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## ABSTRACT

A focal point of recent mass communication research has been the influence on public accessibility to political information, the "agenda setting" function of the media. This function was, tosted during the Kentucky gubernatorial eiection and the Lexington, Kentucky, mayoral election in November 1971. The specific hypothesis postulated that public identification of important issues in the campaigns would reflect the amount of media coverage devoted to these issues and that this effect would be strongest for those people with the least education and least interest in the campaign. Respondents selected at random Srom the Lexington telephone directory were asked what they believed were the major issues of the campaigns. Resulcing data supplied as much evidence that the media reflect public concern as that the public is influerced by media coverage. Correlations becween educational levels or campaign interest and media coverage of issues could not be established. (CH)
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## helia aglenda-setting in a state caifaign

Studying the effects of the mass meciia in shaping public opinion during an election cannaign has veen a long but inconclusive concern of mass comminication research. ©luch of tinis concern has concentrated on studying the influence of the media on voting decisions, and that is where one of the arguments over media effects has centered. In recent years, however, researciers have been investigating the effects of the media, not in influencing voting decisions, but in influencing the political information the public has.

This area now goes under the general rubric of the "agenda-setting" function of the media. Conen (1903) has succinctly sumarized this effect: ' (The media) may not be successful much of the time in telling people winat to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about."

It sinould be noted, however, that a distinction is here being made between media effects on voting choices, and the public's awareness of campaign issucs. It is the latter that is of concern in the present study. Secondly, agenda-setting does not imply that the media are solely responsible for creating public awareness and concern for issucs. In fact, the media may as much reflect public concorn for issues as influence public concern for certain issues. In order to detexaine the extent to which the media set the agenda for the public (rather than reflect the issues of the public), one must take account of each over time. ${ }^{1}$

In a recent test of the agenda setting hypotinesis ilcombs and Shaw (1972) found a strong correlation between the anount of coverage the media devoted to an issue during a three-week period and what voters surveyed during that period said were the imporiant issies. Looking at only uncommitted voters, they con-

McCombs and Siaw point out that in presidential elections there are few alternative sources of information to the mass media. Few peoplo have tine opportunity to learn a candidate's positions at first hand.

This assumption cannot necessarily be made in state and local elections, however. In this situation, nore voters can, if they wisin, hear candidates speak in person and can confront office-scekors in small groups rather than in the huge puilic rallies of presidential politics. For tinis reason, one might expect the media would be less influential in shapin; public judgments about campaign issues locally than in national elections.

On the other hand, Pool (1963) suggested that the U. S. media is more likely to be influential in local, ratice than in national elections:

While a national campaign nay have focused (a voter's) intense interest and deep conviction in tho top office, he is often without any sucn internal guidance on the loss important office. ile has neither the time nor energy to inform inimself of all of them. So how he votes on these minor offices is apt to be affected by any information that comes his way about the candidares for them. It is in tins situation of low intensity of attention and interest that the endorsement of a candidate by a newspaper is capable of influencing a number of votes.

Fool adds that paradoxically, the minor races (where the media might be more influential) are tho ones usually slighted in media coverage.

Jewoll and Cumningian (1968) in their study of kentucky politics, noted that political behavior and attitudes in regard to state elections are much more staide than in presidential campaigns in that state. This suggests again that agenda-setting would be loss likely to occur in state campaigns tian in presidential elections.

This study was aimed at investigating the agenda-setting hypothesis in ine context of a state and a city election in Lexington, Kentucky. The context was the kentucky governor's election and the Lexington mayoral election in Novenber, 1971. ${ }^{2}$

Several factors would secn to be crucial in assessing the agenda-setting function on pubiic opinion. First, time necds to be taken into account. Une needs to $b u$ sure that the direction of influence is from the media to tile public and nut fron tho public to the media. Furthermore, not much is known about the "time-lag" of influance. Lang and Lang (1966), for example, suggest only that media effocts are "long-range" and more apt to occur in the "quicscent': timo butwean campaigrs ratior than during campaigns.

It may be inat any moia influence will not be easily felt during the relatively short period of the campaign itsolf.

Little is known about hte influencu over time. We gencrally speak in vague terms like "long range or short range" or "current." We cannot specify much about what time lag exist etweer nedia coverage and public concern or mareness of issues, if indeed such a ca: 1 relationship exists.

Since the pioneering effort "Burelson and Lazarsfold, fow studies have examined: ponses to the flow of current political inform? the most part only the reinforcing and activating di file electorate's surveillance behavior have teen on. od, periaps because more dramatic impacts are so imperceptio and long torm. In any event, our understanding of the preci.. inplact of the mass media is only fraghentary and based on dated infomation. (Dryor, 1972-72)

Although voting choices tend to be relatively stable, sone voters at some times are influenced by what Sellers (1965) termed the "current flow of information.' ite argucd tiat media coverage of a compaign will be nost influuntial for "those voters with little interest and no strong partisansiip." Ciedia coverage, he wrote, "activates an increased proportion of those voters who have slight interest in information about politics, who are only slightly if at all identified with any party, who are consequently extremely susceptible to tac short-tern forces empiasized inthe flow of current infornation."

On the other hand, Converse (1966) formulated the hypothesis that wile information flow may cause low interest voters to change partisan atti.tudes
between ulections, tiuse same low interest poople may snow more stable matisan attituics during the short icrm of an olection campaign, because tioy pay little attention to media coverage and will not be aware of immediate analysis.

Honever, in an malysis of two decades of presidential election survey ciata, uryor (197l) found that the voters who pay the least attention to media camaign coverage do tend to be the least stable in voting prefurunce, aotn betacon eluctions and during the campaign itself. Thus it would sem tinat agenca-setting is luss likely to take ilace in state and local ulections than in presidential elections, but that the effect will be strongest anong those vith luss interest.

Motiler factor that would seom to make a difference is education. Cinaffoc (1971) wrote that reanalysis of his data on political information ain anong teenagers (Chaffieu, ward and Tipton, 1970) indicates that mass media use does produce subsequent gains in knowledge at the same time that prior knowledge luads to urcater media usc. Tho effuct is to increase the distance botween puople of high and low hnowledge. Tichenor, Donome and ulion (1970) supported this nypothesis. Hincy argued that people with higher education tend to accuire information at a faster rate, thus increasing the 'knowlocige gap.: neciombs and Snaw also roted tat the buttor educated and the more interested are more likely to scel information, but that these sam people are the luast likely to ciange tivir political belicfs.
fhuse studius scem to suggest ihat nedia coverage of changing issues in a camaign wi:l be noted first by those hignly educated, highly interested people, Dut that tiese people are not as apt to change their minds about important issucs as much as the less wucated, less interested voters.

Specifically, this study was designed to test the hypothesis that the puilic's identification of important issues in the campaigns would feflect the
anount of media coverage devoted to thesc issues, and that this relationsaip Would be stroncest for those poople with the least education and interust in tie compaign.

## Metnodology

To investigate the arenda-setting inypothesis, tiois study ashed respond ats at thru difforont times during the campaign to define what they felt were the major issues facing voters in the two campaigns. ${ }^{3}$ Respondents were interviewed in September just aftur the city primary, in tho midde of October, and again
 Snaw desisn (1969), new respondents wore added at each phase to alleviste some of the metiodolorical problems associated with pancl surveys. ${ }^{4}$ Intervievine was done on weekends by telepione, with respondents randonly sulected from tilu Lexineton area telephone directory.

In the enalysis, we identify six different respondent yroups. üroup une is the 303 responeents intervicwes in september. Groun rwo is 200 of these people inturvicwed again in October. Group rour is 139 of these pople intervicwed for a third time in fovember. Group ihre is 52 ruspondents interviewed for the first tine in uctobur; Group Five is 42 of these people interviewed ayain in Novmbur. Group Six is do people interviewed for the first time in Novenber.

At tin same time, the actual content of media coverage of the mayoral and zubrnatorial campagns from Sept. 18 , the date of the city primary, tiarough Nov. 2, the date of the guneral election, was also coded. Storjes were included from tirue newspapurs--tio Louisville Courier-Journal, the morning Lexington ierald, and the cvening Lexinnton leader. ${ }^{5}$ The 6 p . m. and 11 p . m. news show content of two of the threo lexington television stations and the hourly lecal broadcasts of tivo of tim three Lexington An radio stations ware also included. (Une of the local radio stations had so littlu campaign coverage it was dropped from the study; one of the local TV stations refused to participate.) A rescarch assistant
weat to the station studios weekly and coded the content from the orisinal copy for the broadcasts.
.icCoribs and Shaw used a major and minor item distinction in coding media content. Tais study used a "major issue" and "othor" issue code. A major issut was defined as tio issuc that constituted the luad and major portion of a news story; other issucs bere those also mentioncd in that stery. ${ }^{6}$
irinc issue caicgories were formulated for analyzing both respondent and media mention of issues. Percentares of tile frequency of mention were tien computed fur vach of the six respondent groups and each of the seven media sources. Tince media indices were also formed, one for the simec athipapers, one for the two television stations, and one for the two radio stations. Pearson $r$ correlations were then calculated between anci among, the various respondent groups and mocia sources. In computine these correlations, eacil issue was treated as an 'observation'i and tine fruquency of mention of each issuc as the 'iscore.i Finally, cross-laggec corrolation tecmique is utilized in order to indicate directionality (Campel. and Stanley, 1963; Polz and Andrews, 1964; Ciaffeo, 1072, ijecker, 1973).

In it:s simplest form, variables are orderud according to time so tat Several correlation coefficients can be compared. Correlations are computed for betwoen variables one and two at both time one and $t i n d$ two $\left(r \because_{1} Y_{1}\right.$ and $r_{2} \ddot{i}_{2}-$ sue firure one) Then the cross lageed correlations are conputed $\left(r X_{1} Y_{2}\right.$ ail $\left.r X_{2} Y_{1}\right)$. These in turn are compared to a bascline statistic basod upon tice other correlations in the figure. If one (or botil) of the diagonal cofficients exceed the baseline, one assunes it is evidence of some causal relationsinsp.

The technicue makes stringest assumptions about the nature of tile data, including simultaneity of measurement and the equivalence of time lags, but it ERIC is also a useful way of laying out time-ordered variables exen when the data
 O: merthon of issues in the modia (frum oupt. ly-vet. 15) is sianltancous vitia the tinn wo point of the ruspondent intorvjun (th wowonc of uctobur 15) : and


lhe firsi feriod for mouia contcit is onw month: the suculd is a little OVEE thu Wiveks.

Ch:iffar (1975) nutcd th:t the ontimal tinu-liai is no perfunctury matter.'
 +A, , fruct may hore aissipated. lowever, thore is not cluar cut answer about wint tire period to usu in alection studius.

Ia layin: out tho cross-lars, we decided to regard the corrol.ntians betwen media content for Time Ont (Supt. 1s-uct.15) and Time Two (Uct. le-sov. 2) and Groups Tho and Four as one cross-liggud dusign. ilic coryeliations butheen tine sarm inedia content and Groups Tince and Five are truated as replications.

## sosults

The city Election: There was alinost no coverage of the mayoral canpabn in the bexingtom media. Tho iexington herald and Leader domined rar only 16 storics about this race. Of these nine ware concorned with a court suit on the rart ne tae incumbent dufuered in tile september primary that chorged vote fraud. Tho more concerned denjals on the part of Candidate Sykes that ine had made a Lal" not to campaign in exchange for a promise to be naned city manage. 'lherefore, :malysis of the city campaign was dropped.
 by various domoyramic variables compared to the 1970 census for the Lexingtor arer. aspondents liere asled in operi-enaed questions to name the two or taree most important issues facing vocers in the sovernor's campainn. ilosults in terms of

Arequancy of mention are prosented in Table 2 . At all thrac intorview times, tuxes mas the most often mentioned issue. Issues related to law ardordar, "special interests ( $\epsilon . \quad \because$. , farmers, làor, the elderly. etc.) and "ueneral state. (acstly various proposals to reorganize the state sovermert) were seldom cited. ost of the differences between the tireo direrent intervow points occurred witi relatively minor changes in position of issuvs related to "ecology," education,: and "economy." iwo otiner issue cate:ories were included mainly to code media content ratior than for respondent repiles. Yinote are issues stemine fron the "compaisn" (e, s. mudslinging artachs or sources of campaign funus) and "local issues' (issuws relating to one specific commaizy.)

The correlations between frequency of mention of issues by the six yroups are presentud in Table 3 . The correlations for the same respondents at the thred interviwiv points (Groups 1, 2 and 4 and Groups 3 and 5), and the correlations between tie new and reseat respondents are all very injein. It snould be noted that the repat eroups are not procisuly the san people, since replies frow those first respondunts who later Iropped out of the study are included in the risults. Table 4 presents the correlations when the "campais,n" and "local issues" items are dropped. Later analysis comparing media coverage with frequency of mention by respondents dous not include these two catororics. many of the media itums coded as campaign units are not issaes. Sany of tile local itens dealt with jasues oriunted to conmunitics otior rian kesjagton and could not be expected to be a major issue for iexington area residents. The correlations when these itcms are Aropped are nut quite as strong, but thoy are still positive and statistically Significart.
fespondents were not pusied to answer the onen-ended questions, anu a stivstantial numiox of vocers in eacin zroup cijther could not or would not mention
any issuc as bejn: important in the canpaign. The percentage of responuants wa did not mention at least onc issue declines substantiaily over time: 54 in Group Unc; $30 \%$ and $3 \%$ in lirous Two and Threc; and $29 \%, 31 \%$ and $35 \%$ in Groups rour, "ive and iix.


 concernedmainly vith the campagen itself, and not with insues. Amose haif of
 amouncoments of time candidates' apparancos ma cuscriptions of tioir wapaisin stylus, eneral attacks on opponeate tiat wou not issue oriented, anci in the case of tifind perty candiate crandler, apuculation on tiu atect of his vote.
raxes' constituted the major issue discussed in the media, followed by sicuiai interest,: economic issues, law and orcier, local issues, eduation, cology, and uencral state issues.
lable j presunts the correlations between the various muit, نasua on tw number of issue itwas mentioncd in stories about tio guburnatorial racie anan all rine caterorics are incluwd, tix correlations are extracly aige botion for mator items am tutai itums. There is ria consunsus mivin the various media camancls as to what the nows: of the canamon is. This consumus is also very sinw butwuen the the tince purious for all carnarn coverone.
minn tio cotpainn and loral issue categoriws are aropped, the media consumsus lussums. The coeficients are dencraliy strongur during tia closing pe iou of the cempaign than for the contont fron sope. 18 through vet. 15.

 arsicential نluction coverapt. hate are clear print-brudeast differences,
imdicating that the newspapers generaliy were empasizing one set of issucs and

 teicvision. Law wherdre was also a muca more important issue for ticu uroducast nowia and the Lexjigtun Leader than for tie Lexiagton-hersic and the Lowisville Comier-jownal. Tis Louisville paper. sjnce ii ujrcuiatus state-wido, also devoted much more coverage to locei issucs tim dia any oi in otacr nouia.

Lorrelations jetwec: muia covarab and issues cituc by the iublic. For the ramander of tice analysis, only the seven issides (exciuding "campaign" and
iocal issuesi categoriesj are used.
10 test tie agende-seting aypotansis, we first comared correlations
 by ats various panel groups. Table 7 presents tine comrelations usiry total aduia Suas for che entire six-woeks pexiou.
$\therefore$ ifforent relationsings shov when whe the specific time period of dedia covirage is consicierel. In separating the media content into two time perious,
 lwo is tite two-wek period from uct. 15 throwit clectioi: day. Pigures and $j$ prescne the cross-lass for newspajers and television.
vecause of its low corraditions, as woll as its infrequency of mention as a rimary news source iy respondents, mo furtar analysis of ravio is incluatu.

Correlations for rewspaper coverage alu the puitic (rirure 2) for tite most part unceed the critical values for statisticat significancu levels. noviver, no consistent pattern enerbs. In tirms 0 er cross-lag logicl, woth the diagonals
 so thom is no choice uetween aypotiuses that the pubiic fruquency of mention
reflects media coverage, $o^{-}$vice versa, that the inedia frequency reflects public concern. 1 :

Jt can be concluded that there is a rela.ionsinip between the frequency of mention of issues by newspapers and the frequency of mention by the public. However, given the failure of this data to neet the strict assumptions of crosslag analysis, and the failure to "repiicate' between the different groups of respondents, there is no consistent evidence that the media is serving a causal agonda-setting function.

Figure 3 indicates that television content during the early part of the campaign contributes to the negative correlations found between television frequency and respondent frequency. The negative correlation in issue ocverage over the two time periods makes cross-lag interpretations difficult.

Interviews with some of the groups asked respondents to name the medium from whicil they had gotten most of their infomation about the campaign so far. Newspapers were named by $47 \%$, television by $36 \%$ and radio by $6 \%$.

Parti*ioning on this question permits separate cross-lag comparisons for those who named newspapers and those who named television (Figures 4 and 5). kesults are similar to the non-partitioned sample. Of those respondents naming telcvision, (Fig. 4) the correlations with television coverage for the first part. of the campaign period are still negative (although less so than for the nonpartitioned sample). The Time Two correlations arc postive, and stronger than results for the non-partititioned sample, but do not reach statistically significant levels. Results for those wio named newspapers are very similar to the non-partitioned results. (Figure 5). Correlations between those naming television as a primary nets source and newspeper coverage were even stronger than those naming newspapers with newspaper coverage. (Results not shown.)

Respondents were partitioned on two other variables: degrec of interest and education. Interest was tapped by a question that askei respondents "Gencrally, how interested would you say you, yourself, are in the current state elections--very interested, pretty interested, not tow interested or not at all?.. The "not at all" and "not too" categories were collapsed into a "low interest" group. Cross-lags for tho three interest groups with newspaper coverago are prosented in Figures 6, 7 and 8.

The partitioned results tend to suggest tiat, as expected, the higher the interest, thic less the change in salience of issues over time; at. least the correlations over time are somewhat stronger for the high interest respondents.

The cross-lags with media coverage for the High and thedium interest groups are similar to results for the entire smiple. Again, there scems to be a relationship between media coverage and frequency of mention of issues, but no marked evidence that the direction is media to putlic ratner than public to media.

The low interest group (Figure 8) is the most interesting. Wo had expected this group to show the strongest "short range " relationship to media coverage. Yet the synchronous correlations are the weakest here for any of the three interest subsets. Only one coefficient (papers Tine Two with Group Four) reacies statistical significance levels ( $\mathbf{r}+.748, \mathrm{p}$. 05 ). And the sets of diagonal comparisons seen to indicate tho least evidence of the tirce groups in support of a media agenda-setting hypothesis.

Respondents were also partitioned into two educational levels: Those witn a high school education ( $\mathrm{Fi}_{\mathrm{F}}$. 9j) and those with somo formal schooling beyond high scinool (Fig. 10).

The correlations are not narkedly different for the two groups, although two of the media/public coefficients that are statistically significant for the college respondent group are not for the high school respondents. Again, most of
tue cross-lag coe $\quad$ ficinnts exceed the baseline statistic atit only exception is the College Groups 3 and 5 were the Newspaper One to Croup Five ida;onal $r$ exceeas t:e paseline, the public to meia coes not. Again, wiile taere is evidence of a relationsiip between media zrequency an frequency of prilic inention, there is no consistent sujort for t.ie idea that the puilc reflects the mecia, ratier than tatat the nedia reflects tio putic's aseaua.

## Conclusions

上etecti:e stror: enfirical evidence for media effects is a difficult business anc periaps :re have been overly-iessiaistic about tae extent tc wincal
 staulity of tae responderts definitions of wat vere tar min issues involved in tie dovermor's campaigi, the relative sach of consensus among tile ineuia about the issues, ans tae instánility of media coverage between our two tine periods contrivute to tac dificulty.

Se can conclucie that there is a relationsif wetneen newia coverage anc public froquency of mention in a state capaigu. 'ials supports eviaence taat tuc fedia serve sucl. a function in nore freque thy-sturies presidential campaighs. Ine fact that total nedia coverage tiroughout the canmairn correlates stronger nith pliulic mention of issues tatan coverage for specific time rexiows does not jtrigtaen arguments that voters are resjouing to a current flos of information.

Adding measurement over tine :?so indicates tiat snoning a positive relationsiip between media coverage and public frequency is not in itself sufficient to argue for a meuia agenda-settin nyputaesis. ujr ata provide as mucn evidence tatat tie mewia reflects puiic concera as tiat wiouc reflects aecia coverage. fir was evinence founc for expectations aiout tia effect of mediá coverage on low interest or less educated grouis.

Uur selection of Sept. lï as a starting data for nomitoring wedia coverage is aruitraxy as far as the governor's campaign is concemed, altnough it ade
sense for nayor's race. The similarity between the public's issucs in September and those mentioned at later time points indicates that the issues nad already boen set at the tine we began monitoring.

The lack of a perfect correlation between different media sources may, as McCombs and Shaw suggest, ruflect an imperfect "pseudo-environment" for the campaign. It would also weaken arguments that a third furce, say, the candidates themselves, were actually setting the issue agenda. If this ware the case, then the nedia would tend to show more consensus than was found. in part, the lack of consensus could reflect, again as McCombs and Saaw suggest, a political point of view on the part of the media sources, perhaps bas. But the fact that the Lexington Herald and the Leader correlated as positively as they did, even when editorials are included, weakens that line of argument. The fact that the CourierJournal correlates stronger with the Herald, which endorsed opposing candidates fur governor, than witi the Leaiur, suggests that it is soncthing other than political point of view that leads to similarities in coveraye. It could be sender news judgments, but a nore likely argument is common deadines, since they are both morning papers.

We find the differences between newspapers, television and radio inturestins, but think a conclusion that our data suggest an agenda-setting function only for atwspapers too hasty. The television station with the highest percentage of the Lexington audjence refused to participate in the study, and results may have been very different if that station had been included. Still, the data would seem to suggest that recent speculation about the great influence of television rews on election campaigns may be unvarranted. The fact that those respondents who named television as their prinary news source still showed a much stronger relationship to newspaper coverage than to television coverage cannot be discarded lightly. This suggests that to the extent that there is agenda-setting, it is by mediun rather than media.

## Footnotes

1. There is also the related issue of whether or not candidates reflect (or are influenced by) both the media's and the public's interpretation of issues. Such a determination would involve a content analysis of the candidates' speeches again over time, and was beyond the scope of this study. Furthermore, it can be argued that most voters determine candidate positions via the miss media.
2. In the gubernatorial election, Lt. Gov. Wendell Ford, a Denocrat,was running against Republican Tom Emberton. Also, former governor A. B. Chandler was running on his newly-formed Commonwealth Party ticket and William Smith was running as the Independent Party candidate.

In the Lexington mayor's race, Foster Pettit wes rinning against Harry Sykes, the first tlack candidate to seek the office. Both had survived a run-off in September that saw a controversial former councilman defeated, The mayural election is non-partisan. While other studias have indicated that voters do identify party slates in such elections; in this case both candidates were registered Democrats.
3. Respondents specifically were asked: "Now, what do you think are the two or three major issues facing the state in the gubernatorial election?" Earlier they had been asked a battery of media use questions, questions about their political discussions with friends and femily, their political affiliation, registration, and interest in the two campaigns.
4. A forthcoming paper is concerned with methodological implications, specifically the problems of sensitization and attrition in panel designs.
5. The two Lexington papers publish joint editions on Saturday and Sunday, altiough the Saturday editions have separate editorial pages. They publish some joint sections
on Thursdays. In some of the anaiysis, a newspaper index is used that includes these joint editions. The Saturday editorial pages are included in the separate Herald and Leader measures.
6. Editorials as well as news stories are inclided. The Lexington Herald endorsed the Democratic candidates for governor and lt. governor; the Lexington Leader endorsed both Republican candidates. The Courier-Journal endorsed the Rapublican candidate for governor and the Democratic candidate for lieutenant governor.
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## TABLE I

Some Demographic Characteristic, of the sample

|  | Sentember | October |  | November |  |  | Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Grour 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Group 5 | Group 6 |  |
|  | ( $\mathrm{N}=30 \%$ ) | $(\mathrm{N}=200)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=52$ ) | $(\mathrm{N}=139)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=42$ ) | $(10=80)$ |  |

Sex

| Male | $44 \%$ | $45.5 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | 56 | 55.5 | 46 | 58 | 43 | 34 | 52 |

Age

| Over 71 | $14 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $61-70$ | 12 | 13 | 26 | 9 |
| $51-60$ | 29 | 31 | 28 | 14 |
| $41-50$ | 24 | 23 | 14 | 17 |
| $31-40$ | 12 | 8 | 5 | 18 |
| $22-30$ | 6 | 2 | 4 | 21 |
| $18-21$ | 3 | 0 | 6 | 12 |


| Voted for | $(N=75)$ | $(N=26)$ | $(N=47)$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Emberton | 48 | 65 | 57 | $46 \%$ |
| Ford | 45 | 27 | 24 | 37 |
| Chandler | 7 | 4 | 20 | 16 |
| Smith | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 |

Fercentages of frequency of issides mentioned by respondents

|  | September | October |  | November |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\cdots$ | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Group 5 | Group 6 |
| Campaign | 6\% | $13 \%$ | 9\% | 9\% | 6\% | 11\% |
| Taxes | 37 | 38 | 37 | 49 | 35 | 40 |
| Special <br> Interests | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 2 |
| Economy | 7 | 8 | 12 | 9 | 17 | 11 |
| Law and Order | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Local <br> Issues | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 |
| Education | 17 | 11 | 20 | 12 | 11 | 13 |
| Ecology | 14 | 15 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 13 |
| General State |  |  | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  |  |  |
| Issies | 7 | 8 | 1 | 6 | б́ | 7 |

Total number
of issues mentioned 260

209
65
131
52
85

TABLE 3

Correlations of total frequency of mention of issues by the six respondent groups

|  | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Group 5 | Group 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | egories |  |  |
| Group 1 |  | 966 | 952 | 959 | 891 | 888 |
| Group 2 | 972 |  | 905 | 983 | 885 | 896 |
| Group 3 | 954 | 895 |  | 940 | 935 | 921. |
| Group 4 | 964 | 981 | 936 |  | 930 | 920 |
| Group 5 | 876 | 883 | 936 | 933 |  | 956 |
| Group 6 | 883 | 885 | 911 | 913 |  |  |

ERIC Total number
of issues
mentioned

13
0
0
0
0
0
0
Education
Local
Issues
Law and
Order
Economy

Taxes
Campaion
$N$
0
0
ElL BT O乌て
－
6
7

1
\＆
$u$
10
$\stackrel{H}{G}$
ふ
TEuinor
Percentages of media coverage of issues
7 3TGVL

ERIC

Correlations between frequency of mention of items before Oct. 15 and after Oct. 15

| All Campaign Coverage | Seven Issues only |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Major | Total | Major |
| Itams | Items | Items |


| Courier- <br> Journel | .972 | .867 | .646 | .434 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Werald | .900 | .859 | -.433 | .377 |
| Leader | .965 | .897 | -.029 | -.683 |
| Channe1 18 | .960 | .979 | -.120 | .212 |
| Channel 62 | .633 | .648 | .119 | -.269 |
| Whap | .963 | .967 | .528 | . .647 |
| WVLK | .948 | .915 | .060 | -.6172 |
| Papers | .961 | .901 | .088 | .320 |
| TV | .976 | .972 | .970 | .591 |
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Correlations between media frequency during 6 weeks and frequency of mention by the public for seven issues
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FIGURE 1
Basic iieasures for Cross-Lagged Analysis


FIGURE 2

Correlations between newspaper coverage and respondent groups


FIGULL 3
Correlations between television coverage and respondent rroups


FIGURE 4
Correlations between television coverage and respondents naming televisior: as their prinary news source


FIGURE 5
Correlations between newspaper coverage and respondents naming, nowspapers as tileir primary news source


FIGURE 6

Correlations between newspaper coverage and "very interested respondents


FIGURE 7
Correlations between newspaper coverage and 'Somewnat interested' respondents


Figure 8
Correlations vetween newspaper coverase and not very interested' respondents


FICU:IE 9
Correlations between newspaper coverage and respondents with inigh sci:ool education or less


## FIGUiki $] 0$

Correlations between newspaper coverage and respondents $1: i t h$ sone college education


