

Annenberg Media Survey: Journalists and the Public, 2005

Final Report
June 2005

Prepared by Princeton Survey Research Associates International for the Annenberg Foundation Trust at Sunnylands and The Annenberg Public Policy Center

Contents

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Media Bias | 4 |
| The Impact of Partisan Journalism | 11 |
| Believability and Who Are Journalists | 16 |
| Media Accuracy and Ethics | 20 |
| Censorship, Self-Censorship and Journalism's Role in Democracy | 27 |
| Business Operations | 34 |
| Media Ownership | 38 |
| Media Habits: Journalists and Public | 44 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The media landscape continues to undergo dramatic, revolutionary changes that the American people and journalists alike largely welcome. Whether it is 24-hour news channels, free online news, blogs or free newspapers, Americans applaud the proliferation of news and information. By nearly two-to-one, the public says it likes having so much information available. Relatively few say they are overwhelmed by the blitz of news and information.

Journalists welcome these changes, too. While journalists disagree about whether bloggers who comment on the news are journalists, many feel bloggers help keep journalists accountable. And journalists support the press's newest attempt to reach young Americans by handing out free newspapers in major cities as commuters board subways and buses. Many journalists believe these free newspapers help improve the news quality the public receives. The same holds for the now ubiquitous 24-hour cable news channels and free online news, which journalists widely praise as also having a positive impact on the quality of the news.

This study for the Annenberg Foundation Trust at Sunnylands and directed by the The Annenberg Public Policy Center finds that journalists do not like all of the changes occurring in their backyard. Just completed interviews with 673 journalists—owners and executives, editors and producers, and staff journalists—show that journalists uniformly denounce the rise of partisan journalism and say it is bad for the American public. In the face of the rise of “news programs” that take a decidedly political point of view, journalists steadfastly hold to the maxim that objective and fair coverage of the news should prevail. And most journalists think they do a fairly good job of delivering the news in an objective and fair manner and are largely accurate in their reporting. Even with the Jayson Blair scandal at *The New York Times* and the furor over the CBS News/Dan Rather story on President Bush's military service, journalists say the news media deals with its problems effectively.

The American public, according to our national survey of 1500 Americans, agrees that partisan journalism is bad for the American people, but only by a slight margin. A large minority believes it is good if some news organizations have a decidedly political point of view in their coverage. Moreover, the American public is not as convinced as journalists are about the extent or intensity of journalists' commitment to present the news in an objective and fair manner. Many also wonder about the motives of journalists—are they driven to inform the public or to further their financial and professional success? Americans do, however, say they learn more from journalists who keep their political views out of their reporting. As such, the rise in news programs with a decidedly political point of view may be undermining one of the key functions of the media in a democratic society—to keep the public informed about the actions of elected leaders and developments in their community, the nation and the world.

Young Americans, ages 18 to 29, have a somewhat different view about the media than older Americans. It is particularly noteworthy that a slim majority of young Americans believe it is good for the public if some news organizations have a decidedly political point of view. These young Americans are most welcoming of the wealth of news and information available today, yet are less likely than older Americans to believe that the media, free of government censorship, is very important in a democratic society. In fact, these young Americans are more likely than older Americans to feel the government has the right to restrict what the media can print or broadcast. At the same time, younger people are more likely to question the motives of journalists and think

journalists are motivated mainly by the desire for financial and professional success rather than to inform the public. As expected, young people also stand out in their media habits and turn more to some sources of information—the Internet, blogs and talk radio—than network and local TV or newspapers.

Journalists may not be pleased with some of the reasons for the success of the Fox News Channel, with its combination of traditional news delivery with programs that feature hosts who fiercely defend their political viewpoint. But journalists do say Fox News' success has affected the way news organizations both cover and present the news. With an audience of millions, political talk radio is another feature of the media landscape that has changed the way Americans consume information. Americans turn to radio and television programs such as *The O'Reilly Factor* or *Hardball with Chris Matthews* for a variety of reasons. Their top reason is to keep up with the news. This fits with the findings that those who tune into Rush Limbaugh, for example, both largely believe him and think he is a journalist. Fewer, but a notable minority, say they tune into these types of shows because they like to listen to people with a different point of view or to keep up with what people are thinking. These shows also have an entertainment feature that is a drawing card, particularly for younger Americans.

Another feature of the changing media landscape is that Americans, more than ever, are turning to different news organizations based on their political perspective. For example, self-identified Republicans are more likely to tune to Fox's *The O'Reilly Factor*, to Rush Limbaugh and to blogs while self-identified Democrats are more likely to tune to *60 Minutes*, *Nightline* and the Sunday morning news shows. The media consumption patterns of journalists, by contrast, are largely not predicated on political orientation. Many journalists regularly read the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post* and the *Wall Street Journal* and do so whether they hold conservative, moderate or liberal political views. This nonpartisan news consumption is somewhat eroded by slightly more partisan viewing of the Sunday morning news shows and talk radio listenership but the magnitude of this exposure is relatively small. As such, while many in the public are turning to news sources with an arguably partisan slant, journalists largely are not.

Consistent with the previous finding, Americans who describe themselves as Republicans are more likely than Democrats to believe most or almost all of what Rush Limbaugh and the Fox News Channel say. By contrast, more traditional evening news broadcasts such as ABC and CBS, as well as *Time* and CNN, are seen as more believable by Democrats than Republicans. The implication of this finding is that the polarization of news audiences may warrant monitoring to ensure the dialogue and civility that are the foundation of a well functioning democracy are not compromised by business interests that answer logically to what the audience wants to see and hear. Rather, consistent with the core values of journalism, journalists have a professional obligation to provide balanced coverage that not only provides what the audience wants to hear but what the audience needs to know to be informed and engaged citizens.

Below we present detailed findings of these surveys in seven sections:

- Media Bias
- The Impact of Partisan Journalism
- Believability and Who are Journalists
- Media Accuracy and Ethics
- Censorship, Self-Censorship and Journalism's Role in Democracy

- Business Operations
- Media Ownership
- Media Habits: Journalists and Public

The journalists' survey was conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates International between March 7 and May 2, 2005, among 673 journalists including owners and executives, editors and producers, and staff journalists, and representing both print and broadcast media, and local and national organizations. Interviews were conducted online and by telephone by Princeton Data Source. For results based on the total sample, one can say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling is plus or minus 4 percentage points.

The public survey was conducted by telephone between March 3 and April 5, 2005, among a nationwide representative sample of 1500 adults 18 years of age and older. For results based on the total sample, one can say with 95 percent confidence that the error attributable to sampling is plus or minus 3 percentage points.

In addition to sampling error, readers should bear in mind that question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of opinion polls.

Media Bias

The prevailing professional standards of journalism call for journalists to provide fair and objective coverage of the news, checking carefully to keep their own individual biases out of the reporting. Yet charges of bias—whether partisan, ideological, personal or financial—are commonplace accusations against the media, in general, and certain reporters, in particular. So do journalists and the public agree on whether bias exists? What triggers biased reporting and do concerns about the extent to which there may be biased reporting vary by political ideology and type of news story?

Journalists strive for objective and fair reporting...

Objective and fair news reporting has been a bedrock principle of journalism since the early 1900s and it is a tenet that nearly all journalists feel fellow reporters strive to achieve. The vast majority of journalists (94%) think their colleagues try to report the news objectively and fairly, without regard to their individual political views. Indeed, a solid majority (56%) say journalists try to be objective and fair to a great extent. Fewer than four in 10 (38%) are somewhat less confident and say journalists try to a moderate extent to be

objective and fair in their news reporting. Very few feel their colleagues totally disregard this basic principle of journalism, and try only to a small or no extent at all (4%) to be objective and fair in their reporting. National journalists (62%) are more likely than local journalists (51%) and print journalists (60%) more likely than broadcast journalists (48%) to say their colleagues put a great deal of effort into reporting the news in an objective and fair manner.

The public is also confident in journalists' efforts to be objective and fair, but not nearly as confident as journalists themselves. Two-thirds (65%) say journalists try to report the news objectively and fairly. However, the public is much less likely than journalists themselves to say journalists try to a great extent to be fair and objective (18%). Rather, slightly less than half of the public (47%) believe journalists try to be fair and objective to a moderate extent. A sizable minority (29%) is more critical and think journalists make little or no effort to report the news objectively and fairly.

To what extent do journalists who report the news try to do so objectively and fairly, without regard to their own political views—to a great extent, moderate extent, small extent or not at all?

| | JOURNALISTS | PUBLIC |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|
| Great extent | 56% | 18% |
| Moderate extent | 38 | 47 |
| Small extent | 4 | 17 |
| Not at all | * | 12 |
| Don't know | 1 | 5 |
| Refused | 1 | * |

...and largely succeed

And by and large, journalists believe they succeed in being fair and objective. But again, there is some divergence between professional and public opinion. More than nine in 10 (91%) journalists say reporters succeed in being fair and objective, compared to six in 10 (63%) of the public. The difference is largely because three in 10 (31%) journalists say they succeed to a great extent in being fair and objective, while half as many members of the public (14%) take such a strongly positive stance. Relatively few journalists (8%), but more members of the public (36%), feel journalists fall short of their professional mark and succeed in reporting the news objectively and fairly to only a small extent or not at all, or they do not try at all to be objective and fair in their reporting.

To what extent do journalists who report the news actually succeed in reporting the news objectively and fairly—to a great extent, moderate extent, small extent, or not at all?

| | JOURNALISTS | PUBLIC |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------|
| | N=673 | N=1500 |
| Great extent | 31% | 14% |
| Moderate extent | 60 | 49 |
| Small extent | 6 | 15 |
| Not at all | - | 3 |
| Don't try to be objective and fair* | 2 | 18 |
| Don't know | * | 2 |
| Refused | * | * |

* Based on those who do not believe that journalists who report the news try to do so objectively and fairly, including those who don't know or refused

Journalists see personal failings as reason for bias

Journalists and the public see bias creeping into reporting and writing, even unintentionally. Why? We asked journalists what they think is the single most important reason bias slips into reporting. They give two top reasons that are not complimentary to the profession—accepting information without checking it (38%) and a journalist's strong personal views on a subject (29%). The pressure of tight deadlines to report the news is another reason for unintentional bias, mentioned by 18 percent. Editors and producers (45%) are more likely than staff journalists (34%) to say accepting information without checking it can result in unintentionally biased reporting.

When journalists unintentionally let bias into their reporting, do you think it is most likely due to...

| | JOURNALISTS |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Accepting information without checking | 38% |
| Strong personal views on subject | 29 |
| Tight deadlines | 18 |
| Writing for the editor's approval | 7 |
| Writing to match the corporate owner's perspective | 1 |
| Don't know | 4 |
| Refused | 2 |

By contrast, few say that external factors explain why journalists sometimes fall short in delivering objective and fair news coverage. Fewer than one in 10 journalists say writing for an editor's approval (7%) or writing to please a corporate owner's perspective (1%) are the reasons for unintentional bias.

CBS News and Dan Rather: Honest mistake or liberal bias?

The question of journalistic bias is an oft-heard allegation in the investigation of the Dan Rather/CBS News' report on President Bush's National Guard record. In 2004, CBS News' *60 Minutes* and Dan Rather reported on the President's military record and triggered a firestorm of allegations, an investigation, firings and resignations. Was this an honest mistake based on accepting information without thoroughly checking it, the result of tight deadline pressures or the result of a liberal bias on the part of Dan Rather and CBS? The public and journalists come to slightly different conclusions.

Most journalists do not fault CBS News on the central pillar of journalistic ethics: 76 percent say a major reason CBS ran the story was because CBS believed it was accurate and provided new information about Bush. But roughly the same percentage (73%) say a major reason was that CBS responded to a key journalism imperative and rushed the story onto air because they feared another news organization would break the story first. National journalists and seasoned journalists with 20 or more years of experience are more likely than others to think CBS ran the story believing the information was accurate.

On these dimensions, many in the public agree substantially with journalists. Slightly more than one-half (53%) say CBS ran the story because they believed it was accurate and six in 10 (59%) say CBS feared another news organization would break the story first.

CBS News is also viewed as a victim of its sources by many. Nearly six in 10 (56%) journalists believe a major reason CBS News made the mistake is that they were lied to by their sources. Fewer in the general public (42%) agree this is a major reason.

But journalists and the public part company sharply over the issue of whether a liberal bias drove the CBS report. One in ten journalists (10%) say a major reason for the mistake is that CBS and Rather are "liberals who dislike Bush." But fully 40 percent of Americans say CBS' liberal bias is a major reason for the CBS story. A scant 26 percent of the public say this was not a reason at all for the CBS error compared with 54 percent of the journalists who reject the liberal bias charge.

Here are some reasons various people have given for why the people at CBS News and Dan Rather ran the story about Bush. Do you think this was a major reason, a minor reason, or not a reason at all for why CBS News and Dan Rather ran the story?

| | JOURNALISTS N=673 | PUBLIC* N = 1094 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| → CBS News and Dan Rather believed the story was accurate and provided new information about the controversy surrounding Bush's service in the National Guard. | | |
| A major reason | 76% | 53% |
| A minor reason | 15 | 28 |
| Not a reason at all | 5 | 15 |
| Don't know | 2 | 4 |
| Refused | 2 | * |
| → CBS News and Dan Rather were in too much of a rush because they were worried other news organizations would get the story first. | | |
| A major reason | 73% | 59% |
| A minor reason | 20 | 23 |
| Not a reason at all | 4 | 15 |
| Don't know | 2 | 2 |
| Refused | 2 | * |
| → CBS News and Dan Rather were lied to by their sources. | | |
| A major reason | 56% | 42% |
| A minor reason | 21 | 26 |
| Not a reason at all | 15 | 23 |
| Don't know | 6 | 8 |
| Refused | 3 | 1 |
| → CBS News and Dan Rather are liberals who dislike President Bush. | | |
| A major reason | 10% | 40% |
| A minor reason | 31 | 29 |
| Not a reason at all | 54 | 26 |
| Don't know | 3 | 5 |
| Refused | 2 | * |

**Based on those who have read or heard about the events at CBS News involving Dan Rather and have heard or read about the investigation into the CBS News and Dan Rather story*

Liberal bias charges consistent with political views about journalists

Regardless of whether political beliefs creep into news reporting, the public thinks many journalists hold more liberal political views than the American people do. A plurality of the public thinks journalists are liberal in their political views (42%). Fewer think journalists are moderate (29%) or conservative (16%). By contrast, the public thinks that the majority of Americans are either moderate (39%) or conservative (33%), not liberal (17%). When describing their own personal views, 33 percent of Americans consider themselves moderate, 38 percent say they are conservative and 24 percent say they are liberal.

The public's view that many journalists are liberal could reasonably be assumed to be one reason the public thinks journalists are not always successful in reporting the news fairly and objectively. But such a direct link is not found. Those who think journalists are liberal are as likely as those who think journalists are conservative (or moderate) to believe some journalists fail to fully report the news in an objective and fair manner.

Do you think the majority of **journalists** in this country today are liberals, moderates or conservatives?

| | PUBLIC |
|---------------|--------|
| Liberals | 42% |
| Moderates | 29 |
| Conservatives | 16 |
| Don't know | 13 |
| Refused | 1 |

Do you think the majority of the **American people** in this country today are liberals, moderates or conservatives?

| | PUBLIC |
|---------------|--------|
| Liberals | 17% |
| Moderates | 39 |
| Conservatives | 33 |
| Don't know | 10 |
| Refused | 1 |

Journalists span political spectrum

Journalists do tend to think some of their colleagues are liberal, but journalists peg media owners and radio talk show hosts as conservatives. Thinking of newspaper journalists, 54 percent of all journalists say a majority of newspaper journalists are liberal while 37 percent say a majority are moderate. When it comes to television and radio journalists, fewer (34%) say a majority are liberal and more (46%) say a majority of broadcast journalists are moderate. Similarly, one-half (49%) of journalists say a majority of editors and producers are moderate, while one-third (34%) say they are liberal. But fully two-thirds of journalists (66%) say a majority of news media owners are conservative, and 81 percent of journalists judge a majority of radio talk show hosts to be on the right side of the political spectrum.

Journalists of all political persuasions agree that radio talk show hosts are largely conservative. But there the agreement ends. Conservative journalists are consistently more likely than moderate or liberal journalists to think media owners, television and radio journalists and newspaper journalists are liberal. For example, 75 percent of conservative journalists say a majority of editors and producers in this country are liberal, a position held by only 32 percent of moderates and 29 percent of liberals. Similarly, eight in 10 (82%) conservative journalists think a majority of newspaper journalists are liberals compared to one-half of moderate (50%) and slightly more liberal (55%) journalists.

Journalists have a remarkably consistent view of the ideological leanings of the American people: fully 70 percent say a majority of Americans sit in the middle of the political spectrum and are moderates. Only one percent of journalists think that a majority of the public is liberal and only two in 10 (20%) think a majority of the public is conservative. Local journalists (26%) are more likely than national journalists (14%) to think that a majority of Americans are conservative. Broadcast journalists (26%) are also more likely than print journalists (18%) to think a majority of Americans are conservative.

Do you think the majority of [see names below] in this country today are liberals, moderates, or conservatives?

| JOURNALISTS | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| → Newspaper journalists | |
| Liberals | 54% |
| Moderates | 37 |
| Conservatives | 1 |
| Don't know | 6 |
| Refused | 3 |
| → Television and radio journalists | |
| Liberals | 34% |
| Moderates | 46 |
| Conservatives | 8 |
| Don't know | 9 |
| Refused | 3 |
| → Editors and producers | |
| Liberals | 34% |
| Moderates | 49 |
| Conservatives | 5 |
| Don't know | 9 |
| Refused | 3 |
| → Media owners | |
| Liberals | 5% |
| Moderates | 19 |
| Conservatives | 66 |
| Don't know | 8 |
| Refused | 3 |
| → Radio talk show hosts | |
| Liberals | 6% |
| Moderates | 5 |
| Conservatives | 81 |
| Don't know | 6 |
| Refused | 3 |
| → The American people | |
| Liberals | 1% |
| Moderates | 70 |
| Conservatives | 20 |
| Don't know | 6 |
| Refused | 3 |

Charges of liberal bias bigger impact than conservative bent

Journalists believe they are generally successful in reporting the news objectively and fairly, and many also think their colleagues span the political spectrum from liberal to conservative. But they still say that accusations of liberal bias have changed the way journalism is practiced. Slightly more than half (53%) say accusations by conservatives of a liberal bias in the news media have had an effect on news reporting. Self-described liberal (59%) and moderate (54%) journalists are more likely than self-described conservative (40%) journalists to say the liberal bias charge has affected reporting.

Substantially fewer journalists (19%) say liberals' accusations that the news media are representatives of big corporations has had at least a moderate effect on reporting. Fully 80 percent of journalists—whether conservatives, moderates or liberals—see little or no effect on reporting due to the liberal countercharge.

To what extent, if at all, has the charge by conservatives that the news media is liberal affected reporting—to a great extent, moderate extent, small extent, or not at all?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Great extent | 14% |
| Moderate extent | 39 |
| Small extent | 33 |
| Not at all | 14 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | 1 |

To what extent, if at all, has the charge by liberals that the news media are representatives of big corporations affected reporting—to a great extent, moderate extent, small extent, or not at all?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Great extent | 2% |
| Moderate extent | 17 |
| Small extent | 44 |
| Not at all | 36 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | 1 |

Varying views about changes in election campaign coverage

The 2004 election campaign brought an upsurge in accusations of both liberal and conservative biases in the news media and renewed questions about the general quality of campaign reporting in general. Journalists are splintered on the question of how the quality of reporting about the presidential election campaign has changed in their time as a journalist. Just over a third of journalists (36%) say the quality of campaign coverage has improved, while slightly fewer (32%) say it has declined or the quality has not changed (30%).

During the time that you have been a journalist, has the quality of reporting about presidential general election campaigns increased, decreased or stayed about the same?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Increased | 36% |
| Decreased | 32 |
| Stayed about the same | 30 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | 1 |

This divergence of opinion varies, in part, with views about how charges of liberal bias have affected the reporting of the news. More journalists who say charges of liberal bias have had a great or moderate effect on news coverage also think the quality of election coverage has declined (40%) than increased (33%) or stayed the same (26%). Alternatively, among those who say countercharges of a conservative bias have had a great or moderate effect on coverage journalists are equivocal. An equal number of these journalists say the coverage increased (40%) as say it decreased (40%), and half as many (19%) say the quality has remained the same.

In addition, views about the quality of reporting of campaigns vary notably by political orientation. Liberal (40%) and moderate (33%) journalists are more likely than conservative journalists (16%) to say the quality of reporting has declined. By contrast, conservative (53%)

journalists are much more likely than liberal (29%) or moderate (37%) journalists to say the quality of reporting about general election campaigns has improved.

Journalists see less media criticism of Bush than Clinton

A solid majority of journalists believe that the media has covered the current Bush administration differently than the Clinton administration. Nearly two in three (62%) journalists say coverage of the Bush administration is different from their coverage of the Clinton years. One in three (34%) disagree. Among these journalists who see a difference, nearly twice as many say the news media has been more critical of the Clinton administration (64%) than the Bush administration (30%). Views about the coverage of the two administrations split sharply by political orientation. Self-identified liberal journalists seem to be more sensitive to Clinton's treatment while conservative journalists are more sensitive to any criticism the current Bush administration may receive. Liberal journalists (85%) say the news media has been more critical of the Clinton administration, while conservative journalists (89%) feel the media has been more critical of the Bush administration.

Overall, has the news media been more critical of the Bush administration or the Clinton administration?*

| | JOURNALISTS |
|------------------------|-------------|
| | N = 414 |
| Bush administration | 30% |
| Clinton administration | 64 |
| Don't know | 3 |
| Refused | 3 |

**Based on those believe that there is a difference in the way the news media has covered the current Bush administration compared to the Clinton administration*

The Impact of Partisan Journalism

Drawing the line may not always be easy, but allegations of a philosophical bias in news coverage are not necessarily the same as allegations of a partisan bias. The rise of the Fox News Channel and political talk radio has triggered a healthy debate about partisan journalism and its effect on the news the American public receives. From subtle to blatant, some individuals—whether we call them journalists, commentators or TV personalities—have substantial audiences and are a source of information for a growing number of Americans. At its best, some of these programs can be called engaging, feisty or cutting-to-the-chase and at its worst, at least according to journalists, these programs present the news through a partisan filter.

Journalists and public—but not young Americans—shun partisan journalism

News coverage with a decidedly political point of view is bad for the American people, according to most journalists. And a slim majority of the public agrees. At the same time, a majority of young people, ages 18 to 29, disagree, saying it is good if some news organizations have a decidedly partisan view.

A great majority of journalists (80%) say it is bad for the American people if some news organizations have a decidedly political point of view in their coverage. While many print and broadcast journalists think this is bad, more broadcast journalists (58%) than print journalists (44%) say it is very bad. Opinion about partisan journalism also varies somewhat by political orientation. Journalists who consider themselves liberal (84%) or moderate (84%) are more likely than conservative journalists (64%) to say that a decidedly partisan point of view is bad for the American people. By contrast, one-third of self-described conservative journalists (34%) say a partisan point of view is good, more than twice as many as either liberal (14%) or moderate (13%) journalists.

The public agrees that partisan journalism is undesirable, but not as conclusively. A slim majority (53%) say news coverage with a partisan point of view is bad for Americans. A sizable minority (43%), however, say such a partisan perspective is good for the American people, including a small number (6%) who say it is very good. In particular, a majority of young people (54%), ages 18 to 29, say it is good for the American people if some news organizations have a decidedly partisan view. Those with a high school education or less (48%), African Americans (58%) and Hispanics (52%) are more likely than college educated Americans (38%) and whites (40%) to say news coverage with a partisan point of view is good.

Do you think it is a good thing or a bad thing for the American people if some news organizations have a decidedly political point of view in their coverage of the news? Is this a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or a very bad thing?

| | JOURNALISTS | PUBLIC |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|
| Very good thing | 2% | 6% |
| Somewhat good | 14 | 37 |
| Somewhat bad | 33 | 29 |
| Very bad thing | 47 | 24 |
| Don't know | 2 | 4 |
| Refused | 2 | * |

Journalists say some journalists, not most, partisan

Even though most journalists say it is unhealthy for their colleagues to reveal a partisan point of view in news coverage, many (57%) acknowledge that at least some of their colleagues are obviously liberal or conservative in their work. A small fraction (11%) think that most journalists are obviously liberal or obviously conservative, while nearly three in 10 (28%) think only a few journalists are.

How many journalists in America today, if any, are obviously liberal or obviously conservative in their news reporting—most, some, only a few, or none?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|------------|-------------|
| Most | 11% |
| Some | 57 |
| Only a few | 28 |
| None | * |
| Don't know | 3 |
| Refused | 1 |

Self-identified conservative journalists

are more likely than liberal or moderate journalists to say their colleagues are obviously political in their reporting. Four in 10 (39%) conservative journalists say that most journalists in American today are obviously liberal or obviously conservative in their news reporting. In comparison, just a fraction of liberal (7%) and moderate (9%) journalists share this view.

Fox influences coverage and presentation of news

The Fox News Channel is leading the ratings race against CNN and MSNBC. The Fox News Channel's mixture of traditional news delivery, news anchors who reveal their views and programs with combative hosts likely contributes to the assessment that some journalists are obviously liberal or conservative. Moreover, the success of Fox News has done more than that—journalists say it has influenced the way broadcasters cover the news, as well as how they present the news on-air.

A slim majority of journalists (51%) say Fox News has influenced the way other broadcasters cover the news. Four in 10 (40%) say it has had little impact on coverage. An even larger majority of journalists (57%) say Fox News has influenced to a great or moderate extent the way other broadcasters present the news. One-third (33%) say it has little impact on news presentation. More self-described liberal journalists (62%) than conservative journalists (42%) say the success of Fox News has influenced to a great or moderate extent the way others broadcasters cover the news. Moderates fall in the middle (49%). Likewise, more liberal journalists than either moderate or conservative journalists say Fox News is influencing the way news is presented. Seven in ten (69%) self-described liberals, followed by moderates (56%) and conservatives (50%) say the success of the Fox News Channel has influenced the way broadcasters present the news.

To what extent, if at all, has the success of the Fox News Channel influenced the way other broadcasters **cover** the news—to a great extent, moderate extent, small extent, or not at all?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Great extent | 14% |
| Moderate extent | 37 |
| Small extent | 29 |
| Not at all | 11 |
| Don't know | 7 |
| Refused | 3 |

To what extent, if at all, has the success of the Fox News Channel influenced the way other broadcasters **present** the news—to a great extent, moderate extent, small extent, or not at all?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Great extent | 18% |
| Moderate extent | 39 |
| Small extent | 25 |
| Not at all | 8 |
| Don't know | 7 |
| Refused | 2 |

Americans learn more from nonpartisan reporting

What does this change mean for the media, as an institution of democracy charged with informing the public about domestic and international events? If the goal is to inform Americans, the partisan journalism format may be counterproductive. A majority of Americans (55%) say they learn more from journalists who keep their views out of their reporting. A minority (35%) say they learn more from journalists who put their politics into their reporting. By almost an identical margin, a majority (57%) say they enjoy news coverage from journalists who keep their views out of their reporting while a minority (35%) say they enjoy the coverage from journalists who make their political views clear.

More Americans with at least some college learn more from and enjoy listening to journalists who keep their political views out, while more Americans with a high school education or less prefer journalists who make their political views clear. Whites (59%) are more likely than blacks (41%) or Hispanics (43%) to say they learn more from news coverage where journalists keep their political views out of their reporting or news coverage. And, conversely, blacks (48%) and Hispanics (50%) are more likely than whites (30%) to say they learn more from coverage when journalists make their political views clear.

Which do you [see statement below]...news coverage from journalists who keep their political views out of their reporting or news coverage from journalists who make their political views clear?

| | PUBLIC |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| → Learn more from | |
| Coverage from journalists who keep their political views out | 55% |
| Coverage from journalists who make their political views clear | 35 |
| Don't know | 10 |
| Refused | 1 |
| → Enjoy more | |
| Coverage from journalists who keep their political views out | 57% |
| Coverage from journalists who make their political views clear | 35 |
| Don't know | 8 |
| Refused | 1 |

Why watch news shows with a political bent?

Politically themed radio talk shows and television news shows attract both a substantial amount of attention and a substantial number of listeners and viewers. With millions in the audience, the reasons for tuning in are varied, but some themes are consistent. For those who say they listen to political talk radio, nearly two-thirds (64%) say they mostly agree with the talk show hosts they listen to. Only 16 percent say they mostly disagree. Americans who say they are Republicans (73%) are more likely than Democrats (62%) or Independents (56%) to say they mostly agree with the radio hosts they listen to.

Which do you [see statement below]...news coverage from journalists who keep their political views out of their reporting or news coverage from journalists who make their political views clear?

| | PUBLIC |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| → Enjoy more | |
| Coverage from journalists who keep their political views out | 57% |
| Coverage from journalists who make their political views clear | 35 |
| Don't know | 8 |
| Refused | 1 |
| → Learn more from | |
| Coverage from journalists who keep their political views out | 55% |
| Coverage from journalists who make their political views clear | 35 |
| Don't know | 10 |
| Refused | 1 |

While many Americans may agree with the talk show hosts they listen to or watch, that is not the only reason, or even the top reason, they tune in. Rather, simply keeping up with the news is the top reason for listening to or watching shows such as *The O'Reilly Factor* or *Hardball*. Roughly two in three (65%) of those who listen to political talk radio or watch political TV news shows say the major reason they tune in is because the programs help them keep up with the news. This finding spans demographic groups—men and women, older and younger Americans, the less well-educated and better educated uniformly say they tune to these programs to keep up with the news. Put in another context, 38 percent say the programs help them keep up with what people are thinking.

The quick explanation that these shows attract only those who already agree with the hosts' views is not the main reason given by the audience itself. Nearly three in 10 (28%) say that the major reason they tune in is to listen to people who mostly think like they do. In fact, the opposite is more often the case. Roughly four in 10 (44%) say that a major reason they watch is because they like to listen to people who have a different point of view. Democrats (51%) are more likely than Republicans (40%) to say they tune in because they like to listen to people who have a different point of view.

And these shows are fun. More than four in 10 Americans (44%), and a slim majority of younger Americans (53%), say entertainment is a major reason for tuning in to these programs.

Please tell me if the following is a major reason, a minor reason or not a reason at all that you listen to or watch shows such as the O'Reilly Factor or Hardball.*

| PUBLIC | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| N = 991 | |
| → The programs help me keep up with the news | |
| Major reason | 65% |
| Minor reason | 21 |
| Not a reason at all | 11 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | * |
| → The programs help me keep up with what people are thinking. | |
| Major reason | 38% |
| Minor reason | 38 |
| Not a reason at all | 21 |
| Don't know | 3 |
| Refused | 1 |
| → I like to listen to people who mostly think like I do. | |
| Major reason | 28% |
| Minor reason | 33 |
| Not a reason at all | 37 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | * |
| → I like to listen to people who have a different point of view than me. | |
| Major reason | 44% |
| Minor reason | 36 |
| Not a reason at all | 19 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | * |
| → The programs are entertaining. | |
| Major reason | 44% |
| Minor reason | 33 |
| Not a reason at all | 21 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | 1 |

*Based on those who say they listen to radio shows that invite listeners to call in to discuss current events, public issues, or politics, listen to either Rush Limbaugh or Bill O'Reilly on the Radio Factor, or watch either the O'Reilly Factor or Hardball with Chris Matthews at least once a month

Why not tune in?

Why do some people not tune in to political talk radio or television programs like *The O'Reilly Factor* or *Hardball with Chris Matthews*? Here the non-audience is even larger and the reasons more diverse. For some Americans, the shows' fundamental topic is not of interest. One-third (34%) say a major reason they do not watch is because they just do not have much time or interest in politics. Put another way, 35 percent say the major reason they tune out is that the shows are boring.

But the partisan bias of the shows provides reasons enough not to watch as well. One-third (33%) say they do not watch the shows because they are one-sided and not objective. And 27 percent say they do not watch the shows because they do not agree with most of what the people on the shows say.

Please tell me if the following is a major reason, a minor reason or not a reason at all that you do not listen to or watch shows such as the O'Reilly Factor or Hardball?*

| | PUBLIC |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| | N = 509 |
| → I don't have much interest or time for political issues. | |
| Major reason | 34% |
| Minor reason | 24 |
| Not a reason at all | 40 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | * |
| → The shows are boring. | |
| Major reason | 35% |
| Minor reason | 19 |
| Not a reason at all | 39 |
| Don't know | 6 |
| Refused | 1 |
| → The programs are one-sided and do not present information in an objective manner. | |
| Major reason | 33% |
| Minor reason | 19 |
| Not a reason at all | 40 |
| Don't know | 7 |
| Refused | 1 |
| → I don't agree with most of what the people on the shows say. | |
| Major reason | 27% |
| Minor reason | 22 |
| Not a reason at all | 43 |
| Don't know | 7 |
| Refused | 1 |

*Based on those who say they do not listen to radio shows that invite listeners to call in to discuss current events, public issues, or politics, or do not listen to either Rush Limbaugh or Bill O'Reilly on the Radio Factor, or do not watch either the O'Reilly Factor or Hardball with Chris Matthews at least once a month

Believability and Who Are Journalists

Americans expect the news to be reported objectively and fairly, two of the pillars that make the news believable. But the public does not see news sources as equally believable: the public trusts some news sources more than others. The extent to which the public believes a news source shapes their views about journalists and helps explain why journalists and the public have somewhat different ideas about who is a journalist.

Americans trust some news sources more than others

Americans may watch, listen, or read many news sources, but they trust with discretion. More than two-thirds of the public (68%) say there are a few news sources they trust more than others. Only three in 10 (30%) say all the news media are pretty much the same.

Which comes closer to describing your view of the news media?

| | PUBLIC |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| All the news media are pretty much the same to me | 30% |
| There are a few news sources I trust more than others | 68 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | * |

The public trusts local TV news above others

We asked the public how much they believe various news sources and program hosts. Leading the pack is local television news, which provides coverage on community news, sports, weather and traffic. Seven in 10 of those who have an opinion about their local TV news (72%) say they believe almost all (31%) or most (41%) of what local TV newscasters say.

Would you say you believe almost all of what [see list below] says, most of what it says, only some, or almost none of what it says?

| | ALMOST ALL * | MOST * | ONLY SOME * | ALMOST NONE * | | CAN'T RATE |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------|----------------|------------------|-------|---------------|
| Local TV news | 31% | 41% | 25% | 4% | = 101 | 1 |
| Peter Jennings and ABC News | 24 | 40 | 29 | 6 | = 99 | 4 |
| CNN | 23 | 42 | 28 | 7 | = 100 | 7 |
| Brian Williams and NBC News | 22 | 38 | 31 | 9 | = 100 | 13 |
| Fox News Channel | 25 | 31 | 32 | 12 | = 100 | 7 |
| <i>Time</i> Magazine | 18 | 38 | 37 | 7 | = 100 | 15 |
| Dan Rather/Bob Schieffer and CBS News | 21 | 35 | 32 | 12 | = 100 | 11 |
| Local daily newspaper | 21 | 38 | 36 | 5 | = 100 | 3 |
| <i>People</i> Magazine | 7 | 16 | 48 | 29 | = 100 | 14 |
| Rush Limbaugh | 6 | 14 | 44 | 37 | = 101 | 11 |

*Based on those who could rate each

Peter Jennings and ABC News are essentially tied with CNN overall, following closely behind local TV news in believability. Solid majorities of Americans who had an opinion about these media sources say they can believe almost all or most of what Peter Jennings and ABC News (64%) say and what CNN (65%) says. Brian Williams and NBC News follow with a solid majority (60%). Trailing by just a few points, the Fox News Channel (56%); *Time* magazine

(56%); and Dan Rather, Bob Schieffer and CBS News (56%) have more than half the public who have an opinion about these news sources saying they believe almost all or most of what they say.

Many also trust their local newspapers. Roughly six in 10 (59%) of those who had an opinion say they believe almost all or most of what the local daily newspaper they are most familiar with reports.

People, the magazine featuring Hollywood stars, musicians and other famous personalities, is believed at least most of the time by one-fourth of those who gave an opinion (23%). Rush Limbaugh is believed at least most of the time by two in 10 (20%) of those who have an opinion of the talk show host.

Believability in television news differs by party affiliation

Local newspapers and local television news are seen as believable by solid majorities of the public, regardless of political affiliation. However, among Americans who have an opinion, Democrats are more likely to believe most of the news sources we asked about. For example, more than three in four Democrats (78%) say they believe almost all or most of what Jennings and ABC News report, while fewer Independents (62%) and Republicans (53%) say the same. Similarly, more Democrats (71%) than Independents (56%) and Republicans (45%) say Rather, Schieffer and CBS News are believable.

And party affiliation continues to be a factor when it comes to two cable news channels—CNN and the Fox News Channel. Democrats tend to believe CNN while Republicans tend to believe the Fox News Channel. Three-fourths of Americans (75%) who identify themselves as Democrats say they believe CNN compared to half of Republicans (53%). Conversely, more Republicans (71%) than Democrats (54%) believe the Fox News Channel. More Independents say CNN is believable (67%) than Fox News (48%). Similarly, more Republicans (33%) than Democrats (9%) and Independents (14%) say they believe all or most of what Rush Limbaugh says.

Distinction as journalist matters, but difficult for public

There are many media sources—TV, radio, cable, Internet—and a dizzying number of shows, each with its own host or two. Are all the people who report what appears to be the news actually journalists? Is it important for the American people to be able to make this distinction? Nearly all journalists (97%) think it is important that the public be able to distinguish those people who are journalists and those who are not. But journalists admit making the decision is not easy. Most newspeople (85%) also concede it is not easy for the public to do this, including nearly four in 10 (37%) who say this is not easy at all.

Now thinking about the public, how easy is it for the public to distinguish between those who are journalists and those who are not journalists—very easy, somewhat easy, not too easy, or not easy at all?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Very easy | 3% |
| Somewhat easy | 11 |
| Not too easy | 48 |
| Not easy at all | 37 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | * |

Mainstream news sources are journalists

But who, specifically, is a journalist and who is not? We asked the general public and journalists about various people who talk about the news and asked if these people fit their idea of what a journalist is.

Journalists and the public tend to have somewhat similar views about well known people in the news media, particularly on network television. For example, among those who have an opinion of the news people we asked about, the great majority of the public (88%) and journalists (91%) agree that Peter Jennings, a veteran in the business, is a journalist.

After Jennings, the pattern is that journalists are more likely to consider their colleagues “journalists” than the public is. Mike Wallace, part of *60 Minutes* on CBS for decades, is considered a journalist by great majorities as well, though slightly more by journalists (92%) than the public (80%). Brian Williams, who recently succeeded Tom Brokaw as anchor of NBC’s *Nightly News*, is believed to be a journalist by a solid majority of the public (69%) and journalists (80%).

Among “print” journalists, Bob Woodward, a Pulitzer-prize winning newspaper journalist and author, is considered by virtually all (96%) journalists to come close to their idea of what a journalist is. In comparison, only 64 percent of the public who had an opinion say Woodward is a journalist. George Will, both a syndicated newspaper columnist and frequent commentator on various television programs, is considered a journalist by half of the public (50%) but by a solid majority (64%) of journalists.

Moving to TV hosts who are more renown as interviewers than reporters, the pattern reverses. Katie Couric, host of NBC News’ *Today Show* in the morning is more likely to be seen as a journalist than Larry King, who hosts an evening television talk show on CNN. More than six in 10 of the public (62%) say Katie Couric is a journalist, while roughly half of journalists (49%) agree. Fewer of both the public (43%) and journalists (26%) consider Larry King a journalist.

Opinion about hosts of political talk shows varies widely

The public and journalists diverge sharply when it comes to people who host political talk shows. Only one in 10 journalists (12%) think Bill O’Reilly is a fellow journalist. The American people are five times as likely to think O’Reilly as a journalist (55%). Similarly, only a small fraction of journalists (3%) consider Rush Limbaugh a journalist, compared to one-third of Americans who do (32%), a ratio of almost 11 to 1. The one exception to this pattern is Chris Matthews. Of those who offered an opinion, a majority of the public (55%) and nearly as many journalists (49%) say Chris Matthews is a journalist.

Please tell me if you think [see names below] is a journalist or not?

| | JOURNALISTS* | PUBLIC |
|----------------|--------------|--------|
| Peter Jennings | 91% | 88% |
| Mike Wallace | 92 | 80 |
| Brian Williams | 80 | 69 |
| Bob Woodward | 96 | 64 |
| George Will | 64 | 50 |
| Katie Couric | 49 | 62 |
| Chris Matthews | 49 | 55 |
| Larry King | 26 | 43 |
| Bill O'Reilly | 12 | 55 |
| Rush Limbaugh | 3 | 32 |

**Journalists were asked question in modified form: Please tell me how close, if at all, [insert] comes to your idea of what a journalist is. Does [insert] come very close, somewhat close, not too close, or not at all close to your idea of what a journalist is?" Percentages in table are very close and somewhat close combined.*

Percentages do not include people who said they do not know or refused.

Believability and who is a journalist go hand in hand¹

Detailed analysis reveals there is a complex relationship between thinking someone is a journalist and believability. For example, of the news media personalities we asked the public to rate for believability, Peter Jennings leads the pack. Nearly all of the public who say they believe almost all that Jennings reports say he is a journalist (93%). Those who do not think Jennings is believable are somewhat less likely to think he is a journalist (79%). Looking at it from the other direction, seven in 10 of those who say Jennings is a journalist (69%) believe almost all or most of what he says. Only 39 percent of those who do not think he is a journalist believe almost all or most of what he says. In a similar pattern, of those who believe Brian Williams is a journalist, three in four (75%) say they believe all or most of what he says, compared to just 38 percent of those who do not think he is a journalist. Even though fewer Americans believe Rush Limbaugh and fewer consider him a journalist, the same pattern holds—40 percent who say Limbaugh is a journalist believe all or most of what Limbaugh says while relatively few (9%) who do not consider Limbaugh a journalist believe him. Likewise, a solid majority of those who say Limbaugh is believable (68%) consider him a journalist. But only a minority of Americans who say Limbaugh is not believable (24%) say he is a journalist.

Younger Americans less likely to agree with the conventional “journalist” label

Among those who have an opinion of the newspeople we asked about, younger Americans are more likely than older Americans—especially people age 65 or older—to say some of the public figures we asked about are journalists. When it comes to deciding who is a journalist, people under age 30 are more likely to say Rush Limbaugh, Larry King and Katie Couric are journalists. By contrast, people under age 30 are somewhat less likely to say George Will, Bob Woodward and Brian Williams are journalists, especially compared to those age 65 or older. Women, in most cases, are slightly more likely than men to say the news people we asked about are journalists.

Partisanship and who is a journalist

Consistent with the finding that believability and categorizing public figures as journalists are tightly linked, the pattern of partisanship in judgments about who is a journalist mirrors the judgments of the believability of the news organizations. For example, Democrats are more likely to believe Larry King and Republicans are more likely to believe Bill O’Reilly. One-half of Democrats (51%) say they think King is a journalist, compared with only 39 percent of Republicans. Conversely, Republicans (59%) are more likely than Democrats (48%) to say O’Reilly is a journalist.

When it comes to talk radio host Rush Limbaugh, only a third overall say he is a journalist, with little difference by partisanship. Slightly more Republicans (36%) than Democrats (32%) say Limbaugh is a journalist.

Of the other news people asked about in the survey, Democrats are more likely than Republicans to say Mike Wallace, Katie Couric, Peter Jennings and Bob Woodward are journalists. Republicans are more likely to say George Will is a journalist, while party affiliation is not a factor in judging whether Brian Williams and Chris Matthews are journalists.

¹ Consistent with the analysis thus far, the findings below are based on Americans who express an opinion on who is a journalist and believability.

Media Accuracy and Ethics

Many journalists say they hold themselves to high professional and ethical standards in their role of providing information and news in a democratic society. And the public has reasonable expectations for journalists to act exactly in conformity with such standards. Both the journalists and the public give the media good marks on ethics. But on the most basic of performance goals – presenting accurate information in the news – the public sees journalists as falling down on the job, while the journalists do not see the same picture.

Journalists and public disagree on accuracy of reporting

Journalists seemed shocked to learn from readership surveys in the 1980s that many readers believe newspapers and television news are littered with factual errors. And that failing on a most fundamental dimension continues to dog the American news media. While most journalists do not see a problem, the public certainly does. Roughly half of the public (48%) say the stories and reports of news organizations are often inaccurate, while nearly as many say news organizations get the facts straight (45%). Republicans (53%), men (51%) and those 50 and older (54%) are more likely than Democrats (45%), women (45%) and those under 50 (44%) to say that news reports are often inaccurate.

In general, do you think news organizations get the facts straight or do you think their stories and reports are often inaccurate?

| | JOURNALISTS | PUBLIC |
|------------------------|-------------|--------|
| Get the facts straight | 86% | 45% |
| Often inaccurate | 11 | 48 |
| Don't know | 2 | 6 |
| Refused | 1 | 1 |

Journalists see it differently. Most journalists (86%) believe news organizations get the facts straight. Only 11 percent believe news stories are often inaccurate. Twice as many broadcast journalists (21%) than print journalist (8%) think the news stories and reports are often inaccurate. Local journalists are also more skeptical than national journalists (14% vs. 8%, respectively).

Journalists say they fix errors...

Journalists are quick to say that newspapers, television stations and other outlets readily admit their mistakes, pointing to the correction boxes in newspapers and the corrections report aired almost nightly on television news. Three in four journalists (74%) say most news organizations quickly report mistakes, although a sizeable slice of journalists (19%) say news organizations try to ignore such mistakes. Staff journalists (22%), broadcast journalists (26%) and journalists with less than 10 years experience (30%) are more likely than editors and producers (14%), print journalists (16%), journalists with 20 to 29 years experience (17%) and journalists with more than 30 years experience (15%) to say news organizations try to ignore their mistakes.

- When there is a serious mistake made in a news story, do you think most news organizations quickly report they have made a mistake, do they try to ignore the mistake, or do they generally try to cover up the mistake?

| | JOURNALISTS | | PUBLIC | |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----|--------|-----|
| | | | | |
| • Quick to report mistakes | • | 74% | • | 30% |
| • Try to ignore mistakes | • | 19% | • | 24% |
| • Try to cover up mistakes | • | 3% | • | 41% |
| • Don't know | • | 2% | • | 5% |
| • Refused | • | 3% | • | * |
| • | | | | |

...but public not so sure

Many in the public do not see such an obvious drive to correct errors. Fully four in 10 (41%) say news organizations try to cover up mistakes and more than two in 10 (24%) say the news media take a more passive approach and simply try to ignore their errors. Only three in 10 Americans (30%) agree with journalists that the news media moves quickly to acknowledge their mistakes.

Good job handling Blair and Bush military paper problems

While there is broad criticism of the media, the public says two prominent news organizations handled recent scandals well. A solid majority of Americans (61%) who have read or heard about the situation involving Jayson Blair and *The New York Times* say the *Times* did a good job in correcting the problems at the paper. Journalists are even more willing to give the *Times* credit—eight in 10 (80%) say the newspaper has done a good job resolving the issues.

Similarly, a majority (58%) of Americans who have heard of the allegations that CBS News and Dan Rather used forged documents in a story about President Bush's service in the National Guard say CBS News has done a good job correcting the situation. But, in contrast to the *Times* scandal, journalists are less likely than the public to praise the news organization. A bare majority of journalists (52%) say CBS News did a good job handling the problem.

Now, thinking about the events at the *New York Times* involving Jayson Blair, how good a job do you think the *Times* has done correcting the situation—very good, somewhat good, somewhat poor, or very poor?

| | JOURNALISTS | PUBLIC* |
|---------------|-------------|---------|
| | | N = 524 |
| Very good | 32% | 13% |
| Somewhat good | 48 | 48 |
| Somewhat poor | 12 | 20 |
| Very poor | 3 | 10 |
| Don't know | 3 | 9 |
| Refused | 1 | * |

Public was asked, "Overall, how good a job do you think has been done correcting the situation? Did it do a very good job, somewhat good, somewhat poor, or very poor job?"

**Based on those who have heard or read about the events at the New York Times involving Jayson Blair*

Turning now to the allegations that CBS News and Dan Rather used forged documents in a story about President Bush's service in the National Guard, how good a job do you think CBS News has done correcting the situation—very good, somewhat good, somewhat poor, or very poor?

| | JOURNALISTS | PUBLIC* |
|---------------|-------------|----------|
| | | N = 1152 |
| Very good | 11% | 15% |
| Somewhat good | 41 | 43 |
| Somewhat poor | 32 | 22 |
| Very poor | 11 | 13 |
| Don't know | 2 | 7 |
| Refused | 2 | * |

** Public was asked, "Overall, how good a job do you think has been done correcting the situation? Did it do a very good job, somewhat good, somewhat poor, or very poor job?"*

Based on those who have heard or read about the events at CBS News involving Dan Rather

Campaign accuracy and failure to report differential use of deception

The accuracy of election coverage is central to a well-functioning democratic society and falls squarely on the shoulders of the media in their role of keeping the public informed about candidate positions, policy proposals, character and funding. This consists of accurately reporting all aspects of the election campaign including the use of deceptive tactics.

We asked journalists the following: If one candidate is using deceptive tactics more often than his or her opponent, do most journalists report the greater use of deception by one side, report that both sides are using deception, or avoid the matter completely? Journalists say they are hesitant to report that one campaign is more deceptive than the other, perhaps to avoid charges of favoritism or bias. Nearly six in ten (58%) say journalists just report that both sides are using deception. Only one-fourth (25%) say journalists report the greater use of deceptive tactics by one side and one in 10 (11%) say they avoid the matter completely.

Failing to report such differences has a major downside, journalists admit. A large majority—79 percent—of these journalists concede that by failing to point out the greater use of deception by one side, they are suggesting that both sides are engaged in a similar amount of deception, which is an inaccurate portrayal of the campaign.

Broadcast journalists (17%) are more likely than print journalists (9%) to say most journalists avoid the matter completely. Self-described liberal journalists (65%) are more likely to say most journalists just report that both sides are using deception than conservatives (46%).

In a political campaign, if one side is using deceptive tactics more often than the opponents, do most journalists usually report the greater use of deception by one side, just report that both sides are using deception or avoid the matter completely?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Report the greater use of deception by one side | 25% |
| Just report that both sides are using deception | 58 |
| Avoid the matter completely | 11 |
| Don't know | 4 |
| Refused | 2 |

Under these circumstances, do you think that by failing to point out that one side is more deceptive, journalists are suggesting that both sides are engaged in a similar amount of deception or not?*

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | N = 465 |
| Suggesting similar amount | 79% |
| Not suggesting similar amount | 17 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | 2 |

**Based on those who believe that most journalists usually either report that both sides are using deception OR avoid the matter completely*

Journalists ethical practices good

Despite these concerns about accurate reporting, the public says journalists follow good ethical practices and journalists themselves, not surprisingly, concur. In general, journalists and the public rank the ethical practices of professionals we asked about in the same order: teachers are the most ethical, followed by journalists, lawyers, and government officials. Politicians rank last.

Three-fourths of the public (74%) say the ethical practices of journalists are good, although most say somewhat good (67%). This is second only to teachers, who most of the public (89%) say are ethical. Slightly more than half say the ethical practices of government officials (54%) and lawyers (54%) are at least somewhat good. Less than half (43%) say the ethical practices of politicians are good.

Nearly all journalists (95%) believe their profession's ethical practices are good, with one in three (32%) saying very good. And nearly all journalists (92%) find teachers ethical. To a lesser extent, journalists say the ethical practices of lawyers (69%) and government officials (64%) are good. Print journalists (38%) are more likely than broadcast journalists (16%) to think the ethical practices of journalists are very good, while broadcast journalists (74%) are, conversely, much more likely than print journalists (58%) to say the ethical practices of journalists are only somewhat good.

Politicians do not fare as well. Only four in ten journalists (40%) say politicians' ethical practices are good and nearly six in ten (56%) say bad.

Generally, how would you rate the ethical practices of [see list below] very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or very bad?

| | JOURNALISTS | PUBLIC |
|------------------------|-------------|--------|
| → Journalists | | |
| Very good | 32% | 7% |
| Somewhat good | 63 | 67 |
| Somewhat bad | 4 | 17 |
| Very bad | * | 5 |
| Don't know | 1 | 4 |
| Refused | 1 | * |
| → Teachers | | |
| Very good | 52% | 38% |
| Somewhat good | 40 | 51 |
| Somewhat bad | 2 | 5 |
| Very bad | * | 1 |
| Don't know | 5 | 4 |
| Refused | 1 | 1 |
| → Government officials | | |
| Very good | 8% | 3% |
| Somewhat good | 56 | 51 |
| Somewhat bad | 27 | 28 |
| Very bad | 5 | 12 |
| Don't know | 2 | 4 |
| Refused | 1 | 1 |
| → Lawyers | | |
| Very good | 9% | 5% |
| Somewhat good | 60 | 49 |
| Somewhat bad | 23 | 25 |
| Very bad | 3 | 13 |
| Don't know | 4 | 7 |
| Refused | 1 | 1 |
| → Politicians | | |
| Very good | 2% | 2% |
| Somewhat good | 38 | 41 |
| Somewhat bad | 45 | 33 |
| Very bad | 11 | 19 |
| Don't know | 2 | 4 |
| Refused | 1 | 1 |

Journalists say report all conflicts of interests, public less demanding

In an era of increasing scrutiny, journalists come down strongly on the side of reporting their own possible conflicts of interest. Most journalists (85%) say that journalists should disclose all conflicts of interest involving themselves and their news organizations rather than rely on standards of objectivity and fairness (13%). Self-described conservatives (21%) and journalists with less than 10 years experience (22%) differ on this with slightly more saying objectivity and fairness are sufficient than self-described liberals (10%) or those with more experience (12%).

And, do you think journalists' self-reports of conflicts of interest involving themselves and their news organizations enhance the news media's credibility with the public or do such reports undermine their credibility?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Enhance credibility | 86% |
| Undermine credibility | 10 |
| Don't know | 3 |
| Refused | 1 |

Most journalists not only believe it is the right thing to disclose conflicts of interest, but that such disclosures enhance the news media's credibility with the public. Nearly nine in 10 (86%) say that the self-reporting of conflicts enhances credibility. But the public is less impressed by media reporting of their own potential conflicts. Slightly less than half of the public (47%) say journalists should disclose all conflicts of interest, while four in 10 (39%) say standards of objectivity and fairness are sufficient. More men (52%) than women (43%) and more college educated (55%) than less well-educated (40%) say journalists should disclose all conflicts of interest involving themselves.

In your opinion, should journalists disclose all conflicts of interest involving themselves and their news organizations or is the journalistic standard of objectivity and fairness sufficient?

| | PUBLIC |
|-----------------------------------------|--------|
| Disclose all conflicts of interest | 47% |
| Objectivity and fairness are sufficient | 39 |
| Don't know | 13 |
| Refused | 1 |

The media's credibility among the public is seen again in large majorities by both the general public and the journalists. Nearly eight in 10 (78%) Americans say they trust the media to operate in the best interests of the American people, just slightly less than how journalists view themselves (86%).

Differences also over Bush administration payment to commentators

Recent scandals involving the Bush Administration's payments to commentators and journalists to advocate administration policies highlight the differences between the public and journalists about how to handle conflicts of interests. Seven in 10 journalists (69%) say the journalists are more at fault in this situation for not disclosing the government payments. Only 22 percent say the Bush administration is more at fault.

It is the reverse for the public: more than half of the public (53%) say the Bush Administration is more at fault and only three in 10 (32%) say journalists are more at fault. Among the public, Democrats (72%) are more likely to blame the administration, while one-half (51%) of Republicans fault journalists.

Who is more at fault – the journalists for not disclosing a government contract or the Bush Administration for using government funds to promote their policies?*

| | JOURNALISTS | PUBLIC |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------|
| | N = 659 | N = 1228 |
| The journalists | 69% | 32% |
| The Bush Administration | 22 | 53 |
| Don't know | 7 | 14 |
| Refused | 2 | 1 |

*Based on those who think it is always the responsibility of the journalist to report to their readers or listeners if they are accepting money to promote a point of view

Media Developments: From bloggers to free newspapers and 24-hour news

Journalists do not see bloggers as colleagues, but there are positives

Most journalists say bloggers who comment on the news media are not journalists, yet a plurality of journalists say bloggers have had a positive effect on the quality of the news the public receives. Four in five (81%) journalists say bloggers who comment on the news media are not journalists (38%) or are journalists only to a small extent (43%). Fewer than two in 10 (16%) say bloggers are fellow journalists. Yet, at the same time, journalists are somewhat positive about bloggers' impact on the burgeoning blogosphere, with 45 percent saying blogs have had a positive effect on the quality of news the public gets. Somewhat fewer (38%) say they have had a negative effect.

Would you say the increasing number of blogs has a very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, very negative, or not much of an effect on the quality of the news that the public receives?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Very positive | 8% |
| Somewhat positive | 37 |
| Somewhat negative | 22 |
| Very negative | 16 |
| Not much of an effect | 12 |
| Don't know | 3 |
| Refused | 1 |

One in two journalists (51%) say the emergence of blogs have made journalists more accountable. Fewer (44%) say blogs have not made much of a difference. The public is more divided. Roughly as many say blogs have made the media more accountable (43%) as say they have not made much difference (46%).

Do you feel that the emergence of blogs that comment on the news media has made journalists more accountable, less accountable, or has it not made much of a difference?

| | JOURNALISTS | PUBLIC* |
|-------------------------------|-------------|---------|
| | | N = 364 |
| More accountable | 51% | 43% |
| Less accountable | 3 | 5 |
| Not made much of a difference | 44 | 46 |
| Don't know | 2 | 1 |
| Refused | 1 | 5 |

*Based on those who have heard or read a blog that was critical of the news media

Free newspapers

Journalists find the sudden explosion of free newspapers being distributed in major metropolitan areas as a positive development. A slim majority (53%) say these free papers have a positive impact on the quality of news the public receives. Nearly three in 10 (27%) see a negative impact, while a little more than one in 10 (14%) see little impact.

24-hour news channels

Journalists largely endorse the availability of 24 hour cable news channels as having a positive impact on the quality of news. More than six in 10 (64%) say they have a positive impact, with three in 10 (29%) seeing a negative hit from this development.

Free news on the Internet

A great deal of news content is now available online without any charge to the reader, including the massive flow of news from mainstream media outlets such as the *New York Times*, CNN and The Associated Press. Journalists, again, find this a positive development. Fully seven in 10 (70%) journalists say free online news is positive for the quality of news Americans receive, with only two in 10 (20%) saying it is negative.

Would you say [see statement below] has a very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, very negative, or not much of an effect on the quality of the news that the public receives?

JOURNALISTS

→ The increasing number of free daily newspapers available in larger cities

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Very positive | 11% |
| Somewhat positive | 42 |
| Somewhat negative | 20 |
| Very negative | 7 |
| Not much of an effect | 14 |
| Don't know | 4 |
| Refused | 1 |

→ The availability of news 24 hours a day on cable news channels

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Very positive | 23% |
| Somewhat positive | 41 |
| Somewhat negative | 15 |
| Very negative | 14 |
| Not much of an effect | 6 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | 1 |

→ Most news stories being available for free on the Internet

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Very positive | 32% |
| Somewhat positive | 38 |
| Somewhat negative | 15 |
| Very negative | 5 |
| Not much of an effect | 8 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | * |

Censorship, Self-Censorship and Journalism's Role in Democracy

Journalists are usually in the forefront of demands that the “public has a right to know” important facts and information. They often press government and business for information under this banner of serving the public. But journalists admit that there are situations where the media falls short, with journalists’ censoring themselves. The reasons for this are many.

We find that journalists are not afraid to monitor and criticize government institutions and are not constrained by the viewpoint of their company, but admit they self-censor when it comes to the owners of their company or major advertisers. We also find that the public sees the news media in much the same way as other institutions of democracy—its power should be limited or checked in some capacity, especially under special circumstances, but that the news media also has to uphold its responsibility to the public.

Journalists balance audience wants and news values

Deciding which stories get covered and in what manner is a never-ending challenge for news organizations. Over the past three decades, newsrooms across the country have been debating how to strike the right balance between what readers and viewers want, and what journalists think is important for the American people to know. This debate seems to have paid off, at least from the perspective of journalists. Eight in 10 (81%) journalists say journalism does a good job striking a balance between what audiences want to know and what

To start, in your opinion, how good a job does journalism do striking a balance between what audiences want to know and what's important for them to know?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|---------------|-------------|
| Very good | 13% |
| Somewhat good | 68 |
| Somewhat poor | 15 |
| Very poor | 3 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | * |

is important for them to know. But the journalists are not excessive in their self-praise: only 13 percent say journalism is doing a very good job while the bulk of journalists (68%) say journalism is doing a somewhat good job. Despite the modest nature of this judgment, journalists across the spectrum—local and national; print and broadcast; and executives, editors, producers, and staff—agree that journalism does a good job.

Some self-censorship because of owners and advertisers

Most journalists (86%) are quick to say they feel free to report the news as they see it and that they are not constrained by the viewpoint of their company. This is particularly true for national journalists, print journalists and the most seasoned journalists (30 or more years in the field).

Do you feel free to report the news as you see it or do you feel constrained by the viewpoint of your company?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|------------------|-------------|
| Feel free | 86% |
| Feel constrained | 12 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | 1 |

But there are areas where journalists clearly feel limited to some degree. Nearly half (47%) say news organizations shy away—intentionally or unintentionally—from stories that could be negative about the company’s owners. Somewhat fewer journalists feel the pressure to go easy on major advertisers. One in three (33%) say news organizations avoid, to a great or moderate extent, negative stories about major advertisers. In a similar fashion, 29 percent of journalists say the media ducks unfavorable stories about friends of the company’s owners.

Broadcast journalists are slightly more likely than print journalists to say news organizations avoid stories that might be negative about the company’s owners (49% vs. 43%, respectively) or friends of the owners (32% vs. 28%, respectively). Local journalists (36%) are also more likely than national journalists (20%) to think that news organizations avoid potentially negative stories about friends of the company’s owners. Following this pattern, broadcast journalists (46%) are more likely than print journalists (27%) and local journalists (39%) more likely than national journalists (24%) to self-censor when it comes to negative stories about major advertisers. And journalists with less than 10 years experience (45%) are more likely than more seasoned journalists, particularly those with 30 years or more experience (28%), to self-censor regarding negative stories about major advertisers.

Based on your experience, to what extent do media organizations either intentionally or unintentionally avoid news stories that are potentially unfavorable toward [see list below]?

| JOURNALISTS | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| → Owners of the company | |
| Great extent | 17% |
| Moderate extent | 30 |
| Small extent | 31 |
| Not at all | 19 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | 2 |
| → Major advertisers | |
| Great extent | 11% |
| Moderate extent | 22 |
| Small extent | 35 |
| Not at all | 28 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | 1 |
| → Friends of owners of the company | |
| Great extent | 6% |
| Moderate extent | 23 |
| Small extent | 31 |
| Not at all | 34 |
| Don't know | 4 |
| Refused | 2 |

Less self-censorship of politicians and government

Journalists feel little constraint in dealing with stories about government and politicians. Only 15 percent say the media avoids unfavorable stories about the federal government to a great or moderate extent, while the great majority (83%) say this happens only to a small extent or not at all. In the more complex example of a politician supported by the owners of the media company, only two in 10 (21%) journalists say news organizations avoid writing a possibly unfavorable story. Rather three in four (76%) think this type of self-censorship happens only to a small extent or not at all.

Journalists and public disagree on freedom of the press

The potential for government censorship is the starkest flashpoint at the intersection of government and the news media. Many journalists espouse an absolutist First Amendment case against government censorship, but the public takes a much broader view of government power, particularly in a time of terrorism. Nine in 10 (92%) journalists generally reject the right of the government to limit what the media can report. More than four in 10 (44%) say the government never has the right to limit the right of the press to report a story, and nearly half (48%) say the government rarely has that right. Few journalists (6%) say the government always or sometimes has the right.

The public takes the opposite view. A slim majority of the public (51%) say the government has the right to limit the media's reporting of a story, with 14 percent saying the government always has the right and 37 percent saying it sometimes has the right. Slightly less than half (46%) believe the government rarely or never has the right to limit what the media can report.

By adding the context of fighting terrorism to the debate, most journalists (82%) still oppose to the government's censorship of what journalists can report, although with somewhat less intensity. In contrast, public support for governmental censorship increases when it comes to terrorism—two in three (65%) support limits while half as many (31%) do not.

Based on your experience, to what extent do media organizations either intentionally or unintentionally avoid news stories that are potentially unfavorable toward [see list below]?

| JOURNALISTS | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| → The federal government | |
| Great extent | 3% |
| Moderate extent | 12 |
| Small extent | 24 |
| Not at all | 59 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | 1 |
| → Politicians supported by the owners | |
| Great extent | 4% |
| Moderate extent | 17 |
| Small extent | 35 |
| Not at all | 41 |
| Don't know | 3 |
| Refused | 1 |

Do you believe the government never, rarely, sometimes, or always has the right to limit the right of the press to report a story?

| | JOURNALISTS | PUBLIC |
|------------|-------------|--------|
| Never | 44% | 29 |
| Rarely | 48 | 17 |
| Sometimes | 6 | 37 |
| Always | * | 14 |
| Don't know | - | 4 |
| Refused | 1 | * |

And what about for purposes of fighting terrorism? Do you believe the government never, rarely, sometimes, or always has the right to limit the right of the press to report a story?

| | JOURNALISTS | PUBLIC |
|------------|-------------|--------|
| Never | 29% | 17 |
| Rarely | 53 | 14 |
| Sometimes | 15 | 37 |
| Always | 1 | 28 |
| Don't know | 1 | 4 |
| Refused | 1 | * |

Views about government censorship vary by political orientation. Self-described liberal journalists (50%) are more likely than conservatives (32%) to believe the government never has the right to limit what the media can cover. Likewise, liberal journalists (39%) are more likely than moderates (23%) and conservatives (14%) to oppose government censorship for the purpose of fighting terrorism. Among the public, a similar pattern prevails. Democrats (38%), followed by Independents (28%), are more likely than Republicans (18%) to say the government never has the right to limit the media. Similarly, Democrats (22%) and Independents (19%) are more likely than Republicans (9%) to oppose government limitations on the media for the purpose of fighting terrorism. Further, nearly four in 10 Republicans (37%) but fewer Democrats (23%) and Independents (25%) saying the government always has this right.

Public values some basic tenets of democracy more than others

The American public believes in the importance of a news media free of government censorship, but they rank this freedom well down the list of those that are critical in a democracy. When asked how important it is to live in a country where news organizations can report the news without government censorship, a majority (67%) say it is very important, and 25 percent say it is somewhat important. Only 5 percent say such press freedom is of little importance. Freedom of the press is more important to the college educated, those 30 or older, Democrats and Independents. The public is less than rock-solid in its judgment that the news media in the United States truly is free—only three in 10 (30%) say the news media’s ability to report the news without government censorship is a very apt description of the United States. A majority (51%) say this description fits the United States somewhat well.

How important is it to you to live in a country where news organizations can report the news without government censorship? Is it very important, somewhat important, not too important or not important at all?

| | PUBLIC |
|----------------------|--------|
| Very important | 67% |
| Somewhat important | 25 |
| Not too important | 3 |
| Not important at all | 2 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | * |

And how well does the statement “news organizations can report the news without government censorship” describe the United States? Does it describe it very well, somewhat well, not too well or not well at all?

| | PUBLIC |
|-----------------|--------|
| Very well | 30% |
| Somewhat well | 51 |
| Not too well | 10 |
| Not well at all | 6 |
| Don't know | 3 |
| Refused | * |

These findings stand in stark comparison to the importance most Americans place on other basic democratic tenets—a judicial system that treats everyone equally (91%), religious freedom (92%), free and fair elections (84%) and free speech (81%). In each case, overwhelming majorities say these basic tenets of democracy are very important to them.

But public still expects news media to monitor the government

Even as the public sees the government as having the power to censor the press, the public believes strongly that the news media has a responsibility to report what the government is doing with a critical eye. More than seven in 10 (74%) say the media has a responsibility to report what President Bush and his administration do and to point out any problems or faults in their plans or policies, compared to two in 10 (19%) who say such criticism undermines the President's ability to do his job. Likewise, six in 10 (62%) say the media has a responsibility to report on military leaders and the Pentagon, even during the war on terrorism and the war in Iraq, while three in 10 (32%) say such criticism is wrong.

Views about the media as watchdog vary somewhat by political orientation—Democrats (84%) and Independents (79%) are more likely than Republicans (63%) to say the media has a responsibility to point out the problems or faults in the administration's plans or policies. This partisan divide widens over whether the media has a responsibility to report on possible problems with the military's plans and policies, especially at a time of war. A large majority of Democrats (77%) and Independents (68%) think the media has this responsibility, but Republicans are divided, with as many saying it is wrong for the media to criticize military leaders (48%) as say the media has a responsibility to report what military leaders are doing (45%).

Which position is closer to your opinion?

| | PUBLIC |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| The news media should not criticize President Bush and his administration because it undermines their ability to get their job done. | 19% |
| The media has a responsibility to report what the president and his administration do and point out problems or faults in their plans or policies. | 74 |
| Don't know | 6 |
| Refused | 1 |

Which position is closer to your opinion?

| | PUBLIC |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| It is wrong for the news media to criticize military leaders and the Pentagon, especially given the war on terrorism and the war in Iraq. | 32% |
| The media has a responsibility to report what military leaders and the Pentagon are doing and point out problems or faults in their plans or policies. | 62 |
| Don't know | 5 |
| Refused | 1 |

Journalists especially good at self-criticism

Journalists view the events of the day with a critical eye, and they are not afraid to forthrightly criticize their own profession's performance in covering of the most important developments in recent years. There is broad agreement among journalists (81%) that the news media did a poor job of reporting on the problem of terrorism prior to the attacks on September 11, 2001, including nearly four in 10 (37%) who say the media did a very poor job. Furthermore, a majority (59%) say the news media has done a poor job of reporting on the Bush administration's justification for going to war in Iraq, including one in four (26%) who say it has done a very poor job. Conservative journalists (57%) are much more likely than liberal journalists (29%) to say the media has done a good job of reporting the justification for going to war in Iraq. The national journalists, who as a group took the lead in reporting the Administration's justifications for war, are the least positive about the profession's performance, with only 33 percent saying they did a good job. This compares with 46 percent of the local journalists who say the media did a good job.

Overall, how good a job did the news media do of reporting on the problem of terrorism before September 11—very good, somewhat good, somewhat poor, or very poor?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|---------------|-------------|
| Very good | 2% |
| Somewhat good | 15 |
| Somewhat poor | 44 |
| Very poor | 37 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | 1 |

Overall, how good a job has the news media done of reporting on the Bush administration's justification for war in Iraq—very good, somewhat good, somewhat poor, or very poor?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|---------------|-------------|
| Very good | 11% |
| Somewhat good | 28 |
| Somewhat poor | 33 |
| Very poor | 26 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | 1 |

Journalists are more divided on the coverage of two major policy initiatives of Presidents Bush and Clinton. Just as many journalists say the reporting on President Clinton's push for health care in 1993-94 was poor (43%) as say it was good (45%). But these views vary by political orientation. Six in 10 (61%) conservative journalists say the media did a good job reporting on the health care reform debate compared to substantially fewer liberal journalists (38%) who saw a good performance. By contrast, more journalists say the news media did a good job (53%) rather than a bad job (44%) reporting on President Bush's tax cuts. More moderate (59%) than liberal (44%) journalists say the coverage of George W. Bush's tax cuts was good. Conservative journalists were evenly split with 49 percent saying the media did a good job.

Overall, how good a job did the news media do of reporting on the health care reform debate of 1993-94—very good, somewhat good, somewhat poor, or very poor?

| JOURNALISTS | |
|---------------|----|
| Very good | 7% |
| Somewhat good | 38 |
| Somewhat poor | 30 |
| Very poor | 13 |
| Don't know | 8 |
| Refused | 3 |

Overall, how good a job has the news media done of reporting on George W. Bush's tax cuts—very good, somewhat good, somewhat poor, or very poor?

| JOURNALISTS | |
|---------------|----|
| Very good | 9% |
| Somewhat good | 44 |
| Somewhat poor | 32 |
| Very poor | 12 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | 1 |

Business Operations

For years, journalists treated discussions of the business side of news with disdain, arguing that their work should be and is untouched by considerations of profit and loss. Today, most journalists still agree that the pressure for bottom-line profits should not drive news decisions, but they clearly recognize that the drive to make quarterly profits is having a major impact in the newsroom and on the quality of the news the American public sees. As would be expected, this is one area where there are sharp differences between media executives, editors and producers, and staff journalists. Moreover, the public is keenly aware of the profit motive that impacts the quality of news coverage, fueled in part by what they see as an inherent conflict of interest with advertisers and, to a lesser extent, journalists' own motivations.

Profits should not matter, but they do

What role should the pressure to make a profit play in journalistic decisions in a news organization? According to the great majority of journalists (84%), the pressure to make a profit should not matter. More than half (53%) say profit pressures should not influence news decisions at all. And three in 10 (31%) say profits should influence journalistic decisions at a media company only to a small extent. Fewer than two in 10 (16%) journalists think profits should have any notable influence on journalistic decisions. Those journalists who are self-described conservatives are more likely to accept the profit motive (28%) than liberals (12%) or moderates (16%).

In general, to what extent **should** pressure to make a profit influence journalistic decisions at a media company—to a great extent, moderate extent, small extent, or not at all?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Great extent | 1% |
| Moderate extent | 15 |
| Small extent | 31 |
| Not at all | 53 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | * |

Despite general agreement on the goal, in the real world, does the bottom-line pressure affect the news? According to a solid majority of journalists, the answer is yes. More than two-thirds (68%) say the pressure to make a profit influences journalists' decisions to a great extent or moderate extent. One-fourth (26%) say the pressure affects news decisions to a small extent and only a handful of journalists (4%) say the pressure does not influence decisions at all.

And to what extent **does** pressure to make a profit influence journalistic decisions at a media company—to a great extent, moderate extent, small extent, or not at all?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Great extent | 23% |
| Moderate extent | 45 |
| Small extent | 26 |
| Not at all | 4 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | 1 |

Just as many local (67%) and national (66%) journalists say a profit motive influences decisions, but more local journalists (27%) than national journalists (17%) say the pressure to make a profit influences decisions to a great extent. In addition, more staff journalists (73%), and editors and producers (67%) than executives (45%) say the pressure to make a profit affects news decisions to a great or moderate extent. Conversely, executives (55%) are more likely than staff journalists (24%) and editors and producers (32%) to say the effect is small or absent.

Views about the effect of profit pressures vary by political orientation. Nearly eight in 10 liberal journalists (78%) believe the pressure to make a profit influences journalistic decisions,

compared with roughly seven in 10 moderates (66%) and even fewer conservatives (51%).

Profit pressure hits news coverage in many ways

The pressure to make a profit at a news organization has clear consequences. According to a sizeable majority of the journalists who say there is pressure to make a profit (68%), both the number of stories and the type of stories are skewed by business pressures, as are staff size and travel budgets.

Number of stories reduced. A majority of journalists (53%) say the push to make a profit has resulted in cuts in the number of stories covered each day. More of those who actually produce the stories each day—editors and producers (56%) and staff journalists (56%)—believe this is the case compared with the executives who set financial targets (33%). In addition, more print journalists (56%) than broadcast journalists (45%) have seen the pressure to make a profit influence journalistic decisions. Self-described liberal journalists (59%) are more likely than conservative journalists (40%) to say that in their experience the pressure to make a profit has led to a reduction in the number of stories covered.

Reduction in coverage type. A solid majority (64%) say the profit motive has led to a reduction in the types of stories covered overall. Again, more editors and producers (64%) and staff journalists (68%) than executives (44%) say there has been a reduction in the types of stories covered.

Nearly eight in 10 journalists (77%) say they have seen reductions in the number of stories that take extra time and money to report, such as investigative reports and in-depth features. Staff journalists are particularly sensitive to these cuts—a large majority (82%) say this is the case, compared to fewer executives (59%).

And most journalists (85%) say the pressure to make a profit has caused cutbacks in travel budgets. Staff journalists (88%) and editors and producers (84%) are more likely than executives (68%) to see the impact of travel budget limitations.

Quick and dirty stories. Profit pressures have forced one increase that is not a positive one for news quality. A majority of journalists (56%) say the number of “quick and dirty” stories has risen because of profit pressures. More than one-third (37%) of executives say this is the case, but one-half of editors and producers (52%) and even more staff journalists (62%) believe there has been an increase in the number of quick and dirty stories. Two-thirds of self-reported liberal journalists (66%) say there has been an increase in the number of quick and dirty stories compared to about one-half of moderate journalists (53%).

At the news organizations you are familiar with, how have you seen the pressure to make a profit influence journalistic decisions? Has it... *

| | JOURNALISTS N = 630 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| ...caused reductions in the number of stories covered each day? | 53% |
| ...caused cutbacks in the types of stories covered? | 64 |
| ...reduced the number of stories that take time and money to report? | 77 |
| ...caused cutbacks in travel budgets? | 85 |
| ...increased the number of quick-and-dirty stories? | 56 |
| ...led to cutbacks in the number of reporters and editors, without corresponding cutbacks in the workload? | 84 |

*Based on those who believe that pressure to make a profit influences journalistic decisions at a media company

Percentage of journalists who replied “yes”

Staff cuts. More than eight in 10 (84%) say the number of reporters, editors and producers has been cut, without a reduction in workload, due to the pressure to make a profit. Editors and producers (83%) and staff journalists (88%) are the most likely to agree with this view. But even two-thirds of executives (65%) admit the staff cuts have been made without reducing the total work to be done. Print journalists (86%) are also more likely to share this view compared to broadcast journalists (77%).

Journalists who have witnessed staff cuts in the newsroom are almost twice as likely as those who have not witnessed cuts to say the bottom line influences journalistic decisions. Journalists who have seen cutbacks in the staff are much more likely than those who have not to say that profit pressures have led to a reduction in the number of stories covered (60% vs. 16%, respectively), an increase in the number quick-and-dirty stories (62% vs. 26%, respectively) and a reduction in stories that take time and money to report (83% vs. 47%, respectively).

Public fears profit motive hurts news coverage

Journalists are not alone in worrying about the effect of the profit motive on news coverage. Three-quarters of all Americans (72%) think a news organization's efforts to make a profit get in the way of providing high quality news coverage. Only about one in four (23%) say profits do not harm the news quality. And the impact is substantial—almost nine in 10 (88%) believe the profit motive has a great impact (34%) or a moderate impact (54%) on the ability of news companies to provide high quality news coverage.

Most news companies in America are businesses that seek to make a profit. Do you think trying to make a profit gets in the way of providing high quality news coverage or not?

| | PUBLIC |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Profits get in the way | 72% |
| Profits do not get in the way | 23 |
| Don't know | 5 |
| Refused | * |

Hesitation seen before criticism of advertisers

The main source of revenue for most news media companies is advertising. And therein lies a potential problem in the public's view. The public is deeply skeptical of the news media's ability to be critical of major advertisers. Eight in 10 Americans (79%) say a media company would hesitate to report negative stories about a company that provides substantial advertising revenue to the news outlet. Only a small minority of the public (14%) disagree. This fear of advertisers receiving favorable treatment from the news media is remarkably broad. As one might expect, Americans who think profit pressures hurt the quality of news coverage are particularly skeptical, with 85 percent of that group saying a media company would hesitate to publish a negative story about an advertiser. But even among those Americans who do not think the profit motive hurts news quality, fully 69 percent say the news media will pull its punches when an advertiser is the possible subject of a negative story.

Do you believe a media company that receives substantial advertising revenue from a company would hesitate to report negative stories about that company?

| | PUBLIC |
|------------|--------|
| Yes | 79% |
| No | 14 |
| Don't know | 6 |
| Refused | * |

Public split on what motivates journalists

The public's criticism of the news business is not limited to the owners who make the bottom-line decisions. The public is somewhat split in their opinions about what motivates journalists—financial and professional success or the desire to inform the American public. Half (49%) say journalists are motivated mainly by the desire for financial and professional success and slightly fewer (42%) say they are motivated mainly by the desire to

inform the American people about important news stories. Young Americans, ages 18 to 29 (57%), men (57%), Republicans (56%), Independents (52%) and those with at least some college (52%) are more likely to say journalists are motivated mainly by the desire for financial and professional success than Americans ages 50 to 64 (46%), age 65 and older (42%), women (42%), Democrats (42%), and Americans with a high school education or less (46%).

Do you think journalists are motivated mainly by the desire for financial and professional success or mainly by the desire to inform the American people about important news stories?

| | PUBLIC |
|------------------------------------|--------|
| Financial and professional success | 49% |
| Inform the American people | 42 |
| Don't know | 9 |
| Refused | * |

Media Ownership

Media organizations are no strangers to mergers and acquisitions. The number of locally-owned newspapers and television stations has dwindled dramatically, and in the last decade it has become commonplace for smaller news organizations to be bought by larger news corporations or diversified companies. What do journalists and the public think about these acquisitions and their implications?

Journalists say corporate ownership hurts news quality

The ownership by large corporations of most newspapers, radio stations and television stations has a negative impact on the news, according to a sizable majority of journalists. Two in three (65%) journalists say the quality of the news suffers because most news organizations are owned by large corporations, while substantially fewer (21%) say it has no effect and a small percentage (11%) say it has a positive effect on the quality of news coverage. Print journalists (68%) are slightly more likely than broadcast journalists (56%) to say large corporate ownership has a negative impact on the news the American people get.

What effect, if any, does the fact that most newspapers, radio stations, and television stations are owned by large companies have on the news the American public gets—very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, very negative, or no effect at all?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-------------------|-------------|
| Very positive | 1% |
| Somewhat positive | 10 |
| Somewhat negative | 34 |
| Very negative | 31 |
| No effect at all | 21 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | 1 |

Acquisitions and diversification negative for news coverage

When asked specifically about the consequences of large newspaper chains buying smaller news organizations and news organizations being purchased by diversified corporations, journalists believe the news quality the public gets is compromised. Specifically, a solid majority of journalists (68%) say the purchase of local newspapers by larger chains has a negative effect on news quality, including one-third (35%) who say such purchases have a very negative effect. Only one in 10 (10%) see a positive effect. And the acquisition of news organizations by diversified corporations is viewed in an equally negative light. More than six in 10 (65%) journalists say such takeovers have a negative effect on news quality, including three in 10 (30%) who say they have a very negative effect.

Would you say buyouts of local newspapers by large newspaper chains have a very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, very negative, or not much of an effect on the quality of the news that the public receives?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Very positive | 1% |
| Somewhat positive | 9 |
| Somewhat negative | 33 |
| Very negative | 35 |
| Not much of an effect | 18 |
| Don't know | 4 |
| Refused | 1 |

Executives (18%) are somewhat more positive than staff journalists (7%) about the effect of buyouts of local newspapers by large newspaper chains, yet in both cases relatively few say these buyouts have a positive effect on the quality of the news the public receives. Likewise, when it comes to buyouts of news organizations by diversified corporations, few think they have a positive effect on the quality of the news the public receives but local journalists (12%) are a bit more positive than national journalists (5%).

Would you say buyouts of news organizations by diversified corporations have a very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, very negative, or not much of an effect on the quality of the news that the public receives?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Very positive | 1% |
| Somewhat positive | 7 |
| Somewhat negative | 35 |
| Very negative | 30 |
| Not much of an effect | 21 |
| Don't know | 5 |
| Refused | 1 |

Concentrated ownership cuts voices and views to public

Fueling these concerns is the journalists' view that concentration of media ownership leads to a centralization of the voices and sources Americans hear. More than seven in 10 (72%) journalists believe these ownership changes reduce, not increase, the number of different voices and views the American people can hear each day. A minority (22%) think the changes have no real impact. Only a few (4%) say the changes actually help to increase the number and variety of voices and views. Staff journalists (79%) and editors and producers (69%) are much more likely than executives (46%) to say the concentration of ownership has a negative impact on the number of voices and views heard each day.

Which of the following statements comes closest to describing your view of the recent trend in news media ownership with large corporations owning increasing numbers of newspapers, television stations, and radio stations?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| These changes in news media ownership increase the number of different voices and views that the American people can hear each day. | 4% |
| These changes in news media ownership have no real impact on the number of different voices and views that Americans can hear each day. | 22 |
| These changes in news media ownership reduce the number of different voices and views that the American people can hear each day. | 72 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | 1 |

Experience teaches acquisitions are tough on news

Many journalists (46%), particularly broadcast journalists (61%), say they have personally worked for a news organization that was acquired by a larger company. And based on their experiences, these journalists are more likely to report a decline in the quality and quantity of news after mergers and acquisitions, although their views reveal positives and negatives.

There is general agreement among these journalists (83%) that the change in ownership had a major (46%) or minor (37%) impact on

the quality or amount of the news coverage. While journalists overall paint acquisitions negatively by a large margin, those who have gone through the experience are negative, but by smaller margins. Half of journalists (51%) say the quality of the news coverage declined after the takeover. But fully three in 10 (30%) say quality improved and 18 percent saw no change.

More often, journalists say the amount of news coverage was cut by the new owners. A majority (56%) say the buyers cut the news hole available each day, but 24 percent say the amount of news increased. One in five (20%) saw no change after a buyout.

Did the change in ownership have a major impact, a minor impact, or no impact at all on the quality or amount of the news that was covered by the news organization?*

JOURNALISTS

N = 308

| | |
|------------------|-----|
| Major impact | 46% |
| Minor impact | 37 |
| No impact at all | 16 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | - |

**Based on those who during their years as a journalist worked for an organization that was acquired by a larger company*

And how did the **quality** of the news coverage change after the news organization was acquired by the larger company? Did it improve a lot, improve somewhat, decline somewhat, decline a lot, or remain the same?*

JOURNALISTS

N = 256

| | |
|-------------------|-----|
| Improved a lot | 11% |
| Improved somewhat | 19 |
| Declined somewhat | 24 |
| Declined a lot | 27 |
| Remained the same | 18 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | - |

**Based on those who during their years as a journalist worked for an organization that was acquired by a larger company and the change in ownership had an impact on the quality or amount of news that was covered by the news organization*

How did the **amount** of news coverage change after the news organization was acquired by the larger company? Did it increase a lot, increase somewhat, decline somewhat, decline a lot, or remain the same?

JOURNALISTS

N = 256

| | |
|--------------------|----|
| Increased a lot | 9% |
| Increased somewhat | 15 |
| Declined somewhat | 30 |
| Declined a lot | 26 |
| Remained the same | 20 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | * |

**Based on those who during their years as a journalist worked for an organization that was acquired by a larger company and the change in ownership had an impact on the quality or amount of news that was covered by the news organization*

Owners' motives: quality coverage or profits?

An often-heard complaint about the new owners of a news organization is that they will run the business to achieve the largest possible profits, at the cost of cutting the budgets needed for quality news coverage. One in two (49%) journalists—including staff journalists (46%), editors and producers (51%) and executives (54%)—give corporate owners the benefit of the doubt: they say the business owners strive to provide the public with factual and timely news coverage, but that business realities sometimes prevent this from happening. A sizeable minority of journalists (36%) are not that sure saying that making a profit trumps giving the public factual and timely news coverage. Only a small number of journalists (12%) say the owners' top priority is providing the public with factual and timely coverage. As might be expected, staff journalists (41%) are more likely

than executives (23%) to say corporate media owners are usually more concerned with making a profit than providing factual and timely coverage. Broadcast journalists (37%) are somewhat less likely than print journalists (53%) to give corporate owners the benefit of the doubt and say these owners usually strive to provide factual and timely news but that sometimes business realities get in the way.

And which of the following statements comes closest to your view about corporate media owners and the news the American public gets?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| The top priority of corporate media owners is to provide the public with factual, timely news coverage. | 12% |
| Corporate media owners strive to provide the public with factual, timely news coverage but business realities sometimes prevent this from happening. | 49 |
| Corporate media owners are usually more concerned with making a profit than with providing the public with factual, timely news coverage. | 36 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | 2 |

Public split over whether profits or news top priority but impact clear

The American public is evenly split over whether the top priority for corporate media owners is high profits (48%) or the delivery of high quality news coverage (46%). And this is a difference with an impact. Among those who think that media companies try first and foremost to generate high profits for the owners, most (81%) say this bottom-line focus hurts the quality of news coverage.

More men (53%) than women (42%) say media companies' top priority is to generate high profits for the owners while more women (51%) than men (41%) say the priority is to deliver high quality news coverage. Americans age 65 and older are the least likely to think the priority of media companies is to generate high profits.

Little public awareness they own airwaves

The broadcast spectrum that television and radio broadcasts use is officially owned by the public, licensed by the federal government to radio and television stations. This would be news to most Americans. Only three in 10 Americans (29%) correctly say that the public owns the airwaves. An equal number (30%) say (incorrectly) that the television and radio stations own the airwaves. A plurality (40%) acknowledge that they do not know.

Men (39%) and the college educated (38%) are somewhat more likely to know the airwaves are owned by the public than women (20%) and those with a high school education or less (24%). Likewise, slightly more Republicans (32%) and Independents (35%) than Democrats (22%) know the public owns the airwaves.

Do you think the first priority for news media companies in America today is to...

| | PUBLIC |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| Generate high profits for the owners | 48% |
| Deliver high quality news coverage | 46 |
| Don't know | 6 |
| Refused | 1 |

Do you think that the priority given to making high profits usually hurts the quality of news coverage a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or not at all?*

| | PUBLIC |
|---------------|---------|
| | N = 707 |
| A great | 36% |
| A fair amount | 45 |
| Not too much | 14 |
| Not at all | 4 |
| Don't know | 2 |
| Refused | - |

**Based on those who believe the first priority for news media companies in America today is to generate high profits for the owners*

Now, turning to a slightly different topic, do you happen to know if television and radio stations own the airwaves they use to transmit their broadcasts, or are they owned by the public?

| | PUBLIC |
|------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Television and radio stations own the airwaves | 30% |
| Owned by the public | 29 |
| Don't know | 40 |
| Refused | 1 |

Government limits on media ownership applauded by public

Over the past three decades, large companies have bought so many television and radio stations that they have bumped into the limits set by the Federal Communications Commission on the number and location of stations one company can own. While the limits on radio station ownership have been lifted, the limits on the number of television stations one company can own have been upheld by the courts, although several major media companies have filed an appeal to the Supreme Court.

A large majority of Americans (68%) say government regulations restricting the number of television and radio stations any one company can own are good for the news coverage they can receive. Just about as many (71%) agree that the restriction is good because it prevents a few big companies from determining the quality and content of broadcast programs. Only two in 10 (20%) do not support the ownership restrictions because large companies have the resources to offer more and higher quality programming than smaller companies.

The federal government has rules that restrict how many television and radio stations one company can own. In general, how do you feel about these restrictions and their effect on the news coverage we get in this country? Are they very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad for the news coverage we get in this country?

| | PUBLIC |
|---------------|--------|
| Very good | 19% |
| Somewhat good | 49 |
| Somewhat bad | 14 |
| Very bad | 7 |
| Don't know | 9 |
| Refused | * |

Some experts say the restriction on how many television and radio stations one company can own is bad because it limits big companies that have the resources to offer more programming and higher quality programming than small companies. Other experts say this restriction is good because it prevents a few big companies from determining the quality and content of much of the country's television and radio programs. Which view is closer to your own?

| | PUBLIC |
|-------------------------|--------|
| The restriction is bad | 20% |
| The restriction is good | 71 |
| Don't know | 8 |
| Refused | 1 |

Media Habits: Journalists and Public

Journalists are both producers and consumers of news and information. They draw their news from a variety of news sources, including The Associated Press, newspapers, radio, Sunday morning news shows, and blogs. Not surprisingly, journalists consume more media than the average American.

The public also gets their news and information from a variety of sources, but continue to say they primarily turn to television for news. And not all news sources attract the same audience—younger Americans are less interested in traditional news formats and are drawn to blogs and the Internet. Overall, the public prefers more than just headlines in their daily news feed.

Media Habits—Journalists

Journalists turn to AP, national newspapers for news

Three-fourths of journalists (76%) read the AP wire every day, demonstrating the wire service's central role as a source of news for the profession itself. Many journalists also read the major national newspapers—*The New York Times*, *The Los Angeles Times*, *The Wall Street Journal* and *The Washington Post*—regularly. For example, *The New York Times* is read every day by more than half of journalists (55%). One-fourth (27%) say they read the *Times* at least once or a few times a week. The next two leading papers read daily are *The Washington Post* (31%) and *The Wall Street Journal* (26%). Fewer journalists (17%) read *The Los Angeles Times* daily, reflecting in part the paper's west coast base and lack of national distribution. These major national newspapers have a greater appeal for national rather than local staff journalists. For example, three in four (76%) national journalists read *The New York Times* every day, compared to half as many local journalists (34%).

How often, if at all, do you read the following newspapers or news sources?

| JOURNALISTS | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| → AP wire | |
| Every day | 76% |
| A few times a week | 11 |
| About once a week | 3 |
| Less than weekly | 3 |
| Rarely or never | 6 |
| Don't know | - |
| Refused | 2 |
| → <i>New York Times</i> | |
| Every day | 55% |
| A few times a week | 18 |
| About once a week | 9 |
| Less than weekly | 7 |
| Rarely or never | 10 |
| Don't know | - |
| Refused | 1 |
| → <i>Washington Post</i> | |
| Every day | 31% |
| A few times a week | 17 |
| About once a week | 11 |
| Less than weekly | 16 |
| Rarely or never | 23 |
| Don't know | - |
| Refused | 2 |
| → <i>Wall Street Journal</i> | |
| Every day | 26% |
| A few times a week | 17 |
| About once a week | 14 |
| Less than weekly | 18 |
| Rarely or never | 23 |
| Don't know | - |
| Refused | 2 |
| → <i>Los Angeles Times</i> | |
| Every day | 17% |
| A few times a week | 13 |
| About once a week | 10 |
| Less than weekly | 20 |
| Rarely or never | 39 |
| Don't know | - |
| Refused | 3 |

Readership not driven by political ideology

Journalists are reading the major national newspapers regardless of their political orientation. Half of the journalists (49%) consider themselves moderate, while three in 10 (31%) describe themselves as liberal and one in 10 (9%) say they are conservative. The profile of the readership of the AP wire is almost identical to the profile of all journalists: among those who read the wire at least weekly, journalists break down as moderate (50%), liberal (32%) and conservative (8%). Likewise, the readership of *The New York Times* mirrors the overall numbers: self-identified moderate journalists (49%) followed by liberal (34%) and then conservative (7%) journalists. And the same holds true for *The Wall Street Journal* as well as the other major national newspapers.

Newspaper Readership by Journalists' Political Ideology

| Newspaper Readership* | LIBERAL | MODERATE | CONSERVATIVE | OTHER, DON'T KNOW REFUSE | TOTAL |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Journalists political ideology | 31% | 49% | 9% | 10% | = 99 |
| AP wire | 32 | 50 | 8 | 11 | = 101 |
| New York Times | 34 | 49 | 7 | 11 | = 101 |
| Washington Post | 32 | 50 | 6 | 12 | = 100 |
| Wall Street Journal | 29 | 51 | 8 | 12 | = 100 |
| Los Angeles Times | 37 | 47 | 6 | 10 | = 100 |

*At least weekly

National journalists and journalists with more than 10 years of experience read the major newspapers more frequently. *The New York Times* is read frequently by all types of journalists, although less frequently by broadcast journalists. *The Los Angeles Times* and *The Washington Post* are read somewhat more frequently by editors and staff journalists. *The Wall Street Journal* is read the most often by owners, followed by editors and producers, and then staff journalists.

Meet the Press most popular Sunday news show

Most Sunday morning news shows are viewed at least once a month by a minority of journalists. The most popular show among journalists is NBC News' *Meet the Press* with Tim Russert—half of journalists (50%) say they watch it once a month or more. Fewer watch CBS News' *Face the Nation* with Bob Schieffer (33%) or ABC News' *This Week* with George Stephanopoulos (30%) at least every month. This ranking among journalists parallels the audience ratings received by the shows. And roughly two in 10 journalists watch CNN's *Late Edition* with Wolf Blitzer (21%) or *Fox News Sunday* with Chris Wallace (16%) at least monthly.

No ideological break on main shows but conservatives watch Fox and not CNN

The profiles of the audiences for the three long-standing Sunday morning news programs—*Meet the Press*, *Face the Nation* and *This Week*—mirror the ideology of all journalists. For the smaller audiences of the two shows on cable, CNN's *Late Edition* and Fox's *Fox News Sunday*, their audiences are somewhat different when it comes to ideology. The audience of *Fox News Sunday* skews conservative, with conservative journalists making up 16 percent of the audience, almost double that of conservative journalists overall (9%). And only 16 percent of the audience of *Fox News Sunday* are liberal newspeople—half of the percentage of liberal journalists overall (31%). The audience for *Late Edition* is comprised of 35 percent liberal journalists who watch at least monthly, not far from the percentage of liberal journalists overall. But only 3 percent of the audience is conservative journalists.

Journalists with more than 20 years experience make up more of the audience for *Face the Nation* and *This Week*—while the profiles of the audiences for *Meet the Press* and *Fox News Sunday* and *Late Edition* are similar.

How often, if at all, do you watch the following Sunday morning news shows?

JOURNALISTS

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----|
| → <i>Meet the Press</i> with Tim Russert (NBC) | |
| Every week | 14% |
| About twice a month | 19 |
| About once a month | 17 |
| Less than monthly | 20 |
| Never | 29 |
| Don't know | - |
| Refused | 1 |
| → <i>Face the Nation</i> with Bob Schieffer (CBS) | |
| Every week | 5% |
| About twice a month | 12 |
| About once a month | 16 |
| Less than monthly | 25 |
| Never | 40 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | 2 |
| → <i>This Week</i> with George Stephanopoulos (ABC) | |
| Every week | 6% |
| About twice a month | 11 |
| About once a month | 13 |
| Less than monthly | 23 |
| Never | 46 |
| Don't know | - |
| Refused | 2 |
| → <i>Late Edition</i> with Wolf Blitzer (CNN) | |
| Every week | 4% |
| About twice a month | 8 |
| About once a month | 9 |
| Less than monthly | 21 |
| Never | 55 |
| Don't know | - |
| Refused | 2 |
| → <i>Fox News Sunday</i> with Chris Wallace (FOX) | |
| Every week | 3% |
| About twice a month | 6 |
| About once a month | 7 |
| Less than monthly | 17 |
| Never | 64 |
| Don't know | - |
| Refused | 3 |

Journalists listen to talk radio...

Radio shows that invite listeners to call in to discuss current events, public issues, or politics are popular among journalists. Nearly six in 10 journalists (57%) say they listen to talk radio either every day (32%) or every week (25%). One-fourth (25%) listen at least once or twice a month. Local journalists, broadcast journalists, and journalists with less than 20 years experience listen to such shows more frequently.

How often, if at all, do you listen to radio shows that invite listeners to call in to discuss current events, public issues or politics—almost every day, every week, twice a month, once a month or never?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|------------------|-------------|
| Almost every day | 32% |
| Every week | 25 |
| Twice a month | 10 |
| Once a month | 15 |
| Never | 17 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | 1 |

...and major conservative hosts lead

Journalists listen to a wide variety of radio shows, and many journalists often tune in to more than one type of radio show each month. But when asked to name the radio show hosts they have listened to in the past month, more journalists name major conservative hosts rather than liberal leaning hosts. For example, nearly four in 10 (37%) journalists name conservative radio hosts—such as Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, and Bill O'Reilly—while just 14 percent name liberal radio hosts Al Franken and Tom Joyner. In part, this may reflect the fact that conservative talk show hosts have been on the air longer and are available in nearly every radio market compared to liberal radio hosts. Controversial radio hosts—such as Howard Stern, Bob Grant, and Michael Savage—are named by two in 10 (18%) journalists while fewer (9%) name self-help or financial radio hosts—such as Dr. Dean Edell, Dr. Joy Browne, and Jim Cramer—as hosts they have listened to in the past month.

Listenership of Talk Radio Shows*

| | JOURNALISTS |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Conservative hosts (such as Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, and Bill O'Reilly) | 37% |
| Liberal hosts (such as Al Franken and Tom Joyner) | 14 |
| Controversial radio (such as Howard Stern, Bob Grant, and Michael Savage) | 18 |
| Self-help or financial (such as Dr. Dean Edell, Dr. Joy Browne, and Jim Cramer) | 9 |
| Hosts with other views (such as Larry King, Diane Rehm, and Jim Bohannon) | 40 |
| Listens to other hosts or programs (such as NPR, sports, other political talk or news) | 54 |

**Multiple mentions recorded*

There are also some clear differences in the audiences of certain radio shows. Based on the journalists who named radio show hosts they have listened to in the past month, the audience of Rush Limbaugh's radio show is comprised of nearly the same number of self-described conservative (23%) journalists and liberal (23%) journalists, even though in the full group of journalists, liberals outnumber conservatives (31% v. 9%). There is a similar pattern for the audience of all conservative radio hosts (liberal 24%, conservative 19%): conservative journalists again make up a disproportionate share of those who listen to conservative radio hosts.

Talk Radio Listenership by Journalists' Political Ideology

| TALK RADIO SHOWS* | LIBERAL | MODERATE | CONSERVATIVE | OTHER, DON'T KNOW REFUSE | TOTAL |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Journalists political ideology | 31% | 49% | 9% | 10% | = 99 |
| Conservative hosts (such as Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, and Bill O'Reilly) | 24 | 47 | 19 | 9 | = 99 |
| Liberal hosts (such as Al Franken and Tom Joyner) | 45 | 45 | 8 | 2 | = 100 |
| Controversial radio (such as Howard Stern, Bob Grant, and Michael Savage) | 39 | 40 | 12 | 9 | = 100 |
| Self-help or financial (such as Dr. Dean Edell, Dr. Joy Browne, and Jim Cramer) | 40 | 47 | 14 | - | = 101 |
| Hosts with other views (such as Larry King, Diane Rehm, and Jim Bohannon) | 37 | 47 | 10 | 6 | = 100 |
| Listens to other hosts or programs (such as NPR, sports, other political talk or news) | 36 | 46 | 7 | 11 | = 100 |

**Multiple mentions recorded*

There also other types of radio talk show hosts that journalists listen to every month. Four in 10 journalists (40%) name a variety of other radio talk show hosts—such as Larry King, Diane Rehm, and Jim Bohannon—whose political ideology is not the main feature of their show. And a majority of journalists (54%) also name a variety of other radio talk show hosts from a variety of formats—political, national news programs like NPR, and sports.

Sizeable minority read blogs

Ever increasing in number, popularity, and influence are blogs. Two in 10 journalists (20%) say they read a blog almost every day. Another one-third (32%) say they check in on a blog at least a few times a month, if not a few times a week. A small number (4%) say they even write a blog of their own.

How often, if at all, do you read a blog—almost every day, a few times a week, a few times a month, about once a month, less than monthly or never?

| | JOURNALISTS |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Almost every day | 20% |
| A few times a week | 17 |
| A few times a month | 15 |
| About once a month | 5 |
| Less than monthly | 18 |
| Never | 24 |
| Don't know | - |
| Refused | 1 |

Media Habits—Public

TV primary news source

The television continues to be the first news source for most Americans. Nearly seven in 10 (66%) Americans say television is their primary news source for national and international issues. Just 14 percent turn to newspapers as their primary source. Even fewer but notable minorities say they turn to the Internet (10%) or radio (7%) as their primary news source.

Many Americans turn to multiple sources for news, and here daily newspapers are mentioned more often. Four in 10 Americans (39%) turn to newspapers as their second source of news about national and international issues. More than two in 10 (21%) turn to television as the second source, while nearly as many turn to radio (18%) or the Internet (15%) as their second source of news.

To start, what is your [primary/second] source of news about national and international issues—television, newspapers, radio or the Internet?

| | PUBLIC | |
|------------|---------|--------|
| | Primary | Second |
| Television | 66% | 21% |
| Newspapers | 14 | 39 |
| Radio | 7 | 18 |
| Internet | 10 | 15 |
| Don't know | 1 | 5 |
| Refused | 1 | 2 |

Local TV news most viewed

Americans continue to rely on local television news more frequently than other news sources. On average, the public watches local TV news 4.4 days a week. Daily newspapers are also an important source, with the public reading a daily newspaper 3.3 days a week on average. Cable news (3.0) and national network TV news (2.7) are watched fewer days on average.

Detailed further, more than eight in 10 (84%) of the public watch local TV news at least once a week, while seven in 10 (71%) say they read a daily newspaper at least once a week. Fewer but still sizable majorities watch cable TV news (66%) and national network TV news (64%) at least once a week.

Under 30 consume less network news

Consistent with previous findings, young Americans—particularly those under age 30—consume news less frequently from the sources asked about. The frequency of viewing local and network TV news increases with age with those under age 30, followed by those ages 30 to 49, watching less frequently in a given week than those over age 50. The differences across age groups are smaller however when it comes to watching cable TV news. As for daily newspapers, Americans over age 50, especially those over age 65, read more frequently.

College educated Americans watch local TV news less frequently, but read newspapers more often. Although language barriers may be a factor, Hispanics read the newspaper less frequently than whites, while viewing of local, network, and cable TV news is similar for all ethnic and racial groups.

More Democrats watch TV

Americans' news sources vary somewhat by political party affiliation. For example, local and national network television news is watched more frequently by Democrats. On average, Democrats watch local television news 4.8 days per week compared to 4.3 days per week for Republicans and 4.0 days per week for Independents. And Democrats on average watch national television news 3.4 days per week while Republicans and Independents watch 2.3 days

How many days in the past week, did you watch **local TV news**—for example, 'Eyewitness News' or 'Action News'?

| | PUBLIC |
|-------------|--------|
| Zero | 15% |
| One – three | 22 |
| Four – five | 21 |
| Six – seven | 41 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | * |

How many days in the past week, did you read a **daily newspaper**?

| | PUBLIC |
|-------------|--------|
| Zero | 29% |
| One – three | 29 |
| Four – five | 9 |
| Six – seven | 33 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | * |

How many days in the past week, did you watch **cable news**, such as CNN, Fox News Channel or MSNBC?

| | PUBLIC |
|-------------|--------|
| Zero | 33% |
| One - three | 27 |
| Four – five | 13 |
| Six – seven | 26 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | * |

How many days in the past week, did you watch **national network news** on TV—by which I mean Peter Jennings on ABC, Dan Rather on CBS [until March 2005 then Bob Schieffer], Brian Williams on NBC or Jim Lehrer on PBS?

| | PUBLIC |
|-------------|--------|
| Zero | 36% |
| One - three | 29 |
| Four – five | 16 |
| Six – seven | 19 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | * |

per week. However, Republicans watch cable news more times per week (3.3) than Democrats (3.1) and Independents (2.8). But Democrats and Republicans read the newspaper about the same number of times per week (3.5 and 3.4) while Independents do so less often (3.0).

TV news magazines, TV talk shows and political comedy popular

Americans turn to a variety of TV programs that often cover politics and current events. Among the television news magazines, four in 10 Americans (41%) say they watch CBS News' *60 Minutes* regularly² followed closely by NBC News' *Dateline* (37%). Half as many (18%) watch ABC News' late night *Nightline* regularly. As for Sunday morning news shows, three in 10 of the public (29%) say they watch them regularly. *Larry King Live* on CNN, one of the first world-wide talk shows that allows viewers to phone-in their questions and comments, is watched regularly by more than one in 10 Americans (13%). As for television talk shows with a more aggressive and often combative dialogue, nearly two in 10 regularly watch Fox News Channel's *The O'Reilly Factor* (16%), beating out MSNBC's *Hardball* with Chris Matthews (8%).

On the lighter side, roughly two in 10 watch NBC's *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* (22%) and CBS' *Late Show with David Letterman* (19%) regularly. And to a lesser extent, Americans also watch shows that use comedy or satire to portray current events. Almost two in 10 Americans (17%) regularly turn to NBC's *Saturday Night Live*, while one in 10 (11%) turn to *The Daily Show* on the Comedy Central cable channel. And 16 percent regularly watch the television drama *The West Wing*, which focuses on people who work in the White House.

Democrats dominate news magazine audience; GOP watches O'Reilly

The ideology of the audiences for these various TV shows varies. Americans as a whole break down in this survey as Democrats 32 percent, Republicans 31 percent, and Independents 30 percent. In contrast, Democrats make up a somewhat larger portion of the regular viewing audience of *60 Minutes* (40%), *Nightline* (39%) and *Dateline* (42%) compared to Independents (27%, 27% and 25%, respectively) and Republicans (24%, 29% and 27%, respectively). And the audience who watches Sunday morning news shows regularly also leans a bit Independent (35%) and slightly less Republican (27%), with Democrats making up 31 percent. By contrast, the regular viewing audience of *The O'Reilly Factor* is comprised of more Republicans (49%) than Democrats (23%) and Independents (23%). The regular viewers of *Hardball* lean slightly Independent (36%) or Democrat (33%) rather than Republican (28%). The audience for *Larry King Live* is comprised of more Democrats (44%) than Republicans (22%) and Independents (30%).

The late-night shows—Leno and Letterman—tends to attract viewers who are Democratic. And the audience for *The Daily Show*—which touches on current events through comedy and has a younger audience—is made up of notably more Independents (38%) and Democrats (35%) than Republicans (18%).

² For ease of reporting, regular viewers are defined as those who watch at least twice a month for shows that air once or twice a week, and watch at least every week for shows that air more than twice a week.

Sizeable minority tune in to radio talk shows

More than a third of Americans (36%) say they tune in to political talk radio shows at least weekly, with 23 percent saying almost every day and 13 percent saying every week. If the range is broadened to listening at least once a month, more than half of the public (54%) tune into a talk radio show at least that often. Among Americans who say radio is their primary news source, three in four (73%) tune in, with 57 percent listening almost every day to political talk radio. This compares with less than half of those whose primary news source is the Internet (41%), and only about a third of those whose primary source is television (33%) or daily newspapers (34%).

How often, if at all, do you listen to radio shows that invite listeners to call in to discuss current events, public issues or politics—almost every day, every week, twice a month, once a month or never?

| | PUBLIC |
|------------------|--------|
| Almost every day | 23% |
| Every week | 13 |
| Twice a month | 8 |
| Once a month | 10 |
| Never | 46 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | * |

To better gauge the audiences of talk radio, we asked about four specific talk radio shows. Two in 10 Americans say they listen at least once month to conservative talk show hosts Rush Limbaugh (19%) and Bill O'Reilly (19%). Available in fewer radio markets, relatively few (5%) listen to *Air America*, the recently launched liberal radio network that airs Al Franken. And fewer than one in 10 (7%) listen at least once a month to *Counterspin*, a non-partisan weekly radio show from the watchdog organization Fairness And Accuracy In Reporting.

In addition, we asked those who say they listen to talk radio to name the radio show hosts they listen to. Among those who could name the radio show hosts they have listened to in the past month, more than one-third (36%) of Americans name conservative radio hosts—including Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, and Bill O'Reilly. Controversial or edgy talk show hosts such as Howard Stern or Michael Savage are named by one in 10 (9%) Americans as hosts they listen to at least monthly. Relatively few of the

Radio Shows—Named radio hosts*

| | PUBLIC |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Conservative hosts (such as Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, and Bill O'Reilly) | 36% |
| Liberal hosts (such as Al Franken and Tom Joyner) | 5 |
| Controversial radio (such as Howard Stern, Bob Grant, and Michael Savage) | 9 |
| Self-help or financial (such as Dr. Dean Edell, Dr. Joy Browne, and Jim Cramer) | 1 |
| Hosts with other views (such as Larry King, Diane Rehm, and Jim Bohannon) | 5 |
| Listens to other hosts or programs (such as NPR, sports, other political talk or news) | 60 |

*Multiple mentions recorded

public cite liberal radio hosts Al Franken and Tom Joyner (5%); major radio show hosts for whom political ideology is not a major issue (5%); or major self-help or financial radio show hosts (1%). And similar to journalists, a majority of the public (60%) name numerous other radio talk show hosts that deliver information in a variety of formats—political, national news programs such as NPR, local, sports, and “drive-time” shows.

More Republicans tune in to talk radio

Based on those who could name the radio show hosts they have listened to in the past month, the audience of Rush Limbaugh's radio show is made up of mostly Republicans (70%) and few Democrats (15%) or Independents (12%). And the audience profile is nearly identical when all the major conservative talk show hosts are taken into account. In contrast, although few tune in to major liberal radio hosts Al Franken and Tom Joyner, the audience is made up of mostly Democrats (67%), a minority of Independents (25%) and few Republicans (4%). And the audience for controversial or edgy radio show hosts—such as Howard Stern or Michael Savage—is comprised mainly of Republicans (38%) and Independents (40%) and half as many Democrats (16%).

Half use Internet regularly

Americans continue to turn to the Internet for their news. Among the eight in 10 (80%) Americans who say they have access to the Internet at home or at work, more than half (57%) say they go online at least once a week to get information about current events, public issues, and politics, including 22 percent who go online every day for news and information. More than four in 10 (44%) say they never go online for information about current events and politics.

Young and well educated turn to Internet

The young and well-educated go online to get their news and information more than older and less well-educated Americans. Six in 10 Americans under age 50 with access to the Internet (61%) go online at least once a week to get information about current events, public issues or politics, compared to slightly less than half (47%) over age 50. Nearly three in 10 between age 30 and 49 (27%) and two in 10 under age 30 (18%) go online for news seven days a week. More men with access to the Internet (60%) go online for their information about current events, public issues or politics than women (52%). And two in three with at least some college (69%) go online at least once a week compared to notably fewer with a high school education or less (40%).

Blogs an attraction

Reflecting one of the many transformations in the media, some Americans are turning to blogs for information, criticism and news. Nearly three in 10 Americans (28%) say they read an Internet blog at least once a month, including two in 10 (18%) who read them daily or weekly. And among Americans who say the Internet is their primary news source, more than half (54%) read a blog every day (34%) or every week (20%), compared to fewer than two in 10 whose primary news source is television (13%), radio (16%), or daily newspapers (17%).

How often, if at all, do you read an Internet Blog—almost every day, every week, twice a month, once a month or never?*

| | PUBLIC |
|------------------|---------|
| | N = 741 |
| Almost every day | 10% |
| Every week | 8 |
| Twice a month | 3 |
| Once a month | 7 |
| Never | 69 |
| Don't know | 3 |
| Refused | - |

*Based on Form B respondents

Young and well-educated turn to blogs

Blogs have become a component of the media diet of young, well-educated Americans. Nearly half (45%) of those under age 30 read a blog at least once a month. And many under age

30 are frequent readers—three in 10 (29%) read a blog at least weekly, compared to fewer of those age 30 to 49 (20%), age 50 to 64 (15%) and over age 65 (6%). And those with at least some college (25%) read a blog at least weekly, compared to half as many with less education (11%). Republicans (23%) and Independents (21%) are more likely than Democrats (12%) to read an Internet blog at least weekly.

Interest in a variety of stories, followed by political news

We now know how Americans get their news. But what type of news do they care about most? Topping the list, nearly all Americans are interested in stories about the nation (93%) and their local community (92%), with roughly two in three saying they are very interested. Most Americans are also interested in news stories about the world (91%), health (90%), and education (88%)—with just over half very interested in each case. And nearly as many are interested in news stories about the weather (84%), or business and the economy (83%).

Stories about politics also garner interest. Seven in 10 Americans (69%) say they are interested in news stories about politics in Washington—three in 10 (32%) are very interested. And a majority of Americans (55%) are interested in news stories about political campaigns, although only two in 10 (21%) are very interested.

Americans are equally interested in most news stories regardless of their political affiliation. However, Democrats are somewhat more likely than Republicans and Independents to be very interested in news stories about education (64% vs. 50% and 55%) and health (63% vs. 49% and 50%).

Interest in news varies by age, with the youngest usually the least interested and those over age 50 the most interested. For example, those over age 30 show more interest in news stories about the nation, their local community, business and the economy, and the weather. When it comes to news stories about politics in Washington, political campaigns, the world and health, the key difference is between those under age 50 and those over age 50, with the older Americans saying they are more interested. However, Americans under age 30 are less interested in stories about politics in Washington than older Americans. All age groups are very interested in stories about education.

How interested are you in news stories about [see list below]?

| | PUBLIC |
|--------------------------|--------|
| → Our nation | |
| Very interested | 63% |
| Somewhat interested | 30 |
| Not too interested | 3 |
| Not at all interested | 3 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| Refused | * |
| → Local community | |
| Very interested | 65% |
| Somewhat interested | 27 |
| Not too interested | 4 |
| Not at all interested | 3 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | * |
| → The world | |
| Very interested | 53% |
| Somewhat interested | 38 |
| Not too interested | 4 |
| Not at all interested | 4 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | * |
| → Politics in Washington | |
| Very interested | 32% |
| Somewhat interested | 37 |
| Not too interested | 14 |
| Not at all interested | 15 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | 1 |
| → Political campaigns | |
| Very interested | 21% |
| Somewhat interested | 34 |
| Not too interested | 20 |
| Not at all interested | 24 |
| Don't know | * |
| Refused | * |

Public wants more than just headlines

When it comes to major news stories, most Americans want more than headlines. More than a third (36%) say they want in-depth analysis by experts and nearly as many opt for the less-detailed package of headlines plus some further reporting (29%). Less than a third (28%) just want the headlines. Americans who rely on daily newspapers (46%) or the radio (48%) as their primary news source are somewhat more likely to say they prefer in-depth analysis of major news stories than those who rely on television (34%) or the Internet (29%).

Regarding party affiliation, slightly more Democrats (39%) and Independents (40%) prefer in-depth analysis compared to Republicans (32%). More women (32%) than men (26%) favor headlines plus some further reporting, while more men (39%) than women (33%) prefer in-depth analysis. Those under 30 are slightly more likely to pick just headlines compared to older Americans, while those over age 50 stand out in their interest in in-depth analysis compared to those ages 30 to 49.

But not overwhelmed with information

Despite the rapid increase in the number of news options and the means to obtain the news, the public does not feel overloaded with information—more than two in three (69%) say they like having so much information available. Younger Americans stand out in this regard. For example, most Americans under age 30 (84%) like having abundant information compared to fewer Americans ages 30 to 49 (73%), ages 50 to 64 (61%), and those 65 and older (54%). And those whose primary news source is the Internet are more likely to say they like so much information (78%) compared to those whose primary source is television (68%) or newspapers (65%).

For major news stories, what do you usually want in the news? Are you mostly interested in the HEADLINES, do you want the headlines PLUS some further reporting on what happened, or do you want in-depth analysis of the news by experts?

| | PUBLIC |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Headlines | 28% |
| Headlines plus some further reporting on what happened | 29 |
| In-depth analysis of the news by experts | 36 |
| Don't know | 6 |
| Refused | 2 |

Some people say they feel overloaded with information these days, considering all the TV news shows, magazines, newspapers, and computer information services. Others say they like having so much information to choose from. How about you... do you feel overloaded or do you like having so much information available?

| | PUBLIC |
|-------------------------------------------|--------|
| Feel overloaded | 27% |
| Like having so much information available | 69 |
| Don't know | 4 |
| Refused | 1 |