July 31, 1985

TO: Steve R., Dick Brody

FROM: Santa

RE: Assessment of Media Measures in Pre-Post

This memo examines the media items in the 1984 Pre-Post Election Survey, according to Brody's instructions (attached).

Some items, those used in the Post, are old standbys. They are:

A2. Did you listen to any speeches or discussions about the campaign on the radio?

A2a. (IF YES to A2) Would you say you listened to a good many, several, or just one or two?

A3. How about magazines — did you read about the campaign in any magazines?

A3a. (IF YES TO A3) How many magazine articles about the campaign would you say you read — a good many, several, or just one or two?

A4. Did you read about the campaign in any newspapers?

A4a. (IF YES to A4) How many newspaper articles did you read about the campaign — a good many, several, or just one or two?

A5. Did you watch any programs about the campaign on television?

A5a. (IF YES to A5) Would you say you watched a good many, several, or just one or two?

A6. Did you watch the (first) televised (presidential) debate between Carter/ Walter Mondale and (Ronald) Reagan?

A6a. (IF YES TO A6) Did you (watch/listen to) the entire debate or just part of it?

[A7/A7a and A8/A8a are extensions of A6/A6a, asking respectively about second debate and the vice-presidential debate]

Two questions on the 1984 Pre-election survey were asked in 1980 and are not "new content." These are:

C2. How often do you watch the (1980: early evening) national network news on TV — every day, 3 or 4 times a week, once or twice a week, or less often?

C2a. (UNLESS R VOLUNTEERS "NEVER" to C2) When you watch the news on TV, do you pay a great deal of attention to news about government and politics, do you pay some attention, or don't you pay much attention to news about government and politics?

These questions are new (but also asked in Continuous Monitoring)

C2b. How many days in the past week did you watch national news on TV?

C2c. (NOT ASKED IF "NONE" on C2b or "NEVER" on C2) How much attention did you pay to news on TV about the campaign for President: a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little or none?

C3. How many days in the past week did you read a daily newspaper?

C3b. How much attention did you pay to newspaper articles about the campaign for president — a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little or none?

C4. During the past week did you read a weekly news magazine such as Time, Newsweek, U.S.News and World Report or some other weekly news magazine?

C4b. (IF YES TO C4) How much attention did you pay to magazine articles about the campaign for president — a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?

A. COMPARISON WITH 1980 ELECTION STUDY

In both 1980 and 1984, the Post election wave opened with: "Would you say that you were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in following the political campaigns this year?" The media questions followed immediately. The 1980-1984 distributions on these questions are very similar:

A2. Speeches or discussions about campaign on radio?

	YES	NO	N
1980	46.8%	53.1	1406
1984	45.2	54.8	1941

A2a. Listened to a good many, several, just one or two?

	GOOD MANY	SEVERAL	ONE or TWO	NOT ANY*
1980	9.5%	21.2	16.0	53.1
1984	9.6	19.5	15.8	55.0

**NOT ANY includes "NO, DK, NA" on A2.

A3. Did you read about the campaign in any magazines?

	YES	NO	N
1980	34.6%	65.4	1403
1984	34.8	65.2	1942

A3a. How many magazine articles about the campaign would you say you read?

	GOOD MANY	SEVERAL	ONE or TWO	NOT ANY
1980	6.5%	15.8	12.3	65.3
1984	7.0	16.0	11.5	65.5

In 1980, "read magazines" was followed by "watch television," then "watch the Carter-Reagan debate," then some non- campaign specific questions about newspaper readership, before the following question is reached. In 1984, we segue directly from magazines to the next two questions. Since this is the only question where distribution is at all different, an order effect may be suspected. Perhaps saying "yes" to newspaper readership of campaign material is affected by a rebound from a negative report of magazine readership given just previously.

A4. Did you read about the campaign in any newspapers?

	YES	NO	N
1980	70.9%	29.1	1400
1984	76.9	23.1	1943

A4a. How many newspaper articles did you read about the campaign?

	GOOD MANY	SEVERAL	ONE OR TWO	NOT ANY
1980	25.4	29.7	15.2	29.5
1984	24.5	33.7	18.7	23.1

A5. Watch any programs about the campaign on television?

	YES	NO	N
1980	85.9	14.1	1408
1984	86.1	13.9	1943

A5a. Watched a good many, several or just one or two?

	GOOD MANY	SEVERAL	ONE OR TWO	NOT ANY
1980	23.4%	37.9	24.4	14.1
1984	25.3	36.9	23.9	14.0

A6. Watch the (first) debate?

	YES	NO	RADIO	N
1980	69.5	29.5	1.0	1401
1984	63.3	36.4	.3	1924

A6a. Watch all or part?

	ENTIRE	PART	NONE
1980	40.9	29.3	29.7
1984	36.8	26.7	36.5

And, for the sake of completeness, these are the marginals for 1984 debate questions which have no 1980 analogue:

A7: Watch 2nd debate?   A7a. Entire or part?

ENTIRE	PART	DIDN'T WATCH
35.8	26.2	38.0

A8: Watch VP debate? A8a. Entire or part?

ENTIRE	PART	DIDN't WATCH
29.4	22.1	48.5

The distributions for the 1984 Pre-election questons which were also asked in the 1980 pre-election wave are not quite as similar.

C2. How often do you watch the national network news on TV .....

	EVERY DAY	3 or 4 TIMES/WK	1 or 2 X/WK	LESS OFTEN	(VOL:) NEVER	N
1980	38.0%	23.6	18.0	14.0	6.3	1568
1984	45.6	20.5	18.1	12.0	3.7	2249

C2a. ... How much att'n to news about gov't & politics?

	GREAT DEAL	PAY SOME	NOT MUCH	NEVER
1980	42.7	43.1	7.9	6.4
1984	34.0	49.1	13.0	3.8

In 1984, people are more likely to say they watch every day—but less likely to tell us they pay a great deal of attention to news about government and politics. Remember that in 1984 we made it easier than in 1980 for a respondent to tell us that he/she watched the national network news -- in 1980 the question asked specifically about "early evening" network news. In turn, the smaller proportion who reported paying a "great deal" of attention to news about government and politics m'y be due to a fuzzier understanding of what "national network news" really is. If the national or network news that's being reported is, in fact, "break" or noon-time news, the political content might be much lower.

The questionnaire context of these two pairs of questions is quite different. In 1984, the questions follow several on "talking politics," and the open-ended likes and dislikes. In 1980, the questions followed immediately after: "In general, which do you rely on most for news about politics and current events: television, newspapers, magazines or radio?" and that question in turn follows questions about two television media events: Carter's handling of the hostage crisis and Afghanistan.

The effects of changing question placement are probably confounded with the changes in question wording.

B. "NEW" MEDIA ITEMS

Qs. C2b and C2c, C3 and C3b, C4 and C4b. are new content. Several comparisons will be made. First, we compare the new and 1980 (also asked in 1976, 1974) TV items asked in the Pre--C2b/C2c with C2/C2a. Second, we compare the 1980 questions about TV, newspaper and magazines with the 1980 Pre-election question about which media the R attends most. Third, there is a comparison with the Post media battery, although a problem here is that events of the campaign and the election intervened between the Pre and Post so that any campaign reactive effects are likely to be confounded with effects of the differences in question wording. Fourth, we will look at whether the new media items track sensibly by date of interview, especially compared to the two 1980 TV attention items.

1. Comparing C2/C2a with C2b/C2c.

The new item, C2b, is very different from C2. C2 asks about national NETWORK news, while C2b omits this (possibly crucial) word. C2b asks specifically about "last week" and it also asks for a specific number of days watched rather than the vaguer "how often do you watch." If there are differences between these two items, there is no way to know which of these three discrepancies in wording (if any) produced the difference. Table 1 summarizes the differences.

Table 1. How Often Watch by How Many Days Watch

C2b. # of DAYS	C2. EVERY DAY	3 or 4 X/WK	1 or 2 X/WK	LESS OFTEN	NEVER*
SAME AS IN C2	54%	55%	58.3%	59.5%	
5-6**	24				
LESS THAN C2b	21	30.3	23.5		
MORE THAN C2b		13.9	17.9	30.5	

*Those answering "Never" 100% on C2 were not asked how many days in past week they watched national news.

There's a problem with the 5 or 6 days response to "How many days watched" question. In Table 1, the responses to "how many days watched" were re-organized to compare directly with how often watched. So, the row labeled Same means 7 days, 3 or 4 days, 1 or 2 days, respectively. The response 5 or 6 days fits between every day and 3 or 4 times a week, but where? The problem arises because the question coding violates the ancient precept of having exhaustive categories. Somewhat better than 50% give equivalent responses, with most of the rest watching fewer days in response to the more concrete question.

The follow-ons to these two questions are quite different. One asks about attention to government and politics, the other about attention to the campaign. [Miscellaneous point No. 1 — it would be helpful if the values assigned to these items went in the same direction. In this instance, for example, great deal of attention is coded 5 on one follow-on, 1 on the other. Where we can protect users from reversals and negative correlations, I think we should do so.] However, the two items are quite strongly correlated (Taub of .-52 and gamma of -.73).

2. In 1980, one question about media attention (other than the TV questions) was asked: In general, which do you rely on most for news about politics and current events --television, newspapers, magazines, or radio? We replaced this question with three specific questions about television, newspapers and magazines. As we would expect, the media are ranked similarly in the two surveys.

	CHECKED AS MOST ATT'N (1980)	PAYS A GREAT DEAL OR QUITE A BIT ATT'N
TV	63%	40.5
NEWSPAPERS	23%	21.7
MAGAZINES	5%	6.6

3. We also compared the 1984 Pre and Post media measures. To make most sense out of these comparisons, one would like to compare identically worded questions (in the same relative place in the questionnaire) in the Pre and the Post, or differently worded questions asked together either in the Pre or in the Post. Drawing conclusions from comparison of differently worded questions asked at two different points in time is difficult.

On the Post, we asked, how many programs did you watch about the campaign? On the Pre, we asked the 1980 way (C2) how often do you watch national network news and the new way (C2b) how many days did you watch network news last week. How do the cross-breaks of these two questions with the Post question compare?

The taus and gammas are very similar, and moderate. (.32 and .44 respectively for the "how often" question and .32 and .41 for the "how many days" version)

TABLE 2. Distribution of Pre-TV Attention
by Post TV Attention

| | NONE *| | 1- 2 | | 3 - 4 | | 5 -7 DAYS | |
	C2	C2b	C2	C2b	C2	C2b	C2	C2b
WATCHED GOOD MANY/ SEVERAL PGMS	29%	36	52	51	67	64	75	79
1 or 2 PGMS	33	31	33	35	25	25	17	14
NO PGMS	37	34	15	14	8	11	8	7
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

These comparisons are not precise, since watching 5 or 6 days is not exactly the same as "every day" on how often watched; yet it is greater than 3 or 4 times a week. Similarly, watching less often than 1 or 2 times a week is not exactly the same as watching no days.

Basically, the Pre items seem to be relating in the same way with respect to the Post. But note that those who told us on C2b that they watched NO days of television news in the last week are slightly more likely than those who told us on C2 that they watch less often than once or twice a week (or NEVER) to give us the anamolous report of having watched from several to a good many campaign programs. And that if you reported on C2b 5-7 days last week, you were slightly more likely to report having watched several to a good many programs than those who told us "every day" in response to C2.

Similary, the results of breaking the two follow-on questions against whether the Post respondent watched a program about the campaign on TV do not show much. 94% of those answering "Great Deal" on C2a (attention to government and politics) reported watching a program about the campaign in the Post interview, compared to 96% of those answering Great deal or quite a bit to a question about attention to capaign programs when watching TV. 88 and 89% of those answering "some" to C2a and C2c respectively told us that they watched a program about the campaign. Interestingly, 66% of those who told us that they didn't pay much attention to news about government and politics told us they watched a program on the campaign, compared to 76% of those who told us they paid very little attention to programs on the campaign. 54% of those who told us they never watched national network news nevertheless watched a program on the campaign on television (the debates?) while only 50% of those who told us that they paid no

attention to TV coverage of the campaign also said on the Post that they had watched a program on the campaign. 69% of those who told us that they didn't watch national news LAST WEEK told us on the Post that they had watched a program about the campaign.

4. Other Pre- and Post comparisons were made for newspapers and magazines. These comparisons were considerably more straightforward.

a. The comparison of the Pre- question, "How many days in past week did you read a daily newspaper?" with the Post- question asking how many articles R read about the campaign shows nothing surprising. The ordinal coefficents are middling (taub=.41, gamma=.53). Reading "great many articles" goes nicely and monotonically from 3.7% of those who read newspapers 0 days to 41.3% for those who read newspapers 7 days a week, and conversely 56.7% of those who read the paper on no days last week report that they read no articles about the campaign as compared to 7.8% of those who read the newspaper every day telling us that they had not read any articles about the campaign.

It does give a little pause to note that about 43% of those who told us on the Pre that they did not read a newspaper last week nevertheless told us in the post that they had read at least one or two newspaper articles about the campaign.

The relationship between how much attention R paid to newspaper articles about the campaign, as reported in the Pre and whether R read any articles about the campaign, as reported in the Post is stronger, with a gamma coefficient of .79. However, 49% of those who told us on the Pre that they paid no attention to articles about the campaign said on the Post they they had read about the campaign in the newspapers. Although attention to media does <u>not</u> seem to increase strongly over the campaign, it might be worth extending the analysis by looking at the relation between pre and post variables by sample quarters.

b. The Pre- asks about last week's readership of three specific weekly newsmagazines. The Post- asks more generally whether R read about the campaign in any magazine. Each question has an associated follow-on asking for extent of attention to the campaign. 25% of the Pre respondents who told us that they had NOT read one of the specified magazines in the past week reported in the Post having read at least one or two articles about the campaign in a magazine. Five percent of the Post respondents who told us that they had NOT read about the campaign in any magazine reported paying attention to articles about the campaign in the magazines specified on the Pre. This is anamalous.

C. ARE THE MEASURES CAMPAIGN-REACTIVE?

Time is here defined by the four sample quarters:

Target Period A: Sept. 5-Sept. 18
Target Period B: Sept. 19-Oct. 2
Target Period C: Oct. 3-Oct. 16
Target Period D: Oct. 17-Oct. 30

In the following analyses, respondents who were interviewed outside of the target period to which they were assigned were treated as a separate category. Virtually all of the out-of target respondents were interviewed later than their sample quarter and in most analyses, this harder-to-reach group is distinctive.

Recall that we had two versions of the TV question: C2, asking how often R watched national network news, and C2b, asking how many days in the past week R had watched national news. Comparison of these questions shows that both move very modestly in the direction of increased attention through time, and roughly in parallel.

TABLE 3.   Attention to TV News By Sample Quarter

	C2 EVERY DAY	C2b 7 DAYS	C2b 5 + 6 DAYS	C2 3 or 4 DAYS	C2b 3 or 4 DAYS	C2 1 or 2 DAYS	C2b 1 or 2 DAYS	C2 LESS OR NEVER	C2b LESS OR NEVER
A.	46	26	13	19	20	20	22	16	19
B.	46	24	15	18	20	17	20	13	20
C.	46	27	14	21	21	17	19	12	20
D.	48	29	18	21	20	18	20	10	14
OUT	42	26	11	24	23	19	24	16	16

Those who were harder-to-reach tended to watch less national news on TV.

The follow-ons for the attention questions have different over-time distributions. C2a asks about how much attention to government and politics, C2c about attention to campaign. Comparisons are difficult, since C2a has three response alternatives (great deal, some and not much) and C2c has five (great deal, quite a bit, some, very little and none).

In the table that follows, I have combined the "Great deal" and Quite a bit" categories of C2c, and the "Very little" and "None" categories. The sharper responsiveness of the question about following campaign activities (in TV news watched in the last week) is quite evident.

Table 4. Extent of Attention to TV News by Sample Quarter

	Great Deal		Some		Little/Not Much	
	C2a	C2c	C2a	C2c	C2a	C2c
A.	33	43	51	35	16	22
B.	36	45	50	36	14	19
C.	37	55	50	31	13	15
D.	36	56	52	32	13	12
Out	34	50	53	34	13	15

Note that the jump in attention to coverage of campaign activities comes in target period C, which includes the first Reagan-Mondale debate and the Bush-Ferraro encounter. As is sensible, reported attention to campaign events (C2c) tracks better with the campaign than attention to news about government and politics (C2a).

Reported newspaper readership changed only slightly in the course of the campaign. Table 5 below collapses days read for ease of presentation.

Table 5. Newspaper Readership over the Campaign

	NO DAYS	1-2DAYS	3-4 DAYS	5-6 DAYS	7 DAYS
A.	23	18	11	10	38
B.	23	18	12	10	37
C.	24	16	10	9	41
D.	22	16	9	9	44
Out	23	19	14	8	35

As perhaps befits people who have a hard time scheduling appointments with interviewers, the hard-to-reach R's are less likely to report reading a newspaper 7 days a week. Basically, however, newspaper reading is only modestly responsive to campaign events.

TABLE 6. Attention to Campaign Articles, over the Campaign

	GREATDEAL	QUITEBIT	SOME	VERYLITTLE	NONE
A.	8	17	38	29	8
B.	10	14	35	26	14
C.	12	18	35	27	8
D.	11	23	36	23	7
Out	11	18	37	23	10

Among those who read newspapers, there is no strong pattern of
increased attention to campaign coverage about the campaign as the
campaign wears on, although there is a very small rise in Great Deal
and Quite a Bit of reported attention around the debate.

Magazine readership is interesting:

TABLE 7. Read Newsmagazines over the Campaign

	YES	NO
A &B	15	85
C& D	18	82
---	23	77

There is a slight movement, perhaps associated with the debates,
between the first and second halves of the interviewing period, but to
me the most interesting line in the table is the one for the
"out-of-target" respondents -- who are visibly more interested in
reading weekly news magazines.

D. FACTORS UNDERLYING THE MEDIA QUESTIONS?

A truncated principal components analysis of Pre and Post measures
separately, and pre and post measures together, was done. In each
instance, the solution was constrained to one factor.

A problem in doing analyses on these variables is that they are not
independent measures. For example, the Post A5 asks if the R watched
any programs on television. A5a., the following, asks of those who
said yes, the extent of their television watching. A5a is a question
contingent upon the answer to A5 and not independent of it.
Technically, these variables should not be included together in the

factor analysis.

The strategy I followed in most instances was to combine the follow-on
with its lead-in, so that variables were coded No; Yes, little;
yes,some; yes, lots. In the debate variables, the lead-in and
followup variables were combined to make: Yes, All; yes, part; No,
did not watch.

This was a satisfactory solution in the Post, but not as neat in the
Pre. Look at C2 with C2a, for example. Although C2a is partially
dependent on C2 (never watchers were not asked C2a), it is
theoretically independent of attention to government and politics.
(The same is true for the for the C2b and C2c pair and the C3 and C3a
pair.) Because the total proportion of the responses that were
dependent was not very large, and with the proviso that, in particular,
significance tests of these relationships are ruled out, I decided to
treat these variables as independent in the analysis.

Two pages of factor analysis output are included. The general
conclusion that I draw is that the Pre factor is dominated by attention
to news (or watching the debates) on TV. Reading NEWSWEEK seems to be
on a different "dimension" than watching Tom Brokaw, and daily
readership of the newspaper, without the focus of asking about reading
actual news in the newspaper, is also less clearly part of the
underlying factor. The performance of the radio item suggests that
Planning Committee and Board reservations about the nature of listening
to radio news have some justification: a kind of casual attention to 5
minute spot news, surely the modal way of hearing radio news, does not
have the same impact as reading newspapers or watching TV. Magazines
show up badly in the Post factor as well, despite the change in
reference from specific newsmagazines to any magazines.

The correlation of factor 1 with factor 2 is an only moderately high
.62. One doesn't know really whether we have "campaign reactivity" or
different wordings. If the wordings were the same, how high would the
correlation be? To me this suggests that more thought might be given
to splicing and/or form differences.

E. SOME MODEST VALIDITY ASSESMENTS

A place to start in assessing validity is with the notion that
attention to the media ought to be related to reported involvement.
Sure enough, both Factor 1 (pre) and Factor 2 (post) correlate
moderately well with involvement. [Involvement is measured by building
an index from Pre and Post expressions of interest in the campaign,
follow public affairs and care about outcome: as well as counting the
yes mentions on the series of questions asking about R's participation
in campaign activties -- did you go to any speeches, receive mail, wear
a campaign button, etc.] The factors relate almost identically with the
involvement measure: .61 for factor 1, .59 for factor 2.

The factors correlate less well with a measure of "information" which
is an index built of the four "knowledge" questions, J2-J5. The factor

1= .36 and factor 2= .38.

Regression analyses (with the correlation matrix) are included. The predictive power of involvement and education and information and education is virtually the same for factor 1 and factor 2. Education shows very low prediction to media attention, as it also does in the continuous Monitoring, for example.

FACTOR MATRIX (LOADINGS)   *PRE*

FACTOR 1

TVNEWS-HOW OFTEN	V204	0.78567
TVNEWS-ATTN	R205	-0.73362
HM DAYS WATCH TV	R206	-0.80505
TVNEWS ATTNCAMP.2	R1207	0.82633
HM DAYS READ NEWSPAPER	V208	-0.46292
ARTICLES.ATTN.2	R1212	0.64019
ATTN MAG.2	R1214	0.35398

POST   **FACTOR 1**

HOW MUCH LISTEN	R5103	-0.36954
HM MAG ART READ	R5105	-0.45364
HM NEWS ART READ	R5107	-0.61357
WTCHED HOW MANY	R5109	-0.72805
WATCH HOW MUCH	R5111	-0.73762
WATCH 2ND HM	R5113	-0.77108
WATCH VP HM	R5115	-0.73755

FACTOR CONTRIBUTIONS

FACTOR 1

SUM SQUARED LOADINGS	3.23585
% TOTAL VARIANCE	46.22641
CUM. % TOTAL VARIANCE	46.22641
% COMMON VARIANCE	99.99997
CUM. % COMMON VARIANCE	99.99997

FACTOR CONTRIBUTIONS

FACTOR 1

SUM SQUARED LOADINGS	2.93150
% TOTAL VARIANCE	41.87859
CUM. % TOTAL VARIANCE	41.87859
% COMMON VARIANCE	99.99997
CUM. % COMMON VARIANCE	99.99997

COMMUNALITY ESTIMATES

VARIABLE	FINAL INPUT	OUTPUT
V204	1.00000	0.61728
R205	1.00000	0.53820
R206	1.00000	0.64811
R1207	1.00000	0.68282
V208	1.00000	0.21429
R1212	1.00000	0.40985
R1214	1.00000	0.12530
SUM	7.00000	3.23585 (COMMON VARIANCE)

COMMUNALITY ESTIMATES

VARIABLE	FINAL INPUT	OUTPUT
R5103	1.00000	0.13656
R5105	1.00000	0.20579
R5107	1.00000	0.37647
R5109	1.00000	0.53006
R5111	1.00000	0.54408
R5113	1.00000	0.59457
R5115	1.00000	0.54398
SUM	7.00000	2.93150 (COMMON VARIANC

0THE NUMBER OF VARIABLES IS 14
0INPUT MATRIX   1 USED
1JUL 31, 1985 FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR PRE AND POST MEDIA VARIABLES
  FACTAN   2

0 P R I N C I P A L   C O M P O N E N T S   A N A L Y S I S
-THE CHARACTERISTIC ROOTS

0		LAMBDA	PER CENT	CUMULATIVE
0	1	4.99158	35.65%	35.65%
0	2	1.67354	11.95%	47.61%
0	3	1.30310	9.31%	56.92%
0	4	1.12539	8.04%	64.95%
0	5	0.93723	6.69%	71.65%
0	6	0.68123	4.87%	76.52%
0	7	0.59148	4.22%	80.74%
0	8	0.49658	3.55%	84.29%
0	9	0.46369	3.31%	87.60%
0	10	0.44626	3.19%	90.79%
0	11	0.43232	3.09%	93.87%
0	12	0.37371	2.67%	96.54%
0	13	0.28503	2.04%	98.58%
0	14	0.19876	1.42%	100.00%
0	SUM	13.99991		

0FACTOR MATRIX (LOADINGS)
0

		FACTOR 1
TVNEWS-HOW OFTEN	V204	-0.66774
TVNEWS-ATTN	R205	0.67028
HM DAYS WATCH TV	R206	0.68049
TVNEWS ATTNCAMP.2	R1207	-0.75976
HM DAYS READ NEWSPAPER	V208	0.44016
ARTICLES.ATTN.2	R1212	-0.65235
ATTN MAG.2	R1214	-0.37476
HOW MUCH LISTEN #	R5103	-0.31703
HM MAG ART READ	R5105	-0.46332
HM NEWS ART READ	R5107	-0.62562
WTCHED HOW MANY	R5109	-0.64048
WATCH HOW MUCH	R5111	-0.62175
WATCH 2ND HM	R5113	-0.64532
WATCH VP HM	R5115	-0.61368

0COMMUNALITY ESTIMATES

0	VARIABLE	FINAL INPUT	OUTPUT
0	V204	1.00000	0.4458
0	R205	1.00000	0.44928
0	R206	1.00000	0.4630
0	R1207	1.00000	0.57723
0	V208	1.00000	0.19374
0	R1212	1.00000	0.42556
0	R1214	1.00000	0.14044
0	R5103	1.00000	0.10051
0	R5105	1.00000	0.21467
0	R5107	1.00000	0.39141
0	R5109	1.00000	0.41022
0	R5111	1.00000	0.38655
0	R5113	1.00000	0.41644
0	R5115	1.00000	0.37668
0	SUM	14.00000	4.99161

0FACTOR CONTRIBUTIONS
0

	FACTOR 1
SUM SQUARED LOADINGS	4.99161
% TOTAL VARIANCE	35.65433
CUM. % TOTAL VARIANCE	35.65433
% COMMON VARIANCE	99.99997
CUM. % COMMON VARIANCE	99.99997

&REGRESSN DICTIN=S6ZP:MERG.DI DATAIN=SGZP:MERG.DA
REGRESSIONAL ANALYSIS
RECODE=1 PRINT=(CORREL,USTATS)
V=R10,V819 DEPV=R901
V=R10,V819 DEPV=R902
V=R15,V819 DEP=R901
V=R15,V819 DEP=R902
1*** REGRESSN - REGRESSION ANALYSIS ***
0JUL 24, 1985 REGRESSIONAL ANALYSIS
EGRESSN   1
OTHE NUMBER OF VARIABLES IS 5
OILLEGAL CHARACTERS IN THE DATA WILL
 BE TREATED AS MISSING DATA
OTHE DATA ARE NOT WEIGHTED
OTHE DATA WERE TRANSFORMED BY RECODE NUMBER 1

OTOTAL CASE COUNT: 1778
-UNIVARIATE STATISTICS

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	RANGE		VARIABLE NAME
			MIN	MAX	
R10	14.9342	5.4235	3.0000	31.0000	INVOLVEMENT
V819	6.0157	2.3416	1.0000	10.0000	PRE-84 Y3X: SUMMARY
R901	-0.0576	0.9833	-2.1219	2.2986	FACTOR 1
R902	0.0265	0.9929	-1.9887	1.8512	FACTOR 2
R15	1.8088	1.4104	0.0000	4.0000	INFORMATION

OCORRELATION MATRIX

0		R10	V819	R901	R902	R15
		INVOLVEMEN T	PRE-84 Y3X : SUMMARY	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	INFORMATIO N
INVOLVEMENT	R10	1.0000				
PRE-84 Y3X: SUMMARY	V819	0.2925	1.0000			
FACTOR 1	R901	-0.5922	-0.1816	1.0000		
FACTOR 2	R902	0.6149	0.2292	-0.6182	1.0000	
INFORMATION	R15	0.4083	0.3448	-0.3591	0.3846	1.0000

RESSN   2

TANDARD REGRESSION

HE DEPENDENT VARIABLE IS R901   FACTOR   1

STANDARD ERROR OF ESTIMATE	0.79
F-RATIO FOR THE REGRESSION	479.578	PROBABILITY 0.00
MULTIPLE CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	0.5923	ADJUSTED 0.5917
FRACTION OF EXPLAINED VARIANCE	0.3508	ADJUSTED 0.3501
DETERMINANT OF THE CORRELATION MATRIX	0.91442
RESIDUAL DEGREES OF FREEDOM (N-K-1)	1,775
CONSTANT TERM	1.56180	STD. ERROR 0.06509

VARIABLE	B	SIGMA(B)	BETA	SIGMA(BETA)	PARTIAL R	MARGINAL RSQD	T-RATIO (PROB.)	COVARIAN RATIO
OLV) R10	-0.10688	0.00363	-0.58954	0.02000	-0.573	0.3178	29.4780 (0.000)	0.0856
C) V819	-0.00385	0.00840	-0.00917	0.02000	-0.010	0.0001	0.4587 (0.646)	0.0856

SUMMARY

GRESSN   3

STANDARD REGRESSION

THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE IS R902   FACTOR   2

STANDARD ERROR OF ESTIMATE	0.78
F-RATIO FOR THE REGRESSION	545.765	PROBABILITY 0.00
MULTIPLE CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	0.6171	ADJUSTED 0.6165
FRACTION OF EXPLAINED VARIANCE	0.3808	ADJUSTED 0.3801
DETERMINANT OF THE CORRELATION MATRIX	0.91442
RESIDUAL DEGREES OF FREEDOM (N-K-1)	1,775
CONSTANT TERM	-1.74909	STD. ERROR 0.06420

VARIABLE	B	SIGMA(B)	BETA	SIGMA(BETA)	PARTIAL R	MARGINAL RSQD	T-RATIO (PROB.)	COVARIAN RATIO
N VOU) 10	0.10969	0.00358	0.59916	0.01953	0.588	0.3283	30.6758 (0.000)	0.0856
DUC) V819	0.02285	0.00828	0.05388	0.01953	0.065	0.0027	2.7584 (0.006)	0.085

SUMMARY

EGRESSN   4

-STANDARD REGRESSION

OTHE DEPENDENT VARIABLE IS R901   FACTOR   1

0	STANDARD ERROR OF ESTIMATE	0.92
0	F-RATIO FOR THE REGRESSION	135.841	PROBABILITY 0.00
0	MULTIPLE CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	0.3643	ADJUSTED 0.3630
0	FRACTION OF EXPLAINED VARIANCE	0.1327	ADJUSTED 0.1318
0	DETERMINANT OF THE CORRELATION MATRIX	0.88114
0	RESIDUAL DEGREES OF FREEDOM (N-K-1)	1,775
0	CONSTANT TERM	0.53250	STD. ERROR 0.06062

VARIABLE	B	SIGMA(B)	BETA	SIGMA(BETA)	PARTIAL R	MARGINAL RSQD	T-RATIO (PROB.)	COVARIA RATIO
V819 (EDUC)	-0.02756	0.00989	-0.06564	0.02355	-0.066	0.0038	2.7874 (0.006)	0.11
R15 (INFO)	-0.23456	0.01642	-0.33646	0.02355	-0.321	0.0998	14.2884 (0.000)	0.11

SUMMARY

JL 24, 1985   REGRESSIONAL ANALYSIS
RESSN   5
ANDARD REGRESSION
HE DEPENDENT VARIABLE IS   R902   FACTOR   2
     STANDARD ERROR OF ESTIMATE   0.91
     F-RATIO FOR THE REGRESSION   167.163   PROBABILITY 0.00
     MULTIPLE CORRELATION COEFFICIENT   0.3981   ADJUSTED   0.3969
     FRACTION OF EXPLAINED VARIANCE   0.1585   ADJUSTED   0.1576
     DETERMINANT OF THE CORRELATION MATRIX   0.88114
     RESIDUAL DEGREES OF FREEDOM (N-K-1)   1,775
     CONSTANT TERM   -0.69466   STD. ERROR   0.06029

ARIABLE	B	SIGMA(B)	BETA	SIGMA(BETA)	PARTIAL R	MARGINAL RSQD	T-RATIO (PROB.)	COVARIANC RATIO
V619 (EDUC)	0.04647	0.00984	0.10959	0.02320	0.111	0.0106	4.7244 (0.000)	0.1189
MMARY								
R15 INFO	0.24415	0.01633	0.34682	0.02320	0.334	0.1060	14.9520 (0.000)	0.1189

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305

9 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 Fall Pre/Post Study

In order to prepare for the 1986 study committee, the
following analyses of the media attention item in the Fall
Pre/Post study should be undertaken:

I. MARGINALS:

A. Total sample -- Pre-election
204 C2, TV News, how often
205 C2a, TV News, how much att'n
206 C2b, TV News, how many days last week
R 207 C2c, TV News, att'n to campaign
208 C3, Newspapers, how many days last week
R 212 C3b, Newspapers, att'n to campaign
213 C4, Newsmags, read one last week
R 214 C4b, Newsmags, att'n to campaign

B. Total sample -- Post-election
502 A2, Radio, follow campaign
503 A2a, Radio, frequency of use
504 A3, Newsmags, follow campaign
R 505 A3a, Newsmags, frequency of use
506 A4, Newspapers, follow campaign
R 507 A4a, Newspapers, frequency of use
508 A5, TV, follow campaign
509 A5a, TV, frequency of use
510 A6, watch first debate
511 A6a, watch all or part
512 A7, watch 2nd debate
513 A7a, watch all or part
514 A8, watch VP debate
515 A8a, watch all or part

C. Pre-Election Marginals in the early to late sample
replicates.

II. RELIABILITIES

A. Test-Retest: Cross-tabulate the following pairs of variables:

PRE-ELECTION	POST-ELECTION
1.C2 204 with	A5a 5109R
2.C2a 205 with	A5 5108
3.C2c 201R with	A5a 5109 R
4.C3 208 with	A4a 517 R
5.C3b with	A4 5
6.C4 13 with	A3a R
7.C4a 215 with	A3 R

B. Part/Whole Relationships

1. Factor analyses -- constrained to single factor solutions:

   a. Pre: C2,C2a,C2b,C2c,C3,C3b,C4,C4c
   b. Post: A2,A2a,A3,A3a,A4,A4a,A5
      A5a,A6,A6a,A7,A7a,A8,A8a
   c. All 22 items in a. and b.

2. Construct factor score for each respondent from analyses 1.a and 1.b and correlate them

III. VALIDITIES

A. After reviewing the reliability analyses, regress a measure of "involvement" [see: Recode #1 below] on the "media use" factor score with Y3 (education) on the right hand side of the equation.

B. Repeat the same analysis for a measure of "information" [see: Recode #2, below]

IV. RECODES

A. Involvement:

Item	Original	Recode
A1 (Pre)	1=very 3=somewhat 5=not much 8=DK	5=very 3=somewhat 1=not much 0=DK
A1 (Post)	1=very 3=somewhat 5=not much 8=DK	5=very 3=somewhat 1=not much 0=DK
A4 (Pre)	1=care a lot 3=don't care much	5=care a lot 1=don't care much
H1 (Post)	1=most 2=some 3=only now/then 4=hardly at all 8=DK	5=most 4=some 2=only now/then 1=hardly at all 0=DK

handwritten: V 101, V 5101, V 106, V 5733

Count the number of "Yesses" on the following items:
   D3,D4,D5,D6,D7,D8,D9,D10b,D11b,D12b,D14
handwritten: 5411 5912 5413 914 594, 5417, 591B, 5427, 5930, 5933, 5935

Sum the recoded scores on the four indicated items together
with the count of the number of yesses on the D-sequence to
form an index that should range from 1 [low] to 31 [high]

B. Information:

Item	Original	Recode
J2 *R575/*	5=right 1,8=wrong	1=right 0=wrong
J3 *R5752*	5=right 1,8=wrong	1=right 0=wrong
J4 *R5753*	1=right 5,8=wrong	1=right 0=wrong
J5 *R5754*	1=right 5,8=wrong	1=right 0=wrong

Sum the recoded responses to these four items to form the
index of information 0 [low] to 4 [high]

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305

9 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 Fall Pre/Post Study

In order to prepare for the 1986 study committee, the
following analyses of the media attention items in the Fall
Pre/Post study should be undertaken:

I. MARGINALS:

A. Total sample -- Pre-election
204 C2, TV News, how often
205 C2a, TV News, how much att'n
206 C2b, TV News, how many days last week
R 207 C2c, TV News, att'n to campaign
208 C3, Newspapers, how many days last week
R 212 C3b, Newspapers, att'n to campaign
213 C4, Newsmags, read one last week
R 214 C4b, Newsmags, att'n to campaign

B. Total sample -- Post-election
5102 A2, Radio, follow campaign
5103 A2a, Radio, frequency of use
5104 A3, Newsmags, follow campaign
R 5105 A3a, Newsmags, frequency of use
5106 A4, Newspapers, follow campaign
R 5107 A4a, Newspapers, frequency of use
5108 A5, TV, follow campaign
5109 A5a, TV, frequency of use
5110 A6, watch first debate
5111 A6a, watch all or part
5112 A7, watch 2nd debate
5113 A7a, watch all or part
5114 A8, watch VP debate
5115 A8a, watch all or part

C. Pre-Election Marginals in the early to late sample
replicates.

MAR 1 4 1985

II. RELIABILITIES

A. Test-Retest: Cross-tabulate the following pairs of variables:

PRE-ELECTION   POST-ELECTION

1.C2 204 with	A5a	5109 R
2.C2a 205 with	A5	5108
3.C2c 201 R with	A5a	5109 R
4.C32 06 with	A4a	51- R
5.C3b -- R with	A4	5
6.C4 /3 with	A3a	5 R
7.C4a 24 R with	A3	R

B. Part/Whole Relationships

1. Factor analyses -- constrained to single factor solutions:
   a. Pre: C2,C2a,C2b,C2c,C3,C3b,C4,C4c
   b. Post: A2,A2a,A3,A3a,A4,A4a,A5
      A5a,A6,A6a,A7,A7a,A8,A8a
   c. All 22 items in a. and b.

2. Construct factor score for each respondent from analyses 1.a and 1.b and correlate them

III. VALIDITIES

A. After reviewing the reliability analyses, regress a measure of "involvement" [see: Recode #1 below] on the "media use" factor score with Y3 (education) on the right hand side of the equation.

B. Repeat the same analysis for a measure of "information" [see: Recode #2, below]

IV. RECODES

A. Involvement:

Item	Original	Recode
A1 (Pre)	1=very 3=somewhat 5=not much 8=DK	5=very 3=somewhat 1=not much 0=DK
A1 (Post)	1=very 3=somewhat 5=not much 8=DK	5=very 3=somewhat 1=not much 0=DK
A4 (Pre)	1=care a lot 3=don't care much	5=care a lot 1=don't care much
H1 (Post)	1=most 2=some 3=only now/then 4=hardly at all 8=DK	5=most 4=some 2=only now/then 1=hardly at all 0=DK

handwritten annotations: V 101, ewt comp, √ 5101, post act, V 106, √ 5733 follow post

Count the number of "Yesses" on the following items:
D3,D4,D5,D6,D7,D8,D9,D10b,D11b,D12b,D14

handwritten: 5411 5912 5413 5914 5916, 5417, 5918, 5427, 5430, 5433, 5435

Sum the recoded scores on the four indicated items together with the count of the number of yesses on the D-sequence to form an index that should range from 1 [low] to 31 [high]

B. Information:

Item	Original	Recode
J2 *RS751*	5=right 1,8=wrong	1=right 0=wrong
J3 *RS752*	5=right 1,8=wrong	1=right 0=wrong
J4 *RS753*	1=right 5,8=wrong	1=right 0=wrong
J5 *RS754*	1=right 5,8=wrong	1=right 0=wrong

Sum the recoded responses to these four items to form the index of information 0 [low] to 4 [high]

RE: NEWSPAPER CODE

The concern with the Newspaper Code this year was the considerable time it took to code. However, it appears that this was largely a function of the change in sampling frame since the last time we used the code (1980-Post). Also, the Rolling Cross-Section further increased the new sample points, adding considerably to the number of new papers mentioned. In 1984 Pre-Election we coded 88 newspapers that were not part of the 1980 Newspaper Code, and for Rolling Cross-Section we coded 174 new papers. (In addition, there was a large number of mentions that remained in "other" category--309 in Pre-Election and 1059 in Rolling Cross-Section.) In contrast, from the 1978 survey to the 1980 survey, studies based on the same sampling frame, we had to add only 11 newspapers. If this small number of addition is typical for studies based on the same sampling frame, then for subsequent surveys based on the SRC 1980 sampling frame for NES we should have a fairly complete Newspaper Code. However, if a Rolling Cross-Section component is added or if the number of PAs is increased, we may again see a large number of newspapers.

Even though we may not face too much difficulty coding newspapers until the sampling frame changes again (with the 1990 census), we may want to think about the utility and efficiency of this coding process. We get quite a variety of papers and many with only a few mentions. The list of papers on the following page, based on the Pre-Election survey, reports all papers (N=32) that received 1% or more of the total number of mentions (N=2649). These papers constitute almost half (46%) of all mentions. The remaining 54% of the mentions are spread across 194 papers and 309 mentions that remained in the "other" category; a considerable number of these papers received only a few mentions.

The question we need answered is how useful the Newspaper Code is in its present form--coding just name of paper and city of publication. We also need to determine how useful it is to code papers that have only a few mentions. Below is a description of the coding process and possible alternatives to this procedure.

Coding Procedure: For any paper mentioned that is not in the code, the coders wrote a MAKE CARD for the staff. Coders were complaining about the amount of cards they had to write. (We do not have any actual count of the number of cards but a realistic, probably low, estimate is 500.) The staff accumulated and sorted the cards. Any paper that was mentioned 3 or more times was added to the code after verifying that the paper was a daily and determining the correct, complete name. This process was rather time-consuming for several reasons:

--There was no single, complete listing of U.S. newspapers. It was often necessary to consult several different sources to determine the name of the paper and if the paper was a daily.

--The complete name of the paper was not always provided, making it difficult to identify multiple mentions and to be sure which paper R was referring to.

There was a total of 2649 papers mentioned, summing across the three responses. The 32 papers listed below were the most frequently mentioned and are ordered here by number of mention.

Paper	Mentions #	Mentions %
Wall Street Journal	79	3.0
Los Angeles Times	66	2.5
USA Today	63	2.4
New York Times	51	1.9
Milwaukee Journal	51	1.9
Eugene Register-Guard	50	1.9
Des Moines Register	44	1.7
Detroit Free Press	43	1.6
Buffalo Evening News	42	1.6
New York News	41	1.5
San Francisco Chronicle	40	1.5
Elmira Star Gazette (NY)	37	1.4
Rawlins Times (WY)	35	1.3
Shelbyville Times Gazette (TN)	35	1.3
Lakeland Ledger (FL)	34	1.3
Grand Rapids Press	34	1.3
Port Huron Times Herald (MI)	34	1.3
Manchester Union Leader	33	1.2
Statesboro Herald (GA)	33	1.2
Chicago Sun Times	32	1.2
Houston Post	32	1.2
Ledger-Enquirer (GA)	32	1.2
Fresno Bee	31	1.2
The Robisonian (NC)	30	1.1
Chicago Tribune	28	1.1
Milwaukee Sentinel	27	1.0
Atlantic City Press	27	1.0
Denver Rocky Mountain NEWS (CO)	26	1.0
New York Post	26	1.0
Sacramento Bee	26	1.0
Birmingham News (AL)	26	1.0
Daily Herald (Plainview, TX)	26	1.0
	1214	45.8%

--Often a paper had evening, morning, and Sunday editions and it
was difficult to determine which edition R was referring to.
We also had the question of whether the morning and evening
editions of a paper should be coded as two mentions. (We
did code as two mentions.)

Alternatives:

--Continue as is, if users are satisfied with the code and find
the coding of papers with few mentions useful. Including this
question only in the Pre/Post and not in a Rolling Cross Section
component would confine the number of new papers considerably.

--Set the threshold higher and add a paper only after it is has a
considerable number of mentions. (This would still necessitate
the writing of MAKE CARDS by coders and the compiling of cards
by staff.)

--Devise a different coding scheme which would include more
information about the papers and allow some collapsing of codes.
(This option would require considerable investment of time and
should not be undertaken unless we are sure there is considerable
usage for such a code.)

--Code only papers with a certain (high) circulation--nationally
and in the PAs of the survey.

--Collect the names of the papers but do not code them.