RELATIONSHIPS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES TO POLITICAL - NEWS EXPOSURE THROUGH THE MASS MEDIA

by

JOHN CLAYTON REPPERT

B. A., Kansas State University, 1963

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Journalism

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1964

Approved by:

Ralph R. Fashbrook

Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is deeply indebted for the suggestions, guidance, criticisms, and encouragement offered by the members of his committee, Assistant Professor Donald K. Darnell, Assistant Professor Terry A. Welden, and Professor Ralph R. Lashbrook. He is equally indebted to two unofficial members of his committee, Assistant Professor Jack E. Backer, and Assistant Professor Ted J. Barnes, for their generous advice and invaluable aid.

The author also wishes to acknowledge the help of Associate Professor Ralph E. Dakin for providing a potential list of subjects for this study, and to those seventy-eight subjects here discussed for their time and patience.

Further gratitude is expressed to various members of the Dean of Students staff, the Statistics Department, and Psychology Department for their contributions.

By far the greatest debt owed for the completion of this paper is to the author's wife, Pat.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the basic purposes of the mass media is to play a part in the formation and altering of public opinion. This role of the media has received considerable attention from researchers from several disciplines of the social sciences in the domain of public attitudes toward political affairs and personalities.

Review of the Literature

Various methods have been employed in an attempt to find the keys to the effects the media have on attitudes concerning these political affairs and personalities. Research has been done independently in several areas related to this problem: (1) the total effects of all the mass media in influencing attitudes in the general public; (2) the "audiences" of the various media; (3) the relative effectiveness of the individual mass media; and (4) the influence of the source of information upon the receiver's evaluation of the message.

Two notable attempts have been made to combine these related areas into a single study. The first was Lazarsfeld's extensive study of the Erie County, Ohio, electorate in the 1940 presidential campaign,[1] and more recently a less extensive study, combining the above areas, was conducted by Converse in a study of the 1952 electorate.[2]

---

[1]Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet, The People's Choice, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948).

[2]Phillip E. Converse, "Information Flow and the Stability of Partisan Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, (No. 4, 1962), pp. 578-599.

Lazarsfeld made a number of significant findings regarding types of changes likely to take place in voters' attitudes during a campaign and the sources of influence most likely to affect this attitude shift. Regarding the influence of the mass media, Lazarsfeld concluded that interpersonal communications is by far the best means of altering attitudes and that the role of the mass media in affecting grass roots opinion change is basically a secondary one. That is, the mass media reach all people, but produce attitude change principally among "opinion leaders," who thereafter transmit that change to the general public. In regard to the relative effectiveness of the media, he did not attempt an elaborate investigation, but merely suggested that a logical extension of his findings regarding the relative effectiveness of interpersonal communications and the mass media would be that the more closely the media are to interpersonal communications in their manner of delivery, the more effective they would be.

Converse studied a group of voters in the 1952 presidential election, paying particular attention to the effect the amount of exposure to news (as measured by the number of media from which the voter had obtained any information regarding the campaign) had on voter stability. Voter stability was measured three ways: (1) the relationship of a person's vote intention sometime before the election with his actual vote; (2) the relationship of the person's party preference in that particular election, measured before the election, with his actual party preference at the time of voting; and (3) the relationship of a person's party identification and his actual party preference in voting.

He found, in general, a curved relationship. That is, the two most

stable groups were those exposed to no media and those exposed to all of the media. Those exposed to one, two, or three of the media were less stable than the other two groups.

Many other studies have been made regarding the relative effectiveness of the various mass media in laboratory situations. These are in general agreement with results obtained by Lazarsfeld, that the closer the source is to the receiver, the more effective the message.[3] Given the same message in the area of political affairs, and the same sample randomly drawn from the general public, these studies would indicate that a speaker would be most effective, followed by TV, radio, and then the printed media.

Although most of the documented research in this area was completed before TV reached its present popularity, it would seem a logical assumption that it would fall into a place between speakers and the radio.[4] However, in all fairness, it should be noted that the researchers who performed these laboratory experiments hesitated to project their results beyond the laboratory situation. They logically argued that in few if any cases in the real world are the same individuals exposed to the same message through several of the mass media.[5]

In summary, previous documented research in studies of sources of influence change have viewed the public as a homogeneous body. However, considering the contributions made in other areas of the social sciences, made

---

[3]Although numerous examples are available in this area, the procedures and results found by W. H. Wilke, "An Experimental Comparison of Speech, the Radio, and the Printed Page as Propaganda Devices," Archives of Psychology, (No. 169, 1940) are typical.

[4]Joseph T. Klapper, The Effects of Mass Communications, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960), pp. 98-131.

[5]Ibid., p. 110.

by viewing the public in stratified samples on the basis of education and/or income, among others, it appears that little investigation has been made concerning these variables and opinion change. This would seem even more significant in light of the questions that have long existed with researchers in this area concerning the relative effectiveness of the "hard" media, principally magazines, and the "easy" media, radio and television, with regard to the educational level of their audiences.[6]

Other studies related to one or more of the areas of concern in this paper, but not dealing with the problem as it is dealt with here, have been listed in the bibliography for the convenience of anyone interested in further developing any segment of this discussion.

It is noteworthy to add here that communications research, regarding the mass media and opinion, is outdated. A recent authoratative summary of the research concerning the effects of mass communications lists 270 references in the bibliography; only seventy-three of these come from research reported in the last decade.[7] This is inconsistent with the view of the mass media as dynamic influences in an everchanging society.

The Problem

Two areas of concern were suggested by a review of the literature concerning the effects of mass communications. The first was the lack of current research on the everchanging relationship between the media and the

---

[6]Samuel Stouffer. Untitled report on radio and newspapers as sources, 1940. Summarized by Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Radio and the Printed Page, (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1940).

[7]Joseph T. Klapper, Op.cit., pp. 99-101.

public. The second was the direction from which most of the previous studies have investigated the effects of the mass media on public opinion.

Two basic patterns of approach can be discerned as reappearing processes in investigations of mass media-public opinion research. They are: (1) Given a mass media and a message, what alterations can be produced in public opinion; and (2) Given a recorded attitude change, to what can that change be attributed.

Both of these patterns fail to consider the possibility that (1) Given differences in the general public, principally in education and income, can the same message through the same media affect different "classes" differently; and (2) Given the differences in the public, are there relationships between these variables and what people are exposed to, regardless of the effect it might have upon them.

A further problem was posed by the consistent findings of the Yale Communications Research Program and other researchers, regarding the relative effectiveness of sources ranking "high" and "low" on a trustworthiness scale.[8] (1) Can the media be considered as "sources" of information? and (2) Do socio-economic variables affect the perception of people regarding the relative trustworthiness of the media?

Still other unanswered questions were stimulated by examining the media from various artificial socio-economic classes. Do educational and economic variables have any relationship to the public's exposure to the mass media as a whole, or to any of the media individually? What is the relationship between exposure to mass media and interpersonal communication in the area of

---

[8] Ibid.

national, world, and political affairs, and is this relationship associated with socio-economic variables?

These questions comprise the core of the problem to be investigated in this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is two-fold. First, an attempt was made to discover relationships between socio-economic variables and reading, viewing, and listening exposure levels for the various mass media in the area of national, world, and political affairs. Associated with this, an attempt was made to tap any sources of bias regarding the relative trustworthiness of the mass media which might be associated with one or more of the socio-economic variables. Also, the relationships of the socio-economic variables to exposure to interpersonal communications in the area of national, world, and political affairs were examined.

Second, an attempt was made to create a framework for any follow-up study, regarding attitude change during the presidential campaign in the fall of 1964. As a part of this effort, this study was an attempt to examine political consistency political involvement and political awareness as related to one or more of the socio-economic variables.

It is hoped that, in addition to the value this study might have as groundwork for a study on attitude change, it might, also, be useful as a suggestion for another direction from which the effects of the mass media can be viewed.

For the purpose of this study the mass media were limited to newspaper, radio, TV, and magazines. Interpersonal communications included any form of

face-to-face communication.

The socio-economic variables examined were assessed property evaluation, education, and income. Heads of households were defined as those people listed as such in the 1963 Manhattan City Directory, or other people who identified themselves as such to the interviewer at the time of the interview.

Exposure included only reported exposure to news and comment on national, world, and political affairs through the mass media and interpersonal communications.

Hypotheses

Investigation of the relationships of the socio-economic factors to the other variables in this study will be based on the following hypotheses:

1. That there are positive relationships between the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education and exposure to news and comment relating to national, world, and political affairs through the mass media.
   (a) That there is a positive relationship between assessed property evaluation area and exposure to news and comment through the mass media.
   (b) That there is a positive relationship between income and exposure to news and comment through the mass media.
   (c) That there is a positive relationship between education and exposure to news and comment through the mass media.
2. That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through the individual mass media associated with the socio-economic variables of

property evaluation, income, and education.

(a) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through newspapers associated with assessed property evaluation area.

(b) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through newspapers associated with income.

(c) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through newspapers associated with education.

(d) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through radio associated with assessed property evaluation area.

(e) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through radio associated with income.

(f) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through radio associated with education.

(g) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through TV associated with assessed property evaluation area.

(h) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through TV associated with income.

(i) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through TV associated with education.

(j) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through magazines associated with assessed property evaluation area.

(k) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through magazines associated with income.

(l) That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through magazines associated with education.

3. That there are differences in perceptions of the relative trustworthi-

ness of the mass media associated with the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education.

(a) That there are differences in perceptions of the relative trustworthiness of the mass media associated with assessed property evaluation area.

(b) That there are differences in perceptions of the relative trustworthiness of the mass media associated with income.

(c) That there are differences in perceptions of the relative trustworthiness of the mass media associated with education.

4. That there is a positive relationship between the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education and exposure to interpersonal communication relating to national, world, and political affairs.

(a) That there is a positive relationship between assessed property evaluation area and exposure to interpersonal communication relating to national, world, and political affairs.

(b) That there is a positive relationship between income and exposure to interpersonal communication relating to national, world, and political affairs.

(c) That there is a positive relationship between education and exposure to interpersonal communication relating to national, world, and political affairs.

5. That there are positive relationships between the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education and knowledge of and interest in political affairs.

(a) That there is a positive relationship between assessed property

evaluation area and interest in and knowledge of political affairs.

(b) That there is a positive relationship between income and knowledge of and interest in political affairs.

(c) That there is a positive relationship between education and knowledge of and interest in political affairs.

6. That there are positive relationships between the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education and political consistency.

(a) That there is a positive relationship between assessed property evaluation area and political consistency.

(b) That there is a positive relationship between income and political consistency.

(c) That there is a positive relationship between education and political consistency.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The Universe

Since no complete socio-economic map of the city of Manhattan, Kansas, had been prepared in recent years, and no pre-tested panel of subjects had ever been established for surveying in the city, the population was drawn from a study by a student in sociology.[9]

This study included a section reporting the assessed property evaluations of permanent homes, excluding trailers and nursing homes, in six geographic sections of Manhattan.

After observation of the sociology study, it was decided that if information could be obtained, regarding the educational and income levels of the subjects in these areas, that corresponded with the assessed property evaluations, the people in these areas could be regarded as representing different socio-economic populations.

From the six areas defined in the sociology study, four were selected for surveying (for a complete listing of the assessed property evaluations for each of the four areas see Appendix A). One of the original areas was rejected because it represented two distinct groups, and thus was not as homogeneous as the other areas. The remaining five areas were ranked from low to high on average assessed property evaluations and the center area was omitted. This was done because the four remaining areas, if they repre-

---

[9]Cay Carrel, "An Age-Sex Study of Six Sections of Manhattan, Kansas," 1960, (in the files of Dr. D. E. Dakin, Department of Economics and Sociology, Kansas State University).

sented different populations as the sociology study suggested, would indicate trends in relationships of the variables being studied nearly as well as the five areas. Therefore, the additional benefit of having the fifth group would not offset the problems of increased data collection and tabulation that would be created.

The addresses of the occupied permanent dwellings within the four remaining geographic areas were then obtained from the 1963 Manhattan City Directory. Since the numbers of addresses in the four areas varied from twenty-four to seventy-eight, it was decided that twenty-four addresses, the number in the smallest group, would be selected randomly from each of the three larger groups.

After the home addresses were determined, the author again referred to the City Directory and obtained the names of the persons listed as the heads of the households for each of the addresses.

As a result of vacant houses, non-existent addresses, and interviewee refusals to take part in the study, the actual sampled population was reduced from ninety-six (twenty-four in each group) to seventy-eight. The number sampled in each group (groups numbered from low assessed property evaluation to high) was: group one, nineteen; group two, twenty; group three, twenty-one;[10] and group four, eighteen. Additional addresses were not selected to replace the sample drop-out for two reasons: (1) there was no significant difference in the final sample size for the four groups, and

---

[10]Actually twenty-two persons in this group were interviewed by the author, but one person refused to answer any of the questions regarding mass media or discussion exposure, political attitudes of either himself or his family, or questions concerning his income level or intentions to vote in the coming election. The little remaining information was of no value without knowledge of at least some of these other variables.

(2) the smallest return, eighteen, was obtained in the group where the entire population of the geographic area, twenty-four, was sampled.

Construction of the Questionnaire

Information for this study was obtained through a personal interview survey. Because of the large number of questions to be asked and the small number of subjects, the high probability of return through a survey dictated this choice. Also, all of the subjects lived in Manhattan and personal visits to each of the homes were within the time and financial limitations of the study.

Since any re-interviewing of the subjects to obtain additional information after the initial contact was established was regarded as undesirable and possibly damaging to the study, the questionnaire was designed to obtain all desirable information during the initial interview.

The questionnaire was constructed with a three-fold purpose. First, to test the hypotheses regarding the relationship of the socio-economic variables to (a) exposure to the mass media in the area of national, international, and political news, (b) ranking of the mass media on the basis of "trustworthiness," (c) exposure to interpersonal communications of national, international, and political affairs, (d) involvement in public and political affairs, (e) knowledge of political affairs, and (f) political consistency.

Second, to establish more definitely the reliability of the socio-economic differences among the groups.

Third, to examine a number of variables which could conceivably influence a voter to a significant extent during the 1964 presidential campaign.

This was done as groundwork for any follow-up study of attitude change during the 1964 campaign.

Since, it was expected that the subjects would represent a wide range of educational backgrounds, it was important in each question to find the lowest possible denominator designed to get the same types of information from each subject.

The final questionnaire was completed after numerous questions, drawn from the discussions of other studies dealing with one or more areas of concern in this study, were combined with questions originating from the author and members of the author's committee. The principal contributor among the studies reviewed for possible questions was Lazarsfeld's discussion in The People's Choice.[11] Special mention should also be made of the contributions of Mildred Parten's Surveys, Polls, and Samples in improving the form of many of the questions.[12]

A tentative questionnaire was designed for pre-testing in several areas of Manhattan, approximating the areas in the sample. After each of the twelve pre-tests, the subject was asked if there was anything in the questionnaire to which he objected, or anything which he had not understood. This procedure produced several minor changes in the questionnaire.

The final questionnaire (see Appendix B) was composed of forty-five questions, in addition to bibliographical information relating to the interviewee--name, sex, age, and address (for an explanation of the purposes of the various questions see Appendix C).

---

[11]Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet, Op. cit.

[12]Mildred Parten, Surveys, Polls, and Samples, (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1950).

Survey Procedure

This study was conducted between March 30 and April 20, 1964. All surveys were conducted in the subjects' homes with four exceptions. These four subjects stated that they preferred to be interviewed at their places of business.

Once the subject was contacted, the author introduced himself and explained that the survey was concerned with the mass media--TV, newspapers, radio, and magazines--and national, world, and political news, and the subject's opinions.

If the subject indicated he would cooperate in the study, the author read the questions in the order in which they appear on the questionnaire (see Appendix B) and recorded his responses in the categories provided on the questionnaire. The author personally conducted all interviews.

If the subject indicated that he did not wish to take part in the study, he was listed as a refusal on the questionnaire form.

No discussion of the nature of what the author was looking for was carried out in any form until the subject had completed the questionnaire.

After the surveying had begun, an average of three to five people were interviewed each weekday and six to eight each day of the weekend. Call backs were continued until the subject was contacted, or it was determined that no one was living at the address (see Appendix D for a more detailed explanation of survey procedure).

Tabulation

After all surveying was completed, each questionnaire was assigned a number from one to seventy-eight, and the information was transferred to

3 by 5 inch cards, with the subject identified only by number. This transfer of information was done for two reasons: (1) to facilitate the observation of data, and (2) to reduce the possibility of bias in the analysis as the result of positive or negative reactions to the name on the questionnaire or other comments which had been noted there.

After the information was transferred to cards, responses to the various questions were grouped and tabled under the appropriate headings. The information was compared to the assessed property group, income, or educational level of the subjects.

The tabled results were then tested by one or both of two methods to examine the statistical differences in responses associated with the variables being studied. The two tests used were the chi-square contingency test[13] and the Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance by ranks.[14]

The nominal, or at best ordinal, nature of the data dictated the selection of nonparametric tests. The following section from Seigel's Nonparametric Statistics[15] discussing the comparison of nonparametric tests for k independent samples states a rationale for the selection of these two tests.

> The chi-square test for k independent samples is useful when the data are in frequencies, and when measurement of the variables under study is in a nominal scale or in discrete categories of an ordinal scale. It tests whether the proportions or frequencies in the various categories are independent of the condition (sample) under which they were observed. That is, it tests the null hypothesis that the k samples have come from the same population or from

---

[13] Sidney Seigel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), pp. 196-200.

[14] Ibid., pp. 184-193.

[15] Ibid., pp. 193-194.

identical populations with respect to the proportion of cases in the various categories.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks tests whether k independent samples could have come from the same continuous population.

We have no choice among these tests (chi-square, median test, and Kruskal-Wallis test) if our data are in frequencies rather than scores. The chi-square test for k independent samples is uniquely useful for such data.

When the data are such that either the median test of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance may be used, the Kruskal-Wallis test will be found to be more efficient because it uses more of the information in the observations. It converts the scores to ranks, whereas the median test converts them simply to pluses or minuses.[16]

---

[16] Ibid.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

The Subjects

The seventy-eight subjects from the four geographic areas ranged from twenty to eighty-seven years in age, from no formal education to Doctor's degrees, and from annual incomes of less than $2,000 to $60,000. Twenty-one women and fifty-seven men were interviewed as heads of households in this study. The political spectrum of these subjects ranged from non-voters to strong Republicans and Democrats. Total exposure to national, world, and political news and comment through the mass media varied from zero to thirty-four hours per week, while the subjects reported spending between zero and twenty-five hours per week in discussions of national, world, and political affairs.

Each of the seventy-eight subjects was assigned to one of four groups on each of three socio-economic scales. These scales were assessed property evaluation, income, and education.

The average assessed property evaluations for the four areas in the study were ranked from low to high. The subjects from the lowest assessed property evaluation area were designated as assessed property evaluation group one, those from the next higher area as assessed property evaluation group two, those from the next area as assessed property evaluation group three, and those from the highest assessed property evaluation area as assessed property evaluation group four.

The subjects were ranked from low to hi h on the basis of reported income and those in the lowest quarter were designated as income group one,

those in the next higher quarter as income group two, those in the next quarter as income group three, and those in the highest quarter as income group four (due to ties the groups were not equal in number).[17]

The seventy-eight subjects were also ranked from low to high on reported education. The subjects in the lowest quarter (all quarters on this scale were determined by both number and natural divisions in education) were designated as education group one, those in the next higher quarter as education group two, those in the next quarter as education group three, and those in the highest quarter as education group four.

Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

Four groups were established on the basis of assessed property evaluation area (see Table 1).

The ranges of property evaluations for these four areas were: area one, $200 to $3,899; area two, $1,000 to $4,199; area three, $3,500 to $8,299; and area four, $3,300 to $15,099.

The mean property evaluations for these areas were: area one, $969; area two, $2,643; area three, $4,789; and area four, $6,813.

The sizes of the groups from these four areas were nineteen, twenty, twenty-one, and eighteen respectively.

Income Groups

Four groups were established on the basis of reported income (see Table 2).

The ranges of incomes for these four groups were: group one, zero to

---

[17]Five subjects did not report their incomes; they were excluded from the four groups on this scale.

Table 1. Assessed property evaluation groups (numbered low to high), income, education, sex, and age.

Property Evaluation Group	Income (In Thousands)					Education (In Years)				Sex		Age			
	?	0-2	2-6	6-15	15+	0-8	9-12	13-16	17+	M	F	under 46	46-55	56-65	66+
1	0	10	6	3	0	10	9	0	0	11	8	7	1	3	8
2	0	6	10	4	0	7	8	5	0	12	8	5	4	5	6
3	4	0	0	9	8	2	4	6	9	20	1	4	9	4	4
4	1	0	2	5	10	0	5	7	6	14	4	3	7	6	2
Totals:	5	16	18	21	18	19	26	18	15	57	21	19	21	18	20

Group I (N = 19)	Income:	Range, less than $2,000-$9,999	Mean = $3,000;	Median = $3,000
	Education:	Range, none to 12 years;	Mean = 7.4 yrs;	Median = 7 yrs.
	Age:	Range, 24 to 83;	Mean = 55.3;	Median = 60
Group II (N = 20)	Income:	Range, less than $2,000-$11,999;	Mean = $4,100;	Median = $4,000
	Education:	Range, none to 16 years;	Mean = 10.2 yrs;	Median = 12 yrs.
	Age:	Range, 20 to 83;	Mean = 55.9;	Median = 58
Group III (N = 21)	Income:	Range, $8,000-$30,000;	Mean = $15,400;	Median = $11,000
	Education:	Range, 6 to 21 years;	Mean = 15.3 yrs.	Median = 16 yrs.
	Age:	Range, 31 to 87;	Mean = 55.8;	Median = 54
Group IV (N = 18)	Income:	Range, $2,000-$60,000;	Mean = 18,200;	Median = $16,000
	Education:	Range, 9 to 21 years	Mean = 15.2 yrs.	Median = 14 yrs.
	Age:	Range, 21 to 72;	Mean = 52.3;	Median = 53.5

Table 2. Income, education, sex, age, and assessed property evaluation groups.

Income	Education (In Years)				Sex		Age				Property Group (Low to High)			
	0-8	9-12	13-16	17+	M	F	under 46	46-55	56-65	66+	1	2	3	4
Less than $2,000	11	4	1	0	9	7	2	0	2	12	10	6	0	0
$2,000 to $5,999	6	9	3	0	10	8	6	5	5	2	6	10	0	2
$6,000 to $14,999	0	8	7	6	19	2	7	8	5	1	3	4	9	5
$15,000 and Over	0	5	4	9	16	2	4	8	3	3	0	0	8	10
Didn't Report Income	2	0	3	0	3	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	4	1
Totals:	19	26	18	15	57	21	19	21	18	20	19	20	21	18

Less than $2,000 (N = 16)	Education:	Range, none to 15 years;	Mean = 6.3 yrs;	Median = 7 yrs.
	Age:	Range, 20 to 83;	Mean = 66.9;	Median = 73
$2,000 to $5,999 (N = 18)	Education:	Range, under 5 to 16 years;	Mean = 10.3 yrs;	Median = 12 yrs.
	Age:	Range, 24 to 73;	Mean = 49.6;	Median = 53
$6,000 to $14,999 (N = 21)	Education:	Range, 9 to 21 years;	Mean = 14.8 yrs.	Median = 14 yrs.
	Age:	Range, 30 to 73;	Mean = 50.2;	Median = 52
$15,000 and Over (N = 18)	Education:	Range, 9 to 21 years;	Mean = 16.2 yrs;	Median = 16.5 yrs.
	Age:	Range, 21 to 87;	Mean = 52.2;	Median = 52

Table 3. Relationship of education to sex, age, assessed property group and income.

Education (In Years)	Sex		Age				Property Group (Low to High)				Income (In Thousands)				
	M	F	under 46	46-55	56-65	66+	1	2	3	4	?	0-1.9	2-5.9	6-14.9	15+
0 to 8	12	7	2	1	6	10	10	7	2	0	2	11	6	0	0
9 to 12	19	7	8	6	5	7	9	8	4	5	0	4	9	8	5
13 to 16	11	7	4	7	4	3	0	5	6	7	3	1	3	7	4
17+	15	0	5	7	3	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	6	9
Totals:	57	21	19	21	18	20	19	20	21	18	5	16	18	21	18

0 to 8 yrs. (N = 19)	Income:	Range, less than $2,000 to $5,999:	Mean = $2,100;	Median = $1,000
	Age:	Range, 36 to 83;	Mean = 65.4;	Median = 67
9 to 12 yrs. (N = 26)	Income:	Range, less than $2,000 to $25,000;	Mean = $8,400;	Median = $6,000
	Age:	Range, 24 to 87;	Mean = 53;	Median = 54
13 to 16 yrs. (N = 18)	Income:	Range, less than $2,000 to $30,000;	Mean = $11,500;	Median = $11,000
	Age:	Range, 20 to 75;	Mean = 51.7;	Median = 53
17 and more yrs. (N = 15)	Income:	Range, $6,000 to $60,000;	Mean = $18,900;	Median = $15,000
	Age:	Range, 30 to 61;	Mean = 48.7;	Median = 52

$1,999; group two, $2,000 to $5,999; group three, $6,000 to $14,999; and group four, $15,000 and more. The sizes of these groups were sixteen, eighteen, twenty-one, and eighteen respectively.

The five persons who did not give information regarding their income constituted too small a group to examine statistically with the other groups. These five subjects are listed separately at the end of Table 5.

Education Groups

Four groups were established on the basis of education (see Table 3). Group one included all people who had eight years of education or less; group two included those people who had completed the ninth through the twelfth grades; group three included all persons with one year of college education through a bachelor's degree; and group four included those people who had completed some form of post-graduate study.

The sizes of these groups were nineteen, twenty-six, eighteen, and fifteen respectively.

Section I

Exposure to the Mass Media, Collectively

Material in this section relates to the three subsections of hypothesis number one, which is: That there are positive relationships between the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education and exposure to news and comment relating to national, world, and political affairs through the mass media. A discussion of the support for the subsections follows an analysis of the data.

Differences in weekly exposure to news and comment on national, world, and political affairs through the four mass media, individually and combined, were measured in two ways. The Kruskal-Wallis test for one-way analysis of

variance was used to examine differences in lengths of time of reported exposure, and the chi-square test was used to analyze differences in the ratios of media exposures to non-exposures for each group.

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was 1.33.[18] (This H value and all subsequent values for H are uncorrected for tied ranks; an analysis of the tie correction factor for the largest number of tied ranks in any of the following H tests showed that in no case in this study would the correction process increase an H value, which was below the required level of significance, to or beyond the minimum H value for significance.) The chi-square value for differences in ratios of media exposures to non-exposures for the four groups was 20.67.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was not significant (see Table 4 for ranges of exposure times among the members in each of the four groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of media exposures to non-exposures for the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 5).

The nineteen members of group one reported fifty-two media exposures. Seventeen members reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers, eleven through radio, seventeen through TV, and seven through magazines.

---

[18] 6.25 is required for significance at the .10 level of confidence for three degrees of freedom. (All chi-square and Kruskal-Wallis tests reported in this chapter have three degrees of freedom.)

Table 4. Media, range of weekly exposure to political news, median and mean exposure times, all by assessed property groups.

Media	Range of Exposure (In Hours)				Median Exposure (In Hours)				Mean Exposure (In Hours)				Mean Rank			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Paper	0-20	0-14	½-16	1-10	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.5	4.8	3.9	4.5	3.9	39.3	37.8	41.5	39.6
Radio	0-10	0-10½	0-4½	0-7½	1.0	1.5	1.8	1.0	2.3	2.7	2.0	1.5	35.7	43.7	41.4	36.7
TV	0-7	0-7	0-10	½-8	4.5	2.8	3.5	3.3	3.8	2.6	3.2	3.1	47.3	31.6	40.4	38.8
Mag.	0-4½	0-8	0-10	0-10	0	1.3	1.5	2.0	0.6	1.6	2.3	2.7	22.6	38.2	46.0	51.3
Total Media:	0-34	1-32	3-29	4½-28	9.5	9.5	10	9.3	11.5	10.8	12.1	11.3	39.2	36.7	43.5	38.2

Table 5. Exposure and non-exposure to political news through each of the mass media by assessed property group.

Media	Group One		Group Two		Group Three		Group Four	
	Exposed	Non-exposed	Exposed	Non-exposed	Exposed	Non-exposed	Exposed	Non-exposed
Paper	17	2	17	3	21	0	18	0
Radio	11	8	16	4	17	4	12	6
TV	17	2	19	1	20	1	18	0
Mag.	7	12	15	5	20	1	17	1
Totals:	52	24	67	13	78	6	65	7

The twenty members of group two reported sixty-seven media exposures. Seventeen members reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers, sixteen through radio, nin teen through TV, and fifteen through magazines.

The twenty-one members of group three reported seventy-eight media exposures. All twenty-one members reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers, seventeen through radio, twenty through TV, and twenty through magazines.

The eighteen members of group four reported sixty-five media exposures. All eighteen members reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers, twelve through radio, all eighteen through TV, and seventeen through magazines.

By Income Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on reported income was .58. The chi-square value for differences in ratios of media exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 24.86.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was not significant (see Table 6 for ranges of exposure times among the members in each of the four groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of media exposures and non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 7).

The sixteen members of group one reported forty-two media exposures. Thirteen members reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers, eight through radio, fourteen through TV, and seven through magazines.

Table 6. Media, range of weekly exposure to political news, median and mean exposure times, all by income groups.

Media	Range of Exposure (In Hours)				Median Exposure (In Hours)				Mean Exposure (In Hours)				Mean Rank			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Paper	0-14	0-10	1-7	1½-10	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.8	4.5	3.3	4.4	34.7	41.0	34.5	38.1
Radio	0-8	0-10	0-10½	0-7½	0.3	1.3	1.5	1.0	2.3	2.1	2.2	1.9	34.3	37.1	39.0	37.0
TV	0-7	0-5	0-10	½-8	4.0	2.8	3.0	3.3	3.7	2.5	3.3	3.2	42.9	31.3	36.7	37.8
Mag.	0-8	0-5	0-10	0-10	0	0.5	2.0	1.5	1.3	0.9	2.5	2.4	27.9	28.1	45.1	44.5
Totals	1-34	0-22	4½-29	3-28	7.8	8.6	10.	9.3	12.	10.1	11.5	11.9	34.6	35.8	38.2	40.0

Table 7. Exposure and non-exposure to political news through each of the mass media by income group.

Media	Group One		Group Two		Group Three		Group Four	
	Exposed	Non-exposed	Exposed	Non-exposed	Exposed	Non-exposed	Exposed	Non-exposed
Paper	13	3	16	2	21	0	18	0
Radio	8	8	13	5	16	5	15	3
TV	14	2	17	1	20	1	18	0
Mag.	7	9	11	7	19	2	17	1
Totals	42	22	57	15	76	8	68	4

The eighteen members of group two reported fifty-seven media exposures. Sixteen members reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers, thirteen through radio, seventeen through TV, and eleven through magazines.

The twenty-one members of group three reported seventy-six media exposures. All twenty-one members reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers, sixteen through radio, twenty through TV, and nineteen through magazines.

The eighteen members of group four reported sixty-eight media exposures. All eighteen members reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers, fifteen through radio, all eighteen through TV, and seventeen through magazines.

By Education Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on education was 1.32. The chi-square value for differences in ratios of media exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 12.30.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was not significant (see Table 8 for ranges of exposure times among the members in each of the four groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of media exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence (see Table 9).

The nineteen members of group one reported fifty-six media exposures. Sixteen members reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers, thirteen through radio, eighteen through TV, and nine through magazines.

Table 8. Media, range of weekly exposure times to political news, median and mean exposure times, all by education groups.

Media	Range of Exposure (In Hours)				Median Exposure (In Hours)				Mean Exposure (In Hours)				Mean Rank			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Paper	0-20	0-10	1-16	2-9	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.7	3.9	4.8	3.9	38.4	37.7	42.8	39.9
Radio	0-8	0-10½	0-4½	0-7½	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	2.4	2.5	1.8	1.5	40.7	42.0	39.4	33.7
TV	0-7	0-7	½-10	0-5	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.4	3.1	3.6	2.6	42.1	37.7	43.5	34.6
Mag.	0-8	0-6	0-10	0-5	0	1.0	2.0	1.5	1.2	1.4	2.9	1.9	29.1	35.2	51.2	46.1
Totals	1-34	0-23½	5½-29	3-18	8.5	9.0	11.0	8.5	11.7	10.9	13.1	10.	38.4	39.2	43.9	36.0

Table 9. Exposure and non-exposure to political news through each of the mass media by education group.

Media	Group One		Group Two		Group Three		Group Four	
	Exposed	Non-exposed	Exposed	Non-exposed	Exposed	Non-exposed	Exposed	Non-exposed
Paper	16	3	24	2	18	0	15	0
Radio	13	6	19	7	13	5	11	4
TV	18	1	24	2	18	0	14	1
Mag.	9	10	18	8	18	0	14	1
Totals	56	20	85	19	67	5	54	6

The twenty-six members of group two reported eighty-five media exposures. Twenty-four of the members reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers, nineteen through radio, twenty-four through TV, and eighteen through magazines.

The eighteen members of group three reported sixty-seven media exposures. All eighteen members reported exposures to news and comment through newspapers, thirteen through radio, all eighteen through TV, and all eighteen through magazines.

The fifteen members of group four reported fifty-four media exposures. All fifteen members reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers, eleven through radio, fourteen through TV, and fourteen through magazines.

Discussion of Support for Hypothesis

Hypothesis number one, part (a), that there is a positive relationship between assessed property evaluation area and exposure to news and comment through the mass media, was only partially supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was not significant. However, the differences in the ratios of media exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

The members of group one reported 68 per cent on the maximum media exposures; group two, 84 per cent; group three, 93 per cent; and group four, 90 per cent. While the decline in percentage from group three to group four is contrary to the hypothesis, the data suggest that there are differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the groups

and there is a relationship in the predicted direction between the lower two property groups and the upper two property groups.

Hypothesis number one, part (b), that there is a positive relationship between income and exposure to news and comment through the mass media, was partially supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on income was not significant. However, the differences in the ratios of media exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

The members of group one reported 66 per cent of the maximum media exposures; group two, 79 per cent; group three, 90 per cent; and group four, 94 per cent.

The significance of the differences in ratios of media exposures to non-exposures among the groups, and the consistent direction of the percentages of exposures to non-exposures, increasing with the higher income groups, supported this hypothesis.

Hypothesis number one, part (c), that there is a positive relationship between education and exposure to the mass media, was partially supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on education was not significant. However, the differences in the ratios of media exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

The members of group one reported 73 per cent of the maximum media exposures; group two, 82 per cent; group three, 93 per cent; and group four, 90 per cent. While the decline in percentage from group three to four is contrary to this hypothesis, the data suggest, as with the groups based on assessed property evaluation, that there are differences in the ratios of

exposures to non-exposures among the four groups, and there is a relationship in the predicted direction between the percentages of exposures for the lower two education groups and the upper two education groups. (Note the similarity in the support for part (a) and part (c) of hypothesis number one.)

Section II

Exposure to the Mass Media, Individually

Material in this section relates to the twelve subsections of hypothesis number two, which is: That there are differences in exposure to news and comment through the individual mass media associated with the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education. A discussion of the support for the subsections follows the analysis of the data.

Exposure to Newspapers

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was 3.20. The chi-square value for differences in the ratios of newspaper exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 5.67.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was not significant (see Table 4 for ranges of exposure times among the members in each of the four groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of newspaper exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant (see Table 5 for the ratio of members in each group who reported exposure to news and comment through news-

papers to those who reported no newspaper exposure).

By Income Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on income was 1.03. The chi-square value for differences in ratios of newspaper exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 6.82.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was not significant (see Table 6 for the ranges of exposure times among the members in each of the four groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of newspaper exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .10 level of confidence (see Table 7).

Thirteen of the sixteen members in group one reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers. Sixteen of the eighteen members of group two reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers. All twenty-one of the members of group three reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers. All eighteen members of group four reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers.

By Education Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on education was .91. The chi-square value for differences in the ratios of newspaper exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 5.10.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was

not significant (see Table 8 for ranges of exposure among the members in each of the four groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of newspaper exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant (see Table 9 for the ratio of members in each group that reported exposure to news and comment through newspapers to those who reported no newspaper exposure).

Exposure to Radio

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was .71. The chi-square value for differences in the ratios of radio exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 3.57.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was not significant (see Table 4 for ranges of exposure times among the members in each of the four groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of radio exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant (see Table 5 for the ratio of members in each group who reported exposure to news and comment through radio to those who reported no radio exposure).

By Income Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on income was .01. The chi-square value for the differences in the ratios of radio exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 5.08.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was not significant (see Table 6 for ranges of exposure times among the members in each of the four groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of radio exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant (see Table 7 for the ratio of members in each group who reported exposure to news and comment through radio to those who reported no radio exposure).

By Education Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on education was 1.73. The chi-square value for differences in the ratios of radio exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was .16.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was not significant (see Table 8 for ranges of exposure times among the members in each of the four groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of radio exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant (see Table 9 for the ratio of members in each group who reported exposure to news and comment through radio to those who reported no radio exposure).

Exposure to TV

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the

four groups based on assessed property evaluation was 4.44. The chi-square value for differences in ratios of TV exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 2.13.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was not significant (see Table 4 for ranges of exposure times among the members in each of the four groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of TV exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant (see Table 5 for the ratio of members in each group who reported exposure to news and comment through TV to those who reported no TV exposure).

By Income Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on income was 2.45. The chi-square value for differences in ratios of TV exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 2.58.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was not significant (see Table 6 for ranges of exposure times among the members in each of the four groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of TV exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant (see Table 7 for the ratio of members in each group who reported exposure to news and comment through TV to those who reported no TV exposure).

By Education Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the

four groups based on education was 1.90. The chi-square value for differences in ratios of TV exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 1.40.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was not significant (see Table 8 for ranges of exposure times among the members in each of the groups, median and mean exposure times, and the mean rank for each group).

The differences in the ratios of TV exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant (see Table 9 for the ratio of members in each group who reported exposure to news and comment through TV to those who reported no TV exposure).

Exposure to Magazines

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was 17.49. The chi-square value for differences in ratios of magazine exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 24.63.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 4).

The range of magazine exposure times for group one was from zero to four and one-half hours; the median exposure time was zero hours; the mean exposure time was .6 hours; and the mean rank was 22.6

The range of magazine exposure times for group two was from zero to eight hours; the median exposure time was 1.3 hours; the mean exposure time was 1.6 hours; and the mean rank was 38.2.

The range of magazine exposure times for group three was from zero to ten hours; the median exposure time was 1.5 hours; the mean exposure time was 2.3 hours; and the mean rank was 46.0.

The range of magazine exposure times for group four was from zero to ten hours; the median exposure time was 2.0 hours; the mean exposure time was 2.7 hours; and the mean rank was 51.3.

The differences in the ratios of magazine exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 5).

Seven of the nineteen members of group one reported exposure to news and comment through magazines. Fifteen of the twenty members of group two reported exposure to news and comment through magazines. Twenty of the twenty-one members of group three reported exposure to news and comment through magazines. Seventeen of the eighteen members of group four reported exposure to news and comment through magazines.

By Income Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on income was 11.31. The chi-square value for differences in ratios of magazine exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 16.05.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was significant beyond the .02 level of confidence (see Table 6).

The range of magazine exposure times for group one was from zero to eight hours; the median exposure time was zero hours; the mean exposure time was 1.3 hours; the mean rank was 27.9.

The range of magazine exposure times for group two was from zero to five

hours; the median exposure time was .5 hours; the mean exposure time was .9 hours; and the mean rank was 28.1.

The range of magazine exposure times for group three was from zero to ten hours; the median exposure time was 2.0 hours; the mean exposure time was 2.5 hours; and the mean rank was 45.1.

The range of magazine exposure times for group four was from zero to ten hours; the median exposure time was 1.5 hours; the mean exposure time was 2.4 hours; and the mean rank was 44.5.

The differences in the ratios of magazine exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence (see Table 7).

Seven of the sixteen members of group one reported exposure to news and comment through magazines. Eleven of the eighteen members of group two reported exposure to news and comment through magazines. Nineteen of the twenty-one members of group three reported exposure to news and comment through magazines. Seventeen of the eighteen members of group four reported exposure to news and comment through magazines.

By Education Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on education was 11.36. The chi-square value for differences in ratios of magazine exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 17.13.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was significant beyond the .01 level of confidence (see Table 8).

The range of magazine exposure times for group one was from zero to eight hours; the median exposure time was zero hours; the mean exposure time

was 1.2 hours; and the mean rank was 29.1.

The range of magazine exposure times for group two was from zero to six hours; the median exposure time was 1.0 hour; the mean exposure time was 1.4 hours; and the mean rank was 35.2.

The range of magazine exposure times for group three was from zero to ten hours; the median exposure time was 2.0 hours; the mean exposure time was 2.9 hours; and the mean rank was 51.2.

The range of magazine exposure times for group four was from zero to five hours; the median exposure time was 1.5 hours; the mean exposure time was 1.9 hours; and the mean rank was 46.1.

The differences in the ratios of magazine exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 9).

Nine of the nineteen members of group one reported exposure to news and comment through magazines. Eighteen of the twenty-six members of group two reported exposure to news and comment through magazines. All eighteen of the members of group three reported exposure to news and comment through magazines. Fourteen of the fifteen members of group four reported exposure to news and comment through magazines.

Discussion of Support for Hypothesis

Hypothesis number two, part (a), that there are differences in exposure to news and comment through newspapers associated with assessed property evaluation area, was not supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios

of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant.

Hypothesis number two, part (b), that there are differences in exposure to news and comment through newspapers associated with income, was partially supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on income was not significant. However, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .10 level of confidence.

Hypothesis number two, part (c), that there are differences in exposure to news and comment through newspapers associated with education, was not supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on education was not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant.

Hypothesis number two, part (d), that there are differences in exposure to news and comment through radio associated with assessed property evaluation area, was not supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant.

Hypothesis number two, part (e), that there are differences in exposure to news and comment through radio associated with income, was not supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on income was not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant.

Hypothesis number two, part (f), that there are differences in exposure

to news and comment through radio associated with education, was not supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on education was not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant.

Hypothesis number two, part (g), that there are differences in exposure to news and comment through TV associated with assessed property evaluation area, was not supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant.

Hypothesis number two, part (h), that there are differences in exposure to news and comment through TV associated with income, was not supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on income was not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant.

Hypothesis number two, part (i), that there are differences in exposure to news and comment through TV associated with education, was not supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on education was not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant.

Hypothesis number two, part (j), that there are differences in exposure to news and comment through magazines associated with assessed property evaluation area, was supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

Hypothesis number two, part (k), that there are differences in exposure to news and comment through magazines associated with income, was supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on income was significant beyond the .02 level of confidence. Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

Hypothesis number two, part (l), that there are differences in exposure to news and comment through magazines associated with education, was supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on education was significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. Also, the differences in ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

Section III

Ranking of the Mass Media

Material in this section relates to the three subsections of hypothesis number three, which is: That there are differences in perceptions of the relative trustworthiness of the mass media associated with the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education. A discussion of the support for the subsections follows the analysis of the data.

The differences in the ranking of the media were measured by the chi-square test. Due to the small numbers in many of the cells, it was necessary to collapse the rankings to "first or second" and "third or fourth" for statistical testing.

Ranking of Newspapers

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The chi-square value for the differences in ratios of those who ranked newspapers first or second to those who ranked newspapers third or fourth among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was 2.75.

The differences in the ratios of subjects who ranked newspapers first or second to those who ranked newspapers third or fourth among the four groups were not significant (see Table 10 for the ratio of subjects in each class who ranked newspapers first or second to those who ranked newspapers third or fourth).

By Income Groups

The chi-square value for the differences in ratios of those who ranked newspapers first or second to those who ranked newspapers third or fourth among the four groups based on income was 7.55.

The differences in the ratios of subjects who ranked newspapers first or second to those who ranked newspapers third or fourth among the four groups were significant beyond the .10 level of confidence (see Table 11).

Five of the seven members in group one ranked newspapers first or second. Six of the sixteen members of group two ranked newspapers first or second. Six of the eighteen members of group three ranked newspapers first or second. Eleven of the fifteen members of group four ranked newspapers first or second.

By Education Groups

The chi-square value for the differences in the ratios of those who ranked newspapers first or second to those who ranked newspapers third or

Note: The row totals for each of the four ranks in the following three tables are not necessarily equal within each group. These tables handle ties in the following manner: (1) If the subject ranked media W first and the other three tied, media W was given the rank of one and all other media were assigned the rank of three; (2) If the subject ranked media W first, media X and Y equal, and media Z as last, media W was given the rank of one, both X and Y were assigned the rank of two, and media Z was assigned the rank of four; (3) If the subject ranked media W first, media X second, and media Y and Z as equal, media W was given the rank of one, media X was assigned the rank of two, and media Y and Z were both ranked three. No combinations other than the above occurred in the sampling. For statistical analysis the mean of the tied ranks was assigned to each of the media.

Table 10. Frequency of ranks of media on the basis of reliability of reporting, summed by assessed property evaluation groups.

Media	Group One[a]				Group Two[b]				Group Three[c]				Group Four[d]				Total			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Paper	2	5	3	3	4	1	4	5	3	4	5	3	5	6	4	2	14	16	16	13
Radio	0	4	8	1	2	7	4	1	2	3	7	3	1	0	9	7	5	14	28	12
TV	10	0	2	1	6	6	2	0	9	2	2	2	6	7	4	0	31	15	10	3
Mag.	1	2	4	6	2	1	4	7	1	5	3	6	6	2	5	4	10	10	16	23

[a]Six of the nineteen subjects in group one did not rank the media; they are excluded in this table.

[b]Six of the twenty subjects in group two did not rank the media; they are excluded in this table.

[c]Six of the twenty-one subjects in group three did not rank the media; they are excluded in this table.

[d]One of the eighteen subjects in group four did not rank the media; he is excluded in this table.

Table 11. Frequency of ranks of media on the basis of reliability of reporting, summed by income groups.

Media	Group One[a]				Group Two[b]				Group Three[c]				Group Four[d]				Total			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Paper	3	2	1	1	3	3	4	6	1	5	7	5	6	5	3	1	13	15	15	13
Radio	0	2	4	1	1	6	8	1	2	6	8	2	2	0	7	6	5	14	27	10
TV	4	1	1	1	9	5	2	0	10	4	3	1	6	6	2	1	29	16	8	3
Mag.	0	1	3	3	3	1	4	8	5	3	3	7	2	3	5	5	10	8	15	23

[a]Nine of the sixteen subjects in group one did not rank the media; they are excluded in this table.

[b]Two of the eighteen subjects in group two did not rank the media; they are excluded in this table.

[c]Three of the twenty-one subjects in group three did not rank the media; they are excluded in this table.

[d]Three of the eighteen subjects in group four did not rank the media; they are excluded in this table.

Table 12. Frequency of ranks of media on the basis of reliability of reporting, summed by education groups.

Media	Group One[a]				Group Two[b]				Group Three[c]				Group Four[d]				Total			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Paper	4	1	3	2	2	9	5	5	5	2	3	6	3	4	5	0	14	16	16	13
Radio	0	4	5	1	2	3	14	2	0	6	4	6	3	1	5	3	5	14	28	12
TV	6	2	1	1	12	5	4	0	9	4	3	0	4	4	2	2	31	15	10	3
Mag.	0	2	3	5	4	2	5	10	4	3	7	2	2	3	1	6	10	10	16	23

[a]Nine of the nineteen subjects in group one did not rank the media; they are excluded in this table.

[b]Five of the twenty-six subjects in group two did not rank the media; they are excluded in this table.

[c]Two of the eighteen subjects in group three did not rank the media; they are excluded in this table.

[d]Three of the fifteen subjects in group four did not rank the media; they are excluded in this table.

fourth for the four groups based on education was .62.

The differences in the ratios of subjects who ranked newspapers first or second to those who ranked newspapers third or fourth among the four groups were not significant (see Table 12 for the ratio of subjects in each group who ranked newspapers first or second to those who ranked newspapers third or fourth).

Ranking of Radio

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The chi-square value for the differences in ratios of those who ranked radio first or second to those who ranked radio third or fourth among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was 11.99.

The differences in the ratios of subjects who ranked radio first or second to those who ranked radio third or fourth among the four groups were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence (see Table 10).

Four of the thirteen members of group one ranked radio first or second. Nine of the fourteen members of group two ranked radio first or second. Five of the fifteen members of group three ranked radio first or second. One of the seventeen members of group four ranked radio first or second.

By Income Groups

The chi-square value for the differences in ratios of those who ranked radio first or second to those who ranked radio third or fourth among the four groups based on income was 4.12.

The differences in the ratios of subjects who ranked radio first or second to those who ranked radio third or fourth among the four groups were not significant (see Table 11 for the ratio of subjects in each group who

ranked radio first or second to those who ranked radio third or fourth).

By Education Groups

The chi-square value for the differences in ratios of those who ranked radio first or second to those who ranked radio third or fourth among the four groups based on education was .47.

The differences in the ratios of subjects who ranked radio first or second to those who ranked radio third or fourth among the four groups were not significant (see Table 12 for the ratio of subjects in each group who ranked radio first or second to those who ranked radio third or fourth).

Ranking of TV

By All Three Socio-economic Variables

The chi-square values for the differences in ratios of those who ranked TV first or second to those who ranked TV third or fourth among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation, the four groups based on income, and the four groups based on education were 2.05, 1.14, and 2.44 respectively.

None of the differences in ratios of subjects who ranked TV first or second to those who ranked TV third or fourth among the four groups on any one of the variables were significant (see Tables 10, 11, and 12 for the ratio of subjects in each group who ranked TV first or second to those who ranked TV third or fourth for each of the assessed property evaluation groups, the income groups, and the education groups).

Ranking of Magazines

By All Three Socio-economic Variables

The chi-square values for the differences in ratios of those who ranked magazines first or second to those who ranked magazines third or fourth among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation, the four groups based on income, and the four groups based on education were 4.70, 2.33, and 1.17 respectively.

None of the differences in ratios of those who ranked magazines first or second to those who ranked magazines third or fourth among the four groups on any one of the three variables were significant (see Tables 10, 11, and 12 for the ratio of subjects in each group who ranked magazines first or second to those who ranked magazines third or fourth for each of the assessed property evaluation groups, income groups, and education groups).

Discussion of Support for Hypothesis

Hypothesis number three, part (a), that there are differences in perceptions of the relative trustworthiness of the media associated with assessed property evaluation area, was partially supported.

The differences in the ratios of those who ranked newspaper first or second to those who ranked newspaper third or fourth among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation were not significant. The differences in the ratios of those who ranked TV first or second to those who ranked TV third or fourth among the four groups were not significant. Also, the differences in ratios of those who ranked magazines first or second to

those who ranked magazines third or fourth among the four groups were not significant.

However, the differences in the ratios of those who ranked radio first or second to those who ranked radio third or fourth among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

Hypothesis number three, part (b), that there are differences in perceptions of the relative trustworthiness of the media associated with income, was partially supported.

The differences in the ratios of those who ranked radio first or second to those who ranked radio third or fourth among the four groups based on income were not significant. The differences in the ratios of those who ranked TV first or second to those who ranked TV third or fourth among the four groups were not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios of those who ranked magazines first or second to those who ranked magazines third or fourth among the four groups were not significant.

However, the differences in the ratios of those who ranked newspapers first or second to those who ranked newspapers third or fourth among the four groups based on income were significant beyond the .10 level of confidence.

Hypothesis number three, part (c), that there are differences in perceptions of the relative trustworthiness of the mass media associated with education, was not supported.

None of the differences in those who ranked any of the four media first

or second to those who ranked that same media third or fourth among the four groups based on education were significant. (Note the lack of support for differences in ranking of any one media on more than one of the socio-economic variables.)

Section IV

Exposure to Political-News Discussion

Material in this section relates to the three subsections of hypothesis number four, which is: That there is a positive relationship between the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education and exposure to interpersonal communications relating to national, world, and political affairs. A discussion of the support for the subsections follows the analysis of the data.

Differences in weekly exposure to news and comment on national, world, and political affairs through discussion were measured in two ways. The Kruskal-Wallis test for one-way analysis of variance was used to examine differences in lengths of time of reported exposure, and the chi-square test was used to analyze differences in the ratios of discussion exposures to non-exposures for each group.

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was 7.83. The chi-square value for differences in ratios of discussion exposures to non-exposures

among the four groups was 10.32.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was significant beyond the .05 level of confidence (see Table 13).

The range of discussion exposure times for goup one was from zero to seven hours; the median exposure time was .5 hours; the mean exposure time was 1.4 hours; and the mean rank was 32.3.

The range of discussion exposure times for group two was from zero to twenty-five hours; the median exposure time was .5 hours; the mean exposure time was 2.1 hours; and the mean rank was 30.6.

The range of discussion exposure times for group three was from one-half hour to ten and one-half hours; the median exposure time was 1.5 hours; the mean exposure time was 2.5 hours; and the mean rank was 45.1.

The range of discussion exposure times for group four was from one-half hour to nineteen hours; the median exposure time was 2.0 hours; the mean exposure time was 3.7 hours; and the mean rank was 50.4.

The differences in the ratios of discussion exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .02 level of confidence (see Table 14).

Fifteen of the nineteen members of group one reported exposure to political-news discussions, as did fifteen of the twenty members of group two, all twenty-one members of group three, and all eighteen members of group four.

By Income Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on income was 24.49. The chi-square value for the differences in the ratios of discussion exposures to non-exposures among the four

Table 13. Summary of discussion of political news by the four groups on each of the three socio-economic scales.

	Property Evaluation Groups				Income Groups				Education Groups			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Range of Discussion Times (In Hours)	0-7	0-25	½-10½	½-19	0-3½	0-3½	½-25	½-19	0-3½	0-25	½-19	½-8½
Median Discussion Time (In Hours)	.5	.5	1.5	2.0	.5	.5	3.0	1.5	.5	.8	1.8	1.5
Mean Discussion Time (In Hours)	1.4	2.1	2.5	3.7	.5	.9	4.4	3.5	.7	2.6	3.4	3.0
Mean Rank of Discussion Times For Group	32.3	30.6	45.1	50.4	18.8	29.4	49.2	46.5	22.8	38.9	49.4	49.8

Table 14. Exposure and non-exposure to discussion of political news for the four groups on the three socio-economic scales.

	Property Evaluation Groups				Income Groups				Education Groups			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Exposed to Discussion	15	15	21	18	10	15	21	18	11	25	18	15
Non-exposed to Discussion	4	5	0	0	6	3	0	0	8	1	0	0

groups was 24.79.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 13).

The range of discussion exposure times for group one was from zero to three and one-half hours; the median exposure time was .5 hours; the mean exposure time was .5 hours; and the mean rank was 18.8.

The range of discussion exposure times for group two was from zero to three and one-half hours; the median exposure time was .5 hours; the mean exposure time was .9 hours; and the mean rank was 29.4.

The range of discussion exposure times for group three was from one-half hour to twenty-five hours; the median exposure time was 3.0 hours; the mean exposure time was 4.4 hours; and the mean rank was 49.2.

The range of discussion exposure times for group four was from one-half hour to nineteen hours; the median exposure time was 1.5 hours; the mean exposure time was 3.5 hours; and the mean rank was 46.5.

The differences in the ratios of discussion exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 14).

Ten of the sixteen members of group one reported exposure to political-news discussions, as did fifteen of the eighteen members of group two, all twenty-one members of group three, and all eighteen members of group four.

By Education Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in exposure times among the four groups based on education was 17.20. The chi-square value for differences in the ratios of discussion exposures to non-exposures among the four groups was 21.72.

The variance in the per member exposure time among the four groups was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 13).

The range of discussion exposure times among group one was from zero to three and one-half hours; the median exposure time was .5 hours; the mean exposure time was 2.6 hours; and the mean rank was 22.8.

The range of discussion exposure times for group two was from zero to twenty-five hours; the median exposure time was.8 hours; the mean exposure time was 2.6 hours; and the mean rank was 38.9.

The range of discussion exposure times for group three was from one-half hour to nineteen hours; the median exposure time was 1.8 hours; the mean exposure time was 3.4 hours; and the mean rank was 49.4.

The range of discussion exposure times for group four was from one-half hour to eight and one-half hours; the median exposure time was 1.5 hours; the mean exposure time was 3.0 hours; and the mean rank was 49.8.

The differences in the ratios of discussion exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 14).

Eleven of the nineteen members of group one reported exposure to political-news discussions, as did twenty-five of the twenty-six members of group two, all eighteen members of group three, and all fifteen members of group four.

Discussion of Support for Hypothesis

Hypothesis number four, part (a), that there is a positive relationship between assessed property evaluation area and exposure to interpersonal

communications relating to national, world, and political affairs, was partially supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was significant beyond the .05 level of confidence. Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .02 level of confidence.

While neither the variance in exposure times, nor the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures provides a one-two-three-four relationship, the relationship of the lower two assessed property evaluation groups to the upper two groups in the predicted direction on both of the measurements, supported this hypothesis.

Hypothesis number four, part (b), that there is a positive relationship between income and exposure to interpersonal communications relating to national, world, and political affairs, was partially supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on income was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

While neither the variance in exposure times, nor the ratios of exposures to non-exposures provided a one-two-three-four relationship, the relationship of the lower two income groups to the upper two income groups in the predicted direction on both measurements supported this hypothesis.

Hypothesis number four, part (c), that there is a positive relationship between education and exposure to interpersonal communications relating to national, world, and political affairs, was partially supported.

The variance in exposure times among the four groups based on education was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. Also, the differences in the ratios of exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

While, as with the assessed property evaluation groups and the income groups, neither the exposure times, nor the ratios of exposures to non-exposures provided a clear one-two-three-four relationship, again the relationship of the lower two education groups to the upper two groups in the predicted direction on both measurements provided support for this hypothesis.

Section V

Knowledge of and Interest in Political Affairs

Material in this section relates to the three subsections of hypothesis number five, which is: That there are positive relationships between the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education and knowledge of and interest in political affairs. A discussion for the subsections follows the analysis of the data.

Knowledge of Presidential Candidates

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in the numbers of candidates known among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was 20.34.

The variance in the per member number of candidates known among the four groups was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 15).

The range of numbers of candidates known for group one was from zero to eight; the median number known was 2.0; the mean number known was 2.7; and the mean rank was 24.2.

The range of numbers of candidates known for group two was from zero to seven; the median number known was 4.0; the mean number known was 3.5; and the mean rank was 32.6.

The range of numbers of candidates known for group three was from three to nine; the median number known was 6.0; the mean number known was 5.9; and the mean rank was 52.1.

The range of numbers of candidates known for group four was from two to nine; the median number known was 5.5; the mean number known was 5.3; and the mean rank was 48.6.

By Income Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in the numbers of candidates known among the four groups based on income was 22.12. The variance in the per member number of candidates known among the four groups was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 16).

The range of numbers of candidates known for group one was from zero to eight; the median number known was 1.0; the mean number known was 2.3; and the mean rank was 20.3.

The range of numbers of candidates known for group two was from one to seven; the median number known was 4.0; the mean number known was 3.6; and the mean rank was 30.0.

The range of numbers of candidates known for group three was from zero

Table 15. Knowledge of presidential candidates in the 1964 election, including range, median, and mean numbers of candidates known; and exposure to candidates in person, through TV, radio, and books and articles written by the candidates, all by the four property evaluation groups.

	Group One (N = 19)	Group Two (N = 20)	Group Three (N = 21)	Group Four (N = 18)
Knowledge of Candidates				
Range of Numbers of Candidates Known	0-8	0-7	3-9	2-9
Median Number of Candidates Known	2.0	4.0	6.0	5.5
Mean Number of Candidates Known	2.7	3.5	5.9	5.3
Mean Rank	24.2	32.6	52.1	48.6
Exposure to Candidates				
No. of Personal Exposures To Candidates	3	1	5	8
No. of Subjects Having Seen One or More Candidates in Person	2	1	3	4
No. of TV Exposures To Candidates	41	65	102	78
No. of Subjects Having Seen One or More Candidates on TV	14	17[a]	21	18
No. of Radio Exposures To Candidates	2	8	35	11
No. of Subjects Having Heard One or More Candidates on Radio	2	5	12	5
No. of Exposures To Candidates Writings	1	2	11	13
No. of Subjects Having Read Books or Articles By Candidates	1	1	4	7

[a]This was 100% of the subjects who knew one or more candidates.

Table 16. Knowledge of presidential candidates in the 1964 election, including range, median, and mean numbers of candidates known; and exposure to candidates in person, through TV, radio, and books and articles written by the candidates, all by the four income groups.

	Group One (N = 16)	Group Two (N = 17)	Group Three (N = 21)	Group Four (N = 18)
Knowledge of Candidates				
Range of Numbers of Candidates Known	0-8	1-7	0-8	3-9
Median Number of Candidates Known	1.0	4.0	5.0	6.0
Mean Number of Candidates Known	2.3	3.6	5.1	6.2
Mean Rank	20.3	30.0	42.9	51.8
Exposure to Candidates				
No. of Personal Exposures to Candidates	2	0	7	8
No. of Subjects Having Seen One or More Candidates in Person	1	0	5	4
No. of TV Exposures To Candidates	32	51	93	92
No. of Subjects Having Seen One or More Candidates on TV	9	18	20[a]	18
No. of Radio Exposures To Candidates	2	2	28	22
No. of Subjects Having Heard One or More Candidates on Radio	2	2	9	8
No. of Exposures to Candidates Writings	2	1	10	14
No. of Subjects Having Read Books or Articles By Candidates	1	1	4	7

[a]This was 100% of the subjects who knew one or more candidates.

Table 17. Knowledge of presidential candidates in the 1964 election, including range, median, and mean numbers of candidates known; and exposure to candidates in person, through TV, radio, and books and articles written by the candidates, all by the four education groups.

	Group One (N = 19)	Group Two (N = 26)	Group Three (N = 18)	Group Four (N = 15)
Knowledge of Candidates				
Range of Numbers of Candidates Known	0-8	0-8	2-9	4-9
Median Number of Candidates Known	2.0	4.0	5.5	7.0
Mean Number of Candidates Known	2.6	3.8	5.3	6.5
Mean Rank	22.2	34.8	48.0	59.4
Exposure to Candidates				
No. of Personal Exposures to Candidates	2	4	6	5
No. of Subjects Having Seen One or More Candidates in Person	1	3	4	2
No. of TV Exposures To Candidates	41	86	85	74
No. of Subjects Having Seen One or More Candidates on TV	14	23[a]	18	15
No. of Radio Exposures To Candidates	3	9	15	29
No. of Subjects Having Heard One or More Candidates on Radio	3	4	8	9
No. of Exposures to Candidates' Writings	2	1	10	14
No. of Subjects Having Read Books or Articles By Candidates	1	1	4	7

[a]This was 100% of the subjects who knew one or more candidates.

to eight; the median number known was 5.0; the mean number known was 5.1; and the mean rank was 42.9.

The range of numbers of candidates known for group four was from three to nine; the median number known was 6.0; the mean number known was 6.2; and the mean rank was 51.8.

By Education Groups

The Kruskal-Wallis H value for variance in the numbers of candidates known among the four groups based on education was 26.60. The variance in the per member number of candidates known among the four groups was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.(see Table 17).

The range of numbers of candidates known for group one was from zero to eight; the median number known was 2.0; the mean number known was 2.6; and the mean rank was 22.2.

The range of numbers of candidates known for group two was from zero to eight; the median number known was 4.0; the mean number known was 3.8; and the mean rank was 34.8.

The range of numbers of candidates known for group three was from two to nine; the median number known was 5.5; the mean number known was 5.3; and the mean rank was 48.0.

The range of numbers of candidates known for group four was from four to nine; the median number known was 7.0; the mean number known was 6.5; and the mean rank was 59.4.

Exposure to Candidates

The differences in the ratios of candidate exposures to non-exposures among the groups were measured by the chi-square test. For the purpose of

statistical analysis personal exposures, TV exposures, radio exposures, and exposures through books and articles were combined under the heading "exposures," while non-exposures in all of these areas were combined under the heading "non-exposures." Those subjects who reported that they did not know any potential presidential candidates were excluded.

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The chi-square value for differences in ratios of candidate exposures to non-exposures among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was 5.78. The differences in ratios of candidate exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were not significant (see Table 15 for ratios of personal exposures, TV exposures, radio exposures, and exposures through books and articles for each of the groups).

By Income Groups

The chi-square value for differences in ratios of candidate exposures to non-exposures among the four groups based on income was 9.95. The differences in ratios of candidate exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .02 level of confidence (see Table 16).

The ten members of group one reported thirteen candidate exposures. One of the members reported personal exposures to candidates; nine members reported exposures through TV, two through radio, and one through books and articles.

The eighteen members of group two reported twenty-one candidate exposures. None of the members reported personal exposures to candidates; all eighteen members reported exposures through TV, two through radio, and one through books and articles.

The twenty members of group three reported thirty-eight candidate exposures. Five of the members reported personal exposures to candidates; all twenty members reported exposures through TV, nine through radio, and four through books and articles.

The eighteen members of group four reported thirty-seven candidate exposures. Four members reported personal exposures to candidates; all eighteen members reported exposures through TV, eight through radio, and seven through books and articles.

By Education Groups

The chi-square value for differences in ratios of candidate exposures to non-exposures among the four groups based on education was 10.17. The differences in the ratios of candidate exposures to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .02 level of confidence (see Table 17).

The fifteen members of group one reported nineteen candidate exposures. One of the members reported personal exposures to candidates; fourteen members reported exposures through TV, three through radio, and one through books and articles.

The twenty-three members of group two reported thirty-one candidate exposures. Three members reported personal exposures to candidates; all twenty-three members reported exposures through TV, four through radio, and one through books and articles.

The eighteen members of group three reported thirty-four candidate exposures. Four of the members reported personal exposures to candidates; all eighteen members reported exposures through TV, eight through radio, and four through books and articles.

The fifteen members of group four reported thirty-three candidate exposures. Two of the members reported personal exposures to candidates; all fifteen members reported exposures through TV, nine through radio, and seven through books and articles.

Voting Behavior

The differences in the ratios of "votes" to "non-votes" among the groups were measured by the chi-square test. For the purpose of statistical analysis, the numbers of those who voted in 1960 and those who intended to vote in 1964 were combined under the heading "votes"; and the numbers of those who failed to vote in 1960 and those who did not intend to vote in 1964 were combined under the heading "non-votes." Those not eligible to vote were excluded.

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The chi-square value for differences in ratios of votes to non-votes among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was 22.65. The differences in the ratios of votes to non-votes among the four groups were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence (see Table 18).

The nineteen members of group one reported twenty-six votes. Twelve of the members reported that they had voted in the 1960 election, and fourteen reported that they intended to vote in the 1964 election.

The nineteen members of group two reported thirty-three votes. Fifteen of the members reported that they had voted in the 1960 election, and eighteen reported that they intended to vote in the 1964 election.

The twenty-one members of group three reported forty-two votes. All twenty-one members reported that they had voted in the 1960 election, and

Table 18. Summary of voting behavior, intended voting behavior, participation in public and political offices by subjects and their immediate families, and voting influence attempts, all by the four property evaluation groups.

	Group One		Group Two		Group Three		Group Four	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Voted in the 1960 Presidential Election	12	7	15	4[a]	21	0	16	1[a]
Intend to Vote in The 1964 Election	14	5	18	1[b]	21	0	18	0
Participated[c]	1	18	3	17	4	17	4	14
Influence Attempts[d]	2	8	3	7	4	8	5	7

[a]One member of this group was not of legal voting age during the 1960 election; that member was excluded in this tabulation.

[b]One member of this group was not of legal voting age for the 1964 election; that member was excluded in this tabulation.

[c]Records the number of subjects who reported either they, or a member of their immediate family, held an elected, or appointed, public office, or an office in a political party.

[d]Records the number of subjects who reported they had attempted to convince some other person to accept their preference for president in the 1964 election. This tabulation includes only those subjects who reported that they had a preference for president in the 1964 election.

that they intended to vote in the 1964 election.

The eighteen[19] members of group four reported thirty-four votes. Sixteen of the members voted in the 1960 election, and all eighteen reported that they intended to vote in the 1964 election.

By Income Groups

The chi-square value for differences in ratios of votes to non-votes among the four groups based on income was 13.34. The differences in the ratios of votes to non-votes among the four groups were significant beyond the .005 level of confidence (see Table 19).

The fifteen members of group one reported twenty-two votes. Eleven of the members reported that they had voted in the 1960 election, and eleven reported that they intended to vote in the 1964 election.

The eighteen members of group two reported twenty-nine votes. Thirteen of the members reported that they had voted in the 1960 election, and sixteen reported that they intended to vote in the 1964 election.

The twenty-one members[20] of group three reported thirty-eight votes. Seventeen of the members reported that they had voted in the 1960 election, and all twenty-one reported that they intended to vote in the 1964 election.

The eighteen members of group four reported thirty-six votes. All eighteen of the members reported that they had voted in the 1960 election and intended to vote in the 1964 election.

---

[19]One of the eighteen members was not eligible to vote in the 1960 election, but was eligible to vote in 1964.

[20]One of the twenty-one members was not eligible to vote in the 1960 election, but was eligible to vote in 1964.

Table 19. Summary of voting behavior, intended voting behavior, participation in public and political offices by subjects and their immediate families, and voting influence attempts, all by the four income groups.

	Group One		Group Two		Group Three		Group Four	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Voted in the 1960 Presidential Election	11	4[a]	13	5	17	3[a]	18	0
Intend to Vote in The 1964 Election	11	4[b]	16	2	21	0	18	0
Participated[c]	2	14	2	16	3	18	5	13
Influence Attempts[d]	2	6	3	7	2	11	6	7

[a]One member of this group was not of legal voting age during the 1960 election; that member was excluded in this tabulation.

[b]One member of this group was not of legal voting age for the 1964 election; that member was excluded in this tabulation.

[c]Records the number of subjects who reported either they, or a member of their immediate family, held an elected, or appointed, public office, or an office in a political party.

[d]Records the number of subjects who reported they had attempted to convince some other person to accept their preference for president in the 1964 election. This tabulation includes only those subjects who reported that they had a preference for president in the 1964 election.

By Education Groups

The chi-square value for differences in ratios of votes to non-votes among the four groups based on education was 14.35. The differences in the ratios of votes to non-votes among the four groups were significant beyond the .005 level of confidence (see Table 20).

The nineteen members of group one reported twenty-eight votes. Thirteen of the members reported that they had voted in the 1960 election, and fifteen reported that they intended to vote in the 1964 election.

The twenty-six members of group two reported forty-five votes. Twenty-one of the members reported that they had voted in the 1960 election, and twenty-four reported that they intended to vote in the 1964 election.

The seventeen members[21] of group three reported thirty-three votes. Sixteen of the members reported that they had voted in the 1960 election, and all seventeen reported that they intended to vote in the 1964 election.

The fifteen members of group four reported twenty-nine votes. Fourteen of the members reported that they had voted in the 1960 election, and all fifteen reported that they intended to vote in the 1964 election.

Participation and Influence Attempts

For the purpose of discussion in this section, a "participant" is defined as someone who either himself or a member of his immediate family held a public or political office. Also, in the tests to determine differences in the ratios of subjects who had attempted to influence another person's presidential preference in the 1964 election to those who had not, only those

---

[21] One of the seventeen members was not eligible to vote in the 1960 election, but was eligible to vote in 1964.

Table 20. Summary of voting behavior, intended voting behavior, participation in public and political offices by subjects and their immediate families, and voting influence attempts, all by the four education groups.

	Group One		Group Two		Group Three		Group Four	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Voted in the 1960 Presidential Election	13	6	21	5	16[a]	0	14	1
Intend to Vote in The 1964 Election	15	4	24	2	17[b]	0	15	0
Participated[c]	2	17	4	22	4	14	2	13
Influence Attempts[d]	2	6	5	11	3	7	4	6

[a]Two members of this group were not of legal voting age during the 1960 election; those members were excluded in this tabulation.

[b]One member of this group was not of legal voting age for the 1964 election; that member was excluded in this tabulation.

[c]Records the number of subjects who reported either they, or a member of their immediate family, held an elected, or appointed, public office, or an office in a political party.

[d]Records the number of subjects who reported they had attempted to convince some other person to accept their preference for president in the 1964 election. This tabulation includes only those subjects who reported that they had a preference for president in the 1964 election.

subjects who had a preference for president were included.

Participation

By All Three Socio-economic Variables

The chi-square values for the differences in ratios of participants to non-participants among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation, the four groups based on income, and the four groups based on education were 2.45, 2.36, and 1.04 respectively.

None of the differences in ratios of participants to non-participants among the four groups on any one of the three socio-economic variables were significant (see Tables 18, 19, and 20 for the ratios of participants to non-participants for each of the assessed property evaluation groups, the income groups, and the education groups).

Influence Attempts

By All Three Socio-economic Variables

The chi-square values for the differences in ratios of subjects who had attempted to influence another person's presidential preference in the 1964 election to those who had not among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation, the four groups based on income, and the four groups based on education were 1.00, 2.90, and .49 respectively.

None of the differences in ratios of those who had made influence attempts to those who had not among the four groups on any one of the three socio-economic variables were significant (see Tables 18, 19, and 20 for the ratios of those who had made influence attempts to those who had not for each of the assessed property groups, the income groups, and the education groups).

Discussion of Support for Hypothesis

Hypothesis number five, part (a), that there is a positive relationship between assessed property evaluation area and knowledge of and interest in political affairs was partially supported.

The differences in the ratios of exposures to presidential candidates to non-exposures among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation were not significant. The differences in the ratios of participants in political affairs to non-participants among the four groups were not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios of those who had made voting influence attempts to those who had not among the four groups were not significant.

However, the variance in the numbers of presidential candidates known among the four groups was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence, and the relationship of the lower two assessed property evaluation groups to the two upper groups in the numbers of candidates known was in the predicted direction. Also, the differences among the four groups in the ratios of those who voted in the last presidential election to those who did not, and the ratios of those who intended to vote in the 1964 election to those who did not were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. The differences in the percentages of those who voted and those who intended to vote were in the predicted direction in the relationship of the lower two assessed property evaluation groups to the upper two groups.

Hypothesis number five, part (b), that there is a positive relationship between income and knowledge of and interest in political affairs was

partially supported.

The variance in the numbers of presidential candidates known among the four groups based on income was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence; and the higher the income group, the higher the number of candidates known per member. The differences in the ratios of exposures to presidential candidates to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .02 level of confidence; and the higher the income group, the higher the percentage of exposures to non-exposures. Also, the differences among the four groups in the ratios of those who voted in the last election to those who did not, and the ratios of those who intended to vote in the 1964 election to those who did not were significant beyond the .005 level of confidence; and the higher the income group, the higher the percentage of those who had voted in the last presidential election and those who intended to vote in the 1964 election.

However, the differences in the ratios of participants in political affairs to non-participants among the four groups were not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios of those who had made voting influence attempts to those who had not among the four groups were not significant.

Hypothesis number five, part (c), that there is a positive relationship between education and knowledge of and interest in political affairs, was partially supported.

The variance in the numbers of presidential candidates known among the four groups based on education was significant beyond the .001 level of con-

fidence; and the higher the education group, the higher the number of candidates known per member. The differences in the ratios of exposures to presidential candidates to non-exposures among the four groups were significant beyond the .02 level of confidence; and the higher the education group, the higher the percentage of exposures to non-exposures. Also, the differences among the four groups in the ratios of subjects who voted in the last election to those who did not, and the ratios of those who intended to vote in the 1964 election to those who did not were significant beyond the .005 level of confidence; and the relationship of the lower two education groups to the upper two groups in the percentages who voted and intended to vote were in the predicted direction.

However, the differences in the ratios of participants in political affairs to non-participants among the four groups were not significant. Also, the differences in the ratios of those who had made voting influence attempts to those who had not among the four groups were not significant.

Section VI

Political Consistency

Material in this section relates to the three subsections of hypothesis number six, which is: That there are positive relationships between the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education and political consistency. A discussion of the support for the subsections follows the analysis of the data.

Political consistency was examined in two ways, "family consistency" and "voting consistency."

For the purpose of statistical analysis and discussion, the numbers of subjects who were of the same party as their parents, (those people who did not know their parents' political preference and those subjects whose parents were not citizens of the United States were excluded) and the numbers of subjects who were of the same part as their wives, or husbands, (single subjects and subjects who did not know their wife's, or husband's, political preference were excluded) were combined under the heading "family consistents." The numbers of subjects who were of a different party from their parents, and the numbers of subjects who were of a different party from their wives, or husbands, were combined under the heading "family inconsistents." "Independent" was considered as a party.

For the purpose of statistical analysis and discussion, the numbers of subjects who voted in 1960 for the presidential candidate of the party they preferred, (non-voters were excluded) and the numbers of subjects who preferred a presidential candidate of their own party (those who did not intend to vote and those who did not have a presidential preference were excluded) were combined under the heading "vote consistents." The numbers of subjects who voted in 1960 for a presidential candidate of a party other than the one they preferred, and the numbers of subjects who stated that they preferred a presidential candidate of a party other than their own were combined under the heading "vote inconsistents." Independents with no party preference were excluded.

Family Consistency

By All Three Socio-economic Variables

The chi-square values for differences in ratios of family consistents to family inconsistents among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation, the four groups based on income, and the four groups based on education were 1.42, 1.13, and 3.55 respectively.

None of the differences in ratios of family consistents to family inconsistents among the four groups on any one of the socio-economic variables were significant (see Table 21 for the ratios of subjects who were of the same party as their parents to those who were not, and the ratios of subjects who were of the same party as their wives, or husbands, to those who were not for each of the assessed property evaluation groups, the income groups, and the education groups).

Voting Consistency

By Assessed Property Evaluation Groups

The chi-square value for differences in ratios of voting consistents to voting inconsistents among the four groups based on assessed property evaluation was 1.34.

The differences in ratios of voting consistents to voting inconsistents among the four groups were not significant (see Table 21 for the ratios of subjects who voted in 1960 for the presidential candidate of the party they preferred to those who voted for the presidential candidate of some other party, and the ratios of subjects who preferred a presidential candidate of their own party in the 1964 election to those who preferred a presidential candidate of some other party for each of the four groups).

Table 21. Political consistency, as measured by the relationships of the subject's party identification to parent's party identification, wife's (husband's) party identification, subject's 1960 presidential preference, and the subject's 1964 presidential preference for each of the four groups on each of the three socio-economic scales.

	Property Groups				Income Groups				Education Groups			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Party ID Same as Parents'	12	11	15½	11½	8	12	14½	12½	12	17½	10½	10
Party ID Different From Parents'	5	7	4½	6½	5	4	6½	5½	4	6½	7½	5
Party ID Same As Wife's (Husband's) [a]	14	13	15	11	11	14	13	11	14	19	11	19
Party ID Different From Wife's (Husband's)	4	5	6	6	3	4	8	5	3	6	6	6
Party ID Same as 1960 Presidential Preference [b]	9	11	15	14	7	12	15	12	7	19	15	8
Party ID Different From 1960 Presidential Preference	3	3	6	2	3	1	4	4	5	2	2	5
Party ID Same as 1964 Presidential Preference [c]	8	9	15	10	6	10	11	12	8	16	9	9
Party ID Different From 1964 Presidential Preference	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	1	1	0	3	2

[a] Those subjects who were single, or did not know their wife's party were excluded.

[b] Those subjects who did not vote in the 1960 presidential election or who did not have any party preference were excluded.

[c] Those subjects who did not have a presidential preference for the 1964 elections or who did not have any party preference were excluded.

By Income Groups

The chi-square value for differences in ratios of voting consistents to voting inconsistents among the four groups based on income was 3.59.

The differences in ratios of voting consistents to voting inconsistents among the four groups were not significant (see Table 21 for the ratios of subjects who voted in 1960 for the presidential candidate of the party they preferred to those who voted for the presidential candidate of some other party, and the ratios of subjects who preferred a presidential candidate of their own party in the 1964 election to those who preferred a presidential candidate of some other party for each of the four groups).

By Education Groups

The chi-square value for differences in ratios of voting consistents to voting inconsistents among the four groups based on education was 7.62.

The differences in ratios of voting consistents to voting inconsistents among the four groups were significant beyond the .10 level of confidence (see Table 21).

The members of group one reported fifteen voting consistents and six voting inconsistents. Seven members voted in 1960 for the presidential candidate of the party they preferred, while five voted for the presidential candidate of some other party. All sixteen members, who had a presidential preference in the 1964 election, preferred a presidential candidate of their own party.

The members of group two reported thirty-five voting consistents and two voting inconsistents. Nineteen members voted in 1960 for the presidential candidate of the party they preferred, while two voted for the presidential candidate of some other party. All sixteen members, who had a

presidential preference in the 1964 election, preferred a presidential candidate of their own party.

The members of group three reported twenty-four voting consistents and five voting inconsistents. Fifteen members voted in 1960 for the presidential candidate of the party they preferred, while two voted for the presidential candidate of some other party. Nine members said they preferred a presidential candidate of their own party in the 1964 election, while three preferred a presidential candidate of some other party.

The members of group four reported seventeen voting consistents and seven voting inconsistents. Eight members voted in 1960 for the presidential candidate of the party they preferred, while five voted for the presidential candidate of some other party. Nine members said they preferred a presidential candidate of their own party in the 1964 election, while two preferred a presidential candidate of some other party.

Discussion of Support for Hypothesis

Hypothesis number six, part (a), that there is a positive relationship between assessed property evaluation area and political consistency, was not supported.

The differences among the assessed property evaluation groups in the ratios of subjects who were of the same political party as their wives (or husbands) to those who were not, and the ratios of subjects who were of the same political party as their parents to those who were not were not significant. Also, the differences among the groups in the ratios of subjects who voted in 1960 for the presidential candidate of the party they preferred to those who voted for the presidential candidate of some other party, and

the ratios of subjects who preferred a presidential candidate of their own party in the 1964 election to those who preferred a presidential candidate of some other party, were not significant.

Hypothesis number six, part (b), that there is a positive relationship between income and political consistency, was not supported.

The differences among the income groups in the ratios of subjects who were of the same political party as their wives (or husbands) to those who were not, and the ratios of subjects who were of the same political party as their parents to those who were not, were not significant. Also, although the differences among the groups in the ratios of subjects who voted in 1960 for the presidential candidate of the party they preferred to those who voted for the presidential candidate of some other party, and the ratios of subjects who preferred a presidential candidate of their own party in the 1964 election to those who preferred a presidential candidate of some other party were significant beyond the .10 level of confidence, the ratios were not in the predicted direction.

Hypothesis number six, part (c), that there is a positive relationship between education and political consistency, was not supported.

The differences among the education groups in the ratios of subjects who were of the same political party as their wives (or husbands) to those who were not, and the ratios of subjects who were of the same political party as their parents to those who were not, were not significant. Also, the differences among the groups in the ratios of subjects who voted in 1960 for the presidential candidate of the party they preferred to those who voted for the presidential candidate of some other party, and the ratios of subjects who preferred a presidential candidate of their own party in the 1964 election to those who preferred a presidential candidate of some other party, were not significant.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

Limitations

This study was conducted in a university town, Manhattan, Kansas, in the spring of 1964, a presidential election year. Seventy-eight heads of households from four geographic areas of the city were interviewed. Neither age nor sex were controlled variables.

Discussion

The information gathered from interviewing seventy-eight subjects in Manhattan, Kansas, between March 30 and April 20, 1964, generally supported one of the six hypotheses projected in this study, partially supported three others, while failing to support two of the hypotheses.

The hypothesis receiving strongest support was the predicted positive relationship of the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education to exposure to interpersonal communications relating to national, world, and political affairs. An analysis of the subjects by groups on the three scales indicated significant differences in both length of time of weekly discussion exposure and in the ratios of those who took part in discussions to those who did not. Also, the correlation of the predicted relationship of the differences with the obtained indicated strong support for the hypothesis.

The hypothesis which received the least support was that there are differences associated with socio-economic variables in perception of the relative trustworthiness of the media. Although there were incidents which

supported this hypothesis with differences in rankings of the media, the inconsistency of these findings and the large number of negative results indicated a general lack of support for this hypothesis.

Little direct support was found for the hypothesis that there are positive relationships between the socio-economic variables and political consistency. Here the author suggests the similarity of the findings of this study to those of Converse which were mentioned in the introduction of this paper. Although the evidence is not conclusive, the trends on all three socio-economic scales suggest that the least exposed and most highly exposed subjects may be the most stable in voting consistency.

One of the hypotheses receiving partial support was that there are positive relationships between the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education and knowledge of and interest in political affairs.

Significant differences among the four groups on each of the three scales in knowledge of candidates, exposure to candidates, and voting behavior, and the high correlation between the predicted relationship of the differences and the obtained differences supported the hypothesis. However, the data also indicated that there were no significant differences among the groups on any of the three scales in either percentages of participants or percentages of members who had made voting influence attempts. The data in both of these last two areas indicated a slight trend in the predicted direction; it is possible that the small number of subjects prevented these differences from being statistically significant.

The hypothesis predicting positive relationships between the socio-economic variables and exposure to news and comment through the mass media received partial support.

The information regarding differences in lengths of time of exposure among the groups on the three variables indicated that there were no significant differences in this area. Yet, in apparent contrast, the ratios of media exposures to non-exposures among the groups were significantly different on all three variables. This would seem to indicate that either the subjects on the lower ends of the three socio-economic scales spent considerably more time with the fewer media they were exposed to, or, as the author would tend to believe, the subjects on the upper ends of the three scales were more conservative in their estimates of exposure times and/or were narrower in their concept of what constitutes national, world, and political affairs.

The hypothesis predicting differences in exposure to each of the four media associated with the variables of property evaluation, income, and education, received partial support.

Although differences did occur in exposure to newspaper on one variable and in radio on another, the data suggest that neither, radio, TV, nor newspaper exposure is related to the three socio-economic variables. However, magazines seem to be an exception. Significant differences among groups in exposure to magazines appeared in both length of time and in the ratios of exposures to magazines to non-exposures on all three variables. While the data would indicate that both newspaper and TV have universal audiences, related information suggests the differences in actual length of time of exposure to news and comment on national, world, and political affairs through these two media would appear as significant if measured by a more objective manner than requesting the information from the subjects. This position is supported, in part, by pointing out the significance in the

differences of numbers of presidential candidates known among the groups on each of the three variables.

Suggestions for Further Study

The apparent contrast in findings regarding exposure to the mass media by length of time of exposure and exposure vs. non-exposure suggests a need for further research to gain a more precise understanding of this relationship. Initially, further information is needed about the influence of the socio-economic variables upon the concept of news and comment of national, world, and political affairs.

The lack of support for the predicted differences in political consistency, particularly in voting behavior, suggests the need for further research in attitude change between elections to compare with existing studies conducted during a single campaign.

A definite need exists for some method of repeated or continuous observation of attitude change to replace asking subjects to recall an attitude they held at some earlier time to compare with their present attitude on that subject or observing attitudes or behavior at two or more widely spaced times and inferring the amount of attitude change from the difference in the two or more reports. The author suggests that the existing procedures minimize the actual attitude change, since they allow the subject to run the gamut of attitude or behavior change and return to his original position between observations and still be counted as stable.

One other area of concern untapped in this paper was the relationship of the socio-economic variables to the absolute regard of the trustworthiness

of the media. Survey observations would indicate a wide range of regard for the media, both individually and collectively, and any discovery of a key to this relationship could prove a valuable tool in understanding attitude change as a function of the mass media.

On the basis of the significance of the conclusions drawn in particular sections of this study, further research based on the orientation of this study could prove beneficial in gaining a better understanding of the influences that reach different types of people. If this study were extended beyond the limitation of heads of households, one might expect age and sex to have a greater influence upon such variables as exposure to the mass media, voting behavior, and interpersonal communications.

A follow-up study with the same subjects used in this study, made during the 1964 presidential campaign, would supplement this study with information concerning attitude change produced by the campaign. This information could be compared with the differences in exposure to the mass media, or interpersonal communications, that were isolated in this study.

APPENDIX A

Description of the Complete Universe of Four Assessed Property Evaluations From "An Age-Sex Study of Six Sections of Manhattan, Kansas" (1959) by Cay Carrel

GROUP ONE:

AREA: The North and South sides of Yuma, El Paso, Riley, and Pottawatomie from South Juliette Avenue to South 4th Street. Also, the East side of South Juliette from Yuma to Pottawatomie, and the West side of South 4th from Yuma to Pottawatomie. There are fifty-five permanent dwellings within this geographic area, according to the County Assessor's books for 1959.

The following table gives the number of homes within each assessed property evaluation range, according to the County Assessor's books, 1959: (The average assessed evaluation was $969.)

ASSESSED EVALUATION		NUMBER
$ 200-299		2
300-399		5
400-499		3
500-599		3
600-699		4
700-799		8
800-899		5
900-999		0
1,000-1,099		5
1,100-1,199		3
1,200-1,299		6
1,300-1,399		3
1,400-1,499		2
1,500-1,599		1
1,600-1,699		1
1,700-1,799		0
1,800-1,899		1
1,900-1,999		1
2,000-2,199	(note distance)	0
2,200-2,299		1
2,300-3,799	(note distance)	0
3,800-3,899		1
		55

GROUP TWO

AREA: Both sides of Osage from North 10th to North Juliette; both sides of Fremont from North 9th to North Juliette; both sides of North 8th from Fremont to Osage; the East side of North 9th from Fremont to Osage; and the West side of North Juliette from Fremont to Osage. There were seventy-one permanent dwellings within this geographic area, according to the County Assessor's books, 1959.

The following table gives the number of homes within each assessed property evaluation range, according to the County Assessor's books, 1959: (The average assessed evaluation was $2,643.)

ASSESSED EVALUATION	NUMBER
$1,000-1,099	2
1,100-1,399 (note distance)	0
1,400-1,499	1
1,500-1,599	2
1,600-1,799 (note distance)	0
1,800-1,899	3
1,900-1,999	1
2,000-2,099	1
2,100-2,199	4
2,200-2,299	6
2,300-2,399	4
2,400-2,499	4
2,500-2,599	5
2,600-2,699	7
2,700-2,799	3
2,800-2,899	6
2,900-2,999	4
3,000-3,099	2
3,100-3,199	4
3,200-3,299	2
3,300-3,399	0
3,400-3,499	4
3,500-3,599	2
3,600-3,699	1
3,700-3,799	1
3,800-3,999 (note distance)	0
4,000-4,099	1
4,100-4,199	1
	71

GROUP THREE:

AREA: Both sides of Westview, Edgerton, and Wickham from Park Drive to Grandview Drive; the East side of Wickham Road from Grandview to Highway 24; the North side of Park Drive from Westview to Wickham; and the South side of Grandview from Westview to Wickham. There were fifty-five dwellings in this geographic area, according to the County Assessor's books, 1959.

The following table gives the number of homes in each assessed property evaluation range, according to the County Assessor's books, 1959: (The average evaluation was $4,789.)

ASSESSED EVALUATION	NUMBER
$3,500-3,599	1
3,600-3,699	0
3,700-3,799	1
3,800-3,899	0
3,900-3,999	4
4,000-4,099	1
4,100-4,199	4
4,200-4,299	1
4,300-4,399	1
4,400-4,499	6
4,500-4,599	3
4,600-4,699	1
4,700-4,799	1
4,800-4,899	3
4,900-4,999	2
5,000-5,099	2
5,100-5,199	1
5,200-5,299	1
5,300-5,399	3
5,400-5,499	2
5,500-5,599	1
5,600-5,699	2
5,700-5,799	4
5,800-5,899	1
5,900-5,999	0
6,000-6,099	3
6,100-6,299 (note distance)	0
6,300-6,399	1
6,400-4,499 (note distance)	0
6,700-6,799	1
6,800-6,899	1
6,900-6,999	0
7,000-7,099	1
7,100-7,699 (note distance)	0
7,700-7,799	1
7,800-8,199 (note distance)	0
8,200-8,299	1
	55

GROUP FOUR:

AREA: Both sides of Pine Drive from Poyntz to its termination at Pierre; all of both sides of Cedar Drive and Scheu Drive; both sides of Pierre between Pine Drive and Valley Drive; the North side of Pierre from Valley Drive to Delaware; and the first three lots on both sides of Valley Drive South of Pierre. There were twenty-five dwellings in this geographic area, according to the County Assessor's books, 1959. However, from the foregoing description, the author was able to find only twenty-four addresses listed in the 1963 Manhattan City Directory.

The following table gives the number of homes in each assessed property evaluation range, according to the County Assessor's books 1959: (The average evaluation was $6,813.)

ASSESSED EVALUATION	NUMBER	ASSESSED EVALUATION (CONT.)	NUMBER
$ 3,300-3,399	1	$ 9,200-9,299	1
3,400-3,799 (note distance)	0	9,300-9,399	1
3,800-3,899	1	9,400-9,499	0
3,900-4,099 (note distance)	0	9,500-9,599	1
4,100-4,199	2	9,600-9,699	0
4,200-4,299	2	9,700-9,799	1
4,300-4,899 (note distance)	0	9,800-11,999 (note distance)	0
4,900-4,999	1	12,000-12,099	1
5,000-5,099	0	13,000-14,999 (note distance)	0
5,100-5,199	1	15,000-15,099	1
5,200-5,299	0		25
5,300-5,399	1		
5,400-5,499	1		
5,500-5,599	0		
5,600-5,699	1		
5,700-5,799	0		
5,800-5,899	1		
5,900-6,099 (note distance)	0		
6,100-6,199	1		
6,200-6,299	1		
6,300-6,399	0		
6,400-6,499	1		
6,500-6,799 (note distance)	0		
6,800-6,899	1		
6,900-7,299 (note distance)	0		
7,300-7,399	1		
7,400-7,499	0		
7,500-7,599	2		
7,600-9,199 (note distance)	0		

APPENDIX B

The Questionnaire

1. Did you happen to vote in the last presidential election? yes no
(If too young to vote, did you favor a particular candidate?

2. If so, would you mind telling me for whom you voted (or favored)? no

____Kennedy ____Nixon Other_____

3. What names have you heard mentioned as possible candidates in the 1964 presidential election?

___Goldwater ___Johnson ___Lodge ___Nixon ___Rockefeller

___Romney ___Scranton _____

4. Have you seen any of them speak in person? yes no
(If yes, who and when?)

_____ 2 mo. 4 mo. 6 mo. 8 mo. 10 mo. ___year(s)

_____ 2 mo. 4 mo. 6 mo. 8 mo. 10 mo. ___year(s)

5. Have you seen any of them speak on television? yes no
(If yes, who and when?)

_____ 2 mo. 4 mo. 6 mo. 8 mo. 10 mo. ___year(s)

_____ 2 mo. 4 mo. 6 mo. 8 mo. 10 mo. ___year(s)

_____ 2 mo. 4 mo. 6 mo. 8 mo. 10 mo. ___year(s)

6. Have you heard any of them speak on the radio? yes no
(If yes, who and when?)

_____ 2 mo. 4 mo. 6 mo. 8 mo. 10 mo. ___year(s)

_____ 2 mo. 4 mo. 6 mo. 8 mo. 10 mo. ___year(s)

7. Have you read anything written by any of them? yes no

_____ 2 mo. 4 mo. 6 mo. 8 mo. 10 mo. ___year(s)

8. Could you tell me approximately how much time per week you spend in discussions of national, world and political affairs?

0 ½ 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5 5½ 6 6½ 7 7½ 8 more____

9. With whom do you most commonly have these discussions? (I do not need names, only the persons relationship to you, e.g. wife)

____Employee ____Employer ____Immediate Family ____Friend

____Neighbor ____Fellow Employee or Business Associate

Other_____

If the interviewee indicates difficulty in arriving at an answer to a question on "exposure time" on this page, the following procedure will be used to aid him answer the question:

About how much time did you spend (reading, watching, or listening to) national, world and political affairs yesterday? ___min. ___hrs. Do you consider this average for a weekday? yes no (If no, what is average?) Do you do any more or less (reading, listening, or watching) on these subjects on weekends? yes no If yes, how much? ___min. ___hrs. Total for week:_____

_____

Do you happen to read any newspapers regularly? If so, which ones?

10. Could you tell me the average amount of time per week you spend reading news and editorials about national, world, and political affairs in newspapers?

    0 ½ 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5 5½ 6 6½ 7 7½ 8 more_____

11. Could you tell me the average amount of time per week you spend listening to news and comment about national, world, and political affairs on the radio?

    0 ½ 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5 5½ 6 6½ 7 7½ 8 more_____

12. Could you tell me the average amount of time per week you spend watching shows about national, world, and political affairs on television?

    0 ½ 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5 5½ 6 6½ 7 7½ 8 more_____

13. Do you happen to read any magazines regularly? If so which ones?

    ___Atlantic Monthly ___Business Week ___Fortune ___Harpers

    ___Life ___Look ___Newsweek ___The New Yorker ___The Reporter

    ___Time ___Saturday Review ___U. S. News and World Report

    Other:_____

14. Could you tell me the average amount of time per week you spend reading news and editorials about national, world, and political affairs in magazines?

    0 ½ 1 1½ 2 2½ 3 3½ 4 4½ 5 5½ 6 6½ 7 7½ 8 more_____

15. Would you rank these mass media--newspapers, radio, television, and magazines--on the basis of their reliability or "trustworthiness" in reporting. That is, the most reliable would be ranked first, etc.

    ___Newspapers ___Radio ___Television ___Magazines

Name_____ Sex: M F

Address_____ Age_____

1. Do you belong to a religious denomination? Yes No (If yes, would you mind telling me which one?)

_____

2. Could you tell me your approximate total family income per year before taxes and withholding, that includes both you and your wife (or husband) if she (or he) works?

less than $2,000 2 to $3,999 4 to $5,999 6 to $7,999

8 to $9,999 10 to $11,999 12 to $13,999 more_____

3. Could you tell me the name of the last school you attended? What was the last grade (or year) that you completed in that school?

5 or less 6 to 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 ____

4. Where did you attend school? (If several places for one level, which one was attended longest?)

Grade School_____

High School_____

College_____

5. How long have you lived in Manhattan?

less than one year 1 to 5 years 6 to 10 years 11 or more

6. Is there someplace besides Manhattan that you consider home, e.g., where you grew up or somewhere you lived a long time before coming here? (If yes, where?)

_____

7. Are you married? Yes No

8. Do you have children? Yes No How many? 1 2 3 4 5 6 _____

9. How old are they; where do they live; and what do they do?

Age	Home	Occupation
____	_____	_____
____	_____	_____
____	_____	_____

10. Is your wife (or husband) employed? Yes No Where?_____

11. Do you, or does any member of your family hold an elected or appointed public office, or any office in a political party? Yes No

12. If yes, who and in what capacity?

Interviewee Sister Brother Wife Father Mother Son

Daughter Uncle Aunt Other_____

_____ _____

_____ _____

13. Is your father living? Yes No

14. Is your mother living? Yes No

15. Generally, do you think of your parents as being political Independents, as Democrats, Republicans, or supporting some other party?

Independent Democrat Republican Other_____ None Don't Know

16. (If they do favor a party) To what degree do they favor this party?

Strong Medium Weak Don't Know

17. Does your wife think of herself as an Independent, Democrat, Republican, or what?

Independent Democrat Republican Other_____ None

18. (If she does favor a party) To what degree does she favor this party?

Strong Medium Weak Don't Know

19. Do you think of yourself as an Independent, Democrat, Republican, or in favor of some other party?

Independent Democrat Republican Other_____ None

20. If independent, do you feel you are closer to the Democrats or Republicans?

Democrats Republicans

21. (If you do support a party) To what degree do you favor this party?

Strong Medium Weak

22. Regardless of any party preference, do you consider yourself a Conservative, Liberal, or between the two?

Conservative Liberal Center Don't Know

23. Do you intend to vote in the coming presidential election?

Yes No Don't Know

24. Do you know yet if you will generally favor one of the parties in this coming election? Yes No

25. If yes, which one? Democrat Republican Other_____

26. Have you made up your mind which candidate for President you will favor, assuming he makes it through the primaries? Yes No

27. If yes, which one?

Goldwater Johnson Lodge Nixon Rockefeller Romney Scranton

_____

28. How strongly would you say you feel about this choice?

Strong Medium Weak

29. Have you tried to convince anyone else of your choice? Yes No

30. If yes, who? (I do not need names, only that person's relationship to you.)

___Employee ___Employer ___Immediate Family ___Friend

___Neighbor ___Fellow Employee or Business Associate

Other_____

31. Who do you think will win the election?

Goldwater Johnson Lodge Nixon Rockefeller Romney

Scranton _____ Don't Know

32. Attitude of interviewee:

33. Time and date of interview.

APPENDIX C

Explanation of the Questionnaire

The first two questions were related to the subject's voting behavior in the last presidential election. These questions represented attempts to determine, in part, both political consistency and interest in political affairs. Questions three through seven on page one were concerned with the individuals the subject identified as potential presidential candidates in the 1964 election, and his exposure to them through personal observation, TV, radio, and any books or articles written by the candidates. These questions represented attempts to tap the subject's knowledge of and interest in political affairs.

Questions eight and nine on page one were related to the subject's interpersonal communications in the area of national, world, and political affairs. These questions represented a further attempt to determine subject exposure to news of political affairs, and also were partial preparation for any follow-up study on opinion change.

Questions ten through fourteen on page two sought information regarding exposure time to news and comment on national, world, and political affairs through the mass media to obtain necessary data to examine relationships of socio-economic variables to exposure time. Question fifteen asked the subject to rank the mass media on reliability of reporting, in an attempt to examine the relationship of media bias to socio-economic variables.

Questions one through ten on page three asked for personal information about the subject and his family, including religion, income, education, length of time they had lived in Manhattan, marital status, and children. These questions represented an attempt to discover personal variables within the socio-economic groups that could have significant influence on one or more of the variables being studied.

Questions eleven through twenty-one on page four attempted to examine further subject interest in political affairs and political consistency through information regarding the subject's, and his family's, participation in public and political affairs and their preferences of political parties.

Question twenty-two on page four and questions twenty-three through twenty-seven on page five examined political interest and consistency through the subject's intended voting behavior in the 1964 national election. Questions twenty-eight and twenty-nine were attempts to further tap political interest through determining subject attempts to influence others in voting in the 1964 election. Question thirty on page five asked the subject to predict the winner of the 1964 presidential election. This question represented part of the attempt to gather background material for any study on attitude change.

APPENDIX D

Detailed Description of Survey Procedure

The author began by calling two subjects in each of the four groups to set up appointments for the administration of the questionnaire. However, after one refusal and one near refusal, the method of contacting the subjects was discussed with the committee, and it was decided that personal calls at their homes possibly would yield better returns than phone contacts.

The hours of 4:30 p.m. until 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and 2:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays were selected as the best times for contacting the subjects at their homes. These weekday times were those which best avoided conflict with working hours, meals, and activities which took the subjects away from their homes. The weekend hours were designed to avoid interrupting those persons who wished to sleep late on those days and also to avoid conflict with religious services.

One procedure developed by the author after the beginning of the survey was to look through the lists of subjects and try to find names of women who apparently, through the fact they were listed as Mrs. and were named as home owners in the 1963 Manhattan City Directory, were widows. These women were called upon from 4:30 p.m. until 5:15 p.m. whenever possible. This was done because a larger percentage of these older women were at home during these hours, while most of the men worked until 5:00 p.m.

The procedure when someone was contacted at one of the addresses in the sample was for the author to ask for the person the City Directory had listed as the home owner at that address. If the person was at home, the author introduced himself to the respondent, in the following manner: "Good afternoon (or evening), Mr. (or Mrs.) -------. I am John Reppert, and I am a graduate student at Kansas State. I am taking a survey as part of a paper I am writing, and I wonder if you would possibly have ten to fifteen

minutes*, either now or later, that I might talk to you. The survey is concerned with the mass media--TV, newspapers, radio, and magazines--and the national, world, and political news and your opinion."

If the person who answered the door said that the person asked for did not live at that address, the head of the household was requested. If the person sought was not at home, the person answering the door was asked when the subject would most likely be home and a special effort was made to contact him at that time.

In cases where the subject asked the author what he was studying, he was told "communications." This was done to avoid biasing the information regarding exposure to the mass media, particularly newspapers, which are often regarded as synonomous with journalism, the author's major.

No discussion of the nature of what the author was looking for was carried out in any form until the interview was completed, then the information given the interviewees was as brief as possible and only in answer to specific questions. This was a precautionary action to prevent discussion of the study between persons already interviewed and persons who were yet to be interviewed. Also, in cases where the subject was not home, the person who had answered the door was given no information other than that another attempt would be made to contact the subject.

In cases where the addresses could not be located, two steps were taken. First, neighbors, who were not subjects, were asked to help. Second, if the first step was unsuccessful, neighbors, who were not subjects, were asked if they knew where the person listed as the home owner in the City Directory lived.

---

*The average time for the survey was determined in the pre-testing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Berelson, Bernard. Waples and Douglas, editors. "The Effects of Print upon Public Opinion." Print, Radio, and Film in a Democracy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Berelson, Bernard, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Hovland, Carl I., Arthur A. Lumsdaine, and Fred D. Sheffield. Experiments on Mass Communication, Volume III. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.

Katz, Elihu, and Paul F. Lazarsfeld. Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

Klapper, Joseph T. The Effects of Mass Communications. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960.

Lang, Kurt, and Gladys Engel Lang. Burdick and Brodbeck, editors. "The Mass Media and Voting." American Voting Behavior. Glencoe, Illinois:

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet. The People's Choice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948.

Luchins, Abraham S. Hovland, et al. editors. "Primacy-Recency in Impression Formation." The Order of Presentation in Persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.

Merton, Robert K. Mass Persuasion. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

Parten, Mildred. Surveys, Polls, and Samples. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Schramm, Wilbur. The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1954.

Seigel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Smith, Bruce L., Harold D. Lasswell, and Ralph D. Casey. Propaganda, Communication and Public Opinion. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946.

Stouffer, Samuel. Untitled report on radio and newspapers as sources, 1940. Summarized by Paul F. Lazarsfeld. Radio and the Printed Page. New York Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1940.

Periodicals

Converse, Philip E. "Information Flow and the Stability of Partisan Attitudes." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1962, 26:578-599.

Eisenstadt, S. N. "Communications Systems and Social Structure: An Exploratory Comparative Study." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1955, 19:152-67.

Ford, Joseph B. "Is There Mass Communication?" Sociology and Social Research, 1953, 37:4.

Freidson, Eliot. "The Relation of the Social Situation of Contact to the Media of Mass Communication." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1953, 17:230-38.

Haugh, Oscar M. "The Relative Effectiveness of Reading and Listening to Radio Drama as Ways of Imparting Information and Shifting Attitudes." Journal of Educational Research, 1952, 15:489-98.

Hovland, Carl I. "Effects of the Mass Media of Communication." Handbook of Social Psychology, 1954, 2:1062-103.

Hovland, Carl I., and W. Weiss. "The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1951, 15:635-50.

Janis, Irving L. "Personality Correlates of Susceptibility to Persuasion." Journal of Personality, 1954, 22:504-18.

Katz, Daniel. "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24:163-205.

Katz, Elihu. "The Two-Step Flow of Communication: An Up-to-Date Report on an Hypothesis." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1957, 21:61-78.

Klapper, Joseph T. "What We Know About the Effects of Mass Communication: The Brink of Hope." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1957, 21:4.

Knower, Franklin R. "Experimental Studies of Changes in Attitudes--I: A Study of the Effect of Oral Argument on Changes of Attitude." Journal of Social Psychology, 1935, 6:315-47.

Knower, Franklin R. "Experimental Studies of Changes in Attitudes--II: A Study of the Effect of Printed Argument on Changes in Attitude." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1936, 30:522-32.

Lang, Gladys Engel and Kurt Lang. "The Influential Structure of Political Communications: A Study in Unwitting Bias." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1955, 19:168-84.

Larson, Otto N. and Richard Hill. "Mass Media and Interpersonal Communication in the Diffusion of a News Event." American Sociological Review, 1954, 19:426-33.

Lundberg, George A. The Newspaper and Public Opinion." Social Forces, 1926, 4:709-15.

Mott, Frank Luther. "Newspapers in Presidential Campaigns." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1944, 8:348-67.

Riley, Mathilda White and John W. Riley, Jr. "A Sociological Approach to Communication Research." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1951, 15:444-60.

Smythe, Dallas W. "Analysis of Television." Scientific American, 1951, 184:15-17.

Smythe, Dallas W. "Some Observations of Communications Theory." Audio-Visual Communications Review, 1954, 2:23-37.

Swanson, Charles E., James Jenkins, and Robert L. Jones. "President Truman Speaks: A Study of Ideas vs. Media." Journalism Quarterly, 1950, 27:251-62.

Thistlewaite, Donald L., Henry deHaan, and Joseph Kamenetzky. "The Effects of 'Directive' and 'Non-Directive' Communication Procedures on Attitudes." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51:107-13.

Wheeler D. and H. Jordan. "Changes of Individual Opinion to Accord with Group Opinion." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1929, 24:203-15.

Wilke, W. H. "An Experimental Comparison of Speech, the Radio, and the Printed Page as Propaganda Devices." Archives of Psychology, 1940, No. 169.

Unpublished Materials

Berelson, Bernard. "Content, Emphasis, Recognition, and Agreement: An Analysis of the Role of Communication in Determining Public Opinion." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1941.

Carrel, Cay. "An Age-Sex Study of Six Sections of Manhattan, Kansas." Paper in the files of Dr. D. E. Dakin, Department of Economics and Sociology, Kansas State University, 1960.

RELATIONSHIPS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES TO POLITICAL - NEWS EXPOSURE THROUGH THE MASS MEDIA

by

JOHN CLAYTON REPPERT

B. A., Kansas State University, 1963

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Journalism

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1964

This study was a personal interview survey of seventy-eight heads of households in Manhattan, Kansas, between March 30 and April 20, 1964, regarding the relationships of the socio-economic variables of property evaluation, income, and education to the sources of influence that reach the general public in the area of political affairs.

Exposure to sources of influence was measured by exposure to news and comment on national, world, and political affairs through the mass media and through interpersonal communications.

The data indicated a positive relationship between exposure to interpersonal communications relating to national, world, and political affairs and all three socio-economic variables.

There seemed to be a positive relationship between all three of the socio-economic variables and the number of media from which news and comment were obtained. However, no relationship appeared between the socio-economic variables and the length of time of exposure to news and comment through the mass media, with the exception of magazines where there was a positive relationship between the variables and exposure time.

Findings indicated that TV and newspapers have relatively universal audiences for their news and comment, while the audience for news and comment through magazines was primarily in the upper socio-economic categories. The radio audience, while not universal, did not appear to be related to the socio-economic variables.

A section of the study designed to discover possible differences in political consistency and in ranking of the media on the basis of their relative trustworthiness produced negative results.