

Understanding the Correlates of Public Perceptions of Press Freedom

Lee B. Becker

James M. Cox Jr. Center for International Mass Communication Training and Research
Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
lbbecker@uga.edu

Cynthia English

Gallup
1001 Gallup Drive
Omaha, NE 68102
Cynthia_English@gallup.com

Tudor Vlad

James M. Cox Jr. Center for International Mass Communication Training and Research
Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
tvlad@uga.edu

Presented to the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, Chicago, Illinois, Nov. 16 & 17, 2012.

Recent research has shown a high correlation between public perceptions of media freedom in a country and evaluations of media freedom by Freedom House and Reporters Without Borders, both nongovernmental organizations engaged in press freedom monitoring and advocacy. Yet it also has shown that the agreement between the public and elite evaluators is far from perfect.

Becker, English and Vlad, (2012), in the most robust of these analyses, reported correlation coefficients of .74 and .64 (Spearman's rho) between a measure of media freedom from the Gallup World Poll and the measures of press freedom of Freedom House and Reporters Without Borders, respectively. The findings are based on an analysis of a measure of press freedom used in surveys conducted in 134 countries around the world in 2011. The results replicate findings from 2010 from a smaller sample of 111 countries (Becker, English & Vlad, 2011).

Analyses of the discrepant cases in 2011, that is, those countries where the public and the elite evaluators disagreed, showed that changes in the media system as measured by the elite evaluators were not the explanation for the disagreement between the public and the elite assessments (Becker, English & Vlad, 2011). In other words, it was not a matter of the public needing time to catch up with changes in the media system. Rather, citizens in these discrepant cases seemed to bring along with them baggage from their overall mood about the country and its institutions that influenced their assessments of the media.

Analyses of those countries demonstrating changes in public opinion about the media from 2011 to 2012 showed most changes were consistent with the changes identified in the

assessments of press freedom by the elite evaluators (Becker, English and Vlad, 2012). Yet discrepancies existed. In a number of countries, public opinion seems to be based on something that the elite evaluators either did not notice or did not consider to be part of media freedom.

This paper extends this earlier work. The analyses in this paper focus on correlates of public responses to the media freedom item that would seem to be unrelated to the actual level of media freedom itself. They examine structural predictors, such as educational level of the country and level of political freedom, to determine if they explain variation in the public opinion measures once variation attributable to the assessment of the elite evaluator is controlled. The measures of the elite evaluators of Freedom House and Reporters Without Borders are treated as “reality,” and the structural predictors are examined to identify those that explain additional variance in public perceptions of press freedom. The analysis confirms that most of the variance is explained by the “reality” of media freedom, but other predictors are significant nonetheless.

Perceptions of the Media

Research on the media, and particularly of media credibility, has a long tradition in the field of mass communication (American Society of News Editors, 1985; Eveland and Shah, 2003; Gunther, 1992), but interest in the topic was revitalized by the innovative work of Vallone, Ross and Lepper (1985). These researchers showed six segments of nationally televised news programs about the 1982 Beirut massacre to 144 Sanford students six weeks after the event took place. They found that both Pro-Arab and Pro-Israeli partisans rated the programs and those who produced them as biased. The researchers termed this a hostile media phenomenon, arguing that

the students evaluated the media reports based on their own views, rather than the content itself. They also found that those respondents with greater knowledge were more likely to report the media reports to be biased.

Gunther (1992) argued that media professionals had overstated the case when they said that the integrity of reporters is the factor that almost entirely determines media credibility. To test this, he reanalyzed survey data gathered by the American Society of News Editors during December 1984 and January 1985 that asked respondents to rate the credibility of news coverage of many social groups and institutions. Gunther found evidence that audience involvement in an issue, situation, or group predicted more variance in respondents' credibility judgments of media than media attributes or demographic variables.

Watts, Domke, Shah and Fan (1999) used computer-assisted content analysis procedures to examine the balance in coverage of presidential candidates during the 1988, 1992 and 1996 elections. They then linked these findings to public perception of media bias and press coverage of the topic of media balance. The content analyses showed remarkable balance in candidate media coverage in the 1988 and 1996 campaigns and a slight bias favoring the Democratic candidate in 1992. The authors argued that the rising public perception that news media content had a liberal bias is largely due to criticisms driven by conservative elites and reported in news coverage.

Using national data from a panel of respondents, Eveland and Shah (2003) examined the role of interpersonal contexts in perceptions of media bias. They found that the individuals'

perceptions of media bias were at least partly shaped through their interactions with like-minded others, and that the phenomenon is amplified among Republicans.

Gunther and Schmitt (2004) found that the media are singled out for hostile assessments and that those negative effects disappeared if the same content was labeled as coming from non-media sources. Participants in the field experiment were selected from one pro-genetically modified foods group and from one anti-GMF group. Each participant was assigned to a packet that contained a story about biotechnology and GMF. The content was randomly labeled as a newspaper article or a student essay. The participants systematically perceived the information attributed to the newspaper as hostile and persuasive in an unfavorable direction, while they found the so-called student essay as favorable to their own point of view.

Schmitt, Gunther and Liebhart (2004) did additional analyses of these same data to identify mechanisms that explain the hostile media effect. Out of the three processes of data selection and interpretation tested in the analysis (selective recall, selective categorization and different standards), only selective categorization appeared to be an explanation for the hostile media effect.

Gunther and Liebhart (2006) further refined the analysis of this phenomenon by testing the influence of the source (journalist vs. student) and reach (media organization vs. classroom composition). They found that a message associated with a large audience, such as a newspaper article, is more likely to generate a contrast bias, while a message in a low-reach context seemed to lead to an assimilation bias.

To assess how the level of involvement or partisanship, in addition to perceived reach of the message and characteristics of the source, impacted the perception of media bias, Gunther, Miller and Liebhart (2009) selected a group of members of Native American tribes and one of people highly sympathetic to Native American interests. Their common characteristic was that they opposed the genetic modification of wild rice. The participants were exposed to neutral information compiled from various news stories on the GM rice topic. The information was attributed randomly to sources that would be seen as allied to Native American interests generally or not. The findings support the argument audience members process media information in a qualitatively different way than other messages and that members of partisan groups are very sensitive to the mass communication environment. In another experiment involving messages on childhood vaccinations, Gunther, Edgerly, Akin and Broesch (2012) found that a group of partisans, that is, persons with strong antivaccination opinions, saw significantly larger differences between content versions of materials related to vaccination than did a non-partisan control group. Partisans also saw the content differences as more polarized.

Becker, English and Becker (2010) have found that in countries where the citizens perceive little political freedom there is a positive relationship between elite measures of press freedom and confidence in the media and that in countries where citizens perceive little political freedom there is a negative relationship. The researchers also have shown a moderate relationship between elite and public assessments of press freedom (Becker, English & Vlad, 2011) and found that deviant cases are ones in which the public also is either critical of or approving of other institutions in society. As an extension of that research, the same team found

that Americans who criticize the media for having a particular bias, whether too liberal or too conservative, lack confidence and trust in the media to a greater degree than those who do not see the media as partisan (Becker, English & Vlad, 2011). They concluded that media assessments are to a significant degree a reflection of structural characteristics of the nation states as well as characteristics of the individuals

Expectations

The focus of this paper is on what individuals bring to their evaluation of the media that determines how they rate those media in terms of level of media freedom. The assumption is that what the media actually do, that is how free they are in fact, plays the primary role in determining how people evaluate the media. Beyond that, we expect that some locator variables, that is demographic factors such as size of the youth population, educational level of the population, and urbanization of the country, could play a role, as could the economic standing of the country. We also expect that technological factors, such as access to communication technologies, could shape how people in a country evaluate the freedom of their media. Finally, we expect personal variables, such as satisfaction with one's life and where one lives, evaluation of the leaders of the country, could influence how people evaluate their media.

If the public opinion measure of media freedom were pure, that is, based solely on an objective assessment of media freedom in the country, these other variables would have no predictive power beyond what was provided by the objective measures themselves. In this sense, the ideal outcome would be that the objective measures of media freedom explained all of the variance in the public assessments of the media, and the remaining variance was random,

unexplainable by such factors as the level of education of the country or the extent to which its citizens were satisfied with their lives.

Methodology

To test these general expectations, two distinct types of measures were used. The first is of the objective status of media freedom in a country as measured by Freedom House and Reporters Without Borders. The second is of public assessments of their media, of other institutions, of their quality of life, and public reports on such things as the availability of communication technology and of characteristics of the country as a whole. These measures come from the Gallup World Poll.

The best known and most widely used measure of the press freedom is that of Freedom House (Becker, Vlad & Nusser, 2007). Freedom House was founded in 1941 to promote democracy globally. Since 1978, Freedom House has published a global survey of freedom, known as *Freedom in the World*, now covering 195 countries and 14 related or disputed territories (Freedom House, 2012). This indicator is widely used by policy makers, academics, and journalists. In 1980, as a separate undertaking, Freedom House began conducting its media freedom survey—*Freedom of the Press: A Global Survey of Media Independence*—which in 2011 covered 196 countries and territories (Freedom House, 2011).

To measure the press freedom concept, Freedom House attempts to assess the political, legal, and economic environments of each country and evaluate whether the countries promote and do not restrict the free flow of information. In 2011, the research and ratings process involved several hundred analysts and senior-level advisers (Freedom House, 2011). These

analysts and advisers gather information from professional contacts, staff and consultant travel, international visitors, the findings of human rights and press freedom organizations, specialists in geographic and geopolitical areas, the reports of governments and multilateral bodies, and a variety of domestic and international news media. The ratings are reviewed individually and on a comparative basis in a series of six regional meetings with the analysts, ratings advisers with expertise in each region, other invited participants and Freedom House staff. Freedom House then compares the ratings with the previous year's findings. Major proposed numerical shifts or category changes are subjected to more intensive scrutiny. These reviews are followed by cross-regional assessments in which efforts are made to ensure comparability and consistency in the findings. Freedom House asks the raters to use 23 questions divided into three broad categories covering the legal environment, the political environment and the economic environment. Each country is rated in these three categories and assigned a value, with the higher numbers indicating less freedom.

Reporters Without Borders (RWB) has released annually since 2002 a Worldwide Press Freedom (RWB, 2002) report and ranking of individual nations. Based in Paris, RWB defends journalists and media outlets by condemning attacks on press freedom worldwide, by publishing a variety of annual and special reports on media freedom, and by appealing to governments and international organizations on behalf of journalists and media organizations.

RWB (2012) bases the score for each country on responses of its selected panelists to a questionnaire with 44 criteria. Included are measures of actions directly affecting journalists, such as murders, imprisonment, physical attacks and threats, and activities affecting news media,

such as censorship, confiscation of newspaper issues, searches and harassment. The questionnaire also measures the extent to which those who commit acts against the journalists and the media organizations are prosecuted, the amount of self-censorship, and the ability of the media to investigate and criticize. It also assesses financial pressure imposed on journalists and the news media. It examines the legal framework for the media, including penalties for press offences, the existence of a state monopoly for certain kinds of media and how the media are regulated, and the level of independence of the public media. It also examines violations of the free flow of information on the Internet.

In 2012, the questionnaire was sent to 18 freedom of expression groups, to its network of 150 correspondents around the world, and to journalists, researchers, jurists and human rights activists. In 2012, RWB received completed questionnaires from a number of independent sources for 180 countries. RWB said some countries were not included because of a lack of reliable, confirmed data.

Detailed analyses of these two measures has shown that they rate most countries similarly (Becker, Schneider & Vlad, 2012). The Freedom House measures are more focused on institutional characteristics of journalism in the countries, while the RWB measures are focused more on the freedom of individual journalists. The RWB measures give more weight to attacks on the press.

These elite measures of media freedom are the primary independent variable in the analyses. They are treated as the “reality” measures of press freedom in the countries of the world.

Data from the Gallup World Poll were used to measure the dependent variable and the set of predictors other than the “reality” measures from Freedom House and Reporters Without Borders. The Gallup World Poll regularly surveys adult residents in more than 160 countries and areas, representing more than 98% of the world’s adult population. In most cases, randomly selected, nationally representative samples of the entire civilian, non-institutionalized, age 15 and older population of each country are used. Exceptions include areas where the safety of interviewing staff is threatened, scarcely populated islands in some countries, and areas that interviewers can reach only by foot, animal, or small boat. Gallup typically surveys 1,000 individuals in each country, with at least 2,000 surveys being conducted in large countries like China, India and Russia.

Telephone surveys are used in countries where telephone coverage represents at least 80% of the population or is the customary survey methodology. In Central and Eastern Europe, as well as in the developing world, including much of Latin America, the former Soviet Union countries, nearly all of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, an area frame design is used for face-to-face interviewing.

Once collected, the data set goes through a rigorous quality assurance process before being publicly released. After review by the regional directors, Gallup scientists perform additional validity reviews. The data are centrally aggregated and cleaned, ensuring correct variable codes and labels are applied. The data are then reviewed in detail for logical consistency and trends over time. Once the data are cleaned, weighted, and vetted, the final step is to calculate approximate study design effect and margin of error.

Gallup is entirely responsible for the management, design, and control of the Gallup World Poll and is not associated with any political orientation, party, or advocacy group and does not accept partisan entities as clients. Any individual, institution, or governmental agency may access the Gallup World Poll regardless of nationality.

In each country, a standard set of core questions is fielded in each of the major languages of the respective country. In 2010 a new item was added to the core: “Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom, or not?” Response categories were Yes and No, with Don’t Know and Refused coded. Again, the item cannot be asked in some of the countries in which the Gallup World Poll is fielded. The data were aggregated by country, and the percentage of people in a country saying Yes, i.e., that the media in the country were free, was computed for each country for which the measure was used. This characteristic of the country became the dependent variable for the analysis.

Thirty-five other measures from the core were selected because of their possible correlation with public assessments of press freedom. These included demographic measures, such as gender, age and education, and measures of technology in the home, such as Internet access. A large a set of questions dealt with the respondent’s personal feelings, such as confidence in institutions, satisfaction with the quality of services provided, the importance of religion, and sense of the quality of life in general. In each case, the data were aggregated across the country, so the measure was of the percentage of people in the population with that demographic characteristic, access to technology, or personal feelings. The goal here was to be

expansive to try to determine if these factors helped to explain the evaluations of media freedom that could not be explained by the “reality” measures of media freedom.

Since Gallup World Poll data for 2012 are still being collected, this paper uses data from 2010 and 2011 only.

Findings

Table 1 shows the relationship between the public opinion measures of press freedom from the Gallup World Poll in 2011 and the measures of “reality” by Freedom House and Reporters Without Borders. The Spearman rho coefficients are present first, since earlier analyses had shown that the Freedom House and Reporters Without Borders measures are not normally distributed (Becker, Schneider & Vlad, 2012). The FH and RWB measures are reverse coded, so the expected relationship is a negative. Clearly, those countries evaluated highly in terms of press freedom by both of these organizations tend to be those countries in which the public is likely to think the media are free. The relationship is stronger for Freedom House measures than for those of Reporters Without Borders. In both cases, there is no evidence that there is a lag between what the elite evaluators say about the media and what the public says. The correlations are the same or nearly the same whether the 2011 measure is used or the 2009 measure is used. The Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients also are shown in Table 1, and they are very similar to the Spearman rhos.

These same analyses are repeated in Table 2 for the data from 2010. Again, the correlations are slightly higher with the FH measures than with the RWB measures. Again, there is no evidence of a lag. And again, there are only small differences between the Spearman and

Pearson coefficients. These analyses have been reported in a slightly different form earlier (Becker, Schneider & Vlad, 2012; Becker, English & Vlad, 2011). They are offered here only as the starting point for the analyses that follow.

As a next step, the public opinion measure of media freedom from the Gallup World Poll in 2011 was regressed on the Freedom House measure of press freedom and on the cluster of 35 measures of demographic characteristics of the countries, technological status of the countries, and the personal characteristics of the countries, all as measured through the Gallup World Poll and aggregated for the 104 (out of 135) countries for which data were available on all of the selected measures. The Freedom House measure was selected because it showed higher correlations with the public opinion measure of press freedom. The Freedom House measure from 2011 was used.

The multiple R for the equation in 2011 with only the Freedom House measure was .74, with an R square of .54 and an adjusted R square of .54. The R for the full equation, with the 35 additional measures, was .90, with an R square of .81 and an adjusted R square of .71. These same analytic procedures were used for the 2010 data. The multiple R for the analyses using the data from 2010 was .75. The R square was .56, and the adjusted R square was .56. The R for the full equation with the 35 added variables was .93. The R square was .86, and the adjusted R square was .76. These data are for 85 of the 108 countries for which the media freedom measure was obtained.

Because the samples are not probabilistic, statistical tests are not appropriate. The data are treated as descriptive of the 104 countries (2011) and 85 countries (2010) used in the

regression analyses. With this restriction, it is clear from these equations that the added block of variables explains variance in the public opinion measure of media freedom that is not explained by the “reality” measure of press freedom from Freedom House in both years.

Tables 3 and 4 report the zero order correlations for each of the 35 measures used in the equation. Both Spearman rhos and Pearson rs are shown. In addition, partial correlation coefficients are shown for each of these measures for the final equation in which these 35 measures and the “reality” measure from Freedom House was included.

The clustering of the 35 variables available is primitive. With that caveat, it is clear from Tables 3 and 4 that the demographic characteristics of the countries, as measured by the Gallup World Report, do not contribute greatly to the public opinion measure of public opinion once the Freedom House measure is used as a control. The exception to that is employment status. Those countries with high unemployment are likely to be countries that give the media a low score in terms of press freedom. This is true in 2011 and in 2010.

Similarly, the measures of communication technology do not individually contribute much variance to the explanation of media freedom as measured by the Gallup World Poll, controlling for the “reality” measure from Freedom House. This is true both in 2011 and 2010.

The personal measures, overall, are strong predictors of the public assessment of media freedom, controlling for the “reality” measure. Those countries in which people feel safe walking in the city or area in which they live are more likely to rate the media highly. Those countries in which a large number of people want to move to another country rate the media more lowly than countries with small numbers of people who want to move. Countries in which

people are satisfied with their freedom to choose what they want to do with their lives are countries where people rate the media high in terms of press freedom. In both 2011 and 2010, this measure shows the largest partial correlation in the set. Countries in which citizens have a lot of confidence in the honesty of elections are countries in which the media are rated highly in terms of press freedom, controlling for the Freedom House measure. There are differences between 2011 and 2010, but they are not great. The overall picture is the same regardless of data set examined.

These individual correlations are tricky to interpret because of the problem of the differential internal correlations. What seems clear, however, is that the personal factors are the ones that make a difference.

Conclusions

Prior research has shown that there is a strong correlation between public opinion assessments of media freedom and assessments of media freedom by elite evaluators. But the correlation is not perfect, and there has been evidence that the biases are not attributable to random error.

This paper confirms these findings. Clearly most of the variance in the measure of public opinion about press freedom is explained by the actual performance of the media, as measured by the Freedom House measure of press freedom. The paper treats that measure as a surrogate for a measure of the “reality” of media freedom. But the unexplained variance does not appear to be random error. Rather, it is explained by the personal assessments of the people in the countries about their lives and the institutions that serve them. If people feel they have personal

freedom to choose to do what they want, they are more likely to rate the media highly in terms of media freedom. Similarly, if they feel the elections in the country are free, they are more likely to rate the media highly.

The simple conclusion is that public opinion about the media in a country is shaped by what the media do, but it is not wholly controlled by what the media do. The public evaluates its media both based on their performance and on how it evaluates the broader context of that performance. How the public feels about society overall and in particular about the freedom in that society plays a large role in determining how the public feels about the operation of its media.

References

American Society of Newspapers Editors (1985). *Newspaper credibility: Building reader trust*. Washington, DC: ASNE.

Becker, L.B., Schneider, L., & Vlad, T. (2012, July). *A Systematic analysis of the discrepancies between press freedom as measured by reporters*. Paper presented to the international conference Media and the Public Sphere, Lyon, France.

Becker, L.B., English, C., & Vlad, T. (2012, July). *Stability and change in public perceptions of the media*. Paper presented to the Journalism Research and Education Section of the International Association for Media and Communication Research, 2012 Annual Conference, Durban, South Africa.

Becker, L.B., English, C., & Vlad, T., (2011, September). *Understanding the link between public confidence in the media and media freedom*. Paper presented to the World Association for Public Opinion Research, September, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., & English, C. (2010). Examining the linkage between journalistic performance and citizen assessments of media. Presented to the Journalism Research and Education Section of the International Association for Media and Communication Research, Braga, Portugal, July 18-22, 2010.

Eveland Jr., W.P., & Shah, D.V. (2003). The impact of individual and interpersonal factors on perceived news media coverage. *Political Psychology, 24*, 101-117.

Gunther, A.C., Miller, N., & Liebhart, J.L. (2009). Assimilation and contrast in a test of the hostile media effect. *Communication Research, 36*, 747-764.

Gunther, A.C. (1992). Biased press or biased public? Attitudes toward media coverage of social groups. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 56*, 147-167.

Gunther, A.C., & Liebhart, J.L. (2006.) Broad reach or biased source? Decomposing the hostile media effect. *Journal of Communication, 56*, 449-466.

Gunther, A.C., & Schmitt, K. (2004). Mapping boundaries of the hostile media effect. *Journal of Communication, March*, 55-70.

Freedom House (2011): Freedom of the Press 2011. Methodology. Retrieved on April 11, 2012, from <http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press-2011/methodology>

Freedom House (2012) *Freedom in the world*. Retrived on October 25, 23012, from <http://www.freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/Country%20Status%20%26%20Ratings%20Overview%2C%201973-2012.pdf>

Gunther, A.C., Edgerly, S., Akin, H., & Broesch, J.A. (2012). Partisan evaluation of partisan information. *Communication Research, 39* (4), 439-457.

Reporters Without Borders (2022): Press Freedom Index 2002. Retrieved on May 31, 2012, from: <http://en.rsf.org/press-freedom-index-2002,297.html>

2012, from: <http://en.rsf.org/press-freedom-index-2011-2012,1043.html>

Reporters Without Borders (2012a): Press Freedom Index 2011-2012. Retrieved on May 31, 2012, from: <http://en.rsf.org/press-freedom-index-2011-2012,1043.html>

Schmitt, K.M., Gunther, A.C., & Liebhart, J.L. (2004) . Why partisans see mass media as biased. *Communication Research, 31*, 623-641.

Vallone, R.P., Ross, L., & Lepper, M.R. (1985). The hostile media phenomenon: Biased perception and perceptions of media bias in coverage of the Beirut massacre. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 577-585.

Watts, M.D., Domke, D., Shah, D.V., & Fan, D.P. (1999). Elite Cues and media bias in presidential campaigns: Explaining public perceptions of a liberal press. Retrieved November, 8, 2011, from <http://crx.sagepub.com/content/26/2144>

Table 1. Press Freedom Correlations 2011

		Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Spearman Correlation	Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Pearson Correlation
Freedom House Press Freedom 2011		-0.73	-0.73
	N	125	126
Freedom House Press Freedom 2010		-0.72	-0.73
	N	126	126
Freedom House Press Freedom 2009		-0.72	-0.72
	N	126	126
Reporters Without Borders 2011		-0.65	-0.60
	N	126	126
Reporters Without Borders 2010		-0.66	-0.59
	N	126	126
Reporters Without Borders 2009		-0.68	-0.62
	N	126	126

Table 2. Press Freedom Correlations 2010

		Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? Yes Spearman Correlation	Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? Yes Pearson Correlation
Freedom House Press Freedom 2010		-0.74	-0.74
	N	108	108
Freedom House Press Freedom 2009		-0.74	-0.74
	N	108	108
Freedom House Press Freedom 2008		-0.75	-0.75
	N	108	108
Reporters Without Borders 2010		-0.72	-0.62
	N	108	108
Reporters Without Borders 2009		-0.69	-0.59
	N	108	108
Reporters Without Borders 2008		-0.65	-0.55
	N	108	108

Table 3. Public opinion press freedom correlations with other indicators 2011

Correlates		Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Spearman Correlation	Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Pearson Correlation	Partial Correlation*
Demographics				
Gender. Male		-0.18	-0.10	-0.01
	N	135	135	104
Please tell me your age. 15-34		-0.46	-0.46	-0.04
	N	135	135	104
What is your current marital status? Single Separated Divorced Widowed		-0.15	-0.18	-0.11
	N	135	135	104
Educational: Completed elementary education or less		-0.31	-0.27	0.04
	N	134	134	104
Were you born in this country, COUNTRY, or not? Born in this country		-0.24	-0.28	-0.04
	N	135	135	104
Including yourself, how many people who are residents of COUNTRY, age 15 or older, currently in ... ? Mean		-0.47	-0.38	-0.06
	N	135	135	104
How many children under 15 years of age are now living in your household? Mean		-0.33	-0.28	0.02
	N	135	135	104
Do you live in a large city? A large city		-0.08	-0.10	-0.11
	N	133	133	104
Employment Status - Unemployed		-0.31	-0.29	-0.21
	N	134	134	104
Technology				
Does your home have a cellular phone? Yes		0.22	0.19	-0.02
	N	134	134	104
Does your home have a landline telephone? Yes		0.32	0.32	0.06
	N	135	135	104
Does your home have a television? Yes		0.21	0.18	-0.00
	N	134	134	104
Does your home have access to the Internet? Yes		0.40	0.45	0.02
	N	135	135	104
Personal				
Do you feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where you live? Yes		0.31	0.32	0.29
	N	133	133	104
Is religion an important part of your life? Yes		-0.30	-0.36	-0.01
	N	132	132	104

Correlates

		Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Spearman Correlation	Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Pearson Correlation	Partial Correlation*
Ideally, ... ,would you like to move PERMANENTLY to another country...? Like to move to another country		-0.28	-0.29	-0.30
	N	133	133	104
In COUNTRY, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your freedom to choose what you do with your life? Satisfied		0.71	0.69	0.67
	N	135	135	104
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about the military? Yes		0.21	0.21	0.30
	N	122	122	104
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about judicial system and courts? Yes		0.25	0.25	0.41
	N	129	129	104
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about national government? Yes		0.10	0.10	0.47
	N	123	123	104
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about financial institutions or banks? Yes		0.14	0.13	0.35
	N	133	133	104
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in ...? How about religious organizations–churches, mosques, temples, etc? Yes		-0.28	-0.28	0.10
	N	128	128	104
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about honesty of elections? Yes		0.55	0.56	0.51
	N	126	126	104
Do you approve or disapprove of the job performance of the leadership of this country? Approve		0.12	0.13	0.48
	N	122	122	104
On which step of the ladder would you say you personally feel you stand at this time...? Mean 0-10		0.52	0.55	0.25
	N	133	133	104
Just your best guess, on which step do you think you will stand in the future, say about 5 years from now? Mean 0-10		0.35	0.34	0.22
	N	134	134	104
Which ... closest to ... feelings about your households income ...? Living comfortably on present income		0.31	0.40	0.24
	N	135	135	104
Have there been times in the past 12 months when you did not have enough money to buy food ...? Yes		-0.43	-0.40	-0.10
	N	134	134	104
Have there been times in the past 12 months when you did not have enough money to provide adequate shelter ...? Yes		-0.53	-0.47	-0.18
	N	134	134	104
In the city or area ... , are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the educational system or the schools? Satisfied		0.33	0.35	0.43
	N	135	135	104
In the city or area where you live, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of air? Satisfied		0.42	0.41	0.42
	N	134	134	104
In the city or area where you live, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of water? Satisfied		0.59	0.60	0.37
	N	135	135	104

Correlates

		Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Spearman Correlation	Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Pearson Correlation	Partial Correlation*
In the city or area ... , are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the availability of quality health care? Satisfied		0.56	0.57	0.41
	N	135	135	104
In the city or area ..., are you satisfied or ... with the availability of good affordable housing? Satisfied		0.36	0.37	0.34
	N	135	135	104
Life Evaluation Index - Thriving		0.49	0.55	0.27
	N	133	133	104

* These are partial correlations between the listed variable and public opinion press freedom controlling for Freedom House press freedom.

Table 4. Public opinion press freedom correlations with other indicators 2010

Correlates		Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes	Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes	Partial Correlation*
		Spearman Correlation	Pearson Correlation	
Demographics				
Gender. Male		-0.10	-0.04	0.07
	N	112	112	85
Please tell me your age. 15-34		-0.49	-0.48	-0.06
	N	112	112	85
What is your current marital status? Single Separated Divorced Widowed		-0.14	-0.12	-0.03
	N	112	112	85
Educational: Completed elementary education or less		-0.32	-0.28	0.09
	N	111	111	85
Were you born in this country, COUNTRY, or not? Born in this country		-0.18	-0.21	-0.07
	N	112	112	85
Including yourself, how many people who are residents of COUNTRY, age 15 or older, currently in ... ? Mean		-0.46	-0.33	0.05
	N	109	109	85
How many children under 15 years of age are now living in your household? Mean		-0.33	-0.25	0.02
	N	112	112	85
Do you live in a large city? A large city		-0.18	-0.17	-0.13
	N	109	109	85
Employment Status - Unemployed		-0.24	-0.27	-0.42
	N	110	110	85
Technology				
Does your home have a cellular phone? Yes		0.33	0.28	0.10
	N	109	109	85
Does your home have a landline telephone? Yes		0.32	0.33	0.03
	N	112	112	85
Does your home have a television? Yes		0.22	0.20	0.05
	N	112	112	85
Does your home have access to the Internet? Yes		0.45	0.51	0.10
	N	112	112	85
Personal				
Do you feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where you live? Yes		0.19	0.17	0.13
	N	111	111	85
Is religion an important part of your life? Yes		-0.34	-0.36	0.02
	N	111	111	85

Correlates

		Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Spearman Correlation	Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Pearson Correlation	Partial Correlation*
Ideally, ... ,would you like to move PERMANENTLY to another country...? Like to move to another country		-0.20	-0.18	-0.15
	N	112	112	85
In COUNTRY, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your freedom to choose what you do with your life? Satisfied		0.67	0.66	0.60
	N	112	112	85
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about the military? Yes		0.24	0.26	0.31
	N	102	102	85
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about judicial system and courts? Yes		0.29	0.29	0.35
	N	110	110	85
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about national government? Yes		0.11	0.11	0.43
	N	102	102	85
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about financial institutions or banks? Yes		0.09	0.10	0.28
	N	110	110	85
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in ...? How about religious organizations–churches, mosques, temples, etc? Yes		-0.33	-0.31	0.10
	N	104	104	85
In COUNTRY, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about honesty of elections? Yes		0.64	0.61	0.49
	N	105	105	85
Do you approve or disapprove of the job performance of the leadership of this country? Approve		0.05	0.04	0.37
	N	101	101	85
On which step of the ladder would you say you personally feel you stand at this time...? Mean 0-10		0.52	0.54	0.34
	N	112	112	85
Just your best guess, on which step do you think you will stand in the future, say about 5 years from now? Mean 0-10		0.46	0.44	0.35
	N	112	112	85
Which ... closest to ... feelings about your households income ...? Living comfortably on present income		0.34	0.40	0.29
	N	111	111	85
Have there been times in the past 12 months when you did not have enough money to buy food ...? Yes		-0.43	-0.39	-0.14
	N	111	111	85
Have there been times in the past 12 months when you did not have enough money to provide adequate shelter ...? Yes		-0.57	-0.50	-0.24
	N	111	111	85
In the city or area ... , are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the educational system or the schools? Satisfied		0.38	0.38	0.42
	N	112	112	85
In the city or area where you live, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of air? Satisfied		0.47	0.42	0.38
	N	111	111	85
In the city or area where you live, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of water? Satisfied		0.63	0.62	0.40
	N	111	111	85

Correlates

		Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Spearman Correlation	Do the media in this country have a lot of freedom or not? %Yes Pearson Correlation	Partial Correlation*
In the city or area ... , are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the availability of quality health care? Satisfied		0.57	0.55	0.40
	N	111	111	85
In the city or area ..., are you satisfied or ... with the availability of good affordable housing? Satisfied		0.39	0.40	0.27
	N	110	110	85
Life Evaluation Index - Thriving		0.52	0.56	0.35
	N	112	112	85

* These are partial correlations between the listed variable and public opinion press freedom controlling for Freedom House press freedom.