Media Literacy and News Credibility: Does knowledge of media ownership increase skepticism in news consumers?

Seth Ashley, Mark Poepsel, Erin Willis

School of Journalism, University of Missouri at Columbia, Columbia, MO, USA

Abstract

This study explores how increased knowledge of media ownership may affect judgments of credibility in responding to print news. An experiment was conducted with 80 undergraduate journalism students. Subjects were randomly exposed to either an informational article about the pros and cons of consolidation in media ownership or poetry. Then subjects read and analyzed four news stories, analyzing each using a credibility scale that includes judgments of truth, superficiality, general accuracy and completeness. Results show statistically significant differences in judgments of general accuracy and superficiality, suggesting that exposure to informational print about media ownership may promote modest increases in critical responses to news media.
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As Marshall McLuhan famously pointed out, humans live in constructed media environments as unconsciously as fish in water. Therefore, it can be difficult to see that media constructions of reality sometimes offer incomplete or inaccurate portrayals of the world we live in. The growing field of media literacy aims to make media consumers aware of their media environments and increase critical thinking about media’s constructions of reality.

Broadly, media literacy can be defined as the ability to access, analyze, evaluate and communicate a variety of media messages (Hobbs 2008). Christ and Potter (1998) conclude that media literacy is “more than just the development of certain skills, but also the acquisition of knowledge structures, especially about the media industries, general content patterns, and a broad view of effects” (8). Taken together, these two definitions inform our study, which hypothesizes that acquisition of knowledge structures about the media industry—specifically, media ownership—will mitigate the credibility of news messages and encourage skepticism on the part of the news consumer. Put more simply, as media literacy increases, news credibility decreases.

One aspect of media literacy focuses on structural characteristics of media industries, including media ownership and media economics. Some suggest that it is helpful for news consumers to know who owns the media companies that produce news (McChesney 1999, 2004; Silverblatt 2001; Potter 1998). This is because ownership, some believe, shapes the content of news and journalism. The incentive to maximize profit in the commercial media system is thought to limit the diversity of views presented. Ultimately, this is seen as a disservice to democracy, which is dependent on a free and independent press charged with the responsibility of supporting a well-informed citizenry. This is where we focus our attention, by designing a simple experiment that would attempt to gauge the impact of a quick lesson in media ownership on participants’ views of the credibility of four news articles. Before discussing our methods and results, it is useful to review the relevant literature that helps to justify this approach.

Media Literacy, Citizenship and Social Change

Media literate individuals “can decode, evaluate, analyze and produce both print and electronic media” (Christ and Potter 1998, 7). Core concepts of media literacy include a set of knowledge, skills and at-
strains of institutionalized guile. It must be understood that we are not advocating propagandizing in schools and scholars may disagree with this perspective, which is largely a defensive approach designed to counteract growing commercialism in the media. Some teachers and scholars may disagree with this perspective, which could be viewed as ideologically prescriptive. But the authors respond to this concern: “It is important to note that we are not advocating propagandizing in schools for a particular political perspective. We are advocating a view that recognizes that the world is always made by someone, and a decision to tolerate the status quo is as political as a more overtly radical act” (159).

In this study we hypothesize that learning about media ownership leads media consumers to offer lower credibility ratings of news stories. Because of their primary obligation to return value to share-holders, corporate media are not held accountable for their inattention to issues of citizenship and democratic participation. Most Americans are unaware of how the commercial media system shapes the news they receive. Greater awareness of media ownership might promote skepticism about news content by increasing knowledge about characteristics of the “authors” who construct news messages.

Method
Design
To test this hypothesis, we designed a simple between-subjects experiment to determine the impact of increased knowledge on judgments of message credibility. The experiment tested a convenience sample of college students using one independent variable (exposure to a print article about media ownership) and four dependent variables representing judgments made after subjects read four print news stories, assessing truthfulness, superficiality, generate accuracy and completeness.

Sample
A convenience sample of 80 students from a Midwestern university was selected for the study. Participants were recruited from an undergraduate journalism course and told only that they would be reading some news stories and answering some questions in order to help contribute to knowledge and to receive class credit. Participants ranged in age from 19 to 31, with 71 percent of the sample being 19 to 20 years old. Eighty-three percent of the sample was female. Eighty-eight percent of the sample was Caucasian. Participants received class credit for their participation.

Procedure
The experiment was run in a large, relatively quiet meeting room in a new building on a public university campus. The room was well lit with several long tables arranged in four rows of ten along the back of the room. Every effort was made to ensure students were comfortable and able to focus on the reading and evaluation materials provided. Students were free to sign up and participate at their leisure during designated testing times, all occurring between 8 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Upon arrival in the testing room, participants were asked to sign a consent form and given a test packet. Most often, several students participated at the same time. The task took approximately 30 minutes to complete.

Stimuli
Participants were randomly assigned to receive a test package or a control package. In the test package, there was an educational component titled “Media Literacy: More than just sophisticated consumers (Lewis and Jhally 1998).” Media literacy, they say, is a way of extending democracy to the place where democracy is increasingly scripted and defined. Media education should teach students to engage media texts, some argue, but it should also teach them to engage and challenge media institutions. Media literacy education, in this view, is largely a defensive approach designed to counteract growing commercialism in the media. Some teachers and scholars may disagree with this perspective, which could be viewed as ideologically prescriptive. But the authors respond to this concern: “It is important to note that we are not advocating propagandizing in schools for a particular political perspective. We are advocating a view that recognizes that the world is always made by someone, and a decision to tolerate the status quo is as political as a more overtly radical act” (119).

This perspective echoes an argument developed by Masterman (1997) who states that media education will inevitably lead to improved citizenship and social change. He suggests that participatory democracy depends on citizen control of institutions and active involvement with the media. Stuart Ewen also agrees with the view that media literacy is instrumental in the facilitation of democracy, noting, “Media literacy cannot simply be seen as a vaccination against PR or other familiar strains of institutionalized guile. It must be understood as an education in techniques that can democratize the realm of public expression and will magnify the possibility of meaningful public interactions” (2000, 449). Dyson (1998) claims, “The real need is for a better understanding among adults of how media work—with more attention drawn to dated definitions of censorship and freedom of expression and how these are being exploited by corporate interests for the purpose of protecting unfettered freedom of enterprise, without any regard for the social and cultural fallout” (159).

The real need is for a better understanding among adults of how media work—with more attention drawn to dated definitions of censorship and freedom of expression and how these are being exploited by corporate interests for the purpose of protecting unfettered freedom of enterprise, without any regard for the social and cultural fallout” (159).
story, participants answered a series of 18 questions. Responses were given on a seven-point Likert scale. We approached the 18 questions as a unidimensional scale. It was not until we conducted a factor analysis that we grouped certain questions into the four indices that became our four dependent variables: truth, superficiality, general accuracy and completeness. For ten of the 18 questions, the highest number on the scale indicated a more critical response. For eight of the questions, a higher response indicated less critical judgment. The response values for those eight were flipped using statistical software so that when means were found, higher averages always indicated a more critical response.

### Results

In our hypothesis, we predicted that reading information about media ownership would increase an individual’s skepticism of the news and the people and institutions who report it even in ways that might not be intuitively connected to media ownership. The issue of corporate media control is so broad that even a short article about it may create greater skepticism in responding to news stories, even when story content and sources of news are varied. Overall, credibility between the four articles was significantly different. This is not surprising. Different story content is likely to produce different credibility ratings. The story about labor and regulatory goals was viewed least critically (m = 3.52, sd = .78, p < .01), the story about Obama was viewed slightly more critically (m = 3.93, sd = 1.04, p < .01), the story about Iraqi defectors was viewed even more critically (m = 4.31, sd = .83, p < .01), and the economic crisis story was viewed most critically (m = 4.80, sd = .75, p < .01).

Four dependent variables were identified using factor analysis. Table 1 shows four components (the “Truth Factor,” “Superficiality Factor,” “General Accuracy Factor,” and “Completeness Factor”) that emerged and shows which variables loaded on which component. Variables listed below are derived from the 18 questions in the source credibility scale. The 18 variables were, “Whole Story Accuracy,” “Things as they Seem,” “Source Truth,” “Newspaper Truth,” “Reporter Trustworthiness,” “Informed Sources,” “Story Completeness,” “Reporter Access,” “More to the Story,” “Reporter Misled,” “Reporter Expert,” “Newspaper Facts Wrong,” “Reporter Competency,” “Story Bias,” “Newspaper Sensationalism,” “Newspaper Trivialism,” “Subjects Portrayed Fairly,” and “Reporter Bias.”

### Table 1: Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Truth</th>
<th>Superficiality</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Completeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source Truth</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Truth</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter Trustworthiness</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter Competency</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter Misled</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Facts Wrong</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Bias</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Sensationalism</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Trivialism</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter Bias</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Story Accuracy</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things as they Seem</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Sources</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter Expert</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Completeness</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter Access</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More to the Story</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Portrayed Fairly</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Truth: α = .890, Eigenvalue = 7.10  
Superficiality: α = .858, Eigenvalue = 3.06  
General Accuracy: α = .854, Eigenvalue = 1.56  
Completeness: α = .728, Eigenvalue = 1.09
The first index created was labeled “Truth Factor” (α = .890, Eigenvalue = 7.10, percent variance explained = 39%) and included the variables “Source Truth,” “Newspaper Truth,” and “Reporter Trustworthiness.” Based on the original source credibility instrument, the questions about these three variables fit together as measurements of overall truth. The variable “Reporter Competency” also loaded with this index, but it was omitted because it did not fit logically with this index, and Cronbach’s Alpha increased when it was left out.

The second index created was labeled “Superficiality Factor” (α = .858, Eigenvalue = 3.06, percent variance explained = 17%) and included the variables “Newspaper Facts Wrong,” “Story Bias,” “Newspaper Sensationalism,” “Newspaper Trivialism,” and “Reporter Bias.” Together, these variables broadly represent superficiality in reporting. Bias, sensationalism and triviality signal a quality of reporting that fails to go beyond the surface of the content. Getting basic facts wrong is considered here as another indicator of facile reporting. The variable “Reporter Misled” loaded with this index but was left out because it does not fit logically with our conceptualization, and eliminating it from the index did not greatly affect Cronbach’s Alpha. If sources mislead a reporter, that is not necessarily an indication that the reporter or news organization is willing to promote superficial news.

The third index created was labeled “General Accuracy Factor” (α = .854, Eigenvalue = 1.56, percent variance explained = 9%) and included the variables “Whole Story Accurate,” “Things as they seem,” and “Informed Sources.” These variables reflect overall perception that the story represented an accurate view of reality. The first two variables refer broadly to accuracy, and the “Informed Sources” variable is concerned with the sources’ ability to give accurate information. The variable “Reporter Misled” was left out of the index because doing so significantly increased Cronbach’s Alpha, and this variable did not fit with our overall conceptualization of accuracy.

The fourth index was labeled “Completeness Factor” (α = .728, Eigenvalue = 1.09, percent variance explained = 6% and included the variables “Story Completeness,” “Reporter Access,” and “More to the Story.” These variables fit together well over all measures of completeness. The first variable addressed completeness generally, the second variable addressed whether the reporter had access to all the necessary information, and the third variable asked whether relevant information was left out. “Subjects Portrayed Fairly” was eliminated from the index because it did not logically fit with the category and doing so would not cause a large decrease in Cronbach’s Alpha.

Two factors yielded significant findings that supported our hypothesis, and the other two factors did not. The results are summarized in Table 2. Based on the “General Accuracy Factor,” our hypothesis was supported. An independent samples t test comparing the mean scores of the experimental and control groups found a significant difference between the means of the two groups for the “General Accuracy Factor” (t(78) = -2.295, one-tailed, p = .0125, one-tailed). The mean of the experimental group was significantly higher (m = 3.37, sd = .71) than the mean of the control group (m = 3.36, sd = .69). Based on this factor, Table 1 shows that subjects who read about media ownership rated the overall accuracy of news sources more critically than those who did not read about media ownership.

Based on the “Truth Factor,” our hypothesis was not supported (t(78) = -1.287, one-tailed, p = .259). No statistically significant differences were found in the means of the scores of the experimental group (m = 3.19, sd = .68) and the control group (m = 3.09, sd = .71). Based on the “Superficiency Factor,” our hypothesis was supported. An independent samples t test comparing the mean scores of the experimental and control groups found a significant difference between the means of the two groups for the “Superficiency Factor” (t(78) = -2.13, p = .018, one-tailed). The mean of the experimental group was significantly higher (m = 4.56, sd = .63) than the mean of the control group (m = 4.22, sd = .74). Again in this case, the higher mean indicated that people were more critical of the stories they read after having been exposed to information about media ownership. Here, the result indicates people in the test group were more critical of media for being superficial than those in the control condition.

Comprehensiveness of coverage was tested by the “Completeness Factor” (t(78) = -1.20, p = .117), and using this index, our hypothesis was not supported. No significant difference was found between the experimental and control group (m = 5.13, sd = .77). It cannot be stated that participants were skeptical of the thoroughness of news based on this factor.

Discussion

We found limited evidence that shows that learning about media ownership contributes to the lowering of credibility ratings in responding to print news. We did not expect that subjects would be influenced to go beyond the surface of the content. Getting basic facts wrong is considered here as another indicator of facile reporting. The variable “Reporter Misled” loaded with this index but was left out because it does not fit logically with our conceptualization, and eliminating it from the index did not greatly affect Cronbach’s Alpha.

Our “Superficiency Factor” also yielded significant results, suggesting that participants who learned about media ownership were more critical of the tendency to sensationalize or trivialize the news. In contrast to skepticism about accuracy, skepticism related to the print news may be influenced by knowing how news content is produced. The critical thinking processes of people who are aware of the media industry and the obstacles that may prevent these goals are reached may be even more critical. These modest differences we found may suggest that simply reading an informational article about media ownership to be more critical. This must be understood as distinct from real educational impact, which was not measured in this study.
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Appendix A: Education Component

Media Consolidation & Ownership

Pros and Cons of the Corporate Media System

Is a system where corporations control most of the media a hindrance to democracy, or a helper? Here are arguments for and against the corporate media system.

In the United States, five huge conglomerates control the vast majority of media in the United States: Time Warner, Disney, News Corp, Bertelsmann, and Viacom. This is the direct result of media deregulation that occurred during the Reagan and Clinton administrations, and especially as a result of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

While older media regulations controlled the amount of media outlets that any one company could control, media deregulation lifted most of these restrictions. As a result, while 50 media corporations controlled most of the U.S. media in 1983, that number shrank to 25 corporations in 1990, and now is down to five.

Is corporate ownership of the media a good thing or a bad thing— or both? Does it hinder democracy, or help it? Is it the best possible media system? Here is a summary of both sides of the argument.

Arguments in Favor of the Corporate Media System

1. The lack of government control argument. Regardless of any problems that exist in a corporate media system, many people see it as superior to a system that is controlled by the government.

2. The “eyeball democracy” argument. Because the corporate media system is one that is primarily interested in profit, it is based upon ratings. If something is popular, it will remain in the media, but if it is not popular, it’s gone. Because of this, consumers essentially get to vote for content with their eyeballs. If they watch it, it stays on the air. If they don’t watch it, it goes away. Although consumers don’t always get exactly what they want, that’s how democracy works:

3. The quality programming argument. Because people “vote with their eyeballs,” quality media tends to stay in business, while poor quality media does not.

4. The synergy argument. Because media companies control so many related things, consumers can benefit through convenience. For example, thanks to media deregulation, a consumer can now purchase digital television, high speed Internet, and phone service from the same company, and pay a bundled price on one bill.

5. The media diversity argument. Because there are so many different outlets these days—thousands of television stations, radio stations, alternative newspapers, and, of course, the Internet— it doesn’t matter so much if most of the media are owned by a few. Plenty of opportunity is out there for everyone to have a voice.

Arguments Against the Corporate Media System

1. The “market censorship” argument. Because the corporate media system is primarily concerned about profit and ratings, controversial ideas often do not get much or any media coverage. This is true of ideas that are far to the left, far to the right, or otherwise outside of mainstream conventions. In effect, the market “censors” these ideas.

2. The poor quality argument. Corporate media can hinder quality programming because it squelches innovation—especially on media that are expensive to produce, like television. Someone may have a great idea for a television show, but because it hasn’t been tried before, it’s considered too risky—so the network makes yet another batch of reality shows and sexy doctor shows instead.

3. The conflict of interest argument. Ideally, the media are supposed to be gatekeepers who keep tabs on the powerful people in society and prevent them from abusing their power. However, the media themselves have become the powerful people—so how can they be expected to keep tabs of the abuse of power, especially when abuses of power relate to corporations?

4. The monopoly argument. When markets are unregulated and companies have a monopoly or near-monopoly on services, consumers can lose out because of higher prices and poor service. When a company controls a huge portion of the media in a given market, that’s a monopoly.

5. As a country, the United States has accepted the corporate media system as a whole, and hasn’t had a vigorous national debate about this issue since the days of radio in the 1920s and 1930s. The issue of who controls the bulk of a country’s information is a crucial one. Regardless of the results of a debate over the pros and cons of corporate media, this is an important but much neglected debate to consider.
Appendix B: Source Credibility Scale

Instructions: Please answer the following questions about the news article you just read. Circle a number on the scale to indicate your opinion.

On the whole, do you consider this story accurate?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think things are the way the story made them seem?
Completely  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Not at all

Do you think the sources quoted in this story are telling the truth?
Completely  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Not at all

Do you think the newspaper that published this story tells the truth?
Always  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Never

Do you think this reporter is trustworthy?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think the sources quoted in this story really know the truth about what happened?
Definitely  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely Not

On the whole, do you consider this story complete (that is, you were told all you needed to know)?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think this reporter might not have had access to important facts that would change the story significantly?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think there may be more to this story than the news article made it appear?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think the reporter may have been misled by any of the sources?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think the reporter was an expert on this topic?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think this newspaper could have gotten some of the facts wrong on this story?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think the reporter was competent (capable of doing a good job)?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

On the whole, do you consider this story biased in any way?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think this newspaper sensationalized any aspects of the story?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think this newspaper trivialized any aspects of the story?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think the story portrays everyone involved fairly?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No

Do you think the reporter may have been biased in any way?
Definitely Yes  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Definitely No