

Personality Traits and the Consumption of Political Information

Alan S. Gerber
Yale University
Department of Political Science
Institution for Social and Policy Studies
77 Prospect Street, PO Box 208209
New Haven, CT 06520-8209
alan.gerber@yale.edu
203.432.5232 (voice)

Gregory A. Huber
Yale University
Department of Political Science
Institution for Social and Policy Studies
77 Prospect Street, PO Box 208209
New Haven, CT 06520-8209
gregory.huber@yale.edu
203.432.5731 (voice)

David Doherty
Yale University
Institution for Social and Policy Studies
77 Prospect Street, PO Box 208209
New Haven, CT 06520-8209
david.doherty@yale.edu
203.432.5057 (voice)

Conor M. Dowling
Yale University
Institution for Social and Policy Studies
77 Prospect Street, PO Box 208209
New Haven, CT 06520-8209
conor.dowling@yale.edu
203.432.4811 (voice)

Personality Traits and the Consumption of Political Information

ABSTRACT:

In this paper we examine the relationship between dispositional personality traits (the Big Five) and the consumption of political information. We present detailed hypotheses about the characteristics of the political environment that are likely to affect the appeal of politics and political information in general for individuals with different personalities, as well as hypotheses about how personality will affect the attractiveness of particular sources of political information. We find that the Big Five traits are significant predictors of political interest and knowledge as well as consumption of different types of political media. Openness (the degree to which a person needs intellectual stimulation and variety) and Emotional Stability (characterized by low levels of anxiety) are associated with a broad range of engagement with political information and political knowledge. The other three Big Five traits, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Extraversion, are associated only with consumption of specific types of political information.

Keywords: personality traits, Big Five, political interest, political knowledge, news consumption

Some people actively participate in the political system while others do not. Similarly, people vary in how interested they are in political information and how knowledgeable they are about political matters (see, for example, Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and Gaudet 1954; Campbell et al. 1960; Delli Carpini and Keeter 1996; Zaller 1992). Political scientists once regularly studied the role of personality in explaining these political differences between individuals, but this line of inquiry for the most part faded out several decades ago.¹ Recent research, however, suggests that core dispositional personality traits (the Big Five) affect the extent to which individuals participate in politics (Gerber et al. 2010c; Mondak and Halperin 2008; Mondak et al. 2010; Vecchione and Caprara 2009). More extraverted individuals, for example, are more likely to attend political meetings (Mondak et al. 2010) and vote (Gerber et al. 2010c).

In this paper we examine whether these core personality traits—deeply rooted differences in “what people are like”—are also associated with general interest in politics as well as whether people consume different news sources and which news sources people choose to consume. Some previous research has examined the relationships between Big Five traits and broad measures of engagement with political information (Mondak and Halperin 2008).² By examining the relationships between these traits and the consumption of different news sources we are able to present a more robust theoretical framework for understanding how characteristics of distinct political information stimuli shape the relationships between these core personality traits and interest in politics.

Our analysis, which is based on a large nationally representative sample of registered voters, identifies a number of significant relationships between personality traits and the consumption of political

¹ A sampling of this early work includes: Adorno et al. (1950); McClosky (1958); Sniderman (1975); Tomkins (1963). The demise of this research was rooted in disagreements both over how to measure personality and in concerns about whether personality dimensions were distinct from the political beliefs they were supposed to predict. In contrast to earlier measures of personality, the batteries used to measure the Big Five traits we examine here, which were originally identified by psychologists, adhere to an accepted lexical approach to measuring personality traits and appear distinct from politics. We discuss these points in further detail below.

² Mondak and Halperin (2008) examine the relationships between Big Five traits and political interest, political knowledge, television news consumption, and newspaper readership. We discuss the differences between our work and Mondak and Halperin’s below, in section 2.

information. For example, we find that Openness (defined as the degree to which a person needs intellectual stimulation and variety) is associated with greater levels of interest in politics, political knowledge, and news consumption. Extraversion (defined as the degree to which a person needs social interaction) is also associated with interest in politics. However, this association appears to be driven primarily by interest in local, rather than national political matters, and does not carry over to actual knowledge of politics. These relationships, and others, hold even after accounting for many factors previous research has shown explain individual- and contextual-level variation in political interest and news consumption, including state of residence, age, gender, education, income, and employment status.

These findings improve our understanding of how broad variations in “what people are like” affect decisions about whether to seek out, consume, and engage with political information.

Understanding the origins of engagement with the political environment and the choice to acquire political knowledge is an area of ongoing research in political science (e.g., Prior 2003; 2005; forthcoming; Valentino and Sears 1998). Our findings suggest that these important differences across individuals in the consumption of political information may originate partly in basic differences in individuals’ personalities.

In addition, our findings complement recent work on the relationships between Big Five personality traits and other outcomes of interest to political scientists. For instance, our finding that Openness is strongly associated with the consumption of political information is consistent with earlier findings that Openness is positively associated with participation in a variety of political activities (Gerber et al. 2010c; Mondak et al. 2010). Additionally, consistent with previous work that suggests the translation of personality traits to behaviors or attitudes is context-dependent (see Gerber et al. 2010b; Mondak et al. 2010), we find that the relationships between some traits and news consumption depends on whether an election is about to be held. For example, more Extraverted individuals (who thrive on social interactions), report watching the national network news at higher rates just before the 2008 presidential election.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. In the next section we describe the Big Five personality traits. We then discuss the aspects of the political information environment that are likely to attract (or repel) individuals with certain personality traits. We present our expectations both about which personality traits are likely to be associated with a broad interest in political information and how these relationships may vary depending on social context and across types of programming and media formats. We then describe our data and present our analysis. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of the implications of our findings.

1. Personality: The Big Five Traits

Dispositional personality traits are individual-level characteristics that affect how people respond to the array of stimuli they encounter in their environment and, in combination with environmental factors, affect a broad range of behaviors and attitudes (Denissen and Penke 2008; Gerber et al. 2010b; McAdams and Pals 2006; McCrae and Costa 1996; Mondak et al. 2010). Researchers have developed a framework in which dispositional personality traits can be comprehensively conceptualized and measured in terms of five trait domains: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability (sometimes referred to by its inverse, Neuroticism), and Openness.³ The measures of these traits are based on extensive lexical analysis, which rests on the assumption that “most of the socially-relevant and salient personality characteristics have become encoded in the natural language” (John and Srivastava 1999, 103).⁴ As a result of this encoding we are able to meaningfully identify variation in people’s personalities (including our own) along distinct dimensions. Over the past several decades, researchers working with

³ See, for example, John and Srivastava (1999). To be clear, consensus has not—and perhaps never will be—reached on how to conceive of and measure personality in a fully comprehensive way (McAdams 1995). The consensus around the Big Five has to do with the fact that there are core dispositional personality traits and how to measure them. Though few would claim that personality traits alone can offer a complete picture of “what people are like,” trait-based research has contributed substantially to our understanding of how personality affects behaviors and attitudes.

⁴ Lexical analysis involves gathering a set of descriptors that might be used to describe personality traits. Individuals are asked to rate how well each trait describes themselves (or a peer). Researchers then factor analyze these ratings to identify clusters of descriptors that tap the same underlying dimensions of personality.

different types of samples, raters, and methodological variations have repeatedly found that five dimensions (the Big Five) can reliably capture variation in stable, core personality traits (John and Srivastava 1999, 106). To help ground this discussion, Table 1 (adapted from Costa and McCrae 1992, 9; also see Gosling 2008, Tables 2.1-2.5) describes individuals scoring low (i.e., not characterized by the trait) and high (i.e., very typical of the trait) on each of the Big Five traits.

[Table 1 about here]

This advance in how scholars conceive of and measure personality, along with a growing body of evidence that personality traits are in part heritable and stable through the life cycle (e.g., Bouchard 1997; Bouchard and Loehlin 2001; Caspi, Roberts, and Shiner 2005; Plomin and Caspi 1999; Plomin et al. 1990; van Gestel and van Broeckhoven 2003), opens an exciting frontier in social science research. These rigorously validated measures of personality are theorized to be causally prior to attitudes and behaviors, such as media choice (McCrae and Costa 1996). Research finds that Big Five traits predict a wide variety of attitudes and behaviors, including occupational choice and satisfaction (Borghans et al. 2008; Hogan and Holland 2003; Salgado 1997), alcohol and tobacco consumption (Paunonen and Ashton 2001), and behavior in economic games (Ben-Ner, Kramera, and Levy 2008; Koole, Jager, and van den Berg 2001).

In political science, several recent papers examine the association between the Big Five and political attitudes and behaviors. They find that the substantive effect of Big Five traits is often comparable to, or larger in magnitude than, the effect of canonically important demographic variables such as education and income (Gerber et al. 2010a, 2010b, 2010c; Mondak and Halperin 2008; Mondak et al. 2010). Individuals ranking high on the trait of Extraversion, for example, gain greater satisfaction from interactions with others. Survey data suggest extraverts are more likely to participate in a variety of political activities than their more introverted counterparts (e.g., Gerber et al. 2010c; Mondak et al. 2010). Similarly, individuals high on the trait of Openness are amenable to novel experiences and to challenging conventions. Those high on this trait are more likely to hold liberal views on both economic and social policy issues (Gerber et al. 2010b).

2. Personality and Political Information Consumption

Big Five traits predict preferences for a variety of forms of communication and entertainment. For example, they are associated with musical preferences (Rentfrow and Gosling 2003), book reading preferences (Kraaykamp and van Eijck 2005), and cultural participation (e.g., visiting museums and going to concerts, Kraaykamp and van Eijck 2005). However, little previous research has examined the relationships between Big Five traits and attraction to and use of political information.

One notable exception is Mondak and Halperin's (2008) study of the relationships between Big Five traits and a variety of political outcomes, including interest in politics, political knowledge, and some specific forms of news consumption. Our study builds on that work in three important ways. First, below we offer a more precise theoretical framework for understanding how the Big Five are likely to be associated with the consumption of various types of political information. Second, while their innovative research used two random digit dialing (RDD) samples of residents of Tallahassee, Florida, we rely on a large ($N > 8,000$) nationally representative survey sample of registered voters. Third, we examine measures of political information consumption that are more specific than those used by Mondak and Halperin. For example, whereas Mondak and Halperin use a measure of whether an individual watches any news on television, we can examine whether people watch the local news, national news, and political talk shows. In addition, we assess the relationships between Big Five traits and use of "soft news" media such as satirical, late night, and daytime talk programs.⁵

Dispositional personality traits, like the Big Five, shape individuals' responses to the stimuli they encounter in the world around them (Denissen and Penke 2008; McAdams and Pals 2006). Thus, in order to formulate expectations about the relationships between these traits and consumption of political information, we must first consider what aspects of these stimuli (e.g., news reports) are likely to either attract or repel individuals with particular personality traits. We propose that three characteristics of the

⁵ We also use a validated personality battery, the TIPI (described below), as our measure of the Big Five and present model specifications that include controls not employed by Mondak and Halperin (2008), who control for age, education, race, and gender. This allows us to see the extent to which the effects of the Big Five traits on political information consumption are robust to alternative modeling strategies.

political information environment should be particularly relevant: (1) the exchange of ideas, (2) its contentiousness, and (3) the social returns to being politically informed.

First, a key characteristic of the policy-making process and political campaigns is that each involves an exchange of ideas. Thus, news reports and other sources of political information typically include an airing of differing preferences and proposals. This content is likely to be especially appealing to individuals high on Openness, a trait that is associated with an attraction to new and challenging stimuli. Thus, we expect those high on Openness to be more likely to consume political information and be politically knowledgeable. This is the only statistically significant relationship identified in the one study that we are aware of that examines the association between the Big Five traits and television programming choice (Kraaykamp and van Eijck 2005). Specifically, in a sample of 1,366 Dutch respondents, Kraaykamp and van Eijck find a positive association between Openness and a preference for informative (i.e., news) programs.⁶ Similarly, Mondak and Halperin (2008) find that individuals high on Openness tend to be more interested in politics and have more knowledge about political matters.

Second, this exchange of ideas is often contentious. Media reports tend to focus on the conflictual components of the political process (Cappella and Jamieson 1997). One possibility is that this conflict is off-putting to those who are more Agreeable and therefore prefer harmonious relationships. Conflict avoidance will therefore drive down political interest and news consumption among those high on

⁶ Kraaykamp and van Eijck (2005) measure an individual's preference for different television genres using responses to questions asking how "appealing" (1) cultural, (2) informative, (3) soap, and (4) erotic programs are on a scale ranging from one ("does not appeal at all") to four ("appeals very much"). The authors also find a positive association between Openness and a preference for cultural programs. In addition, they find a positive association between Agreeableness ("Friendliness" in the Dutch translation of the Big Five) and a preference for soap programs, but a negative association between Agreeableness and interest in cultural programming. Emotional Stability is negatively associated with a preference for soap and erotic programming. They find no significant relationships between Conscientiousness and Extraversion and media preferences. There appears to be no comparable study of all of the Big Five traits and media use in U.S. populations. Some studies, however, have considered the relationship between two of the five traits—Extraversion and Emotional Stability—and media outcomes. In a sample of 381 undergraduates, Shim and Paul (2007) do not find any relationships between these two traits and self-reported attention to (rather than consumption of) a variety of television genres—including news programming. Weaver (1991) finds a negative and statistically significant relationship between Emotional Stability and a preference for "information" programs; however, the examples of this type of programming are *20/20* and *Nature*, not news programs per se.

Agreeableness. Mondak and Halperin (2008) find some evidence that individuals high in Agreeableness report being less attentive to politics ($p < .10$). Similarly, Emotional Stability—a trait associated with low levels of anxiety—may also affect how people respond to political conflict. Less Emotionally Stable individuals may find exposure to conflict upsetting. If this is the case, then those scoring low on Emotional Stability will report lower levels of interest in politics and less consumption of political information. Although they do not find any consistent relationships between this trait and news consumption, Mondak and Halperin find evidence that *less* Emotionally Stable individuals are more knowledgeable about politics.

Finally, politics is inherently social. The process of campaigns and elections involves a great deal of social interaction, and politics is a means to address socially-relevant issues. This suggests that people high on Extraversion are more likely to be attracted to political information (see also Mondak and Halperin 2008) that facilitates involvement in both campaigns and policy making. Similarly, Shim and Paul (2007, 291) argue that both the nature of political information and its social usefulness may attract Extraverts to political news (although they do not find empirical support for this argument in their sample). The social benefits of being attentive to politics may be particularly important in contexts where political discussions are likely to be especially common. For example, in the weeks before a presidential election, Extraverts may feel particularly compelled to stay informed about political matters. Another possibility related to the social aspects of politics is that keeping informed about politics may be thought of as a social obligation. To the extent that this is the case, people with certain personality traits may feel obligated to either keep informed or at least claim that they are interested in doing so. Mondak and Halperin (2008) conjecture and find some support for the claim that because Conscientiousness is associated with dutifulness and adherence to social norms, people high on this trait may be more likely to report being interested in politics and consuming political information.

To summarize, we expect four of the Big Five to be positively associated with interest in politics and (therefore) political knowledge, but for different reasons. The exchange of ideas that is a constant part of politics should appeal to individuals high on Openness, whereas the social returns to being politically

informed and knowledgeable should attract individuals high on Conscientiousness (who want to adhere to social norms) and Extraversion (who want to be able to discuss politics socially). Of note, these social returns are likely most relevant when politics is most likely to be discussed, such as when an important election is imminent. Finally, the contentiousness that often defines politics is likely to repel both those high on Agreeableness (who prefer harmonious exchanges) and those low on Emotional Stability (who may feel vulnerable in contentious situations).

2.1 The Appeal of Different Mediums and Programming Formats

In contemporary America, there are numerous ways that people can obtain political information. In light of these choices, we also consider how Big Five traits shape decisions about which news information to consume. We focus on how three dimensions of variation in news media might influence the appeal of different sources of political information to individuals with different personality traits: (1) media format preferences (e.g., television versus Internet), (2) presentation of political information (“objective” reporting versus debate), and (3) ancillary content (e.g., comedy, lifestyle). In this section, we do not outline specific hypotheses for the relationship between each Big Five trait and each type of news source. Instead we focus on the traits most likely to attract people to (or repel them from) the most salient characteristics of each news source. As we report below, we find a number of relationships that we did not anticipate.

First, some choices about how to learn about the political world may be driven by broad preferences about media formats. Below, we examine whether Big Five traits predict consumption of television, Internet, and print news differently. There is some evidence from prior research that this may be the case. For example, Bulik (2009) finds evidence that people high on the trait of Openness are more likely to report using the Internet generally. Thus, those high on this trait may be particularly likely to rely on the Internet for political information.

Second, there are a variety of different ways in which political information can be presented in news programming. Here we focus on one medium, television, for which political content can come in different forms. Traditional news programs typically emphasize reporting factual information, whereas

political talk programs revolve around debates and exchanges of ideas. Personality traits may shape the appeal of these various ways of conveying political information. For example, people high on Openness may be particularly attracted to the debates and exchanges of ideas that pervade political talk shows. Another possibility is that those high on Extraversion will be attracted to the interpersonal interactions displayed on these programs. Finally, the more contentious nature of political talk shows is likely to make them less attractive than regular news programs to those who are less Emotionally Stable or more Agreeable.

A second distinction is between local and national news programs. Those high on the trait of Agreeableness—associated with harmonious relations with others—may be particularly attracted to news about local issues that often evoke a sense of community solidarity (e.g., “working together to deal with the crime problem”) as opposed to conflict. In contrast, those high on Openness may be less attracted to local news programs because the information presented in them is insufficiently novel and does not extend beyond their immediate familiar community.

Third, news is often encountered as “soft news” in programming without an explicit news focus (Baum 2002, 2003; Prior 2003). We consider three such sources of soft news: daytime talk shows, satire shows, and late night talk shows. Briefly, the focus on interpersonal interactions and prosocial behavior in daytime talk shows is likely to appeal to more Extraverted and Agreeable individuals. At the same time, the relatively mundane content is less likely to appeal to more Open individuals seeking new ideas, or to Emotionally Stable individuals who do not seek reassurance. Late night satire, by contrast, is a source of irreverent challenges to dominant ideas that often exposes viewers to uncomfortable emotional situations. The challenge to existing ideas is likely to appeal to more Open individuals while repelling those who are more Conscientious. The potential for negative emotionality may repel the more Agreeable and less Emotionally Stable, although humor is a way of overcoming negative feelings that may be attractive to those same (less Emotionally Stable) individuals. Finally, light night talk shows can be thought of as a mix of the friendly exchanges found on daytime talk shows and the cutting commentary found on satire programs. Depending on which aspects of late night talk programming dominate how people think of

these shows, the relationships between Big Five traits and the decision to watch these programs may be similar to those we expect for satire or daytime talk programs.

3. Data and Measurement

Our data come from the 2007-2008 Cooperative Campaign Analysis Project (CCAP: Jackman and Vavreck 2009) survey. The CCAP is an Internet-based survey⁷ of registered voters that, in order to account for the fact that opt-in Internet survey respondents may differ from the general population on factors such as political interest, uses a combination of sampling and matching techniques to approximate a random digit dialing sample on certain observable characteristics.⁸ The CCAP was fielded as a panel survey with five waves before the November 2008 election (the pre-election waves) and one post-election wave. All of the variables we use in our analyses from the CCAP were answered either in the initial baseline (December 2007) wave or the October wave, with the exception of newspaper readership, which was asked on the March wave.⁹

⁷ We note that because the CCAP sample is necessarily composed of Internet users, it may overestimate Internet usage relative to an RDD or in-person survey.

⁸ The survey sample is constructed by first drawing a target population sample. This sample is based on the 2005-2007 American Community Study, November 2008 Current Population Survey Supplement, and the 2007 Pew Religious Life Survey. Thus, this target sample is representative of the general population on a broad range of characteristics including a variety of geographic (state, region, metropolitan statistical area), demographic (age, race, income, education, gender), and other measures (born-again status, employment, interest in news, party identification, ideology, turnout). Polimetrix invited a sample of their opt-in panel of 1.4 million survey respondents to participate in the study. Invitations were stratified based on race, gender, and battleground status, with an oversample of nine battleground and early primary states (Florida, Iowa, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin). Those who completed the survey (approximately 2.5 times the target sample) were then matched to the target sample using nearest neighbor matching based on the variables listed in parentheses above. Finally, weights were calculated to adjust the final sample to reflect the national public on these demographic and other characteristics (including correcting for the oversampling of battleground states). For more detailed information on this type of survey and sampling technique see Vavreck and Rivers (2008). In concrete terms, the weighted CCAP sample we use in our analysis appears similar in levels of political interest to that found in the weighted 2008 ANES time-series survey. In the September wave of the CCAP we find that 59% of respondents are “very much” interested in politics (variable=scap813, “How interested are you in politics?”). In the ANES pre-election survey, the comparable figure is 58% (variable=V0830001b, “How interested are you in information about what's going on in government and politics?” = Extremely or Very interested, restricted to reported registered voters).

⁹ The exact dates that the survey was in the field are: Baseline (December 17, 2007 to January 3, 2008); March (March 21 to April 14, 2008); October (October 22 to November 3, 2008).

3.1 Measuring Political Information Consumption

Our measures of political information consumption fall into two broad categories: (1) general interest in and knowledge of politics and (2) specific forms of news consumption. We discuss our measures of the former category, of which we have three measures, first. (Weighted summary statistics for all model variables appear in Table 2 and full question wording and coding rules appear in the Appendix.) On the baseline and October waves of the CCAP, respondents were asked “How interested are you in politics?”—“very much”, “somewhat”, or “not much” interested. On the October wave, respondents were also asked whether they “follow what’s going on in government and public affairs,” with four response options ranging from “most of the time” to “hardly at all.” These questions, *Interest in Politics* and *Interest in Public Affairs*, serve as our two measures of political interest. To measure a respondent’s level of political knowledge, we created a standardized index based on responses to ten items asking respondents to state which job “people in the news” (e.g., John Dingell, Nancy Pelosi, Bill Gates) hold.¹⁰ The total number of correct responses were summed and then a standardized index (mean equal to zero, standard deviation equal to one) of a respondent’s *Political Knowledge* was created.

With respect to specific forms of news consumption, we use two sets of questions from the CCAP that asked respondents to report their media consumption habits.¹¹ First, in the baseline wave, respondents were asked a series of questions asking them to recall their behavior over the last seven days (e.g., what they had watched on TV or read and how they had used the Internet). For example, respondents were asked “[W]hat kinds of things have you watched on television in the LAST SEVEN DAYS? (Choose as many as apply to you)” with eight types of television programs (news programs, political talk shows, sports, movies, prime time shows, late night comedy/talk shows, satire shows, and daytime talk shows)

¹⁰ Response options for these items were “House Member,” “Senator,” or “Neither.”

¹¹ As Prior (2009a, 2009b) and others have noted, respondent recall of media consumption is often biased (i.e., respondents over report media exposure). In an effort to help respondents’ accurately recall answers to survey questions, the CCAP limited how far respondents had to go back in time (i.e., only for the last week or just for yesterday) to remember certain actions or events, such as what they watched on TV or read. While this may still be an imperfect measure of true media exposure, we believe it is an improvement over open ended recall or questions that measure only aggregate exposure. For an alternative approach, see Prior (2009b).

plus an “other” category available to select. We create indicator variables (one if the respondent reported watching that type of programming in the last seven days, zero if not) for each of these television genres, but focus our analysis on news programs (the examples given to CCAP respondents were: “like 60 Minutes, Dateline, Primetime Live, Anderson Cooper 360 or the Evening News”), political talk shows (“like Hannity and Colmes, Meet the Press, This Week, Face the Nation, or Hardball”), satire shows (“like the Daily Show, the Colbert Report, or Saturday Night Live”), late night comedy/talk shows (“like the Tonight Show, Late Night, or the Late Show”), and daytime talk shows (“like Oprah, Ellen, or Dr. Phil”). In addition to television news consumption, we also examine whether respondents reported (1) using the Internet to “read the news” in the last seven days and (2) reading a newspaper in the last seven days.

Our second measure relies on questions asked in each wave of the CCAP in which respondents were asked to fill out a grid indicating whether and what television stations they watched between the hours of 4pm and 11pm the day before. The grid listed time slots (in half hour increments from 4pm to 7pm and hour increments thereafter) as row headers on the left and television stations (ABC, CBS, NBC, FOX, PBS, or Other) as column headers. Respondents then selected which, if any, stations they watched in each time slot. From this grid, we created indicators for whether a respondent watched (1) any national news or (2) any (evening or late) local news. For example, a respondent who reported watching ABC at 6:30pm on Tuesday (i.e., completed the survey on Wednesday) would be recorded as having watched the national news. We created these indicators for both the baseline and October waves of the CCAP. It is important to note that we are not able to discern whether respondents who select the “Other” category watched any national or local news. As a result, our measures of watching local and national news should be thought of as watching *network* news, whereas the previous measure of television news consumption (based on the “last seven days” question) encompasses other (cable) news programs as well.

3.2 Independent Variables

The primary independent variables of interest in our analysis are measure of the Big Five personality traits. While there are a variety of instruments that are commonly used to measure the Big

Five personality dimensions, we use the Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI, Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann 2003). The TIPI is a quickly administered instrument suitable for situations where longer batteries, such as the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO PI-R, Costa and McCrae 1992), which includes 240 items, are not feasible. Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann (2003, Tables 6 & 9) compared the performance of the TIPI to much longer tests and find that scores based on the 10 items are highly correlated with those obtained from longer instruments.¹² On the TIPI, respondents are asked to report whether “I see myself as” characterized by a series of 10 trait pairs using a seven-point scale ordered from Disagree Strongly to Agree Strongly.¹³ Each Big Five trait is captured by responses to two trait pairs, with one trait pair for each Big Five trait reverse scored to mitigate problems of acquiescence bias.¹⁴ Responses to these 10 items are used to score a respondent’s personality in each of the Big Five traits.¹⁵ We note that personality may affect whether or not a respondent is willing to complete this, or any survey. If this is the case, the CCAP may, for example, over-represent Agreeable individuals relative to their proportion in the population.

We also include several demographic controls in our analyses that previous research has shown are often related to political interest and media choice: age (in years, and squared), gender (indicator for female), race (White [omitted category], Black, Hispanic, and Other), employment status (working full

¹² The correlations between TIPI measures and the 44-item Big Five Inventory (BFI) range from .65 to .87; correlations with the 240-item NEO PI-R range from .56 to .68.

¹³ While some longer Big Five batteries have been criticized for having some items that are political in nature, to the best of our knowledge the TIPI has not. The ten trait pairs used in the TIPI are included in the Appendix.

¹⁴ This reverse coding is important because there is some evidence that personality characteristics are associated with acquiescence bias (Knowles and Nathan 1997). For more on acquiescence bias see Schuman and Presser (1981). Correlations between the two items used to measure each of the Big Five traits range from .24 (for Agreeableness) to .48 (for Stability), which are not particularly high. However, we note that the TIPI was not designed with the intent of achieving high inter-item correlations. Rather, it was designed to 1) be brief; 2) achieve high test-retest reliability (as well as reliability between self- and peer-administered ratings); and 3) yield measures that are highly correlated with those obtained using much longer batteries (see footnote 11). Therefore, because each question in the TIPI is designed to measure part of a broader Big Five trait, inter-item correlations between the two items used to measure each trait are less informative of the items’ reliability (Gosling 2009; more generally, see Kline 2000 and Woods and Hampson 2005 on the misleading nature of alphas calculated on scales with only a small number of items).

¹⁵ The correlations among the Big Five traits and between the Big Five traits and the other independent variables used in our analysis are reported in Appendix Table A1.

time, working part time, retired, unemployed [omitted category]), education (linear scale), and income (linear scale). We also include fixed effects for state of residence and day of the week the survey was completed in all models. In addition, given research on the disparate media choices of Democrats and Republicans (e.g., Stroud 2008), we present supplementary analyses (in the Appendix) that control for political ideology. Because of the correlations between ideology and Big Five personality traits (Carney et al. 2008; Gerber et al. 2010b; Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann 2003; Jost et al. 2003; Mondak and Halperin 2008), we note that caution may be required in interpreting those models. We also consider the robustness of our results to the exclusion of education and income (in the Appendix) because of the correlation between personality traits and these outcomes (e.g., Borghans et al. 2008; Paunonen and Ashton 2001).

Table 2 presents sample statistics for all of the variables we use in our analysis. All question wording and coding rules not discussed in the text are located in the Appendix. We restrict our sample to individuals who provided responses to all of our dependent and independent variables and, because the weekend television grid is very dissimilar from the weekday grid, to those who did not complete the survey on Sunday or Monday (who would have been reporting on weekend TV viewing). These sample restrictions result in 8,664 total observations.¹⁶

[Table 2 about here]

4. Analysis

We begin our analysis by examining the relationships between Big Five personality traits and interest in politics and political knowledge. Table 3a presents the results of a series of ordered logit and OLS regression models.¹⁷ The first three columns employ ordered logit and examine responses to *Interest*

¹⁶ These restrictions do not result in a demonstrably different sample from the full CCAP sample of 20,000 respondents. See Appendix Table A2 for sample statistics for each variable reported in Table 2 among all CCAP respondents.

¹⁷ Appendix Tables A3-A6 report results from two alternative model specifications for each of the dependent variables we examine in Tables 3, 4, 6, and 7: one specification only controls for gender, race, and age (odd numbered columns), the other adds political ideology to the controls presented in the tables reported in the text (even numbered columns). The relationships between Big Five traits and outcomes in

in Politics (Baseline and October) and *Interest in Public Affairs* (October). The fourth column uses OLS and analyzes the *Political Knowledge* index (Mean=0, SD=1) as the dependent variable. The bottom two rows of the table indicate that a test of the joint significance of the Big Five traits reveals that they are jointly statistically significant in all four models ($p < .001$).

[Table 3 about here]

We expected that people high on Openness would be attracted to the exchange of political ideas and thus would be more interested in and informed about political matters. The coefficient on Openness is positive and statistically significant across the four models, demonstrating results that are consistent with Mondak and Halperin's (2008) earlier findings. We report the marginal effects of a two standard deviation (SD) change in each Big Five trait (which corresponds to about 40% of the scale for each item, as each item's standard deviation is about .2 on the 0 to 1 scale) on each interest and knowledge item, as well as estimates of the marginal effects of two SD changes in education (e.g., a change from being a high school graduate to being a college graduate) and income (e.g., a change from a family income of less than \$10,000 to \$60,000-69,999), in Table 3b. The marginal effects we report are the expected proportional change in the likelihood of the outcome of interest relative to the baseline probability of that outcome.¹⁸ These estimates indicate that a two SD increase in Openness is associated with an 21.0% increase (over the baseline probability of 63.0%) in the likelihood of being "very much interested" in politics in the baseline wave of the survey. The magnitude of the effect of Openness is somewhat smaller than, but comparable to, the analogous effects of education and income across the three political interest models.

We also anticipated that people high on Emotional Stability would be willing to tolerate the combative aspects of political debate and, thus, would also be more likely to engage with political information than those lower on this trait. We also find clear support for this expectation in all four

these specifications are for the most part substantively similar to those reported in Tables 3, 4, 6, and 7. We discuss notable exceptions in the text.

¹⁸ All estimated marginal effects are for a 50-year-old White female from California who is working full time. Personality traits, education, and income are set to their sample means.

models presented in Table 3.¹⁹ The marginal effects of Emotional Stability are smaller than those for Openness in the political interest models, but larger in the political knowledge model. We note that our findings regarding Emotional Stability differ from those reported by Mondak and Halperin (2008). These differences may stem from variations across samples or differences in the Big Five batteries used (see footnote 5).

Because Conscientiousness is associated with adherence to social norms we reasoned that this trait would be associated with greater levels of political engagement. We also proposed that people high on Extraversion would be attracted to the social benefits of being politically informed. We find positive relationships between each of these traits and self-reported interest in politics and political affairs (although the relationship between Conscientiousness and *Interest in Politics* falls below conventional levels of statistical significance in the October wave of the survey [column (2); $p=0.173$]). A two SD increase in Conscientiousness is associated with a 3.5-7.0% increase in the probability of reporting high levels of interest in politics and public affairs; a similar change in Extraversion is associated with a 6.2-14.6% increase in the likelihood of these outcomes. However, we do not find a similar relationship in the model predicting political knowledge. In fact, the coefficients on these traits in column (4) are negative (Conscientiousness, $p=.244$; Extraversion, $p=.211$). We cannot be certain about the causes of these differing relationships. However, one explanation is that those high on Conscientiousness and Extraversion are more likely to see themselves as interested in politics (or want others to see them as informed), but are not actually more likely to become informed about political matters.²⁰

Finally, we hypothesized that the conflictual nature of politics may be off-putting to individuals high on Agreeableness. While three of the four Agreeableness coefficients are negative, none are

¹⁹ Accounting for ideology (Appendix Table A3) reduces the effect of Emotional Stability on interest somewhat. Not surprisingly, the most liberal and most conservative are the most interested.

²⁰ An additional possibility is that the insignificant relationships between these traits and political knowledge are due to the specific political facts included in the questions we use in our measure. In either case, the (negative) signs of the coefficients for Conscientiousness and Extraversion are consistent with those reported in Mondak and Halperin (2008).

statistically significant and all are fairly small. This suggests that more Agreeable individuals are not necessarily inherently put off by politics.

4.1 Specific Forms of News Consumption

4.1.1 News Mediums

Turning to specific forms of news consumption, Table 4 presents the results of a series logistic regressions for whether a respondent reported consuming a particular type of news medium in the last seven days: television news programs (column [1]), news on the Internet (column [2]), and a newspaper (column [3]). Marginal effects for Tables 4, 6, and 7 appear in Table 5.

[Tables 4 and 5 about here]

Consistent with previous evidence that people high on the trait of Openness are more likely to use the Internet, we find that people high on this trait were more likely to report using the Internet as a source of news. These same individuals are also more likely to watch television news programs.²¹ A 2 SD increase in Openness is associated with a 7.3% and 10.3% increase (proportional to the baseline probabilities) in the likelihood of reporting consuming Internet and television news, respectively. However, Openness is not associated with the likelihood of reading a newspaper. As before, and contrary to our expectation that those high on Agreeableness would avoid political media, we find that this trait is positively associated with reported consumption of all three news mediums (although the relationship is only statistically significant in the model predicting watching television news programs). In addition, we find that Extraverts are more likely to report having read the newspaper in the last week, which corroborates a similar finding from Mondak and Halperin (2008). Results for Emotional Stability and Conscientiousness are mixed and not statistically significant.

4.1.2 Programming Format

²¹ This relationship does not appear to be driven by an association between Openness and television watching in general. In Appendix Table A7 we report models predicting the number of hours a respondent reported watching television the previous night and find a statistically significant and negative relationship between Openness and television watching. We also find a statistically significant and positive relationship between Extraversion and television watching.

Next, we turn to the question of whether personality traits are associated with consumption of particular television programming formats (we examine local versus national news viewing in the next section). In columns (2) to (5) of Table 6, we examine four specific types of television shows where individuals could conceivably obtain news: political talk shows, satire shows, late night comedy/talk shows, and daytime talk shows. Marginal effects are reported in columns (4) to (7) of Table 5. As a point of comparison, Table 6, column (1) shows the results from Table 4 for television news programs.

[Table 6 about here]

In column (2), we find that Extraversion is positively associated with watching political talk shows. This supports our expectation that people high on Extraversion would be attracted to the interpersonal exchanges that characterize political talk programs. While a 2 SD change in Extraversion only increases the likelihood of watching new programs by 0.4%, the same change in this trait is associated with a 17.6% increase in the likelihood of watching political talk shows. Those who are more Emotionally Stable are also more likely to report watching political talk shows, as expected, but this effect is not statistically significant at the 95% level ($p=.076$; effect of 2 SD increase=7.6%).²² We posited Agreeableness would be associated with aversion to the conflict inherent in political talk shows, but the coefficient on Agreeableness is positive (but not statistically significant). We note that this effect is less positive than the effect of Agreeableness on news programs (column [1])—a 2 SD increase in Agreeableness is associated with an 7.6% increase in the likelihood of watching television news in general, but only a 2.0% increase in the likelihood watching political talk shows—suggesting Agreeable individuals are less attracted to political talk than news programs.

We also find that those high on Conscientiousness are more likely to report watching political talk shows (effect of 2 SD increase=15.4%). We did not anticipate this relationship. In contrast, we do not find any evidence that Openness, a trait we expected might attract people to political talk shows, is associated with watching this type of program. One explanation for these unexpected findings is that these

²² When only controls for core demographic characteristics are included, Emotional Stability is a statistically significant and positive predictor of watching political talk shows (see Appendix Table A5, column [3]).

relationships are an artifact of the relationships between Big Five traits and ideology. The most popular political news programs at the time the survey was fielded included programs hosted by conservatives including *The O'Reilly Factor* and *Hannity and Colmes*. Conscientiousness is strongly associated with conservatism while Openness is strongly associated with liberalism (Carney et al. 2008; Gerber et al. 2010b; Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann 2003; Mondak and Halperin 2008). Thus, if the most popular talk programs are conservative, the relationship between Conscientiousness and political talk viewership may be amplified while the corresponding relationship between Openness and watching these programs may be depressed. We find some suggestive evidence supporting this interpretation in column (4) of Appendix Table A5. Specifically, we find that the coefficient on Conscientiousness is somewhat smaller when we control for ideological self-placement while the coefficient on Openness is positive (though still not statistically significant: $p=.129$).²³

In Table 6, column (3) we present a model predicting consumption of daytime talk shows. Consistent with our expectations we find strong positive associations between both Agreeableness (effect of 2 SD increase=32.5%) and Extraversion (effect of 2 SD increase=15.9%) and watching daytime talk shows. As expected, Emotional Stability is negatively associated with daytime talk show viewership (effect of 2 SD increase=-23.6%). We do not find any support for our hypothesis that Openness would suppress daytime talk show viewing.

Reported watching of satire shows, such as the *Daily Show*, *Colbert Report*, or *Saturday Night Live*, often viewed as liberal mainstays, also appear to reflect the associations between Big Five traits and ideology discussed with regard to political talk programs. Openness, which is associated with liberalism, is positively associated with watching satire shows. Conversely, Conscientiousness, which is associated with conservatism, is negatively associated with watching the same shows. Column (8) of Appendix Table A5 demonstrates that these relationships are attenuated when we control for ideology. Conscientiousness is no longer statistically significant in this model ($p=.297$) and the coefficient on

²³ Another possibility is that Open individuals are not more likely to watch political talk shows because they view many of them as one-sided debates rather than true exchanges of ideas.

Openness is approximately half as large. We also find evidence that Emotional Stability—another trait that is associated with conservatism (Gerber et al. 2010b)—is negatively associated with consumption of satire programs (although this association is only near the borderline of statistical significance at the .05 level: $p=.062$). However, this relationship does not change substantially in the model that controls for ideology. This negative association between Emotional Stability and satire viewing is contrary to the argument that more Emotionally Stable individuals would not be put off by the emotionality often invoked on satire shows. We also note that we do not find that Agreeableness is associated with eschewing satire.

Finally, consistent with our view that late night talk shows are a blending of genres, we do not find any statistically significant relationships between Big Five traits and watching late night talk shows.

4.1.3 Local versus National News

A final point we consider is whether certain types of individuals prefer to watch the national or local news. Table 7 presents a series of logistic regression models for whether the respondent watched any national or local network news (ABC, CBS, NBC, or FOX [only local news] or PBS [only national news]) *yesterday*, based on responses to the television grid the respondent completed in the Baseline (odd numbered columns) and October (even numbered columns) wave of the CCAP. Consistent with the findings presented in Table 4, column (1), we find a consistent positive association between Agreeableness and watching the evening news (although this relationship only reaches conventional levels of statistical significance in two of the four models; effects of 2 SD increase range from 7.8 to 13.8%). Contrary to our expectations, however, the effects of Agreeableness on national and local news watching are similar. We do find support for our expectation that individuals high on Openness are less likely to watch the local news than national news.²⁴

[Table 7 about here]

²⁴ When controls for ideology are included, Openness is not a statistically significant (negative) predictor of watching the local news (see Appendix Table A6, columns [6] and [8]).

The relationships between Conscientiousness and Extraversion and each type of news consumption provide suggestive evidence of context effects. Although Extraverts were no more likely to report watching the national evening (network) news in the baseline wave (effect of 2 SD increase=4.4%), they were significantly more likely to watch the national news during the heat of the 2008 presidential election in the October wave (effect of 2 SD increase=22.0%). This finding supports our expectation that Extraverts are drawn to politics for social reasons, perhaps tuning into the news during those periods of time when they knew they were most likely to be expected to talk about politics with others. Similarly, Conscientiousness is not associated with watching the local news in the baseline wave (effect of 2 SD increase=3.4%), but is positively associated with local news viewership in the October wave (effect of 2 SD increase=10.2%).

5. Discussion

The analysis presented here suggests that underlying personality traits affect whether people are attracted to political information and what types of information sources they are most likely to use. We find clear evidence that Openness and Emotional Stability are positively and strongly associated with interest in and knowledge of politics. This is the case both in the heat of the 2008 presidential general election and early in the presidential primary season. We also find evidence that while more Conscientious and Extraverted individuals are more likely to report that they are interested in politics, they are not necessarily more knowledgeable about politics.

In addition, we find that the relationships between personality traits and news consumption vary across different news sources. These differences appear to reflect the varying appeal of different media (e.g., television versus Internet) as well as the format and substance of news sources. For example, while we find a positive association between Openness and watching any television news programs in the last seven days, we find a negative relationship between this trait and watching local news programs. We argue that this is because those high on Openness are more likely to seek out information sources that present diverse and challenging stories about events outside of the local community. We also find

evidence that Extraverts are more likely to report watching political talk shows (which are likely to feature individuals asserting strong points of view). Our analysis also suggests that some relationships between Big Five traits and media choices (e.g., watching satire programs or political talk shows) are tied to the relationships between these traits and political ideology.

The statistically significant relationships between personality traits and news consumption provide insight into how these traits shape individuals' decisions about what information to consume. As we discuss above, while the magnitudes of these effects are arguably modest in absolute terms, they are often comparable to (or even larger than) the effects of education and income—two individual-level characteristics often identified as strong predictors of political engagement. For example, a 2 SD increase in Openness is associated with 7.3% and 10.3% increases in the likelihood of reporting consuming Internet and television news, respectively. The comparable effects for a substantial change in education (being a high school graduate to being a college graduate) are 11.0% and 5.2%; for a substantial change in income (family income of less than \$10,000 to \$60,000-69,999) the comparable estimates are 9.6% and 7.1%. In other cases, the effects of Big Five traits are substantially smaller than those of these other variables. A two SD increase in Extraversion is associated with a 6.9% increase in the likelihood of reporting reading a newspaper while a 2 SD change in income is associated with an 19.4% increase.

While the magnitudes of some of these effects are modest, there are several reasons why it is notable that we find any relationships at all. First, the Big Five traits are not obviously related to politics. Thus, on their face, it is not clear that they should be related to engagement with political information. Second, our measures of these traits are quite coarse; we use only two items to measure each of these broad traits. More generally, our finding that these traits predict engagement with political information is important because these traits are understood to be building blocks of individual differences in what people are like. The analysis we present here is one step toward integrating our understanding of what drives some people to seek out political information with a broader understanding of what attracts people to consume information about any topic.

Demonstrating that Big Five traits are associated with an individual's stated interest in politics, knowledge about politics, and specific forms of news consumption has a variety of implications for current research concerning both (1) political interest and (2) the association between personality and politics. First, while previous research focuses on how socialization encourages interest in politics (Delli Carpini and Keeter 1996; Valentino and Sears 1998), our results suggest that an additional reason some people are interested in politics but others are not is, quite simply, politics appeals to certain types of individuals more than others. Moreover, given the heritability and stability over the life cycle of the Big Five (see, e.g., Bouchard 1997; Bouchard and Loehlin 2001; Caspi, Roberts, and Shiner 2005; Plomin and Caspi 1999; Plomin et al. 1990; van Gestel and van Broeckhoven 2003), the association between the Big Five and political interest might offer part of the explanation for why political interest also appears to be stable over the life cycle (see Prior forthcoming).

Second, our finding that Openness is associated with interest in politics, political knowledge, and exposure to news is consistent with recent work that shows Openness is positively associated with participation in a variety of political activities, from contacting public officials to attending meetings (Gerber et al. 2010c; Mondak et al. 2010). Thus, it appears that the Big Five trait of Openness is at least part of the reason why some people both (1) express an interest in and follow politics and (2) actively participate in politics.

Third, consistent with previous work that suggests the translation of personality traits to behaviors or attitudes is situation-dependent (i.e., there are environmental factors that influence the effect of these traits on political outcomes, see Gerber et al. 2010b; Mondak et al. 2010), we find that Extraverted individuals reported watching the network news (both national and local) to a greater degree during the heat of the 2008 presidential election. Because the social interactions which Extraverts thrive on are more likely to include political discussions around elections, Extraverts may feel the need to watch more news in order to be active participants in those discussions.

We note that our focus on Big Five traits is not meant to imply that that these are the only psychological characteristics likely to be relevant to engagement with political information. Rather, we

focus on these traits because they are stable psychological building blocks theorized to be causally prior to outcomes such as media choices. Future research should consider the relationships between other psychological characteristics (e.g., Need for Cognition: Cacioppo and Petty 1982; Cacioppo, Petty, and Kao 1984; Cohen, Stotland, and Wolfe 1955) and the consumption of political information, as individual-level differences on these attributes are likely to shape choices about whether to become informed about political matters and, if so, what information sources to use.²⁵

Before concluding we note that our analysis has several limitations. Because our analysis relies on observational survey data it is important to be clear that our claims that Big Five traits cause interest in politics and media choice rather than vice versa are premised on prior research that finds that these traits are stable through the life cycle rather than evidence from the analysis presented here. It could be the case, for example, that personality as measured in the context of a political survey is affected by salient features of the political environment that also affected individuals on the basis of their political beliefs and levels of political interest (e.g., enthusiasm for their party's candidate). We also note that our analysis relies on self-reports of media use. Because of this, our outcome measures may be measured with error. If these errors are randomly distributed throughout the sample, this measurement error should not bias our results. However, as suggested by our finding that Extraversion and Conscientiousness are associated with reported interest in politics, but not political knowledge, misreporting of media consumption may be correlated with the Big Five measures we used in our analysis. This type of systematic over- or under-reporting of media consumption could bias our findings.

Our personality measures are also based on self-reports and may be subject to measurement error. Random measurement error in the independent variable will tend to attenuate the estimated relationships between personality traits and outcomes. Bias due to systematic measurement error may arise if misreporting of personality is correlated with respondent attitudes or behaviors which are correlated with the outcome variables and not controlled for in the statistical analysis. If , for instance, respondents'

²⁵ An important distinction is that psychological characteristics like Need for Cognition do not appear to be heritable (Simonson and Sela 2009). Furthermore, there is evidence that these characteristics are themselves shaped by Big Five traits (Sadowski and Cogburn 1997).

personality items are influenced by perceptions of social desirability, and the degree to which the measures are affected is correlated with omitted factors that are also correlated with the measured outcome variables, the regression estimates will be biased. These limitations notwithstanding, the core contributions offered here provide intriguing evidence about the relationships between personality and the degree and nature of engagement with politics and exposure to political information.

Appendix

Variable Coding and Question Wording

From CCAP

INTEREST IN POLITICS (Baseline and October)

Question

How interested are you in politics?

Response Options (coding)

Very much interested (3); Somewhat interested (2); Not much interested (1); Not sure (1)

INTEREST IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS (October)

Question

Some people seem to follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an election going on or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say you follow what's going on in government and public affairs...

Response Options (coding)

Most of the time (4); Some of the time (3); Only now and then (2); Hardly at all (1); Don't know (1)

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE – STANDARDIZED INDEX

Question

Here is a list of people in the news. Some of these people are members of the U.S. House of Representatives, some others are members of the U.S. Senate. Tell us which job the following people hold: John Dingell; Nancy Pelosi; Bill Gates; John Boehner; Susan Collins; Henry Waxman; Jon Kyl; Dennis Kucinich; Patrick Leahy; Ted Kennedy.

Response Options (coding)

House Member; Senator; Neither; Skipped (1 if correct; 0 if incorrect/skipped). Total correct responses were summed and then a standardized index (mean=0, standard deviation=1) was created.

TELEVISION WATCHING – LAST 7 DAYS (Baseline)

Question

[W]hat kinds of things have you watched on television in the LAST SEVEN DAYS? (Choose as many as apply to you).

Coding

For each category (0=no; 1=yes)

- News programs (like 60 Minutes, Dateline, Primetime Live, Anderson Cooper 360 or the Evening News)
- Political talk shows (like Hannity and Colmes, Meet the Press, This Week, Face the Nation, or Hardball)
- Daytime talk shows (like Oprah, Ellen, or Dr. Phil)
- Satire Shows (like the Daily Show, the Colbert Report, or Saturday Night Live)
- Late Night Comedy/Talk shows (like the Tonight Show, Late Night, or the Late Show)

INTERNET = NEWS – LAST 7 DAYS (Baseline)

Question

We are interested in the kinds of things people do when they use the Internet. What kinds of things have you used the Internet to do in the LAST SEVEN DAYS? (Choose as many as apply to you).

Coding

If respondent selected “read the news”, then 1, if not, 0.

READ NEWSPAPER IN LAST WEEK (March)

Question

How many days in the past week have you read a daily newspaper?

Coding

If respondent reported reading a daily newspaper once or more in the past week, then 1, if not, 0.

TELEVISION WATCHING – YESTERDAY [TV GRID] (Baseline and October)

See text for details.

PERSONALITY: TIPI [10 trait pairs] (Profile)

Question

Here are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to you. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. You should rate the extent to which the pair of traits applies to you, even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other.

I see myself as:

[Correlations between two items listed in brackets.]

Conscientiousness: Dependable, self-disciplined; Disorganized, careless (Reverse coded) [0.382]

Openness: Open to new experiences, complex; Conventional, uncreative (Reverse coded) [0.275]

Agreeableness: Sympathetic, warm; Critical, quarrelsome (Reverse coded) [0.245]

Emotional Stability: Calm, emotionally stable; Anxious, easily upset (Reverse coded) [0.485]

Extraversion: Extraverted, enthusiastic; Reserved, quiet (Reverse coded) [0.426]

Coding

1 = Disagree strongly; 2 = Disagree moderately; 3 = Disagree a little; 4 = Neither agree nor disagree; 5 = Agree a little; 6 = Agree moderately; 7 = Agree strongly. Responses rescaled to range from 0 to 1.

FEMALE (Profile)

Coding

0=male; 1=female

RACE/ETHNICITY (Profile)

Coding

Indicators for: White (excluded category); Black; Hispanic; Other (Native American, Asian, Mixed, Other)

AGE (Profile)

Coding

Indicators for: 18-30 years old (excluded category); 31-40; 41-50; 51-60; 61-70; 71 and up

EDUCATION (Profile)

Coding

1 = no high school diploma; 2 = high school graduate; 3 = some college; 4 = two year degree; 5 = college graduate; 6 = post-graduate

FAMILY INCOME (Profile)

Coding

1 = < \$10,000; 2 = \$10,000-\$14,999; 3 = \$15,000-\$19,999; 4 = \$20,000-\$24,999; 5 = \$25,000-\$29,999; 6 = \$30,000-\$39,999; 7 = \$40,000-\$49,999; 8 = \$50,000-\$59,999; 9 = \$60,000-\$69,999; 10 = \$70,000-\$79,999; 11 = \$80,000-\$99,999; 12 = \$100,000-\$119,999; 13 = \$120,000-\$149,999; 14 = \$150,000 or more; 15 = prefer not to say or missing

EMPLOYMENT STATUS (Profile)

Coding

Indicators for: Working full time, Working Part Time, Retired, Other (excluded category)

IDEOLOGY (Baseline)

Coding

Indicators for: Very Conservative; Conservative; Moderate (excluded category); Liberal; Very Liberal

References

- Adorno, Theodor W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, N.S. (1950.) *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper.
- Baum, M. A. (2002.) Sex, Lies, and War: How Soft News Brings Foreign Policy to the Inattentive Public. *American Political Science Review*, 96, 91-110.
- Baum, M. A. (2003.) *Soft News Goes to War: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy in the New Media Age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ben-Ner, A., Kramera, A., & Levy, O. (2008.) Economic and Hypothetical Dictator Game Experiments: Incentive Effects at the Individual Level. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37, 1775-1784.
- Berelson, B. R., Lazarsfeld, P. F., & McPhee, W. N. (1954.) *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Borghans, L., Duckworth, A.L., Heckman, J. J., & ter Weel, B. (2008.) The Economics and Psychology of Personality Traits. *Journal of Human Resources*, 43, 972-1059.
- Bouchard, T. J., Jr. (1997.) The Genetics of Personality. In K. Blum & E. P. Noble (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychiatric Genetics* (pp. 273-296). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, Inc.
- Bouchard, T. J., Jr., & Loehlin, J. C.. (2001.) Genes, Evolution, and Personality. *Behavior Genetics*, 31, 243-273.
- Bulik, B. S. (2009.) How Personality Can Predict Media Usage. *Advertising Age*, 80, 12.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R.E. (1982.) The Need for Cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 116-131.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., & Kao, C. F. (1984.) The Efficient Assessment of Need for Cognition. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 306-307.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P., Miller, W., & Stokes, D. (1960.) *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cappella, J. N., & Jamieson, K. H.. 1997. *Spiral of Cynicism: The Press and the Public Good*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carney, D. R., Jost, J. T., Gosling, S. D., & Potter J. (2008.) The Secret Lives of Liberals and Conservatives: Personality Profiles, Interaction Styles, and the Things They Leave Behind. *Political Psychology*, 29, 807-840.
- Caspi, A., Roberts, B. W., & Shiner, R L. (2005.) Personality Development: Stability and Change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 453-484.
- Cohen, A. R., Stotland, E., & Wolfe, D.M. (1955.) An Experimental Investigation of Need for Cognition. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 51, 291-294.

- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992.) *NEO PI-R. Professional Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeter, S. (1996.) *What Americans Know about Politics and Why it Matters*. Yale University Press.
- Denissen, J. J. A., & Penke, L. (2008.) Motivational Individual Reaction Norms Underlying the Five-Factor Model of Personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 1285-1302.
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., & Dowling, C. M. (2010a.) Personality Traits and Partisan Self-Concepts. Typescript, Yale University.
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., Dowling, C. M., & Ha, S. E. (2010b.) Personality and Political Attitudes: Relationships Across Issue Domains and Political Contexts. *American Political Science Review*, 104, 111-133.
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., Dowling, C. M., Raso, C., & Ha, S. E.. (2010c.) Personality Traits and Participation in Political Processes. Typescript, Yale University.
- Gosling, S. D. (2008.) *Snoop: What Your Stuff Says about You*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gosling, S. D. (2009.) A Note on Alpha Reliability and Factor Structure in the TIPI. Retrieved January, 5, 2010, from http://homepage.psy.utexas.edu/homepage/faculty/gosling/tipi_alpha_note.htm
- Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (2003.) "A Very Brief Measure of the Big-Five Personality Domains." *Journal of Research in Personality* 37: 504-528.
- Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003.) Using Theory to Evaluate Personality and Job-Performance Relations: A Socioanalytic Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 100-112.
- Jackman, S., & Vavreck, L. (2009.) COOPERATIVE CAMPAIGN ANALYSIS PROJECT, 2007-2008 PANEL STUDY: COMMON CONTENT. [Computer File] Release 2.1: November 19, 2009. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999.) The Big Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Theoretical Perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Ed.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003.) Political Conservatism as Motivated Social Cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339-375.
- Kline, P. (2000.) *Handbook of Psychological Testing*. London, Routledge.
- Knowles, E. S., & Nathan, K. T. (1997.) Acquiescent Responding in Self-reports: Cognitive Style or Social Concern? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 293-301.
- Koole, S. L., Jager, W. & van den Berg, A. E. (2001.) On the Social Nature of Personality: Effects of Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Feedback about Collective Resource Use on Cooperation in a Resource Dilemma. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 289-301.

- Kraaykamp, G., & van Eijck, K. (2005.) Personality, Media Preferences, and Cultural Participation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 1675-1688.
- McAdams, D. P. (1995.) What Do We Know When We Know a Person? *Journal of Personality*, 63, 365-396.
- McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2006.) A New Big Five: Fundamental Principles for an Integrative Science of Personality. *American Psychologist*, 61, 204-217.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1996.) Toward a New Generation of Personality Theories: Theoretical Contexts for the Five-Factor Model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The Five-Factor Model of Personality: Theoretical Perspectives* (pp. 51-87). New York: The Guilford Press.
- McClosky, H. (1958.) Conservatism and Personality. *American Political Science Review*, 52, 27-45.
- Mondak, J. J., & Halperin, K. D. (2008.) A Framework for the Study of Personality and Political Behaviour. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38 335-362.
- Mondak, J. J., Hibbing, M. V., Canache, D., Seligson, M. A., & Anderson, M. R. (2010.) Personality and Civic Engagement: An Integrative Framework for the Study of Trait Effects on Political Behavior. *American Political Science Review*, 104, 85-110.
- Paunonen, S. V., & Ashton, M. C. (2001.) Big Five Factors and Facets and the Prediction of Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 524-539.
- Plomin, R., & Caspi, A. (1999.) Behavior Genetics and Personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Ed.), *Handbook of Personality Research: Theory and Research* (pp. 251-276). New York: Guilford.
- Plomin, R., DeFries, J.C., McClearn, G. E., & McGuffin, P. (1990.) *Behavioral Genetics: A Primer*. New York: W.H. Freeman & Company.
- Prior, M. (2003.) Any Good News in Soft News? The Impact of Soft News Preference on Political Knowledge. *Political Communication*, 20, 149-171.
- _____. (2005.) News vs. Entertainment: How Increasing Media Choice Widens Gaps in Political Knowledge and Turnout. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49, 577-592.
- _____. (2009a.) The Immensely Inflated News Audience: Assessing Bias in Self-reported News Exposure. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 73, 130-143.
- _____. (2009b.) Improving Media Effects Research through Better Measurement of News Exposure. *Journal of Politics*, 71, 893-908.
- _____. (Forthcoming.) You Either Got It or You Don't? The Stability of Political Interest over the Life Cycle. *Journal of Politics*.
- Rentfrow, P. J., & Gosling, S. D. (2003.) The do re mi's of Everyday Life: The Structure and Personality Correlates of Music Preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 1236-1256.

- Sadowski, C. J., & Cogburn, H. E. (1997.) Need for Cognition in the Big-Five Factor Structure. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 131, 307-312.
- Salgado, J. F. (1997.) The Five Factor Model of Personality and Job Performance in the European Community. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 30-43.
- Schuman, H., & Presser, S. (1981.) *Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments in Question Form, Wording, and Context*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shim, J. W., & Paul, B. (2007.) Effects of Personality Types on the Use of Television Genre. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51, 287-304.
- Simonson, I., & Sela, A. (2009.) On the Heritability of Choice, Judgment, and 'Irrationality': Genetic Effects on Prudence and Constructive Predispositions. Stanford University Graduate School of Business Research Paper No. 2029. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1435095>
- Sniderman, P. M. (1975.) *Personality and Democratic Politics* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stroud, N. J. (2008.) Media Use and Political Predispositions: Revisiting the Concept of Selective Exposure. *Political Behavior*, 30, 341-366.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1963.) Left and Right: A Basic Dimension of Ideology and Personality. In R. W. White (Ed.), *The Study of Lives* (pp. 388-411). Chicago: Atherton.
- van Gestel, S., & van Broeckhoven, C. (2003.) Genetics of Personality: Are we Making Progress? *Molecular Psychiatry*, 8, 840-752.
- Valentino, N. A., & Sears, D. O. (1998.) Event-Driven Political Communication and the Preadult Socialization of Partisanship. *Political Behavior*, 20, 127-154.
- Vavreck, L., & Rivers, D. (2008.) The 2006 Cooperative Congressional Election Study. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 18, 355-366.
- Vecchione, M., & Caprara, G. V. (2009.) Personality Determinants of Political Participation: The Contribution of Traits and Self-Efficacy Beliefs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 487-492.
- Weaver, J. B. (1991.) Exploring the Links between Personality and Media Preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 1293-1299.
- Woods, S. A., & Hampson, S. E. (2005.) Measuring the Big Five with Single Items Using a Bipolar Response Scale. *European Journal of Personality*, 19, 373-390.
- Zaller, J. R. (1992). *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Table 1. Characteristics of the Big Five Personality Traits

	Low on Trait	High on Trait
Extraversion	Reserved, serious, prefer to be left alone or with a few close friends	Outgoing, active, and high-spirited, prefer to be around people
Agreeableness	Hardheaded, skeptical, proud, competitive	Compassionate, good-natured, eager to cooperate
Conscientiousness	Easygoing, careless, prefer not to make plans	Well-organized, strive to achieve goals
Emotional Stability	Sensitive, emotional, prone to feelings that are upsetting	Secure, hardy, relaxed under stressful conditions
Openness to Experience	Down-to-earth, practical, traditional	Broad interests, imaginative

Note: Adapted from Costa and McCrae (1992, 9).

Table 2. Summary Statistics for Model Variables (N=8664)

Dependent Variables	Mean [st. dev.]	Independent Variables	Mean [st. dev.]
Interest in Politics (1=not that much/NS, 2=somewhat, 3=very much) [Baseline]	2.483 [.6693]	Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.765 [.1996]
Interest in Politics (1=not that much/NS, 2=somewhat, 3=very much) [October]	2.447 [.6763]	Openness (0-1)	0.696 [.1975]
Interest in Public Affairs (1=hardly at all/DK, 4=most of the time) [October]	3.422 [.8679]	Agreeableness (0-1)	0.708 [.1924]
Political Knowledge (standardized index)	-0.094 [.9976]	Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.673 [.2275]
TV - news programs (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.532 [.499]	Extraversion (0-1)	0.514 [.2431]
Internet - news (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.780 [.4146]	Female = 1	0.504 [.5]
Read newspaper in last week (1=Yes)	0.679 [.4667]	White = 1	0.802 [.3986]
TV - political talk (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.390 [.4878]	Black = 1	0.096 [.2942]
TV - satire (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.202 [.4015]	Hispanic = 1	0.059 [.2364]
TV - daytime talk (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.214 [.41]	Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	0.043 [.2028]
TV - late night (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.178 [.3822]	Age (Years)	50.251 [15.2297]
Watched Any National News Yesterday, 1=Yes [Baseline]	0.216 [.4117]	Age^2/100	27.571 [15.7074]
Watched Any National News Yesterday, 1=Yes [October]	0.207 [.4053]	Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)	3.428 [1.5482]
Watched Any Local News Yesterday (Evening or Late), 1=Yes [Baseline]	0.410 [.4918]	Income (1=<10k; 14=>150k; 15=RF)	8.675 [3.9241]
Watched Any Local News Yesterday (Evening or Late), 1=Yes [October]	0.423 [.494]	Income Refused	0.097 [.2954]
Total Hours of TV Watching Yesterday (0 to 7) [Baseline]	3.877 [2.6948]	Working full time (1=Yes)	0.464 [.4987]
Total Hours of TV Watching Yesterday (0 to 7) [October]	3.791 [2.6083]	Working part time (1=Yes)	0.093 [.2907]
		Retired (1=Yes)	0.196 [.3967]
		Unemployed, temporarily laid off, other, or missing (1=Yes)	0.248 [.4316]

Note: Cell entries are weighted means with standard deviations in brackets. Source: 2008 CCAP.

Table 3a. Big Five Personality Traits and Political Interest and Political Knowledge

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Interest in Politics (1=not that much/NS, 2=somewhat, 3=very much)		Interest in Public Affairs (1=hardly at all/DK, 4=most of the time)	Political Knowledge (standardized index)
	Baseline	October	October	Baseline
Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.494 [0.183]**	0.243 [0.178]	0.577 [0.163]**	-0.066 [0.056]
Openness (0-1)	1.458 [0.170]**	1.290 [0.181]**	1.231 [0.158]**	0.273 [0.074]**
Agreeableness (0-1)	-0.115 [0.235]	-0.256 [0.209]	0.021 [0.223]	-0.160 [0.092]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.613 [0.184]**	0.491 [0.179]**	0.511 [0.193]**	0.330 [0.095]**
Extraversion (0-1)	0.800 [0.094]**	0.719 [0.100]**	0.401 [0.119]**	-0.061 [0.048]
Female = 1	-0.807 [0.066]**	-0.605 [0.071]**	-0.515 [0.085]**	-0.403 [0.027]**
Black = 1	-0.480 [0.156]**	-0.187 [0.148]	-0.476 [0.129]**	-0.258 [0.049]**
Hispanic = 1	-0.502 [0.176]**	-0.226 [0.126]	-0.714 [0.189]**	-0.273 [0.044]**
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	-0.354 [0.164]*	-0.312 [0.129]*	-0.627 [0.230]**	-0.125 [0.088]
Age (Years)	-0.028 [0.018]	-0.024 [0.015]	-0.010 [0.018]	0.006 [0.007]
Age^2/100	0.056 [0.019]**	0.046 [0.016]**	0.043 [0.018]*	-0.001 [0.007]
Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)	0.220 [0.026]**	0.213 [0.027]**	0.257 [0.022]**	0.147 [0.011]**
Income (1=<10k; 14=>150k; 15=RF)	0.095 [0.012]**	0.094 [0.011]**	0.111 [0.012]**	0.039 [0.005]**
Income Refused	-0.714 [0.151]**	-0.548 [0.140]**	-0.838 [0.166]**	-0.186 [0.063]**
Working full time (1=Yes)	-0.159 [0.086]	-0.119 [0.106]	-0.169 [0.083]*	-0.093 [0.035]*
Working part time (1=Yes)	-0.286 [0.113]*	-0.154 [0.113]	-0.175 [0.155]	-0.058 [0.047]
Retired (1=Yes)	-0.177 [0.131]	-0.049 [0.111]	-0.045 [0.135]	0.035 [0.034]
Cutpoint 1	-0.064 [0.461]	-0.409 [0.374]	0.125 [0.418]	
Cutpoint 2	2.222 [0.481]	1.860 [0.360]	1.225 [0.406]	
Cutpoint 3			2.850 [0.409]	
Constant				-0.955 [0.196]**
Observations	8664	8664	8664	8664
R-squared				0.215
Fixed State and Day Survey Took Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
F/chi-squared test: Joint Significance of Big Five	280.54	413.42	191.68	6.33
Prob > F or chi-squared	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Note: Ordered logit (columns [1] to [3]) & OLS (column [4]) coefficients with robust standard errors, clustered by state, in brackets. CA is the omitted state.

Source: 2008 CCAP. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1% (two-tailed)

Table 3b. Marginal Effects of Big Five Traits, Education, and Income

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Interest in Politics (probability of "very much interested" response)		Interest in Public Affairs (probability of "most of the time" response)	Political Knowledge (standardized index)
	Baseline	October	October	Baseline
Baseline Probability	63.0%	62.3%	68.6%	-0.094
Conscientiousness	7.0%	3.5%	7.0%	-0.025
Openness	21.0%	18.9%	15.1%	0.107
Agreeableness	-1.6%	-3.7%	0.2%	-0.061
Emotional Stability	10.1%	8.3%	7.1%	0.147
Extraversion	14.6%	13.4%	6.2%	-0.030
Education	23.4%	23.1%	23.2%	0.427
Income	23.3%	23.5%	23.3%	0.258

Note: Cell entries in columns (1) to (3) are the estimated effect of a two standard deviation change in the independent variable on the probability of the outcome (proportional to the baseline probability of the outcome with all independent variables set at their mean or mode). Cell entries in column (4) are the estimated linear effect of a two standard deviation change in the independent variable on the political knowledge standardized index (mean=0, standard deviation=1). For each of the Big Five traits a 2 SD change corresponds to moving about .4 on the 0 to 1 scale. For education, a 2 SD change is equivalent to, for example, a change from no high school degree to having a college degree. For income, a 2 SD change is equivalent to, for example, a change from a family income of less than \$10,000 to \$60,000-69,999. See Table 2 for means and standard deviations for each variable.

Table 4. Big Five Personality Traits and Consumption of Different News Mediums

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	TV - news programs (last 7 days), 1=Yes	Internet - news (last 7 days), 1=Yes	Read newspaper in last week (1=Yes)
	Baseline		
Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.115 [0.156]	-0.176 [0.190]	-0.043 [0.142]
Openness (0-1)	0.559 [0.156]**	0.918 [0.223]**	-0.170 [0.163]
Agreeableness (0-1)	0.425 [0.165]**	0.367 [0.264]	0.410 [0.213]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	-0.142 [0.168]	0.289 [0.261]	-0.071 [0.178]
Extraversion (0-1)	0.015 [0.112]	-0.351 [0.185]	0.413 [0.123]**
Female = 1	0.009 [0.059]	-0.516 [0.091]**	-0.083 [0.062]
Black = 1	0.296 [0.121]*	-0.418 [0.173]*	0.215 [0.169]
Hispanic = 1	0.075 [0.108]	-0.141 [0.210]	0.594 [0.135]**
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	-0.119 [0.182]	0.099 [0.142]	-0.153 [0.156]
Age (Years)	0.010 [0.009]	0.001 [0.014]	-0.011 [0.013]
Age^2/100	0.009 [0.008]	-0.001 [0.015]	0.038 [0.013]**
Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)	0.038 [0.020]	0.188 [0.032]**	0.108 [0.028]**
Income (1=<10k; 14=>150k; 15=RF)	0.023 [0.013]	0.070 [0.015]**	0.086 [0.012]**
Income Refused	-0.329 [0.125]**	-0.394 [0.140]**	-0.482 [0.137]**
Working full time (1=Yes)	-0.019 [0.052]	0.156 [0.089]	0.219 [0.081]**
Working part time (1=Yes)	0.061 [0.120]	-0.049 [0.157]	0.433 [0.128]**
Retired (1=Yes)	0.199 [0.100]*	0.119 [0.121]	0.084 [0.110]
Constant	-1.602 [0.308]**	-0.348 [0.462]	-1.296 [0.410]**
Observations	8664	8664	8649
Fixed State and Day Survey Took Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chi-squared test: Joint Significance of Big Five	25.13	27.34	20.27
Prob > chi-squared	0.000	0.000	0.000

Note: Logit coefficients with robust standard errors, clustered by state, in brackets. CA is the omitted state. We lose 15 observations in column (3) because every resident of the District of Columbia in our sample reported reading a newspaper in the last seven days.

Source: 2008 CCAP. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1% (two-tailed)

Table 5. Marginal Effects of Big Five Traits, Education, and Income on Tables 4, 6, & 7 Outcomes

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	TV - news programs (last 7 days), 1=Yes	Internet - news (last 7 days), 1=Yes	Read newspaper in last week (1=Yes)	TV - political talk (last 7 days), 1=Yes	TV - daytime talk (last 7 days), 1=Yes	TV - satire (last 7 days), 1=Yes	TV - late night (last 7 days), 1=Yes	Watched Any National News Yesterday, 1=Yes		Watched Any Local News Yesterday (Evening or Late), 1=Yes	
	Baseline							Baseline	October	Baseline	October
Baseline Probability	52.9%	79.7%	66.3%	38.9%	15.6%	19.5%	9.9%	13.2%	9.2%	20.6%	23.1%
Conscientiousness	2.1%	-1.4%	-0.6%	15.4%	-0.5%	-16.2%	-13.0%	-9.0%	-6.7%	3.4%	10.2%
Openness	10.3%	7.3%	-2.2%	-0.1%	-0.4%	56.4%	14.5%	-6.9%	-6.0%	-13.1%	-14.4%
Agreeableness	7.6%	2.8%	5.3%	2.0%	32.5%	0.4%	5.4%	9.6%	13.8%	13.0%	7.8%
Emotional Stability	-3.0%	2.6%	-1.1%	7.6%	-23.6%	-14.0%	-9.5%	3.7%	-3.0%	3.7%	7.5%
Extraversion	0.4%	-3.5%	6.9%	17.6%	15.9%	-1.8%	12.2%	4.4%	22.0%	11.6%	17.1%
Education	5.2%	11.0%	10.6%	11.0%	-38.5%	25.8%	-16.5%	-8.3%	-2.3%	-25.6%	-30.1%
Income	7.1%	9.6%	19.4%	31.3%	-21.9%	12.4%	-10.8%	-15.3%	-15.4%	3.8%	7.5%

Note : Cell entries are the estimated effect of a two standard deviation change in the independent variable on the probability of the outcome (proportional to the baseline probability of the outcome with all independent variables set at their mean or mode). For each of the Big Five traits a 2 SD change corresponds to moving about .4 on the 0 to 1 scale. For education, a 2 SD change is equivalent to, for example, a change from no high school degree to having a college degree. For income, a 2 SD change is equivalent to, for example, a change from a family income of less than \$10,000 to \$60,000-69,999. See Table 2 for means and standard deviations for each variable.

Table 6. Big Five Personality Traits and Types of Television Viewing

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	TV - news programs (last 7 days), 1=Yes	TV - political talk (last 7 days), 1=Yes	TV - daytime talk (last 7 days), 1=Yes	TV - satire (last 7 days), 1=Yes	TV - late night (last 7 days), 1=Yes
	Baseline				
Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.115 [0.156]	0.655 [0.190]**	-0.014 [0.194]	-0.521 [0.154]**	-0.375 [0.217]
Openness (0-1)	0.559 [0.156]**	-0.006 [0.199]	-0.011 [0.210]	1.789 [0.196]**	0.410 [0.240]
Agreeableness (0-1)	0.425 [0.165]**	0.085 [0.170]	1.010 [0.246]**	0.015 [0.231]	0.157 [0.178]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	-0.142 [0.168]	0.279 [0.157]	-0.627 [0.160]**	-0.391 [0.210]	-0.236 [0.185]
Extraversion (0-1)	0.015 [0.112]	0.583 [0.097]**	0.381 [0.185]*	-0.046 [0.180]	0.273 [0.208]
Female = 1	0.009 [0.059]	-0.570 [0.064]**	0.962 [0.059]**	-0.153 [0.072]*	-0.228 [0.069]**
Black = 1	0.296 [0.121]*	-0.157 [0.158]	0.772 [0.151]**	-0.119 [0.145]	0.400 [0.113]**
Hispanic = 1	0.075 [0.108]	-0.209 [0.123]	0.093 [0.167]	0.008 [0.129]	0.347 [0.303]
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	-0.119 [0.182]	-0.196 [0.169]	0.071 [0.212]	-0.057 [0.188]	0.103 [0.207]
Age (Years)	0.010 [0.009]	0.004 [0.013]	0.009 [0.017]	-0.054 [0.013]**	-0.028 [0.015]
Age^2/100	0.009 [0.008]	0.026 [0.013]	-0.012 [0.017]	0.031 [0.013]*	0.025 [0.015]
Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)	0.038 [0.020]	0.062 [0.024]**	-0.157 [0.032]**	0.111 [0.030]**	-0.063 [0.029]*
Income (1=<10k; 14=>150k; 15=RF)	0.023 [0.013]	0.077 [0.009]**	-0.039 [0.015]**	0.023 [0.014]	-0.018 [0.012]
Income Refused	-0.329 [0.125]**	-0.407 [0.106]**	0.132 [0.160]	-0.438 [0.147]**	-0.082 [0.142]
Working full time (1=Yes)	-0.019 [0.052]	-0.145 [0.078]	-0.282 [0.115]*	-0.012 [0.126]	-0.145 [0.098]
Working part time (1=Yes)	0.061 [0.120]	-0.225 [0.134]	0.185 [0.132]	0.128 [0.162]	0.090 [0.161]
Retired (1=Yes)	0.199 [0.100]*	0.055 [0.122]	0.062 [0.123]	0.198 [0.139]	-0.041 [0.150]
Constant	-1.602 [0.308]**	-2.506 [0.363]**	-2.084 [0.483]**	-0.469 [0.478]	-0.794 [0.429]
Observations	8664	8664	8664	8664	8664
Fixed State and Day Survey Took Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chi-squared test: Joint Significance of Big Five	25.13	128.46	27.35	119.64	10.25
Prob > chi-squared	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.070

Note: Logit coefficients with robust standard errors, clustered by state, in brackets. CA is the omitted state.

Source: 2008 CCAP. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1% (two-tailed)

Table 7. Big Five Personality Traits and National and Local News Watching

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Watched Any National News Yesterday, 1=Yes		Watched Any Local News Yesterday (Evening or Late), 1=Yes	
	Baseline	October	Baseline	October
Conscientiousness (0-1)	-0.268 [0.219]	-0.192 [0.213]	0.110 [0.194]	0.345 [0.132]**
Openness (0-1)	-0.203 [0.225]	-0.168 [0.241]	-0.420 [0.155]**	-0.478 [0.198]*
Agreeableness (0-1)	0.291 [0.189]	0.398 [0.183]*	0.428 [0.181]*	0.266 [0.209]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.097 [0.194]	-0.074 [0.142]	0.104 [0.136]	0.219 [0.167]
Extraversion (0-1)	0.103 [0.147]	0.489 [0.135]**	0.296 [0.092]**	0.449 [0.144]**
Female = 1	0.101 [0.100]	0.168 [0.086]	0.108 [0.074]	0.186 [0.070]**
Black = 1	0.413 [0.182]*	0.859 [0.144]**	0.389 [0.098]**	0.261 [0.124]*
Hispanic = 1	0.214 [0.165]	0.205 [0.162]	0.230 [0.094]*	0.125 [0.093]
Other (Native American, Asian, Mixed, Other) = 1	-0.070 [0.223]	0.146 [0.159]	0.035 [0.180]	0.039 [0.175]
Age (Years)	0.082 [0.015]**	0.071 [0.015]**	0.071 [0.012]**	0.059 [0.015]**
Age^2/100	-0.055 [0.015]**	-0.046 [0.014]**	-0.048 [0.012]**	-0.033 [0.015]*
Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)	-0.033 [0.031]	-0.009 [0.026]	-0.111 [0.021]**	-0.135 [0.023]**
Income (1=<10k; 14=>150k; 15=RF)	-0.026 [0.012]*	-0.025 [0.013]*	0.007 [0.010]	0.015 [0.016]
Income Refused	0.018 [0.123]	0.035 [0.143]	-0.023 [0.103]	-0.157 [0.143]
Working full time (1=Yes)	-0.151 [0.122]	-0.197 [0.147]	-0.141 [0.102]	-0.233 [0.092]*
Working part time (1=Yes)	-0.003 [0.151]	-0.053 [0.132]	0.124 [0.145]	-0.107 [0.108]
Retired (1=Yes)	0.182 [0.165]	0.394 [0.137]**	0.285 [0.151]	0.262 [0.108]*
Constant	-4.230 [0.445]**	-4.627 [0.371]**	-3.692 [0.362]**	-3.437 [0.368]**
Observations	8664	8664	8664	8664
Fixed State and Day Survey Took Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chi-squared test: Joint Significance of Big Five	4.61	25.73	23.92	20.43
Prob > chi-squared	0.470	0.000	0.000	0.000

Note: Logit coefficients with robust standard errors, clustered by state, in brackets. CA is the omitted state.

Source: 2008 CCAP. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1% (two-tailed)

Table A1a. Correlations among Big Five Traits (N=8664)

	Conscientiousness (0-1)	Openness (0-1)	Agreeableness (0-1)	Emotional Stability (0-1)	Extraversion (0-1)
Conscientiousness (0-1)	1				
Openness (0-1)	0.1966	1			
Agreeableness (0-1)	0.2692	0.2144	1		
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.3541	0.2237	0.3824	1	
Extraversion (0-1)	0.0868	0.2993	0.0326	0.0462	1

Note: Cell entries are weighted correlation coefficients. Source: 2008 CCAP.

Table A1b. Correlations between Big Five Traits and Control Variables (N=8664)

	Conscientiousness (0-1)	Openness (0-1)	Agreeableness (0-1)	Emotional Stability (0-1)	Extraversion (0-1)
Female = 1	0.034	-0.018	0.220	-0.069	0.062
White = 1	-0.003	-0.045	-0.007	-0.052	0.018
Black = 1	0.065	0.029	0.055	0.060	-0.038
Hispanic = 1	-0.035	0.024	-0.025	0.011	0.012
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	-0.048	0.019	-0.037	0.002	0.006
Age (Years)	0.129	-0.057	0.146	0.140	0.001
Age^2/100	0.121	-0.060	0.143	0.132	-0.006
Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)	0.071	0.160	0.017	0.143	0.046
Income (1=<10k; 14=>150k; 15=RF)	0.116	0.117	0.012	0.148	0.085
Income Refused	0.028	0.008	0.041	0.007	-0.019
Working full time (1=Yes)	0.023	0.054	-0.059	0.090	0.039
Working part time (1=Yes)	0.011	0.022	0.037	-0.012	0.000
Retired (1=Yes)	0.078	-0.077	0.072	0.054	-0.037
Unemployed, temporarily laid off, other, or missing (1=Yes)	-0.106	-0.006	-0.023	-0.146	-0.011

Note: Cell entries are weighted correlation coefficients. Source: 2008 CCAP.

Table A2. Summary Statistics for Full CCAP Sample

Dependent Variables	Mean [st. dev.]	Independent Variables	Mean [st. dev.]
Interest in Politics (1=not that much/NS, 2=somewhat, 3=very much) [Baseline]	2.421 [.6989]	Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.756 [.2022]
Interest in Politics (1=not that much/NS, 2=somewhat, 3=very much) [October]	2.453 [.6797]	Openness (0-1)	0.697 [.1959]
Interest in Public Affairs (1=hardly at all/DK, 4=most of the time) [October]	3.422 [.8683]	Agreeableness (0-1)	0.705 [.1938]
Political Knowledge (standardized index)	-0.127 [1.0268]	Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.671 [.2257]
TV - news programs (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.520 [.4996]	Extraversion (0-1)	0.517 [.2433]
Internet - news (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.748 [.4342]	Female = 1	0.531 [.4991]
Read newspaper in last week (1=Yes)	0.673 [.469]	White = 1	0.765 [.4243]
TV - political talk (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.368 [.4824]	Black = 1	0.116 [.3205]
TV - satire (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.197 [.3976]	Hispanic = 1	0.074 [.2609]
TV - daytime talk (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.215 [.4109]	Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	0.046 [.2092]
TV - late night (last 7 days), 1=Yes	0.175 [.3796]	Age (Years)	47.715 [16.5387]
Watched Any National News Yesterday, 1=Yes [Baseline]	0.201 [.4004]	Age^2/100	25.502 [16.6576]
Watched Any National News Yesterday, 1=Yes [October]	0.175 [.3796]	Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)	3.252 [1.5323]
Watched Any Local News Yesterday (Evening or Late), 1=Yes [Baseline]	0.398 [.4895]	Income (1=<10k; 14=>150k; 15=RF)	8.466 [4.0258]
Watched Any Local News Yesterday (Evening or Late), 1=Yes [October]	0.379 [.4851]	Income Refused	0.099 [.2985]
Total Hours of TV Watching Yesterday (0 to 7) [Baseline]	2.982 [2.9437]	Working full time (1=Yes)	0.459 [.4983]
Total Hours of TV Watching Yesterday (0 to 7) [October]	3.467 [2.7358]	Working part time (1=Yes)	0.093 [.2899]
		Retired (1=Yes)	0.176 [.3809]
		Unemployed, temporarily laid off, other, or missing (1=Yes)	0.272 [.4452]

Note: Cell entries are weighted means with standard deviations in brackets. Source: 2008 CCAP.

Table A3. Robustness of Table 3 Results

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Interest in Politics (1=not that much/NS, 2=somewhat, 3=very much)				Interest in Public Affairs (1=hardly at all/DK, 4=most of the time)		Political Knowledge (standardized index)	
	Baseline		October		October		Baseline	
Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.612 [0.192]**	0.299 [0.192]	0.365 [0.197]	0.053 [0.164]	0.703 [0.181]**	0.404 [0.162]*	0.006 [0.063]	-0.130 [0.062]*
Openness (0-1)	1.695 [0.176]**	1.593 [0.215]**	1.514 [0.180]**	1.381 [0.202]**	1.489 [0.163]**	1.404 [0.172]**	0.439 [0.078]**	0.227 [0.087]*
Agreeableness (0-1)	-0.220 [0.232]	-0.160 [0.257]	-0.352 [0.211]	-0.273 [0.205]	-0.096 [0.222]	-0.020 [0.200]	-0.218 [0.105]*	-0.179 [0.090]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	0.907 [0.169]**	0.420 [0.167]*	0.788 [0.173]**	0.311 [0.158]*	0.853 [0.199]**	0.291 [0.157]	0.493 [0.102]**	0.281 [0.088]**
Extraversion (0-1)	0.862 [0.090]**	0.839 [0.084]**	0.774 [0.092]**	0.766 [0.119]**	0.489 [0.116]**	0.395 [0.136]**	-0.019 [0.052]	-0.049 [0.046]
Female = 1	-0.901 [0.067]**	-0.858 [0.060]**	-0.703 [0.075]**	-0.637 [0.064]**	-0.630 [0.076]**	-0.544 [0.073]**	-0.457 [0.024]**	-0.411 [0.027]**
Black = 1	-0.479 [0.144]**	-0.267 [0.152]	-0.196 [0.138]	0.028 [0.149]	-0.491 [0.128]**	-0.341 [0.131]**	-0.241 [0.058]**	-0.228 [0.057]**
Hispanic = 1	-0.513 [0.189]**	-0.359 [0.149]*	-0.239 [0.132]	-0.122 [0.123]	-0.719 [0.197]**	-0.606 [0.209]**	-0.288 [0.055]**	-0.248 [0.045]**
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	-0.260 [0.146]	-0.402 [0.184]*	-0.209 [0.131]	-0.317 [0.141]*	-0.492 [0.200]*	-0.659 [0.254]**	-0.073 [0.082]	-0.126 [0.088]
Age (Years)	-0.015 [0.016]	-0.022 [0.014]	-0.014 [0.014]	-0.021 [0.012]	0.001 [0.017]	-0.012 [0.014]	0.006 [0.007]	0.007 [0.006]
Age^2/100	0.039 [0.016]*	0.051 [0.015]**	0.033 [0.014]*	0.042 [0.013]**	0.029 [0.016]	0.045 [0.014]**	0.000 [0.007]	-0.002 [0.006]
Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)		0.176 [0.023]**		0.172 [0.025]**		0.211 [0.024]**		0.133 [0.010]**
Income (1=<10k; 14>=150k; 15=RF)		0.083 [0.013]**		0.079 [0.011]**		0.095 [0.014]**		0.037 [0.005]**
Income Refused		-0.640 [0.153]**		-0.463 [0.136]**		-0.647 [0.152]**		-0.140 [0.055]*
Working full time (1=Yes)		-0.258 [0.090]**		-0.175 [0.100]		-0.239 [0.070]**		-0.126 [0.033]**
Working part time (1=Yes)		-0.361 [0.087]**		-0.195 [0.090]*		-0.254 [0.165]		-0.103 [0.043]*
Retired (1=Yes)		-0.249 [0.124]*		-0.091 [0.106]		-0.133 [0.130]		-0.004 [0.033]
Very Conservative (1=Yes)		1.320 [0.128]**		1.126 [0.111]**		0.967 [0.129]**		0.211 [0.031]**
Conservative (1=Yes)		0.174 [0.114]		0.218 [0.104]*		0.180 [0.113]		0.047 [0.035]
Liberal(1=Yes)		0.317 [0.111]**		0.438 [0.112]**		0.228 [0.116]		0.113 [0.037]**
Very Liberal (1=Yes)		1.185 [0.115]**		1.080 [0.110]**		0.787 [0.098]**		0.243 [0.045]**
Cutpoint 1	-0.815 [0.418]	-0.393 [0.429]	-1.219 [0.347]	-0.658 [0.362]	-0.849 [0.380]	-0.461 [0.360]		
Cutpoint 2	1.378 [0.451]	2.203 [0.462]	0.963 [0.339]	1.843 [0.349]	0.205 [0.365]	0.827 [0.332]		
Cutpoint 3					1.744 [0.368]	2.589 [0.329]		
Constant							-0.365 [0.178]*	-0.879 [0.178]**
Observations	8664	8230	8664	8230	8664	8230	8664	8230
R-squared							0.143	0.196
Fixed State and Day Survey Took Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
F/chi-squared test: Joint Significance of Big Five	423.93	257.26	746.24	247.50	244.91	116.24	9.86	4.95
Prob > F or chi-squared	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Note: Ordered logit (columns [1] to [6])/OLS (columns [7] & [8]) coefficients with robust standard errors, clustered by state, in brackets. CA is the omitted state.

Source: 2008 CCAP. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1% (two-tailed)

Table A4. Robustness of Table 4 Results

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	TV - news programs (last 7 days), 1=Yes		Internet - news (last 7 days), 1=Yes		Read newspaper in last week (1=Yes)	
	Baseline					
Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.151 [0.153]	0.195 [0.172]	-0.007 [0.206]	-0.268 [0.219]	0.123 [0.158]	-0.004 [0.141]
Openness (0-1)	0.600 [0.156]**	0.334 [0.155]*	1.114 [0.223]**	0.883 [0.199]**	0.005 [0.150]	-0.396 [0.189]*
Agreeableness (0-1)	0.390 [0.163]*	0.424 [0.158]**	0.258 [0.248]	0.418 [0.310]	0.302 [0.210]	0.535 [0.230]*
Emotional Stability (0-1)	-0.079 [0.167]	-0.101 [0.156]	0.583 [0.263]*	0.261 [0.231]	0.223 [0.177]	-0.126 [0.181]
Extraversion (0-1)	0.042 [0.113]	0.006 [0.107]	-0.244 [0.172]	-0.472 [0.168]**	0.493 [0.122]**	0.444 [0.120]**
Female = 1	-0.020 [0.064]	-0.041 [0.062]	-0.643 [0.087]**	-0.568 [0.097]**	-0.193 [0.060]**	-0.197 [0.065]**
Black = 1	0.293 [0.124]*	0.245 [0.122]*	-0.409 [0.168]*	-0.463 [0.158]**	0.162 [0.172]	0.287 [0.162]
Hispanic = 1	0.060 [0.111]	0.020 [0.103]	-0.172 [0.223]	-0.174 [0.210]	0.534 [0.117]**	0.597 [0.183]**
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	-0.110 [0.179]	-0.172 [0.181]	0.188 [0.147]	0.109 [0.165]	-0.079 [0.159]	-0.173 [0.159]
Age (Years)	0.006 [0.010]	0.008 [0.010]	0.011 [0.013]	0.016 [0.014]	0.009 [0.012]	-0.017 [0.013]
Age^2/100	0.015 [0.009]	0.011 [0.010]	-0.011 [0.013]	-0.013 [0.014]	0.015 [0.012]	0.045 [0.013]**
Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)		0.000 [0.018]		0.168 [0.030]**		0.081 [0.026]**
Income (1=<10k; 14=>150k; 15=RF)		0.030 [0.012]*		0.061 [0.014]**		0.087 [0.012]**
Income Refused		-0.377 [0.122]**		-0.313 [0.124]*		-0.462 [0.121]**
Working full time (1=Yes)		-0.065 [0.054]		0.131 [0.080]		0.145 [0.081]
Working part time (1=Yes)		0.035 [0.125]		-0.064 [0.145]		0.372 [0.127]**
Retired (1=Yes)		0.171 [0.106]		0.037 [0.113]		-0.016 [0.111]
Very Conservative (1=Yes)		-0.769 [0.070]**		0.023 [0.101]		-0.457 [0.100]**
Conservative (1=Yes)		-0.575 [0.068]**		-0.147 [0.089]		-0.267 [0.102]**
Liberal(1=Yes)		0.071 [0.103]		0.162 [0.108]		0.136 [0.099]
Very Liberal (1=Yes)		-0.063 [0.102]		0.411 [0.144]**		-0.128 [0.098]
Constant	-1.336 [0.331]**	-1.080 [0.317]**	0.393 [0.451]	-0.474 [0.483]	-0.801 [0.378]*	-0.877 [0.430]*
Observations	8664	8230	8664	8230	8649	8215
Fixed State and Day Survey Took Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chi-squared test: Joint Significance of Big Five	30.65	13.37	49.88	32.18	41.61	26.94
Prob > chi-squared	0.000	0.020	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Note : Logit coefficients with robust standard errors, clustered by state, in brackets. CA is the omitted state.

Source: 2008 CCAP. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1% (two-tailed)

Table A5. Robustness of Table 6 Results

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	TV - news programs (last 7 days), 1=Yes		TV - political talk (last 7 days), 1=Yes		TV - daytime talk (last 7 days), 1=Yes		TV - satire (last 7 days), 1=Yes		TV - late night (last 7 days), 1=Yes	
	Baseline									
Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.151 [0.153]	0.195 [0.172]	0.739 [0.192]**	0.463 [0.188]*	-0.102 [0.195]	0.199 [0.216]	-0.474 [0.158]**	-0.199 [0.190]	-0.427 [0.219]	-0.152 [0.220]
Openness (0-1)	0.600 [0.156]**	0.334 [0.155]*	0.115 [0.191]	0.315 [0.208]	-0.172 [0.216]	-0.026 [0.243]	1.889 [0.194]**	1.048 [0.161]**	0.338 [0.232]	0.155 [0.211]
Agreeableness (0-1)	0.390 [0.163]*	0.424 [0.158]**	-0.011 [0.173]	0.099 [0.162]	1.067 [0.250]**	1.004 [0.239]**	-0.039 [0.219]	0.139 [0.249]	0.188 [0.183]	0.379 [0.207]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	-0.079 [0.167]	-0.101 [0.156]	0.438 [0.152]**	0.048 [0.155]	-0.851 [0.153]**	-0.568 [0.130]**	-0.273 [0.196]	-0.299 [0.234]	-0.345 [0.191]	-0.179 [0.204]
Extraversion (0-1)	0.042 [0.113]	0.006 [0.107]	0.655 [0.097]**	0.537 [0.101]**	0.300 [0.176]	0.324 [0.187]	-0.010 [0.177]	0.020 [0.175]	0.242 [0.201]	0.251 [0.197]
Female = 1	-0.020 [0.064]	-0.041 [0.062]	-0.624 [0.069]**	-0.498 [0.063]**	1.088 [0.061]**	0.958 [0.067]**	-0.196 [0.080]*	-0.247 [0.064]**	-0.161 [0.073]*	-0.281 [0.066]**
Black = 1	0.293 [0.124]*	0.245 [0.122]*	-0.170 [0.158]	0.000 [0.164]	0.748 [0.159]**	0.649 [0.144]**	-0.100 [0.140]	-0.182 [0.125]	0.388 [0.118]**	0.358 [0.125]**
Hispanic = 1	0.060 [0.111]	0.020 [0.103]	-0.207 [0.126]	-0.068 [0.129]	0.093 [0.169]	0.221 [0.194]	-0.017 [0.129]	-0.111 [0.160]	0.333 [0.298]	0.253 [0.210]
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	-0.110 [0.179]	-0.172 [0.181]	-0.156 [0.166]	-0.174 [0.164]	-0.006 [0.215]	0.028 [0.221]	-0.030 [0.183]	-0.031 [0.212]	0.067 [0.207]	0.032 [0.214]
Age (Years)	0.006 [0.010]	0.008 [0.010]	0.009 [0.013]	0.000 [0.014]	-0.006 [0.014]	0.019 [0.015]	-0.055 [0.013]**	-0.043 [0.015]**	-0.032 [0.013]*	-0.032 [0.016]*
Age^2/100	0.015 [0.009]	0.011 [0.010]	0.022 [0.012]	0.029 [0.014]*	0.006 [0.013]	-0.021 [0.015]	0.034 [0.013]**	0.022 [0.015]	0.030 [0.012]*	0.030 [0.016]
Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)		0.000 [0.018]		0.056 [0.024]*		-0.177 [0.027]**		0.055 [0.026]*		-0.084 [0.030]**
Income (1=<10k; 14=>150k; 15=RF)		0.030 [0.012]*		0.070 [0.010]**		-0.039 [0.014]**		0.040 [0.012]**		-0.017 [0.011]
Income Refused		-0.377 [0.122]**		-0.356 [0.115]**		0.066 [0.176]		-0.463 [0.145]**		-0.110 [0.138]
Working full time (1=Yes)		-0.065 [0.054]		-0.179 [0.090]*		-0.289 [0.105]**		0.029 [0.137]		-0.059 [0.092]
Working part time (1=Yes)		0.035 [0.125]		-0.262 [0.141]		0.217 [0.120]		0.164 [0.158]		0.247 [0.152]
Retired (1=Yes)		0.171 [0.106]		-0.003 [0.124]		0.046 [0.112]		0.200 [0.133]		-0.017 [0.138]
Very Conservative (1=Yes)		-0.769 [0.070]**		0.711 [0.097]**		-0.693 [0.109]**		-1.245 [0.116]**		-0.816 [0.109]**
Conservative (1=Yes)		-0.575 [0.068]**		0.384 [0.107]**		-0.316 [0.082]**		-0.851 [0.114]**		-0.467 [0.105]**
Liberal(1=Yes)		0.071 [0.103]		-0.112 [0.106]		-0.007 [0.130]		0.441 [0.101]**		0.078 [0.126]
Very Liberal (1=Yes)		-0.063 [0.102]		0.110 [0.113]		-0.180 [0.152]		0.436 [0.096]**		-0.347 [0.131]**
Constant	-1.336 [0.331]**	-1.080 [0.317]**	-2.052 [0.351]**	-2.405 [0.355]**	-2.564 [0.484]**	-2.084 [0.509]**	-0.019 [0.452]	-0.600 [0.542]	-1.020 [0.427]*	-0.476 [0.438]
Observations	8664	8230	8664	8230	8664	8230	8664	8230	8664	8230
Fixed State and Day Survey Took Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chi-squared test: Joint Significance of Big Five	30.65	13.37	152.06	122.80	43.24	30.35	124.97	60.74	11.86	6.40
Prob > chi-squared	0.000	0.020	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.040	0.270

Note: Logit coefficients with robust standard errors, clustered by state, in brackets. CA is the omitted state.

Source: 2008 CCAP. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1% (two-tailed)

Table A6. Robustness of Table 7 Results

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Watched Any National News Yesterday, 1=Yes				Watched Any Local News Yesterday (Evening or Late), 1=Yes			
	Baseline		October		Baseline		October	
Conscientiousness (0-1)	-0.304 [0.220]	-0.177 [0.249]	-0.213 [0.216]	0.171 [0.227]	0.113 [0.196]	0.017 [0.206]	0.339 [0.125]**	0.401 [0.148]**
Openness (0-1)	-0.277 [0.223]	-0.415 [0.266]	-0.237 [0.235]	-0.543 [0.236]*	-0.513 [0.145]**	-0.182 [0.186]	-0.590 [0.195]**	-0.420 [0.215]
Agreeableness (0-1)	0.323 [0.186]	0.122 [0.207]	0.422 [0.174]*	0.167 [0.189]	0.436 [0.177]*	0.401 [0.184]*	0.269 [0.199]	0.205 [0.194]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	-0.021 [0.186]	0.157 [0.222]	-0.184 [0.135]	-0.024 [0.152]	-0.008 [0.136]	-0.070 [0.162]	0.084 [0.171]	0.068 [0.177]
Extraversion (0-1)	0.063 [0.145]	0.068 [0.164]	0.440 [0.127]**	0.465 [0.149]**	0.273 [0.098]**	0.284 [0.099]**	0.431 [0.151]**	0.453 [0.136]**
Female = 1	0.154 [0.091]	0.071 [0.090]	0.217 [0.065]**	0.118 [0.070]	0.169 [0.077]*	0.175 [0.074]*	0.245 [0.071]**	0.250 [0.056]**
Black = 1	0.428 [0.184]*	0.349 [0.180]	0.887 [0.146]**	0.711 [0.157]**	0.361 [0.100]**	0.514 [0.081]**	0.227 [0.129]	0.300 [0.130]*
Hispanic = 1	0.213 [0.167]	0.205 [0.138]	0.208 [0.162]	0.098 [0.155]	0.224 [0.094]*	0.217 [0.096]*	0.120 [0.099]	0.205 [0.080]*
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	-0.094 [0.223]	-0.122 [0.253]	0.126 [0.164]	0.130 [0.176]	0.004 [0.180]	0.117 [0.178]	0.000 [0.166]	0.112 [0.178]
Age (Years)	0.069 [0.014]**	0.084 [0.016]**	0.050 [0.014]**	0.083 [0.016]**	0.059 [0.010]**	0.060 [0.012]**	0.046 [0.013]**	0.059 [0.014]**
Age^2/100	-0.037 [0.013]**	-0.056 [0.016]**	-0.017 [0.013]	-0.056 [0.016]**	-0.029 [0.009]**	-0.039 [0.012]**	-0.013 [0.012]	-0.035 [0.013]**
Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)		-0.075 [0.031]*		-0.047 [0.027]		-0.121 [0.023]**		-0.139 [0.021]**
Income (1=<10k; 14=>150k; 15=RF)		-0.024 [0.013]		-0.023 [0.013]		0.008 [0.011]		0.008 [0.015]
Income Refused		-0.044 [0.119]		0.067 [0.130]		-0.061 [0.114]		-0.075 [0.141]
Working full time (1=Yes)		-0.142 [0.106]		-0.150 [0.121]		-0.137 [0.092]		-0.222 [0.099]*
Working part time (1=Yes)		-0.018 [0.151]		0.017 [0.138]		0.128 [0.149]		-0.065 [0.115]
Retired (1=Yes)		0.210 [0.174]		0.441 [0.132]**		0.296 [0.134]*		0.266 [0.120]*
Very Conservative (1=Yes)		-0.923 [0.101]**		-1.021 [0.107]**		-0.027 [0.083]		0.077 [0.101]
Conservative (1=Yes)		-0.566 [0.106]**		-0.727 [0.086]**		0.032 [0.084]		0.138 [0.084]
Liberal(1=Yes)		0.030 [0.073]		0.244 [0.102]*		-0.226 [0.090]*		0.056 [0.080]
Very Liberal (1=Yes)		-0.272 [0.115]*		-0.098 [0.112]		-0.491 [0.124]**		-0.457 [0.133]**
Constant	-4.295 [0.440]**	-3.729 [0.464]**	-4.508 [0.395]**	-4.401 [0.469]**	-3.810 [0.361]**	-3.214 [0.371]**	-3.611 [0.381]**	-3.283 [0.389]**
Observations	8664	8230	8664	8230	8664	8230	8664	8230
Fixed State and Day Survey Took Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chi-squared test: Joint Significance of Big Five	7.10	3.64	27.39	13.51	22.52	17.20	17.46	16.63
Prob > chi-squared	0.210	0.600	0.000	0.020	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010

Note: Logit coefficients with robust standard errors, clustered by state, in brackets. CA is the omitted state.

Source: 2008 CCAP. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1% (two-tailed)

Table A7. Total Hours of Television Consumption "Yesterday" (4pm to 11pm)

	(1)	(2)
	Yesterday (0 to 7)	
	Baseline	October
Conscientiousness (0-1)	0.300 [0.195]	0.190 [0.172]
Openness (0-1)	-0.727 [0.183]**	-0.362 [0.174]*
Agreeableness (0-1)	0.224 [0.239]	0.265 [0.223]
Emotional Stability (0-1)	-0.142 [0.205]	0.032 [0.210]
Extraversion (0-1)	0.452 [0.124]**	0.419 [0.162]*
Female = 1	-0.077 [0.072]	-0.014 [0.073]
Black = 1	0.817 [0.132]**	0.804 [0.138]**
Hispanic = 1	0.565 [0.146]**	0.270 [0.197]
Other (Native American,Asian,Mixed,Other) = 1	0.327 [0.197]	0.180 [0.171]
Age (Years)	0.127 [0.017]**	0.137 [0.015]**
Age^2/100	-0.102 [0.016]**	-0.106 [0.014]**
Education (1=No HS; 6=Post-grad)	-0.190 [0.030]**	-0.186 [0.021]**
Income (1=<10k; 14=>150k; 15=RF)	-0.082 [0.014]**	-0.030 [0.011]**
Income Refused	0.265 [0.135]	-0.010 [0.125]
Working full time (1=Yes)	-0.550 [0.090]**	-0.667 [0.100]**
Working part time (1=Yes)	-0.331 [0.133]*	-0.334 [0.143]*
Retired (1=Yes)	0.141 [0.153]	0.282 [0.135]*
Constant	1.608 [0.476]**	0.286 [0.446]
Observations	8664	8664
R-squared	0.107	0.125
Fixed State and Day Survey Took Effects	Yes	Yes
Chi-squared test: Joint Significance of Big Five	6.62	2.32
Prob > chi-squared	0.000	0.060

Note : OLS coefficients with robust standard errors, clustered by state, in brackets. CA is the omitted state.

Source: 2008 CCAP. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1% (two-tailed)