TABLE CI

SUMMARY OF REGULAR NEWS VIEWING IN
1962 STILLWATER STUDY

<u>Family</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	26	19	1	43	23
2	73	14	0	76	72
3	56	18	2	61	32
4	0	41	0	41	26
5	144	23	0	154	125
6	96	128	59	214	72
7	99	38	5	126	87
8	46	20	7	46	23
9	95	52	0	115	70
10	12	18	8	30	26
11	4	27	0	29	15

TABLE CI (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
12	8	0	8	11	11
13	116	71	14	138	81
14	22	11	11	39	28
15	167	59	7	181	162
16	95	23	1	106	75
17	0	8	65	55	16
18	38	120	0	144	104
19	142	145	0	210	185
<u>20</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>103</u>
Totals	1,327	900	188	1,931	1,336

TABLE CI (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	59	43	22	98	78
2	29	13	0	41	37
3	23	56	83	117	88
4	15	29	0	44	29
5	124	121	0	205	176
6	35	63	158	181	39
7	34	58	35	101	62
8	7	29	26	40	17
9	30	99	0	109	64
10	14	15	9	19	15
11	14	66	61	70	56
12	7	0	7	9	9
13	66	68	1	102	45
14	63	25	43	98	87
15	26	10	59	83	64

TABLE CI (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
16	33	66	14	89	58
17	19	18	79	59	20
18	41	178	0	176	136
19	7	68	0	70	45
<u>20</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>41</u>
Totals	685	1,038	597	1,761	1,166

<u>Family</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewers Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
1	12	170	133
2	26	129	139
3	81	238	230
4	33	85	103
5	77	412	407
6	5	539	258

TABLE CI (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewers Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
7	87	269	275
8	15	135	78
9	52	276	231
10	0	76	45
11	31	172	116
12	56	30	76
13	0	336	183
14	76	175	202
15	32	328	277
16	237	232	401
17	2	189	77
18	144	377	424
19	10	362	265
<u>20</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>205</u>	<u>185</u>
Totals	1,008	4,735	4,105

TABLE CII

SUMMARY OF REGULAR NEWS VIEWING IN WICHITA STUDY

Family	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	0	0	4	4	0
2	130	64	21	138	90
3	20	18	26	40	30
4	8	16	3	23	19
5	90	78	177	189	122
6	33	26	96	119	79
7	132	21	0	133	104
8	95	66	48	183	137
9	0	86	25	94	76
<u>10</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>187</u>	<u>158</u>
Totals	572	423	532	1,105	815

Family	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	0	2	33	14	10
2	45	53	33	75	27
3	23	74	76	110	100
4	20	61	12	62	58
5	15	45	112	118	51
6	34	20	91	107	67
7	23	63	0	71	42
8	44	59	38	111	65
9	0	20	41	49	31
<u>10</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>37</u>
Totals	221	404	496	778	488

TABLE CII (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
1	10	39	24
2	18	346	183
3	63	237	203
4	98	120	179
5	26	517	266
6	64	300	250
7	9	239	184
8	119	350	367
9	68	172	193
<u>10</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>328</u>	<u>338</u>
Totals	594	2,648	2,187

TABLE CIII

SUMMARY OF REGULAR NEWS VIEWING IN TULSA STUDY

<u>Family</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	53	16	1	60	49
2	55	22	0	67	61
3	46	19	3	60	59
4	24	6	48	67	52
5	177	8	16	184	133
6	13	0	0	13	3
7	10	4	0	14	14

TABLE CIII (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
8	15	50	31	83	57
9	60	9	36	100	81
<u>10</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>68</u>
Totals	507	205	135	739	577

<u>Family</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	8	26	9	40	29
2	5	29	0	29	23
3	2	27	14	36	35
4	81	28	31	109	94
5	42	20	92	109	58
6	7	61	0	52	42
7	65	67	100	147	147
8	7	37	107	99	73
9	48	23	34	91	72
<u>10</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>139</u>
Totals	405	384	387	874	712

TABLE CIII (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
1	61	113	150
2	10	111	100
3	21	111	116
4	128	218	289
5	10	355	252
6	61	81	116
7	94	246	255
8	43	247	199
9	40	210	212
<u>10</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>331</u>	<u>305</u>
Totals	543	2,023	1,994

TABLE CIV

SUMMARY FOR 1961 STILLWATER STUDY BY DAY PART

<u>Category</u>	<u>Morn- ing</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>After- noon</u>	<u>Eve- ning</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Number News Shows Tuned	10	31	8	66	106	221
Minutes Tuned to News	121	318	40	764	1,465	2,708
Attentive Minutes	12	115	15	377	532	1,051
Inattentive Minutes	37	75	14	267	563	956
No Audience Minutes	72	145	17	199	526	959

TABLE CIV (Continued)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Morn- ing</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>After- noon</u>	<u>Eve- ning</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Attentive Viewer Minutes						
Men	0	75	0	238	419	732
Women	0	30	5	117	203	355
Children	12	29	18	169	73	301
Total	12	134	23	524	695	1,388
Inattentive Viewer Minutes						
Men	0	19	0	132	256	407
Women	0	43	11	91	311	456
Children	39	28	4	111	122	304
Total	39	90	15	334	689	1,167
Total Viewer Minutes	51	224	38	858	1,384	2,555

TABLE CV

SUMMARY OF 1962 STILLWATER STUDY BY DAY PART

<u>Category</u>	<u>Morn- ing</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>After- noon</u>	<u>Eve- ning</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Number News Shows Tuned	20	39	33	140	123	355
Minutes Tuned to News	113	350	165	1,951	1,526	4,105
Attentive Minutes	33	95	64	831	908	1,931
Inattentive Minutes	39	130	63	831	698	1,761
No Audience Minutes	60	151	47	570	180	1,008

TABLE CV (Continued)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Morn- ing</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>After- noon</u>	<u>Eve- ning</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Attentive Viewer Minutes						
Men	0	46	18	564	699	1,327
Women	7	59	51	347	436	900
Children	36	15	2	91	44	188
Total	43	120	71	1,002	1,179	2,415
Inattentive Viewer Minutes						
Men	1	39	12	317	316	685
Women	12	61	43	420	502	1,038
Children	76	51	35	351	84	597
Total	89	151	90	1,088	902	2,320
Total Viewer Minutes	132	271	161	2,090	2,081	4,735

TABLE CVI

SUMMARY OF WICHITA STUDY BY DAY PART

<u>Category</u>	<u>Morn- ing</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>After- noon</u>	<u>Eve- ning</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Number News Shows Tuned	23	31	28	55	68	205
Minutes Tuned to News	113	349	140	666	919	2,187
Attentive Minutes	30	111	53	340	571	1,105
Inattentive Minutes	47	102	43	196	390	778
No Audience Minutes	46	155	51	201	141	594

TABLE CVI (Continued)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Morn- ing</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>After- noon</u>	<u>Eve- ning</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Attentive Viewer Minutes						
Men	17	7	6	200	342	572
Women	4	10	34	65	310	423
Children	12	110	21	196	193	532
Total	33	127	61	461	845	1,527
Inattentive Viewer Minutes						
Men	8	13	5	55	140	221
Women	28	54	37	62	223	404
Children	21	60	16	195	204	496
Total	57	127	58	312	567	1,121
Total Viewer Minutes	90	254	119	773	1,412	2,648

TABLE CVII

SUMMARY OF TULSA STUDY BY DAY PART

<u>Category</u>	<u>Morn- ing</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>After- noon</u>	<u>Eve- ning</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Number News Shows Tuned	3	15	25	78	76	197
Minutes Tuned to News	15	150	155	800	874	1,994
Attentive Minutes	3	54	20	231	431	739
Inattentive Minutes	5	61	82	363	363	874
No Audience Minutes	8	39	59	282	155	543

TABLE CVII (Continued)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Morn- ing</u>	<u>Noon</u>	<u>After- noon</u>	<u>Eye- ning</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Attentive Viewer Minutes						
Men	0	11	9	98	389	507
Women	0	13	9	77	106	205
Children	3	38	6	82	6	135
Total	3	62	24	257	501	847
Inattentive Viewer Minutes						
Men	0	7	31	227	140	405
Women	0	44	17	113	210	384
Children	10	58	39	160	120	387
Total	10	109	87	500	470	1,176
Total Viewer Minutes	13	171	111	757	971	2,023

TABLE CVIII

SUMMARY OF 1961 STILLWATER STUDY BY TV STATION

<u>Category</u>	<u>Total</u>
Station Selection	
Number of News Shows Tuned Per Station	
KVOO-TV (2)	2
WKY-TV (4)	121
KOCO-TV (5)	50
KOTV (6)	2
KTUL-TV (8)	0
KWTV (9)	<u>46</u>
Total	221

TABLE CVIII (Continued)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Total</u>
Station Selection	
Minutes of News Tuned Per Station	
KVOO-TV	34
WKY-TV	1,519
KOCO-TV	521
KOTV	31
KTUL-TV	0
KWTV	<u>603</u>
Total	2,708

TABLE CIX

SUMMARY OF 1962 STILLWATER STUDY BY TV STATION

<u>Category</u>	<u>Total</u>
Station Selection	
Number of News Shows Tuned Per Station	
KVOO-TV (2)	23
WKY-TV (4)	172
KOCO-TV (5)	42
KOTV (6)	13
KTUL-TV (8)	0
KWTV (9)	<u>105</u>
Total	355

TABLE CIX (Continued)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Total</u>
Station Selection	
Minutes of News Tuned Per Station	
KVOO-TV	170
WKY-TV	2,209
KOCO-TV	335
KOTV	109
KTUL-TV	0
KWTW	<u>1,282</u>
Total	4,105

TABLE CX

SUMMARY OF WICHITA STUDY BY STATION

<u>Category</u>	<u>Total</u>
Station Selection	
Number of News Shows Tuned Per Station	
KARD-TV	97
KAKE-TV	66
KTVH	<u>42</u>
Total	205
Minutes of News Tuned Per Station	
KARD-TV	942
KAKE-TV	820
KTVH	<u>425</u>
Total	2,187

TABLE CXI
SUMMARY OF TULSA STUDY BY STATION

<u>Category</u>	<u>Total</u>
Station Selection	
Number of News Shows Tuned Per Station	
KVOO-TV (2)	93
KOTV (6)	65
KTUL-TV (8)	38
KTEN-TV (10)	<u>1</u>
Total	197
Minutes of News Tuned Per Station	
KVOO-TV	830
KOTV	714
KTUL-TV	435
KTEN-TV	<u>15</u>
Total	1,994

TABLE CXII
 NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED,
 LOCAL AND NETWORK NEWS

Stillwater, 1961 Family	Local		Network	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	19	222	2	18
2	13	195	7	55
3	11	145	1	11
4	13	158	6	90
5	10	144	0	0
6	10	124	2	30
7	12	155	5	58
8	14	192	9	95
9	11	125	3	45
10	9	113	2	30
11	3	29	2	20
12	19	235	3	45
13	5	46	2	30
14	2	20	2	15
<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>187</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>76</u>
Totals	165	2,090	56	618
Average Per Family	11	139.3	3.7	41.2

TABLE CXIII
 NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED,
 LOCAL AND NETWORK NEWS

Stillwater, 1962 Family	Local		Network	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	9	125	1	8
2	9	109	3	30
3	11	160	10	70
4	5	53	4	50
5	19	282	9	125
6	11	178	6	80
7	18	225	6	50
8	6	68	1	10
9	13	151	7	80
10	4	30	1	15
11	8	86	4	30
12	9	51	2	25
13	11	141	4	42
14	16	167	3	35
15	16	240	3	37
16	19	281	11	120
17	10	64	2	13
18	27	304	15	120
19	15	166	14	99
<u>20</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>185</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	249	3,066	106	1,039
Average Per Family	12.4	153.3	5.3	51.9

TABLE CXIV
 NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED,
 LOCAL AND NETWORK NEWS

<u>Wichita Family</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Network</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Minutes</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Minutes</u>
1	1	10	2	14
2	12	163	2	20
3	10	118	15	85
4	10	114	13	65
5	15	205	5	61
6	15	180	9	70
7	8	99	8	85
8	21	244	10	123
9	10	140	7	53
<u>10</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>233</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>105</u>
Totals	121	1,506	84	681
Average Per Family	12.1	150.6	8.4	68.1

TABLE CXV
 NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED,
 LOCAL AND NETWORK NEWS

<u>Tulsa Family</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Network</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Minutes</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Minutes</u>
1	10	120	2	30
2	7	78	2	22
3	10	105	3	11
4	14	145	14	144
5	17	227	5	25
6	9	76	4	40
7	16	160	9	95
8	17	132	10	67
9	14	119	7	93
<u>10</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>145</u>
Totals	132	1,322	65	672
Average Per Family	13.2	132.2	6.5	67.2

TABLE CXVI

NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, NETWORK NEWS
IN 1961 STILLWATER STUDY

Family	NBC		CBS		ABC	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	1	3	0	0	1	15
2	6	40	0	0	1	15
3	1	11	0	0	0	0
4	4	60	0	0	2	30
5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	1	15	1	15
7	1	5	2	23	2	30
8	9	95	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	3	45
10	0	0	0	0	2	30
11	1	15	1	5	0	0
12	1	15	0	0	2	30
13	1	15	0	0	1	15
14	0	0	1	5	1	10
<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>51</u>
Totals	28	274	7	58	21	286
Per Cent						
Per Network	50.0	44.3	12.5	9.4	37.5	46.3

TABLE CXVII

 NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, NETWORK NEWS
 IN 1962 STILLWATER STUDY

Family	NBC		CBS		ABC	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	1	8	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	2	20	1	10
3	8	60	2	10	0	0
4	1	15	2	20	1	15
5	0	0	9	125	0	0
6	5	75	0	0	1	5
7	0	0	3	15	3	35
8	0	0	0	0	1	10
9	3	36	2	19	2	25
10	1	15	0	0	0	0
11	3	25	1	5	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	2	25
13	3	32	0	0	1	10
14	2	30	1	5	0	0
15	3	37	0	0	0	0
16	11	120	0	0	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	2	13
18	9	70	6	50	0	0
19	8	63	1	5	5	31
<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	58	586	29	274	19	179
Per Cent Per Network	54.7	56.4	27.4	26.4	17.9	17.2

TABLE CXVIII

NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, NETWORK NEWS
IN WICHITA STUDY

Family	NBC		CBS		ABC	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	2	14	0	0	0	0
2	1	5	0	0	1	15
3	14	80	0	0	1	5
4	3	15	10	50	0	0
5	1	5	2	30	2	26
6	7	60	1	5	1	5
7	8	85	0	0	0	0
8	5	61	0	0	5	62
9	2	20	0	0	5	33
<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>30</u>
Totals	52	410	15	95	17	176
Per Cent Per Network	61.9	60.2	17.9	14.0	20.2	25.8

TABLE CXIX

NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, NETWORK NEWS
IN TULSA STUDY

Family	NBC		CBS		ABC	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	1	15	0	0	1	15
2	1	7	1	15	0	0
3	2	10	1	1	0	0
4	4	20	10	124	0	0
5	5	25	0	0	0	0

TABLE CXIX (Continued)

Family	<u>NBC</u>		<u>CBS</u>		<u>ABC</u>	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
6	2	30	2	10	0	0
7	1	15	8	80	0	0
8	6	33	4	34	0	0
9	6	63	1	30	0	0
<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	36	333	28	324	1	15
Per Cent						
Per Network	55.4	49.6	43.1	48.2	1.5	2.2

TABLE CXX

NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, EVENING NETWORK NEWS (15-MINUTE PROGRAMS) IN 1961 STILLWATER STUDY

Family	<u>NBC</u>		<u>CBS</u>		<u>ABC</u>	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	15	0	0	0	0
3	1	11	0	0	0	0
4	4	60	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	1	15	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	2	23	2	30
8	5	75	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE CXX (Continued)

Family	<u>NBC</u>		<u>CBS</u>		<u>ABC</u>	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
11	1	15	0	0	0	0
12	1	15	0	0	0	0
13	1	15	0	0	1	15
14	0	0	0	0	1	15
<u>15</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>33</u>
Totals	14	206	3	38	7	93
Per Cent Per Network	58.3	61.1	12.5	11.3	29.2	27.6

TABLE CXXI

NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, EVENING NETWORK
NEWS (15-MINUTE PROGRAMS) IN 1962 STILLWATER STUDY

Family	<u>NBC</u>		<u>CBS</u>		<u>ABC</u>	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	1	8	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	15	0	0
3	2	30	0	0	0	0
4	1	15	1	15	1	15
5	0	0	8	120	0	0
6	5	75	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	2	25
8	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	3	36	2	19	1	15
10	1	15	0	0	0	0
11	1	15	0	0	0	0

TABLE CXXI (Continued)

Family	<u>NBC</u>		<u>CBS</u>		<u>ABC</u>	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
12	0	0	0	0	1	15
13	3	32	0	0	0	0
14	2	30	0	0	0	0
15	3	37	0	0	0	0
16	6	90	0	0	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	4	45	2	30	0	0
19	5	53	0	0	1	12
<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	37	481	14	199	6	82
Per Cent Per Network	64.9	63.1	24.6	26.1	10.5	10.8

TABLE CXXII

NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, EVENING NETWORK
NEWS (15-MINUTE PROGRAMS) IN WICHITA STUDY

Family	<u>NBC</u>		<u>CBS</u>		<u>ABC</u>	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	1	11	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	1	15
3	1	15	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	2	30	2	26
6	3	40	0	0	0	0
7	5	70	0	0	0	0

TABLE CXXII (Continued)

Family	<u>NBC</u>		<u>CBS</u>		<u>ABC</u>	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
8	5	61	0	0	4	57
9	1	15	0	0	1	13
<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>30</u>
Totals	18	242	2	30	10	141
Per Cent Per Network	60.0	58.6	6.7	7.3	33.3	34.1

TABLE CXXIII

NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, EVENING NETWORK
NEWS (15-MINUTE PROGRAMS) IN TULSA STUDY

Family	<u>NBC</u>		<u>CBS</u>		<u>ABC</u>	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	1	15	0	0	1	15
2	1	7	1	15	0	0
3	0	0	1	1	0	0
4	0	0	7	99	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	2	30	0	0	0	0
7	1	15	2	30	0	0
8	2	13	2	24	0	0
9	4	53	0	0	0	0
<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	19	248	13	169	1	15
Per Cent Per Network	57.6	57.4	39.4	39.1	3.0	3.5

TABLE CXXIV

NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, FIVE-MINUTE NETWORK NEWS PROGRAMS
IN THE 1961 STILLWATER STUDY

Family	NBC		CBS		ABC	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	1	3	0	0	0	0
2	5	25	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	1	5	0	0	0	0
8	4	20	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	1	5	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	1	5	0	0
<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
Totals	14	68	4	20	1	5
Per Cent Per Network	73.7	73.1	21.1	21.5	5.2	5.4

TABLE CXXV

NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, FIVE-MINUTE NETWORK NEWS PROGRAMS
IN THE 1962 STILLWATER STUDY

Family	<u>NBC</u>		<u>CBS</u>		<u>ABC</u>	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	5	0	0
3	6	30	2	10	0	0
4	0	0	1	5	0	0
5	0	0	1	5	0	0
6	0	0	3	15	1	5
7	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	2	10	1	5	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	1	5	0	0
15	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	0	0	4	20	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	5	25	4	20	0	0
19	3	10	1	5	1	3
<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	16	75	19	95	2	8
Per Cent						
Per						
Network	43.2	42.1	51.4	53.4	5.4	4.5

TABLE CXXVI

NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, FIVE-MINUTE NETWORK NEWS PROGRAMS
IN WICHITA STUDY

Family	NBC		CBS		ABC	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	1	3	0	0	0	0
2	1	5	0	0	0	0
3	13	65	0	0	1	5
4	3	15	10	50	0	0
5	1	5	0	0	0	0
6	4	20	1	5	1	5
7	3	15	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	1	5
9	1	5	0	0	4	20
<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	34	168	13	65	7	35
Per Cent Per Network	63.0	62.7	24.1	24.3	12.9	13.0

TABLE CXXVII

NUMBER OF SHOWS AND MINUTES TUNED, FIVE-MINUTE NETWORK NEWS PROGRAMS
IN TULSA STUDY

Family	<u>NBC</u>		<u>CBS</u>		<u>ABC</u>	
	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes	Number	Minutes
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	2	10	0	0	0	0
4	4	20	2	10	0	0
5	5	25	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	2	10	0	0
7	0	0	4	20	0	0
8	4	20	2	10	0	0
9	2	10	0	0	0	0
<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	17	85	10	50	0	0
Per Cent Per Network	63.0	63.0	37.0	37.0	0	0

APPENDIX B

VIEWING OF SPECIAL NEWS PROGRAMS

TABLE CXXVIII

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL NEWS VIEWING FOR
ALL FAMILIES IN ALL STUDIES

	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
Stillwater, 1961 (15)	222	121	21	287	219
Stillwater, 1962 (20)	726	482	78	920	782
Wichita, 1963 (10)	237	249	147	346	284
Tulsa, 1963 (10)	<u>389</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>467</u>	<u>351</u>
55 Families	1,574	995	389	2,020	1,636

TABLE CXXVIII (Continued)

	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
Stillwater, 1961 (15)	58	86	48	170	102
Stillwater, 1962 (20)	185	353	154	570	432
Wichita, 1963 (10)	27	70	74	126	64
Tulsa, 1963 (10)	<u>70</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>259</u>	<u>143</u>
55 Families	340	677	415	1,125	741

	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewers Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
Stillwater, 1961 (15)	98	556	487
Stillwater, 1962 (20)	363	1,978	1,715
Wichita, 1963 (10)	108	804	518
Tulsa, 1963 (10)	<u>105</u>	<u>1,052</u>	<u>715</u>
55 Families	674	4,390	3,435

TABLE CXXIX

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL NEWS VIEWING
IN 1961 STILLWATER STUDY

<u>Family</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	0	0	0	0	0
2	11	0	0	11	11
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0
5	24	25	0	27	25
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	111	28	3	117	80
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	37	4	0	39	25
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	18	0	18	18
13	26	45	14	57	55
14	1	0	4	5	4
<u>15</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	222	121	21	287	219

TABLE CXXIX (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0
5	3	5	0	5	3
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	41	20	61	24
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	23	23	0	42	28
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0
12	24	3	2	27	27
13	0	2	9	9	7
14	8	0	17	14	13
<u>15</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	58	86	48	170	102

TABLE CXXIX (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewers Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
1	0	0	0
2	0	11	11
3	0	0	0
4	0	0	0
5	0	57	30
6	0	0	0
7	19	203	160
8	0	0	0
9	6	87	73
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	15	47	60
13	37	96	101
14	12	30	30
<u>15</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>22</u>
Totals	98	556	487

TABLE CXXX

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL NEWS VIEWING
IN 1962 STILLWATER STUDY

Family	Attentive Minutes			Total Attentive Minutes	Total Attentive Minutes Only
	Men	Women	Children		
1	0	16	1	16	16
2	99	48	0	60	54
3	99	103	1	172	152
4	0	15	0	15	15
5	37	0	0	37	37
6	0	29	31	31	23
7	59	49	2	86	56
8	10	0	24	25	23
9	0	0	1	1	0
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	12	0	12	12
12	0	0	0	0	0
13	141	101	0	154	108
14	0	0	0	0	0
15	40	12	5	40	31
16	19	0	0	19	19
17	0	0	13	13	13
18	0	17	0	17	17
19	39	28	0	39	37
<u>20</u>	<u>183</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>183</u>	<u>169</u>
Totals	726	482	78	920	782

TABLE CXXX (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	5	11	0	15	15
2	30	5	0	26	20
3	14	76	56	115	95
4	5	42	0	44	44
5	10	0	0	10	10
6	0	1	8	9	1
7	48	44	49	94	64
8	6	0	6	7	5
9	0	10	6	7	6
10	0	12	0	12	12
11	0	7	3	7	7
12	0	0	0	0	0
13	37	45	0	72	26
14	0	0	0	0	0
15	6	0	9	15	6
16	0	30	0	30	30
17	4	0	17	21	21
18	2	52	0	52	52
19	0	2	0	2	0
<u>20</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>18</u>
Totals	185	353	154	570	432

TABLE CXXX (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewers Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
1	4	33	35
2	20	182	100
3	58	349	325
4	88	62	147
5	13	47	60
6	28	69	60
7	30	251	180
8	0	46	30
9	9	17	16
10	0	12	12
11	46	22	65
12	0	0	0
13	0	324	180
14	0	0	0
15	0	72	46
16	41	49	90
17	0	34	34
18	11	71	80
19	0	69	39
<u>20</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>269</u>	<u>216</u>
Totals	363	1,978	1,715

TABLE CXXXI

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL NEWS VIEWING
IN WICHITA STUDY

<u>Family</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0
3	25	13	3	25	19
4	0	0	0	0	0
5	8	25	14	25	21
6	26	0	12	27	4
7	11	23	0	34	23
8	133	141	14	151	137
9	0	0	0	0	0
<u>10</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>80</u>
Totals	237	249	147	346	284

<u>Family</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	0	0	0	0	0
2	5	5	0	5	5
3	11	8	7	16	10
4	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	4	4	0
6	0	0	41	27	4
7	0	35	0	35	24

TABLE CXXXI (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
8	11	16	20	31	17
9	0	0	0	0	0
<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>
Totals	27	70	74	126	64

<u>Family</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewers Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
1	0	0	0
2	0	10	5
3	15	67	50
4	0	0	0
5	0	51	25
6	17	79	48
7	2	69	60
8	12	335	180
9	0	0	0
<u>10</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>193</u>	<u>150</u>
Totals	108	804	518

TABLE CXXXII
 SUMMARY OF SPECIAL NEWS VIEWING
 IN TULSA STUDY

<u>Family</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Attentive Minutes</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	97	59	1	114	106
2	55	51	48	55	48
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	36	29	0	61	48
5	80	1	94	113	26
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	2	1	0	3	3
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	51	0	0	51	51
<u>10</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>69</u>
Totals	389	143	143	467	351

<u>Family</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
1	3	19	6	25	17
2	0	4	4	7	0
3	0	0	0	0	0
4	34	40	30	62	49
5	17	56	82	104	17
6	0	16	0	16	16
7	0	23	17	23	23
8	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE CXXXII (Continued)

<u>Family</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>			<u>Total Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>Total Inattentive Minutes Only</u>
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Children</u>		
9	4	0	0	4	4
<u>10</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>17</u>
Totals	70	168	139	259	143

<u>Family</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>	<u>Total Viewers Minutes</u>	<u>Total Minutes Set On</u>
1	19	185	150
2	0	162	55
3	0	0	0
4	40	169	150
5	1	330	131
6	12	16	28
7	15	43	41
8	0	0	0
9	5	55	60
<u>10</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>100</u>
Totals	105	1,052	715

TABLE CXXXIII

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL NEWS BY PROGRAM
IN 1961 STILLWATER STUDY

<u>Program</u>	<u>Number of Shows Tuned</u>	<u>Minutes Set On</u>	<u>Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>
Brinkley's Journal	4	101	124	47	52	4
20th Century	2	40	39	8	19	14
Eyewitness	4	108	124	74	25	30
CBS Reports	1	50	73	40	4	8
Closeup	3	72	83	42	33	23
Other	<u>3</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>19</u>
Totals	17	487	556	287	170	98

TABLE CXXXIV
SUMMARY OF SPECIAL NEWS BY PROGRAM
IN 1962 STILLWATER STUDY

<u>Program</u>	<u>Number of Shows Tuned</u>	<u>Minutes Set On</u>	<u>Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>
Brinkley's Journal	3	55	70	44	9	11
20th Century	1	17	17	12	2	3
Eyewitness	4	68	51	26	21	25
CBS Reports	5	207	161	59	92	61
Biography	3	64	51	25	17	23
Project 20	1	60	155	55	7	0
Chet Huntley	1	30	45	30	0	0
Issues and Answers	2	42	42	13	29	0
Meet the Press	1	30	1	0	1	29
Editor's Choice	1	4	4	0	4	0
Washington Report	2	60	72	60	12	0
Other	<u>24</u>	<u>1,078</u>	<u>1,309</u>	<u>596</u>	<u>376</u>	<u>211</u>
Totals	48	1,715	1,978	920	570	363

TABLE CXXXIV
SUMMARY OF SPECIAL NEWS BY PROGRAM
IN 1962 STILLWATER STUDY

<u>Program</u>	<u>Number of Shows Tuned</u>	<u>Minutes Set On</u>	<u>Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>
Brinkley's Journal	3	55	70	44	9	11
20th Century	1	17	17	12	2	3
Eyewitness	4	68	51	26	21	25
CBS Reports	5	207	161	59	92	61
Biography	3	64	51	25	17	23
Project 20	1	60	155	55	7	0
Chet Huntley	1	30	45	30	0	0
Issues and Answers	2	42	42	13	29	0
Meet the Press	1	30	1	0	1	29
Editor's Choice	1	4	4	0	4	0
Washington Report	2	60	72	60	12	0
Other	<u>24</u>	<u>1,078</u>	<u>1,309</u>	<u>596</u>	<u>376</u>	<u>211</u>
Totals	48	1,715	1,978	920	570	363

TABLE CXXXV

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL NEWS BY PROGRAM
IN WICHITA STUDY

<u>Program</u>	<u>Number of Shows Tuned</u>	<u>Minutes Set On</u>	<u>Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>
NBC White Paper	5	188	369	158	44	17
Chet Huntley	5	150	178	93	38	32
Meet the Press	1	30	36	5	19	11
Howard V. Smith	1	30	24	11	11	15
Other	<u>4</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>197</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>33</u>
Totals	16	518	804	346	126	108

TABLE CXXXVI
 SUMMARY OF SPECIAL NEWS BY PROGRAM
 IN TULSA STUDY

<u>Program</u>	<u>Number of Shows Tuned</u>	<u>Minutes Set On</u>	<u>Viewer Minutes</u>	<u>Attentive Minutes</u>	<u>Inattentive Minutes</u>	<u>No Audience Minutes</u>
Biography	1	30	27	17	10	3
20th Century	4	81	117	52	40	15
Eyewitness	3	71	58	53	5	13
CBS Reports	1	60	42	4	17	39
Chet Huntley	3	88	101	54	19	16
Brinkley's Journal	2	60	138	41	59	0
Meet the Press	1	30	37	14	15	1
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>295</u>	<u>532</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>18</u>
Totals	21	715	1,052	467	259	105

APPENDIX C

VIEWING OF NEWS COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMMING

TABLE CXXXVII

SUMMARY OF TOTAL SETS-IN-USE COMPARED TO MINUTES-TUNED-TO-NEWS
IN 1961 STILLWATER STUDY

<u>Family</u>	<u>Sets-In-Use</u>	<u>Minutes-Tuned-To Regular-News</u>	<u>Minutes-Tuned-To Special-News</u>	<u>Per Cent News</u>
1	2,370	240	0	10.13
2	3,022	250	11	8.64
3	3,788	156	0	4.12
4	3,844	248	0	6.45
5	3,982	144	30	4.37
6	2,094	154	0	7.35
7	2,005	213	160	18.60
8	1,353	287	0	21.21
9	4,807	170	73	5.06
10	4,745	143	0	3.01
11	3,209	49	0	1.53
12	2,944	280	60	11.55
13	3,215	76	101	5.51
14	3,330	35	30	1.95
<u>15</u>	<u>4,403</u>	<u>263</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>6.47</u>
Totals	49,111	2,708	487	6.51

(All News) - 3,195

TABLE CXXXVIII

SUMMARY OF TOTAL SETS-IN-USE COMPARED TO MINUTES-TUNED-TO-NEWS
IN 1962 STILLWATER STUDY

<u>Family</u>	<u>Sets-In-Use</u>	<u>Minutes-Tuned-To Regular-News</u>	<u>Minutes-Tuned-To Special-News</u>	<u>Per Cent News</u>
1	1,838	133	35	9.14
2	2,611	139	100	9.15
3	4,872	230	325	11.39
4	1,848	103	147	13.53
5	5,087	407	60	9.18
6	3,247	258	60	9.79
7	5,308	275	180	8.57
8	1,855	78	30	5.82
9	2,678	231	16	9.22
10	3,311	45	12	1.72
11	3,802	116	65	4.76
12	2,940	76	0	2.59
13	2,783	183	180	13.04
14	3,621	202	0	5.58
15	3,175	277	46	10.17
16	3,245	401	90	15.13
17	3,623	77	34	3.06
18	3,139	424	80	16.06
19	1,765	265	39	17.22
<u>20</u>	<u>2,818</u>	<u>185</u>	<u>216</u>	<u>14.23</u>
Totals	63,566	4,105	1,715	9.16

(All News) - 5,820

TABLE CXXXIX

SUMMARY OF TOTAL SETS-IN-USE COMPARED TO MINUTES-TUNED-TO-NEWS
IN WICHITA STUDY

<u>Family</u>	<u>Sets-In-Use</u>	<u>Minutes-Tuned-To Regular-News</u>	<u>Minutes-Tuned-To Special-News</u>	<u>Per Cent News</u>
1	2,195	24	0	1.09
2	4,116	183	5	4.57
3	6,914	203	50	3.66
4	3,908	179	0	4.58
5	4,923	266	25	5.91
6	4,857	250	48	6.14
7	2,071	184	60	11.78
8	4,091	367	180	13.39
9	5,553	193	0	3.48
<u>10</u>	<u>6,630</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>7.36</u>
Totals	45,258	2,187	518	5.98

(All News) - 2,705

TABLE CXL

SUMMARY OF TOTAL SETS-IN-USE COMPARED TO MINUTES-TUNED-TO-NEWS
IN TULSA STUDY

<u>Family</u>	<u>Sets-In-Use</u>	<u>Minutes-Tuned-To Regular-News</u>	<u>Minutes-Tuned-To Special-News</u>	<u>Per Cent News</u>
1	5,282	150	150	5.68
2	2,075	100	55	7.47
3	3,632	116	0	3.19
4	3,188	289	150	13.77
5	4,755	252	131	8.05
6	3,784	116	28	3.81
7	5,616	255	41	5.27
8	2,265	199	0	8.79
9	2,535	212	60	10.73
<u>10</u>	<u>4,729</u>	<u>305</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>8.56</u>
Totals	37,861	1,994	715	7.16

(All News) - 2,709

VITA

John Warren Parrish

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: PHOTOCRONOGRAPHIC MEASUREMENT OF AUDIENCES OF TELEVISION
NEWS SHOWS

Major Field: Journalism Management

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born near Drumright, Oklahoma, November 1, 1939,
the son of William M. and Vergia M. Parrish.

Education: Received Bachelor of Science degree in General Business,
with major in Industrial Editing, in 1961 from Oklahoma State
University; completed requirements for Master of Science degree
from Oklahoma State University, May, 1964.

Professional Experience: Editor and assistant manager of The
Southside Times, suburban weekly newspaper in Tulsa, Oklahoma;
graduate assistant in the School of Journalism, Oklahoma State
University, 1962-63; reporter for the Duncan Daily Banner,
Duncan, Oklahoma, 1960; served in the United States Air Force.
Member of Sigma Delta Chi, national journalistic society, and
Pi Alpha Mu, national advertising and publishing fraternity.