

NEWSPAPER ACCURACY

MASTER'S PROJECT

By

HAL MARSHALL

FALL 1975

Hal Marshall

Newspaper Accuracy

Tucson's two major daily newspapers are separately owned, but share the same production and circulation facilities. Their newsrooms are under the same roof--but at opposite ends of the building.

The Arizona Daily Star is a liberal, Democratic-oriented newspaper. The Tucson Daily Citizen is moderately Republican on the left-right scale.

But the two newspapers are very similar if measured solely in terms of accuracy using the Charnley method.

This simple technique was developed by Mitchell V. Charnley in 1936. A two-page questionnaire was mailed to the newsmaker along with a clipping of the newspaper story to be evaluated.¹

Charnley, Charles H. Brown,² Fred C. Berry Jr.³ and William B. Blankenburg⁴ used the same basic technique to measure newspaper accuracy, but in each case differing degrees of selectivity were used. Some of the researchers excluded stories that named more than one newsmaker. Sports and social items were excluded along with other types of news coverage. And frequent newsmakers received just one questionnaire.

The four researchers--with their selectivity--found that roughly half of the newspaper articles sent to the persons mentioned in the stories were judged entirely accurate.

An accuracy measurement of the Arizona Daily Star and Tucson Daily Citizen sought to compare newspaper accuracy in Tucson with other areas similarly surveyed and to determine how similar the two Tucson dailies are in accuracy performance.

(more)

add 1 newspaper accuracy

Another purpose of this survey was to test the selectivity element of the previous studies. The entire work product of the Tucson newspapers was surveyed and compared against results obtained in the more selective surveys which eliminated certain types of news from consideration.

Charnley clipped 1,000 local stories at the rate of 25 a day from three Minneapolis dailies in 1936. He mailed each clipping and a two-page questionnaire to persons indicated in the stories as the source of information. Only 319 of 591 questionnaires returned--or 54 per cent--deemed stories entirely accurate.

Almost 30 years later Charles H. Brown used the same method to sample accuracy of selected stories from 42 small city daily newspapers in Oklahoma. He clipped 200 stories at random over a two-week period. The 143 usable replies showed 59.5 per cent of the stories were considered accurate.

The following year--1966--Berry studied accuracy in three San Francisco area dailies. He clipped a Monday-through-Saturday group of newspapers over a three-week period, omitting Sunday because one newspaper didn't publish on that day and the other two produced a combined edition. He received 371 responses from 489 questionnaires. The combined accuracy rate for the three dailies he surveyed was 46.3 per cent.

In 1967-68, Blankenburg examined accuracy in a rural daily and a suburban daily, both on the West Coast. Four different times over a seven-month period, he mailed out questionnaires involving 100-plus stories. From approximately 440 stories sent out, the 332 returns showed 40.1 per cent were accurate.

(more)

add 2 newspaper accuracy

Charnley excluded sports, color stories, stories originating from more than one principal news source, human interest stories, critical or commentary stories and stories where there was any visible subjectivity.

He confined his survey to simple "straight" news, longer "straight" news, speech stories when they could be submitted to the speakers for checking, and "news interviews" when the persons interviewed could check the stories.

Brown confined his survey to fairly long stories that had a single principal source of information. Berry excluded sports, society, entertainment, real estate and business items and no person received more than one questionnaire. Blankenburg followed the same general procedure employed by Berry.

PROCEDURE

In Tucson, a two-page questionnaire, based on one used by Blankenburg, was pretested in July 1974. The full-scale survey covered issues of the Arizona Daily Star and Tucson Daily Citizen published during the week of Oct. 6-12, 1974. Such departments as business, sports, entertainment and women's sections were included in the survey.

Excepted were weddings, engagements, the church page, editorial and comment page sections, book reviews, public records and stories that couldn't be checked by the original source of information. Because this was a local news accuracy survey, stories originating with wire services and syndicates were not included.

(more)

For a test of newspaper accuracy, the mailed questionnaire is simple, efficient and requires very little manpower. Its shortcoming is that it does not allow input by the person who wrote the story.

In contrast, both newsmakers and reporters are consulted in the interview method of gauging newspaper accuracy. This technique, although providing greater latitude in determining accuracy, demands more manpower and costs more if a large sample is used. David L. Grey and Gary C. Lawrence applied the personal interview method to a portion of Blankenburg's sample.⁵ Several surveys of this type also were conducted in Ottawa, Canada, by students at Carleton University under supervision of T. Joseph Scanlon. The accuracy rate where a reporter was able to have some input was 61.4 per cent for 200 stories.⁶

Thus, the mailed questionnaire serves as a tradeout and compromise. Without reporter input its results are not ideal, but the task of obtaining fairly reliable data is neither unwieldy nor prohibitively expensive. Its findings are valuable when looked at as a measure of the opinions of people mentioned in news stories. Inaccuracies cited in the study are those perceived solely by the newsmakers.

Stories were clipped and mailed as soon as possible and never later than three days after publication. The news clipping to be evaluated for accuracy was stapled to the questionnaire. All questionnaires were coded and a copy of each story was filed to be used in a follow-up mailing to those who did not respond within two weeks.

(more)

add 4 newspaper accuracy

The response rate was 68.5 per cent so a follow-up mailing was not attempted.

Initially, each story was to be screened for typographical errors before going to a potential respondent. However, logging of typographical errors was discontinued except when noted by a respondent.

The survey was under way before it became apparent that a proliferation of typographical errors was occurring. A subsequent check with the newspapers disclosed that the week before the survey both had switched to visual display terminals from using tapes which were fed into photographic typesetters. An attempt was made to read proof on the VDTs, but as one editor noted, there was virtually no proofreading. The special circumstances provided a nontypical situation. For that reason, such errors are noted only when cited in a questionnaire.

Obtaining local addresses for many respondents was more difficult than anticipated, because of a tendency by both newspapers--and especially the Arizona Daily Star--to eliminate addresses unless needed for identification.⁷

A cover letter under a University of Arizona Journalism Department letterhead accompanied the questionnaire. The letter explained the survey, noted a stamped return envelope was enclosed and assured confidentiality. A postscript apologized to frequent newsmakers, warning them that they would receive more than one questionnaire.

(more)

add 5 newspaper accuracy

The first page of the questionnaire dealt with objective facts, ranging from the first question concerning accuracy of the story to 11 questions on possible mistakes, starting with name and concluding with spelling. If the story was accurate, the respondent was asked to skip the rest of the questions on the first page and go to the second page where a series of subjective questions asked if the headline was inaccurate, if anything was under- or overemphasized and if anything was omitted. Other questions concerned the source used by the reporter, seriousness of any mistakes, acquaintanceship with anyone on the newspaper's staff, opinion of the newspaper and whether the respondent was a regular reader.

Question 14, "Is the headline inaccurate?" should have been reworded to "Is the headline accurate?" Pretesting did not disclose the confusion it prompted in a number of respondents, who misread the question. Results were changed in some cases to conform with the intent of the respondents after spot checks were made with them.

Most of the questions could be answered by placing an X in the proper spot.

The questionnaire asked 23 questions. The second question, actually one of direction, instructed the respondent to mark an X in spaces below that would identify any error found.

A total of 628 questionnaires covering 370 stories were mailed out over a period of 10 days. Over the next six weeks, 430 questionnaires covering 267 stories were returned.⁸

(more)

add 6 newspaper accuracy

Many respondents added comments on the back of the questionnaire or on a separate sheet of paper.

Although no follow-up mailing was attempted, telephone prompting was used after two weeks had elapsed. Politicians waited to respond in many cases until after the November elections--a period of three to four weeks after questionnaires were sent out.

Several losing candidates went into great detail in explaining their answers, thus raising the question of how valid the answers were for losing candidates who responded after the election. Telephone prompting also indicated that at least a dozen responses were going to be filled out by administrative assistants and not the governmental official or candidate.

The questionnaire prompted one public defender to write a letter of more than two pages explaining his reactions to a story because "it is difficult to give meaningful criticism to the article by merely filling in the blanks."

Some people, including a college president, wanted to discuss the survey before filling out the questionnaire. A professional actor had to be traced through the press department of CBS-TV, and responded when he received a questionnaire.

One public official used the survey to needle reporters at a board meeting, saying he was getting a chance to grade them. On a percentage basis, more football coaches responded than did their players who were quoted in stories.

The most difficult problem in conducting the survey was reaching the key respondent, especially when that person was identified only by occupation and not by name. The clerk on duty during an armed

(more)

add 7 newspaper accuracy

robbery was seldom named. Someone who responded to a "clerk" questionnaire did not answer all the questions. In an effort to get the rest of the questions answered, the actual clerk was contacted, mostly as a result of chance. She had not seen the questionnaire and presumed management had filled out the one sent to the firm. Another questionnaire sent to her home and answered in full was substituted for the first one.

The survey had to be explained to the Police Department community relations officer before responses were obtained from that area. On many occasions he supplies the press with information from the investigating officer.

Potential respondents received handwritten personal notes on the form letter accompanying the questionnaire if they were acquainted with the researcher. This was done to encourage a greater response. A few indicated the note kept them from discarding the questionnaire.

A problem in a survey covering more than one newspaper in the same community is the multiple questionnaires some newsmakers will receive. A good local story will be carried by both newspapers on a daily basis for several days and that means the newsmakers will find at least six or eight questionnaires in their mailboxes within a short time.

Handwritten notes were added to the subsequent questionnaires sent to these people apologizing for the inconvenience and promising the bombardment would cease within 10 days.

The 430 usable questionnaires were returned by 226 persons mentioned in 133 Arizona Daily Star stories and 204 persons mentioned in 134 Tucson Daily Citizen news accounts. Most stories referred to

(more)

add 8 newspaper accuracy

more than one principal newsmaker. The greatest number of questionnaires sent out on one story was 12.

The newsmaker who was mentioned first in each story has special significance when data are compared with Charnley, et al. Because the previous studies used, or were reduced to, only one response per story, the Tucson survey relied on the response of the first-mentioned newsmaker when making comparisons with the earlier works. If the first-mentioned did not return a questionnaire, the response of the next-mentioned person was used.

RESULTS

Respondents found 46.7 per cent of the Tucson newspaper stories accurate. The accuracy rate increases if just one response per story is considered, but only when this survey is compared with previous studies will it use the one-response-per-story rate of 47.9 per cent.

Comparing the Star and Citizen. The newspapers mirror each other in terms of accuracy. The survey shows that newsmakers judged 46.5 per cent of the Star stories and 47.1 per cent of the Citizen stories entirely accurate.

On an errors-per-story basis, the Star scored slightly lower--1.10 to 1.14.

Table 1 shows how similar the two newspapers are in the types of errors noted by respondents. All categories are less than 2 per cent apart except for underemphasis, where the Citizen is 5 per cent higher in the error rank.

(more)

The similarities indicate the staffs of the two newspapers are basically similar in the way they handle news. Obviously one reason for the similarities is that competing reporters for the most part are using the same news sources.

The newspapers use each other as news sources, too--a practice which could have a bearing on the similarities.

The types of errors, defined by Berry as objective and subjective, reflect the higher incidence of subjective errors. The objective error deals with such objective facts as name, age, address. The subjective error involves a personal decision. The thrust of the story and the way the respondent perceives it affects him can influence his decision on a subjective error.

In some respects an alleged misquotation qualifies for the subjective category. Most reporters can recall news sources complaining about a quotation attributed to them. Some sources will admit they said it, but cringe upon seeing it in print and say they should have phrased the remark differently. Others will insist they were quoted out of context, possibly because of a different perception of how the reporter intended to write the story.

Wrong quotations--in keeping with Berry's breakdown--are counted as objective errors, but the probability of some complaints of quotation errors being subjective in nature should be noted.

Omissions constitute the largest error percentage in the four error types classified as subjective. More than one-fourth of all errors were omissions. Respondents felt something was omitted that was necessary for a clear understanding of the subject.

(more)

add 10 newspaper accuracy

Berry suggested a method of reducing subjective errors. It is the use of this question directed at every person interviewed: "What is the significance of this event?" or, worded another way, "What does this event mean to you?"

"A reporter loses no interpretative independence by asking the question. It forces persons involved in events to focus and summarize for the newsman, and may in fact help speed the reporter's comprehension of complicated issues," he said.⁹

Comparing the five surveys. Table 2 shows a comparison between the Tucson survey and those previously conducted. The range is from Brown's high of 59.5 per cent accuracy to Blankenburg's 40.1 per cent. One factor affecting the attempt to make valid comparisons is a variation in each study's treatment of typographical errors. Unlike three others, the Tucson survey did not log "typos" unless noted by respondents.¹⁰

Brown does not mention typographical errors in the mistake classifications set up for his study. Berry noted that his accuracy percentage findings rise from 46.3 per cent to 52.2 per cent when all "typo" and spelling errors are excluded. More than one-third of the total errors found in the Blankenburg study were typographical and spelling. Only Charnley separated spelling and mechanical errors into two categories.

The best comparison is between Berry's survey and this one, because of the metropolitan-suburban newspapers and the number of stories. His sample consisted of 270 stories, just three more than the Tucson study.

(more)

add 11 newspaper accuracy

Accuracy for the San Francisco area newspapers was 46.3 per cent, just 1.6 per cent below Tucson's accuracy showing.

Accuracy as a function of newsgathering. An analysis of the methods used by Tucson reporters to develop news stories shows that submitting a written press release to the newspaper is the most effective way to promote accuracy. Stories based on press releases were accurate 55.8 per cent of the time, the best accuracy rating among seven methods of obtaining news.

(Actually, the accuracy rating of news stories based on press releases increases to 58.1 per cent when all Tucson responses are studied. The 55.8 figure is based on one response per story.)

The press release conveys information the sender wants to publicize. If a release isn't changed appreciably in being reproduced by the newspaper, the result probably is counted as accurate because it conveys the sender's message. A press release seldom, if ever, concerns news embarrassing to the sender and thus the published report is not likely to be faulted subjectively because of its story content.

But the basic local news filling a daily newspaper is the product of other newsgathering methods. The most trustworthy writing, according to the Tucson study, is by the reporter who personally attended the event. Reporter-at-event stories were judged accurate 55.2 per cent of the time. The third most accurate newsgathering method in Tucson depended upon acquaintanceship--getting the story from someone the reporter knows or, presumably, deals with frequently. The adjusted accuracy rate for these stories was 50 per cent. The personal interview was the fourth most accurate method at 48.7 per cent.

(more)

The use of the telephone increases the incidence of errors.

The telephone interview is used more times to obtain news stories than any other method in Tucson. However, it is only fifth in terms of accuracy. Respondents said just 44.7 per cent of the stories obtained by telephone were accurate. Tucson's most common newsgathering tool is one of the least reliable, for names, figures and other information can be easily misunderstood over the telephone.

Berry noted that in a "personal, face-to-face interview more channels carry messages passing between reporter and interviewee. Facial expressions, gestures, pauses, posture and inflections all convey meaning to an astute reporter. However, when he interviews someone over the phone, the reporter gets information over only one channel, and it already has built-in distortion. Thus a good deal of meaning is lost."¹¹

The least reliable method of obtaining news was the "other" category which covers police, court records and other sources. It had an accuracy rating of 33.3 per cent. Similarly, just 37 per cent of the stories originating from an unknown source were judged accurate.

Table 3 shows how Tucson reporters obtained their stories and the accuracy ranking for each category. The Tucson information is compared with Berry's San Francisco area survey, both in terms of accuracy and the frequency of each method's use.

That the Tucson survey was not limited to "straight" news might account for the difference in how often each method of obtaining news was used. Reporter at event, personal interview and telephone interview were one, two and three in Berry's survey while the order was reversed in Tucson.

(more)

add 13 newspaper accuracy

Telephone interviews were less accurate in San Francisco than in Tucson, but the personal interview produced greater accuracy in the Bay Area. Reporters at events in Tucson were more accurate than their counterparts in San Francisco. Among the seven methods of obtaining a story, the accuracy percentages in Tucson were higher than those for San Francisco only for telephone interviews and reporter at event. All others closely approximated, but were slightly lower than, results shown in San Francisco.

The Tucson results further support the premise that personal contact between reporters and newsmakers increases accuracy.

Types of errors and their meaning. As discussed earlier, subjective errors, with the exception of misquotations, constitute the largest error grouping.

Table 4 shows how much higher the omissions category is in the Tucson survey than in those conducted on the West Coast by Berry and Blankenburg. The Tucson omissions reached 26.8 per cent, compared with 16 per cent for Berry and 12.6 per cent for Blankenburg.

Because exact copies of the questionnaires used by Berry and Blankenburg were not available, it is difficult to determine if questionnaire design could be a factor in the marked difference arising in this category.

The timing of the Tucson survey provides a logical explanation for the variance. The study was conducted at a time when tighter writing and a smaller news hole were imposed by changes in the economy and a newsprint shortage.¹²

The error rankings for the two Tucson newspapers are combined on a one-response-per-story basis for Table 4, but Table 1 shows all the errors noted during the survey and separates them according to

(more)

add 14 newspaper accuracy

newspaper. Broken down this way, the data reflect an even higher percentage of omission than Table 4's 26.8. Respondents cited omissions in 32.7 per cent of Citizen stories and 31.2 per cent of Star stories.

The second most prevalent inaccuracy for both newspapers was inaccurate headline--17.1 per cent for the Star and 16.1 per cent for the Citizen.

Frequently respondents cited more than one type of error in an article. Three respondents cited the maximum for a single story--six errors.

Acquaintanceship and error seriousness. Despite the errors, many respondents gave the Tucson newspapers an excellent or good rating. Table 5 ties in the relationship of respondents to newspaper people and shows that in a general sense both accuracy and a more positive opinion of the newspaper increase with acquaintanceship.

Blankenburg found that "a high degree of acquaintanceship between the newsmaker and the newspaper staff was an aid to accuracy ...and that a close acquaintanceship also appears to ameliorate the impact of errors."¹³

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The mail survey is a relatively inexpensive method of checking newspaper accuracy from the standpoint of the people mentioned in the stories.

A survey that measures the newspaper's entire work product produces about the same results as one that is more selective and eliminates such sections as women's pages, sports, entertainment and business.

(more)

add 15 newspaper accuracy

The Tucson survey supports data obtained eight years earlier in the San Francisco area. Accuracy rates were 47.9 for Tucson and 46.3 per cent for the San Francisco area.

Variations in the types of errors in the Tucson and San Francisco area surveys do not appear significant except in the omissions category. Tighter writing and a smaller news hole existing at the time of the Tucson survey might explain the higher incidence of omissions. Timing of the surveys could be another factor. Tucson was surveyed during the month before a general election. San Francisco was surveyed in the summer.

The accuracy ratings for the Arizona Daily Star and Tucson Daily Citizen are extremely close, the Star's being 46.5 per cent and the Citizen's 47.1. Demonstrating only a miniscule difference the survey showed the Star had a slightly better errors-per-story ratio of 1.10 to 1.14.

The two Tucson newspapers committed the same types of errors at about the same rate in all categories studied except for under-emphasis, where the Citizen's error rate was 5 per cent higher.

Although the editorial page philosophy of the Star is liberal and the Citizen's is conservative by comparison, the survey indicates the staffs of the two newspapers are very similar when accuracy is measured, category by category.

Use of the telephone was the most prevalent newsgathering method in Tucson, but only fifth in accuracy. Personal interview was the second in terms of use, but fourth in accuracy. Reporter at event and press release were third and fourth in use, but nearly tied for the best in accuracy. The press release was first by less than 1 per cent.

(more)

The Tucson study also supports some data obtained from surveys in two other West Coast cities. One similarity was that acquaintanceship between newsmaker and someone on the newspaper helped improve accuracy and when there was an error, it wasn't considered as serious by the "acquainted" newsmaker.

A survey such as this has several practical applications. It can signal a problem area. If a newspaper's rate of objective errors is higher than was found in comparable studies, reporting and editing deserve extra scrutiny.

Even with the utmost caution, some errors are inevitable. Thus a staff study of survey results can re-emphasize the necessity to guard against the avoidable errors.

The more times a reporter can be at an event, the better the accuracy. The personal interview is more reliable than the telephone interview.

Berry termed inaccurate headline, overemphasis, underemphasis and omission as subjective errors. In most surveys the number of subjective errors outnumbered objective errors (name, age, etc.). Subjective errors dominated the Tucson survey. This category many times also should include the respondent's complaint of misquotation. Once he sees his words in print his judgment of quotations easily becomes subjective, especially if at the outset he had a different concept of how the story would be written.

FOOTNOTES

1. Mitchell V. Charnley, "Preliminary Notes on a Study of Newspaper Accuracy," Journalism Quarterly, 13: 394-401 (December 1936).
2. Charles H. Brown, "Majority of Readers Give Papers an A for Accuracy," Editor & Publisher, Feb. 13, 1965, pp. 13, 63.
3. Fred C. Berry Jr., "A Study of Accuracy in Local News Stories of Three Dailies," Journalism Quarterly, 44: 482-90 (Autumn 1967).
4. William B. Blankenburg, "News Accuracy: Some Findings on the Meaning of Errors," The Journal of Communication, Vol. 20, No. 4, December 1970, pp. 375-86.
5. David L. Grey and Gary C. Lawrence, "Main Causes of 'Subjective' Errors in News Stories," News Research for Better Newspapers, edited by Chilton R. Bush, Vol. IV. New York: American Newspaper Publishers Association, 1969, pp. 72-75.
6. T. Joseph Scanlon, "A New Approach to Study of Newspaper Accuracy," Journalism Quarterly, 49: 587-90 (Autumn 1972).
7. "If the story seems to call for not running a local address we take it out," said Citizen Managing Editor Dale Walton. The paper has ceased running local addresses in public records (e.g. specific address where burglary occurred) and in stories if the city desk doesn't think the address is necessary.

"We have no blanket rule. We don't run addresses in certain cases," said Star City Editor Richard Gilman. "The general idea is to protect the people involved. In a crime story we don't unless it's germane to the story. In many cases we would prefer to identify people another way," he said.
8. Four questionnaires mailed to criminal defendants were returned as "unable to forward" or "not deliverable as addressed" or, as in the case of the man who pleaded guilty to fraud in a \$4 million phony stock case, "addressee unknown."

(more)

add 1 footnotes

9. Berry, op. cit.

10. Studies by Bradley S. Greenberg and Edward L. Razinsky indicate errors have to be prevalent (average one or more for every 10 words) "before the accumulation of errors will affect the receivers." They also believe that "many of the misspellings, punctuation excesses and grammatical blunders might not have been recognized" by their subjects. "Some Effects of Variations in Message Quality," Journalism Quarterly, 43: 486-92 (Autumn 1966).

11. Berry, op. cit.

12. A comparison of the percentage of space both newspapers devoted to news during the month of October in 1966, 1968 and 1974 indicates a shrinking news hole. The figures are 36.4 per cent for 1966, 36.7 per cent for 1968 and 29.7 per cent for 1974. Source: Quentin J. Robb, advertising director, Tucson Newspapers, Inc.

13. Berry, op. cit.

TABLE 1

Error ranks in Star and Citizen

(Shown as percentages of total responses)*

ERROR TYPES	STAR	CITIZEN
OBJECTIVE		
Name Wrong	4.0%	3.9%
Title Wrong	5.3	5.4
Age Wrong	.4	.5
Address Wrong	.4	.5
Respondent's Quotation Wrong	15.0	14.7
Other Person's Quotation Wrong	3.5	3.4
Incorrect Figures	4.4	5.4
Errors in Times	1.3	1.0
Errors in Location	.9	1.0
Errors in Dates	1.3	1.5
Spelling Errors (Also 'typos' if noted by respondents)	1.8	.5
SUBJECTIVE		
Headline Inaccurate	17.1	16.1
Overemphasis	12.2	13.1
Underemphasis	12.2	17.2
Omission	31.2	32.7

* Totals exceed 100% because of responses with more than one error.

TABLE 2
Five Newspaper Accuracy Surveys Compared

Survey	Newspapers Used	No. of Stories	No. of Errors	Mean No. of Errors Per Story	Response Rate	% of Stories Accurate
Charnley (1936)	3 metro dailies	591	455	.77	59.1%	54%
Brown (1965)	42 small weeklies	143	123	.86	72%	59.5%
Berry (1966)	2 metro, 1 suburban daily	270	412	1.52	75.8%	46.3%
Blankenburg (1967-68)	1 suburban, 1 rural daily	332	389	1.17	75.5%	40.1%
Marshall (1974)	2 metro dailies	267	302	1.13	68.5% *	47.9%

* On a basis of one response per story this could be adjusted to 72 per cent, because 267 responses were received on questionnaires sent out for 370 stories.

TABLE 3

Methods of Obtaining News Stories

METHOD	USE RANK	ACCURACY RANK	PERCENT ACCURATE	NO. STORIES USING METHOD *
Telephone interview	1	3	44.7%	85
Personal interview	2	2	48.7	80
Reporter at event	3	1	55.2	58
Press release	4	4	55.8	43
Other (police court, etc.)	5	6	33.3	33
Don't know	6	5	37.0	27
Someone respondent knows	7	7	50.0 **	11(5)**
			53	19

* Total exceeds number of stories because frequently more than one source was used to gather information for a single story.

** Sample included just five stories with 80 per cent accuracy, but if all 11 responses are counted for entire survey (not just one response per story) accuracy drops to 50 per cent. The larger sample was used for this category.

TABLE 4

Error Ranks in Three Newspaper Accuracy Surveys

(Shown as Percentages of Total Errors Found)

Type of Error	Berry (412 Errors)	Blankenburg (389 Errors)	Marshall (302 Errors)
Omission	16.0%	12.6%	26.8%
Misquotation	13.1	11.8	18.2
Typographic and spelling	12.9	34.5	1.7 *
Inaccurate headline	12.9	7.7	12.9
Overemphasis	10.2	6.7	8.6
Underemphasis	10.2	8.5	11.3
Name Wrong	7.0	3.6	4.6
Figures Wrong	5.6	5.1	4.3
Title Wrong	3.1	2.3	6.0
Age Wrong	2.2	.5	.7
Address Wrong	2.2	1.0	.3
Location Wrong	2.2	2.1	1.3
Times Wrong	1.7	2.3	1.3
Dates Wrong	1.7	1.3	2.0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Typographical errors counted in Tucson study (Marshall column) if respondent noted them. Berry and Blankenburg noted such errors before sending copy of article to prospective respondents for evaluation.

TABLE 5

Acquaintanceship, Accuracy and Positive Opinions of Newspaper

DEGREE OF ACQUAINTANCESHIP WITH SOMEONE ON NEWSPAPER	% OF STORIES FOUND ACCURATE	% RATING NEWSPAPER GOOD OR EXCELLENT
Don't know anyone	44.4%	56%
Know name or face	43.9	54.7
Know well enough to speak to	47.3	66.7
Know very well	50.0	64.6