MEDIA STRUCTURE AND AUDIENCE INFLUENCES ON CHANNEL REPERTOIRE

Douglas A. Ferguson

Department of Telecommunications
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403
419-372-6007

FERGUSON at BGSUOPIE

Elizabeth M. Perse

Department of Communication
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
302-831-8041

BWH20160 at UDELVM

First Place Paper (Open Category)
in the Research Division

Presented at the annual meeting of the
Broadcast Education Association
April 1992

Running Head: ACTIVE REPERTOIRE

Media Structure and Audience Influences on Channel Repertoire

Channel repertoire is the number of available television channels that viewers choose to watch, typically fewer than a dozen. The operative word is *choose*, because choice of favored channels is active rather than passive, especially as the number of possible choices has mushroomed in recent years. As a result, channel repertoire is one element of the "new media environment" (Webster, 1986) that embodies the concept of selectivity. This paper argues that channel repertoire is one framework for understanding audience activity and selectivity.

There are practical reasons to study channel repertoire. Competitive considerations implore the broadcast and cable channels to have "top of the mind" awareness. As compression technologies promise 400-channel cable television systems, the need for channels to attract loyal viewers increases in a fragmented environment. Merely discovering that viewers are unable to comprehend tens of channels, let alone hundred of channels, may give solace to media practitioners thrust into future shock. Auletta (1991) outlined the revolutionary impact of channel fragmentation on the Big Three networks.

The theoretical implications of channel repertoire are even more compelling. The portrayal of viewers as passive couch potatoes has been popular for many years because watching television involves some nonselective behavior. Bechtel, Achepohl, and Akers (1971) found that people engage in a variety of activities while watching television. Viewing is not necessarily active. Moreover, the universe of options in the multichannel environment is determined by the situation (e.g., cable, VCR, independent channels). But a small number of channels, chosen from a much larger set of available channels, suggests that audiences in the new media environment may be actively and selectively choosing their television options (Ferguson, 1990).

Past research on channel repertoire used different definitions based on method. *General* channel repertoire simply asks how many channels are viewed regularly, without reference to particular channel identification. The answer is more likely to be a guess because the response is not grounded by specific recollection. *Aided* channel repertoire presents a roster of channels from which a repertoire can be recalled. The answer is more accurate but does not distinguish between salient channels and less memorable channels. *Unaided* channel repertoire asks which channels are viewed regularly, without any assistance. The answer is the best conceptualization of channel repertoire but is susceptible to temporary memory lapse that may omit salient channels. Greenberg, Heeter, and Lin (1988) noted "unaided recall provides a smaller set of channels in the channel repertoire of the individual viewer" (p. 197).

Total channel repertoire

Total channel repertoire (TCR) is the number of channels that viewers remember watching if aided recall is used. From May 1981 data, Nielsen (1982) observed that viewers watched only 8 channels from an offering of 25 channels. Heeter and Greenberg (1988) noted "one individual's repertoire of 10 regular channels may be very different from another's repertoire" (p. 38). Lochte and Warren (1989) studied TCR and suggested future research into the use of remote control devices (RCDs).

Remote control devices are an increasingly important element of the new media environment (Walker & Bellamy, 1991). Remote control penetration in 1990 had reached 77.0% of television households in the United States (Shagrin, 1990), compared with 70.2% VCR penetration ("In Brief," 1991) and 61.2% cable penetration (Sheridan, 1991).

Ainslie (1988) reported on "grazing" (flipping through channels with remote control devices) as a new way of watching television. Drawing on a

national sample of 650 adult respondents surveyed by Frank N. Magid Associates, Ainslie found that two major motivations for grazing were boredom and concern for missing a better program on another channel.

Heeter (1985) found that TCR is predicted by cable television subscription. Ainslie (1988) reported that viewers with remote control devices have significantly higher TCRs than viewers without RCDs. Ferguson (1992) confirmed these structural variables (cable subscription and RCD use) and measured RCD motivations suggested by Ainslie (1988). Walker and Bellamy (1991) also identified motivations for RCD use, many of which may predict TCR.

Wenner (1990) found that RCD use is related to greater affinity for television. It is reasonable to expect that the amount of viewing and higher levels of channel changing would also be related to RCD use and total channel repertoire.

The first hypothesis of the study focused on Total Channel Repertoire. We expected that TCR would be explained by structural variables such as cable subscription and VCR ownership and by television behaviors, such as higher overall television viewing, greater affinity for the medium, and higher levels of channel changing. Because TCR reflects a base level awareness of program content, we predicted that:

H1: Total Channel Repertoire will be predicted by: (a) cable subscription, RCD ownership and VCR ownership, (b) higher levels of television exposure, affinity, and channel changing.

Active Channel Repertoire

Active channel repertoire (ACR) is the number of channels that viewers freely recall watching (i.e., unaided). Active channel repertoire is generally smaller than total channel repertoire (Greenberg, Heeter, & Lin,

1988). Based on models of free recall in cognitive psychology, ACR indicates that channels have been accessed frequently, recently, or committed to long-term memory (Klatzky, 1980). Active CR also reflects a more mindful and active use of television, because channels are remembered without prompts and at top of mind. Thus, viewers will more aware of channels whose programs were actively processed during exposure (Bahrick, 1979).

Active CR is similar to channel familiarity, or the number of channels with which a viewer is familiar (Greenberg & Heeter, 1988). Channel familiarity is assessed by asking respondents to freely indicate the channels they remember being able to receive (Greenberg, Srigley, Baldwin, & Heeter, 1988; Heeter, 1985, 1988). In general, awareness of channel alternatives is due to a more active use of television. Heeter (1985, 1988) observed that channel familiarity is related to lower levels of habitual television use and predicted by greater use of program guides, higher levels of channel changing, searching for programs to watch by changing channels sequentially, and checking all channels before making a decision. But, channel familiarity differs from ACR because, although we expect that viewers will be more familiar with the channels they watch, some viewers may be aware of channels (especially high profile cable channels such as CNN, ESPN, and MTV) that they do not watch.

It is clear that ACR is also influenced by structural and media use variables. Cable subscription and VCR ownership increase channel options and greater television exposure increases opportunity to watch different channels. But, because ACR reflects a more active and intentional use of television, higher ACR should be related to higher levels of audience activity.

Audience Activity

Audience activity describes how intentionally and purposely people select and use media technologies and content. Audience activity has been a central assumption of the uses and gratifications perspective (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974). Audience members were seen as active because they select and use media content to satisfy specific communication needs. Blumler (1979), however, expanded understanding of audience activity by suggesting that audience members are variably active along several different dimensions: utility, intentionality, selectivity, and imperviousness to influence. Levy and Windahl (1984, 1985) also demonstrated that audience activity has a temporal dimension, occurring before, during, and after media exposure. Scholars have investigated influences on audience activity (Levy & Windahl, 1984; Perse, 1990a; Rubin & Perse, 1987b), outcomes of audience activity (Perse, 1990b; Rubin & Perse, 1987a), and audience activity in the newer media environment (Ferguson, 1992; Levy, 1987; Lin, 1990; Perse, 1990a). This study considered three specific aspects of audience activity. We expected that audience intentionality, effort, and motivations for changing channels would influence ACR.

Intentional media use is planned and purposive. Intentionality is reflected in program guide use (Gantz & Eastman, 1983) and "making appointments" to watch news (Levy, 1978) and soap operas (Lemish, 1985). Intentionality is associated with greater attention to programs during exposure (Rubin, Perse, & Taylor, 1988). Because intentionality is linked to greater awareness of programming alternatives and schedules and plans to watch specific programs, intentionality should be associated with greater awareness of the channels that are watched.

Effort is goal-directed cognitive activity. Cognitive effort directs selective attention to specific aspects of a situation (Kahneman, 1973). Effort is reflected in conscious, controlled, and voluntary mental activity (Shiffrin & Schneider, 1977). Effort also influences what children learn from print and television (Salomon & Leigh, 1984). Because effort marks greater attention and awareness, we expect cognitive effort to be associated with awareness of channels watched.

Overall levels of channel changing should have an impact on total CR (Ainslie, 1988; Ferguson, 1992; Heeter, 1985). However, channel changing is not necessarily related to active CR. Channel changing is still theoretically ambiguous. On one hand, high levels of flipping could reflect an active viewer who is constantly reevaluating program offerings during television exposure (e.g., Heeter, 1985). Alternately, changing is part of a distracted use of television marked by lower levels of attention (Perse, 1990a).

Recent research has noted that viewers change channels for a variety of different reasons (Ainslie, 1988; Ferguson, 1992; Walker & Bellamy, 1991). Reasons for changing channels are related differentially to levels of channel changing (Walker & Bellamy, 1991). Most recently, Ferguson (1992) observed that a measure that most likely assessed ACR was unrelated to overall levels of channel changing, but positively related to specific reasons for changing channels. Active CR should be influenced more by reasons for changing channels that reflect a goal-directed search for specific programming content.

Instrumental and ritualistic viewing motives. Rubin (1984) argued that television viewing motives are a primary signal of audience activity. Ritualistic television use, which is marked by watching to pass time or out of

habit, is a nonselective and less active use of television that focuses on using television as a medium, not specific content. Instrumental use, on the other hand, reflects selective and purposive exposure to specific content (see also Rubin & Perse, 1987b). Ritualistic and Instrumental viewing motives should be linked differentially to TCR and ACR.

Ritualistic viewing motives, especially watching to pass the time or out of habit, are related to higher levels of exposure to television and exposure to a wide variety of different program types (Rubin, 1981, 1983, 1984). So, ritualistic viewing motives should be positively related to TCR. But, ritualistic motives may not be related to awareness of the channels watched. Heeter (1985) reported that many people claimed that they didn't know which channels they watched, "I don't know, I just watch TV" (p. 22). She observed that channel familiarity was negatively linked to viewing television for habitual reasons. Ritualistic viewing motives should be associated to lower ACR because ritualistic television use is inattentive to content and accompanied by distracting activities (Perse, 1990a; Rubin & Perse, 1987b).

Instrumental viewing motives, such as viewing to seek information, entertainment, and excitement, are also related to higher levels of television exposure (Rubin, 1981, 1983) and exposure to several different program types, such as news, action-adventure, comedy, documentaries, magazine shows, drama, serials, sports, and talk shows, and game shows (Rubin, 1981, 1983; Rubin & Rubin, 1982). Clearly, these different program types are found on a variety of different channels.

Unlike ritualistic motives, instrumental motives should be linked to greater awareness of the channels that are watched, because instrumental use of television is more active and aware. Rubin and Perse (1987a), for example, observed a connection between instrumental soap opera viewing motives and

program viewing intention and greater attention to the programs. Similarly, watching local news for informational reasons predicted cognitive involvement with program content (Rubin & Perse, 1987b). In general, an instrumental use of television is reflected in more use of program guides to plan viewing, greater planning of time to watch specific programs, and more thought about program content (Perse, 1990a). The greater planning, effort, and awareness suggests that instrumental television use would be associated with higher ACR.

The second hypothesis of the study focused on Active Channel Repertoire. We expected that ACR would be explained only in part by media environment and television behaviors. Because ACR reflects a mindful and aware use of program content, we predicted that:

H2: Active Channel Repertoire will be predicted by: (a) cable subscription, RCD ownership, and VCR ownership, (b) higher levels of television exposure and affinity, (c) higher levels of instrumental viewing motives and lower levels of ritualistic viewing motives, and (d) higher levels of viewing intention, effort, and more salient reasons to change channels to seek specific program content.

Method

Procedure and Sample

A random-digit-dialing telephone survey was conducted in Spring 1991 among adults living off-campus in [a university town in the Midwest]. Out of the 813 valid attempts (excluding business numbers and no answers), there were 615 completions and 198 refusals, for a 75.6% completion rate. The sample was 45.1% male and ranged in age from 17 - 93 (M = 36.27, SD = 17.01). The average respondent had completed 14.45 years of education (ranging from 8 - 20 years, SD = 2.45). Hollingshead's two-factor social position index measured

occupational level (Miller, 1983) and ranged from 1 - 88 (M = 62.29, SD = 22.51).

Channel Repertoire

Total channel repertoire was operationalized as the sum of all channels for which at least some response (in hours) was given. The possible range was from 0 to 44 channels, given the capacity of the only cable system in the sampling area during the survey. Total channel repertoire ranged from 0 - 38 (M = 9.96, SD = 6.18). Active channel repertoire, on the other hand, was defined as the sum of the broadcast channels and the unaided responses. Active channel repertoire ranged from 0 - 38 (M = 6.53, SD = 3.23).

Structural Variables

Because media structure has an impact on the number of channels available for viewing, we considered three main media structure variables in this study: cable subscription, RCD ownership, and VCR ownership. Of the sample, 68.7% subscribed to cable, 73.5% reported owning a remote control device, and 76.9% had access to a VCR where they lived.

Television Behaviors

Television exposure. Respondents indicated how many hours they viewed "yesterday" and "on a typical day." Averaged numbers of hours ranged from 0 to 17 (M = 2.98, SD = 2.24).

Television affinity. Respondents expressed their agreement (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree) with five statements drawn from past research (Perse, 1990a; Rubin, 1983) that concern perceptions of television's importance.[1] Averaged affinity scores ranged from 1.00 - 3.20 (M = 1.85, SD = 0.46, Cronbach alpha = .77).

Channel changing. Ferguson (1992) reported on the unreliability of asking respondents to indicate how many times per hour they change channels.

Such mundane behavior is difficult to recall precisely. Instead, respondents with RCDs described their frequency (1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = often, 4 = very often) to the question "How often do you flip channels?" The mean score was 2.37 (SD = 0.81).

Viewing Motives

Respondents indicated their agreement (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree) with 16 statements about their own reasons for watching television. The 16 statements were drawn from larger sets of television viewing motivations (Rubin, 1983). These statements were selected because they were items that loaded on instrumental and ritualistic motive factors in previous research (Perse, 1990a).[2] Eight items concerned watching television for ritualistic reasons, pass time, habit, companionship, and escape. Eight items focused on instrumental reasons, entertainment, excitement, learning, and social utility. A principle components analysis with varimax rotation identified two factors that accounted for 39.9% of the variance and supported the conceptual distinction between ritualistic and instrumental motives.

Item responses were averaged to create scale scores. Ritualistic reasons ranged from 1.00 - 3.63 (M = 2.44, SD = 0.48, alpha = .83). Instrumental reasons scores ranged from 1.00 - 3.63 (M = 2.59, SD = .33, alpha = .68).

Audience Activity

Intentionality. To assess intentionality, or planning television exposure, respondents indicated their agreement (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree) with five statements drawn from previous research (Rubin & Perse, 1987a).[3] Average intentionality scores ranged from 1.00 - 3.80 (M = 2.26, SD = 0.49, alpha = .81).

Effort. Effort was assessed with a three-item scale adapted from Salomon and Leigh (1984). Respondents marked their agreement (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree) with the following statements: "When I watch television, I usually think hard, like I'm studying a book"; "When I watch television, I try to concentrate on the program"; and "I put a lot of mental effort into my television viewing." Averaged effort scores ranged from 1.00 - 3.33 (M = 2.17, SD = 0.43). The three-item scale was only moderately reliable (alpha = .57).

Channel changing motivations. A six-item scale was adapted from RCD motivations identified by Ainslie (1988) and Walker & Bellamy (1991). Respondents identified their RCD motivations for flipping through channels: (1) to watch news, (2) to watch music videos, (3) to peek at other programs out of curiosity, (4) to watch two or more channels at the same time, (5) to avoid commercials, and (6) to avoid certain persons on television.[4] These RCD "changing motives" were indicated by verbal frequencies (4 = very often, 3 = usually, 2 = seldom and 1 = never). Changing motive scores ranged from 1.00 - 3.44 (M = 2.33, SD = 0.92, alpha = .70).

Statistical Analysis

After scale construction, there were two stages to data analysis. First, pearson and partial correlations (controlling for demographic variables of age, sex, education, and occupational level) were computed to explore the bivariate associations between the variables of the investigation. Second, hierarchical multiple regression was used to test the two hypotheses of the study. In all cases, demographics were entered on the first step to control for any variance they might contribute to the equation. Because RCD ownership was so highly correlated with both flipping frequency and reasons for changing

channels, it was excluded from the analyses. All analyses, then, included only those respondents who owned remote control devices (n = 452).

Results

Bivariate Relationships Pearson correlations provide preliminary support for the study's hypotheses.

Table 1 about here

Total CR is related to cable subscription (r = .58, p < .001), television exposure (r = .33, p < .001), television affinity (r = .34, p < .001), and to levels of channel changing (r = .12, p < .05). Active CR is linked to cable subscription (r = .33, p < .001), television exposure (r = .19, p < .001), affinity (r = .15, p < .01), instrumental viewing motives (r = .21, p < .001), intention (r = .21, p < .001), effort (r = .22, p < .001), and motives for changing channels (r = .20, p < .001). These relationships remain significant after controlling for age, sex, education, and occupational level.

Predicting Total Channel Repertoire

The first hypothesis predicted that total channel repertoire would be explained by media structure and television behaviors. Hierarchical multiple regression was used to test the hypothesis. Demographic variables (age, sex, education, and occupational level) were entered on the first step to control for any variance they might contribute to total channel repertoire. The regression is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 about here

The demographics accounted for only 1.7% of the variance on the first step. At this stage, education was a significant negative predictor. At the second step, the media structure variables (cable subscription and VCR ownership) accounted for a significant increase of 33.8% of the variance. Cable subscription was a significant, positive predictor. The television behaviors, entered at the third step, added an additional 9.2% ($p < .001$) to the variance. At this step, education was no longer a significant contributor to the equation.

The final equation accounted for 44.7% of the variance in TCR ($R = .67$, adjusted $R^2 = 43.5\%$) and supported the first hypothesis. Cable subscription ($ß = .53$, $p < .001$), television exposure ($ß = .21$, $p < .001$), television affinity ($ß = .14$, $p < .001$), and levels of channel changing ($ß = .14$, $p < .001$) were significant positive contributors.

Predicting Active Channel Repertoire

The second hypothesis predicted that ACR is an outcome of a mindful and aware use of television and linked to instrumental viewing motives and higher levels of audience activity. Hierarchical multiple regression tested the second hypothesis. Once again, demographics were entered on the first step.

Age, sex, education, and occupational level accounted for 3.8% ($p < .01$) in the variance in ACR. Sex (male) was a significant predictor. At step two, the media structure variables accounted for an additional 11.4% of the variance ($p < .001$). Cable subscription became a significant, positive predictor. The television behaviors, entered at step three, added 3.8% to the variance ($p < .001$). Television exposure and levels of channel changing entered the equation as significant, positive predictors. Television viewing motives accounted for an additional 2.3% to the variance at step four ($p < .01$). Instrumental motives were significant, positive predictors.

Levels of channel changing dropped out of the equation at this step. At step five, measures of audience activity added 3.3% to the variance ($p < .001$).

The final equation accounted for 24.5% of the variance in ACR ($R = .50$, adjusted $R^2 = 21.8\%$) and partially supported the second hypothesis. Sex (male, $\beta = -.15$, $p < .01$) and television affinity ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .05$) were significant, negative predictors. Effort ($\beta = .14$, $p < .01$), motives for changing channels ($\beta = .13$, $p < .05$), intentionality ($\beta = .12$, $p < .05$), and instrumental viewing motives ($\beta = .10$, $p < .05$) were significant, positive contributors to the equation.

Discussion

The results of our study support prior findings. Channel repertoires, in general, are rather limited. Although cable subscribers in our sample were able to receive 44 different channels, most watched only a small set of the channels. Clearly, not all viewers avail themselves of greater programming options. Media policy analysts should be aware that availability and use are not synonymous. Future research should consider how to encourage viewers to increase their channel repertoires.

The distinction between "total" and "active" channel repertoire produced some useful comparisons in this study. As we expected, ACR is smaller than TCR. People keep a smaller set of channels at the top of their minds. Moreover, the conceptual difference contributes to theoretical considerations of the perceptions of viewers. The idea of total channel repertoire suggests that people "specialize" their television viewing such that the number of available channels is far less important than the desirability of additional choices. Active channel repertoire, on the other hand, suggests that viewers' "perceived repertoire" is more telling than their actual repertoire.

Availability of newer technologies (cable and RCD ownership) was the most substantial predictor of both TCR and ACR. Contrary to our prediction, VCR ownership was unrelated to CR. Although VCRs increase the activity with which viewers' use television (Levy, 1987; Lin, 1990), the results of our study do not support the idea that VCR ownership increases channel selectivity. Future research might consider whether kinds of use of time-shifted materials or reasons for using VCRs might influence channel repertoire (Levy & Fink, 1984; Rubin & Bantz, 1987).

Even though media structure (especially cable television) remains the most important predictor of both kinds of channel repertoire, *how* people use television adds significantly, as does *why* people watch and *how actively* they watch. The levels of exposure are consistent for TCR and ACR, but affinity appears to differentiate channel repertoires. Viewers who enjoy television report higher TCR, as one might expect. We found, however, that affinity decreases somewhat with ACR.

Perhaps the typical viewer's unaided impression of choice is negative. This is another example of perceived reality affecting the evaluation of television quality. The new media environment may grow into hundreds of channels without substantially increasing the viewers' appreciation for quality along with the quantity.

The influence of television viewing motivations and affinity also point out that channel repertoire can be explained, in part, by instrumental television viewing. Our results support the conceptualization of instrumental television viewing as an active, content-oriented use of television. Instrumental viewing motives were significant predictors of larger active channel repertoires, or awareness of programming options. And, similar to

past research (Rubin, 1984), television affinity, or importance of the medium, is less important to instrumental viewers than aspects of specific content.

The results of this study also support the importance of audience activity as an intervening variable in media use (Blumler, 1979; Levy & Windahl, 1985). Increased activity, especially planning and effort, predict greater awareness of programming alternatives. Future research should continue to explore the role of audience activity before, during, and after television exposure (Levy, 1987; Lin, 1990; Perse, 1990a). Kubey and Csikszentmihalyi (1990) studied activity during exposure and portrayed audiences as passive, but their data came mainly from 1976-1977 when cable television was rare, RCDs more rare, and VCRs nearly nonexistent (p. 44).

RCD channel changing had an effect on total channel repertoire, as we hypothesized. Our inability to detect similar effects on ACR was disappointing. One possible explanation is that "grazing" is less intense among channels that are best remembered. The differential influence of channel changing on TCR and ACR reinforces the theoretical ambiguity of channel changing. On one hand, channel changing is a sign of greater selectivity and reevaluation of programs (Heeter, 1985). On the other hand, channel changing also appears to signal a less attentive use of television (Perse, 1990a). The results of this study suggest that higher levels of channel changing can increase TCR somewhat. Grazing may expose viewers to channels with which they would be otherwise unfamiliar.

Overall levels of channel changing, however, appear to have little impact on ACR, or awareness of different channels. Instead, the reasons for changing channels are linked to ACR. Similar to earlier research (Ferguson, 1992), reasons for changing channels that focus on specific content options (e.g., to follow more than one program at a time or to avoid commercials)

predict ACR. Future research should continue to uncover different reasons for channel changing and their impact on media uses and effects (Ainslie, 1988; Ferguson, 1992; Walker & Bellamy, 1991).

The results of this study offer some insight into the impact of newer technologies on traditional media effects (Bryant, 1986; Webster, 1986). First, there is evidence that television viewers may be increasing in channel selectivity. Our respondents, for the most part, chose only a small subset of available channels to watch. Second, newer television technologies, especially cable and remote control devices, increase channel repertoire. With these choice-increasing technologies, viewers may encounter fewer consistent television messages in news and entertainment.

The results of this study, then, suggest that channel repertoire may be an important variable in media effects because larger TCR may mean exposure to more diverse messages. But, the distinction between TCR and ACR also has implications for media effects. Future research might explore whether higher ACR decreases media effects because active and aware viewers are more obstinate to media effects (Blumler, 1979). On the other hand, higher ACR might increase some outcomes because viewers are actively involved with and processing television messages (Perse, 1990b; Rubin & Perse, 1987a).

The findings in this study are subject to the usual limitations of telephone survey research. Future work should include fewer predictor variables, although the intercorrelations found here were not large enough to cause problems with multicollinearity. Although cable penetration has stabilized somewhat (Sheridan, 1991), research should continue to explore changes in and influences on TCR and ACR. Longitudinal studies suggest that cable subscribers learn about, use, and appreciate more specialized channels over time (Sparkes & Kang, 1986). Clearly channel repertoire is not stagnant, but evolves as media structure and audience activity change.

Notes

[1]The five affinity statements were: "I would rather watch TV than do anything else," "I could easily do without television for several days" (recoded), "I would feel lost without television to watch," "Whenever I'm unable to watch television, I really miss it," and "Watching television is one of the more important things I do each day."

[2]The eight ritualistic statements were: (I watch television) "Because it gives me something to occupy my time," "Just because it's on," "When I have nothing better to do," "When there's no on else to talk to be with," "Because it passes the time away, particularly when I'm bored," "So I can get away from the family or others," "Because it makes me feel less lonely," and "Because it's a habit, just something I do.

The eight instrumental reasons were: (I watch television) "Because it helps me learn things about myself and others," "Because it entertains me," "Because it's thrilling," "Because it's enjoyable," "So I can talk with others about what's on," "Because it's exciting," "Because it amuses me," and "So I can learn about what could happen to me.

[3]The five intentionality items were: "I often make arrangements so I don't miss a favorite television program," "I look forward to watching a favorite TV program," "I plan my time so I do not miss a favorite TV program," "I often check the time so that I won't miss a favorite TV program, and "I usually plan my evening so I don't miss television."

[4]The six channel changing motives were: How often do you follow more than one program at a time using the remote control? How often do you avoid commercials using the remote control to change channels? How often do you change channels because you want to peek at other programs? How often to you change channels to watch music videos? How often do you change channels to look around for the news? How often do you change channels to avoid obnoxious people on TV?

References

Ainslie, P. (1988, September). Confronting a nation of grazers. Channels: The Business of Communications, pp. 54-62.

Auletta, K. (1991). Three blind mice. New York: Random House.

Bahrick, H. P. (1979). Broader methods and narrower theories for memory research: Comments on the papers by Eysenck and Cermak. In L. S. Cermak & F. I. M. Craik (Eds.), Levels of processing in human memory (pp. 141-156). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bechtel, R. B., Achepohl, C., & Akers, R. (1971). Correlates between observed behavior and questionnaire responses on television viewing. In E. A. Rubenstein, G. Comstock, & J. P. Murray (Eds.), Television and social behavior, Television in day-to-day life: Patterns of use (Vol. 4). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Blumler, J. G. (1979). The role of theory in uses and gratifications studies. Communication Research, 6, 9-36.

Bryant, J. (1986). The road most traveled: Yet another cultivation critique. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 30, 231-235.

Ferguson, D. A. (1992). Channel repertoire in the presence of remote control devices, VCRs, and cable television. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 36, 83-91.

Ferguson, D. A. (1990). Selective exposure to television: Predicting inheritance effects from VCR and cable penetration. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association.

Gantz, W., & Eastman, S. T. (1983). Viewer uses of promotional media to find out about television programs. Journal of Broadcasting, 27, 269-277.

Greenberg, B. S., & Heeter, C. (1988). Conclusions and a research agenda. In C. Heeter & B. S. Greenberg (Eds.), Cableviewing (pp. 289-305). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Greenberg, B. S., Heeter, C., & Lin, C. A. (1988). Playboy viewing styles. In C. Heeter & B. S. Greenberg (Eds.), Cableviewing (pp. 191-203). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Greenberg, B. S., Srigley, R., Baldwin, T. F., & Heeter, C. (1988). Free system-specific cable guides as an incentive. In C. Heeter & B. S. Greenberg (Eds.), Cableviewing (pp. 264-288). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Heeter, C. (1985). Program selection with abundance of choice: A process model. Human Communication Research, 12, 125-152.

Heeter, C. (1988). The choice process model. In C. Heeter & B. S. Greenberg (Eds.), Cableviewing (pp. 11-32). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Heeter, C., & Greenberg, B. S. (1988). Cableviewing. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

In Brief. (1991, February 11). Broadcasting, p. 97.

Kahneman, D. (1973). Attention and effort. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1974). Utilization of mass communication by the individual. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research (pp. 19-32). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Klatzky, R. L. (1980). Human memory: Structures and processes (2nd ed.). New York: Freeman.

Kubey, R., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). Television and the quality of life: How viewing shapes everday experience. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lemish, D. (1985). Soap opera viewing in college: A naturalistic inquiry. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 29, 275-293.

Levy, M. R. (1978). The audience experience with television news. Journalism Monographs, 55.

Levy, M. R. (1987). VCR use and the concept of audience activity. Communication Quarterly, 35, 267-275.

Levy, M. R., & Fink, E. L. (1984). Home vide recorders and the transience of television broadcasts. Journal of Communication, 34(2), 56-71.

Levy, M. R., & Windahl, S. (1984). Audience activity and gratifications: A conceptual clarification and exploration. Communication Research, 11, 51-78.

Levy, M. R., & Windahl, S. (1985). The concept of audience activity. In K. E. Rosengren, L. A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), Media gratifications research: Current perspectives on gratifications research (pp. 109-122). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lin, C. A. (1990). Audience activity and VCR use. In J. R. Dobrow (Ed.), Social & cultural aspects of VCR use (pp. 75-92). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lochte, R. H., & Warren, J. (1989). A channel repertoire for TVRO satellite viewers. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 33, 91-95.

Miller, D. C. (1983). Hollingshead's two factor index of social position. In Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement (pp. 300-308). New York: Longman.

Nielsen, A. C. Jr. (1982). The outlook for electronic media. Journal of Advertising Research, 22(6), 9-16.

Perse, E. M. (1990a). Audience selectivity and involvement in the newer media environment. Communication Research, 17, 675-697.

Perse, E. M. (1990b). Media involvement and local news effects. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 34, 17-36.

Rubin, A. M. (1981). An examination of television viewing motivations. Communication Research, 8, 141-165.

Rubin, A. M. (1983). Television uses and gratifications: The interactions of viewing patterns and motivations. Journal of Broadcasting, 27, 37-51.

Rubin, A. M. (1984). Ritualized and instrumental television viewing. Journal of Communication, 34(3), 67-77.

Rubin, A. M., & Bantz, C. R. (1987). Utility of videocassette recorders. American Behavioral Scientist, 30, 167-185.

Rubin, A. M., & Perse, E. M. (1987a). Audience activity and soap opera involvement: A uses and effects investigation. Human Communication Research, 14, 246-268.

Rubin, A. M., & Perse, E. M. (1987b). Audience activity and television news gratifications. Communication Research, 14, 58-84.

Rubin, A. M., Perse, E. M., & Taylor, D. S. (1988). A methodological examination of cultivation. Communication Research, 15, 107-134.

Rubin, A. M., & Rubin, R. B. (1982). Older persons' TV viewing patterns and motivations. Communication Research, 9, 287-313.

Salomon, G., & Leigh, T. (1984). Predispositions about learning from print and television. Journal of Communication, 34(2), 119-135.

Shagrin, C. (Spring, 1990). On the trail of the elusive 90's viewer. Nielsen Newscast, pp. 2-3.

Sheridan, P. J. (1991, July 1). FCC report concedes TV's future to cable. Broadcasting, pp. 19-20.

Shiffrin, R. M., & Schneider, W. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: II. Perceptual learning, automatic attending, and a general theory. Psychological Review, 84, 127-190.

Sparkes, V. M., & Kang, N. (1986). Public reactions to cable television: Time in the diffusion process. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 30, 213-229.

Walker, J. R., & Bellamy, R. V. (1991). The gratifications of grazing: An exploratory study of remote control use. Journalism Quarterly, 68, 422-431.

Webster, J. G. (1986). Audience behavior in the new media environment. Journal of Communication, 36(3), 77-91.

Wenner, L. A. (1990, November). In our hands, in our lives: Remote control and the audience relationship with television. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, Chicago.

Table 1

Pearson and Partial Correlations

	CAB	VCR	TV	AFF	CHA	RIT	INS	INT	EFF	CHM	TOT	ACT
VCR Own	.09	--										
	.09											
TV Exp	.11	-.08	--									
	.13	-.05										
Affinity	.16	-.06	.44	--								
	.17	-.03	.40									
Change	-.01	-.13	-.06	-.03	--							
	.01	-.14	-.01	.03								
Ritual	.00	-.05	.20	.27	.29	--						
	.03	-.05	.20	.33	.23							
Instru	.08	-.01	.15	.24	.08	.16	--					
	.10	-.02	.17	.28	.03	.12						
Intent	.10	-.04	.36	.57	.00	.20	.29	--				
	.11	-.02	.35	.56	.00	.21	.30					
Effort	.08	-.07	.17	.46	.04	-.02	.30	.32	--			
	.08	-.06	.14	.43	.07	.00	.32	.31				
Ch Mot	.14	-.02	.01	.03	.64	.31	.16	.06	.07	--		
	.18	-.04	.07	.12	.57	.22	.11	.08	.11			
Tot CR	.58	.00	.33	.34	.12	.16	.25	.24	.24	.27	--	
	.59	.01	.32	.32	.14	.17	.26	.23	.22	.32		
Act CR	.33	.06	.19	.15	.09	.09	.21	.21	.22	.20	.50	--
	.33	.05	.22	.16	.09	.13	.21	.22	.20	.21	.51	
Age	.07	-.06	.14	.26	-.33	-.27	-.14	.06	.14	-.38	.07	.02
Sex	-.03	-.05	.12	.04	-.19	.06	-.04	-.01	-.11	-.17	-.03	-.19
Educ	.08	.10	-.22	-.18	-.09	-.25	-.09	-.11	-.11	-.12	-.07	.06
Occup	-.01	-.07	-.07	.00	.20	.05	-.01	.02	-.08	.14	-.01	-.02

Note. Zero-order correlations are in first row. The second row reports 4th-order correlations, controlling for age, sex, education, and occupational level.

r = .10, p < .05; r = .13, p < .01; r = .16, p < .001.

Table 2

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Summary:

Regressing Channel Repertoire

		Total Channel Rep			Active Channel Rep		
	Step Entered	R^2	R^2 Change	Final ß	R^2	R^2 Change	Final ß
Demographics	1	.02	.02		.04	.04**	
Age				.02			.08
Sex				-.03			-.15**
Education				-.04			.08
Occupation				.00			-.03
Media Structure	2	.36	.34***		.15	.11***	
Cable Subscription				.53***			.28***
VCR Ownership				-.01			.04
Television Behaviors	3	.45	.09***		.19	.04***	
TV Exposure				.21***			.14**
TV Affinity				.14***			-.14*
Channel Changing				.14***			.00
Viewing Motives	4				.21	.02***	
Ritualistic							.08
Instrumental							.10*
Audience Activity	5				.24	.03***	
Intentionality							.12*
Effort							.14**
Changing Motives							.13*

Note. Step 1: $F(4, 419) = 1.76$, $p = .14$. $F(4, 402) = 3.99$, $p < .01$.
Step 2: $F(6, 417) = 38.28$, $p < .001$. $F(6, 400) = 11.95$, $p < .001$.
Step 3: $F(9, 414) = 37.14$, $p < .001$. $F(9, 397) = 10.31$, $p < .001$.
Step 4: $F(11, 395) = 9.66$, $p < .001$.
Step 5: $F(14, 392) = 9.07$, $p < .001$.

***$p < .001$. ** $p < .01$. *$p < .05$.