

How
Journalists
See Journalists

in 2004

VIEWS ON PROFITS, PERFORMANCE AND POLITICS



FOREWORD

News organizations today are facing pressures that could not even be imagined a decade ago. Competition is growing ever fiercer as the media choices available for Americans proliferate. The pressures may be greatest on the people who bring Americans the news – executives, editors and reporters at national and local news organizations.

To understand how they view the changing media landscape and their own performance, the Pew Research Center for The People & The Press and the Project for Excellence in Journalism conducted a major survey of journalists. We drew samples from national and local news organizations in print, television, radio, and the Internet, interviewing 547 working journalists, editors, and news executives.

This survey builds on surveys conducted in 1999, 1995 and 1989 by the Center for The People & The Press. The questionnaire was the result of collaboration between the Center and members of the Project for Excellence in Journalism and the Committee of Concerned Journalists. Their commentary on the findings is included here.

We hope that this report informs the news media and the public on the issues facing journalists today.

Andrew Kohut

Director

Pew Research Center for The People & The Press



How
Journalists
See Journalists

in 2004

VIEWS ON PROFITS, PERFORMANCE AND POLITICS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	1
VIEWS ON PERFORMANCE	6
COVERING THE PRESIDENT AND THE CAMPAIGN	14
TODAY'S CHANGING NEWSROOM	18
VALUES AND THE PRESS	24
COMMENTARY: A CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE <i>by Bill Kovach, Tom Rosenstiel, Amy Mitchell</i>	27
SURVEY METHODOLOGY	33
QUESTIONNAIRE	40



Press Going Too Easy on Bush
BOTTOM-LINE PRESSURES NOW HURTING COVERAGE, SAY
JOURNALISTS

Journalists are unhappy with the way things are going in their profession these days. Many give poor grades to the coverage offered by the types of media that serve most Americans: daily newspapers, local TV, network TV news and cable news outlets. In fact, despite recent scandals at the New York Times and USA Today, only national newspapers – and the websites of national news organizations – receive good performance grades from the journalistic ranks.

Roughly half of journalists at national media outlets (51%), and about as many from local media (46%), believe that journalism is going in the wrong direction, as significant majorities of journalists have come to believe that increased bottom line pressure is “seriously hurting” the quality of news coverage. This is the view of 66% of national news people and 57% of the local journalists questioned in this survey.

Journalists at national news organizations generally take a dimmer view of state of the profession than do local journalists. But both groups express considerably more concern over the deleterious impact of bottom-line pressures than they did in polls taken by the Center in 1995 and 1999. Further, both print and broadcast journalists voice high levels of concern about this problem, as do majorities working at nearly all levels of news organizations.

The notable dissent from this opinion comes from those at the top of national news organizations. Most executives at national news organizations (57%) feel increased business pressures are “mostly just changing the way news organizations do things” rather than seriously undermining quality.

The survey of journalists – conducted March 10-April 20 among 547 national and local reporters, editors and executives by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press in

The survey of journalists is based on interviews with 547 national and local reporters, producers, editors, and executives across the country. In addition to addressing current issues facing journalism, it also updates trends from earlier surveys conducted in 1995 and 1999.

<i>Effect of</i>	--- National ---			---- Local ----		
	1995	1999	2004	1995	1999	2004
<i>bottom-line pressure</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>on news coverage</i>						
Hurting	41	49	66	33	46	57
Just changing	38	40	29	50	46	35
Other/DK	<u>21</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
	100	100	100	100	100	100
<i>Reporting is</i>						
<i>increasingly sloppy</i>						
<i>and error-prone</i>						
Valid criticism	30	40	45	40	55	47
Not valid	65	58	54	59	42	52
Don't know	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100	100	100	100	100

collaboration with the Project for Excellence in Journalism and the Committee of Concerned Journalists – also finds increased worries about *economic pressures* in the responses to an open-ended question about the biggest problem facing journalism today. As was the case in the 1999 survey, problems with the *quality of coverage* were cited most frequently. Underscoring these worries, the polling finds a continuing rise in the percentage of journalists believing that news reports are full of factual errors. In the national media, this view increased from 30% in 1995 to 40% in 1999 to 45% in the current survey.

When asked about what is going well in journalism these days, print and broadcast journalists have strikingly different things to say. TV and radio journalists most often mention the *speed of coverage* – the ability to respond quickly to breaking news stories – while print journalists emphasize the *quality of coverage* and the *watchdog role* the press plays as the profession’s best features.

“Journalism is becoming more and more a business operation. What news stories will make our station/news-paper the most profitable? This has always been part of the ‘business’ but now it has become the major factor.” –
Vice President of online news at a local TV station

Journalists whose own newsrooms have undergone staff reductions are among the most worried that bottom-line pressures are undermining quality. Fully three-quarters of national and local journalists who have experienced staff cuts at their workplace say bottom-line pressures are seriously hurting the quality of news coverage. Those not reporting staff reductions are far more likely to say business pressures are just changing newsgathering techniques.

Beyond the stress of shrinking workplaces, there are a number of specific criticisms of the news media that are closely associated with the view that bottom-line pressure is hurting the quality of news coverage. First, there is almost universal agreement among those who worry about growing financial pressure that the media is paying too little attention to complex stories. In addition, the belief that the 24-hour news cycle is weakening journalism is

Views of Journalists Concerned About Bottom-Line Pressures			
<i>Percent citing as valid criticisms...</i>	<u>Yes, concerned</u> %	<u>Not concerned</u> %	<u>Difference</u>
News avoids complex issues	86	64	+22
24/7 cycle weakens journalism	50	26	+24
The press is too timid	56	31	+25
Increasingly sloppy reporting	52	36	+16

Based on national journalists.

much more prevalent among this group than among news people who do not view financial pressure as a big problem, and a majority says news reports are increasingly full of factual errors and sloppy reporting. And most journalists who worry about declining quality due to bottom-line pressures say

that the press is “too timid” these days.

In that regard, the poll finds that many journalists – especially those in the national media – believe that the press has not been critical enough of President Bush. Majorities of print and broadcast journalists at national news organizations believe the press has been insufficiently critical of the administration. Many local print journalists concur. This is a minority opinion only among local news executives and broadcast journalists. While the press gives itself about the same overall grade for its coverage of George W. Bush as it did nine years ago for its coverage of Bill Clinton (B- among national journalists, C+ from local journalists), the criticism in 1995 was that the press was focusing too much on Clinton’s problems, and too little on his achievements.

	General <u>Public*</u> %	Nat'l <u>Press</u> %	Local <u>Press</u> %
Too critical	34	8	19
Not critical enough	24	55	37
Fair	35	35	42
Don't know	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
	100	100	100

* Public figures from May 2004 Pew Media Believability Study (N=1,800)

There are significant ideological differences among news people in attitudes toward coverage of Bush, with many more self-described liberals than moderates or conservatives faulting the press for being insufficiently critical. In terms of their overall ideological outlook, majorities of national (54%) and local journalists (61%) continue to describe themselves as moderates. The percentage identifying themselves as liberal has increased from 1995: 34% of national journalists describe themselves as liberals, compared with 22% nine years ago. The trend among local journalists has been similar – 23% say they are liberals, up from 14% in 1995. More striking is the relatively small minority of journalists who think of themselves as politically conservative (7% national, 12% local). As was the case a decade ago, the journalists as a group are much less conservative than the general public (33% conservative).

The strong sentiment in favor of a more critical view of White House coverage is just one way the climate of opinion among journalists has changed since the 1990s. More generally, there has been a steep decline in the percentage of national and local news people who think the traditional criticism of the press as too cynical still holds up. If anything, more national news people today fault the press for being too *timid*, not too cynical.

“We don’t ask ‘why’ – or ‘why not’ – nearly as much as we should, particularly when covering our government.” – *Staff writer at a local daily newspaper*

Not only do many national news people believe the press has gone too soft in its coverage

of President Bush, they express considerably less confidence in the political judgment of the American public than they did five years ago. Since 1999, the percentage saying they have a great deal of confidence in the public’s election choices has fallen from 52% to 31% in the national sample of journalists.

Nonetheless, journalists have at least as much confidence in the public’s electoral judgments as does the public itself. In addition, the growing distrust in the public’s electoral decisions is not being driven by negative feelings about President Bush. Journalists who think the press is not critical enough of Bush are no more likely than others to express skepticism about the public’s judgments.

By more than three-to-one, national and local journalists believe it is a bad thing if some news organizations have a “decidedly ideological point of view” in their news coverage. And more than four-in-ten in both groups say journalists too often let their ideological views show in their reporting. This view is held more by self-described conservative journalists than moderates or liberals.

At the same time, the single news outlet that strikes most journalists as taking a particular ideological stance – either liberal or conservative – is Fox News Channel. Among national journalists, more than twice as many could identify a daily news organization that they think is “especially conservative in its coverage” than one they believe is “especially liberal” (82% vs. 38%). And Fox has by far the highest profile as a conservative news organization; it was cited unprompted by 69% of national journalists. The New York Times was most often mentioned as the national daily news organization that takes a decidedly liberal point of view, but only by 20% of the national sample.

The survey shows that journalists continue to have a positive opinion of the Internet’s impact on journalism. Not only do majorities of national (60%) and local journalists (51%) believe the Internet has made journalism better, but they give relatively high grades for the websites of national news organizations.

News people also acknowledge a downside to the Internet – solid majorities of both national

	Public 2004*	National press		Local press	
	<u>2004*</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2004</u>
	%	%	%	%	%
A great deal	20	52	31	28	22
A fair amount	48	41	51	56	54
Not very much	24	6	15	13	21
None at all	5	1	2	3	2
Don’t know	<u>3</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100	100	100	100

* Public figures from May 2004 Pew Media Believability Study (N=1,800)

and local journalists think the Internet allows too much posting of links to unfiltered material. In addition, sizable numbers in the national (42%) and local samples (35%) say the Internet has intensified the deadline pressure they face. The changing media environment is generally having an impact on journalists' workloads – pluralities of national and local news people say they are increasingly rewriting and repackaging stories for multiple uses.

While journalists voice increasing concern over sloppy and error-filled news reports, there is no evidence that recent scandals like those at USA Today and the New York Times are having a significant impact on the way journalists view the profession. The number of journalists who cite “ethics and standards” as the biggest problem facing journalism has not grown since 1999. And most say that while plagiarism may be getting more attention these days, it is actually no more prevalent today than in the past.

“Episodes like the Jayson Blair plagiarism scandal only feed perceptions that journalists fabricate and distort. We need to mend the breach with readers, be as clear as possible about what we know and how, and admit clearly and loudly when we’re wrong.” – *Senior editor at a national news magazine*

Section I: Views on Performance

Journalists are divided over whether their profession is advancing or regressing. Only about half of local journalists – and even fewer national journalists – feel their profession is moving in the right direction. In particular, national TV and radio journalists are the most negative, with 61% saying the field is headed in the wrong direction, compared with just 33% who say the opposite.

There also is a significant divide between executives and reporters in these national organizations, with executives seeing the profession headed in the right direction (by a 57% to 38% margin) while reporters say things are declining (by 54% to 39%).

	Right Direction %	Wrong Direction %	DK %
Local	51	46	3=100
National	43	51	6=100
<i>Within national...</i>			
Print	52	42	6=100
Broadcast	33	61	6=100
Executives	57	38	5=100
Sr. Editors	43	52	5=100
Reporters	39	54	7=100

Continuing Concerns Over Quality

Problems with the quality of coverage remains a major concern of journalists, but an increasing percentage mention business and financial factors. A plurality of national journalists (41%) cite quality concerns such as sensationalistic coverage; the need for accuracy; and a lack of depth, relevance and objectivity as the most important problems facing their profession. Collectively, these were also the top concerns volunteered by national journalists in 1999, and in a similar survey a decade earlier.

Among local journalists, however, business and financial problems are now mentioned as frequently as concerns over the quality of coverage. More than a third of local

	--National--		---Local---	
	1999	2004	1999	2004
	%	%	%	%
Quality of Coverage	44	41	39	33
Reporting accurately	10	8	10	10
Not relevant/Out of touch	12	7	6	7
Sensationalism	8	8	12	5
Lack of depth/context	--	6	--	4
Reporting objectively/Balance	12	5	6	4
Business and Financial	25	30	25	35
Decline in audience/readership	14	9	11	8
Lack of resources/cutbacks	3	8	4	9
Bottom-line emphasis	8	5	7	9
Corporate owners/consolidation	2	5	2	4
Commercial/ratings pressure	6	3	6	4
Loss of Credibility w/ Public	30	28	34	23
Credibility problem	23	22	28	17
Lack of trustworthiness	6	5	8	4
Changing Media Environment	24	15	19	7
Too much competition	17	5	15	2
Need to adapt to changes	--	3	--	2
Speed/pace of reporting	--	5	--	2
Ethics and Standards	11	5	10	6
Public disinterest/apathy	3	4	3	3

news people (35%) cite business and financial factors as the biggest problem facing journalism, up from 25% five years ago.

Print Journalists Worried About Losing Readers

There are significant differences among journalists in different media, as well as those working at local and national news organizations, over the biggest problem confronting journalism. Broadcast journalists, especially at the national level, cite issues relating to quality much more often than do their print counterparts. Roughly half of national broadcast journalists (51%) cite quality concerns, compared with 32% of national print journalists.

By comparison, declining readership is cited by 15% of print journalists at both national and local news organizations, but no more than 2% of broadcast journalists view loss of audience as the most important concern. Instead, broadcast journalists view limits on resources – and the pressure to make profits and get bigger ratings – as the biggest financial problems.

Despite the growing concern over business and financial issues, fewer journalists mention an overly competitive media environment as the biggest problem. In 1999, 17% of national and 15% of local journalists specifically mentioned increasing competition as a problem; just 5% of national and 2% of local journalists say this today.

While the quality of coverage and business concerns are seen as the leading problems facing journalism, the *single* word mentioned more frequently than any other by journalists assessing their profession is “credibility.” Roughly a quarter of both national and local journalists mentioned problems with public trust and confidence in some form, and one-in-five specifically mentioned credibility as the biggest concern for the profession.

Print journalists are far more likely than those in broadcast to see credibility as the biggest problem facing journalism today. Four-in-ten (39%) journalists working at national newspapers, magazines and wire services say credibility is the biggest problem, compared with just 15% at national TV and radio outlets. And this gap exists at the local level as well, with local print journalists nearly three-times as likely as local broadcast journalists (33% vs. 12%) to cite credibility as their greatest concern.

	-National-		--Local--	
	<u>Print</u>	<u>TV*</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>TV</u>
	%	%	%	%
Quality of coverage	32	51	30	37
Economic/Business	31	28	36	33
Declining audience	15	2	15	1
Resources/staffing	10	14	9	12
Profit/Ratings pressures	5	9	9	14
Credibility	39	15	33	12

* National TV column also includes journalists working in radio.

There is also a sizeable difference between younger and older journalists in perceptions of the credibility problem. Just one-in-ten journalists under age 35 cite concerns about credibility and public trust as the biggest problem facing the profession, compared with about quarter of those age 35 to 54 (26%), and a third of those age 55 and older.

A Credibility Gap	
<i>Age</i>	<i>% citing credibility as top problem</i>
18-34	10
35-54	26
55+	33

Though a number of journalists specifically mentioned recent scandals involving New York Times reporter Jayson Blair and USA Today’s Jack Kelley in describing why the profession has lost credibility with the public, relatively few expressed concerns with any broader ethical problems in their field. In fact, just 5% of national journalists (and 6% of local news people) cite ethics or a lack of standards as the biggest problem in journalism, about half as many as in the 1999 survey.

Plagiarism Not Widespread

The vast majority of journalists of all backgrounds and at all workplaces say that plagiarism is no more prevalent today than it has been in the past, just more of a focus on the problem. More than seven-in-ten national (77%) and local (72%) journalists agree with the statement “We are hearing more about plagiarism but its prevalence has not increased.” About one-in-five at both the national and local level (21% of national journalists, 23% local) say there is more plagiarism today than in the past.

There is virtually no difference across different groups of journalists in this perception. Broadcast and print journalists, as well as executives, senior editors, and reporters all predominantly say that recent incidents of plagiarism do not signify a wider problem in the field. There is similarly no difference in this view between young and old, those who are more and less experienced, or those who are more and less educated.

What the Press is Doing Well

Print and broadcast journalists also differ over what journalism is doing well these days. Print journalists most often point to the quality and depth of coverage that is provided. They describe the volume of topics covered, coverage with context and insight, and an ability to make the news interesting and relevant. Fully 42% of local print journalists and 31% of their national counterparts cited some aspect of the quality of coverage as journalism’s best performance trait, compared with just 18% of local

“With the increased outreach on the air and Internet, the public has a greater variety of sources and more information at their fingertips.” –
Correspondent at a national news service

broadcast journalists and 19% of national broadcast journalists.

Those working in television and radio are more likely to cite the timeliness and speed of reporting as what journalism is doing best today. Among local journalists, broadcast journalists are more than twice as likely as those working in print (33% vs. 14%) to cite the immediate coverage of live and breaking news as journalism's greatest strength. This gap is even wider within the national press, with 37% of national broadcast journalists – and just 11% of national print journalists – citing timeliness and speed as the best aspect of today's news.

The watchdog role of the press is cited as journalism's strength by fewer in the field. Print journalists are about twice as likely as those in broadcasting to say investigative reporting and watchdog journalism is what the press is doing well these days. By contrast, those in TV and radio make far more mention of the value of news websites and the use of production technology to better deliver news to the public.

As was the case five years ago, roughly half of journalists say the profession does a good job of striking a balance between what audiences want to know and what's important for them to know. This opinion is held by comparable numbers of national and local journalists, as well as among those working in both print, broadcast, and Internet media.

Criticisms of the Press

Nearly eight-in-ten in both national and local news organizations believe the criticism that the press pays too little attention to complex issues is valid (78% national, 77% local). This is comparable to findings in previous press surveys conducted in 1995 and 1999. Roughly two-thirds also agree that there are too many talk shows on cable television today, and this

What the Press is Doing Well				
	-National-		--Local--	
	Print	TV*	Print	TV
	%	%	%	%
Quality of Coverage (Scope, relevance, depth Insight, clarity, accuracy)	31	18	42	19
Timeliness and Speed (Breaking news and live coverage)	11	37	14	33
Serving as Watchdog (Investigative reporting)	15	6	9	5
Other Strengths				
Coverage of the war	7	10	3	4
Local news and issues	2	0	9	8
Websites	1	4	1	5
Access to mult. sources	5	7	0	4
Diverse viewpoints	2	1	6	4
Use of technology	2	8	1	4

* The National TV column includes journalists working in radio.

Striking the Balance in Coverage				
<i>How good a job in striking the balance between what people want and need</i>				
	-National-		--Local--	
	1999	2004	1999	2004
	%	%	%	%
Excellent	4	3	6	4
Good	45	46	49	44
Only fair	45	43	42	45
Poor	4	6	3	5
Don't know	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
	100	100	100	100

view is shared equally by both print and broadcast journalists.

Most journalists also accept as valid the criticism that the distinction between reporting and commentary has seriously eroded, although the percentage who cite this as a valid criticism has, if anything, declined since 1999. However, far more national and local journalists regard this as a legitimate critique than did so in 1995.

A growing number of national journalists, in particular, say news reports are increasingly full of factual errors and sloppy reporting. The number of national journalists who view this as a valid criticism has increased steadily from 30% in 1995 to 40% in 1999 to 45% today. A comparable percentage of local journalists say this is a valid

	--- National ---			---- Local ----		
	1995	1999	2004	1995	1999	2004
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Too little attention to complex issues	80	71	78	75	72	77
Blurring of reporting and commentary	53	69	64	44	68	59
Journalists are out of touch with public	--	57	47	--	51	44
Too many factual errors	30	40	45	40	55	47
The press is too cynical	54	53	37	53	51	40
Too many cable talk shows	--	--	63	--	--	64
Internet allows unvetted information	--	--	57	--	--	58
The press is too timid	--	--	47	--	--	42
Ideological views showing too much	--	--	45	--	--	43
24/7 news cycle weakening journalism	--	--	42	--	--	40

criticism (47%). That represents a decline from 1999 (55%), but is higher than the 1995 level (40%).

In both 1995 and 1999, slim majorities agreed with the criticism that the press was too cynical, but this perception has ebbed among both national (37%) and local (40%) journalists today. In fact, more national journalists say the press is too timid (47%) than too cynical. In addition, the proportion who feel the press can be criticized for becoming out of touch with their audience has dropped slightly within both groups of journalists.

Grading the Media

Journalists give the highest ratings to major national newspapers – 92% of national journalists and 80% of local journalists give national newspapers a grade of A or B. By contrast, local TV news receives the lowest grades; just 32% of local journalists say local TV news outlets deserve a grade of A or B and national journalists’ grades are even lower

	-National-		--Local--	
	Pct.	Avg. Grade	Pct.	Avg. Grade
	A/B	Grade	A/B	Grade
National Newspapers	92	B+	80	B
Your own organization	83	B	73	B
Local Newspapers	49	B-	58	B-
Network TV News	43	C+	52	B-
Cable TV News	43	C+	48	C+
Local TV News	21	C-	32	C

(21% A or B).

Grades for other news media – network TV news, cable TV news, and local newspapers – fall somewhere in between national newspapers and local TV news. In that regard, little has changed from nine years ago, when journalists gave very similar grades to these media organizations.

Most journalists give their own news organization middling grades. Just 22% of national journalists, and 14% of local journalists, gave their organization an A, though roughly six-in-ten of both groups gave their own organization a grade in the B range. These grades also are similar to the grades journalists assigned in 1995.

Print journalists are particularly critical of network and local TV news. Just 32% of national print journalists give favorable grades (A or B) to network TV news, while twice as many (65%) assign grades of C or D. Journalists at local newspapers are, at most, only slightly more favorable. By comparison, a majority of journalists working at both national and local TV and radio outlets give favorable grades to network news programs.

Nearly half (47%) of local TV journalists give favorable grades to their own field's performance, compared with only 18% of local print journalists. The print/broadcast gap is slightly narrower among journalists at national outlets, but only because ratings of local TV news are low among all national reporters whether in print or broadcasting. Among broadcast media, cable TV news channels are the exception to the media divide, as they are graded similarly by both print and TV/radio journalists.

Journalists were also asked to give a grade to national news organizations for their websites, and the marks were fairly strong. Sizable majorities of both national (70%) and local (57%) journalists gave grades of A or B to major media websites. And the grades among local journalists are lower only because more said they were unable to rate these websites – very few in either group gave poor marks to the websites.

<i>Percent giving grade of A or B to...</i>	<i>-National-</i>		<i>--Local--</i>	
	<i>Print</i>	<i>TV*</i>	<i>Print</i>	<i>TV</i>
Network TV News	32	55	38	67
Cable TV News	44	41	44	52
Local TV News	14	30	18	47
National Newspapers	92	94	86	75
Local Newspapers	48	50	60	56
Your own news org.	82	82	78	67

* The National TV column includes journalists working in radio.

Why is Journalism on the Wrong Track?

In the general evaluation of whether their profession is headed in the right direction or the wrong direction, journalists were almost evenly divided in their view. While those taking a pessimistic view were not asked directly what they had in mind, an analysis of their responses to other questions provides some indication of the factors behind this opinion.

In particular, journalists who say things are going badly are significantly more likely to take their profession and employers to task for the quality of the news product. They believe the press has become too timid, and almost unanimously say the press pays too little attention to complex issues. Nearly three-quarters of journalists who say the profession is headed in the wrong direction say the distinction between reporting and commentary has seriously eroded, compared with only half of those who think things are on the right track.

“Especially in television reporting, the need to compete for ratings results in an obsession with non-news, frivolity and entertainment.” – *Producer at a major television news network*

Concerns about the impact of bottom-line pressures also are far more prevalent among those saying the profession is on the wrong track, which is closely related to concerns about sloppy reporting and the increasing commercialization of the news. Many say the emergence of the 24-hour news cycle has weakened journalism and that news reports are increasingly full of factual errors. And those critical of the overall direction of journalism more frequently cite sensationalistic reporting and an emphasis on ratings as the biggest problems facing the profession.

Within the newsroom, those who are unhappy with the leadership of their own news organization are far more negative about the profession as a whole compared with those who are satisfied with their bosses. In addition, those who have participated in training or professional development over the past 12 months are significantly more optimistic about the profession as a whole than those who have had no such training.

But overall cynicism about journalism is *not* simply an expression of sour grapes on the part of those who have faced economic pressures or staffing cuts at their own place of work. Those who have seen their newsrooms shrink, or who say that resource and staffing limitations are the biggest problem facing the profession, are no more or less likely to be negative about the direction of journalism than those who have not faced resource limitations.

Training Linked to Outlook

<i>Journalism is headed in the...</i>	<i>Participated in training or professional development</i>	
	<u>Yes</u> %	<u>No</u> %
Right direction	58	36
Wrong direction	38	61
Don't know	<u>4</u> 100	<u>3</u> 100

Similarly, there are no generational or ideological divides on this general evaluation of the state of the profession. Journalists young and old, liberal, moderate and conservative are all about evenly divided in terms of whether they are optimistic or pessimistic about the field.

Section II: Covering the President and the Campaign

Many journalists today feel that news media has lost its critical edge – especially when it comes to coverage of the Bush administration. Reporters and editors in national news organizations, in particular, feel the press has gone too easy on the Bush administration. Moreover, the perception that news organizations have gone soft is not confined to attitudes about coverage of Bush. An increasing number of both national and local journalists feel the traditional criticism of the press as too cynical is no longer valid. Indeed, on both the national and local level, more fault the press for being too timid than too cynical.

The journalists surveyed give middling ratings to national news coverage of Bush’s presidency. A narrow majority of national journalists (53%) give the coverage a grade of A or B; local journalists are far less generous in their grading of how their colleagues in national news organizations have covered Bush (43% A or B). In a similar survey in 1995, national journalists, in particular, offered more positive opinions of coverage of the Clinton administration (65% A or B).

The journalists are somewhat more positive in their assessments of the presidential campaign. A majority of national journalists (56%) say coverage of the campaign has been better than coverage of the 2000 campaign. Local journalists are more divided: 46% say coverage of the current campaign is better than in 2000, while 34% say it is worse.

Differences Over Bush Coverage

Solid majorities of national print and TV journalists, as well as Internet journalists, say the media has not been critical enough in its coverage of the administration. A smaller plurality of local print journalists agree (46%).

But local television journalists, on balance, feel the coverage of the Bush administration has been fair. A plurality of this group (44%) believes the coverage has been fair; moreover, nearly as many say coverage has been too critical of the administration (25%) as say it has been not critical enough (28%).

Local TV Reporters: Press Not Too Easy on Bush				
	-National-		--Local--	
	Print	TV*	Print	TV*
	%	%	%	%
<i>Press coverage of Bush administration has been...</i>				
Too critical	9	8	14	25
Not critical enough	55	55	46	28
Fair	34	36	40	44
Don't know/Refused	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
	100	100	100	100

* The TV columns include journalists working in radio.

Ideological Divisions

Much has been made of the public’s ideological divisions in this election year, but journalists also are divided along ideological lines over several issues, including press coverage of the Bush administration. Liberals who work in national and local news organizations overwhelmingly feel the press has not been critical enough of the Bush administration. Roughly two-thirds of liberal journalists (68%) express that view, compared with 28% who say coverage has been fair and 3% who believe the press has been too critical of the administration.

Self-described moderates offer a mixed judgment of the Bush coverage – about the same percentages say it has not been critical enough (44%)

and fair (43%). But most conservatives (53%) think the press has been too critical of the administration, compared with 30% who view it as fair and 17% who think it has been too critical.

	<i>Journalist's ideology</i>		
	<u>Cons</u>	<u>Mod</u>	<u>Lib</u>
<i>Press coverage of Bush administration has been...</i>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Too critical	53	12	3
Not critical enough	17	44	68
Fair	30	43	28
Don't know/Refused	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100	100

Beyond Bush: Cynicism Concerns Decline

In the 1999 survey, narrow majorities of both national (53%) and local (51%) journalists agreed that the statement, “the press is too cynical,” represented a valid criticism of news organizations.

But there has been a dramatic decline in the percentage of national and local journalists who feel the press can be legitimately criticized for excessive cynicism. Just 37% of national journalists and only slightly more local journalists (40%) view the press as too cynical. This pattern is even more apparent among Internet journalists: 24% view the press as too cynical, compared with 48% five years ago.

Internet journalists, in particular, believe that the press can be faulted for being too timid rather than too cynical (56% too timid vs. 24% too cynical). Journalists working at national news

	<u>-National-</u>		<u>--Local--</u>	
	<u>1999</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2004</u>
<i>The press is too cynical</i>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Valid criticism	53	37	51	40
Not a valid criticism	45	63	48	59
Don't know/Refused	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100	100	100
<i>The press is too timid</i>				
Valid criticism	--	47	--	42
Not a valid criticism	--	52	--	56
Don't know/Refused	--	<u>1</u>	--	<u>2</u>
		100		100

organizations agree (47% vs. 37%). But local journalists are split: 42% view the press as too timid, 40% too cynical.

Ideological Coverage – Valid Criticism?

Overall, news people are divided over whether journalists today too often let their own ideological views show in their reporting. Similar percentages of national (45%) and local (43%) journalists view this as a valid criticism.

But local executives, in particular, approach this issue very differently. Roughly seven-in-ten local news executives (73%) say coverage too often reflects a journalist’s ideology; roughly six-in-ten national news executives (62%) agree that this is *not* a valid criticism of the press.

By comparison, there is broad agreement across the spectrum of reporters, managers and executives that is a bad thing if news organizations take a “decidedly” ideological point of view in their coverage of the news. Fully 72% of national journalists and 74% of local journalists have a negative view of news organizations taking a strongly ideological stance in their coverage.

Fox’s Outsized Impact

Most national and local journalists do not believe any national daily news organization is “especially liberal” in its news coverage. Roughly six-in-ten in both groups (62% national/59% local) say no national daily news organization strikes them as particularly liberal in its coverage. Among the minority that names a specific news organization as being especially liberal, the New York Times was mentioned most frequently (20% national/17% local).

<i>Journalists let ideological views show too often...</i>	-----National-----			-----Local-----		
	Execu- tives	Top editors	Reporters	Execu- tives	Top editors	Reporters
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Valid criticism	38	46	46	73	36	33
Not valid	62	51	52	27	61	67
Don't know	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
	100	100	100	100	100	100

<i>Can you think of any news orgs. that are... especially liberal?</i>	National	Local
	%	%
Yes	38	41
NY Times	20	17
CNN	2	6
CBS News	2	5
Wash. Post	4	2
NPR	2	2
NBC News	1	3
ABC News	2	2
Other	5	5
No/Don't know	62	59
	100	100
<i>...especially conservative?</i>	National	Local
	%	%
Yes	82	63
Fox News	69	42
Wall St. Journal	8	11
Wash. Times	9	4
Radio (misc. non-NPR)	2	2
NY Post	1	1
Other	3	6
No/Don't know	18	37
	100	100

By contrast, solid majorities of both national and local journalists say there is an organization that they think is especially conservative – and for most the organization that comes to mind is Fox News Channel. Fully 69% of national journalists cited Fox News Channel as especially conservative in its coverage. Fewer local journalists (42%) mentioned Fox; still, a much higher percentage of local journalists named Fox than any other single news organization, conservative or liberal.

Roughly two-thirds of self-described conservatives (68%) could identify a specific news organization that is especially liberal, and the same number (68%) could name a news organization that is “especially conservative.” But moderates and liberals could identify conservative news organizations far more often than liberal ones. Roughly three-quarters of liberals (74%) and a majority of moderates (56%) say they couldn’t think of any news organization that is especially liberal.

Most Liberals Don’t See a Liberal Point of View			
<i>Think of any news org. that is...</i>	<i>Journalist’s Ideology</i>		
	<u>Cons</u>	<u>Mod</u>	<u>Lib</u>
	%	%	%
Especially liberal	68	40	24
Especially conservative	68	70	79

Section III: Today's Changing Newsroom

Newsroom staff cutbacks are hitting print journalism at both the national and local level. About half of respondents working at newspapers or magazines (48% nationally, 54% locally) say the size of their newsroom staff has decreased in the past three years. Relatively few in the print sector are seeing growth in the number of staff.

The picture is more mixed in television and radio, with about equal numbers saying their newsrooms are growing as shrinking. About half (47%) of those in national broadcast media say there has been no change in staffing compared with three years ago.

One significant change in the news business is growth in the practice of repackaging and repurposing news stories for multiple uses. About half of both national and local respondents (48% each) say they are doing this more now than in the past; print and broadcast journalists at each level are similar in this respect.

	-National-		--Local--	
	<u>Print</u>	<u>TV*</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>TV</u>
<i>Newsroom staff size over past 3 years</i>	%	%	%	%
Decreased	48	26	54	31
Increased	15	22	16	30
Stayed the same	34	47	29	32
Don't know	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
	100	100	100	100
<i>Repackaging stories...</i>				
More often	52	43	53	42
Same amount	16	25	15	24
Less often	0	2	3	5
Don't repackage	13	10	6	14
Don't know	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>15</u>
	100	100	100	100

* The National TV column includes journalists working in radio.

At the same time, relatively few voice unhappiness with this trend, with the notable exception of local broadcast reporters. Three-in-ten local TV reporters (29%) say they are unhappy over repackaging stories for multiple purposes. That compares with only about one-in-ten national radio and TV news people, and similar percentages of national and local print journalists.

Most journalists today give good ratings to the quality of leadership in their own organizations, a view that has changed little since 1999. At the national level, 30% of news professionals say their management is doing an excellent job, and 41% say they are doing a good job. There is relatively little difference between national print and broadcast media in leadership ratings. But over half of executives at the national level say the quality of leadership is excellent (and 38% rate it as good). Senior newsroom staff and line journalists are less positive.

At the local level, 22% overall rate leadership as excellent, and nearly half (47%) say the quality is good. Ratings are higher among local newspaper journalists than among those in television and executives rate leadership more positively than reporters and producers.

<i>Quality of leadership in your news organization</i>	-----National-----			-----Local-----		
	Execu-	Top	Repor-	Execu-	Top	Repor-
	<u>tives</u>	<u>editors</u>	<u>ters</u>	<u>tives</u>	<u>editors</u>	<u>ters</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	54	30	23	40	18	15
Good	38	41	42	38	67	38
Fair	3	25	25	9	10	35
Poor	0	3	8	2	1	11
Don't know	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100	100	100	100	100

Training and professional development programs are fairly common in newsrooms today. About half (47%) of national journalists and 56% of local journalists say they have participated in such activities provided by their news organization in the past twelve months. Among those who have taken part in training, close to half say they participated in such a program for five days or more over the past year.

Executives and senior editors and producers are more likely than line staff to report having taken part in professional development activity. Respondents who have participated in training rate their own news organization's management more highly than those who have not participated, and this is especially true of reporters.

In a related area, large majorities of respondents (76% nationally and 77% locally) say there are ongoing management efforts to address ethical issues in their newsroom, about the same as in 1999. As with training and professional development, those who report that their organizations are engaged in this activity rate their management more favorably.

Internet's Impact Mostly Positive

Most news professionals (60% at the national level, 51% locally) say the emergence of the Internet has made journalism better; very few say it has hurt journalism. These views are fairly similar to those expressed by journalists in 1999. More local journalists say the Internet has had either a positive or negative impact, with higher percentage today saying it has made journalism worse (18% compared with 8% in 1999). Only local news executives are divided over the Internet's impact: 31% say it has been good for

<i>Emergence of the Internet has made journalism...</i>	-National-		--Local--	
	<u>1999</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2004</u>
	%	%	%	%
Better	54	60	47	51
Worse	12	15	8	18
Not much difference	26	21	42	27
Both (vol.)	5	3	2	2
Don't know	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
	100	100	100	100

journalism; 27% view it negatively.

Not surprisingly, enthusiasm about the Internet is greatest among younger respondents in the survey. More than seven-in-ten (72%) of those under 35 years of age think the Internet has been good for the profession; just 13% view it negatively. Journalists age 35 and older also have a generally positive view of the Internet's impact, though by a much smaller margin (54% better, 15% worse).

Changes for the Better

Those who believe the Internet has helped journalism most frequently cite its power as a research tool. Nearly half of those who see a positive impact of the Internet mention some aspect of the Internet as a convenient place to find timely information, to get data at any hour of the day, and to do fact-checking on deadline. Those who work for local news organizations are especially likely to mention this benefit of the Internet (61% of local vs. 47% of national and 16% of Internet journalists).

“Personally, I have been able to use the Internet for almost every story I work on. The Internet has helped me find the right interview for a story, find the right information for a story, and given me more ideas about how to go about doing a story.”— *Producer at a TV news program*

Another widely noted positive impact of the Internet is its ability to deliver information to the public more quickly and to promote greater competition among news organizations. This view is much more prevalent among print journalists than among those working in TV and radio. A frequent comment within this theme is that print journalism now has the ability to compete with television and radio for breaking news. Also, the speed of the Internet in delivering information was the single most cited benefit among journalists who work primarily on their organization's websites.

About one-in-five say the Internet has helped journalism by making far more information available to the public, and by helping to improve the accuracy of the information. A related notion, mentioned about as often, is that the Internet has broadened the range of outlets and voices available to the public. This includes more points of view, deeper stories, and coverage of topics and stories that otherwise would not have fit into existing time and space available. These changes have forced journalism to be more innovative and responsive to the public; one respondent said the Internet has “democratized the press.”

“The Internet has allowed newspapers to be more like 24-hour operations to better compete with broadcast outlets. It has allowed us to go deeper in our research of important topics.”— *Online editor at a local newspaper*

A less common argument for why the web has made journalism better is that the Internet has made journalism more accountable by enabling the public – and other journalists – to more easily verify the accuracy of information and communicate these concerns directly to those who produced a report. Only around one-in-twenty who see the web as having had a positive influence make this case.

Changes for the Worse

Those who think the Internet has been bad for journalism most often cite the fact that it promotes the spread of unvetted and unfiltered information to the public; nearly half (53% national, 45% local) cite this concern. Others express a related concern about the speed and pressure of the Internet leading to too many factual errors in news coverage (17% national, 29% local).

“Too often, rumor and innuendo and works in progress are being reported as fact. I worry that the traditional job of filtering is not always being performed adequately. There is such a thing as too much filtering, of course, but when raw tips are treated the same way as confirmed news, the reading and viewing public is not served.”— *Senior editor at a national news magazine*

Another concern raised by some is that the Internet has promoted the rise of pseudo-journalism, “junk” sites, and low-brow news. One negative consequence cited by several respondents is that “news” reported on these sites force mainstream journalists to waste time chasing down baseless rumors and innuendo. In a similar vein, a smaller group refers specifically to the Internet having damaged the credibility of journalism in the mind of the public.

Around one-in-ten who see the Internet as having a bad influence on journalism say the web has made journalists lazy by allowing them to do research at their desks rather than going out into the field, with some specifically stating that the Internet has made plagiarism too easy.

Internet’s Downside

The survey’s respondents were asked specifically about two issues related to the growth of the Internet: increased deadline pressures, and the potential spread of misinformation and rumors into the news. Majorities of both print and broadcast journalists say that the Internet has increased the amount of bad information that finds its way into news stories.

Internet’s Impact				
	-National-		--Local--	
	<u>Print</u>	<u>TV*</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>TV</u>
<i>On deadline pressures...</i>	%	%	%	%
Increased	53	31	48	22
Decreased	1	2	3	3
No Change	45	66	49	72
Don’t know	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
	100	100	100	100
<i>On level of misinformation released to the public</i>				
Increased	60	70	60	54
Decreased	2	1	3	1
No Change	35	26	35	41
Don’t know	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
	100	100	100	100

* The National TV column includes journalists working in radio.

Overall, 65% of national journalists and 57% of local journalists agree; smaller numbers think there has been no change (31% nationally, 38% locally). Hardly anyone thinks the Internet has reduced the amount of misinformation in circulation, though only 38% of those working with websites think the problem is worse because of the Internet.

But there is a considerable difference of opinion on the Internet's impact on deadline pressures. Majorities overall believe the Internet has neither increased nor decreased such pressures (55% of national respondents, 60% of local respondents feel this way). Hardly anyone thinks deadline pressures have declined, and 42% at the national level and 35% at the local level say the pressure is greater.

Within these averages there is a great deal of variation by type of medium and by job title. At both the national and local level, print journalists are far more likely than TV and radio journalists to say deadline pressure has been increased by the Internet. National media executives are more likely than their editors or line journalists to feel this way. And, perhaps not surprisingly, those whose principal job responsibility is Internet-based journalism are the most likely to feel greater deadline pressures (78%).

Journalists in the Online Sector

The poll included a separate sample of 68 journalists whose job responsibilities include managing, editing, or writing for the online outlets of national and local news organizations. Job titles for this group of respondents included "online content manager," "online editor," "website manager," and the like.

For the most part, online journalists are not significantly different from others demographically with the exception of age. The average age of respondents in the Internet group is 42, compared with 46 among the rest of the sample. Similarly, those working in online jobs had an average of 18 years experience, compared with 22 years for the rest of the respondents. More say they have undergone training or professional development activities provided by their organization (66% vs. 52%). And far more say the Internet has increased their deadline pressures.

Given the evolving nature of news organizations' websites, it is no surprise that those in the online sector say they are doing more repackaging of stories than in the past: 71%, versus 48% for other journalists. But more are happy about the change than unhappy by a margin of five-to-one (44% vs. 9%).

In most cases, the opinions of online journalists track closely with non-Internet journalists

regarding the state of the profession, the reasons for declining audiences, the validity of criticisms about journalism, the quality of their own news organization, and their own personal and political values. They are somewhat more likely than their counterparts who work in broadcasting to say journalists have become out of touch with their audiences, and to offer that a boring and static news product is one reason some media are facing declining audiences, but many print journalists share this concern. In that vein, more online journalists than others in both print and broadcasting see the changing media environment as the biggest problem facing journalism.

“Young readership has been declining, but the Internet provides a way to recapture and educate these lost readers in current events in a way that they feel comfortable and not alienated.”– *Online manager at a local newspaper*

Not surprisingly, most of the key differences between the views of online journalists and others pertain to the role of the Internet itself. One of the biggest differences is that majorities (57%) of those whose principal job is *not* in online journalism say the Internet allows too much posting of links to material that is unfiltered or unvetted; just 28% of those working in the sector agree that this is a valid criticism. Similarly, far more of those who do not primarily work on their news organization’s website say the Internet has allowed more misinformation to find its way into news stories (61%, compared with just 38% among online journalists). And fewer Internet than non-Internet journalists say the Internet has hurt journalism (3% versus 16%).

Section IV: Values and the Press

Journalists at national and local news organizations are notably different from the general public in their ideology and attitudes toward political and social issues. Most national and local journalists, as well as a plurality of Americans (41%), describe themselves as political moderates. But news people – especially national journalists – are more liberal, and far less conservative, than the general public.

About a third of national journalists (34%) and somewhat fewer local journalists (23%) describe themselves as liberals; that compares with 19% of the public in a May survey conducted by the Pew Research Center. Moreover, there is a relatively small number of conservatives at national and local news organizations. Just 7% of national news people and 12% of local journalists describe themselves as conservatives, compared with a third of all Americans.

In this regard, Internet journalists are similar ideologically to local journalists: 57% describe themselves as moderates, while 27% say they are liberals and 13% conservatives. Local TV and radio journalists include the lowest percentage of liberals of any of the journalist groups surveyed (15%). Even among local TV and radio journalists, however, just 13% describe themselves as conservatives.

Moderates Abound, But Few Newsroom Conservatives			
	General Public*	Nat'l Press	Local Press
<i>Ideological self-rating</i>	%	%	%
Liberal	20	34	23
Moderate	41	54	61
Conservative	33	7	12
Don't know	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>
	100	100	100

* Public figures from May 2004 Pew Media Believability Study (N=1800)

Major Differences: God and Morality, Homosexuality

The 1995 survey of journalists found particularly sharp differences between journalists and the public when it came to attitudes toward morality and homosexuality. A solid majority of Americans consistently have expressed the opinion that it is necessary to believe in God to be a moral person. Nearly six-in-ten (58%) expressed that view in a 2002 Pew Research Center survey, while 40% said that belief in God is not a prerequisite for morality. Journalists, regardless of their organization and position, take a decidedly different view. Fully 91% of those who work at national news organizations say it is *not* necessary to believe in God to be moral; 78% of local journalists agree.

As was the case in 1995, journalists are much more accepting of homosexuality than is the general public. Overwhelming majorities of national (88%) and local (74%) say homosexuality should be accepted by society. Only about half of the public agrees (51%).

Since the mid-1990s, however, public support has increased for societal acceptance of homosexuality, while journalists' attitudes have been more stable. In a 1993 Times-Mirror survey, most Americans (53%) said homosexuality should be discouraged; today a narrow majority (51%) believes homosexuality should be accepted. National journalists also have become slightly more accepting of homosexuality since 1995 (83% then, 88% today), while local journalists' views have been stable (75% then, 74% today).

	General Public*	Nat'l Press	Local Press
<i>Belief in God ...</i>	%	%	%
Is necessary to be moral	58	6	18
Is not necessary to be moral	40	91	78
Don't know	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
	100	100	100
<i>Homosexuality should be...</i>			
Accepted by society	51	88	74
Discouraged by society	42	5	14
Don't know	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>12</u>
	100	100	100

* Public figures from U.S. component of the 2002 Pew Global Attitudes Project (Aug. 19-Sept. 8, 2002, N=1,501)

More Agreement on Safety Net

There is more common ground between news professionals and the public in attitudes toward individual freedom and government assistance for needy people. Identical majorities of local journalists (58%) and the public (58%) say it is more important that Americans be free to pursue their goals without government interference, than that government guarantee that no one is in need.

National journalists are divided over this question – 49% place higher priority on freedom from government interference while 42% say it is more important that the government play an active role to guarantee aid to the needy. Opinion among Internet journalists divides along similar lines: 51% believe freedom from government interference is more important; 43% say a government guarantee of aid for the needy is more important.

	General Public*	Nat'l Press	Local Press
<i>What's more important...</i>	%	%	%
Everyone free to pursue goals w/out govt. interference	58	49	58
Govt. guarantee that no one is in need	34	42	35
Don't know	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>
	100	100	100

* Public figures from U.S. component of the 2002 Pew Global Attitudes Project (Aug. 19-Sept. 8, 2002, N=1,501)

Conservative Journalists Secular Too

There is a broad consensus among news professionals, regardless of their ideology, that it is not necessary to believe in God to be moral. But other issues – homosexuality and the government’s role in aiding the needy – produce wider fissures along ideological lines.

Journalists who identify themselves as liberals are virtually unanimous in their view that homosexuality should be accepted by society (95% agree). More than eight-in-ten moderates (84%) agree. But only about half of conservatives (49%) say homosexuality should be accepted.

The news people surveyed also are deeply divided over the question of whether individual freedom, or government aid to the needy, is more important. Liberals by a wide margin (61%-33%) place greater priority on government guarantees of aid for the needy. By contrast, conservatives overwhelmingly say it is more important that everyone be free to pursue life’s goals (88%); just 9% feel it is more important for government to guarantee that no one is in need.

Ideology and Values			
	<i>Journalist's ideology</i>		
	<u>Cons</u>	<u>Mod</u>	<u>Lib</u>
<i>Necessary to believe in God in order to be moral?</i>	%	%	%
Yes	26	12	3
No	72	85	96
Don't know	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100	100
<i>Homosexuality</i>			
Should be accepted by society	49	84	95
Should be rejected by society	40	8	2
Don't know	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>
	100	100	100
<i>Which is more important?</i>			
Govt. guarantee no one is in need	9	36	61
People free from gov't interference	88	57	33
Don't know	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>
	100	100	100

A CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE: A COMMENTARY ON THE FINDINGS

By Bill Kovach, Tom Rosenstiel and Amy Mitchell

While their worries are changing, the problems that journalists see with their profession in many ways seem more intractable than they did a few years ago.

News people feel better about some elements of their work. But they fear more than ever that the economic behavior of their companies is eroding the quality of journalism.

In particular, they think business pressures are making the news they produce thinner and shallower. And they report more cases of advertisers and owners breaching the independence of the newsroom.

These worries, in turn, seem to have widened the divide between the people who cover the news and the business executives they work for.

The changes in attitude have come after a period in which news companies, faced with declining audiences and pressure on revenues, have in many cases made further cuts in newsgathering resources.

There are also alarming signs that the news industry is continuing the short-term mentality that some critics contend has undermined journalism in the past. Online news is one of the few areas seeing general audience growth today, yet online journalists more often than any others report their newsrooms have suffered staff cuts.

Only five years earlier, news people were much more likely to see failures of their own making as more of an issue. Since then, they have come to feel more in touch with audiences, less cynical and more embracing of new technology. In other words, journalists feel they have made progress on the areas that they can control in the newsroom.

While feeling closer to audiences, however, news people also have less confidence in the American public to make wise electoral decisions, a finding that raises questions about the kind of journalism they may produce in the future.

There are also signs that the people who staff newsrooms, at least at the national level, tend to describe themselves as more liberal than in the past.

These findings, which build on work by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press and the Committee of Concerned Journalists five years ago, mark the beginning of an annual collaboration between the Pew Center and the Project for Excellence in Journalism to monitor the feelings of journalists.

In addition to assessing the change from 1999, this survey puts down some new baselines for further study—matters such as whether the press is too timid, the impact of cable, the Internet and political ideology.

What Journalists Are Worried About

News people are not confident about the future of journalism. Overall, they appear split over whether journalism is headed in the right or wrong direction. At the national level a slim majority

are pessimistic. At the local level a slim majority are optimistic. Broadcasters are more pessimistic. Print people are more optimistic. Internet journalists are the most optimistic of all.

Yet eliminate certain job descriptions and things look bleaker. Nationally, remove business executives and a majority of journalists think things are moving in the wrong direction. At the local level, it is only senior news managers who are confident. Business executives are split.

More important, the source of their concern is different than five years ago. Increasingly, journalists worry that the economics of journalism are eroding quality.

Sizable majorities of journalists (66% nationally and 57% locally) think “increased bottom line pressure is seriously hurting the quality of news coverage.” That is a dramatic increase from five years ago, when fewer than half in the news business felt this way.

And their concerns may be justified. The State of the News Media 2004 report produced by the Project for Excellence in Journalism in March found that most sectors of the news media have seen clear cutbacks in newsgathering resources. The number of newspaper newsroom staffers shrunk by 2,000 between 2000 and 2004, a drop of 4% overall. Some major online news sites saw much deeper cuts, such as MSNBC, which cut around a quarter of its staff between 2001 and 2003. Radio newsroom staffing declined by 57% from 1994 to 2001. After an uptick in 1999, network staffing began to drop again in 2000. Since 1985 the number of network news correspondents has declined by 35 percent while the number of stories per reporter increased by 30 percent.

Nationally, quality is still the problem news people worry about most but they are worried about it less than five years ago. Locally, as many journalists now cite economic pressure as journalism’s biggest problem as point to a lack of quality.

And those who have felt the economic pressure more acutely are the most worried of all. Among those who reported staff cuts in the last three years, three-quarters feel increased bottom line pressure is “seriously hurting” news quality. They also were more likely than average to name economic and business pressures as journalism’s biggest problem.

There are also signs that the economic influences on the news business have become more pernicious. Five years ago we found that financial pressure in the newsroom was “not a matter of executives or advertisers pressuring journalists about what to write or broadcast.” It was more subtle than that.

Unfortunately, that is less true today. Now a third of local journalists say they have felt such pressure, most notably from either advertisers or from corporate owners. In other words, one of the most dearly held principles of journalism—the independence of the newsroom about editorial decision-making—increasingly is being breached.

There is also alarming news here for the Internet. Advertiser and corporate interference with the news content are similarly high among those who work in online news, where the line between independently produced content and advertising may be harder to detect.

These numbers bear watching—closely.

A Newsroom-Executive Divide

All of this may be at the root of another problem that has intensified over the last five years. There is a manifest and widening gulf between journalists and the people they work for.

The survey broke news people down into three separate groups. Executives were those who have chief financial responsibility for the news company—publishers, CEOs, chief financial officers. Senior news executives included editors-in-chief, executive editors, managing editors and executive producers, down to assistant managing editors. Newsroom staff included everyone from bureau chiefs down to cub reporters.

In general, journalists have less confidence in their bosses than they did a few years ago.

Less than a third of national journalists rate their leadership as “excellent,” down six points from five years ago. Less than a quarter of local journalists feel that way, also down slightly from five years ago.

It may be no surprise that the level of confidence in the bosses declines as you move down the ranks. Yet now even senior news managers are not confident in the people above them.

It is here, at the level of senior news executives, where the rating of the leadership has dropped most precipitously. Five years ago, 42% of senior news executives nationally had high confidence in their bosses. Today, just 30% do. Locally, the number is 18%.

What is behind the widening morale problem in newsrooms?

The survey results offer two possible explanations. One is that executives and journalists cannot even agree on the basic situation in their newsrooms. Nationally, journalists are twice as likely to report that their staffs have decreased as are business executives who run news companies.

A second divide between executives and newsroom staffers is over the question of the impact of economics. Nationally, journalists are more than twice as likely as executives to say bottom line pressure is eroding journalistic quality. The divide exists at the local level as well but not as drastically.

Whatever the reasons for this, unless staffers and bosses can agree on first describing what is going on in the company and then agree on its impact, it seems doubtful they could agree on how to deal with it.

Specific Areas of Concern

Beyond cutbacks and pressure to help advertisers or corporate siblings, journalists have other worries as well. Five years ago, people in the news business shared two overriding concerns. As we said back then, “They believe that the news media have blurred the lines between news and entertainment and that the culture of argument is overwhelming the culture of reporting... Concerns about punditry overwhelming reporting, for instance, have swelled dramatically in only four years.”

Today, the concerns are more varied and less easy to categorize. The worries about punditry are still there but they have diminished both nationally and especially locally.

A bigger issue now is a sense of shallowness. Roughly eight-in-ten in the news business feel the news media pay “too little attention ... to complex issues,” up from five years ago to levels seen

in the mid-1990s, at the peak of the fascination with tabloid crime stories like O.J. and JonBenet Ramsey.

On the issue of accuracy, journalists seem divided. Nationally, the number of journalists who feel that news reports are increasingly sloppy and inaccurate is rising. Locally, it is dropping.

And about some matters people in the news business—across all levels—are clearly less worried than they were five years ago.

Fewer journalists today see the press as too cynical. And, compared with five years ago, fewer also see journalists as out of touch with their audiences.

Both of these are areas that reform movements such as public journalism—which was concerned with trying to reconnect journalists and the public—focused on.

The Internet as a Place of Confidence and Cuts

In such a landscape, the Internet should be a glimmer of hope, and in many ways it is. The State of the News Media 2004 report found that the Internet was one of the few places where news audiences were growing. Just as importantly, young people sought out news online in the same percentages as older people. Privately, some of the country's top newspaper executives report that they now have more readers on the web than they do in print. Financially the picture is also promising, if embryonic. Revenues from the Internet, according to the State of the News Media report, are growing exponentially, though for now they remain small.

Generally, the Internet journalists surveyed, most of whom work for websites of major news organizations, reflect that booming sense of the future. They rate their product highly: fully 85% give the websites of national news organizations a grade of A or B.

Journalists also seem less fearful of technology. While majorities feel the Internet has too much unvetted and unfiltered material, most news people also now see the 24-hour news cycle as not harming journalism. More journalists than five years ago think the Internet is making journalism better.

Yet the survey points to something troubling here that online journalists are privately frustrated by. The Internet is the most likely place in journalism to be suffering staff cuts (62%).

Given the growth in Internet news audiences and the growing confidence of journalists about the content, one might have expected that companies planning on the future would be moving resources into this growth area.

The fact that this is not happening has two possible implications. First, it suggests that the news industry is managing for the short-term to such a degree that it is leaving malnourished the one area that could grow the business out of its current dilemma of declining audience. To maintain profits, it is penny wise and pound foolish. If this is the case, it would be an old story—and a familiar mistake—repeated again.

The other possibility is that the news business has lost confidence in the basic economic principle that had fueled its development for much of the last 200 years:

Namely, that if you can aggregate a large-enough audience in one place, the revenue stream will work itself out eventually.

Yet the companies who produce online news apparently do not have confidence that will happen

here. If they are not willing to invest in the newsroom now, when audience and revenues look promising, what will ever convince them to?

Confidence in the Public

Ultimately journalism is predicated on faith in the public. Here, journalists' views have become dramatically more pessimistic.

The percentage of national journalists who have a great deal of confidence in the ability of the American public to make good decisions has declined by more than 20 points since 1999. Confidence among local journalists has fallen as well.

What is going on? Does this suggest that as news people get closer to their audiences they conclude people are less wise than they once believed? Is it possible that market research data is persuading journalists today that they understand their audiences better and also that those audiences are dumber than they thought?

Or, is the loss of confidence in the public more tied to journalists' views about the content of news? They see news doing a poorer job of covering complex issues and conclude that this will leave Americans unprepared for making good decisions.

It is also possible that journalists are leaping to another conclusion: They see the content of the news becoming shallower and conclude that this must be what the public wants or why else would their organizations be providing it?

There is also a fourth possibility: liberal journalists unhappy with President George W. Bush's policies could be dismayed that the public chose Bush in 2000 and until recently have largely approved of his performance.

In the end, whatever the cause of declining faith in the public, the implications are troubling. Even if the economics of journalism work themselves out, how can journalists work on behalf of a public they are coming to see as less wise and less able? A cynical view of the public becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy that leads journalists to produce a shallower product because they think the public cannot handle anything else.

Politics and Ideology

The findings on politics also point to trends worth watching. Journalists tend to be split over whether the press has become too timid and also too easy on Bush—and the split is between national journalists and local. The national journalists tend to feel the press has been insufficiently critical of Bush. National journalists also are the more likely to describe themselves as personally liberal.

But this does not mean that journalists want to abandon the model of the independent press. Across the board, news people disapprove of news organizations having a decidedly ideologically point of view. Even among Internet journalists, often thought of as writing with more edge, three-quarters do not favor moving toward this more ideological, more European model of journalism.

The fact that journalists are more likely to see a conservative tilt in the news than a liberal one invites various explanations. It could be a sign of liberal bias. It also could be a natural response by journalists tired of people producing partisan journalism on the right positioning themselves as the counterbalance to a mainstream press they characterize as left wing. There will be no settling of that.

On the other hand, the fact that the New York Times is the organization most often cited as liberal may embarrass the Times. The fact that large majorities of journalists cite Fox as conservative may not embarrass that cable network.

Journalists' own politics are also harder to analyze than people might think. The fact that journalists—especially national journalists—are more likely than in the past to describe themselves as liberal reinforces the findings of the major academic study on this question, namely that of David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, in their series of books “The American Journalist.”

But what does liberal mean to journalists? We would be reluctant to infer too much here. The survey includes just four questions probing journalists' political attitudes, yet the answers to these questions suggest journalists have in mind something other than a classic big government liberalism and something more along the lines of libertarianism. More journalists said they think it is more important for people to be free to pursue their goals without government interference than it is for government to ensure that no one is in need.

This libertarian strain is particularly strong among local journalists, who are also more likely to describe themselves as moderate.

More research here is probably useful. The debate over press ideology is fraught with difficulty. Some of the research done in the past has been, frankly, poor, and on the other side, some journalists would rather not face the question at all. Neither of these approaches is satisfactory.

But there is something here for journalists to be concerned about.

Crossing from Concern to Frustration

Five years ago we found a profession that had become more concerned about its performance and more willing to adapt. The findings back then, we said, paint “a picture of an industry aware it is at a cross roads. Journalists have come to agree with their critics and are embarking on self examination that is a likely first step to change.”

Today, some of that change has happened, but what remains are problems that seem more structural and protracted.

While journalists feel they have gotten closer to their audiences and more willing to innovate, they also are more pessimistic about the public. It is possible that journalists feel they have done much of what they can do themselves to address journalism's problems. What they are left with are issues they cannot contend with alone. And they believe the companies they work for in the last five years have moved in ways that have only made things worse.

On top of that, there are signs that the growth areas in journalism are not seeing the kind of investment of resources to build for the future.

If five years ago we saw the seeds of change, today we see a trend toward fragmentation among all players involved – journalists, executives and the public.

Not only do they disagree on solutions, they seem further apart on identifying the problems.

Bill Kovach is chairman of the Committee of Concerned Journalists. Tom Rosenstiel is director of the Project for Excellence in Journalism. Amy Mitchell is associate director.

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press Journalists Survey Methodology

This survey is based on interviews with 547 journalists and news media executives by telephone and online. The same questionnaire was used for both modes. The interviews were completed from March 10, 2004 through April 20, 2004.

Design of the Media Samples

Three samples were drawn for this survey: a national news media sample, a local news media sample and an Internet news sample. Both the national and local samples were divided into two groups: print and broadcast (which includes television and radio).

For the national sample, the print category includes newspapers, magazines, wire services, and news services; the television category encompasses cable, television and radio networks.

For the local sample, the print category includes newspapers from a listing of the top 100 newspapers ranked by circulation, excluding those selected for the national sample. The television category includes local television stations from the top 100 media markets.

Within each of these market/medium strata (national and local, print and television), specific organizational positions (i.e., managing editor, correspondent) were selected.

The Internet sample was selected from online-only news outlets, as well as the online news outlets of traditional print and television news organizations. The specific sampling procedures are outlined below.

To obtain a sample that represented a cross-section of news organizations and of the people working at all levels of those organizations, the news media were divided into the following groupings:

- (1) Importance of medium in terms of size of audience, market or influence.
 - a) National audience
 - b) Local audience
 - c) Internet audience
- (2) Type of media
 - a) Newspapers
 - b) News magazines
 - c) Wire services
 - d) News services
 - e) Television stations and networks
 - f) Radio stations and networks
- (3) Organizational responsibility of the individual respondent
 - a) Executive
 - b) Senior editors and producers
 - c) Working editors and journalists

Identifying the Samples

National newspapers were identified using 2002 circulation numbers in 2003 Editor & Publisher International Year Book.

National television news organizations included the three national networks, major national cable networks, public television, and radio chains with Washington, D.C. bureaus. Particularly for the national sample, every attempt was made to replicate the selection of news organizations used for an earlier Center survey conducted in 1995.

The news media executives and journalists in each position within these organizations were drawn from the News Media Yellow Book database online, with the exception of national radio organizations, which were drawn from Bacon's MediaSource, and national newspapers, which were drawn from Editor & Publisher International Year Book. A complete listing of the selected national news organizations is below.

Local newspapers were also identified using 2002 circulation numbers in 2003 Editor & Publisher International Year Book. They include the 84 (out of the top 100) papers that were not pulled for the national sample.

Local television stations were selected from the top 100 media markets, as defined by Nielsen Media Research for 2003. After the local sample was selected, Bacon's MediaSource was used to identify the news media executives and journalists in each organization.

Respondents were selected using a two-stage sampling procedure. In the first stage, news media organizations were selected and in the second stage individuals were chosen from those organizations. The criteria for selecting national and local news organizations are outlined below.

Media Organizations Sampled

National Media

Television Networks

ABC, CBS, NBC, PBS,
CNN, C-SPAN, CNBC,
MSNBC, FOX Cable News,
Telemundo, Univision

Chains with Washington, D.C. Bureaus

Gannett, Cox, Hearst

Radio

Associated Press Radio
ABC Radio Networks
CBS Radio Networks
Westwood One
Black Radio Network
National Public Radio

Newspapers

Arizona Republic
Atlanta Journal-Constitution
Boston Globe
Chicago Tribune
Detroit Free Press
Houston Chronicle
Long Island Newsday
Los Angeles Times
Miami Herald
New York Daily News
New York Times
Philadelphia Inquirer
San Francisco Chronicle
USA TODAY
Wall Street Journal
Washington Post

Magazines

Newsweek
Time
U.S. News & World Report

Wire Services

Associated Press
Bloomberg News Service
Reuters

News Services

Copley
Cox Newspapers
Gannett
Hearst
Knight-Ridder
Newhouse
Scripps-Howard

Local Media

Television

A random sample was selected from all stations listed in the top 100 media markets.

Print

The top 100 newspapers ranked by circulation were selected, excluding those newspapers selected for the national sample.

Respondents Selected at each Organization (By Title)

National Sample

Executive Level

TV & Radio: President/CEO, Vice President, General Manager, Station Manager

Print: Publisher, President/CEO, Vice President

Senior Editors and Producers

TV & Radio: News Division Executive, Executive Producer

Print: Assistant Managing Editor, Managing Editor, Executive Editor, Section Editor

Working Journalists and Editors

TV & Radio: Bureau Chief, Senior Producer, Correspondent, Anchor

Print: Bureau Chief, Senior Editor, Columnist, Associate Editor, Reporter, Correspondent, Assignment editor

Local Sample

Executive Level

Television: President/CEO, Vice President, General Manager, Station Manager

Print: Publisher, President/CEO, Vice President

Senior Editors and Producers

Print: Assistant Managing Editor, Managing Editor, Executive Editor, Business, Metro and Editorial Section Editors

Television: News Director

Working Journalists and Editors

Television: Producer, Correspondent

Print: National Editor, Editor, Reporter, Senior Editor, National and Foreign Editors, Associate Editors, Columnist

Internet Sample

Online Producer, Online Vice President, Online Content Manager, General Manager of Website, Online Editor

The national and local news media samples were each divided into subgroups, defined by the type of news organization and the respondent's position within that organization. Each subgroup was randomly split into replicates. Quotas were set for the number of interviews to be completed in each subgroup. The Internet sample was also assigned a quota. These quotas were set to ensure adequate representation of the smaller subgroups in the final sample of completed interviews. The subgroups, quotas, and number of completed interviews for each are listed below.

Component	<u>Quota</u>	<u>Completed</u>
National Print	110	130
National Newspapers		
Executives	12	12
Senior Editors and Producers	21	28
Working Journalists and Editors	34	40
National Magazines		
Executives	4	2
Senior Editors and Producers	7	7
Working Journalists and Editors	11	12
National News Services		
Executives	2	3
Senior Editors and Producers	4	7
Working Journalists and Editors	7	10
Wire Services		
Executives	2	1
Senior Editors and Producers	3	3
Working Journalists and Editors	3	5
National Broadcast	110	117
National TV and Radio		
Executives	20	19
Senior Editors and Producers	35	38
Working Journalists and Editors	55	60
Local Print	115	118
Local Newspapers		
Executives	30	28
Senior Editors and Producers	35	39
Working Journalists and Editors	50	51
Local Broadcast	115	114
Local TV News		
Executives	30	27
Senior Editors and Producers	35	33
Working Journalists and Editors	50	54
Internet	50	68

Each person sampled for this survey was mailed an advance letter. The letters were intended to introduce the survey to prospective respondents, describe the nature and purpose of the survey and encourage participation. The letter was sent from the Pew Research Center; the Project for Excellence in Journalism; and the Committee of Concerned Journalists was involved. It contained a URL and a password to complete the survey online as well as notification that interviewers would be calling as well.

As soon as the letters were mailed, a website was available for respondents to complete the interview online.

Approximately one week after the letter was mailed, trained interviewers began calling the sampled individuals to remind them of the letter, discuss doing the survey online or conducting the interview on the telephone. In all cases, a follow-up email was sent after three days of initial calls, repeating the substance of the letter and providing the URL again.

If a respondent refused an interview, in most cases an email appeal was sent, asking the individual to reconsider. This was followed approximately one week later by another telephone call.

If a member of the sample had not completed the interview online or by telephone within two weeks of mailing the first letter, follow-up telephone calls were made to complete the interview or to schedule an appointment to do so.

The interviewers were experienced, executive specialists trained to ensure their familiarity with the questionnaire and their professionalism in dealing with news media professionals. The interviews were completed from March 10, 2004 through April 20, 2004.

Interviews were completed with 67% of the selected news media respondents who still held their position; 12% could not be reached in order to complete an interview, despite repeated calls; and 21% refused to participate in the survey.

Profile of News Professionals

Journalists and managers in major national and local news organizations tend to be well-educated, middle-aged, with substantial experience in the field. The median age of those surveyed is 47 years, with nearly four-in-ten (38%) falling between 45 and 54 years of age. Only 13% are under the age of 35. The median experience of the respondents is 22 years.

Most of the journalists surveyed have a college degree; less than 10% have not completed college. Significant numbers have a graduate degree or at least some graduate school experience. About half of print journalists have a degree in journalism; communications degrees are more common among broadcast professionals at the local level.

	-National-		--Local--	
	Print	Brdcast	Print	TV
Median age	48	45	51	44
	%	%	%	%
Female	37	36	26	34
Male	<u>63</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>66</u>
	100	100	100	100
White, non-Hispanic	82	84	89	77
Black	6	6	6	8
Hispanic	6	7	0	6
Labor union member	7	20	3	13
Graduate degree	32	32	24	20
Some graduate work	14	7	17	12
College graduate	49	55	51	62
Less than college	5	5	8	5
<i>College or Post-grad degree in...</i>				
Journalism	48	30	49	27
Communications	9	18	7	40
Other	38	46	36	27
Number of cases	(130)	(117)	(118)	(114)
* The National TV column includes journalists working in radio.				

PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESS
SURVEY OF JOURNALISTS
FINAL TOPLINE
March 10 - April 20, 2004
Total National Press N=247
Total Local Press N=232
Total Internet Press N=68

Results are reported separately for national, local, and internet journalists. Further breakdowns by medium (*Print* includes newspapers, magazines, wire services and news services. *Broadcast* includes national TV and radio news, and local TV news) and by employment level (*Executives* include presidents, CEOs, general managers and publishers; *Senior editors and producers*; and *working journalists and editors*). See *Survey Methodology* section for complete sample descriptions.

Q.1 What do you feel is the most important problem facing journalism today? (**OPEN-ENDED; RECORD VERBATIM RESPONSE; PROBE FOR CLARITY: INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF NECESSARY, QUESTION REFERS TO JOURNALISM "IN GENERAL."**)

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>		<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>			<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>
'04	'99	'04	'99		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
N=	(130)	(117)	(118)	(114)	(37)	(83)	(127)	(55)	(72)	(105)	(68)				
41	44	33	39	QUALITY OF COVERAGE (NET)	32	51	30	37	32	45	41	35	28	36	32
8	10	10	10	Reporting Accurately / Factually	7	9	7	12	5	7	9	11	4	12	6
8	8	5	12	Sensationalism / tabloid / infotainment	4	13	2	8	3	10	9	4	1	8	3
7	12	7	6	News not relevant enough / Out of touch	9	4	13	0	8	8	5	7	10	4	10
7	2	3	*	Other quality of coverage	3	10	1	5	3	7	7	2	6	2	4
6	--	4	--	Lack of depth / context	3	9	3	6	3	4	8	4	3	6	6
5	12	4	6	Lack of objectivity / Balanced stories	2	9	3	6	14	4	3	7	4	3	3
3	--	4	--	Lack investigative journalism / Watchdog role	3	3	6	2	3	4	2	2	1	7	0
2	8	*	5	Lack of restraint / Not selective in coverage	0	3	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	1	0
1	3	1	3	Quality of writing / Less clichéd / Hold interest	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	2	0	2	2
1	4	0	3	Follow fads/Pack journalism/Trendy stories	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
30	25	35	25	ECONOMIC/BUSINESS PRESSURES (NET)	31	28	36	33	32	29	29	35	31	37	32
9	14	8	11	Declining audience / Attracting an audience	15	2	15	1	14	8	7	13	8	6	10
8	3	9	4	Lack of resources / Financial cutbacks	7	9	8	10	8	12	6	7	8	10	7
5	8	9	7	Too much bottom-line emphasis / Profits	5	3	9	9	5	5	4	7	8	10	9
5	2	4	2	Corporate ownership & consolidation	5	4	3	4	5	5	4	6	1	5	6
5	*	3	6	Staffing problems / Not enough journalists	5	4	3	4	5	2	6	4	4	3	2
3	6	4	6	Commercialization / Ratings over quality	0	6	1	8	3	2	3	0	3	8	6
1	--	2	--	Not enough time	0	2	3	2	0	0	2	2	0	4	0
1	--	2	--	Other economic / business pressures	1	1	1	4	0	1	1	2	3	2	0

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>	
<u>National</u>		<u>Local</u>			N=	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'99	'04	'99			(130)	(117)	(118)	(114)	(37)	(83)	(127)	(55)	(72)	(105)	(68)
28	30	23	34	CREDIBILITY / PUBLIC TRUST (NET)	39	15	33	12	22	30	28	16	29	22	19	
22	23	17	28	Credibility problem	30	12	28	6	16	19	24	15	24	14	16	
5	6	4	8	Lack of public trust	7	3	4	4	0	7	5	6	6	3	3	
2	6	3	3	Other credibility issues	3	1	2	4	5	4	0	0	1	5	0	
15	24	7	19	MEDIA ENVIRONMENT (NET)	15	14	6	9	22	15	13	9	8	6	27	
5	17	2	15	Too much competition / Fragmentation	5	5	2	2	11	4	4	4	1	1	7	
5	--	2	--	Speed / pace of reporting / Too fast	2	7	0	4	0	6	5	2	1	3	4	
3	--	2	--	Need to adapt to changing technology / society	5	1	3	1	11	2	2	2	3	2	10	
2	6	1	3	Too much news / Overload of information	2	2	1	1	3	2	1	2	1	0	2	
2	4	0	3	24/7 News cycle	2	3	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	2	
1	--	*	--	Other media environment	2	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	1	0	4	
5	11	6	10	ETHICS AND STANDARDS (NET)	6	4	6	5	0	6	6	6	7	5	4	
MISCELLANEOUS																
4	3	3	3	Public lacks interest / Public apathy	4	3	6	1	5	2	4	2	6	3	6	
3	--	3	--	Limits on press freedom / Government secrecy	2	4	2	5	3	0	5	0	4	5	2	
3	4	1	3	Confusion between opinion & reporting	2	4	1	2	3	2	3	0	3	1	2	
2	--	*	--	Undue criticism of the press	1	3	1	0	3	4	1	0	1	0	0	
0	4	0	4	Confusion between tabloid TV and news	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
*	1	0	0	Arrogance	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
5	8	10	14	OTHER	5	4	9	10	3	5	6	7	11	10	3	
1	3	3	2	NO ANSWER	0	2	1	5	0	0	2	2	4	3	0	

Q.2 What do you think journalism is doing especially WELL these days? (OPEN-ENDED; RECORD VERBATIM RESPONSE; PROBE FOR CLARITY: INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF NECESSARY, QUESTION REFERS TO JOURNALISM "IN GENERAL.")

	<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
	<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
'04													
25	31		31	18	42	19	30	28	21	33	36	26	18
5	6	QUALITY OF COVERAGE (NET)	4	5	5	7	8	5	3	2	13	4	3
4	7	Large volume, scope of coverage	5	3	10	4	3	5	4	9	7	7	4
4	2	Other quality of coverage	5	3	1	4	11	4	2	4	0	3	7
3	5	Depth of coverage	4	2	7	4	3	1	4	11	3	4	0
3	3	Relevant to people's lives	4	2	5	1	0	7	1	0	4	4	2
2	2	Insightful analysis / What's behind the news	2	2	4	0	0	2	2	0	6	1	0
2	1	Interesting coverage	3	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	0
2	1	Covering trends / change	2	1	2	0	3	1	2	0	1	1	0
1	3	Accuracy	2	0	6	0	0	1	1	4	1	4	0
1	2	Graphics, color, design	2	0	4	0	0	1	2	2	6	0	0
1	1	Good writing	1	1	2	1	3	0	1	4	0	1	3
		Relevant to important issues											
23	24	TIMELINESS AND SPEED (NET)	11	37	14	33	24	25	21	13	25	29	24
19	17	Quick response to breaking news / speed	11	28	12	23	19	19	19	6	22	20	21
3	6	On-site reporting / Live coverage	1	6	0	12	0	6	2	4	4	9	0
1	4	Ability to cover 24-hour news cycle	0	3	3	5	3	1	1	6	0	6	2
*	0	Other timeliness and speed	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2
20	18	COVERAGE OF SPECIFIC TOPICS (NET)	23	17	20	17	24	21	19	18	19	17	16
9	4	War, terrorism, foreign policy	7	10	3	4	8	8	9	0	6	5	2
6	1	Foreign reporting / International news	7	4	1	2	11	7	3	2	0	2	3
3	3	Other coverage of specific topics	5	1	3	3	0	2	4	0	4	4	6
2	1	Election / political coverage	4	1	1	1	3	1	3	0	0	2	0
1	9	Local news and issues	2	0	9	8	3	1	1	16	8	5	9
1	1	Economic issues / Business news	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	2	2
0	1	Sports	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0
11	7	WATCHDOG ROLE (NET)	15	6	9	5	8	16	9	9	7	7	10
7	3	Investigative reporting	10	4	4	1	8	10	6	4	1	3	4
4	5	Watchdog/ Keep eye on government for public	6	2	5	4	0	7	3	6	6	4	6

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u> '04	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u> '04		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
		MISCELLANEOUS (NET)											
6	2	Wide variety of media sources / Choice	5	7	0	4	3	4	8	0	0	4	6
5	2	Technology (general mention)	2	8	1	4	5	5	4	2	0	4	4
2	5	Diversity of views/ Wide range of perspectives	2	1	6	4	0	2	2	4	4	7	4
2	3	Informing the public	2	3	2	5	5	2	2	6	3	3	7
2	3	Online websites / The Internet	1	4	1	5	5	0	3	0	1	6	15
2	3	Willing to examine itself / Self-policing	3	1	6	1	0	2	2	6	4	2	3
2	3	Fairness, balance, lack of bias	2	2	3	3	8	1	0	4	3	3	4
1	1	Innovation / Response to declining audience	2	0	3	0	3	0	1	0	1	2	3
1	1	Efficient, does a lot with limited resources	2	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	3	1	0
11	9	OTHER	12	10	9	9	14	10	12	11	8	8	18
10	6	NO ANSWER/NONE/NOTHING	9	11	3	9	5	6	14	9	1	8	6

Q.3 Thinking about journalism overall in the U.S. today, do you think it is generally going in the right direction or the wrong direction?

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u> '04	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u> '04		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
43	51	Right direction	52	33	53	48	57	43	39	49	60	46	54
51	46	Wrong direction	42	61	43	49	38	52	54	49	36	51	44
<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.4a Thinking more generally about the news media, what grade A, B, C, D, or F would you give network television news for its overall news coverage these days?

<i>TOTAL</i> <u>National</u>		<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Local</u>		<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Internet</u>	
'04	'95	'04	'95												
4	2	8	4	"A"	1	7	4	12	11	2	3	4	7	10	3
39	46	44	45	"B"	31	48	34	55	35	35	43	45	37	49	35
44	38	36	41	"C"	48	39	45	26	43	45	43	40	38	32	47
11	8	10	6	"D"	17	5	13	7	8	15	10	9	14	8	12
1	*	2	1	"F"	1	1	3	0	0	2	0	2	4	*	2
<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>2</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
C+	B-	B-	B-	Average Grade	C+	B-	C+	B-	B-	C+	C+	C+	C+	B-	C+

Q.4b What grade A, B, C, D, or F would you give local television news for its overall coverage these days?

<i>TOTAL</i> <u>National</u>		<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Local</u>		<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Internet</u>	
'04	'95	'04	'95												
1	1	4	5	"A"	0	3	2	6	3	0	2	7	4	2	0
20	13	28	34	"B"	14	27	16	41	19	18	22	22	31	29	37
39	37	39	34	"C"	38	40	40	37	51	34	39	40	36	40	35
31	30	23	19	"D"	39	21	35	11	21	38	28	24	22	24	25
7	13	6	6	"F"	8	6	7	5	3	10	7	7	7	5	3
<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>2</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
C-	C-	C	C	Average Grade	C-	C	C-	C+	C	C-	C-	C	C	C	C

Q.4c What grade A, B, C, D, or F would you give the major national newspapers for their overall coverage these days?

<i>TOTAL</i> <u>National</u>		<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Local</u>			<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Internet</u>
'04	'95	'04	'95												
25	23	23	17	"A"	21	31	25	22	29	25	24	22	15	31	21
67	71	57	68	"B"	71	63	61	53	65	66	69	56	61	54	69
7	4	15	12	"C"	7	5	12	17	3	9	6	13	17	14	9
1	*	4	1	"D"	1	1	2	6	3	0	1	7	6	1	1
0	0	0	0	"F"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
B+	B+	B	B	Average Grade	B+	B+	B	B	B+	B+	B+	B	B	B+	B

Q.4d What grade A, B, C, D, or F would you give the typical daily newspaper for its overall coverage these days?

<i>TOTAL</i> <u>National</u>		<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Local</u>			<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Internet</u>
'04	'95	'04	'95												
3	1	6	2	"A"	2	4	5	7	5	0	3	4	4	9	10
46	35	52	44	"B"	46	46	55	49	52	50	42	40	51	59	56
43	47	35	45	"C"	47	39	37	32	38	43	45	43	38	28	28
5	7	5	7	"D"	3	6	1	9	5	5	4	11	3	3	3
*	*	1	0	"F"	1	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	4	0	2
<u>3</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
B-	C+	B-	C+	Average Grade	B-	B-	B-	B-	B-	C+	B-	C+	B-	B-	B-

Q.4e What grade A, B, C, D, or F would you give cable TV news channels for their overall coverage these days?

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>		<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>			<u>NATIONAL</u> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<u>LOCAL</u> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<u>LOCAL</u> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
'04		'04													
5		7		"A"	3	7	6	9	5	4	5	2	2	14	15
38		41		"B"	41	34	38	43	35	34	41	31	39	47	38
38		32		"C"	38	38	36	29	41	40	36	42	39	23	37
17		15		"D"	16	18	15	15	16	19	16	16	15	14	7
1		3		"F"	1	2	3	2	0	2	2	6	1	2	2
<u>1</u>		<u>2</u>		Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
100		100			100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
C+		C+		Average Grade	C+	C+	C+	C+	C+	C+	C+	C	C+	B-	B-

Q.4f What grade A, B, C, D, or F would you give national news organizations for the way they have covered George W. Bush's presidency, so far?

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>		<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>			<u>NATIONAL</u> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<u>LOCAL</u> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<u>LOCAL</u> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
'04	'95	'04	'95												
4	4	6	4	"A"	5	3	5	7	3	2	5	4	4	8	6
49	61	37	43	"B"	48	51	33	42	54	54	45	36	31	43	29
37	29	43	43	"C"	37	38	46	39	35	37	38	43	50	38	47
7	5	11	9	"D"	8	5	14	8	5	4	9	13	12	9	13
2	*	2	1	"F"	1	3	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	1	2
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
B-	B-	C+	C+	Average Grade	B-	B-	C+	B-	B-	B-	C+	C+	C+	B-	C+

1995 figures for the way news organizations "have covered Bill Clinton's presidency, so far."

Q.4g What grade A, B, C, D, or F would you give national news organizations for their websites?

<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04												
18	13	"A"	14	22	12	15	16	21	16	5	13	18	25
52	44	"B"	53	49	46	43	40	54	52	51	43	42	60
18	20	"C"	18	19	25	15	30	17	16	20	29	14	13
2	3	"D"	3	1	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	4	0
*	1	"F"	1	0	1	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	2
<u>10</u>	<u>19</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>11</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
B	B	Average Grade	B	B	B-	B	B-	B	B	B-	B	B	B

Q.4h What grade A, B, C, D, or F would you give (Name of respondent's news organization) for its overall coverage these days?

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'95	'04	'95												
22	20	14	13	"A"	18	26	14	14	38	20	19	14	19	10	12
61	67	59	69	"B"	64	56	64	53	54	59	64	60	67	52	63
14	9	21	16	"C"	14	15	21	21	5	19	13	15	11	31	22
2	0	3	1	"D"	2	3	1	4	0	1	4	2	0	5	2
*	0	*	0	"F"	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0
<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
B	B+	B	B	Average Grade	B	B	B	B	B+	B	B	B	B	B-	B

Q.5 Thus far, do you think press coverage of the presidential campaign has been better or worse than it was in 2000?

<i>TOTAL</i> <u>National</u>			<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Local</u>				<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>			<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>			<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Internet</u>
'04	'92'	'04	'92'																
56	46	46	51	Better		61	51	46	46	68	56	53	49	40	48				57
24	19	34	18	Worse		23	26	35	33	16	22	28	33	35	34				27
10	30	15	27	Same (VOL PHONE SURVEY ONLY)		8	12	13	18	11	11	9	14	21	12				6
<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)		<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>				<u>10</u>
100	100	100	100			100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100				100

Q.6 Would you say the press has been too critical, not critical enough, or fair in the way it has covered the Bush administration?

<i>TOTAL</i> <u>National</u>			<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Local</u>				<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>			<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>			<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Internet</u>
'04		'04																	
8		19		Too critical		9	8	14	25	19	4	9	26	17	18				12
55		37		Not critical enough		55	55	46	28	40	53	60	29	37	41				54
35		42		Fair		34	36	40	44	41	40	30	45	42	40				29
<u>2</u>		<u>2</u>		Don't know/Refused (VOL)		<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>				<u>5</u>
100		100				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100				100

Q.7 In your opinion, is increased bottom line pressure seriously hurting the quality of news coverage these days or is it mostly just changing the way news organizations do things?

<i>TOTAL</i> <u>National</u>						<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Local</u>							<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>			<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Print</u> <u>Broadcast</u>			<i>NATIONAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>LOCAL</i> <u>Exec</u> <u>Sr.</u> <u>Jour</u>			<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Internet</u>
'04	'99	'95	'04	'99	'95																				
66	49	41	57	46	33	Hurting																			
29	40	38	35	46	50	Just changing																			
1	1	8	3	2	8	Neither/no effect (VOL PH. SURVEY ONLY)																			
3	9	11	4	5	7	Both (VOL PHONE SURVEY ONLY)																			
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)																			
100	100	100	100	100	100																				

¹ In 1992 the question was worded: "...better or worse than it was in 1988."

Q.8 Here are some criticisms made of the press. For each one of these criticisms, do you think this is a valid criticism of the news media overall, or not?
(INSERT ITEM)

a. The distinction between reporting and commentary has seriously eroded.

<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>	
<u>National</u>			<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>	
'04	'99	'95	'04	'99	'95												
64	69	53	59	68	44	Valid criticism	58	71	57	61	54	64	67	62	63	55	57
35	30	44	40	32	53	Not a valid criticism	41	29	42	37	43	35	33	38	36	43	43
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

b. News reports are increasingly full of factual errors and sloppy reporting.

<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>	
<u>National</u>			<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>	
'04	'99	'95	'04	'99	'95												
45	40	30	47	55	40	Valid criticism	44	47	41	54	35	48	47	51	44	48	57
54	58	65	52	42	59	Not a valid criticism	55	52	59	45	65	51	52	49	54	52	41
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
100	100	100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

c. Too little attention is paid to complex issues.

<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>	
<u>National</u>			<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>	
'04	'99	'95	'04	'99	'95												
78	71	80	77	72	75	Valid criticism	74	84	73	82	65	80	82	78	81	74	75
21	27	17	22	28	22	Not a valid criticism	25	15	27	17	32	20	17	22	18	26	25
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

d. The press is too cynical.

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>				<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>	<u>'95</u>	<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>	<u>'95</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
37	53	54	40	51	53	Valid criticism	38	36	42	38	43	36	35	40	47	34	24
63	45	44	59	48	45	Not a valid criticism	62	64	58	60	57	64	65	60	50	65	76
0	2	2	1	1	2	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	0
100	100	100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

e. Journalists have become out-of-touch with their audiences.

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>				<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>	<u>'95</u>	<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>	<u>'95</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
47	57		44	51		Valid criticism	58	34	52	34	43	55	43	49	49	37	59
50	41		55	49		Not a valid criticism	39	63	47	64	51	42	55	51	50	61	41
3	2		1	*		Don't know/Refused (VOL)	3	3	1	2	6	3	2	0	1	2	0
100	100		100	100			100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

f. Journalists are letting their ideological views show in their reporting too frequently.

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>		<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>			<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>	<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
45		43		Valid criticism	43	46	43	44	38	46	46	73	36	33	47
53		56		Not a valid criticism	55	51	57	54	62	51	52	27	61	67	52
2		1		Don't know/Refused (VOL)	2	3	0	2	0	3	2	0	3	0	1
100		100			100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

g. The press is too timid these days.

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>		<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>			<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>	<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
47		42		Valid criticism	48	44	51	32	32	45	52	31	43	47	56
52		56		Not a valid criticism	52	53	47	67	62	55	47	66	56	52	44
1		2		Don't know/Refused (VOL)	0	3	2	1	6	0	1	4	1	1	0
100		100			100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

h. There are too many talk shows on cable television today.

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
'04	'04												
63	64	Valid criticism	63	64	69	59	54	70	62	64	62	65	52
34	31	Not a valid criticism	35	32	27	36	43	28	35	31	31	32	44
3	5	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	2	4	4	5	3	2	3	5	7	3	4
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

i. The emergence of the 24 hour news cycle is weakening journalism.

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
'04	'04												
42	40	Valid criticism	35	49	41	39	27	43	45	38	40	40	38
57	59	Not a valid criticism	63	50	58	59	73	57	53	58	58	60	62
1	1	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	2	1	1	2	0	0	2	4	1	0	0
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

j. The Internet allows too much posting of links to material that is unvetted or unfiltered.

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
'04	'04												
57	58	Valid criticism	58	55	57	59	54	59	56	64	58	54	28
42	37	Not a valid criticism	41	44	40	34	43	40	43	33	35	41	72
1	5	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	1	1	3	7	3	1	1	3	7	5	0
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

ROTATE Q.9 AND Q.10

Q.9 Is there any daily national news organization that you think is especially *liberal* in its coverage of the news, or can't you think of any?

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
'04	'04												
38	41	Yes	38	38	48	34	30	40	39	51	43	34	34
59	56	Can't think of any	60	58	50	61	70	55	58	45	53	63	62
3	3	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	2	4	3	5	0	5	3	4	4	3	4
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

IF 1, IN Q.9, ASK:

Q.9a What news organization is that? (RECORD VERBATIM. ALLOW MULTIPLE ANSWERS, BUT DO NOT PROBE)

BASED ON TOTAL:

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
'04	'04												
20	17	New York Times	22	19	26	7	16	24	19	27	17	11	13
4	2	Washington Post	6	2	4	0	0	2	6	4	3	1	4
2	6	CNN	1	4	3	10	5	1	2	9	4	6	6
2	5	CBS	1	4	3	7	0	1	4	4	6	5	3
2	2	ABC	0	4	2	3	0	1	3	6	0	2	2
2	2	NPR	2	2	2	3	0	0	3	2	3	2	6
1	3	NBC	1	2	2	4	0	1	2	4	3	2	4
1	2	Los Angeles Times	2	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	2
1	1	Other Newspaper	2	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	3	3
*	1	Fox News Channel	1	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	2	3
5	5	OTHER (NET)	5	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	8	4	2
4	3	Don't know/Refused	3	5	3	3	0	5	5	2	0	6	2
8	15	TELEVISION (NET)	5	11	9	21	11	7	7	15	15	14	13
24	21	NEWSPAPER (NET)	28	21	33	8	16	29	24	33	24	12	18

Q.10 Is there any daily national news organization that you think is especially *conservative* in its coverage of the news, or can't you think of any?

	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
				<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
'04		'04												
82		63	Yes	78	86	68	59	87	83	80	58	61	68	66
15		35	Can't think of any	20	10	30	39	14	13	17	42	35	30	29
3		2	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	2	4	2	2	0	4	3	0	4	2	5
100		100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

IF 1, IN Q.10, ASK:

Q.10a What news organization is that? (RECORD VERBATIM. ALLOW MULTIPLE ANSWERS, BUT DO NOT PROBE)

BASED ON TOTAL:

	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
				<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
'04		'04												
69		42	Fox News Channel	57	83	39	46	68	70	69	36	44	44	60
9		4	Washington Times	11	7	5	3	3	10	10	2	1	7	2
8		11	Wall St. Journal	11	5	18	4	16	6	7	11	11	11	6
2		2	Radio (Miscellaneous)	1	3	0	4	3	0	2	0	4	2	2
1		1	New York Post	2	1	2	1	0	4	0	0	0	3	2
1		1	Rupert Murdoch newspapers/NewsCorp	1	1	2	1	0	0	2	4	1	0	2
3		6	OTHER (NET)	5	2	7	5	5	4	2	6	3	9	3
1		2	Don't know/Refused	2	0	2	3	0	2	1	2	0	4	0
70		44	TELEVISION (NET)	58	83	40	48	70	70	69	38	44	47	60
19		20	NEWSPAPERS (NET)	24	13	31	9	22	19	17	20	15	23	9

Q.11 Do you think that it is a good thing or a bad thing if some daily news organizations have a decidedly ideological point of view in their coverage of the news?

	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
				<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
'04		'04												
22		21	Good thing	23	21	20	21	24	17	25	20	22	20	25
72		74	Bad thing	74	69	77	72	68	78	69	76	72	75	74
6		5	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	3	10	3	7	8	5	6	4	6	5	1
100		100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.12 Do you feel that the emergence of the Internet has made journalism better, worse, or hasn't it made much of a difference?

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>		<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'99	'04	'99												
60	54	51	47	Better	60	60	46	57	57	51	67	31	53	61	63
15	12	18	8	Worse	16	13	19	18	13	13	16	27	19	12	3
21	26	27	42	Not much difference	21	22	32	21	27	30	14	38	22	24	32
3	5	2	2	Both (VOL PHONE SURVEY ONLY)	2	4	2	1	3	4	3	2	4	0	2
<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	Don't know/refused	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

IF 1 OR 2 (BETTER OR WORSE) IN Q.12

Q.12a In what ways do you think this has changed journalism for the (worse)(better)? (OPEN-ENDED. RECORD VERBATIM RESPONSE)?

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>		<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04														
47	61			Change for the Better:											16
25	20			Research tool for journalists / Easier/faster info											54
23	19			Greater speed /24 hour cycle /More competition											23
20	11			Public gets more information/greater accuracy											23
3	8			More voices heard/Democratizes news business											5
3	4			Promotes greater accountability for journalism											0
1	1			Other											2
(148)	(119)			Don't Know											(43)
				(N)											

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>		<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04														
53	45			Change for the Worse:											n/a
17	29			Too much unvetted, unfiltered information											
17	7			Increased speed leads to error											
				Makes journalists lazy/encourages plagiarism											
				Promotes rise of pseudo-journalism, junk sites,											
14	21			low-brow news											
14	10			Damages public credibility of journalism											
14	17			Other											
(36)	(42)			(N)											(2)

Q.13 How confident are you that a news organization that is owned by a corporate parent can do a good job covering news about the parent company? Are you very confident, somewhat confident, not too confident, or not at all confident?

<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04												
18	12	Very confident	14	22	12	13	46	15	12	7	21	10	10
43	39	Somewhat confident	41	45	40	38	40	48	39	49	38	35	43
29	36	Not too confident	35	22	35	37	11	25	37	33	25	45	34
10	12	Not at all confident	9	11	13	10	3	12	11	9	15	10	13
*	1	Don't know/refused	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	0
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.14 Which of the following statements comes closer to your view about plagiarism in journalism today? First (READ OPTIONS)...

<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04												
21	23	There is more plagiarism today than in the past	24	18	20	25	16	19	24	27	24	20	27
77	72	We are hearing more about plagiarism but its prevalence has not increased	76	77	78	67	84	78	73	71	72	73	72
2	5	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	0	5	2	8	0	2	3	2	4	7	1
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Now, thinking about your own newsroom...

Q.15 How would you rate the quality of leadership in your news organization? Would you say it is excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'99	'04	'99												
30	36	22	24	Excellent	30	30	23	21	54	30	23	40	18	15	21
41	44	47	51	Good	45	37	55	38	38	41	42	38	67	38	47
22	15	21	21	Only fair	19	25	20	23	3	25	25	9	10	35	25
5	5	6	4	Poor	3	7	2	9	0	3	8	2	1	11	4
2	*	4	*	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	3	1	0	2	5	1	2	11	4	1	3
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.16 Is there any on-going effort to address ethical issues in your newsroom, directed by your news organization's management?

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>		<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'99	'04	'99												
76	81	77	72	Yes	75	77	85	68	92	82	67	86	81	69	78
21	19	18	25	No	22	19	13	24	5	13	30	9	14	27	21
<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.17 Compared to three years ago, has the size of the newsroom staff at your organization increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>		<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04														
18	23			Increased	15	22	16	30	24	17	17	24	28	19	19
37	43			Decreased	48	26	54	31	19	43	39	40	40	46	62
41	30			Stayed the same	34	47	29	32	54	35	40	29	28	33	18
<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>			Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
100	100				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.18 Approximately how many stories or packages do most reporters at your news organization produce in a typical week?

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>		<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04														
0	*			None	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
33	20			1-3	45	20	35	5	13	40	35	20	31	13	22
27	44			4-7	21	33	36	52	14	29	29	27	39	55	38
5	12			8-10	2	7	2	22	14	2	3	9	13	13	10
8	4			10+	2	15	0	7	5	4	12	6	3	3	6
<u>27</u>	<u>20</u>			Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>30</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>24</u>
100	100				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.19 These days, are you rewriting or repackaging stories for multiple uses more, less or the same as in the past, or don't you do this at all?

[IF REWRITING OR REPACKAGING "MORE" (CODE 1 IN Q.19)]

Q.19a Are you happy or unhappy about this change, or doesn't it matter to you?

	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
				<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
'04	'04													
48	48	48	More	52	43	53	42	54	56	41	62	46	42	71
18	16	16	Happy	24	11	18	12	46	19	9	27	22	5	44
6	8	8	Unhappy	6	5	4	12	5	5	6	6	6	11	9
23	24	24	Doesn't matter	21	26	30	18	3	30	25	29	17	26	18
1	*	*	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
1	4	4	Less	0	2	3	5	0	3	0	0	4	6	0
20	19	19	Same	16	25	15	24	24	19	20	18	19	20	16
12	10	10	Don't do this at all	13	10	6	14	6	10	15	7	14	8	0
<u>20</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>19</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>13</u>
100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.20 In the past 12 months, did you participate in training or professional development - other than technical training - provided by your news organization?

	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Internet</u>
				<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	
'04	'04													
47	56	56	Yes	58	36	65	47	68	47	42	62	73	41	66
52	41	41	No	41	64	32	50	27	53	58	33	24	57	34
<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

IF YES, PARTICIPATED IN TRAINING (Q.20=1)

Q.20a On approximately how many days did you participate in training or professional development?

	<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
	<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04		N=	(75)	(42)	(77)	(53)	(25)	(39)	(53)	(34)	(53)	(43)	(45)
38	38	1-3 days		35	45	29	51	20	36	49	29	36	47	31
33	34	4-6 days		35	29	35	32	44	38	23	32	32	37	36
21	18	7-13 days		20	21	26	7	12	18	26	27	26	2	22
4	9	14 + days		4	5	9	8	8	5	2	12	6	9	11
4	1	Don't know/Refused (VOL)		6	0	1	2	16	3	0	0	0	5	0
100	100			100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.21 Have there been instances in which your newsroom was encouraged to do a story because it related to an owner, advertiser, or sponsor?

	<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
	<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04													
15	32	Yes		18	12	29	36	5	18	16	24	31	38	35
81	60	No		77	84	64	56	87	80	79	69	65	52	57
4	8	Don't know/Refused (VOL)		5	4	7	8	8	2	5	7	4	10	8
100	100			100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

IF Q.21=1, ASK:

Q.21a PLEASE DESCRIBE _____

	<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
	<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04													
38	36	INTERNAL SOURCE:												
24	24	Corporate ownership, or managerial influence												
8	12	Coverage of company-sponsored events												
8	3	Promotions of other programming on network/station												
27	36	EXTERNAL SOURCE: Advertiser/sponsor influence												
11	16	Other												
27	20	Refused/Rather not say												
(37)	(75)	(N)												

Q.22 Generally speaking, how good a job does journalism do striking a balance between what audiences want to know and what's important for them to know?
(READ CHOICES)

<i>TOTAL</i> <u>National</u>			<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Local</u>				<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>'04</u>	<u>'00</u>	<u>'99</u>	<u>'04</u>	<u>'00</u>	<u>'99</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
3	2	4	4	2	6	Excellent	4	3	5	3	8	0	5	2	4	5	0
46	35	45	44	33	49	Good	46	45	49	39	57	39	47	47	46	42	55
43	55	45	45	57	42	Only fair	45	41	43	46	24	55	41	47	44	44	41
6	5	4	5	5	3	Poor	5	7	2	9	8	5	5	4	3	7	4
<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.23 For each of the following, please indicate whether you think it is a major reason, a minor reason, or not a reason some types of news media have lost audience or readership.

a. The press does not pay enough attention to stories that are meaningful to average Americans.

<i>TOTAL</i> <u>National</u>		<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Local</u>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>	<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
39	41	48	42	Major reason	54	23	54	43	32	43	39	58	53	41	52
39	40	36	40	Minor reason	34	44	36	35	46	34	39	27	36	39	35
21	18	14	18	Not a reason	12	31	10	18	22	19	22	13	8	19	13
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>*</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

b. The public is not interested in serious news.

<i>TOTAL</i> <u>National</u>		<i>TOTAL</i> <u>Local</u>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>	<u>'04</u>	<u>'99</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
30	22	24	26	Major reason	30	30	19	29	19	29	34	25	15	29	24
36	42	43	43	Minor reason	35	37	50	36	32	40	34	44	49	39	44
33	35	32	31	Not a reason	35	31	31	32	49	30	31	31	33	31	32
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

c. Specialized news outlets allow people to get only the news they want.

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>		<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'99	'04	'99												
45	40	42	40	Major reason	44	47	40	44	52	46	43	46	43	39	55
43	42	40	50	Minor reason	45	40	45	35	43	39	46	38	42	40	32
10	17	17	10	Not a reason	10	9	15	18	5	12	9	14	14	20	13
<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

d. News organizations focus too much on sensational stories and scandals.

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>		<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'99	'04	'99												
37	43	43	43	Major reason	25	50	33	54	22	40	39	37	39	50	37
38	39	39	39	Minor reason	43	33	45	32	48	37	36	47	38	35	41
24	17	17	17	Not a reason	31	15	22	12	30	22	23	16	22	14	22
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

e. News coverage is too boring and static for a fast-paced society.

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>		<u>Local</u>			<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'99	'04	'99												
15	22	22	22	Major reason	17	13	33	11	11	15	17	34	24	14	31
45	41	41	41	Minor reason	48	42	44	39	38	46	46	46	38	42	37
39	35	35	35	Not a reason	35	43	23	47	51	37	36	18	37	42	32
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

f. Americans are too busy these days.

<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04												
47	51	Major reason	52	40	58	42	46	48	46	53	56	46	55
34	32	Minor reason	34	35	31	34	38	36	32	29	31	35	35
18	16	Not a reason	14	22	11	21	16	15	20	18	12	17	10
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

g. Too much of news coverage is repetitive.

<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04												
43	55	Major reason	41	44	39	50	49	49	36	56	40	41	38
39	44	Minor reason	41	37	47	41	38	39	40	38	44	47	44
17	10	Not a reason	18	16	14	6	13	11	22	6	13	11	16
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.24 How much trust and confidence do you have in the wisdom of the American people when it comes to making choices on election day? A great deal, a fair amount, not very much, or none at all?

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'99	'04	'99												
31	52	22	28	A great deal	27	35	24	21	48	34	24	12	28	24	15
51	41	54	56	A fair amount	54	48	57	51	38	48	57	62	54	49	53
15	6	21	13	Not very much	18	13	19	22	8	17	16	22	14	25	28
2	1	2	3	None at all	0	3	0	3	3	1	2	2	1	2	3
<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.25 Has the Internet increased or decreased the deadline pressure you face, or has there been no change?

<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04												
42	35	Increased	53	31	48	22	57	41	39	34	49	25	78
2	4	Decreased	1	2	3	3	0	1	2	2	1	6	0
55	60	No change	45	66	49	72	40	58	58	60	49	69	22
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.26 Has the Internet increased or decreased the amount of misinformation, such as false rumors, that finds its way into news stories in general, or has there been no change?

<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'04												
65	57	Increased	60	70	60	54	54	66	67	56	58	56	38
1	2	Decreased	2	1	3	1	0	1	2	2	3	1	6
31	38	No change	35	26	35	41	41	30	29	42	35	38	54
<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>
100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Finally a few questions about your personal views and values.

Q.27 How would you describe your political thinking. Would you say you are:

<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>			<i>NATIONAL</i>		<i>LOCAL</i>		<i>NATIONAL</i>			<i>LOCAL</i>			<i>TOTAL</i>
<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>Local</u>		<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'95	'04	'95												
5	2	2	2	Very liberal	5	3	2	1	0	2	7	0	0	4	2
29	20	21	12	Liberal	36	20	28	14	16	25	34	11	24	25	25
54	64	61	64	Moderate	48	61	57	65	60	59	49	76	60	53	57
7	4	11	17	Conservative	8	7	11	11	19	4	6	11	11	11	10
*	1	1	1	Very conservative	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	3
<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.28 Which comes closer to your own views, even if neither is exactly right?

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>		<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>			<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>
					<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04		'04													
91		78		It IS NOT necessary to believe in God in order to be moral and have good values	95	86	90	65	92	86	93	80	78	76	94
				OR											
6		18		It IS necessary to believe in God in order to be moral and have good values	3	8	9	27	5	7	5	16	17	20	4
*		*		Neither (VOL)	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
<u>3</u>		<u>4</u>		Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>
100		100			100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.29 Which comes closer to your own views, even if neither is exactly right?

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>		<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>			<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>
					<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04	'95	'04	'95												
88	83	74	75	Homosexuality is a way of life that should be accepted by society	94	82	79	68	92	87	88	78	75	71	91
				OR											
5	4	14	14	Homosexuality is a way of life that should be discouraged by society	4	7	14	14	3	5	6	13	14	14	7
<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	Neither /Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>2</u>
100	100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.30 What's more important in American society – that everyone be free to pursue their life's goals without interference from the government OR that the government play an active role in society so as to guarantee that nobody is in need?

<u>TOTAL</u> <u>National</u>		<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Local</u>			<u>NATIONAL</u>		<u>LOCAL</u>		<u>NATIONAL</u>			<u>LOCAL</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>
					<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Print</u>	<u>Broadcast</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Exec</u>	<u>Sr.</u>	<u>Jour</u>	<u>Internet</u>
'04		'04													
49		58		Free to pursue their life's goals without government interference	44	54	53	64	70	40	48	69	57	53	51
42		35		Government guarantees nobody in need	49	34	42	27	27	49	42	26	33	41	43
<u>2</u>		<u>7</u>		Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>7</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>
100		100			100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

SELECTED GENERAL PUBLIC COMPARISONS

**PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESS
MAY 2004 POLITICAL/BELIEVABILITY SURVEY**

FINAL TOPLINE

May 3 - 9, 2004

N=1,800 Adults nationwide

Compare to Journalists Q.6

Q.16 Would you say the press has been too critical, not critical enough, or fair in the way it has covered the Bush administration?

		Early <u>July 2003</u> ¹	Clinton <u>June 1993</u>
34	Too critical	25	35
24	Not critical enough	23	12
35	Fair	48	49
<u>7</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>
100		100	100

Compare to Journalists Q.24

Q.17 How much trust and confidence do you have in the wisdom of the American people when it comes to making choices on election day? A great deal, a fair amount, not very much, or none at all?

20	A great deal
48	A fair amount
24	Not very much
5	None at all
<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL.)
100	

¹ In 2003 and 1993 the question was worded: "Do you think the press has been too critical of the [Bush/Clinton] Administration policies and performance so far, not critical enough or do you think that the press has handled this about right?"









THE PEW RESEARCH CENTER
For The People & The Press

1150 18th Street, N.W., Suite 975
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-3126
www.people-press.org



PROJECT FOR EXCELLENCE IN JOURNALISM

ccj

Committee of Concerned Journalists

Project for Excellence in Journalism
1850 K Street, N.W., Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-7394
www.journalism.org