

VIRAL VIEWERS: EXAMINING THE ROLE OF PARASOCIAL INTERACTION ON
LOCAL TV NEWS WEB SITE VISITORS' LOYALTY AND COMMITMENT

by

JOY CHAVEZ MAPAYE

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the School of Journalism and Communication
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

September 2010

University of Oregon Graduate School

Confirmation of Approval and Acceptance of Dissertation prepared by:

Joy Mapaye

Title:

"Viral Viewers: Examining the Role of Parasocial Interaction on Local TV News Web site Visitors' Loyalty and Commitment"

This dissertation has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the Department of Journalism and Communication by:

Kim Sheehan, Chairperson, Journalism and Communication

Scott Maier, Member, Journalism and Communication

Biswarup Sen, Member, Journalism and Communication

David Boush, Outside Member, Marketing

and Richard Linton, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies/Dean of the Graduate School for the University of Oregon.

September 4, 2010

Original approval signatures are on file with the Graduate School and the University of Oregon Libraries.

© 2010 Joy Chavez Mapaye

An Abstract of the Dissertation of

Joy Chavez Mapaye

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the School of Journalism and Communication to be taken

September 2010

Title: VIRAL VIEWERS: EXAMINING THE ROLE OF PARASOCIAL
INTERACTION ON LOCAL TV NEWS WEB SITE VISITORS' LOYALTY
AND COMMITMENT

Approved: _____

Kim Sheehan

The purpose of this research is to advance understanding of mediated relationships in the form of parasocial interaction (PSI) in local television news branding efforts, particularly the influence of PSI on loyalty and commitment outcomes. This research is the first of its kind to attempt a test of both the TV PSI construct and Web PSI construct and their applicability to local news in the digital age. As part of this examination, the study introduces the concept of viral viewers. Motivated in part by affect, these viewers are willing to promote the station and its content across media platforms. Viewing and visiting characteristics leading to TV station and Web site loyalty and commitment are also identified.

This study uses an online survey to explore three research questions and four hypotheses. The population of interest is visitors to local television news Web sites.

Television stations in the Pacific Northwest were solicited to take part in the study. Six participating stations posted the survey on their Web sites. Data were collected from 277 respondents.

Regression models showed Web PSI, station usefulness/quality, and TV PSI are all statistically significant predictors of loyalty and commitment. Web PSI has the largest beta coefficient when compared to the contribution of other variables. Hierarchical multiple regression also found that station usefulness/quality, site usefulness/quality, TV PSI, and Web PSI partially mediated the relationship between viewing and visiting characteristics and loyalty and commitment. The study concludes that local TV stations must be mindful of producing good content with viral potential in order to acquire help from viral viewers. Furthermore, news personalities remain important to overall brand strategy.

This research fills three significant gaps in the literature surrounding local TV news research. First, it brings research on parasocial interaction into the digital age, advancing the application of the TV and Web parasocial constructs. Second, this study reconceptualizes notions of audience and promotion by introducing the concept of viral viewers. Third, it brings together scholarship regarding branding and local TV news, providing a systematic analysis of branding's role in local TV stations' multi-platform news strategy.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Joy Chavez Mapaye

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon
Washington State University at Pullman

DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of Philosophy, Communication and Society, 2010, University of Oregon
Master of Arts, Communication, 2000, Washington State University at Pullman
Bachelor of Arts, Communication, 1997, Washington State University at Pullman

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

New Media and Digital Culture
Television News
Marketing Communications

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Assistant Professor, University of Alaska Anchorage, 2005-present
Term Assistant Professor, University of Alaska Anchorage, 2003-2005
Reporter and Fill-in Anchor/Producer, KTUU-TV, 2001-present
Medical Content Editor, KTUU.com, 2007-2010

GRANTS, AWARDS AND HONORS:

- Procreativity Documentary Grant Project: Teen Pregnancy in Alaska,
University of Alaska Anchorage, 2010
- Glenn Starlin Fellowship Award, University of Oregon, 2009
- Kappa Tau Alpha National Honor Society in Journalism and Mass
Communication, University of Oregon, 2009
- RTVJ Division Top Faculty/Student Co-authored Paper Award,
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 2009
- Communication Technology Division Open Category Paper Award,
Broadcast Education Association, 2008
- Anchorage as Portal, Place and Process: Growing the Diverse Voices of
Anchorage Grant Project, University of Alaska Anchorage, 2007
- Alaska's Top 40 Under 40 Award, Anchorage Chamber of Commerce and
The Alaska Journal of Commerce, 2006
- Outstanding Alumna Award, Women of Color Day Celebration,
Honored by the Coalition of Women Students, Washington State University,
2005
- Best News Story, Alaska Broadcasters Association, 2004
- “We are Anchorage” Grant Project, University of Alaska Anchorage, 2004
- Best Documentary, The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northwest, Emmy nomination, 2003

PUBLICATIONS:

- Ryan, K., & Mapaye, J.C. (2010). Beyond “Anchorman”: A comparative analysis of
race, gender, and correspondent roles in network news. *Electronic News*, 4,
97-117.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Someone once said a dissertation is a process, not a product. This process has taught me many things, but most of all I've learned that no one can do this entirely on their own. This dissertation exists because so many wonderful people have allowed me to pursue this intellectual journey.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my colleagues at the University of Alaska Anchorage and the Department of Journalism and Public Communications, especially Dr. Fred Pearce for permitting me to take a leave of absence.

Next, I would like to thank the remarkable professors at the School of Journalism and Communication at the University of Oregon, especially Dr. Leslie Steeves, Dr. John Russial, and Rebecca Force. I am also grateful to my colleague, research partner, and friend Dr. Kathleen Ryan, as well as my doctoral cohort "The Excelsiors" (Lisa, Greg, Phil and Hiroko) for their support.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Scott Maier, Dr. Biswarup Sen, and Dr. Dave Boush for their time, expertise, and guidance. Not only are they renowned scholars and astonishing professors, but some of the nicest and most supportive people I've ever met.

My deepest gratitude goes to my dissertation committee chair and adviser, Dr. Kim Sheehan. This dissertation would not have been possible without her. During this journey, her guidance, patience, and knowledge helped me to overcome obstacles and achieve this goal. As a friend and mentor, she was there every step of the way, taking

the time to read multiple drafts and answer countless e-mails. She was a vital lifeline during this process. I will forever be grateful.

My appreciation also goes to my parents, my sister Michelle, my brothers Ferdinand and Emmanuel for providing a foundation of faith and for being a constant source of love and support. Finally, I would like to thank my husband Dale for his patience, kindness, and unconditional love during this challenging, but ultimately rewarding process. In many ways, I share this Ph.D. with him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| The Significance of Parasocial Interaction | 4 |
| Plans for Research..... | 6 |
| II. FROM TV VIEWERS TO VIRAL VIEWERS | 7 |
| Local TV News Is Born | 8 |
| The TV News Audience..... | 10 |
| TV News Promotion | 11 |
| Local TV News Online | 12 |
| The Local TV News Online Audience..... | 16 |
| Viral Viewers: Audience as Promotion | 20 |
| Cultivating the Local TV News Identity..... | 21 |
| Summary | 23 |
| III. LITERATURE REVIEW | 24 |
| Branding and Television..... | 24 |
| Affective Economics and Television | 34 |
| Parasocial Interaction and Television | 38 |
| Theoretical Limitations..... | 42 |
| Research Questions..... | 43 |
| Hypotheses..... | 45 |

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| IV. METHODS | 47 |
| Survey Research..... | 47 |
| Participants..... | 50 |
| Survey Instrument..... | 54 |
| Treatment of Data | 61 |
| Respondent Profile..... | 70 |
| Validity | 71 |
| Summary | 73 |
| V. RESULTS | 75 |
| Respondent Media Use Profile | 76 |
| Loyalty and Commitment Predictors | 80 |
| Research Question 1 | 80 |
| Parasocial Interaction..... | 85 |
| Research Question 2 | 85 |
| Mediated Relationships..... | 90 |
| Research Question 3 | 90 |
| Hypotheses..... | 101 |
| Hypothesis 1..... | 101 |
| Hypothesis 2..... | 102 |
| Hypothesis 3..... | 102 |

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| Hypothesis 4..... | 103 |
| Summary of Results..... | 104 |
| VI. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS | 107 |
| Implications for Theory | 108 |
| Branding..... | 108 |
| Affective Economics..... | 109 |
| Parasocial Interaction..... | 111 |
| Implications for Practice | 112 |
| News Anchors/Personalities | 113 |
| News Web Sites | 115 |
| Promotions/Audience..... | 116 |
| Media Habits..... | 118 |
| Limitations and Future Research | 119 |
| Limitations | 120 |
| Future Research | 123 |
| Conclusion | 125 |
| APPENDICES | 127 |
| A. LOCAL TV NEWS SURVEY..... | 124 |
| B. ADVANCE NOTICE E-MAIL..... | 145 |
| C. FOLLOW-UP LETTER..... | 147 |

| Chapter | Page |
|---|------|
| D. FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL WITH SURVEY LINK..... | 149 |
| E. FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL REMINDER..... | 151 |
| F. THANK YOU E-MAIL..... | 153 |
| G. POSTED SURVEYS | 155 |
| H. MODEL SUMMARY AND ANOVA TABLES FOR RESEARCH QUESTION 3..... | 162 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 195 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Measurement Summary | 63 |
| 2. Variables for Research Question 3 | 68 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

By March 2010, revenue for local television news stations was in a free fall (Pew, 2010). A report by the Pew Project for Excellence in Journalism on television stations around the country showed an estimated 22% drop in profits from 2008 to 2009, with some analysts predicting another decline from 2009 to 2010. The report indicated that almost all major monetary indices for local TV are pointing down.

The primary reason behind the downturn is audience fragmentation. The report found that in every designated market area (DMA) the size of the local television news audience is in sharp decline. The study shows downward trends for every time of day and for every month of the year. The key metrics for audience in television (ratings and shares) show loss of audience across all news products: morning newscasts, early evening news, and late news.

The Pew study shows the audience decline is part of long-term trend at stations around country. In the 1970s and 1980s, television news drew large audiences. Local television news, in particular, enjoyed a big share of advertising revenue (Campbell, 2006; Malone, 2009). Today, however, the media environment is highly competitive. News organizations fight for a much smaller share of the broadcast audience, while competing online for an audience as well.

For many in the broadcast industry, the fierce media competition has brought about anxiety. With more people online, the broadcast audience continues to fragment.

In 1998, nearly two-thirds of the public (64%) watched local television news. A decade later, by 2008, that number had fallen to 52% (Pew, 2010; Pew, 2008).

Further, the erosion in audience took an even bigger toll on local stations in 2008 and 2009. Audience decline, coupled with the economic recession, resulted in low profit margins as local advertising revenue continued to wither. Stations saw budget cutbacks and layoffs. A 2009 study from the Radio Television Digital News Association (RTDNA)'s survey of local TV stations found more than 1,200 people in TV news lost their jobs in 2008, about 4.3% of the local TV news workforce. The RTDNA report also showed that average salaries dropped, as did the news budget across market sizes. Stations with the smallest staffs were the ones most likely to cut back on the number of hours it broadcasts news. In his analysis, RTDNA researcher Bob Papper noted, "This is the worst budget report I've seen in 15 years" (Papper, 2009).

Some of the laid off employees from local TV stations were considered to be among the most experienced and well-known on-air news personalities at their stations (Malone, 2009; Stelter, 2008). The layoffs that took place across the country saw many longtime anchors as casualties in stations' attempts to balance the budget. Even the *New York Times* called local TV news anchors "a dying breed" (Stelter, 2008). The *Times* report noted that stations looking to cut costs saw veteran anchors' salaries as tempting targets.

The layoffs of popular local news anchors and reporters go against the grain of traditional marketing efforts in local television news. Before the advent of digital and social media, most would argue that talent was king on local television (Allen, 2001; Eastman, 2000). Local TV stations guarded popular anchors and reporters. Personalities

dominated the local TV airwaves and ultimately, the ratings. News managers and news consultants knew the formula was simple: The more likeable the personality, the more likeable the station, the more likely viewers would tune in and bring needed advertising revenue with them. Personality and the viability of the station have always been linked.

This linkage is a core principle behind branding. Bellamy and Traudt (2000) maintained that strong brand identity is vital to producing audiences, expanding markets, and opening new markets. They defined branding as a way to make a product “stand out” from competitors. For television, Freeman (1999) explained, this means creating a distinct personality from other channels of programming. Ferguson (1992) stated that a strong brand image has a greater likelihood of becoming part of an individual or family’s routine, what he calls “channel repertoire.” Ferguson maintained that despite the unending number of channel choices, viewers tend to follow a routine and limit their choice to select channels. Bellamy and Traudt emphasized that differentiation is vital in establishing this type of loyalty. Anchors and other news personalities help to provide this difference.

Some scholars argue it is also this difference that will help people cross media platforms. Jenkins (2006) called affective economics “the solution to a perceived crisis in American broadcasting – a crisis brought about by shifts in media technology that are granting viewers much greater control over the flow of media into their homes” (p.54). Jenkins argues that people are more likely to pursue content across media platforms if there is an emotion attachment. Using an online survey and other methods, he tested this notion on entertainment television. Jenkins found evidence of affective ties, but did not

formulate a construct to test the phenomenon. In local television news, academic research has also found evidence of this emotional tie in the form of parasocial interaction.

The Significance of Parasocial Interaction

The notion of parasocial interaction (PSI) or pseudo friendships with local TV newscasters establishes that emotional bonds can exist between audience members and news personalities (Levy, 1979). A parasocial relationship is one-sided and not reciprocal (Horton & Wohl, 1956). It is the audience member, not the mediated performer who forms the relationship through continual encounters over time. In some cases, this bond could be even more important than the television content itself (Giles, 2002; Perse, 1990).

The earliest study to examine this emotional attachment in the local news context was Levy (1979). In the research, Levy found evidence of parasocial interaction. News viewers often thought of news anchors and reporters as “like friends.” Levy noted that members of the news audience created affective ties with newscasters; these ties were further strengthened over shared experiences. These experiences include important news stories or the “happy talk” banter among newscasters.

In order to further explore this mediated relationship, Rubin, Perse and Powell created the original TV PSI scale in 1985. Later, Rubin and Perse (1987) modified the original 20-item parasocial interaction scale to 10 items. Since then, the 10-item scale has been used to study a range of questions concerning TV viewing motivation (Conway & Rubin, 1991), satisfaction with soap operas (Perse & Rubin, 1988), local TV news involvement (Perse, 1990), and others. In 1999, Hoerner adapted the PSI scale to examine interaction between Web visitors and Web sites. Rather than actual persons as the basis for

parasocial interaction, Hoerner maintained that the design and ease-of-use of the Web site itself can be the foundation of a parasocial relationship.

While Hoerner helped move the study of parasocial interaction to the Internet, no studies have yet applied Web PSI to that of local TV news Web sites. Further, despite the range of activity regarding TV PSI in the late 1980s and early 1990s, very little movement has taken place in terms of developing the TV PSI construct. This is especially true in terms of its applicability to the local news context and how parasocial interaction affects the loyalty and commitment of online viewers. In addition, the conceptualization of the television news audience has not been fully developed in parasocial research. Past studies in parasocial interaction have failed to recognize the capabilities of audience members to do promotional work on behalf of local news stations. In a digital and social media age, these capabilities can no longer be ignored. As such, this study attempts to address all of these issues surrounding parasocial interaction.

The purpose of this research is three-fold. First and foremost, this study assesses the importance of parasocial interaction on local TV news Web site visitors' loyalty and commitment to the TV station's news programs, station Web site, and station brand. Second, this research determines to what extent parasocial constructs for television and the Web differ and outlines key differences and similarities. Third, the study identifies key attributes outside of parasocial interaction that contribute to loyalty and commitment. These attributes include viewer attitudes and behaviors.

This research fills three critical gaps in the academic literature surrounding local TV news research. First, it brings research on parasocial interaction into the digital age, extending and updating the application of the TV and Web PSI constructs. Second, this

study provides insight into the online local TV news audience and also helps to conceptualize the notion of viral viewers. Third, it fills the divide in the academic literature regarding branding and local TV news, providing a systematic analysis of branding's role in local TV stations' multi-platform strategy.

Plans for Research

Since visitors to local television news Web sites are the population for this study, the next chapter provides context by discussing local television news in the digital age. Essentially, the chapter outlines how news consumption in the digital era has changed, shifted audience expectations and habits, and left local television news stations attempting to adapt. The second chapter also outlines strategies many stations have implemented in order to connect with the news audience. Chapter II discusses the evolution of the TV news viewer and provides the characteristics of viral viewers. Next, the third chapter presents a review of important literature in branding, affective economics, and parasocial interaction. The literature review provides key definitions related to the TV and Web parasocial constructs, loyalty, and commitment. Based on this overview, three research questions and four hypotheses are presented. The fourth chapter discusses the method used for analysis of these research questions and hypotheses, as well as detailed procedures on the tests used to examine the variables in the study. An online self-administered questionnaire was used to investigate the research questions and hypotheses. The fifth chapter discusses the findings of this study. Lastly, the final chapter addresses the implications of the results, the study's limitations, and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER II

FROM TV VIEWERS TO VIRAL VIEWERS

Since online television viewers are the population for this study, Chapter II provides an overview of the local television news industry and its audience. This overview includes a discussion of the changing digital and social media environment and how both the industry and the online television news audience are attempting to navigate this climate.

The first section of this chapter chronicles the history of local television news and traditional notions of audience and promotion. The next section reviews changes in industry, audience, and promotion. This section includes the local television news industry's transition from producing on-air broadcasts to online news and thereafter to multiple platforms and engagement strategies with social media. The subsequent section discusses viral marketing and how the present television news environment has facilitated the notion of viral viewers. The last section of the chapter outlines the significance of these changes and the importance of local TV stations cultivating their own identities outside of network affiliation. This chapter helps to provide context for the research study.

Local TV News Is Born

For the most part, the history of local television news remains understudied. One of the primary reasons for this is practical. It is simply much easier to focus on network news rather than the hundreds of local stations around the country (Hinds, 1995). While it is difficult to pinpoint the idea of “first” in local television news, there are moments of importance that clearly warrant mention.

The book *News Is People* chronicles the late 1940s as an important time for local television news. On July 16, 1948 New York’s local TV station WPIX Channel 11 debuted its newscast called the “Telepix Newsreel” (Allen, 2001). Many consider this time frame to be the dawn of the local television news era. KTLA in Los Angeles, WBKB in Chicago and others also began broadcasting at about this time. The day after its debut, WPIX covered its first major story – a plane headed for LaGuardia Airport crashed in Pennsylvania. Two dozen New Yorkers were on board. WPIX provided updates and film footage of the crash, while the television networks featured week-old footage of news out of Berlin and Jerusalem (Allen, 2001). In many ways, this incident shows the immediacy and impact local stations provided that the networks could not match.

The number of local stations increased after the Federal Communications Commission ended the television license freeze in 1952. Local newscasts also increased in terms of air time, going from 15 minutes to 30 and some to an hour of local news (Hinds, 1995). The television networks continued to maintain affiliate stations across the country, sharing both entertainment and news programming. These affiliates, however,

also became a source of local news footage for the networks when a big story broke in the area.

Local television news began to turn a profit in the mid 1970s, with interest in the Watergate scandal and improved quality of local TV news (Campbell, 2006). At this time, competition remained limited for television news. Local TV stations competed with each other on the local level and national television news dominated the national media landscape. Because of this dominance, historians have dubbed this time period as the “network era” (Campbell, 2006). This era would eventually give way to the current fragmented media landscape.

Today, there are more than one thousand local television stations around the country. These stations are classified by Designated Market Areas (DMA). According to the Nielsen Media Research Company, an individual DMA includes all homes with television in the market area, and DMAs are ranked according to the number of homes with television. There are 210 television markets in the United States. A large market includes Seattle, Washington and Portland, Oregon and others in the 1-25 Nielsen DMA. A medium market includes Spokane, Washington and other cities in the 26-50 and 51-100 DMA. A small market includes Anchorage, Alaska; Eugene, Oregon; and Medford, Oregon and those in the 101-150 and 151-210 DMA. As for affiliations, the majority of local stations, more than 600, are affiliated with the three major networks of ABC, CBS, or NBC. More than 100 stations are affiliated with FOX, while more than 300 are independent stations that may carry programs through the WB and others (Hinds, 1995).

There are also more than 350 non-commercial Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) member stations (PBS, 2010).

The TV News Audience

Interest in the television audience goes back to the birth of the medium. From the beginning, there was a need to count who was watching. In the 1950s, A.C. Nielsen became the company associated with television ratings. Nielsen ratings became critical benchmarks for success and often determined whether a television show lived or died (Campbell, 2006). In all local television markets, November, February, May, and July are the months designated for Nielsen ratings (many larger DMAs collect ratings data during other months as well). The ratings and shares from these time periods can affect local stations' profits. Ratings and shares determine how much local stations can charge advertisers for television commercials. The revenue is then used to fund the news department and other station operations. In many ways, the audience plays a role in the business of television stations.

From a scholarly perspective, there are many research traditions within audience studies. For the most part, however, theories of audience activity are reflected in two primary paradigms: the audience as passive consumers of media content and the audience as active interpreters of their experience (McQuail, 2000). The former assumes the audience as uniform and easily manipulated; the latter assumes the audience as multifaceted contributors whose preferences and experiences influence media use (McQuail, 2000).

As with early research into media effects, early television studies also catered in large part to passive consumption models (McQuail, 2000). The “hypodermic” model of effects dominated. This model asserts that TV viewers simply watched and did not contribute. TV viewers did not interact with television content. However, in the 1970s and the 1980s, British cultural studies began to redefine assumptions about television’s relationship with its audience (Spigel & Olsson, 2004). Rather than approaching television as a powerful persuader of masses, the interest now centered on what the audience did with the medium.

TV News Promotion

Part of that interest rested on the idea of audience “flow.” Williams (1975) developed the notion of flow by conceptualizing television in terms of its continuity of content. Rather than merely attending to one program, television provides “flow” or an endless and seamless array of news, entertainment, and advertising. His work is considered one of the founding texts of television studies. Promotion attempts to understand and explain audience “flow” or how members of the audience move from one program to the next or one medium to the next (Caldwell, 2003).

While important, academic literature surrounding the influence of promotion on local television news remains thin. In some respects, the limited literature stems from the conflict surrounding the promotion of television newscasts. Early on, these debates centered on the conflicting role of the media as the Fourth Estate and the marketing strategies needed to acquire and retain an audience (Buchman, 2000). This underlying conflict remains an issue.

From a scholarly perspective, there are many ways to analyze promotion and its functions. Eastman (2000) outlined three primary ways to frame television promotions for analysis: as mini-programs for television shows, as motivators for viewers, and as commercials for programs. For decades, television stations have used promotion to recruit and retain an audience. A bigger audience often translates into higher ratings, which consequently impacts the television station's bottom line. The audience, in many ways, determines the fate of the television station. Promotion is vital in that it helps the audience find the television content. As the competition increases in the media landscape, the need for promotion rises as well. Bellamy and Traudt (2000) showed that intense competition creates a need for constant self-promotion. In addition, promotion is critical in efforts to get TV viewers to cross media platforms (Ferguson, 2000).

Local TV News Online

Ferguson (2000) attempted to map this type of audience flow from television to television station Web sites. Television began to invest in Web sites in the early 1990s. The networks first used their online presence primarily for tie-ins with entertainment shows and to add value to existing broadcast content (King, 1998). Local stations, meanwhile, reworked on-air newscasts for the Web. Content analysis of early Web sites showed these sites often contained dated material and promotional content, but not a lot of news or updates (Bates and King, 1996).

Even as recently as 2003, another study of local television news Web sites found little reason for TV viewers to go online. Using content analysis, researchers discovered text-only stories were the most common content on local TV station Web sites. The study

also found as many as 55 percent of the stations did not have more information about on-air stories on the Web site (Pitts, 2003). Other research as well points to broadcast television's lack of interactivity and personalization. In 2000, researchers found sites simply re-proposed on-air content for the online medium (Chan-Olmsted & Park, 2000). This approach, however, does little to retain and attract new audiences – especially for local news (Pitts, 2003). Studies showed viewers want to interact with TV news, not just watch it (Papper, 2006).

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, social media emerged as a new and different way to engage the audience. Social media is defined as public or semi-public Web-based services that allow people to view and share connections and commentary online (Boyd & Ellison, 2007). Blogs were one of the first of these applications to appear. Blogs have been a growing phenomenon since 1998. In that year, there was an estimated 30,000 blogs. By the beginning of 2004, however, that number had grown to at least three million (Johnson & Kaye, 2004). The blog phenomenon caught on so quickly – that many have dubbed 2004 as “The Year of the Blog” (Abrahamson, 2005; McGann, 2005). What began, however, as a way to share personal information, underwent transformation. Today, the definition of a blog has expanded and their uses have now grown to encompass many areas including business, promotions, internal communication, and journalism (Dearstyne, 2005). Many local TV stations turned to blogs to help connect with the audience.

On July 6, 2005, KING 5 News in Seattle launched Blogger KING. The blog invited viewers inside the newsroom and offered different perspectives from reporters,

anchors, photographers, and other people in the organization (Mapaye, 2006). The inaugural post promoted “the inside scoop” on the stories viewers saw on television or read online. The blog also encouraged viewers to comment on the stories openly with little or no censorship. In his post, Director of Digital Media Cory Bergman wrote that blogs were a great way to connect to people, especially in television, where the medium often lends itself to isolation. As a remedy for this, he wrote, blogs can add a personal touch, a “unique two-way connection that has yet to be duplicated on the air” (Beauchamp, 2005, p. 25). At stations around the country, news anchors, reporters, and other station staff began blogging about everything from behind-the-scenes news operations to personal triumph over weight loss (Beauchamp, 2005).

The early 2000s saw an explosion in social media sites (Boyd & Ellison, 2007). Friendster came out in 2002, followed by MySpace in 2003, Facebook in 2004 and YouTube in 2005. In many ways, YouTube revolutionized video sharing. Prior to YouTube, it was difficult for ordinary people to disseminate video content to a potential audience of millions. Many other social networking sites also developed at this time including Twitter in 2006 and foursquare in 2009. Television news took notice and with good reason. From 2005 to 2009, the share of adult Internet users using social network sites has more than quadrupled from 8% to 35% and the number of users is projected to continue to increase exponentially (Lenhart, 2009).

On the national scene, CNN pioneered interaction with social network users and use of user-generated content. The network’s iReports allows viewers to submit their own pictures and videos, some of which end up on television. CNN anchor Rick Sanchez

also takes questions and comments from several social network and microblogging sites, including MySpace and Twitter. In 2008, CBS invested in YouTube and began to put its news shows on the video-sharing site. The move allows viewers to embed the CBS content on their own wikis and blogs. In addition, all of the major television networks' Web sites now enable viewers to share text and video stories through e-mail and social network sites such as del.ici.ous and Facebook.

On the local level, a movement is underway to follow the efforts of the national television and cable networks in making more strategic use of their Web sites. A 2009 survey of local television news stations around the country showed improvement in the content offered. Ninety percent of the news Web sites had video, text, and still pictures. Blogs, live cameras and audio were found on 60% of sites and more than 30% allow users to access streaming audio and recorded newscasts (Papper, 2010). Additional efforts were also underway to bring in more content from viewers and to promote station Web sites as online communities where people can discuss news stories of interest, share their pictures, videos, and perspectives. Many station sites also now enable Web site visitors to send story videos and links to others via computers or cell phones, as well as to promote the local news story to blogs, including *The Huffington Post* and social sites such as Digg. Local stations are also using Twitter to promote their newscasts and for breaking news stories. Approximately 36% of local TV newsrooms use Twitter daily, while 16% use Twitter periodically (Papper, 2010). Concurrent with these changes, the online audience has adapted and evolved as well.

The Local TV News Online Audience

Among the first studies to investigate the online local television news audience was King (1998). King used an online survey to ask visitors of local news sites about their uses and gratifications, along with Web design and content preferences. Twenty-eight U.S. television stations promoted King's survey on their Web sites. Approximately 2,493 respondents participated in the survey.

King helped to establish a demographic profile of visitors to local TV Web sites. Respondents reported ages ranging from 18 to 80 with a mean of 40. He noted that the survey, in keeping with human subjects review procedures, screened out those under 18. As for gender, a little more than 57% of the respondents were male, and nearly 43% were female. King observed that the survey appeared to represent more gender diversity compared to earlier Web surveys. Earlier surveys showed an extreme gender skew on the Internet in favor of men. However, King maintained that recent surveys appear to show a narrowing of the gender gap online. In terms of education, the majority of respondents had some college education.

The study found the need for Web-specific content and measures. Seven overall conclusions resulted from the research: (1) The local TV Web audience is a subset of the more general Internet population; (2) The TV Web audience ranks "site preference" the most important reason they go online, indicating a very targeted, instrumental type of use of the medium; (3) TV Web users express high degree of preference for interactive control over content through such things as search tools and links; (4) TV Web users use the Web primarily for "news" and "research" related activities; (5) TV Web gratifications

can be somewhat useful predictors of design and content choices; (6) TV Web users not only make going online part of their regular daily activities, but much of that Web use in all categories takes place at home; (7) Use of the Web does not necessarily mean less use of other media. Even with these conclusions, however, King noted that the study required more refinement. Specifically, King recommended looking at variables not included in the research, such as satisfaction and emotional attachment. King also suggested a need to reexamine the role of branding and promotional strategies.

A decade after King's study, a 2008 report from the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press showed that key news audiences are now blending online and traditional sources ("Key News Audiences," 2008). Most Americans fit into three main news audiences: Integrators (23%), Traditionalists (46%), or Net-Newsters (13%). Members of a fourth audience category – the Disengaged – have very little interest in news consumption. Integrators, on the other hand, are considered highly desirable members of the audience. This audience segment also shares a number of characteristics with Net-Newsters, a group that tends to be younger and more likely to turn to the Web for news and information rather than traditional news sources. Those who prefer these sources are the Traditionalists. They are older, less educated and less affluent. Traditionalists tend to choose television as their sole medium of choice, without supplementing the medium with online new sources. The Pew Research Center survey was conducted April 30 to June 1, 2008 and the sample used consisted of 3,615 adults nationwide. A more detailed description of these engaged audience segments is provided next.

Traditionalists

This segment represents 46% of the public. They are older, less-educated and less affluent.

- Heavy reliance on TV news, morning, daytime, evening, and night.
- Most have a computer, but few get news online on a typical day
- Understand news better by seeing pictures rather than reading or hearing
- Strong interest in the weather, relatively little interest in science and tech news

Integrators

This segment represents 23% of the public. They are well-educated and affluent, middle aged.

- Television is their main news source, but most get news online on a typical day
- Spend the most time with the news on a typical day
- Greater interest in political news – and sports – than other audience segments

Net-Newsers

This segment represents 13% of the public. They are affluent, well-educated and relatively young.

- More regularly read political blogs than watch network news
- Frequent online news viewers
- Heavy tech usage, and a strong interest in tech news
- Leads the way in using new Web features and other technologies

Today, a Pew 2010 report shows 92% of Americans use multiple platforms to get their news (Purcell, Rainie, Mitchell, Rosenstiel & Olmstead, 2010). Overall, despite the decline in audience numbers, local stations fared well in the study. Local TV remained the number one medium for news. On a typical day 78% of Americans get news from a local TV station, 61% get some kind of news online. The report was based on telephone interviews among a random sample of 2,259 adults.

The report describes online news users as younger than the general adult population. Approximately two-thirds of online news users (68%) are under age 50, about 29% are under age 30, with the median age at 40. Most online news users (67%) have at least some college education. Of these, 22% have a bachelor's degree and 15% have advanced degrees. In terms of local TV news, the report describes TV viewers' salient demographics as older than online news users (65 and older). Women are also more likely to watch local TV news on a regular basis. The Pew report did not collect data regarding online news users who specifically access local TV news Web sites.

Even so, the Pew report provided other important insight regarding online news users. While the number of news sites remains infinite, the typical news consumer only uses a handful of sites, with no particular favorite among this group. Approximately 46% of Americans use between 4-6 media platforms, another 46% use two or three, and just 7% use one platform for their primary news source. Group loyalty to sites, not a single source loyalty appears to be the case.

The 2010 Pew report also described today's new multi-platform media environment as portable, personalized, and participatory. Approximately 37% of Internet

users help create news content, comment about news or disseminate news through social media sites such as Facebook or Twitter. Of those who get news online, 75% get news through e-mails that have been forwarded or posts on social network sites and 52% share news links through e-mail or networks. News is now social and participatory.

Viral Viewers: Audience as Promotion

Indeed, the new media environment has allowed TV viewers and online news users to be part of the news promotion process. Whereas distinctions previously existed between audience and promotion, today the audience itself functions as promotion. Rather than simply promoting to an audience, the audience can help promote the television news content to others.

In some ways, this has always been the case. Marketing practitioners and scholars are quick to point out that word-of-mouth communication (WOM) has been around for awhile (O’Leary & Sheehan, 2008). In the case of local television, people tell other people to watch the news. Some have even used VCRs and DVRs to record newscasts and passed those recordings on to others. Today, however, the evolution of television and the Web has allowed so much more. The rise of social media has generated tremendous interest on the use of electronic word of mouth communication (eWOM) for promotion. Studies have shown that in many instances, eWOM is more effective than marketer-generated communication (Thorson & Rodgers, 2006). Yet, as Cheong and Morrison (2008) observed, despite the attention, more research needs to be done on the influence of what they call a “revolution” in eWOM and user-generated content. Often, this revolution comes in the form of viral marketing. Viral marketing is defined as a

phenomenon that facilitates or encourages people to pass along a marketing message or a particular brand's story through "word-of-mouth" (Scott, 2010). It is the idea that information and content can spread quickly from one person to the next via the Internet. This content can also include videos. Indeed, TV news content today can be passed on from one person to an entire network of people fairly easily. The content is often "contagious" or viral, spreading quickly. In many cases, television today is not just viewed, but reviewed, customized, and then passed on. Today's social and digital media landscape has enabled the emergence of a new type of local and national news audience: the viral viewer.

This study characterizes viral viewers as engaged and committed segments of the television audience. These viewers are not only loyal; they work to promote television brands and products. In the case of local television news, they can help promote news stories and function as fans, perhaps motivated in part by parasocial interaction or affective ties to the station's news personalities or news site. This research seeks to determine to what extent these viral viewers exist on local television news Web sites and to examine what attributes contribute to the formation of the online local television news audience's loyalty and commitment to the station's news programs, the station's Web site, and the station brand.

Cultivating the Local TV News Identity

While local television remains a popular source for news, the decline in audience remains a concern for the industry. Adding to this anxiety is the growing worry among local TV stations that the TV networks will soon abandon the traditional network-affiliate

model that has been in place for decades (“The State of the News Media,” 2010). In today’s media environment, the networks no longer needed local stations in order to get to an audience. This concern, as well as dwindling advertising revenue weighs prominently on local TV stations.

To counter this, Mermigas (2008) advocated that local stations learn to stand on their own and cultivate their own distinctive station brand, independent of their network affiliation. She suggested that this approach include leveraging unique local content and engaging in new digital enterprises to offset the decline in traditional ads. One way a company has attempted to put Mermigas’ recommendations to work is through the development of hyperlocal neighborhood Web sites. Hyperlocal is defined as niche news content for a very specific community, often produced and consumed by community members (“Fisher Extends Hyperlocal Push,” 2009). Fisher Communications Incorporated, owners of more than a dozen stations in the Northwest, has developed 44 hyperlocal sites in Seattle, 28 sites in Portland, Oregon and 10 hyperlocal sites in Eugene, Oregon. Fisher describes the hyperlocal push as a way to increase local content offerings, while expanding advertising opportunities (“Fisher Extends Hyperlocal Push,” 2009). To support the hyperlocal sites, Fisher restructured their newsrooms to be able to gather and post news on a real-time basis. Stories covered by station reporters are complemented with user-generated content (“Fisher Extends Hyperlocal Push,” 2009).

Rosenberg (2008) also emphasized the need for stations to attend to their Web sites and expand the current role of these sites. Ferguson (2000) concluded that the old network-affiliate model of promotion, characterized by local stations’ strong associations

with their national counterparts (ABC, CBS, NBC, etc.) appears to be less relevant compared to the model of a locally oriented station. Local is the key, along with more interactivity and the need to attract a younger demographic. All these factors appeared to point to greater use of local television station Web sites. As Polon (1999) noted, “The whole point of a Web site is to increase viewer loyalty to your station and its services, thus counteracting declining numbers.” While stated more than a decade ago, relatively few studies have specifically examined local TV news Web sites. Those studies that have investigated these news sites showed a need to do more. Gregson (2008) found local television stations missed many opportunities to use the Web site to engage the audience, promote newscasts, and the overall station brand.

Summary

In order to provide an understanding of the respondents in the study and context for the local television news climate, this chapter discussed the evolution of the local television news industry and its attempt to adapt to the digital and social media news environment. The chapter also discussed how concurrent to the industry, the online television news audience has adapted and evolved, enabling viral promotion and viewership. The next chapter provides a theoretical framework for the research study by offering an overview of relevant scholarly literature in branding, affective economics, and parasocial interaction. Three research questions and four hypotheses are presented, discussed, and explained.

CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review provides an overview of areas in communication, marketing, and psychology literature to help outline the three research questions and four hypotheses. The first section discusses branding and television and the progression of academic research in this area. Key variables in loyalty, commitment, usefulness, and quality are defined in this section. The next section of the literature review goes over the evolution of television theory and new media, along with the emotional underpinnings critical to the concept of affective economics. The third section further examines the role of affect in the form of parasocial interaction. The television parasocial interaction (TV PSI) construct and Web parasocial interaction (Web PSI) construct are examined. The chapter concludes with an explanation and discussion of the three research questions and four hypotheses.

Branding and Television

The word “brand” comes from the Norse word “to burn” (Keller, 1998). Indeed, the idea of “brand” originates from cattle owners burning symbols on their livestock or “branding” them in order to identify them. Today, branding remains associated with identification. The American Marketing Association defines brands as an icon, logo, design, symbol, etc. that represents a company. Keller (1998), however, disagrees with this definition and classified these items as elements of a brand, but not the essence of what a brand entails. Instead, Keller defined a brand as a product with added dimensions

that differentiate it from other products used to satisfy the same need. Essentially, the idea of difference is central to the concept of brands. These dimensions can be tangible (good product or service) or intangible (represents something, symbolism). Brands are important because they can have special meaning to consumers. An example of a brand's impact is when Coke decided to change its formula. The change to New Coke created an uproar with consumers who saw Coke not as a product, but as something that represented Americana, nostalgia, etc. The Coke brand evoked special meaning from consumers. Classic Coke was brought back as a result. These special meanings can also be applicable to television brands.

In marketing literature, Keller (1993, 1998) classified consumption of television as an "experience good." These types of goods depend heavily on branding because consumers cannot inspect the good ahead of time. Rather, experience goods rely on word-of-mouth, reputation, and other elements essential to branding. From the beginning, television, especially that of local news has had strong influence from marketing and branding.

In 1948 before WPIX-TV hit the airwaves in New York, station managers had two major obstacles to overcome. As Allen (2001) chronicled, the first was to establish a sense of identity for the station as a whole; the second in particular was to try to explain the concept of local television news to potential viewers. Station managers solved their dilemma with call letters that helped explain both. Managers selected the letters PIX to underscore the idea of pictures. At the time, the distinction was definitely needed: newspapers and radio were the ones synonymous with the idea of "news" and journalism, not television. Managers decided a promotional ad explaining that "WPIX brings to

Television the experience of The News” would help viewers understand that the station sought to bring them news you could see. To further distinguish themselves from the television network newscasts, the station also developed the motto, “First on Scene, First on Screen” to emphasize the close proximity and immediacy of local television news. The call letters and the motto helped to articulate core differences between WPIX and its competitors on the national and local level. Essentially, the WPIX brand attempted to stand out and create a difference in the minds of consumers from other news products designed to satisfy the same need (Keller, 1998).

Around the country and over time, other local stations would develop similar promotional campaigns, with a focus on call letters to begin the development of a station brand. KARE-TV in Minneapolis and KING-TV in Seattle are just two examples where station identity is tied directly to promotion efforts. KARE attempts to show its empathy for viewers through community service and in-depth stories devoted to community profiles. KING attempts to project its dominance in the market through promotions regarding its ratings across different news programs. Station managers found call letters useful and helpful, especially with two core principles of branding: identification and distinction.

Indeed, Bellamy and Traudt (2000) noted that call letters are tied to the station brand. Branding in television can also include utilizing other elements such as how the station chooses to present television personalities and channel identity. Television channels attempt to create identities that will build loyalty and viewership. For example, MTV attempts to attract the 12 to 34 year old demographic with its image of being young, hip, and edgy. CNN, on the other hand, uses the image of professional, unbiased,

comprehensive news coverage. In order to attract a wider audience in between its coverage of war or other crises, CNN turned to programs such as “Larry King Live” and “Anderson Cooper 360.” These shows are heavily promoted using the personalities of the show hosts. Overall, branding is critical to television in that awareness and image are essentially all that television has to sell to an audience it must create and maintain.

Critical in the creation and maintenance of local television news’ brand are news consultants. Early on, news consultants such as Magid and Associates and audience research companies such as Nielsen ratings helped shape local television news (Allen, 2001). Among these developments included the concept of “Eyewitness News.” The format was based on the idea of action video and breaking news stories. The reporter was an “eyewitness” to all these events outside the studio. “Eyewitness News” was one of the first branding efforts related to television news. Other developments facilitated by consultants included the idea of Q scores (rating anchors based on personality and likeability), and additional promotions based on the notion of parasocial interaction. This concept is discussed in detail later in this chapter.

However, despite the amount of applied research generated regarding local television news and branding, academic research on the topic has been scarce. While branding is deeply entrenched in marketing literature, its application to the media industry and television is still developing (Chan-Olmsted & Kim, 2001). Although some published studies have been closely related (Owen, 1993; Aaker, 1996; Keller, 1998; Ryan, 1999), few academic studies have examined media branding in television. Bellamy and Traudt (2000) sought to address this gap with their study on television branding as promotion. The authors called attention to the importance of branding in television by

stating, “It is perhaps the only means of gaining a place in a television viewer’s channel repertoire” (p.157). The concept of channel repertoire essentially ties into the idea of brand loyalty.

Using a convenient sample from a college-age population of 18-34, the researchers sought to survey respondents regarding television viewing habits and network recall. The survey was based on Bellamy and Traudt’s application of Aaker’s (1996) “Brand Equity 10” to the study of television networks. Brand equity is defined as the differential effect of consumer knowledge on customer response to the marketing of the brand (Keller, 1998). It is the difference between the product with the brand and without. Brand equity resides in the minds of consumers. Aaker outlined the elements of brand equity to include the following: price, satisfaction, loyalty, perceived quality, leadership, value, personality, organizational association, awareness, and market share (pp.318-319). Of these, Bellamy and Traudt identified viewer satisfaction, viewer loyalty, and personality as particularly relevant to television. They argued that viewer satisfaction and loyalty held “great promise” for the evaluation of network brand equity, especially given the simplicity of measurement. Respondents could simply rate their level of satisfaction or as in the case of loyalty, be asked about their intentions to watch the program again.

Another important area for assessing television brand equity was through brand personality or the extent through which viewers find the brand interesting, informative, trustworthy, and concerned about its audience (Bellamy & Traudt, 2000). In television news, Buchman (2000) found news anchors and other news talent contribute to the station’s or channel’s brand personality. In addition, Bellamy and Traudt established that

brand differentiation complements brand personality, adding to a sense of difference or the idea that viewers could distinguish channels from each other.

This discussion on brand equity, however, leaves out what Hughes (2008) argued is the most essential aspect of brands in the current marketing environment: whether or not customers are willing to evangelize the product. Hughes maintained that in order to measure evangelization only two questions are needed for any survey: (1) How did you hear about us? (2) Would you go out of your way to recommend our product to a friend (p. 218)? The first question tracks marketing effectiveness and word-of-mouth (WOM). O’Leary and Sheehan (2008) define WOM as “the process of information exchange, especially recommendations about products and services, between two people in an informal way” (p.2). The second question provides the degree of evangelization the consumer is willing to provide.

To some extent, the idea of evangelization is rooted in the concept of opinion leaders. The idea first emerged during the 1940s presidential election. Later, Katz and Lazarsfeld (1955) showed the applicability of interpersonal influence in other contexts (food, fashion, entertainment). Levy (1979) demonstrated that this influence also was relevant to TV news, where individuals engaged in surveillance of news topics in order to tell others about news. In marketing, Feick and Price’s (1987) concept of market mavens also articulated the need to examine opinion leaders and interpersonal influence.

Along with the idea of influence, a brand community’s role in building brand loyalty is also relevant. Muniz and O’Guinn (2001) defined a brand community as a specialized, non-geographically bound community based on a set of structure social

relations among admirers of the brand. Muniz and O'Guinn showed that the hallmarks of community can be fully replicated in computer-mediated contexts.

Brand communities consist of three primary components: shared consciousness, rituals and traditions, and a sense of moral responsibility. Shared consciousness is a connection among members of the community. It reflects in the sense of belonging members feel. This consciousness also contributes to the idea that members of the brand community are different from those who do not belong to the community. Rituals and traditions within the brand community help perpetuate the brand's history and values. These rituals also help new members understand and conform to the community's norms. As sense of moral responsibility is the duty or obligation members feel toward each other and the community at large. In times of crisis or threats to the community, this responsibility will result in collective action.

Results of Muniz and O'Guinn's study indicated that brands are social objects and meanings are socially constructed. Rather than mere spectators, consumers in the study were actively engaged in the creation of the brand. The brand wasn't the most important thing in people's lives, but neither was it trivial. Members of brand communities expected companies to be good stewards of the brand. Members might define success differently from those of marketers.

McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig (2002) agreed with Muniz and O'Guinn's assessment of the importance of social relations within brand communities. However, they felt the concept as previously outlined remained incomplete. They argued that brand communities are essentially consumer-centric and the existence and meaningfulness of brand communities inhere to customer experience. They also noted that the decision to

participate in a brand community was not an easy one. Indeed, there were barriers to entry. Those new to the community might not feel accepted. They maintained that the design of the community must reflect something for those new to the community, as well as ways to recognize those more fully integrated. For the most part, they advocated marketers to create spaces for community. Their study found these communities helped foster long-term relationships. Consumers who were heavily involved in brand communities tend to be more emotionally invested in the welfare of the company. Allowing consumers to share their stories about the brand will further help them invest in the outcome of the product. Creating the space for affect and expressions is fundamental to this relationship (Jenkins, 2006). Brand communities can provide this forum and can be used for television products. Members of the brand community or audience become the best source of promotion for the company. The Internet remains a great facilitator of brand communities given its global reach and access, allowing for a wide variety of interests.

The marketing literature shows these are important branding considerations to study. Keller, however, noted that despite marketing communications and branding efforts, a consumer's experience will depend heavily on the product or service itself. Mantrala, Naik, Sridhar, and Thorson's (2007) study on the newspaper industry showed that content in news is a significant factor in creating the brand. They maintained that managers should attempt to locate the "sweet spot" of product function. This resembles a bell curve. It is critical for companies to know if they are on the uphill or downhill side of this profit function. Those on the left side will suffer reduction in profit if they disinvest in the product, those on the right will experience erosion in profit. They believed that

most in the newspaper industry mistakenly believe they are on the right side, when they are really on the left side of the profit function. The mistake made here is that newspapers fail to invest enough to keep the quality of their news content high. This disinvestment leads to the “suicide spiral” where lack of investment leads to poor news quality, which in turn leads to a decline in circulation. The spiral continues from there. Their results showed that investing in good news quality is good for business.

For television news, more stations are investing online with their station Web sites. However, many believe that more online resources are needed. As discussed in Chapter II, Ferguson (2000) maintained that the old network-affiliate model is becoming less relevant, and local stations need to rely on their local content more. Polon (1999) argued that the primary purpose of the station Web site is to increase viewer loyalty and boost audience numbers. However, while stated almost a decade ago, relatively few academic studies have specifically examined broadcasters’ use of online promotion.

Bates and King’s (1995) content analysis found that while local stations did attempt self-promotion, their sites lacked good original content and full Internet functionality. Other studies on broadcasting and Web sites that followed showed some improvement in news content, interactivity, and promotion (Niekamp, 1996; Kiernan & Levy, 1997; Ferguson, 1999). However, while content and Internet functionality improved, Gregson (2008) found television stations, local affiliates in particular, missed many opportunities to use the Web site to engage the audience and promote newscasts.

Ha and Chan-Olmsted (2004) also came to similar conclusions regarding cable networks and their Web sites. Their research established Web sites as extensions of the television brand, meaning station sites often leverage the brand equity of the station. The

notion of brand extension is based on “the affect transfer of the consumers of an established brand to the new products bearing the same brand name” (Ha & Chan-Olmsted, 2004, p.626; Lane, 2000).

Ha and Chan-Olmsted pointed to an imminent need for cable networks to improve promotional efforts on their sites and vice versa. Ideally, the researchers argued building viewership required a “pull and push strategy,” where cable Web sites can pull in audiences by providing content not found on television and then after visiting the site, push that audience back to the television viewing experience. Their primary focus though was to examine the television features on cable network Web sites that most predicted viewer loyalty, along with other questions. A random sample of Internet users from a database was used to solicit respondents. The survey used questions regarding repeat viewership, involvement, and attachment as items in the viewer loyalty scale.

Standard multiple regression determined five features most likely to predict loyalty: (1) news/weather updates, (2) background for news, (3) information about stars/gossip, (4) episode synopsis, and (5) sweepstakes. Additionally, the study discovered the three most important sources of knowledge about the networks’ Web sites were through cross promotion on television, search engines, and word-of-mouth. However, fully examining cross promotion was difficult in that a large number of respondents were nontelevision Web site visitors. Nevertheless, Ha and Chan-Olmsted helped ascertain predictors of loyalty for potential members of the online television audience. Data on frequency of viewing and hours watching television and visiting Web sites were also collected.

Building on the idea of improving loyalty, Gupta and Kim (2007) explored ways to increase engagement and develop commitment in virtual communities. Data for the study were collected from a Web site for two weeks. The online survey was publicized on Urii.com. A total of 275 valid responses were generated. Gupta and Kim found that the balanced effects of cognition and affect were important factors to consider. Cognition involved functional usefulness, social usefulness, and system quality. Affect included aspects of pleasure and arousal. Both influenced attitude, which resulted in commitment. Encouraging participation and relationship building led to stronger commitment to the community. While similar to loyalty, Gupta and Kim outlined a distinct difference by not only assessing attachment, involvement, and intention to view but by defining commitment as the “member’s helping behavior and active participation in the virtual community” (p.30). The researchers maintained that understanding the mechanism by which this commitment is formed is essential.

Affective Economics and Television

For media companies, programs on different media platforms help to extend the company or show brand (Eastman, 2000). Through synergy, media companies attempt to provide different points of entry for the audience. Often, transmedia storytelling is used to bring an audience from one medium to another. Jenkins (2006) defined transmedia storytelling as multiple texts of the narrative; a story not contained within a single medium. He used the movie *The Matrix* as one example of transmedia storytelling, in which the film’s narrative is presented in the movie, online, in video games, and across other media. Indeed, transmedia storytelling is an example of how television and digital media complement each other.

Caldwell (2003) argued these strategies attempt to build a relationship as well as an emotional bond with the audience. Through individualization and immersion of media content, members of the audience become invested in story, and ultimately, the brand. As Caldwell explained, effective branding “is frequently praised for having created psychological and empathic relationships with consumers” (p. 138). Jenkins (2006) noted that the promotion of transmedia experiences often involves appealing to “intense feelings” with program content (p. 147). He also pointed out that often such promotions assume an active audience and that members of the audience will follow media strategies across multiple media platforms.

In today’s digital age, the number of platforms continues to increase. Digitization is contributing to convergence and an explosion in the number of channel choices (Jenkins, 2006). With these choices comes a need for program content. Hence, Caldwell (2004) asserted that digital media depends on television. Television has the structures, processes, and industries needed to generate content for the online platform.

In many ways, new media can enhance television’s potential. As Seiter (1999) observed, television is the least legitimate of all media forms. Digital media, however, is helping television with its status. Simply put, new media needs television. Online, the proliferation of television content shows the importance of TV in everyday lives. Television content is also a form of “common currency” online, as studies show it is one of the first topics people talk about in order to initiate conversations online. Digital media has also brought fans, the most active of audience segments, from the margins to the center of current thinking in media production (Jenkins, 2006). Show producers once dismissed fans. Today, however, fans are part of the conversation. Fans represent a loyal

group, whose activities can help show producers. This remains the struggle surrounding media convergence and television. Corporate and grassroots efforts are at times at war, at times supporting each others' efforts (Jenkins, 2006). Collective intelligence presents a new kind of power in the digital media environment. The potential for collective action exists, but has not been fully realized.

New digital media also exhibits aspects that depart from past televisual style (Caldwell, 1995; 2004). There are four major changes in media corporation strategies that encourage and stimulate the volatility of the televisual form. These changes encourage extensions and transformations of the TV text. For one, the shelf life of television programs or content is now considered when developing shows. Producers want to know if the show will have "legs" that will allow its appeal to persist past the original airing. Second, old shows or other old material are now considered "legacy holdings" that can be reworked and re-mastered in order to present it as new. Third, FCC changes to financial syndication rules allow networks to own more syndicated programs, leading some independent production companies to accuse networks of "sweetheart deals" that favor in-house production. Fourth, the focus on migrating texts and repurposing content has also contributed to new aspects of televisuality. NBC's news department led the way in this effort. Bits and pieces of hybridized NBC news anchor Brian Williams were distributed across NBC platforms (CNBC, MSNBC, MSN network, etc.) for custom e-content (Caldwell, 2004).

These fundamental changes in television form and audience have scholars negotiating new ground regarding promotion and consumption. Jenkins (2006) indicated the two could very well go together. Jenkins suggested that a perspective grounded in

affective economics was better suited to explain television audience and promotion in today's participatory culture. Affective economics takes into account the multiple platforms and applications that comprise digital and social media. This approach is based on feelings and uses emotional capital to harness audience activity to help with television promotion.

Jenkins (2006) noted that many have called affective economics "the solution to a perceived crisis in American broadcasting – a crisis brought about by shifts in media technology that are granting viewers much greater control over the flow of media into their homes" (p.54). While somewhat critical of the profit motive behind promotion and marketing efforts, Jenkins reconciled that the old television model of audience flow appeared inadequate in the new digital environment. He noted that audience measurement was often "clumsy" and that the "impression" or ratings method of measuring an audience doesn't provide much information. Impressions simply count who is there. Expressions, however, are affect-based and provide quality evaluation of a broadcast product. This evaluation includes attentiveness to programming and long-term investment in the television brand.

To outline affective economics, Jenkins relied on Kevin Roberts, the CEO of Saatchi & Saatchi Worldwide to explain the idea of "love marks" and "emotional capital" (p.69). Roberts argued consumers become invested in a brand when there is an emotional connection. The stronger the connection, the more investment is made. These investments should be made on multiple platforms. Rather than experience "love" for the brand on only one medium, consumers should experience these "love marks" each time a

connection is made with the brand. These emotional connections should be made on air, online, mobile, with different social media, and other platforms.

In order to assess whether affect brought TV viewers across platforms, Jenkins conducted an online survey of *American Idol* viewers. The survey was posted on the official FOX Web site. Most viewers visiting the Web site were doing so to get more information about the show, the contestants or in order to take part in online fan communities. Results of the survey indicated most fans discovered the show through word-of-mouth. Some found the show through channel surfing and began watching because of program awareness through promotions. An emotional connection developed with show contestants as viewers got to know contestants' backgrounds and aspirations. The bond was strengthened by an understanding that viewers, through their vote, in some way shaped contestants' futures. The emotional connection further deepened through social viewing. Of those surveyed, 78% of *American Idol* viewers reported they watched the show with family or friends. During the week, 74% reported talking about the show with friends. Jenkins concluded that in addition to affect, social viewing appears to be "an important driver behind brand and content extension" (p.82)

Parasocial Interaction and Television

The notion of an emotional connection with television personae began in 1956, when Horton and Wohl published their seminal work on parasocial interaction in the journal *Psychiatry*. The authors were interested in what they described as observations of intimacy from a distance or the illusion of face-to-face relationships with mediated performers. At the time, Horton and Wohl described how the new mass media of radio, television, and the movies enabled "remote and illustrious men" to be in the same circle

as one's peers. Television, especially, was identified as one that "makes available nuances of appearance and gesture to which ordinary social perception is attentive and to which interaction is cued" (p.215). Using techniques such as direct address and the perception of personal and private conversation, television fosters parasocial relationships in that interactions with the audience appear reciprocal, albeit one-sided in reality.

However, while the concept of parasocial interaction was groundbreaking, it didn't gain significant attention until the advent of uses and gratifications research in the 1970s (Spigel & Olsson, 2004). Years after, Levy (1979) attempted to test parasocial interaction and investigate the theory as it applied to television news. Specifically, Levy was interested in the interaction between the news audience and local TV newscasters.

The research method involved focus group discussions and surveys. Approximately 240 people took part in the study, chosen from 40 randomly selected housing clusters. One of Levy's primary hypothesis was the stronger an individual's parasocial interaction with news personae, the more television news he or she will watch. In order to test the hypothesis, an index of parasocial behavior was created, using four items: *The newscasters are almost like friends you see every day; I like hearing the voices of the newscasters in my house; When the newscaster shows how he feels about the news, it helps me make up my mind about that news item; Television shows you what people in the news are really like.* The four-item index had a Cronbach alpha coefficient reported at .68.

Levy found evidence of parasocial interaction. Nearly 52 percent of respondents regarded newscasters as someone who is "like a friend" and about 68 percent noticed if the newscaster was missing or on vacation. Levy noted that members of the news

audience created affective ties with newscasters; these ties were further strengthened over shared experiences. These experiences included important news stories or the “happy talk” banter among newscasters. The data provided evidence for the hypothesis. Viewers with higher levels of parasocial behavior increased their exposure to the newscasts, hoping to have more opportunities to “interact” with the news personae. Levy also found a strong negative correlation between education and parasocial interaction, indicating those with higher levels of education have less need for parasocial relationships. The correlation between age and parasocial interaction was weak, but statistically significant.

Several years later, Rubin, Perse, and Powell (1985) created a 20-item PSI scale with a .93 Cronbach alpha. Following Rubin et al.’s work on PSI, a new scale was developed that allowed for greater precision in measurement. Rubin and Perse (1987) modified the original 20-item parasocial interaction scale to 10 items. Since then, the 10-item scale has been used to study a range of questions concerning TV viewing motivation (Conway & Rubin, 1991), satisfaction with soap operas (Perse & Rubin, 1988), local TV news involvement (Perse, 1990), and others. The news involvement scale had an alpha of .91 (Rubin, 1994). All the measures used Likert scales where respondents indicated their level of disagreement or agreement (strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 5).

Similar to the original study by Levy, data indicate that viewers develop affinity with persona they watch (Rubin & Perse, 1987) and that “the more attracted one is to the persona, the more likely a viewer will seek to watch the persona” (Conway & Rubin, 1991 p. 449). Using hierarchical regression analysis and controlling for variables such as age, Conway and Rubin (1991) found parasocial interaction helped explain information, entertainment, relaxation, and pass-time motives. Other studies (Perse & Rubin, 1988;

Rubin & Step, 2000) also used parasocial interaction as predictors, as well as hierarchical regression analysis and convenient samples from university courses. Thorson and Rodgers (2006) used the same methods, but used parasocial interaction as a mediating variable in a study about political candidates, electronic word of mouth communication (eWOM), and interactivity. Using procedures outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986), a series of regressions found parasocial interaction mediated the effects of interactivity and perceived interactivity on attitude toward the site, impressions of the candidate, and voting intention. The study combined both use of the TV PSI (Rubin et. al, 1985) and Web PSI scale developed by Hoerner (1999).

Hoerner first adapted the PSI scale for the online platform. Hoerner sought to examine the interaction between Web visitors and the Web site as a persona. The study argued that the definition of persona as outlined by Horton and Wohl (1956) has changed and that the “literal, mediated personality of the newscast or soap opera is gone” (p.146). Instead, Hoerner maintained that Web sites can be free of an actual persona and can function as the persona itself. In other words, it is possible for visitors to Web sites to form parasocial relationships with the site alone.

Using Rubin et al.’s (1985) original 20-item TV PSI scale, Hoerner developed a 15-item scale, modifying items to reflect online users’ Web browsing activity. Research participants from a university sample were used for the experiment and to test the new Web PSI scale. The 15-item scale was reduced to 10 items after factor analysis revealed some statements did not contribute to parasocial interaction. As with the original PSI scale, Hoerner used a 5-step Likert scale (strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 5).

Kumar and Benbasat (2002) also attempted to characterize the Web site as a social actor. Their construct of “parasocial presence” articulated the ways in which a medium (in this case a Web site) can create the presence of understanding, caring, interacting, and relationship building. The authors likened the relationship with a Web site and its visitors to that of an interpersonal relationship. They advocated that online vendors encourage participation, personalization, and use of virtual communities. They saw Amazon.com as example of parasocial presence. In addition, Luo, McGoldrick, Beatty, and Keeling (2006) maintained that the interface matters to perceptions of trustworthiness.

Meanwhile, Giles (2002) attempted to expand the notion of parasocial interaction into a wider context. Essentially, Giles sought to review and set a future direction for PSI research. Many of these studies showed that in some instances, PSI could be more important than the actual television content itself. Giles concluded that PSI was a complicated construct that produced different types of relationships depending on different media and media figures.

Theoretical Limitations

This review identified three primary gaps in the academic literature regarding local TV news research and branding. For one, while essential, Gupta and Kim’s (2007) commitment construct does not incorporate the element of evangelization, otherwise known as word-of-mouth (WOM) or participants’ willingness to help make content “viral” online. Thus far, the literature has relegated promotional efforts to the purview the station, not the audience. As WOM is critical to branding, inclusion of this component to the commitment construct will be beneficial and complementary to the loyalty construct

used by Ha and Chan-Olmsted (2004). The literature also indicates that measurement of satisfaction and difference are helpful gauges of brand equity (Aaker, 1996; Bellamy & Traudt, 2000). Past research shows a need to bring research regarding television and branding into the digital age, with particular application to the local news context and the online local news audience population.

Second, Jenkin's (2006) notion of affective economics has yet to be applied to local television news. Modification of the commitment construct and inclusion of survey items that address both the viral nature of convergence culture and the work of fans will help bridge understanding of both branding and affect, and assist in further conceptualizing the idea of viral viewers.

Third, literature regarding both parasocial constructs requires updates that better reflected today's digital media ecosystem. Results from the TV PSI construct (Rubin & Perse, 1987) have primarily been based on convenient samples. The construct's application to an online audience is one that will shed new light on the concept. Adding to this, the Web PSI construct's (Hoerner, 1999) applicability to the local television news context and online audience will help to further extend theory in this area. This study seeks to address these limitations in an examination of the role of parasocial interaction on local television news Web site visitors' loyalty and commitment.

Research Questions

The three proposed research questions and four proposed hypotheses are derived from the literature and seek to reexamine findings and relationships from previous studies and place them in the new context of local TV news, using an online audience sample. By formalizing these new relationships and findings, knowledge into the phenomenon of

marketing in general and the role of PSI in Web usage in this specific context will be enhanced. Additionally, survey techniques will enhance research validity. Key constructs for this study include: TV PSI (Rubin & Perse, 1987), Web PSI (Hoerner, 1999), loyalty (Ha & Chan-Olmsted, 2004), and commitment (Gupta & Kim, 2007). While the TV PSI, Web PSI and loyalty constructs remain relatively unchanged from the cited studies, the commitment construct has been modified to incorporate items that assess digital evangelization or willingness to help promote television content on air and online through “viral” means. Underlying this modified construct is the notion of affective economics theorized by Jenkins (2006).

The first research question seeks to identify particular viewer traits that help in the formation of station and site brand devotion. The literature showed Bellamy and Traudt (2000) and Ha and Chan-Olmsted (2004) found specific qualities (satisfaction, station difference, use of specific site features) contributed to loyalty. However, these same qualities have not been studied with the commitment construct. Research question 1 attempts to assess if these qualities are consistent with this study’s loyalty construct and applicable to the commitment construct as well.

RQ1: What viewing and visiting characteristics lead to TV station and Web site brand loyalty and commitment?

The second research question seeks to identify and possibly solidify any differences with the TV PSI and Web PSI constructs. As both constructs have never before been studied in this particular context, possible differences and similarities are

worth investigating. Further, use of an online sample rather than a convenient student sample should be informative.

RQ2: How is the TV PSI construct different from the Web PSI construct?

The third research question attempts to investigate the underlying relationships between viewing and visiting characteristics (such as attitudes and behaviors) and loyalty and commitment. Gupta and Kim (2007) established the importance of both cognition (usefulness and quality) and affect in the formation of commitment. These variables, however, were not tested as mediators, nor were they tested on the loyalty construct. As Thorson and Rodgers (2006) used hierarchical multiple regression to test parasocial interaction as a mediator, this study proposes the same. Furthermore, albeit a weak correlation, given the statistical significance Levy (1979) found with age, this study intends to use age as a control variable. Since relationships and not age and demographics are the focus of this study, using age as a control variable will help clarify these ties.

RQ3: Do perceived station usefulness and quality, perceived site usefulness and quality, TV PSI, and Web PSI mediate the relationship between viewing and visiting characteristics (such as attitudes and behaviors) and loyalty and commitment?

Hypotheses

For the first two hypotheses, Gupta and Kim (2007) established that cognition variables (usefulness and quality) are positively related to commitment toward the site. While this relationship has not been established for the loyalty construct, or the

relationship with local TV news stations, the literature, particularly Ha and Chan-Olmsted (2004), indicates the relationships could be applicable to local TV news stations and their Web sites. For the last two hypotheses, Rubin and Perse (1987) and Hoerner (1999) have shown these relationships as predictors of loyalty and repeat viewing and visiting. These constructs have not yet been applied to the commitment scale. However, the literature indicates these positive relationships could exist. Once these relationships are assessed, standard multiple regression is proposed similar to Ha and Chan-Olmsted (2004) to determine the best predictor of loyalty and commitment.

H1: Perceived station usefulness and quality is positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site.

H2: Perceived site usefulness and quality is positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site.

H3: Perceived relationships, in the form of TV PSI are positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site.

H4: Perceived relationships, in the form of Web PSI are positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site.

CHAPTER IV

METHODS

This chapter presents the research design used to address the three research questions and four hypotheses presented in Chapter III. The first section of this chapter provides the rationale for the use of survey research in this study. The second section describes the research participants and the procedures used to administer the survey. In section three, the survey instrument and variables are described in detail, as well as the statistical tests used to answer the research questions and hypotheses. This chapter concludes with a respondent profile and discussion of study validity.

Survey Research

This study used an approach grounded in quantitative research design because it sought to collect data to support or refute hypotheses regarding the online local television news audience's loyalty and commitment to the station's news programs and to the station Web site. Special attention was paid to the relationship between parasocial interaction and loyalty and commitment outcomes. Quantitative research involves testing theories and examining variables for relationships. The approach is often deductive (from general to specific) and is generally associated with the positivist/postpositivist paradigm (Creswell, 2009). Given that the study also sought to describe attributes of the online TV news audience, a survey research method was employed in order to produce a quantitative or numeric description of a population's attitudes, beliefs, and opinions (Wimmer and Dominick, 2006). Survey inquiry uses a sample to infer a population's values. Given the population of interest are those online; a self-administered Web-based

survey was the appropriate data collection procedure for this study. An online survey was used to examine the three research questions and four hypotheses.

A primary advantage with self-administered surveys is the reduction in interviewer bias (Wimmer and Dominick, 2006). In addition, the benefits of self-administered surveys usually involve time and costs. Aaker, Kumar, and Day (2007) outlined many benefits of Web-based surveys: they are fast, inexpensive, and give researchers control over data quality. Survey programs now employ “skip logic” features that allow researchers to apply survey parameters and keep respondents from answering questions incorrectly. Links to the survey, as well as the code to embed surveys on to other sites, can be distributed via e-mail, free of charge to people all over the country or the world. Once respondents are finished with the survey, the data can be transferred directly into statistical programs such as SPSS, simplifying and protecting against the loss of data (Lefever, Dal & Matthiasdottir, 2007). Unlike manual data entry, data are available instantaneously for analysis.

Online surveys, however, pose some challenges. For one, there is no procedure to obtain a representative sample of the Internet population. As Gwartney (2007) explained, there is no master e-mail list of the U.S. population. This non-random method of population sampling can be seen as a limitation. As King (1998) stated, generalizability is always questionable without a random sample. The notion of sample size also comes into question with a non-random sample. Wilhoit and Weaver (1990) noted that for random samples, at the 95% confidence level, 400 respondents are needed to achieve a sampling error of 4.9. In general, the greater the sample size, the lower the sampling

error. For non-random samples, however, a bigger sample size doesn't always equate with accurate projections of the general population (Dillman, 2007). As a non-random sample, the results are not projectable to any population other than those surveyed.

Nevertheless, Aaker et al. stated these limitations come with the nature of the Web. Indeed, the Web audience is difficult to measure given the Internet's global reach. To achieve validity with online surveys, survey design and sample selection are critical. King noted that targeting specific populations could help. Wimmer and Dominick (2006) referred to these targeted, non-probability samples as purposive samples. These samples are selected for specific characteristics and qualities. In the case of this research, the purposive sample consists of visitors to local television Web sites.

King suggested other ways to mitigate the drawbacks of a non-random sample. These included comparing the results with other studies on the Internet population, as well as incorporating filter questions and "quality check" questions such as the local television station's call letters or channel number. Unlike the national news sites, King maintained that those visiting local television sites were more likely to live within the station's DMA or have ties to the area. This information could be helpful when attempting to describe user characteristics.

Other issues with online surveys include problems with browsers and fear of viruses or spam (Dillman, 2007). Dommeyer, Baum, Hanna, and Chapman (2004) also found that even when there is an e-mail list for the population, the e-mail list can be unreliable and it is still difficult to get people to participate. Sax, Gilmartin, and Bryant (2003) also found ease of distribution online does not always equal efficiency. Indeed,

while online surveys generally produce lower response rates, use of an incentive generated results that were comparable to those of the paper questionnaires.

Comley (2002) noted three primary reasons why people participate in online surveys: the first page of the survey explains the study well, a previous relationship with the Web site or brand, and personal relevance of the survey topic. Sax, Gilmartin, and Bryant (2003) found personal relevance to be a factor in their study of more than 4,000 freshmen. Their study focused on those more likely to respond to surveys and analysis of non-response. The study showed that young, affluent males were more likely to respond to surveys. Their study also found women were twice as likely to respond and race/ethnicity was not a significant factor. Both the advantages and disadvantages of online surveys were considered for this research. As a whole, given the research scope and the purposive sample, the benefits of using an online survey for this study outweighed the limitations.

Participants

The population of interest in this study was visitors to local television Web sites. In order to attract respondents to the survey, permission was solicited from television stations representing small, medium, and large markets in the Pacific Northwest. ABC, CBS, and NBC stations in these cities were contacted to gauge interest in the study and to obtain contact information. FOX stations were not contacted. In many cities, FOX often partners with ABC, CBS, or NBC to produce newscasts. Stations in Seattle and Portland were contacted to represent large market stations. Stations in Spokane, Washington were contacted to represent medium market stations and stations in Anchorage, Eugene, and

Medford were contacted to represent small market stations. As an incentive for television stations to participate, stations were told research results would be shared with participating stations.

Recruitment materials (see Appendix B-F) and formal contact protocols followed the procedures outlined in Dillman's (2007) Tailored Design Method (TDM). Dillman suggested five primary steps for contact, which were modified for the purposes of this research.

- 1) Advance-notice e-mail – An e-mail was sent to ABC, CBS, and NBC stations in the Seattle, Portland, Spokane, Anchorage, Eugene, and Medford markets regarding the study in September 2009. The e-mail outlined the purposes and benefits of participating in the research. The advance notice e-mail requested those interested in participating to e-mail the researcher with the name and e-mail address of the person who can post the survey online.
- 2) Follow-up letter and phone call – Letters were sent and phone calls were made to stations that did not respond to the initial advance-notice e-mail.
- 3) Survey link sent via e-mail for posting on Web site – Interested stations were sent the survey link and survey code for the station Web site. The e-mail was sent to the contact person designated by the station. The e-mail included a CC to the news manager who approved posting the survey.
- 4) Follow-up e-mail – Three days before survey implementation, the contact person was reminded via e-mail to post the survey on the station Web site.

- 5) Thank you e-mail – Stations were sent a thank you e-mail for participating in the survey. The thank you e-mail outlined the timeline for the study and when results would be available.

The advance-notice e-mail was sent to a total of 18 local television stations in the Pacific Northwest. Of these stations, nine stations expressed interest in taking part in the study. KING-TV in Seattle, KOIN-TV and KGW-TV in Portland, KHQ-TV in Spokane, KTUU-TV in Anchorage, KEZI-TV in Eugene, KOBV-TV and KDRV-TV in Medford and KOHD in Bend. The station in Bend expressed interest after hearing about the study from another station.

The stations in Seattle and Portland later decided to decline from participation. All three large market stations needed permission from corporate management. Permission could not be secured in time for the survey launch date. In follow-up letters and calls to non-response stations, Fisher Broadcasting stations in Seattle, Portland, and Eugene declined participation citing the need to study their own recently-launched hyperlocal initiative. As a result, six stations agreed to participate: KHQ, KTUU, KEZI, KOBV, KDRV, and KOHD. Other stations did not respond to follow-up efforts.

In order to add to the number of participating stations, six local TV stations in Boise and Pocatello, Idaho were contacted to take part in the study. Four did not respond. One station in Boise declined. A station in Pocatello was interested, but cited lack of time to assist with the survey due to massive layoffs recently experienced by the station. In all, six local TV stations took part in the research study and posted the online survey on their Web sites (see Appendix G).

The survey was initially administered the last two weeks of October 2009 (starting October 19) and the first two weeks of November 2009. The timing of the survey was purposeful on two fronts: (1) October is often a time where traditional television routines are established given the availability of ‘new’ programming on network prime time (2) November covers a ratings period for television, and stations generally promote their news programming during this time. Because of these reasons, activity online was expected to be high. However, by the end of the second week in November, respondent participation remained low. Extensions were requested for the online surveys to remain posted until Thanksgiving. Online activity on local television news sites after this time was anticipated to drop given the upcoming holiday season.

As an incentive to participate, respondents were offered a chance to win a \$150 gift certificate from Amazon.com. Three certificates were awarded. Participants’ chances of winning depended on the number of survey respondents. For example, if a total of 400 people responded, odds of winning would be 1 in 133. At the end of the survey, respondents could voluntarily provide their e-mail address. Only the winners would be contacted and all e-mails would be deleted at the end of the study. In keeping with University of Oregon human subjects review, all online data were encrypted in order to protect the privacy of survey respondents. No identifying information was solicited. Respondents were self-selected, although filter questions and other precautions such as noting station call letters assisted with validity. In all, 323 respondents started the survey, 277 complete questionnaires were valid for analysis.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was created using SurveyMonkey.com. The site employs several features that helped ensure validity; these features include limiting respondents to answering the survey once. These precautions, along with others, helped ensure that the purposive sample of local television Web site visitors was attained. Prior to the survey launch, a pretest was administered to a small group of people who visit local TV news Web sites. Wimmer and Dominick (2006) advocated use of a pretest in order to improve survey construction and avoid any misunderstanding among respondents. The pretest found some questions in need of clarification. Feedback from the pretest was incorporated in the final questionnaire.

Once the university's IRB approved the research protocol, a pilot test followed October 5-7 on KTUU-TV's Web site. The purpose of the pilot test was to make sure the survey functioned properly on the site. In addition, the test enabled assessment of respondents' interaction with the survey format. Question comprehension and scale validity were also assessed. A total of 15 respondents completed the survey. While response was low, the pilot test provided important feedback regarding the survey. The test indicated that the survey was easy to understand, but a few minor changes in wording needed to be made. Some ordinal-level measures were also changed to interval-level measures to provide more options later in data analysis. Perhaps the most important lesson learned, however, was regarding survey visibility and placement. The announcement for the pilot test was hard to find on the Web site and was placed much lower on the homepage. Once field-testing was complete, the survey was distributed to

all stations participating in the study. Information regarding the importance of placement was sent to the stations, along with the survey link. The survey was available to the online TV news audience starting October 19, 2009.

The final questionnaire was comprised of 38 questions (see Appendix A). Different question types were used to produce variables with varying levels of measurement: nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio. The study's core variables employed 5-point question formats using Likert or Likert-type scales. These scales included a series of statements where respondents can strongly disagree, disagree, stay neutral (either disagree or agree), agree or strongly agree. In addition, in order to comply with IRB, a no basis for answer option was provided for all scale item questions. Responses to the statements were then weighed and responses are added to produce one score. These scales are the most commonly used scale in mass media research (Wimmer and Dominick, 2006). Likert or Likert-type scales are also popular in attempting to solve marketing research problems (Aaker, Kumar & Day, 2007). In all, the survey consisted of five sections that examined the following areas:

- 1) Questions related to the local TV news Web site, including site usefulness and quality, and Web parasocial interaction
- 2) Questions related to the local news station, including station usefulness and quality, station brand qualities, station difference, station satisfaction, favorite newscasters, and TV parasocial interaction
- 3) Questions related to loyalty and commitment to news station and site
- 4) Questions on traditional media and social media use
- 5) Questions related to background and demographics

Section One

The first question dealt with informed consent. Respondents needed to consent to survey participation prior to advancing to the rest of the survey questions. Those who declined consent were taken to the end of the survey. The next question regarding station call letters (Question 2) helped to ensure validity. Respondents were asked to provide the call letters of the local TV news site where they accessed the survey. These responses were compared to SurveyMonkey response collectors. SurveyMonkey provides collectors that allow identification of the site source. Respondents who accessed the survey from KTUU-TV were put into the specific KTUU response collector. Comparing information from the collectors with the call letters provided by respondents helped to legitimize responses. The next series of questions dealt specifically with the station Web site: what led respondents to the site (Question 3), frequency of site visit (Question 4), and site features accessed (Question 5). These questions helped provide information on audience flow, frequency, and interest.

Questions regarding the value of the site and Web parasocial interaction were next. The first set (Question 6) dealt with the site's usefulness and quality (Gupta & Kim, 2007). Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their disagreement or agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) regarding the following scale items: *This station's Web site is useful in keeping up with current issues and events; this station's Web site is useful in sharing viewpoints and opinions with other people about current issues and events; this station's Web site is easy to use; this station's Web site is well designed for users.*

The second set of questions (Question 7) involved the Web parasocial interaction scale (Hoerner, 1999). Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their disagreement or agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) regarding the following scale items: *This Web site is interested in my opinions and comments; I feel as if I am part of a close-knit group when I visit this Web site; visiting this Web site helps me form opinions about the topics and issues presented at this site; the personality of this Web site is friendly and down-to-earth; I felt the time I spent visiting this Web site was worth it.*

Section Two

The first two questions in this section (Question 8 and Question 9) were filter questions that asked respondents whether or not they watched local TV news or the on-air newscasts associated with the station site. Those who answered no skipped the questions related to the local TV news station. The next questions dealt with newscast viewing frequency (Question 10) and how newscasts were watched, basically whether on-air, Internet, recorded via DVR or VCR, etc. (Question 11)

The question that followed measured station value – that of station usefulness and quality (Question 12). Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their disagreement or agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) regarding the following questions: *This station's local news programs are useful in keeping up with current issues and events; this station presents quality local news.* As part of this question, respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their disagreement or agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) regarding the

following statement: *This TV station is different from the other stations in this area.* This question helped to assess whether respondents see the station as distinct from the others. The idea of distinction is important in that branding strives on the idea of difference (Keller, 1998). In keeping with brand inquiry, Question 13 solicited station brand qualities from respondents. The question asked, “*When you think about the local TV station affiliated with this site, what qualities come to mind?*” A text box was provided for respondent comments. To assess overall brand contentment, Question 14 asked respondents to indicate their level of satisfaction on a scale of 1 (not at all satisfied) to 5 (extremely satisfied) regarding the following statement, “*Overall, how satisfied are you with the local news from this television station?*”

The next series of questions (Question 15-21) dealt with the respondent’s favorite newscaster. The questions here pertained to the respondent’s level of contact with their favorite newscaster, as well as how often they accessed information about their favorite newscaster on the station Web site. These questions produced categorical variables. The last question in this section (Question 22) also dealt with newscasters and related to the study’s core inquiry. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their disagreement or agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) regarding the following questions from the 10-item scale created by Rubin and Perse (1987) and slightly modified for this study: *I feel sorry for my favorite newscaster when he or she makes a mistake; my favorite newscaster makes me feel comfortable, as if I am with a good friend; I see my favorite newscaster as a natural, down-to-earth person; I look forward to watching my favorite newscaster on the news; if my favorite newscaster*

appeared on another TV program, I would watch that program; when my favorite newscaster reports a story, he or she seems to understand the kinds of things I want to know; if there were a story about my favorite newscaster in the newspaper, magazine, or online, I would read it; I miss seeing my favorite newscaster when he or she is on vacation; I would like to meet my favorite newscaster in person; I find my favorite newscaster to be attractive.

Section Three

Section three of the survey asked respondents about their devotion and dedication to the local TV station and its Web site. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their disagreement or agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) regarding the following scale items, which were modified from Ha and Chan-Olmsted's (2004) loyalty construct (Question 23): *After visiting this site, I want to watch this station's newscasts more often; after visiting this site, I feel more involved with this station's newscasts; after visiting this site, I feel more attached to this station's newscasts.*

Next, respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their disagreement or agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) regarding the modified scale items from Gupta and Kim's (2007) commitment construct (Question 24). Questions that relate to brand loyalty and word-of-mouth promotion were also included: *I intend to visit this Web site again; I intend to watch this station's on-air newscasts again; I tell others about interesting news stories on this Web site; I tell others about interesting stories on this station's TV newscasts; I send others videos or links of interesting news*

stories from this station's Web site; I actively contribute comments or content to this Web site; this is the only local TV news Web site I visit; this is the only local news station I watch; I care about the long-term success of this news station.

The last item (Question 25) in section three asked, “*What advice would you give to local TV stations to attract more people to watch or go to the station Web site?*” A text box was provided for respondents. This question was primarily to solicit comments from respondents regarding the experiences they felt were missing from their encounter with the station and its site.

Section Four

Section four asked respondents about their use of different media (Question 26) and how many hours on an average day they spend watching television (Question 27), watching local news (Question 28), spend online (Question 29), and spend online visiting local news Web sites (Question 30). The general media question sought to yield categorical data. The questions inquiring about time viewing and visiting had fill-in-the-blank answers in order to obtain continuous data. Question 31 asked respondents about their use of different social media, hoping to attain categorical data for frequency analysis. Question 32 inquired about respondents' attitudes toward social media and social media as a news platform. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their disagreement or agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) regarding the following questions: *I like using social networks (Facebook, Twitter, etc.); social networks (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) are useful ways to get news; this station should use social networks (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) more often.*

Section Five

Background and demographic questions on the survey included age (Question 33), gender (Question 34), race/ethnicity (Question 35), level of education (Question 36), income (Question 37), and how far respondents live from the TV station (Question 38). The last question regarding residence attempted to determine whether the respondents were primarily local or whether respondents resided in other states or even other countries, given the global reach of the Internet. The demographic questions allowed for group comparisons and for additional analysis.

Treatment of Data

This section provides a synopsis of the procedures and tests used to examine the three research questions and the four hypotheses. The data were downloaded from SurveyMonkey.com and uploaded into the SPSS statistical computer program for analysis. Several frequency tests as well as statistical tests were performed. Data analysis and interpretation followed steps outlined by Creswell (2009).

Step 1

Given the self-selected nonrandom sample, it was difficult to determine who did not respond to the survey. Instead, this study collected survey respondents' background and demographic information and compared the data to previous studies on the Internet population. King's (1998) audience analysis of online local TV news visitors, along with other studies helped with this effort. The similarities and differences with the different samples are discussed in the respondent profile section later in this chapter.

Step 2

Differences outlined in step one determined whether response bias existed and whether nonrespondents' participation would have significantly altered results. In addition, in order to further assess validity, an independent samples t-test was conducted to compare early and late respondents on key variables such as TV PSI, Web PSI, loyalty, and commitment. The findings are also outlined in the respondent profile section.

Step 3

Descriptive analysis of survey data was done. Analysis indicated means and standard deviations for interval-level variables in the study. For nominal data, frequencies or percentages were reported instead of means and standard deviations.

Step 4

The Cronbach alpha statistic was used for reliability checks to assess the internal consistency of the study's scales. This assessment helped determine if the items in a scale are measuring the same underlying construct (Wimmer & Dominick, 2006). The process used to examine reliability included checking the inter-item correlation matrix for negative values, assessing Cronbach alpha values, and evaluating alpha values to determine if the overall scale would benefit should certain items be deleted (Pallant, 2007). The procedure found no negative values, indicating the scale items were measuring the same principal characteristic. All Cronbach alpha values were at .8 or above, which is considered preferable in social science studies (Field, 2005). No items from the scales were deleted given the relatively high values. Table 1 summarizes the

means, standard deviations, and Cronbach alpha values of the scales used for this study.

Past studies have found all scales used for this study to be reliable and valid.

Table 1. Measurement Summary

| Measures | M | SD | Cronbach α |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|
| Station usefulness and quality | 8.65 | 1.50 | .92 |
| Site usefulness and quality | 15.65 | 3.84 | .82 |
| TV parasocial interaction | 33.01 | 12.44 | .96 |
| Web parasocial interaction | 17.18 | 4.59 | .84 |
| Loyalty to news station and site | 9.92 | 2.43 | .91 |
| Commitment to news station and site | 32.23 | 6.06 | .80 |

Step 5

SPSS was used to test the primary inferential research questions and hypotheses.

The research assessed both relationships among variables and comparisons among groups. For the most part, independent variables were measured on a continuous score, along with the mediating and dependent variables. A variety of techniques were employed to explore relationships, including correlation analysis, standard multiple regression, and hierarchical multiple regression to test for mediation. For comparing groups, t-tests were used to examine the influence of gender and two-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) examined differences involving two independent variables. Prior to analysis, the assumptions of each statistical test were assessed.

Detailed procedures of how these tests were used to answer the research questions and hypotheses are outlined below.

For Research Question 1 (What viewing and visiting characteristics lead to TV station and Web site brand loyalty and commitment?) correlation analysis was used. The following attributes were compared to loyalty and commitment to investigate any relationships: station difference, satisfaction, age, hours watching TV, hours watching local TV news, hours online, and hours visiting local news sites. The variables were selected based on the literature and measurement properties. Continuous variables are needed for correlation analysis.

For correlation analysis, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to investigate the strength of the relationship between two variables. Scatterplots and preliminary analysis were performed to assess correlation assumptions, including linearity. An r of 1 indicates a perfect positive correlation, while an r of -1 indicates a perfect negative correlation. A zero reflects an absence of a linear relationship (Aaker et al., 2007). Essentially, the closer the value is to 0.00, the weaker the relationship (Pyrzack, 2003). A positive relationship shows that as the value of one variable goes up, the other variable's value increases as well. A negative relationship shows that as the value of one variable increases, the other decreases and vice versa (Pallant, 2007).

The correlation coefficient was used to measure the size of an effect (Field, 2005). Values between 0 and 1 can be interpreted in different ways, however, Cohen (1988) suggested the following: $r = .10-.29$ small effect, $r = .30-.49$ medium effect, $r = .50$ to 1.0, large effect. Wimmer and Dominick (2006) proposed that rather than examine the

numbers alone, to instead place values in the context of the research and the nature of the study. After correlation analysis, standard multiple regression was used to determine the attributes that best lead to loyalty and commitment. Only variables found to have significant relationships from the correlation analysis were used for multiple regression.

Multiple regression is an extension of correlation. The technique is used not only to explore relationships, but to examine the predictive ability of independent variables on one continuous dependent variable (Aaker et al., 2007). There are different types of multiple regression techniques that can be used; the specific technique depends on the type of question that needs to be answered. For Research Question 1, standard multiple regression was employed. With standard multiple regression, all the independent variables are entered in the equation simultaneously (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Preliminary analysis for multiple regression included checking for multicollinearity, linearity, and other issues sensitive to the statistical technique. The results were evaluated to see how much of the variance in the dependent variable is explained in the model (Pallant, 2007). The R square value and p value (statistical significance) were reported. Thereafter, the independent variables were assessed to see which of the independent variables made a statistically significant and unique contribution to the model. Beta values and statistical significance were reported.

In order to compare groups for Research Question 1, a two-way between groups ANOVA was used to investigate the affect of age and frequency of visiting the station's Web site, as well as age and watching the station's newscasts. Frequency measures specific to the station and site were measured on an ordinal scale. In order to create a

categorical variable for the continuous variable of age, four categories were generated for the test: Group 1: 18-34; Group 2: 35-47; Group 3: 48-56; and Group 4: 57 and older.

The categories were created using the visual binning feature in SPSS, which allowed identification of suitable cut-off points for categories (Pallant, 2007). Respondents were divided into the four groups according to their age. The dependent variables were loyalty and commitment. The two-way ANOVA allows for a simultaneous test of each of the independent variables and also identifies any interaction effects (Pyrzczak, 2003).

Levene's test for homogeneity of variances was used to examine assumptions. A Levene's test with a value greater than .05 indicates there is no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance. Interpretation of the results involved identifying any significant interaction effects and main effects. While partial eta squared was provided in the SPSS output, eta squared was calculated instead. Levine & Hullett (2002) cautioned researchers using partial eta square in place of eta square are at risk of reporting incorrect and often overestimated values. Cohen (1988) was used to classify effect size as small, medium, or large. Post-hoc tests were performed for results with significant interactions or main effects that warranted closer attention.

Research Question 2 (How is the TV PSI construct different from the Web PSI construct?) was approached along several fronts. First, the internal consistency of both scales was compared. This assessment included checking the inter-item correlation matrix and the Cronbach's alpha value. Afterwards, both constructs were correlated with each other. Other correlations followed: the variables used for Research Question 1 and the liking social networks variable.

Next, t-tests were used to compare gender differences with the two constructs and with the likelihood of crossing media platforms variable. An independent-samples t-test was used to compare the mean scores of two different groups. The test assesses whether one group is statistically different from the other in relation to the dependent variable (Pyrzczak, 2003). Interpretation of the analysis involves checking the mean and standard deviation of both groups, checking assumptions (starting with Levene's test for equality of variances), assessing the differences between the two groups, and calculating effect size (Pallant, 2007).

Following this, a two-way between-groups ANOVA was used to compare gender and education with both TV and Web PSI. Age and frequency of visiting the station Web site, as well as age and watching the station's newscasts were also examined. Primarily, however, the survey research was interested in the strength of relationships between variables, rather than differences among groups.

In order to answer Research Question 3 (Do perceived station usefulness and quality, perceived site usefulness and quality, TV PSI, and Web PSI mediate the relationship between viewing and visiting characteristics (such as attitudes and behaviors) and loyalty and commitment?), hierarchical multiple regression was used to test for mediation. Unlike standard multiple regression, hierarchical multiple regression allows variables to be entered into the equation in a specific order. Variables were entered into blocks, which allowed for certain variables to be controlled, while assessing the predictive ability of other variables (Pallant, 2007). Table 2 illustrates the independent variables, mediating variables, and dependent variables used for analysis. The

independent variables were determined by Research Question 1. While age is a factor in television news viewing and online use, it was not considered critical in the assessment of these relationships given the study's purposive sample. Age was used as the control variable.

Table 2. Variables for Research Question 3

| Independent Variables | Mediating Variables | Dependent Variables |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Station Difference | Station Usefulness and Quality | Loyalty to News Station and Site |
| Satisfaction | Site Usefulness and Quality | Commitment to News Station and Site |
| Hours Watching TV | TV Parasocial Interaction | |
| Hours Online | Web Parasocial Interaction | |
| Likely to Always Access Weather Information on Site | | |

The study followed the steps outlined by Williams (2003), Bates and Khasawneh (2002), Baron and Kenny (1986), and Judd and Kenny (1981) to test for mediation using hierarchical multiple regression in SPSS:

- 1) The control variable was entered into block one, then the independent variables (I) were entered into the model as block two, and regressed on the dependent variable (D).

- 2) The control variable was entered into block one, then the mediator variable (M) was entered into the model as block two, and regressed on the dependent variable (D).
- 3) The control variable was entered into block one, then the independent variables (I) were entered into the model as block two, and regressed on the mediator variable (M).
- 4) If steps 1-3 produced significant models, the control variable was entered into block one, then the mediator variable (M) was entered into the model as block two, then the independent variables (I) were entered into block three, and regressed on the dependent variable (D). If a significant model for step four was found, partial mediation existed; meanwhile, if a nonsignificant model resulted, full mediation existed. If full mediation was found, the effect of I on D could be mediated or altered when M is controlled for, and the effect of I on D would no longer be significant (Williams, 2003; Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Four hypotheses summed up the core relationships this study sought to examine. In order to answer all four hypotheses, correlation analysis was used. The research analysis used a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient to examine Hypothesis 1 (Perceived station usefulness and quality is positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site.), Hypothesis 2 (Perceived site usefulness and quality is positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site.), Hypothesis 3 (Perceived relationships, in the form of TV PSI is positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site.), and Hypothesis 4 (Perceived relationships, in

the form of Web PSI is positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site.). After correlation analysis, standard multiple regression was used to determine the best predictor of loyalty and commitment.

Step 6

The final step in the data analysis was to present the results in figures or tables and interpret the results from the statistical tests. This last step involved drawing conclusions from the results. Interpretation consisted of reporting whether or not results of statistical tests were statistically significant, whether the results answered the research questions or hypotheses, and an explanation of why the results might have occurred. This explanation tied back to theory and the literature. The study's results and implications for theory and practice are discussed in the last two chapters.

Respondent Profile

In total, 327 respondents started the survey. Responses from the six stations involved in the study were as follows: KHQ (N = 107), KTUU (N = 111), KEZI (N = 69), KOBH (N = 18), KDRV (N = 11), and KOHD (N = 11). Overall, 277 surveys were valid for analysis. Approximately 62.6% of respondents were women, 37.4% were men. The majority of respondents (76%) were White/Anglo, while 10.3% identified themselves American Indian/Native American/Alaska Native, a little more than 5% total were Black/African American or Hispanic/Latino. Those who consider themselves Asian/Pacific Islander, mixed race/ethnicity or preferred not to answer made up 8% of total respondents. The mean age for respondents was 45, with the minimum age at 18, the maximum at 77 years old. Most respondents had some college education (44.3%) or

their bachelor's degree (23.3%). Some had attended graduate school (9.2%), while a few (7.6%) had their master's degree. When it came to income, 26.3% made less than \$30,000, followed by 22.1% who made just under \$49,000. Income was difficult to assess in that 18.3% preferred not to answer the question.

Validity

Given the self-selected sample for this study, the respondent profile above was compared to previous studies (King, 1998; Pew, 2010) outlined in Chapter II to help assess validity. Statistical tests were also used to examine validity issues. While there are different types of validity, this section aims to address the overall issue of external validity, or the extent to which the study as a whole measures what it is supposed to measure and whether the possibility exists that findings can be applied to other similar contexts (Pallant, 2007; Wimmer & Dominick, 2006).

Comparisons show the study's respondents are similar in age, gender, and educational levels. While King's (1998) sample had more men participating in the survey, he noted that the gender gap on the Internet was narrowing. After more than a decade, studies show the gap has narrowed considerably (Pew, 2010). Additional items used to assess validity included identification of station call letters and proximity to the television station. Of those who typed in the call letters of the station, close to 100% matched the response collector for that specific station. Five responses did not have an exact match, but came close to the call letters. Approximately 53.4% of respondents reported living in the same city where the local TV station was located, close to the same city (30.9%) or in the same state (11.8%).

In addition to these measures, statistical tests of validity were also important to conduct. T -tests were used to examine key variables to see if there were differences between early and late respondents. Radhakrishna and Doamekpor (2008) maintained that late respondents have characteristics similar to those of non-respondents. Additional tests to explore these differences help to strengthen the validity of studies.

To conduct these tests, respondents were placed into two groups: early responders and late responders. Early responders were those who participated in the survey in October. Late responders were those who took part in the survey in November. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the scores for early and late responders when it came to key variables in the study: station usefulness and quality, site usefulness and quality, TV parasocial interaction, Web parasocial interaction, loyalty, and commitment.

Starting with station usefulness and quality, the t-test indicated there was no significant difference in the scores for early responders ($M = 8.41$, $SD = 1.83$) and late responders ($M = 8.82$, $SD = 1.17$); $t(150.91) = -1.90$, $p = .059$ n.s. (two-tailed). For site usefulness and quality, the t-test indicated there was no significant difference in the scores for early responders ($M = 15.31$, $SD = 4.18$) and late responders ($M = 15.91$, $SD = 3.56$); $t(230.35) = -1.25$, $p = .210$ n.s. (two-tailed). The remaining tests revealed the same pattern. In terms of TV parasocial interaction, the t-test found no significant difference in the scores for early responders ($M = 31.51$, $SD = 13.57$) and late responders ($M = 34.19$, $SD = 11.38$); $t(207) = -1.55$, $p = .122$ n.s. (two-tailed). In gauging Web parasocial interaction, the t-test also showed there was no significant difference in the scores for

early responders ($M = 16.81$, $SD = 4.98$) and late responders ($M = 17.45$, $SD = 4.28$); $t(229.85) = -1.12$, $p = .262$ n.s. (two-tailed). As for loyalty, the t-test indicated there was no significant difference in the scores for early responders ($M = 9.95$, $SD = 2.37$) and late responders ($M = 9.89$, $SD = 2.48$); $t(209) = 1.78$, $p = .859$ n.s. (two-tailed). Finally with commitment, the t-test pointed to the same conclusion: no significant difference in the scores for early responders ($M = 31.65$, $SD = 5.92$) and late responders ($M = 32.71$, $SD = 6.15$); $t(202) = -1.24$, $p = .216$ n.s. (two-tailed).

Radhakrishna and Doamekpor (2008) argued that when t-tests showed no difference between early respondents and late respondents, it is then possible to generalize the findings to the population. While attempting to generalize using a non-random sample is cautioned (Dillman, 2007), the tests nonetheless helped to ensure some measure of validity. Wimmer and Dominick (2006) believed that validity was a matter of degree, that studies were not completely valid or invalid. Rather, most studies end up somewhere in the middle. This study's attempts at validity opted for that middle ground.

Summary

This chapter presented the research process used to investigate the role of parasocial interaction on local TV news Web site visitors' loyalty and commitment. Visitors to six local TV stations in the Pacific Northwest were invited to participate in the online survey posted on each station's Web site. In all, there were 277 useable surveys for analysis. Given the method, the overall response rate could not be calculated. However, the validity of the sample was assessed through comparative means. Comparisons with previous studies show the sample exhibits a similar profile to that of

Internet users in past studies. To further assess validity, responses were compared using statistical tests. These responses showed there were no statistically significant differences between early responders and late responders of the survey, therefore strengthening validity arguments. The survey participants represented the online local TV news audience for one station in Alaska, one in Washington, and four in Oregon.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

This chapter provides the respondent media use profile and the results of the statistical tests used to answer the three research questions and four hypotheses discussed in the previous chapters. The research questions examined what factors contribute to loyalty and commitment of the local television station brand as well as the specific role of parasocial interaction in establishing brand dedication in the form of loyalty and commitment. The first research question attempted to determine the viewing and visiting attributes that contribute to station and site attachment. The second research question endeavored to provide an assessment of differences between the TV parasocial construct (Rubin & Perse, 1987) and the Web parasocial construct (Hoerner, 1999). Meanwhile, the four hypotheses examined the relationships that govern usefulness and quality, parasocial interaction, and loyalty and commitment. Lastly, the third research question evaluated whether parasocial interaction explains the relationship between viewing and visiting attributes and loyalty and commitment. For all statistical tests, the alpha value was set at .05. Prior to a discussion on statistical results, a respondent media use profile is presented. This profile, along with the research questions and hypotheses contributed to the academic literature by bringing parasocial interaction into the digital age, providing

insight into the online local TV news audience, and advancing literature regarding branding and local TV news.

Respondent Media Use Profile

The majority of respondents visited the local TV news site where they found the survey because of habit (53.3%), a story during the station's newscast (12.5%), a promotion during the newscast or commercial break (6.3%), a blog article or link (5.2%) or a combination of both on-air and online means (10.5%). A text box was provided for comments regarding a variety of these means. These comments included, "Looking for a story I missed [on the newscast]," "I often check when I hear about an interesting story," and "Things were slow at work." Additional comments dealt with television promotion that prompted people to visit the station Web site. These comments included, "Station commercial for the 11p.m. segment" and "Commercial news update with a prompt to visit the site."

Most respondents visited the site often, visiting several times a week (30%), once a day (17.1%) or several times a day (18.8%). Respondents were asked to also rate features found on local TV news Web sites. One means they never access the feature, selecting 5 means they always use the feature. Each feature was rated separately. Of the items, the majority selected "always" for local news ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 1.13$), breaking news ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.19$), and weather ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 1.39$).

A majority of respondents (91.6%) watch local television news and specifically

watch the on-air newscasts affiliated with the TV news site (90.5%). A text box was provided for respondents to cite reasons for not watching local news. Some of these reasons include, "Get all my news online," "Too busy, tend to use online outlets for news," and "I do not watch television on a regular basis." One reason for not watching the station affiliated with the site includes preference for a competing station ("I prefer the other station's weather;" "I don't like the anchors, too much effort in graphics and not in stories, not in-depth coverage"). In the latter comment, one respondent felt the station was more style than substance, placing more importance on the visual graphics versus good news content. Another reason for not watching was that geographic location hindered viewership ("I don't live where I can see this TV news on the air.").

Those who do watch the on-air newscasts affiliated with the site watch often: several times a week (28.4%), once a day (31.5%) or several times a day (25.9%). Most respondents watch these newscasts during its regularly scheduled time (81%), use a combination of watching live newscasts, on the Internet or recorded by DVR (9.5%) or the Internet alone to watch newscasts (5.6%). As a whole, respondents felt the TV station associated with the Web site was different from other TV stations in the area. A '1' indicated strong disagreement; a '5' pointed to strong agreement that the station was indeed different. The idea of station difference resonated with respondents ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 1.11$). As for satisfaction with news from the local station (one indicated not at all satisfied, five meant extremely satisfied), respondents tended to be quite satisfied ($M =$

4.22, $SD = .854$), with very little variability in the assessment of this satisfaction.

In addition to these questions, respondents were asked about their relationship with their favorite newscaster. Ninety percent of respondents did not personally know their favorite newscaster, 80% had never met their favorite newscaster in person, and 92% had never attempted to contact their favorite newscaster. Of those who had attempted to contact their favorite newscaster, most used e-mail, while one mentioned using the phone. Another respondent reported using Facebook to initiate contact. Online, 81% had not read their favorite newscaster's biography on the Web site, while 15% reported reading newscaster biographies. The rest reported the newscaster did not have a biography on the Web site. In terms of blogs, nearly 89% had not read their favorite newscaster's blog on the Web site, while 7% had read the blog. The others noted there were no newscaster blogs on the site. As for online interaction, 93% had not responded with comments to their favorite newscaster's blog, while 3% had responded with comments.

Respondents were also asked to select all of the media they use in order to get news. The most popular news sources were broadcast television (83%), traditional print newspapers (54.5%), online newspapers (50.8%), and broadcast radio (50.4%). Regarding social media, Facebook (52.3%) and YouTube (26.5%) were noted, although some respondents reported they did not visit or use social network sites (34.5%) at all. In addition, respondents were asked to rate their attitude on social networks and news. A

'1' indicated strong disagreement; a '5' meant strong agreement with the statement.

In general, respondents remained moderate to the following statements: *I like using social networks* ($M = 3.02, SD = 1.66$); *social networks are useful ways to get news* ($M = 2.55, SD = 1.50$); *this station should use social networks more often* ($M = 2.57, SD = 1.42$). Lastly, respondents were asked about the time they spend watching television or visiting sites online. On a typical day respondents reported an average of three hours watching television, one hour specifically watching local TV news, four hours online, and one hour specifically visiting news sites.

The respondent media use profile revealed four important points. First, respondents varied in their media use, but tended to lean toward the Integrators audience segment (Pew, 2008). As outlined in Chapter II, this audience segment uses television as the primary source of news, but supplements news sources with online and other traditional media. Traditionalists rarely go online, while Net-Newsters tend to rely primarily on online sources for news. Second, television promotion of the Web presence works. Many respondents went online after they saw promotions during the newscast or commercial break that piqued their interest. Third, most respondents don't personally know their favorite newscaster and have not attempted to increase contact with their favorite newscaster outside of the television news relationship. Lastly, there is evidence of site and station loyalty. Respondents habitually checked the site and perceived distinctions with the station apart from the other stations in the market. Respondents also

felt a high degree of satisfaction with the local news content from the station. These viewing and visiting attributes and their possible contributions to loyalty and commitment are further examined in the research questions and hypotheses.

Loyalty and Commitment Predictors

Research Question 1

Research question 1 examined which viewing and visiting characteristics lead to TV station and Web site brand loyalty and commitment. Three approaches were used to examine the research question: Correlation analysis, standard multiple regression, and two-way between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results are outlined in detail below.

For correlation analysis, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to describe both the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two continuous variables (Pyrzczak, 2003). Data indicate several attributes contribute to TV station and Web site brand loyalty and commitment. These attributes can be classified as brand attitudes and viewing and visiting behaviors. Starting with attitudes, respondents who believed there was a distinct difference with the local TV news station and were also extremely satisfied with the local news from the station were more likely to be loyal and committed. Perceived difference with the station and loyalty were significantly correlated ($r = .372, p = .001$), as was perceived difference with the station and commitment ($r = .497, p = .001$). Satisfaction with news from the station and loyalty were significantly correlated ($r = .523, p = .001$), along with satisfaction with news from the station and commitment ($r = .550, p = .001$). In addition, those who like to use social networks and

loyalty were significantly correlated ($r = .160, p = .05$), as was those who like to use social networks and commitment ($r = .268, p = .001$).

Next, viewing and visiting behaviors that lead to station and site loyalty included accessing site features such as breaking news, local news, and weather. Respondents' likelihood to access breaking news on the local TV news site was significantly and positively correlated with loyalty ($r = .172, p = .013$) and commitment ($r = .246, p = .001$). In addition, respondents' likelihood to access local news on the TV news site was significantly and positively correlated with loyalty ($r = .155, p = .025$) and commitment ($r = .173, p = .014$). Lastly, respondents' likelihood to access weather on the TV news site was significantly and positively correlated with loyalty ($r = .233, p = .001$) and commitment ($r = .268, p = .001$). Significant and positive correlations were also found with hours watching local news and loyalty ($r = .281, p = .001$) and hours watching television and loyalty ($r = .157, p = .023$), hours watching local news and commitment ($r = .210, p = .003$), as well as hours online and commitment ($r = .298, p = .001$), and hours online visiting news sites and commitment ($r = .200, p = .004$).

There was not significant correlations between age and loyalty ($r = .009, p = .895$ n.s.) and age and commitment ($r = -.124, p = .080$ n.s.). Other nonsignificant correlations include hours watching television and commitment ($r = -.001, p = .985$ n.s.), hours online and loyalty ($r = .112, p = .110$ n.s.), and hours online visiting news sites and loyalty ($r = .100, p = .151$ n.s.). These significant correlations show where possible relationships with loyalty and commitment can exist. After correlation analysis discovered potential contributors to loyalty and commitment, standard multiple regression was used to identify

the best predictors. Only variables found in the correlation analysis to be statistically significant were used for multiple regression.

The results of the first model indicated the seven predictors explained 37% of the variance in loyalty ($R^2 = .363$, $F(7,188) = 15.31$, $p = .001$). The model indicates three variables made a statistically significant and unique contribution to the equation: station difference ($\beta = .166$, $p = .010$), station satisfaction ($\beta = .397$, $p = .001$), and hours watching local TV news ($\beta = .191$, $p = .001$). Of these variables, satisfaction provided the most predictive ability to loyalty. Variables that did not make a significant contribution to loyalty included accessing breaking news ($\beta = .016$, $p = .857$ n.s.), accessing local news on the site ($\beta = -.043$, $p = .617$ n.s.), accessing weather ($\beta = .112$, $p = .118$ n.s.), and liking social networks ($\beta = .086$, $p = .155$ n.s.).

The results of the second model indicated the nine predictors explained 49% of the variance in commitment ($R^2 = .493$, $F(9, 189) = 20.41$, $p = .001$). The model indicates four variables made a statistically significant and unique contribution to the equation: accessing weather ($\beta = .162$, $p = .013$), station difference ($\beta = .275$, $p = .001$), station satisfaction ($\beta = .375$, $p = .001$), and hours online ($\beta = .183$, $p = .003$). Satisfaction was the greatest contributor to commitment. Variables that did not make a significant contribution to commitment included accessing breaking news ($\beta = .117$, $p = .126$ n.s.), accessing local news ($\beta = -.103$, $p = .179$ n.s.), liking social networks ($\beta = .092$, $p = .101$ n.s.), and hours watching local TV news ($\beta = .030$, $p = .585$ n.s.)

Both regression models showed satisfaction and station difference as strong predictors of loyalty and commitment. The number of hours watching television also

leads to loyalty, while the number of hours online foretells commitment. Respondents who most often access weather information on the news site also appear to predict commitment.

In addition to examining relationships and predictors, differences among groups were also explored to further investigate variables involved with loyalty and commitment. A two-way between groups ANOVA was conducted to examine the influence of age, frequency of visits/viewing to loyalty and commitment. The two-way design included two categorical independent variables and one continuous dependent variable.

The first ANOVA test allowed for a simultaneous test of frequency of site visit and age variables on loyalty. Levene's test for homogeneity of variances showed a significance value of .094. The value is greater than .05, indicating there is no violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance. The interaction effect between age and site frequency was not statistically significant, $F(15, 183) = .612, p = .863$ n.s. There was no difference in loyalty scores when it came to respondents' age and the number of times they accessed the local TV station Web site. The main effect of age ($F(3, 183) = .387, p = .763$ n.s.) and the main effect of visit frequency ($F(6, 183) = 1.63, p = .140$ n.s.) were also not significant.

Similar results were found for ANOVAs that involved frequency of site visit and age as independent variables and commitment as the dependent variable (Levene's test $p = .398$), $F(16, 176) = .840, p = .639$ n.s. There was no interaction effect. The main effect of age also did not reach statistical significance $F(3, 176) = 1.75, p = .158$ n.s. The main

effect of site visit on commitment, however, was significant $F(6, 176) = 5.95, p = .001$, although the effect size or strength of the association was small (eta squared = .0027 or .27% of variance explained).

Data from other ANOVAs echoed these results. For frequency of watching the station's on-air newscasts, age, and loyalty (Levene's test $p = .115$), $F(13, 184) = .986, p = .467$ n.s., the test found no differences in loyalty scores and no interaction effect. The main effect of age, did not reach statistical significance $F(3, 184) = 1.71, p = .166$ n.s. The main effect of frequency of watching on loyalty, however, was significant $F(7, 184) = 3.91, p = .001$, albeit the effect size or strength of the association was small (eta squared = .665 or .67% of variance explained).

For frequency of watching the station's on-air newscasts, age, and commitment (Levene's test $p = .056$), $F(12, 179) = 1.26, p = .243$ n.s., the test found no differences, no interaction effect. The main effect of age also did not reach statistical significance $F(3, 179) = 2.70, p = .047$ n.s. Meanwhile, the main effect of watching frequency on commitment, was significant $F(7, 179) = 5.34, p = .001$, the effect size or strength of the association, nonetheless, was small (eta squared = .0052 or .52% of variance explained).

The tests using two-way between groups ANOVA showed age and frequency of visiting/viewing together does not impact loyalty and commitment. However, frequency of site visit and frequency of viewing does have some affect on loyalty and commitment, albeit the connection or differences remain slight.

Parasocial Interaction

Research Question 2

Research question 2 examined the TV parasocial interaction construct and the Web parasocial interaction construct for differences. The focus of these tests was exploring relationships, as well as exploring differences between groups. The statistical techniques used were correlation analysis, t-tests, and two-way between-groups ANOVA. Prior to these tests, however, the reliabilities of both the TV PSI and Web PSI scales were examined.

Rubin and Perse (1987) found the television parasocial interaction scale had good internal consistency, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient reported at .96. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the TV PSI scale remained the same for this study at .96. Similarly, Hoerner (1999) found the Web parasocial interaction scale to be valid. Using factor analysis, Hoerner demonstrated the Web PSI scale could be used to measure parasocial interaction and affinity for a Web site. This study is the first test of Hoerner's scale, modified for the local television news Web site context. Previous modifications of the Web PSI scale showed the Web PSI scale has good internal consistency, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient reported at .83 (Thorson & Rodgers, 2006). The Web PSI scale for this study had a Cronbach alpha coefficient at .84. An examination of the item-total statistics show a lower alpha would result should any of the scale items be deleted. The values of each scale are above .8, suggesting the items are more or less measuring the same underlying construct. Overall, however, the TV parasocial construct remains more reliable than the Web parasocial construct.

Next, both scales were correlated with each other to determine the strength of their relationship. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to assess association. The results indicate there is a significant positive correlation between TV PSI and Web PSI ($r = .379, p = .001$), with moderate levels of television parasocial interaction associated with Web parasocial interaction.

Other correlations also show statistically significant relationships: accessing breaking news and TV PSI ($r = .159, p = .022$) or Web PSI ($r = .370, p = .001$); accessing local news and TV PSI ($r = .147, p = .036$) or Web PSI ($r = .345, p = .001$); accessing weather and TV PSI ($r = .142, p = .042$) or Web PSI ($r = .397, p = .001$). As with loyalty and commitment, always accessing these site features appear to be associated with both TV and Web parasocial interaction, as with hours watching television and Web PSI ($r = .195, p = .002$) and hours online visiting news sites and Web PSI ($r = .183, p = .003$).

However, unlike loyalty and commitment, no relationships appear to be in place for the following variables: hours watching television and TV PSI ($r = .084, p = .236$); hours online visiting news sites and TV PSI ($r = .107, p = .130$); hours online and TV PSI ($r = .070, p = .329$), and hours online and Web PSI ($r = .086, p = .176$), liking social networks and TV PSI ($r = .138, p = .051$), and liking social networks and Web PSI ($r = .122, p = .051$).

Following correlation analysis, t-tests were used to examine if there is a statistical difference in the mean scores according to gender. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the TV PSI scores for men and women. The data indicate there was no significant difference in the scores for men ($M = 34.15, SD = 9.80$) and women

($M = 32.44$, $SD = 14.02$); $t(195) = 1.01$, $p = .312$ n.s. (two-tailed). Similarly, when assessing a specific item on the television parasocial scale that measured whether or not respondents were willing to cross platforms to learn more about their favorite newscaster (*if there were a story about my favorite newscaster in the newspaper, magazine, or online, I would read it*), an independent samples t-test showed there was no significant difference in the scores for men ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 1.17$) and women ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.56$); $t(201) = 1.07$, $p = .283$ n.s. (two-tailed). As for Web parasocial interaction, an independent samples t-test indicated there was no significant difference in the scores for men ($M = 16.53$, $SD = 4.79$) and women ($M = 17.61$, $SD = 4.18$); $t(252) = -1.87$, $p = .062$ n.s. (two-tailed).

To further assess group differences, a two-way between-groups ANOVA was used to investigate the role of both gender and education on TV PSI and Web PSI. Levy (1979) found respondent education to be strongly correlated with parasocial interaction. However, for gender, education, and TV parasocial (Levene's test $p = .001$), $F(6, 185) = 1.03$, $p = .406$ n.s., the test found no differences in TV parasocial scores and no interaction effect. The main effect of gender, did not reach statistical significance $F(1, 185) = 1.29$, $p = .257$ n.s. Neither did the main effect of education $F(7, 185) = .472$, $p = .854$ n.s. Likewise, for gender, education, and Web parasocial (Levene's test $p = .256$), $F(6, 239) = .561$, $p = .761$ n.s., the test found no differences in Web parasocial scores and no interaction effect. The main effect of gender, did not reach statistical significance $F(1, 239) = .041$, $p = .840$ n.s. and while the main effect of education proved to be significant $F(7, 239) = 2.93$, $p = .006$, the effect size or strength of the association, nonetheless, was

small (eta squared = .0048 or .48% of variance explained).

Meanwhile, an assessment of age and frequency of visits produced comparable results. Unlike previous tests, the frequency of visit variable here used an ordinal scale and was specific to the station Web site. For age, frequency of site visit, and TV parasocial (Levene's test $p = .006$), $F(16, 173) = .919$, $p = .549$ n.s., the test found no differences in TV parasocial scores and no interaction effect. The main effect of age, did not reach statistical significance $F(3, 173) = .825$, $p = .482$ n.s. Neither did the main effect of site frequency $F(6, 173) = 1.14$, $p = .339$ n.s.

For age, frequency of site visit, and Web parasocial (Levene's test $p = .002$), $F(17, 227) = .523$, $p = .940$ n.s., the test found no differences in TV parasocial scores and no interaction effect. The main effect of age, did not reach statistical significance $F(3, 227) = .615$, $p = .606$ n.s. The main effect of site frequency proved to be significant $F(6, 227) = 5.91$, $p = .001$, but the effect size or strength of the association was small (eta squared = .0079 or .79% of variance explained).

Turning to the influence of age and frequency of viewing specific to the TV station's newscasts, statistical significance was found for both the interaction and one of the main effects. After testing for frequency of watching the station's on-air newscasts, age, and TV parasocial interaction (Levene's test $p = .121$), $F(12, 176) = 1.85$, $p = .042$, the test found differences in TV parasocial scores and an interaction effect with age and watching frequency. In other words, frequency of watching is influenced by age, and has a slight moderating effect on TV parasocial interaction scores. The main effect of age, did not reach statistical significance $F(3, 176) = 1.71$, $p = .166$ n.s. However, the main effect

of watching frequency $F(7, 176) = 5.81, p = .001$ proved to be significant. The effect size or strength of the association was small (eta squared = .021 or 2.11% of variance explained).

Lastly, regarding the influence of frequency of watching the station's on-air newscasts, age, and Web parasocial (Levene's test $p = .604$), $F(13, 184) = 2.20, p = .011$ the test found differences in Web parasocial scores and an interaction effect. Age influenced the frequency of watching television news and both provided differences in Web parasocial scores. The main effect of age was statistically significant $F(3, 184) = 2.20, p = .029$. The main effect of watching frequency was significant as well $F(7, 184) = 5.45, p = .001$. The effect size or strength of the associations was as follows: watching frequency (eta squared = .0074 or .74% of variance explained), interaction (eta squared = .00557 or .56% of variance explained), and age (eta squared = .00178 or .18% of variance explained).

In many ways, the TV PSI construct and the Web PSI construct are more similar than dissimilar. Both constructs measure affinity, but how this affinity is measured is the principal difference. TV PSI relies on personae to form relationships, while Web PSI does not. The data show differences with the two constructs as small, although respondents (the online TV news audience) appear to show more of this difference with Web PSI, rather than TV PSI. For example, while no main effect was detected with gender, education and TV PSI, a slight main effect for Web PSI was found. This is parallel to age and frequency of site visit. No main effect for frequency for TV PSI, but one for Web PSI. In terms of interaction effects, a test of frequency of watching the

station's on-air newscasts and age found a statistically significant interaction for both constructs. However, while the TV PSI found one main effect, Web PSI found both main effects significant.

Other results pointed to more similarity than differences. Relationships existed with other variables found with loyalty and commitment: accessing breaking news, accessing local news, and accessing weather. Gender did not appear to account for differences, neither did hours watching television or visiting Web sites except in the following cases where correlations with Web PSI found significant relationships with hours watching television and hours online visiting news sites. In the end, the correlation analysis of both constructs show the strength of the relationship between the two as moderate ($r = .379, p = .001$), accounting for both likeness and difference.

Mediated Relationships

Research Question 3

Research question 3 asked if perceived station usefulness and quality, perceived site usefulness and quality, TV parasocial interaction, and Web parasocial interaction mediated the relationship between viewing/visiting attitudes and behaviors and loyalty and commitment. Hierarchical multiple regression was used to answer the question. The procedure used to conduct the regression analysis is presented in detail in Chapter IV. The study followed the procedures outlined by Williams (2003), Bates and Khasawneh (2002), Baron and Kenny (1986), and Judd and Kenny (1981) for conducting the analysis and presenting the results. The results of each step are presented below using the following: an "I" represented the independent variables; "D" represented the dependent

variables; “C” represented the control variable and “M” represented the mediating variables.

Station usefulness/quality and loyalty. The following steps were used for mediation analysis:

1. C+I=D: Step 1 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .358$.
 2. C+M=D: Step 2 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .199$.
 3. C+I=M: Step 3 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .458$.
- Step 4 was conducted because the models in Steps 1 through 3 were significant.
4. C+M+I=D: Step 4 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .365$.

Please see Appendix H for Steps 1-4 model summary and ANOVA tables on station usefulness/quality and loyalty.

Step 1. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .433, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .216, p = .001$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .175, p = .004$).

Step 2. The variable with a significant *beta* was station usefulness and quality ($\beta = .448, p = .001$).

Step 3. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .599, p = .001$) and station difference ($\beta = .148, p = .010$). The significance of the models in Steps 1 through 3 shows a mediated model exists for the dependent variable. Step 4 was performed to conclude if the model was fully or partially mediated.

Step 4. The significant *betas* of the variables satisfaction ($\beta = .364, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .199, p = .002$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .171, p = .004$) show their overall importance to this model. The significant result ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .365$ in

Step 4 shows a partially mediated model exists. As a result, perceived station usefulness and quality changes the relationship between viewer attitudes/behaviors and loyalty.

After controlling for the mediating variable, the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is reduced but not to the point of nonsignificance.

Station usefulness/quality and commitment. The following steps were used for mediation analysis:

1. C+I=D: Step 1 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .474$.
2. C+M=D: Step 2 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .195$.
3. C+I=M: Step 3 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .458$.

Step 4 was conducted because the models in Steps 1 through 3 were significant.

4. C+M+I=D: Step 4 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .474$.

Please see Appendix H for Steps 1-4 model summary and ANOVA tables on station usefulness/quality and commitment.

Step 1. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .388, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .286, p = .001$), hours online ($\beta = .215, p = .001$), and weather ($\beta = .177, p = .002$).

Step 2. The variable with a significant *beta* was station usefulness and quality ($\beta = .426, p = .001$).

Step 3. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .599, p = .001$) and station difference ($\beta = .148, p = .010$). The significance of the models in Steps 1 through 3 shows a mediated model exists for the dependent variable. Step 4 was performed to conclude if the model was fully or partially mediated.

Step 4.—The significant *betas* of the variables satisfaction ($\beta = .372, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .282, p = .001$), hours online ($\beta = .215, p = .001$), and accessing weather ($\beta = .176, p = .002$) show their overall importance to this model. The significant result ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .474$ in Step 4 shows a partially mediated model exists. As a result, station usefulness/quality changes the relationship between viewer attitudes/behaviors and commitment. After controlling for the mediating variable, the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is reduced but not to the point of nonsignificance.

Site usefulness/quality and loyalty. The following steps were used for mediation analysis:

1. C+I=D: Step 1 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .358$.
 2. C+M=D: Step 2 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .221$.
 3. C+I=M: Step 3 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .293$.
- Step 4 was conducted because the models in Steps 1 through 3 were significant.
4. C+M+I=D: Step 4 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .395$.

Please see Appendix H for Steps 1-4 model summary and ANOVA tables on site usefulness/quality and loyalty.

Step 1.—The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .433, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .216, p = .001$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .175, p = .004$).

Step 2.—The variable with a significant *beta* was site usefulness and quality ($\beta = .470, p = .001$).

Step 3. The variable with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .324, p = .001$), weather ($\beta = .239, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .177, p = .007$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .143, p = .023$). The significance of the models in Steps 1 through 3 shows a mediated model exists for the dependent variable. Step 4 was performed to conclude if the model was fully or partially mediated.

Step 4. The significant *betas* of the variables satisfaction ($\beta = .358, p = .001$), site usefulness and quality ($\beta = .229, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .175, p = .005$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .143, p = .016$) show their overall importance to this model. The significant result ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .395$ in Step 4 shows a partially mediated model exists. As a result, site usefulness/quality changes the relationship between viewer attitudes/behaviors and loyalty. After controlling for the mediating variable, the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is reduced but not to the point of nonsignificance.

Site usefulness/quality and commitment. The following steps were used for mediation analysis:

1. C+I=D: Step 1 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .474$.
 2. C+M=D: Step 2 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .210$.
 3. C+I=M: Step 3 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .293$.
- Step 4 was conducted because the models in Steps 1 through 3 were significant.
4. C+M+I=D: Step 4 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .494$.

Please see Appendix H for Steps 1-4 model summary and ANOVA tables on site usefulness/quality and commitment.

Step 1. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .388, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .286, p = .001$), hours online ($\beta = .215, p = .001$), and weather ($\beta = .177, p = .002$).

Step 2. The variables with significant *betas* were site usefulness and quality ($\beta = .441, p = .001$) and ($\beta = -.132, p = .038$).

Step 3. The variable with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .324, p = .001$), weather ($\beta = .239, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .177, p = .007$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .143, p = .023$). The significance of the models in Steps 1 through 3 shows a mediated model exists for the dependent variable. Step 4 was performed to conclude if the model was fully or partially mediated.

Step 4. The significant *betas* of the variables were satisfaction ($\beta = .333, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .256, p = .001$), hours online ($\beta = .223, p = .001$), site usefulness and quality ($\beta = .171, p = .006$), and accessing weather ($\beta = .136, p = .017$) show their overall importance to this model. The significant result ($p = .001$), $R^2 = .494$ in Step 4 shows a partially mediated model exists. As a result, site usefulness/quality changes the relationship between viewer attitudes/behaviors and commitment. After controlling for the mediating variable, the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is reduced but not to the point of nonsignificance.

TV parasocial interaction and loyalty. The following steps were used for mediation analysis:

1. C+I=D: Step 1 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .358$.
 2. C+M=D: Step 2 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .158$.
 3. C+I=M: Step 3 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .191$.
- Step 4 was conducted because the models in Steps 1 through 3 were significant.
4. C+M+I=D: Step 4 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .384$.

Please see Appendix H for Steps 1-4 model summary and ANOVA tables on TV parasocial interaction and loyalty.

Step 1. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .433, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .216, p = .001$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .175, p = .004$).

Step 2. The variable with a significant *beta* was TV parasocial interaction ($\beta = .400, p = .001$).

Step 3. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .292, p = .001$) and station difference ($\beta = .205, p = .005$). The significance of the models in Steps 1 through 3 shows a mediated model exists for the dependent variable. Step 4 was performed to conclude if the model was fully or partially mediated.

Step 4. The significant *betas* of the variables satisfaction ($\beta = .380, p = .001$), TV parasocial interaction ($\beta = .180, p = .005$), station difference ($\beta = .179, p = .006$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .161, p = .008$) show their overall importance to this

model. The significant result ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .384$ in Step 4 shows a partially mediated model exists. As a result, TV PSI changes the relationship between viewer attitudes/behaviors and loyalty. After controlling for the mediating variable, the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is reduced but not to the point of nonsignificance.

TV parasocial interaction and commitment. The following steps were used for mediation analysis:

1. C+I=D: Step 1 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .474$.
 2. C+M=D: Step 2 produced a statistically significant ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .201$.
 3. C+I=M: Step 3 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .191$.
- Step 4 was conducted because the models in Steps 1 through 3 were significant.
4. C+M+I=D: Step 4 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .504$.

Please see Appendix H for Steps 1-4 model summary and ANOVA tables on TV parasocial interaction and commitment.

Step 1. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .388$, $p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .286$, $p = .001$), hours online ($\beta = .215$, $p = .001$), and weather ($\beta = .177$, $p = .002$).

Step 2. The variable with significant *betas* were TV parasocial interaction ($\beta = .433$, $p = .001$) and age ($\beta = -.167$, $p = .011$).

Step 3. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .292, p = .001$) and station difference ($\beta = .205, p = .005$). The significance of the models in Steps 1 through 3 shows a mediated model exists for the dependent variable. Step 4 was performed to conclude if the model was fully or partially mediated.

Step 4. The significant *betas* of the variables satisfaction ($\beta = .332, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .247, p = .001$), hours online ($\beta = .213, p = .001$), TV parasocial interaction ($\beta = .194, p = .001$), and accessing weather ($\beta = .171, p = .002$) show their overall importance to this model. The significant result ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .504$ in Step 4 shows a partially mediated model exists. As a result, TV PSI changes the relationship viewer between attitudes/behaviors and commitment. After controlling for the mediating variable, the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is reduced but not to the point of nonsignificance.

Web parasocial interaction and loyalty. The following steps were used for mediation analysis:

1. C+I=D: Step 1 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .358$.
 2. C+M=D: Step 2 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .268$.
 3. C+I=M: Step 3 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .440$.
- Step 4 was conducted because the models in Steps 1 through 3 were significant.
4. C+M+I=D: Step 4 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .390$.

Please see Appendix H for Steps 1-4 model summary and ANOVA tables on Web parasocial interaction and loyalty.

Step 1. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .433, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .216, p = .001$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .175, p = .004$).

Step 2. The variable with a significant *beta* was Web parasocial interaction ($\beta = .519, p = .001$)

Step 3. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .372, p = .001$), accessing weather ($\beta = .266, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .252, p = .001$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .203, p = .001$). The significance of the models in Steps 1 through 3 shows a mediated model exists for the dependent variable. Step 4 was performed to conclude if the model was fully or partially mediated.

Step 4. The significant *betas* of the variables satisfaction ($\beta = .344, p = .001$), Web parasocial interaction ($\beta = .240, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .156, p = .015$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .127, p = .036$) show their overall importance to this model. The significant result ($p = .001$), $R^2 = .390$ in Step 4 shows a partially mediated model exists. As a result, Web PSI changes the relationship between viewer attitudes/behaviors and loyalty. After controlling for the mediating variable, the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is reduced but not to the point of nonsignificance.

Web parasocial interaction and commitment. The following steps were used for mediation analysis:

1. C+I=D: Step 1 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .474$.
 2. C+M=D: Step 2 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .355$.
 - 3 C+I=M: Step 3 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .440$.
- Step 4 was conducted because the models in Steps 1 through 3 were significant.
4. C+M+I=D: Step 4 produced a statistically significant model ($p = .001$), $R_2 = .529$.

Please see Appendix H for Steps 1-4 model summary and ANOVA tables on Web parasocial interaction and commitment.

Step 1. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .388, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .286, p = .001$), hours online ($\beta = .215, p = .001$), and weather ($\beta = .177, p = .002$).

Step 2. The variable with significant *betas* were Web parasocial interaction ($\beta = .584, p = .001$) and age ($\beta = -.160, p = .006$).

Step 3. The variables with significant *betas* were satisfaction ($\beta = .372, p = .001$), accessing weather ($\beta = .266, p = .001$), station difference ($\beta = .252, p = .001$), and hours watching television ($\beta = .203, p = .001$). The significance of the models in Steps 1 through 3 shows a mediated model exists for the dependent variable. Step 4 was performed to conclude if the model was fully or partially mediated.

Step 4. The significant *betas* of the variables Web parasocial interaction

($\beta = .314, p = .001$), satisfaction ($\beta = .272, p = .001$), hours online ($\beta = .213, p = .001$), and station difference ($\beta = .207, p = .001$) show their overall importance to this model. The significant result ($p = .001$), $R^2 = .529$ in Step 4 shows a partially mediated model exists. As a result, Web PSI changes the relationship between viewer attitudes/behaviors and commitment. After controlling for the mediating variable, the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is reduced but not to the point of nonsignificance.

Hypotheses

Correlation analysis was used for the hypotheses. In order to investigate the strength of relationships, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used. After these relationships were analyzed, standard multiple regression was used to determine the best predictor of both loyalty and commitment. Detailed results of the tests are outlined below.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that perceived usefulness and quality of the TV news Web site is positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site. The results indicate there is a positive correlation between the variables of site usefulness and quality and loyalty ($r = .470, p = .001$), with moderate levels of site usefulness and quality associated with loyalty. Usefulness and quality helps to explain nearly 22% of the variance in respondents' scores on the loyalty scale. Results also showed that site usefulness and quality is positively correlated with commitment ($r = .438, p = .001$), with

moderate levels of usefulness and quality associated with commitment. Site usefulness and quality helps to explain approximately 18% of the variance in respondents' scores on the commitment scale.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 predicted that perceived usefulness and quality of the TV station's local news programming is positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site. The results show there is a positive correlation between the variables of usefulness and quality of local news and loyalty ($r = .444, p = .001$), with moderate levels of usefulness and quality of local news associated with loyalty. Usefulness and quality of local news helps to explain nearly 19% of the variance in respondents' scores on the loyalty scale. Results also showed that usefulness and quality of local news is positively correlated with commitment ($r = .433, p = .001$), with moderate levels of usefulness and quality of local news associated with commitment. Usefulness and quality of local news helps to explain approximately 18% of the variance in respondents' scores on the commitment scale.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 predicted that perceived relationships, in the form of TV parasocial interaction is positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site. The results indicate there is a positive correlation between the variables of TV parasocial interaction and loyalty ($r = .397, p = .001$), with moderate levels of parasocial interaction associated with loyalty. TV parasocial interaction helps to explain nearly 16% of the variance in respondents' scores on the loyalty scale. Results also showed that TV

parasocial interaction is positively correlated with commitment ($r = .417, p = .001$), with moderate levels of parasocial interaction associated with commitment. TV parasocial interaction helps to explain approximately 17% of the variance in respondents' scores on the commitment scale.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 predicted that perceived relationships, in the form of Web parasocial interaction is positively related to loyalty and commitment toward the station and site. The results show there is a positive correlation between the variables of Web parasocial interaction and loyalty ($r = .517, p = .001$), with moderately high levels of parasocial interaction associated with loyalty. Web parasocial interaction helps to explain nearly 26% of the variance in respondents' scores on the loyalty scale. Results also showed that Web parasocial interaction is positively correlated with commitment ($r = .574, p = .001$), with high levels of parasocial interaction associated with commitment. Web parasocial interaction helps to explain approximately 32% of the variance in respondents' scores on the commitment scale.

Correlation analysis determined relationships existed with the four variables of site usefulness and quality, station usefulness and quality, TV parasocial interaction, and Web parasocial interaction when correlated with loyalty and commitment. Once these relationships were established, standard multiple regression was used to conclude which of the four variables was the best predictor of both loyalty and commitment.

The results of the first model indicated the four predictors explained 37% of the variance in loyalty ($R^2 = .366, F(4,193) = 27.88, p = .001$). It was found that Web

parasocial interaction significantly predicted loyalty ($\beta = .30, p = .001$), as did station usefulness and quality ($\beta = .226, p = .001$), and TV parasocial interaction ($\beta = .180, p = .005$). However, site usefulness and quality ($\beta = .078, p = .386$ n.s.) did not contribute significantly to the regression model.

The results of the second model indicated the four predictors explained 41% of the variance in commitment ($R^2 = .413, F(4,188) = 33.07, p = .001$). It was found that Web parasocial interaction significantly predicted commitment ($\beta = .477, p = .001$), as did station usefulness and quality ($\beta = .228, p = .001$), and TV parasocial interaction ($\beta = .183, p = .004$). However, site usefulness and quality ($\beta = -.082, p = .351$ n.s.) did not contribute significantly to the regression model.

The four hypotheses accurately predicted positive relationships with station usefulness and quality, site usefulness and quality, TV parasocial interaction, and Web parasocial interaction with loyalty and commitment. Both regression models showed that out of these variables, Web parasocial interaction, station usefulness and quality, and TV parasocial interaction all serve as statistically significant predictors of loyalty and commitment. In addition, Web parasocial interaction exhibited the largest beta coefficient when compared to the contribution of other variables.

Summary of Results

This chapter provided an overview of respondents' media use and the results of the statistical tests used to answer the three research questions and four hypotheses. The study found media use among respondents primarily classified them as Integrators (Pew, 2008). As an audience segment, respondents used television as the primary source of

news, but went online as well. Descriptive data also showed television promotion can be effective in bringing television viewers online to the television news Web site. As for relationships with their favorite newscaster, the majority of respondents reported they did not personally know their favorite newscaster and have not made attempts to contact them online or through other means. In addition, the data indicated that respondents displayed evidence of loyalty given the high satisfaction scores, station difference scores, and habitual visits to the news site.

Research question 1 further investigated predictors of loyalty and commitment. The regression models confirmed satisfaction and station difference as strong predictors of loyalty and commitment. The number of hours watching television also fostered loyalty, while the number of hours online and accessing weather information led to commitment. Frequency of site visit specific to the station's site and frequency of viewing specific to the station's news programming had some affect on loyalty and commitment, although the differences remain small.

Research question 2 examined the TV PSI construct and the Web PSI construct. Both constructs reliably measured affinity, but TV PSI relies on personae to form relationships and Web PSI does not. The data show differences with the two constructs as slight, with differences among groups more pronounced with Web PSI. Relationships were found with other variables related to loyalty and commitment: accessing breaking news, accessing local news, and accessing weather. Overall, analysis showed more similarities than differences with TV PSI and Web PSI.

Research question 3 found statistically significant models for steps 1-3 with all

mediating variables: station usefulness/quality, site usefulness/quality, TV PSI, and Web PSI. Given the significance found, testing was done for step 4. All the models for the mediating variables were found to be statistically significant for step 4, indicating partial mediation between viewer attitudes and behaviors and loyalty and commitment.

Lastly, the four hypotheses correctly predicted positive relationships with station usefulness and quality, site usefulness and quality, TV parasocial interaction, and Web parasocial interaction and loyalty and commitment. Both regression models showed these variables, with the exception of site usefulness/quality serve as statistically significant predictors of loyalty and commitment. Of these variables, Web parasocial interaction had the largest beta coefficient compared to the other variables.

CHAPTER VI

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research was to advance knowledge regarding the role of parasocial interaction in local television news branding efforts, particularly in regard to the influence on loyalty and commitment outcomes. This research was the first of its kind to test both the interplay between the TV PSI construct (Rubin & Perse, 1987) and Web PSI construct (Hoerner, 1999) and their applicability to local news in the digital age. The findings from this research provide evidence for the centrality of parasocial interaction in local television news.

This chapter discusses the key implications for both theory and practice. From a theoretical perspective, the results help to advance literature in communication, marketing, and psychology regarding parasocial interaction. The research also helps to align studies in branding and television news. In addition to advancing theory, the study offers practitioners insight concerning the online TV news audience and their relationship to the station's newscasters and Web site. The results also provide stations specific indicators important to promotional efforts. Lastly, this chapter presents limitations and future research areas for consideration.

Implications for Theory

This research helped to bridge three important gaps in local television news scholarship. First, the study brought parasocial interaction into the digital age by applying both the TV and Web parasocial constructs to local TV news. Second, the study sought to re-conceptualize the online local TV news audience as both capable of functioning as audience members and as active promoters of TV content, establishing the notion of viral viewers. The modification of Gupta and Kim's (2007) commitment construct helped to further develop this concept. Third, this research addressed the need to integrate and update the academic literature on branding and local TV news.

Branding

Research question 1 examined which viewing and visiting characteristics led to TV station and Web site brand loyalty and commitment. The research incorporated site features and frequency of use items from Ha and Chan-Olmsted (2004), as well as Aaker's (1996) "Brand Equity 10" elements (satisfaction, difference, loyalty, perceived quality, personality, etc.) and Bellamy and Traudt's (2000) concept of integrating branding and television studies. The convenience sample used in Bellamy and Traudt's study was replaced by this study's online local television news sample.

Frequency analysis showed several characteristics most resonated with respondents. These characteristics were then used in the correlation analysis and put into regression models. Data from both regression models indicated that satisfaction and station difference were strong predictors of loyalty and commitment. The number of hours watching television also led to loyalty, while the number of hours online helps

predict commitment. Respondents who most often accessed weather information on the news site also helped to predict commitment. In addition to identifying predictors of loyalty and commitment, this study further advanced Ha and Chan-Olmsted's study on television branding and Web site cross promotion by placing this research under the local news context, rather than cable television. Cable television and local news are similar in that advertising supports both. However, cable revenue also comes from subscriber fees, which help create stability despite the economic downturn ("The State of the News Media," 2009). Also, unlike local news, key indicators (median prime-time viewership, profits, operation costs, etc.) showed cable gained in 2009 and is poised to do so again for 2010 ("The State of the News Media," 2010). As a whole, content for local news remains geared toward a general audience, versus a niche and often partisan audience for cable news channels such as MSNBC and FOX ("The State of the News Media," 2010).

Affective Economics

While the idea of affective ties in television has been around for awhile (Horton and Wohl, 1956; Levy, 1979), the notion that emotional bond helps to bring members of the television audience across media platforms is just starting to gain ground (Caldwell, 2003; Jenkins, 2006). Drawing from marketing literature and Kevin Roberts' notion of "love marks," Jenkins (2006) explained the concept of "affective economics" as the idea of building love for the brand on multiple platforms. Jenkins argued that in television's transition to digital, fans or loyal segments of the audience have become critical in the success of television shows by not only watching shows, but promoting them as well. However, while Jenkins' concept helped create a framework; no construct yet existed that

combined both audience and the viral nature of television news content promotion. This study's modification of Gupta and Kim's (2007) commitment construct to include the concept of evangelization or word-of-mouth (WOM) starts to fill this important research gap. Changes to the construct include the addition of three statements that measured WOM: *I tell others about interesting news stories on this Web site; I tell others about interesting stories on this station's TV newscasts; I send others videos or links of interesting news stories from this station's Web site.* In the original construct, Gupta and Kim defined commitment as not only devotion to the online community, but a member's helping behavior and active participation. This study's modification is valuable in that it builds on the original construct's definition and provides specificity in how audience members help. In addition, the WOM statements reflect the fact that videos can now be passed on through viral means. The modified commitment construct had a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .80, indicating good reliability. Face validity for the construct also appeared credible.

Research question 3 found that in addition to station usefulness/quality and perceived site usefulness/quality, TV PSI and Web PSI partially mediated the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables. The regression models showed affective ties to the station's news persona and the affinity to the Web site helped to explain the relationship between viewing/visiting characteristics (such as attitudes and behaviors) and loyalty and commitment.

Parasocial Interaction

In the original studies, tests of the TV PSI construct and Web PSI construct relied on convenience samples from university populations. Much of recent research in this area has also based their findings on this type of sample (Conway & Rubin, 1991; Rubin & Step, 2000; Thorson and Rodgers, 2006). This study, then, offered a new perspective on these established constructs by using a real-world online sample. This study was also the first test of the Web PSI construct for local television news. The results showed both constructs as reliable (TV PSI $\alpha = .96$; Web PSI $\alpha = .84$). The Cronbach alpha coefficient of both scales remained the same, if not better, than the original studies. In the case of Web PSI, the original construct had a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .83. The consistency of the scales helped with issues of validity, as they remained reliable in different contexts. TV parasocial interaction remained applicable to an online TV news audience, while Web PSI worked for the context of local television news.

Research question 2 also showed that although TV PSI relies on personae to form relationships and Web PSI is independent of personae, overall, there were only slight differences with the two constructs. This small difference was exhibited with respondents and Web PSI. The data showed no main effect was detected with gender, education and TV PSI, but a small main effect for Web PSI and education was established. This was analogous to age and frequency of site visit. No main effect for frequency for TV PSI, but one for Web PSI. As for interaction effects, a test of frequency of watching the station's on-air newscasts and age found a statistically significant interaction for both constructs. However, while TV PSI found only one main effect

significant, Web PSI found both main effects significant. From this, it appeared that as a whole, Web PSI was more sensitive to respondent differences. Perhaps the interactive nature of being online made respondents more responsive to Web PSI when compared to TV viewing.

As for the study's hypotheses, correlation analysis showed support for the propositions predicting positive relationships with loyalty and commitment and the variables of station usefulness and quality, site usefulness and quality, TV PSI, and Web PSI. However, the regression model showed not all these variables had significant contributions. As a predictor of loyalty and commitment, the regression models point to Web PSI as the strongest indicator. Respondents who had higher Web PSI scores were more likely to be loyal ($\beta = .30, p = .001$) or committed ($\beta = .477, p = .001$) to the news station and site. Those with higher TV PSI scores were also likely to be loyal ($\beta = .180, p = .005$) or committed ($\beta = .183, p = .004$), but not as strongly as Web PSI. The data also showed that station usefulness and quality, not site usefulness and quality contributed significantly to the regression models. These results suggest audience loyalty and commitment reside within the core brand or the TV station, not the brand extension or Web site. All three constructs with significant contributions involved the news station, while the site usefulness and quality scale lacked that component.

Implications for Practice

For practitioners, the results answer important questions about news personalities, news platforms, news promotion/audience, and media habits. It is hoped that this data will be useful to stations. In addition to these practical implications, stations were also

provided with results specific to their interests. These results included the names of respondents' favorite station newscasters and open-ended comments that asked respondents about qualities they associated with the station, as well as specific advice on how to attract more people to watch the station's local news programming or visit the station site.

News Anchors/Personalities

The results from statistical tests involving TV PSI show that news anchors and news personalities matter to viewers' loyalty and commitment. A closer examination of the TV PSI scale items show specific areas stations can focus on. In order, the five highest rated items were: *I see my favorite newscaster as a natural, down-to-earth person; if there were a story about my favorite newscaster in the newspaper, magazine, or online, I would read it; I look forward to watching my favorite newscaster on the news; when my favorite newscaster reports a story, he or she seems to understand the kinds of things I want to know; my favorite newscaster makes me feel comfortable, as if I am with a good friend.*

While similar to previous TV PSI results where viewers looked for newscasters who were "like friends," the data indicated that viewers were generally looking for news personalities they can empathize with, and with whom they feel can empathize back. The power of this affective tie is evident in the other higher rated scale items: viewers were willing to cross platforms to learn more about their favorite newscaster. In addition, respondents also looked forward to their interactions via the newscasts. However, while viewers were willing to cross platforms for their favorite newscaster, the media use

profile shows most respondents might not be ready to take the TV parasocial relationship to the next level. The majority of respondents had not read their favorite newscaster's biography, blog, or contributed comments to the newscaster's blog.

While seemingly contradictory, Giles (2002) argued the phenomenon of parasocial interaction is fairly complex, with varying degrees of PSI based on different media figures. Rather than examine PSI in isolation, Giles maintained that PSI should be considered in the matrix of usual social activity. In other words, most respondents appeared content with their current newscaster relationship via television newscasts. Once respondents feel the need to elevate this relationship, they will take action to do so by going online or accessing other media in order to fulfill their parasocial relationship needs. The bottom line, however, is that news personalities remain important to viewers and the station.

The quality of the station's news anchors and news personalities reflects on respondents' overall perceptions of the station. When given an opportunity to provide open-ended comments about the qualities associated with the local TV station, 63 of the 195 comments specifically mentioned the stations' newscasters. The comment section was prior to survey questions about news personalities. The comments included the following from respondents:

"Born and raised in Eugene, I've grown up watching this station. My parents became attached (I guess that's what you call it) to the weatherman and newscasters. Because of this experience, I grew up believing this station had the best, most accurate news."

"Announcers who know the local area. Friendly announcers. Announcers who are active in the local community."

“It's a quality station that as I have grown up in Alaska with this TV station it is like an old friend or kind of a comfort to come in after work and turn on KTUU, it's the only news channel on my T.V.”

“I like the newcasters, they seem very nice and like friends.”

While the other comments did not mention station news personalities specifically, most still continued to reveal viewers' perceptions of newscasters:

“Clear, open minded, and friendly.”

“Personable, professional, little to no mistakes, and usually contains topics that I am interested in.”

“Consistently good quality reporting.”

As the comments indicated and the statistical tests showed, station quality and usefulness remained important, along with affect. Should the quality of talent and content lack, perception of station quality tends to suffer. One respondent noted the following:

“Inexperienced reporters (probably because [the station's owner] doesn't want to pay extra reporters who have gained longevity).”

Further, in addition to serving as an indicator of quality, newscasters also helped the station distinguish itself from competing stations. News personalities added to the perception of difference among viewers.

News Web Sites

The results from statistical tests involving Web PSI showed that a Web site's persona or design matters to viewers' loyalty and commitment. An examination of the Web PSI construct revealed the two highest rated scale items were: *I felt the time I spent visiting this Web site was worth it and the personality of this Web site is friendly and down-to-earth*. It was important that respondents felt they were provided value in

exchange for their time. They also felt the site was friendly, a place where they were welcomed. This study showed strong evidence that Web persona was relevant to site design. What requires more study, however, was whether this persona was intrinsic to the site alone or whether the persona was transferred from the station's newscasters. Given that the Web PSI items came before the TV PSI items and newscaster questions, this study leans toward the conclusion that scores were based on site persona alone, divorced from the station's newscasters.

News managers should also take note that most respondents visited the site often, visiting several times a week (30%), once a day (17.1%) or several times a day (18.8%). Respondents also rated several features found on local TV news Web sites. Of the features, the majority selected "always" for local news, breaking news, and weather. Lastly, respondents believed a Web site should first and foremost be useful with current issues and events, followed by easy to use. In both design and practice, respondents wanted the site updated often and news items of interest easily found. Comments from respondents regarding different strategies to attract more visitors to the site reflected this: "Quicker updating of Web site on a more regular basis."

"Keep the Web sites interesting and updated with current information throughout the day."

Promotions/Audience

The results showed that cross-promotion was essential to local television news Web site traffic. While the data indicated most respondents came to the site out of habit; a good number of respondents (17%) visited the site because of promotion on the station's newscast or during a commercial break. Furthermore, the commitment

construct demonstrated that the online TV news audience was willing to promote the station and its news content if given the opportunity and the right content to do so. A closer examination of the scale items showed respondents rated the following five items high: *I intend to watch this station's on-air newscasts again; I intend to visit this Web site again; I care about the long-term success of this news station; I tell others about interesting stories on this station's TV newscasts; I tell others about interesting news stories on this Web site.* These items indicate both short-term and long-term devotion and willingness to share the station's promotional work.

The scale item respondents rated lowest showed that while respondents were generally willing to spread the word, they weren't as actively engaged in the brand community (*I actively contribute comments or content to this Web site*). One possible reason for lack of engagement could be that respondents are more interested in interacting with the station, rather than other viewers. Another reason could be that stations are not creating enough of a community to warrant participation. A closer examination of news sites as brand communities requires further investigation. The other lower score scale items were: *this is the only local TV news Web site I visit; this is the only local news station I watch.* While concerned about the long-term well-being of the station and exhibiting overall station/site loyalty, respondents were consistent with results from Pew (2010). The Pew results showed online news users as loyal to a group of sites, not a single site source.

However, while the audience is committed to spreading television news content, part of that commitment is stipulated on the notion that the news stories are "interesting."

Stations must continue to produce good content in order to make use of viral viewers. As Mantrala, Naik, Sridhar, and Thorson (2007) pointed out, good content is at the core of news products. Statistical tests from this study also showed quality and usefulness partially mediated or helped to explain the relationship between viewing/visiting characteristics and loyalty and commitment. A respondent comment exhibits this need for quality and usefulness, intertwined with parasocial interaction. The comment also displays willingness to pass the news content to others via social networks reinforcing today's new multi-platform media environment as portable, personalized, and participatory (Pew, 2010).

“Tonight I wanted to know more about the breaking news of the command post for the H1N1. I have the swine flu and can't leave my house until I am not running a fever. The 11 p.m. news is not on here yet, I will check in the morning as I wanted to Facebook the article to my friends ... I do love channel 12 as they don't forget us in Grants Pass. I like all the newscasters so picking one is too hard.”

Media Habits

The research showed respondents fell under the classification of Integrators (“Key News Audiences,” 2008), using television as the primary source of news, but also going online as well. Descriptive data showed that those who watched the on-air newscasts affiliated with the site watched often: several times a week (28.4%), once a day (31.5%) or several times a day (25.9%). The majority of respondents watched these newscasts during its regular broadcast time (81%), watched using a combination of recorded or live shows (9.5%) or watched on the Internet (5.6%).

Of news sources used, respondents reported broadcast television (83%), traditional print newspapers (54.5%), online newspapers (50.8%), and broadcast radio

(50.4%) for traditional media. For social media, Facebook (52.3%) and YouTube (26.5%) remained popular. Some respondents reported they did not visit or use social network sites (34.5%) at all. Respondent comments, however, showed the increasing use of social media among television viewers:

“I really appreciate the breaking news that goes onto Twitter. I subscribe via text to the station's Twitter so that I can get the latest news even when I'm not near my computer. Something that'd be nice is to make a separate traffic, accident Twitter or tweet about traffic more, so I know what to avoid on my drive home from work.”

“Blogs. Put things online people won't get on the news. Make it easy for people to see the things they missed.”

Additional comments showed respondents knew if they missed a news story on television, they can often find it on the station site. In addition, respondents were keenly aware that the function of local news was to provide local information, not national news items. In general, the comments and the data show respondents had a channel and site repertoire (Ferguson, 1992) where despite the endless number of choices, only a few select channels and sites are repeatedly viewed or visited.

Limitations and Future Research

This study is unique in that it brought TV PSI research to the digital age and placed Web PSI research in the local television news context. The alignment of branding and television studies affords this research a novel perspective previously missing from academic literature. The introduction of the viral viewers' concept further enhances research on audience and promotion. These contributions, however, also come with some limitations.

Limitations

To begin, the majority of tests used to assess relationships were correlation and multiple regression analysis. Neither approaches claim definitive cause and effect relationships. These relationships can only be established through experiments. The strength of relationships, however, was established.

Moreover, for mediation analysis, rather than test each mediator separately, perhaps tests that allowed for simultaneous analysis of multiple mediators could have gained further insight. Mediation tests using hierarchical multiple regression showed all the mediating variables as helping to explain the relationship between the independent variables and dependent variables. However, standard multiple regression showed that site usefulness/quality failed to make a statistically significant contribution to loyalty and commitment. Web PSI, station usefulness/quality, and TV PSI were all statistically significant predictors of loyalty and commitment. A simultaneous test of mediators might have helped alleviate the slight ambiguity of these results. In keeping with previous studies, however, each mediator for this study was tested separately.

Another limitation of this study was the nonrandom sample. Because of this, caution should be taken when projecting results to a population other than the one surveyed. However, given that the original studies on TV and Web PSI both involved convenience samples from university classrooms, this research actually provides fresh insight into both constructs in that the research sample involved real-world respondents from the population of interest. By using a purposive sample of visitors to local TV news Web sites, this research advances knowledge on parasocial interaction. This targeted

sample was selected for specific characteristics. As Ha and Chan-Olmsted (2004) found, even a random sample can make analysis difficult if the sample does not possess the specific qualities sought for the study.

Additionally, this study's low response was a limitation. Of the 323 surveys filled out, 277 were valid for analysis. Reasons for the low response could have arisen from a number of factors. For one, survey fatigue could have been an issue. Unlike King's (1998) study where online surveys were fairly limited on the Internet, the online survey today is ubiquitous. A chance at winning a \$150 gift certificate from Amazon.com might not have provided enough of an incentive. The length of the survey, with eight pages of questions, could have also deterred participation. A general lack of time could also have played a role, with potential respondents too busy to take part in the survey.

Furthermore, the stations used in the study were ones located in medium and small markets. In general, smaller market sizes do not have as big an audience or as many visitors to the Web site. The inclusion of larger market stations might have helped to boost survey response, as well as added a different point of view. Respondents from large, medium, and small markets would have also allowed for an ANOVA test of differences. Perhaps large market stations are better able to foster community on their Web sites given that more resources are usually available at these stations. Further, levels of Web PSI could be different given the Web site quality at large market stations. Levels of TV PSI would also be interesting to gauge for large markets. In small markets, close community ties often allow for personal, first-hand encounters with the station brand and its personalities. Following Giles' (2002) lead on attempting to place parasocial

relationships in the context of ordinary social encounters, does the perception of opportunity to encounter the news personality in the real world affect PSI scores? In other words, the chances of meeting news personalities in a small community are much greater than ones in a large city. Knowing these chances, would respondents exhibit higher or lower TV PSI scores? These questions lend themselves to future study.

It should be noted, however, that although only medium and small market stations were used, three of the six stations in the study were located in the largest city of that state (Anchorage) or located in the second most populated city (Spokane, Eugene). In addition, as a regional study where the stations were all located in the Pacific Northwest, there could be varying degrees of difference given the regional variation found throughout the country. Possible regional differences are also worth a closer examination.

Even with these limitations, however, the research's respondent profile was relatively similar compared to previous studies (King, 1998; "The State of the News Media," 2010). T-tests were also used to examine key variables for differences between early and late respondents. No differences were found. Radhakrishna and Doamekpor (2008) maintained that when t-tests showed no difference between early respondents and late respondents, it is possible to generalize the findings to the population. While this approach is cautioned (Dillman, 2007), the tests did help establish some measure of validity. According to Wimmer and Dominick (2006) validity is always a matter of degree; no study is completely valid or invalid. Most studies end up in the middle. It is

believed this study found that middle ground. By focusing on the exploring the strength of relationships rather than demographic data, this research achieved its purpose.

Future Research

It is hoped that this inquiry is just the beginning for research in this area. Future research should consider three specific areas that hold great potential for fruitful scholarship. First, some of the limitations above should be addressed. Future research should include a simultaneous test of mediating variables, as well as a test of station differences for large, medium, and small market stations. The inclusion of results from these analyses will further refine this study.

Second, investigating regional differences are also important to pursue. Replicating this study and involving more stations from different regions of the country would aid in the understanding of the parasocial interaction construct and whether there are any regional variations. This approach would help boost participant numbers and strengthen validity. Any regional variations would make for an interesting study.

Lastly, future research would also benefit from various methods. A quantitative content analysis of parasocial interaction on local TV news Web sites would complement results from this study. This content analysis could even include an examination of different factors that contribute to “viral worthy” news stories. Preliminary research on viral videos has shown that videos with viral potential are ones that tend to be short, offer an element of surprise, and has an underlying emotional undercurrent (Mapaye, 2009). Research on the elements of viral news stories is one that offers a lot of promise. This stream of research also further validates television’s need for new media and vice versa.

In many ways, new media is much more demanding of content than television. Whereas someone once commented that television was a “news beast” that demanded new content every 24 hours, another had noted that new media had more voracious demands – new content every 24 seconds. This type of research also nurtures qualitative approaches that provide additional depth to the numbers provided in this study.

These qualitative approaches could first include a deeper reading of comments provided by respondents in this study and an examination of themes. Later, in-depth interviews of local television news viewers or station employees regarding their thoughts on parasocial interaction could prove valuable in filling important gaps respondents failed to mention. Ethnographic studies of local television newsrooms or of viewers’ media habits could also provide much texture and depth regarding this phenomenon.

Another area for future research includes a closer examination of the increasingly affective nature of news, where news personalities appeal to viewers with strong emotional arguments. CNN, MSNBC, and FOX all offer good case studies where news and opinion are sometimes blurred. Examples on the local TV news level would also be worth an investigation.

Moreover, the affective nature of Web sites also holds great potential. This study found that Web PSI was the strongest contribution to loyalty and commitment. A study of a Web site’s affective elements could uncover important insights regarding design. This line of inquiry also begins to answer the question of whether or not a Web site can be more affective in nature than a person’s face or personalities in general. In the digital and social media age, perhaps these fundamental relationships have changed.

Finally, as with Jenkins (2006), the purpose of this research was to understand, not to critique. However, critical approaches for future research should be considered. Among these approaches should be cultural studies and political economy. A political economic analysis could help by providing context and understanding of the economic forces and investments that shaped today's local TV news landscape. Both Caldwell (2003) and Meehan (2005) offer good starting points for this vein of research.

Conclusion

This study has provided important contributions to scholarly literature in communication, marketing, and psychology. This is the first research of its kind to fully embrace the digital local television news environment and fundamental changes in audience. By incorporating branding, television, and affect, this study brought parasocial interaction to a new level of understanding and provided fresh insight regarding the audience's role in today's participatory media ecosystem.

First, this research illuminates the continued importance of parasocial relationships in local television news. The audience wants news personalities who are relatable, ones who appear to understand what they need to know. Far from eliminating longtime anchors, news managers should assess the overall value of a news personality to the station. This evaluation should include a news talent's role in cross promotion to online, mobile, and social media platforms.

Second, parasocial relationships are also important in Web design. Designing a site with a welcoming persona helps establish relationships with the online audience. Design should also incorporate elements that facilitate ease of use and foster online

communities. In addition, Web site content should be frequently updated and news items easily found.

Third, news managers should keep a close watch on news content and quality, while attempting to produce news stories with viral potential. Rather than focusing on news production that begins and ends with “on air” content to an audience, news managers should cultivate a mindset where the audience also functions as promotion. It is hoped that through viral viewers, loyalty and commitment to the station brand will prosper.

As with all brands, loyalty and commitment take time to cultivate. This study shows that developing an audience is not achieved by marketing/branding alone. While parasocial relationships help bring the audience to newscasts or to the Web site, members will only come back so long as they receive value for their time.

While it is difficult to cure all that ails the local television news industry, this research concludes that good content and good talent in local television news are ultimately contagious. Building on these fundamentals and with the help of viral viewers, local television’s continued transition to the digital news age is one that warrants both scholars and practitioners watch closely and stay tuned.

APPENDIX A
LOCAL TV NEWS SURVEY

Local TV News Web Site Survey

1. Local TV News Survey

Do you visit local TV news Web sites? Do you watch local TV news? If so, your opinion is valuable to this important academic research project. Please click "Next" for more information on how you can help and also be entered for a chance to win a \$150 gift certificate from Amazon.com.

Local TV News Web Site Survey

2. Welcome!

Thank you for taking the time to complete this academic research survey. Your help is valuable to this project. To show our appreciation, you will have a chance to win one of three \$150 gift certificates from Amazon.com. The odds of winning are based on the number of people who respond to the survey. If a total of 400 people respond, which is expected, then odds of winning would be 1 in 133.

Winners will be notified at the conclusion of the study via e-mail. Otherwise, you will not be contacted. All the information you provide will remain anonymous. Providing your e-mail is voluntary. Your survey responses are not linked to your e-mail address. You will not be added to mailing lists. Once the research project is complete, your e-mail address will be destroyed.

The purpose of this survey is to ask you about local television news and local television news Web sites. This research is part of a University of Oregon graduate study. This survey has not been commissioned by a particular TV station or group of stations.

Only those 18 and older are allowed to take part in this study. Those under 18 may not participate.

All you need to do is complete this short survey, which should take approximately 10 minutes or less. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to participate, simply stop reading here and click on "Exit this Survey" on the upper right of the page. Again, responses will be completely anonymous; your name will not appear anywhere on the survey. Clicking the "Yes - I Consent" button below constitutes your consent to participate.

Please feel free to print this page for your records. If you have any questions regarding the research, please e-mail me at jmapaye@uoregon.edu. You may also contact my adviser, Dr. Kim Sheehan at ksheehan@uoregon.edu.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the Office for Protection of Human Subjects at the University of Oregon, (541) 346-2510. The Office oversees the review of the research to protect your rights and is not involved with this study.

Thank you again for your help.

Sincerely,

Joy Mapaye
Ph.D. candidate
University of Oregon

1. Do you consent to take part in this survey?

- YES - I CONSENT to take part in this survey.
- NO - I DO NOT CONSENT to take part in this survey.

Local TV News Web Site Survey

3. Local TV News Web Sites

Please mark only one answer unless the directions indicate otherwise. Click on "Next" at the bottom of the page once you're done answering the questions. Click on "Prev" to go back to the previous page. The progress bar at the top of the page lets you know how much of the survey you have completed.

Ready? First, let's talk about local television news Web sites.

1. Please type the call letters of the local TV news site where you found a link to this survey. Example: KABC

2. Which one of the following led you to visit this local TV news site today?

- A blog link or article
- An e-mail
- Bing
- Google
- Another search engine
- Another news Web site
- A text message
- A story during this station's newscast
- A promotion during this station's newscast
- A promotion during a commercial break
- Habit, I check this news site often
- Newspaper
- Radio
- Social networks (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, etc.)
- Word of mouth
- A combination of these items or other (please specify)

Local TV News Web Site Survey

4. Local Television News

Next, let's discuss local television news.

1. Do you watch local television news?

Yes

No

If no, please specify reasons for not watching.

Local TV News Web Site Survey

5. Local Television News

1. Do you watch the on-air newscasts affiliated with this TV news site?

Yes

No

If no, please specify reasons for not watching.

Local TV News Web Site Survey

6. Local Television News

1. Which one best describes how often you watch the on-air newscasts affiliated with this TV news site?

- I do not watch this station's on-air newscasts.
- Today was the first time I watched this station's on-air newscasts.
- I watch this station's on-air newscasts once a month.
- I watch this station's on-air newscasts several times a month, but not every week.
- I watch this station's on-air newscasts once a week.
- I watch this station's on-air newscasts several times a week, but not every day.
- I watch this station's on-air newscasts once a day.
- I watch this station's on-air newscasts several times a day.

2. Which one best describes HOW you usually watch the newscasts affiliated with this TV news site?

- I do not watch this station's on-air newscasts.
- I watch newscasts during its regularly scheduled time.
- I watch newscasts on the Internet.
- I watch newscasts after using a DVR or VCR to record it.
- I watch newscasts using a combination of these items (please specify).

3. For each of the statements below, please indicate the extent of your disagreement or agreement.

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Disagree or Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | No Basis for Answer |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| This station's local news programs are useful in keeping up with current issues and events. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| This station presents quality local news. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| This TV station is different from the other stations in this area. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

4. When you think about the local TV station affiliated with this site, what qualities come to mind?

Local TV News Web Site Survey

7. Local Newscasters

For the questions below, please think of your favorite newscaster on this television station's news programs.

1. My favorite newscaster on this station is

2. I personally know my favorite newscaster.

No

Yes

3. I have met my favorite newscaster in person.

No

Yes

4. I have attempted to contact my favorite newscaster.

No

Yes (please specify how - e-mail, letter, etc.)

5. I have read my favorite newscaster's biography on this Web site.

No

Yes

My favorite newscaster does not have a biography on this Web site.

6. I have read my favorite newscaster's blog on this Web site.

No

Yes

My favorite newscaster does not have a blog on this Web site.

7. I have responded to my favorite newscaster's blog on this Web site.

No

Yes

My favorite newscaster does not have a blog on this Web site.

Local TV News Web Site Survey

8. Web and TV News

1. These are questions about your experience with this local news Web site and this TV station's news programs. For each of the statements below, please indicate the extent of your disagreement or agreement.

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Disagree or Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | No Basis for Answer |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| After visiting this site, I want to watch this station's newscasts more often. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| After visiting this site, I feel more involved with this station's newscasts. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| After visiting this site, I feel more attached to this station's newscasts. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

2. These are additional questions about this local news Web site and this TV station's news programs. For each of the statements below, please indicate the extent of your disagreement or agreement.

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Disagree or Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree | No Basis for Answer |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| I intend to visit this Web site again. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I intend to watch this station's on-air newscasts again. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I tell others about interesting news stories on this Web site. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I tell others about interesting stories on this station's TV newscasts. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I send others videos or links of interesting news stories from this station's Web site. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I actively contribute comments or content to this Web site. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| This is the only local TV news Web site I visit. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| This is the only local news station I watch. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I care about the long-term success of this news station. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

3. What advice would you give to local TV stations to attract more people to watch or go to the station Web site?

Local TV News Web Site Survey

9. General Media Use

1. In general, how do you get news? Please select all the answers that apply.

- Blogs
- Bing
- Cell phones
- E-mail
- Google
- Magazines (print)
- Magazines (online)
- MSN.com
- Newspapers (print)
- Newspapers (online)
- Radio (broadcast)
- Radio (online)
- Television (broadcast)
- Television (online)
- Word of mouth
- Yahoo
- I don't use any of these on a regular basis.
- Other (please specify)
-

2. On an average day, how many hours do you spend watching television?

3. On an average day, how many hours do you spend specifically watching local television news?

4. On an average day, how many hours do you spend online?

5. On an average day, how many hours do you spend specifically visiting news Web sites?

Local TV News Web Site Survey

10. Background

You're almost done! We only have a few more questions to go.

These final questions are about your background.

1. What is your age?

2. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

3. What is your race/ethnicity?

- White/Anglo
- Black/African American
- Hispanic/Latino
- American Indian/Native American/Alaska Native
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Prefer not to answer
- Mixed race/ethnicity (please specify)

4. What is your completed level of education?

- Some high school
- High school degree
- Some college
- Bachelor's degree
- Some graduate school
- Master's degree
- Ph.D., M.D. or J.D.
- Prefer not to answer

Local TV News Web Site Survey

5. What is your level of income?

- Less than \$30,000
- \$30 - 49,999
- \$50 - 74,999
- \$75,000 - 99,999
- \$100,000 or more
- Prefer not to answer

6. Which best describes where you live?

- I live in the same city where this TV station is located.
- I live close to the same city where this TV station is located.
- I live in the same state where this TV station is located, but not close to the same city where this TV station is located.
- I live in the United States, but in a different state from where this TV station is located.
- I live outside the United States (please specify country)

7. Thank you very much! This is the end of the survey.

Please enter your e-mail address in the box if you want to be entered for a chance to win a \$150 gift certificate. Your answers will be separated from your e-mail.

The winners will be notified at the conclusion of the study. Otherwise, you will not be contacted. After the study ends, all e-mail addresses will be deleted.

Local TV News Web Site Survey

11. Thank you!

Thank you for your interest in this survey. Your opinion is valuable to this research project. Please click "Done" to close this survey.

APPENDIX B
ADVANCE NOTICE E-MAIL

Dear [*station manager's name*],

My name is Joy Chavez Mapaye. I'm a doctoral candidate at the University of Oregon's School of Journalism and Communication. I am writing to invite your station to participate in my graduate research on local TV news Web sites. This academic study examines whether station branding, especially that of news talent, helps bring visitors to the Web site and whether visitors to the site in general are likely to watch local news. This research also hopes to explore the importance of TV-Web cross promotion. You're eligible to be in this study because the research includes local TV stations in the Pacific Northwest. I obtained your contact information from [*describe source*].

If you decide to participate in this study, please provide a name and e-mail address of the person I need to contact in order to send the online survey link via e-mail. This person will need to post an announcement and link to the online survey hosted by surveymonkey.com. The announcement and link will need to be placed on the homepage of your station's Web site from October 19 to November 13.

For participating in this academic research, your station will receive the results of the study. Stations will get the combined results from all the stations participating and results specific to the station. Competing stations will not receive each other's individual results.

If you'd like to participate or have any questions about the study, please email or contact me at jmapaye@uoregon.edu or (907) 351-8528. You can also contact my adviser Dr. Kim Sheehan at ksheehan@uoregon.edu.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Joy Chavez Mapaye
Ph.D. candidate
University of Oregon

APPENDIX C
FOLLOW-UP LETTER

[Date]

Dear [*station manager's name*]:

My name is Joy Chavez Mapaye. I'm a doctoral candidate at the University of Oregon's School of Journalism and Communication. I sent you an e-mail regarding my research project and I wanted to follow up with this letter.

I am writing to invite your station to participate in my graduate research on local TV news Web sites. This academic study examines whether station branding, especially that of news talent, helps bring visitors to the Web site and whether visitors to the site in general are likely to watch local news. This research also hopes to explore the importance of TV-Web cross promotion. You're eligible to be in this study because the research includes local TV stations in the Pacific Northwest.

If you decide to participate in this study, please provide a name and e-mail address of the person I need to contact in order to send the online survey link via e-mail. This person will need to post an announcement and link to the online survey hosted by surveymonkey.com. The announcement and link will need to be placed on the homepage of your station's Web site from October 19 to November 13.

For participating in this academic research, your station will receive the results of the study. Stations will get the combined results from all the stations participating and results specific to the station. Competing stations will not receive each other's individual results.

If you'd like to participate or have any questions about the study, please email or contact me at jmapaye@uoregon.edu or (907) 351-8528. You can also contact my adviser Dr. Kim Sheehan at ksheehan@uoregon.edu.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Joy Chavez Mapaye
Ph.D. candidate - Communication and Society
New Media and Digital Culture
School of Journalism and Communication
University of Oregon

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL WITH SURVEY LINK

Dear [*Web person's name*],

My name is Joy Chavez Mapaye. I'm a doctoral candidate at the University of Oregon's School of Journalism and Communication.

[*Station manager's name*] gave me your contact information for my research project. Last month, I sent an e-mail inviting your station to participate in my graduate research about local TV news Web sites. The research I'm conducting is about whether station branding, especially that of news talent, helps bring visitors to the Web site and whether visitors to the site in general are likely to watch local news. This research also hopes to explore the importance of TV-Web cross promotion.

[*Station manager's name*] has approved this study. I'm including [*Station manager's name*] in this e-mail just in case you have any questions about approval. In order to conduct the study, I need for you to post an announcement and link to an online survey on the homepage of your station's Web site from October 19 to November 13. Here is the link to the survey. Simply copy the code below. Then, paste the code into the HTML of your Web site. The link will send people to the survey hosted by surveymonkey.com.

[*Link address provided here*]

If you have trouble placing the link to your site, you can also send visitors to the alternative address below.

[*Link address provided here*]

The recommended text for the survey is "Help local TV news with your opinion. Get a chance to win \$150. University of Oregon academic survey"

If you have any questions about the study, please email or contact me at jmapaye@uoregon.edu or (907) 351-8528. You can also contact my adviser Dr. Kim Sheehan at ksheehan@uoregon.edu.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Joy Chavez Mapaye
Ph.D. candidate
University of Oregon

APPENDIX E
FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL REMINDER

Dear [*Web person's name*],

Thank you for your help with my study on local TV news Web sites. As a reminder, in order to conduct the study, I need for you to post the online survey on the homepage of your station's Web site from October 19 to November 13. Here is the link to the survey you can place on your site.

[*Link address provided here*]

The recommended text for the survey is "Help local TV news with your opinion. Get a chance to win \$150. University of Oregon academic survey"

If you have any questions about the study, please email or contact me at jmapaye@uoregon.edu or (907) 351-8528. You can also contact my adviser Dr. Kim Sheehan at ksheehan@uoregon.edu.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Joy Chavez Mapaye
Ph.D. candidate
University of Oregon

APPENDIX F
THANK YOU E-MAIL

Dear [*Station manager and Web person's name*],

Thank you for your help with my research on local TV news Web sites. The data gathering portion of the study is now complete. Please feel free to remove the online survey from your station Web site.

Results and analysis of the study will be available late summer 2010. I will contact the station with the research results at that time.

If you have any questions about the study, please email or contact me at jmapaye@uoregon.edu or (907) 351-8528. You can also contact my adviser Dr. Kim Sheehan at ksheehan@uoregon.edu.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Joy Chavez Mapaye
Ph.D. candidate
University of Oregon

APPENDIX G
POSTED SURVEYS

KTUU-TV NBC Anchorage

KTUU.com | Alaska's news and information source | - KTUU.com Alaska's news and information source - Mozilla Firefox

File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help

http://www.ktuu.com/

MEMBER CENTER: Create Account | Log In

SITE SEARCH WEB SEARCH BY Google

ALASKA'S NEWS SOURCE

HOME NEWS WEATHER SPORTS FEATURES GO TO AK HEALTH CONNECTIONS WHAT'S ON 2

FUND...FUTURE NOMINATE A STUDENT BY CLICKING HERE*

Alaska News

- Begich says he won't turn over e-mails
- Allen to be sentenced Oct. 28
- Police shoot suspected burglar at Eagle River pharmacy
- Film on Alaska Native civil rights to go national
- AFN Convention: Click here to watch a live video stream and chat

Latest video

Life Edition (Oct 22) 05:47

PERSONAL E MAIL

Mike Ross CHANNEL 2 NEWS

ADVERTISEMENT

HERE for the REAL PEBBLE PICTURE

ACS Wireless

Done

i start Mozilla Firefox KTUU.com | Alaska's ... Pacific Northwest TV ... 11:38 AM

KTUU.com | Alaska's news and information source | - KTUU.com Alaska's news and information source - Mozilla Firefox

File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help

http://www.ktuu.com/

Friends of Mat-Su amputee fundraiser for new house

Jim White lost his legs to Peripheral Artery Disease, when his legs weren't getting enough blood. Always independent, White needs many repairs to his home, and his friends are raising funds for a new one. [More>>](#)

Father-daughter team headlines Day 1 of AFN

Willie and Elizabeth Hensley, a father-daughter team, were the keynote speakers on the first day of the annual Alaska Federation of Natives convention. Elizabeth spoke about tribal government recognition. [More>>](#)

Senate Republicans confirm Coghill, elect Bunde minority leader

Updated: Oct 22, 2009 3:00 PM ADT
Republican members of the Alaska state Senate on Thursday confirmed John Coghill's appointment to replace former Sen. Gene Theriault, who resigned to take a job in Gov. Sean Parnell's administration, and elected Sen. Con Bunde as minority leader. [More>>](#)

Anchorage plans to offer free H1N1 vaccines

The City of Anchorage plans to offer swine flu vaccines free to everyone who wants one. [More>>](#)

Channel 2 News Daily Digest

Email Address *

Log In

Daily Digest

Subscribe

Breaking News Updates

Email Address *

Log In

Breaking News

Subscribe

Max HERE For More Information

FREE PIZZA PARTIES HUGE GRAND PRIZE

SUNDAY NIGHT SHOWDOWN

PARTICIPATE IN AN ACADEMIC STUDY OF LOCAL TV STATION WEB SITES YOU COULD WIN \$150!

CLICK HERE TO TAKE THE ONLINE SURVEY

Interior Alaska
Extended weather forecasts for Alaska's Interior communities.

Kenai Peninsula
Extended forecasts for the Kenai Peninsula.

Northern Alaska
Extended forecasts for Alaska's Northern communities.

Southcentral Alaska
Extended forecast for Alaska's Southcentral communities.

desk at (907) 762-9260 or e-mail news_desk@ktuu.

KTUU Satellite Truck
Contact the Sat truck and AMP by e-mail or by calling (907) 441-8577.

Syntax Productions
Contact Syntax Productions by calling (907) 762-9500.

Done

i start Mozilla Firefox KTUU.com | Alaska's ... Pacific Northwest TV ... 11:38 AM

KHQ -TV NBC Spokane

KHQ Right Now - News and Weather for Spokane and North Idaho | - KHQ Home - Mozilla Firefox

File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help

http://www.khq.com/

KHQ Right Now - News and Weather f...

MEMBER CENTER: Create Account | Log In

SITE SEARCH WEB SEARCH BY Google

KHQ 206 Right Now *If you want **Swx** carried on Dish Network & DirecTV*

Call Dish Network: 888-825-2557
Call DirecTV: 888-777-2454

Home News Weather Sports Video Programming Community Interact DTV Marketplace Contact Us Lifestyle

FIND IT CLICK HERE LINKS MENTIONED ON KHQ

WEATHER RIGHT NOW SCHOOL CLOSURES & DELAYS

Local Radar 6-Day Forecast Right Now In loading... Upload Weather Pix!

VIDEO RIGHT NOW

Multiple-car accident blocks I-90 **Top Headlines**

SPOKANE, Wash. - Monday morning commuters on eastbound I-90 encountered delays after several vehicles wrecked just east of the Sprague exit at 8:19 am. The crash left lanes blocked for about an hour and backed up traffic.

COEUR D'ALENE DAIRY QUEEN RABBED

Read aping.video.ap.org

start KHQ Right Now - New... Pacific Northwest TV ... 10:04 AM

KHQ Right Now - News and Weather for Spokane and North Idaho | - KHQ Home - Mozilla Firefox

File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help

http://www.khq.com/

KHQ Right Now - News and Weather f...

Stressed Out A Lot? Consider Signing The Pledge

KHQ Online Poll

Do you think the parents of "balloon boy" Falcon Heene should go to jail for staging the balloon hoax?

Yes No

Local News More>>

Multiple-car accident blocks I-90

SPOKANE, Wash. - Monday morning commuters on eastbound I-90 encountered delays after several vehicles wrecked just east of the Sprague exit at 8:19 am. The crash left lanes blocked for about an hour and backed up traffic.

Coeur d'Alene Dairy Queen rabbed

Read aping.video.ap.org

Top Local Sports More>>

Seahawks fail to find the end zone in 27 - 3 loss to Arizona

Larry Fitzgerald tied his career high with 13 receptions for 100 yards and a touchdown for the Cardinals (3-2), who led 14-0 before Seattle's offense ran its first play.

Featured Coverage More>>

2009 General Election Voters' Guide

Spokane County is unable to publish voter guides for the upcoming election due to a lack of funds. Here you can find the online version.

Help local TV by taking this University of Oregon survey and earning a shot at \$150!

Lisa's weight-loss challenge

- 100 lbs down! What's next?
- Abandoning a diet plan
- Getting past a rough patch
- Turning the tide after a gain
- More in Results Not Typical

THE LION KING
NOVEMBER 11-DECEMBER 6
INS PERFORMING ARTS CENTER
Spokane - WA

KHQ Event Calendar

Upcoming events:

start KHQ Right Now - New... Pacific Northwest TV ... 10:05 AM

KEZI-TV ABC Eugene

KEZI | Connecting You - Mozilla Firefox
 File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help
 http://kezi.com/

KEZI | Connecting You

KEZI.COM
24/7 Nonstop News

If you want **KEZI 9.2 NEWS** carried on local satellite, please call:
 888-825-2567
 888-777-2454

Powered by **56** Broken Clouds

Home News Weather Sports Community 9Listens GreenSPACE
 News Tips News Links News Releases Inside KEZI 9 Contact Us Contests KEZI 9.2

Login | Create Account

Police Need Help With Solving Recent Hit-And-Run Cases.

Hart Godbold, 26, was riding his bike on the sidewalk of 30th Avenue on Friday night when he was hit.

ULTIMATE FANSITE

Right Now
 In the Field | In the Newsroom

DAY PLANNER Mon
 8:00 55° NO 58° 5:30 62°

Waiting for flash.quantserve.com...

start KEZI | Connecting Yo... Pacific Northwest TV ... 10:06 AM

KEZI | Connecting You - Mozilla Firefox
 File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help
 http://kezi.com/

KEZI | Connecting You

the Douglas County Major Crimes Team is looking for whoever shot two women in Glendale, killing one of them.

Don't Pick Up Those Falling Leaves Just Yet
 The cities of Eugene and Springfield say despite the fall weather, it's still too early to start collecting leaves.

Police Need Help With Solving Recent Hit-And-Run Cases
 Hart Godbold, 26, was riding his bike on the sidewalk of 30th Avenue on Friday night when he was hit.

Business Beats
 The Big Business of Weddings it takes a lot of businesses working together to help your special day go smoothly.

The Great Rotary Duck Race
 Follow the 2009 Great Rotary Duck Race Presented By First Tech Credit Union.

Healthwatch
 We bring you the latest reports to keep you healthy

WIN \$150 Help local TV news with your opinion. UO academic survey - Start Now!

Pet of the Week
 Cocoa

OregonTaxAmnesty.com

Send Us YOUR question
 SUBMIT Questions Here

WxPix Gallery
 Skinner's Butte Leaves

http://kezi.com/ad/redirect/142256/479/

start KEZI | Connecting Yo... Pacific Northwest TV ... 10:07 AM

KDRV-TV ABC Medford

KDRV | KDRV 12 - Mozilla Firefox

File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help

http://kdrv.com/

KDRV | KDRV 12

KDRV.COM NEWS WATCH 12 abc

50° Medford
Overcast updated 10:55 am

Home News Cash Crunch Weather Sports Community GreenSPACE

News Tips News Links NewsWatch 12 Bios About Us Contact Us Jobs Contests

Login | Create Account

Elk hunting season starts
Many hunters go years without seeing an elk. [watch now](#)

Top Stories

OSU says more than 200 with swine flu
Officials figure that most students have shrugged off their symptoms, meaning the reported tally is probably low.

Former Ashland editor indicted on theft, forgery
Andrew Bolsinger is already serving a prison sentence for a separate crime.

Gearhart crash report targets pilot
Last year a small plane crashed into a house killing 5 people.

SHOWS abc NEWS

Done

start KDRV | KDRV 12 - Mo... Pacific Northwest TV ... 10:07 AM

KDRV | KDRV 12 - Mozilla Firefox

File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help

http://kdrv.com/

KDRV | KDRV 12

More » and hope.

The Oprah Winfrey Show on KDRV at 4 PM

THIS WEEK ON OPRAH | LATEST FROM OPRAH.COM

More Special Reports

WIN \$150 Help local TV news with your opinion. UO academic survey - Start Now!

Off the Wall

West Linn Teacher Nick Kintz to start school as Nicole
Kintz has taught math at West Linn High School for 20 years.

Behind on your taxes?
OregonTaxAmnesty.com

What's On

| Sun | Mon | Tue | Wed | Thu | Fri | Sat |
|-----|-----|---------|------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| | | 7:00pm | Jeopardy | | | |
| | | 7:30pm | Wheel of Fortune | | | |
| | | 8:00pm | Dancing With The Stars | | | |
| | | 10:00pm | Castle | | | |
| | | 11:00pm | NewsWatch 12 at 11 | | | |

SPORTS STARS OF TOMORROW

dexnews.com powered by dex

What Where

category, business, real, etc., state, address, ZIP SEARCH

Transferring data from images.oprah.com...

start KDRV | KDRV 12 - Mo... Pacific Northwest TV ... 10:08 AM

KOHD-TV ABC Bend

KOHD | Connecting You - Mozilla Firefox

File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help

http://kohd.com/

KOHD | Connecting You

MORE NEWS FEWER COMMERCIALS

Current Conditions
48 Humidity: 76%
 Wind: SSW 3 mph
 Wx: Scattered Clouds

[Home](#)
[News](#)
[Weather](#)
[Sports](#)
[Contests](#)
[Community](#)
[GreenSPACE](#)
[Flashback](#)

[News Tips](#)
[News Links](#)
[KOHD Bios](#)
[About Us](#)
[Contact Us](#)
[Jobs](#)
[What's On](#)
[Login](#) | [Create Account](#)

Sen. Wyden Answers Questions from Redmond National Guard Troops

The senator answers questions before National Guard men and women head back to the Middle East.

[watch now](#)

Right Now

MONDAY, OCTOBER 19TH

| 6AM | NOON | 5PM |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| 45 40% | 50 20% | 56 NW 5+ |
| S 5 | NW 5 | NW 5+ |

50% OFF

Local Businesses & Restaurants

Read a3.twing.com

start KOHD | Connecting Y... Pacific Northwest TV ... 10:09 AM

KOHD | Connecting You - Mozilla Firefox

File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help

http://kohd.com/

KOHD | Connecting You

Kenny's 1st waggin' tips: Stopping Jumping

[More »](#)

Direct Connect: Truck Stop Skate Park

Bend's skate park fire and it's future, discussed.

[More »](#)

WIN \$150 Help local TV news with your opinion. UO academic survey - Start Now!

[Start Now!](#)

GOCC students launch a grassroots campaign to rally support for a \$53 million bond measure. The story at 5/6pm tonight.

Tonight on #DirectConnect: Gabe Triplett, Truck Stop Skate Park's instructor takes your questions on...

[GET WIDGET >>](#)

Perspectives

Girl Time
KOHD Anchor Lauren Biskind talks about a reunion with friends

Blazermania
Anchor Jay Frank runs through the Trailblazer line up

Community Share

Share with KOHD's Community

Submit a Photo Submit an Event Submit a Video

*Community contributed content requires that you set up a user account. You must be logged in to submit content

Read a3.twing.com

start KOHD | Connecting Y... Pacific Northwest TV ... 10:09 AM

KOBI-TV NBC Medford

KOBI5/KOTI2 - Mozilla Firefox
File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help
http://www.localnewscomesfirst.com/
KOBIS/KOTI2

NBC 5 2
KOBI-TV & MEDFORD KOTI-TV & KIAMATH FALLS

HOME VIDEO NEWS WEATHER SPORTS TV LISTINGS SPECIAL PROGRAMS ABOUT US CONTACT US

DriveLessSaveMore.com

LOCAL NEWS

TODAY'S LOCAL WEATHER LOCAL SPORTS

MICROWAVE UPGRADE DR. OZ

Done
start KOBI5/KOTI2 - Mozill... Pacific Northwest TV ... 9:48 AM

KOBI5/KOTI2 - Mozilla Firefox
File Edit View History Bookmarks Tools Help
http://www.localnewscomesfirst.com/
KOBIS/KOTI2

ONEIHI'S FOOD STORES
EAGLE POINT DENTAL CENTER FOR ADVANCED DENTISTRY

Automotive Group
CHECK OUT OUR WEEKLY VEHICLE SPECIALS!!

Behind on your taxes?
OregonTaxAmnesty.com

HELP LOCAL TV NEWS WITH YOUR OPINION
GET A CHANCE TO WIN \$150
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON ACADEMIC SURVEY

Let Us Fight for You

RESPONDING TO CHILD ABUSE OREGON LOTTERY LINK HERE'S MY CARD DIGITAL TELEVISION

Done
start KOBI5/KOTI2 - Mozill... Pacific Northwest TV ... 9:48 AM

APPENDIX H

MODEL SUMMARY AND ANOVA TABLES FOR

RESEARCH QUESTION 3

Station Usefulness/Quality and Loyalty

Step 1

Table 3 (model summary) and Table 4 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 1 (C+I=D).

Table 3. Model Summary: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .009 ^b | .000 | -.005 | 2.44051 | .000 | .017 | 1 | 204 | .896 |
| 2 | .598 ^b | .358 | .339 | 1.97974 | .358 | 22.202 | 5 | 199 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 4. Regression ANOVA: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| ANOVA ^c | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .103 | 1 | .103 | .017 | .896 ^a |
| | Residual | 1215.046 | 204 | 5.956 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 435.191 | 6 | 72.532 | 18.506 | .000 ^a |
| | Residual | 779.958 | 199 | 3.919 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Step 2

Table 5 (model summary) and Table 6 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 2 (C+M=D).

Table 5. Model Summary: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .009 ^a | .000 | -.005 | 2.44046 | .000 | .017 | 1 | 206 | .895 |
| 2 | .446 ^b | .199 | .191 | 2.18952 | .199 | 50.925 | 1 | 205 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 6. Regression ANOVA: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .104 | 1 | .104 | .017 | .895 ^a |
| | Residual | 1226.900 | 206 | 5.956 | | |
| | Total | 1227.004 | 207 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 244.237 | 2 | 122.119 | 25.473 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 982.767 | 205 | 4.794 | | |
| | Total | 1227.004 | 207 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Step 3

Table 7 (model summary) and Table 8 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 3 (C+I=M).

Table 7. Model Summary: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .083 ^b | .007 | .002 | 1.50293 | .007 | 1.412 | 1 | 205 | .236 |
| 2 | .677 ^b | .458 | .441 | 1.12430 | .451 | 33.265 | 5 | 200 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: stationuse and stationq1

Table 8. Regression ANOVA: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 3.188 | 1 | 3.188 | 1.412 | .236 ^b |
| | Residual | 463.052 | 205 | 2.259 | | |
| | Total | 466.241 | 206 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 213.429 | 6 | 35.572 | 28.141 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 252.811 | 200 | 1.264 | | |
| | Total | 466.241 | 206 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: stationuse and stationq1

Step 4

Table 9 (model summary) and Table 10 (ANOVA) show the results of Step 4 (C+M+I=D).

Table 9. Model Summary: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| Model Summary ^d | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|--|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change | |
| 1 | .009 ^a | .000 | -.005 | 2.44051 | .000 | .017 | 1 | 204 | .896 | |
| 2 | .446 ^b | .199 | .191 | 2.18962 | .199 | 50.428 | 1 | 203 | .000 | |
| 3 | .604 ^c | .365 | .343 | 1.97370 | .166 | 10.369 | 5 | 198 | .000 | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 10. Regression ANOVA: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| ANOVA ^d | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .103 | 1 | .103 | .017 | .896 ^a |
| | Residual | 1215.046 | 204 | 5.956 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 241.877 | 2 | 120.939 | 25.225 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 973.272 | 203 | 4.794 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |
| 3 | Regression | 443.845 | 7 | 63.406 | 16.277 | .000 ^c |
| | Residual | 771.304 | 198 | 3.895 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Station Usefulness/Quality and Commitment

Step 1

Table 11 (model summary) and Table 12 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 1 (C+I=D).

Table 11. Model Summary: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^a | .015 | .010 | 6.03014 | .015 | 3.053 | 1 | 197 | .082 |
| 2 | .688 ^b | .474 | .457 | 4.46564 | .458 | 33.443 | 5 | 192 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 12. Regression ANOVA: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| ANOVA ^c | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 111.032 | 1 | 111.032 | 3.053 | .082 ^a |
| | Residual | 7163.441 | 197 | 36.363 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 3445.613 | 6 | 574.269 | 28.797 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 3828.860 | 192 | 19.942 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Step 2

Table 13 (model summary) and Table 14 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 2 (C+M=D).

Table 13. Model Summary: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^b | .015 | .010 | 6.02992 | .015 | 3.100 | 1 | 200 | .080 |
| 2 | .442 ^b | .195 | .187 | 5.46463 | .180 | 44.518 | 1 | 199 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 14. Regression ANOVA: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 112.715 | 1 | 112.715 | 3.100 | .080 ^b |
| | Residual | 7271.977 | 200 | 36.360 | | |
| | Total | 7384.692 | 201 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 1442.114 | 2 | 721.057 | 24.146 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 5942.578 | 199 | 29.862 | | |
| | Total | 7384.692 | 201 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Step 3

Table 15 (model summary) and Table 16 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 3 (C+I=M).

Table 15. Model Summary: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .083 ^a | .007 | .002 | 1.50293 | .007 | 1.412 | 1 | 205 | .236 |
| 2 | .676 ^b | .456 | .440 | 1.12572 | .450 | 33.080 | 5 | 200 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours online , weather, hours watching local TV news, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: stationuse and stationql

Table 16. Score Regression ANOVA: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 3.188 | 1 | 3.188 | 1.412 | .236 ^a |
| | Residual | 463.052 | 205 | 2.259 | | |
| | Total | 466.241 | 206 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 212.793 | 6 | 35.465 | 27.986 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 253.448 | 200 | 1.267 | | |
| | Total | 466.241 | 206 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours online , weather, hours watching local TV news, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: stationuse and stationql

Step 4

Table 17 (model summary) and Table 18 (ANOVA) show the results of Step 4 (C+M+I=D).

Table 17. Model Summary: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| Model Summary ^d | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^a | .015 | .010 | 6.03014 | .015 | 3.053 | 1 | 197 | .082 |
| 2 | .442 ^b | .195 | .187 | 5.48505 | .180 | 43.847 | 1 | 196 | .000 |
| 3 | .689 ^c | .474 | .455 | 4.47559 | .279 | 20.248 | 5 | 191 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 18. Regression ANOVA: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| ANOVA ^d | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 111.032 | 1 | 111.032 | 3.053 | .082 ^a |
| | Residual | 7163.441 | 197 | 36.363 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 1420.590 | 2 | 710.295 | 23.782 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 5853.883 | 196 | 29.867 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |
| 3 | Regression | 3448.566 | 7 | 492.652 | 24.595 | .000 ^c |
| | Residual | 3825.907 | 191 | 20.031 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, stationuse and stationql, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Site Usefulness/Quality and Loyalty

Step 1

Table 19 (model summary) and Table 20 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 1 (C+I=D).

Table 19. Model Summary: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .009 ^a | .000 | -.005 | 2.44051 | .000 | .017 | 1 | 204 | .896 |
| 2 | .598 ^b | .358 | .339 | 1.97974 | .358 | 22.202 | 5 | 199 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 20. Regression ANOVA: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .103 | 1 | .103 | .017 | .896 ^a |
| | Residual | 1215.046 | 204 | 5.956 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 435.191 | 6 | 72.532 | 18.506 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 779.958 | 199 | 3.919 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Step 2

Table 21 (model summary) and Table 22 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 2 (C+M=D).

Table 21. Model Summary: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .009 ^a | .000 | -.005 | 2.44051 | .000 | .017 | 1 | 204 | .896 |
| 2 | .470 ^b | .221 | .213 | 2.15951 | .221 | 57.546 | 1 | 203 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 22. Regression ANOVA: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| ANOVA ^c | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .103 | 1 | .103 | .017 | .896 ^a |
| | Residual | 1215.046 | 204 | 5.956 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 268.465 | 2 | 134.232 | 28.784 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 946.684 | 203 | 4.663 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Step 3

Table 23 (model summary) and Table 24 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 3 (C+I=M).

Table 23. Model Summary: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .020 ^a | .000 | -.004 | 3.85753 | .000 | .082 | 1 | 205 | .775 |
| 2 | .541 ^b | .293 | .272 | 3.28413 | .293 | 16.567 | 5 | 200 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total usefulness items

Table 24. Regression ANOVA: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 1.221 | 1 | 1.221 | .082 | .775 ^a |
| | Residual | 3050.511 | 205 | 14.881 | | |
| | Total | 3051.733 | 206 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 894.629 | 6 | 149.105 | 13.825 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 2157.104 | 200 | 10.786 | | |
| | Total | 3051.733 | 206 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total usefulness items

Step 4

Table 25 (model summary) and Table 26 (ANOVA) show the results of Step 4 (C+M+I=D).

Table 25. Model Summary: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| Model Summary ^d | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .009 ^a | .000 | -.005 | 2.44051 | .000 | .017 | 1 | 204 | .896 |
| 2 | .470 ^b | .221 | .213 | 2.15951 | .221 | 57.546 | 1 | 203 | .000 |
| 3 | .629 ^c | .395 | .374 | 1.92650 | .174 | 11.415 | 5 | 198 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items, hours watching television, hours online, weather, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 26. Regression ANOVA: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| ANOVA ^d | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .103 | 1 | .103 | .017 | .896 ^a |
| | Residual | 1215.046 | 204 | 5.956 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 268.465 | 2 | 134.232 | 28.784 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 946.684 | 203 | 4.663 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |
| 3 | Regression | 480.292 | 7 | 68.613 | 18.487 | .000 ^c |
| | Residual | 734.857 | 198 | 3.711 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items, hours watching television, hours online, weather, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Site Usefulness/Quality and Commitment

Step 1

Table 27 (model summary) and Table 28 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 1 (C+I=D).

Table 27. Model Summary: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^a | .015 | .010 | 6.03014 | .015 | 3.053 | 1 | 197 | .082 |
| 2 | .688 ^b | .474 | .457 | 4.46564 | .458 | 33.443 | 5 | 192 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 28. Regression ANOVA: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 111.032 | 1 | 111.032 | 3.053 | .082 ^a |
| | Residual | 7163.441 | 197 | 36.363 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 3445.613 | 6 | 574.269 | 28.797 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 3828.860 | 192 | 19.942 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Step 2

Table 29 (model summary) and Table 30 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 2 (C+M=D).

Table 29. Model Summary: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^a | .015 | .010 | 6.03014 | .015 | 3.053 | 1 | 197 | .082 |
| 2 | .458 ^b | .210 | .202 | 5.41583 | .194 | 48.226 | 1 | 196 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 30. Regression ANOVA: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| ANOVA ^c | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 111.032 | 1 | 111.032 | 3.053 | .082 ^a |
| | Residual | 7163.441 | 197 | 36.363 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 1525.559 | 2 | 762.780 | 26.006 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 5748.913 | 196 | 29.331 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Step 3

Table 31 (model summary) and Table 32 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 3 (C+I=M).

Table 31. Model Summary: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .020 ^a | .000 | -.004 | 3.95753 | .000 | .082 | 1 | 205 | .775 |
| 2 | .541 ^b | .293 | .272 | 3.28413 | .293 | 16.567 | 5 | 200 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total usefultsite items

Table 32. Regression ANOVA: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 1.221 | 1 | 1.221 | .082 | .775 ^a |
| | Residual | 3050.511 | 205 | 14.881 | | |
| | Total | 3051.733 | 206 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 894.629 | 6 | 149.105 | 13.825 | .000 ^a |
| | Residual | 2157.104 | 200 | 10.786 | | |
| | Total | 3051.733 | 206 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total usefultsite items

Step 4

Table 33 (model summary) and Table 34 (ANOVA) show the results of Step 4 (C+M+I=D).

Table 33. Model Summary: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^a | .015 | .010 | 6.03014 | .015 | 3.053 | 1 | 197 | .082 |
| 2 | .458 ^b | .210 | .202 | 5.41583 | .194 | 48.226 | 1 | 196 | .000 |
| 3 | .703 ^c | .494 | .476 | 4.38877 | .285 | 21.494 | 5 | 191 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items, hours watching television, hours online, weather, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 34. Regression ANOVA: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| ANOVA ^d | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 111.032 | 1 | 111.032 | 3.053 | .082 ^a |
| | Residual | 7163.441 | 197 | 36.363 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 1525.559 | 2 | 762.780 | 26.006 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 5748.913 | 196 | 29.331 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |
| 3 | Regression | 3595.558 | 7 | 513.651 | 26.667 | .000 ^c |
| | Residual | 3678.915 | 191 | 19.261 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total usefulness items, hours watching television, hours online, weather, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total commit items

TV Parasocial Interaction and Loyalty

Step 1

Table 35 (model summary) and Table 36 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 1 (C+I=D).

Table 35. Model Summary: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .009 ^a | .000 | -.005 | 2.44051 | .000 | .017 | 1 | 204 | .896 |
| 2 | .598 ^b | .358 | .339 | 1.97974 | .358 | 22.202 | 5 | 199 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 36. Regression ANOVA: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .103 | 1 | .103 | .017 | .896 ^a |
| | Residual | 1215.046 | 204 | 5.956 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 435.191 | 6 | 72.532 | 18.506 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 779.958 | 199 | 3.919 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Step 2

Table 37 (model summary) and Table 38 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 2 (C+M=D). The variable with a significant *beta* was TV parasocial interaction ($\beta = .400, p = .001$).

Table 37. Model Summary: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .009 ^a | .000 | -.005 | 2.44076 | .000 | .017 | 1 | 196 | .898 |
| 2 | .398 ^b | .158 | .150 | 2.24486 | .158 | 36.699 | 1 | 195 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 38. Regression ANOVA: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .099 | 1 | .099 | .017 | .898 ^a |
| | Residual | 1167.630 | 196 | 5.957 | | |
| | Total | 1167.729 | 197 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 185.042 | 2 | 92.521 | 18.359 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 982.686 | 195 | 5.039 | | |
| | Total | 1167.729 | 197 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Step 3

Table 39 (model summary) and Table 40 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 3 (C+I=M).

Table 39. Model Summary: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .100 ^a | .010 | .005 | 12.40977 | .010 | 1.982 | 1 | 195 | .161 |
| 2 | .436 ^b | .191 | .165 | 11.36850 | .180 | 8.471 | 5 | 190 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total parasocial items

Table 40. Regression ANOVA: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 305.200 | 1 | 305.200 | 1.982 | .161 ^a |
| | Residual | 30030.471 | 195 | 154.002 | | |
| | Total | 30335.671 | 196 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 5779.523 | 6 | 963.254 | 7.453 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 24556.148 | 190 | 129.243 | | |
| | Total | 30335.671 | 196 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total parasocial items

Step 4

Table 41 (model summary) and Table 42 (ANOVA) show the results of Step 4 (C+M+I=D).

Table 41. Model Summary: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| Model Summary ^d | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .009 ^a | .000 | -.005 | 2.44079 | .000 | .016 | 1 | 195 | .898 |
| 2 | .398 ^b | .158 | .150 | 2.24492 | .158 | 36.511 | 1 | 194 | .000 |
| 3 | .620 ^c | .384 | .362 | 1.94530 | .226 | 13.873 | 5 | 189 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items, weather, hours watching television, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 42. Regression ANOVA: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| ANOVA ^d | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .098 | 1 | .098 | .016 | .898 ^a |
| | Residual | 1161.703 | 195 | 5.957 | | |
| | Total | 1161.801 | 196 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 184.103 | 2 | 92.051 | 18.265 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 977.698 | 194 | 5.040 | | |
| | Total | 1161.801 | 196 | | | |
| 3 | Regression | 446.586 | 7 | 63.798 | 16.859 | .000 ^c |
| | Residual | 715.215 | 189 | 3.784 | | |
| | Total | 1161.801 | 196 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items, weather, hours watching television, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

TV Parasocial Interaction and Commitment

Step 1

Table 43 (model summary) and Table 44 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 1 (C+I=D).

Table 43. Model Summary: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^a | .015 | .010 | 6.03014 | .015 | 3.053 | 1 | 197 | .082 |
| 2 | .688 ^b | .474 | .457 | 4.46564 | .458 | 33.443 | 5 | 192 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 44. Regression ANOVA: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| ANOVA ^c | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 111.032 | 1 | 111.032 | 3.053 | .082 ^a |
| | Residual | 7163.441 | 197 | 36.363 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 3445.613 | 6 | 574.269 | 28.797 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 3828.860 | 192 | 19.942 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Step 2

Table 45 (model summary) and Table 46 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 2 (C+M=D).

Table 45. Model Summary: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^b | .015 | .010 | 6.03062 | .015 | 2.960 | 1 | 191 | .087 |
| 2 | .448 ^b | .201 | .193 | 5.44599 | .186 | 44.209 | 1 | 190 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 46. Regression ANOVA: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 107.668 | 1 | 107.668 | 2.960 | .087 ^a |
| | Residual | 6946.367 | 191 | 36.368 | | |
| | Total | 7054.034 | 192 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 1418.863 | 2 | 709.432 | 23.920 | .000 ^a |
| | Residual | 5635.171 | 190 | 29.659 | | |
| | Total | 7054.034 | 192 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Step 3

Table 47 (model summary) and Table 48 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 3 (C+I=M).

Table 47. Model Summary: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .100 ^a | .010 | .005 | 12.40977 | .010 | 1.982 | 1 | 195 | .161 |
| 2 | .436 ^a | .191 | .165 | 11.36850 | .180 | 8.471 | 5 | 190 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total parasocial items

Table 48. Regression ANOVA: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 305.200 | 1 | 305.200 | 1.982 | .161 ^a |
| | Residual | 30030.471 | 195 | 154.002 | | |
| | Total | 30335.671 | 196 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 5779.523 | 6 | 963.254 | 7.453 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 24556.148 | 190 | 129.243 | | |
| | Total | 30335.671 | 196 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total parasocial items

Step 4

Table 49 (model summary) and Table 50 (ANOVA) show the results of Step 4 (C+M+I=D).

Table 49. Model Summary: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| Model Summary ^d | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^a | .015 | .010 | 6.03062 | .015 | 2.960 | 1 | 191 | .087 |
| 2 | .448 ^b | .201 | .193 | 5.44599 | .186 | 44.209 | 1 | 190 | .000 |
| 3 | .710 ^c | .504 | .485 | 4.34890 | .303 | 22.591 | 5 | 185 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items, weather, hours watching television, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 50. Regression ANOVA: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| ANOVA ^d | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 107.668 | 1 | 107.668 | 2.960 | .087 ^a |
| | Residual | 6946.367 | 191 | 36.368 | | |
| | Total | 7054.034 | 192 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 1418.863 | 2 | 709.432 | 23.920 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 5635.171 | 190 | 29.659 | | |
| | Total | 7054.034 | 192 | | | |
| 3 | Regression | 3555.136 | 7 | 507.877 | 26.853 | .000 ^c |
| | Residual | 3498.898 | 185 | 18.913 | | |
| | Total | 7054.034 | 192 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total parasocial items, weather, hours watching television, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Web Parasocial Interaction and Loyalty

Step 1

Table 51 (model summary) and Table 52 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 1 (C+I=D).

Table 51. Model Summary: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .009 ^a | .000 | -.005 | 2.44051 | .000 | .017 | 1 | 204 | .896 |
| 2 | .598 ^b | .358 | .339 | 1.97974 | .358 | 22.202 | 5 | 199 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 52. Regression ANOVA: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .103 | 1 | .103 | .017 | .896 ^a |
| | Residual | 1215.046 | 204 | 5.956 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 435.191 | 6 | 72.532 | 18.506 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 779.958 | 199 | 3.919 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Step 2

Table 53 (model summary) and Table 54 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 2 (C+M=D).

Table 53. Model Summary: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .009 ^a | .000 | -.005 | 2.44049 | .000 | .017 | 1 | 205 | .895 |
| 2 | .518 ^b | .268 | .261 | 2.09324 | .268 | 74.655 | 1 | 204 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 54. Regression ANOVA: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| ANOVA ^c | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .103 | 1 | .103 | .017 | .895 ^a |
| | Residual | 1220.973 | 205 | 5.956 | | |
| | Total | 1221.077 | 206 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 327.218 | 2 | 163.609 | 37.339 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 893.859 | 204 | 4.382 | | |
| | Total | 1221.077 | 206 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items

c. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Step 3

Table 55 (model summary) and Table 56 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 3 (C+I=M).

Table 55. Model Summary: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| Model Summary^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .063 ^a | .004 | .000 | 4.60056 | .004 | .806 | 1 | 205 | .370 |
| 2 | .663 ^b | .440 | .423 | 3.49238 | .436 | 31.148 | 5 | 200 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total siteper items

Table 56. Regression ANOVA: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| ANOVA^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 17.062 | 1 | 17.062 | .806 | .370 ^a |
| | Residual | 4338.858 | 205 | 21.165 | | |
| | Total | 4355.920 | 206 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 1916.578 | 6 | 319.430 | 26.190 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 2439.342 | 200 | 12.197 | | |
| | Total | 4355.920 | 206 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television , weather, hours online , this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total siteper items

Step 4

Table 57 and Table 58 show the results of Step 4 (C+M+I=D).

Table 57. Model Summary: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| Model Summary ^d | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .009 ^a | .000 | -.005 | 2.44051 | .000 | .017 | 1 | 204 | .896 |
| 2 | .518 ^b | .268 | .261 | 2.09329 | .268 | 74.289 | 1 | 203 | .000 |
| 3 | .625 ^c | .390 | .369 | 1.93440 | .122 | 7.944 | 5 | 198 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items, hours online , hours watching television , weather, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Table 58. Regression ANOVA: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| ANOVA ^d | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | .103 | 1 | .103 | .017 | .896 ^a |
| | Residual | 1215.046 | 204 | 5.956 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 325.629 | 2 | 162.815 | 37.156 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 889.520 | 203 | 4.382 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |
| 3 | Regression | 474.250 | 7 | 67.750 | 18.106 | .000 ^c |
| | Residual | 740.899 | 198 | 3.742 | | |
| | Total | 1215.149 | 205 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items, hours online , hours watching television , weather, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total loyalty items

Web Parasocial Interaction and Commitment

Step 1

Table 59 (model summary) and Table 60 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 1 (C+I=D).

Table 59. Model Summary: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^a | .015 | .010 | 6.03014 | .015 | 3.053 | 1 | 197 | .082 |
| 2 | .688 ^b | .474 | .457 | 4.46564 | .458 | 33.443 | 5 | 192 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 60. Regression ANOVA: Step 1 (C+I=D)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 111.032 | 1 | 111.032 | 3.053 | .082 ^a |
| | Residual | 7163.441 | 197 | 36.363 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 3445.613 | 6 | 574.269 | 28.797 | .000 ^a |
| | Residual | 3828.860 | 192 | 19.942 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Step 2

Tables 61 (model summary) and Table 62 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 2 (C+M=D).

Table 61. Model Summary: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^a | .015 | .010 | 6.03007 | .015 | 3.069 | 1 | 198 | .081 |
| 2 | .596 ^b | .355 | .348 | 4.89300 | .340 | 103.718 | 1 | 197 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 62. Regression ANOVA: Step 2 (C+M=D)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 111.593 | 1 | 111.593 | 3.069 | .081 ^a |
| | Residual | 7199.620 | 198 | 36.362 | | |
| | Total | 7311.213 | 199 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 2594.754 | 2 | 1297.377 | 54.190 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 4716.458 | 197 | 23.941 | | |
| | Total | 7311.213 | 199 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items

c. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Step 3

Table 63 (model summary) and Table 64 (ANOVA) present the results of Step 3 (C+I=M).

Table 63. Model Summary: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| Model Summary ^a | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .063 ^b | .004 | .000 | 4.60056 | .004 | .806 | 1 | 205 | .370 |
| 2 | .663 ^b | .440 | .423 | 3.49238 | .436 | 31.148 | 5 | 200 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total siteper items

Table 64. Regression ANOVA: Step 3 (C+I=M)

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 17.062 | 1 | 17.062 | .806 | .370 ^b |
| | Residual | 4338.858 | 205 | 21.165 | | |
| | Total | 4355.920 | 206 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 1916.578 | 6 | 319.430 | 26.190 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 2439.342 | 200 | 12.197 | | |
| | Total | 4355.920 | 206 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, how satisfied are you with news from this station, hours watching television, weather, hours online, this station is different from other stations in area

c. Dependent Variable: total siteper items

Step 4

Table 65 (model summary) and Table 66 (ANOVA) show the results of Step 4 (C+M+I=D).

Table 65. Model Summary: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| Model Summary ^d | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .124 ^a | .015 | .010 | 6.03014 | .015 | 3.053 | 1 | 197 | .082 |
| 2 | .596 ^b | .355 | .348 | 4.89312 | .340 | 103.192 | 1 | 196 | .000 |
| 3 | .727 ^c | .529 | .512 | 4.23597 | .174 | 14.106 | 5 | 191 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items, hours online , hours watching television , weather, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total commit items

Table 66. Regression ANOVA: Step 4 (C+M+I=D)

| ANOVA ^d | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 111.032 | 1 | 111.032 | 3.053 | .082 ^a |
| | Residual | 7163.441 | 197 | 36.363 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 2581.715 | 2 | 1290.858 | 53.915 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 4692.758 | 196 | 23.943 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |
| 3 | Regression | 3847.275 | 7 | 549.611 | 30.630 | .000 ^c |
| | Residual | 3427.198 | 191 | 17.943 | | |
| | Total | 7274.473 | 198 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), age

b. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items

c. Predictors: (Constant), age, total siteper items, hours online , hours watching television , weather, this station is different from other stations in area, how satisfied are you with news from this station

d. Dependent Variable: total commit items

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aaker, D. A. (1996). *Building strong brands*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Aaker, D. A., Kumar, V., & Day, G. S. (2007). *Marketing research* (9th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Allen, C. M. (2001). *News is people: The rise of local TV news and the fall of news from New York*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Abrahamson, D. (2005). From the many, to the many: The journalistic promise of blogs. *Journal of Magazine and New Media Research*, Summer 2005.
- Beauchamp, L. (2005, September). Blogosphere boom. *RTNDA Communicator*, 59(8), 24-26.
- Bates, R., & Khasawneh, S. (2002). *Self-efficacy as a mediator in college students' perceptions and use of online learning systems: An empirical investigation*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Bates, B. J., & King, R. E. (1996, April). *Television and the web: How local television broadcasters are using the World Wide Web*. Paper presented to the Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas, NV.
- Bellamy, R. V., & Traudt, P. J. (2000). Television branding as promotion. In S. T. Eastman (Ed.), *Research in media promotion* (pp. 127-159). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), article 11. Retrieved February 10, 2010, from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol13/issue1/boyd.ellison.html>
- Buchman, J. G. (2000). Television newscast promotion and marketing. In S. T. Eastman (Ed.), *Research in media promotion* (pp. 265-296). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D.A. (1986). The mediator-moderator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.

- Caldwell, J. (1995). *Televisuality style, crisis, and authority in American television*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Caldwell, J. T. (2003). Second-shift media aesthetics: Programming, interactivity, and user flows. In A. Everett, & J. T. Caldwell (Ed.), *New media: Theories and practices of digitextuality* (pp. 127-144). New York, NY: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Books, Inc.
- Caldwell, J. (2004). Convergence television: Aggregating form and repurposing content in the culture of conglomeration. In Spigel, L. & Olsson, J. (Ed.). (2004). *Television after TV: essays on a medium in transition* (pp. 41-74). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Campbell, R., Martin, C. R., & Fabos, B. (2006). *Media and culture 5: An introduction to mass communication* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Erlbaum.
- Comley, P. (2002). Online survey techniques: Current issues and future trends. *Interactive Marketing*, 4(2), 156-169.
- Conway, J. C., & Rubin, A. M. (1991). Psychological predictors of television viewing motivation. *Communication Research*, 18, 443-463.
- Chan-Olmsted, S. M., & Park, J. S. (2000). From on-air to online world: Examining the content and structures of broadcast TV stations' Web sites. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77(2), 321. Retrieved October 17, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global.
- Chan-Olmsted, S. M., & Kim, Y. (2001). Perceptions of branding among television station managers: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 45 (1), 75-91.
- Cheong, H. J., & Morrison, M. A. (2008). Consumers' reliance on product information and recommendations found in UGC. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8(2), 1-29. Retrieved from <http://proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=31929438&site=ehost-live>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Dearstyne, B. W. (2005). Blogs: The new information revolution? *Information Management Journal*, 39(5), 38. Retrieved October 18, 2005, from ABI/INFORM Global.
- Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dommeier, C. J., Baum, P., Hanna, R. W., & Chapman, K. S. (2004). Gathering faculty teaching evaluations by in-class and online surveys: Their effects on response rates and evaluations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(5), 611-623. doi:10.1080/02602930410001689171
- Eastman, S. T. (Ed.). (2000). *Research in media promotion*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Feick, L. F., & Price, L. L. (1987). The market maven: A diffuser of marketplace information. *Journal of Marketing*, 51(1), 83-97.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ferguson, D. A. (1992). Channel repertoire in the presence of remote control devices, VCRS and cable television. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 38, 83-91.
- Ferguson, D. A. (1999). Network television promotion. In S. T. Eastman, D. A. Ferguson, & R. A. Klein (Ed.), *Promotion and marketing for broadcasting and cable* (3rd ed., pp.89-96). Boston, MA: Focal Press.
- Ferguson, D. A. (2000). Online program promotion. In S. T. Eastman (Ed.), *Research in media promotion* (pp. 265-296). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Fisher extends hyperlocal push to Oregon. (2009). *TVNewsCheck*. Retrieved October 7, 2009, from <http://www.tvnewscheck.com/articles/2009/10/07/daily.5/>.
- Freeman, L. (1999, June 7). On TV, image is everything. *Electronic Media*, 18.
- Giles, D. (2002, August). Parasocial interaction: A review of the literature and a model for future research. *Media Psychology*, 4(3), 279-305. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from Academic Search Premier.

- Gregson, K. S. (2008). Missed opportunities: Use of the web to promote the local television newscast. *Journal of Website Promotion*, 3(1), 102-117. doi:10.1080/15533610802052837
- Gupta, S., & Kim, H. (2007, January). Developing the commitment to virtual community: The balanced effects of cognition and affect. *Information Resources Management Journal*, 20(1), 28-45. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from Business Source Premier.
- Gwartney, P. A. (2007). *The telephone interviewer's handbook: How to conduct standardized conversations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ha, L., & Chan-Olmsted, S.M. (2004). Cross media use in electronic media: The role of cable television Web sites in cable television network branding and viewership. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 48(4), 620-645.
- Hinds, L. B. (1995). *Broadcasting the local news: The early years of Pittsburgh's KDKA-TV*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.
- Hoerner, J. (1999). Scaling the Web: A parasocial interaction scale for World Wide Web sites. In D. W. Schumann and E. Thorson (Ed.), *Advertising and the World Wide Web* (pp. 135-147). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Horton, D., & Wohl, R. R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction. *Psychiatry*, 19, 215-229.
- Hughes, M. (2008). *Buzzmarketing: Get people to talk about your stuff*. New York, NY: The Penguin Group.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Jenkins, H. (2008). *Confessions of an Aca/Fan: Transmedia storytelling 101*. Retrieved January 29, 2008, from http://www.henryjenkins.org/2007/03/transmedia_storytelling_101.html
- Johnson, T. J., & Kaye, B. K. (2004). Wag the blog: How reliance on traditional media and the Internet influence credibility perceptions of weblogs among blog users. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(3), 622. Retrieved October 17, 2005, from ABI/INFORM Global.
- Judd, C. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1981). Process analysis: Estimating mediation in treatment evaluations. *Evaluation Review*, 5(5), 602-619.

- Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P.F. (1955). *Personal influence: The part played by people in the flow of mass communications*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Keller, Kevin L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (January), 1-22.
- Keller, K. (1998). *Strategic management: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Key news audiences now blend online and traditional sources. (2008). *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved November 1, 2008, from <http://people-press.org/report/444/news-media>
- Kiernan, V., & Levy, M. (1999). Competition among broadcast-related Web sites. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 43, 271-297.
- King, R. E. (1998). The uses and gratifications of the World Wide Web: An audience analysis for local television news broadcasters (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Kumar, N., & Benbasat, I. (2002). Para-social presence and communication capabilities of a Web site. *e-Service Journal* 1(3), 5-24. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from Business Source Premier.
- Lane, V.R. (2000). The impact of ad repetition and ad content on consumer perceptions of incongruent extensions. *Journal of Marketing*, 64(2), 80-91.
- Lefever, S., Dal, M., & Matthíasdóttir, Á. (2007). Online data collection in academic research: Advantages and limitations. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(4), 574-582. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00638.x
- Lenhart, A. (2009). Adults and social network Websites. *Pew Research Center's Internet & American Life Project*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2009/Adults-and-Social-Network-Websites.aspx>
- Levine, T. R., & Hullett, C. R. (2002). Eta squared, partial eta squared, and misreporting of effect size in communication research. *Human Communication Research*, 28 (4), 612-25.
- Levy, M. R. (1979). Watching TV news as para-social interaction. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 23, 69-80.

- Luo, J., McGoldrick, P., Beatty, S., & Keeling, K. (2006, April). On-screen characters: their design and influence on consumer trust. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 20(2), 112-124. Retrieved March 2, 2009, doi:10.1108/08876040610657048
- Malone, M. (2009). Cover story: Dawn of the post “star anchor” era. *Broadcasting and Cable*. Retrieved April 6, 2009, from http://www.broadcastingcable.com/article/191239-Cover_Story_Dawn_of_the_Post_Star_Anchor_Era.php
- Mapaye, J. C. (2006, April). *A test in transparency: Blogger KING*. Paper presented at the 51st Annual Convention of the Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- Mapaye, J. C. (2009, November). *Viral voters: The YouTube vote in Election 2008*. Paper presented at the 95th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Mantrala, M., Naik, P., Sridhar, S., & Thorson, E. (2007, April). Uphill or Downhill? Locating the firm on a profit function. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(2), 26-44. Retrieved March 20, 2009, doi:10.1509/jmkg.71.2.26
- McAlexander, J. H., Schouten, J. W., & Koenig, H. (2002). Building brand community. *Journal of Marketing*, 66 (January) 38-54.
- McGann, R. (2005). *Blog readership surged 58 percent in 2004*. Retrieved November 17, 2005, from http://www.clickz.com/stats/sectors/traffic_patterns/print.php/3453431
- McQuail, D. (2000). *McQuail's mass communication theory* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McQuail, D. (2005). *McQuail's mass communication theory* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Meehan, E. R. (2005). *Why TV Is Not Our Fault*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Mermigas, D. (2008). *MediaPost publications - does local TV have A future?* Retrieved November 16, 2008, from http://www.mediapost.com/publications/?fa=Articles.showArticleHomePage&art_aid=94588

- Muniz Jr., A. M., & O'Guinn, T. C. (2001). Brand community. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(4), 412-432. Retrieved from <http://proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=5244454&site=ehost-live>
- Neumeier, M. (2006). *The brand gap: How to bridge the distance between business strategy and design*. Berkeley, CA: New Riders.
- Niekamp, R. (1996, August). *Television station sites on the World Wide Web*. Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Chicago, IL.
- O'Leary, S., & Sheehan, K. (2008). *Building a buzz to beat the big boys: Word-of-mouth marketing for small businesses*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- Owen, S. (1993). The Landor imagepower survey: A global assessment of brand strength. In D. A. Aaker & A. L. Biel (Ed.), *Brand equity and advertising: Advertising's role in building strong brands* (pp. 11-32). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual*. (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Open University Press.
- Papper, R. (2006). The future of news survey. Retrieved April 23, 2006 from http://www.rtdna.org/pages/media_items/the-future-of-news-survey-2006239.php
- Papper, R. (2010). RTDNA 2010 TV and radio news staffing and profitability survey. Retrieved April 30, 2010 from http://www.rtdna.org/pages/media_items/2010-tv-and-radio-news-staffing-and-profitability-survey1943.php?id=1943
- PBS. (2010). Retrieved June 9, 2010, from <http://www.pbs.org/>
- Perse, E. M. (1990). Media involvement and local news effects. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 34, 17-36.
- Perse, E. M. (2000). Applying theory to the practice of promotion. In S. T. Eastman (Ed.), *Research in media promotion* (pp. 19-53). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Perse, E. M. & Rubin, A.M. (1988). Audience activity and satisfaction with favorite television soap opera. *Journalism Quarterly*, 65, 368-375.

- Pitts, M. J. (2003). Television Web sites and changes in the nature of storytelling. *Studies in Media & Information Literacy Education*, Aug. 2003, 3, 3. Retrieved October 22, 2005, from Academic Search Premier.
- Polon, M. (1999, July 19). You are what your website says you are. *TV Broadcast*. Retrieved from <http://www.TVBroadcast.com/99.7.16.7.htm>.
- Purcell, K., Rainie, L., Mitchell, A., Rosenstiel, T., Olmstead, K. (2010). Understanding the participatory news consumer. *Pew Research Center's Internet & American Life Project*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2010/Online-News.aspx>.
- Pyrczak, F. (2003). *Making sense of statistics: A conceptual overview*. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.
- Radhakrishna, R., & Doamekpor, P. (2008). Strategies for generalizing findings in survey research. *Extension Journal, Inc.*, 46(2).
- Rosenberg, S. (2008). *Stations must tap web's stand-alone potential*. Crain Communications Inc. (MI). Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=32576695&site=ehost-live>
- Rubin, A. M., Perse, E. M., & Powell, R. A. (1985). Loneliness, parasocial interaction, and local television news viewing. *Human Communication Research*, 12, 155-180.
- Rubin, A. M., & Perse, E. M. (1987). Audience activity and soap opera involvement. *Human Communication Research* 14, 246-268.
- Rubin, A. M. (1994). Parasocial interaction scale. In R. B. Rubin, P. Palmgreen, & H. E. Sypher (Ed.), *Communication research measures: A sourcebook* (pp. 273-277). New York: Guilford.
- Rubin, A. M. & Step, M.M. (2000). Impact of motivation, attraction, and parasocial interaction on talk radio listening. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 44(4), 635-654.
- Ryan, L. (1999, June 14). Experts say be bold, but be careful. *Electronic Media*, 36, 38.
- Sax, L. J., Gilmartin, S. K., & Bryant, A. N. (2003). Assessing response rates and nonresponse bias in web and paper surveys. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(4), 409. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.consortiumlibrary.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=10574181&site=ehost-live>

- Scott, D. M. (2010). *The new rules of marketing and PR: How to use social media, blogs, news releases, online video, and viral marketing to reach buyers directly*. (2nd ed.) Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Seiter, E. (1999). *Television and new media audiences*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Spigel, L., & Olsson, J. (Ed.). (2004). *Television after TV: essays on a medium in transition*. Durham : Duke University Press.
- Stelter, B. (2008). A generation of local TV anchors is signing off. *The New York Times*. Retrieved October, 9 2009, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/01/business/media/01anchor.html?pagewanted=all>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- The state of the news media: An annual report on American journalism. (2009). *PEW Project for Excellence in Journalism*. Retrieved March 15, 2010, from http://www.stateofthemedias.org/2009/narrative_cabletv_economics.php?media=7&cat=3
- The state of the news media: An annual report on American journalism. (2010). *PEW Project for Excellence in Journalism*. Retrieved March 15, 2010, from http://www.stateofthemedias.org/2010/overview_intro.php
- Thorson, K. S., & Rodgers, S. (2006). Relationships between blogs as eWOM and interactivity, perceived interactivity, and parasocial interaction. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 6(2), 39-50.
- Wilhoit, C. G., & Weaver, D. H. (1990). *Newsroom guide to polls & surveys*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press
- Williams, R. (1975). *Television: Technology and cultural form*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Williams, H. A. (2003). *A mediated hierarchical regression analysis of factors related to research productivity of human resource education and workforce development postsecondary faculty* (Doctoral dissertation). Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2006). *Mass media research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.