COMPUTERS IN JOURNALISM:
AID OR OBSTACLE
FOR THE INVESTIGATIVE REPORTER?

by

Julie Denise Fosgate

A Thesis Presented to the

FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

(Journalism)

June 1978

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY PARK
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007

This thesis, written by

Julie Denise Fosgate

under the direction of her Thesis Committee, and approved by all its members, has been presented to and accepted by the Dean of The Graduate School, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

William Murray

Dean

Date May 24, 1978

THESIS COMMITTEE

William T Slater

Chairman

William R Faith

At this point, I would like to recognize a few of the many people who contributed to the completion of this work.

First and foremost, I want to thank my committee members--Dr. William T. Slater, whose arrival at USC in the fall of 1977 allowed me the chance to draft him as chairman, mentor and friend; Dr. Edward P. Bassett, who has been a source of unending support and like a second father to me; and Dr. William R. Faith, in whose class this topic first took shape and direction.

A special gratitude is extended to Keith B. Keener, who showed me that computers don't have to be formidable or mysterious,and to Joseph Saltzman, for being the one to encourage me to attend graduate school.

My parents have supported me for the duration of my studies in both spirit and in actuality, and that is only one of the many debts I owe them.

For day-to-day inspiration, there were my roommates, Helena Moshy and Cynthia Martin. They kept me going even when it seemed nothing would go right.

And lastly, I would like to acknowledge the loyalty and devotion of Vince Caruso, who for the past year and a half has made everything worthwhile.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The movie: All the President's Men. The setting: the Library of Congress. Robert Redford and Dustin Hoffman, as Washington Post reporters Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, are seated at a table. Before them are thousands of book slips, neatly stacked. Painstakingly, they begin to search through the pile for the particular piece of information they hope to find. The overhead camera focuses on them and moves slowly higher, ascending further toward the top of the cavernous building. The figures of the two reporters grow smaller and smaller, and the immensity of their task is graphically shown.

That particular scene has stuck in my own mind ever since I viewed a preview showing of the film at Warner Brothers Studio in 1976. It is much more than fantasy; it is a dramatic representation of a very real situation. In the past 20 years, government has grown exponentially, becoming more complex and bureaucratic than ever. The volume of public information has multiplied as well.

Investigative reporters are faced with coping with this overwhelming barricade. In order to bring news and truth to the American public, they must know where the information is as well as how to uncover it.

Increasingly, this has come to mean dealing not with paperwork but with computer programs, punch cards and microfilm. As the information becomes more compact and efficient, it also becomes more intricate and inaccessible to those unfamiliar with the system.

Suppose we rewrote that scene in the movie, and the library information was contained not on individual slips of paper, but in a computer data storage system. Would Woodward and Bernstein have been able to gain access to it then? Could they have convinced a willing federal employee to hand them the information? Would they have known what to do with it if they had?

In this particular real-life situation, the reporters were not successful anyway; the information they had hoped to find had either been removed or did not exist in that form. But this is not an isolated case. On a wide scale, the government is depending increasingly on the capabilities of computers to handle its flood of data. The question is: how is this affecting the role of the investigative reporter and his effectiveness?

It is the contention of this paper that journalism in general is failing to keep pace with these developments and could profit--both monetarily and in the payoff of better reporting--by adapting computer knowledge to its own purposes and advantages.

Is computerization helping or hindering the reporter to gain access to government information? What degree and kind of exposure have journalists had in the area of data storage and retrieval systems? Do they think learning about this specialized field would be worthwhile? These are some of the questions to which this paper addresses itself.

Chapter 1

BACKGROUND

It is important, I think, to first establish what investigative reporting is, and what place it has both in journalism and in the scheme of government in this country.

The Fourth Branch

Freedom of the press, as all grammar school students learn, is guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. But Joseph Califano, former aide to Lyndon Johnson and currently one of Jimmy Carter's Cabinet members, believes the importance of the press goes beyond even that distinction. In his words,

> There is a fourth place at the table of American democratic power which the framers tried to set independent of the three branches of government. The press--in modern terms, television, radio, newspapers, magazines, and books--was conceived of as the people's eyes and ears and often their voice.[1]

It is, in effect, the fourth branch of our democratic system.

It is Califano's contention that the presidency has expanded its powers over the last few decades while the other branches have weakened, or at best stagnated. He

---

[1]Joseph Califano, A Presidential Nation (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1975), p. 12.

sees this imbalance as dangerous, and the press is not exempt from his accusation of decline. The benefit of Watergate may be its dramatic representation of this tilt of balance, when

> . . . despite the brilliant investigative work of a few news organizations, television demonstrated how the media could be turned more into an instrument of presidential power than a persistent skeptic of its exercise.[2]

Califano also warns that while the media may regard itself as a potent critic of the presidency, that is not how it is viewed by the chief executive. The president sees the media as an instrument for developing support, and often he spends as much time trying to manipulate its reaction to his policies as he does in formulating the policies themselves.[3]

Some interesting variations on this theme are put forth by David Wise, a former Washington correspondent. It is his belief that erosion of confidence between the people and their government, not imbalance of power, has been the most significant political development in recent years.

Government deception, he says, is supported by a system of official secrecy.

> Government misinformation is distributed by the government information machine. The message would have little meaning if there were no medium to transmit

---

[2]Ibid., p. 5.

[3]Ibid., p. 102.

it to the public. The press is the medium.[4]

Wise detected an "unprecedented effort" on the part of the Nixon administration to discredit the American press. This was a dangerous policy, Wise believes, since the press is essential to the democratic system.

> The press is often called "the Fourth Branch of government," a term that at once reflects its quintessential importance and a major weakness. For the press is not a branch of government and to the extent that singly, or collectively, its members forget this fact, or confuse themselves with the government, the public is not served.[5]

He added that the press can be validly criticized, not for analyzing and criticizing the government too much but for doing it too little. The press should question government information more vigorously, be unwilling to accept handouts as fact, and avoid passive reporting. To do otherwise only makes it that much easier for government to mislead the public.

A fascinating argument took place among the pages of the magazine Commentary between Daniel Moynihan and Max Frankel, a reporter for the New York Times. Moynihan's article appeared in March, 1971, when he expressed concern that the press was endangering not the reputation of a particular president, but that of government itself. Men

---

[4]David Wise, The Politics of Lying (New York: Random House, 1973), p. 14.

[5]Ibid., p. 15.

of government are dependent on journalists, and if that relationship has grown troubled, his immediate answer is the distrust that grew out of the U-2 affair in 1960. But Moynihan says there are more basic problems between the presidency and the press, and that several circumstances have contributed to reversing the balance of power to favor the media.

Five reasons for this are listed by Moynihan: the evolution of journalism as an elite profession, or at least a profession attractive to elites;[6] the rise of a notion of the near-omnipotence of the presidency and its accompanying overinflated expectations of presidential competence;[7] the dependence of Washington reporters on clandestine information frequently antagonistic to presidential interests;[8] the concept of objectivity with respect to the reporting of events and the unwillingness of the press to forego the entertainment value of a fascinating but untruthful charge;[9] and finally, the most important in Moynihan's mind, the absence of a professional tradition of self-correction.[10]

He concluded by admitting that there is nothing wrong with investigative reporting and that indeed, there

---

[6]Norman Thomas, The Presidency in Contemporary Context (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1975), p. 110.

[7]Ibid., p. 111. [8]Ibid., p. 113.

[9]Ibid., p. 115. [10]Ibid., p. 117.

ought to be more. But,

> . . . the issue is not one of serious inquiry, but of an almost feckless hostility to power. This may not be good for us . . . it is no longer a matter of this or that administration; it is becoming a matter of national morale.[11]

In a subsequent issue of the magazine, Frankel attempts to answer these charges, the central point being this balance of power.

> I found it odd that he never attempted to define either the old balance of power or any balance that he deems desirable . . . (If some of our histories are correct in suggesting that the Hearst and Pulitzer press were once able to goad or frighten the country and its President into war, then it would seem that there has been, indeed, a most remarkable shift in the balance of power, though hardly in the direction Mr. Moynihan suggests.)[12]

If reporters are more educated, it is only to keep up with the credentials of the holders of public office, Frankel says, rejecting the notion of an elite group. And if we Americans do have exaggerated expectations, that is a burden only to a president who insists on perpetuating the erroneous image.[13]

As for the use of clandestine information, Frankel points out that the majority of deliberate leaks are not secret documents but guarded suggestions to look into a matter that might otherwise be neglected. Would Moynihan have such information ignored? On the subject of objectiv-

---

[11] Ibid., p. 125. [12] Ibid., p. 136.

[13] Ibid., p. 138.

ity, Frankel says,

> The problem for thoughtful journalism is that we can never be sure about motivation and we certainly cannot know consequence. And in some small measure, at least, we know that we contribute to consequence. These are horrendous problems and we lose sleep over them, but they are not solved by the automatic assumption in our editorial suites of the absolute power to decide that Moynihan deserves to be heard, and another man does not.[14]

Lastly, Frankel contends that the press corrects itself in one sense every morning. And beyond that, such opportunity is rarely denied the White House, as men of power are able to make their views known, almost by definition.[15]

This issue of the relationship between press and government is indeed a complex one, with no easy answers. Developments in recent years have complicated the situation even further, and it may be some time before we can determine the effects of events such as Watergate. But in any case it is apparent that warnings like the following may be simplistic but nonetheless worth heeding:

> There is a tendency among many officials, both elected and appointed, to conduct public business in secret. Reporters and editors must carry on a constant fight for free access to information.[16]

---

[14]Ibid., p. 141.

[15]Ibid., p. 142.

[16]Philip Ault and Edwin Emery, Reporting the News (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1959), p. 151.

The Evolution of Investigative Reporting

At the turn of the century, from about 1880 to 1914, a tradition began to establish itself in the field of journalism. Its mission was the exposure of corruption in government or the collusion of government with private interests, and the practitioners of this specialty came to be called "muckrakers." They included the likes of David Graham Phillips, Lincoln Steffens, and Upton Sinclair. These writers, and others like them, set the precedent for what we know today as investigative reporting.

There is no official definition of what does or does not qualify as investigative reporting. But the technique is generally recognizable; note the similarities in the following descriptions:

> A newspaper must search for the concealed stories--those that the public should know about, but which might have been unwritten either through neglect or a calculated effort by someone to hide them. Development of such stories is called investigative reporting.[17]

> Investigative reporting is almost self-explanatory and can apply to any subject. Usually it describes the writing that results from digging out facts beneath the surface. There is no opinion in truly investigative reporting. It resembles a scientific approach. Fact is laid upon fact. No conclusions are drawn until the facts themselves form a conclusion.[18]

---

[17] Ibid., p. 203.

[18] Neale Copple, Depth Reporting, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 19.

> News stories originated by reporters with and sometimes without editorial direction. Significant news that might not have otherwise been developed through official sources.[19]

The definition that is perhaps the most concise is that of David Anderson and Peter Benjaminson, offered in a book devoted entirely to this subject--investigative reporting is simply the reporting of concealed information.[20]

There is also a general consensus on how one goes about doing investigative research. One suggestion was to work with a committee that has the power of subpoena for any assignment in a field concerning government.[21] Another was to know public officials, their duties and the type of news obtainable for each; depend on them for news tips, background information, and interpretation.[22] Good qualities included relentless tenacity and "a knowledge of what information is printable evidence and what is mere rumor."[23]

---

[19]John Hohenberg, The Professional Journalist (New York: Holt-Dryden Company, 1960), p. 387.

[20]David Anderson and Peter Benjaminson, Investigative Reporting (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1976), p. 5.

[21]Hohenberg, p. 388.

[22]Victor Danilov, Public Affairs Reporting (New York: Macmillan Company, 1955), p. 3.

[23]Phillip Ault and Edwin Emery, Reporting the News (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1959), p. 204.

Most of those offering advice mentioned checking and investigating public records, and that is the subject of Anderson and Benjaminson's book. They categorize public records in three ways: those the law entitles the public to see, those the law prohibits the public from seeing, and those not mentioned by the law. They caution that although records-keeping is fairly consistent from state to state, which kinds of records are public and which are not varies widely.

> The truth is that even within the same government office, the accessibility of the records often depends on which clerk is approached first, how he or she is handled by the reporter, and whether he or she (or his boss) is mad at the newspaper that day.[24]

If handled properly, professional bureaucrats who are used to collecting paper and are protected by civil service statutes are able to provide massive documentation for reporters.

Federal legislation concerning access to public information was passed in 1967 under the name of the Freedom of Information Act. It was part of an attempt to deal with the problem of excessive secrecy, and it states that all federal agencies, with certain specified exceptions, shall make their records available to any member of the public that requests them. It was drafted principally with newsmen in mind.

---

[24]Anderson and Benjaminson, p. 39.

Unfortunately, the Freedom of Information Act has not been widely successful. Several methods have been used to circumvent the purpose of the Act, among them: exempting potentially embarrassing information; delaying response to requests on the basis that the requests were not specific enough; charging an arbitrarily high fee for gathering the solicited information; and extending the trade secret exemption (which is legal) to cover all other information concerning the manufacturer.[25]

Under these conditions, a requester of information can wait more than two years before the tactics and appeals are played out and the case comes to court. Of the more than 200 cases brought to court under the Act in the first five years, only ten had been brought by newspapers.

Since the passage of the Act, a growing amount of government information previously prepared only in paper form has been computerized.[26] There are two channels reporters may use in obtaining this information, either through commercial "information brokers" or through the federal agencies.

The commercial services have access to many of the larger data bases, excluding those containing classified

---

[25]Nicholas Henry, Public Administration and Public Affairs (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. 92.

[26]Jane Staenberg, Analyst in Information Sciences, Science Policy Research Division, Library of Congress.

information. The major competitors are Systems Development Corporation (SDC) and Lockheed Information Systems (LIS), and between them have access to over 80 data bases. The per hour average charge ranges from $35 to $125.

Detailed descriptions of the federal information systems are contained in a "Directory of Computerized Data Files and Related Software Available from Federal Agencies--1975," prepared by the National Technical Information Service of the Department of Commerce.

The growing use of computerized data systems by the government has been possible in the past decade because of the improvements in technology that have made the systems both cheaper and easier to use. When the IBM 7090 system arrived on the market in 1959, it was worth $2,880,000 and time on it cost about $800 an hour.[27] This prohibitively high price has been reduced to anywhere from $35 to $150 per hour.

And by the late 60s, the software had developed to the point where the computer has practically been trained to program itself. It is no longer necessary to be an expert or to hire one to make it work for you. We have reached the time when computers are simple and inexpensive

---

[27]Philip Meyer, Precision Journalism (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1973), p. 102.

enough to make them useful for the working reporter, and that is the argument put forth by Philip Meyer, a national correspondent for the Knight newspapers.

Meyer thinks journalists would profit by adapting some of the research tools of the social sciences.

> Journalists and social scientists used to be much more alike than they are today. Together, we would rely heavily on observation and interpretation, collecting our observations from public records, from interviews, from direct participation, and then spinning out our interpretations. The difference was that we journalists put our interpretations in readable English while the social scientists couched theirs in jargon.[28]

A lot has happened to social science in the last twenty years, Meyer says, but not so with journalism. The revolution in social science has been brought about by the development and widespread availability of the computer. Data that was previously too extensive and unwieldy to quantify has yielded to measuring.

Journalists have neglected to keep pace with these developments because of a preoccupation with the question of whether objectivity is desirable or even possible. Since World War II, the debate has persisted. But in Meyer's mind there is no longer any validity to the idea that specialized knowledge is of no use to the reporter, as it might cause him to focus his attention on detail not of interest to the reader. This "professional amateur"

---

[28]Ibid., p. 3.

model has become obsolete. Today's readers are more highly educated, better informed, and more knowledge hungry. Beyond that, the rapid pace of change and increasing complexity of events has placed a bigger burden on the reporter, who must understand those events in order to make sense of them for his audience.[29]

There is more time and emphasis being placed today not on only covering spot news, but on writing in depth. This kind of coverage involves intensive and systematic fact-finding efforts, and this is where we can benefit by using the new research techniques.[30] Computers can collect information, analyze data, count and calculate at such high speed that the costs are relatively low, particularly when compared to manual expenses.

If journalism is to take advantage of these new tools, two things will have to happen: editors must feel the need for systematic research strongly enough to develop in-house capacity, and reporters must develop the talent and knowledge to use it. In Meyer's words,

> It used to be said that journalism is history in a hurry . . . to cope with the acceleration of social change in today's world, journalism must become social science in a hurry.[31]

It was largely the argument put forth in this book that influenced me in formulating the hypothesis for this

---

[29]Ibid., pp. 6-7. [30]Ibid., p. 13.

[31]Ibid., p. 14.

study. The computer has become a significant presence in today's society, and can only continue to increase in importance as our world becomes more complex. Few aspects of our lives will not feel this electronic influence, and journalists can hardly expect to be exempt.

There has been little research devoted to this idea, so I was limited in possible sources. I decided that the best method for determining what effect computerization might be having on the field would be to ask the journalists themselves, through a survey.

I wanted to determine what journalists have experienced in dealing with government information that might be computerized. What are their thoughts on the use of such data systems? Do they consider knowledge of such systems useful and when would they consider seeking training?

Chapter 2

METHODOLOGY

Backstrom and Hirsh offered seven steps for designing a survey in their book, Survey Research. Those steps are (1) define the purpose, (2) identify the population, (3) select the research method, (4) select the sample, (5) construct the questionnaire, (6) interview and process the data, and (7) report and analyze the data.[32] This chapter will explain the process I went through in the first six steps; the last, reporting and analyzing the data, will be covered in the following chapter.

The purpose here is to determine what relationship, if any, exists between the use of computers as data storage bases by the United States government and the ability of journalists to find the information they seek.

The intended population is investigative reporters. There are relatively few journalists who are strictly investigative reporters, so I decided to use the city side staff as a whole. Through the questionnaire, I would determine whether the respondents had done this type of work.

Journalists tend to be pressed for time and involved

---

[32]Charles Backstrom and Gerald Hirsh, Survey Research, (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1963), p. 19.

with various projects, and for those reasons a short written questionnaire was selected. To keep the time requirement to a minimum, I used multiple choice answers for the majority of the questions, leaving only three open-end answers.

I felt that only larger newspapers in metropolitan areas would be likely to have a substantial amount of investigative reporting, as smaller newspapers have less money to spend on operating budgets and tend to concentrate on day-to-day reporting.

Once I had decided to stay within California to give myself the advantage of proximity, I chose Los Angeles and San Francisco as the major metropolitan areas and selected two newspapers from each city. The northern newspapers were the San Francisco Chronicle and the Examiner; in the south were the Los Angeles Times and another daily newspaper which agreed to participate in the survey only if it were guaranteed anonymity. From here forth, that publication will be referred to simply as the "fourth newspaper."

The questionnaire itself was one-page, printed on both front and back. It began by asking the respondent simple warm-up questions, such as: how long have you been employed in journalism? It then progresses to the areas of investigative reporting, computerization, and then ended with biographical information. In all, 37 questions

were included.

I sent letters of inquiry to the editors of the newspapers and at each was referred to either the managing editor, city editor, or metropolitan editor. Through telephone conversations, I explained my position as a graduate student working on a thesis and three of the editors agreed at that time to participate. The fourth asked to see the questionnaire first and subsequently agreed to cooperate, with the afore-mentioned stipulation of anonymity.

After acquiring permission, I personally visited each of the newspapers and met with the appropriate editors to deliver the questionnaires and answer any questions. The editors were responsible for distributing the copies among their staffs. (All felt it would be inappropriate for me to wander about their city rooms trying to convince the reporters to cooperate. I appreciated their concern and trusted them to act in my behalf, as they all seemed genuinely willing to help me with this project.)

Arrangements were then made for me to pick up the Los Angeles returns in person, but I was unable to prolong my stay in San Francisco, so those replies were mailed back to me. Of the 200 questionnaires I distributed between March 30 and May 4, 1978, 79 were returned, just slightly under 40 percent.

The results of those returns were coded onto computer sheets and then key punched onto computer cards along with a program of instructions, using Fortran language and SPSS procedures. The computer was instructed to perform a number of calculations, including absolute frequency, adjusted frequency, cumulative frequency, mean, mode, median, standard deviation, standard error, minimum, maximum and range. Statistics were prepared for the group as a whole and for each individual newspaper.

For a replica of the questionnaire used, see Appendix A.

Chapter 3

DATA ANALYSIS

Processing the returns by computer allowed for a variety of statistics to be calculated. To list all of them here, however, would probably mean overloading the reader with a series of confusing numbers. For that reason, more detailed information in the form of the actual tables produced by the computer may be found in Appendix B, where cited. This is also where the data for the individual newspapers may be located.

For the body of this work I have selected the statistics I feel are most relevant and enlightening. The missing responses (no answer) will not be included here, so the total number of replies for any given question will not necessarily by 79 (the total of returned questionnaires). The percentages will add up to 100, as they have been adjusted to exclude the missing responses.[33]

The first series of questions presented concerns the personal characteristics of the respondents. The majority of this information was reserved for the end of the questionnaire, but I am presenting it first because it

---

[33]The percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number, so totals may be a point off in either direction.

sometimes helps to have a feeling for the kind of people involved and any possible biases.

About one-third of the journalists had been employed in the field for more than ten years.

one to five years	5 or	6%
five to ten years	20	26%
ten to twenty years . . .	25	32%
more than twenty years .	27	35%

Reportorial positions were being held at the time by nearly all of the respondents.

reporter	73 or	95%
editor	4	5%

Given the definition of investigative reporting as the reporting of concealed information, the vast majority said they had done this kind of writing.

yes	70 or	92%
no	6	8%

When asked about their levels of education, 84 percent listed completion of a college degree or beyond to the postgraduate level.

high school	4 or	5%
partial college	9	12%
college	29	38%
postgraduate	35	45%

Two-thirds of the staff members belonged to some union.

Newspaper Guild . . . . . 41 or 52%

other 10 14%

Only about one-third, however, listed membership in a professional organization.

Sigma Delta Chi . . . . . 9 or 11%

Press clubs 7 9%

other 10 13%

The Democratic party was claimed as an affiliation by three-fourths of the respondents.

Democratic . . . . . 51 or 75%

Republican 3 4%

other 5 7%

none 9 13%

Nearly all of the journalists said they were registered voters and had participated in the 1976 presidential election.

registered . . . . . 70 or 92%

not registered 6 8%

voted in 1976 . . . . . 71 93%

did not vote 5 7%

About three-fourths of the staff was male.

male . . . . . 60 or 79%

female 16 21%

Nearly half of those who responded were beyond the age of 40.

20 to 30 years old . . .	11 or	15%
31 to 40 years old . . .	31	41%
41 to 50 years old . . .	15	20%
over 50 years old	19	25%

The majority of the group said they had come from a Caucasian background.

Caucasian	64 or	85%
Black	3	4%
Mexican-American	2	3%
Asian	4	5%
other	2	3%

Taking this information into account, we can draw a mental picture of the typical member of this group of respondents. He (and he is male) has been in journalism for ten to twenty years and is currently a reporter. He has done some investigative reporting. He has taken classes beyond his college degree. He belongs to a union but probably not to a professional organization. He is a Democrat, a registered voter, and was active in the last presidential election. He is white, between the ages of 30 and 40.

The remaining questions dealt with the respondent's experiences and opinions. The first set of related answers concerns the amount of investigative reporting done in this country in recent years. I was looking for two things here: a relationship between the amount in the past

five and ten years, and a comparison between the nation as a whole and the respondent's own newspaper.

Nearly all of the journalists believed investigative reporting in the United States as a whole had increased to some extent over the past ten years.

decreased	1 or	1%
no change	2	3%
increased	16	21%
increased somewhat . . .	29	38%
increased greatly	29	38%

While 96 percent said they thought investigative reporting had increased nationwide, 82 percent felt their own newspaper had increased its investigative coverage for the same time period.

decreased greatly	1 or	1%
decreased somewhat . . .	1	1%
decreased	2	3%
no change	9	13%
increased	23	32%
increased somewhat . . .	19	26%
increased greatly	17	24%

The same question posed for a five-year period yielded a 90 percent response that it had increased to some degree.

decreased greatly	1 or	1%
no change	6	8%

increased	13	17%
increased somewhat . . .	26	34%
increased greatly	31	40%

For their own newspapers in that five-year period, 76 percent fell somewhere on the increasing side of the scale, as compared to 90 percent for the United States.

decreased greatly	2 or	3%
decreased	2	3%
no change	13	18%
increased	22	30%
increased somewhat . . .	19	26%
increased greatly	16	22%

There is no doubt that by far the majority of respondents believe the field of investigative reporting had increased in the past decade. They seem to feel the output level is slightly less in the past five years, but still increasing at a good rate. It is interesting to note that a small portion, between 10 and 15 percent, did not feel their own newspapers had kept pace with the nationwide trend.

When asked about the general effect of investigative reporting on the American public, all but one of the journalists said it was beneficial to some degree.

neutral	1 or	1%
beneficial	11	15%
somewhat beneficial . . .	23	30%

greatly beneficial . . .	41	54%

Another set of questions dealt with the reporter's experiences in seeking information from government agencies, the types of agencies he approached, and his feelings about how to describe those dealings.

During the last five years, 86 percent of the journalists had approached government agencies on an average of at least once a week.

less than yearly	2 or	3%
every few months	3	4%
monthly	6	8%
weekly	35	47%
semi-weekly	6	8%
daily	23	31%

About half could not single out a level of government with which they dealt most often, and chose a combination of the categories.

local	16 or	21%
county	5	7%
state	6	8%
special district	2	3%
federal	6	8%
combination	40	53%

When asked to name specific agencies, about a third listed the police department.

law enforcement	19 or	36%

energy and utilities . .	5	9%
courts and attorneys . .	7	13%
city hall	7	13%
board of supervisors . .	1	2%
other	14	26%

Some of the other agencies listed included the registrar of voters, education, health, the White House, and the governor's office.

The reporters were then asked to rate their experiences on a three-point scale in four categories. The majority described them as both successful and time-consuming, but were closer to being neutral on the qualities of pleasantness and ease.

successful	31 or	52%
neutral	25	42%
unsuccessful	4	7%
pleasant	19	40%
neutral	24	50%
unpleasant	5	10%
difficult	16	34%
neutral	24	51%
easy	7	15%
time-consuming	42	74%
neutral	11	19%
not time-consuming . . .	4	7%

The largest consensus was on length of time involved, followed by degree of success. The fairly neutral descriptions were weighted on the side of pleasant and difficult.

About three-fourths of the journalists indicated that the agencies they encountered used computers in storing information some of the time.

never	1 or	1%
sometimes	56	77%
always	10	14%
I don't know	6	8%

A smaller portion, but still a majority, said these agencies used computers in disseminating information.

never	6 or	8%
sometimes	42	56%
always	3	4%
I don't know	24	32%

Nearly three-fourths of those interviewed judged that computer knowledge is helpful for reporters.

unnecessary	18 or	25%
helpful	52	71%
required	3	4%

The same percentage then replied that they had had no personal training in computers.

no	54 or	71%
yes	22	29%

Of those who did claim some kind of training, half had learned what they knew on the job, largely through using video display terminals.

college	5 or	21%
technical school	1	4%
personal instruction	4	17%
on job	11	16%
other	3	13%

Two-thirds rated themselves as having low proficiency with computers and of the remaining, most felt they had no ability at all.

none	21 or	27%
low	51	66%
moderate	5	7%

When asked in the context of their particular jobs, 80 percent said computer familiarity would be beneficial.

irrelevant	14 or	19%
beneficial	60	80%
mandatory	1	1%

To pursue such training, two-thirds would make the effort if the opportunity were provided by their employers.

own initiative	3 or	4%
employer opportunity	48	66%
other circumstances	17	23%
no circumstances	5	7%

Those who said they would do so under other circum-

stances indicated that would be if and when it was necessary for an assignment or their job.

Almost half of the journalists believe the computerization of government data has made it more accessible to some degree.

much less accessible . .	6 or	9%
somewhat less accessible.	3	4%
less accessible	7	10%
no change	20	29%
more accessible	14	20%
somewhat more accessible.	15	21%
much more accessible . .	5	7%

Those who felt it had become more accessible attributed the change to the efficiency and ease of computers as well as their speed. The expertise required to use them, the ability to hide information, and the use of the computer systems by bureaucrats rather than the public were listed as reasons for the information becoming less accessible. The others felt that regardless of the introduction of the computers, journalists are still dealing with people, and the degree of accessibility depends more on this human factor than on machines.

efficient	13 or	24%
faster	7	13%
human factor	9	17%
expertise	3	6%

secrecy	10	19%
government use	1	2%
other	11	20%

The importance of computers in investigative research was seen as increasing by 79 percent.

decreasing greatly	1 or	1%
no change	14	20%
increasing	25	36%
increasing somewhat	19	27%
increasing greatly	11	16%

Speculating on the effect of this increased importance of computers, about 40 percent felt it would not be significant and nearly the same percentage indicated it would be a beneficial influence.

greatly detrimental	4 or	6%
somewhat detrimental	1	1%
detrimental	6	9%
no change	28	41%
beneficial	16	23%
somewhat beneficial	9	13%
greatly beneficial	5	7%

Many of the same reasons cited in explaining the effect on accessibility were repeated here.

efficient	9 or	21%
faster	3	7%
human factor	9	21%

expertise	2	5%
secrecy	7	17%
lower cost	1	2%
other	11	26%

When viewed in its entirety, the questionnaire provides some interesting insights. The great majority of journalists believe investigative reporting has been on the rise for the last ten years; a small portion indicated that although their own newspapers had also been increasing the amount of investigative reporting, they had not quite kept pace with the national trend. With only one exception, all felt this kind of journalism is beneficial to the public.

Most of the reporters approach government agencies on an average of once a week, and that includes all levels of bureaucracy. Those experiences were generally rated as successful and time-consuming.

About three-fourths of the respondents said these agencies sometimes used computers in storing information, and about half in disseminating that information.

When asked about reporting in general and their own jobs in particular, approximately three-fourths said computer knowledge and familiarity is helpful and beneficial. Essentially the same number said they personally had not had any such training. Of the few who claimed such training, half had been limited to the use of video display terminals on the job. Two-thirds considered themselves as

having a low level of computer proficiency; the same proportion indicated that if their employers made the opportunity available, they would seek such training.

About half of the journalists thought computerization of government data has made it more accessible to some degree. They attributed this change to the efficiency, ease and speed of computers in collecting information. Most felt this importance of computers in investigative research would continue to increase in the future, for essentially the same reasons. About half thought this would benefit journalism and the others felt it would not be a significant influence.

CONCLUSION

What conclusions can be drawn from the results of this survey?

Investigative reporting has been on the increase during the last decade, and is perceived by journalists as a beneficial product for the American public. In order to report that which was previously concealed, the definition used here, a certain amount of time and energy must be expended. It makes sense that whatever can be done to reduce that human expense would help the reporter make better use of his time, thereby resulting in better reporting.

Computer systems are currently being used by other professions, as well as the United States government, and journalism would be well advised to do the same. Both the hardware and software have developed to the stage where it is economically and technically feasible for nonexperts to use such systems.

Keeping up with these technological progressions should not be desirable but essential for the media, who are constantly acting on behalf of the people of this country. Freedom of the press is part of the national tradition of democracy, but the words become meaningless

if and when the press is unwilling or unable to carry out its task to the fullest extent possible. Having access to government data bases is useless unless journalists make the effort to learn how to use them and then take advantage of that access.

Most journalists have not had that kind of training. The majority have been exposed to video display terminals, devices used for composing and storing newspaper copy. As limited as the VDT is, that is a sufficient starting point and should not be underrated as an introduction to computer systems. As reporters, we must first lose our fear of the unknown in this area, and the VDT provides the opportunity to gain familiarity and confidence with the hardware. But by no means should our use end there.

If additional training is to be pursued, it seems the burden for providing it rests on the management of the newspapers. Most journalists expressed the belief that such knowledge would be useful, but indicated they would seek it only if the opportunity were arranged by their employers.

This is not an unreasonable request. Many businesses encourage further education of their employees, and I see no reason why journalism should not participate in this practice. There are several ways to accomplish this goal.

Newspapers might pay tuition fees for reporters willing to take courses at nearby colleges on their own. Or some arrangement might be made whereby a group of reporters could take instruction together, through a college or private consultant. Perhaps a seminar or series of seminars could be offered by the newspaper for its employees. Even in an indirect way, newspapers could work through some professional organization to present the topic at meetings or conventions.

There are several ways to get the information to the reporters, but it will take the commitment of the upper levels of management to do so in a thorough manner. As it stands today, only a handful of journalists consider themselves to have even a moderate level of computer proficiency, and they have achieved that on their own. It will have to become apparent to editors that a working knowledge of computers can make their staff members better reporters, and that in turn will make their products better newspapers.

It does not appear that journalists have found the use of computers by government to be an obstacle to access; most feel the speed and ease of computers has in fact improved it. But they are in agreement that they could use more knowledge of those systems in order to perform their own jobs.

Computers may be used to do just that in numerous areas. For instance, newspapers often conduct surveys of their own, perhaps to find out public opinion on an upcoming piece of legislation. Computers can enable the reporters to do a more thorough and sophisticated job of it. Responses can be coded and run through a variety of statistical procedures in seconds, when the same process would be impossibly time-consuming if done by hand.

As government turns more and more to data storage systems, reporters may save hours spent in looking for information. Let's say a reporter receives a tip on some questionable land holdings by a politician, acquired shortly before the site of a new airport was chosen. The reporter's method of investigating the circumstances will not change--he will look through the public records for dates, names and other specifics that might shed some light on the subject. But the means for that search can make a great difference; if the records on land ownership have been computerized, the process will take a fraction of the time required to search those files personally.

The data collected here has raised some additional questions in my own mind and opened some possible avenues for further study. Most obviously, my study was limited to the metropolitan areas of California, and may not be entirely representative of the country as a whole. What

are the conditions and opinions of computerization in other regions?

More insight might be derived from a more detailed look at specific instances of reporters encountering or using computers. This kind of study is much harder to quantify and analyze, as interviews would probably be more suitable than a questionnaire. But it would allow the surveyor to go beyond general questioning.

It would also be worthwhile to determine more about the kind of training reporters would be most likely to find useful. Do they need to learn a computer language like Fortran, or at least be familiar with it? Is learning to operate a key punch machine sufficient, as long as there is someone available to do the programming? What about some basic statistics--mean, mode and median and how they differ?

These are some of the questions left unanswered by my own study, and the reader may have thought of others worth pursuing. I only hope this survey has helped to show both where journalism is and where it might direct itself on the subject of computerized data systems. The development of this technology is so integral to the future of our society that the press cannot afford to sit on the sidelines as an impartial observer. It must become involved, learn the rules of the game, and play to win.

The alternative is to reject some new and exciting tools that could be used to contribute to its effectiveness, at the possible expense of the American democratic system. It is the public's right to know, and journalism must be ready to embrace new methods to carry out its mission to the greatest extent possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, David, and Peter Benjaminson. Investigative Reporting. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1976.

Ault, Phillip, and Edwin Emery. Reporting the News. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1975.

Backstrom, Charles, and Gerald Hirsh. Survey Research. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1963.

Califano, Joseph. A Presidential Nation. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1975.

Copple, Neale. Depth Reporting. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964.

Danilov, Victor. Public Affairs Reporting. New York, Macmillan & Company, 1955.

Henry, Nicholas. Public Administration and Public Affairs. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Hohenberg, John. The Professional Journalist. New York, Holt-Dryden Company, 1960.

Meyer, Philip. Precision Journalism. Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University Press, 1973.

Thomas, Norman. The Presidency in Contemporary Context. New York, Dodd, Mead & Company, 1975.

Wise, David. The Politics of Lying. New York, Random House, 1973.

Appendix A

THE SURVEY

Dear Professional Journalist:

The following questionnaire is being distributed in connection with a Master's thesis I am developing at the University of Southern California. Your cooperation in providing this information is most appreciated.

Sincerely,

Julie Fosgate

****

1. How long have you been employed in journalism?

__less than one

__1 to 5

__5 to 10

__10 to 20

__more than 20

2. What is your present job title? _____

3. Using the defintion of investigative reporting as the reporting of concealed information, have you personally done this kind of writing?

__yes

__no

4. In the last ten years, do you think the amount of investigative reporting in the United States as a whole has:

__decreased greatly

__decreased somewhat

__decreased

__no change

__increased

__increased somewhat

__increased greatly

5. In the last ten years, investigative reporting on your own newspaper has:

__decreased greatly

__decreased somewhat

__decreased

__no change

__increased

__increased somewhat

__increased greatly

6. In the last five years, investigative reporting in the United States has:

__decreased greatly

__decreased somewhat

__decreased

__no change

__increased

__increased somewhat

__increased greatly

7. In the last five years, investigative reporting on your own newspaper has:

__decreased greatly

__decreased somewhat

__decreased

__no change

__increased

__increased somewhat

__increased greatly

8. In your opinion, the effect of investigative reporting on the American public is generally:

__greatly detrimental

__somewhat detrimental

__detrimental

__neutral

__beneficial

__somewhat beneficial

__greatly beneficial

9. In the last five years, how often have you approached government agencies seeking information?

__less than yearly

__yearly

__every few months

__monthly

__weekly

__semiweekly

__daily

10. With what level of government do you most often deal?

__local

__county

__state

__special district

__federal

11. With which particular agencies do you most often interact? _____

12a. How would you describe the majority of those dealings?

__unsuccessful

__neutral

__successful

b. (same)

__pleasant

__neutral

__unpleasant

c. (same)

__easy

__neutral

__difficult

d. (same)

__time-consuming

__neutral

__not time-consuming

13. Does this agency(ies) use computerization in storing information?

__never

__sometimes

__always

__I don't know

14. Does this agency(ies) use computerization in disseminating information?

__never

__sometimes

__always

__I don't know

15. As a reporter, do you find knowledge and familiarity with computers and/or data storage systems:

__unnecessary

__helpful

__required

16a. Have you had any personal training or exposure to computers?

__no

__yes

b. If yes, what kind?

__high school course(s)

__college course(s)

__technical school course(s)

__personal reading and/or instruction

__other

17. How would you define your level of computer knowledge?

__none

__low

__moderate

__highly proficient

18. For someone in your position, familiarity with computers would be:

__irrelevant

__beneficial

__mandatory

19. You would pursue such training:

__on your own initiative

__if the opportunity were made available by your employer

__under other circumstances

__under no circumstances

20. In your experience, computerization as a method of storing and retrieving information has made government data:

__much less accessible

__somewhat less accessible

__less accessible

__no change

__more accessible

__somewhat more accessible

__much more accessible

21. Why do you believe this is so? _____

22. As a reporter, how do you see the importance of the computer in the future as it will affect investigative research in journalism?

__decreasing greatly

__decreasing somewhat

__decreasing

__no change

__increasing

__increasing somewhat

__increasing greatly

23a. How do you interpret this effect on journalism?

__greatly detrimental

__somewhat detrimental

__detrimental

__no change

__beneficial

__somewhat beneficial

__greatly beneficial

b. Explain _____

Personal data

24. Last year of school completed:

__high school

__partial college

__college

__postgraduate

25. Union membership(s):_____

26. Professional organization(s):_____

27. Political affiliation:

__Republican

__Democrat

__other

__none

28. Are you a registered voter at this time?

__yes

__no

29. Did you vote in the 1976 presidential election?

__yes

__no

30. Sex:

__male

__female

31. Age:

__under 20

__20 to 30

__31 to 40

__41 to 50

__over 50

32. Ethnic background:

__Caucasian

__Black

__Mexican-American

__Asian

__other

Appendix B

THE COMPUTER RUN

The following tables are the statistics provided by the computer run on the survey results. The first set is for all the cases combined, followed by a set for each of the four individual newspapers. "CHRO" stands for the San Francisco Chronicle, "EXAM" for the San Francisco Examiner, "TIME" for the Los Angeles Times, and "FOUR" for the fourth newspaper, which requested anonymity.

No response was coded in all cases with a "9," and appears in these tables as a missing case.

For the different tables, please refer to the pages indicated:

Section 1

COMBINED CASES

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

PAPER NEWSPAPER OF RESPONDENT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
CHRONICLE	1.	18	22.8	22.8	22.8
EXAMINER	2.	25	31.6	31.6	54.4
TIMES	3.	12	15.2	15.2	69.6
FOURTH PAPER	4.	24	30.4	30.4	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.532	STD ERR	0.130	MEDIAN	2.360
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	1.153	VARIANCE	1.329
KURTOSIS	-1.448	SKEWNESS	0.075	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	79	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

YEARS YEARS EMPLOYED IN JOURNALISM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
1-5	2.	5	6.3	6.5	6.5
5-10	3.	20	25.3	26.0	32.5
10-20	4.	25	31.6	32.5	64.9
>20	5.	27	34.2	35.1	100.0
	9.	2	2.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.961	STD ERR	0.107	MEDIAN	4.040
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	0.938	VARIANCE	0.880
KURTOSIS	-0.871	SKEWNESS	-0.412	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 77 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

TITLE PRESENT JOB TITLE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
REPORTER	1.	73	92.4	94.8	94.8
EDITOR	2.	4	5.1	5.2	100.0
	9.	2	2.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.052	STD ERR	0.025	MEDIAN	1.027
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.223	VARIANCE	0.050
KURTOSIS	15.361	SKEWNESS	4.119	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 77 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q3 HAVE YOU BEEN AN INVESTIGATIVE REPORTER?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	70	88.6	92.1	92.1
NO	2.	6	7.6	7.9	100.0
	9.	3	3.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.079	STD ERR	0.031	MEDIAN	1.043
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.271	VARIANCE	0.074
KURTOSIS	8.371	SKEWNESS	3.186	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 76 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q4 LAST 10 YEARS, US INV REPORTING HAS.

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	2.	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
STAYED THE SAME	4.	2	2.5	2.6	3.9
	5.	16	20.3	20.8	24.7
	6.	29	36.7	37.7	62.3
INCREASED	7.	29	36.7	37.7	100.0
	9.	2	2.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.065	STD ERR	0.108	MEDIAN	6.172
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	0.951	VARIANCE	0.904
KURTOSIS	3.019	SKEWNESS	-1.264	RANGE	5.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 77 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q5 LAST 10 YEARS, YOUR PAPERS REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DECREASED	1.	1	1.3	1.4	1.4
	2.	1	1.3	1.4	2.8
	3.	2	2.5	2.8	5.6
STAYED THE SAME	4.	9	11.4	12.5	18.1
	5.	23	29.1	31.9	50.0
	6.	19	24.1	26.4	76.4
INCREASED	7.	17	21.5	23.6	100.0
	9.	7	8.9	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.458	STD ERR	0.149	MEDIAN	5.500
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.266	VARIANCE	1.604
KURTOSIS	1.341	SKEWNESS	-0.888	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q6 LAST 5 YEARS, US INV. REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DECREASED	1.	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
STAYED THE SAME	4.	6	7.6	7.8	9.1
	5.	13	16.5	16.9	26.0
	6.	26	32.9	33.8	59.7
INCREASED	7.	31	39.2	40.3	100.0
	9.	2	2.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.013	STD ERR	0.126	MEDIAN	6.212
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	1.106	VARIANCE	1.224
KURTOSIS	4.232	SKEWNESS	-1.583	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 77 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q7 LAST 5 YEARS, YOUR PAPERS REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DECREASED	1.	2	2.5	2.7	2.7
	3.	2	2.5	2.7	5.4
STAYED THE SAME	4.	13	16.5	17.6	23.0
	5.	22	27.8	29.7	52.7
	6.	19	24.1	25.7	78.4
INCREASED	7.	16	20.3	21.6	100.0
	9.	5	6.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.351	STD ERR	0.153	MEDIAN	5.409
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.318	VARIANCE	1.738
KURTOSIS	1.518	SKEWNESS	-0.903	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 74 MISSING CASES 5

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q8 EFFECT OF INV. REPORTING ON THE PUBLIC I

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NEUTRAL	4.	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
	5.	11	13.9	14.5	15.8
	6.	23	29.1	30.3	46.1
BENEFICIAL	7.	41	51.9	53.9	100.0
	9.	3	3.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.368	STD ERR	0.090	MEDIAN	6.573
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	0.780	VARIANCE	0.609
KURTOSIS	-0.127	SKEWNESS	-0.930	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 76 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q9 LAST 5 YEARS, SOUGHT GOVT INFORMATION

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LESS THAN ONCE PER Y	1.	2	2.5	2.7	2.7
EVERY FEW	3.	3	3.8	4.0	6.7
MONTHLY	4.	6	7.6	8.0	14.7
WEEKLY	5.	35	44.3	46.7	61.3
SEMIWEEKLY	6.	6	7.6	8.0	69.3
DAILY	7.	23	29.1	30.7	100.0
	9.	4	5.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.427	STD ERR	0.156	MEDIAN	5.257
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.347	VARIANCE	1.815
KURTOSIS	1.497	SKEWNESS	-0.827	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 75 MISSING CASES 4

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q10 DEAL WITH WHAT LEVEL OF GOVT MOST?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LOCAL	1.	16	20.3	21.3	21.3
COUNTY	2.	5	6.3	6.7	28.0
STATE	3.	6	7.6	8.0	36.0
SPECIAL DIST	4.	2	2.5	2.7	38.7
FED	5.	6	7.6	8.0	46.7
	6.	40	50.6	53.3	100.0
	9.	4	5.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.293	STD ERR	0.244	MEDIAN	5.563
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	2.110	VARIANCE	4.453
KURTOSIS	-1.368	SKEWNESS	-0.656	RANGE	5.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	6.000		
VALID CASES	75	MISSING CASES	4		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q11 DEAL WITH WHICH AGENCIES?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
ENERGY	1.	5	6.3	9.4	9.4
COURTS, ATTYS	2.	7	8.9	13.2	22.6
POLICE	3.	19	24.1	35.8	58.5
CITY HALL	4.	7	8.9	13.2	71.7
SUPERVISORS	5.	1	1.3	1.9	73.6
OTHER	8.	14	17.7	26.4	100.0
	9.	26	32.9	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.170	STD ERR	0.338	MEDIAN	3.263
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	2.463	VARIANCE	6.067
KURTOSIS	-1.006	SKEWNESS	0.704	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		
VALID CASES	53	MISSING CASES	26		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q12A DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
UNSUCCESSFUL	1.	4	5.1	6.7	6.7
NEUTRAL	2.	25	31.6	41.7	48.3
SUCCESSFUL	3.	31	39.2	51.7	100.0
	9.	19	24.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.450	STD ERR	0.080	MEDIAN	2.532
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.622	VARIANCE	0.387
KURTOSIS	-0.464	SKEWNESS	-0.678	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 60 MISSING CASES 19

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q12B DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
PLEASANT	1.	19	24.1	39.6	39.6
NEUTRAL	2.	24	30.4	50.0	89.6
UNPLEASANT	3.	5	6.3	10.4	100.0
	9.	31	39.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.708	STD ERR	0.094	MEDIAN	1.708
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.651	VARIANCE	0.424
KURTOSIS	-0.660	SKEWNESS	0.372	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 48 MISSING CASES 31

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q12C DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EASY	1.	7	8.9	14.9	14.9
NEUTRAL	2.	24	30.4	51.1	66.0
DIFFICULT	3.	16	20.3	34.0	100.0
	9.	32	40.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.191	STD ERR	0.099	MEDIAN	2.188
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.680	VARIANCE	0.463
KURTOSIS	-0.777	SKEWNESS	-0.256	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	47	MISSING CASES	32		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q12D DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
TIME CONSUMING	1.	42	53.2	73.7	73.7
NEUTRAL	2.	11	13.9	19.3	93.0
NOT TIME CONSUMING	3.	4	5.1	7.0	100.0
	9.	22	27.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.333	STD ERR	0.080	MEDIAN	1.179
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.607	VARIANCE	0.369
KURTOSIS	1.730	SKEWNESS	1.669	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	57	MISSING CASES	22		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q13 AGENCY USES COMPUTERS TO STORE INFOR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NEVER	1.	1	1.3	1.4	1.4
SOMETIMES	2.	56	70.9	76.7	78.1
ALWAYS	3.	10	12.7	13.7	91.8
DON'T KNOW	4.	6	7.6	8.2	100.0
	9.	6	7.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.288	STD ERR	0.074	MEDIAN	2.134
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.634	VARIANCE	0.402
KURTOSIS	2.217	SKEWNESS	1.695	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 73 MISSING CASES 6

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q14 AGENCY USES COMPUTERS TO DISSEMINATE INF

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NEVER	1.	6	7.6	8.0	8.0
SOMETIMES	2.	42	53.2	56.0	64.0
ALWAYS	3.	3	3.8	4.0	68.0
DON'T KNOW	4.	24	30.4	32.0	100.0
	9.	4	5.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.600	STD ERR	0.119	MEDIAN	2.250
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	1.027	VARIANCE	1.054
KURTOSIS	-1.318	SKEWNESS	0.416	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 75 MISSING CASES 4

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q15 FOR REPORTERS, COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
UNNECESSARY	1.	18	22.8	24.7	24.7
HELPFUL	2.	52	65.8	71.2	95.9
REQUIRED	3.	3	3.8	4.1	100.0
	9.	6	7.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.795	STD ERR	0.058	MEDIAN	1.856
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.499	VARIANCE	0.249
KURTOSIS	0.186	SKEWNESS	-0.382	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 73 MISSING CASES 6

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q16A HAVE YOU HAD COMPUTER TRAINING?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO	1.	54	68.4	71.1	71.1
YES	2.	22	27.8	28.9	100.0
	9.	3	3.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.289	STD ERR	0.052	MEDIAN	1.204
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.457	VARIANCE	0.208
KURTOSIS	-1.133	SKEWNESS	0.947	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 76 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q16B WHAT KIND OF TRAINING?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
COLLEGE	2.	5	6.3	20.8	20.8
TECH SCHOOL	3.	1	1.3	4.2	25.0
PERSONAL	4.	4	5.1	16.7	41.7
ON JOB	5.	11	13.9	45.8	87.5
OTHER	6.	3	3.8	12.5	100.0
	9.	55	69.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.250	STD ERR	0.277	MEDIAN	4.682
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.359	VARIANCE	1.848
KURTOSIS	-0.752	SKEWNESS	-0.722	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	6.000		
VALID CASES	24	MISSING CASES	55		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q17 YOUR LEVEL OF COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NONE	1.	21	26.6	27.3	27.3
LOW	2.	51	64.6	66.2	93.5
MODERATE	3.	5	6.3	6.5	100.0
	9.	2	2.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.792	STD ERR	0.062	MEDIAN	1.843
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.546	VARIANCE	0.298
KURTOSIS	-0.082	SKEWNESS	-0.097	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	77	MISSING CASES	2		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q18 IN YOUR JOB, COMPUTER FAMILIARITY IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
IRRELEVANT	1.	14	17.7	18.7	18.7
BENEFICIAL	2.	60	75.9	80.0	98.7
MANDATORY	3.	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
	9.	4	5.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.827	STD ERR	0.048	MEDIAN	1.892
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.415	VARIANCE	0.172
KURTOSIS	1.067	SKEWNESS	-1.162	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	75	MISSING CASES	4		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q19 YOU WOULD PURSUE SUCH TRAINING

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
OWN INITIATIVE	1.	3	3.8	4.1	4.1
EMPLOYER OPPORTUNITY	2.	48	60.8	65.8	69.9
OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES	3.	17	21.5	23.3	93.2
NO CIRCUMSTANCES	4.	5	6.3	6.8	100.0
	9.	6	7.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.329	STD ERR	0.078	MEDIAN	2.198
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.668	VARIANCE	0.446
KURTOSIS	0.846	SKEWNESS	0.946	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	73	MISSING CASES	6		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q20 COMPUTERIZATION OF GOVT DATA HAS MADE IT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LESS ACCESSIBLE	1.	6	7.6	8.6	8.6
	2.	3	3.8	4.3	12.9
	3.	7	8.9	10.0	22.9
SAME	4.	20	25.3	28.6	51.4
	5.	14	17.7	20.0	71.4
	6.	15	19.0	21.4	92.9
MORE ACCESSIBLE	7.	5	6.3	7.1	100.0
	9.	9	11.4	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.400	STD ERR	0.193	MEDIAN	4.450
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.619	VARIANCE	2.620
KURTOSIS	-0.240	SKEWNESS	-0.512	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q21 WHY DO YOU THINK SO?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EFFICIENT	1.	13	16.5	24.1	24.1
FASTER	2.	7	8.9	13.0	37.0
HUMAN FACTOR	3.	9	11.4	16.7	53.7
EXPERTISE	4.	3	3.8	5.6	59.3
SECRECY	5.	10	12.7	18.5	77.8
GOVT USE	6.	1	1.3	1.9	79.6
	8.	11	13.9	20.4	100.0
	9.	25	31.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.889	STD ERR	0.346	MEDIAN	3.278
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	2.545	VARIANCE	6.478
KURTOSIS	-1.074	SKEWNESS	0.500	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q22 FUTURE IMPORTANCE OF COMPS ON INV RESEAR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DECREASING	1.	1	1.3	1.4	1.4
SAME	4.	14	17.7	20.0	21.4
	5.	25	31.6	35.7	57.1
	6.	19	24.1	27.1	84.3
INCREASING	7.	11	13.9	15.7	100.0
	9.	9	11.4	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.329	STD ERR	0.133	MEDIAN	5.300
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.113	VARIANCE	1.238
KURTOSIS	1.862	SKEWNESS	-0.625	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	70	MISSING CASES	9		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q23A THIS EFFECT ON JOURNALISM WILL BE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DETRIMENTAL	1.	4	5.1	5.8	5.8
	2.	1	1.3	1.4	7.2
	3.	6	7.6	8.7	15.9
NEUTRAL	4.	28	35.4	40.6	56.5
	5.	16	20.3	23.2	79.7
	6.	9	11.4	13.0	92.8
BENEFICIAL	7.	5	6.3	7.2	100.0
	9.	10	12.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.420	STD ERR	0.167	MEDIAN	4.339
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.387	VARIANCE	1.924
KURTOSIS	0.710	SKEWNESS	-0.392	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	69	MISSING CASES	10		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q23B WHY DO YOU THINK SO?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EFFICIENT	1.	9	11.4	21.4	21.4
FASTER	2.	3	3.8	7.1	28.6
HUMAN FACTOR	3.	9	11.4	21.4	50.0
EXPERTISE	4.	2	2.5	4.8	54.8
SECRECY	5.	7	8.9	16.7	71.4
LOWER COST	7.	1	1.3	2.4	73.8
	8.	11	13.9	26.2	100.0
	9.	37	46.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.286	STD ERR	0.411	MEDIAN	3.500
MODE	8.000	STD DEV	2.662	VARIANCE	7.087
KURTOSIS	-1.375	SKEWNESS	0.288	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q24 EDUCATION LEVEL

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
HI SCHOOL	1.	4	5.1	5.2	5.2
PARTIAL COLLEGE	2.	9	11.4	11.7	16.9
COLLEGE	3.	29	36.7	37.7	54.5
POSTGRADUATE	4.	35	44.3	45.5	100.0
	9.	2	2.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.234	STD ERR	0.098	MEDIAN	3.379
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	0.857	VARIANCE	0.734
KURTOSIS	0.381	SKEWNESS	-0.990	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 77 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q25 UNION MEMBERSHIP

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
GUILD	1.	41	51.9	65.1	65.1
OTHER	2.	10	12.7	15.9	81.0
NONE	3.	12	15.2	19.0	100.0
	9.	16	20.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.540	STD ERR	0.101	MEDIAN	1.268
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.800	VARIANCE	0.640
KURTOSIS	-0.609	SKEWNESS	1.039	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 63 MISSING CASES 16

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q26 PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
SDX	1.	9	11.4	22.0	22.0
PRESS CLUB	2.	7	8.9	17.1	39.0
OTHER	3.	10	12.7	24.4	63.4
NONE	4.	15	19.0	36.6	100.0
	9.	38	48.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.756	STD ERR	0.184	MEDIAN	2.950
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.179	VARIANCE	1.389
KURTOSIS	-1.375	SKEWNESS	-0.365	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 41 MISSING CASES 38

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q27 POLITCIAL PARTY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
REPUBLICAN	1.	3	3.8	4.4	4.4
DEMOCRAT	2.	51	64.6	75.0	79.4
OTHER	3.	5	6.3	7.4	86.8
NONE	4.	9	11.4	13.2	100.0
	9.	11	13.9	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.294	STD ERR	0.091	MEDIAN	2.108
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.754	VARIANCE	0.569
KURTOSIS	1.211	SKEWNESS	1.385	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 68 MISSING CASES 11

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q28 REGISTERED VOTER?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	70	88.6	92.1	92.1
NO	2.	6	7.6	7.9	100.0
	9.	3	3.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.079	STD ERR	0.031	MEDIAN	1.043
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.271	VARIANCE	0.074
KURTOSIS	8.371	SKEWNESS	3.186	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	76	MISSING CASES	3		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q29 VOTED IN 1976 ELECTION?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	71	89.9	93.4	93.4
NO	2.	4	5.1	5.3	98.7
	4.	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
	9.	3	3.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.092	STD ERR	0.047	MEDIAN	1.035
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.406	VARIANCE	0.165
KURTOSIS	36.381	SKEWNESS	5.638	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	76	MISSING CASES	3		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q30 SEX

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
MALE	1.	60	75.9	78.9	78.9
FEMALE	2.	16	20.3	21.1	100.0
	9.	3	3.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.211	STD ERR	0.047	MEDIAN	1.133
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.410	VARIANCE	0.168
KURTOSIS	0.101	SKEWNESS	1.449	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	76	MISSING CASES	3		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q31 AGE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
20-30	2.	11	13.9	14.5	14.5
30-40	3.	31	39.2	40.8	55.3
40-50	4.	15	19.0	19.7	75.0
50+	5.	19	24.1	25.0	100.0
	9.	3	3.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.553	STD ERR	0.118	MEDIAN	3.371
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	1.025	VARIANCE	1.051
KURTOSIS	-1.150	SKEWNESS	0.160	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 76 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES ON COMBINED CASES
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO EXAM TIME FOUR

Q32 ETHNIC BACKGROUND

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
CAUCASIAN	1.	64	81.0	85.3	85.3
BLACK	2.	3	3.8	4.0	89.3
MEX-AMER	3.	2	2.5	2.7	92.0
ASIAN	4.	4	5.1	5.3	97.3
OTHER	5.	2	2.5	2.7	100.0
	9.	4	5.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	79	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.360	STD ERR	0.112	MEDIAN	1.086
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.968	VARIANCE	0.936
KURTOSIS	6.262	SKEWNESS	2.708	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 75 MISSING CASES 4

Section 2

CHRONICLE

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

PAPER NEWSPAPER OF RESPONDENT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
CHRONICLE	1.	18	100.0	100.0	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	1.000

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

YEARS YEARS EMPLOYED IN JOURNALISM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
5-10	3.	7	38.9	38.9	38.9
10-20	4.	7	38.9	38.9	77.8
>20	5.	4	22.2	22.2	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.833	STD ERR	0.185	MEDIAN	3.786
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.786	VARIANCE	0.618
KURTOSIS	-1.241	SKEWNESS	0.318	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	3.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

TITLE PRESENT JOB TITLE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
REPORTER	1.	18	100.0	100.0	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	1.000

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q3 HAVE YOU BEEN AN INVESTIGATIVE REPORTER?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	16	88.9	88.9	88.9
NO	2.	2	11.1	11.1	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.111	STD ERR	0.076	MEDIAN	1.063
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.323	VARIANCE	0.105
KURTOSIS	5.977	SKEWNESS	2.706	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	18	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q4 LAST 10 YEARS, US INV REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	5.	4	22.2	22.2	22.2
	6.	10	55.6	55.6	77.8
INCREASED	7.	4	22.2	22.2	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.000	STD ERR	0.162	MEDIAN	6.000
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	0.686	VARIANCE	0.471
KURTOSIS	-0.584	SKEWNESS	0.0	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	5.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q5 LAST 10 YEARS, YOUR PAPERS REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STAYED THE SAME	4.	4	22.2	26.7	26.7
	5.	5	27.8	33.3	60.0
	6.	6	33.3	40.0	100.0
	9.	3	16.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.133	STD ERR	0.215	MEDIAN	5.200
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	0.834	VARIANCE	0.695
KURTOSIS	-1.499	SKEWNESS	-0.274	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	6.000		
VALID CASES	15	MISSING CASES	3		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q6 LAST 5 YEARS, US INV. REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STAYED THE SAME	4.	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
	5.	2	11.1	11.1	22.2
	6.	8	44.4	44.4	66.7
INCREASED	7.	6	33.3	33.3	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.000	STD ERR	0.229	MEDIAN	6.125
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	0.970	VARIANCE	0.941
KURTOSIS	0.173	SKEWNESS	-0.870	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q7 LAST 5 YEARS, YOUR PAPERS REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DECREASED	1.	1	5.6	5.9	5.9
STAYED THE SAME	4.	6	33.3	35.3	41.2
	5.	4	22.2	23.5	64.7
	6.	6	33.3	35.3	100.0
	9.	1	5.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.765	STD ERR	0.315	MEDIAN	4.875
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.300	VARIANCE	1.691
KURTOSIS	3.250	SKEWNESS	-1.439	RANGE	5.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	6.000		
VALID CASES	17	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q8 EFFECT OF INV. REPORTING ON THE PUBLIC I

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	5.	4	22.2	23.5	23.5
	6.	5	27.8	29.4	52.9
BENEFICIAL	7.	8	44.4	47.1	100.0
	9.	1	5.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.235	STD ERR	0.202	MEDIAN	6.400
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	0.831	VARIANCE	0.691
KURTOSIS	-1.357	SKEWNESS	-0.496	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	5.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	17	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q9 LAST 5 YEARS, SOUGHT GOVT INFORMATION

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EVERY FEW	3.	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
MONTHLY	4.	1	5.6	5.6	11.1
WEEKLY	5.	6	33.3	33.3	44.4
SEMIWEEKLY	6.	3	16.7	16.7	61.1
DAILY	7.	7	38.9	38.9	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.778	STD ERR	0.286	MEDIAN	5.833
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	1.215	VARIANCE	1.477
KURTOSIS	-0.257	SKEWNESS	-0.629	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	3.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q10 DEAL WITH WHAT LEVEL OF GOVT MOST?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LOCAL	1.	4	22.2	22.2	22.2
STATE	3.	3	16.7	16.7	38.9
FED	5.	2	11.1	11.1	50.0
	6.	9	50.0	50.0	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.278	STD ERR	0.497	MEDIAN	5.500
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	2.109	VARIANCE	4.448
KURTOSIS	-1.284	SKEWNESS	-0.708	RANGE	5.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	6.000		
VALID CASES	18	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q11 DEAL WITH WHICH AGENCIES?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
ENERGY	1.	2	11.1	12.5	12.5
COURTS, ATTYS	2.	3	16.7	18.8	31.3
POLICE	3.	2	11.1	12.5	43.8
CITY HALL	4.	4	22.2	25.0	68.8
OTHER	8.	5	27.8	31.3	100.0
	9.	2	11.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.375	STD ERR	0.676	MEDIAN	3.750
MODE	8.000	STD DEV	2.705	VARIANCE	7.317
KURTOSIS	-1.428	SKEWNESS	0.445	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 16 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q12A DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
UNSUCCESSFUL	1.	2	11.1	13.3	13.3
NEUTRAL	2.	4	22.2	26.7	40.0
SUCCESSFUL	3.	9	50.0	60.0	100.0
	9.	3	16.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.467	STD ERR	0.192	MEDIAN	2.667
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.743	VARIANCE	0.552
KURTOSIS	-0.106	SKEWNESS	-1.074	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	15	MISSING CASES	3		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q12B DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
PLEASANT	1.	5	27.8	38.5	38.5
NEUTRAL	2.	7	38.9	53.8	92.3
UNPLEASANT	3.	1	5.6	7.7	100.0
	9.	5	27.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.692	STD ERR	0.175	MEDIAN	1.714
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.630	VARIANCE	0.397
KURTOSIS	-0.317	SKEWNESS	0.307	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 13 MISSING CASES 5

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q12C DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EASY	1.	2	11.1	15.4	15.4
NEUTRAL	2.	7	38.9	53.8	69.2
DIFFICULT	3.	4	22.2	30.8	100.0
	9.	5	27.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.154	STD ERR	0.191	MEDIAN	2.143
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.689	VARIANCE	0.474
KURTOSIS	-0.496	SKEWNESS	-0.203	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 13 MISSING CASES 5

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q12D DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
TIME CONSUMING	1.	10	55.6	66.7	66.7
NEUTRAL	2.	5	27.8	33.3	100.0
	9.	3	16.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.333	STD ERR	0.126	MEDIAN	1.250
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.488	VARIANCE	0.238
KURTOSIS	-1.615	SKEWNESS	0.788	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 15 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q13 AGENCY USES COMPUTERS TO STORE INFOR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NEVER	1.	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
SOMETIMES	2.	14	77.8	77.8	83.3
ALWAYS	3.	1	5.6	5.6	88.9
DON'T KNOW	4.	2	11.1	11.1	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.222	STD ERR	0.173	MEDIAN	2.071
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.732	VARIANCE	0.536
KURTOSIS	2.985	SKEWNESS	1.641	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q14 AGENCY USES COMPUTERS TO DISSEMINATE INF

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NEVER	1.	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
SOMETIMES	2.	12	66.7	66.7	72.2
ALWAYS	3.	1	5.6	5.6	77.8
DON'T KNOW	4.	4	22.2	22.2	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.444	STD ERR	0.217	MEDIAN	2.167
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.922	VARIANCE	0.850
KURTOSIS	-0.322	SKEWNESS	0.943	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	18	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q15 FOR REPORTERS, COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
UNNECESSARY	1.	1	5.6	5.9	5.9
HELPFUL	2.	16	88.9	94.1	100.0
	9.	1	5.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.941	STD ERR	0.059	MEDIAN	1.969
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.243	VARIANCE	0.059
KURTOSIS	17.000	SKEWNESS	-4.123	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	17	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q16A HAVE YOU HAD COMPUTER TRAINING?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO	1.	12	66.7	66.7	66.7
YES	2.	6	33.3	33.3	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.333	STD ERR	0.114	MEDIAN	1.250
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.485	VARIANCE	0.235
KURTOSIS	-1.594	SKEWNESS	0.773	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	18	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q16B WHAT KIND OF TRAINING?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
COLLEGE	2.	1	5.6	16.7	16.7
ON JOB	5.	2	11.1	33.3	50.0
OTHER	6.	3	16.7	50.0	100.0
	9.	12	66.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.000	STD ERR	0.632	MEDIAN	5.500
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	1.549	VARIANCE	2.400
KURTOSIS	3.958	SKEWNESS	-1.936	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	6.000		

VALID CASES 6 MISSING CASES 12

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q17 YOUR LEVEL OF COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NONE	1.	6	33.3	33.3	33.3
LOW	2.	10	55.6	55.6	88.9
MODERATE	3.	2	11.1	11.1	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.778	STD ERR	0.152	MEDIAN	1.800
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.647	VARIANCE	0.418
KURTOSIS	-0.411	SKEWNESS	0.230	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	18	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q18 IN YOUR JOB, COMPUTER FAMILIARITY IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
IRRELEVANT	1.	1	5.6	5.9	5.9
BENEFICIAL	2.	16	88.9	94.1	100.0
	9.	1	5.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.941	STD ERR	0.059	MEDIAN	1.969
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.243	VARIANCE	0.059
KURTOSIS	17.000	SKEWNESS	-4.123	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 17 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q19 YOU WOULD PURSUE SUCH TRAINING

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
OWN INITIATIVE	1.	2	11.1	11.8	11.8
EMPLOYER OPPORTUNITY	2.	12	66.7	70.6	82.4
OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES	3.	3	16.7	17.6	100.0
	9.	1	5.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.059	STD ERR	0.135	MEDIAN	2.042
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.556	VARIANCE	0.309
KURTOSIS	0.991	SKEWNESS	0.051	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 17 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q20 COMPUTERIZATION OF GOVT DATA HAS MADE IT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LESS ACCESSIBLE	1.	1	5.6	6.7	6.7
	2.	1	5.6	6.7	13.3
	3.	2	11.1	13.3	26.7
SAME	4.	4	22.2	26.7	53.3
	5.	3	16.7	20.0	73.3
	6.	4	22.2	26.7	100.0
	9.	3	16.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.267	STD ERR	0.396	MEDIAN	4.375
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.534	VARIANCE	2.352
KURTOSIS	-0.147	SKEWNESS	-0.654	RANGE	5.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	6.000		
VALID CASES	15	MISSING CASES	3		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q21 WHY DO YOU THINK SO?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EFFICIENT	1.	5	27.8	35.7	35.7
FASTER	2.	2	11.1	14.3	50.0
HUMAN FACTOR	3.	1	5.6	7.1	57.1
EXPERTISE	4.	1	5.6	7.1	64.3
SECRECY	5.	2	11.1	14.3	78.6
GOVT USE	6.	1	5.6	7.1	85.7
	8.	2	11.1	14.3	100.0
	9.	4	22.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.429	STD ERR	0.693	MEDIAN	2.500
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	2.593	VARIANCE	6.725
KURTOSIS	-0.833	SKEWNESS	0.713	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 14 MISSING CASES 4

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q22 FUTURE IMPORTANCE OF COMPS ON INV RESEAR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
SAME	4.	3	16.7	18.8	18.8
	5.	6	33.3	37.5	56.3
	6.	6	33.3	37.5	93.8
INCREASING	7.	1	5.6	6.3	100.0
	9.	2	11.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.313	STD ERR	0.218	MEDIAN	5.333
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	0.873	VARIANCE	0.762
KURTOSIS	-0.554	SKEWNESS	-0.024	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	16	MISSING CASES	2		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q23A THIS EFFECT ON JOURNALISM WILL BE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	3.	2	11.1	12.5	12.5
NEUTRAL	4.	5	27.8	31.3	43.8
	5.	5	27.8	31.3	75.0
	6.	3	16.7	18.8	93.8
BENEFICIAL	7.	1	5.6	6.3	100.0
	9.	2	11.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.750	STD ERR	0.281	MEDIAN	4.700
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.125	VARIANCE	1.267
KURTOSIS	-0.398	SKEWNESS	0.241	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	3.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 16 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q23B WHY DO YOU THINK SO?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EFFICIENT	1.	2	11.1	18.2	18.2
HUMAN FACTOR	3.	3	16.7	27.3	45.5
EXPERTISE	4.	1	5.6	9.1	54.5
SECRECY	5.	2	11.1	18.2	72.7
LOWER COST	7.	1	5.6	9.1	81.8
	8.	2	11.1	18.2	100.0
	9.	7	38.9	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.364	STD ERR	0.754	MEDIAN	4.000
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	2.501	VARIANCE	6.255
KURTOSIS	-1.051	SKEWNESS	0.244	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		
VALID CASES	11	MISSING CASES	7		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q24 EDUCATION LEVEL

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
PARTIAL COLLEGE	2.	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
COLLEGE	3.	8	44.4	44.4	50.0
POSTGRADUATE	4.	9	50.0	50.0	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.444	STD ERR	0.145	MEDIAN	3.500
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	0.616	VARIANCE	0.379
KURTOSIS	-0.391	SKEWNESS	-0.616	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q25 UNION MEMBERSHIP

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
GUILD	1.	18	100.0	100.0	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	1.000

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q26 PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
SDX	1.	1	5.6	11.1	11.1
PRESS CLUB	2.	3	16.7	33.3	44.4
OTHER	3.	1	5.6	11.1	55.6
NONE	4.	4	22.2	44.4	100.0
	9.	9	50.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.889	STD ERR	0.389	MEDIAN	3.000
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.167	VARIANCE	1.361
KURTOSIS	-1.579	SKEWNESS	-0.340	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 9 MISSING CASES 9

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q27 POLITCIAL PARTY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DEMOCRAT	2.	12	66.7	80.0	80.0
OTHER	3.	1	5.6	6.7	86.7
NONE	4.	2	11.1	13.3	100.0
	9.	3	16.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.333	STD ERR	0.187	MEDIAN	2.125
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.724	VARIANCE	0.524
KURTOSIS	2.550	SKEWNESS	1.981	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 15 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q28 REGISTERED VOTER?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	18	100.0	100.0	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	1.000

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q29 VOTED IN 1976 ELECTION?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	18	100.0	100.0	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	1.000

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q30 SEX

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
MALE	1.	15	83.3	83.3	83.3
FEMALE	2.	3	16.7	16.7	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.167	STD ERR	0.090	MEDIAN	1.100
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.383	VARIANCE	0.147
KURTOSIS	2.040	SKEWNESS	1.956	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q31 AGE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
20-30	2.	3	16.7	16.7	16.7
30-40	3.	9	50.0	50.0	66.7
40-50	4.	3	16.7	16.7	83.3
50+	5.	3	16.7	16.7	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.333	STD ERR	0.229	MEDIAN	3.167
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.970	VARIANCE	0.941
KURTOSIS	-0.458	SKEWNESS	0.531	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE CHRO

Q32 ETHNIC BACKGROUND

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
CAUCASIAN	1.	17	94.4	94.4	94.4
ASIAN	4.	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
	TOTAL	18	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.167	STD ERR	0.167	MEDIAN	1.088
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.707	VARIANCE	0.500
KURTOSIS	18.000	SKEWNESS	4.243	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	18	MISSING CASES	0		

Section 3

EXAMINER

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

PAPER NEWSPAPER OF RESPONDENT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EXAMINER	2.	25	100.0	100.0	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	2.000
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	2.000

VALID CASES 25 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

YEARS YEARS EMPLOYED IN JOURNALISM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
1-5	2.	1	4.0	4.3	4.3
5-10	3.	3	12.0	13.0	17.4
10-20	4.	5	20.0	21.7	39.1
>20	5.	14	56.0	60.9	100.0
	9.	2	8.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.391	STD ERR	0.186	MEDIAN	4.679
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	0.891	VARIANCE	0.794
KURTOSIS	0.895	SKEWNESS	-1.328	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 23 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

TITLE PRESENT JOB TITLE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
REPORTER	1.	19	76.0	82.6	82.6
EDITOR	2.	4	16.0	17.4	100.0
	9.	2	8.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.174	STD ERR	0.081	MEDIAN	1.105
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.388	VARIANCE	0.150
KURTOSIS	1.522	SKEWNESS	1.843	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 23 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q3 HAVE YOU BEEN AN INVESTIGATIVE REPORTER?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	22	88.0	95.7	95.7
NO	2.	1	4.0	4.3	100.0
	9.	2	8.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.043	STD ERR	0.043	MEDIAN	1.023
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.209	VARIANCE	0.043
KURTOSIS	23.000	SKEWNESS	4.796	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	23	MISSING CASES	2		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q4 LAST 10 YEARS, US INV REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	2.	1	4.0	4.3	4.3
	5.	7	28.0	30.4	34.8
	6.	5	20.0	21.7	56.5
INCREASED	7.	10	40.0	43.5	100.0
	9.	2	8.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.957	STD ERR	0.255	MEDIAN	6.200
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	1.224	VARIANCE	1.498
KURTOSIS	3.538	SKEWNESS	-1.540	RANGE	5.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 23 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q5 LAST 10 YEARS, YOUR PAPERS REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	2.	1	4.0	4.5	4.5
	5.	9	36.0	40.9	45.5
	6.	6	24.0	27.3	72.7
INCREASED	7.	6	24.0	27.3	100.0
	9.	3	12.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.682	STD ERR	0.250	MEDIAN	5.667
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.171	VARIANCE	1.370
KURTOSIS	3.405	SKEWNESS	-1.268	RANGE	5.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 22 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q6 LAST 5 YEARS, US INV. REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DECREASED	1.	1	4.0	4.3	4.3
	5.	5	20.0	21.7	26.1
	6.	7	28.0	30.4	56.5
INCREASED	7.	10	40.0	43.5	100.0
	9.	2	8.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.000	STD ERR	0.281	MEDIAN	6.286
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	1.348	VARIANCE	1.818
KURTOSIS	8.109	SKEWNESS	-2.437	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 23 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q7 LAST 5 YEARS, YOUR PAPERS REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	3.	1	4.0	4.5	4.5
	5.	8	32.0	36.4	40.9
	6.	4	16.0	18.2	59.1
INCREASED	7.	9	36.0	40.9	100.0
	9.	3	12.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.909	STD ERR	0.236	MEDIAN	6.000
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	1.109	VARIANCE	1.229
KURTOSIS	0.287	SKEWNESS	-0.728	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	3.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 22 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q8 EFFECT OF INV. REPORTING ON THE PUBLIC I

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	5.	3	12.0	13.0	13.0
	6.	7	28.0	30.4	43.5
BENEFICIAL	7.	13	52.0	56.5	100.0
	9.	2	8.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.435	STD ERR	0.152	MEDIAN	6.615
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	0.728	VARIANCE	0.530
KURTOSIS	-0.414	SKEWNESS	-0.916	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	5.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	23	MISSING CASES	2		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q9 LAST 5 YEARS, SOUGHT GOVT INFORMATION

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
MONTHLY	4.	2	8.0	9.1	9.1
WEEKLY	5.	14	56.0	63.6	72.7
SEMIWEEKLY	6.	2	8.0	9.1	81.8
DAILY	7.	4	16.0	18.2	100.0
	9.	3	12.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.364	STD ERR	0.192	MEDIAN	5.143
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	0.902	VARIANCE	0.814
KURTOSIS	-0.019	SKEWNESS	0.877	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 22 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q10 DEAL WITH WHAT LEVEL OF GOVT MOST?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LOCAL	1.	6	24.0	28.6	28.6
COUNTY	2.	1	4.0	4.8	33.3
STATE	3.	3	12.0	14.3	47.6
	6.	11	44.0	52.4	100.0
	9.	4	16.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.952	STD ERR	0.500	MEDIAN	5.545
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	2.291	VARIANCE	5.248
KURTOSIS	-1.875	SKEWNESS	-0.322	RANGE	5.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	6.000		

VALID CASES 21 MISSING CASES 4

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q11 DEAL WITH WHICH AGENCIES?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
ENERGY	1.	2	8.0	16.7	16.7
COURTS, ATTYS	2.	1	4.0	8.3	25.0
POLICE	3.	5	20.0	41.7	66.7
OTHER	8.	4	16.0	33.3	100.0
	9.	13	52.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.250	STD ERR	0.827	MEDIAN	3.100
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	2.864	VARIANCE	8.205
KURTOSIS	-1.571	SKEWNESS	0.562	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		
VALID CASES	12	MISSING CASES	13		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q12A DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
UNSUCCESSFUL	1.	1	4.0	6.7	6.7
NEUTRAL	2.	5	20.0	33.3	40.0
SUCCESSFUL	3.	9	36.0	60.0	100.0
	9.	10	40.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.533	STD ERR	0.165	MEDIAN	2.667
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.640	VARIANCE	0.410
KURTOSIS	0.398	SKEWNESS	-1.085	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	15	MISSING CASES	10		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q12B DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
PLEASANT	1.	7	28.0	70.0	70.0
NEUTRAL	2.	2	8.0	20.0	90.0
UNPLEASANT	3.	1	4.0	10.0	100.0
	9.	15	60.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.400	STD ERR	0.221	MEDIAN	1.214
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.699	VARIANCE	0.489
KURTOSIS	2.045	SKEWNESS	1.658	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 10 MISSING CASES 15

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q12C DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EASY	1.	4	16.0	36.4	36.4
NEUTRAL	2.	1	4.0	9.1	45.5
DIFFICULT	3.	6	24.0	54.5	100.0
	9.	14	56.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.182	STD ERR	0.296	MEDIAN	2.583
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.982	VARIANCE	0.964
KURTOSIS	-2.095	SKEWNESS	-0.429	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 14

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q12D DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
TIME CONSUMING	1.	9	36.0	81.8	81.8
NEUTRAL	2.	1	4.0	9.1	90.9
NOT TIME CONSUMING	3.	1	4.0	9.1	100.0
	9.	14	56.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.273	STD ERR	0.195	MEDIAN	1.111
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.647	VARIANCE	0.418
KURTOSIS	5.510	SKEWNESS	2.420	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 14

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q13 AGENCY USES COMPUTERS TO STORE INFOR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
SOMETIMES	2.	14	56.0	70.0	70.0
ALWAYS	3.	3	12.0	15.0	85.0
DON'T KNOW	4.	3	12.0	15.0	100.0
	9.	5	20.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.450	STD ERR	0.170	MEDIAN	2.214
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.759	VARIANCE	0.576
KURTOSIS	0.412	SKEWNESS	1.389	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 20 MISSING CASES 5

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q14 AGENCY USES COMPUTERS TO DISSEMINATE INF

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NEVER	1.	1	4.0	4.3	4.3
SOMETIMES	2.	13	52.0	56.5	60.9
ALWAYS	3.	2	8.0	8.7	69.6
DON'T KNOW	4.	7	28.0	30.4	100.0
	9.	2	8.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.652	STD ERR	0.205	MEDIAN	2.308
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.982	VARIANCE	0.964
KURTOSIS	-1.342	SKEWNESS	0.479	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 23 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q15 FOR REPORTERS, COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
UNNECESSARY	1.	6	24.0	27.3	27.3
HELPFUL	2.	13	52.0	59.1	86.4
REQUIRED	3.	3	12.0	13.6	100.0
	9.	3	12.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.864	STD ERR	0.136	MEDIAN	1.885
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.640	VARIANCE	0.409
KURTOSIS	-0.320	SKEWNESS	0.114	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	22	MISSING CASES	3		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q16A HAVE YOU HAD COMPUTER TRAINING?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO	1.	19	76.0	79.2	79.2
YES	2.	5	20.0	20.8	100.0
	9.	1	4.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.208	STD ERR	0.085	MEDIAN	1.132
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.415	VARIANCE	0.172
KURTOSIS	0.377	SKEWNESS	1.534	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 24 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q16B WHAT KIND OF TRAINING?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
COLLEGE	2.	1	4.0	16.7	16.7
PERSONAL	4.	1	4.0	16.7	33.3
ON JOB	5.	4	16.0	66.7	100.0
	9.	19	76.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.333	STD ERR	0.494	MEDIAN	4.750
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.211	VARIANCE	1.467
KURTOSIS	3.657	SKEWNESS	-1.952	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 6 MISSING CASES 19

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q17 YOUR LEVEL OF COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NONE	1.	8	32.0	32.0	32.0
LOW	2.	16	64.0	64.0	96.0
MODERATE	3.	1	4.0	4.0	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.720	STD ERR	0.108	MEDIAN	1.781
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.542	VARIANCE	0.293
KURTOSIS	-0.347	SKEWNESS	-0.153	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	25	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q18 IN YOUR JOB, COMPUTER FAMILIARITY IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
IRRELEVANT	1.	3	12.0	12.0	12.0
BENEFICIAL	2.	21	84.0	84.0	96.0
MANDATORY	3.	1	4.0	4.0	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.920	STD ERR	0.080	MEDIAN	1.952
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.400	VARIANCE	0.160
KURTOSIS	3.925	SKEWNESS	-0.754	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 25 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q19 YOU WOULD PURSUE SUCH TRAINING

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
OWN INITIATIVE	1.	1	4.0	4.3	4.3
EMPLOYER OPPORTUNITY	2.	18	72.0	78.3	82.6
OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES	3.	3	12.0	13.0	95.7
NO CIRCUMSTANCES	4.	1	4.0	4.3	100.0
	9.	2	8.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.174	STD ERR	0.120	MEDIAN	2.083
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.576	VARIANCE	0.332
KURTOSIS	4.364	SKEWNESS	1.579	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 23 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FXAM

Q20 COMPUTERIZATION OF GOVT DATA HAS MADE IT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LESS ACCESSIBLE	1.	2	8.0	9.1	9.1
	2.	1	4.0	4.5	13.6
	3.	2	8.0	9.1	22.7
SAME	4.	4	16.0	18.2	40.9
	5.	5	20.0	22.7	63.6
	6.	5	20.0	22.7	86.4
MORE ACCESSIBLE	7.	3	12.0	13.6	100.0
	9.	3	12.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.636	STD ERR	0.381	MEDIAN	4.900
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.787	VARIANCE	3.195
KURTOSIS	-0.226	SKEWNESS	-0.658	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	22	MISSING CASES	3		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q21 WHY DO YOU THINK SO?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EFFICIENT	1.	4	16.0	26.7	26.7
FASTER	2.	3	12.0	20.0	46.7
HUMAN FACTOR	3.	1	4.0	6.7	53.3
EXPERTISE	4.	1	4.0	6.7	60.0
SECRECY	5.	4	16.0	26.7	86.7
	8.	2	8.0	13.3	100.0
	9.	10	40.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.533	STD ERR	0.624	MEDIAN	3.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	2.416	VARIANCE	5.838
KURTOSIS	-0.558	SKEWNESS	0.672	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		
VALID CASES	15	MISSING CASES	10		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q22 FUTURE IMPORTANCE OF COMPS ON INV RESEAR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DECREASING	1.	1	4.0	4.3	4.3
SAME	4.	3	12.0	13.0	17.4
	5.	7	28.0	30.4	47.8
	6.	7	28.0	30.4	78.3
INCREASING	7.	5	20.0	21.7	100.0
	9.	2	8.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.435	STD ERR	0.287	MEDIAN	5.571
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.376	VARIANCE	1.893
KURTOSIS	3.718	SKEWNESS	-1.457	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 23 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q23A THIS EFFECT ON JOURNALISM WILL BE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DETRIMENTAL	1.	1	4.0	4.5	4.5
	2.	1	4.0	4.5	9.1
	3.	2	8.0	9.1	18.2
NEUTRAL	4.	7	28.0	31.8	50.0
	5.	5	20.0	22.7	72.7
	6.	4	16.0	18.2	90.9
BENEFICIAL	7.	2	8.0	9.1	100.0
	9.	3	12.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.545	STD ERR	0.320	MEDIAN	4.500
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.503	VARIANCE	2.260
KURTOSIS	0.278	SKEWNESS	-0.420	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	22	MISSING CASES	3		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q23B WHY DO YOU THINK SO?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EFFICIENT	1.	4	16.0	30.8	30.8
FASTER	2.	1	4.0	7.7	38.5
HUMAN FACTOR	3.	3	12.0	23.1	61.5
	8.	5	20.0	38.5	100.0
	9.	12	48.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.231	STD ERR	0.885	MEDIAN	3.000
MODE	8.000	STD DEV	3.193	VARIANCE	10.192
KURTOSIS	-1.967	SKEWNESS	0.352	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 13 MISSING CASES 12

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q24 EDUCATION LEVEL

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
HI SCHOOL	1.	4	16.0	16.0	16.0
PARTIAL COLLEGE	2.	3	12.0	12.0	28.0
COLLEGE	3.	8	32.0	32.0	60.0
POSTGRADUATE	4.	10	40.0	40.0	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.960	STD ERR	0.220	MEDIAN	3.188
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.098	VARIANCE	1.207
KURTOSIS	-0.721	SKEWNESS	-0.735	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	25	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q25 UNION MEMBERSHIP

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
GUILD	1.	21	84.0	95.5	95.5
OTHER	2.	1	4.0	4.5	100.0
	9.	3	12.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.045	STD ERR	0.045	MEDIAN	1.024
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.213	VARIANCE	0.045
KURTOSIS	22.000	SKEWNESS	4.690	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 22 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q26 PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
SDX	1.	4	16.0	50.0	50.0
PRESS CLUB	2.	2	8.0	25.0	75.0
NONE	4.	2	8.0	25.0	100.0
	9.	17	68.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.000	STD ERR	0.463	MEDIAN	1.500
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.309	VARIANCE	1.714
KURTOSIS	-0.700	SKEWNESS	1.018	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 8 MISSING CASES 17

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q27 POLITCIAL PARTY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DEMOCRAT	2.	20	80.0	90.9	90.9
OTHER	3.	1	4.0	4.5	95.5
NONE	4.	1	4.0	4.5	100.0
	9.	3	12.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.136	STD ERR	0.100	MEDIAN	2.050
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.468	VARIANCE	0.219
KURTOSIS	13.270	SKEWNESS	3.621	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 22 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q28 REGISTERED VOTER?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	23	92.0	92.0	92.0
NO	2.	2	8.0	8.0	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.080	STD ERR	0.055	MEDIAN	1.043
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.277	VARIANCE	0.077
KURTOSIS	9.641	SKEWNESS	3.298	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 25 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q29 VOTED IN 1976 ELECTION?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	23	92.0	92.0	92.0
NO	2.	1	4.0	4.0	96.0
	4.	1	4.0	4.0	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.160	STD ERR	0.125	MEDIAN	1.043
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.624	VARIANCE	0.390
KURTOSIS	19.658	SKEWNESS	4.352	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 25 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q30 SEX

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
MALE	1.	20	80.0	80.0	80.0
FEMALE	2.	5	20.0	20.0	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.200	STD ERR	0.082	MEDIAN	1.125
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.408	VARIANCE	0.167
KURTOSIS	0.593	SKEWNESS	1.597	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 25 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q31 AGE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
20-30	2.	2	8.0	8.0	8.0
30-40	3.	6	24.0	24.0	32.0
40-50	4.	7	28.0	28.0	60.0
50+	5.	10	40.0	40.0	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.000	STD ERR	0.200	MEDIAN	4.143
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.000	VARIANCE	1.000
KURTOSIS	-0.846	SKEWNESS	-0.543	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 25 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE EXAM

Q32 ETHNIC BACKGROUND

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
CAUCASIAN	1.	19	76.0	79.2	79.2
BLACK	2.	2	8.0	8.3	87.5
ASIAN	4.	2	8.0	8.3	95.8
OTHER	5.	1	4.0	4.2	100.0
	9.	1	4.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.500	STD ERR	0.233	MEDIAN	1.132
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.142	VARIANCE	1.304
KURTOSIS	4.182	SKEWNESS	2.292	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		
VALID CASES	24	MISSING CASES	1		

Section 4

TIMES

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

PAPER NEWSPAPER OF RESPONDENT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
TIMES	3.	12	100.0	100.0	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	3.000
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	3.000	MAXIMUM	3.000

VALID CASES 12 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

YEARS YEARS EMPLOYED IN JOURNALISM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
5-10	3.	3	25.0	25.0	25.0
10-20	4.	5	41.7	41.7	66.7
>20	5.	4	33.3	33.3	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.083	STD ERR	0.229	MEDIAN	4.100
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	0.793	VARIANCE	0.629
KURTOSIS	-1.261	SKEWNESS	-0.161	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	3.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 12 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

TITLE PRESENT JOB TITLE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
REPORTER	1.	12	100.0	100.0	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	1.000

VALID CASES 12 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q3 HAVE YOU BEEN AN INVESTIGATIVE REPORTER?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	11	91.7	91.7	91.7
NO	2.	1	8.3	8.3	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.083	STD ERR	0.083	MEDIAN	1.045
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.289	VARIANCE	0.083
KURTOSIS	12.000	SKEWNESS	3.464	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	12	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q4 LAST 10 YEARS, US INV REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STAYED THE SAME	4.	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
	6.	5	41.7	41.7	50.0
INCREASED	7.	6	50.0	50.0	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.333	STD ERR	0.256	MEDIAN	6.500
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	0.888	VARIANCE	0.788
KURTOSIS	3.808	SKEWNESS	-1.733	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 12 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q5 LAST 10 YEARS, YOUR PAPERS REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	5.	2	16.7	16.7	16.7
	6.	4	33.3	33.3	50.0
INCREASED	7.	6	50.0	50.0	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.333	STD ERR	0.225	MEDIAN	6.500
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	0.778	VARIANCE	0.606
KURTOSIS	-0.792	SKEWNESS	-0.719	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	5.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	12	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q6 LAST 5 YEARS, US INV. REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STAYED THE SAME	4.	2	16.7	16.7	16.7
	5.	2	16.7	16.7	33.3
	6.	3	25.0	25.0	58.3
INCREASED	7.	5	41.7	41.7	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.917	STD ERR	0.336	MEDIAN	6.167
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	1.164	VARIANCE	1.356
KURTOSIS	-1.009	SKEWNESS	-0.640	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	12	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q7 LAST 5 YEARS, YOUR PAPERS REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STAYED THE SAME	4.	3	25.0	25.0	25.0
	5.	2	16.7	16.7	41.7
	6.	4	33.3	33.3	75.0
INCREASED	7.	3	25.0	25.0	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.583	STD ERR	0.336	MEDIAN	5.750
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	1.165	VARIANCE	1.356
KURTOSIS	-1.352	SKEWNESS	-0.241	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 12 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q8 EFFECT OF INV. REPORTING ON THE PUBLIC I

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
	5.	2	16.7	16.7	16.7
	6.	3	25.0	25.0	41.7
BENEFICIAL	7.	7	58.3	58.3	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.417	STD ERR	0.229	MEDIAN	6.643
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	0.793	VARIANCE	0.629
KURTOSIS	-0.464	SKEWNESS	-0.988	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	5.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	12	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q9 LAST 5 YEARS, SOUGHT GOVT INFORMATION

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EVERY FEW	3.	2	16.7	16.7	16.7
MONTHLY	4.	3	25.0	25.0	41.7
WEEKLY	5.	5	41.7	41.7	83.3
DAILY	7.	2	16.7	16.7	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.750	STD ERR	0.372	MEDIAN	4.700
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.288	VARIANCE	1.659
KURTOSIS	0.030	SKEWNESS	0.555	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	3.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 12 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q10 DEAL WITH WHAT LEVEL OF GOVT MOST?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LOCAL	1.	1	8.3	8.3	8.3
COUNTY	2.	1	8.3	8.3	16.7
SPECIAL DIST	4.	1	8.3	8.3	25.0
FED	5.	3	25.0	25.0	50.0
	6.	6	50.0	50.0	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.833	STD ERR	0.490	MEDIAN	5.500
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	1.697	VARIANCE	2.879
KURTOSIS	1.518	SKEWNESS	-1.566	RANGE	5.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	6.000		

VALID CASES 12 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q11 DEAL WITH WHICH AGENCIES?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
COURTS, ATTYS	2.	1	8.3	14.3	14.3
POLICE	3.	3	25.0	42.9	57.1
OTHER	8.	3	25.0	42.9	100.0
	9.	5	41.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.000	STD ERR	1.069	MEDIAN	3.333
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	2.828	VARIANCE	8.000
KURTOSIS	-2.687	SKEWNESS	0.309	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 7 MISSING CASES 5

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q12A DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NEUTRAL	2.	3	25.0	33.3	33.3
SUCCESSFUL	3.	6	50.0	66.7	100.0
	9.	3	25.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.667	STD ERR	0.167	MEDIAN	2.750
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.500	VARIANCE	0.250
KURTOSIS	-1.714	SKEWNESS	-0.857	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 9 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q12B DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
PLEASANT	1.	2	16.7	22.2	22.2
NEUTRAL	2.	4	33.3	44.4	66.7
UNPLEASANT	3.	3	25.0	33.3	100.0
	9.	3	25.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.111	STD ERR	0.261	MEDIAN	2.125
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.782	VARIANCE	0.611
KURTOSIS	-1.041	SKEWNESS	-0.216	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 9 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q12C DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EASY	1.	1	8.3	11.1	11.1
NEUTRAL	2.	4	33.3	44.4	55.6
DIFFICULT	3.	4	33.3	44.4	100.0
	9.	3	25.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.333	STD ERR	0.236	MEDIAN	2.375
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.707	VARIANCE	0.500
KURTOSIS	-0.286	SKEWNESS	-0.606	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 9 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q12D DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
TIME CONSUMING	1.	8	66.7	72.7	72.7
NEUTRAL	2.	3	25.0	27.3	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.273	STD ERR	0.141	MEDIAN	1.188
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.467	VARIANCE	0.218
KURTOSIS	-0.764	SKEWNESS	1.189	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	11	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q13 AGENCY USES COMPUTERS TO STORE INFOR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
SOMETIMES	2.	10	83.3	90.9	90.9
ALWAYS	3.	1	8.3	9.1	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.091	STD ERR	0.091	MEDIAN	2.050
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.302	VARIANCE	0.091
KURTOSIS	11.000	SKEWNESS	3.317	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	11	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q14 AGENCY USES COMPUTERS TO DISSEMINATE INF

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NEVER	1.	3	25.0	27.3	27.3
SOMETIMES	2.	4	33.3	36.4	63.6
DON'T KNOW	4.	4	33.3	36.4	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.455	STD ERR	0.390	MEDIAN	2.125
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	1.293	VARIANCE	1.673
KURTOSIS	-1.780	SKEWNESS	0.291	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q15 FOR REPORTERS, COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
UNNECESSARY	1.	2	16.7	18.2	18.2
HELPFUL	2.	9	75.0	81.8	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.818	STD ERR	0.122	MEDIAN	1.889
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.405	VARIANCE	0.164
KURTOSIS	2.037	SKEWNESS	-1.923	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q16A HAVE YOU HAD COMPUTER TRAINING?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO	1.	7	58.3	63.6	63.6
YES	2.	4	33.3	36.4	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.364	STD ERR	0.152	MEDIAN	1.286
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.505	VARIANCE	0.255
KURTOSIS	-1.964	SKEWNESS	0.661	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	11	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q16B WHAT KIND OF TRAINING?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
COLLEGE	2.	1	8.3	25.0	25.0
PERSONAL	4.	2	16.7	50.0	75.0
ON JOB	5.	1	8.3	25.0	100.0
	9.	8	66.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.750	STD ERR	0.629	MEDIAN	4.000
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.258	VARIANCE	1.583
KURTOSIS	2.227	SKEWNESS	-1.129	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 4 MISSING CASES 8

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE. TIME

Q17 YOUR LEVEL OF COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NONE	1.	2	16.7	18.2	18.2
LOW	2.	9	75.0	81.8	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.818	STD ERR	0.122	MEDIAN	1.889
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.405	VARIANCE	0.164
KURTOSIS	2.037	SKEWNESS	-1.923	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q18 IN YOUR JOB, COMPUTER FAMILIARITY IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
IRRELEVANT	1.	1	8.3	9.1	9.1
BENEFICIAL	2.	10	83.3	90.9	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.909	STD ERR	0.091	MEDIAN	1.950
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.302	VARIANCE	0.091
KURTOSIS	11.000	SKEWNESS	-3.317	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	11	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q19 YOU WOULD PURSUE SUCH TRAINING

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EMPLOYER OPPORTUNITY	2.	7	58.3	63.6	63.6
OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES	3.	3	25.0	27.3	90.9
NO CIRCUMSTANCES	4.	1	8.3	9.1	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.455	STD ERR	0.207	MEDIAN	2.286
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.688	VARIANCE	0.473
KURTOSIS	0.976	SKEWNESS	1.324	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q20 COMPUTERIZATION OF GOVT DATA HAS MADE IT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LESS ACCESSIBLE	1.	1	8.3	9.1	9.1
SAME	4.	7	58.3	63.6	72.7
	6.	2	16.7	18.2	90.9
MORE ACCESSIBLE	7.	1	8.3	9.1	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.364	STD ERR	0.472	MEDIAN	4.143
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.567	VARIANCE	2.455
KURTOSIS	1.639	SKEWNESS	-0.359	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q21 WHY DO YOU THINK SO?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EFFICIENT	1.	1	8.3	12.5	12.5
HUMAN FACTOR	3.	3	25.0	37.5	50.0
SECRECY	5.	1	8.3	12.5	62.5
	8.	3	25.0	37.5	100.0
	9.	4	33.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.875	STD ERR	0.990	MEDIAN	4.000
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	2.800	VARIANCE	7.839
KURTOSIS	-1.839	SKEWNESS	0.118	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		
VALID CASES	8	MISSING CASES	4		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q22 FUTURE IMPORTANCE OF COMPS ON INV RESEAR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
SAME	4.	3	25.0	27.3	27.3
	5.	3	25.0	27.3	54.5
	6.	3	25.0	27.3	81.8
INCREASING	7.	2	16.7	18.2	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.364	STD ERR	0.338	MEDIAN	5.333
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.120	VARIANCE	1.255
KURTOSIS	-1.225	SKEWNESS	0.155	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q23A THIS EFFECT ON JOURNALISM WILL BE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DETRIMENTAL	1.	1	8.3	9.1	9.1
NEUTRAL	4.	7	58.3	63.6	72.7
	5.	1	8.3	9.1	81.8
	6.	1	8.3	9.1	90.9
BENEFICIAL	7.	1	8.3	9.1	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.273	STD ERR	0.449	MEDIAN	4.143
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.489	VARIANCE	2.218
KURTOSIS	2.513	SKEWNESS	-0.347	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q23B WHY DO YOU THINK SO?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EFFICIENT	1.	2	16.7	40.0	40.0
FASTER	2.	1	8.3	20.0	60.0
HUMAN FACTOR	3.	1	8.3	20.0	80.0
SECRECY	5.	1	8.3	20.0	100.0
	9.	7	58.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.400	STD ERR	0.748	MEDIAN	2.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.673	VARIANCE	2.800
KURTOSIS	0.536	SKEWNESS	1.089	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 5 MISSING CASES 7

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q24 EDUCATION LEVEL

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
COLLEGE	3.	3	25.0	27.3	27.3
POSTGRADUATE	4.	8	66.7	72.7	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.727	STD ERR	0.141	MEDIAN	3.813
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	0.467	VARIANCE	0.218
KURTOSIS	-0.764	SKEWNESS	-1.189	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	3.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q25 UNION MEMBERSHIP

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
GUILD	1.	2	16.7	100.0	100.0
	9.	10	83.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	1.000

VALID CASES 2 MISSING CASES 10

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q26 PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
PRESS CLUB	2.	1	8.3	33.3	33.3
OTHER	3.	1	8.3	33.3	66.7
NONE	4.	1	8.3	33.3	100.0
	9.	9	75.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.000	STD ERR	0.577	MEDIAN	3.000
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	1.000	VARIANCE	1.000
SKEWNESS	0.0	RANGE	2.000	MINIMUM	2.000
MAXIMUM	4.000				

VALID CASES 3 MISSING CASES 9

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q27 POLITCIAL PARTY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
REPUBLICAN	1.	1	8.3	10.0	10.0
DEMOCRAT	2.	7	58.3	70.0	80.0
OTHER	3.	1	8.3	10.0	90.0
NONE	4.	1	8.3	10.0	100.0
	9.	2	16.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.200	STD ERR	0.249	MEDIAN	2.071
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.789	VARIANCE	0.622
KURTOSIS	2.985	SKEWNESS	1.290	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	10	MISSING CASES	2		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q28 REGISTERED VOTER?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	11	91.7	100.0	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	1.000

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q29 VOTED IN 1976 ELECTION?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	11	91.7	100.0	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	1.000

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q30 SEX

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
MALE	1.	8	66.7	72.7	72.7
FEMALE	2.	3	25.0	27.3	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.273	STD ERR	0.141	MEDIAN	1.188
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.467	VARIANCE	0.218
KURTOSIS	-0.764	SKEWNESS	1.189	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	11	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q31 AGE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
20-30	2.	1	8.3	9.1	9.1
30-40	3.	7	58.3	63.6	72.7
40-50	4.	1	8.3	9.1	81.8
50+	5.	2	16.7	18.2	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.364	STD ERR	0.279	MEDIAN	3.143
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.924	VARIANCE	0.855
KURTOSIS	0.373	SKEWNESS	0.951	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		
VALID CASES	11	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE TIME

Q32 FTHNIC BACKGROUND

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
CAUCASIAN	1.	9	75.0	81.8	81.8
BLACK	2.	1	8.3	9.1	90.9
MEX-AMER	3.	1	8.3	9.1	100.0
	9.	1	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.273	STD ERR	0.195	MEDIAN	1.111
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.647	VARIANCE	0.418
KURTOSIS	5.510	SKEWNESS	2.420	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 11 MISSING CASES 1

Section 5

FOURTH NEWSPAPER

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

PAPER NEWSPAPER OF RESPONDENT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
FOURTH PAPER	4.	24	100.0	100.0	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	4.000
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	4.000

VALID CASES 24 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

YEARS YEARS EMPLOYED IN JOURNALISM

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
1-5	2.	4	16.7	16.7	16.7
5-10	3.	7	29.2	29.2	45.8
10-20	4.	8	33.3	33.3	79.2
>20	5.	5	20.8	20.8	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.583	STD ERR	0.208	MEDIAN	3.625
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.018	VARIANCE	1.036
KURTOSIS	-0.999	SKEWNESS	-0.111	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 24 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

TITLE PRESENT JOB TITLE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
REPORTER	1.	24	100.0	100.0	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.000	STD ERR	0.0	MEDIAN	1.000
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.0	VARIANCE	0.0
RANGE	0.0	MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	1.000

VALID CASES 24 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q3 HAVE YOU BEEN AN INVESTIGATIVE REPORTER?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	21	87.5	91.3	91.3
NO	2.	2	8.3	8.7	100.0
	9.	1	4.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.087	STD ERR	0.060	MEDIAN	1.048
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.288	VARIANCE	0.083
KURTOSIS	8.605	SKEWNESS	3.140	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	23	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q4 LAST 10 YEARS, US INV REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STAYED THE SAME	4.	1	4.2	4.2	4.2
	5.	5	20.8	20.8	25.0
	6.	9	37.5	37.5	62.5
INCREASED	7.	9	37.5	37.5	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.083	STD ERR	0.180	MEDIAN	6.167
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	0.881	VARIANCE	0.775
KURTOSIS	-0.422	SKEWNESS	-0.589	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	24	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q5 LAST 10 YEARS, YOUR PAPERS REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DECREASED	1.	1	4.2	4.3	4.3
	3.	2	8.3	8.7	13.0
STAYED THE SAME	4.	5	20.8	21.7	34.8
	5.	7	29.2	30.4	65.2
	6.	3	12.5	13.0	78.3
INCREASED	7.	5	20.8	21.7	100.0
	9.	1	4.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.000	STD ERR	0.321	MEDIAN	5.000
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.537	VARIANCE	2.364
KURTOSIS	0.563	SKEWNESS	-0.575	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	23	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q6 LAST 5 YEARS, US INV. REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
STAYED THE SAME	4.	2	8.3	8.3	8.3
	5.	4	16.7	16.7	25.0
	6.	8	33.3	33.3	58.3
INCREASED	7.	10	41.7	41.7	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.083	STD ERR	0.199	MEDIAN	6.250
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	0.974	VARIANCE	0.949
KURTOSIS	-0.287	SKEWNESS	-0.793	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	24	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q7 LAST 5 YEARS, YOUR PAPERS REPORTING HAS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DECREASED	1.	1	4.2	4.3	4.3
	3.	1	4.2	4.3	8.7
STAYED THE SAME	4.	4	16.7	17.4	26.1
	5.	8	33.3	34.8	60.9
	6.	5	20.8	21.7	82.6
INCREASED	7.	4	16.7	17.4	100.0
	9.	1	4.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.130	STD ERR	0.297	MEDIAN	5.188
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.424	VARIANCE	2.028
KURTOSIS	1.918	SKEWNESS	-0.974	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		
VALID CASES	23	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q8 EFFECT OF INV. REPORTING ON THE PUBLIC I

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NEUTRAL	4.	1	4.2	4.2	4.2
	5.	2	8.3	8.3	12.5
	6.	8	33.3	33.3	45.8
BENEFICIAL	7.	13	54.2	54.2	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	6.375	STD ERR	0.168	MEDIAN	6.577
MODE	7.000	STD DEV	0.824	VARIANCE	0.679
KURTOSIS	1.594	SKEWNESS	-1.342	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 24 MISSING CASES 0

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q9 LAST 5 YEARS, SOUGHT GOVT INFORMATION

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LESS THAN ONCE PER Y	1.	2	8.3	8.7	8.7
WEEKLY	5.	10	41.7	43.5	52.2
SEMIWEEKLY	6.	1	4.2	4.3	56.5
DAILY	7.	10	41.7	43.5	100.0
	9.	1	4.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.565	STD ERR	0.360	MEDIAN	5.450
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.727	VARIANCE	2.984
KURTOSIS	2.662	SKEWNESS	-1.569	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 23 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q10 DEAL WITH WHAT LEVEL OF GOVT MOST?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LOCAL	1.	5	20.8	20.8	20.8
COUNTY	2.	3	12.5	12.5	33.3
SPECIAL DIST	4.	1	4.2	4.2	37.5
FED	5.	1	4.2	4.2	41.7
	6.	14	58.3	58.3	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.333	STD ERR	0.449	MEDIAN	5.643
MODE	6.000	STD DEV	2.200	VARIANCE	4.841
KURTOSIS	-1.472	SKEWNESS	-0.705	RANGE	5.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	6.000		
VALID CASES	24	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q11 DEAL WITH WHICH AGENCIES?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
ENERGY	1.	1	4.2	5.6	5.6
COURTS, ATTYS	2.	2	8.3	11.1	16.7
POLICE	3.	9	37.5	50.0	66.7
CITY HALL	4.	3	12.5	16.7	83.3
SUPERVISORS	5.	1	4.2	5.6	88.9
OTHER	8.	2	8.3	11.1	100.0
	9.	6	25.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.611	STD ERR	0.429	MEDIAN	3.167
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	1.819	VARIANCE	3.310
KURTOSIS	2.561	SKEWNESS	1.579	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 18 MISSING CASES 6

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q12A DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
UNSUCCESSFUL	1.	1	4.2	4.8	4.8
NEUTRAL	2.	13	54.2	61.9	66.7
SUCCESSFUL	3.	7	29.2	33.3	100.0
	9.	3	12.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.286	STD ERR	0.122	MEDIAN	2.231
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.561	VARIANCE	0.314
KURTOSIS	-0.335	SKEWNESS	0.038	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 21 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q12B DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
PLEASANT	1.	5	20.8	31.3	31.3
NEUTRAL	2.	11	45.8	68.8	100.0
	9.	8	33.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.688	STD ERR	0.120	MEDIAN	1.773
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.479	VARIANCE	0.229
KURTOSIS	-1.391	SKEWNESS	-0.895	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	16	MISSING CASES	8		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q12C DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NEUTRAL	2.	12	50.0	85.7	85.7
DIFFICULT	3.	2	8.3	14.3	100.0
	9.	10	41.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.143	STD ERR	0.097	MEDIAN	2.083
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.363	VARIANCE	0.132
KURTOSIS	3.792	SKEWNESS	2.295	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 14 MISSING CASES 10

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q12D DESCRIBE THOSE DEALINGS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
TIME CONSUMING	1.	15	62.5	75.0	75.0
NEUTRAL	2.	2	8.3	10.0	85.0
NOT TIME CONSUMING	3.	3	12.5	15.0	100.0
	9.	4	16.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.400	STD ERR	0.169	MEDIAN	1.167
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.754	VARIANCE	0.568
KURTOSIS	1.000	SKEWNESS	1.605	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		
VALID CASES	20	MISSING CASES	4		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q13 AGENCY USES COMPUTERS TO STORE INFOR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
SOMETIMES	2.	18	75.0	75.0	75.0
ALWAYS	3.	5	20.8	20.8	95.8
DON'T KNOW	4.	1	4.2	4.2	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.292	STD ERR	0.112	MEDIAN	2.167
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.550	VARIANCE	0.303
KURTOSIS	2.676	SKEWNESS	1.800	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	24	MISSING CASES	0		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q14 AGENCY USES COMPUTERS TO DISSEMINATE INF

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NEVER	1.	1	4.2	4.3	4.3
SOMETIMES	2.	13	54.2	56.5	60.9
DON'T KNOW	4.	9	37.5	39.1	100.0
	9.	1	4.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.739	STD ERR	0.220	MEDIAN	2.308
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	1.054	VARIANCE	1.111
KURTOSIS	-1.725	SKEWNESS	0.320	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	23	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q15 FOR REPORTERS, COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
UNNECESSARY	1.	9	37.5	39.1	39.1
HELPFUL	2.	14	58.3	60.9	100.0
	9.	1	4.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.609	STD ERR	0.104	MEDIAN	1.679
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.499	VARIANCE	0.249
KURTOSIS	-1.951	SKEWNESS	-0.477	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	23	MISSING CASES	1		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q16A HAVE YOU HAD COMPUTER TRAINING?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NO	1.	16	66.7	69.6	69.6
YES	2.	7	29.2	30.4	100.0
	9.	1	4.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.304	STD ERR	0.098	MEDIAN	1.219
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.470	VARIANCE	0.221
KURTOSIS	-1.291	SKEWNESS	0.911	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 23 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q16B WHAT KIND OF TRAINING?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
COLLEGE	2.	2	8.3	25.0	25.0
TECH SCHOOL	3.	1	4.2	12.5	37.5
PERSONAL	4.	1	4.2	12.5	50.0
ON JOB	5.	4	16.7	50.0	100.0
	9.	16	66.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.875	STD ERR	0.479	MEDIAN	4.500
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.356	VARIANCE	1.839
KURTOSIS	-1.686	SKEWNESS	-0.623	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		

VALID CASES 8 MISSING CASES 16

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q17 YOUR LEVEL OF COMPUTER KNOWLEDGE IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
NONE	1.	5	20.8	21.7	21.7
LOW	2.	16	66.7	69.6	91.3
MODERATE	3.	2	8.3	8.7	100.0
	9.	1	4.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.870	STD ERR	0.114	MEDIAN	1.906
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.548	VARIANCE	0.300
KURTOSIS	0.601	SKEWNESS	-0.110	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 23 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q18 IN YOUR JOB, COMPUTER FAMILIARITY IS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
IRRELEVANT	1.	9	37.5	40.9	40.9
BENEFICIAL	2.	13	54.2	59.1	100.0
	9.	2	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.591	STD ERR	0.107	MEDIAN	1.654
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.503	VARIANCE	0.253
KURTOSIS	-2.037	SKEWNESS	-0.397	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 22 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q19 YOU WOULD PURSUE SUCH TRAINING

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EMPLOYER OPPORTUNITY	2.	11	45.8	50.0	50.0
OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES	3.	8	33.3	36.4	86.4
NO CIRCUMSTANCES	4.	3	12.5	13.6	100.0
	9.	2	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.636	STD ERR	0.155	MEDIAN	2.500
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.727	VARIANCE	0.528
KURTOSIS	-0.682	SKEWNESS	0.704	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	22	MISSING CASES	2		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q20 COMPUTERIZATION OF GOVT DATA HAS MADE IT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
LESS ACCESSIBLE	1.	2	8.3	9.1	9.1
	2.	1	4.2	4.5	13.6
	3.	3	12.5	13.6	27.3
SAME	4.	5	20.8	22.7	50.0
	5.	6	25.0	27.3	77.3
	6.	4	16.7	18.2	95.5
MORE ACCESSIBLE	7.	1	4.2	4.5	100.0
	9.	2	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.273	STD ERR	0.343	MEDIAN	4.500
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.609	VARIANCE	2.589
KURTOSIS	-0.107	SKEWNESS	-0.565	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 22 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q21 WHY DO YOU THINK SO?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EFFICIENT	1.	3	12.5	17.6	17.6
FASTER	2.	2	8.3	11.8	29.4
HUMAN FACTOR	3.	4	16.7	23.5	52.9
EXPERTISE	4.	1	4.2	5.9	58.8
SECRECY	5.	3	12.5	17.6	76.5
	8.	4	16.7	23.5	100.0
	9.	7	29.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.118	STD ERR	0.624	MEDIAN	3.375
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	2.571	VARIANCE	6.610
KURTOSIS	-1.072	SKEWNESS	0.503	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		

VALID CASES 17 MISSING CASES 7

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q22 FUTURE IMPORTANCE OF COMPS ON INV RESEAR

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
SAME	4.	5	20.8	25.0	25.0
	5.	9	37.5	45.0	70.0
	6.	3	12.5	15.0	85.0
INCREASING	7.	3	12.5	15.0	100.0
	9.	4	16.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.200	STD ERR	0.225	MEDIAN	5.056
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	1.005	VARIANCE	1.011
KURTOSIS	-0.490	SKEWNESS	0.594	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	4.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 20 MISSING CASES 4

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q23A THIS EFFECT ON JOURNALISM WILL BE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
DETRIMENTAL	1.	2	8.3	10.0	10.0
	3.	2	8.3	10.0	20.0
NEUTRAL	4.	9	37.5	45.0	65.0
	5.	5	20.8	25.0	90.0
	6.	1	4.2	5.0	95.0
BENEFICIAL	7.	1	4.2	5.0	100.0
	9.	4	16.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	4.100	STD ERR	0.315	MEDIAN	4.167
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.410	VARIANCE	1.989
KURTOSIS	1.474	SKEWNESS	-0.570	RANGE	6.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	7.000		

VALID CASES 20 MISSING CASES 4

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q23B WHY DO YOU THINK SO?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
EFFICIENT	1.	1	4.2	7.7	7.7
FASTER	2.	1	4.2	7.7	15.4
HUMAN FACTOR	3.	2	8.3	15.4	30.8
EXPERTISE	4.	1	4.2	7.7	38.5
SECRECY	5.	4	16.7	30.8	69.2
	8.	4	16.7	30.8	100.0
	9.	11	45.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	5.000	STD ERR	0.670	MEDIAN	4.875
MODE	5.000	STD DEV	2.415	VARIANCE	5.833
KURTOSIS	-1.115	SKEWNESS	0.0	RANGE	7.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	8.000		
VALID CASES	13	MISSING CASES	11		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q24 EDUCATION LEVEL

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
PARTIAL COLLEGE	2.	5	20.8	21.7	21.7
COLLEGE	3.	10	41.7	43.5	65.2
POSTGRADUATE	4.	8	33.3	34.8	100.0
	9.	1	4.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.130	STD ERR	0.158	MEDIAN	3.150
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.757	VARIANCE	0.573
KURTOSIS	-1.140	SKEWNESS	-0.228	RANGE	2.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 23 MISSING CASES 1

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q25 UNION MEMBERSHIP

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
OTHER	2.	9	37.5	42.9	42.9
NONE	3.	12	50.0	57.1	100.0
	9.	3	12.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.571	STD ERR	0.111	MEDIAN	2.625
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	0.507	VARIANCE	0.257
KURTOSIS	-2.115	SKEWNESS	-0.311	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	3.000		

VALID CASES 21 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q26 PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
SDX	1.	4	16.7	19.0	19.0
PRESS CLUB	2.	1	4.2	4.8	23.8
OTHER	3.	8	33.3	38.1	61.9
NONE	4.	8	33.3	38.1	100.0
	9.	3	12.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.952	STD ERR	0.244	MEDIAN	3.188
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	1.117	VARIANCE	1.248
KURTOSIS	-0.533	SKEWNESS	-0.850	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		

VALID CASES 21 MISSING CASES 3

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q27 POLITCIAL PARTY

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
REPUBLICAN	1.	2	8.3	9.5	9.5
DEMOCRAT	2.	12	50.0	57.1	66.7
OTHER	3.	2	8.3	9.5	76.2
NONE	4.	5	20.8	23.8	100.0
	9.	3	12.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	2.476	STD ERR	0.214	MEDIAN	2.208
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	0.981	VARIANCE	0.962
KURTOSIS	-0.791	SKEWNESS	0.600	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	4.000		
VALID CASES	21	MISSING CASES	3		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q28 REGISTERED VOTER?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	18	75.0	81.8	81.8
NO	2.	4	16.7	18.2	100.0
	9.	2	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.182	STD ERR	0.084	MEDIAN	1.111
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.395	VARIANCE	0.156
KURTOSIS	1.250	SKEWNESS	1.773	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 22 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q29 VOTED IN 1976 ELECTION?

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
YES	1.	19	79.2	86.4	86.4
NO	2.	3	12.5	13.6	100.0
	9.	2	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.136	STD ERR	0.075	MEDIAN	1.079
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.351	VARIANCE	0.123
KURTOSIS	3.498	SKEWNESS	2.278	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		

VALID CASES 22 MISSING CASES 2

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q30 SEX

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
MALE	1.	17	70.8	77.3	77.3
FEMALE	2.	5	20.8	22.7	100.0
	9.	2	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.227	STD ERR	0.091	MEDIAN	1.147
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	0.429	VARIANCE	0.184
KURTOSIS	-0.057	SKEWNESS	1.399	RANGE	1.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	2.000		
VALID CASES	22	MISSING CASES	2		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q31 AGE

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
20-30	2.	5	20.8	22.7	22.7
30-40	3.	9	37.5	40.9	63.6
40-50	4.	4	16.7	18.2	81.8
50+	5.	4	16.7	18.2	100.0
	9.	2	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	3.318	STD ERR	0.222	MEDIAN	3.167
MODE	3.000	STD DEV	1.041	VARIANCE	1.084
KURTOSIS	-0.890	SKEWNESS	0.397	RANGE	3.000
MINIMUM	2.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		
VALID CASES	22	MISSING CASES	2		

FREQUENCIES ON SURVEY DATA
FREQUENCIES BY EACH NEWSPAPER
FILE THESIS (CREATION DATE = 05/11/78) SURVEY
SUBFILE FOUR

Q32 ETHNIC BACKGROUND

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
CAUCASIAN	1.	19	79.2	86.4	86.4
MEX-AMER	3.	1	4.2	4.5	90.9
ASIAN	4.	1	4.2	4.5	95.5
OTHER	5.	1	4.2	4.5	100.0
	9.	2	8.3	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	24	100.0	100.0	

MEAN	1.409	STD ERR	0.234	MEDIAN	1.079
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.098	VARIANCE	1.206
KURTOSIS	6.040	SKEWNESS	2.628	RANGE	4.000
MINIMUM	1.000	MAXIMUM	5.000		
VALID CASES	22	MISSING CASES	2		