

THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESS, PART 2
-- A Report on an Investigation of
Public Attitudes Toward the Press --
Terrorism and News Leaks

Conducted For:

TIMES MIRROR

Conducted By:

THE GALLUP ORGANIZATION, INC.
53 Bank Street
Princeton, New Jersey 08542

G086181

October, 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
INTRODUCTION.....	i
DETAILED FINDINGS.....	1
I. Trend in General Press Favorability.....	2
II. Trend in General Press Performance.....	7
Fairness on Social and Political Issues.....	8
Independence of News Organizations.....	8
Specific Power Structure Influences.....	8
Perceived Characteristics of the News Media.....	9
III. Satisfaction With Level and Quality of News Coverage.....	12
IV. Salience of Accident and Terrorism Related News Stories...	15
V. Overall Press Performance Ratings In Covering Terrorist Incidents.....	21
Press Performance Ratings of Specific Accident/Terrorist Incidents.....	22
Awareness of and Judgment About the NBC-TV Hideout Interview With Abu Abbas.....	26
Ways News Organizations Have Done a GOOD Job Covering Terrorist Incidents.....	31
Ways News Organizations Have Done a BAD Job Covering Terrorist Incidents.....	33
Amount of News Coverage of Terrorist Incidents/Hostage Taking.....	35
Perceived Amount of Opportunity Press Gives Terrorists to Promote Their Cause.....	38

	<u>Page Number</u>
VI. Perceived Importance of Reasons News Organizations Do Not Do a Good Job Covering Terrorism.....	40
VII. Perceived Effects of Press Coverage of Terrorism Likelihood of Terrorism If No News Coverage.....	46
Perceived Effects of News Coverage of Terrorist Incidents on Aspects of Terrorism.....	47
Perceived Effect of News Coverage of Terrorist Incidents on the Public Interest.....	52
Amount of News Coverage Desired If Taken Hostage.....	56
VIII. Should Press Coverage of Terrorist Incidents Be Controlled?.....	60
IX. Explanations for Positive Attitude Toward Press Coverage of Terrorism Despite Criticism.....	63
X. News Leaks and the Press: Salience Of and Knowledge About News Leaks.....	75
Why Leaks Happen.....	77
Overall Evaluation of News Leaks.....	79
News Leaks and National Security.....	82
Press Freedom to Cover National Security Stories.....	86
How to Deal With News Leaks.....	88
XI. Results of the September, 1986 Supplemental Survey.....	90
 TECHNICAL APPENDIX:	
Sampling Tolerances.....	94
Design of the Telephone Sample.....	97
Composition of the Sample.....	101
The Questionnaires.....	103

INTRODUCTION

"People and the Press" is a comprehensive investigation into public attitudes toward the press conducted by The Gallup Organization, Inc. on behalf of Times Mirror. Part 2 in the series, reported herein, presents findings about two current news media issues: terrorism and news leaks. In addition, general press opinion in America is tracked from the measurements taken in 1985. The objectives of the "People and the Press, Part 2" survey were as follows:

- To reexamine the public's general opinions about the press in order to track those attitudes through time.
- To determine the level of satisfaction, and the degree of favorability toward press coverage of terrorist incidents.
- To measure perceived performance ratings for news organizations' coverage of terrorist incidents.
- To identify perceived effects of news organizations' coverage of terrorist incidents.
- To measure the salience of and knowledge about news leaks.
- To determine public attitudes about news leaks and their perceived effect on national security.

How the Survey Was Conducted

The findings on general press attitudes, and those on terrorism and news leaks are based on telephone interviews with 1,504 adults, conducted between July 10-24, 1986. This survey contained the principal questions for the "People and the Press, Part 2." It contained a subset of repeat questions from the 1985 survey on general attitudes toward the press used for trend analysis. The margin of error due to sampling for the total sample of 1,504 is ± 3 percentage points.

DETAILED FINDINGS

A higher proportion of women (86%) professed a favorable opinion of network TV news than men (80%). College graduates (75%) and residents of the West (77%) were less likely to have a favorable opinion of network TV news. The only small, though significant difference among subgroups of the population in favorability ratings of daily newspapers is the smaller than average proportion of Western readers (74%) rating newspapers favorably.

Favorable Opinions of Each*

	<u>Military</u> %	<u>Network TV News</u> %	<u>Daily Newspapers</u> %	<u>Ronald Reagan</u> %	<u>CIA</u> %	<u>Number of Interviews</u>
Total	84	83	79	73	50	(1504)
<u>Sex</u>						
Male	87	80	78	76	55	(754)
Female	82	86	79	70	44	(750)
<u>Age</u>						
Under 30	85	86	81	80	52	(427)
30 - 49	83	83	76	72	50	(625)
50 and over	85	81	80	68	47	(445)
<u>Education</u>						
College graduate	80	75	77	74	56	(488)
Other college	84	85	74	77	52	(329)
High school graduate	87	85	83	75	48	(561)
Less than high school graduate	85	88	76	65	44	(117)
Male College graduate	85	72	75	78	59	(557)
Female College graduate	74	78	80	68	51	(416)

*Respondents saying very favorable or mostly favorable for each person/organization. Based on total sample.

II. Trend in General Press Performance

The Questions: *In presenting the news dealing with political and social issues, do you think that news organizations deal fairly with all sides or do they tend to favor one side?*

In general, do you think news organizations are pretty independent or are they often influenced by powerful people and organizations?

Now I will read a list of some different groups. As I read each one, tell me whether or not you feel this group often influences news organizations in the way they report the news. First. . .

Business Corporations; Conservatives; Democrats; The Federal Government; Catholics; Jews; Liberals; Advertisers.

Next I'm going to read you some pairs of opposite phrases. After I read each pair, tell me which one phrase you feel better describes news organizations generally. If you think neither phrase applies, please say so.

Protects democracy OR Hurts democracy?

Care about how good a job they do OR Don't care about how good a job they do?

Highly professional OR Not professional?

Stand up for America OR Too critical of America?

Politically biased in their reporting OR Careful that their reporting is not politically biased?

Several questions from the 1985 "People and the Press" study were repeated in the present survey in order to be able to observe any changes in the public's general view of the press over the year. Any major change in general attitudes toward press performance would necessarily complicate and confound findings on the topics to be examined currently: attitudes about press coverage of terrorism and news leaks.

Perceived Characteristics of the News Media. Descriptive items designed to highlight some areas of public criticism toward the press, while at the same time demonstrating the extent to which people say good things about news organizations have changed very little since the last survey. The findings show that news organizations: care about quality (77%), are highly professional (71%), protect democracy (58%), stand up for America (53%), are politically biased in reporting (42%).

	July 1985 %	August 1985 %	June 1986 %
<u>Fairness of News Organizations on Social and Political Issues</u>			
Deal fairly with all sides	37	31	34
Favor one side	57	59	53
Can't say	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>13</u>
Total	100	100	100
Number of Interviews	(1504)	(1018)	(2104)

	July 1985 %	August 1985 %	June 1986 %
<u>Independence Of News Organizations</u>			
Pretty independent	37	31	37
Often influenced	53	58	53
Can't say	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>
Total	100	100	100
Number of Interviews	(1504)	(1018)	(2104)

	July 1986 %	August 1985 %	June 1985 %
<u>Perceived Characteristics of News Organizations</u>			
Care about quality	77	--	79
Don't care	16	--	11
Neither	5	--	4
Don't know	<u>2</u>	--	<u>6</u>
Total	100		100
Highly professional	71	65	72
Not professional	13	16	11
Neither	12	13	9
Don't know	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	100	100	100
Protect democracy	58	--	54
Hurt democracy	18	--	23
Neither	17	--	13
Don't know	<u>7</u>	--	<u>10</u>
Total	100		100
Stand up for America	53	45	52
Too critical of America	28	34	30
Neither	15	15	10
Don't know	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	100	100	100
Politically biased in reporting	42	--	45
Careful, no bias in reporting	41	--	36
Neither	9	--	7
Don't know	<u>8</u>	--	<u>12</u>
Total	100		100
Number of Interviews	(1504)	(1018)	(2104)

more satisfied than the public as a whole, as were Reagan supporters (65%).

Although this may reflect the lack of corruption stories during the current administration, it poses an interesting turn around from the days of the last major corruption in government -- Watergate.

The very high overall satisfaction for news organizations' coverage of advances in medical technology (80%) holds among most segments of the public examined. Younger people (85%) expressed satisfaction in a significantly larger proportion than older people (75%); residents from the Midwest (85%) and South (83%) were also satisfied in larger numbers; and those favorable to Reagan (83%) were satisfied with coverage of advances in medical technology more frequently than those unfavorable to the President (75%).

In assigning their satisfaction ratings to the topics examined, it is possible, even probable, that respondents were unable to totally untangle their feelings about the story (e.g., good news type story -- advances in medical technology -- versus bad news type stories -- corruption or terrorism) from the news organizations' coverage of those stories.

Level of Satisfaction With News Coverage	Advancements In Medical Technology %	International Acts of Terrorism %	Corruption In Government %
Very satisfied	22	16	8
Mostly satisfied	58] 80	45] 61	50] 58
Mostly dissatisfied	13	24	28
Very dissatisfied	3	13	11
No opinion	4	2	3
Total	100	100	100
Number of Interviews	(1504)	(1504)	(1504)

IV. Saliency of Accident and Terrorism Related News Stories

The Question: *Next, I will read a list of some news stories covered by news organizations over the past year or so. As I read each item, tell me if you happened to follow this news story very closely, fairly closely, not too closely, or not at all closely.*

The nuclear accident at Chernobyl in the Soviet Union.

The U.S. air strikes against Libya.

The explosion of the Space Shuttle Challenger.

The hijacking of the Achille Lauro cruise ship in the Mediterranean.

The TWA hostage crisis that took place last summer in Beirut, Lebanon.

Large majorities of the public expressed interest in following the five accident and terrorism related news stories. The proportion of the public who followed each story very or fairly closely are as follows:

Accident Stories:

Challenger 96%

Chernobyl 80%

Terrorism Stories:

Libya Air Strike 85%

TWA Hostage Crisis 79%

Achille Lauro 68%

How Closely Stories Followed

<u>News Stories</u>	<u>Very Closely</u> %	<u>Fairly Closely</u> %	<u>Not Too Closely</u> %	<u>Not At All Closely</u> %	<u>Can't Say</u> %	<u>Total</u> %
Space Shuttle Challenger accident	80	16	3	1	*	100
	96					
Air strikes against Libya	58	27	11	3	1	100
	85					
Nuclear accident Chernobyl, USSR	46	34	15	5	*	100
	80					
TWA hostage crisis, Beirut	48	31	17	4	*	100
	79					
Hijacking of Achille Lauro	35	33	27	7	*	100
	68					

Number of Interviews for Each Item (1504)

*Less than one-half of one percent.

Closely Followed Terrorism Related Stories*

	<u>Air Strikes Against Libya</u> %	<u>TWA Hostage Crisis, Beirut</u> %	<u>Hijacking of Achille Lauro</u> %	<u>Number of Interviews</u>
Total	85	79	68	(1504)
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	93	76	67	(754)
Female	78	81	69	(750)
<u>Age</u>				
Under 30	86	75	58	(427)
30 - 49	88	78	68	(625)
50 and over	82	82	76	(445)
<u>Education</u>				
College graduate	90	81	74	(488)
Other college	91	81	72	(329)
High school graduate	84	77	67	(561)
Less than high school graduate	77	77	62	(117)
<u>Region</u>				
East	87	85	72	(419)
Midwest	83	78	69	(454)
South	88	78	70	(399)
West	83	72	60	(231)

*Respondents who reported very closely or fairly closely following each story.
Based on total sample.

V. Overall Press Performance Ratings In Covering Terrorist Incidents

The Questions: *In general, how would you rate the job network TV news does in covering these terrorist incidents: excellent, good, only fair, or poor?*

In general, how would you rate the job newspapers/news magazines do in covering these terrorist incidents: excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

Three-quarters of the public (75%) gave the press positive ratings for the job it does covering terrorist incidents. This favorable rating holds for both network TV and daily newspapers most familiar to respondents. About one out of five rated the press performance as only fair in covering terrorism. In the split ballot, half sample test, a somewhat higher proportion of the public rated network TV news as excellent (22%) compared to an excellent rating for daily newspapers (17%). These findings extend across all demographic groups analyzed.

Rating the Job Covering
Terrorist Incidents

	<u>Network TV News</u> %		<u>Newspapers/ News Magazines</u> %
Excellent	22] 75	17
Good	53		57] 74
Only fair	20		21
Poor	4		3
Don't know	<u>1</u>		<u>2</u>
Total	100		100
Number of Interviews*	(748)		(756)

*Based on half-samples asked for each news medium.

Press Performance Ratings of Specific Accident/Terrorist Incidents

The Question: *FOR EACH STORY FOLLOWED "VERY CLOSELY" OR "FAIRLY CLOSELY" IN Q. 7, ASK:*

In general, how would you rate the job news organizations did in covering (INSERT ITEM): excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

The nuclear accident at Chernobyl in the Soviet Union.

The U.S. air strikes against Libya.

The explosion of the Space Shuttle Challenger.

The hijacking of the Achille Lauro cruise ship in the Mediterranean.

The TWA hostage crisis that took place last summer in Beirut, Lebanon.

Accidents. Most Americans who closely followed the story gave the press positive ratings for its coverage of the explosion of the Space Shuttle Challenger (90%) -- a majority rated the press excellent (57%) while one-third felt coverage was good (33%). The story of the nuclear power plant accident at Chernobyl was not only followed closely by fewer people, but it was also rated positively by a smaller proportion (71%) of those so interested. Further, those interested in this accident were more likely to rate press coverage as good (50%) rather than excellent (21%). One in five (21%) of the followers of the Chernobyl story rated press coverage as only fair. The relatively lower rating for this disaster story is most likely related to the public's frustration with the press' inability to obtain facts about the accident from the Soviet government, which carefully controlled the information released from the scene of the accident.

Coverage Ratings of Terrorism Related Stories
Based on Those Who Closely Followed*

	<u>TWA Hostage</u>	<u>Air Strikes</u>	<u>Hijacking of</u>
	<u>Crisis, Beirut</u>	<u>Against Libya</u>	<u>Achille Lauro</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Excellent	30	28	26
Good	50] 80	52] 80	54] 80
Only fair	15	16	16
Poor	2	3	2
Don't know	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	100	100	100
Number of Interviews	(1192)	(1313)	(1058)

*Less than one-half of one percent.

**Based on respondents who reported very closely or fairly closely following each story.

Awareness of and Judgment About the NBC-TV Hideout
Interview With Abu Abbas

The Question: *Did you happen to see or hear about the interview from the hideout of terrorist leader Abu Abbas that was broadcast last May by NBC television?*

As you may know, Abu Abbas has been accused of planning the Achille Lauro hijacking. Abbas agreed to be interviewed by NBC on the condition that the network not reveal the location of his hideout. Some people feel it was wrong for NBC to interview Abbas on his terms because the network was in effect protecting a known terrorist from prosecution. Others disagree, saying that it was important to show Americans how terrorists think and that agreeing to his terms was the only way to get the story. Which position comes closer to your own?

Just over one-fourth of the public (28%) admitted that they saw or heard about the interview from the hideout of terrorist leader Abu Abbas broadcast by NBC television. Men (31%) and college educated (40%) people were more likely to report knowledge of that event.

The public was equally divided on its view of the Abu Abbas hideout interview; 45% felt it was wrong for NBC to accept Abbas's terms of not revealing the location of his hideout, while 44% felt it was important for NBC to conduct the interview since accepting his terms was the only way to get the story of how terrorists think. Responses repercentageged among only those respondents who were aware of the NBC interview reveal a similar distribution. However, a somewhat larger proportion of the aware public felt it was wrong to accept Abbas's terms.

Public judgment about conducting the Abbas interview under his terms is related to age, education, and partisan political affiliations. Higher proportions of younger people (50%) and better educated (50%) people felt it was wrong for NBC to conduct the interview. However, it should be noted that older and less educated people were more likely to be unwilling or unable to offer a judgment.

	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Sex</u>		<u>Col- lege Grad.</u> %	<u>Other Col- lege</u> %	<u>High School Grad.</u> %	<u>Less Than High School Grad.</u> %	<u>Male Col- lege Grad.</u> %	<u>Female Col- lege Grad.</u> %
		<u>Male</u> %	<u>Female</u> %						
Abu Abbas Hideout Interview On NBC TV									
Aware	28	31	24	40	27	24	24	45	32
Not aware	66	65	67	55	69	70	66	52	60
Don't know	6	4	9	5	4	6	10	3	8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of Inter- views	(1504)	(754)	(750)	(488)	(329)	(561)	(117)	(275)	(213)

	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Aware Public*</u> %
<u>Right or Wrong for NBC To Accept Abbas's Terms</u>		
Wrong for NBC to accept terms	45	51
Important for NBC to interview Abbas	44	43
Don't know	11	6
Total	100	100
Number of Interviews	(1504)	(451)

*Based on those respondents who reported that they were aware of the Abu Abbas interview with NBC (Q. 20).

Should NBC Have Accepted Abbas's Terms?

	<u>Wrong</u> %	<u>Right</u> %	<u>Don't</u> <u>Know</u> %	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Number of</u> <u>Interviews</u>
<u>General Satisfaction with</u> <u>Terrorism Coverage</u>					
Satisfied	40	49	11	100	(917)
Dissatisfied	54	36	11	100	(550)
<u>Terrorism Coverage Effect</u> <u>On Public Interest</u>					
Helped	39	51	10	100	(962)
Harmed	64	26	10	100	(378)

Ways News Organizaitons Have Done A Good Job Covering Terrorist Incidents *	Total %	Effect of Terrorism Coverage On Public Interest	
		Helped %	Harmed %
Did a good job (generally)	24	25	20
Keep the public informed/up-to-date	21	23	21
Complete coverage/very thorough	16	17	12
Live coverage/eyewitness news	11	13	9
Precise and well-informed	10	11	6
Made public aware/alerted public	8	7	9
Brought diversified information/ presented both sides	3	4	1
Third party interviews good	2	2	1
Good follow-up	1	2	1
News organizations suggested remedies	1	2	1
Miscellaneous	2	2	4
None	7	5	14
Don't know	14	11	15
Number of Interviews	(1504)	(962)	(378)

Multiple Responses

<u>Ways News Organizations Have Done A Bad Job Covering Terrorist Incidents</u>	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Effect of Terrorism Coverage On Public Interest</u>	
		<u>Helped</u> %	<u>Harmed</u> %
They overdo it/too much coverage	18	16	22
Withhold information/don't tell all	12	11	13
Too much publicity for terrorists	10	8	17
Biased/one-sided	6	5	9
Inaccurate/false information	6	6	6
Tell too much	5	4	7
Invasion of privacy	4	5	4
Sensationalism	4	3	6
Too graphic/show too much violence	3	3	3
Poor follow-up	2	3	3
No information why incident happened	2	2	2
Scare people/afraid to travel	1	1	2
Too much speculation	1	1	2
Miscellaneous	5	5	4
None	19	24	8
Don't know	18	17	14
Number of Interviews	(1504)	(962)	(378)

Multiple Responses

<u>Amount of News Coverage of Hostage Incidents</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Sex</u>		<u>Age</u>			
		<u>%</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Under</u>	<u>30-49</u>	<u>50+</u>
			<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Too much	51	56	47	39	56	56	
About the right amount	40	36	44	51	37	34	
Too little	7	7	6	9	6	5	
Don't know	2	1	3	1	1	5	
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Number of Interviews	(1504)	(754)	(750)	(427)	(625)	(445)	

<u>Amount of News Coverage Of Hostage Incidents</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Self-Designated Political Ideology</u>			
		<u>Strong</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Strong</u>
		<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Liberal</u>	<u>Liberal</u>
Too much	51	61	51	52	43
About the right amount	40	33	39	41	47
Too little	7	4	8	5	8
Don't know	2	2	2	2	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Number of Interviews	(1504)	(269)	(571)	(392)	(212)

Perceived Amount of Opportunity Press Gives Terrorists To
Promote Their Cause

The Question: *In trying to keep the public informed, do news organizations give terrorists too much opportunity to promote their cause or are news organizations careful not to give terrorists too much opportunity to promote their cause?*

A majority of the public (56%) felt news organizations give terrorists too much opportunity to promote their cause, while one-third (34%) felt news organizations were careful not to give terrorists too much opportunity. Disproportionately higher numbers of Republicans (61%) felt news coverage gives terrorists too much opportunity to promote their cause. Likewise, Easterners (62%), especially compared to Southerners (52%) and Midwesterners (52%) perceived too much opportunity. The proportions distributed across levels of education do not show a clear pattern. People without a high school diploma, the lowest category of education, were significantly less likely to have said press coverage of terrorist incidents provides too much opportunity to the terrorists.

VI. Perceived Importance Of Reasons News Organizations Do Not Do
A Good Job Covering Terrorism

The Question: *Next I will read some possible reasons why news organizations sometimes don't do a good job in covering terrorist incidents. As I read each reason, tell me if you think this is a major factor, a minor factor, or not a factor in explaining why they sometimes don't do a good job.*

Competition among news organizations to attract big audiences.

Individual journalists trying to outdo one another.

Terrorists are good at manipulating the media.

News people sympathize with the terrorists.

News people themselves enjoy showing violence.

The government is good at manipulating news organizations for its own purposes.

When asked to evaluate several reasons why news organizations do not do a good job covering terrorist incidents, most people attributed such failure to institutional, competitive aspects of commercial journalism rather than to the personal flaws of the journalists, editors, and other news people. Large majorities perceived competition among news organizations to attract big audiences (68%), and individual journalists trying to outdo one another (56%) as major factors in press failure to do a good job in covering terrorist incidents. One-half (52%) believed that terrorists being good at manipulating the news was a major factor in not doing a good job. The public expressed a mixed opinion on the importance of government manipulation of news organizations for its own purposes as a factor in poor coverage: one-third perceived government manipulation as a major factor (34%), another third perceived it as a minor factor (35%), and one-quarter believed it was not a factor (24%). Reasons thought least likely to be a factor were news people sympathize with the terrorists (49%, not a factor), and news people enjoy showing violence (40%, not a factor).

Reasons perceived as a major factor in why news organizations do not do a good job in covering terrorist incidents vary somewhat by education level. Better educated people were most likely to have cited competition among news organizations, while less educated people were more likely to have stated terrorists or government manipulation, as well as news people enjoy showing violence and sympathize with the terrorists.

As expected, people dissatisfied with news coverage of terrorist incidents and those who feel the public interest is harmed by such coverage were more likely than their counterparts to consider each of the reasons examined as major factors. However, two reasons evaluated -- individual journalists trying to outdo one another, and terrorists are good at manipulating the media -- had the most significant differences between those satisfied versus dissatisfied with news coverage and those who said coverage helped versus harmed the public interest.

Two of the reasons for news organizations not doing a good job showed small differences among political affiliation variables. More Republicans (61%), and to some degree, a larger proportion of strong Reagan supporters (59%) perceived journalists trying to outdo one another as a major factor in doing a poor job. On the other hand, more Democrats (38%), more Reagan detractors (45%), and fewer strong conservatives (23%) felt government manipulation of news for its own purposes was a major factor.

	Major Factor Rating*					Satisfied W/ News Coverage		Effect of Terrorism Coverage on Public Interes	
	Total	Col- lege Grad.	Other Col- lege	High School Grad.	Less Than High School Grad.	Satis- fied	Dis- satis- fied	Helped	Harme
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Reasons Press Does Not Always Do a Good Job Covering Terrorism</u>									
Competition among news organizations to attract big audiences	68	73	74	68	59	65	73	66	78
Individual journalists trying to outdo one another	56	55	56	58	54	52	64	51	68
Terrorists are good at manipulating the media	52	44	51	54	56	46	61	48	65
The government is good at manipulating news organizations for its own purposes	34	21	30	40	38	32	39	34	36
News people themselves enjoy showing violence	26	20	22	28	33	22	33	23	36
News people sympathize with the terrorists	15	7	9	17	25	12	20	14	20
Number of Interviews	(1504)	(488)	(329)	(561)	(117)	(917)	(550)	(962)	(378)

*Those respondents who rated each factors as a MAJOR reason the press does not always do a good job covering terrorist incidents. Based on total sample.

Self-Described Political Ideology

	<u>Strong Conservative</u> %	<u>Moderate Conservative</u> %	<u>Moderate Liberal</u> %	<u>Strong Liberal</u> %
The government is good at manipulating news organizations for its own purposes	*			
Major factor	23	38	39	31
Minor factor	39	34	36	37
Not a factor	34	22	20	24
Don't know	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number of Interviews	(269)	(571)	(392)	(212)

Perceived Effects of News Coverage Of Terrorist Incidents on Aspects of Terrorism

The Question: *Do you think that news coverage of terrorist incidents has an important effect on: (READ ITEM. IF "YES," THEN ASK FOLLOW-UP QUESTION) Does news coverage have an important effect on: (INSERT NEXT ITEM. REPEAT FOR REST OF LIST.)*

a. *Sympathy for the terrorist cause?*

Does news coverage increase sympathy or decrease sympathy?

b. *The chances of terrorist acts occurring in the future?*

Does news coverage increase or decrease the chances?

c. *The length of time hostages are held captive?*

Does news coverage make the time longer or shorter?

d. *How quickly the government responds to the terrorist demands?*

Does news coverage lead the government to respond more quickly or less quickly?

e. *The chances that the government will give in to the terrorist demands?*

Does news coverage increase or decrease the chances?

f. *The safety of the hostages?*

Does news coverage make things safer or less safe?

Of the six aspects of terrorism examined, only one was clearly perceived as being positively affected by news coverage. More than half of the public (56%) felt news coverage of terrorist incidents lead to the government responding more quickly to the situation. One-quarter (27%) thought press coverage had no effect on the speed of government response.

Perception of News Coverage Effect on
Terrorism

<u>Aspects of Terrorism</u>	<u>Effect Positive</u> %	<u>No Effect</u> %	<u>Effect Negative</u> %	<u>Don't Know</u> %	<u>Total</u> %
How quickly the government responds to the terrorist demands?	56	27	6	11	100
The safety of the hostages?	33	28	25	14	100
Sympathy for the terrorist cause?	14	48	29	9	100
The length of time hostages are held captive?	13	27	44	16	100
The chances of terrorist acts occurring in the future?	7	21	60	12	100
The chances that the government will give in to the terrorist demands?	4	63	21	12	100

Number of Interviews for Each Item (1504)

Of those who felt that news coverage made things safer for the hostages, about five out of seven (69%) thought this increased safety of the hostages made all of the press coverage of terrorist demands worthwhile. About one-fourth (23%) felt that even though the hostages are safer because of the press coverage, it is not worth it in the long run.

The Question: *Some say that the increased safety of the hostages makes all the press coverage of terrorist demands worthwhile. Others say that even though the hostages are safer because of press coverage it is not worth it in the long run. Which comes closer to your opinion?*

Based on Respondents Who Say News Coverage Makes Things Safer

	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Sex</u>	
		<u>Male</u> %	<u>Female</u> %
<u>Hostage Safety Makes Press Coverage Of Terrorist Demands. . .</u>			
Worthwhile	69	63	73
Not Worth It	23	27	20
Don't know	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	100	100	100
Number of Interviews	(498)	(258)	(240)

Effect of News Coverage of Terrorist
Incidents on Public Interest

	<u>Helped</u> %	<u>Harmed</u> %	<u>Don't Know</u> %	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Number of Interviews</u>
Total	65	23	12	100	(1504)
<u>Sex</u>					
Male	65	27	8	100	(754)
Female	65	20	15	100	(750)
<u>Age</u>					
Under 30	71	20	9	100	(427)
30 - 49	64	26	10	100	(625)
50 & over	60	24	16	100	(445)
<u>Education</u>					
College graduate	60	30	10	100	(488)
Other college	66	23	11	100	(329)
High school graduate	68	22	10	100	(561)
Less than high school graduate	64	21	15	100	(117)
Male college graduate	59	31	10	100	(275)
Female college graduate	60	29	11	100	(213)

Effect of News Coverage of Terrorist Incidents on Public Interest

	<u>Helped</u> %	<u>Harmed</u> %	<u>Don't Know</u> %	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Number of Interviews</u>
Total	65	23	12	100	(1504)
<u>Satisfaction With News Coverage of Terrorism</u>					
Satisfied	74	15	11	100	(917)
Dissatisfied	51	37	12	100	(550)

News Coverage Desired If Respondent Were A
Hostage

	<u>As Much As Possible</u> %	<u>Minimize Coverage</u> %	<u>Don't Know</u> %	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Number of Interviews</u>
Total	47	43	10	100	(1504)
<u>Age</u>					
Under 30	56	36	8	100	(427)
30 - 49	47	43	10	100	(625)
50 & over	42	47	11	100	(445)
<u>Political Party I.D.</u>					
Republican	53	40	7	100	(510)
Democrat	50	39	11	100	(422)
Independent	41	48	11	100	(572)
<u>Self-Described Political Ideology</u>					
Strong conservative	42	46	12	100	(269)
Moderate conservative	47	43	10	100	(571)
Moderate liberal	48	44	8	100	(392)
Strong liberal	53	37	10	100	(212)
<u>Satisfaction With News Coverage of Terrorism</u>					
Satisfied	56	33	11	100	(917)
Dissatisfied	35	57	8	100	(550)
<u>Effect of Terrorism On Public Interest</u>					
Helped	58	34	8	100	(962)
Harmed	27	65	8	100	(378)

Amount of News Coverage Desired If
Respondent Were Hostage

<u>News Coverage Effect on Aspects of Terrorism</u>	<u>Maximum Coverage</u> %	<u>Minimum Coverage</u> %	<u>Don't Know</u> %	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Number of Interviews</u>
The chances of terrorist acts occurring in the future?					
Increases chances	39	51	10	100	(943)
No effect	61	34	5	100	(324)
Decreases chances	65	27	8	100	(87)
The chances that the government will give in to the terrorist demands?					
Increases chances	47	48	5	100	(317)
No effect	47	42	11	100	(986)
Decreases chances	54	42	4	100	(62)

*Less than one-half of one percent.

Control Over How News Organizations Report on Terrorist Incidents

	Give Government More Control %	News Organizations Decide %	Don't Know %	Total %	Number of Interviews
Total	29	64	7	100	(1504)
<u>Sex</u>					
Male	26	67	7	100	(754)
Female	31	61	8	100	(750)
<u>Age</u>					
Under 30	30	65	5	100	(427)
30 - 49	25	70	5	100	(625)
50 & over	33	55	12	100	(445)
<u>Education</u>					
College graduate	21	75	4	100	(488)
Other college	22	71	7	100	(329)
High school graduate	33	60	7	100	(561)
Less than high school graduate	36	53	11	100	(117)

IX. Explaining Positive Attitude Toward Press Coverage of Terrorist Incidents Despite Criticisms

Strong Support Americans generally expressed very positive attitudes toward the way news organizations* cover terrorist incidents. When asked directly, three-quarters of the American public (75%) rated press coverage of terrorist incidents as excellent or good. When asked to rate the job news organizations did in covering two specific terrorist incidents -- the TWA hostage crisis in Beirut, Lebanon and the hijacking of the Achille Lauro in the Mediterranean -- four out of five (80%) rated the press job as excellent or good for each incident.

Yet when the questioning adds specificity about the news coverage of terrorist incidents, the first signs of slippage become apparent. Although overall support remains high, a smaller proportion of the public (61%) expressed satisfaction with the way news organizations cover stories about international acts of terrorism, such as hostage taking and bombings. This question specifically asks the respondents to consider how much coverage news organizations give to the topic, as well as the quality.

Another more global question yielded a similar level of high support for news organizations' coverage of terrorist incidents. About two-thirds of the public (65%) thought that, overall, the public interest has been helped by the way news organizations have covered terrorist incidents.

*NOTE: Split-ballot, half-samples rated either network TV news, or the daily newspaper with which they were most familiar.

Within the limitations of the data available, a survey analysis was conducted in order to explain the contradiction of why substantial majorities of the public expressed overall high positive ratings for the way news organizations cover terrorist incidents, despite widespread criticism of specific aspects of that coverage. From the prior "People and the Press" study, variants of two possible related explanations are suggested:

- The public can live with press abuses as long as it sees the press as providing basically accurate information (e.g., allows them to follow news stories that interest them).
- The public likes the news and accepts press frailties in exchange for a product it enjoys (e.g., keeps them up-to-date and informed about terrorism).

In order to test these hypotheses, survey questions were identified as empirical measures. For each inquiry the dependent variable to be explained was the overall rating of the job the press* did covering terrorist incidents. For each test, ratings are compared across categories of respondents who specifically criticized press coverage on two issues:

- the press provides too much coverage (Question 11), and
- the press provides too much opportunity for terrorists to promote their cause (Question 17).

*NOTE: For purposes of this analysis, the half-sample, split-ballot responses to Question 13 were combined (i.e., ratings of network TV news and daily newspapers were combined as one variable). This was necessary to increase the sample size for analysis and justifiable since the response to each type of news organization yielded nearly identical response ratings.

The findings from the analysis of the interest level scale did not distinguish positive ratings across high versus low levels of the scale. That is, segments of the public who expressed high interest (followed terrorism stories closely) did not rate press performance any higher/lower than those who both expressed less interest in the terrorism stories and were critical of general press coverage. On reflection, the interest level scale developed was judged as not a very good indicator of "those who enjoy the product." Rather the scale reflected interest in the news stories about terrorism per se, perhaps without regard for the media which delivered the product. No other questions are available in this survey to serve as an indicator of this variable.

Q. 17 COVERAGE PROVIDES TOO MUCH OPPORTUNITY TO PROMOTE TERRORIST CAUSE

Q. 13 (TV - Newspapers Combined)
Ratings of Press Covering Terrorist Incidents

Ways Press Has Done A Good Job**	Excellent	Good	Fair/ Poor	Don't Know	Total	Number of Interviews
	%	%	%	%	%	
Keeps public up-to-date and well informed	23	51	25	1	100	(421)
	74					
Did <u>not</u> mention up-to-date and well informed	11	51	36	2	100	(445)
	62					

COVERAGE DOES NOT PROVIDE TOO MUCH OPPORTUNITY TO PROMOTE TERRORIST CAUSE

Q. 13 (TV - Newspapers Combined)
Ratings of Press Covering Terrorist Incidents

Ways Press Has Done A Good Job**	Excellent	Good	Fair/ Poor	Don't Know	Total	Number of Interviews
	%	%	%	%	%	
Keeps public up-to-date and well informed	30	59	10	*	100	(257)
	89					
Did <u>not</u> mention up-to-date and well informed	22	58	18	2	100	(254)
	80					

*Less than one-half of one percent.

**Unaided open-ended question.

Q. 17 Amount of Opportunity News Organizations Give Terrorists
to Promote Their Cause

Interest Level (Closely Follow)	<u>Too Much Opportunity</u>				<u>Not Too Much Opportunity</u>			
	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Scale 1 (All Items)</u>								
High interest	68	31	1	100	88	11	1	100
Medium interest	67	32	1	100	87	12	1	100
Low interest	68	29	3	100	78	21	1	100
<u>Scale 2 (Terror Items)</u>								
High interest	67	32	1	100	87	12	1	100
Medium interest	72	27	1	100	85	14	1	100
Low interest	64	33	3	100	80	18	1	100

Q. 11 Amount of Coverage News Organizations Give to Terrorist Incidents

News Coverage Effect on (Q. 15)	<u>Too Much Coverage</u>				<u>Not Too Much Coverage</u>			
	<u>Positive</u> %	<u>Negative</u> %	<u>DK</u> %	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Positive</u> %	<u>Negative</u> %	<u>DK</u> %	<u>Total</u> %
<u>Speed of Gov't Response</u>								
Responds quicker	76	23	1	100	84	15	1	100
No effect	56	42	2	100	80	20	*	100
Responds slower	76	22	2	100	78	22	--	100
<u>Safety of Hostages</u>								
Safer	83	14	3	100	81	17	2	100
No effect	56	42	--	100	86	13	1	100
Less safe	63	35	1	100	77	21	2	100
<u>Sympathy Terrorist Cause</u>								
Increase sympathy	59	39	2	100	83	14	3	100
No effect	75	24	1	100	83	14	3	100
Decrease sympathy	63	35	2	100	84	16	--	100
<u>Length Hostages Held</u>								
Longer	66	32	1	100	79	20	1	100
No effect	67	32	1	100	86	13	1	100
Shorter	74	22	4	100	84	16	--	100
<u>Terror Acts in Future</u>								
Increases chances	66	32	2	100	83	17	*	100
No effect	71	28	1	100	82	18	*	100
Decreases chances	63	34	3	100	89	8	3	100
<u>Government Give In To Demands</u>								
Increases chances	67	32	1	100	81	16	3	100
No effect	69	30	1	100	84	15	1	100
Decreases chances	58	34	8	100	80	20	--	100

X. News Leaks and the Press: Salience Of and Knowledge About News Leaks

The Questions: *Have you ever heard the term "news leak?"*

In your opinion, does a news leak happen when a reporter finds out something newsworthy on his own or when a government official gives newsworthy information to a reporter?

Although most Americans claim they have heard about news leaks (84%), just over one-half (56%) were informed on this topic. A very large segment of the public -- 44% -- have little interest in or knowledge about the subject of news leaks, given that they either reported unfamiliarity with the term or failed to demonstrate a basic knowledge of what a news leak is.

Most likely to be informed about and presumably attentive to the subject of news leaks are men (63%), college graduates (69%) and people aged 30-49 (63%). Numerous Gallup surveys, including last year's Times Mirror Survey, reveal men are more interested than women in political and public affairs topics. News leaks are no exception. Controlling for education, this relationship still holds. Three-fourths (75%) of male college graduates, compared with 60% of female college graduates are classified as informed about news leaks. Perhaps the "Watergate generation" hypothesis explains why people in their 30s and 40s appear to be more tuned into the subject of leaks than older and younger people.

Awareness/Knowledge Of News Leaks

	<u>Total Heard About</u>		Haven't Heard About %	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Number of Interviews</u>
	<u>Informed</u> %	<u>Not Informed</u> %			
Total	56	28	16	100	(1504)
	84				
<u>Sex</u>					
Male	63	23	14	100	(754)
Female	49	33	18	100	(750)
<u>Age</u>					
Under 30	50	30	20	100	(427)
30 - 49	63	27	10	100	(625)
50 +	52	28	20	100	(445)
<u>Education</u>					
College graduate	69	25	6	100	(488)
Other college	58	31	11	100	(329)
High school graduate	55	32	13	100	(561)
Less than high school graduate	44	21	35	100	(117)
Male college graduate	75	19	6	100	(275)
Female college graduate	60	33	7	100	(213)

Why Officials Leak Information to the Press**

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Party I.D.</u>			
	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Republican</u> %	<u>Democrat</u> %	<u>Independent</u> %
For personal advancement	33	36	31	32
For a worthy cause	15	10	20	16
For partisan political purposes	15	13	17	14
Intentional "unofficial" announcements	12	14	12	12
To gain favor with reporters	7	6	8	7
To test public opinion/ reaction	5	4	6	6
To seek revenge against an opponent	4	4	5	3
Inadvertently/mistake/ unintentional	3	2	4	3
Manipulate the press	2	2	1	3
Dissatisfaction/Disagree with government handling/policy	2	4	1	1
To help enemies of the U.S.	1	1	--	*
Other	6	5	8	6
Don't know	13	14	11	14
Number of Interviews	(891)	(311)	(245)	(335)

*Less than one-half of one percent.

**Based on informed public; Multiple responses.

Effect of News Leaks on Public Interest*

	<u>Serves Public Interest</u> %	<u>Harms Public Interest</u> %	<u>Don't Know</u> %	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Number of Interviews</u>
Total	43	42	15	100	(891)
<u>Age</u>					
Under 30	50	37	13	100	(232)
30 - 49	44	41	15	100	(410)
50 +	36	48	16	100	(246)
<u>Party I.D.</u>					
Republican	39	51	10	100	(311)
Democrat	48	37	15	100	(245)
Independent	44	37	19	100	(335)
<u>Opinion of Reagan</u>					
Very favorable	36	54	10	100	(255)
Mostly favorable	44	40	16	100	(409)
Unfavorable	54	32	14	100	(211)
<u>Political Ideology</u>					
Strong conservative	32	54	14	100	(165)
Moderate conservative	40	43	17	100	(345)
Moderate liberal	53	34	13	100	(242)
Strong liberal	50	40	10	100	(120)

*Based on informed public.

News Leaks and National Security

The Question: *Some people say that news leaks by senior officials in Washington frequently threaten national security. Others feel that news leaks by senior officials rarely compromise national security. Which comes closer to your view?*

The informed public had a mixed opinion on whether news leaks seriously affect national security. A bare majority (51%) felt leaks rarely compromise national security, while two out of five Americans (41%) thought news leaks frequently threaten national security.

Among the informed public, perceptions about whether news leaks compromise national security divide most sharply by education. By a 2-to-1 margin (61% vs. 31%), college graduates felt leaks "rarely compromise" national security rather than "frequently threaten" national security. Those without any college training divide evenly (46% -- frequently threaten; 45% -- rarely compromise).

The political correlates also exist, in the predicted direction, with Republicans, conservatives and pro-Reagan people more likely than Democrats, liberals, and anti-Reagan people to take the view that leaks constitute a real threat to national security. The relationships, however, are not as strong as those seen by education.

As expected, those who feel leaks harm the public interest (60%) are much more likely than those who see leaks as serving the public interest (27%) to feel that national security is frequently threatened by this activity.

The Question: *Why do you think the government often criticizes the press for reporting stories about national security issues:*

- *More because the government believes the stories would harm the nation's defenses? OR*
- *More because the government is trying to cover up problems with the nation's defenses?*

Opinion is also divided on why the government criticizes the press for reporting national security issues. About one out of two (49%) felt the government is trying to cover up problems with the nation's defenses. Approximately two in five (39%) held the opinion that such criticism was because the government believes the stories harm the nation's defenses.

These two attitudes are related to partisanship and self-described political ideology. However, the largest differences are found among those who have a favorable versus unfavorable opinion of President Reagan. Over one-half (56%) of Reagan supporters, compared to fifteen percent of Reagan detractors, defended the government's criticism. At the same time, seven in ten (70%) of the Reagan critics, versus 34% of the Reagan supporters, believed the government is trying to cover up problems.

Press Freedom to Cover National Security Stories

The Question: *Do you think news organizations have too much freedom to cover national security stories, not enough freedom, or about the right amount?*

Three out of five Americans (61%) felt that news organizations had the right amount of freedom to cover national security stories. Further, there is little evidence of much support to restrain news organizations in their reporting a national security story. A majority of the public, and of every subgroup tested -- including Republicans, conservatives, strong Reagan partisans and those who see leaks as harmful to the public interest -- reject the notion that the press has too much freedom to cover national security issues. That is not to say there is no correlation between partisanship and attitudes toward press freedom, only that it is a weak one.

How to Deal With News Leaks

The Question: *Which of the following, if any, would you favor as a way of reducing news leaks that might affect national security?*

- *Have a special unit in the White House to investigate leaks?*
- *Require all senior officials to take lie detector tests on a regular basis?*
- *Allow the Justice Department to block publication of information it feels threatens national security?*

Again opinion was divided on how to deal with those news leaks that might affect national security. A plurality (46%) believed the Justice Department should be allowed to block information it feels threatens national security. About a third of the public (34%) felt there should be a special unit in the White House to investigate leaks. Only one out of five (20%) felt all senior officials should be required to take lie detector tests on a regular basis.

There are few differences by subgroups in response to the three alternatives presented on how to deal with leaks. College graduates were more likely than those with no college to reject all three proposed alternatives. People under 30, perhaps less likely to make the Watergate connection, were more likely than older people (42% versus 32%) to favor a special White House unit like Nixon's plumbers.

XI. Results of the September, 1986 Supplemental Survey

Three events occurred in September, 1986 related to the topics of this study: the takeover of an American airliner in Pakistan, a terrorist attack at a synagogue in Turkey, and the arrest of an American journalist in Moscow. In order to assess the public's attitudes about these events, a special supplemental telephone survey of 776 adults was conducted the week following their occurrence. The following is a brief description of the results of this survey.

About three-quarters of the public showed interest in following the terrorist takeover of the Pan Am airliner in Karachi, Pakistan (76%) and the arrest in Moscow of Nicholas Daniloff (73%). Significantly fewer closely followed the story of the terrorist attack on a synagogue in Istanbul, Turkey (52%).

Seven out of ten (72%) of those who followed the Pan Am takeover incident very closely or fairly closely, rated the job news organizations did in covering the incident as excellent or good. The proportion of the public who rated the press positively for its coverage of the Pan Am takeover in Karachi is slightly lower than the proportion who gave positive ratings to the press for its coverage of the TWA hostage crisis (80%) and the hijacking of the Achille Lauro (80%).

The Daniloff Affair

The arrest in Moscow of U.S. News and World Report correspondent Nicholas Daniloff on charges of espionage allows yet a different aspect of American opinions about the press to be examined. The foregoing analysis of terrorism involved press performance in covering terrorism, and the consequences of media coverage of specific terrorist incidents. The inquiry about news leaks was concerned with the operation of the press in a free society, and the perceived effects that leaks to the press have on matters of national security. The Daniloff affair, however, provided the opportunity to explore American attitudes about the operation of the Western press in a closed society, as well as perceptions about the impact of an American reporter's arrest on superpower relations.

One-half of the public (51%) thought the Daniloff arrest would not seriously harm U.S./Soviet relations, while nearly two out of five Americans (38%) felt serious harm in relations would result. When asked whether the Summit meeting scheduled in November between President Reagan and Secretary Gorbachev should be cancelled because of Daniloff's arrest, seven out of ten Americans (71%) believed the Summit was too important to cancel over this matter; only one in five (20%) thought the meeting should be cancelled.

Most Americans believed that Daniloff's arrest was motivated by Soviet authorities' desire to have someone to trade for the accused Soviet spy being held at the time in the U.S. (65%). A small proportion of the public felt that the Soviets really thought Daniloff was spy (14%), and less than one in ten (8%) attributed Soviet motives for the arrest to a desire to scare Western reporters who work in the U.S.S.R.

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

The number at this point is 3, which means that the 33 percent obtained in the sample is subject to a sampling error of plus or minus 3 points. Another way of saying it is that very probably (95 chances out of 100) the true figure would be somewhere between 30 and 36, with the most likely figure the 33 obtained.

In comparing survey results in two samples, such as, for example, men and women, the question arises as to how large a difference between them must be before one can be reasonably sure that it reflects a real difference. In the tables below, the number of points which must be allowed for in such comparisons is indicated.

Two tables are provided. One is for percentages near 20 or 80; the other for percentages near 50. For percentages in between, the error to be allowed for is between those shown in the two tables:

		Recommended Allowance for Sampling Error of the Difference					
		In Percentage Points (at 95 in 100 confidence level)*					
		Percentages near 20 or percentages near 80					
		1500	1000	750	600	400	
TABLE A	Size of Sample						
	1500	3					
	1000	4	4				
	750	4	5	5			
	600	5	5	5	5		
	400	5	6	6	6	7	
	200	7	7	7	8	8	9
	100	10	10	10	10	11	12
		Percentages near 50					
		1500	1000	750	600	400	200
TABLE B	Size of Sample						
	1500	4					
	1000	5	5				
	750	5	6	6			
	600	6	6	6	7		
	400	7	7	7	8	8	
	200	9	9	9	10	10	12
	100	12	12	13	13	13	14

Here is an example of how the tables would be used: Let us say that 50 percent of men respond a certain way and 40 percent of women respond that way also. for a difference of 10 percentage points between them. Can we say with any

*The chances are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not larger than the figures shown.

DESIGN OF THE TELEPHONE SAMPLE

The sample of telephone numbers-used for this survey is a disproportionate random sample of telephone households in the continental United States.

The random digit aspect of the sample design is used to avoid "listing" bias. According to the most recent estimates from the Bureau of the Census, there are 87.5 million households in the United States, and just over 92% of them contain one or more telephones. Telephone directories only list about 74% of such "telephone households," and numerous studies have shown that households with unlisted telephone numbers are different in several important ways from listed households. Moreover, nearly 15% of listed telephone numbers are "discontinued" due to household mobility and directory publishing lag, and it is reasonable to assume that a roughly equal number are working residential numbers too new to be found in published directories.

In order to avoid these various sources of bias, a random digit procedure designed to provide representation of listed and unlisted (including not-yet-listed) numbers is used. The design of the sample ensures this representation by random generation of the last two digits of telephone numbers selected on the basis of their area code, telephone exchange (the first 3 digits of a telephone number), and bank number (the fourth and fifth digits).

The selection procedure produces a sample that is superior to random selection from a frame of listed telephone households, and the superiority is greater to the degree that the assignment of telephone numbers to households is made independently of their publication status in the directory. That is, if unlisted numbers tend to be found in the same telephone banks as listed numbers and if, in general, banks containing relatively few listed numbers also contain proportionally few unlisted numbers, then the sample that results from the

Exchanges are assigned to a single county on the basis of where listed residents live. Nationally, about 80% of all exchanges appear to fall totally within county boundaries. For those exchanges that overlap county lines, exchanges are treated as belonging to the county with the highest number of listed residents.

The disproportionate aspect of the sample which is based on exchange-level household income information, is the result of a desire to ensure a sufficiently large number of certain types of respondents whom past analysis had shown to be especially important in understanding attitudes toward the press. Specifically, analysis of "The People and the Press (I)" had revealed a small group of individuals who were particularly vociferous in their criticisms of the press, and who were relatively upscale. Disproportionate selection was accomplished by arraying selected telephone exchanges according to Survey Sampling, Inc.'s estimated household income figures (derived from Census information and other sources, and regularly updated), and by selecting telephone exchanges from the top of the list at a higher probability than exchanges from the bottom of the list. Controlling the disproportionality allows us to calculate weights that, when applied to the data, will allow appropriate generalizations to be made to a cross-section of the adult population. Once these disproportionality weights have been applied, the total sample is then balanced in order to bring its demographic characteristics into line with the latest available information from the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

COMPOSITION OF THE SAMPLE

	<u>%</u>	<u>Number of Interviews</u>
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	50.1	754
Female	<u>49.9</u>	<u>750</u>
	100.0	1504
<u>Race</u>		
White	89.4	1344
Black	5.2	79
Other	<u>5.4</u>	<u>81</u>
	100.0	1504
<u>Age</u>		
Under 30 years	28.4	427
30-49 years	41.5	625
50 years and older	29.6	445
Undesignated	<u>0.5</u>	<u>7</u>
	100.0	1504
<u>Education</u>		
College graduate	32.4	488
Other college	21.9	329
High school graduate	37.3	561
Less than high school	7.8	117
Undesignated	<u>0.6</u>	<u>9</u>
	100.0	1504

SAMPLE SIZE 1986 (1504) Telephone Int
1985 (2104) In-Person Int

TOP-LINE RESULTS JULY, 1986

SEX: M [] F []
TIME STARTED: _____
TIME FINISHED: _____
LENGTH: _____

REFUSAL CONVERSION 1 []
INTERVIEWER'S NAME: _____
INTERVIEWER'S I.D.: _____
DATE: _____

Bottom 40% 1 []
Top 20% 2 []
Middle 40% 3 []

TIMES MIRROR SURVEY
THE PRESS AND TERRORISM

G086181

REPLICATE: _____
PAGE: _____

INTRODUCTION: Hello, I am _____ calling from The Gallup Organization in Princeton, New Jersey. I would like to ask a few questions of the youngest male/oldest female 18 years of age or older who is now at home.

1. We'd like your opinion of some people and organizations. First, how would you describe your overall opinion of Ronald Reagan: very favorable, mostly favorable, mostly unfavorable, or very unfavorable? (RECORD RESPONSE BELOW) Next, how would you describe your overall opinion of (REPEAT FOR ITEMS b, c, d, e)?

7/86
~~6/86~~

6/85
YLS

	Very Favorable	Mostly Favorable	Mostly Unfavorable	Very Unfavorable	Never Heard Of	Can't Rate
a. Ronald Reagan	28 26	45 43	13 18	11 10	- -	3 = 100 3 = 100
b. The CIA	7 7	43 42	18 23	6 10	1 2	25 = 100 16 = 100
c. The military	32 24	53 53	7 13	3 5	- *	5 = 100 5 = 100
d. The daily newspaper you are most familiar with	28 25	51 56	11 8	6 3	- -	4 = 100 8 = 100
e. Network TV news	30 25	53 59	10 8	4 2	- *	3 = 100 6 = 100

Next, I have some questions to get your views on news organizations generally. . .

2. In presenting the news dealing with political and social issues, do you think that news organizations deal fairly with all sides or do they tend to favor one side?.

	<u>'86</u>	<u>'85</u>
1[]Fairly with all sides	37	34
2[]Favor one side	57	53
0[]Can't say	<u>6</u>	<u>13</u>
	100	100

3. In general, do you think news organizations are pretty independent or are they often influenced by powerful people and organizations?

	<u>'86</u>	'	<u>'85</u>
1[]Pretty independent	37		37
2[]Often influenced by the powerful	53		53
0[]Can't say	<u>10</u>		<u>10</u>
	100		100

4.

Now I will read a list of some different groups. As I read each one, tell me whether or not you feel this group often influences news organizations in the way they report the news. First. . . (READ LIST. START AT "X")

	<u>Yes, Often Influences</u>	<u>No, Does Not</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
a. Business Corporations	74	20	6 = 100
	<u>70</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10 = 100</u>
b. Conservatives	46	41	13 = 100
	<u>45</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>16 = 100</u>
c. Democrats	56	36	8 = 100
	<u>58</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>11 = 100</u>
d. The Federal Government	72	23	5 = 100
	<u>73</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>8 = 100</u>
e. Catholics	32	57	11 = 100
	<u>35</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>16 = 100</u>
f. Jews	34	55	11 = 100
	<u>33</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>18 = 100</u>
g. Liberals	51	40	9 = 100
	<u>48</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>15 = 100</u>
h. Advertisers	73	24	3 = 100
	65	26	9 = 100

5. Next I'm going to read you some pairs of opposite phrases. After I read each pair, tell me which one phrase you feel better describes news organizations generally. If you think neither phrase applies, please say so. (READ. START AT "X")

	'86	'85		
a. 1[]Protect democracy? <u>OR</u>	58	54		
2[]Hurt democracy?	18	23		
3[]NEITHER APPLIES	17	13		
0[]DON'T KNOW	7	10		
	100	100		
b. 1[]Care about how good a job they do? <u>OR</u>	77	79		
2[]Don't care about how good a job they do?	16	11		
3[]NEITHER APPLIES	5	4		
0[]DON'T KNOW	2	6		
	100	100		
c. 1[]Highly professional? <u>OR</u>	71	72		
2[]Not professional?	13	11		
3[]NEITHER APPLIES	12	9		
0[]DON'T KNOW	4	8		
	100	100		
d. 1[]Stand up for America? <u>OR</u>	53	52		
2[]Too critical of America?	28	30		
3[]NEITHER APPLIES	15	10		
0[]DON'T KNOW	4	8		
	100	100		
e. 1[]Politically biased in their reporting? <u>OR</u>		42	45	
2[]Careful that their reporting is <u>not</u> politically biased?		41	36	
3[]NEITHER APPLIES		9	7	
0[]DON'T KNOW		8	12	
		100	100	

6. We'd like to find out how satisfied you are with the way news organizations cover different kinds of news stories. Considering how much coverage they give to the topic and the quality of the coverage, are you very satisfied, mostly satisfied, mostly dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the way they cover (INSERT ITEM, START AT "X")? And what about the way they cover (INSERT NEXT ITEM)?

	<u>Very Satisfied</u>	<u>Mostly Satisfied</u>	<u>Mostly Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Very Dissatisfied</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>	
a. Corruption in government	8	50	28	11	3	= 100
b. International acts of terrorism such as hostage taking and bombings.	16	45	24	13	2	= 100
c. Advancements in medical technology such as the mechanical heart.	22	58	13	3	4	= 100

7. Next, I will read a list of some news stories covered by news organizations over the past year or so. As I read each item, tell me if you happened to follow this news story very closely, fairly closely, not too closely, or not at all closely. (READ LIST. START WITH ITEM a)

	<u>Very Closely</u>	<u>Fairly Closely</u>	<u>Not Too Closely</u>	<u>Not At All Closely</u>	<u>Can't Say</u>
a. The nuclear accident at Chernobyl in the Soviet Union.	46	34	15	5	* = 100
b. The U.S. air strikes against Libya.	58	27	11	3	1 = 100
c. The explosion of the Space Shuttle Challenger.	80	16	3	1	* = 100
d. The hijacking of the Achille Lauro cruise ship in the Mediterranean.	35	33	25	7	* = 100
e. The TWA hostage crisis that took place last summer in Beirut, Lebanon.	48	31	17	4	* = 100

FOR EACH STORY FOLLOWED "VERY CLOSELY" OR "FAIRLY CLOSELY" IN Q. 6, ASK Q. 7:

8. In general, how would you rate the job news organizations did in covering (INSERT ITEM FROM Q. 7): excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Only Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
a. The nuclear accident at Chernobyl in the Soviet Union.	21	50	21	6	2 = 100
b. The U.S. air strikes against Libya.	28	52	16	3	2 = 100
c. The explosion of the Space Shuttle Challenger.	57	33	7	2	* = 100
d. The hijacking of the Achille Lauro cruise ship in the Mediterranean.	26	54	16	2	2 = 100
e. The TWA hostage crisis that took place last summer in Beirut, Lebanon.	30	50	15	2	2 = 100

9. Thinking specifically about terrorist incidents such as hostage takings and bombings, in what ways have news organizations done a good job of covering these incidents?

See Attached

(PROBE: Anything else?)

See attached

10. And in what ways have they done a bad job of covering these incidents?

See Attached

(PROBE: Anything else?)

In answering the next series of questions, we'd like you to think about how news organizations cover terrorist incidents of hostage taking such as the Achille Lauro hijacking, the TWA hostage crisis in Beirut, and the Iran hostage situation of 1979 to 1980.

11. First, do you think news organizations generally give these terrorist incidents too much news coverage, too little coverage, or about the right amount?

51 1[.]Too much

7 2[]Too little

40 3[]About the right amount

2 0[]Don't know

12. If you were a hostage, would you like as much news coverage for your situation as you could get, or would you want to minimize news coverage?

47 As much coverage as possible
 43 Minimize coverage
10 Don't know
 100

13. In general, how would you rate the job network TV news does in covering these terrorist incidents: (READ) newspapers; news mags/

		<u>Network TV News</u>	<u>Newspapers/News Mags.</u>
1[]Excellent	NOTE:	22	17
2[]Good	SPLIT	53	57
3[]Only fair	SAMPLE	20	21
4[]Poor		4	3
0[]DON'T KNOW		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
		100	100

14. How likely is it that these terrorist incidents would occur even if news organizations did not cover them the way they do: (READ)

1[]Very likely 28
 2[]Fairly likely 39
 3[]Not too likely 24
 4[]Not at all likely 3
 0[]DON'T KNOW 6
 100

15. Do you think that news coverage of terrorist incidents has an important effect on: (READ ITEM. IF "YES," THEN ASK FOLLOW-UP QUESTION) Does news coverage have an important effect on: (INSERT NEXT ITEM. REPEAT FOR REST OF LIST.)

IF "YES" ASK:

a.	Sympathy for the terrorist cause?	45 Yes 48 No 7 DK <u>100</u>	Does news coverage increase sympathy or decrease sympathy? 29 Increase 14 Decrease 2 Don't Know <u>45</u>
b.	The chances of terrorist acts occurring in the future?	70 Yes 21 No 9 Don't Know <u>100</u>	Does news coverage increase or decrease the chances? 60 Increase 7 Decrease 3 Don't Know <u>70</u>
c.	The length of time hostages are held captive?	61 Yes 27 No 12 Don't Know <u>100</u>	Does news coverage make the time longer or shorter? 44 Longer 13 Shorter 4 Don't Know <u>61</u>
d.	How quickly the government responds to the terrorist demands?	65 Yes 27 No 8 Don't Know <u>100</u>	Does news coverage lead the government to respond more quickly or less quickly? 56 More Quickly 6 Less Quickly 3 Don't Know <u>65</u>
e.	The chances that the government will give in to the terrorist demands?	26 Yes 63 No 11 Don't Know <u>100</u>	Does news coverage increase or decrease the chances? 21 Increase 4 Decrease 1 Don't Know <u>26</u>
f.	The safety of the hostages?	63 Yes 28 No 9 Don't Know <u>100</u>	Does news coverage make things safer or less safe? 33 Safer -- ASK Q. 16 25 Less Safe 5 Don't Know <u>63</u>

IF "SAFER" IN Q. 15f, ASK Q. 16. OTHERS GO TO Q. 17.

16. Some say that the increased safety of the hostages makes all the press coverage of terrorist demands worthwhile. Others say that even though the hostages are safer because of press coverage it is not worth it in the long run. Which comes closer to your opinion?

69 Worthwhile
23 Not worth it
8 Don't know
100

ASK ALL:

17. In trying to keep the public informed, do news organizations give terrorists too much opportunity to promote their cause or are news organizations careful not to give terrorists too much opportunity to promote their cause?

56 Give terrorist too much opportunity
34 Careful not to give terrorist too much opportunity
10 Don't know
100

18. Some people feel that the government should have more control over how news organizations report on terrorist incidents. Others feel that most decisions on how to report the story should be made by the news organizations themselves. Which comes closer to your opinion?

29 Give government more control
64 News organizations should make decisions
7 Don't know
100

19. Overall, do you think the public interest has been helped or harmed by the way news organizations have covered the terrorist incidents in recent years?

65 Helped
23 Harmed
12 Don't know
100

20. Did you happen to see or hear about the interview from the hideout of terrorist leader Abu Abbas that was broadcast last May by NBC television?

28 Yes

66 No

$\frac{6}{100}$ Don't know

21. As you may know, Abu Abbas has been accused of planning the Achille Lauro hijacking. Abbas agreed to be interviewed by NBC on the condition that the network not reveal the location of his hideout. Some people feel it was wrong for NBC to interview Abbas on his terms because the network was in effect protecting a known terrorist from prosecution. Others disagree, saying that it was important to show Americans how terrorists think and that agreeing to his terms was the only way to get the story. Which position comes closer to your own?

45 Wrong for NBC to accept terms

44 Important for NBC to interview Abbas

$\frac{11}{100}$ Don't know

22. Next I will read some possible reasons why news organizations sometimes don't do a good job in covering terrorist incidents. As I read each reason, tell me if you think this is a major factor, a minor factor, or not a factor in explaining why they sometimes don't do a good job. (READ LIST. START AT "X")

	<u>Major Factor</u>	<u>Minor Factor</u>	<u>Not A Factor</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
a. Competition among news organizations to attract big audiences.	68	20	8	4 = 100
b. Individual journalists trying to outdo one another.	56	32	9	3 = 100
c. Terrorists are good at manipulating the media.	52	30	12	6 = 100
d. News people sympathize with the terrorists.	15	32	49	4 = 100
e. News people themselves enjoy showing violence.	26	30	40	4 = 100
f. The government is good at manipulating news organizations for its own purposes.	34	35	24	7 = 100

On another subject. . .

23. Have you ever heard the term "news leak"?

84	Yes	
16	No	
*	Don't know	GO TO Q. 28
<u>100</u>		

24. In your opinion, does a news leak happen when a reporter finds out something newsworthy on his own or when a government official gives newsworthy information to a reporter?

19	Reporter finds -- GO TO Q. 28
55	Government official provides
<u>10</u>	Don't know -- GO TO Q. 28
84	

25. Why do you think, generally, that officials leak information to the press?
(DO NOT READ. CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

15	For a worthy cause	
15	For partisan political purposes	
33	For personal advancement	
4	To seek revenge against an opponent	
7	To gain favor with reporters	
1	To help enemies of the U.S.	
6	Other (SPECIFY): _____	

5	Test Public Opinion/ Reaction
12	Intentional "Unofficial Announcements
2	Manipulate the Press
2	Disagree with Gov't Action
3	Inadvertent Mistake/ Unintentional
13	Don't Know

26. Which comes closer to your opinion: news leaks serve the public interest more by providing Americans with information they should have OR news leaks harm the public interest more by revealing information that people ought not to have?

43	Serves public interest
42	Harms public interest
<u>15</u>	Don't know
100	

27. Some people say that news leaks by senior officials in Washington frequently threaten national security. Others feel that news leaks by senior officials rarely compromise national security. Which comes closer to your view?

41 Frequently threaten national security

51 Rarely compromise national security

$\frac{8}{100}$ Don't know

ASK ALL:

28. Why do you think the government often criticizes the press for reporting stories about national security issues: (READ)

39 More because the government believes the stories would harm the nation's defenses?

OR

49 More because the government is trying to cover up problems with the nation's defenses?

$\frac{12}{100}$ DON'T KNOW

29. Do you think news organizations have too much freedom to cover national security stories, not enough freedom, or about the right amount?

19 Too much freedom

17 Not enough

61 Right amount

$\frac{3}{100}$ Don't know

30. Which of the following, if any, would you favor as a way of reducing news leaks that might affect national security? (READ. CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

34 Have a special unit in the White House to investigate leaks?

20 Require all senior officials to take lie detector tests on a regular basis?

46 Allow the Justice Department to block publication of information it feels threatens national security?

3 OTHER (SPECIFY): _____

12 NONE OF THESE

6 DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER

86181

Q9. THINKING SPECIFICALLY ABOUT TERRORIST INCIDENTS SUCH AS HOSTAGE TAKINGS AND BOMBINGS, IN WHAT WAYS HAVE NEWS ORGANIZATIONS DONE A GOOD JOB OF COVERING THESE INCIDENTS?

TWO COLUMN CODE

COL 1

-
1. THEY DID A GOOD JOB: (GENERAL) NEWS ORGANIZATIONS TRY THEIR BEST IN
----- COVERING THESE SITUATIONS; GOOD AT GATHERING INFORMATION; REPORTED AVAILABLE NEWS AND COVERED THE BEST THEY CAN. 24%
 2. COMPLETE COVERAGE/VERY THOROUGH: THEY GET IN AND TRY TO GET THE WHOLE
----- STORY AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE; THEY GAVE AS MUCH INFORMATION AS POSSIBLE; COMPREHENSIVE COVERAGE; FINDING OUT ALL THEY COULD. 16%
 3. KEEP THE PUBLIC WELL INFORMED/UP TO DATE: THEY WOULD TRY TO KEEP UP WITH
----- THE MAIN TOPIC SO YOU KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON; THEY WOULD KEEP THE PEOPLE INFORMED FOR THE TOTAL DURATION OF THE INCIDENT; MANY NEWS UP DATES; THEY WERE QUICK ABOUT INFORMING US. 21%
 4. MADE PUBLIC AWARE OF TERRORISM/ALERTED THE PUBLIC: MADE THE PEOPLE AWARE
----- OF THE DANGERS. THEY LET THE PEOPLE KNOW THERE IS A THREAT AND THAT IT DOES HAPPEN AND CAN HAPPEN AT ANY TIME; MADE PEOPLE LESS LIKELY TO TRAVEL NOW. 8%
 5. EYEWITNESS NEWS/LIVE COVERAGE: THEY WERE ABLE TO GET ADEQUATE FILM
----- COVERAGE ON LOCATION; JOURNALISTS RISKED THEIR LIVES AND WERE ABLE TO GET BEHIND SCENE STORIES; THEY WOULD GET RIGHT TO THE SCENE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AND THAT IS LIVE ACTION. 11%
 6. PRECISE AND WELL INFORMED: THEY WOULD TRY TO BE AS ACCURATE AS POSSIBLE; 10%
----- FACTS WERE PRESENTED VERY WELL, THEY GAVE VERY ACCURATE COVERAGE AND AS MANY DETAILS AS POSSIBLE.
 7. BROUGHT US DIVERSIFIED INFORMATION/PRESENTED BOTH SIDES: THEY COVERED THE
----- GOVERNMENTS REACTION AS WELL AS THE PEOPLE'S REACTIONS; THEY WERE VERY FAIR IN REPORTING FOR BOTH FAMILY AND THE POLITICAL SITUATION. 3%
 8. THIRD PARTY INTERVIEWS HAVE BEEN GOOD: THEY SHOWED US WHAT FAMILIES OF
----- HOSTAGES WENT THROUGH; THEY INTERVIEWED THE PEOPLE TRYING TO FIND OUT THEIR DEMANDS, TALKED WITH WITNESSES; GOOD COVERAGE OF RELATING TO THE VICTIMS FAMILIES. 2%
 9. SUGGESTED REMEDIES: THEY WOULD TRY TO FIND THE CAUSE AND HOW IT MIGHT BE
----- PREVENTED; THEY WOULD TRY TO GET PEOPLE HOME SAFE AND BROUGHT AID TO THE SCENE. 1%

86181 09.

COL 1 CONTINUED

0. GOOD FOLLOW UP: THEY WOULD TAKE IT FROM THE BEGINNING RIGHT THROUGH; VERY
GOOD FOLLOW UP AFTER INCIDENT.

13

X.

Y.

COL 2

1. SPECIFIC MENTION OF TV:

2%

2. SPECIFIC MENTION OF NEWSPAPERS/MAGAZINE:

1%

3. SPECIFIC MENTION OF RADIO:

*

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

0. NONE

7%

X. MISC - WRITE UP

2%

Y. DK

14%

86181

Q10. AND IN WHAT WAYS HAVE THEY DONE A BAD JOB OF COVERING THESE INCIDENTS?

TWO COLUMN CODE

COL 1

1. THEY OVER DO IT/TOO MUCH COVERAGE: OVER DO IT - OVER ZEALOUS; OVER AND
----- OVER, KILLING THE ISSUE; TOO MUCH 18%
EXPOSURE; THEY'VE BEEN FOCUSING TOO MUCH ON THE INCIDENTS; OVER COVERAGE;
TOO REPETITIOUS; SOME THING OVER AND OVER; REDUNDENCY, TRYING TO STRETCH
IT OUT TOO FAR; TOO MUCH REPEATED DAY AFTER DAY - TOO TOO MUCH.
2. TOO MUCH PUBLICITY FOR TERRORISTS: THEY GIVE TERRORISTS TOO MUCH COVERAGE,
----- WHICH IS WHAT THE TERRORISTS WANT - 10%
ATTENTION; SHOULD NOT FOCUS ON ANY TERRORIST GROUPS; THEY GIVE THEM TOO
MUCH AIR TIME; BY PLAYING UP TO THE TERRORISTS.
3. INVASION OF PRIVACY: CAMERAS IN THE FACE OR MOURNING FAMILIES; TALKING TO
----- VICTIM'S FAMILIES - SHOWING ALL OF THEIR GRIEF; KEEP 4%
BUGGING FAMILIES OF HOSTAGES; SHOULD NOT BOTHER FAMILIES OF PEOPLE WHO WERE
HIT BY TRAGEDY.
4. TOO GRAPHIC/SHOW TOO MUCH VIOLENCE: SOMETIMES SHOWING THE BLOOD AND GUTS
----- OF IT; SOMETIMES PICTURES ARE TOO 3%
GRAPHIC; SOMETIMES THEY GET A LITTLE TOO GORY IN THE DETAILS THEY SHOW.
5. INACCURATE/FALSE INFORMATION: SOMETIMES THEY LISTEN TO ONE PERSON MORE
----- THAN ANOTHER AND THAT MAKES IT NOT ACCURATE; 6%
SOME OF THE REPORTS ARE CONTRADICTORY; THEY HYPE THINGS UP WHICH MAKES IT
INCORRECT; SOMETIMES GET FALSE INFORMATION FROM UNINFORMED INFORMANTS; THEY
DON'T LET THE JOURNALISTS TELL THE TRUTH; SOMETIMES THEY LIE AND PEOPLE
BUY IT.
6. WITH-HOLD INFORMATION/DON'T TELL EVERYTHING: INITIALLY WITH-HOLD
----- INFORMATION; NOT ENOUGH 12%
INFORMATION GIVEN; BY NOT TELLING US EVERYTHING - CENSORING OUT WHAT THEY
DON'T WANT US TO KNOW MOSTLY BY POLITICAL COMPONENTS; WE DON'T KNOW THAT
THEY'RE REPORTING EVERYTHING.
7. POOR FOLLOW UP: FOLLOW UP IS TERRIBLE; THEY GIVE THE INITIAL REPORT AND
----- THEY DON'T TELL HOW IT ENDS; NO FOLLOW THROUGH WITH 2%
STORIES.
8. BIASED/ONE SIDED: BIAS BASED ON OUR OWN CULTURE; VERY ONE SIDED; THEY'RE
----- GENERALLY BIASED TOWARD THE U.S. VIEW; I WONDER HOW 6%
MUCH OF THE OTHER SIDE'S VIEW WE GET; THEY ONLY TELL THE AMERICAN'S SIDE;
DISPLAY OF EMOTIONS - UNBALANCED VALUES AND CULTURES WERE IMPROPERLY
DISPLAYED. I THINK THERE SHOULD BE MORE REPORTING OF THE TERRORIST
POINT OF VIEW.

86181 Q10

COL 1 CONTINUED

9. NO INFORMATION ON WHY INCIDENT HAPPENED: THEY TREAT THESE INCIDENTS AS
----- "TOPICAL", THAT IS, THERE IS 2%
LITTLE EFFORT TO DETERMINE WHY THEY OCCUR; THEY GIVE NO REASON OR
EXPLANATION ON WHY IT HAPPENED; THEY NEVER STATE THE CAUSE.
0. TELL TOO MUCH: SOMETIMES THEY SHOULD KEEP QUIET ABOUT CERTAIN NEGOTIATIONS
----- AT TIMES THEY TELL THINGS THEY SHOULDN'T, ESPECIALLY 5%
GOVERNMENT AND THEY TELL OTHER COUNTRIES; TEND TO PLACE MILITARY PEOPLE'S
LIVES IN JEOPARDY BECAUSE THEY TELL TOO MUCH LIKE THE LIBYA AIR STRIKE.
- X. SENSATIONALISM: THEY SENSATIONALIZE; SOMETIMES THEY'RE TOO SENSATIONAL;
----- TENDENCY TO SENSATIONALIZE THE INCIDENT ITSELF RATHER THAN 4%
SIMPLY REPORT IT.
- Y. SCARE PEOPLE/AFRAID TO TRAVEL: PUT A SCARE INTO PEOPLE WHEN SOME PEOPLE
----- HAVE TO TRAVEL; BECAUSE OF THE PRESS, THEY 1%
ARE AFRAID TO TRAVEL.

COL 2

1. TOO MUCH SPECULATION: SPECULATE TOO MUCH IN TRYING TO FIND WHAT IS GOING TO
----- HAPPEN BEFORE THEY REACT; TENDENCY TO EDITORIALIZE IT 1%
TOO MUCH RATHER THAN SIMPLY REPORT THE NEWS.
2. SPECIFIC MENTION OF TV:
----- 1%
3. SPECIFIC MENTION OF NEWSPAPERS/MAGAZINES:
----- *
4. SPECIFIC MENTION OF RADIO:
----- *
5. 9.
6. 0. NONE - I THINK THEY'VE DONE A REAL 19%
GOOD JOB ON THE WHOLE.
7. X. MISC - WRITE UP 5%
8. Y. DK 18%

SEPTEMBER, 1986 SUPPLEMENTAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

On another subject. . . .

201. As I read a list of some recent news events, tell me if you happened to follow this news story very closely, fairly closely, not too closely, or not at all closely?

	<u>Very Closely</u>	<u>Fairly Closely</u>	<u>Not Too Closely</u>	<u>Not At All Closely</u>	<u>Never Heard Of</u>	<u>Can't Say</u>	
a. The terrorist take over of a Pan Am airliner in Karachi, Pakistan.	32%	44	17	7	*	*	= 100
	1 []	2 []	3 []	4 []	5 []	0 []	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: center; align-items: center; gap: 20px;"> } 76 </div>							
b. The arrest in Moscow of U.S. News and World Report correspondent Nicholas Daniloff.	33%	40	20	6	*	1	= 100
	1 []	2 []	3 []	4 []	5 []	0 []	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: center; align-items: center; gap: 20px;"> } 73 </div>							
c. The terrorist attack on a Jewish synagogue in Istanbul, Turkey.	19%	33	27	18	3	*	= 100
	1 []	2 []	3 []	4 []	5 []	0 []	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: center; align-items: center; gap: 20px;"> } 52 </div>							

IF "VERY CLOSELY" OR "FAIRLY CLOSELY" IN Q.201a. ASK Q. 202. OTHERS GO TO Q. 203.

202. In general, how would you rate the job news organizations did in covering the terrorist takeover of the Pan Am airliner in Karachi, Pakistan?

1 [] Excellent	18%	}	72
2 [] Good	54		
3 [] Only fair	21		
4 [] Poor	3		
0 [] Don't know	<u>4</u>		
	100		

*Less than one-half of one percent.

ASK EVERYONE:

203. Do you think the arrest in Moscow of U.S. News and World Report correspondent Daniloff on charges of espionage will seriously harm U.S. - Soviet relations or not?

58% 1[]Yes

51 2[]No

11 0[]Don't know

100

204. As you may know, there is a Summit meeting scheduled in November between Reagan and Secretary Gorbachev. Do you feel that the Reagan Administration should refuse to attend the Summit as long as Daniloff is held or do you think the summit is too important to cancel over this matter?

20 1[]Cancel

71 2[]Too important

9 0[]Don't know

100

205. Why do you think the Soviets arrested Daniloff? Was it because they wanted to scare western reporters who work in the Soviet Union, because they wanted to have someone to trade for an accused Soviet spy now being held in the U.S., or was it because they really thought Daniloff was a spy?

8 1[]Scare western reporters

65 2[]Wanted to have someone to trade

14 3[]Really thought Daniloff was a spy

1 4[]OTHER (VOLUNTEERED)

12 0[]DON'T KNOW

100

206. Do you think that Daniloff's arrest will make Western reporters in the Soviet Union less likely to go after important stories, more likely to go after important stories, or won't it affect the way they cover the Soviet Union?

22 1[]Less likely

16 2[]More likely

52 3[]Won't affect

10 0[]Don't know

100

207. How much of a chance do you think there is that Daniloff was actually involved in spying on the Soviets? (READ)

24 1[]No chance what so ever

34 2[]Only a very small chance

22 3[]Somewhat of a chance

10 4[]A good chance

10 0[]DON'T KNOW

100

208. Do you feel it is possible for an American journalist to do a good job in a place like Moscow without seriously risking getting in trouble with Soviet authorities?

28 1[]Yes

63 2[]No

9 0[]Don't know

100