INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road. Ann Arbor. MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9403982

The role of the campaign media in the political issue learning of new U.S. citizens

Martinelli, Kathleen Ann, Ph.D.

Stanford University, 1993

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE ROLE OF THE CAMPAIGN MEDIA IN THE POLITICAL ISSUE LEARNING OF NEW U.S. CITIZENS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

AND THE COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES

OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Kathleen Ann Martinelli

August 1993

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Steven H. Chaffee (Principal Advisor)

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Byron Reeves

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Jeremy Cohen

Approved for the University Committee on Graduate Studies:

THE ROLE OF THE CAMPAIGN MEDIA IN
THE POLITICAL ISSUE LEARNING OF NEW U.S. CITIZENS

Kathleen Ann Martinelli
Stanford University, 1993

A cross sectional survey of newly naturalized U.S. citizens (N=199), during the month preceding the 1988 U.S. presidential election, explores the effects of the mass media on political issue knowledge of new voters. In particular, the study uses within-media measures of exposure, attention, and recall to explore the influences of three types of media -- newspapers, television news, and television ads -- on political socialization. Controlling for traditional indicators of immigrant political socialization, each of these three channels made a separate, significant contribution to issue learning. For newspapers and television news, questions about attention were the strongest of the three predictor items, which also included measures of frequency of exposure, and campaign item recall. Media use measures for television campaign advertisements were limited to attention and recall items; the recall measure was designed specifically for this study. Recall of television advertisements was, by far, the media variable with the greatest predictive strength. These results held even with a more stringent test, controlling for other political knowledge. The results demonstrate that newspapers, television news, and televised campaign advertisements each play a part in the political

socialization of new citizens. They also point to the need for further explorations of different measures of media use, especially with regard to advertisements.

Dividing the respondents into high versus low groups based on English language competency and length of time in the U.S., did not replicate previous findings that immigrants use television as a bridging medium in political socialization. Trust in news was negatively correlated with knowledge, but interacted with news attention to predict learning.

Overall, the fact that each channel made a separate contribution to issue learning, means that each channel provided issue information to voters through its coverage of the 1988 presidential campaign.

Dedicated with love

To Bobby
for dreams and lunch that lasts forever

PREFACE

I have loved reading all my life. During the last year I have come to the conclusion that writing a novel is a labor of love and writing a dissertation is a labor!

I am fortunate to have been able to work with and learn from the professors and students in this department. I thank them all for their patience with me through this long ordeal. It has been a special privilege to have worked under my advisor, Steve Chaffee. I thank Steve for his guidance, for his calm throughout my storm, for his careful editing and suggestions, and for his accessibility despite all the other demands on his time. I will never cease to marvel at how a brief conversation with him can reveal the hidden way out of a maze of seemingly confusing ideas.

To Jeremy Cohen I owe a special debt of gratitude. His teaching skills and genuine concern for his students have been truly inspiring. My experience as his head TA for Comm 1 boosted my confidence and helped me to grow. I will never forget it. Nor will I forget his friendship and moral support at a time when I felt my life was crumbling.

I thank Byron Reeves for my firsthand introduction to the world of experimental research and for his help in trying to unlock that "black box" of cognition we call the mind. I thank him also for

inspiring the recall measures in this dissertation, and for his support in my job search. Don Roberts not only agreed to serve on my orals committee as the clock approached midnight, saving me from a fate worse than "pumpkinhood," but gave me some special insights into thinking and writing. I won't use the word "utilize" under any conditions (well, perhaps at gunpoint). Cliff Nass's advice on statistics and job hunting have been especially helpful. And I can't thank him enough for getting my computer account back with a quick phone call and a few swift keystrokes.

I also thank some special faculty members in the Department of Political Science -- Dick Brody and Paul Sniderman -- for their roles in fueling my interest in political communication. I especially owe John Ferejohn for an introduction to the world of Congress, for his homemade seminar pizzas, and for forgiving me for running out of gas in his driveway!

The students in this department have provided special encouragement, intellectual stimulation, and friendship. Members of my own "cohort" are now spread across the country, but were always willing to throw out a life preserver or two when I needed them -- especially in statistics. Ed Maibach, Mikey Basil, John Newhagen, and Laurie Mason are simply the best, and that is what I wish for them always. Students from previous years also provided help, encouragement, and friendship. Among them, Erica Austin and Sara Spears have special places in my heart.

Lola Romero has helped immensely to make my frenzied life a little less harried and hassled during these past few months. My deepest thanks goes out to her for her level head and calm approach to the paper chase. And to my friend and confidant Gloria Beckwith I wish happiness always. I wouldn't have survived without her to laugh with, to cry with, and to share with.

I also appreciate the funding support I received from the Stanford Office of Graduate Studies and the Department of Communication. Both were generous and helped make this project possible. Thanks also to the new citizens who cared enough to take the time to complete the surveys I sent them.

Much love and gratitude goes to my parents, who showed me the worlds I could visit through books, and who instilled in me both a fighting spirit that has gotten me over many a rough wave, and a gentleness and understanding that allows me to be accepting of others. Most of all, I thank them for their love and guidance, without which I couldn't have come this far.

The dedication of this dissertation cannot even begin to express my thanks to my husband, Bobby, for his contributions to this enterprise. His limitless love, and his advice, support, encouragement, patience, and strength have made even the roughest currents seem smooth. I thank him too for the most delicious meals imaginable, and for understanding when I had bursitis of the brain and couldn't concentrate!

Finally, I thank God for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

THE ROLE OF THE CAMPAIGN MEDIA IN THE POLITICAL ISSUE LEARNING OF NEW U.S. CITIZENS: AN INTRODUCTION

America has been a society of immigrants throughout its history. Every year hundreds of thousands immigrate to the United States, some of whom choose to become permanent residents and acquire citizenship. A number of these individuals encounter a political system that is strikingly different from that of their native countries. It is reasonable to assume that if these adults had developed political identities or politically relevant attitudinal dispositions in their native countries, their adaptation to the United States would necessitate a change in these established attitudes, i.e. political resocialization would be necessary.

If political socialization is a process of induction into the political culture, as Almond (1960) writes, it may be reasonable to expect that newly naturalized U.S. citizens -- a group that comprises a portion of the cohort of new voters in each election -- have a greater immediate need for political information/ orientation than do most indigenous adults. When combining this need with the fact that the mass media are primary sources of

political information, it follows that in seeking such knowledge, new citizens will turn to the mass media. While there is a long history of immigrant socialization research in the United States, researchers are just beginning to examine the role of the media in the political socialization of immigrants.

Over the past two decades, the relationship between the mass media and political socialization in general has been a major topic among mass communication scholars. Current approaches conceptualize political socialization as a process through which individuals develop relevant knowledge, skills, and dispositions that allow them to function competently within the existing sociopolitical structure. But while political socialization has received attention from scholars, particular groups have been neglected in studies. First, the subjects of this research most frequently have been children, even though Brim and Wheeler (1966) proposed the importance of examining adult political socialization. Second, most of the political socialization research has ignored an important characteristic of American society: the existence of ethnic subcultures. Thus, while questions concerning immigrants' adaptation to the United States played an early role in sociological research (Thomas and Znaniecki, 1927), it was not until recently that immigrants' political socialization became a specific research concern.[1]

---

[1]Thomas and Znaniecki studied the adaptation of Polish immigrants in Chicago, one of six major old Polish colonies in the U.S., in part through their written communication (letters). They outlined a number of the

For induction into the political culture to occur, learning must take place. This learning might involve, depending on the individual's prior knowledge, how American democracy functions, the policy thrusts of the two major political parties, and where candidates stand on current issues. For naturalized citizens, some knowledge of the U.S. government and U.S. history can be assumed, since both are requirements for general naturalization.[2] However, knowledge of candidate issue positions cannot be assumed. It is precisely this issue learning, which arises within the context of a major election campaign, with which this dissertation is concerned.

Since the mid-1970s, the study of the relative contributions to issue learning of different media -- particularly television advertisements, television news, and newspapers -- has been a topic of controversy in the media effects literature. Research traditions central to the present study also include differential use of newspapers and television news in acquiring political knowledge (Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986), immigrants' use of television as a bridge to public affairs (Chaffee, Nass, and Yang, 1990), and new voters' characteristics and impact on the U.S.

---

factors that played a role in their socialization and later in their disorganization.

[2]Additional requirements for general naturalization, according to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, include the ability to speak, read, and write English; lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence; continuous residence in this country for at least five years; being at least 18 years of age; and possessing "good character."

political system (Jennings and Niemi, 1981; Nie, Verba, and Petrocik, 1976).

This dissertation deals with aspects of political socialization that have been largely ignored in the literature. It focuses on the relationship between the use of mass media by newly naturalized citizens, and the knowledge they acquired of the issue positions of George Bush and Michael Dukakis in the 1988 presidential campaign. Since more people depend on television for their news than on any other medium, understanding more about the media's role in political learning is an important endeavor (McLeod and McDonald, 1985). For instance, do adult new citizens receive their politically relevant information from television news, similar to native-born adolescents, or from newspapers, similar to native-born adults?

In addition, because much of the debate around this question has centered on the particulars of the measures of media contact used -- different measures producing different findings (McLeod and McDonald, 1985; Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986) -- this dissertation will approach the question using a variety of measures of media use.

The final area to be explored in this study is the relationship between media credibility (operationally defined as trust in media channels) and political knowledge. Chaffee, Nass, and Yang (1991) studied trust in U.S. media among Korean Americans. Their findings indicated that only with experience in the U.S. were

immigrants able to recognize the independence of the U.S. Press from the U.S. government. In addition, it has been demonstrated that those who are skeptical of news media are less influenced by media content than those who are more trusting (Bishop, Boersma, and Williams, 1969). These studies point to the importance of examining whether media trust affects issue learning of this immigrant sample.

This study is organized into six major chapters and two appendices. The following chapter presents a literature review of theories and empirical findings concerning: (1) new voters; (2) political socialization of immigrants; (3) pluralism and assimilation in political socialization; and (4) the role of the mass media in political socialization. Chapter 3 presents a review of the literature on political learning and the mass media. A brief review of pertinent media trust studies and content studies of media issue coverage during the 1988 presidential campaign also are presented in Chapter 3. The variables and questions addressed in this study are presented in this chapter as well.

Chapter 4 presents the methods employed for the study, including sampling procedures, measurements of variables, and statistical procedures to test the questions advanced in Chapter 3. The findings are presented and discussed in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 summarizes the study and presents theoretical and empirical implications for the findings. This chapter also includes limitations of this study and suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2

IMMIGRANT POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION AND MASS MEDIA INFLUENCES

For the immigrant to the United States, the continuing process of socialization reflects the individual's adaptation to a new environment that has social, cultural, and political aspects. While immigrant socialization is a research area that has been explored scientifically since the early 1900s, political socialization in general is a relatively new topic, especially in the media effects literature. Consequently, study of the effects of media use on immigrants' political socialization is an even newer area of exploration. Assessing the relationships between immigrants' mass media use and their political socialization involves a number of questions. First, if immigrants are resocialized (or experience secondary socialization) in the host society, how does the process differ from the original (or primary) socialization of native-born people? Second, assuming, based on previous research, that immigrants' use of the host society's mass media is a part of their socialization to the host society, what roles do the media play in this process? Third, what theories in the media effects literature can be applied to immigrant socialization? Fourth, what has previous research on the mass media and political socialization

shown? Fifth, what has been done to study the effects of mass media use on immigrant political socialization? Finally, the citizenship recently acquired by the respondents in this study qualifies them to vote in U.S. elections. What has research shown about new voters and how do findings relate to immigrants in particular? This chapter explores these questions through a review of the theories and empirical findings in the relevant literatures. Because socialization of indigenous minority groups has been studied more frequently than that of immigrants, and the two often have been found to be similar in factors affecting their media use and adaptation, findings from both areas of study will be presented here.

While most of the questions raised here are not addressed empirically in this study, the literatures reviewed here provide essential background context for the theoretical and real-world setting of the study itself.

The New Voter

While new voters are present in all elections in this country, their voting behavior and political involvement have been of more importance in some elections than in others (Chaffee and Becker, 1975; Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes, 1966; Levy and Kramer, 1972; Nie, Verba, and Petrocik, 1976). Research has not

limited "new voters" to citizens who came of voting age since the previous election. During the 1920s, women (who had just been given the vote through Constitutional amendment) and immigrants were particular groups of new voters who had a strong impact on the political party realignment in the United States (Nie et al., 1976).

Nie et al.'s The Changing American Voter (1976) explained the political party realignment in the 1920s from Republican to Democratic as a result of the Democratic Party's mobilization of women, immigrants, and immigrants' children, rather than as a result of conversion of Republicans. They pointed out that Southern and Eastern European immigration crested during the first decade of this century. The ten to twelve years it took for these immigrants to become naturalized citizens meant that a large cohort of their children were also coming of voting age in the 1920s. They labeled immigrants' children as "doubly immunized," because first, they had no personal political experience in the U.S., and second, they had not inherited a party identification from their immigrant parents (Nie et al., 1976, p. 77). Policies, religion, and the economic state of the nation played roles in the increasingly Democratic character of the votes cast by women and new citizens in the 1920s and 1930s.

The depression, Roosevelt's New Deal policies, and the presidential candidacy of Al Smith, a Catholic (as were many immigrants and their children), gave the Democratic Party appeal

among women and immigrant first-time voters (Nie et al., 1976). Thus as they saw themselves as being affected by the particular issues and conditions, they became politically involved and exercised their new voting rights, mostly as Democrats (Nie et al., 1976).[3]

In the early 1970s the electorate was again changing. According to Nie et al. (1976), the public was more involved in politics in the early 1970s than it had been in the previous forty years. Racial issues, the Vietnam war, the urban crisis, Watergate, and the economic recession each had profound effects on the public, especially the new cohort of voters who entered the electorate in the sixties and seventies. The major change in party alignment that occurred during these two decades was the growth in partisan independence, a change that Nie and his colleagues attributed to the cohort of new voters. The number of new voters in the 1960s and early 1970s was fairly large. This unusual increase was due to three factors: 1) the high birth rate following World War II; 2) increased political involvement (because of the issues mentioned earlier) that motivated people who had been previously eligible to vote, but hadn't, to participate (Nie et al., 1976); and 3) the 18-year-old vote, which brought 18-20 year olds into the electorate for the 1972 presidential election (Beck and Jennings, 1969; Chaffee and Becker, 1975). Nie et al. (1976)

---

[3]See also Levy and Kramer (1972) for a discussion of how ethnic groups (Italians, Germans, etc.) in the eastern and midwestern states affected party alignment and voting from the 1920s to the 1960s.

pointed out that issues pushed these new voters to a partisan commitment (independent) that was different from that of the previous generation within their own families.

Campbell et al. (1966) studied first-time voters as well as voters vs. nonvoters. They characterized the nonvoter as an individual with low involvement, "whose emotional investment in politics and its partisan decisions is on the average much less than that of the voter" (Campbell et al., 1966, p. 111). They concluded that the nonvoter could be expected to be less stable in partisan inclinations than the voter and more responsive to massive political stimuli that produce attitudinal shifts over time.

In terms of voters and first-time voters, some studies have assumed that the young have little impact on the electorate, because they tend to adopt the views and allegiances of their parents, their local and regional political surrounds, and their general socioeconomic strata. While some studies have shown some correlation between the voting tendencies of parents and their children (Campbell et al., 1954; Milbrath, 1965), as Sears (1969) pointed out, the correlations are neither great, nor especially stable over the life cycle. Other recent studies have demonstrated that the young did not follow their parents' vote choice or party identification when they reached voting age (Block, Haan, and Smith, 1969; Himmelweit, 1983; Jennings and Niemi, 1981).

In a panel study of parents and their high school children carried out in the politically turbulent era of 1965 to 1973, Jennings and Niemi (1981) found that once they were eligible to vote, the young adults did not follow their parents' vote choice or party allegiance. This finding did not vary for those who had close contact with their parents, for those who were living at home unmarried, or with the warmth of relationships or age of parents. In addition, they found no education effect at Time 2 (1973), noting that the eventual differences between the more and less educated young voters already existed at Time 1 (1965).

A number of studies support the contention that young adults are less involved in politics, are less informed, vote less often, and in general participate less than do older citizens (Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet, 1948; Campbell et al., 1966; McPhee and Glaser, 1962; Milbrath, 1965). These effects have not held among southern blacks (Agger, Goldrich, and Swanson, 1964). This indicates that age (youth) is not the critical variable. Key (1966) found that new voters were more interested in the campaign and gave more thought to their voting decision than did either "standpatters" or "switchers."

Chaffee and Becker (1975) examined the impact of Watergate on new voters in Madison, Wisconsin, in the 1972 presidential election (the first election for the 18-year-old vote). They found that young first-time voters, regardless of education, were more likely than older voters to believe high administration

officials were involved in Watergate ($p<.01$). In terms of mass media influences on young voters, Chaffee and Becker found that viewing the Ervin Committee hearings on television correlated with young voters' increases in feelings of efficacy and social responsibility, but was not associated with any changes in trust in the political system. However, reading about Watergate in newspapers and magazines was associated with an increase in trust in the political system for young voters. This held for older voters as well.

Immigrants had played an important role as new voters during the 1920s, contributing to changing the face of the American electorate. Their participation in the political system at that time was motivated by issues that affected them as well as by their religious background (for those who were Catholics) (Nie et al., 1976). Over time, new voters in general have been shown to participate more in politics when they are affected by issues and the economic climate (Campbell et al., 1966; Chaffee and Becker, 1975; Himmelweit, 1983; Jennings and Niemi, 1981; Nie et al., 1976). Few studies of new voters have specifically examined immigrants, or the impact of the media on them. Those that have indicate that attending to television news coverage of specific political events and newspaper reading about political events can affect political attitudes and participation among new voters. Which media contribute to political learning has not been examined much in this connection.

By virtue of their recently acquired citizenship, the respondents in this study present a good opportunity for following up previous studies of new immigrant voters as well as for assessing the specific impact of the media on their political issue knowledge. As Nie et al. (1976) pointed out, these respondents have no previous personal experience in U.S. politics, nor do they have a long-term history of American political party identification.[4] There is presumably a good deal of room, then, for them to add to their store of political knowledge when they experience their first U.S. election campaign in the new role as voters.

The remainder of this chapter examines research on immigrant socialization and media use by immigrants, adults, and children as background for the research questions advanced in this study.

Immigrant Socialization and Mass Media Use

Socialization will be approached in this dissertation as "the process by which people learn the fundamental parameters of their culture; they acquire an understanding of the nature of the

---

[4]This does not mean that respondents do not have a party affiliation. Of the 165 who had registered to vote at the time of this survey, 71 were registered Republicans, and 65 were Democrats; that is, more than 80 percent had registered within one of the two major parties. But the concept of "party identification" implies psychological ties that presumably run deeper than the practical matter of vote registration (Campbell et al., 1966).

society in which they must relate and function adequately and of the rules and norms that guide such functioning" (Roberts and Maccoby, 1985, p. 572). For the native-born, this process involves primary socialization and resocialization to the same society and its rules and norms over the life span. But this is not the case for the adult immigrant or new citizen, whose primary socialization was to a different society and who must undergo secondary socialization to the United States. What factors have been found to play roles in this secondary socialization process? How does the immigrant adapt to American society?

Immigrants' secondary socialization to the host society, particularly to the United States which has historically experienced significant immigration, has been scientifically studied since the mid-1930s (Olmedo, 1980). During these past sixty years, immigrants' socio-cultural adaptation has been an interdisciplinary research interest among social scientists, including anthropologists (Nagata, 1969), sociologists (Blalock, 1982; Gordon, 1964; Kim and Hurh, 1980), social psychologists (Y. Kim, 1980; Olmedo, 1980), and communication scientists (Chaffee, Nass and Yang, 1989; Chaffee and Yang, 1988; Subervi-Velez, 1986; Yang, 1988).

Among the perspectives that have dominated discussions on immigrant adaptation are assimilation and pluralism. The assimilation perspective assumes that fundamental social change leads to greater homogeneity in society. It is a "process by which a subordinate individual or group takes on the characteristics of

the dominant group and is eventually accepted as part of that group" (Schaefer, 1979, p. 37). Pluralism, on the other hand, leads to sustained ethnic differentiation and continued heterogeneity in society. According to this perspective, ethnic, national, or minority groups may practice their own cultural traits and still participate in the dominant society (Schaefer, 1979). In this case, they socialize to the host country while maintaining ties to their country of origin. Research findings from these two perspectives are important here, not for the purpose of determining the degree of socialization that has taken place among respondents, but for identifying the various factors that have been shown to influence immigrant socialization.

Research on immigrant socialization has shown that the degree of adaptation differs across individuals depending on a number of pre- and post-immigration characteristics, including, but not limited to, age at time of immigration, length of stay in the United States, the nature of the political system of the immigrant's country of origin, English language competency, use of the mass media, and education. For example, if the political system in the United States differs from the type of system in the country of origin, political learning may progress more slowly than if the systems were highly similar.[5] The following points outline the

[5]This particular factor, the nature of the political system in the country of origin, is not included in the present study because the sample sizes from each country are too small for meaningful statistical analysis and there is no agreed-upon typology for classifying countries into a few categories. This remains a topic for future investigation, especially in relation to the communication system of the country of origin.

general research findings on the above factors, which mostly enter into the present study as control variables.

(1) English-Language Media Use and Assimilation. Although many immigrants in U.S. metropolitan areas have a heterogeneous media environment (access to both host and ethnic media), the present study is limited to examining citizens' use of American media (English-language television and newspapers). This is in keeping with research that has shown immigrants' mass media use to be associated with their degree of assimilation into the host society (Goldlust and Richmond, 1974; Jeffres and Hur, 1981; J. Kim, 1980; Y. Kim, 1976; Subervi-Velez, 1984). For instance, a greater degree of assimilation would be associated with more extensive consumption of the products of the American mass media (see, for example, DeFleur and Cho, 1957), but assimilation seems to be unaffected by use of home-country media (Chaffee et al., 1990). In addition, a typical indicator of assimilation has been the immigrant's intent to establish permanent residence (i.e. "plan to live permanently in the U.S."). This factor is a given in the present study, since all respondents are naturalized citizens. Thus, it is not unreasonable to expect these citizens to have experienced a relatively high degree of assimilation, and to be using American media in some degree.

(2) Length of Time in the United States. Research has consistently demonstrated that immigrants' use of host society media increases over time, while ethnic media use gradually decreases with length of time spent in the host society (Greenberg et al., 1983; Jeffres and Hur, 1981; Y. Kim, 1976, 1978; Richmond, 1969; Subervi-Velez, 1984). Undoubtedly, time spent in the U.S. affects other relevant behaviors as well, such as English competency (Chaffee et al., 1990), and general awareness of American political issues. One challenge in studies such as this is to show that the specific variables under study (in this case, use of mass media) account for variation beyond that which can be explained by the passage of time alone.

(3) Competencies in the Host Society and Media Use. Education, socioeconomic status in the host country, and English language competency all have been shown to affect use of host society media (Chaffee, Nass, and Yang, 1990; de la Garza and Brischetto, 1983; Jeffres and Hur, 1981; Y. Kim, 1976, 1977; Lee, 1984; Subervi-Velez, 1984; Yang, 1988). In general, the higher the immigrant's competency in these areas, the more he or she would use host media, relative to ethnic media. Moreover, English competency affects the way in which immigrants learn. For instance, it has been shown that the lower the level of English competency, the more likely the immigrant will be to use American television in a manner similar to indigenous adolescents

(Chaffee et al., 1990). In specific, even well-educated immigrants will tend first to turn to television for political news rather than to newspapers; but as English competency increases (and time in the U.S. accumulates), the newspaper tends to become the chosen political news source; the newspaper also begins to outstrip television as a source of political learning, a pattern more like that found with indigenous adults in the United States (Chaffee et al., 1990).

Despite the early recognition of the role of the media in ethnics' adaptation, it was not until some fifty years later that this research area became active. Cooley (1909) alluded to the assimilation functions served by the dominant (host) society press, but it was not until the late 1950s that this topic received serious attention (DeFleur and Cho, 1957; Duncan, 1967; Gordon, 1964; Nagata, 1969; Spindler and Goldschmidt, 1952). For example, Spindler and Goldschmidt (1952) used American movie-going (together with radio possession) as a component in their index of social acculturation among Menomini Indians. Similarly, DeFleur and Cho (1957) studied the assimilation of first-generation (Issei) Japanese women. Their assimilation index included attendance at Japanese movies, attendance at American movies, time devoted to American radio or television programs, and subscriptions to American newspapers and/or magazines. Among their conclusions was that:

> "Extensive consumption of the products of the American mass media would indicate a somewhat greater facility with the majority culture patterns than would be the case of those who remained isolated from these sources." (DeFleur and Cho, 1957, p. 248)

Gordon (1964) proposed that the mass media (and public schools) exerted overwhelming acculturation powers over immigrants' children. And in reference to the socialization of immigrants in general, Shibutani and Kwan (1965) suggested that the extent to which individuals become acculturated to the way of life of the dominant group is dependent on the extent of their participation in communication channels of the dominant group. A basic assumption underlying these studies is that access to, exposure to, and use of the mass media of the dominant society aid and encourage adaptation to that society (Subervi-Velez, 1986).[6]

---

[6]Other examinations of the roles of the media in the assimilation process also have proposed that ethnic channels serve as vehicles for immigrants to learn about and to accommodate to the adopted land (Hunter, 1960; Park, 1938, 1922; Soltes, 1924; Zubrzycki, 1958). Similarly, Marzolf (1979) and Wittke (1957) have argued that while ethnic media help the immigrant adjust to the way of life of the dominant group, they also slow down the adjustment process by helping the immigrant to sustain traditional ties. While the present study does not discount the value of ethnic media in the assimilation process, it focuses strictly on the use of dominant (in this case, English-language) media since the criterion of concern here is the learning of issue differences between candidates for U.S. president, which is not itself an intellectual topic. It is interesting to note that recent research on ethnic media use tends to emphasize the intermediating role of the mass media between pre- and post-immigration characteristics and immigrants' socialization(Jeffres and Hur, 1979; Y. Kim, 1977; Subervi-Velez, 1984) rather than conceive of ethnic media use behaviors as evidence of ethnicity.

In the United States, some of the major theoretical and empirical research on the impact of the mass media on ethnic and migrant group assimilation has been conducted by Kim (1982a, 1982b, 1984). Focusing on communication patterns among Koreans in Chicago in the 1970s, Kim conducted a series of studies on interpersonal and intrapersonal communication practices of foreign immigrants in the United States. Kim (1982a) found that the use of ethnic media by immigrants decreased rapidly over time and that interaction with the dominant society's media and people greatly accelerated immigrants' acculturation. Based on these findings, Kim proposed that continuous processes involving immigrants' personal communication, social communication, and their communication environment. According to her theory and findings, the degree of acculturation is affected by the similarity between the original and the host culture, age at the time of immigration, educational background, personality characteristics -- such as tolerance for ambiguity -- and familiarity with the host culture prior to immigration (Kim, 1982a). Also considered important influences on the acculturation process are post-immigration characteristics such as social status and geographical location (for example, Subervi-Velez, 1984; Kim, 1982a).

Similar media influences have been found among Hispanics. Ownership of a television or radio set, or simple exposure to other mass media outlets, have been used as indicators of Latino adaptation. In general, Latinos have been found to have lower

exposure to print media than Anglos (Brischetto and de la Garza, 1985; Duran, 1980; Greenberg et al., 1983; Shoemaker et al., 1984). This may indicate low acculturation to print because low exposure to print appears to be related to language and status variables (Chaffee et al., 1990; Subervi-Velez, 1986). Others have found that higher education, lower age, lower income, and lower socioeconomic status were associated with greater exposure to and/or preference for English-language media among Hispanics (Brennan, 1968; de la Garza and Brischetto, 1983; Dunn, 1975). Language and residency variables have been found to follow a similar pattern. As noted above, the ability to read or to understand the language of the dominant society or ethnic group has been associated with the use of or preference for the mass media of the dominant society or ethnic group. It also has been shown that English language ability is positively related to an increased preference for or exposure to Anglo media among Hispanics (Dunn, 1975; Duran, 1980; Greenberg et al., 1983).

Greenberg et al. (1983) studied Hispanic adults in the Southwest and found that the number of years of residency in the community was positively related to the frequency of newspaper reading in general and negatively related to the amount of time immigrants spent reading Spanish newspapers. This may indicate that as acculturation progresses, immigrants become less concerned with events occurring in their countries of origin. Greenberg and his colleagues also found that the two groups had

similar profiles on, among other items, amount of time spent reading newspapers and magazines and the percentage who watched local and national news on television.

A number of studies also have examined media orientations as they are related to cultural identification. Neuendorf, Korzenny, and Armstrong (1980) found no support for the hypotheses that Spanish-surnamed Michigan residents who identified themselves as "American" would watch more English-language television, watch less Spanish-language television, and be more exposed to news content than would those who identified themselves as "Hispanic" or as "Hispanic-American". In a study of fifth and tenth grade students in the southwestern United States, Korzenny, Neuendorf, M. Burgoon, J. Burgoon, and Greenberg (1983) found that cultural identification did not appear to differentiate newspaper readership or time spent with newspapers among adolescents of different ages.

Subervi-Velez (1984) studied similarities and differences in exposure to Hispanic and Anglo media among Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban residents of Chicago. He found that exposure to the media was a function of a combination of variables for each Hispanic group -- including some support for the pluralism perspective. He also found there was a general assimilation process in Latinos' increased exposure to Anglo media and their decreased exposure to Hispanic media. The individual's language ability and the proportion of years spent in the United States also

were found to be principal variables influencing media exposure patterns of Hispanics (Subervi-Velez, 1984).

Immigrants and minorities also have been the focus of political knowledge studies. Tan (1983), who studied Blacks, Mexican-Americans and Anglos in Lubbock, Texas, found that exposure to the media contributed to political knowledge and participation among members of all three groups. In 1980 de la Garza and Brischetto (1984) studied Hispanics in San Antonio, Texas, and East Los Angeles, and found that watching local news was positively related to Latinos' turnout. They also found that reading a daily newspaper was a significant predictor of preference for a presidential candidate (Jimmy Carter) in the election. However, neither variable was associated with voters' registration nor with general political participation (de la Garza and Brischetto, 1984). In another study, de la Garza and Brischetto (1983) found that the number of hours Latinos spent listening to the radio and the frequency with which they watched local news or read newspapers had little relationship to the manner in which they defined the principal problems facing Mexican-Americans or the country, or to their evaluations of government spending or practices.

While studies of Hispanics and other minorities, such as those conducted by Tan (1983) and de la Garza and Brischetto (1983, 1984) found media use to be predictive of or associated with political knowledge, the authors failed to specify the language

used in the media that influenced or did not influence political decisions (Subervi-Velez, 1986). Subervi-Velez (1984), however, controlled for sex, age, education, proportion of years in the United States, and English and Spanish reading ability, and showed that exposure to Anglo print media had significant influence on political knowledge (but not on participation) of three Latino groups (Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban).

Finally, a major finding from the assimilation perspective on Hispanics and the media is that Mexican-Americans relied more on English-language television than on Spanish-language television for news (de la Garza and Brischetto, 1983). The respondents, regardless of education level, reported that English-language television was their most trusted source of local news. Mexican-Americans who were bilingual, or English monolinguals, reported that English-language television, followed by English newspapers, and then English radio were their most trusted sources of political news (de la Garza and Brischetto, 1983).

These studies, taken as a whole, indicate that many researchers consider mass media use by immigrants to be important. For the most part, though, they have been content to explain the antecedents of media patterns, and have merely assumed that these media experiences have important consequences. Only a few studies to date have examined in any detail the assumption that mass media are important sources of political learning for immigrants to the U.S.

Recent findings on Korean immigrants and the media. One exception to the tendency of researchers to assume, rather than test, the effects of media on immigrants' political knowledge is a study of Korean immigrants in the San Francisco Bay area. This study is the most immediate model for the present survey. Chaffee et al. (1990) examined whether Korean immigrants became socialized to new political roles and capabilities through newspapers, as has seemed to be the case for indigenous adults, or through television news, as has seemed to be the case for indigenous adolescents. They controlled for factors such as education, Korean and American social contacts, age at immigration, length of time in the United States, intention to remain in the United States or to return to Korea, United States citizenship, socioeconomic status, and psychological identification of self. They found that, similar to the indigenous adolescent, the newcomer to American politics is not as prepared to read newspapers as are indigenous adults. As a result, television becomes the medium through which immigrants begin to learn about political issues and to get involved in discussions (1990). This makes sense when the ease of watching television and of comprehending television news are taken into account. While clarity of a message is necessary in both print and broadcast, television focuses on no more than three ideas per story, and sentences are shorter and written in active voice, all of which should make the stories easier to process. When lack of English

language skills and United States political schemata place a significant constraint on reading, television can fill the resultant information gap.

Chaffee et al. (1990) also concluded that individuals with stronger language skills and greater exposure to U. S. politics get more out of the newspaper. This holds for indigenous U.S. adults, Korean immigrants reading Korean newspapers, or Korean-Americans with strong English skills reading American newspapers.

In terms of the importance of English language competency in the political socialization of immigrants, Chaffee et al. wrote that "television is neither the ultimate nor the optimal medium of choice in political socialization, but it is the key medium for those who have little choice" (1990). The education of Korean immigrants also was found to be of some consequence through its effect on language competency which, in turn, affected media use. For example, more highly educated Koreans were more likely to have strong English-language capabilities and, therefore, to have read English-language newspapers. These results among Korean immigrants are consistent with those reported earlier for other immigrant and indigenous minority groups.

The government-press association in the immigrant's country of origin also exerts influence over the amount of trust immigrants place in the American media and government. In the same survey project, Chaffee et al. (1991) found that immigrants

who used the Korean media perceived similar associations between the press and the government in Korea, and between the press and the government in America. American-media users were found to be better at disassociating the American government from the American press, while pluralistic media users (those who used both Korean and American media) evidenced the strongest contrast between Korean and American media -- perceiving little association between the American government and the U.S. press, yet strong ties between the Korean government and its press. The researchers concluded that when the immigrant moves from a system based on state supervision of the news media, it requires some years of experience in the United States to detect the independence of the American press from the U.S. government. "Following the news in one's adopted country is the key factor in clarifying the press/government relationship, particularly if the person also continues to follow the contrasting, controlled press of the country of origin" (Chaffee et al., 1991, p. 118), the idea being that the observed contrast in the news originating from the two countries reflects the difference in the media/government relationships.

Yang (1988) studied the role of the media in the process of political socialization of Korean immigrants and found it to be bidimensional. He concluded that American media exposure (both newspapers and television) had significant impact on explaining the variances in knowledge of, interest in, and discussion of

American politics, controlling for pre- and post-immigration characteristics. Korean newspaper exposure, in turn, made significant contributions to explaining specifically the variance in Korean political interest, knowledge and discussion.

The literatures on socialization and political socialization of immigrants and minorities indicate that television news plays a bridging role for adult immigrants whose English-language skills are not strong (Chaffee et al., 1990; Subervi-Velez, 1986). As a result, immigrants appear to use the media in much the same manner as do adolescents indigenous to the United States. Immigrants first turn to television for information and only later, as their language skills improve, to the print media. The similarity in media use patterns between native-born adolescents and immigrants necessitates a review of the literature on the media's role in the socialization of children.

Mass Media Influences on the Political Socialization of Children

Several scholars have compared the socialization processes of children and immigrants and concluded they are similar (Chaffee et al., 1990; Easton and Dennis, 1965; O'Keefe and Reid-Nash, 1987; Yang, 1988). Easton and Dennis (1965) pointed out that the major difference between the socialization processes of these two groups

is that while it is first-time socialization for the child, it is a process of resocialization for the immigrant. O'Keefe and Reid-Nash (1987) have suggested that during the socialization process adult immigrants are likely to show less change than are children. However, they cautioned that these smaller changes do not constitute lesser socialization, but instead point to differences in the socialization process at different life stages. Their hypothesis is based on three key factors: (1) adult immigrants are more practiced at the socialization process; (2) adult immigrants are less constrained to fill the role of learner; and (3) adult immigrants are better able to resist socialization norms with which they do not agree. Thus, while for children socialization is a first-time process, for the immigrant the process is complex and should be conceptualized as multi-directional. The immigrant must socialize to the host country, and also must decide whether to maintain ties to her country of origin, or to resocialize.

Conceptualizations of the political socialization process in early studies differed greatly from what O'Keefe and Reid-Nash have since proposed. First, early models were primarily linear cause-effect models. Second, they neglected mass media variables as agents of socialization (Chaffee, Ward, and Tipton, 1970). Third, they focused mainly on children as socializees, betraying a reluctance to call the adult learning experience socialization (Cook and Scioli, 1972; Easton and Dennis, 1969; Atkin, 1981). The primary agents of socialization examined by researchers were the

family, schools, churches, and peers. These factors were pitted against each other in examinations of their relative importance, but none was ever shown to be very powerful beyond the simple fact of parent-child correlations for political party identification (Jennings and Niemi, 1974).

The neglect in early studies of the role played by the media in political socialization has been attributed to the limited effects model of communication (Chaffee, Ward, and Tipton, 1970), which held that mass media effects on behaviors, attitudes, and cognitions were limited by other factors. This 1970 study by Chaffee et al. marked a turning point in the study of political socialization. In a panel survey of 1,291 Wisconsin junior and senior high school students, Chaffee and his colleagues demonstrated causal effects between mass media use and political knowledge. They found that mass media use predicted adolescents' political understanding and political behaviors and concluded that the media should be considered as independent or intervening variables in the political socialization process, not just as one of a number of dependent variables (Chaffee et al., 1970). They reasoned that the media could not "merely reinforce" more primary sources of information because the child was still in the process of forming, rather than defending, political predispositions (Chaffee et al., 1970).

Thus, since adolescents are likely to hold a limited amount of political predispositions for the media to reinforce, the media

instead are supplying new information. This is likely to be the case for immigrants as well. For example, those who have been in the United States longer and possess stronger English skills may have a greater understanding of U.S. politics and therefore have more well-developed political predispositions. In this case the media would play more of a reinforcing role. However, for those whose time in the U.S. is limited and whose language skills are weak, the media may be supplying new information. And, in accordance with previous research (Chaffee et al., 1990), the information supplier for immigrants who fall into this second category most likely would be television.

Hollander (1971) found in the same era that mass media were major sources of adolescents' learning about the Vietnam War and concluded that "the new 'parent' is the mass media" (p. 479). However, although these studies by Hollander (1971) and Chaffee et al. (1970)were published, there was a time lag between their appearance in print and widespread recognition of the mass media as important factors in the political socialization process. In fact, in a 1976 review chapter describing the bulk of political socialization research, Kraus and Davis wrote that "mass communication and television were totally ignored, dismissed as relatively unimportant, or barely noted" (1976, p. 12). They concluded, however, that the media's influences appeared independent of parents' influence (Kraus and Davis, 1976).

Conceptualizations of political socialization have changed greatly since Kraus and Davis wrote. Current political socialization research often takes a mass communication perspective and includes mass communication as a central focus in its models. Much of this change is attributable to a shift toward communication and psychological theory-driven conceptualizations of political socialization at the individual level of analysis. Moreover, the process of socialization is viewed as reciprocal, with interactants sharing and reinterpreting information, rather than simply transmitting and absorbing it.

According to O'Keefe and Reid-Nash (1987), conceptualizing political socialization should include some type of outcome of the individual's integration into the socio-political system. Such products might include the development of relevant knowledge, behavioral confidence, behavioral competence, motivation to perform competently, engagement in appropriate behaviors, and evaluative competence -- the individual's ability to assess her own performance (O'Keefe and Reid-Nash, 1987).

This process is not necessarily linear; individuals may develop competence informationally, without developing competence behaviorally. For example, an individual may understand the implications of a political issue on the ballot and may have a particular opinion on the issue, but may not have learned how to go about voting in the election. Similarly, the immigrant moving to the United States may face many conflicts in

terms of values, norms, and behavioral patterns. Therefore she must depend on communication channels to provide information to help her understand the new society. This new information may not fit with the immigrant's current knowledge, necessitating processes other than simple acquisition of information. Indeed, Chaffee et al. (1991) demonstrated that the process can be multidirectional, i.e. an individual may need to reject (or unlearn) previous information and learn new ways of thinking, depending on the situation. Thus, the immigrant may need to unlearn political ideas from her country of origin and learn new U.S. political information, to be able to function competently in the new environment.

This multidirectional conceptualization fits well with social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), which holds that the family, the media, and other agents of socialization interact in a reciprocal, as opposed to a competing, manner. Viewed from this perspective, personal, environmental, and behavioral factors do not have to interact symmetrically, simultaneously, or with equal strength. Instead, as Bandura pointed out, the relative influence of each of these three factors will vary, depending on the context and on the individual. Although the present study is not a test of the theory of social cognition, it rests on it as an assumption. As Chaffee (1982) has suggested, individuals, in this case immigrants, rely on different channels of communication depending on their accessibility and the likelihood that the source will provide

pertinent information in a particular situation. Thus immigrants who are information seekers are likely to turn to the most accessible sources of political information -- the mass media.

If we try to understand political socialization by studying how the different elements in the communication process depend on each other, depending on context, we move toward a model of socializing agents represented by intersecting circles, indicating intersecting spheres of experience (Austin, 1989; Leifer, Gordon, and Graves, 1974; Roberts and Maccoby, 1985). The intersections of the spheres represent opportunities for mutual causation, and in the areas in which the different spheres of experience do not overlap, each agent might contribute discretely. It has been shown, for example, that interpersonal communication factors can predict mass media communication outcomes, which in turn can predict interpersonal communication and opinion change (Lull, 1980; Wilson, 1984). And while interpersonal communication has some indirect impact on political orientations, exposure to news is necessary for direct media impact. If exposure behavior is a criterion of political socialization, youths' involvement in politics helps to determine such behavior. Similarly, Chaffee et al. (1990) suggested that the mass media form a bridge between the micro-social environment, such as the home, to the larger society. They pointed out that the media can "flesh out" general information children learn in school about government and national history (Chaffee and Yang, 1988). For new citizens, the information they

acquire through interpersonal sources or through the process of preparing for naturalization may be similarly "fleshed out" by the media.

This model of reciprocal influences was used to study the political socialization of adolescents (Austin, 1989). Austin found that the structure of family communication is important in children's political socialization. In specific, she found that parents can influence their children's opinions through direct communication about news content as well as more indirectly, by influencing the adolescent's general orientation to the media, which in turn influences the adolescent's analysis of particular events in the news (Austin, 1989). This study was conducted on American adolescents, but similar results have been found in other countries.

Liebes and Ribak (1992) studied Israeli teens using an abbreviated model of McLeod and Chaffee's (1972) typology of family communication. They found that a pluralistic pattern of family interaction increases children's viewing of television news, especially in families of lower education. In addition, children of less-educated pluralists view television news more regularly than children of other family types at the same educational level. Finally, they showed that political participation was more likely to be introduced in a pluralistic family, based on measures of media exposure, political knowledge and conversations.

While this dissertation acknowledges the probable effects of family, peers, and organizations on adult socialization, its purpose is to examine the relative effects of the use of different media on the political socialization (or resocialization) of recently naturalized United States citizens. This section specifically examined research on the political socialization of children because of the similarities that have been shown to exist between children/adolescent socialization and immigrant socialization under particular conditions (i.e. immigrants who have spent fewer years in the United States and whose English capabilities are not strong). But not all immigrants/new citizens fall into this category. Others are more educated, have been in this country longer, and have strong English skills. These individuals might be expected to use the media for political information in a manner similar to native-born adults. Therefore, the following section will examine the potential for the media to exert influence on the political learning of adults in general, and on the political learning of new citizens in specific.

The Mass Media and the Political Socialization of Adults

Despite the fact that Herbert Hyman (1959) described political socialization as a learning process, a description that implies people are active participants in their socialization, early political socialization studies conceptualized it as a passive process

during which people absorbed rather than sought information. As O'Keefe and Reid-Nash (1987) have put it, the socializee was seen as an object of socialization rather than as the subject of it. These same earlier models conceptualized the political learning process as unidirectional, focusing on what was learned rather than on what was relearned or unlearned (Chaffee et al., 1990).

Development of political socialization research has progressively moved away from these limited conceptualizations. Current definitions describe political socialization as a process through which individuals develop relevant knowledge, skills, and dispositions that enable them to function competently within the existing socio-political structure. The key elements in this approach to the study of socialization are recognition that it is a continuing process, and that individuals are active participants who acquire new attitudes and cognitions and change existing ones. Recent research also has recognized that political socialization is not limited to children.

A growing number of studies support the premise that adults continue to develop and are socialized, desocialized, and resocialized throughout the life span (Brim and Wheeler, 1966; O'Keefe and Reid-Nash, 1987; Wilson, 1984; Chaffee and Yang, 1988). As they move through their lives and confront changes in their families, educational statuses, work situations, etc., they need to resocialize to form new behaviors and roles (Brim, 1968; Dion, 1985). Moreover, adults are likely to enter voluntarily into

situations in which socialization to new norms or roles is required (Brim, 1968). According to O'Keefe and Reid-Nash (1987), change by choice is likely to involve more active use and manipulation of communication channels by the socializee. Although some immigrants may leave their countries of origin because of unsatisfactory conditions, they enter the United States voluntarily. Thus we would expect their active use of communication channels as they resocialize. The motivations of individuals are central to this process of resocialization.

Chaffee (1982) has shown that the mass media and people in our daily lives serve complementary roles -- people offer opinions more often than information, and seek information more often than opinions -- making the topic, timing, and accessibility of information important factors in the socialization process. Most important here is the role of the individual. As noted earlier, individuals are considered to be active participants in their own socialization. Motivations to socialize come into play here because a person is likely to give differential effort and interpretations to information and opinions depending on whether the information has been sought or merely received.

For adults, motivation to be socialized may explain the strategies used and the success of the socialization process (O'Keefe and Reid-Nash, 1987). O'Keefe and Reid-Nash view the basic processes of socialization as similar for children and adults, but note some basic differences. Because of the consistency of the

individual's basic personality during the adult years and the changes children undergo, the childhood socializing experience is more likely than the adult experience to have the greater impact. Adults also can exert greater resistance to norms with which they are not in agreement (1987).

Others have argued that children assume the role of student/learner, while adults have greater choice of nonconforming options (Dion, 1985; Mortimer and Simmons, 1978). However, this may not be the situation for adult immigrants. It seems reasonable that the more dissimilar the host country and their country of origin are, the more they will need to resocialize to function competently in the host country. As a result, they may need to adjust to new norms and values, and to assume the role of student/learner.

Direct experience also serves to influence political socialization. The focus on children in studies of political socialization has ignored the effects of direct political experience (Beck, 1977). Danowski and Ruchinskas (1983) found that an individual's experience with the media during the first election of active participation makes a lasting impression. This point is highly relevant to a study of adult citizens naturalized during an election year, which is the design of the present study.

The process of conceptualizing communication behavior has received attention as well. O'Keefe and Reid-Nash (1987) have asserted that if the focus is on communication behavior, the

paradigm should include: 1) an explicit conceptualization of the pattern of communication, 2) explication of the predictors of communication behaviors, and 3) causal delineation of the consequences and effects of the communication behavior. The third point should include the effects of the behavior by itself as well as the effects of the behavior as a function of interactions with predictors (O'Keefe and Reid-Nash, 1987). Socialization-based models also should include particular variables, such as the following: 1) age or life cycle, 2) agent(s) of influence, 3) type of learning processes involved, 4) social structural constraints that may impinge on the learning process (education level, type of communication, language competency), and 5) the dependent variable or behavior that is the focus of the process (O'Keefe and Reid-Nash, 1987). Thus, the immigrant's pre- and post-immigration characteristics are central to a model of their socialization.

O'Keefe and Reid-Nash (1987) have identified the area of political socialization as "clearly the most conceptually and methodologically complete topical work relating communication to socialization" (p. 426). An important aspect of conceptualizing political socialization is whether communication is viewed as an independent variable or as a behavior that is contingent on various conditions such as political interest. Behind conceptualizations of the socialization process lies the assumption that individuals are driven by a desire to gain competence. The

socialization literature contains a number of views on the role competence plays in the process.

White (1959, 1960) described competence as a learned characteristic, and proposed that individuals possess intrinsic motivation to gain competence (the ability to interact effectively with the environment). Competence also has been tied to formal socialization processes and defined as the "capability for effective performance for self and society" (Clausen, 1968, p. 6). Smith (1968) further saw competence as rooted in conceptualizing an organism as an active participant in interaction with its environment, and concluded that competence has close links to motivational processes.

Competence appears to be the bridge between the traditionally divergent role theory and symbolic interaction perspectives on socialization. Competence has been viewed either as an outcome of a succession of interacting socializing experiences, or as a criterion for effective role performance (Inkeles, 1968; Smith, 1968). The term has been narrowly restricted in the socialization literature as a criterion variable and has not been developed as a linkage between communication and socialization (O'Keefe and Reid-Nash, 1987). O'Keefe and Reid-Nash wrote, however, that the motivational component is critical for communication as an interaction and that it allows for communication to be an independent variable, a dependent variable, or an intervening variable (1987). In keeping with this

suggestion, communication can be an agent in the development of competence, a facilitating factor, or the outcome of a socializing process.

Through the process of socialization, the individual can develop competence to cope successfully with a particular role or situation. When socialization occurs, the effective functioning of society may be evaluated in terms of the degree of competence with which the criteria for established roles are met. In the case of the political system, competent functioning of the system is dependent on the extent to which citizens actively participate in voting. In addition, because competence deals with levels of effect in a nonlinear manner, the existence of behavioral competence does not mean attitudinal or informational competence also are present with respect to a given topic, situation, or role. For example, O'Keefe (1985), studying a campaign advocating greater citizen involvement in crime prevention, found that for some individuals the campaign had large attitudinal effects while not necessarily having informational effects. For others it stimulated behavioral changes without concurrent attitudinal changes.

Research on the political competence of adults (often operationalized as political knowledge) has shown that television does not contribute much to political knowledge after adolescence; in adult samples, newspapers and magazines are the media most strongly associated with political competence (Becker and Whitney, 1980; Drew and Weaver, 1991; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan,

and Signorielli, 1984; Kennamer, 1987a; Patterson and McClure, 1976; Wade and Schramm, 1969). Only a handful of studies have demonstrated a significant positive correlation between indicators of adult political competence and consumption of news and public affairs on television (Allen and Chaffee, 1979; Kennamer, 1987b; McLeod and McDonald, 1985; Sears and Chaffee, 1978).

Summary

Research on the political socialization of native-born children and adults shows fairly strong evidence for the following:

(1) The mass media constitute principal sources of information for young people (Chaffee, Ward and Tipton, 1970). While radio and television are the predominant media during childhood (Drew and Reeves, 1980), the use of print media increases from adolescence on (Chaffee and Tims, 1982).

(2) Adult immigrants use the mass media in a manner similar to adolescents native to the United States (Chaffee and Yang, 1988; Easton and Dennis, 1965; O'Keefe and Reid-Nash, 1987; Subervi-Velez, 1986; Yang, 1988).

(3) Immigrants' mass media use is associated with their degree of assimilation into the host society (Goldlust and Richmond, 1974; Jeffres and Hur, 1981; Y. Kim, 1976; Subervi-Velez, 1984). Immigrants' use of host society media increases

over time while ethnic media use gradually decreases with length of time in the host society (Greenberg et al., 1983; Jeffres and Hur, 1981; Y. Kim, 1976, 1978; Richmond, 1969; Subervi-Velez, 1984).

(4) Education, socioeconomic status in the host country, and English-language competency all can affect the use of host society media (Chaffee et al., 1990; de la Garza and Brischetto, 1983; Jeffres and Hur, 1981; Y. Kim, 1976, 1977; Lee, 1984; Subervi-Velez, 1984; Yang, 1988).

(5) Exposure to the media contributes to political participation and knowledge for blacks, Mexican-Americans and Hispanics (Tan, 1983), and to voter turnout for Mexican-Americans, regardless of education (Buehler, 1976). Increased exposure to communication leads to greater participation in voluntary organizations, which in turn leads to greater interest in politics and group awareness, and to greater participation in general (Miyares, 1980).

The bulk of the research demonstrates that the mass media are influential forces in the political socialization of immigrants, but that the medium that supplies information often is dictated by the individual's pre- and post-immigration characteristics. In addition, for the immigrants in the present study, the fact that they chose to become naturalized U.S. citizens carries with it some important implications. First, the desire to become a citizen implies that they have experienced a relatively high degree of assimilation into our society. Second, as naturalized citizens they

are eligible to vote in U.S. elections, and are part of the cohort of new voters in the 1988 presidential election. Third, because naturalization requires some knowledge of U.S. history and government, it can be assumed that members of this sample took on the role of learner, which in turn implies some degree of motivation to socialize to U.S. politics. Fourth, while some of their information could be acquired through interpersonal sources, it is not unreasonable to expect that they would find the mass media the most accessible sources of political information. Fifth, political knowledge is an indicator of the degree of political socialization competency (the immigrant's ability to organize, stabilize, and modify his political world) the immigrant has attained (O'Keefe and Reid-Nash, 1987).

Because one of the purposes of this study is to isolate the effects of mass media use on citizens' political knowledge, the following pre- and post-naturalization characteristics will be controlled: English-language competency, years in the United States, socioeconomic status, income, education, and gender. In addition, because political interest and participation can have reciprocal effects on political learning, the citizens' level of interest in U.S. politics and intention to vote in the presidential election also will be used as controls. To provide a more stringent test of the media's effects on issue knowledge, Constitutional knowledge, operationally defined as the new citizens' knowledge of the terms of office of U.S. political leaders, also will be controlled for in a

series of regressions. The following chapter will examine the literature on the role of the media in political learning, focusing on specific media and on different methods of measuring media use.

Chapter 3

THE MASS MEDIA AND POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE

Knowledge about politics is the essence of the "enlightened electorate" of which Jefferson and others wrote in constructing the American political system. Not surprisingly, knowledge has become a popular criterion variable in the era of survey research on mass media effects. While operationalizations of political knowledge can take a number of forms in survey research, the basic assumption underlying the different measures is that people learn the differences between the sides in a political controversy, and then base their choices on that knowledge. Surveys often ask about differences between particular candidates. Candidate differences, rather than party differences that endure beyond any particular election, often are the focus in mass media research because they are more likely to be emphasized in media coverage of a political campaign.

Political knowledge has become the primary method of measuring the concept of political socialization. Political socialization, as a special form of socialization, normally refers to the ways society transmits its political culture from one generation to the next. It is the process by which an individual learns politically relevant cognitions, attitudes, and behavioral patterns

(Atkin, 1981; Dawson, Prewitt, and Dawson, 1977; Langton, 1969). Research on the mass media and political socialization is based on the theory that the mass media influence such learning processes significantly (Subervi-Velez, 1986; O'Keefe and Reid-Nash, 1987).

In current conceptualizations, political learning is viewed as an active pursuit. The trend at the individual level of analysis has been toward perceiving socializees as being active in pursuing learning experiences, interpreting and processing them, and exerting greater control over their outcomes (Johnsson-Smaragdi, 1983; Zigler and Seitz, 1978). The emergence of cognitive development and information processing as the dominant paradigm in individual-level socialization has been the basis for this view (Baldwin, 1969; Zigler and Child, 1973).

According to Berlyne (1960), there are a number of situations in which the individual has a strong desire to assume a new role or pattern of behavior. This desire leads the individual to take an active role in (1) anticipating the need to learn requisite cognitions, attitudes, and behaviors; (2) seeking out individuals and information that facilitate learning; and (3) engaging in activities that bring about desired change. In this proactive socialization model, communication behavior is a critical variable (Berlyne, 1960).

For the new U.S. citizen assuming the role of voter for the first time, the desire to participate competently in the U.S. political sphere motivates her to seek out political information. And the

most easily accessible sources of such information are the media (O'Keefe and Reid-Nash, 1987). Citizens' knowledge of presidential candidates' issue positions is largely dependent on media portrayals of the campaign and particularly on the campaign's journalistic coverage (Roper, 1983). Newspapers and television have been shown to be the dominant media in political learning, with their relative contributions varying with the age and socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents (Atkin, 1981; Dominick, 1972; Conway, Stevens, and Smith, 1975). Typical content analyses show that about 40 percent of the content of American newspapers involves public affairs, government, and politics (McCombs, 1987). The literature offers research results demonstrating that the mass media, in general, play a major role in citizens' acquisition of issue-knowledge. As will become evident, the lack of agreement across studies as to the comparative magnitude of the effects of different types of media and the more appropriate measures of media use points clearly to the need for further research, and for the use of relevant control variables. The purposes of this study involve assessing the comparative roles of different types of media in the issue learning of new citizens, as well as how to best operationalize the concept of "media use" (exposure, attention, or recall) for each particular type of medium (newspapers, television news, and television ads). Therefore this chapter will examine the literature in terms of the following questions:

(1) How have newspapers and television news been shown to contribute to political learning? Which appears most influential under which conditions?

(2) And what about news versus ads? Which contributes most to political knowledge?

(3) What are the correlations normally found among relevant "control" variables, and how do these controls correlate with political knowledge measures? How much of the variance in political knowledge have these variables accounted for in previous studies?

(4) How have the different measures of media use for each type of medium correlated with one another in previous studies? How have they correlated with political knowledge? How much of the variance in political knowledge have these measures accounted for? How have they fared comparatively in explaining political knowledge?

(5) How have the different media use measures correlated with controls?

(6) What role might media trust play in the issue learning of new citizens?

Between-Channel Effects on Political Learning

Newspapers versus television in political learning. A number of studies have examined the effects of newspaper

reading and television news viewing on political knowledge. In general, it has been found that newspaper readers have greater knowledge of current politics and are more likely to participate politically than are those who rely solely on television for political news (Berkowitz and Pritchard, 1989; Chaffee and Tims, 1982; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, and Signorielli, 1984). This is not to say that television news viewers do not read the newspaper. In fact, the accumulating evidence reveals that individuals who follow politics most closely on television "also follow politics closely in the print media" (Chaffee et al., 1990). Thus, rather than replacing newspapers as a political information source, television often acts as a supplement.

McLeod, Bybee, and Durall (1979) found that newspaper reading was a primary factor in promoting citizens' awareness of candidates' issue positions in 1976; the impact of television viewing was negligible. Similarly, Patterson (1980) found that regular exposure to newspapers had more impact on increases in voters' knowledge about candidates than did television news exposure.

In a survey during the 1986 Indiana congressional election campaign, Berkowitz and Pritchard (1989) found that reliance on newspapers significantly predicted an individual's ability to compare the positions of the candidates on different issues, but reliance on television news did not.

Choi and Becker (1987) also found that newspaper reading increased voters' ability to discriminate between issue positions of candidates in the 1982 Iowa gubernatorial campaign, but television news viewing did not. Similar findings were reported by Patterson (1979) and McLeod, Bybee, and Durall (1979).

Weaver and Drew (1991) studied issue-position learning during the 1990 off-year senatorial election in Indiana. They found that attention to campaign news in local newspapers was a significant predictor of issue knowledge, but attention to television campaign news was not. When they measured exposure for both media instead of attention, they found that neither newspaper exposure nor television exposure was a significant predictor of knowledge (Weaver and Drew, 1991).

Both television news and newspapers have been shown to play major roles in the political socialization of young people in the U.S. and other western democracies (Atkin and Gantz, 1975; Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986; Chaffee, Ward, and Tipton, 1970; Conway, Stevens, and Smith, 1975; Drew and Reeves, 1980; Garramone, 1986; Garramone and Atkin, 1986; Hawkins, Pingree, and Roberts, 1975). For young people (those below voting age), a positive correlation between television news exposure and political knowledge is found consistently across studies (Chaffee et al., 1970; Conway et al., 1975; Hawkins et al., 1975; Gollin and Anderson, 1980; Atkin and Gantz, 1978; Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986).

Chaffee et al. (1970) surveyed adolescents in May and November in the context of the 1968 presidential election. They found that public affairs media exposure both via newspapers and via television were correlated with political knowledge at both points in time, and explained significant variance in knowledge gain over time.

In studies examining the comparative effects of television news viewing and newspapers, results haven't always been consistent. Chaffee (1977) described secondary analyses of an eight-year panel survey conducted by Jennings and Niemi. A national sample of high school seniors was interviewed in 1965 and again as young adults in 1973. In the high school wave, there was a significant association between public affairs newspaper reading and political knowledge. The association between newspaper use in 1965 and knowledge in 1973 was significant, but not as strong as the reverse causal linkage. Chaffee (1977) also found that broadcast news exposure did not appear to have a significant impact on subsequent knowledge.

Several other studies have demonstrated findings in which an index of political knowledge is associated with exposure to televised and/or newspaper news (Hirsch, 1971; Johnson, 1973; Tolley, 1973; Hawkins, 1974; Hawkins et al., 1979; Jackson-Beeck, 1979). Respondents in these studies were of varying socioeconomic backgrounds and ages, ranging from early elementary school to high school. No consistent differences were

found for newspapers versus television news predictors in these studies.

In analyzing the effects of newspapers and television news on issue awareness during the 1984 presidential election, Zhao and Chaffee (1986) found that exposure to newspaper stories about national politics was a better predictor of issue knowledge than attention to televised campaign news, but not as strong a predictor as was specific attention to television news about the presidential candidates or attention to television news about the respondent's favored candidate.

In a panel study of Wisconsin adolescents and their parents, Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) found for both groups that when initial knowledge levels are controlled, the contributions made to knowledge gain on party issue positions by newspapers and television news were about equal.

Overall, the literature indicates that citizens learn where the candidates stand on the issues through both newspapers and television news. However, the comparative effects of newspapers and television news on political knowledge vary across studies depending on a number of factors, including age of respondents/subjects, the measures of media use employed -- exposure or attention -- the operationalization of knowledge, and the particular campaign studied.

Television advertising vs. newspaper and television news in political learning. One of the most widely-cited studies in the literature on the effects of television news and ads on political learning has been Patterson and McClure's (1976) analysis of the 1972 presidential campaign. They concluded that voters learn issue information from "exposure" to televised political ads, but not from exposure to television news.[7] This particular conclusion led to a number of other studies comparing the effects of television ads and television news on political knowledge (for example, Atkin, 1977; Hofstetter, Zukin, and Buss, 1978; Patterson, 1980; Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986; Zhao and Chaffee, 1986).

Some studies have concluded the opposite of Patterson and McClure (1976). In a test of the Patterson-McClure propositions in the context of the 1984 Reagan-Mondale presidential campaign, Zhao and Chaffee (1986) used issue knowledge as the dependent variable, and attention (instead of exposure) to television news and attention to ads as the independent measures. Controlling for demographics, campaign activities, and general political knowledge, they concluded that television news was informative, while television ads were not (Zhao and Chaffee, 1986).

Hofstetter, Zukin, and Buss (1978) analyzed data from the 1972 Nixon-McGovern campaign. They found that when demographic and political variables were controlled, neither

---

[7]Patterson and McClure's (1976) measure of exposure to political ads was the self-reported number of hours of prime time television programs watched by respondents, rather than a direct question about ad exposure. Thus exposure to ads was inferred, rather than measured.

network news nor political ads was associated with more political information.[8] However, when they dropped all controls, the effect of network news on information was almost twice that of political advertising.

Weaver and Drew (1991) came to the opposite conclusion for ads versus television news. In their statewide sample of voters, Weaver and Drew (1991) found no significant impact on issue knowledge, for their measures of attention to television ads and attention to television news during the 1990 Indiana senatorial election. However, an item about having seen a television advertisement about the candidates did have a significant impact on issue knowledge ($p<.001$). In addition, attention to newspapers had a significant impact on knowledge ($p<.01$).

In another study, this one involving the 1988 presidential election, Drew and Weaver (1991) measured exposure to local television news, exposure to national television news, exposure to local newspapers, exposure to regional newspapers, attention to television news (general), attention to newspapers (general), and attention to television ads. They found that none of these measures had a significant impact on issue knowledge.

Finally, in some studies both ads and television news have been found to predict knowledge. Zhao et al. (1992) recently attempted to replicate Zhao and Chaffee's (1986) findings in the context of the 1990 Helms-Gantt U.S. senatorial contest, in a

---

[8]Hofstetter, Zukin, and Buss did not report the wording of their questions used to operationalize television news use or political advertising use.

survey in Orange County, North Carolina. Their dependent variable was a measure of issue knowledge based on respondents' perceptions of the positions of each candidate on seven different issues. They found that both attention to televised campaign news and attention to ads were informative, with ads appearing to be more informative. They concluded that attention to campaign news is a steady, reliable source of issue information, since it explained about 2 percent of the residual variance (beyond controls) in this and Zhao's other surveys. The contribution made by political ads fluctuates greatly, they concluded by comparing the study to others, depending on the nature and intensity of the advertising campaign in a given election (Zhao et al., 1992).

So overall, the findings across studies vary. Sometimes political ad measures are strong predictors of knowledge; sometimes they are not. Sometimes a measure of television news attention significantly predicts knowledge; sometimes it does not. And sometimes a measure of newspaper use or newspaper attention predicts knowledge; sometimes not. The results vary depending on operationalizations of media use, operationalizations of political knowledge, and the particulars of the campaign being studied.

Media Use Measures and Political Knowledge

This section examines the literatures on the relationships among different measures of media use as well the relationships between media use measures and political issue knowledge. First, media use measures (exposure, attention, and recall) for each type of medium (newspapers, television news, and television ads) will be examined separately. Second, relationships among all the measures and types will be discussed.

Newspaper reading and political knowledge. Contact with or use of newspapers has most frequently been measured as exposure (frequency of newspaper reading).[9] Because exposure measures have been the "norm" for operationalizing newspaper use in political learning studies (for example, Atkin, 1978; Drew and Reeves, 1980; Gollin and Anderson, 1980; Jennings and Niemi, 1974), few have comparatively examined newspaper exposure and attention.[10] One exception is Chaffee and Schleuder (1986). In

---

[9]The two most common operationalizations of exposure are asking respondents either how many days in a week they normally read the newspaper or how many days in the past week they read a daily newspaper. The present study uses the second measure to operationalize exposure.

[10]The operationalizations of attention to newspapers vary. For example, Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) asked about attention to articles in the newspaper about national politics and government. Yang (1988) combined how often an American newspaper was read, with the number of American newspapers regularly read by the respondent, into a composite index. Zhao and Chaffee (1986) asked about attention to news about national politics when reading the newspaper. While attention to the newspaper in general may be capturing something very different from attention to political information in the paper, the two are not mutually exclusive. The present study uses an index combining how much attention the respondent pays to

their study of adolescents and their parents, Chaffee and Schleuder found that newspaper exposure was significantly and positively correlated with newspaper attention for both adolescents and their parents (.40 and .46, respectively). Similar results were reported by McLeod and McDonald (1985) and Chaffee and Choe (1979) for other samples. The high correlation between the two newspaper use measurement methods should not be surprising, considering exposure is a necessary condition for attention. If one does not read a newspaper, its articles cannot be attended to.

In terms of the third operationalization contained in the present study -- free recall of newspaper articles read -- no previous studies employing this type of measure for newspaper use could be found. However, it is unlikely an individual could recall an article she had read in the paper without having read the paper, indicating there should be some degree of positive association between newspaper exposure and recall. Because attention (or increased mental effort) has been recognized as an important variable in the processing of mass communication messages (for example, Reeves, Newhagen, Maibach, Basil, and Kurz, 1991; Reeves, Thorson, and Schleuder, 1985), it seems reasonable that the ability to recall a message would be predicated on having attended to it. Thus, while recall is not a typical operationalization for newspaper use, it might prove to be a useful supplementary predictor of political knowledge.

---

news about U.S. national politics in the newspaper, with how much attention the respondent pays to presidential campaign news in the paper.

How have the different operationalizations of newspaper use been associated with political knowledge? Of the studies measuring only newspaper exposure, it has been found to be significantly and positively associated with political knowledge (Atkin and Gantz, 1978; Chaffee et al., 1970; Patterson and McClure, 1976; Yang, 1988; Zhao and Chaffee, 1986). In a study that measured both exposure and attention, similar results held.

Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) found a significant positive association between newspaper exposure and issue knowledge for adolescents (.11) and for their parents (.27).[11] Their results were similar for the newspaper attention measures; the correlation between the knowledge and attention measures was .13 for adolescents and .21 for their parents (Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986). The newspaper attention and exposure correlations with issue knowledge were closer for adolescents than for their parents. In fact, the association for the parents between these measures and the knowledge index was lower for attention than exposure. It should be noted that because attention was contingent on exposure, the attention-knowledge correlations represented only those who were exposed to newspapers the previous week.

These studies demonstrate that the correlations between political knowledge and both exposure and attention to newspapers are positive and usually significant. It does not seem to matter much which question is asked. These results hold for

---

[11]These exposure and attention results correspond to knowledge measures taken at Time 3 in Chaffee and Schleuder's (1986) panel study.

adult and adolescent samples, although the degree of association for both measures is lower for adolescents. This may be because adolescents are less acculturated to using newspapers for political information, meaning they rely more on other sources (particularly television), or they are not especially political in their news interests. Consequently, if immigrants use media as Chaffee et al.'s (1990) findings suggest, similarly low newspaper exposure and attention correlations among new citizens may indicate less acculturation to this medium.

Newspapers also have been shown to influence political knowledge. In general, it has been found that newspaper readers have greater knowledge of current politics and are more likely to participate politically than are non-readers (Chaffee and Tims, 1982; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, and Signorielli, 1984). A number of studies have assessed the specific influence of newspaper attention and/or exposure on political knowledge.

In analyzing the effects of newspaper reading (exposure) on issue awareness, Zhao and Chaffee (1986) found it accounted for a significant 1.6 percent increment to the variance explained, beyond the controls. Newspaper exposure also accounted for a significant portion of the variance explained in political knowledge in other studies (Chaffee and Choe, 1979; Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986). In specific, Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) found that newspaper exposure was a significant predictor of party-issue knowledge for the parent sample, but not for the adolescents.

Chaffee and Choe (1979) achieved similar results for adults, with exposure explaining 6.3 percent of the variance. Studies of adults not indigenous to this country have found that the role of newspaper exposure as a predictor of knowledge varies depending on socialization characteristics (Chaffee et al., 1990; Yang, 1988).

In their study of Korean immigrants, Chaffee et al. (1990) controlled for English competency. They found that exposure to U.S. newspapers accounted for a significant portion of the variance explained for those with strong English skills, but not for those whose skills were weak (Chaffee et al., 1990). They also controlled for length of stay in the U.S. and found that newspaper reading was a marginally significant predictor of knowledge for those who had been in the U.S. for a long time, but not for those who had been here only a short time.[12]

Chaffee and Choe (1979) and Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) also included measures of newspaper attention. A year after the 1980 election in their panel study, Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) found that newspaper attention had no significant influence on the party-issue knowledge of adolescents or their parents beyond the newspaper exposure contribution (which also had not been significant for the adolescents). Chaffee and Choe (1979), however, found that their newspaper attention measure explained a median (across sub-analyses) of 3.9 percent of the variance beyond the

---

[12]In dividing the sample into short- and long-time residents, Chaffee et al. (1989) split the sample at the mean. The level of significance for the variance in knowledge explained by newspaper exposure for long-time residents was only marginal ($p<.10$).

contributions made by newspaper exposure and whether one read a daily newspaper.

Overall, newspaper exposure measures have accounted for a significant portion of the variance explained in issue knowledge beyond respondent-characteristic controls for adults. This finding does not appear to hold for adolescents, nor for immigrants under particular conditions. The implication is that newspapers are not the primary medium through which newcomers to U.S. politics learn their political information. Thus, if political learning does take place, it must be occurring for these individuals through another medium.

Television use and political knowledge. Examination of the literature on correlations among television use measures, reveals that studies have yielded consistently positive correlations between measures of television news exposure and attention to public affairs news (Chaffee and Choe, 1979; Chaffee and Schleuder [both parents and adolescents], 1986; Drew and Weaver, 1991; McLeod and McDonald, 1985).

The associations between these measures of television use and political knowledge, however, differ from what has been found with newspapers. Cross-sectional correlations between time spent with television (a very rough indicator of exposure) and political knowledge frequently have been negative (Benton and Frazier, 1976; Miller, Singletary, and Chen, 1988; Patterson and McClure, 1976). This relationship has held up for questions

specifically related to television news exposure (frequency of viewing). The association between television exposure and political knowledge for adolescents, however, has been positive (Atkin, 1977; Atkin and Gantz, 1978; Chaffee et al., 1970; Hawkins, 1974; Hawkins, Pingree, Smith, and Bechtolt, 1979; Jackson-Beeck, 1979). The negative cross-sectional results for adults do not mean that television viewing negates or takes away learning. The negative result most likely has been obtained because adults who have reported greater amounts of exposure to television often were not readers as well. Individuals who fall into the category of nonreaders often are less well-educated and have lower incomes and socioeconomic status than those who also expose themselves to newspapers. Panel studies in which knowledge and exposure are measured at more than one point in time have found positive correlations between television exposure and knowledge. By measuring learning at more than one point in time, panel studies remove individual differences -- socioeconomic status, education, and income. Thus, as Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) have pointed out, television exposure is positively associated with learning over time.

Research also has shown that measures of attention to television often correlate positively with political knowledge, in samples of adolescents and adults (Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986; Drew and Weaver, 1991; McLeod and McDonald, 1985; Zhao and Chaffee, 1986). This brings up the question of whether to compare

the newspaper attention and exposure measures with the analogous television measures.

Should correlations between political knowledge and the two types of measures be consistent across media? The answer appears to be no. When one asks about newspaper use -- either as frequency of exposure or amount of attention -- the answer probably implies reading, attending, and subsequent learning. Television is a different beast. Time spent with television, even with news programs on, does not necessarily equate with attending and learning. When they sit in front of the television set, people often are engaged in other activities, such as eating, talking, playing, even reading the newspaper. These activities detract attention away from programming (Anderson and Lorch, 1983; Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986).

Recall of television news, similar to newspaper recall, is a measure that is not commonly used in conjunction with television exposure and attention.[13] However, we do know a few things from previous studies. First, although viewers have tended to forget much of what they viewed on television news, they have been able to recall some information when given cues (Jeffres, 1986). Second, most communication assumes, probably correctly, that learning is a multi-stage process (McGuire, 1985), and it is not unreasonable that attention is one of these stages. Third, from a

---

[13]Recall of printed and televised material as a method of assessing political learning in conjunction with exposure and attention, as well as in contrast with them, is an operationalization of media use specifically designed for this study.

cognitive perspective, a consistent finding in research on storage and retrieval of information is that prior knowledge guides integration and memory of information (Mandler, 1978; Stein and Glenn, 1979; Thorndyke, 1977). The resulting expectation is that individuals who attend to political news will be better able to recall it.

The question to be examined next is whether the different methods of measuring television use (in this case exposure and attention) have contributed to explaining political knowledge. Overall, the results of studies that have included both measures have indicated that television news exposure was not a significant predictor of political knowledge, but attention to television news was (Chaffee and Choe, 1979; Chaffee and Schleuder [both children and adults], 1986; McLeod and McDonald, 1985). Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) did find that television exposure was a slightly stronger predictor for adolescents than for their parents.

Zhao et al. (1992) also tested measures of exposure and attention to television news. Their attention measure (as well as their exposure measure) was a combination of attention (or exposure) to news stories about candidates Jesse Helms and Harvey Gantt during the 1990 U.S. senatorial race in Orange County, North Carolina. They found that exposure to television news added significantly to the variance explained in political knowledge (1.04 percent increment to variance). Attention to

television news was an even stronger predictor, accounting for an increment to the variance explained of 2.14 percent.

Some studies have examined separately measures of attention, and of exposure, to television news (Chaffee et al., 1990; Zhao and Chaffee, 1986). These studies compared the specific effects for each measure. Zhao and Chaffee (1986) found that their three measures of attention to candidate-specific campaign news explained a total of 2.1 percent of the variance in political knowledge ($p<.01$).[14]

In their study of Korean immigrants, Chaffee et al. (1990) measured only exposure to television news (an eight-item index) and found that it had significant impact on the political learning of those whose English language skills were weak, but no significant impact for those with strong language skills. Similarly they found that exposure to television news was a significant predictor of knowledge for those who had been in the U.S. only a brief time, but not significant for those who had been here a long time (Chaffee et al., 1990).

Overall, the regression results indicate that a measure of attention to television news accounts for a significant portion of the variance explained in political knowledge, beyond simple exposure. It also appears that for immigrants, television news

---

[14]The significant attention result did not extend, however, to attention to television national news or to attention to television campaign news. Thus, Zhao and Chaffee (1986) concluded that detection of television attention effects "apparently requires quite specific measures, and a close correspondence between the dependent measure and the TV content asked about" (p. 16).

exposure plays a substantial role in political learning (Chaffee et al., 1990). These findings indicate that immigrants whose English language skills constrain their reading tend to use television for political information, a conclusion that is consonant with findings regarding native-born adolescents' television use.

Televised political advertisements and political knowledge. The third media channel that is of interest in this study is televised political advertising. Only one study using more than one operationalization (exposure, attention, recall) to measure the use of political ads could be found in the literature examined. Weaver and Drew (1991) asked respondents whether they had seen an ad (exposure) and also asked about attention to election campaign ads. While they did not report their correlations, recalling having seen an ad was a significant predictor of issue knowledge ($p<.001$); self-reported attention to ads was not significant (Weaver and Drew, 1991). The remainder of this section focuses solely on the correlations between the individual operationalizations and political knowledge.

One of the earliest studies to assess the influence of political ads inferred a significant and positive association between exposure to ads and political knowledge for adults (Patterson and McClure, 1976).[15] Positive correlations have been found for

---

[15]Patterson and McClure's (1976) measure of "exposure to ads" consisted of asking respondents how many hours of prime time television they watched, and assuming this meant they were exposed to ads during this time period.

children as well. During the 1976 presidential primaries, Atkin (1977) examined elementary school children and found that their candidate knowledge was mildly correlated with the frequency and intensity of exposure to campaign commercials. The correlation was higher for older students than for younger students.

Associations between knowledge and ad attention have also been positive. In the context of the 1984 Reagan-Mondale presidential campaign, Zhao and Chaffee (1986) studied attention to ads and found it was significantly and positively associated with issue awareness. Zhao et al. (1992) replicated Zhao and Chaffee's attention/knowledge correlation. Studies of immigrants have not focused on campaign advertising effects. However, based on research of adult samples, it is expected that attention to ads will be positively associated with issue knowledge.

Recall of political ads has not been used as an indicator of political knowledge in many previous studies. Recall has been studied most frequently in terms of positive and negative advertising (Johnson and Copeland, 1987; Lang, 1985; Garramone, 1984; Sabato, 1981; Shapiro and Rieger, 1989). Such studies have found increased recall of negative messages, a finding that is particularly salient given the negative nature of many of the ads in the 1988 campaign (Jamieson, 1992; Kern, 1989). But how have different methods of measuring use of political ads been found to

correlate with political learning? Have they been shown to have predictive strength?

Zhao and Chaffee (1986) used attention to political ads as a measure and found that while attention to ads about the respondents' favored candidate was marginally significant in predicting political knowledge ($p<.05$), it did not add significantly to the variance explained beyond that of the personal characteristics (control) variables. Similar results were found by Hofstetter, Zukin, and Buss (1978).

Zhao et al. (1992) measured attention to ads in general and found that it added significantly to the variance explained in the issue knowledge of adults in Orange County, North Carolina, accounting for a significant 3.1 percent increment to the variance explained. Their measure of exposure to ads, however, fell short of conventional significance ($p<.063$) (Zhao et al., 1992).

But why do negative ads work? Why are they more memorable than positive ads? A number of researchers have shown that negative information is weighted more heavily than positive information when forming evaluations of social stimuli (Anderson, 1965; Hamilton and Huffman, 1971; Hodges, 1974; Kellerman, 1984; Miller and Rowe, 1967).

Recently, Shapiro and Rieger (1989) demonstrated that negative political ads were more memorable than positive ones. An indication of why recall of political ads might be a useful operationalization of television ad use is provided by research that

has shown that negative information is easier to retrieve than positive information during information processing (Feldman, 1966; Reeves, Thorson, and Schleuder, 1986; Richey, Koenigs, Richey, and Fortin, 1975).

The effects of advertising on the political knowledge of immigrants and new voters have not been explored. On the basis of previous studies of native-born adults, it is expected that attention to ads will have greater predictive strength than will exposure to ads. In addition, due to both the negative nature of the political ads in the 1988 presidential campaign, and research findings that negative ads have been easier to recall than positive, the recall measure is expected to be a positive predictor of issue knowledge.

Mass media use and its influence on political knowledge. A number of studies have examined the total contributions made to issue knowledge by the different measures of mass media use. In his study of Korean immigrants, Yang (1988) found that exposure to American television news and public affairs programs and exposure to American newspapers produced a significant increment to the variance explained in knowledge of American political issues (incremental R square, .02; $p<.05$). The total R square produced by the controls and the media use measures was a significant ($p<.001$) 29 percent (Yang, 1988).

Drew and Weaver (1991) studied the effects of media use on candidate issue knowledge in the 1988 presidential campaign. In

their sample of Indiana voters, they included measures of general television news exposure, national television news exposure, local newspaper exposure, regional newspaper exposure, attention to television news, attention to newspapers (general) and attention to television ads. As a block, the media measures produced no significant increment to R square beyond the variance explained by the controls. However, the total R square produced by the controls and the media use measures was a significant 26 percent ($p<.001$).

Weaver and Drew (1991) studied issue learning in the 1990 U.S. senatorial campaign in Indiana. The total increment to R square produced by their media use measures was a significant 9 percent ($p<.001$). This finding pertained to their statewide sample of voters. The total R square produced by the controls and the media use measures for that sample was a significant 15 percent ($p<.01$). For their Bloomington city sample, the media use measures accounted for a significant 5 percent of the variance in issue knowledge, beyond the controls ($p<.001$). The total R square produced by the media measures and the controls was a significant ($p<.001$) 29 percent (Weaver and Drew, 1991).

In their study of Korean immigrants, Chaffee et al. (1990) found that their media use measures and relevant controls explained a significant ($p<.001$) 24 percent of the variance in knowledge of U.S. political issues.

Chaffee and Schleuder's (1986) panel study of adolescents and their parents demonstrated that newspaper and television news exposure and attention accounted for a significant 7 percent of the variance in issue knowledge at Time 3 for the parents ($p<.01$), and a significant 7 percent of the variance at Time 3 for the adolescents ($p<.01$), controlling for issue knowledge at time I. The total R square for the media measures and the Time I knowledge control was .26 ($p<.01$) for the parents, and .13 for the adolescents ($p<.01$).

Overall, studies have shown that mass media measures accounted for a significant increment to the variance in issue knowledge, beyond relevant controls (an exception is Drew and Weaver, 1991). The total R square produced by the media measures and controls ranges mostly from 20 to 29 percent, although it is lower in some studies, as noted above. It is reasonable to expect, based on the literature, that the total R square for this sample of new U.S. citizens will be in the 20- to 29-percent range, as well.

Pre- and Post-Naturalization Characteristics and Political Knowledge

The pre- and post-naturalization characteristics to be controlled for in this study are length of time in the United States,

English competency, education, socioeconomic status, income, and gender. Interest in U.S. politics and intention to vote in the 1988 presidential election are additional controls. In a more stringent test of the questions, Constitutional knowledge (knowledge of elected and appointed officials' terms of office) will be an additional control. Previous studies of immigrant political socialization to the United States have demonstrated that these factors play important roles in the socialization process. There is at least some reason to expect each of them to be correlated with either political knowledge or media use behaviors, which would mean they are potential sources of confounding in this survey.

In his 1988 study of the political socialization of Korean immigrants in the San Francisco Bay area, Yang included English competency, length of stay, education, and socioeconomic status (among others) as control variables. He found significant positive correlations between English competency and the following characteristics: length of time in the U.S. (.29), education (.58), self-rated socioeconomic status (.46), and citizenship (.27) (Yang, 1988). These findings are consistent with other studies of immigrants and minorities that have demonstrated better English skills among the more educated, high socioeconomic status immigrants who had been in the U.S. a number of years (for example, Chaffee et al., 1990; Kim, 1982a; Subervi-Velez, 1986). In addition, Yang (1988) found significant positive correlations between length of stay and education (.21), SES (.22), and

citizenship (.47). Significant positive correlations also were found between citizenship and education (.33) and citizenship and SES (.22). Finally, education and SES were significantly and positively correlated (Yang, 1988).

Similar correlations between personal characteristic variables have been found among native-born Americans as well. Some of the studies that provide relevant comparisons for the present analysis have produced patterns typical of many other surveys of those variables. In their 1984 study of voters in Dane County, Wisconsin, Zhao and Chaffee (1986) found significant positive correlations between education and income (.24).[16] Zhao and Chaffee also found significant positive correlations between campaign interest and income (.10) and campaign interest and education (.21). These findings indicate that individuals of higher income and education, two characteristics that also have been consistently associated with one another (Austin, 1989; Chaffee et al., 1990; McLeod and McDonald, 1985), are likely to be relatively high in campaign interest. The correlations among control variables in previous studies of both immigrants and native-born Americans (both adults and children) indicate that similar results are likely to be found among the present sample of new citizens. In specific, education, socioeconomic status, income, and length of time in the United States are expected to be positively associated

[16]While this measure is not identical to Yang's (1988), it indicates the same type and direction of association since Yang's measure of SES is a composite of income and self-perceived socioeconomic class.

with English competency, and campaign interest is expected to be positively associated with socioeconomic status, income, education, and length of time in this country.

Issue Knowledge and Control Variables. It is also important to look at the correlations between these control variables and the dependent variable, issue knowledge, that have been found in previous research. Yang (1988) found significant positive associations between Koreans' knowledge of American political issues and length of stay (.22), English competency (.46), SES (.30), and education (.35). These results are in keeping with those found in other immigrant socialization studies (de la Garza and Brischetto, 1983; Chaffee et al., 1990; Subervi-Velez, 1984). Yang (1988) also found citizenship was significantly and positively associated with knowledge (.19), leading to the expectation that citizens in the present study may be relatively knowledgeable as well. This proposed general relationship may not hold for all citizens in the sample, however. As studies of native-born adolescents have indicated, those who have a greater understanding of politics and a more mature information processing capacity have been predicted to acquire complex information more broadly and deeply than those with less developed characteristics (for example, Atkin and Gantz, 1978; Drew and Reeves, 1980). Thus, while adult immigrants may be more practiced in the role of learner than adolescents, since it is

secondary socialization for them, low education and weak English skills may be associated with lower levels of learning.

In their sample of native U.S. voters, Zhao and Chaffee (1986) found that issue knowledge was significantly and positively correlated with income (.15), education (.31), and campaign interest (.25). These results were corroborated by Zhao et al. (1992). The findings for income and education also are consistent with those that have been found among the immigrant samples discussed above.

We need also to look at whether these controls predict political knowledge. Zhao and Chaffee (1986) used hierarchical regression and found that their control variables -- income, age, education, Congressional knowledge, self-perceived political knowledge, campaign activity, campaign interest, and a candidate voting decision -- explained 27 percent of the variance in issue knowledge. Zhao et al. (1992) used similar controls and found that they explained 29 percent of the variance in issue knowledge. The controls used by Yang (1988) and Chaffee et al. (1990) -- length of stay, age at immigration, English competency, education, SES, interethnic relations, intraethnic relations, ethnic identification, host identification, citizenship, and intent to permanently live in the U.S. -- explained 24 percent of the variance in their index of American political knowledge. While some of the controls used in the present study differ from those used in those three studies, this research indicates that it is not unreasonable to expect that

they will explain between 20 and 30 percent of the variance in issue knowledge of new citizens.

Further Explorations: Media Trust and Issue Knowledge

It has frequently been suggested that trust in media is a mediating factor in political learning (see, for example, Rogers, 1983). Neither direct effects of trust on political learning nor its indirect effects, has been examined in previous studies. Trust in the press is normally treated in research as a singular attitude. "Media credibility" involves a number of dimensions of judgment and derives from a complex web of political opinions and other predecessors. Television credibility has consistently surpassed newspaper credibility over the past thirty years. By the mid-1980s, respondents asked by the Roper organization which medium they would select when confronted with conflicting news reports chose television 46 percent of the time versus 22 percent for newspapers. As Newhagen and Nass (1989) have pointed out, a problem in the study of source credibility has been the definition of what a source is. Frequently, no distinction is made between a person as a source as opposed to an organization as a source (for example, Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz, 1970). The confusion increases, according to Newhagen and Nass, when the media channel becomes the perceived source of information. Their

findings suggest that respondents' confidence in a newspaper is based on its performance as an institution, whereas perceptions of trustworthiness of television are based on the performance of an aggregate of on-camera personalities. Thus asking respondents to comparatively evaluate trustworthiness across media channels imposes a requirement that they evaluate them across levels of analysis. To avoid this confusion, this study asks questions about trust in media specific to each channel.

Previous studies have demonstrated that channel variables interact with the source of a political ad. For instance, Cohen (1976) found that some candidates are more effective on radio, while others are more effective on television. Andreoli and Worchel (1978) demonstrated that source trustworthiness interacted with the channel such that low credibility sources (candidates) were least effective on television, while high credibility sources (newscasters) were most effective on television.

In a review of communication campaign studies, Rogers and Storey (1987) draw general propositions on factors contributing to campaign success. Among these generalizations is that the perceived credibility (the degree to which a source or channel is considered trustworthy or knowledgeable) of a source or channel enhances the effectiveness of a communication campaign. They point out that campaign success is dependent in part on audience perceptions of a match between what the communication source/channel is promoting and that source's/channel's motives.

"For example, commercial sources are often perceived as low in credibility because they are trying to sell a product" (Rogers and Storey, 1987, p. 838). Accordingly, respondents' evaluations of the trustworthiness of political ads in this study might be low if they perceived political ads as attempting to "sell" candidates.

While Yang (1988) did not study the effects of media trust on political learning, he did find a positive, but nonsignificant, association between trust in U.S. news media and knowledge of U.S. political issues (+.03). (See Yang, 1988, Appendix 1).

Chaffee et al. (1991) studied trust in U.S. media among Korean Americans. They controlled for length of time in the U.S., age at immigration, whether the individual was a U.S. citizen, whether he planned to return to Korea or stay in the U.S., education, English competency, socioeconomic status, social contacts, and psychological identification with both the Korean and U.S. cultures. In the final analysis, they divided their sample into low versus high users of U.S. media and low versus high users of Korean media, as well as into users of both U.S. and Korean media and users of Korean media only. They found that those who used Korean media only were no better than the low media use group at differentiating press-government relations in the U.S. from those in Korea (where the government-media link implies that trust in one institution is tantamount to trust in the other). They also found that American media users were more accurate (Chaffee et al., 1991). While their perception of the Korean media-

government association was the same as that of the Korean media users, the American media users were better at disassociating the U.S. government from the American press.

Chaffee et al. (1991) concluded that only with experience in the U.S. were immigrants able to recognize the independence of the U.S. press from the U.S. government. Moreover, since the 11 control variables failed to affect appreciably the relationship between trust in media and trust in government, the authors concluded that attention to the American press specifically provided the vehicle for acquiring this understanding. "Following the news in one's adopted country is the key factor in clarifying the press/government relationship, particularly if the person also continues to follow the contrasting, controlled press of the country of origin" (Chaffee et al., 1991).

This study examines the effects of trust in media channels on issue learning in terms of the American media only. This limitation is imposed since Chaffee et al. (1991) demonstrated that only with experience (with American news) does the independence of the U.S. press impress itself on immigrants from countries with a press-government relationship different than that of the U.S.[17]

---

[17]While respondents in this study could have been divided into groups based on the type of government of the country from which they immigrated, between-country differences in trust is not the focus of this particular study. This would entail coding more than 40 government-media systems around the world, based on the media-government system at the time the respondent immigrated. However, since trust in the channel of information might affect learning from that channel, media trust is a factor that deserves some attention here.

Summary

The present study is an effort to integrate findings from the literatures on immigrant socialization, new voters, and mass media effects in a study of new U.S. citizens. As the last two chapters have demonstrated, there are a number of specific findings in these literatures that bear on both the political socialization of new U.S. citizens and the role of the media in that process. In terms of the media's role, a number of results and conclusions can be applied to form expectations about media influences on the issue knowledge of new citizens in the present study. The differential roles of media and media use measures between adolescents and parents found by Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) are especially applicable. Their finding that, of newspaper and television exposure measures, only newspaper exposure significantly predicted issue knowledge of adults, and the accompanying finding that television news attention was a significant predictor of knowledge of adults, indicate the following:

(1) Adults use both television and newspapers for political information.

(2) Exposure measures account for most of the effects of newspapers on adults' political knowledge.

(3) Attention measures account for most of the effects of television on political knowledge.

(4) Measures of attention (or exposure) to television ads will not relate strongly to issue learning, unless the campaign is particularly intense and issue-oriented.

These points, taken in conjunction with Chaffee et al.'s (1990) conclusion that immigrants use television as a bridge in political socialization, lead to the following expectation about the influence the media will have on new citizens in the present study: Measures of television use should explain more of the variance in political knowledge among citizens if their English competency is not strong and if they have been in the U.S. a relatively short time (but long enough to be naturalized). In specific, if the sample is low in English skills, television is expected to contribute strongly to their political knowledge and the measure that is likely to best explain this variance is attention to television news. This is not to say that viewing television precludes reading newspapers. It merely means that among individuals of lower language skills, television is the easiest and most likely medium through which they can learn about politics.

The literature on immigrant socialization points to a number of pre- and post-immigration characteristics that play an important role in secondary socialization. These characteristics include English competency, self-perceived socioeconomic status, income, education, gender, and length of time in the United States. Many of these indicators of socialization are associated with particular media use patterns of immigrants and therefore will be

controlled for in this study. Newspaper measures in this study are exposure, attention, and recall of newspaper stories; television measures are exposure, attention, and recall of television news stories about the campaign; and television ad measures are attention and recall of ads.

The data will be analyzed to answer the following questions:

(1) Do new citizens learn about the issue positions of the 1988 presidential candidates through the mass media?

(2) Is televised campaign advertising in 1988 influential in the political learning of new citizens, as the results of Zhao et al. (1992) and Weaver and Drew (1991) indicate they might be?

(3) Do measurement issues matter? Is, for instance, a question about attention to television news a more valid measure of television news use, than is a question about exposure to television news? Similarly, for ads, is a measure of recall of television ads a more valid assessment of the use of political advertising than is a measure of attention to television ads?

(4) Do new citizens with lesser English language skills and fewer years in the U.S. use television as a "bridge" to political socialization, as Chaffee et al.'s (1990) findings on Koreans immigrants suggest?

(5) Does the degree of trust new citizens have in the media channels of interest here predict their political learning? Do attention to news and trust in news channels work together to

affect issue knowledge, as findings by Chaffee et al. (1991) suggest?

Setting the Stage: The 1988 Presidential Campaign in the Media

To predict issue-information learning from the mass media, it is necessary to establish that the media carried the kinds of information in question, during the 1988 campaign. Patterson and McClure (1976) concluded that citizens could learn issue information from television ads but not from television news, primarily by noting that newscasts failed to cover issue differences between Nixon and McGovern in 1972. Numerous analyses of the content of campaign television news, newspapers, and advertisements have been conducted. One primary criticism of television news has been that it focuses on the strategic and horse-race aspects of the presidential campaign at the expense of issue coverage. Newspapers have not had to contend with as much criticism as television news (probably in part because Patterson and McClure didn't analyze them), but they too have received their share of scrutiny. These content studies have emphasized the relative amounts of different kinds of content; our concern here is more with the absolute amount of issue content, specifically.

In some elections it has been demonstrated that horse-race content outweighed issue content in television newscasts (for

example, Kern, 1989; Patterson and McClure, 1976; Robinson and Sheehan, 1983). The same has been shown for newspapers (Patterson and Davis, 1985), although they also have been praised for their trend in recent elections of providing in-depth special series on major party candidates (Alger, 1989). Political advertising has been found to be increasingly negative in recent campaigns (Merritt, 1984), but those negative "attack ads" may often address issues [not necessarily honestly] (Jamieson, 1992).

For the present study, an issue is operationally defined as a policy question on which Bush and Dukakis differed in 1988. Based on this definition, what about media content in 1988? Were issues addressed in the media? The results of studies of media content in the 1988 election (Davis, 1989; Lichter, Amundson, and Noyes, 1988) defy continued criticism that television news does not address issues. A content analysis of network television news coverage conducted by Davis (1989) showed that 40 percent of 415 stories sampled focused on issues. Other evidence that television news provided a significant amount of coverage of candidate issue positions, especially during the early primaries, was found by Lichter et al. (1988). They sampled network news stories about the presidential primaries and found that 215 stories focused on issues, approximately 46 percent. Moreover, 75 of these network news stories mentioned at least one of what the authors defined as the four major economic issues of 1988: taxes, trade, unemployment, or the state of the economy (Lichter et al.,

1988). Each of the ten most frequently addressed issues was covered in more than fifty stories (Lichter et al., 1988).

Similar findings were demonstrated for selected newspapers. In a content analysis of issues of the New York Times and the Indianapolis Star from September to November of 1988, Hershey (1989) found that of the presidential campaign coverage in the New York Times, 47 percent of the stories dealt mainly or exclusively with policy issues in September. This percentage dropped to 32 percent in October (the month the present survey was conducted). The Indianapolis Star focused on policy issues in 23 percent of its presidential campaign stories in September, and in 37 percent of its stories in October (Hershey, 1989, p. 97).[18]

Televised political ads often have been criticized for not focusing on the issues in a campaign (Devlin, 1973; Minow, Burch, Corcoran, Heard, and Price, 1969; O'Keefe and Sheinkopf, 1974; Patterson and McClure, 1976). But content analyses of political ads aired about Bush and Dukakis demonstrate that issues were addressed in 1988. Shyles (1991) analyzed the 34 Bush ads and the 37 Dukakis ads televised during the campaign.[19] He classified the issues under seven headings (headings were developed by

---

[18]While these are not the newspapers our respondents, who mostly lived in northern and central California, read in 1988, the findings are probably typical of daily newspapers across the country. Presidential campaign coverage is mainly based on wire services and articles republished from a few leading newspapers.

[19]The 34 Bush ads and the 37 Dukakis ads include ads telecast during both the primary campaign and the general election campaign. Of the Bush ads, 15 were broadcast only during the general election, and 25 of the Dukakis ads were from the general election. Shyles did not analyze the two -- primary vs. general election -- ads separately.

Shyles, 1983): (1) domestic; (2) economy; (3) environment; (4) foreign policy/foreign relations; (5) government management; (6) national security; and (7) national well-being.[20] He found that of the 18 minutes of ads broadcast by the Bush campaign, the proportions of the total minutes devoted to each issue category were: (1) domestic, 25.9; (2) economy, 23.8; (3) environment, 2.2; (4) foreign policy/foreign relations, 10.1; (5) government management, 13,7; (6) national security, 14.4; and (7) national well-being, 10.1. Of the 21 minutes of Dukakis ads, Shyles found the following proportions devoted to each category: (1) domestic, 36.6; (2) economy, 21.6; (3) environment, 1.1; (4) foreign policy, 21.6; (5) government management, 7.7; (6) national security, 1.0; and (7) national well-being, 11.3 (Shyles, 1991, p. 145). Based on these findings, it cannot be concluded that the two major

---

[20]"'Domestic' issues specifically concerned national and social welfare problems, for example, education, crime, civil rights, industry, and nongovernmental institutions. 'Economy' focused on economic growth and the effect of the recession on the standard of living, the status of business and finance, costs, prices, the work force, earning and buying potential, and so on. 'Environment' included mentions focusing on nuclear dumping, nuclear waste, pollution, and ecological policies (i.e., the impact of the EPA on the nation and the world).
Foreign Policy/Foreign Relations' included international relationships, agreements, expectations, resolutions, occurrences and negotiations between nations, foreign trade, foreign trouble spots, and institutions negotiating foreign affairs. 'Government Management' focused on financial government programs, policies of taxation, and budgetary and financial policies of government. National Security/Military Strength' focused on safety of the nation from military aggression of potential international enemies, the maintenance of a safe margin of weapons protection against threats to the physical survival of the nation's people, and references to peace and avoidance of war. 'National Well-Being' focused on the vision of the American Dream, the hope of all Americans for the continued growth of the nation, subsequent status of the nation in the long run, and values and commitment of citizens to strive for the continued success of America," (Shyles, 1991, p. 142).

candidates did not address issues in their 1988 ads. It is expected that new citizens who viewed the ads will have learned from them about candidates' positions on a variety of issues. The presentations also may have enhanced the learning effects of the ads during this campaign. The ads were particularly negative in 1988, and research has demonstrated better memory for negative stimuli (Devlin, 1981; Johnson and Copeland, 1987; New Campaign Techniques, 1986; Shapiro and Rieger, 1989).

Not only were political ads negative in 1988, but "[N]ever before in a presidential campaign have televised ads sponsored by a major party candidate lied so blatantly" (Jamieson, 1992, p. ix). Even the popular press asserted that negative political advertising had reached an all-time high in 1988 ("Fewer Americans," 1989). Strategists for Bush produced both bolstering ads (positive ads -- in this case for Bush -- designed to promote a candidate's favorable personal attributes or issue positions) and attack ads (ads that call attention to failings in the opponent's character or issue positions [Pfau and Burgoon, 1988]). The three attack ads aired most frequently concerned Dukakis's "responsibility" for the pollution of Boston Harbor, the "revolving prison door" ad asserting Dukakis was soft on crime, and Michael Dukakis in a tank, an unflattering image designed to suggest his unfitness to serve as the nation's commander-in-chief. All three provided distortions of Dukakis's issue stands or his record as Massachusetts governor

(Jamieson, 1992). In addition, all three were extremely visual (and deceptive) associations, she concluded.[21]

During this particular campaign, the news media spent a lot of time focusing on campaign strategy (Davis, 1989: Hershey, 1988; Patterson, 1989), rather than on the truth behind the distortions. Not until the ad with Dukakis riding in the tank "rumbled into the World Series" did its obvious distortion of Dukakis's defense posture prompt ABC (and later the other networks), the Washington Post, and other major papers to set the record straight (Jamieson, 1992). The deceptions might have been uncovered earlier had Dukakis himself attempted to set the record straight, but he remained silent on the issue through the debates and did not respond in ads until October. Suffice to say, 1988 was an intense campaign that provided vivid stimuli, as well as issue content, for voters.

In summary, the obvious negativity and visual memorability of the ads in 1988 provide a prime opportunity for testing the effects of televised ads on voter learning of candidate issue positions. In constructing our knowledge measures for the present study, we drew the issue content from the daily newspaper and television news coverage, and the prominent advertising claims, of the campaign itself. (See Chapter 4 for a detailed description of the political issue knowledge index.)

---

[21]These famous negative ads were broadcast more frequently on news programs decrying the practice, than as paid commercials. We assume that our respondents were not particularly sensitive to this distinction, and would recall these as ads (not news) in any event.

Chapter 4
METHOD

This chapter presents the methods employed in the present study. The first section contains a brief description of the Naturalized Citizen Survey created specifically to collect the data for this study. The second section presents the operationalization and measurement of the variables for the study. The data analysis methods comprise the third section.

Naturalized Citizen Survey

The data for the present study are based on a mail survey (Naturalized Citizen Survey) conducted by the Institute for Communication Research (ICR) at Stanford University in October 1988. The Naturalized Citizen Survey, developed by this author and Steven H. Chaffee, was designed to examine the relationships between mass media use and knowledge of American politics in regard to the 1988 presidential election for newly naturalized citizens living in the San Francisco Bay area. (See Appendix A for a complete copy of the questionnaire.)

The survey instrument includes a number of questions regarding naturalized citizens' demographic characteristics,

consumption of both American and country-of-origin mass media, attention and exposure to both types of media, recall of political advertisements and news, knowledge of presidential candidates' issue positions, and general knowledge about United States politics.

Sampling procedure and final sample. The sample of newly-naturalized citizens who participated in this study was taken from records of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) in San Francisco in October, 1988. For the sample, 1,000 adult American citizens naturalized in San Francisco between January 1, 1988 and July 1, 1988 were selected from the INS records. Beginning with the sixth adult (person age 18 or over) naturalized in January, every sixth adult was selected until 1,000 names and addresses were obtained.[22]

Each new citizen in the sample was sent a questionnaire in English and an introduction letter that asked the new citizen to complete the questionnaire and to mail it back using the enclosed stamped envelope addressed to the ICR at Stanford University. Because of the large number of different native languages involved in the sample population, the survey was sent only in English.[23] Prior to the mailing, the questionnaire had been

---

[22]Because the purpose of this study was to collect data from citizens of voting age only, if an individual was less than 18 years of age, the next person was selected for inclusion in the study, followed by the sixth person after this individual, etc.

[23]The largest percentage of respondents, 27.9 percent, had immigrated to the United States from the Philippines. In addition, 8.6 percent were from China (another 4.1 percent from the Republic of China); 8.1 percent from Hong Kong; and 8.1 percent from Fiji.

pretested on nine students, three each enrolled in beginning, intermediate, and advanced English as a Second Language courses at Palo Alto High School, Palo Alto, California.

Respondents were asked to complete the survey and mail it back prior to the election on November 8. (The survey was mailed to the sample population on the day of the second televised presidential debate between George Bush and Michael Dukakis, October 13.) No surveys were returned after November 10; the return rate was 19.9% .[24] The resulting sample was large enough (N=199) for multivariate correlational analysis, even though the return rate was too low to generate confidence in the representativeness of marginal percentages for single variables.

The data collected provided considerable variance for testing the relationships hypothesized. Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for all variables included in this study. The respondents represented 48 different countries, and 41 different native languages or dialects. About 92 percent of them planned to vote in the presidential election; about 36% were registered Republicans and 33% were registered Democrats; in annual income per household, the median was approximately $35,000. The sample population also was relatively well-educated, with about 62% holding college degrees. However in most cases they received

---

[24]Given that some of the addresses already were out of date, the mailed return actually represents a response rate of 20.8 percent, accounting for undeliverable items. This low response rate is consistent with relatively low rates in mail surveys for Korean immigrants, for example, which rarely have exceeded 25 percent (Yang, 1988; Hurh and Kim, 1984; Lee, 1975).

their education in their country of origin, so educational attainment does not have the same socialization and knowledge implications it would have in a survey of indigenous U.S. adults.

Operationalization and Measurement

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of all the predictor variables involved in this study. Computation of means in Table 1 was performed substituting the mean for missing values. The frequency of responses to all survey questions can be found in Appendix A. Appendix B contains the bivariate correlations for all variables in this study.

Pre- and post-naturalization characteristics (controls). Pre- and post-naturalization characteristics are defined as those that help shape the naturalized citizen's social position in the United States. Table 2 contains the bivariate correlations between the control variables and issue knowledge. The following six variables were selected to measure the control characteristics:

1. Length of Stay: The number of years the new citizen has resided in the United States was arrived at by asking respondents what year they came to the United States. (Q28: "What year did you come to the U.S.?") The year was then subtracted from 1988.

Table 1

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS
OF VARIABLES AND INDICES

VARIABLE NAME	MEAN	S.D.	RANGE	N
Voting intention	3.28	1.2	0-4	189
Female*	1.79	.9	1-3	190
Length of time in U.S.	10.20	6.7	1-65	192
English language competency	8.22	2.6	1-12	198
Socioeconomic status (perceived)	1.71	.7	1-3	196
Education	3.49	.8	0-4	197
Income	3.42	1.7	0-6	189
Interest in U.S. politics	3.24	1.0	1-4	199
Constitutional knowledge	3.38	1.3	0-5	197
Newspaper exposure (days/week)$	4.13	2.5	0-7	198
Newspaper news attention$	3.73	1.8	0-6	192
Newspaper news recall$	1.59	.7	0-2	195
Television news exposure (days/wk)$	5.03	2.1	0-7	199
Television news attention$	4.33	1.5	0-6	199
Television news story recall$	1.65	.6	0-2	193
Television ad attention$	2.89	1.9	0-6	196
Television ad recall$	3.61	2.5	0-6	194
Socialization	0.00	1.4	-3.5-4.2	199
Newspaper trust	2.70	.7	1-4	199
Television news trust	2.90	.8	1-4	199
Television ad trust	1.91	.9	1-4	199
Issue knowledge	12.93	5.4	1-23	196

* Female is coded 1=Male, 2=No answer, 3=Female.

$ A high score indicates a higher degree of media contact, i.e. more frequent exposure, greater attention, and greater ability to recall a particular ad or news item.

Computation of means in Table 1 was performed substituting the mean for user-missing values.

As Table 1 shows, the mean number of years respondents have been in the United States is 10.1, with the median being 8 years. As Table 2 shows, length of stay was significantly associated with socioeconomic status and income.

2. Annual Family Income: The respondent was asked his/her yearly family income before taxes. (Q31: "What is your approximate yearly family income range, before taxes?") The response format was a six-point scale, ranging from "less than $15,000 per year" to "more than $60,000." The median income of respondents was in the range from $30,000 to $35,000. Income was significantly associated with socioeconomic status, education, language competency and length of time in the U.S. It also was significantly associated with issue knowledge (see Table 2).

3. Education: The respondent was asked the highest degree held. (Q30: "What is the highest educational degree you hold?") Response categories were "grade school," "high school," "college," "other (please specify)." Advanced degrees were combined with the "college" category.

The mean response was between high school graduate and college for highest degree held; the median was college graduate. Education was significantly associated with socioeconomic status, income, English competency, interest in U.S. politics ($p<.05$), intention to vote and issue knowledge. This indicated some degree

of multicollinearity among the controls, but no association was greater than .42 (education and English competency).

4. Self-perception of Social Class: Respondents were asked to locate themselves in their present U.S. social class. (Q35: "Which U.S. social class would you place yourself in?") The response format included the following six categories: "upper class," "upper middle class," "middle class," "lower middle class," "working class," "don't know." The mean score for this characteristic among respondents was between lower middle and middle class, while the median was middle class. (See Table 1.) Socioeconomic status was significantly associated with income, education, length of stay, and issue knowledge, with the greatest association being with income (.44).

Control variables 2,3, and 4 (annual family income, education, and self-perception of social class) often are combined in studies as a single index representing socioeconomic status. They are not combined in this study for the following reasons. First, education is a pre-immigration characteristic for many respondents in this study, so its usual associations with income and socioeconomic status (both post-immigration characteristics) in studies of indigenous adults cannot be assumed. Second, socioeconomic status may be interpreted by the respondent in terms of the social class system in the country of origin, which

Table 2
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CONTROL VARIABLES AND ISSUE KNOWLEDGE

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) Socioeconomic Status	---	.44**	.25**	.14	.31**
(2) Income	.44**	---	.36**	.33**	.26**
(3) Education	.25**	.36**	---	.42**	.02
(4) English Competency	.14	.33**	.42**	---	.06
(5) Length of time in US	.31**	.27**	.02	.06	---
(6) Female	.13	−.03	−.02	.02	−.02
(7) Interest US politics	.12	.18*	.18*	.26**	.09
(8) Intention to vote	.07	.14	.22**	.17*	.04
(9) Issue knowledge	.20**	.28**	.26**	.30**	.13
(10) Constitutional knowl.	.12	.23**	.07	.16*	.04

Variable	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(1) Socioeconomic status	.13	.12	.07	.19**	.12
(2) Income	.03	.18*	.14	.28**	.23**

Cell entries are Pearson correlation coefficients; * p<.05; ** p<.01; N=199

Table 2
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CONTROL VARIABLES AND ISSUE KNOWLEDGE
(Cont.)

Variable	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(3) Education	.02	.18*	.22**	.26**	.07
(4) English competency	.02	.26**	.17*	.29**	.16*
(5) Length of time in US	.02	.09	.04	.13	.04
(6) Female	---	-.13	.03	-.06	-.03
(7) Interest US politics	.13	---	.29**	.37**	.13
(8) Intention to vote	.03	.29**	---	.33**	.19*
(9) Issue knowledge	.06	.37**	.33**	---	.37**
(10) Constitutional knowl.	-.03	.13	.19*	.37**	---

Cell entries are Pearson correlation coefficients; * p<.05; ** p<.01; N=199

may be very different from the system in the United States. While some degree of multicollinearity was indicated among these three measures, it should not render the matrix inversion too unstable. To ensure that multicollinearity is not a problem, tolerance will be checked for variables in all regression analyses.

5. English Language Competency: Traditionally, competency in the language of the host country refers to a measure of the new citizen's knowledge of and skill with the host language. In this

study, it is operationally defined as the respondent's self-evaluation of his/her English, which was measured by three questions (Q34: "How good is your use of the English language?" in terms of "speaking," "reading," and "writing." The response format for each item was a four-point scale (1 = "not good" to 4 = "excellent.") The overall reliability of the three-item index (Cronbach's alpha) is .91.

The mean level of English competency among respondents was "very good," with the median response slightly higher but still within the same category. English competency was found to be significantly associated with income, education, interest in U.S. politics, intention to vote, and issue knowledge.

6. Female: New citizens were asked their gender ("Are you male or female?"). The response scale was coded as follows: 1 = "male," and 3 = "female," which means that positive correlations in the analyses that follow indicate that females are higher than males on the correlate in question. Of the respondents reporting their gender (9 did not), 75 were female and 115 were male. This variable was not significantly associated with any of the other controls, indicating that its presence in the regressions will not control for much variance. It remains in the analysis as a variable that has been important in some studies, and for which there might be a suppressor effect here.

Other control variables. Three additional variables were selected to control for respondents' interest and participation in the presidential election, as well as for their knowledge of politicians' terms of office, thereby providing a more stringent test of the effects of the media variables on issue knowledge.

7. Interest in U.S. Politics: Respondent's interest in politics was operationally defined as the new citizen's self-evaluation of his/her interest level. (Q13: "How interested are you in news about U.S. politics?") The response format was a four-point scale (1 = "very interested" to 4 = "not at all interested"). The mean score indicated that the average respondent was "somewhat interested" in U.S. politics (the median response is about the same). This control, as expected, was significantly associated with income, education, English competency, intention to vote, and issue knowledge. Among the control variables it had the highest association with political knowledge (.37), so it will be a stringent control in regression analysis.

8. Voting Intention: A composite index that combined the respondent's plan to vote in the presidential election with his/her act of registering to vote. (Q4: "Do you plan to vote in the U.S. election November 8?" and Q5: "Have you registered to vote? (If yes, for what party?") The response format for voting intention was a three-point scale (0 = "probably no" or "definitely no"; 1 = "probably yes"; 2 = "definitely yes"). Registering to vote is

measured in the following manner: 0 = "not registered", 2 = "Republican", "Democrat", "Independent". The two items were standardized and summed together to create an index for voting intention. The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of the index is .79.

Most respondents were registered and intended to vote in the 1988 election. Voting intention was most significantly associated with education and issue knowledge.

Political knowledge control. The following variable, Constitutional knowledge, will be used as a further, stringent control in a second set of hierarchical regressions. Because an individual's ability to learn also might play a role in issue knowledge, controlling for other types of political knowledge provides a more rigorous test of the questions without confounding the tests of campaign media effects. This Constitutional knowledge measure contains information all new citizens were required to learn about U.S. government -- terms of office for elected and appointed officials. This also is information that is not normally highlighted by the media during a campaign, and includes offices that were not prominent in the 1988 campaign (e.g., Governor of California). As a result, its addition provides a more rigorous test of the questions. Other studies also have controlled for various types of political knowledge (for example, Zhao and Chaffee, 1986).

9. Constitutional Knowledge. Respondents' Constitutional knowledge was operationally defined as the new citizen's knowledge of major public officials' terms of office. (Q22: "What is the term of office of the following? (How many years is each official elected or appointed for?) Circle answer." The offices were: "President of the U.S.," "Governor of California," "U.S. Senator," "U.S. Congressman," and "Supreme Court Justice." For each office, respondents could answer "2 years," "4 years," "6 years," "no limit." Responses for the five offices were summed, producing a range from 0 to 5. The mean score was 3.3, and the median was 4, indicating that these newly naturalized citizens had studied the U.S. Constitution rather well.

Mass media variables. This study includes eight different media measures: exposure, attention, and recall measures for newspaper stories on the campaign; exposure, attention, and recall measures for television news; and attention and recall of television advertisements. (An exposure measure for televised campaign ads was deemed impractical in the self-report format.) The bivariate correlations between the media measures and the control variables are presented in Table 3. The media contact measures were operationalized as follows:

1. Exposure to Newspapers: (Q26: "How many days in the past week did you read an American newspaper?")The frequency of

reading an American newspaper was measured using an 8-point scale, ranging from 0 (no days per week) to 7 (days per week). As Table 1 shows, respondents read a newspaper an average of four days during the preceding week. Newspaper exposure was significantly associated with all variables except socioeconomic status. The highest association was between newspaper exposure and interest in U.S. politics (.39). This has been a standard measure in many surveys.

2. Attention to Newspaper Campaign News: A composite index combining the amount of attention the citizen pays to "U.S. national politics" in newspapers and the attention the citizen pays to "Presidential campaign news" in newspapers. (Q15: "For each of the following, indicate how much attention you have given to it **both** on television **and** in newspapers: Circle the number from 0 to 3, where 0 means 'no attention' and 3 means 'very much.'") The scores for both newspaper items were standardized and summed together. The correlation between the items is .74 and the overall reliability of the index (Cronbach's alpha) is .85. These questions were modeled on recent survey items regarding news media attention, and adapted for self-administration in the mailed questionnaire.

The mean response for amount of attention paid to newspaper campaign stories (3.7 on a scale of 0 to 6) was nearer to "very much"

Table 3

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CONTROL VARIABLES AND MEDIA USE VARIABLES

Variable	Socioeconomic Status	Income	Education	English competency
Newspaper exposure	.13	.26**	.29**	.29**
Newspaper attention	.09	.07	.24**	.23**
Newspaper recall	.06	.14	.14	.20**
TV news exposure	.15*	.09	.12	.13
TV news attention	.14	.07	.15*	.21**
TV news recall	.02	.06	.13	.20**
TV ad attention	−.09	−.12	.04	.08
TV ad recall	.12	.21**	.21**	.31**

Variable	Female	Interest US politics	Intention to vote	Length of time in US
Newspaper exposure	−.19*	.39**	.35**	.26**
Newspaper attention	−.11	.56**	.19**	.13
Newspaper recall	−.16*	.26**	.22**	−.01
TV news exposure	.08	.29**	.11	.09
TV news attention	−.05	.69**	.27	.12
TV news recall	−.05	.23**	.23**	−.04
TV ad attention	.00	.36**	.13	−.04

Cell entries are Pearson correlation coefficients; * p<.05; ** p<.01; N=199

Table 3

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CONTROL VARIABLES AND MEDIA USE VARIABLES (Cont.)

Variable	Constitutional knowledge
Newspaper exposure	.12
Newspaper attention	.23**
Newspaper recall	.18*
TV news exposure	-.07
TV news attention	.14
TV news recall	.13
TV ad attention	-.06
TV ad recall	.29**

Cell entries are Pearson correlation coefficients; N=199

* $p<.05$

** $p<.01$

than to "no attention." Newspaper attention was most strongly associated with education, English competency, interest in U.S. politics and intention to vote.

3. Recall of Newspaper Campaign Story: A composite index that combines the respondent's recall of a story with the respondent's ability to describe a story. (Q7-A: "Can you remember a newspaper story you read about the presidential campaign?" Q7-B: "If yes, what was it about?") This item was created for this study. Respondents were given one point if they remembered a story and one more point if they described the story. The range for this variable is 0 to 2.

The median score on this measure (2.0) indicates most respondents said they remembered a story they had read and were able to describe it. This may produce a "ceiling effect" in data analysis. Newspaper recall was significantly associated with English competency, interest in U.S. politics, and intention to vote.

4. Exposure to National News on Television: (Q11: "How many days in the past week did you watch American national news on television?") The frequency of viewing national news on television was measured using an 8-point scale ranging from 0 (no days) to 7 (every day). This has been a standard question in many surveys.

At the mean, respondents reported having watched national news 5 days in the past week. Exposure to national news on television was only significantly correlated with interest in U.S. politics (and marginally correlated with socioeconomic status).

5. Attention to Television Campaign News: A composite index combining the amount of attention the citizen pays to "U.S. national politics" on television and the amount of attention the citizen pays to "Presidential campaign news" on television. (Q15: "For each of the following, indicate how much attention you have given to it **both** on television **and** in newspapers: Circle the number from 0 to 3, where 0 means 'no attention' and 3 means 'very much.'") The scores for both television news items were standardized and

summed together. The correlation between the items is .65 and the overall reliability of the index (Cronbach's alpha) is .79.

The mean amount of attention respondents reported paying to presidential campaign news on television was 4.3 (on a scale of 0 to 6). This is higher than the mean amount of attention to newspaper campaign stories, which was 3.7.

Television news attention was significantly correlated with English competency and interest in U.S. politics. The highest correlation among the controls and the media measures was between television news attention and interest in U.S. politics (.69).

6. Recall of Television Campaign Story: An index that combines the respondent's recall of a story with the respondent's ability to describe a story. (Q12-A: "Can you remember a news story you watched about the presidential campaign?" Q12-B: "If yes, what was it about?"). This item was created for this study. Respondents were given one point for saying they recalled a story and one more point for describing the story. The range is 0 to 2. The correlation for the items is .67.

The mean score for respondents was 1.4 (median=2.0), indicating that, on average, they were able to describe a story they saw on television. This recall mean is slightly higher than the recall mean for newspapers (1.4 versus 1.2).

Television news recall was significantly correlated with English competency, interest in U.S. politics, and intention to vote.

7. Attention to Presidential Campaign Advertisements: A composite index combining the amount of attention the citizen pays to television "Commercials for Bush" and to television "Commercials for Dukakis." (Q15: "For each of the following, indicate how much attention you have given to it both on television and in newspapers: Circle the number from 0 to 3, where 0 means 'no attention' and 3 means 'very much.'") The scores for both items were standardized and summed together. The correlation between the items was .53 and the overall reliability of the index (Cronbach's alpha) was .69. These items were created for this study, but are modeled on attention questions asked in recent interview-format survey research.

On a scale of 0 to 6, the mean amount of attention paid to ads by respondents was 2.8 (median 3.0). This was lower than both of the means for attention to newspapers and attention to television news, suggesting that respondents do not view themselves as investing as much mental effort into campaign ads as they do news. Attention to ads was significantly correlated only with interest in U.S. politics (.36).

8. Recall of Television Campaign Advertisements: A composite index that combines four items: the respondent's recall of an

advertisement about Dukakis, the respondent's ability to describe the advertisement, the respondent's recall of an advertisement about Bush, and the respondent's ability to describe the advertisement. (Q17A: "Do you remember seeing a television commercial for or against George Bush?" Q17B: "If yes, what was it about?" Q18A: "Do you remember seeing a television commercial for or against Michael Dukakis?" Q18B: "If yes, what was it about?") The range for this index is 0 to 4. Respondents received points on the following basis: one point for remembering an ad about Bush, one point for describing the ad, one point for remembering an ad about Dukakis, and one point for describing it. The scores were standardized and summed together. The overall reliability of the index (Cronbach's alpha) was .88.[25] This measure is unique to this study.

On a scale of 0 to 4, the mean score for ad recall was 2.5 (median=3.0), indicating that most respondents were able to remember both kinds of ads, and to describe at least one ad for or against Bush or Dukakis. Ad recall was significantly associated with income, education, English competency, interest in U.S. politics, and intention to vote.

Independent variables for further exploratory analyses. Several additional variables were created to use in further exploratory analyses: socialization, news attention, newspaper trust, television news trust, television ad trust, and news trust.

---

[25]This ad recall operationalization was suggested by Byron Reeves.

Socialization: This independent variable will be used to test whether television plays a bridging role in political learning for immigrants who rate their English competency as low and who have been in the U.S. a relatively shorter length of time. For these analyses, English language competency and length of time in the U.S. (see above question wording) are standardized, summed together, and split at the median (-.09) into low and high groups, resulting in two new variables that will be referred to as high socialization and low socialization.

Among the media measures, low socialization is significantly and positively correlated with television news attention, television ad attention, and television ad recall. (See Table 12). It is not correlated with the dependent variable, issue knowledge. High socialization is significantly and positively correlated only with newspaper exposure and newspaper attention. High socialization is not correlated with the dependent variable. Because English competency and length of stay were combined to create this socialization variable, it is comparable to, but not the same as, the separate measures of English competency and length of stay used by Chaffee et al. (1990).

News Attention: An index combining the indices for Attention to Television Campaign News and Attention to Newspaper Campaign News (see above for these two media

measures). The indices were standardized and summed to form a measure of News attention. The frequency distribution for this measure is in Appendix C. News attention is significantly and positively correlated with interest in U.S. politics, attention to newspapers, and attention to television news.

Trust in Newspapers, Trust in Television News and Trust in Television Ads : These three measures are operationally defined as the respondent's belief (opinion) about the trustworthiness of the information on presidential candidates provided by each channel. (Q19. "How much do you trust the following to tell you the truth about the candidates for President?" a) "American newspapers," b) "Television news," d) "Television commercials."[26] The response format for each item was a four-point scale (1= "Do not trust" to 4="Trust very much").

The mean and median responses for newspaper trust are "trust somewhat." The same holds for television news trust. Possible response-set tendencies among respondents for a series of questions with the same response scale are not evident here, especially when the question of trust shifts to television commercials. The mean and median response for trust in television commercials is "trust somewhat," roughly equivalent to a score of 2 on a scale of 1 to 4. In fact, 73 percent of the

---

[26]This question also asks about trust in c) "Magazines," e) "The U.S. government," and f) "A newspaper in your native language." These variables were not used in this study because they do not relate to the particular channels of interest here.

respondents said they either "do not trust' or "trust a little" television ads to tell them the truth about presidential candidates. This indicates that, contrary to findings by Atwood and Sanders (1975), these particular voters did differentiate between television news and television ads when evaluating trust in channels as information sources.

Newspaper trust is significantly associated with interest in U.S. politics and attention to newspapers ($p<.05$); and with trust in television news, trust in ads, and television news attention ($p<.01$). (See Table 10 for the bivariate correlations among the three trust measures. The bivariate correlations among the trust measures and all other variables are in Appendix C.) Trust in television news is significantly and negatively correlated with income, Constitutional knowledge, and issue knowledge ($p<.05$); significantly and positively correlated with interest in U.S. politics and television news exposure ($p<.05$); and significantly correlated with newspaper trust and television news attention ($p<.01$). Trust in television advertisements is significantly and negatively correlated with income, English language competency, Constitutional knowledge, television news recall ($p<.01$); significantly and negatively correlated with television ad recall, issue knowledge, and newspaper recall ($p<.05$); and significantly and positively associated with trust in newspapers and trust in television news ($p<.01$), and with attention to television ads ($p<.05$).

News Trust: An index combining the amount of trust the citizen has in newspapers and television news to tell the truth about the candidates. (Q19: Same as above.) The responses for the "American newspapers" and "Television news" items were standardized and summed to form a measure of news trust. News trust is significantly and positively correlated only with interest in U.S. politics and attention to television news (see Appendix C.)

The most nearly parallel study using media trust measures was conducted by Yang (1988). Yang found that of the variables common to both studies (English competency, length of time in the U.S., self-perceived socioeconomic status, and education), none was significantly correlated with his measure of American media trust. American media trust also was not significantly correlated with any of his media use measures or with knowledge of American political issues (Yang, 1988).

Knowledge of Presidential Candidate Issue Positions: "Political knowledge" as a campaign outcome has been operationalized in different ways in media effects studies. For example, the following types of knowledge indices have been used as operationalizations: identification of leaders, and major cities and countries in the news (Atkin and Gantz, 1978), knowledge of major candidates' party affiliations (Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986), knowledge about political issues in the news (Hawkins, Pingree,

and Roberts, 1975; knowledge of candidate issue positions (Drew and Weaver, 1991; McLeod, Bybee, and Durall, 1980; Weaver and Drew, 1991; Zhao and Chaffee, 1986), knowledge of the issue positions of the two major parties (Conway, Stevens, and Smith, 1975; Gollin and Anderson, 1980), knowledge of party symbols (Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986), knowledge of politicians' ideological positions -- liberal or conservative (Chaffee et al., 1990; Chaffee and Yang; 1988), knowledge of the ideological positions of political statements (Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986; Chaffee et al., 1990; Yang, 1988), knowledge of current candidates and their terms of office (Zhao and Chaffee, 1986), and confidence in one's knowledge of where candidates stand on the issues (Patterson and McClure, 1976; Zhao et al., 1992). The present study operationalizes political knowledge as an index of the comparative positions of candidates George Bush and Michael Dukakis on 26 issues.

The dependent variable in this study is new citizens' knowledge of where George Bush and Michael Dukakis stood on a variety of issues in the 1988 presidential campaign. Issue knowledge in this study was measured by a two-page list of items that asked the respondents to identify which candidate was more in favor of each of 26 different issue statements.[27] The issues selected were policy questions on which Bush, Dukakis, and their

---

[27]Brody and Page (1972) found some evidence that when respondents did not know where a candidate stood on an issue, they "projected" their own opinions on the candidate they favored. This survey also asked each respondent whether they favored or opposed each issue. No evidence was detected of projection by respondents.

respective parties had taken clearly contrasting positions in the 1988 campaign year.[28] Table 4 provides the frequencies of correct responses. Table 5 contains the response frequencies issue by issue. (Q20: "The next questions ask about proposals some people have made for the U.S. government. For each one, do two things: (1) Show your opinion by marking column 1; and (2) Show which candidate favors it more by marking column 2. (a) Increase the minimum wage"; (b) "Provide military aid to Nicaraguan contras"; (c) "Execute convicted drug kingpins"; (d) "Require teachers to lead Pledge of Allegiance"; (e) "Restrict abortions in Constitution"; (f) "Require balanced budget in Constitution"; (g) "Build the MX missile system"; (h) "Increase business income taxes"; (i) Build the Star Wars defense system"; (j) "Provide for prayer in schools in Constitution"; (k) "Give tax incentives to the oil industry"; (l) "Provide health care for every American"; (m) "Restrict ownership of handguns"; (n) "Strengthen conventional U.S. military forces"; (o) "Restrict imports"; (p) "Do more for affirmative action"; (q) "Raise taxes on the rich"; (r) "Fight communist expansion"; (s) "Fund more day care programs"; (t) "Sanctions against South Africa"; (u) "Restrict immigration"; (v) "Lower unemployment"; (w) "Reduce taxes"; (x) "Reduce military spending as much as possible"; (y) "Appoint liberal judges to the

---

[28]Wording and coding of "correct" responses was agreed upon, after some discussion and elimination of ambiguous or arguable issues, by a Republican and a Democrat. The items were also reviewed by several professors and graduate students in the Department of Communication at Stanford University.

Supreme Court"; (z) "Provide equal rights for women in Constitution." The response items for each issue were: "Bush favors more," "Dukakis favors more," and "No difference." The answers "Bush favors more" were given 1 point ("correct" answer) for the following items: (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i), (j), (k), (r), (u), and (w). The answers "Dukakis favors more" were given 1 point for items: (h), (l), (m), (n), (o), (p), (q), (t), (v), (x), (y), and (z). Any answer was given 1 point for item (s), because both candidates said they were in favor of day care. Respondents received a score of 1 for a correct answer and 0 for an incorrect answer, resulting in a 0-26 range of possible scores. The 325 zero-order correlations between the items were all positive, ranging from .01 to .59, and the overall reliability of the index (Cronbach's alpha) is .86.[29]

[29]Some uncertainty naturally exists in the "absolute" positions of the candidates on each issue. The question asks only "which candidate favors it more" (emphasis added). In addition, while it is common during a campaign for one candidate to take a position on an issue that is not addressed by the opposing candidate, through comparative judgments respondents can infer the position of the other candidate; i.e., to know Bush's position is to know Dukakis's position.

Table 4

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION
OF DEPENDENT VARIABLE: ISSUE KNOWLEDGE

NUMBER CORRECT	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
1.0	5	2.6	2.6
2.0	2	1.0	3.6
3.0	6	3.1	6.6
4.0	5	2.6	9.2
5.0	2	1.0	10.2
6.0	8	4.1	14.3
7.0	5	2.6	16.8
8.0	13	6.6	23.5
9.0	9	4.6	28.1
10.0	8	4.1	32.1
11.0	10	5.1	37.2
12.0	9	4.6	41.8
13.0	15	7.7	49.5
14.0	15	7.7	57.1
15.0	9	4.6	61.7
16.0	17	8.7	70.4
17.0	13	6.6	77.0
18.0	11	5.6	82.7
19.0	14	7.1	89.8
20.0	11	5.6	95.4
21.0	5	2.6	98.0
22.0	3	1.5	99.5
23.0	1	.5	100.0

N=196; Skewness (-.392), not significant
Note: The nominal range for the dependent variable is 1-26, but no single individual attributed all issues to the "correct" candidate, making the actual range 1-23. In no case were all issues attributed "incorrectly" by a respondent.

Table 5

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES TO CANDIDATE ISSUE KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS

ISSUE	BUSH FAVORS	DUKAKIS FAVORS	NO DIFFERENCE	M*
Increase minimum wage	148	16	28	7
Provide military aid to contras	150	9	30	10
Execute convicted drug kingpins	129	20	41	9
Require teachers lead Pledge of Allegiance	117	17	52	13
Restrict abortions in Constitution	115	28	47	9
Require balanced budget in Constitution	47	84	60	8
Build MX missile system	140	20	32	7
Increase business income taxes	28	120	43	8

N=199
* Missing

Table 5 (Continued)

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES TO CANDIDATE ISSUE KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS

ISSUE	BUSH FAVORS	DUKAKIS FAVORS	NO DIFFERENCE	M*
Build "Star Wars" defense system	155	6	25	13
Provide for prayer in schools in Constitution	105	24	57	13
Give tax incentives to oil industry	74	28	74	23
Provide health care for all Americans	30	124	37	8
Restrict ownership of handguns	62	69	58	10
Strengthen U.S. conventional military forces	77	70	43	9
Restrict imports	35	82	65	17
Do more for affirmative action	35	76	60	28
Raise taxes for the rich	16	132	41	10

N=199
* Missing

Table 5 (Continued)

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES TO CANDIDATE ISSUE KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS

ISSUE	BUSH FAVORS	DUKAKIS FAVORS	NO DIFFERENCE	M*
Fight communist expansion	116	13	58	12
Fund more day care programs	27	91	70	11
Sanctions against South Africa	38	80	64	17
Restrict immigration	55	28	101	15
Lower unemployment	57	64	64	14
Reduce taxes	89	42	59	9
Reduce military spending	17	140	32	10
Appoint liberal judges to Supreme Court	15	101	63	20
Provide equal rights for women in Constitution	21	96	71	11

N=199
* Missing

Data Analysis

The central empirical test in this study is a planned hierarchical regression analysis examining the relative contributions to issue knowledge made by the different media channels and media use measures. These tests will be performed again, using Constitutional knowledge as an additional control. These hierarchical regressions will be followed by exploratory analyses (also hierarchical regressions) that test Chaffee et al.'s (1990 and 1991) findings on Korean immigrants for this population of new citizens.

In the primary analyses, the first regression model includes only the control characteristics of the respondents. In order to test the relative contributions to issue-knowledge made by the different types of media and the different measures of media use, (after controlling for the pre- and post-naturalization characteristics) the regression model constituted three additional equations, one for each channel's effect on the dependent variable (issue knowledge).

The first regression equation is a base equation that includes: gender, household income, education, length of time in the United States, language competency, perceived socioeconomic status, interest in U.S. politics, and intention to vote (and Constitutional knowledge in the second set of tests). In the second equation, the three newspaper variables are added to the first equation. The

third equation adds only the three television news variables to the base equation. In the fourth equation, only the two television advertisement variables are added to the base equation. The fifth equation adds all eight media variables to the base equation, constituting the full model.

The R-square for the first equation indicates the variance of the dependent variable explained by the eight pre- and post-naturalization characteristics without regard to media effects. Increment to R-square for the second equation indicates the specific contribution of the newspaper media variables to issue knowledge, when the first equation variables are controlled. Similarly, the increment to R-square for the third equation indicates the specific contribution of the television news variables, and the increment to R-square for the fourth equation indicates the specific contribution of the television advertisement variables to the base equation. The full model provides an estimate of the predictive power of the total set of independent variables, including each of the new citizens' naturalization characteristics and media use indicators. Each increment to R square is tested against the residual variance following the first (control block) equation. This procedure provides a unique test of the significance of each channel, and the final equation yields an estimate of the total amount of variance explained by all the variables in the study. No attempt is made to compare the different indicators (e.g., exposure versus attention versus recall) of the influence of

the different channels on issue knowledge. For this study, these different operationalizations are considered parallel attempts to tap the same variable construct. After testing the main hypotheses, however, we will consider the value of these three different methods of asking survey questions about campaign media experiences.

The first exploratory analysis is similar to Chaffee et al.'s 1991 analysis of the effects on issue knowledge of trust in U.S. media among Korean Americans. The effects of trust in the three media channels will be examined separately. These analyses will be followed by a test of the effects on issue knowledge of news trust and news attention (indices), and a test of the interaction between news trust and news attention.

The final analysis tests Chaffee et al.'s (1990) conclusion that television plays a bridging role in political learning for immigrants who rate their English competency as low and who have been in the U.S. a relatively shorter length of time. The high and low socialization indices are used in this analysis.

Chapter 5
RESULTS

The presentation of results in this chapter begins with a discussion of the correlations between the media use measures and the dependent variable. These bivariate statistics are presented in Table 6. The results of the multivariate tests of the influence of the controls and the media use variables on political knowledge will then be presented. We turn first to an examination of the within-medium correlations.

Newspaper exposure is significantly correlated with both newspaper attention (.53) and newspaper recall (.42). This was expected since exposure is a precursor to attention and to the ability to recall something that was read. The association between newspaper attention and newspaper recall (.42) also is significant. This makes intuitive sense if the ability to recall information is predicated on having attended to it. Thus these correlations indicate the presence of some multicollinearity among the newspaper variables, although since almost all the coefficients are well below .7 they should not make the regression results too unstable (Tabachnick and Fidell (1989).[30]

[30]As a multicollinearity check, tolerance will be computed for all variables in each regression. Tolerance will be reported in all tables.

Table 6
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEDIA USE VARIABLES AND ISSUE KNOWLEDGE

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) Newspaper exposure	—				
(2)Newspaper attention	.53**	—			
(3)Newspaper recall	.42**	.42**	—		
(4)TV news exposure	.24**	.24**	.13	—	
(5)TV news attention	.32**	.69**	.28**	.43**	—
(6)TV news recall	.15*	.25**	.46**	.22**	.23**
(7)TV ad attention	.08	.29**	.19**	.28**	.50**
(8)TV ad recall	.24**	.27**	.32**	.15*	.28**
(9)Issue knowledge	.24**	.36**	.20**	.02	.33**

Variable	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
(6)TV news recall	—			
(7)TV ad attention	.15*	—		
(8)TV ad recall	.31**	.22**	—	
(9)Issue knowledge	.20**	.14	.36**	—

Cell entries are Pearson correlation coefficients; * p<.05; ** p<.01; N=199

All three newspaper measures are also significantly associated with the dependent variable, issue knowledge. This result is consistent with previous studies for newspaper attention and exposure (see, for example, Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986; Zhao and Chaffee, 1986)

Significant correlations also are found among the three television news measures. As Table 6 shows, the correlation between television news exposure and television news attention is .43 ($p<.01$), the most significant association among the television news measures. Television news exposure is correlated with television news recall at .22 ($p<.01$); and television news attention is correlated with television news recall at .23 ($p<.01$). Of the three measures, only television news exposure is not correlated with issue knowledge (.02, $p>.05$). Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) also found that the correlation between television news attention and issue knowledge was stronger than the correlation between television news exposure and issue knowledge.

The two measures for advertising are significantly correlated (.22). Recall of a political ad is significantly associated with issue knowledge, but the association between ad attention and issue knowledge is not significant (.14).

Turning to the correlations across media, as Table 6 shows, the correlations between the media variables are positive and significant in all but two cases. Attention to television ads is not significantly correlated with exposure to newspapers, nor is

exposure to television news significantly correlated with newspaper recall. There is no reason to expect they would be associated. These correlations between channels will not be problematic in the hierarchical regression analysis, since only one exposure item, one attention item, and one recall item will be entered in each predictor block representing a particular channel. The highly significant within-medium correlations, especially for television news, will, however, distort the beta weights in regression. The tests of significance will be applied to the R square values, which are not affected by multicollinearity.

In examining the newspaper-television news correlations, we find that although newspaper exposure and television news exposure are significantly correlated (.24), this correlation coefficient is smaller than the other corresponding correlation coefficients between these media. Attention to television news and attention to newspapers produce the most significant entry in the table (.69). This suggests that the individual differences in the use of these media do not carry over to a person's attention to news, which appears to be an individual difference that cuts across channels. The newspaper and television news recall measures are also significantly correlated (.46). Recall is to some extent an ability of the individual, again not channel-specific.

When the corresponding measures for advertising are examined, attention to ads correlates .29 ($p<.01$) with newspaper attention and .50 with television attention. This indicates that

individual differences in use of a medium do carry over to an extent, since both ads and television news are features of the same medium. Ad recall correlates .32 with newspaper recall and .31 with television news recall. Since these are measures designed for this study, these results are not comparable with previous studies.

Regression Results

Table 7 summarizes the results of the planned hierarchical regressions used to test the research questions. In these particular regressions, the effects on issue knowledge of the control variables are assessed prior to examining the contributions that the media use variables make to issue knowledge. This method reassesses the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables at each step of the hierarchy, allowing for the determination of the added predictive contributions made by each block of variables. Because there were 26 separate issue items comprising the dependent variable, a case was lost if an individual failed to answer any of the items. While listwise deletion of data with missing values is the default in SPSS regression, concern over the number of cases lost (approximately 30) necessitated inclusion of missing values. The analyses were performed with missing values set equal to zero (0). This in effect treats the citizen as not having answered correctly if she did not

Table 7

KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE ISSUE POSITIONS
BY NEW CITIZEN CHARACTERISTICS AND MASS MEDIA USE:
REGRESSION ANALYSES

VARIABLE	Raw r	Eq. 1	Eq. 1.1	Eq. 1.2	Eq. 1.3	Eq. 1.4
Socioeconomic Status .	.19**	06	.05	.07	.06	.07
Income	.28**	.11	.15*	.13	.09	.13
Education	.26**	.07	.05	.07	.06	.05
English Competency	.29**	.13	.13	.12	.10	.10
Length of time in US	.13	.05	.06	.06	.06	.06
Female	-.06	-.04	-.05	-.02	-.05	- .04
Interest US Politics	.37**	.22***	.14	.14	.20**	.14
Intention to Vote	.33**	.19**	.22***	.17**	.16**	.18**
Newspaper Variables						
Newspaper Exposure	.24**		-.13			-.09
Newspaper Attention	.36**		.24**			.19*
Newspaper Recall	.20**		.01			.04
Television News Variable						
TV News Exposure	.02			-.19**		-.16*
TV News Attention	.33**			.19*		.04
TV News Recall	.20**			.06		.05
Television Ad Variables						
TV Ad Attention	.13				.01	.02
TV Ad Recall	.36**				.22***	.19**
N=199						
Total R Square		.249***	.281***	.283***	.289***	.328***
Incremental R square by Entering Media Variables into Eq. 1			.032**	.034**	.040**	.079**

Note: Entries are standardized beta weights

* p<.05
** p<.01
***p<.001

Tolerance ranges from .29 to .88 in all equations

answer at all, which is the way a self-administered knowledge test would ordinarily be scored.

Issue knowledge and mass media use. The first equation (Equation 1) in Table 7 is a base model with issue knowledge as the dependent variable and eight control variables as the independent variables. As shown in Table 7, column 1, intention to vote ($p<.01$) and interest in U.S. politics ($p<.001$) make significant contributions to the explanation of variance. The multiple R-square for Equation 1 is .249, meaning that the control variables collectively explain approximately one-quarter of the variance in issue knowledge. This finding is consonant with (although a bit lower than) expectations based on previous studies. Zhao and Chaffee (1986) found that their control variables explained 27 percent of the variance in issue knowledge. Similarly, Zhao et al. (1992) found that the control block produced a multiple R-square of .292. These other studies to some extent used other variables, of course. Further, the correlation of knowledge with education probably means something different here than it would for a sample of native-born U.S. citizens, because the education of most of these respondents occurred in the countries of origin, not in the U.S., and thus has less to do with knowledge of U.S. politics.

Equation 1.1 in Table 7 adds the newspaper variables: exposure to newspapers, attention to newspaper election news,

and recall of a newspaper campaign story, to the base equation. The newspaper variables produce an increment to the variance explained of slightly more than 3 percent ($p < .01$). There is not a previous study with all three measures.[31] However, Zhao and Chaffee (1986) found that newspaper exposure explained a significant 1.6 percent increment of the variance in issue knowledge, and they note a number of prior studies that report positive relationships between newspaper use and other measures of public affairs knowledge.

The only significant predictor among the three newspaper measures, when they are pitted against one another in regression, is attention to newspaper stories about the presidential campaign ($p < .01$). Simple exposure to newspapers (how many days an American newspaper was read during the preceding week) and recall of a particular newspaper story about the campaign do not contribute much to issue knowledge that is not already captured in the attention measure. But how do the results for the individual newspaper measures compare to those in previous studies?

Chaffee et al. (1990) found that newspaper exposure was a significant predictor of issue knowledge for Koreans with strong English competency. It was negative and nonsignificant for those with weak English skills (Chaffee et al., 1990). Yang (1988) found

---

[31]Most studies enter attention to newspapers and attention to television news as a block and/or exposure to newspapers and exposure to television news as a block (Chaffee and Choe, 1979; Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986; Yang, 1988) or as part of blocks of a number of media use variables (Drew and Weaver, 1991; Weaver and Drew, 1991).

that newspaper exposure did not predict knowledge of political issues for Korean immigrants. Chaffee and Schleuder found that newspaper exposure was a significant predictor of party-issue knowledge for parents, but not for adolescents. This seems to indicate that exposure to newspapers, which often accounts for most of the effects of newspapers on knowledge for native-born adults, affects these new citizens in a manner similar to native-born adolescents.

The result for newspaper attention is not consistent with some previous studies (Chaffee and Choe, 1979; Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986). Chaffee and Schleuder found that newspaper attention did not significantly predict political knowledge for parents or adolescents. The finding in the present study is closer to that of Weaver and Drew (1991), who found newspaper attention to be a significant predictor of issue knowledge for their statewide sample of voters.

Equation 1.2 in Table 7 adds the block of three television news variables (exposure to television news, attention to television news about the campaign, and recall of a television news story about the campaign) to the controls (removing the newspaper measures of Equation 1.1). The three television measures add a significant 3.4 percent increment ($p<.01$) to the variance that was explained by the controls. Zhao and Chaffee (1986) and Zhao et al. (1992) added only attention to television news in a block. In both

cases, attention to news produced a significant increment to the variance of at least 2.1 percent.

When the three television news measures are entered as a block, exposure is a significant negative predictor of issue knowledge ($p < .01$). The sign of the beta for television news exposure is negative due to multicollinearity with the attention measure, however. The raw correlation for the exposure measure is a non-significant +.02. We should not infer that television news exposure somehow detracts from issue knowledge, only that it does not contribute unless it is accompanied by attention. That is also the conclusion of Chaffee and Schleuder (1986).

Attention to television news about the campaign is significant and positive ($p < .05$). The overall pattern of the television results coincides with Chaffee and Schleuder's conclusion that, for television, questions about attention are the more valid measure. The lack of impact of the recall measure may be related in part to Jeffres' (1986) conclusion that people often forget most of what they learn in news broadcasts, but can recall some of the content when given cues in subsequent tests. The new citizen questionnaire provided no recall cues other than asking about a presidential campaign story, which may have made it difficult for those who had seen a story on television to retrieve it. In any event, the recall method did not improve upon measurement for television news in this study.

Equation 1.3 in Table 7 includes the new citizens' characteristics and the two television advertising variables: attention to ads for Bush and Dukakis, and recall of an ad for or against Bush or Dukakis. The advertising measures produce a significant 4.0 percent increment to the variance explained by the controls ($p<.01$).

The respondent's ability to recall and describe a particular campaign advertisement is the most significant media use predictor in this model ($p < .001$), a finding that justifies our addition of the recall measure to the questionnaire. While attention to ads is not significant, the recall measure is accounting for those who say they paid attention to candidates' ads (the two measures were significantly correlated, $p<.01$), and more.

The nonsignificance of the attention to ads was expected. It has not been a strong predictor of political knowledge in most studies (Drew and Weaver, 1991; Patterson, 1980; Weaver and Drew, 1991; Zhao and Chaffee, 1986) although Zhao et al. (1992) and Patterson and McClure (1976) are exceptions.

Overall, each block of variables adds significantly to the predictive power of the model, well beyond the variance accounted for by the control variables. The changes in R-square of 3.4 percent or greater for television news and ads are, in fact, higher than any reported in the five or so various tests of those two channels by Zhao and others. The new citizens in this survey

may have had more to learn from the campaign of 1988 than does the typical voter in other samples.

The full model with all the control variables and all the mass media variables is shown in Equation 1.4. The increment to R square for this final, summary equation is greater than the sum of any two increments for the specific media, indicating that some unique variance is being explained by each of the three channels. The ability to recall and describe a particular television advertisement for or against one of the candidates is the most important single predictor of knowledge of candidate issue positions ($p < .01$). Intention to vote also contributes significantly ($p<.01$). These new citizens seem to have been preparing well for their first U.S. election as voters. Of the remaining mass media use variables, exposure to television news (negative, but artifactual) and attention to newspaper stories about the campaign (positive) are both significant ($p < .05$) as well.

As pointed out earlier, these specific betas are somewhat questionable because of multicollinearity between some of the media variables. There seem to be unique contributions to immigrants' issue knowledge from each of the three channels. Campaign advertisement recall, a measure designed specifically for this study, is particularly impressive in Equation 1.4. Campaign advertising may have reached sectors of this population that more purposeful channels did not; the recall items for newspapers and television news do not produce much extra statistical power here.

The relatively weak results for newspapers, compared to most surveys of indigenous adults, lend some credence to Chaffee et al.'s conclusion that it is television that plays the "bridging role" in immigrant socialization (1989). The "bridging" role of television will be tested on this sample of new citizens later in this chapter.

The total R square produced by all the variables in Equation 1.4 compares well with the results of other studies. Many have found that the media measures and controls explained a significant 24 to 29 percent of the variance in issue knowledge (Yang, 1988; Drew and Weaver, 1991; Weaver and Drew, 1991 [city sample]; and Chaffee et al., 1990). Although different measures were used in these other studies, the variables in the present study explain a significant ($p<.001$) 32.8 percent of the variance in issue knowledge.

In sum, these regression findings show that these newly naturalized citizens in Northern California learned about where George Bush and Michael Dukakis stood on the issues through their use of the mass media. Their learning was also stimulated if they planned to vote in this first U.S. election for which they were eligible. All other factors measured in this study are overshadowed in this multivariate analysis by the three media channels and intention to vote. The next section provides a more stringent test of the effects of the different channels and media use measures on issue knowledge.

Table 8

KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE ISSUE POSITIONS
BY NEW CITIZEN CHARACTERISTICS AND MASS MEDIA USE
CONTROLLING FOR CONSTITUTIONAL KNOWLEDGE:
REGRESSION ANALYSES

VARIABLE	Raw r	Eq. 1	Eq. 1.1	Eq. 1.2	Eq. 1.3	Eq. 1.4
Socioeconomic status	.19	.05	.04	.05	.05	.05
Income	.28	.06	.10	.08	.06	.09
Education	.26	.09	.08	.09	.08	.08
English Competency	.29	.10	.11	.10	.07	.08
Length of time in US	.13	.06	.06	.06	.06	.07
Female	-.06	-.03	-.04	-.02	-.04	-.04
Interest US politics	.37	.22**	.16*	.15	.19**	.15
Intention to vote	.33	.15**	.18**	.14**	.13**	.15*
Constitutional knowledge	.36	.27***	.24***	.24***	.23***	.20**
Newspaper Variables						
Newspaper exposure	.24		-.10			-.07
Newspaper attention	.36		.17*			.14
Newspaper recall	.20		-.03			-.07
Television News Variables						
TV news exposure	.02			-.15*		-.13
TV news attention	.33			.15*		.04
TV news recall	.20			.05		.01
Television Ad Variables						
TV ad attention	.14				.04	.03
TV ad recall	.36				.16**	.17**
Note: Entries are standardized beta weights						
N=199						
Total R Square		.314***	.331***	.335***	.338***	.366***
Incremental R Square by Entering Media Variables into Eq.1			.017**	.021**	.024**	.052**

* p<.05
** p<.01
***p<.001

Hierarchical regressions controlling for Constitutional knowledge. An individual's ability to learn also might play a role in issue knowledge. Therefore, controlling for ability to learn will make for a more stringent test of the influence of the mass media measures on knowledge.[32] The hierarchical regressions were performed again, adding the Constitutional knowledge measure to the block of control variables.

As Table 8 shows, Constitutional knowledge is significantly correlated with the dependent variable ($p<.01$), and it is the most significant predictor in each regression equation. In Equation 1, interest in U.S. politics and intention to vote remain significant (see Table 7) with this added control, however. The addition of the Constitutional knowledge control also produced a significant increment to R square ($p<.01$), explaining 6.5 percent of the variance beyond the original eight control variables in Table 7, Equation 1.

In Equation 1.1, the newspaper measures are added to the base equation. Constitutional knowledge is the most significant predictor in this model ($p<.001$). Interest in U.S. politics and intention to vote are significant predictors, despite changes due to the Constitutional knowledge measure. While intention to vote is not at the same level of significance as it was without the knowledge control, interest in U.S. politics is now significant at the

---

[32]Zhao and Chaffee (1986) also controlled for other kinds of political knowledge to separate out the effects of candidate-specific knowledge from the larger body of political knowledge that an individual could build up without the presidential campaign.

p<.05 level. Of the newspaper measures, only newspaper attention is significant (p<.05), similar to Table 7. The newspaper measures produce a significant 1.7 percent increment to the variance that was already explained by the controls. Hence the learning effect attributable to newspaper use survives even this stringent control.

Equation 1.2 adds the television news measures to the base equation. Again, Constitutional knowledge is the most significant predictor. Interest in U.S. politics also is significant (p<.05). Among the television news measures, both television news exposure and television news attention are significant (p<.05), although exposure is again negative. The television news measures produce a significant 2.1 percent increment (p<.01) to R square beyond the variance explained by the controls, so the effect of television news has also survived this added control.

In Equation 1.3, the advertising measures are added to the controls. Interest in U.S. politics, intention to vote, and Constitutional knowledge are all significant among the controls. Television ad recall also remains significant (p<.01). The two advertising measures produce a significant 2.4 increment (p<.01) to the variance explained in Equation 1, again supporting the inference of a significant issue-learning effect attributable to campaign ads.

In the full model, intention to vote and Constitutional knowledge are significant predictors of issue learning. The only media measure that is significant in Equation 1.4 is television ad

recall, ($p<.01$). In the full model, the eight media measures add a significant 5.2 percent increment to the variance explained by the controls, including Constitutional knowledge. This increment is, again, greater that the sum of the increments added by any two blocks of media measures.

The results indicate that even in a more stringent test, measures of newspaper attention, television news attention and television ad recall each significantly predict issue knowledge. In addition each block of media measures continues to add a significant increment to R square beyond the control measures. But what happens when the corresponding measures of these channels (exposure, attention, or recall) are added as separate blocks (for example, newspaper exposure and television news exposure as a block)? The following section examines this question.

The across-channel effects of media-use measures on issue knowledge. Previous studies have examined the contributions to issue knowledge made by the corresponding media use measures of competing channels (Chaffee and Schleuder, 1986; Chaffee and Choe, 1979). This analysis is performed separately for the two exposure measures, the three attention measures and the three recall measures. Each corresponding set of measures is entered as a separate block. The results are reported in Table 9.

Table 9

KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE ISSUE POSITIONS
BY NEW CITIZEN CHARACTERISTICS AND ACROSS-MEDIA USE MEASURES:
HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION ANALYSES

Variable	Eq.1	Eq. 2	Eq. 3	Eq. 4
Socioeconomic status	.06	.07	.06	.06
Income	.11	.11	.13	.09
Education	.07	.08	.04	.06
English competency	.13	.14*	.12	.09
Length of time in US	.05	.06	.04	.06
Female	-.04	-.04	-.04	-.05
Interest US politics	.22***	.26***	.12*	.20**
Intention to vote	.19**	.20**	.19**	.17**
Exposure Variables				
Newspaper exposure		-.03		
TV news exposure		-.12		
Attention Variables				
Newspaper attention			.17*	
TV news attention			.01	
TV ad attention			.03	
Recall Variables				
Newspaper recall				-.03
TV news recall				-.01
TV ad recall				.23***
Note: Entries are standardized beta weights				
N=199				
Total R square	.249***	.271***	.271***	.290***
Incremental R square by entering media use measures into Eq.1		.022**	.022**	.041**

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
Tolerance range for table .31 to .72

(Constitutional knowledge is not included as a control in this analysis.)

Equation 1 in Table 9 is the base equation with only the controls entered. In Equation 2, the two media exposure measures -- exposure to newspapers and exposure to television news are entered. The exposure measures produce a significant 2.2 percent increment ($p<.01$) to the variance explained by the controls. Neither of the two exposure measures is significant by itself. Among the controls, interest in U.S. politics ($p<.001$), intention to vote ($p<.01$), and language competency ($p<.05$) are significant. The three attention measures are entered as a block in Equation 3. Attention to newspapers is significant and positive ($p<.05$), as is interest in U.S. politics. Intention to vote also is a significant predictor of issue knowledge ($p<.01$). The three attention measures add a significant 2.2 percent increment ($p<.01$) to the variance explained by the controls.

In Equation 4, the three recall measures are entered. Interest in U.S. politics and intention to vote are significant ($p<.01$). Television ad recall is the only significant recall variable ($p<.001$). The recall measures add a significant 4.1 percent increment ($p<.01$) to the variance explained by the controls.

How do these findings compare with Chaffee and Schleuder's (1986)? Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) entered television news attention and newspaper attention as a block. The block produced a significant increment to the variance explained beyond the

controls for both parents and adolescents, as it did for the new voters in this study. However, while Chaffee and Schleuder found that attention to television news was the significant predictor among the two measures (for both parents and adolescents), it is newspaper attention that is the significant predictor of issue knowledge for new voters in this study. These findings also differ from those of Chaffee and Schleuder (1986) in terms of the media exposure measures. While they found that newspaper exposure was a significant and positive predictor of parents' issue knowledge ($p<.01$), it is negative and insignificant for new citizens in this study.

Table 10

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG MEDIA TRUST MEASURES

Variable	Newspaper trust	TV news trust	TV ad trust
Newspaper trust	---		
TV news trust	.54**	---	
TV ad trust	.27**	.26**	---

** $p<.01$

Media trust and issue knowledge. As Table 10 shows, the three channel trust measures are significantly and positively correlated with one another ($p<.01$). Table 11 presents the results of hierarchical regressions using the trust measures. In Equation 1, the control variables are entered as a block followed by the three trust measures. The trust measures produce a significant 3.1 percent increment ($p<.01$) to the variance explained beyond the controls. Among the controls, intention to vote is a significant predictor of issue knowledge ($p<.01$) as is interest in U.S. politics ($p<.001$). Among the three trust measures, only trust in television news is significant; it is a negative predictor ($p<.05$). (Tolerance ranges from .67 to .93 for all variables.) The block does add a significant increment to the variance explained by the controls ($p<.01$).[33]

Equation 2 adds newspaper trust and newspaper attention as a block. Newspaper trust is a significant, and negative, predictor of issue knowledge ($p<.05$). The block adds a significant 2.9 percent increment to the variance explained beyond the controls ($p<.01$). Television news trust and television news attention are added as a block to the base equation in Equation 3. Trust in television news is a significant, negative, predictor of issue knowledge ($p<.01$), and television news attention is a significant predictor as well ($p<.05$). The television news block adds a significant 4.3 percent increment to the variance explained.

---

[33]The variance explained by the controls is .249. See Table 9 for the standardized beta weights.

Table 11

KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE ISSUE POSITIONS
BY NEW CITIZEN CHARACTERISTICS, MASS MEDIA USE, AND MEDIA TRUST:
HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION ANALYSES

Variable	Eq.1	Eq.2[$]	Eq.3	Eq.4
Socioeconomic status	.06	.06	.05	.05
Income	.08	.10	.10	.08
Education	.06	.03	.06	.06
English competency	.12	.12	.12	.08
Length of time in US	.04	.04	.03	.06
Female	-.03	-.04	-.03	-.04
Interest US politics	.26***	.19**	.17*	.20**
Intention to vote	.17**	.19**	.17**	.16**
Trust and Media Use Variables				
Newspaper trust	.02	-.25*		
TV news trust	-.18*		-.20**	
TV ad trust	-.03			-.05
Newspaper attention		-.10		
TV news attention			.16*	
TV ad recall				.21***
Note: Entries are standardized beta weights				
N=199				
Total R square	.280***	.278***	.292***	.291***
Incremental R square by entering media use/ media trust block	.031**	.029**	.043**	.042**

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
Tolerance range for all variables: .67 to .93

Table 11
KNOWLEDGE OF CANDIDATE ISSUE POSITIONS
BY NEW CITIZEN CHARACTERISTICS, MASS MEDIA USE, AND MEDIA TRUST:
HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION ANALYSES
(Cont.)

Variable	Eq.5	Eq.6	Eq.7
Socioeconomic status	.06	.06	.06
Income	.12	.11	.11
Education	.03	.04	.04
English competency	.12	.11	.11
Length of time in US	.03	.02	.03
Female	-.04	-.02	-.03
Interest US politics	.16*	.15*	.16*
Intention to vote	.19**	.18**	.19**
Trust and Media Use Variables			
Newspaper attention	-.10		
News attention		.21*	-.24
Newspaper trust	-.25*		
News trust		-.17*	-.45**
Incremental R square	.029**	.050**	.036**
Interaction Variables			
Newspaper trust by newspaper attention	.36		
News trust by news attention			.56*
Note: Entries are standardized beta weights			
Incremental R square	.007@		.023**

@ Interactions were also tested for TV news attention x TV news trust and TV ad attention x TV ad trust; both were nonsignificant.
* p<.05
** p<.01
***p<.001
Tolerance range for all variables: .67 to .93

Equation 4 adds television ad recall and television ad trust as a block. Television ad trust is non-significant, and television ad recall is a significant predictor of issue knowledge ($p<.001$). The block adds a significant 4.2 percent increment to the variance explained beyond the controls ($p<.01$).

Equations 5-7 in the second half of Table 11 test interactions between the media use measures and the trust measures. In Equation 5 the interaction between newspaper trust and newspaper attention is added to the equation as a third block. The increment to the variance explained beyond the controls and the newspaper trust and newspaper attention block is not significant ($p>.05$). The same is true for the increment to R square for the interactions between television news attention and television news trust ($p>.05$) and between television ad recall and television ad trust ($p>.05$). These results are reported, but not included in the table.

For equation 6, the newspaper attention and television news attention measures were summed to form an index of news attention. The newspaper trust and television news trust measures were summed to form an index of news trust. These two indices are entered as a block in Equation 6. News attention is a significant predictor of issue knowledge ($p<.05$), and news trust is significant, and negative ($p<.05$). The two news indices produce a significant 5.0 percent increment to the variance already explained by the control variables ($p<.01$).

Finally, Equation 7 adds the interaction between the news trust and news attention indices. These are summary indices, representing the most reliable indicators of the two behaviors, attention and trust, available in this study. The interaction term is a significant predictor of issue knowledge ($p<.01$). The interaction also produces a significant 2.3 increment to the variance explained beyond the control block and the news trust and news attention block ($p<.01$). This finding, while difficult to interpret quantitatively due to the distorted beta weights in Equation 7 of Table 11, indicates that attention coupled with trust enhances issue learning during the campaign. This positive effect of trust, in its interaction with attention, occurs despite the negative raw correlations of all the media trust measures with issue knowledge and with attention in the aggregate.

The results of the hierarchical regressions in Table 11 show that media trust does help predict issue knowledge for this sample of new voters. This study also sheds some light on the conditions under which trust in media predicted issue knowledge for these new citizens. Trust in each medium -- newspaper trust, television news trust, and television ad trust -- entered as a block explains a significant amount of the variance in issue learning beyond the variance explained by the controls ($p<.01$). This indicates that trust does influence knowledge. The individual beta for the television news trust measure is negative, and not easily interpretable, however. It could mean that non-trusting new

citizens do not believe what the candidates claim, or what the media say their positions are. Or it could simply reflect a general skepticism toward the "press," among knowledgeable immigrants.

The television ad trust measure also is negative, as is its correlation with issue knowledge. So while individuals said they did not trust ads very much to tell them the truth about the candidates for president, they still learned from them and were able to recall them. This supports previous findings regarding negative ads and recall showing that while people say they do not like negative ads, they still can recall them (Copeland and Johnson-Cartee, 1990; Negative Advertising Pro and Con, 1986; Shapiro and Rieger, 1989).

Finally, when attention to newspapers and attention to television news are combined into a single measure of attention to news and the newspaper trust and television news trust measures are combined to form a single index of news trust, attention to news does not significantly predict issue knowledge, but news trust does ($p<.01$). The negative sign of the beta is due to the correlation between the trust and attention measures. It does not mean that a citizen who trusts the media learns less. The interaction between news trust and news attention is particularly important to note. The new citizens who trust news and pay attention to it do learn more about candidate issue positions from media reports.

The "bridging" role of television. The final analysis in this study is a retest of Chaffee et al.'s (1990) conclusion that television plays a bridging role in political learning for immigrants who rate their English competency as low and who have been in the U.S. a relatively shorter length of time. For these analyses English language competency and length of time in the U.S. are standardized, summed together and split at the median into low and high groups, resulting in two new variables that will be referred to here as high socialization and low socialization.

The "bridge" notion would predict that television news attention would be a stronger correlate of issue knowledge than is newspaper attention for new citizens who are in the low socialization category. Conversely, among new citizens in the high socialization category, newspaper attention would be a stronger correlate of issue knowledge than television news would be. Table 12 presents the intercorrelations among the media use measures, issue knowledge and low and high socialization. The entries above the diagonal are for the high socialization group, with entries below the diagonal pertaining to the low socialization group.

As Table 12 shows, the bridge notion is not supported for the low socialization group when the raw correlations are examined. There is no significant difference ($p>.05$) between the newspaper attention-issue knowledge correlation (.46, $p<.001$) and the television news attention-issue knowledge correlation(.41, $p<.001$). What about new citizens who are in the high socialization group?

Table 12

INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEDIA USE MEASURES AND SOCIALIZATION INDICATORS BY HIGH AND LOW LEVELS OF SOCIALIZATION

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)Socialization	---	.16	.21*	.19*	-.12
(2)Issue knowl.	.16	---	.11	.18	.11
(3)Newspaper exposure	.06	.19*	---	.42***	.44***
(4)Newspaper attention	.18	.46***	.57***	---	.39***
(5)Newspaper recall	.17	.23*	.52***	.51***	---
(6)TV news exposure	.19	.14	.31**	.26**	.19*
(7)TV news attention	.25**	.41***	.37***	.68***	.34***
(8)TV news recall	.10	.21*	.16	.30**	.51***
(9)TV ad attention	.25**	.22*	.18	.38***	.23*
(10)TV ad recall	.20*	.37***	.20*	.33**	.35***

Cell entries are Pearson correlation coefficients; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Entries above the diagonal are for respondents high on socialization; entries below the diagonal are for respondents low on socialization.

Table 12

INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEDIA USE MEASURES AND SOCIALIZATION INDICATORS BY HIGH AND LOW LEVELS OF SOCIALIZATION
(Cont.)

Variable	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(1)Socialization	.06	.15	-.15	-.07	-.06
(2)Issue knowl.	-.16	.21*	.12	.07	.27**
(3)Newspaper exposure	.09	.17	.03	-.02	.11
(4)Newspaper attention	.17	.71***	.20*	.18	.09
(5)Newspaper recall	.05	.25**	.31**	.06	.24*
(6)TV news exposure	—	.31**	.21*	.30**	.23*
(7)TV news attention	.51***	—	.17	.46***	.31**
(8)TV news recall	.36***	.36***	—	.07	.36***
(9)TV ad attention	.26**	.55***	.28**	—	.22*
(10) TV ad recall	.04	.21*	.30**	.25**	—

Cell entries are Pearson correlation coefficients; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Entries above the diagonal are for respondents high on socialization; entries below the diagonal are for respondents low on socialization.

We find that the television news attention-issue knowledge correlation is significant ($p<.05$), but the newspaper attention-issue knowledge correlation is not ($p>.05$). This is, if anything, in a direction opposite that found by Chaffee et al. (1990). Again, the bridge notion is not supported.

To further test the bridging proposition, hierarchical regressions were performed for the low and high socialization groups. The results of these regressions are in Table 13. Each media measure is entered in a separate regression, with the control variables entered as the first block.

Table 13 shows that, among those in the low socialization group, newspaper attention is a more significant correlate of issue

Table 13

MEDIA-ISSUE KNOWLEDGE RELATIONSHIP
BY LEVEL OF SOCIALIZATION

	Low socialization (n=99)	High socialization (n=100)
Newspaper attention	.30***	-.06
TV news attention	.24*	-.03
TV ad recall	.23**	.22**

Note: Entries are standardized beta weights

* $p<.05$
** $p<.01$
*** $p<.001$

knowledge than is television news attention, although both are significant. For new citizens low in socialization, television did not serve as a bridge. For the high socialization group, neither newspaper attention nor television news attention measures were significant correlates of issue knowledge. Again, the bridging notion is not supported.

The final two analyses entered the television ad recall measures for both groups. In both cases, television ad recall significantly predicted knowledge ($p<.01$). What these findings suggest is that individuals who rate their English competency below average and who have not been in the U.S. as long a time as others, use both newspapers and television for information, with attention to newspapers contributing more significantly to their political learning than attention to television. The fact that this study did not replicate Chaffee et al.'s (1990) results is not worrisome for the following reasons: 1) One of their controls was citizenship, a characteristic that all respondents in the present study have in common. 2) The decision to become citizens means that they intend to live here permanently, another of Chaffee et al.'s controls. 3) Chaffee et al. (1990) performed separate analyses for English competency and length of time in the U.S., while this study combined the two measures into a single index. 4) The fact that these individuals chose to become citizens also indicates they may more socialized to the U.S. than were members of Chaffee et al.'s sample in general. This might have eliminated

individual differences in media use that were expected between the high and low socialization groups, if television was performing a bridging role. In short, for those more experienced and motivated new citizens, television may already have performed the bridging function Chaffee et al. noted among newer immigrants. The strong contribution television ad recall made to the issue knowledge of both groups should be noted. This indicates that both groups did learn from ads, and also indicates that we should not lump the two types of television fare -- ads and news -- into a single heading under "television." The respondents in this survey certainly did not.

Chapter 6

ASSESSING THE RESULTS: THE MASS MEDIA'S INFLUENCE ON THE POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION OF NEW CITIZENS

While all new voters and U.S. citizens are dependent on the mass media for acquiring knowledge about presidential candidates' issue positions, naturalized citizens, by virtue of their newfound need for political information, seem to be even more heavily dependent on the media than the average citizen. While the socialization of immigrants has been a topic in the sociology literature since the early 1900s, the political socialization of new citizens has only recently been explored in the media effects literature. Immigrants (new citizens specifically) were selected for this study both because they are new voters and because of recent political socialization studies that have shown immigrants' media use and its effects to be similar to those of native-born adolescents under particular circumstances.

The results in Chapter 5 provide some important insights into the factors affecting the political learning of new citizens. In particular, this study provides additional evidence as to which types of media use measures are most useful, and successfully

documents the power of unaided recall as a measure of the influence of television advertising on issue learning.

New citizens in this study did apparently learn about where the candidates stood on the issues through political ads, as well as from news in each medium. This was the case even when knowledge of elected and appointed officials' terms of office was controlled for (Constitutional knowledge). The recall measure developed for this study provided a better method of measuring the effects of political ads on the learning process, than the ad attention measure. In part, this may be because of the respondents' interpretation of "attention" to ads. It is possible that attention is interpreted by some from a credibility or believability perspective; i.e. do they give the information in the ads much weight? Maybe not, and if this was the case, it certainly doesn't mean they couldn't still learn from them. Perhaps there is a degree of social undesirability attached to saying one pays attention to ads, but that stigma vanishes when the person is challenged to recall a specific advertisement from the campaign.

Television ads versus television news as sources of issue learning. An examination of the television ads and television news regression results showed that the differences in R-square change are negligible between the two equations, with the television news measures explaining 3.7 percent of the variance and the television ad measures explaining 3.5 percent. On the basis of these findings,

television ads and television news make about the same contributions to issue knowledge for these particular citizens in this particular election. This is not consonant with Patterson and McClure's conclusion that ads provide issue information, but television news does not. It is more in accord with Zhao's studies, which always show a contribution due to television news, and sometimes a separate contribution due to ads as well.

This result would have been much different without the ad recall measure, however. The correlation between ad attention and ad recall is significant, but the coefficient is low enough to indicate the two measures are not explaining the same variance. In addition, the correlation between issue knowledge and ad attention is not significant (r=.14), whereas the correlations between issue knowledge and television news attention, television news recall, and television ad recall all are significant. It can be inferred that, by itself, the ad attention measure would have explained considerably less than the television news measures. Thus, without this particular operationalization of advertising use, television news would have seemed more influential than ads on issue knowledge. This would have been the opposite of Patterson and McClure's conclusion and consistent with Zhao and Chaffee (1986).

Other measurement issues. It is evident that the particular choice of measures employed of media use -- exposure, attention,

or recall -- matters. Turning to the newspaper measures, support was found for the strong impact of newspaper reading on knowledge. This was evidenced in the regression analysis for attention to newspaper items only. This finding does differ from Chaffee and Choe's (1979), which showed that simple newspaper exposure accounted for most of the effects of newspapers. This finding might be peculiar to this new citizen sample. To "read" an American newspaper may for them not imply reading the front page, or news at all. Hence the more specific attention measure is a better method of capturing the variance in newspaper reading that is of interest in this study, at least for samples of this sort.

Across-channel effects of media-use measures. When corresponding measures across channels (exposure, attention, and recall) were entered as separate blocks, newspaper attention and television ad recall appear to be tapping consistent individual differences that account for substantial variation in learning beyond the effects of simple exposure. This supports Chaffee and Schleuder's (1986) conclusion that attention measures are important when comparing the effects on learning of newspapers versus television. It differs from their conclusion as well. Chaffee and Schleuder demonstrated that attention measures were essential because exposure understated the case for television's effects. However, in this case, it is newspaper stories about the presidential campaign and national politics for which the attention

measure is most useful. This may be related to the characteristics of this particular sample of new voters. At the mean, they were educated, and evaluated their English competency in reading, writing, and speaking as very good to excellent. These new citizens seem to correspond more to highly educated samples of native-born adults (college graduates), rather than to high-variance samples that include the less educated (high school diploma or less). As Chaffee and Schleuder pointed out, cross sectional studies often find a negative correlation between television use and knowledge -- a finding that was not reflected in this study.

The fact that the interaction between the news trust index and the news attention index was a significant predictor of issue knowledge indicates that further exploration of the effects of trust on political cognitions should be done on other samples. If respondents are information seekers, as many of those in this sample apparently were, trust in news channels, whether it is trust in the institution providing the news or trust in the broadcaster, is an individual difference that might affect how much is learned.

Finally, the notion of television as a bridge to political socialization did not hold up in this particular study. Education and the implications citizenship carries with it are the most likely reasons these findings differed from Chaffee, Nass, and Yang's (1990). As citizens, these respondents were qualified to vote,

which provided a motivation for them to learn the differences between the candidates. This same type of motivation does not necessarily exist for all immigrants. These results further support other studies that have found new voters to be politically active and/or politically knowledgeable.

Limitations to This Study

Finally, there are limitations to the present study. First, the target population of this research is newly naturalized citizens in the San Francisco Bay area. Therefore, the findings are constrained by ethnicity and the individuals' decisions to become U.S. citizens. It cannot even be stated, given the low response rate, that this sample is representative of all Bay area new citizens -- some individuals may not have responded because of language competency, lack of political interest, or a general disinclination to participate in a survey, and those people might well have learned much less from the campaign of 1988. A 1988 sample is not representative of all years. The 1988 campaign was not especially "typical," and for the mass media it no doubt marked just one point in their continuing evolution. These results, however, should help guide future research in political socialization, especially in terms of recall as a measure of media use.

Second, although the sample size of this study was large enough for multivariate statistical analysis (N=199), the survey return rate was relatively low (19.9%). As a result (or possibly a cause) of this low rate, education level of the sample is skewed to the right as is English language competency, both factors that tend to enhance learning of political information through the media (Chaffee et al., 1990). It is important for future researchers to survey more varied samples, perhaps by making extra effort to enhance the return rate.

Third, the measures are not all comparable. The wording of the television news and newspaper news exposure measures were not consistent with wording of the attention and recall measures for these same media (exposure did not specifically address campaign news). There was no exposure measure for ads. Even when wording is identical, "paying attention" to ads, to television news, and to newspapers may evoke recall of different kinds of experiences and exert different social desirability influences on respondents. Experimentation with alternative wordings should continue. The meanings of survey questions for immigrants deserve special attention.

Finally, there is an obvious need for additional research on various facets of the role of the mass media on new citizens' political attitudes and behaviors. As the population of new citizens continues to increase over time, the importance of their participation in American politics does likewise. Thus, this study

has been limited to the most direct of mass media effects, that of informing citizens. More subtle and contentious outcomes, such as media effects on new citizens' party identification, voting behavior, or political attitudes remain to be explored in depth. This study provides evidence that such research will be worthwhile. The media account for considerable variance in immigrant political socialization at the cognitive level, and it would be surprising if this did not translate into some affective and behavioral influences as well.

Appendix A

NATURALIZED CITIZEN SURVEY
AND FREQUENCIES OF CLOSED-ENDED RESPONSES

Stanford University
October 1988

Institute for
Communication Research

Dear New U.S. Citizen:

The Institute for Communication Research at Stanford University is doing a study of what new citizens of the United States think about politics and the 1988 election for President. You have been chosen at random to help us by completing the enclosed survey. All your answers are confidential. Do not write your name on the questionnaire or on the envelope when you send it back to us. This is an anonymous survey, and your answers will be used for statistical purposes only. Please have the survey filled out by the person whose name is on the envelope.

The success of our study depends on your cooperation. Please fill out the questionnaire and send it back in the enclosed envelope as soon as you can. Definitely complete it **before** the election, November 8. This is **not** a test, it is a survey about what people think. Try to answer every question you can, but if you find a question you cannot answer just skip it and go on to the next one.

If you have any questions, you may call either of us:

Ms. Kathleen Kurz
(415) 723-2910

Professor Steven Chaffee
(415) 723-1941

Thank you for your cooperation. If you would like to receive a report of the results of this survey, please send us a separate request and it will be sent to you when the study is completed. If you have concerns or dissatisfaction with any aspect of this study, you may report them anonymously to the Human Subjects Coordinator, Sponsored Projects, Stanford University, 723-4697.

Please complete the questionnaire before election day, November 8, 1988, and return it to us as soon as possible.

1. Are you a naturalized U.S. citizen? 199 yes 0 no

2. What other country were you a citizen of previously?

_____
(name of your country of origin)

Some questions below refer to "your country of origin." Please answer those questions for the country you have named in answer to Question 2.

3. What is your native language? _____
(name of native language)

4. Do you plan to vote in the U.S. election November 8? Mark answer:

150 definitely yes
33 probably yes
10 probably no
5 definitely no
1 missing

5. Have you registered to vote? (If yes, for what party?)

26	Not registered	65	Democrat	9	Other
71	Republican	20	Independent	8	missing

Questions about Newspapers and Television

6. How many days in the past week did you read an American newspaper? Circle number of days:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 days	
n=	25	12	16	31	21	23	8	62	1 missing

7. Can you remember a newspaper story you read about the presidential campaign?
70 no 121 yes
If yes, what was it about? _____

8. What newspaper do you read most often for news about the U.S.?

_____
(name of U.S. newspaper)

9. How many days in the past week did you read a newspaper written in the language of people from your country of origin? (Country you named in Question 2) Circle number of days:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 days	
n=	97	36	15	6	6	8	4	24	3 missing

10. What newspaper do you read most often for news about your country of origin? (Country you named in Question 2)

_____
(name of newspaper)

11. How many days in the past week did you watch American national news on television?

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 days
n=	5	11	15	27	14	23	20	84

12. Can you remember a news story you watched about the presidential campaign? 49 no 143 yes

If yes, what was it about? _____

13. How interested are you in news about U.S. politics?

84	81	32	2
very interested	somewhat interested	not very interested	not at all interested

14. How interested are you in news about your country of origin?

91	76	24	7
very interested	somewhat interested	not very interested	not at all interested

1 missing

15. For each of the following, indicate how much attention you have given to it both on television and in the newspapers: Circle the number from 0 to 3, where 0 means "no attention" and 3 means "very much."

where: attention:	ON TELEVISION No attention			Very much	IN NEWSPAPERS No attention			Very much
World news	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
	0	22	58	115	14	31	65	81
U.S. national politics	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
	7	33	76	79	20	46	67	58
News from your country of origin	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
	9	34	56	97	20	38	46	87
Presidential campaign news	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
	6	30	77	85	19	45	63	64
What George Bush says	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
	19	42	64	72	28	57	50	53
What Mike Dukakis says	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
	21	55	50	71	33	53	53	51
Commercials for Bush	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
	47	57	45	42	71	53	33	28
Commercials for Dukakis	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
	42	66	45	42	72	53	34	27
Democratic Convention	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
	34	49	48	64	50	55	47	35
Republican Convention	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
	29	53	55	58	47	63	39	40

16. Recently there have been two presidential debates on television between George Bush and Michael Dukakis. Answer the following questions twice, once for each of these debates.

	1st Debate September 25			2nd Debate October 13		
	no	some	a lot	no	some	a lot
Did you watch it?	52	72	71	43	80	73
Pay attention to it?	38	81	71	35	82	75
Talk about it?	48	95	49	53	91	49
Read about it?	55	98	40	51	100	42

17. Do you remember seeing a television commercial for or against George Bush? 66 no 127 yes
If yes, what was it about? _____

18. Do you remember seeing a television commercial for or against Michael Dukakis? 61 no 130 yes
If yes, what was it about? _____

19. How much do you trust the following to tell you the truth about the candidates for President?

	Do not trust	Trust a little	Trust somewhat	Trust very much
American newspapers	8	62	103	22
Television news	9	43	105	38
Magazines	13	66	95	16
Television commercials	72	73	39	8
The U.S. government	19	47	82	42
A newspaper in your native language	29	71	61	19

20. The next questions ask about proposals some people have made for the U.S. government. For each one, do two things:
1. Show your opinion by marking column 1, and
2. Show which candidate favors it more by marking column 2.

	Column 1 Your opinion		Column 2 Bush or Dukakis	
a. Increase the minimum wage:	148	I favor	131	Bush favors more
	16	I oppose	33	Dukakis favors more
	28	No opinion	28	No difference
b. Provide military aid to Nicaraguan contras:	51	I favor	150	Bush favors more
	90	I oppose	9	Dukakis favors more
	54	No opinion	30	No difference

	Column 1 Your Opinion	Column 2 Bush or Dukakis
c. Execute convicted drug kingpins:	151 I favor	129 Bush favors more
	15 I oppose	20 Dukakis favors more
	28 No opinion	41 No difference
d. Require teachers to lead Pledge of Allegiance:	89 I favor	117 Bush favors more
	42 I oppose	17 Dukakis favors more
	65 No opinion	52 No difference
e. Restrict abortions in Constitution:	72 I favor	115 Bush favors more
	79 I oppose	28 Dukakis favors more
	45 No opinion	47 No difference
f. Require balanced budget in Constitution:	144 I favor	47 Bush favors more
	17 I oppose	84 Dukakis favors more
	34 No opinion	60 No difference
g. Build the MX missile system:	77 I favor	140 Bush favors more
	69 I oppose	20 Dukakis favors more
	50 No opinion	32 No difference
h. Increase business income taxes:	87 I favor	28 Bush favors more
	67 I oppose	120 Dukakis favors more
	40 No opinion	43 No difference
i. Build the "Star Wars" defense system:	85 I favor	155 Bush favors more
	78 I oppose	6 Dukakis favors more
	30 No opinion	25 No difference
j. Provide for prayer in schools in Constitution:	68 I favor	105 Bush favors more
	71 I oppose	24 Dukakis favors more
	54 No opinion	27 No difference
k. Give tax incentives to the oil industry:	51 I favor	74 Bush favors more
	61 I oppose	28 Dukakis favors more
	75 No opinion	74 No difference
l. Provide health care for every American:	165 I favor	30 Bush favors more
	13 I oppose	124 Dukakis favors more
	17 No opinion	37 No difference
m. Restrict ownership of handguns:	134 I favor	62 Bush favors more
	41 I oppose	69 Dukakis favors more
	20 No opinion	58 No difference
n. Strengthen conventional U.S. military forces:	125 I favor	77 Bush favors more
	22 I oppose	70 Dukakis favors more
	49 No opinion	43 No difference
o. Restrict imports:	75 I favor	35 Bush favors more
	71 I oppose	82 Dukakis favors more
	47 No opinion	65 No difference

	Column 1 Your Opinion	Column 2 Bush or Dukakis
p. Do more for affirmative action:	105 I favor 16 I oppose 58 No opinion	35 Bush favors more 76 Dukakis favors more 60 No difference
q. Raise taxes on the rich:	142 I favor 27 I oppose 28 No opinion	16 Bush favors more 132 Dukakis favors more 41 No difference
r. Fight communist expansion:	136 I favor 16 I oppose 39 No opinion	116 Bush favors more 13 Dukakis favors more 58 No difference
s. Fund more day care programs:	133 I favor 17 I oppose 46 No opinion	27 Bush favors more 91 Dukakis favors more 70 No difference
t. Sanctions against South Africa:	98 I favor 26 I oppose 67 No opinion	38 Bush favors more 80 Dukakis favors more 64 No difference
u. Restrict immigration:	45 I favor 91 I oppose 57 No opinion	55 Bush favors more 28 Dukakis favors more 101 No difference
v. Lower unemployment:	173 I favor 5 I oppose 15 No opinion	57 Bush favors more 64 Dukakis favors more 64 No difference
w. Reduce taxes:	152 I favor 20 I oppose 25 No opinion	89 Bush favors more 42 Dukakis favors more 59 No difference
x. Reduce military spending as much as possible:	105 I favor 54 I oppose 38 No opinion	17 Bush favors more 140 Dukakis favors more 32 No difference
y. Appoint liberal judges to the Supreme Court:	74 I favor 41 I oppose 78 No opinion	15 Bush favors more 101 Dukakis favors more 63 No difference
z. Provide equal rights for women in Constitution:	150 I favor 10 I oppose 35 No opinion	21 Bush favors more 96 Dukakis favors more 71 No difference

Please check to see that you have marked one answer in each column for each proposal.

21. How do you feel about the presidential candidates now? I am:

45 Definitely for Dukakis
34 Leaning to Dukakis
25 Still undecided
36 Leaning to Bush
55 Definitely for Bush

22. What is the term of office of the following? (How many years is each official elected or appointed for?) Circle answer.

President of U.S.:	2 years 2	4 years 188	6 years 6	no limit 0
Governor of California:	2 years 19	4 years 131	6 years 22	no limit 3
U.S. Senator:	2 years 28	4 years 52	6 years 96	no limit 0
U.S. congressman:	2 years 94	4 years 58	6 years 22	no limit 0
Supreme Court justice:	2 years 8	4 years 10	6 years 16	no limit 145

23. Can you give the name and political party of the following:

	Name (last)	Party
Governor of California	_____	_____
U.S. Senator from California who is running for reelection	_____	_____
Other California U.S. Senator	_____	_____
Governor of New York	_____	_____

24. Do you know which party has the most members in the House of Representatives in Washington?

120 Democratic 34 Republican 39 Don't know

25. Do you know which party has the most members in the U.S. Senate in Washington?

98 Democratic 41 Republican 50 Don't know

Questions About You

26. In U.S. politics, which of the following do you think of yourself as?

18 Strongly liberal
38 Somewhat liberal
52 Middle of the road
42 Somewhat conservative
15 Strongly conservative
24 Don't Know

27. What year were you born? _____

28. What year did you come to the U.S.? _____

29. How many years of school have you completed? _____ years

30. What is the highest educational degree you hold?

4 None 15 Grade school 54 High school 98 College

25 Other degree (please specify):_____

31. What is your approximate yearly family income range, before taxes?

37 Less than $15,000 per year 36 $35,000 to $45,000

28 $15,000 to $25,000 29 $45,000 to $60,000

28 $25,000 to $35,000 30 More than $60,000

32. Are you male or female? 115 Male 75 Female

33. How would describe yourself?

137 Asian 1 Indian 5 Black 14 Hispanic 34 White 8 Other

34. How good is your use of the English language? (circle answer)

Speaking:	Not good 16	Fairly good 69	Very good 72	Excellent 41
Reading:	Not good 12	Fairly good 47	Very good 80	Excellent 56
Writing:	Not good 20	Fairly good 64	Very good 64	Excellent 46

35. Which U.S. social class would you place yourself in?

1 Upper class 42 Lower middle class

29 Upper middle class 31 Working class

80 Middle class 13 Don't know

36. What is the date today? _____ (month) _____ (date)

Please go back and check to see that you have answered all the questions you can.

Thanks again for your cooperation. Please return the questionnaire in our stamped, self-addressed envelope. Your answers will be very helpful to us in our study.

Prof. Steven Chaffee and Ms. Kathleen Kurz
Institute for Communication Research
Stanford University
Stanford CA 94305-2050

APPENDIX B

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG VARIABLES AND INDICES USED IN THE REGRESSION ANALYSES

Key to Variable Names

Variable Code	Variable Name
SES	Self-perceived Socioeconomic Status
LANGCOMP	English Language Competency
EDUC	Education
INCOME	Annual Household Income
LSTAY	Length of Time in the U.S.
FEMALE	Gender
VOTER	Intention to Vote
INTEREST	Interest in U.S. Politics
ISSKNOWL	Issue Knowledge (Knowledge of Candidate Issue Positions)
COKNOWL	Constitutional Knowledge
NPEXPOS	Newspaper Exposure
NPATTN	Newspaper Attention
NPRECALL	Newspaper Recall
TVNEXPOS	Television News Exposure
TVNATTN	Television News Attention
TVNRECAL	Television News Recall
TVADATTN	Television Ad Attention
TVADREC	Television Ad Recall
SOCIALIZ	Socialization Index
TRSTNEWS	Trust in News
TRSTATTN	Trust in News x News Attention
TRUSTNP	Newspaper Trust
TRUSTTVN	Television News Trust
TRUSTADS	Television Ad Trust

- - Correlation Coefficients - -

	SES	LANGCOMP	EDUC	INCOME	LSTAY	FEMALE
SES	1.0000	.1361	.2464**	.4425**	.3105**	.1261
LANGCOMP	.1361	1.0000	.4155**	.3254**	.0627	.0165
EDUC	.2464**	.4155**	1.0000	.3643**	.0191	-.0243
INCOME	.4425**	.3254**	.3643**	1.0000	.2651**	-.0274
LSTAY	.3105**	.0627	.0191	.2651**	1.0000	-.0217
FEMALE	.1261	.0165	-.0243	-.0274	-.0217	1.0000
VOTER	.0702	.1694*	.2221**	.1379	.0406	.0294
INTEREST	.1211	.2591**	.1797*	.1830*	.0897	-.1303
ISSKNOWL	.1976**	.2978**	.2576**	.2845**	.1340	-.0644
COKNOWL	.1237	.1570*	.0715	.2300**	.0405	-.0331
NPEXPOS	.1284	.2874**	.2937**	.2601**	.2619**	-.1862*
NPATTN	.0939	.2255**	.2423**	.0659	.1300	-.1088
NPRECALL	.0320	.2365**	.2727**	.2104**	-.0159	-.1566*
TVNEXPOS	.1514*	.1311	.1207	.0954	.0945	.0817
TVNATTN	.1402	.2129**	.1467*	.0673	.1236	-.0551
TVNRECAL	.0760	.1767*	.1232	.1791*	-.0284	-.0747
TVADATTN	-.0853	.0812	.0395	-.1180	-.0375	.0022
TVADREC	.1170	.3082**	.2130**	.2299**	.0380	.0047
SOCIALIZ	.2978**	.7337**	.2980**	.3870**	.7268**	-.0032
TRSTNEWS	-.0606	-.0345	-.0334	-.1265	-.1266	.0483
TRSTATTN	.0495	.1785*	.1638*	-.0068	.0004	-.0382
TRUSTNP	.0068	-.0548	-.0109	-.0957	.0134	.0425
TRUSTTVN	-.0684	-.0403	-.0461	-.1516*	-.0948	.0505
TRUSTADS	-.1060	-.2691**	-.0847	-.1999**	-.0803	.0542

* - Signif. LE .05 ** - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)

" . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

- - Correlation Coefficients - -

	VOTER	INTEREST	ISSKNOWL	COKNOWL	NPEXPOS	NPATTN
SES	.0702	.1211	.1976**	.1237	.1284	.0939
LANGCOMP	.1694*	.2591**	.2978**	.1570*	.2874**	.2255**
EDUC	.2221**	.1797*	.2576**	.0715	.2937**	.2423**
INCOME	.1379	.1830*	.2845**	.2300**	.2601**	.0659
LSTAY	.0406	.0897	.1340	.0405	.2619**	.1300
FEMALE	.0294	-.1303	-.0644	-.0331	-.1862*	-.1088
VOTER	1.0000	.2901**	.3262**	.1857*	.3472**	.1928**
INTEREST	.2901**	1.0000	.3707**	.1254	.3878**	.5626**
ISSKNOWL	.3262**	.3707**	1.0000	.3682**	.2370**	.3566**
COKNOWL	.1857*	.1254	.3682**	1.0000	.1229	.2345**
NPEXPOS	.3472**	.3878**	.2370**	.1229	1.0000	.5284**
NPATTN	.1928**	.5626**	.3566**	.2345**	.5284**	1.0000
NPRECALL	.2640**	.3132**	.2166**	.1842*	.5127**	.4728**
TVNEXPOS	.1137	.2856**	.0222	-.0729	.2423**	.2386**
TVNATTN	.2660**	.6909**	.3345**	.1365	.3174**	.6989**
TVNRECAL	.2730**	.2559**	.2049**	.1250	.1579*	.2815**
TVADATTN	.1262	.3633**	.1386	-.0604	.0780	.2900**
TVADREC	.2633**	.2362**	.3768**	.2879**	.2543**	.2776**
SOCIALIZ	.1440*	.2386**	.2963**	.1352	.3741**	.2414**
TRSTNEWS	.0266	.1619*	-.1423*	-.0760	.0250	.1107
TRSTATTN	.1894**	.5430**	.2341**	.1362	.3446**	.7701**
TRUSTNP	.0603	.1823*	-.0439	.0360	.1104	.1729*
TRUSTTVN	-.0379	.1457*	-.1835*	-.1773*	-.0472	.0542
TRUSTADS	-.0580	-.0570	-.1664*	-.2170**	-.0473	-.0537

* - Signif. LE .05 ** - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)

" . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

- - Correlation Coefficients - -

	NPRECALL	TVNEXPOS	TVNATTN	TVNRECAL	TVADATTN	TVADREC
SES	.0320	.1514*	.1402	.0760	-.0853	.1170
LANGCOMP	.2365**	.1311	.2129**	.1767*	.0812	.3082**
EDUC	.2727**	.1207	.1467*	.1232	.0395	.2130**
INCOME	.2104**	.0954	.0673	.1791*	-.1180	.2299**
LSTAY	-.0159	.0945	.1236	-.0284	-.0375	.0380
FEMALE	-.1566*	.0817	-.0551	-.0747	.0022	.0047
VOTER	.2640**	.1137	.2660**	.2730**	.1262	.2633**
INTEREST	.3132**	.2856**	.6909**	.2559**	.3633**	.2362**
ISSKNOWL	.2166**	.0222	.3345**	.2049**	.1386	.3768**
COKNOWL	.1842*	-.0729	.1365	.1250	-.0604	.2879**
NPEXPOS	.5127**	.2423**	.3174**	.1579*	.0780	.2543**
NPATTN	.4728**	.2386**	.6989**	.2815**	.2900**	.2776**
NPRECALL	1.0000	.1448*	.3204**	.4356**	.1435*	.3445**
TVNEXPOS	.1448*	1.0000	.4319**	.3019**	.2782**	.1424*
TVNATTN	.3204**	.4319**	1.0000	.3003**	.5033**	.2835**
TVNRECAL	.4356**	.3019**	.3003**	1.0000	.1880**	.3570**
TVADATTN	.1435*	.2782**	.5033**	.1880**	1.0000	.2195**
TVADREC	.3445**	.1424*	.2835**	.3570**	.2195**	1.0000
SOCIALIZ	.1528*	.1538*	.2298**	.1023	.0373	.2373**
TRSTNEWS	.0627	.1368	.2078**	.1136	.1301	-.0654
TRSTATTN	.3554**	.3478**	.7762**	.3155**	.3737**	.1996**
TRUSTNP	.0648	.0725	.1947**	.1351	.1205	-.0273
TRUSTTVN	.0365	.1749*	.2177**	.0341	.1088	-.0998
TRUSTADS	-.1450*	-.0548	-.0040	-.1895**	.1767*	-.1819*

* - Signif. LE .05 ** - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)

" . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

- - Correlation Coefficients - -

	SOCIALIZ	TRSTNEWS	TRSTATTN	TRUSTNP	TRUSTTVN	TRUSTADS
SES	.2978**	-.0606	.0495	.0068	-.0684	-.1060
LANGCOMP	.7337**	-.0345	.1785*	-.0548	-.0403	-.2691**
EDUC	.2980**	-.0334	.1638*	-.0109	-.0461	-.0847
INCOME	.3870**	-.1265	-.0068	-.0957	-.1516*	-.1999**
LSTAY	.7268**	-.1266	.0004	.0134	-.0948	-.0803
FEMALE	-.0032	.0483	-.0382	.0425	.0505	.0542
VOTER	.1440*	.0266	.1894**	.0603	-.0379	-.0580
INTEREST	.2386**	.1619*	.5430**	.1823*	.1457*	-.0570
ISSKNOWL	.2963**	-.1423*	.2341**	-.0439	-.1835*	-.1664*
COKNOWL	.1352	-.0760	.1362	.0360	-.1773*	-.2170**
NPEXPOS	.3741**	.0250	.3446**	.1104	-.0472	-.0473
NPATTN	.2414**	.1107	.7701**	.1729*	.0542	-.0537
NPRECALL	.1528*	.0627	.3554**	.0648	.0365	-.1450*
TVNEXPOS	.1538*	.1368	.3478**	.0725	.1749*	-.0548
TVNATTN	.2298**	.2078**	.7762**	.1947**	.2177**	-.0040
TVNRECAL	.1023	.1136	.3155**	.1351	.0341	-.1895**
TVADATTN	.0373	.1301	.3737**	.1205	.1088	.1767*
TVADREC	.2373**	-.0654	.1996**	-.0273	-.0998	-.1819*
SOCIALIZ	1.0000	-.1103	.1230	-.0285	-.0866	-.2436**
TRSTNEWS	-.1103	1.0000	.6274**	.8553**	.8674**	.3144**
TRSTATTN	.1230	.6274**	1.0000	.5477**	.5397**	.1132
TRUSTNP	-.0285	.8553**	.5477**	1.0000	.5373**	.2713**
TRUSTTVN	-.0866	.8674**	.5397**	.5373**	1.0000	.2575**
TRUSTADS	-.2436**	.3144**	.1132	.2713**	.2575**	1.0000

* - Signif. LE .05 ** - Signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)

" . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

APPENDIX C

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL VARIABLES AND INDICES USED IN THE REGRESSION ANALYSES

Key to Variable Names

Variable Code	Variable Name
SES	Self-perceived Socioeconomic Status
LANGCOMP	English Language Competency
EDUC	Education
INCOME	Annual Household Income
LSTAY	Length of Time in the U.S.
FEMALE	Gender
VOTER	Intention to Vote
INTEREST	Interest in U.S. Politics
ISSKNOWL	Issue Knowledge (Knowledge of Candidate Issue Positions)
COKNOWL	Constitutional Knowledge
NPEXPOS	Newspaper Exposure
NPATTN	Newspaper Attention
NPRECALL	Newspaper Recall
TVNEXPOS	Television News Exposure
TVNATTN	Television News Attention
TVNRECAL	Television News Recall
TVADATTN	Television Ad Attention
TVADREC	Television Ad Recall
SOCIALIZ	Socialization Index
TRSTNEWS	Trust in News
TRSTATTN	Trust in News x News Attention
TRUSTNP	Newspaper Trust
TRUSTTVN	Television News Trust
TRUSTADS	Television Ad Trust

SES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	86	43.2	43.9	43.9
	2.00	80	40.2	40.8	84.7
	3.00	30	15.1	15.3	100.0
	.	3	1.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 196 Missing cases 3

- -

LANGCOMP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	1	.5	.5	.5
	2.00	2	1.0	1.0	1.5
	3.00	11	5.5	5.6	7.1
	4.00	1	.5	.5	7.6
	5.00	10	5.0	5.1	12.6
	6.00	29	14.6	14.6	27.3
	7.00	22	11.1	11.1	38.4
	8.00	22	11.1	11.1	49.5
	9.00	44	22.1	22.2	71.7
	10.00	14	7.0	7.1	78.8
	11.00	8	4.0	4.0	82.8
	12.00	34	17.1	17.2	100.0
	.	1	.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 198 Missing cases 1

EDUC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	1	.5	.5	.5
	1.00	4	2.0	2.0	2.5
	2.00	15	7.5	7.6	10.2
	3.00	54	27.1	27.4	37.6
	4.00	123	61.8	62.4	100.0
	.	2	1.0	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 197 Missing cases 2

- -

INCOME

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	1	.5	.5	.5
	1.00	37	18.6	19.6	20.1
	2.00	28	14.1	14.8	34.9
	3.00	28	14.1	14.8	49.7
	4.00	36	18.1	19.0	68.8
	5.00	29	14.6	15.3	84.1
	6.00	30	15.1	15.9	100.0
	.	10	5.0	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 189 Missing cases 10

LSTAY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	3	1.5	1.6	1.6
	1.00	1	.5	.5	2.1
	4.00	4	2.0	2.1	4.2
	5.00	5	2.5	2.6	6.8
	6.00	46	23.1	24.0	30.7
	7.00	27	13.6	14.1	44.8
	8.00	22	11.1	11.5	56.3
	9.00	20	10.1	10.4	66.7
	10.00	7	3.5	3.6	70.3
	11.00	7	3.5	3.6	74.0
	12.00	6	3.0	3.1	77.1
	13.00	6	3.0	3.1	80.2
	14.00	7	3.5	3.6	83.9
	15.00	5	2.5	2.6	86.5
	16.00	1	.5	.5	87.0
	17.00	4	2.0	2.1	89.1
	18.00	2	1.0	1.0	90.1
	19.00	4	2.0	2.1	92.2
	20.00	1	.5	.5	92.7
	21.00	2	1.0	1.0	93.8
	23.00	3	1.5	1.6	95.3
	25.00	1	.5	.5	95.8
	26.00	3	1.5	1.6	97.4
	27.00	1	.5	.5	97.9
	29.00	1	.5	.5	98.4
	32.00	1	.5	.5	99.0
	33.00	1	.5	.5	99.5
	65.00	1	.5	.5	100.0
	.	7	3.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 192 Missing cases 7

FEMALE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	115	57.8	60.5	60.5
	3.00	75	37.7	39.5	100.0
	.	9	4.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 190 Missing cases 9

- -

VOTER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	12	6.0	6.3	6.3
	1.00	12	6.0	6.3	12.7
	2.00	18	9.0	9.5	22.2
	3.00	17	8.5	9.0	31.2
	4.00	130	65.3	68.8	100.0
	.	10	5.0	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 189 Missing cases 10

- -

INTEREST

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2.00	32	16.1	16.1	17.1
	3.00	81	40.7	40.7	57.8
	4.00	84	42.2	42.2	100.0
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 199 Missing cases 0

ISSKNOWL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	5	2.5	2.6	2.6
	2.00	2	1.0	1.0	3.6
	3.00	6	3.0	3.1	6.6
	4.00	5	2.5	2.6	9.2
	5.00	2	1.0	1.0	10.2
	6.00	8	4.0	4.1	14.3
	7.00	5	2.5	2.6	16.8
	8.00	13	6.5	6.6	23.5
	9.00	9	4.5	4.6	28.1
	10.00	8	4.0	4.1	32.1
	11.00	10	5.0	5.1	37.2
	12.00	9	4.5	4.6	41.8
	13.00	15	7.5	7.7	49.5
	14.00	15	7.5	7.7	57.1
	15.00	9	4.5	4.6	61.7
	16.00	17	8.5	8.7	70.4
	17.00	13	6.5	6.6	77.0
	18.00	11	5.5	5.6	82.7
	19.00	14	7.0	7.1	89.8
	20.00	11	5.5	5.6	95.4
	21.00	5	2.5	2.6	98.0
	22.00	3	1.5	1.5	99.5
	23.00	1	.5	.5	100.0
	.	3	1.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 196 Missing cases 3

COKNOWL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	1	.5	.5	.5
	1.00	18	9.0	9.2	9.7
	2.00	31	15.6	15.8	25.5
	3.00	44	22.1	22.4	48.0
	4.00	56	28.1	28.6	76.5
	5.00	46	23.1	23.5	100.0
	.	3	1.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 196 Missing cases 3

- -

NPEXPOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	25	12.6	12.6	12.6
	1.00	12	6.0	6.1	18.7
	2.00	16	8.0	8.1	26.8
	3.00	31	15.6	15.7	42.4
	4.00	21	10.6	10.6	53.0
	5.00	23	11.6	11.6	64.6
	6.00	8	4.0	4.0	68.7
	7.00	62	31.2	31.3	100.0
	.	1	.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 198 Missing cases 1

NPATTN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	15	7.5	7.8	7.8
	1.00	7	3.5	3.6	11.5
	2.00	31	15.6	16.1	27.6
	3.00	24	12.1	12.5	40.1
	4.00	40	20.1	20.8	60.9
	5.00	34	17.1	17.7	78.6
	6.00	41	20.6	21.4	100.0
	.	7	3.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 192 Missing cases 7

- -

NPRECALL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	69	34.7	35.4	35.4
	1.00	14	7.0	7.2	42.6
	2.00	112	56.3	57.4	100.0
	.	4	2.0	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 195 Missing cases 4

TVNEXPOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	1.00	11	5.5	5.5	8.0
	2.00	15	7.5	7.5	15.6
	3.00	27	13.6	13.6	29.1
	4.00	14	7.0	7.0	36.2
	5.00	23	11.6	11.6	47.7
	6.00	20	10.1	10.1	57.8
	7.00	84	42.2	42.2	100.0
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 199 Missing cases 0

- -

TVNATTN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	3	1.5	1.5	1.5
	1.00	3	1.5	1.5	3.0
	2.00	23	11.6	11.6	14.6
	3.00	23	11.6	11.6	26.1
	4.00	52	26.1	26.1	52.3
	5.00	35	17.6	17.6	69.8
	6.00	60	30.2	30.2	100.0
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 199 Missing cases 0

TVNRECAL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	48	24.1	24.9	24.9
	1.00	17	8.5	8.8	33.7
	2.00	128	64.3	66.3	100.0
	.	6	3.0	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 193 Missing cases 6

- -

TVADATTN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	31	15.6	15.8	15.8
	1.00	9	4.5	4.6	20.4
	2.00	49	24.6	25.0	45.4
	3.00	31	15.6	15.8	61.2
	4.00	39	19.6	19.9	81.1
	5.00	11	5.5	5.6	86.7
	6.00	26	13.1	13.3	100.0
	.	3	1.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 196 Missing cases 3

TVADREC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	49	24.6	25.3	25.3
	1.00	3	1.5	1.5	26.8
	2.00	41	20.6	21.1	47.9
	3.00	10	5.0	5.2	53.1
	4.00	91	45.7	46.9	100.0
	.	5	2.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 194 Missing cases 5

SOCIALIZ

7.02	1	.5	.5	100.0
Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 199 Missing cases 0

- -

TRSTNEWS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2.00	4	2.0	2.0	2.0
	3.00	6	3.0	3.1	5.1
	4.00	35	17.6	17.9	23.0
	5.00	33	16.6	16.8	39.8
	6.00	81	40.7	41.3	81.1
	7.00	22	11.1	11.2	92.3
	8.00	15	7.5	7.7	100.0
	.	3	1.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 196 Missing cases 3

TRSTATTN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	3	1.5	1.5	1.5
	6.00	1	.5	.5	2.0
	7.00	1	.5	.5	2.5
	8.00	1	.5	.5	3.0
	10.00	2	1.0	1.0	4.1
	12.00	4	2.0	2.0	6.1
	15.00	3	1.5	1.5	7.6
	16.00	9	4.5	4.6	12.2
	18.00	1	.5	.5	12.7
	20.00	6	3.0	3.0	15.7
	22.00	2	1.0	1.0	16.8
	24.00	9	4.5	4.6	21.3
	25.00	1	.5	.5	21.8
	28.00	5	2.5	2.5	24.4
	30.00	8	4.0	4.1	28.4
	32.00	6	3.0	3.0	31.5
	35.00	5	2.5	2.5	34.0
	36.00	15	7.5	7.6	41.6
	40.00	9	4.5	4.6	46.2
	42.00	7	3.5	3.6	49.7
	44.00	1	.5	.5	50.3
	45.00	7	3.5	3.6	53.8
	48.00	19	9.5	9.6	63.5
	49.00	2	1.0	1.0	64.5
	50.00	4	2.0	2.0	66.5
	54.00	7	3.5	3.6	70.1
	56.00	5	2.5	2.5	72.6
	60.00	11	5.5	5.6	78.2
	63.00	1	.5	.5	78.7
	66.00	6	3.0	3.0	81.7
	70.00	1	.5	.5	82.2
	72.00	17	8.5	8.6	90.9
	77.00	2	1.0	1.0	91.9
	80.00	3	1.5	1.5	93.4
	84.00	6	3.0	3.0	96.4
	88.00	2	1.0	1.0	97.5
	96.00	5	2.5	2.5	100.0
	.	2	1.0	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 197 Missing cases 2

TRUSTNP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	8	4.0	4.1	4.1
	2.00	62	31.2	31.8	35.9
	3.00	103	51.8	52.8	88.7
	4.00	22	11.1	11.3	100.0
	.	4	2.0	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 195 Missing cases 4

- -

TRUSTTVN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	9	4.5	4.6	4.6
	2.00	43	21.6	22.1	26.7
	3.00	105	52.8	53.8	80.5
	4.00	38	19.1	19.5	100.0
	.	4	2.0	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 195 Missing cases 4

- -

TRUSTADS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	72	36.2	37.5	37.5
	2.00	73	36.7	38.0	75.5
	3.00	39	19.6	20.3	95.8
	4.00	8	4.0	4.2	100.0
	.	7	3.5	Missing	
	Total	199	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 192 Missing cases 7

SOCIALIZ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	-3.45	1	.5	.5	.5
	-2.98	1	.5	.5	1.0
	-2.93	1	.5	.5	1.5
	-2.74	1	.5	.5	2.0
	-2.69	1	.5	.5	2.5
	-2.59	5	2.5	2.5	5.0
	-2.45	2	1.0	1.0	6.0
	-2.31	1	.5	.5	6.5
	-2.12	1	.5	.5	7.0
	-1.97	1	.5	.5	7.5
	-1.83	1	.5	.5	8.0
	-1.68	2	1.0	1.0	9.0
	-1.59	1	.5	.5	9.5
	-1.59	1	.5	.5	10.1
	-1.45	9	4.5	4.5	14.6
	-1.40	2	1.0	1.0	15.6
	-1.35	1	.5	.5	16.1
	-1.30	5	2.5	2.5	18.6
	-1.16	1	.5	.5	19.1
	-1.16	3	1.5	1.5	20.6
	-1.06	3	1.5	1.5	22.1
	-1.06	1	.5	.5	22.6
	-1.02	1	.5	.5	23.1
	-1.02	4	2.0	2.0	25.1
	-.92	4	2.0	2.0	27.1
	-.87	2	1.0	1.0	28.1
	-.85	1	.5	.5	28.6
	-.82	1	.5	.5	29.1
	-.78	3	1.5	1.5	30.7
	-.63	2	1.0	1.0	31.7
	-.59	1	.5	.5	32.2
	-.54	5	2.5	2.5	34.7
	-.47	3	1.5	1.5	36.2
	-.44	2	1.0	1.0	37.2
	-.44	1	.5	.5	37.7
	-.39	4	2.0	2.0	39.7
	-.35	1	.5	.5	40.2
	-.30	8	4.0	4.0	44.2
	-.25	3	1.5	1.5	45.7
	-.15	6	3.0	3.0	48.7
	-.11	1	.5	.5	49.2
	-.09	2	1.0	1.0	50.3
	-.06	1	.5	.5	50.8
	-.01	1	.5	.5	51.3
	-.01	5	2.5	2.5	53.8
	.04	1	.5	.5	54.3
	.08	4	2.0	2.0	56.3

SOCIALIZ

.08	1	.5	.5	56.8
.12	1	.5	.5	57.3
.13	4	2.0	2.0	59.3
.18	1	.5	.5	59.8
.23	2	1.0	1.0	60.8
.23	1	.5	.5	61.3
.28	2	1.0	1.0	62.3
.32	1	.5	.5	62.8
.37	1	.5	.5	63.3
.42	2	1.0	1.0	64.3
.47	5	2.5	2.5	66.8
.47	2	1.0	1.0	67.8
.51	1	.5	.5	68.3
.52	1	.5	.5	68.8
.56	1	.5	.5	69.3
.56	2	1.0	1.0	70.4
.61	1	.5	.5	70.9
.71	1	.5	.5	71.4
.71	1	.5	.5	71.9
.75	3	1.5	1.5	73.4
.85	10	5.0	5.0	78.4
.85	2	1.0	1.0	79.4
.90	1	.5	.5	79.9
.99	1	.5	.5	80.4
.99	1	.5	.5	80.9
1.04	1	.5	.5	81.4
1.14	1	.5	.5	81.9
1.14	1	.5	.5	82.4
1.23	1	.5	.5	82.9
1.28	3	1.5	1.5	84.4
1.42	2	1.0	1.0	85.4
1.42	1	.5	.5	85.9
1.43	1	.5	.5	86.4
1.45	1	.5	.5	86.9
1.57	2	1.0	1.0	87.9
1.57	1	.5	.5	88.4
1.71	3	1.5	1.5	89.9
1.95	2	1.0	1.0	91.0
2.05	1	.5	.5	91.5
2.09	1	.5	.5	92.0
2.14	2	1.0	1.0	93.0
2.14	1	.5	.5	93.5
2.43	2	1.0	1.0	94.5
2.43	1	.5	.5	95.0
2.52	1	.5	.5	95.5
2.57	1	.5	.5	96.0
2.57	1	.5	.5	96.5
2.67	1	.5	.5	97.0
2.72	1	.5	.5	97.5
3.00	1	.5	.5	98.0
3.10	1	.5	.5	98.5
3.29	1	.5	.5	99.0
4.15	1	.5	.5	99.5

APPENDIX D

NEW CITIZENS' COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN

Country	Frequency	Percent
Philippines	55	27.9
China	17	8.6
Vietnam	16	8.1
Hong Kong	16	8.1
Republic of China	8	4.1
India	8	4.1
Iran	8	4.1
Korea	5	2.5
Soviet Union	4	2.0
Mexico	4	2.0
Poland	4	2.0
El Salvador	3	1.5
Britain	3	1.5
Burma	3	1.5
Fiji	2	1.0
Canada	2	1.0
Greece	2	1.0
Nicaragua	2	1.0
Italy	2	1.0
Jamaica	2	1.0

Peru	2	1.0
Afghanistan	2	1.0
Laos	2	1.0
Cuba	1	.5
Chile	1	.5
Guatemala	1	.5
Ceylon	1	.5
Sweden	1	.5
Venezuela	1	.5
Ghana	1	.5
Pakistan	1	.5
France	1	.5
Costa Rica	1	.5
Argentina	1	.5
Switzerland	1	.5
Eritrea	1	.5
Jordan	1	.5
Romania	1	.5
Haiti	1	.5
Iraq	1	.5
Ireland	1	.5
Brazil	1	.5
Zambia	1	.5
Germany	1	.5
Missing	4	2.0

REFERENCES

Agger, R., Goldrich, D., and Swanson, B. (1964). The Rulers and the Ruled: Political Power and Impotence in American Communities. New York: Wiley.

Alger, D.E. (1989). "The media in elections: evidence on the role and impact." In Graber, D.A. (Ed.), Media Power in Politics. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Allen, R.L. and Chaffee, S.H. (1979). "Mass communication and the political participation of black Americans." In Nimmo, D. (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 3. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Almond, G.A. (1960). "A functional approach to comparative politics." in G.A. Almond and J.S. Coleman (Eds.), The Politics of the Developing Areas. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Almond, G. and Verba, S. (1963). The Civic Culture. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Anderson, D. and Lorch, E. (1983). "Looking at television: action or reaction." In Bryant, J. and Anderson, D. (Eds.), Children's Understanding of Television: Research on Attention and Comprehension, pp. 1-33. New York: Academic Press.

Andreoli, V., Worchel, S. "Effects of media, communicator, and message position on attitude change. Public Opinion Quarterly, 42: 59-70.

Atkin, C. (1981). "Communication and political socialization." In D. Nimmo and K. Sanders (Eds.), Handbook of Political Communication. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

Atkin, C. (1978). "Broadcast news programming and the child audience." Journal of Broadcasting, 22: 47-61.

Atkin, C. (1977). "Effects of campaign advertising and newscasts on children." Journalism Quarterly, 54: 503-8.

Atkin, C. and Gantz, W. (1978). "Television news and the child audience." Public Opinion Quarterly, 42: 183-98.

Atwood, L.E. and Sanders, K.R. (1975). "Perception of information sources and likelihood of split-ticket voting." Journalism Quarterly, 52: 421-28.

Austin, E.W. (1989). "Learning to put politics into context: effects of family communication on adolescents' assessment of political news." Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University.

Baldwin, A. (1969). "A cognitive theory of socialization." in Goslin, D. (Ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social Foundations of Thought and Action. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Beck, P.A. (1977). "The role of agents in political socialization." In Renshon, S.A. (Ed.), Handbook of Political Socialization: Theory and Research, pp. 115-41. New York: Free Press.

Beck, P.A. and Jennings, M.K. (1969). "Lowering the voting age: the case of the reluctant electorate." Public Opinion Quarterly, 38: 370-79.

Becker, L.B., McCombs, M.E., and McLeod, J.M. (1975). "The development of political cognitions." In S.H. Chaffee (Ed.), Political Communication: Issues and Strategies for Research. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, 21-63.

Becker, L.B. and Whitney, D.C. (1980). "Effects of media dependencies: audience assessment of government." Communication Research 7: 95-120.

Benton, M., and Frazier, J. (1976). "The agenda-setting function of the mass media at three levels of 'information holding.'" Communication Research, 3:261-74.

Berkowitz, D. and Pritchard, D. (1989). "Political knowledge and communication resources." Journalism Quarterly, 66, 3: 697-701.

Berlo, D.K., Lemert, J.B., and Mertz, R.J. (1970). "Dimensions for evaluating the acceptability of message sources." Public Opinion Quarterly, 33: 563-76.

Berlyne, D. (1960). Conflict, arousal and curiosity. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bishop, R., Boersma, M., and Williams, J. (1969). "Teenagers and news media: credibility canyon." Journalism Quarterly, 46: 597-99.

Blalock, H.M., Jr. (1982). Race and Ethnic Relations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Block, J.H., Haan, N., and Smith, M.B. (1969). "Socialization correlates of student activism." Journal of Social Issues, 25: 143-77.

Brennan, J.E. (1968). "A study of the channels of communication used by Spanish-named residents of San Antonio, Texas." Ph.D. Dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Brim, O.G. (1964) "Socialization through the life cycle." Social Science Research Items, Vol. 18, pp. 1-5.

Brim, O.G. and Wheeler, S. (1966). Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays. New York: John Wiley.

Brischetto, R.R. and de la Garza, R.O. (1985). "The Mexican-American electorate: political opinions and behavior across cultures in San Antonio." The Mexican American Electorate Series. Austin, TX: Center for Mexican American Studies.

Brody, R.A. and Page, B.I. "Comment: the assessment of policy voting." American Political Science Review, 66: 450-58.

Buehler, M.H. (1976). "Political efficacy, political discontent, and voting turnout among Mexican-Americans in Michigan." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Notre Dame.

Campbell, A., Converse, P., Miller, W.E., and Stokes, D.E. (1966). The American Voter. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Chaffee, S.H. (1982). "Mass media and interpersonal channels: competitive, convergent, or complementary?" In Gumpert, G. and Cathcart, R. (Eds.), Inter/Media, pp. 57-75. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chaffee, S.H. (1977). "Mass media effects: new research perspectives." In D. Lerner and M. Nelson (Eds.), Communication Research: A Half-Century Appraisal. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii: 210-241.

Chaffee, S.H. and Becker, L.B. (1975). "Young Voters' Reactions to Early Watergate Issues." American Politics Quarterly, 3:360-385.

Chaffee, S.H. and Choe, S.Y. (1980). "Time of decision and media use during the Ford-Carter campaign." Public Opinion Quarterly 44,1 (Spring): 53-69.

Chaffee, S.H. and Choe, S.Y. (1979). "Communication measurement in the March 1979 NES pilot study." Paper presented to the American Political Science Association, Washington D.C.

Chaffee, S.H., McLeod, J.M., and Wackman, D. (1973). "Family communication patterns in adolescent political participation." In J. Dennis (Ed.), Socialization to Politics: Selected Readings. New York: John Wiley.

Chaffee, S.H., Nass, C.I., and Yang, S.M. (1991). "Trust in U.S. media among Korean Americans." Journalism Quarterly, 68: 111-119.

Chaffee, S.H., Nass, C.I., and Yang, S.M. (1990). "The bridging role of television in immigrant political socialization." Human Communication Research, 17: 266-88.

Chaffee, S.H. and Schleuder, J. (1986). "Measurement and effects of attention to media news." Human Communication Research 13 (1): 76-107.

Chaffee, S.H. and Tims, A.R. (1982). "News media use in adolescence: implications for political cognitions." In Burgoon, M. (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 6, pp. 736-758. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Chaffee, S.H., Ward, S., and Tipton, L. (1970). "Mass communication and political socialization." Journalism Quarterly, 47: 647-59.

Chaffee, S.H. and Yang, S.M. (1988, original). "Communication and political socialization" in Ichilov, O. (Ed.), Political Socialization for Democracy. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press.

Chang, W.H. (1972). "Communication and acculturation: a case study of Korean ethnic group in Los Angeles." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Iowa.

Choi, H.C. and Becker, S.L. (1987). "Media use, issue/image discriminations, and voting." Communication Research, 14, 3: 267-291.

Clausen, J. (1968). Introduction. In J. Clausen (Ed.), Socialization and Society, Boston: Little, Brown.

Cohen, A. "Radio vs. TV: the effect of the medium." Journal of Communication, 26: 29-35.

Comstock, G., Chaffee, S.H., Katzman, N., McCombs, M., and Roberts, D.F. (1978). Television and Human Behavior. New York: Columbia University Press.

Conway, M., Stevens, A., and Smith, R. (1975). "The relation between media use and children's' civic awareness." Journalism Quarterly, 52: 531-38.

Cook, T. and Scioli, F. (1972). "Political socialization research in the United States: A review." In Nimmo, D. and Bonjean, C. (Eds.), Political Attitudes and Public Opinion. New York: David McKay

Cooley, C.H. (1909). Social Organization. New York: Scribner.

Copeland, G.A. and Johnson-Cartee, K.S. (1991). Negative Political Advertising. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Copeland, G.A. and Johnson-Cartee, K.S. (1990). "A reexamination of candidate-sponsored negative political advertising effects." Unpublished manuscript, cited in Copeland, G.A. and Johnson-Cartee, K.S. (1991), Negative Political Advertising. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Danowski, J. and Ruchinskas, J. (1983). "Period, cohort, and aging effects: a study of television exposure in presidential election campaigns, 1952-1980." Communication Research., 10: 77-96.

Davis, D.K. (1989). "Comparative content analysis: TV network news coverage of the 1988 presidential campaign." Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.

Dawson, R.E. and Prewitt, K. (1969). Political Socialization. Boston: Little, Brown.

Dawson, R.E., Prewitt, K., and Dawson, K.S. (1977). Political Socialization (2nd Edition). Boston: Little, Brown.

DeFleur, M.L. and Cho, C.S. (1957). "Assimilation of Japanese-born woman in an American city." Social Problems, 4:244-57.

de la Garza, R.O. and Brischetto, R.R. (1984). "The Mexican American electorate: an explanation of their opinions and behavior." The Mexican American Electorate Series. Austin, TX: Center for Mexican American Studies.

de la Garza, R.O. and Brischetto, R.R. (1983). "The Mexican-American electorate: information sources and policy orientations." The Mexican American Electorate Series. Austin, TX: Center for Mexican American Studies.

Devlin, L.P. (1981). "Reagan's and Carter's ad men review the 1980 television campaigns." Communication Quarterly. 30: 3-12.

Devlin, L.P. (1973). "Contrasts in presidential campaign commercials of 1972." Journal of Broadcasting, 35: 17-26.

Dion, K. (1985). "Socializing in adulthood." in G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology, (Vol. 2). New York: Random House.

Dominick, J. (1972). "Television and political socialization." Educational Broadcasting Review, 6: 48-55.

Drew, D. and Reeves, B. (1980). "Children and television news." Journalism Quarterly 57: 45-54.

Drew, D. and Weaver, D. (1991). "Voter learning in the 1988 presidential election: did the debates and the media matter?" Journalism Quarterly 68.

Duncan, H.D. (1967). "The search for social theory in communication in American sociology." In Dance, F.E.K. (Ed.), Human Communication Theory: Original Essays. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Dunn, E.W., Jr. (1975). Mexican-American media behavior: a factor analysis." Journal of Broadcasting 19, 1:3-10.

Duran, D.F. (1980). Latino Communication Patterns. New York: Arno Press.

Easton, D. and Dennis, J. (1969). Children in the Political System. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Easton, D. and Hess, R. (1962). "The child's political world." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 16:229-246.

Garramone, G.M. (1984). "Voter responses to negative political ads: clarifying sponsor effects." Journalism Quarterly, 61: 250-59.

Gerbner, G. Gross, L., Morgan, M., and Signorielli, N. (1984). "The political correlates of TV viewing." Public Opinion Quarterly 48: 283-300.

Goldlust, J. and Richmond, A.H. (1974). "A multivariate model of immigrant adaptation." International Migration Review, 8 (2): 193-225.

Gollin, A. and Anderson, T. (1980). America's Children and the Mass Media. New York: Newspaper Advertising Bureau.

Gordon, M.M. (1964). Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press.

Graves, T.D. (1967). "Acculturation, access, alcohol in a tri-ethnic community." American Anthropologist, 69 (3-4): 306-321.

Greenberg, B.S., Burgoon, M., Burgoon, J.K., and Korzenny, F. (1983). Mexican Americans and the Mass Media. New Jersey: Ablex.

Hawkins, R. (1974). "Children's acquisition of current events information in the context of family, peers, media use, and pre-existing attitudes." Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University.

Hawkins, R., Pingree, S, and Roberts, D.F. (1975). "Watergate and political socialization." American Politics Quarterly, 3: 406-422.

Hawkins, R., Pingree, S., Smith, K., and Bechtolt, W. (1979). "Adolescents' responses to issues and images." In Kraus, S. (Ed.), The Great Debates: Carter vs. Ford 1976. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hershey, M.R. (1989). "The campaign and the media." In Pomper, G.M. (Ed.), The Election of 1988: Reports and Interpretations. Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House.

Hess, R. and Torney, J. (1967). The Development of Political Attitudes in Children. Chicago: AVC.

Himmelweit, H.T. (1983). "Political socialization." International Social Science Journal. 35: 237-56.

Hofstetter, R., Zukin, C., and Buss, T. (1978). "Political imagery and information in an age of television." Journalism Quarterly 55: 562-69.

Hollander, N. (1971). "Adolescents and the war: the sources of socialization." Journalism Quarterly, 48 472-79.

Hurh, W.M. and Kim, K.C. (1984). Korean Immigrants in America: A Structural Analysis of Ethnic Confinement and Adhesive Adaptation. London: Associated University Presses.

Hunter, E. (1960). In Many Voices: Our Fabulous Foreign-Language Press. Norman Park, GA: Norman College.

Hyman, H. (1959). Political Socialization. New York: Free Press.
Inkeles, A. (1968). "Society, social structure and child socialization." In J. Clausen (Ed.), Socialization and Society. Boston: Little, Brown.

Jackson-Beeck, M. (1979). "Interpersonal and mass communication in children's political socialization." Journalism Quarterly, 56: 48-53.

Jamieson, K.H. (1992). Packaging the Presidency: A History and Criticism of Presidential Campaign Advertising. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Jeffres, L.W. (1986). Mass Media: Processes and Effects, p.250. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.

Jeffres, L.W. and Hur, K.K. (1981). "Communication channels within ethnic groups." International Journal of Intercultural Relations 5: 115-132.

Jeffres, L.W. and Hur, K.K. (1979). "Impact of ethnic issues on ethic voters." In Kraus, S. (Ed.), The Great Debates. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Jennings, M.K. and Niemi, R. (1981). Generations and Politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Jennings, M.K. and Niemi, R. (1974). The Political Character of Adolescence: The Influences of Families and Schools. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Johnson, J.S. and Copeland, G.A. (1987). "Setting the parameters of good taste: negative political advertising." Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, San Francisco.

Johnsson-Smaragdi, U. (1983). TV Use and Social Interaction in Adolescence. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.

Kennamer, J.D. (1987a). "Debate viewing and debate discussion as predictors of campaign cognition. Journalism Quarterly 64: 114-118.

Kennamer, J.D. (1987b). "How media use during campaign affects the intent to vote." Journalism Quarterly 64: 291-300.

Kern, M. (1989). 30-Second Politics: Political Advertising in the Eighties. New York, NY: Praetor.

Kim, J.K. (1980). "Explaining acculturation in a communication framework: an empirical test." Communication Monographs, 47: 155-79.

Kim, K.C. and Hurh, W.W. (1980). "Social and occupational assimilation of Korean immigrant workers in the United States." California Sociologist, 3 (2): 125-142.

Kim, Y.Y. (1984). "Searching for creative integration." In Gudykunst, W.B. and Kim, Y.Y. (Eds.), Methods for Intercultural Communication Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kim, Y.Y. (1982a). "Communication and acculturation." In Samover, L. and Porter R. (Eds.), Intercultural Communication: a Reader. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Kim, Y.Y. (1982b). "Becoming intercultural and human development." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Kim, Y.Y. (1980). "Communication competence and immigrant acculturation: an outline for designing a communication training program." Paper presented to the Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research, Mt. Pocono, PA.

Kim, Y.Y. (1978). "A communication approach to the acculturation process: a study of Korean immigrants in Chicago." International Journal of Intercultural Relations 1: 197-224.

Kim, Y.Y. (1977). "Communication patterns of foreign immigrants in the process of acculturation." Human Communication Research 4, 1:66-77.

Kim, Y.Y. (1976). "Communication patterns of foreign immigrants in the process of acculturation: a survey among the Korean population in Chicago." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University.

Korzenny, F., Neuendorf, K., Burgoon, M., Burgoon, J.K., and Greenberg, B.S. (1983). "Cultural identification as predictor of content preferences of Hispanics," Journalism Quarterly 60, 4:677-85.

Kraus, S. and Davis, D. (1981). "Political debates." in Nimmo, D.D. and Sanders, K.R. (Eds.), Handbook of Political Communication, pp. pp. 273-98. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kraus, S. and Davis, D. (1976). The Effects of Mass Communication on Political Behavior. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Lang, A. (1985). "The cognitive psychophysiology of emotion: fear and anxiety." In Rosenzweig, R.S. and Porter, L.W. (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology, 37: 565-610.

Langton, K.P. (1969). Political Socialization. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lazarsfeld, P., Berelson, B., and Gaudet, H. (1948). The People's Choice. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lee, D. (1984). "Mass media and political socialization of foreign immigrants." Urbana: University of Illinois.

Levy, M.R. and Kramer, M.S. (1972). The Ethnic Factor. New York: Simon & Shuster.

Lichter, S.R., Amundson, D. M. and Noyes, R. (1988). "The video campaign: network coverage of the 1988 primaries." Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Liebes, T. and Ribak, R. (1992). "The contribution of family culture to political participation, political outlook, and its reproduction." Communication Research 19 (5): 618-41.

Leifer, A.D., Gordon, N.J., and Graves, S.B. (1974). "Children's television: more than mere entertainment." Harvard Education Review, 44: 213-45.

Lull, J. (1980). "Family communication patterns and the social uses of television." Communication Research, 7: 319-334.

Mandler, J.M. (1978). "A code in the node: the use of a story schema in retrieval." Discourse Processes, 1: 14-35.

Marzolf, M.T. (1979). The Danish-Language Press in America. New York: Arno Press.

McCombs, M. (1987). "Effect of monopoly in Cleveland on diversity of news content." Journalism Quarterly, 64: 740-44.

McGuire, W.J. (1985). "Inducing resistance to persuasion: some contemporary approaches." In Aronson, E. and Berkowitz (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology, 1.

McGuire, W. J. (1969). "The nature of attitudes and attitude change." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology (2nd ed., Vol. 3, 136-314). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

McLeod, J.M., Bybee, C.R., and Durall, J.A. (1980). "Equivalence of informed political participation: the 1976 presidential debates as a source of influence." Communication Research 6: 463-487.

McLeod, J.M. and Brown, J. (1976). "The family environment and adolescent television use." In J. Brown (Ed.), Children and Television. London: Collier Macmillan.

McLeod, J.M. and Chaffee, S.H. (1972). "The construction of social reality." In J. Tedeschi (Ed.), The Social Influence Processes. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 50-99.

McLeod, J.M. and McDonald, D. (1985). "Beyond simple exposure: media orientations and their impact on political processes." Communication Research 12: 3-34

McPhee, W. and Glaser, W. (1962). Public Opinion and Congressional Elections. New York: Free Press.

Merritt, S. (1984). "Negative political advertising: some empirical findings." Journal of Advertising, 13: 27-38.

Messaris, P. and Sarett, C. (1981). "On the consequences of television-related parent-child interaction." Human Communication Research, 7: 226-44

Milbrath, L. (1965). Political Participation. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Miller, M.M., Singletary, M.W., and Chen, S. (1988). "The Roper question and television versus newspapers as sources of news." Journalism Quarterly, 65: 12-19.

Minow, N.N., Burch, D., Corcoran, T.G., Heard, A., and Price, R. (1969). Voter's Time: Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Commission on Campaign Cost in the Electronic Era. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.

Miyares, M. (1980). Models of Political Participation of Hispanic Americans. New York: Arno Press.

Mortimer, J. and Simmons, R. (1978). "Adult socialization," in R. Turner, J. Coleman, and R. Fox (Eds.), Annual Review of Sociology. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Nagata, K. (1969). "A statistical approach to the study of acculturation of an ethnic group based on communication-oriented variables: the case of the Japanese American in Chicago." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.

Negative Advertising Pro and Con (1986, November 10). Advertising Age, p. 104.

Neuendorf, K.A., Korzenny, F., and Armstrong, G.B. (1980). "Cultural identity and television behaviors of Hispanic Americans." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.

New Campaign Techniques. (1986). In Elections '86. Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly.

Newhagen, J. and Nass, C.I. (1989). "Differential criteria for receiver evaluation of credibility of newspapers and television news." Journalism Quarterly, 66: 277-84.

Nie, N., Verba, S., and Petrocik, J.R. (1976). The Changing American Voter. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Nimmo, D.D. (1978). Political Communication and Public Opinion in America. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.

O'Keefe, G.J. (1985). "Taking a bite out of crime: the impact of a public information campaign." Communication Research, 12: 147-78.

O'Keefe, G.J. and Atwood, L.E. (1981). "Communication and election campaigns." In Nimmo, D.D. and Sanders, K.R. (Eds.), Handbook of Political Communication, pp. 329-55. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

O'Keefe, G.J. and Reid-Nash, K. (1987). "Socializing functions." In C.R. Berger and S.H. Chaffee (Eds.), Handbook of Communication Science. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE, 419-445.

O'Keefe, T. and Sheinkopf, K.G. (1974). "The voter decides: candidate image or campaign issue." Journal of Broadcasting. 18: 403-13.

Olmedo, E.L. (1980). "The role of cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty in acculturation." In A.M. Padilla (Ed.), Acculturation: Theory, Models, and Some New Findings. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, pp. 47-84.

Patterson, T.E. (1980). The Mass Media Election: How Americans Choose Their President. New York: Praeger.

Patterson, T.E. (1989). "The press and the missed assignment." In Nelson, M. (Ed.), The Elections of 1988. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Patterson, T.E. and Davis, R. (1985). "The media campaign: struggle for the agenda." In Nelson, M. (Ed.), The Elections of 1984. Washington D.C.: CQ Press.

Patterson, T.E. and McClure, R.D. (1976). The Unseeing Eye: The Myth of Television Power in National Elections. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Reeves, B., Newhagen, J., Maibach, E., Basil, M., and Kurz, K. (1991). "Negative and positive television messages: effects of message type and context on attention and memory." American Behavioral Scientist 34, 6: 679-94.

Reeves, B., Thorson, E., and Schleuder, J. (1985). "Attention to television: psychological theories and chronometric measures." University of Wisconsin, Madison: Mass Communications Research Center.

Richmond, A.H. (1967). Post-War Immigrants in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Roberts, D.F. and Bachen, C.M. (1981). "Mass communication effects." Annual Review of Psychology, 32: 307-56.

Roberts, D.F. and Maccoby, N. (1985). "Effects of mass communication," in G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology (3rd Ed.), Vol. II. New York: Random House.

Robinson, M.J. and Sheehan, M. (1983). Over the Wire and on TV: CBS and UPI in Campaign '80. New York: Russell Sage.

Rogers, E.M. (1983). Diffusion of Innovations. New York: Free Press.

Rogers, E.M. and Storey, J.D. (1987). "Communication campaigns." In Berger, C.R. and Chaffee, S.H. (Eds.), Handbook of Communication Science. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Roper, B.W. (1983). Trends in Attitudes Toward Television and Other Media: A Twenty-Four Year Review. New York: The Roper Organization.

Schaefer, R.T. (1979). Racial and Ethnic Groups. Boston: Little, Brown.

Sears, D.O. (1969). "Political behavior." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 5. Reading, PA: Addison-Wesley.

Sears, D.O. and Chaffee, S.H. (1978). "Uses and effects of the debates: an overview of empirical studies." In S. Kraus (Ed.), The Great Debates, 1976: Ford vs. Carter, pp. 223-261). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Shapiro, M.A. and Rieger, R.H. (1989). "Comparing positive and negative political advertising." Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.

Shibutani, T. and Kwan, K. (1965). Ethnic Stratification: A Comparative Approach. New York: Macmillan.

Shoemaker, P.J., Danielson, W.A., and Reese, S.D. (1984). "Language and media use among Hispanics and Anglos." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Gainesville, FL.

Shyles, L. (1991). "Issue content and legitimacy in 1988 TV political ads." In F. Biocca (Ed.), Television and Political Advertising, Vol. 2:Signs, Codes, and Images. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shyles, L. (1983). "Defining the issues of a presidential election from televised political spot advertisements." Journal of Broadcasting, 27:333-343.

Smith, M. (1968). "Competence and socialization." In J. Clausen (Ed.), Socialization and Society. Boston: Little, Brown.

Soltes, M. (1924). The Yiddish Press: An Americanization Agency. New York: Columbia University Teachers College.

Spindler, G.C. and Goldschmidt, W. (1952). "Experimental design in the study of cultural change." Southern Journal of Anthropology, 8: 62-83.

Stein, N.L. and Glenn, C.G. (1979). "An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children." In Freedle, R. (Ed.), New Directions in Discourse Processing (Vol. 2). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Subervi-Velez, F.A. (1986). "The mass media and ethnic assimilation and pluralism: a review and research proposal with special focus on Hispanics." Communication Research, 13 (1): 71-96.

Subervi-Velez, F.A. (1984). "Hispanics, the mass media, and politics: assimilation vs. pluralism." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin.

Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L.S. (1989). Using Multivariate Statistics, Second Edition. New York: Harper & Row.

Tan, A. (1983). "Media use and political orientations of ethnic groups," Journalism Quarterly 60, 1: 126-32.

Thomas, W. I. and Znaniecki, F. (1927, Original printing 1918). The Polish Peasant in Europe and America, Vols. 1 & 2. New York: Knopf.

Thorndyke, P.W. (1977). "Cognitive structures in comprehension and memory of narrative discourse." Cognitive Psychology, 9: 77-110.

Wade, S. and Schramm, W. (1986). "The mass media as sources of public affairs science and health knowledge." Public Opinion Quarterly 33: 197-209.

Weaver, D. and Drew, D. (1991). "Voter learning in the 1990 off-year election: did the media matter?" Paper presented at the convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Boston, Mass.

White, R. (1960). "Competence and the psychosexual states of development." In Jones, M. (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1960. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

White, R. (1959). "Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence." Psychological Review, 66: 297-333.

Wilson, D. (1984). "Political opinion change in parent-adolescent dyads." Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Gainesville, FL.

Wittke, C.F. (1957). The German Language Press in America. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

Yang, S.M. (1988). "The role of mass media in immigrants' political socialization: a study of Korean immigrants in northern California." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Stanford University.

Zhao, X., Chaffee, S.H., Bleske, G., and David, P. (1992). "Television news and ads as sources of issue information." Paper presented at the convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Montreal.

Zhao, X. and Chaffee, S.H. (1986). "Political ads versus news as sources of issue information." Paper presented at the convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Norman, Okla.

Zigler, E. and Child, I. (1973). Socialization and Personality Development. Reading, WA: Addison-Wesley.

Zigler, E. and Seitz, V. (1978). "Changing trends in socialization theory and research." American Behavioral Scientist, 21: 721-46.

Zubrzycki, J. (1958). "The role of the foreign language press in immigrant integration." Population Studies 12: 73-82.