DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 802 CS 504 163

AUTHOR Garrison, Bruce
TITLE Legislators' Images of Mass Media News Reporting Performance.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Lincoln, NE, April 7-9, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Attitudes; Ethics; *Legislators; Local Issues; *News Media; *Newspapers; *News Reporting; *State Government
IDENTIFIERS *Media Government Relationship; Media Role

ABSTRACT

To explore the relationships between the news media and public officials, a study focused on the perceptions of the capital press corps coverage held by members of a state legislature. Data were collected in Wisconsin, where the state legislature consists of a 33-member senate and 99-member assembly. Questionnaires containing semantic differential scales developed to determine public images of mass media institutions were mailed to all legislators, 69 of whom responded. Results indicated that the legislators rated television and radio coverage more favorably than newspaper coverage and that they saw far less distinction between statewide or district coverage in both forms of news media. The findings are similar to earlier findings and indicate that ethics remain an important dimension of media performance in the eyes of legislators, as do media potency, style, quality, and stability. (JL)

LEGISLATORS' IMAGES OF MASS MEDIA NEWS REPORTING PERFORMANCE

By Bruce Garrison
Department of Communication
University of Miami
P.O. Box 248127
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

A paper presented to the Mass Communication Division, Central States Speech Association, annual convention, Lincoln, Nebraska, April 7-9, 1983.

The author would like to thank the Department of Communication of the University of Miami and the College of Journalism at Marquette University for their support of this research project for data collection and preparation of this paper. He would also like to thank Prof. Mitchell Shapiro for suggestions for data analysis.

LEGISLATORS' IMAGES OF MASS MEDIA

NEWS REPORTING PERFORMANCE

Journalists covering state government often take the opportunity to criticize the efforts of politicians--- in commentaries, columns, and in the objective reporting that they produce each day. Certainly those government officials at the state level, estimated by some to be the least salient level of government to the public than other levels,[1] have opinions about the quality of work of the media in covering these sources. A recent study by the staff of Michigan Gov. William G. Millikan, released by the National Governor's Association in Washington, illustrates this. This report, reflecting the opinions of 48 governors, stated the media did a "B" job in covering their various states.[2]

If, as we are led to believe by these governors in this study as well as similar studies, the media are not doing the best possible job according to those the media cover, what are the images public officials hold toward news reporting performance? Whether it is covering the chief executive, the legislature, or even the supreme court, the job is not an easy one. Whitehead and Ziff provide this rather typical account:

> If press lore is to be credited, covering a legislative session at the statehouse is roughly akin to covering a baseball team on a long road trip. With everyone uprooted for weeks or months, customary divisions (between newsmen and newsmakers...) dissolve. The heavy boozers find the heavy boozers, the storytellers find the storytellers, the gamblers set up tables, and the straight arrows quiver together.[3]

It is clearly not an easy job and, from the research literature, we know much more about the news media's perceptions of sources and media behavior in general in covering government. Textbooks on reporting, for example, focus on how-to-do-it rather than understanding sources and source perceptions of media

purpose and performance. Researchers have studied the major daily newspapers, the news magazines, and the television and radio networks. And they have concentrated on the public's reactions to coverage, impressions regarding performance, and such similar matters. Little recent scholarly concern has been given to state government and news media performance in covering state government. Furthermore, research tends to focus on public perceptions of media performance and not on the perceptions of the primary sources of state government news--- public officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. While the governor and supreme court of a given state are important news sources and the governor is the leading individual news source in the state, certainly the single largest group of sources in influential positions is the state legislature. Some political scientists believe these representatives are the state's ombudsmen, reaching into the hinterlands.[4] The legislature, therefore, is an important group of news sources and even more important as appropriate evaluators of the performance of the news media coverage of state government.

The body of literature that concerns itself with news media performance in covering state government is growing. Dunn, for example, demonstrated the relationship of the public official and the news media in listing the major components of the public official-reporter communication dyad. Each component, Dunn concluded, on each side of the dyad, must be interrelated with all components on both sides of the relationship. For political reporters, Dunn's five components are: (1) role views, (2) defining news, (3) gathering news in terms of routines and interaction with officials, (4) selecting news, and (5) writing news. On the other side of the source's desk, the four components for public officials are: (1) views toward the press, (2) exposure to the press, (3)

receiving communication, and (4) transmitting communication techniques and purposes.[5]

This study focuses on one component from Dunn's paradigm. Public officials' images of the press, a vital mitigating factor in the interrelationships of source and reporter, will be studied. Dunn further explains the public officials' perceptions of job performance in terms of criticism and praise. Criticisms, Dunn offers, are usually grounded in public officials' own instrumental orientations toward the press. They include improper news emphasis and selection, lack of experience of statehouse reporters, lack of technical knowledge of public officials' areas of administration and/or government, editorials written by isolated editorial writers who have improper information, and a lack of in-depth stories and comprehensive interpretation of state government activity. Praise does not always come in the form of the obverse of the criticisms, he said. Praise includes the various "good" qualities of reporters such as wide range of knowledge and adaptability to situations, his or her interest in state government, and the helpfulness of the press in assisting public officials in achieving their program goals.[6]

Martin found government officials in Washington to be "satisfied" with the performance of the press on the whole, but this is not the case at the state level. State officials spend a good amount of their time criticizing the press, he said.[7] Research by Dunn, in Wisconsin, and by Morgan, in New York, support Martin's general view.[8] News media and source relationships are, however, difficult to analyze because their constituent elements are not easily isolated or disentangled, Blumler and Gurevitch argue. The fusion of the source and reporter occurs, they say, because "each communicator is amply motivated to 'study' the other when pursuing his or her interests."[9] Sanders and Kaid have observed that the relationship between reporters and their political sources is

characterized by most researchers as adversary in contrast to other possible paradigms such as the "exchange" model.[10]

While they are adversary, reporter-public official relationships have been viewed to pivot on communication patterns based on mutual dependence, Dyer and Nayman concluded. As this happens, each side tries to manipulate the other and alter the situation.[11] Dyer and Nayman concluded that Colorado reporters and legislators have quite similar views that reporters recognize but legislators do not. With this, reporters felt "close" to legislators, but legislators did not feel close to reporters.[12] It becomes important, therefore, to study the images public officials hold of reporters and the news media to better understand why this closeness does not exist.

Baker and Walter, in investigating the relationship of the Wyoming state legislature and the news media, said the issue agendas of members of the legislature were similar to the issue agendas of coverage of the major newspapers of the state.[13]

The goal of better news media coverage is blocked by numerous obstacles. Whitehead and Ziff note several, including short staffing, internal splits within the news media between print and broadcast formats, shortages of information from sources, turnover among sources, turnover among reporters, the "ordering" of statehouse news, dependence on set spokesmen for information, and oversimplification of complex processes.[14] Many of these, clearly, influence the perceptions of sources by news media and perceptions of news media performance by sources.

Gormley has determined that coverage of state government by television and by newspapers is not equivalent. Newspapers, he concluded, devote a larger proportion of news stories to state government than does television. Newspapers also give greater prominence to stories than television. While newspaper coverage

of state government could be better, he said, television coverage could be much better. In fact, Gormley characterized television coverage as reflecting "a policy of 'benign neglect.'" Gormley says this finding, plus the fact that television is the nation's foremost information source, leads to public opinion that state government is not very important.[15]

It is the distinction between electronic news media and print news media that is of interest here, particularly as viewed by the public official. Merwin, for example, found television more favorably judged by legislators in Texas. He also determined television was perceived to be more responsible, reputable, wholesome, important, and safe to legislators. Newspapers, in contrast, were viewed to be biased and partial, but truthful and interesting. Merwin said the overall ratings average of television news coverage was higher than newspapers. But he cautions that the two media cannot be equated because of the differences in the way television and newspapers cover state legislative news. It might be as simple as the fact that newspapers offer more material to criticize than time-tight television newscasts.[16]

Public Images of Mass Media

Tannenbaum and McLeod studied public images of mass media institutions, determining five dimensions of consumer perceptions. In their research, they determined a general evaluation dimension which related to pleasantness of the media, its value, importance, and interest arousal capabilities. Ethical evaluation was a second dimension, including fairness, truthfulness, bias, responsibility, and accuracy. The third dimension identified was labeled stylistic evaluation, including colorfulness, excitement, freshness, neatness, and difficulty. Their fourth image dimension included potency, reflecting the power of the mass media, its boldness, and "loudness." The fifth dimension found

was labeled activity, reflecting activity, tenseness, and how modern the media were perceived to be.[17] And, in their benchmark thesaurus study, Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum found evaluation, potency, oriented activity, stability, tautness, receptivity, and aggressiveness dimensions.[18] The dimension reflecting stability seems particularly useful beyond those identified by Tannenbaum and McLeod when applied to mass media performance.

Merwin, looking specifically at public officials' perceptions of mass media performance in covering a state government, identified ethics, potency, style, appearance, and quality as important dimensions of images of legislative coverage of home district newspapers. He also found quality, potency, accuracy, attractiveness, and importance to be dimensions of images of legislative coverage of home district television.[19] Lemert, on the other hand, found just three components of source image in a cross-cultural study. Lemert concluded these were safety, dynamism, and qualification---regardless of sources, scales, cultures, instructions, and situations.[20]

Research Questions

The primary purpose of this paper is to explore the relationships between the news media and the public official. More specifically, this paper will explore the relationships of the capitol press corps and members of a state legislature. In doing so, the principal focus will be on the perceptions of capitol press corps coverage held by members of a state legislature.

In a general way, this paper seeks to determine these perceptions, or images, held of the media. To be more precise, this paper will look not only at state legislators' perceptions of news media performance, but also at legislators' perceptions of differences in print and broadcast news media

performance. Furthermore, it will investigate state legislators' perceptions of differences in coverage at home district and state levels.

This paper will attempt to provide evidence toward answers to these research questions:

(1) What are public officials' images of (a) newspaper coverage in home district, (b) radio and television coverage in home district, (c) newspaper coverage statewide, and (d) radio and television coverage statewide?

(2) What are the general perceptions of public officials---state legislators--- toward news media reporting performance?

(3) What are the similarities and/or differences in public officials' perceptions of print and broadcast news media reporting performance?

(4) What are the similarities and/or differences in public officials' perceptions of home district and statewide news media reporting performance?

Method

To answer the research questions, data were collected in Wisconsin, where the state legislature consists of a 33-member senate and 99-member assembly. The size of this legislature enabled a census to be conducted rather than a sample of a larger body of legislators in another state. A substantial capitol press corps also made selection of the Madison site desireable.

One means of evaluating performance of the mass media was developed by Tannenbaum and McLeod, as discussed earlier, using the semantic differential scale to determine public images of mass media institutions.[21] Following their work, scales were developed to represent their five dimensions of images held by a group of respondents: (1) general evaluation, (2) ethical evaluation, (3) stylistic evaluation, (4) potency, and (5) activity. A sixth dimension, stability, was added from Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum's early work.[22] The

semantic pairs used in construction of the image scale, a questionnaire, were suggested by Tannenbaum and McLeod, by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, Merwin,[23] and by Lemert.[24]

A scale of 35 semantic pairs was developed, representing the dimensions proposed by Tannenbaum and McLeod. To determine differences in print and broadcast news media images held by public officials, legislators were asked to evaluate performance of newspapers and of radio and television using the semantic differential scale. Furthermore, to determine evaluations of news media performance at the home district level and the statewide level, respondents were asked to evaluate performance on these levels as well. Therefore, four evaluations were obtained on the questionnaire: (1) newspaper coverage in home district, (2) newspaper coverage in state of Wisconsin, (3) radio and television coverage in home district, and (4) radio and television coverage in state of Wisconsin.

Because the legislature was in recess at the time data collection occurred, a mail questionnaire containing the four sets of scales and demographic questions was sent to home addresses of all legislators.[25] A memorandum written by a leading member of the Assembly endorsed the study in an attempt to enhance response rate. Two follow-up mailings with personal letters were sent to legislators not responding to the original mailing. Telephone calls, when possible, were made to encourage response. And incomplete questionnaires were returned to respondents in hopes they would be completed.

Data were coded and analyzed using the t-test and factor analysis subprograms of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Each of four sets of image scales were factor analyzed utilizing the principal factoring with iteration method. Main diagonal elements of the correlation matrix were replaced with communality estimates with this procedure. The factor structure

resulting from analysis served as the independent variables; each set of 35 variables (semantic pairs) served as the dependent variables in each analysis. Because of the exploratory nature of this stage of the research, the usual initial factoring criterion, a 1.0 eigenvalue, was not applied. The iteration maximum was 25. A varimax rotation was executed on the data.[26]

Findings

A total of 52.3 percent (n=69) responded to the questionnaire. This figure represents 42.4 percent (n=14) of the Senate and 55.6 percent (n=55) of the Assembly. Of the 14 senators responding, one questionnaire (7.1 percent) was incomplete. Of the 55 Assembly members responding, four questionnaires (7.3 percent) were incomplete. Thus, 65 respondents were included in the analysis (49.2 percent).[27]

Among the respondents, 58.5 percent were Democrats, the mean age was 42.6 years, 86.2 percent were male, 41.5 percent represented urban constituencies and 40.0 percent represented urban-rural constituencies, 35.4 percent had served in the legislature for nine or more years, 20.0 percent were businessmen (the group was quite heterogeneous), and 72.3 percent had a college or a graduate degree. Factoring produced four different sets of theoretical dimensions of media performance images which will be discussed separately below:

Newspaper Coverage in Home District

Legislators perceive seven independent variables, or images, in evaluating performance of newspapers in their home districts:

(1) Stability-Stylistic Evaluation: This factor contains the largest number of semantic pairs (16) and accounts for 64 percent of variance. The stability dimension seems to be strongest, with stable-unstable loading highest on the factor (.83191), as shown in Table 1. Balanced-unbalanced also has a

strong loading (.79027). The stylistic dimension is created by such pairs as smooth-rough and colorful-colorless.

(2) Potency/Ethical Evaluation: This factor accounts for 11.4 percent of variance and contains eight pairs. Potency dimension pairs with highest loading are incomplete-complete (.82590), whole-partial (.66921), and strong-weak (.63929). Ethical evaluation is represented by good-bad (.74624) and fair-unfair (.56748).

(3) Activity/Stylistic Evaluation: This factor accounts for 8.3 percent of variance and contains five pairs. Humorous-serious (.65843) and relaxed-tense (.65256) are highest loading pairs. Urban-rural loads negatively (-.58742), suggesting a strong rural orientation by newspapers.

(4) Affective: Perhaps this factor represents the affective dimension of newspaper coverage, with three pairs. Rash-cautious (.61297) loads highest, with rational-intuitive and unemotional-emotional also associated with this dimension.

(5) Currency: This factor consists of only two pairs, but each reflect an image of currency. Timely-untimely (.79295) loads highest and is paired with passive-active.

(6) General evaluation: This factor stands with one pair, permissive-prohibitive (.73892).

Television and Radio Coverage in Home District

Legislators viewed television and radio coverage in home district with seven images, as shown in Table 2:

(1) Ethical Evaluation: This factor accounts for the largest amount of variance, 63.8 percent, and contains 18 semantic pairs. The strongest loadings are ethical evaluations of television and radio coverage--- careless-careful (.80132), untruthful-truthful (.79372), good-bad (.76383), inaccurate-accurate (.76108), fair-unfair (.72285), and others. There seems to be a qualitative

element to this dimension as well, with careless-careful and balanced-unbalanced (.71909).

(2) Stylistic Evaluation: This factor accounts for 13.4 percent of the variance and contains eight pairs. It is characterized by highest loading pairs smooth-rough (.80688) and colorful-colorless (.80348). There is a qualitative element to this factor also, with attractive-unattractive (.76657) and superior-inferior (.58889) loading on this factor.

(3) Potency: Four pairs create this image, marked by highest loading pair incomplete-complete (.63388) and whole-partial (.59194).

(4) Activity: Only one pair in this factor, relaxed-tense, with a very high loading (.94372), accounting for over 88 percent of the variance.

(5) Geographic Evaluation: Negatively loaded, urban-rural is the only pair in this factor (-.64421), suggesting a rural orientation to the broadcast media coverage.

(6) Affective/Ethical Evaluation: This factor consists of two pairs, unemotional-emotional (.65477) and biased-unbiased (.64523).

(7) Stability: A weak factor, this consists of rational-intuitive (.40584) only.

Newspaper Coverage Statewide

Legislators perceived newspaper coverage of the legislature's activities statewide in six distinct dimensions shown in Table 3:

(1) Ethical: This complex factor accounts for 75.3 percent of the variance with 21 pairs. Ethical evaluations include pairs such as objective-subjective (.86017), balanced-unbalanced (.81575), honest-dishonest (.79879), fair-unfair (.79033), right-wrong (.74688), and biased-unbiased (.70223). There is a general evaluative dimension to this factor as well, with several pairs from other identified dimensions.

(2) General Evaluation: With only 7.9 percent of the variance accounted for by this factor, it contains just four pairs and is marked by relaxed-tense (.70590), unpleasant-pleasant (.65552), and unfriendly-friendly (.63647).

(3) Quality: This factor accounts for little variance (six percent) and contains three pairs. It is characterized by careless-careful (.66291), the strongest loading pair.

(4) Activity/Potency: This factor contains three pairs and suggests a link between activity and potency images with passive-active (.67077) and strong-weak (.66544).

(5) Stylistic Evaluation: Style images are reflected in colorful-colorless (.70476) and humorous-serious (-.56033).

(6) Affective: This is a single semantic pair factor, unemotional-emotional, with a very high loading (.95917).

Television and Radio Coverage Statewide

Members of the legislature see television and radio coverage on a statewide level in seven dimensions shown in Table 4:

(1) Ethical Evaluation: This factor accounts for 66.9 percent of the variance and contains 18 semantic pairs. Eight of the pairs suggest an ethical image of the electronic media coverage statewide, with inaccurate-accurate loaded highest (.85089). Also on this factor are honest-dishonest, good-bad, right-wrong, fair-unfair, and several others. There seems to be a qualitative element here also, with careless-careful (.79348) and superior-inferior (.63864) loading on this factor.

(2) Stylistic Evaluation: This factor contains eight semantic pairs and accounts for 12.1 percent of variance. Colorful-colorless load highest (.76362), with smooth-rough (.70670) also indicative of style images.

(3) Ethical/Quality: This factor, somewhat different from ethical evaluation above, suggests a quality element in ethics concerned with "equal" treatment of news stories. Highest loaded pair is balanced-unbalanced (.69588). Also in this factor of three pairs are biased-unbiased and urban-rural.

(4) Stability/Stylistic/General Evaluation: Two pairs make up this factor, reflecting stability (sane-insane) and style and general evaluation (unpleasant-pleasant).

(5) Oriented Ethical Evaluation: This factor consists of only one semantic pair, inaccurate-accurate, which perhaps reflects a specific orientation to ethics different to the more general orientation in the first factor described above. Loading of this pair is quite high (.90067).

(6) General Evaluation: Permissive-prohibitive loads highest (.64117) on this two-pair factor with unemotional-emotional (-.50798).

(7) Potency: Only one pair, whole-partial creates this factor. Its loading is weak (.57906).

Eigenvalues and variance accounted for on each set of factor analyses are provided in Table 5.

General Perceptions of News Media Performance

Means for all variables are contained in Tables 6-9. These means reveal strong categorical differences. First of all, legislators do perceive significant differences in radio and television coverage over newspaper coverage, rating television and radio coverage more favorably than newspaper coverage. This evaluation does not seem to be influenced by the nature of coverage either, since both geographic levels of coverage of the legislature were lower for nearly all adjective pair mean scores for newspapers.

Second, there seems to be far less distinction by legislators for statewide or district coverage of newspapers or of radio and television.

Legislators did perceive home district coverage more positively than statewide coverage of the legislature, but many mean score differences were not statistically significant at the p=0.05 level.

In Table 6, it is clear legislators perceive broadcast news media far more favorably at both the state and home district levels as suggested in the Texas legislature study by Merwin.[28] There were 19 statistically significant differences in mean scores in evaluating coverage of the current legislative session for the home district of the legislator. Senators and assemblymen felt television was more interesting, courteous, wise, active, sensitive, smooth, fair, strong, relaxed, accurate, whole, balanced, truthful, colorful, superior, friendly, and timely. Only in two cases did legislators view newspapers more positively--- emotional and serious. Both of these were statistically significant. While legislators viewed television and radio higher on 15 other adjective pairs, these were not significant. Interestingly, legislators rated both newspapers and television-radio the same on urban-rural.

At the statewide level, legislators perceived broadcast media more positively on 31 adjective pairs, with nine differences statistically significant. Four adjective pairs were evaluated more positively for newspapers but none of the differences can be attributed to anything but chance. As shown in Table 7, legislators perceived television and radio to be more courteous, fair, unbiased, relaxed, accurate, pleasant, truthful, objective, and friendly. In contrast, the four adjective pairs which were rated higher for newspapers were slight differences that were not significant.

While there were clear differences in medium, there was not such clear differentiation in the perceptions of legislators over home district and statewide reporting of their work in the statehouse. Generally, legislators believed coverage of their home district deserved more positive overall ratings

than did state coverage. In terms of newspaper coverage only, legislators viewed home district coverage more positively on 20 items and state coverage more positively on 13 items. As shown in Table 8, two were rated the same. However, only four of these differences were statistically significant, indicating less overall distinction. Interestingly, two of the items were higher home district ratings (unemotional and biased) and two of the items were higher state ratings (whole and timely). The two items rated equally were rational-intuitive and stable-unstable.

Radio and television evaluations faired about the same as newspapers when studied at the district and state levels, as shown in Table 9. Legislators believed home district coverage was more positively executed, generally, but this is tentative at best since none of those 21 higher means was statistically significant. Of the 12 means which were higher at the state level, just one was statistically significant (attractive-unattractive). There were two adjective pairs rated equally (interesting-boring and superior-inferior).

Looking more closely at newspaper coverage in home district and statewide, we see legislators perceive home district reporting was more unemotional, courteous, wise, careful, sensitive, honest, serious, fair, progressive, unbiased, right, relaxed, accurate, pleasant, balanced, truthful, subjective, sane, cautious, and friendly. Newspaper coverage statewide was perceived to be more interesting, active, urban, complete, permissive, smooth, attractive, strong, good, whole, colorful, superior, and timely. As stated above, most differences should be attributed to nothing more than chance.

Radio and television coverage in the legislator's home district was viewed more unemotional, courteous, wise, active, careful, sensitive, honest, smooth, fair, progressive, unbiased, right, relaxed, accurate, whole, balanced, truthful, stable, sane, cautious, and friendly. Radio and television coverage statewide was

perceived to be more rational, urban, complete, permissive, serious, attractive, strong, good, pleasant, colorful, objective, and timely. Again, these differences were not statistically significant.

Discussion

It seems legislators view the media in broad similar ways, but with subtle distinctions. Legislators in Wisconsin see the media, both print and broadcast, in much the same images that the public in the work by Tannenbaum and McLeod viewed the media. This seems appropriate, since legislatures seem to be demographic microcosms of the state they are elected to represent. Newspapers and radio and television are evaluated ethically and stylistically, in terms of activity, stability, and potency. A dimension of currency surfaces in evaluation of newspapers in home districts.

Review of Tables 6-9 shows some of the mean differences that have been discussed above. It is important to consider a point made by Merwin that may still hold true: Merwin concluded that the nature of newspaper reporting and the nature of television and radio reporting are so different in content depth and format that they should be considered individually.[29] This perspective is supported here in the semantic pair mean differences.

As public officials seek to become increasingly familiar with the objectives and responsibilities of the news media, perhaps data from studies such as this will reflect a change during this decade. There has not, however, been a substantial change in the general images of the news media held by public officials, apparently, over the past decade in comparing these findings with Merwin and with Tannenbaum and McLeod. At this point, though, ethics remain an important dimension of media performance in covering state government in the eyes of legislators, as does media potency, style, quality, and stability. The image

of a stable media may be a new consideration, as it does not seem an important dimension of previous work in this area.

It may be cliche to say it, but this is only a preliminary analysis of the data base and much more will be learned from it. As subsequent analysis occurs this spring, refinement of the factor analysis will look at other possible ordering of semantic pairs in perhaps stronger factor solutions. It may also be valuable to look at demographic characteristics of the legislators participating in the study to predict attitudes toward the news media. Differences may exist in how members of the assembly and senate, how veteran versus freshmen members, and other groups view the news media. It may also be worthwhile to investigate the predictive value of this data in anticipating attitudes toward the media by format or geographic base.

TABLE 1

NEWSPAPER COVERAGE IN HOME DISTRICT

Factor/Semantic Pairs	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Stability-Stylistic Evaluation							
Interesting-boring	.46319	.24390	-.18138	.02930	.13267	-.01727	.38050
Insensitive-sensitive	.65824	.30592	.28636	.21095	-.04395	-.19229	.03440
Honest-dishonest	.38733	.30146	.30142	.34463	-.15831	.05653	.30159
Smooth-rough	.66801	.16843	.01668	.23914	.44169	.23593	-.13573
Attractive-unattractive	.68733	.28244	.04941	-.08871	.07804	.03833	-.02171
Backwards-progressive	.74567	.23881	-.10898	-.03811	.27388	.05005	.10441
Biased-unbiased	.65493	.21176	.35324	.18816	-.18065	.00941	.03678
Right-wrong	.76895	.21836	.26608	.27467	.15254	-.09526	.15716
Inaccurate-accurate	.57735	.48621	.22273	.36583	.13994	-.03315	.24590
Unpleasant-pleasant	.79027	.18550	.11479	.16900	.04835	.01568	.08551
Balanced-unbalanced	.76884	.36926	.10915	.20455	.04131	.01957	.18273
Colorful-colorless	.65427	.29995	-.23799	-.16993	.14270	.32841	-.16552
Superior-inferior	.73020	.50917	-.14298	.07587	.17063	.13826	.08664
Objective-subjective	.64621	.14656	.22083	.52577	.15167	-.04740	.06250
Stable-unstable	.83191	.14608	.16009	.12187	.18852	.07756	.07067
Sane-insane	.69246	.03033	.12094	.17063	.08420	.16592	.33507
Potency-Ethical Evaluation							
Discourteous-courteous	.15588	.52356	.45755	.14837	.18689	-.04933	.14314
Foolish-wise	.41446	.45482	.44255	.08072	.12591	.04657	.02920
Careless-careful	.56823	.63026	.28631	.16261	.11390	-.13577	-.12506
Incomplete-complete	.22245	.82590	.08340	.25748	.15128	.07827	.04747
Fair-unfair	.50761	.56748	.32644	.13373	-.19837	.09578	.24644
Strong-weak	.42334	.63929	-.00888	-.06817	.24962	.31341	.20457
Good-bad	.51880	.74624	.06382	.11943	.12859	.01962	.17522
Whole-partial	.26557	.66921	.23053	.17240	.11308	.14300	-.04177
Activity-Stylistic Evaluation							
Urban-rural	.08452	-.24174	-.58742	-.01000	.25333	.16699	.10852
Humorous-serious	.02916	-.00509	.65843	.12658	.08310	.11981	.10371
Relaxed-tense	.24497	.06118	.65256	.38262	.12983	.23856	-.16932
Untruthful-truthful	.48192	.31424	.49273	.18992	.11415	-.12376	.44381
Unfriendly-friendly	.32189	.38975	.42328	.02228	.05265	.16842	.36514

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

Factor/Semantic Pairs	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Affective							
Unemotional-emotional	-.04887	.22996	.20641	.55844	.01095	-.07376	.05778
Rational-intuitive	.24999	.40648	-.15955	.51245	.05699	.32736	.19681
Rash-cautious	.35858	.01474	.19568	.61297	.01026	.00918	-.04664
Currency							
Passive-active	.16016	.43845	.12806	-.33001	.60271	.29471	.04735
Timely-untimely	.35894	.29988	.04472	.25118	.79295	.11037	.11797
General Evaluation							
Permissive-prohibitive	-.00538	.11544	.11568	.00101	.12278	.73892	.00916

Note: Factor 7 had no high loadings by variables which were not higher on another factor. This is a re-ordered varimax rotation factor matrix.

TABLE 2

TELEVISION AND RADIO COVERAGE IN HOME DISTRICT

Factor/Semantic Pairs	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Ethical Evaluation							
Discourteous-courteous	.49524	.20767	.10706	.08539	.32569	.21100	-.18197
Foolish-wise	.63916	.27618	.08924	.03481	.37679	.19655	.14691
Careless-careful	.80132	.24055	.14258	.01818	.16590	.09381	.11034
Insensitive-sensitive	.64362	.28696	.35649	.11754	.37007	.09162	-.18705
Honest-dishonest	.70331	.18970	.26620	.12112	.06842	-.01150	.16236
Humorous-serious	.44947	-.32615	-.27225	.27135	.29067	-.06193	-.02344
Fair-unfair	.72285	.16223	.25068	.23274	.01918	.27677	-.18805
Strong-weak	.53131	.49218	.43577	.01146	-.03044	.08480	-.13168
Good-bad	.76383	.35331	.34076	-.05460	.06176	.18150	.05911
Backwards-progressive	.57850	.46051	.18958	-.05098	.14145	.06577	-.11473
Right-wrong	.69795	.38719	.10218	-.02909	.16662	.13145	.03879
Inaccurate-accurate	.76108	.25552	.19100	-.08596	.29249	.01544	.20192
Balanced-unbalanced	.71909	.21620	.41852	.24663	-.03474	.26229	.04556
Untruthful-truthful	.79372	.13655	.13698	.20867	.26905	.12146	.20910
Sane-insane	.64817	.17011	.09565	.27723	-.04246	.31314	.03189
Rash-cautious	.59269	-.02373	.04063	.02039	-.13668	-.04554	-.28951
Unfriendly-friendly	.53476	.34478	.15800	.26716	.16090	.03345	-.23680
Stable-unstable	.54738	.36583	.34232	.26222	-.18023	.24083	.07280
Stylistic Evaluation							
Passive-active	.34458	.75207	.07618	.04321	.24600	.03904	.09972
Smooth-rough	.16719	.80688	.10398	.02098	.07030	-.04458	.14625
Attractive-unattractive	.19046	.76657	.16595	.20600	-.01427	-.02658	-.08766
Unpleasant-pleasant	.09718	.51320	.27412	.47804	.19686	.14901	-.08477
Colorful-colorless	.07072	.80348	.14756	.05971	-.01824	-.13458	-.05106
Superior-inferior	.41519	.58889	.47977	.13467	.08032	.07042	.01880
Timely-untimely	.22002	.59683	.22752	.07450	-.21258	.03914	-.26122
Interesting-boring	.28214	.75848	.03182	.09761	-.03171	.00489	.25263

TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

Factor/Semantic Pairs	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Potency							
Incomplete-complete	.44922	.22210	.63388	-.00961	.26153	.13428	.10985
Permissive-prohibitive	.08172	.24224	.43157	.24364	.05453	-.07500	-.08619
Whole-partial	.39776	.17871	.59194	.19889	.15851	.15003	.27944
Objective-subjective	.53833	.17272	.58957	.10326	.03850	.01682	-.04392
Activity							
Relaxed-tense	.14341	.19410	.17939	.94372	-.06862	.01333	.09979
Geographic Evaluation							
Urban-rural	-.20375	.04028	-.12092	.02937	-.64421	-.02099	.00152
Affective-Ethical Evaluation							
Unemotional-emotional	.11268	-.14060	.06393	.06567	.04259	.65477	.25559
Biased-unbiased	.30479	-.01645	.01110	-.04172	.04147	.64523	-.27755
Stability							
Rational-intuitive	.24754	.39777	.18819	.23048	-.11542	.11496	.40548

This is a re-ordered varimax rotated factor matrix.

TABLE 3

NEWSPAPER COVERAGE STATEWIDE

Factor/Semantic Pairs	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Ethical						
Interesting-boring	.57774	.17444	.24715	.35028	.21300	-.03993
Rational-intuitive	.59662	.20953	.46928	.18510	.04518	.03309
Foolish-wise	.57384	.41371	.38600	.27028	.23700	.00302
Incomplete-complete	.78439	.00161	.23499	.16130	-.01723	-.17669
Honest-dishonest	.79879	.31226	.28087	.18779	-.06005	.02273
Smooth-rough	.48935	.21379	.15715	.32994	.37461	-.01444
Attractive-unattractive	.53147	.51831	-.00720	.45359	.34359	.07183
Fair-unfair	.79033	.38061	.19197	.01610	.12485	.23094
Good-bad	.64485	.27128	.37267	.44706	.27085	.05193
Backwards-progressive	.62480	.16406	.35762	.27199	.18897	.10144
Biased-unbiased	.70223	.33533	.23314	-.10086	.14383	.02857
Right-wrong	.74688	.31513	.16994	.29442	.14242	.06181
Inaccurate-accurate	.75754	.27097	.27068	.15834	.09040	.07484
Whole-partial	.74166	.30659	.17403	.13754	.28357	.12612
Balanced-unbalanced	.81575	.35724	.16748	.06263	.11250	-.08966
Untruthful-truthful	.70848	.35983	.34646	.18819	.03872	-.03985
Superior-inferior	.76202	.02318	.14902	.34519	.26807	-.23177
Objective-subjective	.86017	.19116	.21170	.07636	.10904	.01369
Stable-unstable	.59939	.48557	.15759	.42781	.15944	-.04631
Sane-insane	.53120	.35235	.19459	.29302	.28798	.00888
Rash-cautious	.43186	.17376	.36644	-.05889	.28767	.00739
General Evaluation						
Permissive-prohibitive	.30842	.38209	.14104	.04125	.11435	-.31935
Relaxed-tense	.33347	.70590	.14887	-.04586	.21247	-.14042
Unpleasant-pleasant	.26637	.65552	.40699	.27349	.20535	-.09105
Unfriendly-friendly	.40221	.63647	.46515	.19158	.11837	.09997

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

Factor/Semantic Pair	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Quality						
Discourteous-courteous	.42480	.38176	.63312	.14059	.20068	.14343
Careless-careful	.52731	.14054	.66291	.31842	.13530	.00327
Insensitive-sensitive	.51565	.26204	.64341	.08824	.12960	-.02134
Activity-Potency						
Passive-active	.01863	-.01404	.00792	.67077	.09239	-.03594
Strong-weak	.52981	.21959	.23022	.66544	.02560	-.05711
Timely-untimely	.38518	.24734	.24849	.62681	.03660	-.02907
Stylistic Evaluation						
Urban-rural	-.25520	-.17695	.05835	.29503	-.33508	.13977
Humorous-serious	-.00195	-.13750	-.10413	-.03834	-.56033	.05166
Colorful-colorless	.20407	.06195	.15437	.41900	.70476	-.23699
Affective						
Unemotional-emotional	.13630	-.08015	.10134	-.06027	-.20164	.95917

This is a re-ordered varimax rotated factor matrix.

TABLE 4

TELEVISION AND RADIO COVERAGE STATEWIDE

Factor/Semantic Pairs	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Ethical Evaluation							
Rational-intuitive	.63345	.16512	.01414	-.01238	.09320	.14391	.17093
Discourteous-courteous	.60608	.11753	.20768	.37214	.44764	.05421	.02814
Foolish-wise	.70296	.34077	.12996	.31938	.08232	.19681	.11499
Careless-careful	.79348	.21421	.15985	.19058	.19934	.00016	.13117
Insensitive-sensitive	.65649	.21659	.37387	.05935	.26513	-.10732	.07095
Incomplete-complete	.61024	.27853	.38269	.23668	.00928	.07737	.36982
Honest-dishonest	.81626	.08934	.22938	.34279	.20428	-.01001	-.08749
Fair-unfair	.68060	.04033	.39427	.40402	.13563	.07255	-.11489
Strong/weak	.62044	.55767	.12056	.24825	-.11520	.12148	.25077
Good-bad	.79360	.44533	.21451	.07434	.13535	.07147	.05882
Right-wrong	.75620	.26155	.14250	.22045	.11715	.10483	-.02385
Inaccurate-accurate	.85089	.06077	.14248	.39378	.01688	.08602	.03873
Untruthful-truthful	.63173	.04175	.33274	.46083	.17467	.11253	-.08352
Superior-inferior	.63864	.48012	.35380	.17080	.09856	.03846	.16860
Objective-subjective	.61249	.32745	.56417	.17813	.07172	-.01443	.05851
Stable-unstable	.51345	.30492	.39645	.50633	-.03956	.06828	.10041
Rash-cautious	.70481	-.03957	.13829	.11305	-.11831	.41261	-.03164
Unfriendly-friendly	.55877	.09979	.42608	.22149	.29383	.12850	-.46616
Stylistic Evaluation							
Interesting-boring	.30736	.66217	.09257	.33144	-.02179	.17853	.30823
Passive-active	.01092	.54862	.09775	-.00857	-.03429	.05275	.14901
Smooth-rough	.33165	.70670	.08237	-.00855	.14395	.15535	.13287
Humorous-serious	.20802	-.45420	.28962	.05009	.08870	.04927	.09965
Attractive-unattractive	.34111	.68303	.15585	.06942	.28680	.12712	-.04365
Backwards-progressive	.52124	.54418	.22742	.24586	.07627	.24658	-.01621
Colorful-colorless	.16025	.76362	-.08382	.08684	.01369	-.13962	-.11211
Timely-untimely	.28009	.65290	.06561	.24511	.29019	.19388	-.09512

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

Factor/Semantic Pair	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Ethical-Quality							
Urban-rural	-.03486	-.03678	-.57741	.04255	-.07296	-.19899	-.14100
Biased-unbiased	.39840	-.09171	.60779	.15315	.03974	-.04941	-.19041
Balanced-unbalanced	.39206	.07665	.69588	.44458	.22780	-.08787	.11665
Stability-Stylistic-General Evaluation							
Unpleasant-pleasant	.35231	.27471	.09287	.73692	.26308	.20902	-.14731
Sane-insane	.54090	.11252	.05402	.70559	.06795	.09334	.05329
Oriented Ethical Evaluation							
Inaccurate-accurate	.15962	.08482	.15923	.13366	.90067	.06169	.02567
General Evaluation							
Unemotional-emotional	.01934	-.44990	.03154	-.16613	.04015	-.50798	.03641
Permissive-prohibitive	.38552	.13091	.23858	.12025	.23446	.64117	.12654
Potency							
Whole-partial	.46786	.16835	.34146	-.06242	.13516	.09357	.57906

This is a re-ordered varimax rotated factor matrix.

TABLE 5

FACTOR SOLUTION EIGENVALUES AND VARIANCE

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative
Newspaper Coverage of Home District			
1	15.84734	64.1	64.1
2	2.81278	11.4	75.4
3	2.06405	8.3	83.8
4	1.34066	5.4	89.2
5	1.12259	4.5	93.8
6	.79359	3.2	97.0
7	.75221	3.0	100.0
Television and Radio Coverage of Home District			
1	15.16974	63.8	63.8
2	3.18689	13.4	77.2
3	1.55122	6.5	83.8
4	1.09804	4.6	88.4
5	1.01442	4.3	92.7
6	.95429	4.0	96.7
7	.79251	3.3	100.0
Newspaper Coverage Statewide			
1	19.04752	75.3	75.3
2	2.00172	7.9	83.2
3	1.52298	6.0	89.2
4	1.16960	4.6	93.8
5	.79681	3.1	97.0
6	.77008	3.0	100.0
Television and Radio Coverage Statewide			
1	17.20146	66.9	66.9
2	3.11345	12.1	79.0
3	1.49625	5.8	84.8
4	1.32219	5.1	90.0
5	.94878	3.7	93.7
6	.91915	3.6	97.2
7	.71092	2.8	100.0

TABLE 6

MEANS OF NEWSPAPER AND RADIO-TELEVISION ADJECTIVE PAIRS
CURRENT LEGISLATIVE SESSION: HOME DISTRICT

Adjective Pair	Mean, Newspaper	Mean Radio-Television	t-value	p-value*
Interesting-boring	4.3175	5.0159	-3.46	.001
Unemotional-emotional	3.9153	3.4237	2.06	.044
Rational-intuitive	4.1639	4.3607	-1.04	.304
Discourteous-courteous	4.6557	5.0984	-2.36	.022
Foolish-wise	4.3167	4.7333	-2.45	.017
Passive-active	4.4333	4.9000	-2.29	.026
Urban-rural	4.5167	4.5167	0.00	1.000
Careless-careful	4.2903	4.5161	-1.32	.192
Insensitive-sensitive	4.1864	4.5763	-2.49	.016
Incomplete-complete	3.4839	3.8226	-1.57	.121
Permissive-prohibitive	4.0189	4.1132	-0.49	.623
Honest-dishonest	4.9032	5.0806	-0.94	.351
Smooth-rough	4.1525	4.7119	-3.03	.004
Humorous-serious	4.5593	3.9153	3.78	.000
Attractive-unattractive	4.4426	4.6721	-1.33	.188
Fair-unfair	4.2903	4.7581	-2.61	.011
Strong-weak	3.9500	4.5333	-2.69	.009
Good-bad	4.1148	4.4918	-1.86	.068
Backwards-progressive	4.5690	4.9310	-1.97	.053
Baised-unbiased	3.7377	4.0164	-1.19	.238
Right-wrong	4.2542	4.5085	-1.59	.117
Relaxed-tense	4.1552	4.6379	-2.98	.004
Inaccurate-accurate	4.2459	4.6393	-2.31	.025
Whole-partial	3.2623	3.7377	-2.35	.022
Unpleasant-pleasant	4.4483	4.7759	-1.82	.074
Balanced-unbalanced	3.9048	4.2857	-2.17	.034
Untruthful-truthful	4.6721	5.0820	-2.73	.008
Colorful-colorless	4.1167	4.6000	-3.28	.002
Superior-inferior	3.9836	4.3443	-2.08	.042
Objective-subjective	4.0323	4.3710	-1.72	.090
Stable-unstable	4.5345	4.5690	-0.22	.825
Sane-insane	4.9492	5.0847	-1.13	.261
Rash-cautious	4.4407	4.5593	-0.62	.539
Unfriendly-friendly	4.5167	4.9333	-2.47	.016
Timely-untimely	4.4262	5.1803	-4.45	.000

*Two-tail probability.

TABLE 7

MEANS OF NEWSPAPER AND RADIO-TELEVISION ADJECTIVE PAIRS
CURRENT LEGISLATIVE SESSION: STATE OF WISCONSIN

Adjective Pair	Mean Newspaper	Mean Radio-Television	t-value	p-value*
Interesting-boring	4.7627	5.0508	-1.35	.183
Emotional-unemotional	3.4035	3.1930	1.13	.265
Rational-intuitive	4.2500	4.5893	-1.53	.131
Discourteous-courteous	4.2807	4.8070	-2.61	.012
Foolish-wise	4.2456	4.5439	-1.67	.101
Passive-active	4.8421	4.8596	-0.08	.939
Urban-rural	4.5965	4.6140	-0.16	.874
Careless-careful	4.2632	4.4386	-0.87	.389
Insensitive-sensitive	4.0351	4.2982	-1.37	.175
Incomplete-complete	4.0000	4.0536	-0.23	.818
Permissive-prohibitive	4.1321	4.1887	-0.50	.617
Honest-dishonest	4.6207	4.8103	-1.13	.263
Smooth-rough	4.5357	4.6607	-0.72	.478
Humorous-serious	4.1228	4.0000	0.61	.546
Strong-weak	4.3393	4.6071	-1.37	.175
Good-bad	4.2456	4.5614	-1.68	.098
Attractive-unattractive	4.6786	4.9821	-1.80	.078
Fair-unfair	4.1786	4.6071	-2.17	.034
Backwards-progressive	4.5273	4.8000	-1.51	.137
Biased-unbiased	3.2321	3.9643	-3.89	.000
Right-wrong	4.1579	4.4737	-1.76	.083
Relaxed-tense	4.1786	4.5714	-2.66	.010
Inaccurate-accurate	4.1228	4.5614	-2.34	.023
Whole-partial	3.9298	3.7193	0.79	.436
Unpleasant-pleasant	4.3091	4.8727	-3.63	.001
Balanced-unbalanced	3.9649	4.1579	-1.09	.282
Untruthful-truthful	4.4286	4.9286	-3.37	.001
Colorful-colorless	4.3393	4.6964	-1.54	.128
Superior-inferior	4.1053	4.3158	-1.02	.311
Objective-subjective	3.9286	4.3929	-2.37	.021
Stable-unstable	4.5357	4.5000	0.22	.827
Sane-insane	4.8364	4.8545	-0.17	.868
Rash-cautious	4.1818	4.3636	-1.30	.199
Unfriendly-friendly	4.2143	4.6964	-3.35	.001
Timely-untimely	5.1250	5.4286	-1.93	.058

*Two-tail probability.

TABLE 8

MEANS OF HOME DISTRICT AND STATE OF WISCONSIN
CURRENT LEGISLATIVE SESSION: NEWSPAPERS

Adjective Pair	Mean Home District	Mean State of Wisconsin	t-value	p-value*
Interesting-boring	4.3443	4.7705	-1.88	.066
Unemotional-emotional	3.9492	3.3729	2.08	.042
Rational-intuitive	4.2241	4.2241	0.00	1.000
Discourteous-courteous	4.6667	4.3167	1.46	.150
Foolish-wise	4.3559	4.2542	0.61	.545
Passive-active	4.5263	4.8070	-1.05	.298
Urban-rural	4.5500	4.6167	-0.23	.821
Careless-careful	4.3667	4.2167	0.71	.480
Insensitive-sensitive	4.2069	4.0345	0.89	.378
Incomplete-complete	3.5667	3.9167	-1.44	.156
Permissive-prohibitive	4.0000	4.1538	-0.74	.463
Honest-dishonest	4.8500	4.5667	1.49	.142
Smooth-rough	4.1724	4.5172	-1.72	.091
Humorous-serious	4.5345	4.1724	1.68	.098
Attractive-unattractive	4.4828	4.6379	-0.88	.384
Fair-unfair	4.3448	4.1379	0.91	.368
Strong-weak	3.9661	4.2712	-1.32	.192
Good-bad	4.1525	4.2203	-0.32	.750
Backwards-progressive	4.5614	4.5088	0.25	.806
Biased-unbiased	3.7797	3.2881	2.62	.011
Right-wrong	4.2542	4.1525	0.62	.536
Relaxed-tense	4.1724	4.1552	0.11	.917
Inaccurate-accurate	4.2787	4.1311	0.90	.370
Whole-partial	3.3390	3.8814	-2.46	.017
Unpleasant-pleasant	4.5263	4.3158	1.30	.198
Balanced-unbalanced	3.9333	3.9167	0.10	.921
Untruthful-truthful	4.6441	4.3898	1.65	.104
Colorful-colorless	4.1356	4.3220	-0.90	.372
Superior-inferior	4.0172	4.1034	-0.39	.695
Objective-subjective	4.0172	3.9138	0.54	.591
Stable-unstable	4.5439	4.5439	0.00	1.000
Sane-insane	4.9138	4.7931	0.98	.331
Rash-cautious	4.3793	4.1897	1.16	.252
Unfriendly-friendly	4.4746	4.2373	1.08	.287
Timely-untimely	4.4237	5.0339	-2.62	.011

*Two-tail probability.

TABLE 9

MEANS OF HOME DISTRICT AND STATE OF WISCONSIN - CURRENT LEGISLATIVE SESSION: RADIO AND TELEVISION

Adjective Pair	Mean Home District	Mean State of Wisconsin	t-value	p-value
Interesting-boring	5.0517	5.0517	0.00	1.000
Unemotional-emotional	3.4909	3.2182	1.40	.168
Rational-intuitive	4.4364	4.5818	-0.67	.504
Discourteous-courteous	5.1250	4.8214	1.64	.107
Foolish-wise	4.7679	4.5357	1.54	.129
Passive-active	4.9464	4.8571	0.57	.573
Urban-rural	4.5000	4.5893	-0.34	.733
Careless-careful	4.6429	4.4286	1.47	.147
Insensitive-sensitive	4.5536	4.2857	1.72	.092
Incomplete-complete	3.8545	4.0364	-0.75	.459
Permissive-prohibitive	4.0962	4.2115	-0.85	.401
Honest-dishonest	5.0175	4.8070	1.39	.171
Smooth-rough	4.7273	4.6545	0.48	.632
Humorous-serious	3.9107	4.0179	-0.77	.444
Attractive-unattractive	4.6607	4.9643	-2.49	.016
Fair-unfair	4.7857	4.6250	1.05	.296
Strong-weak	4.5273	4.6182	-0.47	.642
Good-bad	4.5357	4.5714	-0.20	.839
Backwards-progressive	4.8704	4.7963	0.53	.598
Baised-unbiased	4.1455	3.9636	0.88	.382
Right-wrong	4.5273	4.5091	0.15	.880
Relaxed-tense	4.6182	4.5636	0.41	.684
Inaccurate-accurate	4.6250	4.5536	0.50	.621
Whole-partial	3.7857	3.6964	0.36	.717
Unpleasant-pleasant	4.7963	4.8333	-0.23	.821
Balanced-unbalanced	4.3036	4.1429	0.91	.366
Untruthful-truthful	5.1091	4.9273	1.37	.176
Colorful-colorless	4.6364	4.7091	-0.37	.712
Superior-inferior	4.3036	4.3036	0.00	1.000
Objective-subjective	4.3393	4.4107	-0.43	.670
Stable-unstable	4.5636	4.5091	0.40	.690
Sane-insane	5.1111	4.8519	1.79	.080
Rash-cautious	4.4815	4.3704	0.67	.507
Unfriendly-friendly	4.8909	4.6909	1.09	.282
Timely-untimely	5.1636	5.4182	-1.51	.137

*Two-tail probability.

FOOTNOTES

1. M. Kent Jennings and Harmon Zeigler, "The Salience of American State Politics," American Political Science Review (June 1970), pp, 523-35..

2. "How 50 Governors Rate Media on News Coverage," Editor and Publisher, 115:41 (October 9, 1982), p. 20.

3. Ralph Whitehead, Jr., and Howard M. Ziff, "Statehouse Coverage: Lobbyists Outlast Journalists," Columbia Journalism Review 12:5 (January-February, 1974), pp. 11-12.

4. Kendall L. Baker and B. Oliver Walter, "The Press as a Source of Information about Activities of a State Legislature," Journalism Quarterly, 52:4 (Winter 1975), p. 735.

5. Delmer D. Dunn, Public Officials and the Press, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1969, pp. 180-81.

6. Ibid., pp. 68-74.

7. L. John Martin, "Government and the News Media," in Dan D. Nimmo and Keith R. Sanders, eds., Handbook of Political Communication, Sage, Beverly Hills, Calif., 1981, pp. 450-51.

8. See Dunn, op. cit.; and see David Morgan, The Capitol Press Corps: Newsmen and the Governing of New York State, Greenwood Press, Westport; Conn., 1978.

9. Jay G. Blumler and Michael Gurevitch, "Politicians and the Press: An Essay on Role Relationships," in Dan D. Nimmo and Keith R. Sanders, eds., Handbook of Political Communication, Sage, Beverly Hills, Calif., 1981, pp. 468-69.

10. See Keith R. Sanders and Lynda Lee Kaid, "Political Communication Theory and Research: An Overview 1976-77," in Brent D. Ruben, ed., Communication Yearbook II, Transaction Books, New Brunswick, N.J., 1978; and see Blumler and Gurevitch, op. cit., pp. 472-74.

11. Carolyn Stewart Dyer and Oguz B. Nayman, "Under the Capitol Dome: Relationships Between Legislators and Reporters," Journalism Quarterly, 54:3 (Autumn 1977), pp. 443-44.

12. Ibid., pp. 452-53.

13. Baker and Walter, op. cit., pp. 740, 761.

14. Whitehead and Ziff, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

15. William T. Gormley, Jr., "Coverage of State Government in the Mass Media," State Government, 52 (Spring 1979), pp. 46-50. See also William T. Gormley, Jr., "Television Coverage of State Government," Public Opinion Quarterly, 42:3 (Summer 1978), pp. 354-59.

16. John Merwin, "How Texas Legislators View News Coverage of Their Work," Journalism Quarterly, 48:2 (Summer 1971), pp. 272-74.

17. Percy H. Tannenbaum and Jack M. McLeod, "Public Images of Mass Media Institutions," in Wayne A. Danielson, ed., The Paul J. Deutschmann Memorial Papers in Mass Communication, Scripps Howard Research, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1963.

18. Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Ill., 1957.

19. John Merwin, "How Members View Legislative News Coverage in Texas," unpublished master's thesis, University of Texas, Austin, 1970, pp. 11-17.

20. James B. Lemert, "Components of Source 'Image': Hong Kong, Brazil, North America," Journalism Quarterly, 46:2 (Summer 1969), pp. 306-09.

21. Tannenbaum and McLeod, op. cit.

22. Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, op. cit.

23. Merwin, op. cit.

24. Lemert, op. cit.

25. Copies of the instrument are available from the author.

26. See Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Bent, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, second edition, McGraw-Hill, New York, N.Y., 1975, pp. 468-514.

27. The response rate seems acceptable. Two recent studies of midwestern state legislatures indicate similar participation levels in surveys. Larson (Charles U. Larson, "The Effect of Source, Message and Channel on Legislators: A Survey of the Illinois House of Representatives and Senate," unpublished paper presented to the Political Communication Division, International Communication Association, Minneapolis, 1981), reported 38 percent response (n=87). Bybee (Carl Bybee, "The Comparative Use of Mass Vs. Interpersonal Sources of Feedback for Legislative Decision-Making," unpublished paper presented to the Political Communication Division, International Communication Association, Minneapolis, 1981), reported 49 percent response in Indiana (n=73).

28. Merwin, op. cit.

29. Merwin, op. cit., pp. 273-74.