

RELIGION ON TELEVISION  
AND IN THE LIVES OF VIEWERS

A Research Proposal  
by

George Gerbner, Larry Gross  
Michael Morgan, and Nancy Signorielli

June 1981

The Annenberg School of Communications  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

University of Pennsylvania  
Proposal for Research Project

Submitted to: Religious Broadcasting Research Project

Title: Religion on Television and in the Lives of Viewers

Principal Investigators: George Gerbner  
Larry Gross  
Michael Morgan  
Nancy Signorielli

Associate Investigator: Stewart M. Hoover

School: The Annenberg School of Communications

Duration: 18 months

Funds Requested:	Direct costs	\$128,535
	Indirect costs	21,384
	Total	149,919

Corporate Name of University: Trustees of University of Pennsylvania

IRS Identification Number: 23-1352685

Contracting Office: Office of Research Administration  
3451 Walnut Street - Franklin Building  
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Officials to Whom Checks should be Mailed: Trustees of University  
of Pennsylvania  
3451 Walnut Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19104



Principal Investigator



Authorizing Official

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
OBJECTIVES AND SPECIAL FEATURES	1
SIGNIFICANCE	5
RELIGION ON TELEVISION	6
Samples of Programs to be Analyzed	6
Dimensions of Analysis	7
Coding and Reliability	8
THE NATURE OF THE AUDIENCE	10
Sample	10
Who Watches	12
Program Selection Patterns	13
Social Context	14
USES AND FUNCTIONS	14
Program Appeal	15
Uses	15
Reasons for Watching	16
THE CULTIVATION OF VIEWER CONCEPTIONS AND ACTIONS	17
Local Church Involvement	17
Social Networks	18
Personal Religious Intensity	19
General Images, Perceptions, and Behaviors	19
BIBLIOGRAPHY	21
APPENDICES	
Appendix I: Previous Research	25
Appendix II: Technical Issues	29
Appendix III: Personnel Qualifications and Staff Publications	36
Appendix IV: Draft of Message System Analysis Instrument	42
Appendix V: Draft of Audience Survey Instrument	55
Appendix VI: Budget	63

## OBJECTIVES AND SPECIAL FEATURES

We propose to conduct a two-year scientific investigation of the content, uses, and impact of religious television. Recent studies of television and religion such as the Gallup survey released in January 1981 and others conducted by the proposed investigators and their students raise some questions that provide part of the research background to this proposal.\* Some studies show that television viewing, with other factors held constant, supplants or perhaps satisfies some religious needs and aspirations. Others suggest that religious television, presumably in contrast with general television, extends the religious involvement of its viewers. Still other studies pose questions of differential relationships of different groups of viewers with different types of formats of religious programs.

However, no study has even attempted to take the first major step toward the factual and objective illumination of the communicational dynamics of religion on television. That step is the investigation of relationships between religious messages embedded in both general and religious television and their (possibly different) functions in the lives of viewers. That is what the proposed study intends to do.

The research design and instrumentation detailed in this proposal will be completed in consultation with the Committee on Religious Broadcasting so that the final design may benefit from the insights and approaches represented on the Committee. Similarly, the final report of the project will be developed in consultation with the Committee in order to make the analysis

---

\* See, for example, Dilworth, 1980; Gerbner, 1977; Gerbner and Connolly, 1978; Morgan and Hoover, 1981. For a review of related research, see Appendix I.

and interpretation of the data as useful as possible to all sponsors of the study. Finally, the public release of the results will be done in collaboration with the Committee so as to allow for both a consensus factual report and possibly different interpretations of different aspects of the data to be made public at the same time.

The questions addressed in this study are not only those of the evidently complex trends in religious broadcasting and audiences. They also include questions about the cultivation in different groups of viewers of different concepts, aspirations and behaviors by different types of programs, messages, and appeals. In other words, we also intend to investigate what happens to religious beliefs and activities in the process of both religious and general viewing, what messages and appeals seem to cultivate what types of response, and what are the implications for church attendance, support, and policy.

In order to address these questions, we shall conduct an analysis of religious messages and appeals on television and relate them to their audiences and to the needs, satisfactions, assumptions, conceptions, and behaviors they tend to cultivate.

Our work will derive additional benefits from its academic base and personnel and from two unique data banks that will be available to this study.

The academic base extends our range of services and assistance in the form of University facilities and interested graduate students. It also provides the guidance of investigators with long-standing scientific interest and accomplishment in the type of research proposed and a record of consultation and collaboration with the sponsors of the research. The research

team (described in Appendix III) also includes staff with expertise in theological and religious organizational studies.

Among the data banks that will become available for analysis are (1) the 12-year Cultural Indicators data archive of network dramatic content and viewers' conceptions of reality (including religious dimensions), and (2) the extensive viewer diary data of Arbitron, Inc. which will be used to relate the religious program study to the audiences, uses, gratifications and functions of the programs.

These data and analytical opportunities represent unique resources available at no additional cost beyond the cost of new data collection. The data banks provide access to already existing information about television programs, viewer responses, and specific viewing patterns that would cost many times the budget of this project to collect. Furthermore, by conducting the project in conjunction with archive data bases and ongoing research programs, the results become baseline data in a continuing assessment of trends in religion and television. It will become possible, therefore, for the Committee or any of its members to trace future developments in religious television content and effects.

While we conceive this research as direct applied service to religious communicators, and will develop data useful to a variety of orientations, we also see it as advancing long-range scientific knowledge of the field. The University's policy on the publication of research conducted under its aegis is designed to assure the free dissemination of such knowledge. We also recognize and wish to protect the interests of the sponsors in making public their own interpretations of the data. That is why we propose that the final formal report of this project be developed and released in

consultation with the Committee. Furthermore, no other publication based on new data collected for this project will be published by us until at least six months after the release of the formal project report.

It is clear that we do not propose a simple content analysis and market survey. Nor do we propose research that attempts to resolve differences in theological or other religious or social orientations or effectiveness. We do expect to shed light on different needs, uses, and aspirations satisfied by the messages and appeals of religious television.

Basically, we propose seminal integrated research inquiring into the nature and functions of religious television to be designed, conducted, and reported with due regard to the sensitivities and controversies that may be involved and with due respect to the integrity and interests of each organization represented on the Committee. Most importantly, we propose to analyze religious television in the context of the selection patterns and styles of life of its viewers, and to establish an objective empirical basis useful to all concerned in making decisions about communications policy.

## SIGNIFICANCE

Religious themes, symbols, and practices have been a part of modern mass media from the earliest days of electronic communications. The first voice broadcast in history was a religious service sent to ships at sea in 1901; the first radio church service was broadcast in 1921, just two months after the inauguration of KDKA, the first commercial radio station. (Swann, 1979) The phenomenon of religious broadcasting has been the subject of a certain amount of social scientific research for four decades (beginning with Parker's 1944 study of the economics of religious radio).

The present need for research on the implications and consequences of both traditional and a new class of prominent religious broadcasts stems from the emergence of at least two processes of social change: (1) the rapid and pervasive spread of television and (2) a period of ferment and transformation in American religion. There are different assessments of the nature and impact of religious television, but by all accounts, the "television church" is booming.

Spurred perhaps by escalating attention given these developments by general mass media, the controversy over the television church has grown more pointed. From a scientific perspective, however, the task is not to determine which religious message is most valid. Nor is it to judge individual programs or personalities. The task of research is to provide objective information about the nature and impact of religious television. To date, commentators on this issue have not had much foundation in anything other than intuition, arguments, and anecdotes. For example, recent analyses of religious television content are based entirely on selected instances of programming and unsystematic assessments of impact.

The most general significance of the proposed study is that it will allow interested parties to have access to more objective, empirical data than have been available to date. Only a disinterested, independent investigation of the various issues, conducted according to rigorous standards of scientific scrutiny, can separate facts from speculation.

#### RELIGION ON TELEVISION

The first step in the proposed investigation is to determine religious content patterns, themes, and appeals in a representative sample of nationally syndicated religious television programs. Besides being of substantial interest on its own in establishing baseline data for religious content and trend studies, this step is necessary for relating these themes, patterns, and appeals (along with other factors) to viewer characteristics, beliefs, and actions. Based on our existing 12-year data archive of network dramatic television programs, a comparative assessment of relevant features of both general and religious television will shed light on the question of convergent vs. divergent religious implications in the two types of programs.

#### Samples of Programs to be Analyzed

A pilot study conducted in preparation for this proposal has already sketched some dimensions of analysis in religious programming. We have also determined that a special analysis of four weeks of religious programming containing all major nationally syndicated religious programs (videotaped by us at three-week intervals) will yield a representative sample of 140 program hours, including both "mainline" and "evangelical" programs, suitable for detailed analysis. Both types of religious programs will be

grouped in classifications containing essentially similar approaches. Individual programs will not be separately reported in order to avoid unwarranted generalizations based on an inadequate sampling of any single program.

In all classes of programs we will search for the aggregate underlying religious themes and patterns (casting, dramatization, story-telling, theological and social concerns, etc.) and for types of financial and local participation appeals.

#### Dimensions of Analysis

More specifically, the "program" section of the instrument will contain items to record program format (e.g., talk/interview, "conventional" service, sermonizing, etc.), tone, place, date, and setting. We will code the appearance and emphasis of about twenty themes, topics, or aspects of life (e.g., nature, politics, science, home and family, etc.). Most of these themes have also been coded for all 1800 programs in our twelve-year data archive, allowing in-depth comparisons of religious and commercial television.

A wide variety of new, "structural/format" items will be applied to the samples of religious programs. These include time devoted to prayer, instrumental music, vocal music, presenting sermons, appeals for funds, etc. These items will both allow us to make observations about religious television programs and to differentiate between classes of programs.

Detailed coding schemes will be applied to financial solicitations, Bible references, and references to local churches. We will also catalogue and document the ailments or problems which may be healed or solved, and identify the means of alleviation. Political, theological, and social issues will be coded in terms of frequency of appearance and tone of presentation.

The proposed research will document explicit program elements which reflect these dimensions and thereby provide clues about the perspectives and orientations different classes of programs are likely to cultivate. Again, the goal of the research is not to evaluate the "quality" of the theology of the television church, but rather to identify it through objective measurement.

The instrument will also include sections for coding the people who appear on religious programs. We will, in effect, "take a census" of the population of the world of religious television, along basic demographic dimensions (age, sex, race, occupation, etc.). These descriptive codes will be applied to all the people who appear, along with whether they are hosts, guests, preachers, audience members, or characters in fictive enactments. We will also code whether the person quotes the Bible, gives a testimonial, or has recovered from some ailment or affliction. The demographic data are also available for the 4500 major and 18,000 minor characters in our data archives of network commercial television, allowing detailed comparative analysis of religious and general programming populations.

A preliminary draft of a message system analysis instrument appears in Appendix IV. Revisions may be made on the basis of further consultation with members of the Committee on Religious Broadcasting Research.

#### Coding and Reliability

In message system analysis, coders are trained to do a specialized kind of observation. They must make reliable discriminations required by the recording instrument and record them in a specific form. Coders must focus only upon what is presented explicitly in the material they are coding and not how it might be judged by a viewer. Coders are instructed to be able

to point to specific evidence for each coding decision they make. They cannot fall back on or use their prior knowledge of specific programs or personalities. Their task is to generate the data for the subsequent analysis that will permit interpretation of the common message elements available to the public of diverse viewers.

Coder training requires 3-4 weeks of instruction and testing. A coder staff of about 12 persons will be split into randomly assigned coding teams of two each. During both the training and data-collection phases of the project, the coder-pairs will be able to monitor the assigned videotape as often as necessary. All of the programs will be coded independently by two separate coder-pairs to provide double-coded data for the final reliability analysis. Reliability is ascertained by a statistical procedure that measures the agreement, beyond chance, of trained analysts on each content item. Only those items meeting the acceptable levels of reliability will be included in the final analyses. Reliability and data analysis techniques are further discussed in Appendix II.

## THE NATURE OF THE AUDIENCE

We propose to design and commission a national survey to collect data in three areas of audience analysis: audience composition, uses and gratifications, and behavioral effects. Data for all three areas will be collected through the same instrument at the same time, allowing the fullest possible range of comparative analyses.\* To provide maximum efficiency at least cost, we propose to have the interviews conducted by telephone rather than in person. The interview will take 30 minutes or less. A working draft of the survey instrument is presented in Appendix V.

### Sample

The audience samples will be drawn from the archives of Arbitron, Inc., a leading national television ratings service. Each year Arbitron collects a full week of viewing data on up to one million households (two to three million viewers), through a television viewing diary log. The initial sample frame is household-based, with the county or independent city as the primary sampling unit, in a full probability design. Selection is accomplished through a combination of telephone directories and a modified

---

\* Other data bases may become available and be utilized for validation of the primary sample. While such data may provide valuable replication tests for baselines and key findings, the proposed research could not be accomplished through secondary analysis alone. For example, a recent NBC survey on religious ideology and network television viewing may be used to validate certain aspects of the new data we propose to collect, but this data base contains weak measures of religious viewing and religious affiliation, no measure of commercial television exposure, and insufficient numbers of viewers of religious programs.

random-digit-dialing procedure, providing a fully representative sample base of households not constrained by unpublished telephone numbers. All potential diary respondents are contacted by phone before the diaries are mailed. Returns are routinely evaluated according to latest census demographic estimates, and weights can be applied to correct for any idiosyncracies or biases in either the original sample frame or in the completed returns.

These diaries are transformed into computer files which can be accessed in various ways, such as in terms of the household as a unit, or in terms of individual viewers. Samples can then be drawn from these archives according to virtually any criteria desired. Since diary respondents record their viewing behavior (and that of all family or household members) by network, channel, and program for every fifteen minute block of viewing, people can then be reinterviewed on the basis of having watched any particular program or set of programs. Furthermore, Arbitron has a complete staff of interviewers and a WATS center.

Our plan is as follows. We will give Arbitron a list of nationally-syndicated religious television programs. They will divide their entire archive into two groups, on the basis of the already-collected diary data: one group watches religious programs, the other does not. Random samples will be drawn from each group and respondents will be reinterviewed until 1500 useable interviews have been completed from each group, for a total sample of 3000 respondents. The same survey instrument, with minor variations, will be given to all respondents.

This method has several strong advantages for the proposed research. For one, all survey data can be analyzed in conjunction with the data from

the viewing diaries. This will provide superior measures of both religious and network television viewing; comparisons with survey measures of religious and network viewing will allow an unusually effective basis for assessing reliability of measurement. For another, the diaries will provide much finer and more significant distinctions among religious viewers than can possibly be inferred from self-report questionnaire methods. Without relying solely on respondents' memories, we will know the specific program genres watched, and whether entire programs or snippets here and there are watched. We will also know basic information about the social context of viewing, in terms of how many people in the household are watching and whether or not they are watching together. Also, because of Arbitron's facilities, data archives, capabilities, and experience, the entire process of sample selection, reinterviewing, and preparation of the data for analysis can be done efficiently, swiftly, and inexpensively. What would otherwise be the most time-consuming and expensive stage of the research -- the selection of an adequately large and representative sample of religious viewers -- will instead be a simple administrative/computer programming operation.

These samples will provide the basis for all audience analyses described below.

#### Who Watches

The most basic issue which the proposed research will provide data to address concerns the sociodemographic composition of the audience for religion. We will examine the extent to which religious and non-religious audiences are distinct, overlapping, or largely indistinguishable, and assess the relationships between religious viewing and a wide variety of social, personal, demographic, and daily-life factors, with regard to the general U.S. population.

We will both identify viewing profiles or clusters of attributes which predict religious television viewing, and assess independent influences of demographic and personal factors. For example, the fact that women are more likely to be in the audience for religious programs (as previous studies suggest) may mean that other apparent determinants of religious viewing (education, income, etc.) are actually spurious.

Basic demographic variables will be age, sex, education, occupation, number of children, family composition, income, marital status, area of residence (geographic, urban/rural), and race/ethnicity. We will include measures of a broad range of potentially important correlates of religious viewing, such as exposure to general media (television, radio, newspapers, magazines, movies, books) as well as to other religious media (particularly radio). The survey instrument will also collect data on health status, mobility, history of institutionalization, and a number of general items related to religion (denomination, religion at age 16, proximity to church, religion of spouse, etc.).

#### Program Selection Patterns

A major dependent variable in these analyses (and an independent variable in other analyses) is not just whether or not respondents watch religious television, but how much they watch, how long they have been watching, and what kinds of programs they watch. It is generally assumed that religious viewers watch more than one program, but little relevant data exist. At issue here is also how long viewers have been watching certain religious programs or the television church in general, and how this relates to general media selection patterns.

### Social Context

The role of the social context of media exposure is an important issue in mass communications research. Our concern is both with simply describing this context -- whether viewers watch alone or with others, and who the others are likely to be -- and with utilizing this information in subsequent analyses. From a "functional" perspective, viewing may provide a basis for group interaction, a focus of activity; in the case of persuasive messages, group viewing may even enhance certain effects through further consideration of the messages and group reinforcement.

Religious viewing patterns will be examined in terms of church attendance, financial contributions, and so on, but these issues are more properly considered in terms of the broader correlates and consequences of exposure to the television church, discussed below. The most important aspects of this phase of the research will be the description and clarification of audience composition in more depth and detail than existing studies have revealed. We will determine the independent, relative predictive power of a broad range of demographic and personal influences on religious viewing. These findings will provide an essential backdrop for all subsequent analyses.

### USES AND FUNCTIONS

The proposed research will examine the perceived uses and gratifications sought and received by the religious, general, and mixed television audiences, and how they relate to the uses and gratifications of local church involvement. Where possible, we will adapt previously used measures of uses and functions (such as those employed by Frank and Greenberg, 1980; see the draft survey instrument in Appendix V).

### Program Appeal

The potential sources of attraction to religious television cover a wide variety of religious, personality, lifestyle, historical, and other dimensions. In addition to religious reasons, some viewers may tune in to the television church as a substitute for commercial television. Extreme dissatisfaction with commercial television or simply the desire for a change or more variety in viewing, or the "entertainment" aspects of some programs, or attraction to certain program hosts, may all be common and relatively non-religious motivations.

Moreover, the ancillary activities of the television church, such as direct mail, phone contact, and magazines and other publications, may account for a large part of the audience's involvement in and support of the ministries. The research will trace the various underlying and interconnected threads of viewer motivations, and assess what kinds of motivations are associated with what kinds of viewing. Basic dimensions of this analysis will revolve around audience attraction to program personalities, entertainment, message content, personal communication, and so on.

### Uses

A major line of mass communications research has argued that what people "do with" media may be as important as what media "do to" people. These "uses" of mass media are related to perceived needs and the ability of mass communication to meet those needs. It is assumed by critics and broadcasters alike that the audience for the television church receives some spiritual benefit from viewing, that the programs "fulfill a need." Nonetheless, what the audience "gets out" of the television church is largely unknown, except in the anecdotal (and not necessarily representative) form in which the broadcasters themselves get "feedback."

We will examine the nature and role of religious and non-religious uses to which religious broadcasting is put, and how they vary across different kinds of programming. It may provide a basis for direct interaction with friends, family, and community, either through group viewing or follow-up discussions; a sense of connection, through mediated interaction, a way of keeping informed or to pass the time; or on another level, numerous spiritual and religious instructions and proscriptions may be actively sought.

### Reasons for Watching

Reasons for watching are closely related, but somewhat distinct, from program appeal, uses, and gratifications. We will adapt standard "reasons for watching" checklists to include items specially relevant to religious programs.

The fullest value of these analyses will derive from a triangulation of motivations and gratifications across three phenomena: commercial television, religious television, and local church attendance and involvement. To the extent that differential clusters of uses and gratifications apply to respondents' perceptions of general television, religious television, and the local church, the research will tell us whether the television church is a substitution or a complement to these other activities, and what it is about the broadcasts that accounts for patterns of effect and interaction.

THE CULTIVATION OF VIEWER CONCEPTIONS AND ACTIONS  
(BEHAVIORAL EFFECTS)

This area of analysis will focus on the correlates and consequences of exposure to religious television. The primary goal is to collect a broad range of relevant data which can be used to uncover differential patterns of beliefs, perspectives, and behaviors of viewers of religious and general television programs. Where possible and desirable, we will utilize measures which have been found to be valid and reliable in previous research. For example, King and Hunt (1975) and Hoge, et al. (1978) offer valuable items and scales of theological and spiritual ideology and actions. A major concern will be to understand whether, and under what circumstances, religious and conventional television have complementary, parallel, or divergent impact on their audiences.

Local Church Involvement

At the forefront of the controversy over the television church is the concern that it may be drawing away both people and funds from local churches. Available data on viewers suggest that most of them believe religious television has made no difference in "your involvement in your local church and its activities over the last three years" (according to a Gallup Poll conducted in November 1980). Overall, two-thirds (65%) report "no difference"; twenty-seven percent report increased involvement, while seven percent say their involvement has lessened.

The inferences which can be validly drawn from such data, however, are extremely limited. Whether respondents can accurately attribute changes in their local church involvement to watching religious broadcasts must be seriously questioned. These results also say nothing about how the pattern

might differ in terms of what types of programs are watched and how frequently, or what happens when important controls -- e.g., exposure to commercial television -- are implemented.

But these data do suggest that the problem is not an "either-or" proposition. It appears that the television church can both amplify and detract from local participation. Or, the television church may be attracting viewers who never went to local churches, or those who stopped attending long before they began watching religious television. The important question is what factors underlie, determine, or predict these diverse outcomes? It is possible that a reduction in local participation may derive from incapacity to attend, inconvenience of attending, or other similar causes. It may also be that viewing religious television may cultivate dissatisfaction with more mundane local congregations. On the other side, it remains to be seen whether apparent increases in local involvement represent a shift from "no" to "some" involvement, or a change from "some" to "more."

By "involvement," we mean more than simply attending or not attending a local church. We will utilize multi-dimensional indicators of attendance, organizational activity, and financial support, as developed and validated by King and Hunt (1975) but expanded to include the television church as well as the community church.

### Social Networks

One behavioral effect of loyalty to the television church may be a marked change in social activities and cohort or peer structures; this may have powerful implications on both formal and informal secondary support systems. The extent of social activity and integration into a social and community network will be examined for viewers of religious programs, controlling for amount of regular television viewing and important demographics.

### Personal Religious Intensity

Preliminary research on how amount of general television viewing relates to frequency of church attendance and intensity of religious attachment points to a negative association: heavy general television viewing goes with lower levels of intensity, and those who watch less are more religious (Morgan and Hoover, 1981). Yet, many heavy viewers may also frequently watch "electronic church" programs, and we can assume with some confidence that they tend to be more religious. Therefore, we intend to develop typologies of religious and general television viewing and analyze whatever countervailing or interactive influences both types of viewing have on religiosity. These tendencies will also be examined in terms of differential religious program selection patterns and other demographic and religious factors.

Some of the dependent measures will be adapted from previous research, and some will be developed expressly for the present study. We will examine such constructs as creedal assent and devotionalism (King and Hunt, 1975) which reflect, respectively, "believing" and "praying" dimensions.

### General Images, Perceptions, and Behaviors

Our research has shown that amount of television viewing makes specific and measurable contributions to people's conceptions of social reality (see, e.g., Gerbner and Gross, 1976; Gerbner, et al., 1980). These studies have documented that television cultivates beliefs and assumptions about danger, interpersonal mistrust, sex- and age-role stereotypes, health practices and beliefs, images of science and scientists, occupational images and aspirations, political orientations, attitudes toward minorities, etc. and some behaviors based on those conceptions. These processes occur through steady, cumulative

exposure to the stable and inter-related "world" or television -- a world that most people experience with little selectivity.

Through the interface of the message analysis of the television church as it relates to the most recurrent patterns of conventional commercial television content, we will determine the extent to which religious television may be distinct from or part of that larger, aggregate system of story-telling. The proposed research will assess which images, values, conceptions, and behaviors cultivated by general viewing may be counteracted or enhanced (or some of both) by attending to the television church, and whether the two kinds of viewing have generally converging or diverging consequences.

We will include some of the major conceptions which we have found television to cultivate, such as images of violence and mistrust. We will also include two kinds of measures of alienation and anomie: those which we have found to be related to general television viewing, and others which more directly reflect religious despair (from King and Hunt, 1975). Special items will assess political orientations and behaviors, images of the church and contemporary "organized religion," confidence in religious leaders, and perceived consequences of "not being saved." Finally, we will include items which tap responses to ambiguity and the need for certainty as these have been featured in earlier studies of religious broadcasting and appear in research which attempts to predict religious orientation (e.g., King and Hunt, 1975).

In sum, the proposed study will generate and integrate a wide variety of relevant information. Combining new information with analyses from existing data banks available to the investigators, this benchmark study will provide comprehensive insight into issues and processes involved in religion and television and their roles in the lives of viewers.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrams, Michael (1980). "The FCC and the Electric Church." Report 415, University of Missouri Freedom of Information Center, January.
- Arbitron Co. (1980). "Description of Methodology," Arbitron Television Market Reports October.
- Armstrong, Ben (1981). "Research Soon Underway: The Uses and Impact of Religious TV" Religious Broadcasting June, pp. 31-34.
- Armstrong, Ben (1979). The Electric Church. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.
- Casmir, F. (1957). "A Telephone Survey of Religious Program Preference Among Listeners and Viewers in Los Angeles," Central States Speech Journal 10, Spring.
- Diamond, Edwin (1980). "God's Television," American Film 5(5), March, pp. 30-35.
- Dilworth, Robert (1980). "Heavy Television Use as a Substitute for Traditional Formal Religious Belief and Behavior," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.
- Duke, Judith S. (1981). Religious Publishing and Communications, White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industries Publications Inc.
- Edwards, Scott (1978). "The Wonderful World of Garner Ted Armstrong," The Humanist January-February, pp. 9-13.
- Ellens, J. Harold (1974). Models of Religious Broadcasting. New York: Eerdmans.
- Fore, William F. (1967). "A Short History of Religious Broadcasting." Unpublished Report, National Council of Churches.
- Fore, William. (1979). "The Electronic Church," Ministry January, p. 5.
- Frank, Ronald and Marshall Greenberg (1980). The Public's Use of Television: Who Watches and Why. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gantz, Walter and Paul Kowalewski (1979). "Religious Broadcasting as an Alternative to Television." Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism, Houston, Texas, August.
- Gerbner, George (1977). "Television: The New State Religion?" Et Cetera June.
- Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan, and Nancy Signorielli (1980). "The Mainstreaming of America: Violence Profile Number 11," Journal of Communication, 30:3, pp. 10-29.

- Gerbner, George and Kathleen Connolly (1978). "Television as New Religion," New Catholic World, March-April.
- Gerbner, George and Larry Gross (1976). "Living with Television: the Violence Profile," Journal of Communication, 26(2), pp. 173-199.
- Hadaway, Christopher (1978). "Denominational Switching and Membership Growth: In Search of a Relationship," Sociological Analysis 39(4) Winter, pp. 321-337.
- Hadden, Jeffrey K. (1980). "Some Sociological Reflections on the Electronic Church." Paper presented at Electronic Church Consultation, New York University, February 6-7.
- Hadden, Jeffrey and Charles Swann (1981). Prime-Time Preachers. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Herzog, Herta (1944). "What do we Really Know About Daytime Serial Listeners," in Lazarsfeld and Stanton (Eds.) Radio Research 1942-1943. New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pierce, pp. 3-53.
- Hoge, Dean, Everett Perry, and Gerald Klever (1978). "Theology as a Source of Disagreement about Protestant Church Goals and Priorities," Review of Religious Research 19(2) Winter, pp. 116-138.
- Hong, Laurence and Marion Dearman (1977). "The Streetcorner Preacher: Sowing Good Seeds by the Wayside," Urban Life 6(1) April, pp. 53-68.
- Hoover, Stewart (1981). "Religion in the Age of Television." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.
- Jeffries-Fox, Bruce (1977). "A Content Analysis of Religious Radio Programs in a Metropolitan Area." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.
- Jennings, Ralph M. (1973). "Policies and Practices of Selected National Bodies as Related to Broadcasting in the Public Interest, 1920-1950." Unpublished Dissertation, New York University.
- Johnstone, Ronald. (1972). "Who Listens to Religious Radio Broadcasts Any-more?" Journal of Broadcasting 16 Winter 1971-72, pp. 91-102.
- Kelley, Dean M. (1972). Why Conservative Churches are Growing. New York: Harper and Row.
- Kelley, Dean M. (1978). "Why Conservative Churches are Still Growing," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 17(2) June, pp. 165-172.
- Krippendorff, Klaus (1970). "Bivariate Agreement Coefficients for the Reliability of Data," in E.F. Borgatta and G.W. Bohrnstedt (eds.) Sociological Methodology. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Inc.

- Kronin, Franklin (1981). "The Language of Television Preachers," Et Cetera Spring, 51-63.
- Lacey, Linda Jo (1978). "The Electric Church: An FCC-'Established' Institution?" Federal Communications Law Journal 31(2), pp. 235-275.
- Langdon, Audrey (1980). "Where Do We Go From Here?" Religious Broadcasting December, pp. 38-39.
- Leibert, Robert M. (1980). Presentation to the Electronic Church Consultation, New York University, February 6-7.
- Loevinger, Lee (1964). "Broadcasting and Religious Liberty," Journal of Broadcasting 9.
- Loevinger, Lee (1965). "Religious Liberty and Broadcasting," George Washington University Law Review 33, p. 631.
- Marty, Martin (1969). The Modern Schism. New York: Harper and Row.
- Marty, Martin (1979). "The Invisible Religion," Presbyterian Survey, May, p. 13.
- McBrien, Robert (1980). Presentation to the Electronic Church Consultation, New York University, February 6-7.
- Morgan, Michael and Stewart Hoover (1981). "Religion and Television: a Preliminary Literature Survey and Secondary Data Analysis." Unpublished Manuscript, University of Pennsylvania.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard (1929). The Social Sources of Denominationalism. New York: Henry Holt and Co.
- Parker, Everett (1980). "Old Time Religion on TV -- Bane or Blessing?" Television Quarterly 17(3), Fall, pp. 71-79.
- Parker, Everett, David Barry, and Dallas Smythe (1955). The Television-Radio Audience and Religion. New York: Harper and Bros.
- Parker, Everett (1944). "Big Business in Religious Radio," Chicago Theological Seminary Register 32, No. 1, January.
- Robertson, Pat (1980). Presentation to the Electronic Church Consultation, New York University, February 6-7.
- Robertson, Pat (1972). Shout It From the Housetops. Plainfield, NJ: Logos.
- Schuller, Robert (1980). Presentation to the Electronic Church Consultation, New York University, February 6-7.
- Scott, William A. (1955). "Reliability of Content Analysis: The Case of Nominal Scale Coding," Public Opinion Quarterly, 17(3), 321-325.

- Sholes, Jerry (1979). Give Me That Prime-Time Religion. New York: Hawthorne Books.
- Swann, Charles (1979). "The Electric Church," Presbyterian Survey May, pp. 9-16.
- Swann, Charles (1980). Presentation to the Electronic Church Consultation, New York University, February 6-7.
- Swann, Charles (1981). "The Television Preachers," E/SA Magazine, January.
- Vernon, Glen (1962). Sociology of Religion. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Weber, Max (1963). The Sociology of Religion (fourth edition). Boston: Beacon Press.

## APPENDIX I

## PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The content and effects of religious broadcasting have been subjected to surprisingly little research. There appears to be not a single systematic, quantitative content analysis of the television church in the published literature. Similarly, there is an extreme paucity of "effects" research. The few prior investigations have tended to deal with self-reported "uses and gratifications" derived from exposure to religious broadcasting, with the major emphasis on the identification of the audience along standard demographic dimensions. Furthermore, the major research efforts pre-date the current "electronic church" controversy, which limits their value and relevance to the situation today.

The landmark study of religious broadcasting was published in 1955 by Parker, Barry, and Smythe. The study included several levels of analysis of 3,559 households, selected to be representative of New Haven, Connecticut. Virtually all respondents (98.4%) identified themselves as at least nominally religious. Parker, et al. found that the specific religious affiliation of households was a weak but statistically significant determinant of exposure to religious broadcasting. Catholics were slightly more evident in the audience for religious programs, although the authors surmised that this was due to the prominence of one Catholic program at the time, Bishop Fulton Sheen's. This assumption has been supported in a more recent study by Johnstone (1972), who found Catholics to comprise a smaller proportion of the audience for religious radio (which continues to be a Protestant stronghold).

Parker et al. also examined demographic correlates of exposure to religious media, finding relatively few significant associations. Demographic factors which did predict membership in the religious audience were social

class (lower SES respondents were more in evidence, but this was significant only for Protestants), income (with lower-income families more likely to watch or listen), church attendance (with non-attenders likely to be non-viewers, but this was significant only for wives or female heads-of-household), education of male head-of-household (significant only for Jews), and age of wife or female head-of-household (with households where she was in the 45-64 age range more likely to watch or listen to religious programs).

Parker, et al. looked at some cognitive aspects of the audience for religion in addition to the dimensions measured through demographic, affiliation, and attendance items. In-depth interviews were conducted with 59 families who were regular listeners or viewers regarding their beliefs, attitudes, and interests; Adorno's (1952) F-Scale Index (which is intended to measure some quality of attraction to authority or authoritarianism) was also administered. The F-Scale discriminated between audiences for different programs; since it was not given to the entire sample, differences between audience members and non-members could not be determined.

Studies by Casmir (1957), Johnstone (1972), and Gantz and Kowaleski (1979) have supported the basic Parker, et al. finding that the audience for religious programs is both large (nearly 50% of the total samples in all these studies reported being at least "occasional" listeners or viewers) and made up of those who already identify with some religious denomination or affiliation.

Johnstone (1972) studied 1490 adults (a nationwide sample selected through standard multi-stage probability procedures). His findings generally supported earlier work, except for the shift in Catholic and Protestant audience patterns (again, with Catholics comprising a larger share of the audience in Parker, et al.'s sample, and Protestants more common in Johnstone's).

Johnstone also looked at demographic variables, and found age to have a positive relationship with listening to religious radio (with older

respondents more likely to be listening). Sex did not seem to make a difference, but he found that more educated respondents were less likely to listen. In a major enhancement of the Parker, et al. study, Johnstone was able to assess geographic differences in exposure to religious radio. Johnstone reports significantly higher rates of listening in rural areas and in geographic regions which have traditionally been more "religious." He concludes:

Religious radio broadcasts appear to be quite unlikely to reach the non-Christian or minimally committed or involved Christian, the young, the highly-educated, and those of urban residence. (p. 98)

A more recent study by Hadden and Swann (1981) analyzed demographic data from commercial audience rating services and found similar viewing patterns for current religious television programs.

Gantz and Kowaleski (1979) attempted to ascertain basic "uses and gratifications" data for viewers of "The 700 Club" and for viewers of potential future programs to be aired on that program's network (the Christian Broadcasting Network, or CBN). While their findings were largely inconclusive, they did confirm that the audience for religion is large (49% of their sample reported regular exposure). While there is no systematic relationship between measures of viewer satisfaction with conventional television and their interest in CBN programming, the authors did find an association between viewers' perception that there is "...too much sex and violence on television..." and their potential membership in the CBN audience.

All in all, the existing research in this area offers remarkably little to build on in the way of generalizable, replicated, and currently applicable findings. Rather, available prior research points out significant, wide gaps in our knowledge. Lack of appropriate and necessary statistical

controls, measures of problematic reliability and validity, and severe sampling limitations characterize much of the research to date.

For example, it is sometimes assumed that the audience for the current television church "is made up of older, less educated members of society, people with low or middle incomes. Women, most over sixty, are predominant" (Parker, 1980, p. 75; see also Hadden and Swann, 1981). But this profile precisely mirrors the composition of the dominant audience for general television programs. Thus, we do not know whether the "electronic church" audience is distinct from the general television audience. As another example, we do not know whether the cluster of attributes which characterize the audience are independent; i.e., is the relationship with education spurious because of age or sex, etc.? Also, finding a positive association between church attendance and watching religious programs says little in and of itself; unless such factors as intensity of religious attachment or allegiance to organized religious activity are controlled, the possibility remains that the high exposure group might personally attend church more often were it not for the television church. Through rigorous application of relevant controls, the proposed research seeks both to solidify the foundation provided by the hints and suggestions offered by previous research and to go a long way towards answering a wide range of often-asked questions which have been rarely addressed through empirical means.

## APPENDIX II

## TECHNICAL ISSUES

Assessment of Coding Reliability

Reliability measures are designed to ascertain the degree to which the recorded data reflect the properties of the material being studied and not the contamination of observer bias or of instrument ambiguity. Theoretically both types of contamination are correctable, either by refining the instrument or intensifying coder training; or, as a last resort, by eliminating the unsalvageable variable or dismissing the incorrigible coder. Measures of reliability thus serve two functions: as diagnostic tools in the confirmation of the recording process, and as final evaluators of the accuracy of the phenomena's representation in the actual recorded data.

Our reliability assessment requires the calculation of an agreement coefficient for each content item in the recording instrument. Five computational formulae are currently available for calculating these coefficients. The variations are distinguished by a difference function, the form of which depends upon the scale type of the particular variable being analyzed. Except for their respective scale-appropriate sensitivity to deviations from perfect agreement, the coefficients make the same basic assumptions as the prototype for nominal scales devised by Scott (1955). Thus, in the case of the binary variable, all formulae yield identical results. (Krippendorff, 1970)

The agreement coefficients range from +1.00 to -1.00, where +1.00 indicates perfect agreement and .00 is agreement due solely to chance. A coefficient of .50 indicates that performance is 50 percent above the level expected by chance. We have defined acceptable levels of reliability as

follows. Items with agreement coefficients of .8 or above are considered as unconditionally reliable, items with coefficients between .6 and .8 are accepted conditionally, while items whose coefficients fall between .5 and .6 are used with extreme caution. Any item whose agreement coefficient is less than .5 will be excluded from any subsequent analysis and will be either revised or discarded.

Reliability is thus ascertained by a statistical procedure that measures the agreement of trained analysts for each content item. If one were to substitute the perceptions and impressions of casual observers, no matter how sophisticated, the value of the investigation would be reduced, and its purpose confounded. Only an objective analysis of unambiguous message elements, and their separation from personal impressions left by unidentified clues, can provide the basis for isolating and understanding stable images in symbolic materials.

Thus, each program in these samples will be coded by two independent pairs of coders and the double corpus of data will be subjected to the reliability analysis. And, only those items meeting the acceptable levels (as stated above) will be included in the final analyses and reports.

#### The Content Data and Analysis Techniques

The final set of data will be compiled from the double-coded reliability data base by randomly selecting one of the two codings for each program. As a last check against deviant coding, and before the final data selection, reliability measures will be computed for each coder-pair. This procedure will help identify problem coder-pairs who may not have been screened out in the training and pre-test phases. In such an instance, the data recorded by the questionable pair will be excluded from the final selection.

The final sample of data will be subjected to an extensive data analysis. Statistical techniques will primarily include multi-dimensional cross-tabulations. Association procedures, such as contingency and cluster analysis, will also be used to examine constellations of certain types of content data such as themes and binary characterization attributes. Where possible we will devise multi-dimensional indices composed of a number of content items relating to a particular topic. These measures will enable us to take a number of different aspects of the portrayal of various topics into account; for example, how the topic is portrayed in the program, in characterizations, and so on.

#### Quality of Survey Data

Arbitron implements a great many complex procedures to help insure the reliability, accuracy, validity, and representativeness of the data obtained, and is accredited by the Broadcasting Rating Council. Each phase of their research is carefully controlled. For example, each television station and network receives a Certification of Program Title Compliance, which must be signed by the station's General Manager, to certify the accurate identification of program titles for every 15 minutes of broadcasting time. Syndicated programs are titled in accordance with the title designated by the syndicator of the series, serial, film, or package (Arbitron, 1980).

Through systematic interval selection techniques, and an extended sample frame procedure, households are selected regardless of whether or not phone numbers are published. When a particular sample unit does not provide enough households, buffer sampling may be employed, but in a typical nationwide measurement, ususally no more than 1.5% of all counties require buffer sampling.

Arbitron then mails a letter to each household, informing them of their selection; this is followed up by an actual telephone solicitation, with calls made at different times of the day. At least five attempts are made to reach each household. A diary is sent for each television set in the household, and cash incentives are included to increase cooperation. Two follow-up phone calls are made after the survey begins--one to make sure the diary arrived, and another to make sure the instructions are understood. Special interviewing techniques are employed in 40 markets to more properly represent minority (usually black and Hispanic) families.

The returned diaries are passed through up to eight separate edit phases, during which the quality of the responses are assessed on a broad range of dimensions and criteria (see Arbitron, 1980, p. 18). Some of these edit phases are done manually, and some by computer. Returned samples are weighted on up to five variables for households (geography, week, cable capability, age of head-of-household, and race/nationality) and four for persons (geography, week, sex-age group, and race/nationality).

Of course, non-response patterns may prevent the original designated sample, the original diary sample, and the final reinterview sample from achieving pure probability status, as is true in all survey research. But unlike most survey research, Arbitron has developed a number of methods for judging and correcting sample error and bias, on the basis of a massive Television National Replication Study and a Ten Market Replication Study (to validate the national investigation). Standard errors (an approximation of sample error, or a numerical range within which a population parameter is likely to fall) are calculated according to estimates, usable responses in a household or person demographic category, a statistical efficiency estimate (derived from the National Replication Study) and a standard error weighting factor (derived from data for each individual market).

The resulting samples will allow for an usual mix of secondary and primary analysis of the same data base. Despite inherent limitations of the sample selection, diary method, and related techniques, the ability to select a large sample of respondents who are known to watch religious programs will provide a superior basis for the study of the consequences of religious television.

#### Dimensions of Audience Analysis

The statistical analyses that will be performed to test the various hypotheses about audience composition and effects range from the simple to the methodologically sophisticated. The simplest analysis will involve tabulating the proportion of respondents giving a certain answer (generally reflecting the messages of religious television programs) to each question, on the basis of amount of viewing of religious and conventional television, while controlling for personal, social, and religious characteristics. This analysis divides respondents into "heavy," "medium," and "light" viewers of religious television programs (using as near to an even three-way split as possible) and compares differences in terms of the gamma measure of association and the percentage difference between heavy and light viewers. In some cases, amount of commercial television viewing will represent a control variable in the same sense as sex, age, education, etc.; in others, we will utilize a typology of religious and commercial television viewers and examine additive and interactive patterns.

Thus, our statistical analyses will begin with the examination of two- to n-way contingency patterns. This procedure will allow us to assess the general differences in the conceptions and behaviors of light, medium, and heavy viewers of religious television, overall, and for specific subgroups. This will clarify the extent and pervasiveness of an observed

relationship and isolate highly susceptible subgroups, as well as provide important information about baseline differences on both independent and dependent variables.

Since crosstabular analyses do not fully guard against the possibility of spuriousness within any given demographic groups, we also calculate partial correlations for respondents within specific demographic classifications while simultaneously implementing relevant controls. For example, we examine non-white respondents as a group while simultaneously controlling for their sex, age, education, income, radio listening, and so on.

We will then turn to statistical analyses that focus on the functional form of the association and tests for linearity. If we find that the relationship does not manifest significant non-linearity, we will employ more powerful correlational and regression procedures to evaluate religious television's independent contribution to beliefs, values, and actions. For example, first-order partial correlations will be used to test for spuriousness and hierarchical regression analysis (with the amount of religious viewing entered after all control variables) will provide estimates of religious television's independent contribution by revealing whether it adds a significant increment to total explained variance.

We will also develop and use indices formed by summing responses to questions related to a specific topic. Although some have already been validated in previous research, all indices will be tested for reliability (in terms of unidimensionality and internal homogeneity) to insure that each item actually belongs to the index. These indices will then be subjected to the same type of statistical analyses as individual questions.

When multiple indicators of a specific variable are available, we will set up complex structural equation models of television's influence

and explicitly test the model's goodness-of-fit. This technique will provide an estimate of the relationship between true (unmeasured) constructs, measurement error, and residual disturbances in the equations. Other techniques we will employ for specialized analyses include canonical correlation, discriminant analysis, and analysis of covariance.

## APPENDIX III

## PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS

GEORGE GERBNER, Co-Principal Investigator, (M.S. and Ph.D., Communication, University of Southern California) is Professor of Communications and Dean of The Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania. He has directed U.S. and multi-national mass communication research projects under contracts and grants from the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Office of Education, UNESCO, the Eisenhower (Violence) Commission, the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior, the American Medical Association, the National Institute of Mental Health, and other agencies. He has written extensively about his research on numerous aspects of mass communication, including violence, education, aging, science, news, and health, and has received many awards and honors. He is editor of the Journal of Communication, a quarterly scholarly journal.

LARRY GROSS, Co-Principal Investigator, (B.A., Psychology, Brandeis; Ph.D., Social Psychology, Columbia) is Associate Professor of Communications at The Annenberg School of Communications. He has been involved in research on mass media content and effects since the early 1970's. He is Co-Principal Investigator on the Cultural Indicators Project, and co-author of studies on television and its impact on social conceptions. He is involved in research on the cultural determinants of symbolic behavior, focusing in particular on the arts, and on ethical aspects of mass media practice. He is co-editor of Studies in Visual Communication, a quarterly scholarly journal.

MICHAEL MORGAN, Co-Principal Investigator, (M.A. and Ph.D., Communications, University of Pennsylvania) is Research Specialist for the Cultural Indicators Project at The Annenberg School of Communications. His research concerns the effects of television on viewers' conceptions and behaviors. He has been involved in a longitudinal study of television's impact on adolescent role socialization and aspirations, and in studies on television, reading, and academic achievement. He is interested in the theory and methodology of mass communication research and multivariate techniques for the analysis of audience data.

NANCY SIGNORIELLI, Co-Principal Investigator, (M.A., Experimental Psychology, Queens; Ph.D., Communications, University of Pennsylvania) is Research Coordinator for the Cultural Indicators Project at The Annenberg School of Communications. She has been active in Cultural Indicators Research since its inception and has had direct responsibility for the annual message system analyses. She has been Co-Principal Investigator of several projects, including Aging with Television and Aging with Television Commercials conducted for the Administration of Aging. She has published and co-authored articles on Cultural Indicators research and is especially interested in television's portrayal of characters, social types, and people, and how these portrayals and images affect viewers' conceptions of social reality.

STEWART M. HOOVER, Associate Investigator, (M.A., Religion and Society, Pacific School of Religion, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley) is a doctoral candidate and research scholar at The Annenberg School of Communications. His research interests have included social effects of television viewing, the relationship between television viewing and moral reasoning in children, organizational and institutional studies in mass communications, viewer education curricula, and religious-institutional uses of television. He is a co-creator of Television Awareness Training, and has been a consultant to the American Medical Association, the National Council of Churches, and a number of other institutions in the area of mass communication policy and regulation. At Berkeley, his research focused on theological and ethical implications of mass communications and on religious-institutional studies.

## CULTURAL INDICATORS ARTICLES AND REPORTS

1. Gerbner, George, "Toward 'Cultural Indicators': The Analysis of Mass Mediated Message Systems." AV Communication Review, 1969. Also in George Gerbner, Ole R. Holsti, Klaus Krippendorff, William J. Paisley, and Philip J. Stone, (eds.), The Analysis of Communication Content; Developments in Scientific Theories and Computer Techniques. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1969.
2. Gerbner, George, "Dimensions of Violence in Television Drama." In Robert K. Baker and Sandra J. Ball (eds.), Violence in the Media, staff report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.
3. Gerbner, George, "Cultural Indicators: The Case of Violence in Television Drama." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March 1970.
4. Gerbner, George, "Violence and Television Drama: Trends and Symbolic Functions." In G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (eds.), Television and Social Behavior, Vol. 1 Content and Control. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1972.
5. Gerbner, George, "Communication and Social Environment." Scientific American, September 1972. Reprinted in Communication: A Scientific American Book. San Francisco, CA.: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1972.
6. Gerbner, George, "Cultural Indicators: The Third Voice." In George Gerbner, Larry P. Gross, and William H. Melody (eds.), Communications Technology and Social Policy. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.
7. Gross, Larry "The Real World of Television." Today's Education (the Journal of the National Education Association), January-February 1974.
8. Gerbner, George and Larry Gross, "The World of Television: Towards Cultural Indicators." Intermedia (Journal of International Institute of Communications), December 1975.
9. Gerbner, George and Larry Gross, "Living with Television: The Violence Profile." Journal of Communication, Spring 1976.
10. Gerbner, George and Larry Gross, "The Scary World of TV's Heavy Viewer." Psychology Today, April 1976.
11. Gerbner, George, "Television: The New State Religion?" et cetera, June 1977.
12. Gerbner, George, "Comparative Cultural Indicators." In George Gerbner (ed.), Mass Media Policies in Changing Cultures. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.
13. Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael F. Eleey, Marilyn Jackson-Beeck, Suzanne Jeffries-Fox, and Nancy Signorielli, "TV Violence Profile No. 8: The Highlights." Journal of Communication, Spring 1977.

14. Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Ealey, Marilyn Jackson-Beeck, Suzanne Jeffries-Fox and Nancy Signorielli. "The Gerbner Violence Profile -- An Analysis of the CBS Report." Journal of Broadcasting, Summer 1977.
15. Gross, Larry, "How True is Television's Image?" Getting the Message Across, Paris, France: The UNESCO Press, 1977.
16. Gross, Larry, "Television as a Trojan Horse." School Media Quarterly, Spring 1977.
17. Gross, Larry and Suzanne Jeffries-Fox, "What Do You Want To Be When You Grow Up, Little Girl?" In Gaye Tuchman, et al (eds.), Hearth and Home: Images of Women in the Mass Media. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
18. Jackson-Beeck, Marilyn, "The Non-Viewers: Who are They?" Journal of Communication, Summer 1977.
19. Jeffries-Fox, Suzanne and George Gerbner, "Television and the Family." (Fernsehen und Familie). Fernsehen und Bildung, 1977, 11(3).
20. Gerbner, George and Larry Gross, Marilyn Jackson-Beeck, Suzanne Jeffries-Fox, and Nancy Signorielli, "Cultural Indicators: Violence Profile No.9." Journal of Communication, Summer 1978.
21. Gerbner, George and Nancy Signorielli, "The World of Television News." In William Adams and Fay Schriebman (eds.), Television News Archives: A Guide to Research. Washington D.C.: George Washington University, 1978.
22. Signorielli, Nancy and George Gerbner, "The Image of the Elderly in Prime-Time Television Drama." Generations, Fall 1978.
23. Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Nancy Signorielli, Michael Morgan and Marilyn Jackson-Beeck, "The Demonstration of Power: Violence Profile No. 10." Journal of Communication, Summer 1979.
24. Gerbner, George and Nancy Signorielli, "Women and Minorities in Television Drama, 1969-1978." Philadelphia: The Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, October 1979.
25. Gross, Larry, "Television and Violence." In Ben Logan and Kate Moody (eds.), Television Awareness Training. New York: Media Action Research Center, 1979.
26. Jeffries-Fox, Suzanne and Nancy Signorielli, "Television and Children's Conceptions about Occupations." In Herbert S. Dordick (ed.), Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Telecommunications Policy Research Conference. Lexington MA.: Lexington Books, 1979.
27. Morgan, Michael and Larry Gross, "Television, IQ, and School Achievement." In S. Scheuyer (ed.), The TV Annual 1978-1979. New York: Macmillan, 1979.

28. Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Nancy Signorielli and Michael Morgan, "Aging with Television: Images on Television Drama and Conceptions of Social Reality." Journal of Communication, Winter 1980.
29. Morgan Michael, "Television Viewing and Reading: Does More Equal Better?" Journal of Communication, Winter 1980.
30. Gerbner, George, "Death in Prime-Time: Notes on the Symbolic Functions of Dying in the Mass Media." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 447, January 1980.
31. Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan and Nancy Signorielli, "Media and the Family: Images and Impact." Paper for the National Research Forum on Family Issues, White House Conference on Families, April 1980.
32. Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan and Nancy Signorielli, "Aging With Television: What Viewers See and What They Say." For the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Aging, Los Angeles Hearing, April 26, 1980.
33. Morgan, Michael and Larry Gross, "Television Viewing, IQ, and Academic Achievement." Journal of Broadcasting, Spring 1980.
34. Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Nancy Signorielli and Michael Morgan, "Television Violence, Victimization and Power." American Behavioral Scientist, Sage Publications, May/June 1980.
35. Gerbner, George, "Children and Power on Television: The Other Side of the Picture." In George Gerbner, Catherine J. Ross and Edward Zigler (eds.), Child Abuse: An Analysis and Agenda for Action. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
36. Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan and Nancy Signorielli, "The 'Mainstreaming' of America: Violence Profile No. 11." Journal of Communication, Summer 1980.
37. Gerbner, George and Larry Gross, "The Violent Face of Television and Its Lessons." In Edward L. Palmer and Aimee Dorr (eds.), Children and the Faces of Television: Teaching, Violence, Selling, New York: Academic Press, 1980.
38. Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan and Nancy Signorielli, "Television's Contribution to Public Understanding of Science: A Pilot Study." Conducted under a grant from the National Science Foundation, Philadelphia: The Annenberg School of Communication, University of Pennsylvania, October 1980.
39. Gerbner, George, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan and Nancy Signorielli, "Scientists on the TV Screen." Society, May/June, 1981.

40. Gross, Larry and Michael Morgan, "Television and Enculturation." In J. R. Dominick and J. Fletcher (eds.), Broadcasting Research Methods: A Reader. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, in press.
41. Signorielli, Nancy, "The Measurement of Violence in Television Programming: Violence Indices." In J. R. Dominick and J. Fletcher (eds.), Broadcasting Research Methods: A Reader. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, in press.
42. Signorielli, Nancy, Larry Gross and Michael Morgan, "Violence in Television Programs: Ten Years Later." In National Institute of Mental Health, Television and Behavior: Ten Years of Scientific Progress and Implications for the 80's, in press.
43. Morgan, Michael and Larry Gross, "Television and Educational Achievement and Aspirations." In National Institute of Mental Health, Television and Behavior: Ten Years of Scientific Progress and Implications for the 80's, in press.
44. Gerbner, George, Michael Morgan and Nancy Signorielli, "Programming Health Portrayals: What Viewers See, Say and Do." In National Institute of Mental Health, Television and Behavior: Ten Years of Scientific Progress and Implications for the 80's, in press.

## APPENDIX IV

## WORKING DRAFT OF MESSAGE SYSTEM ANALYSIS RECORDING INSTRUMENT

AS OF APRIL 1981

SECTION A - THE PROGRAM

## 1. FORMAT of Program

- 0 = cannot code, explain
- 1 = talk/interview, "variety"-style
- 2 = "magazine" format (filmed stories, interviews)
- 3 = "conventional" church service
- 4 = mainly music, "entertainment," some sermonizing
- 5 = mainly sermonizing
- 6 = revival
- 7 = analysis and discussion of theology
- 8 = drama/fictive play
- 9 = biblical enactment

## 2. Presence of AUDIENCE

- 0 = cannot code
- 1 = audience visible, not active
- 2 = audience visible, actively involved, asking questions
- 3 = audience visible, shown praying or singing
- 4 = audience visible, asking questions, praying
- 5 = no audience

## 3. THEMES: TOPICS: aspects of life

The themes, topics, and aspects of life are to be coded according to the emphasis of their presentation (if any) in the program;

- 0 = not mentioned
- 1 = mentioned, in passing, not stressed
- 2 = stressed, major emphasis given
- 3 = primary focus of attention; virtually sole issue

a. Nature

b. Supernatural

c. Science

- d. Politics
- e. Law Enforcement
- f. Crime
- g. Mass Communications
- h. Business
- i. Schools
- j. Religion
- k. Financial Success
- l. Close Relationships between the Sexes
- m. Home
- n. Minority Groups
- o. Armed Forces
- p. Importance of Family
- q. Avoidance or Fear of Aging
- r. Death and/or Dying
- s-u Health Aspects: code emphasis using scheme for a through r.

- s. Physical Handicap, defect or abnormality; give details

Note: This item refers to objectively recognizable physical handicaps. Do not consider social or psychological handicaps, or subjectively perceived physical handicaps such as buck teeth, crossed eyes, tendency to obesity, etc. Handicaps must be physical and conform to common parlance such as "Hire the Handicapped," etc.

- t. Physical Illness ; injury (such as a bodily wound, gunshot, broken leg, etc.) or illness requiring therapy, treatment, medicine, or cure; give details

Note: This items refers only to illness or injury that requires treatment. Minor illness or injuries, in themselves, do not qualify unless some treatment is called for, shown or discussed in the program. Thus a common cold, or bump on the head, should only be considered here if, for example, some remedy (aspirin, ice pack, etc.) is prescribed, taken, or considered. Injuries or illnesses that are not by nature minor should always be coded without reference to treatment.

- u. Mental Illness; retardation, abnormality, serious emotional disorder requiring therapy; cure for mental illness; give details

Note: Do not consider off-hand remarks, such as "you must be crazy," "you're nuts," unless the statement or phrase is actually directed at a character's mental health or statements that refer to mental health in general (such as psychotic, neurotic, etc.)

v and w Code the presentation of these themes and their associated harmful effects (if any):

- 0 = no attention is paid to the theme
- 1 = attention is paid to the theme but not to the harmful effects involved
- 2 = attention is paid to harmful effects and they are minor or incidental to the program
- 3 = attention is paid to harmful effects and they are significant to the program
- 4 = attention is paid to harmful effects and they are the main focus or issue of the program

v. Drugs or Narcotics, Use and Abuse

w. Alcohol, Use and Abuse

4a. MAJOR SETTING

- 1 = cannot code
- 2 = studio, no film
- 3 = church
- 4 = studio, with film
- 5 = church, with film (not including announcements)
- 6 = outdoors
- 7 = other

4b. PLACE

- 0 = cannot code
- 1 = U.S.
- 2 = U.S. and other
- 3 = only other

5a. AILMENTS, problems faith helps to solve (from list below)

- 0 = not mentioned
- 1 = God solves
- 2 = Jesus solves
- 3 = both God and Jesus solve
- 4 = cannot be solved

5b. MEANS OF CURE (for each)

- 0 = cannot code
- 1 = prayer
- 2 = "believing"
- 3 = prayer and believing
- 4 = personal conversion
- 5 = financial contribution
- 6 = watching program
- 7 = writing, calling program
- 8 = other (write in) \_\_\_\_\_



## 11. ITEMS OFFERED

- 0 = not mentioned  
 1 = offered for sale  
 2 = offered as gift  
 3 = offered in exchange for contribution  
 4 = other (write in)

- a. Books  
 b. Pamphlets  
 c. Gifts (necklaces, trinkets)  
 d. Magazines, publications  
 e. Tapes or records  
 f. Display items (pins, bumper stickers, etc.)  
 g. Other items (write in)

## 12. GUESTS: code number of participants who fit each category

- a. Guests, general interest  
 b. Celebrity guests (give category: sports, religion, politics, entertainment, etc.)  
 c. Former sinner, giving dramatic testimonial  
 d. "Average" person, giving "average" testimonial  
 e. Sick person being cured  
 f. Other (write in)

## 13. COMMERCIAL BREAKS, announcement which resemble, in format and lead-in, conventional television commercials

- 0 = none  
 1 = regular, non-religious commercial  
 2 = religious commercial, featuring and/or sponsored by program  
 3 = religious commercial, not clearly part of program

## 14. BIBLE REFERENCES or MENTIONS: For each,

- 0 = doesn't apply/appear  
 1 = applies to/appears in program  
 (write in reference)

- a. Simple mention (e.g., Bible is God's word, reading it is good, etc.)  
 b. Reference to specific Biblical passage, Old Testament  
 c. Reference to specific Biblical passage, New Testament  
 d. Reference to specific Biblical passage, source unclear  
 e. Reference to specific Biblical story, moral, Old Testament  
 f. Reference to specific Biblical story, moral, New Testament  
 g. Reference to specific Biblical story, moral, source unclear  
 h. Detailed treatment of passage, analysis of story, Old Testament

- i. Detailed treatment of passage, analysis of story, New Testament
- j. Detailed treatment of passage, analysis of story, source unclear
15. DEVIL, SATAN: Number of times mentioned: \_\_\_\_\_
16. HELL, PURGATORY: Number of times mentioned: \_\_\_\_\_
17. REQUESTS FOR FUNDS:
- a. Number of separate, discrete appeals made in program: \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Uses for funds mentioned:                   0 = cannot code  
   1 = uses unclear  
   2 = TV show production  
   3 = purchase of air time  
   4 = hospital, help sick  
   5 = spread gospel, evangelize  
   6 = help poor and needy  
   7 = specific building project (specify)  
   8 = educational activities, institutions  
   9 = other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Amount requested, maximum: \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Amount requested, minimum: \$ \_\_\_\_\_
18. SUPPORT SERVICES                           0 = not mentioned  
   1 = mentioned  
   2 = shown on screen
- a. Crisis centers, counseling centers, hotlines
- b. Phone numbers to call
- c. Phones ringing
- d. Counselors
- e. Addresses to write to for further help
19. Non-theological quotations; quotes from historical, political, entertainment, or other figures: NAMES: \_\_\_\_\_
- 20a. VIOLENCE: Number of references: \_\_\_\_\_
- 20b. SEX: Number of references: \_\_\_\_\_
- 20c thru 20g: Code as follows:               0 = not mentioned  
   1 = mentioned
- c. Violence in society
- d. Violence in the world
- e. Sexual sin
- f. Non-sinful sexual behavior
- g. Other (write in)

## 21a. REFERENCES TO LOCAL CHURCHES

- 0 = no mention  
 1 = criticized (explain for what)  
 2 = viewers urged to go, support unconditionally  
 3 = viewers urged to go, support conditionally (specify conditions)  
 4 = other (write in)

## 21b. REFERENCES TO NON-BROADCAST DENOMINATIONS

- 0 = no mention  
 1 = criticized (explain for what)  
 2 = viewers urged to go unconditionally  
 3 = viewers urged to go conditionally  
 4 = other (write in)

c. Number of mentions of non-broadcast churches: \_\_\_\_\_

## 22. SOCIAL/MORAL/POLITICAL ISSUES RAISED

- 0 = not mentioned  
 1 = mentioned  
 2 = stressed

Tendency of presentation:

- 0 = cannot code  
 1 = "traditional liberal"  
 2 = "traditional conservative"  
 3 = mixed, in between, both  
 4 = other (write in)

- a. Abortion
- b. Sexuality
- c. Sexual deviancy
- d. Women's rights, ERA
- e. Contraception
- f. Minority rights
- g. Homosexual rights
- h. Containment of communism/socialism
- i. Military spending
- j. Public school prayer
- k. Death penalty
- l. Drug use
- m. Censorship of Mass Media
- n. Welfare
- o. "Morality" of political candidates or politicians
- p. Pornography
- q. Divorce
- r. Remarriage

- s. Euthenasia
- t. Gun control
- u. Nuclear weapons
- v. Environment
- w. Free enterprise
- x. Alcohol
- y. Labor unions
- z. Rights of Criminals
- z1. Theory of Evolution
- z2. Fetal monitoring
- z3. Other \_\_\_\_\_

## 23. MISCELLANEOUS THEOLOGICAL ISSUES

0 = not mention  
1 = mentioned

- a. Controversy between Christians
- b. "Humanism"
- c. Secularism
- d. Paganism, occultism
- e. Other (write in) \_\_\_\_\_

## 24. Perception, TREATMENT of viewers

0 = cannot code  
1 = viewers need saving  
2 = viewers saved, others "out there" need saving  
3 = viewers and others need saving  
4 = other (write in)

## 25. "FRUIT" of Program

0 = cannot code  
1 = saved souls  
2 = social change  
3 = both  
4 = neither  
5 = other (write in)

SECTION B - THE PARTICIPANTS

Code each person on a separate form.

Major roles are those representing the principal focus of attention. Minor roles constitute all other speaking appearances. All items below are coded for major roles, but only items with an asterisk (\*) are coded for minor roles.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. ROLE(*)   | 0 = cannot code<br>1 = host<br>2 = cohost<br>3 = preacher<br>4 = guest<br>5 = audience member<br>6 = "celebrity" - famous person<br>7 = other (specify) |
| 2. Does person have obvious regional accent?   | 0 = no<br>1 = yes (specify)   |
| 3. Does person give testimonials?  | 0 = no<br>1 = yes   |
| 4. Does person quote the Bible?  | 0 = no<br>1 = yes   |
| 5. Does person speak in tongues?   | 0 = no<br>1 = yes   |
| 6. Does person have musical talent?<br>(sings, etc.)   | 0 = no<br>1 = yes   |
| 7. Has person had a conversion experience?   | 0 = cannot tell<br>1 = always believed<br>2 = now believes  |
| 8. When did person find God or Jesus, or experience "conversion"?<br>(write in actual time ago stated, if any) |   |
| 9. SEX (*)   | 0 = cannot code, <u>explain</u><br>1 = male<br>2 = female   |
| 10. CHRONOLOGICAL AGE (*)  | Record chronological age as known or estimated (from 01 thru 99).   |

11. SOCIAL AGE (\*)
- 0 = cannot code, write in
  - 1 = pre-adolescent, and adolescent period
  - 2 = young adult (few or no family responsibilities; can be from late teens to middle thirties)
  - 3 = settled adult (family, established in career)
  - 4 = elderly, old
12. RACE
- 0 = cannot code, explain
  - 1 = white
  - 2 = black
  - 3 = oriental (Asian, Pacific)
  - 4 = indian (American)
  - 5 = other
13. ETHNICITY
- 0 = cannot code, explain
  - 1 = non-hispanic
  - 2 = hispanic
14. NATIONALITY
- 0 = cannot code, explain
  - 1 = U.S.
  - 2 = foreign, write in
15. RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION
- 0 = cannot code
  - 1 = protestant
  - 2 = catholic
  - 3 = jewish
  - 4 = other religion, write in
16. SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS
- 0 = cannot code; other, write in
  - 1 = clearly upper
  - 2 = middle
  - 3 = clearly lower
17. MARITAL STATUS (\*)
- 0 = cannot code, explain
  - 1 = apparently not married; no impending marriage; no reference to having been married
  - 2 = impending marriage
  - 3 = presently married
  - 4 = separated
  - 5 = formerly but no longer married (widowed, divorced)
  - 6 = remarried
  - 7 = mixed, explain

19. CHILDREN - NATURAL (\*)
- 0 = cannot code; no information
  - 1 = has never had children
  - 2 = has a child of his/her own
20. CHILDREN - MINOR (\*) - Does the person have minor children, natural or otherwise, living with him or her, or for whom he or she is responsible? Code appropriately, and write in the number of children beside your code.
- 0 = cannot code; person has no dependent children
  - 1 = person has permanent, ongoing legal responsibility for minors (natural or adoptive parents, legal guardians)
  - 2 = person has otherwise limited responsibility for minors (babysitters, governess, day-care); explain
21. FAMILY LIFE - Is family or family life important to person?
- 0 = cannot code, explain
  - 1 = yes
  - 2 = no
22. COHABITANTS (\*) - With whom does the person live on a steady basis?
- 0 = cannot code, explain
  - 1 = not discernable with whom the person lives
  - 2 = lives alone
  - 3 = lives only with spouse
  - 4 = lives only with spouse and family
  - 5 = lives only with family
  - 6 = lives with family/ spouse and others
  - 7 = lives only with elderly people (not family members)
  - 8 = lives only with others (not family members)
  - 9 = mixed, combination of above, explain
23. FAMILY - Does the person currently have a family? If so, code the highest degree of involvement.
- Note: "Family" can refer to one or more family members
- 0 = cannot code, explain
  - 1 = no reference made to person currently having a family
  - 2 = specific information that person currently has no family

23. Cont.

- 3 = has a family but does not interact with them
- 4 = has a family and interaction is referred to but not seen
- 5 = has a family and is seen interacting with them

24. OCCUPATION (\*) - Write in person's occupation

25. FIELD OF ACTIVITY MOST CLOSELY RELATED TO OCCUPATION (\*)

- 0 = no discernable occupational activity; uncertain, other, mixed; write in
- 1 = entertainment, art, sports, mass media
- 2 = agriculture, farming, nature, animals
- 3 = business, industry, finance, transport, private agency
- 4 = government, courts, law; official authority
- 5 = health, medicine, social welfare and services
- 6 = education (student, teacher, etc.)
- 7 = science
- 8 = religion
- 9 = illegal activity

26. SUCCESS (\*)

- 0 = cannot code, explain
- 1 = clearly successful
- 2 = both, mixed, uncertain
- 3 = clearly unsuccessful

27. VIOLENCE COMMITTED BY PERSON (\*) - Has the person ever committed any violence? If so, code highest degree

- 0 = no violence committed
- 1 = non-fatal violence committed; does not appear to kill anyone
- 2 = fatal violence committed; kills or appears to kill; or fatal consequences indicated

28. VIOLENCE SUFFERED BY PERSON: VICTIMIZATION (\*) - Has the person ever been subjected to any violence? If so, code the highest degree.

- 0 = not subjected to violence
- 1 = not seriously hurt
- 2 = seriously hurt

29. SAVED - length of time person has been saved

30. NATURE OF PAST PROBLEMS

0 = no

1 = yes

- a. Health problems, life-threatening (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Health problems, minor (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Alcoholism
- d. Drug Addiction
- e. Not being saved
- f. Family tension
- g. General stress, depression
- h. Work-related stress
- i. Financial problems
- j. Lust
- k. Homosexuality
- l. Sexual dysfunction
- m. Sexual deviance
- n. Fear of suicide
- o. Fear of aging
- p. Sleeplessness
- q. Mental illness
- r. Other \_\_\_\_\_

31. Does person appear in a previously filmed clip?

0 = no

1 = yes

32. HEALING

0 = cannot code

1 = healer

2 = healed

3 = neither

4 = not healed

5 = other (write in)

## APPENDIX V

## DRAFT OF AUDIENCE SURVEY QUESTIONS

SIMPLE DEMOGRAPHIC ITEMS:

(Note: Many of these already are available from the diary data. They will also be included in the survey in order to assess reliability and increase precision.)

Age: What is your date of birth?

Education: What is the highest grade in school that you finished and got credit for?

Sex: Are you a male or a female? (only if not obvious)

Income: For statistical purposes, we need to know your family income, from all sources, before taxes last year -- was it under \$5,000, between 5,000 and 10,000, between 10,000 and 15,000, between 15,000 and 20,000, between 20,000 and 30,000, or over 30,000?

Race: We also need to know your race. Do you consider yourself to be black, white, Hispanic, oriental, or some other race?

Marital Status: Are you currently -- married, widowed, divorced, separated, remarried, or have you never been married?

Work Status: Are you presently working full time, part time, going to school, keeping house, or what?  
 (If working): How many hours did you work last week, at all jobs?  
 (If retired, keeping house, etc.): Did you ever work for as long as a year?  
 (If working, or ever worked): What kind of work do you (did you) normally do? That is, what (is/was) your job called?

Household composition: How many people usually live in this household? Have we forgotten anyone, such as babies, roomers, people on vacations? How many people in this household are under 6 years old? between 6 and 12? between 13 and 17? 18 and over?

Information on geographic location, community size and related issues will be derived from the diaries and/or administrative records of Arbitron.

RELIGIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS:

Affiliation: What is your religious affiliation? Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion?  
 (If Protestant): What specific denomination is that, if any?  
 Has that changed in the last three years?  
 Has that changed since you were 16 years old?  
 (repeat for spouse/head-of-household)

Intensity: Would you call yourself a strong (PREFERENCE NAMED ABOVE) or a not very strong (PREFERENCE NAMED ABOVE)?

RELIGIOUS DIMENSIONS:

Most of these items are adapted or selected from previous religious research, and include items utilized by Parker, et al. (1955), King and Hunt (1975), Gantz and Kowalewski (1979), and Hoge, et al. (1978), or items used in national surveys (e.g., the General Social Survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center).

Church Attendance/Activity:

During the last year, how many Sundays per month on the average have you gone to a worship service?

How often do you spend evenings at church meetings or in church work?  
(once a week or more, once a month, less than once a month, once a year, never)

How would you rate your activity in your local congregation -- would you say you are very active, active, inactive, or very inactive in your local congregation?

How about three years ago? Were you very active, active, inactive, or very inactive in your local congregation three years ago?

Church Support:

Last year, approximately what percent of your income was contributed to your church? (open-ended) What about three years ago (open-ended)

During the last year, how often have you made contributions to your church in addition to the general budget and Sunday School -- regularly, once in a while, or never?

During the last year, what was your average monthly contribution for your family to your local congregation? (open-ended)

Religious/Theological Conceptions:

Do you more or less agree or more or less disagree with the following statements:

- parade*
- The true Christian's loyalty must be to the spiritual part of humanity not the bodily
  - Spiritual, and not worldly, affairs in human life should be the concern of the Christian
  - For the Christian, the person-to-person relationship should be at least as important as the person-to-God relationship.
  - The church I attend most often has not kept up with the changes in the world.

- Going to church is exciting and satisfying.
- Of all the world's great religions, Christianity is the best for everyone.
- Christians must look at a person as a total unity and not concern themselves with only a "spiritual part."
- A correct relationship with God is far more important than proper ethical behavior toward other people.
- Most people who try to run their lives according to the teachings of the Bible find that Bible principles are not practical in real life.
- There is certainly a life after death.
- A correct relationship to God, and not good works in society, should be the foremost concern of the Christian.
- The individual, and not society, determines his or her personal fate in life.
- Most human behavior is a result of social pressures and conditions.
- Human action can create a substantially better world than we now have.
- The world is so full of sin that we can expect little improvement in the human condition in history.
- The primary purpose of this life is preparation for the next life.
- If you are religious in your heart, it doesn't matter how often you go to church.

Devotionalism:

How often do you pray privately in places other than at church?  
(regularly, once in a while, hardly ever)

How often do you ask God to forgive your sin?  
(regularly, once in a while, hardly ever)

I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life  
(true-false)

I often experience the joy and peace which come from knowing I am a forgiven sinner (true-false)

I believe that the word of God is revealed in the Scriptures  
(true-false)

SELECTED CONCEPTIONS OF REALITY, SOCIETY, VALUES:

You can classify almost all people as either crooked or honest (true-false)

There are two kinds of people in the world, the weak and the strong (true-false)

There's been a lot of discussion about the way morals and attitudes about sex are changing in this country. If a man and woman have sex relations before they are married, do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?

What is your opinion about a married person having sexual relations with someone other than the marriage partner -- is it always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?

What about sexual relations between two adults of the same sex? (same categories)

Should divorce be easier or more difficult to obtain than it is now?

Do you favor or oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder?

Do you favor or oppose our government spending more money on nuclear weapons?

Do you think that reading the Lord's Prayer or Bible verses should be allowed or forbidden in public schools?

Do you think that abortions should be legal under any circumstances, legal only under certain circumstances, or never legal?

Taken all together, how would you say things are these days -- would you say that you are very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?

In general, do you find life exciting, pretty routine, or dull?

Would you say, in general, that your own health is excellent, good, fair, or poor?

Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?

Do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, or would they try to be fair?

Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

During any given week, what would you say your chances are of being involved in some kind of violence -- do you think the chances are 1 in 10, or 1 in 100 that you'd be involved in violence?

Would you say that fear of crime is a very serious personal problem, somewhat serious, or not very serious for you?

Do you agree or disagree:

Most of the time my life seems to be out of my control.

My personal existence often seems meaningless and without purpose.

Which of these lifestyles would be more satisfying for you personally:

A traditional marriage with the husband as the chief wage-earner and the wife having responsibility for the children and the home, or  
 A marriage where the husband and wife both work and both share responsibility for the children and the home?

True or false -- most women are happiest when they are caring for children and making a home.

True or false -- a woman should not work outside the home if her husband can support the family.

NETWORK/RELIGIOUS TELEVISION VIEWING:

On the average day, about how many hours do you personally spend watching television?

On the average, about how many days a week do you watch any television?

Do you ever watch religious television programs? Which programs do you watch? How often do you watch (PROGRAM NAMED) -- almost every time it's on, occasionally, or rarely? (repeat for each program named)

Does anyone else in your home watch any religious programs? Who? Which programs?

Thinking of all the television you watch as equal to one hundred percent, about what percent of your television viewing is spent watching religious programs? About what percent is spent watching all other kinds of shows?

When you watch television, do you usually watch alone, or usually with other people? Is that the same for both religious and non-religious shows? (If no) How is it different?

Do you ever send any money to support any programs? How often? (regularly - every week or month; once in a while; never; only when there is a special appeal)

How did you first hear about the program(s)? Did you just happen to tune in, were you told about it by a friend, did you read about it, or what?

How long have you been watching this program/these programs? (just started, less than a year, one to three years, over three years)

When you send money to support a program, how much do you usually send?

Do most of the people you know watch religious programs (yes, no)

Do you ever receive information by mail from the programs you watch, like magazines, letters, pamphlets, or newspapers? Which?

Do any of these ministries ever call you?

Do you ever call them? (If yes): How many times have you called in?

X  
 Hausman

Have you changed your church allegiance since you've been watching these shows?  
In what way? (from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_)

Are you a "member" of any of the broadcast ministries you watch? How long have you been a member?

Do you ever listen to religious programs on the radio? (If yes): How often -- would you say you listen to religious radio programs almost every day, a few days a week, a few times a month, or a few times a year?

What is your favorite religious television program?

Here are some reasons people may have for watching religious television programs. For each one, please tell me whether it sounds very much like you, like you sometimes, or not like you at all.

- I watch religious programs on television to get away from the ordinary cares and problems of the day
- I watch because I think I can learn something
- I watch because someone else in the house is watching
- I watch just for "background" while I'm doing other things
- I watch to see a specific religious program I enjoy very much
- I watch because it helps me be a good Christian
- I watch just to keep myself company when I'm alone
- I watch because I'm afraid I might miss something good
- I watch because lots of people I know are watching and I want to be able to talk about it afterwards
- I watch just because I just feel like watching television

How about for other television programs? (repeat list)

Of all the following features, which do you like best about your favorite religious program -- music, preaching, testimonies, the minister or hosts, or the news and information? Which do you like the least?

Should religious television programs deal with social or political issues like military defense or poverty?

Thinking about programs which are not religious, would you say that most regular television programs would be rated G, PG, R, or X?

In general, would you say that there is too much, too little, or about the right amount of sex on television?

In general, would you say that there is too much, too little, or about the right amount of violence on television?

POLITICAL/VOTING BEHAVIOR:

Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent, or what?

In 1980, you remember that Carter ran against Reagan for President. Did you vote in the presidential election last year? (If yes): Did you vote for Carter or Reagan? (If no): Who would you have voted for, if you had voted?

We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals, moderates, and conservatives. Do you generally think of yourself, politically, as liberal, moderate, or conservative? Would you say you are a strong (PREFERENCE) or a not very strong (PREFERENCE)?

Have you ever given money to support the campaign of a political candidate? Have you ever worked for a political candidate in any other ways? Was the election a local election, a state election, or a national election?

X / Have you ever: written to a candidate or office-holder; sent a letter to the editor of a newspaper or magazine expressing your political views; circulated petitions for a candidate; run for any office?

OTHER POSSIBLE QUESTIONS:

Would you describe yourself as a "Born again" Christian?

Have you had the "baptism of the holy spirit?" (speak in tongues, etc.)

Would you say you are "saved"? For how many years have you been saved?

I have discovered satisfying goals and a clear purpose in life. (true-false)

When you have to make decisions in your daily life, how often do you try to find out what God wants you to do? (almost always, once in a while, hardly ever)

I believe in salvation as release from sin, and freedom for new life with God. (yes,no)

Praying to God is the best way to solve one's problems. (agree-disagree)

The important thing is just to believe in God, and it doesn't matter how you worship. (agree-disagree)

I believe in God as a Heavenly Father who watches over me and to whom I am accountable. (agree-disagree)

It is not as important to worry about life after death as about what one can do in this life. (agree-disagree)

Religious freedom in our country is seriously threatened today by groups who oppose all religion. (agree-disagree)

Religious freedom in our country is seriously threatened today by some groups who call themselves religious. (agree-disagree)

The main purpose of the church should be to provide religious education for children and youth. (agree-disagree)

*local*  
X  
How much confidence do you have in the people running: organized religion; education; the medical community; the scientific community; the government; your local church; major companies? (a great deal, only some, hardly any)

If someone does not accept Christ, then they will suffer in the next life, no matter what they do in this life. (agree-disagree)

Do you give money to support your favorite religious program for yourself, or so that it can go on ministering to others?

To what purpose is most of your money put that you send? (to buy air time, to produce the programs, for mission works)

Do you think that your religious beliefs have changed since you started watching religious television programs? How? (become a believer; become a firmer believer; changed denominations; to be coded from open-ended responses)

During the last two years, that is since (\_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_), have you, yourself, been a patient in a hospital, sanitorium, convalescent or nursing home (apart from having a baby)?

Are you now, or have you been in the last two years, confined to your home because of some illness?

When you were 16 years old, were you living in the same (city/town/county) where you live now?

## APPENDIX VI

## BUDGET

(Nov. 1, 1981 - April 30, 1983)

Personnel (see Exhibit A)		\$ 58,073
Salaries	\$ 47,732	
Benefits	10,341	
Message System Analysis		12,912
Wages	\$ 11,900	
Benefits	1,012	
Administration of Audience Survey (see Exhibit B)		43,000
Computer		7,500
Supplies		2,000
Videotape		2,800
Xerox		1,500
Travel		450
Report Preparation		300
Sub-total		<hr/> \$ 128,535
Overhead (see Exhibit C)		21,384
25% of everything except survey		<hr/> 21,384
Total		<hr/> \$ 149,919

## Exhibit A

## Personnel Costs

Nov. 1, 1981 - Oct. 31, 1982

	<u>Salary</u>	<u>Benefits</u>	<u>Total</u>
George Gerbner, Professor of Communications and Dean	\$ 3,500	\$ 931	\$ 4,431
Larry Gross, Assoc. Prof. of Communications	3,500	931	4,431
Michael Morgan, Research Specialist	4,875	956	5,831
Nancy Signorielli, Research Coordinator	6,220	1,219	7,439
Stewart Hoover, Research Associate	5,400	459	5,859
Kendall Whitehouse, Data Control Clerk	2,950	864	3,814
Sheryl Moore, Data Control Clerk	2,588	758	3,346
Office staff	2,000	586	2,586
Total	\$ 31,033	\$ 6,704	\$ 37,737

Nov. 1, 1982 - April 30, 1983

	<u>Salary</u>	<u>Benefits</u>	<u>Total</u>
George Gerbner, Prof. of Comm./Dean	\$ 1,925	\$ 512	\$ 2,437
Larry Gross, Assoc. Prof.	1,925	512	2,437
Michael Morgan, Research Specialist	2,682	526	3,208
Nancy Signorielli, Research Coordinator	3,421	671	4,092
Stewart Hoover, Research Associate	2,700	230	2,930
Kendall Whitehouse, Data Control Clerk	1,623	476	2,099
Sheryl Moore, Data Control Clerk	1,423	417	1,840
Office staff	1,000	293	1,293
	\$ 16,699	\$ 3,637	\$ 20,336