TO: Steve R., Dick Brody

FROM: Santa

CONCERNING: Assessment of Media Measures in RXS

Four media questions were asked from the beginning (January 11) to the end (December 7) of Continuous Monitoring. The questions tracked ongoing media campaign coverage rather than attention to special events. The questions are:

F1. How many days in the past week did you watch national news on TV?

F1a. How much attention did you pay to news on TV about the campaign for President?

F2. How many days in the past week did you read a daily newspaper?

F2b. How much attention did you pay to articles in the newspaper about the campaign for President?

The overall percentages across the entire time period for watching national news on TV and reading newspapers are given in Table 1. Sample percentages for amount of attention paid to campaign coverage in both of these media are given in Table 2.

TABLE 1. DAYS READ NEWSPAPERS OR WATCHED TV NEWS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	$\bar{X}$	SD
F1 - TV	14	6	9	12	8	11	4	35	4.2	2.6
F2 - News	15	8	8	8	6	6	4	47	4.4	2.8

TABLE 2. ATTENTION PAID CAMPAIGN COVERAGE

	Great Deal	Quite A Bit	Some	Very Little	None*
F1a - Attn. TV	19	22	31	13	15
F3b - Attn. News	11	15	32	20	21

* 0 days on F1/F2 are included here

The reported number of days reading a newspaper is higher than the reported number of days watching national news on TV. On the other hand, more attention is paid to campaign coverage on TV than in the newspapers. This is sensible, since the TV watching question focused specifically on national news (where campaign news was presumably inescapable) while undoubtedly many persons faithfully read their daily newspapers with only a glance at the front page and campaign news.

We also asked Rs about their attention to five specific events: the Republican Convention (F34, F34a), the Democrat convention (F4, F4a), and the three debates (F5-F57a). Table 3 compares reported watching of these five events.

TABLE 3

	%YES	$\bar{X}$ HRS WATCHED	S.D.	N
Watch Dem. conv.	71	3.3	4.7	1411
Watch Rep. conv.	63	2.4	3.0	1057

	% Watch All	% Watch Part	None	N
1st Debate - Oct.7	42	28	31	613
2nd Debate - Oct.21	41	28	31	437
VP Debate - Oct.11	36	23	41	559

Again, these distributions are not surprising, with the Ferraro-Bush debate generating least interest, and the Republican convention watched less than the Democratic one.

Most of these measures have interesting over-time differences. We have chosen two ways to look at over time differences: by month and by election year events. The by-month tracking has the advantage of equal intervals, the election year events clustering shows the data in response to real-world events. Table 4 shows how the election year is broken into periods, for purpose of this analysis.

TABLE 4. Election Year Periods

1. Before Iowa primary — Jan.7-Feb.19
2. Iowa through Super Tuesday -- Feb.20-Mar.16
3. Super Tuesday through California -- Mar.17-June 5
4. California to the conventions --June 6-July 18
5. Convention period --July 19-Aug.26
6. Post conventions to 1st Debate --Aug.27-Oct.7
7. Balance of campaign period --Oct.8 to Nov.5
8. Post election --Nov.7-Dec.7

Basically, attention to campaign news either on TV or in newspapers is expected to pick up during a) an interesting primary contest and b) as the election nears. These time periods should also show at least moderate increases in reported number of days watched national news, although the habit of daily newspaper readership may be less influenced by campaign events.

The days watched or read variables behave as expected over time. That is, newspaper readership does not vary significantly with month of interview or with election period. However, the reported number of days watching national news on TV does vary by both month and election period. (Printout from analysis of variance runs is appended).

Four bivariate tables are also appended. These show days watched national news on TV by month and election year cluster; and days read newspaper by month and election year. The "0 days attended" and "7 days attended" rows for both TV and newspaper are reproduced in Tables 5a (by month) and 5b (by election year event cluster) below. (Percent will not sum to 100 since this is only a portion of the table).

TABLE 5a. NUMBER OF DAYS ATTENDED BY MONTHS OF CAMPAIGN

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov
0 Days TV	14	15	14	15	14	19	15	15	13	13	11
0 Days News	16	15	14	15	15	13	17	18	13	14	16
7 Days TV	33	38	37	40	32	28	31	38	35	34	43
7 Days News	34	48	48	49	45	49	43	45	50	48	43

TABLE 5b. NUMBER OF DAYS WATCHED BY ELECTION PERIOD

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
0 Days TV	14	13	15	19	13	14	12	11
0 Days News	16	16	14	16	15	14	14	17
7 Days TV	36	36	35	29	37	33	36	42
7 Days News	49	43	48	44	47	48	48	42

Attention to news about the campaign also moves appropriately with time, both for TV and newspapers, although the 'read news about campaign' is comparatively muted. See Table 6, below. (The breakdown by months is similar). The TV columns should sum across to 100%. as should the columns headed News.

TABLE 6. ATTENTION TO MEDIA BY ELECTION YEAR EVENTS

	Great deal/ Quite a bit		Some		Very little/Never	
	%		%		%	
Election Period	TV	News	TV	News	TV	News
1	28	17	39	39	34	34
2	43	22	29	35	29	44
3	40	25	29	31	31	45
4	35	23	32	35	32	42
5	43	29	31	30	26	41
6	40	29	31	28	29	43
7	52	34	26	32	22	35
Post 8	57	35	32	29	20	36

It is troubling that more people reported paying more attention to news about the campaign on TV after the election. Perhaps the "glow" from election night coverage is remembered long afterwards. It should be noted that the question about attention to campaign news on TV was asked as late as November 27. Certainly in the last week of this period news about the Presidential campaign was pretty hard to come by, much less to pay a Great Deal of attention to. (Attention to articles about the campaign and TV news about the campaign, distributed by month, show the same pattern).

Of the items which ask for recollections of watching a specific event (e.g., watch a debate) as opposed to tracking ongoing media, the convention items show an interesting pattern with regard to time. (Results are presented by months, since equal time intervals are important. The data are similar for election year event clusters.) That is, recollection of the event decays as time passes and slightly inflates after the election.

TABLE 7a. Table 7b.

	%Watch Dem. Conv.	$\bar{X}$ Hrs.	%Watch Rep. Conv.	$\bar{X}$ Hrs.	% Watch Debate 1 All/ Part	% Watch Debate 2 All/ Part	% Watch VP Debate All/ Part
July	79	3.7					
Aug	72	3.6	72	3.4			
Sept	72	3.4	67	2.6			
Oct	68	2.8	60	2.2	43 27	43 29	34 24
Nov	71	3.0	60	2.3	42 29	41 26	38 22

Factor Analysis

I have done factor analysis to assess reliabilities, including separate factor analyses for the version groupings suggested in the memo as well as the entire dataset. Table 8 brings together some of the major factor analysis output. The trouble is that, in doing separte factor analyses, we are adding variables at each version as well as moving in time through the campaign period, which at least theoretically means changing stimuli. Both changes may have an impact on the factor structure. Also, the N's are very different, going from 2028 in the version 1-6 to 54 for version 9. So if the factor loadings bounce around, and they do a bit, further analysis would be needed to figure out why.

Two columns that might usefully be compared are the first and the last. The first represents a factor analysis on the entire dataset in which all variables were thrown in, regardless of version. Pairwise deletion of missing data ensured minimum missing data. If a case had missing data on either variable in the bivariate correlation, it was deleted for that correlation, but could be used for other bivariate correlations which the case had valid data on for both variables. In the last column, factor results are reported for a matrix of correlations which were computed across variables only for the subset of cases responding on all the questions. It is reassuring to note that these two columns compare very favorably.

In all versions (except 9), newspaper readership has the lowest loading. The highest is either Attention to TV News About the Campaign or Watching the Second Debate. It seems clear that a factor score of these variables would measure attention to the campaign via television.

Validity

Three measures of validity were requested: correlations of each of the media items with measures of political interest, political involvement, and opinionation. The relevant matrix is inserted as Table 9. (The correlations are r's; the measure of interest and involvement goes from 1- high to 9 - low; hence the negative correlations with number of days and number hours.)

The opinionation measure is a count of 997's and 998's on the thermometer ratings (i.e., DKs and NAs). The correlations with media watching are only moderate, but have an appropriate pattern. That is, one would not expect watching debates to contribute to variance in number of political figures known, and it does not. But the more days you read the newspaper, the fewer the number of political figures you did not recognize.

Political interest (a combination of interest in campaign [B4.] and follow public affairs [B2.]) is more strongly related to media watching than is involvement (cares who wins and talks to others about supporting candidate). Paying attention to newspaper articles about the campaign, to TV national news about the campaign, and watching the debates are the highest correlations with political interest. The political involvement measures show the same pattern of relationships, but at a lower level.

The education variable (# of years of schooling) has a reasonable pattern of correlation with media variables. With education, the newspaper readership correlation stands out, but especially in comparison to the weak to non- existent correlations with TV watching, either ongoing or special event in nature.

TABLE 8. FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS

FACTOR MATRIX (LOADINGS-ABSOLUTE VALUES)*

			Versions					
		1-13	V1-6	V7	V8	V9	V10	V11-12
Days Wtch. Natnl News	V401	0.64	75	75	68	79	58	60
Attnt. TV Re Campgn	R402	0.71	78	85	78	78	56	67
#Days Read Newspaper	V403	0.42	63	52	39	57	33	50
Attn.News Art Re Cam	R407	0.61	77	72	62	71	55	60
WatchDemCnv	V408	0.61		64	70	52	58	58
#Hrs Watched Dem	R409	0.63		63	70	66	64	60
WatchRepCnv	V410	0.64			69	57	66	63
#HrsWatchedRep	R411	0.65			71	67	70	64
Watch Debate.1	R413	0.63				61	70	63
Watch 2nd Debate	R415	0.68						70
Watch VP Debate	R417	0.63					53	65
			N=2028	N=371	N=484	N=54	N=122	N=396

FACTOR CONTRIBUTIONS

	V1-6	V7	V8	V9	V10	V11-12
Sum Squared Loadings	2.15	2.89	3.58	3.97	3.47	4.25
% Total Variance	53.87	48.16	44.86	44.13	34.70	38.66

Communality Estimates

Variable	Final Input	Output						
V401	1.00	.41	.56	.56	.46	.62	.33	.36
R402	1.00	.50	.61	.72	.61	.61	.31	.45
V403	1.00	.18	.39	.27	.15	.33	.10	.25
R407	1.00	.37	.59	.51	.39	.51	.30	.36
V408	1.00	.38		.41	.49	.27	.33	.34
R409	1.00	.40		.40	.50	.44	.40	.36
V410	1.00	.41			.48	.33	.43	.41
R411	1.00	.43			.51	.46	.49	.41
R413	1.00	.40				.38	.48	.39
R415	1.00	.46						.49
R417	1.00	.39					.27	.43

*The low and high values on the items are scored differently, hence there are negative correlations. The signs of the correlation change from version to version, but the signs are always internally consistent within each version.

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305

4 March 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO: Warren Miller, Don Kinder, and Santa Traugott

FROM: Richard A. Brody

SUBJECT: Procedures for the Study of Media Items in the Rolling Cross-Section

In order to prepare for the 1986 study committee, the following analyses of the media attention items in the rolling cross-section should be undertaken:

I. MARGINALS:

Because of the structure of the data set, we will want to examine the marginal distributions on the media items in three ways:

A. For the entire period -- with missing data excluded from the percentage bases. This is not a very meaningful analysis but we will need a baseline.

B. In time-related clusters:
1. Monthly -- January thru November
2. By election year event clusters:
   a. primary clusters
      (1) before Iowa
      (2) Iowa thru Super Tuesday
      (3) Super Tuesday thru California
      (4) California to the Conventions
   b. Convention period
   c. Post-conventions to first debate
   d. Balance of campaign period
   e. Post-election

[Please note I make no brief for this clustering; a look at content flows indicates variation but I haven't done any detailed checking yet.]

MAR 8 1985

C. ITEMS

1. Marginals
401 F1 [0-7] days of TV news
R402 F1a [1-5] how much att'n
403 F2 [0-7] days of daily newspaper
407 F2b [1-5] how much att'n
408 F3 [1,5] [8=dk] watch Dem conv.
410 F4 [1,5] [8=dk] watch Rep conv.

2. Means, SD's
409 F3a hours of viewing Dem convention
411 F4a hours of viewing Rep convention

3. Indices
Debate attention indices to be constructed and marginals plotted
413 F5 and F5a [see Recode instruction #1]
415 F6 and F6a [ditto]
417 F7 and F7a [ditto]

II. RELIABILITIES

The only approach to reliability that seems feasible in this data set involves factor analysis constrained to a single factor solution -- I assume inter-item correlations are derived from the same analyses. To avoid horrid missing data problems, Versions 1-6 should comprise one analysis, Versions 7, 8, 9, and 10 should comprise four separate analyses, Versions 11 and 12 should be combined for analysis, and Version 13 should be considered separately.

[If I have misread the list of versions that have identical data sets on the media items, correct the clustering according to that principle. N.B.: In the time related analyses some common clusters will be broken up.]

III. VALIDITY

I propose four validity checks:

A. Correlate each of the media measures [F1 - F7] as defined above with an index of Campaign Interest constructed out of items B1 and B2 recoded and combined in the manner described in Recode Instruction #2

B. Do the identical analyses on a measure of Political Involvement constructed out of items B3 and B6 recoded and combined in the manner described in Recode Instruction #3

C. Do the identical analyses with an index of Opinionation constructed by counting the number of 997 or 998 codes on the C2 thermometers. The index is the

proportion of 997's or 998's derived by dividing the count by 14 in versions 1-5 and by 15 in versions 6-13.

D. Correlate each of the media measures with education [Y4]

IV. RECODE INSTRUCTIONS

1. For each of the three debate sequences, index attention to the debates as follows -- using F5 for example:

IF ((F5 eq 1 or 7) and (F5a eq 1)) DEBATE1=1

IF ((F5 eq 1 or 7) and (F5a ne 1)) DEBATE1=2

IF ((F5 eq 5 or 8) DEBATE1=3

[Repeat to construct DEBATE2 from F6 and DEBATE3 from F7]

2. Political interest index from B1 and B2 [cell entries are the derived indices]

	B2 Codes		
B1 Codes	1	3	5
1	1	2	5
2	2	4	6
3	3	6	7
4	4	8	8
8	9	9	9

3. Political Involvement index from B3 and B6 [cell entries are the derived index]

	B3 Codes		
B6 Codes	1	3	8
1	1	4	9
5	3	6	9

ANALYSIS 13

VARIABLE V401 DAYS WTCH NATNL NEWS
STRATA(ROW) R3 ELECTIONYEAR CLUSTERS

		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 DELETED	9 DELETED	TOTALS	REVISED
Before I	1	55	24	36	35	39	42	16	140	0	0	387	387
	Row %	14.2	6.2	9.3	9.0	10.1	10.9	4.1	36.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Before I	2	42	27	23	43	18	36	15	113	0	1	318	317
	Row %	13.2	8.5	7.3	13.6	5.7	11.4	4.7	35.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Before C	3	127	54	78	94	67	107	32	305	1	1	866	864
	Row %	14.7	6.3	9.0	10.9	7.8	12.4	3.7	35.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Cal-C	4	84	31	38	66	46	44	10	133	0	1	453	452
	Row %	18.6	6.9	8.4	14.6	10.2	9.7	2.2	29.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Con-	5	52	31	41	40	37	36	20	152	1	1	411	409
	Row %	12.7	7.6	10.0	9.8	9.0	8.8	4.9	37.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	
to 1st	6	63	27	35	69	32	51	16	147	1	0	441	440
	Row %	14.3	6.1	8.0	15.7	7.3	11.6	3.6	33.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	
camp	7	42	14	31	43	28	49	22	129	0	0	358	358
	Row %	11.7	3.9	8.7	12.0	7.8	13.7	6.1	36.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
ight	8	28	14	17	27	24	26	12	107	0	7	262	255
	Row %	11.0	5.5	6.7	10.6	9.4	10.2	4.7	42.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTALS		493	222	299	417	291	391	143	1,226	3	11	3,496	3,482
REVISED		493	222	299	417	291	391	143	1,226	0	0	3,482	
Row %		14.2	6.4	8.6	12.0	8.4	11.2	4.1	35.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	

ANALYSIS 14

VARIABLE V402 1984:RXSECT FO1A
STRATA(ROW) R3 ELECTIONYEAR CLUSTERS

		0 DELETED	1	2	3	4	5	8 DELETED	9 DELETED	TOTALS	REVISED
Row 1		55	50	56	150	65	9	1	1	387	330
	%	0.0	15.2	17.0	45.5	19.7	2.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 2		42	59	76	91	45	4	0	1	318	275
	%	0.0	21.5	27.6	33.1	16.4	1.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 3		127	143	201	254	133	7	0	1	866	738
	%	0.0	19.4	27.2	34.4	18.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 4		84	58	101	146	52	10	0	2	453	367
	%	0.0	15.8	27.5	39.8	14.2	2.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 5		52	85	91	128	53	1	1	0	411	358
	%	0.0	23.7	25.4	35.8	14.8	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 6		63	98	79	138	58	5	0	0	441	378
	%	0.0	25.9	20.9	36.5	15.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 7		42	85	100	94	34	3	0	0	358	316
	%	0.0	26.9	31.6	29.7	10.8	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 8		64	65	58	49	21	1	0	4	262	194
	%	0.0	33.5	29.9	25.3	10.8	0.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTALS		529	643	762	1,050	461	40	2	9	3,496	2,956
REVISED		0	643	762	1,050	461	40	0	0	2,956	
Row	%	0.0	21.8	25.8	35.5	15.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	

ANALYSIS 15

VARIABLE V403 #DAYS READ NEWSPAPER
STRATA(ROW) R3 ELECTIONYEAR CLUSTERS

		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9 DELETED	TOTALS	REVISED
1		60	23	32	27	26	23	9	187	0	387	387
Row	%	15.5	5.9	8.3	7.0	6.7	5.9	2.3	48.3	0.0	100.0	
2		51	33	30	19	19	19	11	135	1	318	317
Row	%	16.1	10.4	9.5	6.0	6.0	6.0	3.5	42.6	0.0	100.0	
3		121	68	61	71	53	41	36	414	1	866	865
Row	%	14.0	7.9	7.1	8.2	6.1	4.7	4.2	47.9	0.0	100.0	
4		71	41	45	30	24	27	14	201	0	453	453
Row	%	15.7	9.1	9.9	6.6	5.3	6.0	3.1	44.4	0.0	100.0	
5		63	25	40	30	21	28	11	193	0	411	411
Row	%	15.3	6.1	9.7	7.3	5.1	6.8	2.7	47.0	0.0	100.0	
6		62	36	34	34	23	22	18	212	0	441	441
Row	%	14.1	8.2	7.7	7.7	5.2	5.0	4.1	48.1	0.0	100.0	
7		50	27	19	36	21	20	13	172	0	358	358
Row	%	14.0	7.5	5.3	10.1	5.9	5.6	3.6	48.0	0.0	100.0	
8		44	28	12	27	19	13	10	109	0	262	262
Row	%	16.8	10.7	4.6	10.3	7.3	5.0	3.8	41.6	0.0	100.0	
TOTALS		522	281	273	274	206	193	122	1,623	2	3,496	3,494
REVISED		522	281	273	274	206	193	122	1,623	0	3,494	
Row	%	14.9	8.0	7.8	7.8	5.9	5.5	3.5	46.5	0.0	100.0	

ANALYSIS 16

VARIABLE R407 ATTN NEWS ART RE CAM
STRATA(ROW) R3 ELECTIONYEAR CLUSTERS

		1	2	3	4	5	9 DELETED	TOTALS	REVISED
1		27	40	150	86	84	0	387	387
Row	%	7.0	10.3	38.8	22.2	21.7	0.0	100.0	
2		33	35	109	60	77	4	318	314
Row	%	10.5	11.1	34.7	19.1	24.5	0.0	100.0	
3		76	135	265	195	190	5	866	861
Row	%	8.8	15.7	30.8	22.6	22.1	0.0	100.0	
4		35	69	158	87	103	1	453	452
Row	%	7.7	15.3	35.0	19.2	22.8	0.0	100.0	
5		49	69	125	81	87	0	411	411
Row	%	11.9	16.8	30.4	19.7	21.2	0.0	100.0	
6		58	70	124	106	83	0	441	441
Row	%	13.2	15.9	28.1	24.0	18.8	0.0	100.0	
7		45	75	114	57	66	1	358	357
Row	%	12.6	21.0	31.9	16.0	18.5	0.0	100.0	
8		47	44	77	38	56	0	262	262
Row	%	17.9	16.8	29.4	14.5	21.4	0.0	100.0	
TOTALS		370	537	1,122	710	746	11	3,496	3,485
REVISED		370	537	1,122	710	746	0	3,485	
Row	%	10.6	15.4	32.2	20.4	21.4	0.0	100.0	

ANALYSIS 1

VARIABLE V401 DAYS WTCH NATNL NEWS
STRATA(ROW) V105 1984:RXSECT MONTH INTVW

		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 DELETED	9 DELETED	TOTALS	REVISED
Jan	1	27	9	21	18	20	26	11	64	0	0	196	196
	Row %	13.8	4.6	10.7	9.2	10.2	13.3	5.6	32.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Feb	2	47	29	21	37	23	36	8	121	0	0	322	322
	Row %	14.6	9.0	6.5	11.5	7.1	11.2	2.5	37.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Mar	3	46	20	26	43	24	35	17	122	0	1	334	333
	Row %	13.8	6.0	7.8	12.9	7.2	10.5	5.1	36.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Apr	4	49	17	23	35	23	37	11	130	0	0	325	325
	Row %	15.1	5.2	7.1	10.8	7.1	11.4	3.4	40.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
May	5	47	29	39	36	28	41	15	110	1	1	347	345
	Row %	13.6	8.4	11.3	10.4	8.1	11.9	4.3	31.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	
June	6	57	20	29	38	33	33	9	85	0	1	305	304
	Row %	18.8	6.6	9.5	12.5	10.9	10.9	3.0	28.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
July	7	48	21	32	48	33	33	10	102	1	1	329	327
	Row %	14.7	6.4	9.8	14.7	10.1	10.1	3.1	31.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Aug	8	50	26	31	33	27	28	14	127	0	0	336	336
	Row %	14.9	7.7	9.2	9.8	8.0	8.3	4.2	37.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Sept	9	42	20	25	50	20	37	13	109	1	0	317	316
	Row %	13.3	6.3	7.9	15.8	6.3	11.7	4.1	34.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Oct	10	47	14	31	47	28	53	22	124	0	0	366	366
	Row %	12.8	3.8	8.5	12.8	7.7	14.5	6.0	33.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Nov	11	33	12	19	29	31	32	13	128	0	3	300	297
	Row %	11.1	4.0	6.4	9.8	10.4	10.8	4.4	43.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	
	12	0	5	2	3	1	0	0	4	0	4	19	15
	Row %	0.0	33.3	13.3	20.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	26.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTALS		493	222	299	417	291	391	143	1,226	3	11	3,496	3,482
REVISED		493	222	299	417	291	391	143	1,226	0	0	3,482	
	Row %	14.2	6.4	8.6	12.0	8.4	11.2	4.1	35.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	

ANALYSIS 2

Re-run this, using R3

VARIABLE V402 1984:RXSECT FO1A
STRATA(ROW) V105 1984:RXSECT MONTH INTVW

		0 DELETED	1	2	3	4	5	8 DELETED	9 DELETED	TOTALS	REVISED
Row 1		27	21	27	80	34	6	0	1	196	168
	%	0.0	12.5	16.1	47.6	20.2	3.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 2		47	50	57	116	46	5	1	0	322	274
	%	0.0	18.2	20.8	42.3	16.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 3		46	66	95	80	44	2	0	1	334	287
	%	0.0	23.0	33.1	27.9	15.3	0.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 4		49	61	71	93	48	3	0	0	325	276
	%	0.0	22.1	25.7	33.7	17.4	1.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 5		47	49	71	113	62	4	0	1	347	299
	%	0.0	16.4	23.7	37.8	20.7	1.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 6		57	35	75	91	38	8	0	1	305	247
	%	0.0	14.2	30.4	36.8	15.4	3.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 7		48	52	73	110	42	2	1	1	329	279
	%	0.0	18.6	26.2	39.4	15.1	0.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 8		50	70	71	102	42	1	0	0	336	286
	%	0.0	24.5	24.8	35.7	14.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 9		42	73	54	102	41	5	0	0	317	275
	%	0.0	26.5	19.6	37.1	14.9	1.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 10		47	88	95	98	35	3	0	0	366	319
	%	0.0	27.6	29.8	30.7	11.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 11		51	78	73	65	29	1	0	3	300	246
	%	0.0	31.7	29.7	26.4	11.8	0.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Row 12		18	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTALS		529	643	762	1,050	461	40	2	9	3,496	2,956
REVISED		0	643	762	1,050	461	40	0	0	2,956	
Row	%	0.0	21.8	25.8	35.5	15.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	

ANALYSIS 3

VARIABLE V403 #DAYS READ NEWSPAPER
STRATA(ROW) V105 1984:RXSECT MONTH INTVW

		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9 DELETED	TOTALS	REVISED
1		32	15	18	9	14	18	4	86	0	196	196
Row	%	16.3	7.7	9.2	4.6	7.1	9.2	2.0	43.9	0.0	100.0	
2		48	21	34	24	19	14	7	155	0	322	322
Row	%	14.9	6.5	10.6	7.5	5.9	4.3	2.2	48.1	0.0	100.0	
3		46	37	22	25	17	15	12	159	1	334	333
Row	%	13.8	11.1	6.6	7.5	5.1	4.5	3.6	47.7	0.0	100.0	
4		48	21	19	27	23	13	15	159	0	325	325
Row	%	14.8	6.5	5.8	8.3	7.1	4.0	4.6	48.9	0.0	100.0	
5		52	27	26	29	22	19	17	154	1	347	346
Row	%	15.0	7.8	7.5	8.4	6.4	5.5	4.9	44.5	0.0	100.0	
6		40	26	25	21	15	22	8	148	0	305	305
Row	%	13.1	8.5	8.2	6.9	4.9	7.2	2.6	48.5	0.0	100.0	
7		55	26	38	22	20	19	8	141	0	329	329
Row	%	16.7	7.9	11.6	6.7	6.1	5.8	2.4	42.9	0.0	100.0	
8		59	21	30	23	20	19	12	152	0	336	336
Row	%	17.6	6.3	8.9	6.8	6.0	5.7	3.6	45.2	0.0	100.0	
9		41	26	24	25	15	18	11	157	0	317	317
Row	%	12.9	8.2	7.6	7.9	4.7	5.7	3.5	49.5	0.0	100.0	
10		51	31	21	35	18	19	15	176	0	366	366
Row	%	13.9	8.5	5.7	9.6	4.9	5.2	4.1	48.1	0.0	100.0	
11		47	29	14	33	21	15	13	128	0	300	300
Row	%	15.7	9.7	4.7	11.0	7.0	5.0	4.3	42.7	0.0	100.0	
12		3	1	2	1	2	2	0	8	0	19	19
Row	%	15.8	5.3	10.5	5.3	10.5	10.5	0.0	42.1	0.0	100.0	
TOTALS		522	281	273	274	206	193	122	1,623	2	3,496	3,494
REVISED		522	281	273	274	206	193	122	1,623	0	3,494	
Row	%	14.9	8.0	7.8	7.8	5.9	5.5	3.5	46.5	0.0	100.0	

ANALYSIS 4

VARIABLE R407 ATTN NEWS ART RE CAM
STRATA(ROW) V105 1984:RXSECT MONTH INTVW

		1	2	3	4	5	9	TOTALS	REVISED
Row	1	13	23	68	46	46	0	196	196
	%	6.6	11.7	34.7	23.5	23.5	0.0	100.0	
Row	2	22	32	128	69	68	3	322	319
	%	6.9	10.0	40.1	21.6	21.3	0.0	100.0	
Row	3	41	53	108	59	72	1	334	333
	%	12.3	15.9	32.4	17.7	21.6	0.0	100.0	
Row	4	30	56	90	67	79	3	325	322
	%	9.3	17.4	28.0	20.8	24.5	0.0	100.0	
Row	5	26	43	112	87	77	2	347	345
	%	7.5	12.5	32.5	25.2	22.3	0.0	100.0	
Row	6	22	43	114	63	62	1	305	304
	%	7.2	14.1	37.5	20.7	20.4	0.0	100.0	
Row	7	33	52	107	63	74	0	329	329
	%	10.0	15.8	32.5	19.1	22.5	0.0	100.0	
Row	8	40	54	94	69	79	0	336	336
	%	11.9	16.1	28.0	20.5	23.5	0.0	100.0	
Row	9	41	47	91	83	55	0	317	317
	%	12.9	14.8	28.7	26.2	17.4	0.0	100.0	
Row	10	49	79	115	52	70	1	366	365
	%	13.4	21.6	31.5	14.2	19.2	0.0	100.0	
Row	11	49	53	87	50	61	0	300	300
	%	16.3	17.7	29.0	16.7	20.3	0.0	100.0	
Row	12	4	2	8	2	3	0	19	19
	%	21.1	10.5	42.1	10.5	15.8	0.0	100.0	
TOTALS		370	537	1,122	710	746	11	3,496	3,485
REVISED		370	537	1,122	710	746	0	3,485	
Row	%	10.6	15.4	32.2	20.4	21.4	0.0	100.0	

CORRELATIONS

		R1 POLITICAL INTEREST	R2 POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT	R5 OPINIONATION	V401 DAYS WTCH NATNL NEWS	R402 ATTNTVNEWS:RE CAMPGN	V403 #DAYS READ NEWSPAPER	R407 ATTN NEWS ART RE CAM	V408 WATCHDEMCNV	R409 #HRS WATCHED DEM
POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT 1=HI	R2	0.3612								
OPINIONATION 1=LO	R5	0.2935	0.0939							
DAYS WTCH NATNL NEWS	V401	-0.3545	-0.1392	-0.1809						
ATTNTVNEWS:RE CAMPGN	R402	0.4681	0.2587	0.2063	-0.6636					
#DAYS READ NEWSPAPER	V403	-0.2818	-0.1015	-0.2445	0.2386	-0.1790				
ATTN NEWS ART RE CAM	R407	0.4717	0.2540	0.2389	-0.2970	0.4475	-0.5755			
WATCHDEMCNV	V408	0.2787	0.1704	0.1725	-0.2948	0.3466	-0.1321	0.2276		
#HRS WATCHED DEM	R409	-0.2665	-0.1355	-0.1389	0.2905	-0.3435	0.1649	-0.2972	-0.4561	
WATCH RECONV	V410	0.2761	0.1926	0.1526	-0.3004	0.3184	-0.1378	0.2367	0.5764	-0.3092
#HRSWATCHEDREP	R411	-0.2561	-0.1365	-0.1097	0.2686	-0.3392	0.1599	-0.2620	-0.3510	0.6430
WATCH DEBATE.1	R413	0.4102	0.2319	0.1749	-0.3296	0.3862	-0.1700	0.3223	0.2539	-0.2635
WATCH 2ND DEBATE	R415	0.3929	0.1585	0.1789	-0.3446	0.4003	-0.2365	0.3474	0.3008	-0.2817
WATCH 2ND DEBATE	R417	0.3418	0.1622	0.2129	-0.3187	0.3443	-0.2020	0.3119	0.2611	-0.2808
EDUCATION-YEARS	1018	0.2189	0.1103	0.3391	0.0661	-0.1033	0.1763	-0.1934	-0.0800	0.0766

CORRELATIONS

		V410 1984:RXSECT FO4	R411 #HRSWATCHEDREP	R413 WATCH DEBATE.1	R415 WATCH 2ND DEBATE
#HRSWATCHEDREP	R411	-0.5087			
WATCH DEBATE.1	R413	0.2929	-0.2843		
WATCH 2ND DEBATE	R415	0.3443	-0.3340	0.5412	
WATCH 2ND DEBATE	R417	0.3315	-0.2835	0.4736	0.4895
		-0.0466	-0.0167	-0.0989	-0.0759

***** Normal termination of MDC $ 2.10 3.13 secs

```
OSIRIS IV MONITOR SYSTEM
09:28:15 JUL 30, 1985

***** The last command has been processed. 'Bye.
```