News Media Credibility of the Internet and Television

Davood Mehrabi
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication
University Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang,Selangor, Malaysia
E-mail: davood.mehrabi@yahoo.com

Musa Abu Hassan
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication
University Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang,Selangor, Malaysia
E-mail: musaupm@gmail.com

Muhamad Sham Shahkat Ali
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication
University Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang,Selangor, Malaysia
E-mail: sham@fbmk.upm.edu.my

Abstract

In this study, a survey design was used to determine the factors influences the perception of media credibility to decipher how respondents perceive the Internet and television in terms of credibility for news information. A survey with 270 non-academic professional staff was conducted to determine the factors that influence their perception towards media credibility. The systematic sampling method was used to select for inclusion in the sample. The results of the study revealed that television is more credible than Internet to convey news. This study also explored a positive and significant relationship between issue salience, media reliance, and media usage with perception of the Internet and television credibility.

Keywords: Media credibility; issue salience; media usage; media reliance

1. Introduction

Always when a new medium arises it affects on existing media (Liu, 2003). Concerns in the newspaper industry, rising number of people turning to radio for news, and then about the number relying on television made arising studies of the credibility of a medium (Johnson and Kaye, 2004). Eastin (2001) argue the advent of information and communication technology (ICT), especially the Internet, is giving some impact to our daily life. The explosive growth of the Internet since the 1980s has been far faster than the growth of any other communications medium, faster than the spread of the telephone, radio, television, or even cellular telephones (Fogg et al., 2001). This growth has been possible largely because of the open processes that have supported the development of the Internet technologies and the administration of Internet resources (Lu and Andrews, 2006). In general, since the late 1990s when the Internet began providing new interactive environment of information that allowed users to seek information and communicate with others in ways never before possible, the concept of credibility has revived considerable attention (Hilligoss and Rieh, 2008). Penetration and growing reliance on the Internet has also motivated researchers to study the credibility of online news in compare to traditional media (Lu and Andrews, 2006).

Internet news is abundant and easily available nowadays (Lu and Andrews, 2006). So many readers are getting the opportunity to get information via the Internet instead traditional ways (Eastin, 2001). Due to the nature of the Internet such as the anonymity of sender location, the role of sender, and even identity of the sender, there are few barriers stop people from publishing on the internet. These matters often lead to concerns about fabricated or false quotation and other type of information counterfeit (Fogg, 2003). However, the amount of information on the Internet currently is increasing tremendously and it has become a massive information storehouse, and there are many different types of information sources available through the online media and traditional media, but this creates a possibility for false information, thereby potentially perceived credibility away from a proper care (Eastin, 2001). In sum, In today's environment of digital media, the rapid rise of the Internet has created some questions like; is the publishing in traditional media better and more credible than posting a webpage on the Internet? Based on these questions, past studies on media credibility may help to understand the relative credibility of the Internet as a new medium (Metzger, Flanagin, Eyal, Lemus, and McCann, 2003).

However, studies conducted in different countries have arrived at different conclusions about the Internet credibility. But a few studies conducted in the West have reported that the Internet was taking its place alongside TV or newspapers (Lu and Andrews, 2006). Flanagin and Metzger (2001) also argue that a large part of media credibility studies focused on traditional media, but these studies have either neglected the Internet and World Wide Web. However, many people do rely on online media for information, but it is not still certain if online media meet people's expectations. Despite of the fact that there is a serious concern about misinformation on the Internet, but online audiences are increasing (Hilligoss and Rieh, 2008), and when people are using online media, they must place some reliance on it (Fogg, 2003). Therefore the credibility of online and traditional media is becoming an increasingly important topic to understand in the field of communication, and various studies in different countries have reported different results about the Internet credibility (Lu and Andrews, 2006).

However, the internet has become a major source of news and information in recent years. But, because of privacy issues, content accuracy, reliability, and other related concerns, some observers have predicted a trouble for online news in future (Abdulla, Garrison, Salwen, Driscoll, and Casey, 2002). Generally, because past researches revealed that people are less likely rely on the media they do not perceived as credible. Therefore, credibility is crucial for the internet (Johnson and Kaye, 1998).

2. Literature Review

Audience members seek information for various purpose, especially, for comfort, empowerment, learn, and knowledge to act. But all information is not useful and credible to them. Then they filter out useless information and retaining only that which is useful and believable. Credibility is one of the criteria using to filter unbelievable information (Wathen and Burkell, 2002). Credibility defines as "judgments made by a perceiver (e.g., a message recipient) concerning the believability of a communicator" (O'Keefe, 1990, pp. 130-131). But others believe that this definition should also include institutions as well as persons as communicators (Gass and Seiter, 2007). In general, the scholarly examination of credibility is perhaps among the oldest lines in communication research, originating with ancient Greeks (Griffin, 2009; Liu, 2003). On the other hand, Garrison (2003) reminded that the investigation of perceived credibility and components of audience attitudes have began as new mass communication technologies have appeared.

Usually, credible information is referred to believable information (Fogg et al., 2001; Tseng and Fogg, 1999), and it is a person's perception of the truth of a piece of information (Eisend, 2006). Self (1996) also stated that this concept remembered Aristotle's argument that persuasion was based upon fitting the message to audience need in the linear model of speaker-message-audience. In sum, different researchers, in fact, employed different definitions of credibility. This definitions helps to

demonstrate that credibility is a complex, interdependent, and multidimensional concept (Burgoon, Burgoon, and Wilkinson, 1981).

During the 1950s, competition from television provoked the industry to look at the various news media credibility in the eyes of the public. During 1960s, then reliance on TV climbed so steadily that by the 1968 television news had attained confidence from twice as many people as the newspapers (Erskine, 1970; Self, 1996). In today's media environment, advent of the Internet as a new and widely used medium for the delivery of information raises the question of how to assess credibility of this medium (Wathen and Burkell, 2002). So, the focus of media credibility research is now more about medium effects such as differences between newspapers, television and online media (Newhagen and Nass, 1989).

Media credibility, due to the deep penetration of the Internet, has received renewed attention in recent years (Wathen and Burkell, 2002). However, interest in newspaper credibility may reached in the highest point in the late 1980s, but the media credibility issue has recently been revived with the involvement of traditional media (for example, television and newspapers) in the Internet (Garrison, 2003). In sum, recent studies mostly focus on examining the credibility of the Internet with traditional media counterparts. For example, the result of a study on "Perceptions of Internet information credibility", conducted by Flanagin and Metzger (2000), shows that the Internet information was as credible as television. Flanagin and Metzger (2000) also concluded that credibility among different types of information sought by audience members, such as news and entertainment, varied by media channels. Respondents reported that they did not verify Internet-based information. However, this finding varied by the type of information needed. Level of experience using of the Internet and how an audience perceived the information were related with whether they made to verify information found on the Internet.

Before traditional media became established in online environment, Internet research credibility were examined (Johnson and Kaye, 2004). While Fogg et al. (2002) argue that online users are becoming increasingly sceptical of the online information and as a result those who offer online information need to increase the credibility of information, but most studies found web information more credible than traditional media counterparts (Johnson and Kaye, 1998). However, the Internet helps to information flow and freedom, also it introduces an increased potential for error or exploitation on information. But credibility of online information may derive from the capability of mutual interaction between users and sources.

What is important to explore people's evaluation of media credibility are factors those affecting the perception of media. In particular, media use considered as a predictor for understanding perception of media credibility (Lu and Andrews, 2006). However, from several decades ago, some studies investigated the relationship between media use and media credibility (Bracken, 2006; Choi, Watt, and Lynch, 2006). But the findings of all previous studies about media use and credibility always are not fit together. However, several studies have shown positive correlation between media use and perceived media credibility (Kiouis, 2001). That is, those who use a particular media more often are those who perceive the credibility of these media positively than those who use this media less often (Rimmer and Weaver, 1987). On the other hand, it doesn't sound logical that a person spends time to seek information from a source he does not trust on. Generally, the findings of some studies are inconsistent with aforementioned studies. For example the result of a study conducted by Rimmer and Weaver (1987) indicates no significant relationship between how often the local newspaper is read and level of newspaper credibility. In the studies of local newspaper credibility it should be considered that some of local newspapers do little to cover of the local news story, because people are aware of their local news story and events, and local newspaper also use their pages to increase advertising to make money. Lu and Andrews (2006) also argue that media use was significantly related to credibility of newspaper, radio, magazine, and the Internet. But it was not consistent association between television viewing and its absolute credibility. However, the relationship between respondents' television viewing and their perceived credibility almost reached a considerable level. In general, credibility of television may refer

to this notion that "seeing is believing." Although the television is most destructive medium of entertainment, but it is necessary to distinguish between different information displayed through this medium when we want to access the credibility of television.

However, the relationship between media use and perceived media credibility has investigated for several decades but the findings of a study conducted by Rimmer and Weaver (1987) indicate that the rate of media use needs to be clearly distinguished from level of preference for various media. They also note that the Roper-type questions that ask which medium people choose for different news or where people habitually obtain the majority of their news are not a proper question to determine frequency of media use. Studies of media use have consistently shown that online media are as a complement to traditional media more complementary than competitive media (Bucy, 2003). Based on this finding that online media are as a complement to traditional media, it can be deducted that credibility is something a medium cannot earn it by its own but it also should be obtained by other media.

The salience of an issue is a factor that looks to manipulate how audience members evaluated a medium (Brown, Mutch, Spoon, and Wakimoto, 1996). Past research studies demonstrate that salience influences the perception of media credibility (Eastin, 2001; Flanagin and Metzger, 2003; Gunther, 1992). Main statement of issue salience assumption argues that audience members have a tendency to get information on issues they discern as an important issue (Hutchings, 2001). If the issue is not salience, audience members won't judge about the credibility of delivered medium seriously. If the issue is salience, they will place the delivered medium as a high credible medium. Moreover, the more salient the issue, the greater perceived credibility of a medium (Bélanger and Meguid, 2008).

A large body of studies suggest a relationship between an individual's involvement with salient issues and distrust of a medium. For instance, when people consider a subject as an important subject in a medium, they are just likely, if not more likely, to persuaded by argument on the issue and not any inclined to perceive a medium as biased (Gunther, 1992). When we look at different media news, normally, media tends to start with the most important issues. On the other hand readership also looking for what they supposed as important issue, so if readership finds what they want in a medium, they may judge it as a credible medium.

Numerous researchers found out that a lot of reasons influence perception of media credibility, with media reliance and media use being frequently inspected (Mingxin, 2006). When people have a purpose of gaining information on required issue of the day, they will become more rely on the mass media (Wanta and Hu, 1994). The findings of a study accomplished by Rimmer and Weaver (1987) showed that media use and media reliance are different. While media use tap behavioural measures of frequency of use of various media, but media reliance use of measures of preferences for various media. Past research studies investigated the impact of media reliance on the perception of media credibility (Johnson and Kaye, 2004; Johnson, Kaye, Bichard, and Wong, 2008; Mingxin, 2006). Some research findings also suggest that credibility of a medium or source of information is strongly associated with reliance on a medium or source of information (Johnson and Kaye, 2002, 2004). On the other hand, others researcher such as Mingxin (2006) discovered that media reliance has less affect on media credibility. Johnson and Kaye (2004) also provided evidence that those who rely little on traditional media were more likely to view weblogs as credible. Johnson et al. (2008) in a study on the perceptions of blog credibility also identified media reliance as a strong predictor of media credibility. This finding is expected because when audiences rely on a medium to meet their needs, they may influence the judgement of media credibility.

This study will make comparison between Internet and television from the point of view of news media credibility. Hence, the present research poses the following questions:

Is there any significant relationship between media use and perceived media credibility?

Is there any significant relationship between issue salience and perceived media credibility?

Is there any significant relationship between media reliance and perception of media credibility?

3. Method

In this study, a survey design was used to determine the factors influences the perception of news media credibility. This study was conducted at Universiti Putra Malaysia. Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM) is a public university located in central Peninsular Malaysia, close to the capital city, Kuala Lumpur. This location was selected based on following reasons: First; past research studies that indicate media users are those who are educated (Howard, Rainie, and Jones, 2001); due to this reason, the researcher supposed that the selection of an academic location can assist to examine the objectives of the study. Second, the Internet is a new media and some people do not use it, some others cannot afford it, and some people do not use it well **(**Howard et al., 2001). But in this location due to existing of the Internet and work's nature of the staff, they are able to use of the Internet in their workplace.

The sample of this study consists of 270 non-academic professional staff. The systematic sampling method was used to select for inclusion in the sample. The main method of data collection in this study was based on questionnaire. The questionnaire was adopted from previous studies (A. J. Flanagin and Metzger, 2007; Johnson et al., 2008; Mingxin, 2006; Wanta and Hu, 1994). Some of the questions were modified to suit the present study setting. Because the present study investigates about the perceived credibility of news, the word "news" added in the original questions.

To measure the perception of news media credibility the researcher applied eight commonly identified items: clarity, biasness, telling the whole story, accuracy, believability, trust, fairness, and timeliness. The respondents were asked the following statements to examine respondents' perception towards media selected in this study to get news. The asked statements to measure the perception of media credibility were repeated for two types of media selected in this study, including: It is clear, it is bias, telling the whole story, it is accurate, it is believable, can be trusted, it is fair, and it is timely. Respondents were required to indicate their perception toward news media credibility according to five-point Likert scale ranged from: (5) strongly agree, (4) agree, (3) neutral, (2) disagree, (1) strongly disagree. The measurement of perceived media credibility is a combination of the total of the eight items above with the credibility ratings of two different news media.

To measure issue salience as an independent variable, two types of question was developed. Two of these questions were applied by Flanagin and Metzger (2007). These two questions were opposed by asking the participants to rate "how relevant the story was to their own life" and "how important they felt the story was." The researcher also refined these two types of question: If I feel news is relevant to my own life, I visit the news through (name of selected media), and I often get news from (name of selected media) if I feel the news is important. In the original instrument a seven point scale was used. This scale was modified into a five-point scale suited to the format of the other variables in this study. The researcher also added a new item that is related to society and asked the respondents "If I feel news is relevant to my society, I get the news in (name of selected media)". As well as, to measure issue salience respondents were required rate the following statements: After getting news in (name of selected media), I often think about what I have got, I often discuss with others, I often recommend what I have obtained to a friend.

In the current study four types of questions were used to examine the reliance on media to get news. The first type of questions was adopted from Wanta and Hu (1994) where which asked "I rely on (name of selected media) to get news". At the same question Johnson et, al. (2008) asked respondents whether they (5) "heavily rely," (4) "rely," (3) "sometimes rely," (2) "rarely rely," or (1) "never rely" on blogs for political information.

The second type of questions was adopted from Mingxin (2006) that respondents were required to respond the following item: "on average how long do you not use mass media, thus you may feel something absent from your everyday life? The response choices for the question sort from "have not the feeling", "6-7 days", "4-5 days", "2-3 days", "1 day", indicating individual's reliance on mass media gradually increases. The same question was used in the current study to measure this subject. However, the researcher used five options for the question ranged from (5) "6-7 days," (4) "4-5 days," (3) "2-3 days," (2) "1 days," (1) "have not the feeling."

The researcher asked respondents about the amount of the time they spent to get news on different mass media. In this study to measure media usage the following question was used to measure media usage: How many minutes or hours do you use the following media to get news?

Pretesting was carried out on 31 non-academic professional staff at UPM. The pre-testing was conducted from 16 to 23 of February 2009. In this study, the overall reliability index for all items in the questionnaire is 0.9574. It was found that the results of per-testing met requirement of 0.70 Cronbach's alpha value for social science studies. According to Festinger and Katz (1966) it is considered acceptable, therefore, the researcher is confident that data collected in this study will be reliable.

Table 1:   The reliability coefficient of variables at pre-test and actual study

Name of Variables	Pre-test (n = 31)	Actual study (n = 270)
Media reliance	.858	.826
Issue salience	.949	.940
Media credibility	.931	.931

According to the sample size of the study, in February and March 2009, 270 sets of questionnaires were handed to the staff at Universiti Putra Malaysia and a sufficient amount time was given to the respondents to assigning items on the questionnaire sheets. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the profile of respondents. It was also used to describe the frequency and percentage of variables of the study. To find out the relationship between media reliance, issue salience, and media usage with perceived media credibility Spearmen Rho correlation coefficient was used.

4. Results
4.1. Respondent profile

Of the 270 questionnaire distributed to the sample of the study, 225 completed questionnaires were collected, producing an 83.3% response rate. Demographic data of the 225 respondents who completed the questionnaire was shown in Table 2. Based on information from Table 2, almost equally one half of the respondents were male and one half of them were female (50.2% vs. 49.8%). The average age was 37.7, and standard deviation was 9.3, with a minimum 23 years old and a maximum of 57 years old. Almost one-thirds (31.5%) of the respondents belonged to the age group of 30-36 years old. The lowest age categories were located between 37 to 43 years old (12%), and 51 to 57 years old (12%), as presented in Table 2. It would seem that most of non-academic professional staff was relatively young in age. Demographic data also showed that slightly more than two-thirds of the respondents were degree holder (68%), and only more than five percentage (5.6%) hold diploma or matriculation qualification. More than three-quarters of the respondents (79.2%) in this study were married, while one-fifth of them (20.8%) were single as indicated in Table 2. Table 2 was also indicated more information of the demographic characteristics of the respondents of this study.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents' profile

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Gender (n= 219)		
Male	110	50.2
Female	109	49.8
Age (n = 213)		
23-29	51	23.9
30-36	67	31.5
37-43	26	12.2
44-50	43	20.2
51-57	26	12.2
Educational level (n = 213)		
Diploma / Matriculation	12	5.6
Degree / Professional. Qualification	144	67.6
Master, PhD	57	26.8
Marital status (n = 221)		
Single	46	20.8
Married	175	79.2

4.2. Media reliance

Second section of the questionnaire was designed to examine the reliance on television and Internet. Based on information from Table 3, 36% of the respondent reported a little reliance on television and 5.8% reported a much reliance on television to get news. In reference to Table 3, almost one-third of respondents (32.4%) reported a little reliance on the Internet to get news and 5.8% of the respondents reported a much reliance on the internet to get news.

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents Based on Reliance on media (n = 225)

Variable	Level	Frequency	Percentage
Television			
	Much	13	5.8
	Moderate	131	58.2
	Little	81	36.0
Internet			
	Much	13	5.8
	Moderate	139	61.8
	Little	73	32.4

4.3. Issue salience

In this study the perception of respondents towards credibility of television and Internet was measured based on salience of issues. The descriptive statistic including level of issue salience, frequency, and percentage was analyzed for television and Internet.

To get news from television 4.9% of the respondents reported a much salience of issue and 46.7% of them reported a little salience of issues. Information in the Table 4 indicated, the Internet was rated as a medium when issues was perceived as a low salience. In reference to information presented in the Table 4, less than 1.0% of the respondents reported a little salience of issues on the Internet and almost three-fourth of them reports a low salience of issue on the internet to get news.

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents Based on Issue Salience

Variable	Level	Frequency	Percentage
Television			
	Much	11	4.9
	Moderate	109	48.4
	Little	105	46.7
Internet			
	Much	2	0.9
	Moderate	56	24.9
	Little	167	74.2

4.4. Media usage

Based on information presented in the Table 5, the Internet was rated as a high usage medium (M = 79, SD = 56.13), followed by television (M = 78.97, SD = 48.77).

Table 5: Distribution of Respondents Based on Media usage

Media	Mean	Standard Deviation
Internet	79	56.13
Television	78.97	48.77

The resulting frequency distribution of television is shown in Table 6. Based on information it is revealed that 59.1% of the respondents agree that news is timeliness, followed by fairness 55.0%, clarity 48.9%, trust 46.8%, believable 43.6%, accuracy 42.7%, and tells the whole story 37.3%. Analysis of data also indicates that 40.0% of the respondents reported a neutral perception toward bias of news in television.

Table 6: Distribution of Respondents' perception towards components of television credibility

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
Scale Item(s)	%	%	%	%	%	M	SD
It is clear	25.6	48.9	16.9	6.4	2.3	3.89	.93
It is biased	15.5	30.9	40.0	11.8	1.8	3.46	.95
It tells the whole story	10.5	37.3	34.5	14.5	3.2	3.37	.96
It is accurate	10.9	42.7	33.2	10.9	2.3	3.49	.90
It is believable	9.1	43.6	34.1	10.0	3.2	3.45	.90
It can be trusted	8.2	46.8	31.4	10.5	3.2	3.46	.90
It is fair	19.1	55.0	19.5	4.5	1.8	3.85	.84
It is timeliness	18.2	59.1	18.2	3.6	0.9	3.90	.76

The resulting frequency distribution of the Internet is shown in Table 7. It is revealed that 37.6% of the respondents agree that news on the Internet is clear. Analysis of data also indicate that 55.0% of the respondents reported a neutral perception toward bias of news on the Internet, followed by accuracy 51.8%, trust 50.5%, believability 48.6%, tells the whole story 45.7%, timeliness 40.0%, and fairness 37.7%.

Table 7: Distribution of Respondents' perception towards components of the Internet credibility

Scale Item(s)	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	M	SD
It is clear	18.3	37.6	36.2	7.4	0.5	3.66	.87
It is biased	5.5	19.5	55.0	15.9	4.1	3.06	.85
It tells the whole story	12.8	30.6	45.7	9.1	1.8	3.43	.89
It is accurate	7.3	27.7	51.8	12.3	0.9	3.28	.80
It is believable	5.0	30.5	48.6	14.5	1.4	3.23	.80
It can be trusted	5.5	29.5	50.5	12.7	1.8	3.24	.81
It is fair	18.6	35.0	37.7	7.7	0.9	3.62	.90
It is timeliness	15.9	34.5	40.0	8.6	0.9	3.55	.89

4.5. Different medium's credibility

Eight-item credibility scale was used to measure respondents' perception of news media credibility. Items included clear, bias, accurate, believable, trust, timeless, fairness, as well as telling the whole story. Based on findings presented in Table 8 it can be concluded that the credibility of television to get news was rated higher in comparison with the Internet (M = 2.27, SD = .58).

Table 8: Different medium's credibility

Medium	Mean	Standard deviation
Television	2.54	.55
Internet	2.27	.58

4.5.1. Perception of television credibility

Based on information presented in Table 9, there is a positive and almost negligible correlation between perception towards credibility of television news program and television usage. As it was shown in Table 9 (r_s = .003, p = .97), p value is so closer to 0 than to 1, that means that the relationship is closer to being significantly neutral, than being significantly positive.

The results of data analysis also revealed that salience of television news program had a negligible correlation with perception of television credibility (r_s = .189, p = .005). The relationship was also positive and statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that reliance on television news program had a relationship with non-academic professional staff's perception towards credibility of television. The direction of the relationship indicates a positive and negligible correlation. Based on results in Table 9 (r_s = .169, p = .012) it can be noted that the correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 9: Relationship between media reliance, issue salience, media usage, and perception of television credibility

Variable	Perception of Television Credibility	
	r_s	P
Media reliance (n = 220)	.169	.012*
Issue salience (n = 220)	.189	.005*
Media usage (n = 194)	.003	.97

Note: * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

4.5.2. Perception of the Internet credibility

Based on findings from the sample of the study, the amount of time spend on the Internet to get news had negligible and significant relationship with perception of the Internet credibility (r_s = .185, p = .01). In reference to the result the correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. The result states that non-

academic professional staff who getting news on the Internet, they have a positive perception towards the Internet as a medium to get news.

The coefficient of correlation shown in Table 10 also reveals that non-academic professional staff has a positive perception towards the Internet credibility in term of news salience. The results specify that the relationship between news salience and perception of the Internet credibility was negligible with a positive direction. However, the relationship between these two variables was not statistically significant ($r_s = .12$, $p = .076$). The results from Table 10 show that reliance on the Internet had a positive relationship with perception of internet credibility to get news. Though the direction of relationship between the Internet reliance and perception of the Internet credibility is positive but negligible ($r_s = .121$, $p = .072$). Based on the results correlation was not statistically significant.

Table 10: Relationship between media reliance, issue salience, media usage, and perception of the Internet credibility

Variable	Perception of the Internet Credibility	
	r_s	p
Media reliance(n = 220)	.121	.072
Issue salience (n = 220)	.120	.076
Media usage (n = 194)	.185	.01*

Note: * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

5. Discussion

Results indicate that there is a positive relationship between perceived credibility and amount of time spent on television viewing, and the Internet using. In the case of television, Lu and Anderson (2006) didn't find a significant relationship between perception of television credibility and television viewing (Lu and Andrews, 2006). The results of this study are also inconsistent with the findings of a study a conducted by Rimmer and Weaver (1987) that didn't find a relationship between media use and perception of media credibility. However the findings of this study support this idea that more time people spent on a medium, they gave to it more credibility (Lu and Andrews, 2006).

Based on the findings of this study it can be noted that there is a positive relationship between issue salience and perceived credibility of television and Internet. These findings were consistent with earlier work conducted by (Eastin, 2001; Gunther, 1992) on message credibility in both online and offline environment. Findings of another study conducted by Flanagin and Metzger (2007) also revealed that there is a positive relationship between issue salience and perception of message credibility.

The results of current study explored that there is a positive relationship between reliance on television and Internet to get news. The results presented here support the Johnson and Kaye (2000) assertion that reliance is an extremely important in credibility judgement of traditional media, such as print media and television. However, the results of this study revealed that in the case of online media it can be also important in credibility judgement.

As findings of this study revealed, perception of media credibility by non-academic professional staff is moderately low, sorting from 2.54 (television), and 2.27 (Internet) on a Likert-type five point scale. It means lower than moderate credible, but television (2.54) was nearly moderate credible. Based on the results of the study, television was rated more credible than Internet to convey news among non-academic professional staff. When audiences perceived television news program as more credible, then perhaps news viewing will increase. Rationally, this has implications for the ever-increasing exciting and important international and local news. These results might be helpful to apply to overall information available from television.

6. Limitations and suggestions for future study

Of the 270 questionnaire distributed to the sample of the study, about one-fifth of distributed questionnaires were not returned. It is possible that non-respondents would be different from respondents in their evaluations of the questions asked in this study. Returned questionnaires also showed that some respondents obviously skipped some questions, specially, the questions regarding the media usage factors. In addition, the results of this study was analyzed by a correlation test, thus it cannot be determined in cause and effect relationship among variables of the study. Above factors could affect the precise reflection of respondents' opinion towards perception of media credibility, and consequently the results of the study.

Given the limitation of this study, a future study should address the following issues:

To investigate about what is the difference between those who rely on online media and those who rely on traditional media

To distinguish what is the strongest predictor of reliance on traditional and online media.

Investigation upon the criteria for selection of each medium

References

[1] Abdulla, A. A., Garrison, B., Salwen, M., Driscoll, P., and Casey, D., 2002. The credibility of newspapers, television news, and online news. *Paper presented at the Mass Communication and Society Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, annual convention, Miami Beach, Fla.*

[2] Bélanger, É., and Meguid, B. M., 2008. Issue salience, issue ownership, and issue-based vote choice. *Electoral Studies,* 27(3), 477-491.

[3] Bracken, C. C., 2006. Perceived source credibility of local television news: the impact of television form and prsence. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 50(4), 723-741.

[4] Brown, J. K., Mutch, R. W., Spoon, C. W., and Wakimoto, R. H., 1996. Proceedings: Symposium on fire in wilderness and park management (ed): *DIANE Publishing; United states.*

[5] Bucy, E. P., 2003. Media credibility reconsidered: Synergy effects between on-air and online news. *Journalism and mass communication quarterly,* 80(2), 247-264.

[6] Burgoon, M., Burgoon, J. K., and Wilkinson, M., 1981. Newspaper Image and Evaluation. *Journalism quarterly,* 58(3), 411-433.

[7] Choi, J. H., Watt, J. H., and Lynch, M., 2006. Perceptions of News Credibility about the War in Iraq: Why War Opponents Perceived the Internet as the Most Credible Medium. *Journal of computer-mediated communication,* 12(1), 209-229.

[8] Eastin, M. S., 2001. Credibility Assessments of Online Health Information: The Effects of Source Expertise and Knowledge of Content. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication,* 6(4).

[9] Eisend, M., 2006. Source Credibility Dimensions in Marketing Communication – A Generalized Solution. *Journal of Empirical Generalizations in Marketing Science,* 10(1), 1-33.

[10] Erskine, H., 1970. The polls: opinion of the news media. *Public Opinion Quarterly,* 34(4), 630-643.

[11] Festinger, L., and Katz, D., 1966. Research method in behavioral sciences (ed). *United States: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.*

[12] Flanagin, A. J. and Metzger, M. J., 2003. The perceived credibility of personal Web page information as influenced by the sex of the source. *Computers in Human Behavior,* 19(6), 683-701.

[13] Flanagin, A. J., and Metzger, M. J., 2000. Perceptions of internet information credibility. *Journalism and mass communication quarterly,* 77(3), 515-540.

[14] Flanagin, A. J., and Metzger, M. J., 2007. The role of site features, user attributes, and information verification behaviors on the perceived credibility of web-based information. *New media and society,* 9(2), 319-342.

[15] Fogg, B. J., 2003. persuasive technology: using computers to change what we think and do. *San Francisco: Morgan Kaufman Publishers.*

[16] Fogg, B. J., Marshall, J., Osipovich, A., Varma, C., Fang, N., and al, e., 2001. What makes web sites credible? A report on a large quantitative study. *Paper presented at the In proceedings of ACM HCI 2001 conference on human factors in computing systems*

[17] Garrison, B., 2003. The perceived credibility of electronic mail in newspaper newsgathering. Paper presented at the Newspaper Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication conference.

[18] Gass, R. H., and Seiter, J. S., 2007. Persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining (3rd ed.). *Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.*

[19] Griffin, E., 2009. A first look at communication theory (7th ed.). *New York: McGraw-Hill.*

[20] Gunther, A. C., 1992. Biased Press or Biased Public? Attitudes Toward Media Cover. *Public Opinion Quarterly,* 56(2), 147-167.

[21] Hilligoss, B., and Rieh, S. Y., 2008. Developing a unifying framework of credibility assessment: Construct, heuristics, and interaction in context. *Information Processing and Management,* 44(4), 1467-1484.

[22] Hutchings, V. L., 2001. Political Context, Issue Salience, and Selective Attentiveness: Constituent Knowledge of the Clarence Thomas Confirmation Vote. *The journal of politics,* 63(3), 846-868.

[23] Johnson, T. J., and Kaye, B. K., 1998. Cruising is believing?: Comparing internet and traditional sources on media credibility measures. *Journalism and mass communication quarterly,* 75(2), 325-340.

[24] Johnson, T. J., and Kaye, B. K., 2002. Webbelievability: A path model examining how convinience and reliance predict online credibility. *Journalism and mass communication quarterly,* 79(3), 619-642.

[25] Johnson, T. J., and Kaye, B. K., 2004. Wag the blog: How reliance on traditional media and the internet influence credibility perceptions of weblogs among blog users. *Journalism and mass communication quarterly,* 81(3), 622-642.

[26] Johnson, T. J., Kaye, B. K., Bichard, S. L., and Wong, W. J., 2008. Every blog has its day: Politicallyinterested internet users' perceptions of blog credibility. *Journal of Computer-Mediated communication,* 13(1), 100-122.

[27] Kiousis, S., 2001. Public Trust or Mistrust? Perception of Media Credibility in the Information Age. *Mass communication and society,* 4(4), 381-403.

[28] Liu, Z., 2003. Perception of credibility of scholarly information on the web. *Information processing and management,* 40(2004), 1027-1038.

[29] Lu, H., and Andrews, J. E., 2006. College Students' Perception of the Absolute Media Credibility about SARS-Related News during the SARS Outbreak in Taiwan. *China Media Research,* 2(2), 85-93.

[30] Metzger, M. J., Flanagin, A. J., Eyal, K., Lemus, D., and McCann, R. M., 2003. Credibility for the 21st century: integrating perspectives on source, message, and media credibility in the contemporary media environment. *In P.J. Kalbfleisch. Communication Yearbook (pp. 293-336). United States: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.*

[31] Mingxin, Z., 2006. The Present Situation and Analysis of Mass Media Use and Media Credibility in Countryside of Mid-China: The Case of Hubei Province. *China Media Research,* 2(4), 37-47.

[32] Newhagen, J., and Nass, C., 1989. Differential criteria for evaluating credibility of newspapers and TV news. *Journalism quarterly,* 66(2), 277-284.

[33]   O'Keefe, D. J., 1990. Persuasion: theory and research. *Newbury Park: CA: Sage.*

[34]   Rimmer, T., and Weaver, D., 1987. Different questions, different answers? Media use and media credibility. *Journalism quarterly,* 64(1), 28-36.

[35]   Self, C. C., 1996. Credibility. In M. B. Salwen and D. W. Stacks (Eds.). An integrated approach to communication theory and research *(pp. 421-441). Mahwah: NJ: Erlbaum.*

[36]   Tseng, S., and Fogg, B. J., 1999. Credibility and computing technology. *Communication of the ACM,* 42(5), 39-44.

[37]   Wanta, W., and Hu, Y. W., 1994. The effects of credibility, reliance, and exposure on media agenda-setting: A path analysis model. *Journalism Quarterly,* 71(1), 90-98.

[38]   Wathen, C. N., and Burkell, J., 2002. Believe it or not: Factors influencing credibility on the web. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology,* 53(2), 134-144.