



1988

Personality and television program preference

Scott Joseph Patterson
University of the Pacific, spatters@sfsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds



Part of the [Broadcast and Video Studies Commons](#), and the [Television Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Patterson, Scott Joseph. (1988). *Personality and television program preference*. University of the Pacific, Thesis. https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/2156

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

PERSONALITY AND TELEVISION PROGRAM PREFERENCE

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

Presented by

Scott Joseph Patterson, B.A.

1988

This thesis, written and submitted by

Scott J. Patterson

is approved for recommendation to the Committee
on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific.

Department Chairman or Dean:

Jon L. Shanber

Thesis Committee:

Linda L. Nelson

Chairman

Jon L. Shanber

R. A. Fay

Dated 5/26/68

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In most media productions, the producer always has a space to acknowledge the contributions of others. This space, titled the credits, usually appeared at the end of the program. But, since a thesis is not a radio program, a compromise of styles was called for by this producer. Thus, a list of credits, this time at the beginning of the show.

First, I would like to acknowledge my production advisor, Linda Nolan, for her guidance and support through this process. Her ability to make sense of the madness, both as a friend and as an advisor made writing this thesis intellectually challenging, spiritually stimulating, and thoroughly enjoyable.

Next, the associate producers of this project should be recognized for their contributions. It is not possible to describe on a single page the many ways in which the rest of my committee helped me in the completion of this production. Jon Schamber, who always had time to listen to a new thought or concern and then share with me his analysis and Alan Ray for always asking about my progress and reminding me of the seriousness of my task - my thanks to you both.

No production of this kind can be completed without the help of the Grips, Gaffers, Editors, and Sound-people of life. A big Hollywood Thank You to Joanne Babin, Rick Houlberg, Tony and Mary Pou, and Roger Levinson for their confidence and support.

Finally, I would like to thank my family, the executive producers of this project. Without their much appreciated confidence, support and guidance, this thesis would never have been written.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW.....	1
Uses and Gratifications Theory.....	3
Personality Theory.....	23
II. METHODS OF INQUIRY.....	36
Subjects.....	36
Personality Operationalized.....	37
Television Program Preference Operationalized.....	39
III. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.....	46
Summary of Results.....	51
IV. DISCUSSION.....	52
Why the Differences Emerged.....	52
Limitations.....	55
Conclusions and Implications.....	58
APPENDICES	
A. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.....	62
B. Program Preference Questionnaire.....	70
C. Breakdown of Sample by Gender.....	73
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Programs Listed by Content Type.....	40
2. Oblimin Factor Loadings.....	42
3. Factor Reliability Coefficients.....	45
4. Preference for Program Type by Extraversion/Intraversion.....	47
5. Preference for Program Type by Sensing/Intuiting.....	48
6. Preference for Program Type by Thinking/Feeling.....	49
7. Preference for Program Type by Judging/Perceiving.....	50

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Communicologist Aubrey Fisher (1978) stated, "The psychological perspective of human communication has generated many new issues and directions, which have characterized a significant portion of research efforts in the field of human communication in recent years" (p.149). Fisher pointed out that one of the most significant implications of research utilizing a psychological perspective of human communication is the inclusion of the receiver as an active participant in the communication process. Fisher further indicated that in an attempt to assess the effects of the mass media upon its audience (the receivers), it is important to understand how this mass audience is active in interpreting mass communication. But first, what is mass communication?

Wright (1986) observed three major characteristics of mass communication: (1) the mass communication audience is a relatively large one; (2) the audience is a heterogeneous one composed of people from varied social groups and with varied and different characteristics; and (3) the audience is an anonymous one, that is, the audience member and the communicator are generally not personally known to each other. Each of these three characteristics refers to the audience or receiver of mass communication. It is important that the media researcher understand the mass audience because understanding why the mass audience entered into the communication as a participant will yield information helpful to media programmers, advertisers, and media researchers.

Perhaps the paradigm of mass communication research that places the strongest emphasis on the activity of the mass audience, particularly the television audience, is

the uses and gratifications paradigm. Any study of audience uses and gratifications of television must explore program selection in terms of the audience member in relation to the program content. In other words, the researcher must attempt to explain why the audience has different uses for the different mass media by examining the use the audience has for the content of the mediated message.

Klapper (1961) posited that different members of the media audience will have different uses for the mass media and they will be affected differently by different types of mass media. This idea that the mass media audience is not homogeneous makes it necessary for the mass communication researcher to create ways in which to describe and classify the members of the audience. The most common of these classification techniques is based on demographic variables (i.e. women 18-24) and is the standard of classification used by audience researchers such as the Neilson Corporation, the Arbitron Corporation, and the Radio Research Consortium. It is this researcher's contention that descriptions of audience personality should be used in mass media research to further describe the members of the mass audience. The purpose of this thesis, therefore, is to justify the classification of television viewers by personality type in order to explore, describe, and explain the specific media behaviors of members of the television audience.

The first step in this process is to define what is implied by the term "Uses and Gratifications" and to elaborate on current perspectives of the uses and gratifications paradigm in order to understand the need for the present research. As the second step in this process, a discussion of the variable of audience personality will be explored in order to describe why some of the people exhibit different preferences for different television program content. The end result of this discussion on personality and program preference will be a contribution to the body of heuristic knowledge surrounding the reasons for specific television behaviors by the audience.

Literature Review

This section will review the literature relevant to the areas of uses and gratifications research and personality research. An introduction to psychoanalytic personality theory, the theory of Carl Jung specifically, will also be included to enhance an understanding of the theoretical frame used for the study of personality.

Uses and Gratifications

In order to facilitate an understanding of the theoretical framework used for the study of the mass media, a discussion of the development of the uses and gratifications paradigm will be presented which will illustrate the development of a definition of the theory. Once a common definition of uses and gratifications has been established, six current areas of research in the uses and gratifications will be reviewed.

Development of the Uses and Gratifications Paradigm

Early media researchers believed in a "magic bullet" theory of media effects (Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955). This approach held the belief that mass media affects all audience members directly by reaching each person as a socially isolated individual, directly influencing his or her knowledge, opinions, attitudes, beliefs, and behavior. In other words, individual audience members were believed to be directly and heavily influenced by the messages presented by mass media. Most studies of the mass audience that emerged from the magic bullet paradigm viewed the needs and interests of individuals as significant "intervening" variables between attention to the stimulus and the resulting response to media messages (Blumer, 1939; Lasswell, 1927; Viereck, 1930).

In 1940, Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet conducted a study of voting behavior in Elmira, New York (1948). This study discovered that interpersonal communication (people to people) was of extreme importance in the diffusion of messages from the mass media to society. The implication was that individuals provide much of the persuasive power in the media persuasion process. In other words, the mass media was no longer seen as all powerful but rather as limited in its effects on the audience. This model of combined mass media and interpersonal communication guided researchers away from a direct effects (magic bullet) model of mass communication to a limited effects approach.

By 1960, 150 million Americans had acquired television sets and rearranged their lives to accommodate the schedule of television programs presented on their living room screens (Agee, Ault, & Emery, 1985). Concerned Americans, however, still knew very little about the effects of this mass medium on the people who were watching it. Parents in particular were asking questions such as: Would the new medium stunt or stimulate the growth of their children? Was it going to create armies of juvenile delinquents? Would it turn children into zombies or passive robots? Lowery and DeFleur (1983) indicated this concern among American parents generated a new interest in studying the effects of television on its audience.

It was with the notion of limited effects in mind that Schram, Lyle, and Parker (1961) approached the first major study of the effects of television on North American children. This study presented the findings and conclusions from eleven investigations carried out between 1958 and 1960 in ten communities in the United States and Canada. Schram and his associates summarized the findings of the eleven studies with the following statement about the effects of television on children:

For *some* children, under *some* conditions, *some* television is harmful. For *other* children under the same conditions, or for the same children under *other* conditions, it may be beneficial. For *most* children, under *most* conditions, *most* television is probably neither harmful nor particularly beneficial (p. 13).

Klapper (1960) extended and modified this statement into a general comment about the effects of television on all people: "Some people are effected under some conditions by some television content some of the time" (p. 24). Both Schram et. al. and Klapper indicated in discussions of their research that in order to understand television's impact and effect on the audience, we have to first get away from studying what television does to people and substitute what people do with television. This called for a paradigm shift and launched many researchers into audience program selection and use as a primary focus in the study of the mass media audience.

In attempting to provide a framework for explaining program choice by members of the television audience, the uses and gratifications paradigm has emerged as predominant. Uses and gratifications is a general label for a set of specific theoretical viewpoints tied together by a shared emphasis on an active media audience (Blumler, 1979; Katz, 1979; Swanson, 1979). Uses and gratifications researchers view the audience as "active selectors and interpreters of media messages who utilize media messages to gratify their individual needs" (DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1982, p. 188). This paradigm assumes that viewers have program preferences related to content type and that individuals will evidence such preferences in their program choices (McQuail, Blumler, and Brown, 1972). In other words, this paradigm places the program selection process in the hands of the audience member. Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1974) outlined three purposes of uses and gratifications research. The first objective is to examine how the mass media are used by individuals to gratify their needs. The second purpose is to describe and explain the reasons for specific media behaviors and the third goal is to explore the functions and consequences of media use.

So, with the shift of attention away from exploring what the media does to people to exploring what people do with the media, researchers began to inquire how the needs and interests of individuals affected their mass media use and whether the mass media gratified these same needs and interests. Herzog (1944), in one of the first media uses and gratifications writings, studied the appeals of radio and the rewards provided by attention (listening) to radio soap operas. Her findings revealed that certain motivations or human needs (i.e. the need to pass time or be entertained) underly listening. In other words, the audience has a purpose in exposing themselves to certain radio content and they gain some benefit from listening. In another early study, Stephenson (1967) developed the "play" theory of mass communication. His research viewed mass media exposure as "playing." It implied the kinds of gratifications received from playing a game of "Monopoly" for example (i.e. entertainment and diversion) were also received from exposure to the mass media. Therefore, exposure to the mass media is a form of play. These studies and similar early studies of the uses and gratifications of the mass media (Mendelsohn, 1964; Waples, Berelson, & Bradshaw, 1940; Wolfe and Fiske, 1949) found support for the idea of media uses and gratifications, but the studies were lacking in the fact that they did not share a coherent approach to the same topic. This lack of coherence was later commented on by both Nordenstreng (1970) and McQuail, Blumler, and Brown (1972). The implication was that many of the key terms in the uses and gratifications literature (use, gratification, function, need) had been given many different definitions by different researchers. They also stated that in addition to these definitional problems, no research had developed an overall view of how all of the various theoretical viewpoints that make up uses and gratifications were actually "tied together."

In response to this call for coherence in the approach taken to study uses and

gratifications of the mass media, Blumler and Katz (1974) reviewed the status of uses and gratifications research at the time. This particular summary has provided the most accepted basis for theorizing about the uses and gratifications of the mass media used in research today (Rosengren, Wenner, & Palmgren, 1985).

Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch (Blumler and Katz, 1974, chap. 1) discussed four basic assumptions of uses and gratifications research. They are as follows: (1) Media use is goal directed -- in other words the patterns of use of the mass media by audience members are shaped by expectations as to what the media content have to offer. (2) The audience actively selects which media (i.e., books, radio, movies, television) and what content they choose to expose themselves to -- this emphasizes the idea that the audience is actively in control of their media choices. (3) There are other sources of entertainment that compete with the mass media for the audience's attention -- this assumption indicates the limitation of the mass media in meeting the full range of human needs. It also indicates that there are other more traditional non-media related ways of need gratification (such as interpersonal communication). (4) The audience is aware of their media use and can report it when asked -- this assumption indicates that self-report data derived from the audience member should be used as the basis for explaining their behavior.

Working from these four basic assumptions, Rosengren (1974) developed a theoretical definition for the uses and gratifications paradigm. His definition can be broken down and summarized into six basic components:

- A. There are certain social and psychologically derived needs and
- B. the expectations as to whether
- C. the mass media or some other activity will fulfill these needs leads to
- D. exposure to the mass media or engaging in some other activity which results in
- E. the gratification of these needs or
- F. other consequences of media use (that may be largely unintentional).

(Rosengren, 1974, pg. 270)

This basic outline of the uses and gratifications paradigm has been the guiding model for virtually all research done to date in this area of mass communication research (Rosengren et al., 1985).

Current Research Findings

Current research in uses and gratifications tends to be centered around six topics that correspond to the six-part definition of the paradigm outlined by Rosengren (1974). The six areas are as follows: (1) audience needs; (2) expectancy-value research; (3) audience activity; (4) media consumption or exposure; (5) gratifications sought and obtained; and (6) gratification and media effects. This author is concerned most with media consumption and audience needs, so a detailed review of these aspects of uses and gratifications research will follow an overview of the other four areas of research.

Expectancy-value research.

Expectancy-value research relates directly to part B of Rosengren's outline. Rosengren et al. (1985) stated, "If audience members are to select from among various media and non-media alternatives according to their needs, they must have some

perceptions of the alternatives most likely to meet those needs" (p. 23). In other words the audience member has to have some expectations about their media choices in order to be able to evaluate them.

Most researchers of expectancy-value view selection behavior as a function of (1) expectancy -- the belief that some behavior will result in a desired outcome, and (2) evaluation -- the emotional reaction to the outcome (Galloway and Meek, 1981; Palmgren and Rayburn, 1982, 1983; Rayburn and Palmgren, 1984; Van Leuven, 1981). The research of Palmgren and Rayburn (1982, 1983; Rayburn and Palmgren 1984) provides the best summary of the implications of expectancy-value research. Their research indicated that audience expectations of the media are important in motivating the audience to consume different media. Based on the evaluation of these consumption decision outcomes, the audience then either reinforces or reevaluates their expectations for use in further consumption decisions. For example, an audience member watches "Late Night with David Letterman" to be entertained. If the audience member is entertained, expectancy-value researchers would say the audience member's opinion that viewing "Late Night" is entertaining was reinforced, and that the audience member will be likely to watch "Late Night" again to receive the same entertainment need gratification.

Audience activity research.

The next area of research (part C) to be considered in this overview is the area of audience activity. Recall that Katz's et al. (1974) second assumption about uses and gratifications research is the idea that the audience is an active participant in the mass communication process. Levy and Windahl (1984) indicated that audience activity can best be defined in relation to two dimensions: audience orientation and temporal

orientation. The first dimension, audience orientation, consists of three levels: (1) selectivity -- the audience actively chooses which media to expose themselves to; (2) involvement -- the audience is active in consuming the mass media; they have the ability to evaluate and respond based on what they see, hear, and read; and (3) utility -- the audience has a use for the media and can alter their use to maximize utility. The second dimension, the temporal, subdivides activity based on its occurrence before, during, or after exposure. For example, the audience member may be extremely active before exposure in deciding which particular content to watch. During exposure, the same audience member actively evaluates the worth of the program being watched. After exposure, the audience member makes decisions about whether or not they would watch the program again. Combining these two dimensions of audience activity, researchers have delineated two distinct areas of the active audience: studies of medium and content choice (de Bock, 1980; McLeod and Becker, 1981; Mendelsohn and O'Keefe, 1976; Peled and Katz, 1974) and studies investigating the active creation of meaning as a result of exposure (Garramone, 1983; McLeod and Becker, 1981).

Gratifications sought and obtained research.

The next area of research that needs to be addressed is the area of gratifications sought and obtained through media exposure. Initial research into this area centered around the creation of typologies of gratifications that were both sought and obtained through the mass media (Katz et al., 1974). In the past nine years, much research has been undertaken to examine the relation between gratifications sought and gratifications obtained (Levy and Windahl, 1984; McLeod and Becker, 1981; McLeod et al., 1982; Palmgren and Rayburn, 1979; Palmgren et al., 1980, 1981; Rayburn and Palmgren, 1984; Rayburn et al., 1984; Wenner, 1982, 1983). The general finding of all of

these studies is that strong correlations ($r = .40$ to $.80$) exist between gratifications sought and gratifications obtained. In other words, the audience generally gets what it expects from mass media exposure. Roberts and Bachen (1981) pointed out that significant research needs to be done in this area in terms of how we alter our media gratification expectations based on the gratifications obtained. For example, the first time an audience member views a television situation comedy, the audience member has an expectation that the show will make him/her laugh. If, however, the audience member does not laugh, the next time he/she watches the same show they will not expect to laugh as much as he/she did before the first time the show was watched.

Media effects research.

A review of effects literature that incorporates the views of the uses and gratifications paradigm reveals over twenty studies that have empirically examined the effects of television on the audience (Becker, 1976; Blumler and McQuail, 1968; de Bock, 1980; Garramone, 1983; Greenberg, 1974; Hedinsson, 1981; Hur and Robinson, 1981; McLeod and Becker, 1974; McLeod et al., 1977; Norlund, 1978; Roe, 1983b; Rosengren and Windahl, 1977; Rubin, 1981, 1983, 1988; A. Rubin and R. Rubin, 1982; Weaver, 1980; Wenner, 1982, 1983; Windahl, 1981). The implications of the research done by these theorists has sponsored the call for yet another paradigm shift away from uses and gratifications and towards a uses and effects model of mass communication (Rubin, 1988). Palmgren et al. (1985) also indicated that the results of these studies have shown that "a variety of audience gratifications [again both sought and obtained] are related to a wide spectrum of media effects, including knowledge, dependency, attitudes, perceptions of social reality, agenda-setting, discussion, and various political effects variables" (p. 31). In other words, the utilization of the uses and gratifications

paradigm has opened a new door to the study of media effects that was not possible without the incorporation of the idea of first examining what the audience does with the media and then examining what the consequences of this use may be.

This research will now move from an overview of four research trends of importance in conceptualizing uses and gratifications, to two areas of research that will illustrate both the purpose and need for this study in terms of current issues in uses and gratifications research.

Media exposure research.

Research into media uses or part D of the outline provided by Rosengren (1974) generally seeks to investigate the link between gratifications (again sought and/or obtained) and media exposure, choice of medium, and content choice. When conducting uses research, investigators have followed three major approaches: (1) the study of different media types and their comparative uses; (2) the study of the use of a specific medium; and (3) exploration of the use of specific media content.

Adoni (1979) compared the contribution various media (books, movies, newspapers, radio, and television) made to the political socialization of Israeli youth. In this example of comparative media uses research, Adoni hypothesized that different types of the mass media (print versus electronic media) would serve different roles in the socialization process and the audience would have different uses for different media. Her findings indicated that there is a tendency for audience members to prefer certain media types, but there is a high degree of interchangeability between them. Thus the tendency to use one medium for one purpose does not exclude the use of other media for the same purpose. For example, books may be used for entertainment, and movies may also be used for entertainment. Regarding the hypothesis about print and

electronic media serving different functions in the socialization process, Adoni indicated that there is a difference in the type of material presented on the different media. In the case of her research, however, the media were seen as interrelating to reinforce the view espoused on the media. In other words, the content of newspapers confirmed the content of the television news and visa-versa. This study is representative of other studies done in this area of comparative mass media uses research (Becker, 1979; Lichtenstein and Rosenfeld, 1984; Swanson, 1977, 1979).

Towers', (1987) research into why adults read magazines provides an example of the research done in the area of specific medium use. A sample of 543 adults were interviewed regarding their agreement with 14 gratification statements that applied to magazine readership. His results indicated that the general gratification obtained from magazine readership was what Towers labeled a "surveillance gratification."

Surveillance relates to the need to know about what is going on in the world. The primary use of magazines, therefore, was to provide the reader with information about the world. Other research that has explored specific medium use are Palmgren and Rayburn, 1979; Bantz, 1982; Houghton-Larsen, 1982; Jeffres, 1983; Lichtenstein and Rosenfeld, 1983; Weibull, 1983; Levy and Windahl, 1985; Zillman, 1985; Lain, 1986.

The third research trend in the area of media use are studies that examine the audience's use for specific media content. Levy (1977) undertook research to assess the subjective meaning of television news-watching for the average American. Data was collected utilizing a combined methodology of focus groups and the administration of a survey instrument reflecting the subjects' agreement with certain statements about the uses and gratifications of watching network television news. His results indicated five audience uses and gratifications of television news which were identified as follows: (1) surveillance; (2) cognitive orientation -- the idea of television news watching as an element in the process of opinion-formation and opinion-holding; (3)

dissatisfactions -- this factor relates to the parts of the news the audience does not care for. The audience can obtain some gratification from disagreeing with the news; (4) affective orientation -- the emotional responses felt by the audience while watching television news; and (5) diversion -- watching the news to pass time or escape from reality. Of these five gratification factors, Levy concluded that the factors of cognitive orientation and diversion emerged as the most commonly mentioned reasons given by the audience for television news consumption.

Stanford (1984) correlated the gratifications sought and obtained from television viewing with favorite program types and audience member gratifications. Respondents were asked to identify their favorite television program and then respond to a series of gratification statements regarding their watching of the program (i.e., does watching (Name of Program) let you relax?). Program mentions were coded into categories reflecting six program content types (Comedy/Variety, Mystery, News/Information, Sports, Movies, Drama) and were then correlated with the responses to the gratification statements. The results of this study indicated that if the general orientations to television gratifications are known to the researchers, general orientations to specific television program types can be hypothesized. In other words, if researchers know that an audience member's general orientation to television is to seek information about the world, the audience member will generally watch more television news than an audience member whose orientation to the television is for entertainment. An important implication of this study was that it is possible to predict favorite television program types from knowledge of general orientations to television.

Other research that has addressed the use of specific media content by the members of the audience include Palmgren, Werner, and Rayburn (1980), Bantz (1982), Rayburn, Palmgren, and Acker (1984), Stanford and Riccomini (1984), Towers (1985), and Sun and Lull (1986).

Audience needs research.

Research into the area of audience needs seeks to expand upon part A of Rosengren's (1974) outline and can be classified into two general trends: (1) research into typologies of needs that can be satisfied by the mass media, and (2) research into the origins of these needs.

One of the first studies of need typologies utilizing the view of uses and gratifications expounded by Katz et al. (1974) and Rosengren (1974) was Peled and Katz's (1974) research on media use in time of crisis which illustrated five important audience needs that can be fulfilled by the mass media. Under the auspice of the Israel Broadcasting Authority, Peled and Katz undertook a series of studies during the Yom-Kippur crisis to ascertain "home-front expectations of broadcasting and to assess the extent to which the media were fulfilling them" (p. 49). In other words, they studied the needs of Israeli civilians who were removed from the war zone and the degree to which the mass media filled these needs. The analysis of data collected indicated that there were five types of needs that could be fulfilled by the mass media: cognitive, affective, personal integrative, social integrative, and escapist. Cognitive needs refer to the audience member's need for information and knowledge about people, places, and events in the world around them. Peled and Katz indicated that the mass media can be effective in presenting information about events that are of importance to people. Affective needs refer to the pursuit of the emotional pleasure and entertainment that can be obtained from media viewing. Personal integrative needs refer to the audience's need for confidence and clarification of their values, beliefs, and attitudes. Presentation of similar viewpoints on the mass media tends to reinforce existing values beliefs and attitudes while the presentation of contrasting viewpoints can cause the reevaluation of existing ones. Social integrative needs refer to

the need to interact with other people and to strengthen contact with family and friends. The mass media provides both a reason for people to gather ("Come over and watch TV," or "Let's go to a movie.") and information to use in conversation when they have gathered (i.e., "Did you see the news tonight?"). Escapist needs refer specifically to the audience's need to relax, reduce tension, and separate themselves from reality. The mass media provides the basis to escape the present and to fantasize about the past and the future.

In further research Blumler (1979), replicated the methodology used by Peled and Katz and found that audience needs can be divided into four similar categories. First is surveillance, or the cognitive ordering of the environment. The second is curiosity, or the need to know about events or happenings in the world around them. The third is diversion which is the same as Peled and Katz's escape need. The fourth is identified as personal identity or the need for a sense of self-meaning.

Rubin (1981) continues by examining needs in terms of television viewing motivations. By utilizing a questionnaire which assessed the respondents' agreement to statements regarding viewing motivation, he found that nine different factors of television viewing motivation emerged. The factors were as follows: viewing to pass time/as a habit; viewing for companionship; viewing for arousal/ excitement; viewing for specific program content; viewing for relaxation; viewing for information/learning; viewing for escape/to forget; viewing for entertainment/enjoyment; and viewing for social interaction. Many other investigations have established similar typologies of audience needs or motivations (Greenberg, 1974; Hur and Robinson, 1981; Kippax and Murray, 1980; Lometti et al., 1977; Lull, 1980; McQuail, 1979; A. Rubin and R. Rubin, 1982).

In his research, Rubin (1981) established the link between needs and motivations and identified how the typologies interrelate by discussing how needs create viewing

motivations. In his discussion of this link between needs and motivation, Rubin stated that it is important to "understand and explain the motivations for media usage and their links to psychological needs" (p. 142). This statement points the way to the second area of audience needs research - - the origin of the needs that create the motivation.

Researchers have been successful in compiling ever increasing typologies of audience needs and viewing motivations, but little effort has been exerted to explain the origins of these needs and motivations. A review of the literature in the area of the origins of audience needs finds, as postulated by Rosengren (1974), that these need origins are either social or psychological.

By far the majority of the research has concentrated on the social origins of audience needs. Johnstone (1974) observed that "members of mass audiences do not experience the media as anonymous and isolated individuals, but rather, as members of organized social groups and as participants in a cultural milieu" (p. 35). According to this view, then, many of the needs of individuals originate from interaction with the world around them. Many researchers have approached the question of the social creation of needs (Blumler, 1979; Brown et al., 1974; Hedinsson, 1981; Johnsson-Smaragdi, 1983; Johnstone, 1974; Norlund, 1978; Palmgren and Rayburn, 1979; Roe, 1983a, 1983b; Rosengren and Windahl, 1972, 1977; Rubin and Rubin, 1982). The general conclusion these researchers make about their findings is that it is possible to state that many uses of the mass media have their origins in the structure and processes of society (Palmgren et al., 1985). The implications of this research was that social needs are created in individuals by events that occur in the environment around them. Psychological needs, on the other hand, are needs that are created internally within the individual.

In 1974, McGuire put forth the best exposition to date on the psychological motives for media use. Specifically, the motivational aspects of media consumption that focus

on why an individual maintains continued exposure to certain kinds of material rather than on what causes the initial exposure (p. 170). Utilizing four perspectives on the study of human motivation, McGuire created a 16-cell classification scheme for human motives and media use. After presenting the theory behind his structure, McGuire identified how each of the theories represented in the 16 cells can be utilized to study the underlying motivation that people have to continue exposure to particular media content. The important implication and conclusion drawn by McGuire was that theories of psychology (particularly consistency theory, attribution theory, complexity theory, and various personality theories) should be utilized to achieve greater understanding of the needs and motivations that underly the audience's use of the mass media.

Few studies have been undertaken in response to McGuire's call for the exploration of the psychological roots of needs. Greenberg (1974), studied 726 school-age children to determine their attitudes toward media use. The children's attitudes toward the use of television were correlated with their attitudes toward the use of aggression to solve problems and the amount of violent television programming to which they were exposed. The results indicated that the children who had positive attitudes toward the use of television tended to watch more television. The results also indicated that children who had positive attitudes toward the use of aggression to solve problems tended to have a positive attitude toward viewing aggressive programs on television. The conclusion Greenberg draws from these results is that the underlying attitudes humans have toward television effect their orientation to television.

Hur and Robinson (1981) investigated the impact of viewing the television program "Roots" on the attitudes of British viewers towards American culture. The results of their study indicated that the series "evoked positive reactions from British viewers in terms of their perceived attitude change toward the black race and

American blacks in particular" (p. 588). The implication of this study was that the process of watching television can have an effect on audience attitudes. These attitudes in turn affect both the way the audience leads their lives and the way they watch television.

The area of audience attitudes and how these attitudes both affect and are effected by the mass media has not been the only area of response to McGuire's call for the incorporation of psychological theories in uses and gratifications research. Other research has been undertaken to incorporate personality variables in examining media uses and gratifications.

Norlund (1978) examined the effect of psychological dispositions toward greater or lesser degrees of interpersonal interaction on the degree of parasocial activity exhibited by television viewers. Parasocial viewing activity is defined as "perceived interpersonal viewer interaction with a mediated personality" (p. 151). In other words, do people who have a high need for interpersonal interaction satisfy their need by "talking back" to their television sets? The psychological variable studied was the level of viewer neuroticism (i.e., the degree to which a person feels nervousness in relation to the world around him/her) as measured by one dimension on an instrument constructed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1969). The hypothesis examining the relation of the personality trait of neuroticism to parasocial interaction was that a neurotic disposition would lead to greater usage of the mass media for interpersonal interaction needs. The results supported this hypothesis that high levels of neuroticism correlated significantly with high levels of parasocial activity. Norlund indicated in his discussion, however, that variables of past consumption experience, amount of exposure, and content preferences should be examined to determine their links to psychological variables in further exploration of parasocial interaction.

Gunter and Furnham (1983) established a need for a systematic and

comprehensive examination of the impact of television violence within a broad theoretical framework that incorporated a standardized, tried and tested measure of personality. They used personality variables to control for individual differences in the cognitive effects of individuals' perceptions of violent portrayals on television. The researchers utilized the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1969), which measures the personality factors of neuroticism, extraversion, psychoticism, and lying to account for individual differences in perception. Violent television programs were divided into five types: British-produced crime-detective series; American produced crime-detective series; a western film; a science fiction series; and cartoon shows. Using a factor analysis of the perceptions obtained by viewers of violence portrayed on each of the program types, the researchers found that viewers characterized by different degrees of neuroticism, extraversion and psychoticism were found to differ in their sensitivity to the seriousness of violent episodes. The lying trait did not load significantly into a factor. The most significant result was that persons who scored high on the neuroticism scale were more sensitive to violent episodes than were people who scored lower in that dimension.

In further research, Gunter, Furnham, and Jarrett (1984) again used the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire to control for individual differences in delayed memory for television news. Delayed memory was defined as retention of content after a two-hour period of time. Relating retention scores to subject's personality scores on the EPQ, results indicated that introverts remembered more than extraverts and that level of neuroticism made little difference to memory performance.

Wazenried and Woody (1979) categorized rock and country music lyrics into two orientations: extentional and intentional. Extentional lyrics are typified as being fantasy-oriented while intentional lyrics are seen as reality-oriented. Utilizing Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, subjects were grouped by personality type

and asked to rate their preferences for different types of lyrics. The data yielded the following insights into lyrical preferences: (1) Males with a high preference for Country extentional lyrics will tend to be venturesome (socially bold and uninhibited) and forthright (natural, artless, sentimental); (2) Males with a high preference for rock intentional lyrics will be suspicious (self-opinionated, hard to fool), self-sufficient (prefers his own decisions, resourceful), and less intelligent (concrete-thinking); (3) Females with high preferences for rock extentional lyrics will be apprehensive (worrying, degressive, troubled); (4) Females with high preference for country extentional lyrics will be assertive (independent, aggressive, stubborn). The researchers indicated that future research should be undertaken to explore the possibility of making predictive statements about the music preferences of audience members with different personality types. Ultimately, the question that would prove the most informative, if answered, is -- can knowledge of personality type be used to predict preference for different types of media content (i. e., television programming, music types, and newspaper sections to name a few).

Other than these six studies just described, this author has been unable to locate other research that has been conducted whose purpose was to incorporate psychological theories into media uses and gratifications research. Palmgren et al. (1985) indicated in their review of uses and gratifications research that "McGuire's (1974) call for the incorporation of psychology theories into uses and gratifications research goes largely unheeded a decade after it was issued" (p. 21). Rubin (1988) further extended this call to the present in his discussion of media uses and effects and the link that psychological predispositions have to media selection and use processes by the active audience.

Summary

The above section has reviewed the published literature in the area of audience uses and gratifications of the mass media. First, the theoretical development of the uses and gratifications paradigm as it evolved as an answer to the question, "What do people do with the mass media?" was explored. The second step in this analysis of the uses and gratifications paradigm was to survey the relevant literature in order to establish the existence of a body of knowledge that provides the justification and purpose for this study. This review of the literature revealed six major trends in uses and gratifications research: (1) audience needs; (2) expectancy-value research; (3) audience activity; (4) media consumption or exposure; (5) gratifications sought and obtained; and (6) gratification and media effects. This study directly relates to two of the above mentioned research areas: audience needs and media consumption. As reviewed in the research of audience uses and gratifications of the mass media, there has been a call for the further understanding and incorporation of psychological theories in the research paradigm. Personality theories in particular have been mentioned as one of the most fruitful but yet least explored of these human psychology theories. This study, in answer to the call for the incorporation of personality variables in uses and gratifications research, will attempt to use audience member personality as the means to further describe "some of the people", as posited by Klapper (1960), in relation to their media consumption. Specifically, this study will use personality variables as a higher-level definition of audience needs in order to explore how audience needs as reflected in personality type influence choice of favorite television program content. This study will investigate the relation of audience needs as manifested through personality, and media consumption in an effort to answer the call put forth for the incorporation of psychological theories in the uses and gratifications research

paradigm.

Personality

It is now necessary to define and delineate what is meant by the term "personality." In order to do this, a theoretical definition of personality will be presented and discussed. Next, the personality theory of Carl Jung will be explored in order for the reader to have a greater understanding of the conceptual framework from which this research will evolve.

Personality - Defined

Researchers who study personality, personologists, have been considering theoretical definitions of personality for many years. Take for example these definitions of personality posed by top personologists:

The general orientation the psyche will take
(Jung, 1926, p. 11).

The dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his (or her) characteristic behavior and thought (Allport, 1961, p. 28).

A stable set of characteristics and tendencies that determine those commonalities and differences in the psychological behavior of people that have continuity in time and that may not be easily understood as the sole result of the social and biological pressures of the moment (Maddi, 1976, p. 9).

While there is not one agreed upon definition of personality, it is possible to

summarize conceptually the general components of personality theory. Maddi (1976) hypothesized that there are two essential elements to any personality: the core and the periphery. The core of personality delineates the things that are common to all people and discloses the inherent attributes of human beings. Most commonly these core tendencies are statements about the overall directionality, purpose, and function of life. The idea that all behavior constitutes an attempt to actualize one's inherent potentialities is an example of a core tendency. These core tendencies can be viewed as core characteristics which are structural (meaning they provide form) entities such as sexuality and aggressiveness which are potentially part of all people. The periphery of personality are statements made about attributes of personality that are much more concrete and tied to behavior. For example, a person who consistently exhibits extraverted behavior can be said to have an extraverted personality. These personality attributes (extraversion, for example) are more commonly referred to in personality research as traits. Allport (1966) defined trait as "a generalized and focalized neuropsychic system (peculiar to the individual), with the capacity to render many stimuli functionally equivalent, and to initiate and guide consistent forms of adaptive and expressive behavior" (p. 295). In other words, traits are relatively stable and enduring predispositions that exert fairly standardized effects upon behavior. For example, people who can be described as having emotional personality traits will be more likely to place emphasis on value rather than logic when judging the world around them.

The identification of differences between people forms the basis of theorizing about the periphery of personality with its emphasis on personality traits. The identification of similarities among people is the basis of theorizing about the core of personality with its emphasis upon the characteristics and tendencies that define human nature and are constantly expressed in every day life.

Key to this discussion of the core and the periphery of personality is the link between behavior and personality. According to Mischel (1968), personality is "An abstraction or hypothetical construction from or about behavior, whereas behavior itself consists of observable events. Statements that deal with 'personality' describe inferred, hypothesized, mediating internal states, structure and organization of individuals" (p. 4).

This view of behavior in relation to personality led Nolan (1985) to state, "Traditionally, personality psychology deals with inferences about the individual's personality, focusing on behavioral observations as signs of the underlying processes within the person that serve as clues to his or her personality" (p. 22). The thoughts of these two theorists leads to the conclusion that individual personality traits are made manifest through behavior. As a result of this manifestation, it is possible to make inferences about personality based on observable behavior and to describe personality in terms of consistent behavioral patterns.

At present there are a number of paradigms that guide personality research. Maddi (1976) proposed three general categories of personality theories: The conflict model, the fulfillment model, and the consistency model. Each of these models has two distinct versions.

The conflict model assumes that the person is continuously and inevitably in the grips of the clash between two great opposing, unchangeable forces. In the first version of this model, the psychosocial version, the source of one great force is in the person and the source of the other great force is in groups or societies. An example of this version can be found in the work of Freud (1960) where the Id represents three instincts found in every person: self-preservation, sexual, and death. The Id and the Ego, which represents all of a person's accumulated experience, are in constant conflict with the Superego which represents an abstract representation of the rules

and regulations of society in terms of ideas of good and bad, right and wrong. The Superego keeps the instinctual gratification required by the Id in line with societal norms. Thus, conflict can erupt when the Superego frustrates the Id. In the second version of the conflict model, the intrapsychic version, both great forces arise from within the person. The work of Jung(1929) can be categorized into this version. In Jungian theory the personal conscious is in continuous conflict for the governance of behavior with the personal and collective unconscious. This conflict is described by Jung in terms of the process of "individuation" which is the process of becoming aware of such things as the "anima" or "animus," the "shadow," the "persona," the functions of thought, and all other components of the psyche. Jung's theories will be discussed more completely in the next section. This version of the conflict model has also been titled the psychoanalytic paradigm by other researchers (McGuire, 1974; Nolan, 1985).

The second of Maddi's three categories of personality models is the fulfillment model. The fulfillment model assumes only one great force or power (i.e., the need to reach self-actualization) guides life and localizes it in the person. This model construes life as the progressively greater expression of this force. The actualization version of this model defines this great force in the form of a genetic blueprint determining the person's special capabilities. The positions of Rogers (1959, 1961) and Maslow (1962) are typical of the theorizing in this version. Both these researchers describe the core tendency of personality as being (1) the inherent attempt of the individual to actualize or develop all his or her capacities in ways which serve to maintain and enhance life, and (2) the attempt to actualize the self-concept, which is a psychological manifestation of the developing of the individual's capacities. The second version of the fulfillment model is the perfection version. The perfection version emphasizes the ideals of what is fine, excellent, and meaningful in life. The great force here constitutes striving toward these ideals of perfection. Inherent in this version are the works of Adler (the

idea that superiority is the ultimate perfection, albeit fictional; 1956), Allport (the theory of propiate functioning; 1955, 1961), and the existential psychology of Binswanger (1963).

The last of Maddi's three categories is the consistency model of personality. The consistency model places emphasis upon the formative influence of feedback from the external world. Life is to be understood as the extended attempt to maintain consistency. The first version of the consistency model is labeled the cognitive dissonance version. The core tendency of this version is to minimize large discrepancies between expectation and occurrence, while maximizing small discrepancies between expectation and occurrence. In other words, the core tendency is to reduce the amount of imbalance an individual has with his or her environment. The theorizing of Kelly (1955) and McClelland (1951) have been categorized into this version. The work of Fiske and Maddi (1961) comprise the activation version of the consistency model. This version places emphasis on consistency or inconsistency between the degree of bodily tension or activation (this is also known as stress and is often operationalized through bio-feedback data) that is customary for the person and that which actually exists at the time. The goal is to maintain the level of activation to which he/she is accustomed. Three sources of stimulation must be balanced in this version: the exteroceptive, the excitation of sense organs sensitive to events in the external world; the interoceptive, the excitation of sense organs sensitive to events within the body itself and; the cortical which is brain stimulation.

There is no one correct paradigm that guides personality research, but rather it is a combination of the research of each of the above paradigms that provides us with useful information about the concept of personality. The question now becomes, which of the above paradigms is the most useful in application to mass media research? Nolan (1985) indicates that within the field of personality, certain personality differences do

make a substantial difference in perception and behavior and that perception and behavior are largely determined by psychical predispositions. Psychoanalytic theory postulates that within each individual's psyche is the predisposition to perceive and behave in a certain manner. Many studies have looked for and verified these predispositions and their behavioral manifestations in such areas as work situations (Saunders, 1955), conflict behavior (Nolan, 1985), academic performance (Mac Kinnon, 1961) and many other contexts.

It is this researcher's contention that the psychoanalytic paradigm, particularly the theories of Carl Jung, should be more extensively used as a means for investigating the link predispositions have to the behavior of the active audience. McGuire (1974) indicates support for this exploration when he states, "The ego-defensive theories of personality (such as those of Jung) lie implicitly or explicitly behind much of the discussion of selective attention of media content" (p. 186). In the section that follows, Jungian theory is conceptualized in order to provide a framework in which to apply personality variables in mass communication research.

Jungian Personality Theory

There are three core concepts discussed in Jungian theory: The conscious, the unconscious, and the collective unconscious (Jung, 1929). The ego or conscious mind according to Jung is that part of the psyche that directs the business of everyday living or the everyday processes that lead to self-actualization. The conscious mind is always the direct opposite of the unconscious mind(s). The personal unconscious is comprised of experiences that were once conscious but now are either forced by defenses out of the conscious mind because of their threatening nature or simply are no longer the focus of attention. It is possible for items in the personal unconscious to become

conscious when they become salient. The collective unconscious is defined as the accumulated experience of the human species that has a direct effect on behavior. The collective unconscious is comprised of archetypes which are a universal form or a predisposition of certain thoughts or feelings (Jung, 1929). These thoughts or feelings can never become conscious because they are essences that are understood as images rather than concrete symbols. Examples of archetypes are: (1) the shadow - - essences of the animalistic instincts inherited by man from the lower forms of life; (2) the anima and animus - - The anima is the essence of the female that is present in every male and the animus is the essence of male that is present in every female. This collective unconscious is a part of every human because it is passed on genetically from our ancestors.

The substance or core of Jungian personality theory consists of the conflict between the conscious and the archetypes of the unconscious that occurs as the person strives towards self-actualization. Therefore, self-actualization can be defined as a combination of conscious and unconscious experience. It is on these core considerations that Jung bases his theory for explaining the principles on which individuals accept or reject certain elements (people, places, things, ideas, etc.) of their environment or in the ways they act and react toward these elements. A discussion of the periphery of Jungian personality will now demonstrate how we can describe the behavior of individuals in the throes of psychic conflict.

Jung (1929) and Myers (1962) identified two attitudes or general orientations a person's personality can take in relation to reality: extraversion and introversion. Introversion and extraversion are opposite ends of a continuum which describes how human beings gather their information about reality. The extravert's orientation to life is interest in the outer world of people and things. He/she likes to direct both perception and judgement upon his or her outside environment. The introvert, on the

other hand, is oriented to the inner world of concepts and ideas and directs both perception and judgement upon ideas. Jung implies in these definitions that humans have perceptions and make judgements about the information they receive whether it be from the internal or external world.

Jungian theory implies two ways of perceiving (sensing and intuiting) and two ways of judging (thinking and feeling). Perception deals with how humans actually obtain information about reality. Sensing people obtain information through the five human senses while intuiting people perceive by way of the unconscious - - they can "feel" what is not there by way of intuition. For example, a sensing person reads the words on this page for what they actually say while an intuiting person reads the words on this page for what they might mean or imply. Judging refers to the process of how we make decisions about the information that individuals' perceive. People who prefer thinking approach the judging process as a logical one in which there is a clear decision to be made based on cause and effect. Feeling people, on the other hand, approach the decision making process as an affective process of appreciation (is the information good or bad, what is its value?).

According to Myers (1962) these components of perception and judging combine into four different types: (1) sensing plus thinking - - personalities with this combination tend to be factual and matter of fact and prefer factual things; (2) sensing plus feeling - - personalities of this type tend to be sociable and friendly who like emotion applied to factual settings; (3) intuition plus feeling - - personalities with this combination tend to be warm towards new ideas and have the commitment to follow them up; (4) intuition plus thinking - - personalities of this type like to focus on the possibilities of a situation but approach the analysis of these possibilities very logically.

Ideally all of the attitudes and functions would develop equally and work in

harmony with one another. This is seldom the case. Instead, one attitude (extraversion) and one function (thinking) become dominant, and the other attitude (introversion) and the other three functions (feeling, sensing, intuiting) remain undeveloped and unconscious (Nolan, 1985). The result of this dominance is that the undeveloped attitude and functions may be expressed in the dreams and fantasies of the unconscious.

By combining the two attitudes and the four functions, Jung (1929) described eight different types of personalities. These eight types, however, probably never exist in the pure form, because every person has both attitudes and all functions at his/her disposal and which become conscious and which remain unconscious is a matter of personal development. Listed below are the eight pure types with a brief description of what the person would tend to be like:

Thinking Extravert. Lives according to fixed rules. Objective and cold. Positive and dogmatic in one's thinking. Feeling is repressed.

Feeling Extravert. Very emotional and respectful of authority and tradition. Sociable person who seeks harmony with the world. Thinking is repressed.

Sensing Extravert. Pleasure-seeking, jolly, and socially adaptive. Constantly seeking new sensory experiences. Probably interested in such things as good food and art. Very realistic. Intuition is repressed.

Intuiting Extravert. Decisions guided by hunches rather than by facts. Very changeable and creative. Has trouble staying with one idea very long, rather moves from one idea to another very rapidly. Knows much about one's own unconscious. Sensation is repressed.

Thinking Introvert. Intense desire for privacy. Socially inhibited with poor practical judgement. Very intellectual person who ignores the practicalities of everyday living. Feeling is repressed.

Feeling Introvert. Quiet, thoughtful, and hypersensitive. Childish, enigmatic, and indifferent to the feelings and opinions of others. Very little expression of emotion. Thinking is repressed.

Sensing Introvert. Life guided by just what happens. Artistic, passive, and calm. Detached from human affairs since one's main concern is over what happens. Intuition is repressed.

Intuiting Introvert. The odd, eccentric daydreamer who creates new but "strange" ideas. Seldom understood by other people, but this is not a source of concern. Life is guided by inner experiences rather than outer ones.

(Hergenhahn, 1980, p.59)

These eight pure types constitute the key elements of the periphery of Jung's personality theory. Based on this periphery theory and the notion that human behavior is consistent and predictable, researchers have developed paper and pencil instruments which are designed to measure individual preferences for the types. One of these measures, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

The link between underlying dispositions and behavior can now be conceptualized through the application of Jung's theory. Behavior that was once considered to be random and unique in individuals can now be seen as orderly and consistent (therefore predictable), due to the realization of a few basic differences in the way individuals approach life.

Summary

This chapter has attempted to provide a theoretical rationale for the incorporation of personality theory into media audience uses and gratifications research. In her discussion of media use, Stanford (1984) indicates that it is possible to predict favorite television programs from knowledge of general orientations the audience member has to the television content. Rubin (1981) described these general orientations as needs or motivations the audience has for consuming particular program content. It is this researcher's contention that descriptions of audience member personality could provide more accurate and differentiating descriptions of the psychological needs that motivate audience members to consume one type of television content over others.

Personality is conceptualized through the observation of human behavior. Personality theory states that there are some basic core tendencies that are common to all people and that these core tendencies create needs in people. The behavior of people is representative of the human being's effort to gratify needs. With these assumptions in mind, it is possible to classify and describe the personality of individuals in relation to consistent behavior patterns.

Theorizing about the periphery of personality concentrates on the idea of types and the actual description and classification of personality. Thus, it can be said that internal mediating states interact to create human needs which result in consistent behaviors to gratify these needs. Personality descriptions are utilized to describe these consistent behaviors. For example, people who can be described as having an extraverted personality type can be said to consistently exhibit behaviors (such as high levels of social interaction) that will lead to the gratification of their extraverted needs. This conclusion about the periphery of personality has important implications for the

study of audience member uses and gratifications of the mass media.

Of the sparse amount of uses and gratifications research that has incorporated personality variables, one general question is frequently asked but never answered. Can knowledge of personality type be used to predict preference for different types of media content? This chapter has laid the theoretical groundwork that indicates that it should be possible, utilizing the proper research methods in personality, to answer this question.

Psychoanalytic personality theory posits that the personality is a manifestation of the subconscious, guiding an individual's preferences for behavioral responses (Jung 1929; Nolan, 1985). Therefore, this study proposes that the variable of personality should be examined in an attempt to further define who are "some of the people" as posited by Klapper (1960). It is this researcher's contention that the psychoanalytic paradigm of Carl Jung can be effectively used as a means for investigating the link personality predispositions have to behavior as manifested in television program choice. This thesis will utilize psychoanalytically derived descriptions of personality provided by Carl Jung in exploring the idea that an individual's personality type may describe his or her predispositions to expose him or herself to a particular type of television program content.

The descriptions of personality provided by Jung, as mentioned earlier, are to be seen as dimensional in nature. For example, in describing a person's orientation to the world, Jung (1929) says the person can be extraverted or introverted and that these two concepts anchor the ends of a continuum. Extraverted people are said to have an orientation to the outer world of people and things, while introverted people have an orientation to the inner world of thoughts and ideas. Extraversion and introversion are seen as opposites and a person can only be described as having a preference for one end of the dimension or the other. With this idea in mind, it is possible to state that

introverted types will exhibit different behaviors than extraverted types, feeling types will differ from thinking types, and sensing types will differ in their behavior as compared to intuiting types. It is important and justifiable for the personologist to undertake research that attempts to explore, describe and explain the differences in behavior exhibited by people at the different ends of these personality dimensions.

Due to the highly exploratory nature of this study no hypothesis regarding prediction of preferences can be made at this time and the following research questions will guide this research:

RQ# 1 - Do extraverted and introverted people differ in their preferences for television program content?

RQ# 2 - Do sensing and intuiting people differ in their preferences for television program content?

RQ# 3- Do thinking and feeling people differ in their preferences for television program content?

Myers (1962) in developing the MBTI created a fourth dimensional description of personality (judging-perceiving) that points to a person's preference for either the judging process (thinking-feeling) or the perceiving process (sensing-intuiting). This dimension of personality can be used, much as the other three, to further describe the behavioral predispositions of people. The inclusion of this fourth dimension provides for the asking of a fourth research question.

RQ# 4 - Do judging and perceiving people differ in their preferences for television program content?

CHAPTER TWO - METHODS OF INQUIRY

The last chapter laid the theoretical foundations for this research and identified four research questions that will guide this research. Now, the method used for answering these research questions needs to be explained. In order to describe the method, three different topics need to be discussed. First, the subjects utilized in this research need to be described. Second, the method of operationalizing the independent variable of personality type will be examined. Third, the development of an instrument to operationalize the dependent variable of television program preference will be described.

Subjects

The sampling frame used to select the subjects for this study was comprised of the names of students drawn from the rosters of two communication classes at a small, private university in the Western United States. These two particular classes were chosen, because the administration of the instrument utilized to operationalize personality, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), was already part of the course structure for the two courses. Students were induced to participate in completing the second instrument, operationalizing television program preference, after listening to a brief but impassioned plea for subjects from the author of this research. All of the 250 subjects listed in the sampling frame completed at least one of the two instruments, and 197 subjects completed both of the testing instruments indicating a response rate of 79%.

Personality - Operationalized

A common ground from which to begin to apply personality variables to mass media research has been elaborated in the previous chapter. Now attention needs to be turned to how the abstract concept of personality can be measured and confined to independent units of analysis.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is a paper and pencil inventory which requires individuals to assess their own personality traits from a scale of forced choice questions. This instrument is derived from Jungian psychoanalytic theory and has been developed, revised and extensively tested and used over the past 40 years. A copy of the MBTI can be found in Appendix A.

This test measures four dimensions of personality: (1) Judging/Perceiving (JP), coming to a conclusion about something versus becoming aware of something; (2) Thinking/Feeling (TF), arriving at judgements by impersonal and logical processes versus subjective and affective processes; (3) Sensing/Intuiting (SN), perceiving directly through the five senses versus indirectly by way of the unconscious; and (4) Extraversion/Introversion (EI), orienting toward the outer world of people and things versus the inner world of concepts and ideas (Nolan, 1985). The inventory shows the direction of the individual's preference and classifies respondents on four dicotomous categories (JP, TF, SN, EI). So, people can be said to prefer the trait of sensing or intuiting, thinking or feeling.

Carlson (1985) indicated that there is a multitude of research being done utilizing the MBTI (one bibliography lists approximately 700 references) which reflects the largely successful efforts to apply the indicator in a variety of settings. The original reliability studies, reported in the Myers-Briggs Manual (1962), yielded reliability coefficients of $r > .80$ for all dimensions. More recent studies (Carskadon, 1977 and

Carlson, 1985) have also found similar favorable correlations.

Construct validity, that is the extent to which the test actually measures some attribute that people are supposed to possess, has been examined most frequently in terms of intertest correlations. Wakefield, Sasek, Brubaker, and Friedman (1976) correlated the MBTI with Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) which contains scales for psychoticism, neuroticism, extraversion, and lying. Significant correlations were found between the EI scale and the EPQ's extraversion and the TF scale and neuroticism. Ross (1966) completed a factor analysis and found the MBTI to have substantial loadings on different factors. This lends credibility to the instrument's premise of an independent four-dimensional construct of personality. Mendelsohn (1970) indicates that there are few instruments better than the MBTI for efficiently providing useful information about personality.

The answer sheets were hand scored utilizing the method set forth by Myers (1962). Each item on the instrument has two answers, one weighted in favor of one of the eight preferences and the other weighted in favor of the opposite preference. To avoid potential social desirability bias, different weights are assigned to certain answers. To determine the person's type, the answers for each preference are totaled, yielding eight numerical scores. These eight scores are then interpreted as four pairs of scores with the larger of each pair indicating the preference. The indicator yields two types of scores for each person. It classifies respondents on four dichotomous type categories, and it also produces eight numerical scores which can be transformed into four continuous scores for purposes of statistical analysis. MBTI scores may, therefore, be treated as dichotomous or continuous data.

Television Program Preference - Operationalized

The first step in creating an instrument to operationalize television program preference was to classify and describe the different types of network television programs currently available to the broadcast viewing audience. Dominick and Pearce (1976) developed a typology of content types in network television programming. They divided television programming into 8 general types: news, game show, interview programs, sports, situation comedy, variety, drama, and action/adventure. Similar classifications of television programming have been created by other researchers (Heeter, 1985; Stanford, 1984; Webster and Wakshlag, 1983).

All of the television programming presented by the three network affiliate stations serving the Stockton/Sacramento broadcast area for one typical Fall week in 1987 were coded into 7 of the program content categories. The content category of variety programs was eliminated from the analysis because of the general lack of variety programs currently available on network affiliate channels (Agee, Ault, & Emery, 1985). This research defines one typical fall week as the first week in October, 1987. Dominick and Pearce (1976), indicate that this week is representative of the network programming for that broadcast year. Shows that were pre-empted that week were determined by examining subsequent weeks' schedules.

Once all of the shows (n=148) were listed on a sheet of paper, they were all assigned a number between 1 and 148. Utilizing a table of random numbers, seven programs representing each of the seven categories were selected and included on the questionnaire. Table One lists each of the programs used by program type.

Table 1

Programs Listed by Content Type1) News Programs

MacNeil Leherr News Hour

60 Minutes

Good Morning America

Nightline

West 57th

48 Hours

Twenty/Twenty

3) Sports Programs

Monday Night Football

Monday Night Baseball

Sacramento Kings Basketball

San Francisco Giants Baseball

Oakland A's Baseball

Saturday Night Main Event

George Michael's Sports Machine

5) Situation Comedy

Night Court

Perfect Strangers

Designing Women

Head of the Class

Alf

Cheers

Frank's Place

2) Interview Programs

Will Shriner

Barbara Walters Interviews

Born Famous

Donahue

Oprah Winfrey

Latenight with David Letterman

The Tonight Show

4) Drama Programs

Hotel

Beauty and the Beast

Cagney and Lacey

L.A. Law

Highway to Heaven

Dynasty

General Hospital

6) Action/Adventure

Miami Vice

Hunter

Spenser: For Hire

Simon and Simon

Crime Story

Magnum P. I.

Ohara

Table 1 cont.7) Game Show

Win, Lose, or Draw

Animal Crack-ups

Jeopardy

Hollywood Squares

Wheel of Fortune

The Price is Right

Scrabble

Subjects were then asked to indicate their preference for viewing the listed program by circling their response on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "never would watch" to "would watch at every opportunity" (See Appendix B).

After the questionnaires were distributed and collected, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine the validity of the dependent measure. As recommended by Kim and Mueller (1978), a correlation matrix was first generated for all 49 program content categories. Any program that did not significantly correlate ($r > .40$) with any other program was eliminated from the solution. Thus, the following 8 programs were eliminated from the analysis at this point: "48 Hours," "The Will Shriner Show," "Born Famous," "Beauty and the Beast," "General Hospital," "Alf," "Ohara," and "Animal Crack-ups."

Utilizing a principle components extraction with an oblimin rotation, 11 factors with eigenvalues > 1.00 were extracted and rotated. This method is consistent with the utilization of factor analysis in uses and gratifications research as recommended by Gorsuch (1983) and Day and Becker (1988). Any program that did not possess a measure of sampling adequacy $> .60$ was eliminated from the analysis as indicated by Kaiser

(1974). This stipulation resulted in the following programs being eliminated at this point: "West 57th," "Good Morning America," "Nightline," "Sacramento Kings Basketball," "Saturday Night Main Event," "Hotel," "Cagney and Lacey," "L. A. Law," "Dynasty," "Designing Women," and "Win, Lose, or Draw." The factor loadings for each of the remaining programs after the oblimin rotation are presented in Table 2.

Table Two

Oblimin Rotated Factor Loadings of Items on the Eleven Factors

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Eigenvalue</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
<u>1) Factor 1 - - Action/Adventure</u>	8.37	
Miami Vice		.75
Hunter		.78
Spenser: For Hire		.69
Crime Story		.75
<u>2) Factor 2 - - Sports</u>	4.45	
Monday Night Football		.76
Monday Night Baseball		.90
San Francisco Giants Baseball		.88
Oakland A's Baseball		.85
George Michael's Sports Machine		.70
<u>3) Factor 3 - - Magazine Shows</u>	3.13	
Twenty/Twenty		.80
60 Minutes		.64
Barbara Walters Interviews		.79

Table 2 - cont.

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Eigenvalue</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
<u>4) Factor 4 - - Game Shows</u>	2.35	
Hollywood Squares		.67
Wheel of Fortune		.76
The Price is Right		.75
Scrabble		.74
<u>5) Factor 5 - - Situation Comedy</u>	1.95	
Night Court		.83
Perfect Strangers		.82
Head of the Class		.79
Cheers		.65
<u>6) Factor 6 - - Romantic Adventure</u>	1.57	
Highway to Heaven		.63
Simon and Simon		.78
Magnum, P. I.		.70
<u>7) Factor 7 - - Dramedy</u>	1.46	
Frank's Place		.72
<u>8) Factor 8 - - Newscast</u>	1.21	
MacNeil Leherr News Hour		.83
<u>9) Factor 9 - - Daytime Interview</u>	1.19	
Donahue		.79
Oprah Winfrey		.79
<u>10) Factor 10 - - Night-time Interview</u>	1.06	
The Tonight Show		.79
Latenight with David Letterman		.85

Table 2 - cont.

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Eigenvalue</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
11) Factor 11 -- Quiz Show	1.00	
Jeopardy		.66

As advised by Gorsuch (1983) and Day and Becker (1988) factors #7, 8, and 11 were eliminated from the analysis as trivial factors. In addition, after the factor analysis was completed it was discovered that the initial program category schemata used for the selection of television programs was not truly represented by the factors that emerged. The first sign of this problem can be evidenced by the failure of any of the drama programs to load significantly into any factor. The only exception to this statement, however, can be found in factor 6 where "Highway to Heaven" loaded. The three programs which loaded significantly into factor 6 can be described as "romantic adventure" and as a result, the drama program type category was eliminated from the analysis and replaced with this new category. Romantic adventure programs are defined as those adventure programs who place a strong and continuing emphasis on relationship initiation and development.

The second problem was discovered in relation to the news and interview program categories. Three separate factors emerged from these two program types. Factor 3 emerged with three programs that are all considered to be of the magazine show format as discussed by Heeter (1985). A magazine show is defined as any show containing lengthy, in-depth news-stories and is differentiated from standard news programs because few stories are covered in great detail as opposed to the standard news format of covering many stories with little detail.

The second two factors that emerged from these categories can both be considered interview programs. One factor (*9) included the shows "Donahue" and "Oprah

Winfrey" while the other factor (*10) included "The Tonight Show" and "Latenight with David Letterman." This difference was interpreted as a difference in the broadcast times for the different shows. "Donahue" and "Oprah Winfrey" are both daytime interview shows while "The Tonight Show" and "Latenight with David Letterman" are both night-time interview programs. As a result, "The Tonight Show" and "Latenight with David Letterman" were assigned to a new program type, night-time interview.

Additive factors were created from the programs that loaded significantly into each of the eight factors and Crombach's Alpha reliability coefficients were then computed for each of the factors to obtain a measure of scale reliability. The alpha scores are listed in Table 3.

Table 3

<u>Factor Reliability Coefficients</u>			
<u>Factor Name</u>	<u>Alpha</u>	<u>Factor Name</u>	<u>Alpha</u>
Action/Adventure	.80	Situation Comedy	.81
Sports	.88	Romantic Adventure	.72
Magazine Shows	.75	Daytime Interview	.74
Game Show	.76	Night-time Interview	.71

The exploratory factor analysis resulted in the emergence of 8 independent, univariate factors. The alpha reliability coefficients indicate that the additive scales created for each of the program type factors are reliable. Thus, a reasonably valid and reliable measurement model was created for the dependent variable (television program preference). Attention now turns to the testing of the theoretical model.

CHAPTER THREE

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter will present the results of the data collected from 197 subjects. Each research question will be examined in turn and the results will be presented in tabular form with a summary of each table discussing which findings were significant and which were not.

RQ* 1 - Do extraverted and introverted people differ in their preferences for television program content?

This research question was answered by utilizing the T-test to compare the mean preferences for both extraverts and introverts for each of the eight types of television program content that emerged from the factor analysis of the dependent measure. Table 4 summarizes the results of this analysis with television program preference as the dependent variable and personality type as the independent variable.

Table 4

Preference for Television Program Type by Extroversion/Introversion

Program Type	Extraverts			Introverts			Pooled Variance		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	T	DF.	P
Action	8.54	3.67	116	8.15	3.61	81	0.75	1,195	.46
Sports	11.66	5.89	116	10.44	5.56	81	1.46	1,195	.15
Magazine	8.85	2.88	116	9.43	3.15	81	-1.33	1,195	.18
Game Shows	6.83	2.79	116	7.23	3.11	81	-0.96	1,195	.34
Sit Com	11.06	4.33	116	10.81	3.94	81	0.42	1,195	.67
Rom. Adventure	6.49	2.83	116	6.13	2.77	81	0.88	1,195	.38
D.T. Interview	5.82	2.20	116	5.65	2.37	81	0.50	1,195	.62
N.T. Interview	6.53	2.30	116	5.69	2.43	81	2.47	1,195	.01*

* - Indicates statistically significant ($p < .05$) result

In response to the first research question, the results indicate that extraverts and introverts differ in their preferences for Night-time interview programs. A comparison of the mean preference scores indicates that extraverted people (mean = 6.53) prefer to watch these night-time interview shows more than introverted people (mean = 5.69).

RQ#2 - Do sensing and intuiting people differ in their preferences for television program content?

This research question was answered by utilizing a the T-test to compare the mean preferences for both sensing and intuiting people for each of the eight types of television program content utilized in this research. Table 5 summarizes the results of

this analysis with television program preference as the dependent variable and personality type as the independent variable.

Table 5

Preference for Television Program Type by Sensing/Intuiting

Program Type	Sensing			Intuiting			Pooled Variance		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	T	DF.	P
Action	9.43	3.78	103	7.23	3.11	94	4.42	1,195	.000*
Sports	12.09	6.14	103	10.15	5.20	94	2.38	1,195	.02*
Magazine	9.23	3.07	103	8.94	2.94	94	0.69	1,195	.49
Game Shows	7.80	2.93	103	6.12	2.68	94	4.19	1,195	.000*
Sit Com	11.81	4.11	103	10.04	4.04	94	3.03	1,195	.003*
Rom. Adventure	6.74	2.92	103	5.91	2.61	94	2.08	1,195	.04*
D. T. Interview	5.69	2.22	103	5.82	2.32	94	-0.40	1,195	.69
N.T. Interview	5.94	2.42	103	6.46	2.33	94	-1.52	1,195	.13

*- Indicates statistically significant ($p < .05$) result

In response to research question number two, sensing and intuiting people differ in their preferences for five types of television programs: sports, situation comedies, action/adventure shows, romantic adventure shows, and game shows. In each case that a significant difference occurred, an analysis of the mean preference scores reveals that sensing people preferred the program more than intuiting people did.

RQ*3- Do thinking and feeling people differ in their preferences for television program content?

This research question was answered by utilizing the T-test to compare the mean preferences for both thinking and feeling people for each of the eight types of

television program content utilized in this research. Table 6 summarizes the results of this analysis with television program preference as the dependent variable and personality type as the independent variable.

Table 6

Preference for Television Program Type by Thinking/Feeling
Thinking Feeling Pooled Variance

Program Type	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	T	DF.	P
Action	9.53	4.09	72	7.72	3.18	125	3.45	1, 195	.001*
Sports	11.46	5.40	72	11.00	5.99	125	0.54	1, 195	.587
Magazine	9.07	2.88	72	9.10	3.08	125	-0.08	1, 195	.938
Game Shows	7.51	3.17	72	6.70	2.75	125	1.90	1, 195	.059
Sit Com	11.38	4.60	72	10.73	3.89	125	1.05	1, 195	.295
Rom. Adventure	6.50	2.65	72	6.26	2.89	125	0.59	1, 195	.557
D. T. Interview	5.17	2.18	72	6.09	2.25	125	-2.80	1, 195	.006*
N.T. Interview	6.11	2.32	72	6.23	2.43	125	-0.34	1, 195	.733

*- Indicates statistically significant ($p < .05$) result

In response to research question number three, the results indicate that thinking and feeling people differ in their preference for two types of television programs: daytime interview and action/adventure shows. By comparing the mean preference scores for each program type, it can be concluded that feeling people prefer daytime interview shows more than thinking people do and thinking people prefer action/adventure shows more than feeling people do.

RQ*4 - Do judging and perceiving people differ in their preferences for television program content?

This research question was answered by utilizing the T-test to compare the mean preferences for both judging and perceiving people for each of the eight types of television program content utilized in this research. Table 7 summarizes the results of this analysis with television program preference as the dependent variable and personality type as the independent variable.

Table 7

Preference for Television Program Type by Judging/Perceiving

Program Type	Judging			Perceiving			Pooled Variance		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	T	DF.	P
Action	8.82	3.87	91	8.00	3.41	106	1.59	1, 195	.113
Sports	10.75	5.83	91	11.52	5.73	106	-0.93	1, 195	.351
Magazine	9.43	3.35	91	8.80	2.65	106	1.47	1, 195	.145
Game Shows	7.51	3.30	91	6.56	2.49	106	2.29	1, 195	.023*
Sit Com	11.00	4.44	91	10.93	3.93	106	0.11	1, 195	.912
Rom. Adventure	6.75	3.04	91	6.00	2.54	106	1.88	1, 195	.062
D. T. Interview	5.99	2.34	91	5.55	2.19	106	1.37	1, 195	.173
N.T. Interview	5.79	2.47	91	6.53	2.27	106	-2.18	1, 195	.030*

*- Indicates statistically significant ($p < .05$) result

In response to research question number four, judging and perceiving people showed a significant difference in their preferences for both night-time interview programs and game shows. By again comparing the mean preference scores for these program types, perceiving people report a higher preference for night-time interview

shows than do judging people. On the other hand, judging people show a stronger preference for game shows as compared to perceiving people.

Summary of Results

A summary of these results show that in relation to some television program types, there are significant intra-dimensional differences in people's preferences. Significant differences in preference for daytime interview programs were found in the thinking/feeling dimension. Both the dimensions of extraversion/introversion and judging/perceiving showed significant differences in the preference for night-time interview programs. A significant difference in preference for sports programs was found between sensing and intuiting people. Sensing and intuiting people also differed in their preference for situation comedies. Differences in preference for action/adventure programming were evidenced in both the sensing/intuiting and thinking/feeling dimensions. Preference differences for game shows were found in both the sensing/intuiting dimension and the judging/perceiving dimension. Finally, sensing and intuiting people differed in their preferences for non-violent action programs. No difference in preference for magazine programs was evidenced by any personality dimension.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

The overall results of this study lend support to the idea that certain differences in personality do make a difference in the television audience member's program preferences. This final chapter will discuss the results of this research in four ways. First, explanations as to why the program preference differences emerged will be offered. Second, several limitations of the current research will be examined. Third, a discussion of how this research adds to the current body of knowledge in uses and gratifications research will be presented. Fourth, this research will conclude with a discussion of possible implications for future research.

Why the Differences Emerged

This section will discuss the results of the data analysis to explain why certain personality types exhibited preferences for different types of television programs. Overall, every dimension of personality measured by the MBTI resulted in significant intradimensional differences in program preference.

The most significant difference occurred in the sensing and intuiting dimension. The results indicate that sensing people have a greater preference than intuiting people for five types of television programming. It is this author's contention that this result does not point to preference for a particular program type, but rather can be explained as a preference for the entire medium. Since intuiting people showed no preference for any programming as opposed to sensing people, it can be implied that the results reflect a general orientation to the medium itself rather than a specific program type. Television is a medium that leaves little to the imagination. McLuan

(1964) describes television as a cool medium that tends to amputate the imagination of the viewer. McLuan's perspective is congruent with these results which indicate that intuiting people, who prefer to understand the world through their unconscious (or imagination), generally are not oriented to a medium that limits their intuitive ability. Sensing people, on the other hand, may prefer television for the same reason that intuiting people do not. Television is a sensation oriented medium - - visual images, spoken words, special effects and musical backgrounds provide a complete world that allows the sensing person to thrive by just observing what happens on the screen. This conclusion is appropriate considering the notion of oppositeness implied in each dimension.

The results from the thinking/feeling dimension serve to extend and support the findings of Gunter and Furnham (1983). Thinking people preferred to watch action/adventure programs more than feeling people. Gunter and Furnham established that people characterized by high levels of neuroticism react more negatively to violent television programs. Wakefield et al. (1976) found that the neuroticism scale of the instrument used by Gunter and Furnham correlated significantly with the thinking/feeling scale of the MBTI. The correlation indicates that people who can be described as having high levels of neuroticism on the EPQ are more likely to exhibit a feeling preference on the MBTI. It follows, therefore, that feeling people are more likely to be upset by the violence on action/adventure programs and, therefore, would be less likely to watch such programming. Another explanation for this result could be that thinking people find an emotional release in the vicarious experience of watching action/adventure programs. This preference could be a result of the thinking person's unconscious mind exerting its need to find the emotional release that is not available in the conscious world.

With regard for the feeling type's preference for daytime interview programs,

the emotional nature of the subjects discussed on these programs (i.e. rape, incest, poverty) may be appealing to the strong empathic nature of the feeling type.

The extraversion and introversion dimension revealed that extraverts tend to prefer to watch night-time interview programs more than introverted people. Night-time interview programs can be described as having content indicative of a social club. Many different celebrities and/or acts are presented on each night's program. This constantly changing human repertoire may be a kind of situation that the extravert would be oriented toward because of their need for a rapidly changing external world.

An additional explanation of these results can be put forth. Because of their outer world orientation, extraverted people may spend less time at home where their television sets are as opposed to introverted people. Extraverted people may be out interacting with the outside world for most of the day and/or night, and the only time they can watch the television is late at night when these night-time interview programs are aired. Introverted people on the other hand spend more time at home and therefore are more likely to get their fill of television during the prime time hours. Thus, the reason that extraverted people prefer to watch night-time interview programs over introverted people may be explained by saying that there are potentially more extraverts than introverts watching television late at night.

The final dimension of personality measured in this study, judging/perceiving, revealed that judging people prefer to watch game shows as compared to perceiving people and perceiving people prefer to watch daytime interview programs as compared to judging people. The judging preference for game shows could be attributed to the fact that judging people prefer coming to a conclusion about things. The definite outcome provided by game show programming may appeal to the judging person's need for the finality of an outcome. In television game shows, there is always a winner and

a loser. Another explanation for this result is that the game show format is made up of numerous judgements and coming to quick decisions. Judging types like to make decisions and they may find entertainment in "playing along" with the contestants on the program.

In considering the reasons for the perceiving person's preference for daytime interview programs, the orientation to gathering information about the world that marks the behavior of the perceiving person may provide the explanation. Perceiving people may prefer to watch interview programs because the interview program format offers no explanations nor judgements of the material offered, but rather simply offers information about reality.

Limitations

As with most social science research, several limitations to the generalizability of this study have been discovered.

The first set of limitations involve the independent variable used for this research. In the above paragraphs, many conclusions about using personality to describe the media behavior of the active audience have been discussed. Personality is not a concept that can be clearly described. A researcher cannot say "Look, there goes an extravert!" Rather, personologists describe personality in terms of consistent behavior patterns. Thus, a rigid definition of personality may not, in fact, even exist. This study attempted to measure personality by utilizing the MBTI which is based on Jungian personality theory. While this instrument has been used by researchers in many settings, it does not specifically relate to the behavior of media use. Therefore, the descriptions of personality provided by the MBTI may not be accurate descriptions of the observable behavior of the active audience.

In addition, the results of the personality measure were only interpreted intradimensionally. If this study were to be conducted again, an analysis should be conducted that accounts for the combination of two, three, or all four of the personality dimensions. This combination of personality traits could reveal patterns of use that are more specific and significant because the personality types created by the combination of traits would provide more differentiating and exact descriptions of audience member personality.

The second set of limitations involves the dependent measure utilized in this research. The first problem with this instrument is its failure to represent all of the available television program content. The factor analysis of the dependent measure was the first indication that the content categories provided by Dominick and Pearse were not all-inclusive. The subjects utilized in this study interpreted the programs in different ways, thus different program content categories emerged from the ones developed a priori. This led to the exclusion from analysis almost all drama programs and a significant portion of the news programming. In addition, the wide variety of programming available on cable television networks was not described. MTV, ESPN, CNN and other popular cable channels were never represented in the pool of programming used to select questionnaire items. Also, the increased availability of movies, through movie channels and video cassettes, was never accounted for in the dependent measure. The ability of the active audience to self-program their television sets by using their VCR's was never addressed.

In addition to not being able to account for all types of television programming, a second problem was encountered with recognition of the programs that were included in the instrument. Since no descriptions of the programs were provided to the respondents, many programs were unknown to the subjects. If a respondent did not recognize a program or had never watched a program, they responded by indicating

that they "would never watch the program" even though the program type itself may be a favorite of that particular person. The lack of recognition problem resulted in a skewing towards the middle of the preference scale to occur. This limitation was evidenced by the failure of significant preference scores to emerge. In addition, because of the lack of program descriptions, it should be mentioned that this instrument may have more accurately measured use rather than preference. These limitations caution against overinterpretation of the findings, because the failure of strong preferences to emerge indicates that the variance accounted for in the statistical measures may not be significant.

A final limitation in this research focuses on the sampling frame utilized to gather data. The first problem is closely related to the limitation regarding the failure of preferences to emerge. Another explanation for this lack of preference emergence may be that the number of subjects utilized (N-197) was too few, resulting in a small effect size. It would be interesting to readminister the measurement instruments to more people in order to see if once the effect size was increased, significant preference scores would emerge.

In addition to the problem of a small sample size, the characteristics of the respondents themselves may have contributed to the lack of generalizability. The sample was composed entirely of college students. College students are not your typical television viewers. Their viewing patterns, or when they watch television, are not typical of American society as a whole. Generally a college student tends to watch less television than the average American and they tend to watch television at different times. For example, a student may watch more daytime programming during the week between classes while they watch little prime-time programming because of the pressures of homework. In addition, the sample drawn was in no way a random sampling of the television audience, not even of the college student television

audience.

In addition to the limitation of effect size, no analysis was ever undertaken to assess or control for the effects of gender. Appendix C shows the breakdown of the sample by gender. It is possible that the results of this study may be explained on the basis of gender differences. Additional analyses could be undertaken to explore the effect that gender may have on the results of this research.

If this study were to be undertaken again, a more exacting measure of the dependent variable should be utilized. Perhaps viewing diaries or experimental exposure to different types of programming would allow more significant preferences to emerge. In addition, the problems of sampling inadequacy should be addressed in order to increase both the effect size and the generalizability of the study by including non-students in the subject pool.

Conclusions and Implications for Future Research

The results of this research add to the body of knowledge surrounding the uses and gratifications paradigm. This research has contributed to two areas of uses and gratifications research: audience needs and media consumption.

First, perhaps the most significant contribution to the current body of knowledge is that this study is a significant response to the call put forth by McGuire (1974) to incorporate psychological theories into uses and gratifications research. The results of this research indicate it is possible to explore and measure the psychological origins of audience needs and relate these descriptions of the audience to their media behavior. This research also serves to support and extend McGuire's conclusion that the ego defensive theories of personality lie explicitly or implicitly behind much of the discussion of selective attention to media content. The psychoanalytically derived

descriptions of personality provided by Jung can be used to describe the behavior of the audience member in relation to television use. The question raised by Wazenreid and Woody (1979) about the the use of personality descriptions to predict audience behavior can now be answered. It is possible, given descriptions of personality, to predict audience preference for different types of television programming.

Second, this research adds new information to the heuristic knowledge surrounding the audience member's use of a specific medium content as discussed by Levy (1977) and Stanford (1984). This study used personality variables as higher-level definitions of audience needs in order to explore how audience needs as reflected in personality type influence the process of choosing which television programs to watch. The results indicate that certain personality types do exhibit differences in their media use behaviors. This conclusion lends support for the idea that different people use the media differently and this research has described and explained how and what this difference is through the incorporation of personality variables. In addition, the results of this study lend support for the use of the personality variable in describing "some of the people" as posited by Klapper (1960).

There appears to be enough evidence gathered from this study to warrant the further incorporation of personality variables in uses and gratifications research. Even with the limitations of this study, significant information has been added to the current body of knowledge surrounding uses and gratifications research. There are, however, five different ways that descriptions of audience member personality can be utilized in uses and gratifications research.

First, descriptions of audience member personality could be used to account for individual differences in studies of comparative medium use. The results of the sensing/intuiting dimension indicate that this personality trait may be used to predict for preferences for either hot or cool media as described by McLuan. For example, this

research indicates that sensing people prefer television as opposed to intuiting people. Would intuiting people prefer the "cool" medium of books as opposed to sensing people?

Second, could descriptions of personality be incorporated into gratifications sought and obtained research and expectancy-value research? This research indicates personality variables could be used to describe the internal need states that create both expectancies and gratifications sought. So, questions could be asked such as: Do different personality types have differing expectancies for the mass media? or Do certain personality types obtain more gratification from the mass media than others?

Third, this research also provides evidence for the continued exploration of other personality theories in relation to the origins of audience needs. For example, if one were to assume the self-actualizing approach to personality as discussed by Rogers and Maslow instead of the psychoanalytic approach used in this research, could the mass media then be seen as a tool to aid in reaching the goal of self-actualization. How do different people use television, for example, to confirm their personality and what affect does this confirmation have on the process of self-actualization? What happens when the mass media disconfirms an audience member's personality?

Fourth, as implied in the limitation section, personality is simply a summary description of people's behavior. It could be possible that the unique behaviors of media use (such as channel switching and multiple media use) could be analyzed to discover new descriptions of the periphery of personality. These "media personalities" could perhaps provide more differentiating descriptions of the members of the active audience.

Finally, it would be interesting to take the questions asked by this research and reverse them. In other words, instead of asking how personality affects our media use, researchers could ask how media use affects our personality. The expansion of Rubin (1988) into research regarding the uses and effects of the mass media indicate the

possibility that personality may not only affect our media decisions, but these media decisions may also effect our personality which in turn again effects our media use. The implication here is that a process view of the effects of personality on mass media use could be established that would account for the limitations of current linear media effects models such as dependency theory.

Appendix A

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR

FORM F

by Katharine C. Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers

DIRECTIONS:

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to these questions. Your answers will help show how you like to look at things and how you like to go about deciding things. Knowing your own preferences and learning about other people's can help you understand where your special strengths are, what kinds of work you might enjoy and be successful doing, and how people with different preferences can relate to each other and be valuable to society.

Read each question carefully and mark your answer on the separate answer sheet. *Make no marks on the question booklet.* Do not think too long about any question. If you cannot decide on a question, skip it but be careful that the *next* space you mark on the answer sheet has the same number as the question you are then answering.

Read the directions on your answer sheet, fill in your name and any other facts asked for, and work through until you have answered all the questions.



Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. 577 College Ave., Palo Alto,
California 94306. © Copyright 1976 by Isabel Briggs Myers. Copyright
1943, 1944, 1957 by Katharine C. Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers. No
reproduction is lawful without written permission of the publisher.
NINTH PRINTING, 1984

Which answer comes closest to telling how you usually feel or act?

1. Does following a schedule
 - (A) appeal to you, or
 - (B) cramp you?
2. Do you usually get along better with
 - (A) imaginative people, or
 - (B) realistic people?
3. If strangers are staring at you in a crowd, do you
 - (A) often become aware of it, or
 - (B) seldom notice it?
4. Are you more careful about
 - (A) people's feelings, or
 - (B) their rights?
5. Are you
 - (A) inclined to enjoy deciding things, or
 - (B) just as glad to have circumstances decide a matter for you?
6. When you are with a group of people, would you usually rather
 - (A) join in the talk of the group, or
 - (B) talk individually with people you know well?
7. When you have more knowledge or skill in something than the people around you, is it more satisfying
 - (A) to guard your superior knowledge, or
 - (B) to share it with those who want to learn?
8. When you have done all you can to remedy a troublesome situation, are you
 - (A) able to stop worrying about it, or
 - (B) still more or less haunted by it?
9. If you were asked on a Saturday morning what you were going to do that day, would you
 - (A) be able to tell pretty well, or
 - (B) list twice too many things, or
 - (C) have to wait and see?
10. Do you think on the whole that
 - (A) children have the best of it, or
 - (B) life is more interesting for grown-ups?
11. In doing something that many other people do, does it appeal to you more to
 - (A) do it in the accepted way, or
 - (B) invent a way of your own?
12. When you were small, did you
 - (A) feel sure of your parents' love and devotion to you, or
 - (B) feel that they admired and approved of some other child more than they did of you?
13. Do you
 - (A) rather prefer to do things at the last minute, or
 - (B) find that hard on the nerves?
14. If a breakdown or mix-up halted a job on which you and a lot of others were working, would your impulse be to
 - (A) enjoy the breathing spell, or
 - (B) look for some part of the work where you could still make progress, or
 - (C) join the "trouble-shooters" who were wrestling with the difficulty?
15. Do you usually
 - (A) show your feelings freely, or
 - (B) keep your feelings to yourself?
16. When you have decided upon a course of action, do you
 - (A) reconsider it if unforeseen disadvantages are pointed out to you, or
 - (B) usually put it through to a finish, however it may inconvenience yourself and others?
17. In reading for pleasure, do you
 - (A) enjoy odd or original ways of saying things, or
 - (B) like writers to say exactly what they mean?

18. In any of the ordinary emergencies of everyday life, do you prefer to
 (A) take orders and be helpful, or
 (B) give orders and be responsible?
19. At parties, do you
 (A) sometimes get bored, or
 (B) always have fun?
20. Is it harder for you to adapt to
 (A) routine, or
 (B) constant change?
21. Would you be more willing to take on a heavy load of extra work for the sake of
 (A) extra comforts and luxuries, or
 (B) a chance to achieve something important?
22. Are the things you plan or undertake
 (A) almost always things you can finish, or
 (B) often things that prove too difficult to carry through?
23. Are you more attracted to
 (A) a person with a quick and brilliant mind, or
 (B) a practical person with a lot of common sense?
24. Do you find people in general
 (A) slow to appreciate and accept ideas not their own, or
 (B) reasonably open-minded?
25. When you have to meet strangers, do you find it
 (A) pleasant, or at least easy, or
 (B) something that takes a good deal of effort?
26. Are you inclined to
 (A) value sentiment more than logic, or
 (B) value logic more than sentiment?
27. Do you prefer to
 (A) arrange dates, parties, etc. well in advance, or
 (B) be free to do whatever looks like fun when the time comes?
28. In making plans which concern other people, do you prefer to
 (A) take them into your confidence, or
 (B) keep them in the dark until the last possible moment?
29. Is it a higher compliment to be called
 (A) a person of real feeling, or
 (B) a consistently reasonable person?
30. When you have a decision to make, do you usually
 (A) make it right away, or
 (B) wait as long as you reasonably can before deciding?
31. When you run into an unexpected difficulty in something you are doing, do you feel it to be
 (A) a piece of bad luck, or
 (B) a nuisance, or
 (C) all in the day's work?
32. Do you almost always
 (A) enjoy the present moment and make the most of it, or
 (B) feel that something just ahead is more important?
33. Are you
 (A) easy to get to know, or
 (B) hard to get to know?
34. With most of the people you know, do you
 (A) feel that they mean what they say, or
 (B) feel you must watch for a hidden meaning?
35. When you start a big project that is due in a week, do you
 (A) take time to list the separate things to be done and the order of doing them, or
 (B) plunge in?
36. In solving a personal problem, do you
 (A) feel more confident about it if you have asked other people's advice, or
 (B) feel that nobody else is in as good a position to judge as you are?
37. Do you admire more the people who are
 (A) conventional enough never to make themselves conspicuous, or
 (B) too original and individual to care whether they are conspicuous or not?
38. Which mistake would be more natural for you:
 (A) to drift from one thing to another all your life, or
 (B) to stay in a rut that didn't suit you?

39. When you run across people who are mistaken in their beliefs, do you feel that
 (A) it is your duty to set them right, or
 (B) it is their privilege to be wrong?
40. When an attractive chance for leadership comes to you, do you
 (A) accept it if it is something you can really swing, or
 (B) sometimes let it slip because you are too modest about your own abilities,
 (C) or doesn't leadership ever attract you?
41. Among your friends, are you
 (A) one of the last to hear what is going on, or
 (B) full of news about everybody?
42. Are you at your best
 (A) when dealing with the unexpected, or
 (B) when following a carefully worked-out plan?
43. Does the importance of doing well on a test make it generally
 (A) easier for you to concentrate and do your best, or
 (B) harder for you to concentrate and do yourself justice?
44. In your free hours, do you
 (A) very much enjoy stopping somewhere for refreshments, or
 (B) usually want to use the time and money another way?
45. At the time in your life when things piled up on you the worst, did you find
 (A) that you had gotten into an impossible situation, or
 (B) that by doing only the necessary things you could work your way out?
46. Do most of the people you know
 (A) take their fair share of praise and blame, or
 (B) grab all the credit they can but shift any blame on to someone else?
47. When you are in an embarrassing spot, do you usually
 (A) change the subject, or
 (B) turn it into a joke, or
 (C) days later, think of what you should have said?
48. Are such emotional "ups and downs" as you may feel
 (A) very marked, or
 (B) rather moderate?
49. Do you think that having a daily routine is
 (A) a comfortable way to get things done, or
 (B) painful even when necessary?
50. Are you usually
 (A) a "good mixer", or
 (B) rather quiet and reserved?
51. In your early childhood (at six or eight), did you
 (A) feel your parents were very wise people who should be obeyed, or
 (B) find their authority irksome and escape it when possible?
52. When you have a suggestion that ought to be made at a meeting, do you
 (A) stand up and make it as a matter of course, or
 (B) hesitate to do so?
53. Do you get more annoyed at
 (A) fancy theories, or
 (B) people who don't like theories?
54. When you are helping in a group undertaking, are you more often struck by
 (A) the cooperation, or
 (B) the inefficiency,
 (C) or don't you get involved in group undertakings?
55. When you go somewhere for the day, would you rather
 (A) plan what you will do and when, or
 (B) just go?
56. Are the things you worry about
 (A) often really not worth it, or
 (B) always more or less serious?
57. In deciding something important, do you
 (A) find you can trust your feeling about what is best to do, or
 (B) think you should do the *logical* thing, no matter how you feel about it?

58. Do you tend to have
 (A) deep friendships with a very few people, or
 (B) broad friendships with many different people?
59. Do you think your friends
 (A) feel you are open to suggestions, or
 (B) know better than to try to talk you out of anything you've decided to do?
60. Does the idea of making a list of what you should get done over a week-end
 (A) appeal to you, or
 (B) leave you cold, or
 (C) positively depress you?
61. In traveling, would you rather go
 (A) with a companion who had made the trip before and "knew the ropes", or
 (B) alone or with someone greener at it than yourself?
62. Would you rather have
 (A) an opportunity that may lead to bigger things, or
 (B) an experience that you are sure to enjoy?
63. Among your personal beliefs, are there
 (A) some things that cannot be proved, or
 (B) only things that *can* be proved?
64. Would you rather
 (A) support the established methods of doing good, or
 (B) analyze what is still wrong and attack unsolved problems?
65. Has it been your experience that you
 (A) often fall in love with a notion or project that turns out to be a disappointment—so that you "go up like a rocket and come down like the stick", or do you
 (B) use enough judgment on your enthusiasms so that they do not let you down?
66. Do you think you get
 (A) more enthusiastic about things than the average person, or
 (B) less enthusiastic about things than the average person?
67. If you divided all the people you know into those you like, those you dislike, and those toward whom you feel indifferent, would there be more of
 (A) those you like, or
 (B) those you dislike?
- [On this next question *only*, if two answers are true, mark both.]
68. In your daily work, do you
 (A) rather enjoy an emergency that makes you work against time, or
 (B) hate to work under pressure, or
 (C) usually plan your work so you won't *need* to work under pressure?
69. Are you more likely to speak up in
 (A) praise, or
 (B) blame?
70. Is it higher praise to say someone has
 (A) vision, or
 (B) common sense?
71. When playing cards, do you enjoy most
 (A) the sociability,
 (B) the excitement of winning,
 (C) the problem of getting the most out of each hand,
 (D) the risk of playing for stakes,
 (E) or don't you enjoy playing cards?

Go on to the next page.

Which word in each pair appeals to you more?

- | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|-----|---------------------|-------------|-----|
| 72. (A) firm-minded | warm-hearted | (B) | 98. (A) sensible | fascinating | (B) |
| 73. (A) imaginative | matter-of-fact | (B) | 99. (A) changing | permanent | (B) |
| 74. (A) systematic | spontaneous | (B) | 100. (A) determined | devoted | (B) |
| 75. (A) congenial | effective | (B) | 101. (A) system | zest | (B) |
| 76. (A) theory | certainty | (B) | 102. (A) facts | ideas | (B) |
| 77. (A) party | theater | (B) | 103. (A) compassion | foresight | (B) |
| 78. (A) build | invent | (B) | 104. (A) concrete | abstract | (B) |
| 79. (A) analyze | sympathize | (B) | 105. (A) justice | mercy | (B) |
| 80. (A) popular | intimate | (B) | 106. (A) calm | lively | (B) |
| 81. (A) benefits | blessings | (B) | 107. (A) make | create | (B) |
| 82. (A) casual | correct | (B) | 108. (A) wary | trustful | (B) |
| 83. (A) active | intellectual | (B) | 109. (A) orderly | easy-going | (B) |
| 84. (A) uncritical | critical | (B) | 110. (A) approve | question | (B) |
| 85. (A) scheduled | unplanned | (B) | 111. (A) gentle | firm | (B) |
| 86. (A) convincing | touching | (B) | 112. (A) foundation | spire | (B) |
| 87. (A) reserved | talkative | (B) | 113. (A) quick | careful | (B) |
| 88. (A) statement | concept | (B) | 114. (A) thinking | feeling | (B) |
| 89. (A) soft | hard | (B) | 115. (A) theory | experience | (B) |
| 90. (A) production | design | (B) | 116. (A) sociable | detached | (B) |
| 91. (A) forgive | tolerate | (B) | 117. (A) sign | symbol | (B) |
| 92. (A) hearty | quiet | (B) | 118. (A) systematic | casual | (B) |
| 93. (A) who | what | (B) | 119. (A) literal | figurative | (B) |
| 94. (A) impulse | decision | (B) | 120. (A) peacemaker | judge | (B) |
| 95. (A) speak | write | (B) | 121. (A) accept | change | (B) |
| 96. (A) affection | tenderness | (B) | 122. (A) agree | discuss | (B) |
| 97. (A) punctual | leisurely | (B) | 123. (A) executive | scholar | (B) |

Which answer comes closest to telling how you usually feel or act?

124. Do you find the more routine parts of your day
(A) restful, or
(B) boring?
125. If you think you are not getting a square deal in a club or team to which you belong, is it better to
(A) shut up and take it, or
(B) use the threat of resigning if necessary to get your rights?
126. Can you
(A) talk easily to almost anyone for as long as you have to, or
(B) find a lot to say only to certain people or under certain conditions?
127. When strangers notice you, does it
(A) make you uncomfortable, or
(B) not bother you at all?
128. If you were a teacher, would you rather teach
(A) fact courses, or
(B) courses involving theory?
129. When something starts to be the fashion, are you usually
(A) one of the first to try it, or
(B) not much interested?
130. In solving a difficult personal problem, do you
(A) tend to do more worrying than is useful in reaching a decision, or
(B) feel no more anxiety than the situation requires?
131. If people seem to slight you, do you
(A) tell yourself they didn't mean anything by it, or
(B) distrust their good will and stay on guard with them thereafter?
132. When you have a special job to do, do you like to
(A) organize it carefully before you start, or
(B) find out what is necessary as you go along?
133. Do you feel it is a worse fault
(A) to show too much warmth, or
(B) not to have warmth enough?
134. When you are at a party, do you like to
(A) help get things going, or
(B) let the others have fun in their own way?
135. When a new opportunity comes up, do you
(A) decide about it fairly quickly, or
(B) sometimes miss out through taking too long to make up your mind?
136. In managing your life, do you tend to
(A) undertake too much and get into a tight spot, or
(B) hold yourself down to what you can comfortably handle?
137. When you find yourself definitely in the wrong, would you rather
(A) admit you are wrong, or
(B) not admit it, though everyone knows it,
(C) or don't you ever find yourself in the wrong?
138. Can the new people you meet tell what you are interested in
(A) right away, or
(B) only after they really get to know you?
139. In your home life, when you come to the end of some undertaking, are you
(A) clear as to what comes next and ready to tackle it, or
(B) glad to relax until the next inspiration hits you?
140. Do you think it more important to
(A) be able to see the possibilities in a situation, or
(B) be able to adjust to the facts as they are?
141. Do you feel that the people whom you know personally owe their successes more to
(A) ability and hard work, or
(B) luck, or
(C) bluff, pull and shoving themselves ahead of others?
142. In getting a job done, do you depend upon
(A) starting early, so as to finish with time to spare, or
(B) the extra speed you develop at the last minute?
143. After associating with superstitious people, have you
(A) found yourself slightly affected by their superstitions, or
(B) remained entirely unaffected?

144. When you don't agree with what has just been said, do you usually
 (A) let it go, or
 (B) put up an argument?
145. Would you rather be considered
 (A) a practical person, or
 (B) an ingenious person?
146. Out of all the good resolutions you may have made, are there
 (A) some you have kept to this day, or
 (B) none that have really lasted?
147. Would you rather work under someone who is
 (A) always kind, or
 (B) always fair?
148. In a large group, do you more often
 (A) introduce others, or
 (B) get introduced?
149. Would you rather have as a friend someone who
 (A) is always coming up with new ideas, or
 (B) has both feet on the ground?
150. When you have to do business with strangers, do you feel
 (A) confident and at ease, or
 (B) a little fussed or afraid that they won't want to bother with you?
151. When it is settled well in advance that you will do a certain thing at a certain time, do you find it
 (A) nice to be able to plan accordingly, or
 (B) a little unpleasant to be tied down?
152. Do you feel that sarcasm
 (A) should never be used where it can hurt people's feelings, or
 (B) is too effective a form of speech to be discarded for such a reason?
153. When you think of some little thing you should do or buy, do you
 (A) often forget it till much later, or
 (B) usually get it down on paper to remind yourself, or
 (C) always carry through on it without reminders?
154. Do you more often let
 (A) your heart rule your head, or
 (B) your head rule your heart?
155. In listening to a new idea, are you more anxious to
 (A) find out all about it, or
 (B) judge whether it is right or wrong?
156. Are you ~~oppressed~~ by
 (A) many different worries, or
 (B) comparatively few?
157. When you don't approve of the way a friend is acting, do you
 (A) wait and see what happens, or
 (B) do or say something about it?
158. Do you feel it is a worse fault to be
 (A) unsympathetic, or
 (B) unreasonable?
159. When a new situation comes up which conflicts with your plans, do you try first to
 (A) change your plans to fit the situation, or
 (B) change the situation to fit your plans?
160. Do you think the people close to you know how you feel
 (A) about most things, or
 (B) only when you have had some special reason to tell them?
161. When you have a serious choice to make, do you
 (A) almost always come to a clear-cut decision, or
 (B) sometimes find it so hard to decide that you do not wholeheartedly follow up either choice?
162. On most matters, do you
 (A) have a pretty definite opinion, or
 (B) like to keep an open mind?
163. As you get to know people better, do you more often find that they
 (A) let you down or disappoint you in some way, or
 (B) improve upon acquaintance?
164. When the truth would not be polite, are you more likely to tell
 (A) a polite lie, or
 (B) the impolite truth?
165. In your way of living, do you prefer to be
 (A) original, or
 (B) conventional?
166. Would you have liked to argue the meaning of
 (A) a lot of these questions, or
 (B) only a few?

APPENDIX B

PROGRAM PREFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read the list of television programs below and circle the number of the response that best indicates how often you would watch the program if given the chance. Please take your time and thank you for your help.

Your Name _____

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Would
Would	Would	Would	Would	Watch at Every
Watch	Watch	Watch	Watch	Opportunity

01. Miami Vice	1	2	3	4	5
02. Will Shriner	1	2	3	4	5
03. Hotel	1	2	3	4	5
04. Win, Lose, or Draw	1	2	3	4	5
05. Monday Night Football	1	2	3	4	5
06. Hunter	1	2	3	4	5
07. Barbara Walters Interviews	1	2	3	4	5
08. Beauty and the Beast	1	2	3	4	5
09. Animal Crack-Ups	1	2	3	4	5
10. Late Night with David Letterman	1	2	3	4	5
11. 20/20	1	2	3	4	5
12. Born Famous	1	2	3	4	5
13. Night Court	1	2	3	4	5
14. Perfect Strangers	1	2	3	4	5
15. Monday Night Baseball	1	2	3	4	5
16. West 57th	1	2	3	4	5
17. Jeopardy	1	2	3	4	5
18. 48 Hours	1	2	3	4	5
19. The Tonight Show	1	2	3	4	5
20. Designing Women	1	2	3	4	5
21. Cagney and Lacey	1	2	3	4	5
22. Sacramento Kings Basketball	1	2	3	4	5

	1	2	3	4	5
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Would
	Would	Would	Would	Would	Watch at Every
	Watch	Watch	Watch	Watch	Opportunity
23. L. A. Law				1	2 3 4 5
24. Spenser: For Hire				1	2 3 4 5
25. McNeil Leher News Hour				1	2 3 4 5
26. Hollywood Squares				1	2 3 4 5
27. 60 Minutes				1	2 3 4 5
28. San Francisco Giant's Baseball				1	2 3 4 5
29. Simon and Simon				1	2 3 4 5
30. Highway to Heaven				1	2 3 4 5
31. Wheel of Fortune				1	2 3 4 5
32. Oakland A's Baseball				1	2 3 4 5
33. Head of the Class				1	2 3 4 5
34. Crime Story				1	2 3 4 5
35. Alf				1	2 3 4 5
36. Good Morning America				1	2 3 4 5
37. The Price is Right				1	2 3 4 5
38. Cheers				1	2 3 4 5
39. Frank's Place				1	2 3 4 5
40. Dynasty				1	2 3 4 5
41. Donahue				1	2 3 4 5
42. General Hospital				1	2 3 4 5
43. Scrabble				1	2 3 4 5
44. Saturday Night Main Event				1	2 3 4 5
45. Magnum P. I.				1	2 3 4 5
46. Oprah Winfrey				1	2 3 4 5
47. Ohara				1	2 3 4 5
48. Nightline				1	2 3 4 5
49. George Michael's Sports Machine				1	2 3 4 5

Thank you for your help so far. Please answer the following questions regarding yourself and the amount of television you watch. Circle the appropriate response.

50. Do you watch television:

- 1) Once or twice a week
- 2) Three or four times a week
- 3) One or two hours a day
- 4) Three to five hours a day
- 5) Six or more hours a day
- 6) Don't watch television

51. Do you subscribe to cable television? 1. Yes 2. No

51a. If Yes, do you watch:

- 1) More cable channels than regular network channels (ABC, NBC, CBS).
- 2) More regular network channels than cable channels.
- 3) Equal amounts of both network and cable channels.
- 4) Don't know

52. Do you own a VCR? 1) Yes 2) No

53. What is your favorite television program? _____

54. What is your sex? 1) Male 2) Female

APPENDIX C**Breakdown of Sample by Gender**

Total number of respondents - 197

Total number of females who responded - 122 or 61.9% of the sample.

Total number of males who responded - 75 or 38.1% of the sample.

List of References

- Adler, A. (1956). The individual psychology of Alfred Adler. New York: Basic Books.
- Adoni, H. (1979). The functions of mass media in the political socialization of adolescents. Communication Research 16: 84-106.
- Agee, W.K., Ault, P. H., & Emery, E. (1985). Introduction to mass communications. New York: Harper and Row.
- Allport, G. W. (1955). Becoming: Basic considerations for a psychology of personality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Allport, G. W. (1961). Pattern and growth in personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Allport, G. W. (1966). Traits revisited. American Psychology, 21: 1-10.
- Bantz, C. R. (1982). Exploring uses and gratifications: A comparison of reported uses of television and reported uses of favorite program type. Communication Research 9: 352-379.
- Becker, L. B. (1979). Measurement of gratifications. Communication Research 6: 54-73.
- Becker, L. B. (1976). Two tests of media gratifications: Watergate and the 1974 election. Journalism Quarterly, 53: 28-33.
- Binswanger, L. (1963). Being-in-the-world: Selected papers of Ludwig Binswanger. New York: Basic Books.
- Blumer, H. (1939). Elementary collective behavior. In A. M. Lee (Ed.), New outline of the principles of sociology. New York: Barnes and Noble.
- Blumler, J. G. (1979). The role of theory in uses and gratifications studies. Communication Research, 6: 9-36.

- Blumler, J. G. and Katz, E. (1974). The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratification research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Blumler, J. G. and McQuail, D. (1968). Television in politics: Its uses and influences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brown, J. R., Cramond, J. K., & Wilde, R. J. (1974). Displacement effects of television and the child's functional orientation to media. In J. Blumler and E. Katz, eds., The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratification research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Carlson, J. G. (1985). Recent assessments of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Journal of Personality Assessment, 49(4): 356-365.
- Carskadon, T. G. (1977). Test-retest reliabilities of continuous scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Psychological Reports, 41: 1011-1012.
- Day, K. D. and Becker, C. (1988). The latent structure of uses and gratifications of music. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, San Diego.
- deBock, H. (1980). Gratification during a newspaper strike and a TV black-out. Journalism Quarterly, 57: 61-66.
- De Fleur, M. L. and Ball-Rokeach, S. (1982). Theories of mass communication (4th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Dominick, J. R. and Pearce, M. C. (1976). Trends in network prime-time programming, 1953-74. Journal of Communication, Winter: 70-80.
- Eysenck, H. J. and Eysenck, S. (1969). Personality structure and measurement. London: Routledge and Kegan.
- Fisher, B. A. (1978). Perspectives on human communication. New York: MacMillan.
- Fiske, D. W. and Maddi, S. R. (1961). Functions of varied experience. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey.

- Freud, S. (1960). The psychopathology of everyday life (Standard ed.) London: Hogarth Press.
- Galloway, J. J. and Meek, F. L. (1981). Audience uses and gratifications: An expectancy model." Communication Research 8: 435-450.
- Garramone, G. M. (1983). Issues versus image orientation and effects of political advertising. Communication Research 10: 59-76.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). Factor analysis. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Greenberg, B. S. (1974). Gratifications of television viewing and their correlates for British children. In J. Blumler and E. Katz, eds., The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratification research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Gunter, B. and Furnham, A. (1983). Personality and perception of TV violence. Journal of Personal and Individual Differences, 4: 315-321.
- Gunter, B., Furnham, A., & Jarrett, J. (1984). Personality, time of day, and delayed memory for TV news. Journal of Personal and Individual Differences, 5: 35-39.
- Hedinsson, E. (1981). TV, family, and society: The social origins and effects of adolescents' TV use. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Heeter, C. (1985). Program selection with an abundance of choice: A process model. Human Communication Research, 12: 126-152.
- Hergenhahn, B. R. (1980). An introduction to theories of personality. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Herzog, H. (1944). "What do we really know about daytime serial listeners?" in P. F. Lazarsfeld and F. N. Stanton, (Eds.), Radio research, 1942-1943. New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pierce.
- Houghton-Larsen, R. (1982). Patterns of media usage related to gratifications sought. Canadian Journal of Communication, 8: 42-55.

- Hur, K. K. and Robinson, J. P. (1981). A uses and gratifications analysis of viewing of "Roots" in Britain. Journalism Quarterly, 58: 582-588.
- Jeffres, L. W. (1983). Media use for personal identification: Linking uses and gratifications to culturally significant goals. Mass Communication Review, 10: 6-12.
- Johnsson-Smaragdi, U. (1983). TV use and social interaction in Adolescence. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Johnstone, J. W. (1974). Social integration and mass media use among adolescents: A case study. In J. Blumler and E. Katz, eds., The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratification research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Jung, C. G. (1926). Psychological Types. (H. G. Baynes, trans.) New York: Harcourt Brace. (Originally published, 1921).
- Jung, C. G. (1929). The structure and dynamics of the psyche. (H. G. Baynes, trans.) Princeton University Press.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. Psychometrika, 35: 401-415.
- Katz, E. (1979). The uses of Becker, Blumler, and Swanson. Communication Research, 6: 74-83.
- Katz, E. and Lazarsfeld, P. (1955). Personal influence. New York: Free Press.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J. G. and Gurevitch, M. (1974). Utilization of mass communication by the individual. In J. Blumler and E. Katz, eds., The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratification research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Kelly, G. A. (1955). The psychology of personal constructs. New York: Norton.
- Kim, J. and Mueller, C. W. (1978). Factor analysis: Statistical methods and practical issues. Beverly Hills: Sage.

- Kippax, S. and Murray, J. P. (1980). Using the mass media: Need gratification and perceived utility. Communication Research 7: 335-360.
- Klapper, J. T. (1960). The effects of mass communication. New York: Free Press.
- Lain, L. B. (1986). Steps toward a comprehensive model of newspaper readership. Journalism Quarterly, 63: 69-74.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1927). Propaganda technique in the World War. New York: Knopf.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B. & Gaudet, H. (1948). The people's choice. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Levy, M. R. (1977). Experiencing television news. Journal of Communication, 27: 112-117.
- Levy, M. R. and Windahl, S. (1985). The concept of audience activity. In K. E. Rosengren, L. A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), Media gratifications research: Current perspectives. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Levy, M. R. and Windahl, S. (1984). Audience activity and gratifications: A conceptual clarification and exploration. Communication Research 11: 51-78.
- Lichtenstein, S. L. and Rosenfeld, L. B. (1984). Normative expectations and individual decisions concerning media gratification choices. Communication Research 11: 393-413.
- Lichtenstein, S. L. and Rosenfeld, L. B. (1983). Uses and misuses of gratifications research: An explication of media functions. Communication Research 10: 97-109.
- Lometti, G. E., Reeves, B., & Bybee, C. R. (1977). Investigating the assumptions of uses and gratifications research. Communication Research 4: 321-338.
- Lowery, S. and De Fleur, M. D. (1983). Milestones in mass communication research. New York, Longman.

- Lull, J. (1980). Family communication patterns and the social uses of television. Communication Research 7: 319-334.
- MacKinnon, D. W. (1961). The personality correlates of creativity: A study of American architects. Berkeley, CA: Institute of Personality Assessment and Research.
- Maddi, S. R. (1976). Personality theories: A comparative analysis. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Maslow, A. H. (1962). Some basic propositions of a growth and self-actualization psychology. In Perceiving, behaving, becoming: A new focus for education. Washington, D.C.: Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McClelland, D. C. (1951). Personality. New York: Dryden.
- McGuire, W. J. (1974). Psychological motives and communication gratification. In J. Blumler and E. Katz, eds., The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratification research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- McLeod, J. M. and Becker, L. B. (1981). The uses and gratifications approach. In D. D. Nimmo and K. R. Sanders (Eds.) Handbook of political communication. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- McLeod, J. M. and Becker, L. B. (1974). Testing the validity of gratifications measures through political effects analysis. In J. Blumler and E. Katz, eds., The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratification research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- McLeod, J. M., Becker, L. B., & Ziemke, D. A. (1977). Decline and fall at the White House: A longitudinal analysis of communication effects. Communication Research 4: 3-22.

- McLeod, J. M., Bybee, C. R., & Durall, J. A. (1982). Evaluating media performance by gratifications sought and received. Journalism Quarterly, 59: 3-12.
- McLuan, M. (1964). Understanding media. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McQuail, D. (1979). The uses and gratifications approach: Past, troubles, and future. Mass Communication, 2: 73-89.
- McQuail, D., Blumler, J. G., and Brown, J. R. (1972). The television audience: A revised perspective. In D. McQuail (Ed.) Sociology of mass communications. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- McQuail, D. and Gurevitch, M. (1974). Explaining audience behavior: Three approaches considered. In J. Blumler and E. Katz, eds., The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratification research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Mendelsohn, G. A. (1965). Review of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. In O. K. Buros (Ed.) Sixth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, N. J.: Gryphon Press.
- Mendelsohn, H. (1964). Listening to radio. In L. A. Dexter and D. M. White (Eds.) People, society, and mass communications. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Mendelsohn, H. and O'Keefe, G. J. (1976). The people choose a president. New York: Praeger.
- Mischel, W. (1968). Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley.
- Myers, I. B. (1962). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Manual. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Nolan, L. L. (1985). Conflict management: Effects of perception and personality on strategies for handling conflict. Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

- Nordenstreng, K. (1970). Comments on "gratification research" in broadcasting. Public Opinion Quarterly, 34, p. 32-44.
- Nordlund, J. E. (1978). Media interaction. Communication Research 5: 150-175.
- Palmgreen, P. and Rayburn, J. D. (1983). A response to Stanford. Communication Research 10: 253-257.
- Palmgreen, P. and Rayburn, J. D. (1982). Gratifications sought and media exposure: an expectancy value model. Communication Research 9: 561-580.
- Palmgreen, P. and Rayburn, J. D. (1979). Uses and gratifications and exposure to public television: A discrepancy approach. Communication Research 6: 155-180.
- Palmgreen, P., Wenner, L. A., & Rayburn, J. D. (1981). Gratifications discrepancies and news program choice. Communication Research 8: 451-478.
- Palmgreen, P., Wenner, L. A., & Rayburn, J. D. (1980). Relations between gratifications sought and obtained: A study of television news. Communication Research 7: 161-192.
- Peled, T. and Katz, E. (1974). Media functions in wartime: The Israel homefront in October 1973. In J. G. Blumler and E. Katz (Eds.) The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Rayburn, J. D. and Palmgreen, P. (1984). Merging uses and gratifications and expectancy value theory. Communication Research 11: 537-562.
- Rayburn, J. D., Palmgreen, P., and Acker, T. (1984). Media gratifications and choosing a morning news program. Journalism Quarterly, 61: 149-156.
- Roberts, D. L. and Bachen, C. M. (1981). Mass communication effects. Annual Review of Psychology, 32: 307-356.

- Roe, K. (1983a). The influence of video technology in adolescence. Media Panel Report 27, Vaxjo University College and Lund University.
- Roe, K. (1983b). Mass media and adolescent schooling: Conflict or co-existence? Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Rogers, C. R. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A study of a science. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rogers, C. R. (1961). On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rosengren, K. E. (1974). "Uses and gratifications: A paradigm outlined." in J. Blumler and E. Katz, eds., The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratification research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Rosengren, K. E., Wenner, L. A., & Palmgreen, P. (1985). Media gratifications research: Current perspectives. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Rosengren, K. E. and Windahl, S. (1977). Mass media use: Causes and effects. Communications: International Journal of Communication Research 3: 336-351.
- Rosengren, K. E. and Windahl, S. (1972). Mass media consumption as a functional alternative. In D. McQuail (Ed.) Sociology of mass communications. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- Ross, J. (1966). "The relationship between a Jungian personality inventory and test of ability, personality, and interest." Australian Journal of Psychology, 18: 1-17.
- Rubin, A. M. (1988). The variable nature of audience activity: A gratifications approach. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, San Diego.
- Rubin, A. M. (1983). Television uses and gratifications: The interaction of viewing patterns and motivations. Journal of Broadcasting 27: 37-51.

- Rubin, A. M. (1981). An examination of television viewing motivations. Communication Research 8: 141-165.
- Rubin, A. M. and Rubin, R. B. (1982). Older persons' TV viewing patterns and motivations. Communication Research 9: 287-313.
- Saunders, D. R. (1955). Some preliminary interpretive material for the PRI. Research Memorandum 55-15. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.
- Schramm, W. Lyle, J. & Parker, E. (1961). Television in the lives of our children. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Stanford, S. W. (1984). Predicting favorite TV program gratifications from general orientations. Communication Research 11: 519-536.
- Stanford, S. W. and Riccomini, B. (1984). Linking TV program orientations and gratifications: An experimental approach. Journalism Quarterly, 61: 76-82.
- Stephenson, W. (1967). The play theory of mass communication. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sun, S. W. and Lull, J. (1986). The adolescent audience for music videos and why they watch. Journal of Communication, 36: 115-125.
- Swanson, D. L. (1979). The continuing evolution of the uses and gratifications approach. Communication Research, 6: 3-7.
- Swanson, D. L. (1977). The uses and misuses of uses and gratifications. Human Communication, 3: 214-221.
- Towers, W. M. (1987). Adult readership of magazines and why they read. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Salt Lake City.
- Towers, W. M. (1985). Perceived helpfulness of radio news and some uses and gratifications. Communication Research 6: 20-32.

- Van Leuven, J. (1981). Expectancy theory in media and message selection. Communication Research 8: 425-434.
- Viereck, G. S. (1930). Spreading germs of hate. New York: Horace Liveright.
- Wakefield, J. A., Sasek, J., Brubaker, M. L., & Friedman, A. F. (1976). "Validity of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire." Psychological Reports, 39: 115-120.
- Waples, D., Berelson, B., and Bradshaw, F. R. (1940). What reading does to people. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wanzenried, J. W. and Woody, R. H. (1979). Personality factors and preference for rock and country lyrics. Popular Music and Society, 6: 302-306.
- Weaver, D. H. (1980). Audience need for orientation and media effects. Communication Research 7: 361-376.
- Webster, J. and Wakshlag, J. (1983). The impact of group viewing on patterns of television program choice. Journal of Broadcasting, 26: 445-455.
- Weibull, L. (1983). Newspaper readership in Sweden. Newspaper Research Journal, 4: 53-64.
- Wenner, L. A. (1983) Political news on television: A reconsideration of audience orientations. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 47: 380-395.
- Wenner, L. A. (1982). Gratifications sought and obtained in program dependency: A study of network evening news and *60 Minutes*. Communication Research 9: 539-560.
- Windahl, S. (1981). Uses and gratifications at the crossroads. In G. C. Wilhoit and H. de Bock (Eds.) Mass communication review yearbook. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Wolfe, K. M. and Fiske, M. (1949). Why children read comics. In P. F. Lazarsfeld and K. M. Stanton (Eds.) Communications research, 1948-1948. New York: Harper and Row.

Wright, C. R. (1986). Mass communication: A sociological perspective. New York: Random House.

Zillman, D. (1985). The experimental exploration of gratifications from media entertainment. In K. E. Rosengren, L. A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), Media gratifications research: Current perspectives. Beverly Hills: Sage.