DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 723 CS 202 474

AUTHOR Hesse, Michael B.
TITLE A Coorientational Study of Wisconsin State Senators: Their Role in the Communication Process.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (Ottawa, Canada, August 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Government (Administrative Body); Higher Education; Mass Media; *News Reporting; *Political Issues; Press Opinion; *Public Opinion; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *State Senators; Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this constituency study was to determine the level of awareness and corresponding opinions of constituents with regard to three issues. Thirty-three Wisconsin state senators served as subjects along with 1,650 Wisconsin citizens who were interviewed via telephone regarding their views. The political public relations environment in a rural setting is one of high surveillance. Rural senators become quite accurate in their assessment of the voting public, and opinion agreement seems to become a precondition to reelection. Urban senators, on the other hand, do not display the same sensitivity to constituents. They come into office about as discrepant from the views of their constituents as are new rural senators, and they seem to stay that way. The results of this study are presented in both narrative and table format. (RB)

A COORIENTATIONAL STUDY OF WISCONSIN STATE SENATORS: THEIR ROLE IN THE COMMUNICATION PROCESS

Michael B. Hesse
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Presented to the Association for Education in Journalism, Ottawa, Canada, August 1975.

Introduction

The use of coorientational models to examine communication systems has rapidly increased over the past several years. The general model of interpersonal coorientation, based mainly on the work of Newcomb,[1] was introduced as a set of criteria by Chaffee and McLeod and later refined.[2] Studies using the coorientation criteria range from communication within families to larger systems such as communities, social service agencies and university student bodies.[3]

To date, there have been no studies reported in political public relations which attempt to analyze the structure of coorientation between legislators and their voting publics. This study describes an analysis in a survey of one public (Wisconsin constituents) and one legislative body (the Wisconsin state senate). This system has been examined unilaterally by measuring legislators' perceptions of their constituents views on current issues, but not vice versa

The Coorientational Model

From the point of view of this study, the most profitable model with respect to communication is that of McLeod and Chaffee (1973). Their general model of coorientation involves a fundamental paradigm, in its most general form, consisting of a system of cross-perceptions and beliefs between two human beings. The interpersonal model allows for distinguishing between two sets of evaluative cognitions which each actor in the coorientational model is assumed to have: Each individual is assumed to know what he things about a given object, and to have some idea of what the other person thinks about the "same" thing.

Three variables (agreement, congruency and accuracy) are proposed to account for the relationships between these two sets of evaluations. Agreement is the extent to which the two actors eventually agree upon the object on which they are both focused. Congruency is the perceived agreement between two persons, or the extent to which one person thinks the other agrees with him. Accuracy is the correctness with which they perceive each other's appraisal of an object or topic.

The three variables are not independent of one another, since they are in part tied together by related measures. Given a coorientation situation of high agreement and accuracy, the consequence is high congruency. Or given high congruency and accuracy, the logical consequence is high agreement. However, two people could have high agreement and congruency with no communication going on.

One important question to be asked with regard to the model is how the variables are functionally related to communication. Can they predict if communication will take place? If there is agreement, there is no guarantee that communication has taken place, for two persons could agree on a topic without ever having communicated with one another. Congruency should change after a discussion, therefore it can be seen as a somewhat reliable indicator whether any communication has taken place. Accuracy seems to be the most useful tool in predicting whether communication has taken place; if two persons perceive one another's appraisal of an object more similarly than before, it can usually be assumed they have communicated. The more two persons coorient by communicating their private values to one another, the more accurate perception of one another's values should become.

Theoretically, two persons could achieve "perfect" accuracy via communication, whereas "perfect" agreement is less likely to result from communication alone.

The central question still unanswered in this area of research deals with what individual attribute is being measured by these comparisons. The consistency of earlier findings using the coorientational paradigm (Chaffee and McLeod, 1968; Hilton, 1967) suggest there is a definite relationship between the three variables. Reviews of the person perception literature[4] (Tagiuri, 1958; Laing, 1970) suggest the same. The possibility that such variables are artifacts if the measurement instrument has been raised and as yet not resolved in both areas of research (Cronbach, 1955, 1968).[5]

The Chaffee-McLeod model may be generalized to include more persons, different cognitions and additional levels of reciprocal cognitions over time. Other similar models have been advanced in recent years. Taguiri, Bruner and Blake [6] from which some of Chaffee and McLeod's basic notions are derived, apply the model to person perception research.

Procedure

In this study, each state senator is looked upon as one person, and his district constituents as the second "person." The topic within the system consists of three current issues facing the Wisconsin legislature in the form of controversial bills which had been introduced during the session in which the study was conducted. The bills included legislation to: (1) redistribute the state taxes, to aid poorer districts; (2) merge the University of Wisconsin campuses and the nine State University campuses into a single system of higher education, and; (3) to provide state aid to parochial schools. All three issues occasioned major editorial attention in the newspapers, debate within the legislature and precipitated bitter division within the political parties. Since this study is primarily interested in the overall pattern of coorientation rather than the particulars of Wisconsin politics, the data for the three issues have been combined.

The Legislative Survey

Personal interviews were conducted with each of the state's 33 senators. Legislators were asked their opinions on each of the three issues and also asked to estimate the distribution of constituent opinion within their districts on the issues. These "estimates" were later compared to actual opinions within the district measured by the constituency surveys.

Following the formal portion of the interview, open-ended discussions were purposely conducted with each senator regarding his attitudes and opinions of district politics, voting behavior and reaction to survey questions.

Senators were also asked to explain methods used to reach constituents and methods used to "listen" to their district constituencies.

The Constituency Surveys

The main objective of the constituency questionnaire was to determine the level of awareness and corresponding opinions of constituents with regard to the three issues. A total sample of 1650 citizens was obtained via telephone surveys. This total reflects the 50 calls made to each of the state's 33 senatorial districts. By using 50 responses per district, two percentage points were assigned to each respondent's tabulation, thus each district had a total of 100 percentage points and could be easily compared (for coorientational measure purposes) to the legislator's distributional assessment of constituency opinion.

The study analysis was conducted in two parts. The first stage consisted of an examination of the demographic variables which were hypothesized to control the structure of the legislative-constituent relationship. The second stage of the analysis dealt with other factors such as legislative voting records on selected issues, the image of legislators as presented via the media and other methods used by legislators to communicate with the constituent.

Measurement

Three separate measures were taken from the data on the three issues. The first measure, overall deviation, (from accuracy, agreement and congruency) was derived by taking the differences from the three response categories

(pro-pro, con-con, neutral-neutral), squaring them and summing the quantity and then calculating the square root of this sum of squares. This method is similar to that used in semantic differential research. This overall measure is non-directional and takes into account deviations in either direction, treating them as absolute deviations from agreement, accuracy and congruency. In addition, the overall deviation quantity represented the extent of disagreement, inaccuracy and noncongruency, rather then the obverse, since the measure reflects a difference between two distributions.

The second measure, neutral deviation, is a directional deviation which takes into account whether or not the senator underestimated or overestimated opinion of constituents within his district. This deviation is obtained by taking the difference between the two neutral categories of response in each of the two distributions and ignoring the pro and con categories of opinion. A minus quantity indicated the senator had underestimated the number of individuals within his district who hold no opinion or are neutral with regard to the particular issue. A positive quantity indicated the opposite.

The third measure, predominant deviation, is a directional measure and ignores all "neutral" opinion by comparing the ratios of pro to con in the senatorial and constituent distributions. In addition, this sign also expresses a deviation from the senator's point of view. A positive signed quantity indicated the predominant view held by the senator was more favorable toward a selected issue then the views held by his constituency. For example, if the senator indicated he was 60% for an issue, 20% against it and 20% neutral and the constituency revealed constituents are 30% for the

issue, 10% against it and 60% are neutral, there exists "perfect predominant agreement" because the ratios of the two distributions (60-20; 30-10) regarding pro and con opinion are the same. If however, the constituent's views were 40-30 (favor-disfavor) with 30% neutral, the predominant deviation score for agreement would then be +23%, since the predominance of his opinion is more favorable than his constituency's. To further explain the measurement of the three variables, the following table should serve as an illustration:

Table I - Measurement Computations for Agreement, Congruency and Accuracy

Distributions 1 and 2	Measure for Agreement* on Study Issues		
	Pro (+)	Neutral (0)	Con (-)
Senatorial Opinion Re X	A 1	A 2	A 3
Constituent Opinion Re X	B 1	B 2	B 3

*For congruency substitute senatorial perception of constituency for B; for accuracy substitute senatorial perception of constituency for A.

To demonstrate the three operational definitions, consider the following example:

	Constituency Opinion	Senatorial Estimate of Constituency Opinion
Pro	38%	40%
Con	22%	35%
Neutral	40%	25%

This comparison can provide three operational definitions of accuracy. Predominant accuracy is the difference between the two ratios of non-neutral opinion (38-32, and 40-35). Converting these to bases of 100 each, they become 63% and 53%, respectively. The senator has underestimated his constituency's support for the bill by 10%, predominantly speaking, so the table entry would be -10%. Next, he also underestimated the percentage of his constituents who hold no opinion by 40-25 = 15%. The table entry would be -15% in this case. Finally, overall inaccuracy is based on the sum of the differences squared: $(12)^2 + (13)^2 + (15)^2 = 144 + 169 + 225 = 538$. The square root of this sum is 23.2, which is the index that would be incorporated into a mean value to be entered into the appropriate cell of the data table.[8]

Structural and Process Variables

The first section of this analysis focuses on demographic variables which might control the structure of the communication system between legislators and constituents. The second stage of the analyses concentrates upon some aspects of the communication process within the structure.

The analysis revealed only two demographic variables that appear to have a significant impact on the pattern of coorientation, although a number of structural variables (tenure, rurality, electoral risk) were run against the dependent variable (coorientation variables).

In principle, tenure in office could yield a semi-continuous distribution for statistical analyses. But the Wisconsin state senate is a highly stable

body. In the survey year (1971), the state had just elected a Democratic governor and state Assembly, but the senate had maintained its 20-13 Republican majority. Tenure was distributed bimodally, with 15 members serving their first or second terms and the remaining 18 incumbents were serving for much longer periods of time. Accordingly, the groups were divided into "short" and "long" tenure.

Rurality, a measure of the rural nature of senatorial districts proved to be a more complex concept. Since all senatorial districts represent approximately equal numbers of constituents, factors other than population density had to be considered. Other factors (presence of heavy industry, building height in high population areas, number of service institutions, number of high density shopping areas, kilowatt hours of electrical power generated within the area, and number of police and emergency personnel assigned to the area) were considered and were highly correlated to population density. All were incorporated into a "rurality" index, and the distribution was clearly bimodal. The sample was dichotomized into 15 rural districts and 18 urban ones. In addition, it was expected there would be a strong correlation between tenure and rurality, but these two attributes proved not to be associated.

The analysis revealed only three process variables which demonstrated a significant impact upon the pattern of coorientation. Six process variables were examined (see Table 2), and (1) the extent of legislator to constituent communication activity; (2) the extent of constituent to legislator communication activity and; (3) media inconsistency, in general, displayed the highest correlations to the dependent measure.

Table 2. Correlation Coefficient Matrix for Accuracy*

Total Deviation from Perfect Accuracy	Accuracy	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Media (1) Exposure	.44								
Normal Vote (2)	.41	.30							
Media Inconsistency (3)	-.53	.51	.33						
Representational Role (4)	.40	.28	.38	.32					
Synchronic (5) Communication	.63	.48	-.41	-.59	.63				
Diachronic (6) Communication	-.65	-.54	.53	.69	-.68	.49			
STRUCTURAL VARIABLES									
Rurality (7)	-.40	-.39	.42	.51	.46	-.31	.38		
Tenure (8)	-.41	-.39	.55	.41	-.40	.26	.50	.36	

Media Exposure-The amount of coverage given to Legislature. High scores represent high coverage.

Normal Vote - Percentage of the vote cast for senators. A higher quantity reflects a higher percentage of the vote obtained.

Media Inconsistancy - Dissimilarity between reported opinion of the senator and the stated senatorial opinion on study issues gathered in survey. Higher scores represent higher amounts of inconsistency.

Representational Role - Degree of "representativeness" of legislator to higher quantity reflected a "political" stance, a lower score reflected a "delegate" stance.

Synchronic Communication - "Sending" communication of senators. A higher score reflects a greater presence of this behavioral mode.

Diachronic Communication - "Listening" communication behavior. A higher score reflects a greater presence of this behavioral mode.

*Negatively signed quantities indicate an inverse relationship to total deviation from perfect accuracy.

Legislator to constituent communication activity was measured by asking legislators how they communicated with constituents. Senators were asked to respond to a number of items pertaining to the extent of their communication activity directed at constituents ("Do you send mailings to constituents on your issue position?..."Do you send press releases to area media and selected constituents?"). Responses to the items (sometimes, always, never) were weighted and summed to produce an index. Senators exhibiting a high degree of legislator to constituent communication activity were categorized as "synchronic communicators"[9] (seeking to synchronize their views with those of their constituents or seeking agreement).

Constituent to legislator communication activity sought to measure the degree of "listening" behavior of legislators and the extent to which legislators actively seek opinions and values from constituents before making policy considerations. Those exhibiting a high degree of constituent to legislator communication activity were categorized as "diachronic communicators"[10] (information seeking to assess a common problem which generally precedes information giving to propose a solution to the problem or seeking accuracy).

This variable was measured by asking senators to respond to a series of items designed to reveal the extent of their "listening" behavior ("Do you mail (or phone) surveys to determine constituent opinion on issues?"... "Do you visit district meetings to observe and solicit district opinion on issues?"). Responses to the items (sometimes, always, never) were weighted and summed to produce an index of constituent to legislator communication activity.

Inconsistency of reporting was measured by determining what articles selected from district newspapers reported the senators as saying (regarding the three study issues) and then measuring the dissimilarity between the reported opinion and the stated senatorial opinion (gathered in the legislative survey).

Results

The biserial correlation coefficient was used to analyze the data. All of the study variables, with the exception of the dependent measures, were non-normally distributed. The biserial correlation coefficient is used in cases such as this when one variable (Y) is continuous while the other (second) variable (X) is dichotomized.[11]

It should also be noted that deviation from perfect agreement, congruency and accuracy are shown in all data presentations. The larger the number in a table, the greater the amount of disagreement, noncongruency and inaccuracy.

(1) Structural variables

Accuracy. Table 3 indicates that rural senators, as a group, are remarkably accurate, both in assessing the predominance of opinion within their constituencies, and in estimating the degree of issue neutrality. The long-tenure rural group, which is also the closest to its constituency in terms of agreement (Table 5) is particularly accurate. Overall, the senators who have served shorter terms in office tend to be less accurate. With the exception of the long-tenure rural group, there is a definite tendency to underestimate the extent to which constituents hold no opinion on the issues.

Table 3. Inaccuracy of Senator in Estimating Constituents Opinions, by structure

		Short tenure	Long tenure	Row mean
RURAL:	Dominant	+5%	-1%	+2%
	Neutral	-10%	+5%	-3%
	Overall	10.0	3.0	6.5
URBAN:	Dominant	+9%	+10%	+10%
	Neutral	-26%	-28%	-27%
	Overall	38.8	28.9	31.3
Column mean	Dominant	+7%	+5%	+6%
	Neutral	-18%	-12%	-15%
	Overall	24.4	15.9	20.2

Congruency. Table 4 indicates the extent of non-congruency between the senators and their estimates of their constituents' views. The rural long-tenure group stands out, this time as seeing itself as closer to its constituency. Almost without exception, the senators underestimate the degree of disagreement between themselves and their constituents. For the total sample, the predominance of non-congruency is a difference of only +8% (they are a net of 8% more favorable to the bills than they estimate the predominant number of their constituents to be).

Table 4. Non-Congruency between Senator's Opinions and His Estimate of Constituents' Opinions, by Structure

		Short tenure	Long tenure	Row mean
RURAL:	Predominant	+10%	-4%	+6%
	Neutral	-19%	+16%	-2%
	Overall	48.5	31.1	39.8
URBAN:	Predominant	+9%	+14%	-+12%
	Neutral	-36%	-27%	-32%
	Overall	42.9	38.1	42.5
Column mean	Predominant	+10%	+5%	+8%
	Neutral	-28%	-6%	-17%
	Overall	45.7	34.6	40.2

Agreement. The pattern of the congruency data is rather consistently similar to that of the agreement data (Table 5). Where disagreement is relatively high, so is noncongruency. The signs indicating the directional differences are almost all identical to those in the congruency table.

Table 5. Disagreement between Senator and Constituency by Structure

		Short tenure	Long tenure	Row mean
RURAL:	Predominant	+21%	+13%	+17%
	Neutral	-30%	+14%	-8%
	Overall	55.2	37.1	46.1
URBAN:	Predominant	+17%	+16%	+17%
	Neutral	-27%	-21%	-24%
	Overall	50.4	54.5	52.4
Column mean	Predominant	+19%	+15%	+15%
	Neutral	-28%	-4%	-16%
	Overall	52.8	45.8	49.3

Overall agreement tends to be the highest in the group of seven senators who have enjoyed long tenure representing a rural constituency. This occurs primarily because they are closest to their constituents both in the predominance of their opinions and in the degree to which they remain undecided on the bills. With the exception of the rural long-tenure group, the senators express much less neutrality than their constituents. This is quite understandable, however, for the issues were being hotly debated in the legislature at the time of the survey.

The data from the structural variable analysis makes it apparent that coorientational "closeness" to one's constituency is predictable from both rurality and length of tenure in office. If one looks on rural-urban background as an antecedent to a political career, but length of tenure as a possible outcome of the communication process, it would seem that rural senators differ from their urban colleagues in two respects. First, they have remarkably accurate perceptions of their constituents views; secondly, as length of time in office increases, their opinions come more into line with those of their constituents. Legislators from urban areas appear to extend their time in office (tenure) by increasing their accuracy in estimating constituents' views, rather than by coming more into line with constituents' opinions.[12]

(2) Process variables

Media Inconsistency. Table 6 indicates there is a negative relationship between media "accuracy" and senatorial "accuracy." Those senators achieving low inaccuracy scores reside in districts where media reports of senatorial issue position are highly inaccurate.

Table 6. Inaccuracy and Media Inconsistency

Media Inconsistency	Inaccuracy		
	High	Medium	Low
High	3	7	8
Low	7	6	2

33

The data agreement and congruency (Table 7) were similar. Those senators displaying high disagreement and noncongruency with their constituents, resided in areas where media reports were more consistent with senatorial statements.

These findings run counter to the existing literature.[13] It may be that those senators who possess a high ability to estimate district opinion do not use the media very much, and when they do their coverage is inconsistent with their stated views; this may lead them to intentionally avoid the media.

Table 7. Disagreement and Media Inconsistency

Media Inconsistency	Disagreement		
	High	Medium	Low
High	3	7	7
Low	6	6	4

33

Knowing the reporting of the media within their districts leaves something to be desired, they rely upon their abilities to estimate constituent opinion when dealing with constiuents. In addition, those senators who do not agree with constituents (and also cannot adequately perceive this disagreement) may rely upon the media to carry their messages to constituents.

"Synchronic" Communication. The data from Table 8 indicate those senators who are most adept at reading constituent opinion engage in less amounts of "informational output" activity than do those who are poor assessors of constituent opinion. Those senators who achieve a moderate amount of accuracy tend to engage in greater "output" oriented communication activity. Of the 10 senators who achieved high accuracy scores, nine of them engaged in low amounts of "synchronic" communication activity.

Table 8. Inaccuracy and "Synchronic" Communication

"Synchronic" Communication	Inaccuracy		
	High	Medium	Low
High	9	10	2
Low	1	3	8

33

The relationship between agreement and congruency and "synchronic" communication was similar to the relationship between agreement and congruency and the independent measure of media inconsistency. Senators who disagreed little with constituents engaged in greater amounts of "output" communication behavior than did those who achieved high disagreement scores. Of those who moderately disagreed, (13), twelve of them engaged in high "output" communication activity and one engaged in low "synchronic" communication behavior. The congruency data was similar to the agreement data (the relationship between congruency and the independent measure was weaker, however, the biserial correlation coefficient calculated for congruency was $r_b = -.60$ and for agreement was $r_b = -.65$).

Table 9. Disagreement and "Synchronic" Communication

"Synchronic" Communication	Disagreement		
	High	Medium	Low
High	1	12	8
Low	8	1	3

33

It should be noted the results run counter to the existing literature.[14] It seems legislators who engage in a great deal of "synchronic" communication behavior or "information output" are seeking agreement and congruency, but not accuracy. It may well be these senators recognize their inability to assess district opinion (for whatever reason), and attempt to overcome this inability by talking to and speaking before constituent groups rather than listening to and speaking with constituents.

"Diachronic" Communication. This variable showed the greatest relationship to the dependent measures of coorientation (see Table 2). The results of the data were almost the obverse of the data generated for "synchronic" communication. Senators who were measured as being highly accurate engaged in high amounts of "listening" communication activity. Those who listened little were highly inaccurate. Of those who engaged in medium amounts of "listening" communication activity behavior (13 senators), the great majority of them (10) engaged in high "input" communication.

Table 10. Inaccuracy and "Diachronic" Communication

"Diachronic" Communication	Inaccuracy		
	High	Medium	Low
High	1	10	9
Low	9	3	1

33

The results of the agreement and congruency data were, once again, similar. Senators who achieved high disagreement and high noncongruency with constituents engaged in little "listening" communication behavior. Once again the correlation coefficient calculated for agreement and "diachronic" communication was higher (thus indicating a stronger relationship between agreement and "diachronic" communication than that congruency and "diachronic" communication) than that calculated for congruency and "diachronic" communication. (See Table 11.)

Table 11. Disagreement and "Diachronic" Communication

"Diachronic" Communication	Disagreement		
	High	Medium	Low
High	3	12	5
Low	6	1	6

33

DISCUSSION

The political public relations environment in a rural setting is one of high surveillance. Rural senators become quite accurate in their assessment of the voting public, and opinion agreement seems to become a pre-condition to re-election.

Urban senators, on the other hand, do not display the same sensitivity to constituents. They come into office about as discrepant from the views of their constituents as are new rural senators. But they seem to stay that way. In spite of accurate reporting by the media, it may be that the urban setting with its multiplicity of people and institutions and varying opinions on issues, tends to obscure these senators' positions on issues. Also, it may be more difficult to familiarize oneself with legitimate public relations channels in urban areas with sophisticated networks of communication.

It may also be that urban senators substitute media coverage for personal surveillance of constituents, thereby remaining out of direct touch with opinion within their districts. However, the urban senators who survive longer periods of time do seem to maintain some type of interpersonal contact, and the resultant "political savvy" may payoff in

continued re-election. Rural senators, on the other hand, seem to continue to stick closely to opinions of constituents and perform "delegate" (operating on instructions from constituents) roles of representation.

Tenure in office is closely related to the ability to perceive district opinion; it seems the way to insure longevity is to come closer into line with district opinion on issues, as is exhibited by those displaying high accuracy, mostly the rural senators. Those senators from urban areas (highly inaccurate) display higher degrees of agreement and congruency and are seen as "politicians" (operating on conscience or political savvy). As a rule, this group is low tenured. However, there are senators within this group who possess longer tenure, but they also demonstrate high accuracy.

Those senators engaging in large amounts of "synchronic" communication activity are not very accurate in estimating district opinion, but are in agreement with the constituents on the issues. These senators are usually "politician" representatives and low tenured, and it would seem seeking agreement is not sufficient to establish tenure in office. Simply sending news releases to the media, speaking to constituent groups and talking to voters does not insure re-election. Even though these senators are able to perceive agreement quite well, they are highly inaccurate in estimating the true opinion. This may be due to the fact they do not listen to their "public" -- they only offer information.

The successful senators (in terms of tenure in office and the resultant re-election) are those who engage in a great deal of listening behavior. This group of senators is highly accurate in estimating district opinion, even though they may think their estimates are off. Typically these senators

regularly send out public opinion polls, meet with constituents and listen to them speak and conduct regular "campaign walks" through their districts producing a setting of high continuous surveillance..

CONCLUSIONS

What seems to be emerging then, is a description of the significant attributes of successful political public relations (if success can be measured on the basis of repeated election to senatorial office). Long tenured senators in Wisconsin typically reside in rural districts and display, from the beginning, a desire and ability to accurately assess the opinions within their districts. Typically, they vote with district opinion as a guide when casting ballots on legislative issues. Their urban counterparts (those measured as being highly accurate) appear to extend their tenure by increasing their accuracy in estimating views of their "publics", rather than by coming to agree with them.

The structural variables account for a moderate amount of the variance in the dependent variables of coorientation, however the correlation coefficients of tenure and rurality show a much weaker relationship then that of the process variables, therefore, the structure probably does not determine the pattern of coorientation.

the pattern of coorientation is more likely controlled by the nature of the communication process within the public relations environment. The findings do not support previous literature that media reports will be consistent with senatorial stated views where legislators are highly accurate. Perhaps those who possess high ability to assess public-held views recognize this shortcoming of the media (poor reporting) in their districts, and instead rely upon other more (reliable) interpersonal

methods of communication. The evidence that those senators most adept at opinion assessment utilize "diachronic" or listening public relations procedures, in part, bears out this notion.

It is also interesting to note that in districts where senatorial inaccuracy is high, media reports are consistent with the personal views held by senators. Once again, perhaps the ability of the media to accurately reflect senatorial opinion leads these legislators to rely more heavily on mass coverage (because it's well done) and "synchronic" procedures and to ignore more time consuming methods of communication which would increase their coorientational abilities. Again, the data bear this notion out.

This study has demonstrated that those legislators from urban districts who display low accuracy are not engaging in a great deal of communication with constituents. Perhaps it is untrue, as suggested by the literature, that rural legislators know their districts so well they do not have to bother with continuous communication with their publics. It seems more apparent that rural legislators (and some urban ones) know their districts well, but only because of continued surveillance of their constituents and repeated use of "listening" procedures commonly used in professional public relations. Some urban legislators may find it difficult to observe target public values due to the heterogeneous nature of urban areas, thus making surveillance of a multiplicity of opinions a relatively harder task than in more homogeneous rural areas. However, successful implementation of "listening" communication behavior seems to result in senatorial "success" regardless of demographic structure.

* * * * * * * *

FOOTNOTES

1. T. M. Newcomb, "An approach to the study of communicative acts." Psychological Review, 1953, 60:393-404.

2. J. M. McLeod and S. H. Chaffee, "Interpersonal approaches to communication research." American Behavioral Scientist, March-April, 1973.

3. J. E. Grunig and K. R. Stamm, "Communication and coorientation of collectivities," American Behavioral Scientist, March-April, 1973.

4. R. Taguiri, J. Bruner and R. Blake, "On the relation between feelings and perception of feelings among members of small groups," In E. Macoby, T.M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958

5. E. Cronbach.

6. Op. cit.

7. C. E. Osgood, G. J. Suci and P. H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

8. M. B. Hesse and S. H. Chaffee, "Coorientation in political communication: A structural analysis." Paper presented at the Annual International Communication Association convention, Montreal, 1973. The authors previously used these measures and much of the structural data and structural results were reported in that paper.

9. F. Thayer, Communication and Communication Systems. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin Publishing, 1968. Thayer discusses this in depth.

10. Ibid.

11. R. Ostle, Statistics for Scientific Research. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1960.

12. See note 8.

13. R. Davidson, The Role of the Congressman. Newark: Hastings House 1969.

14. Ibid.