

Schriftenreihe Politische Kommunikation und
demokratische Öffentlichkeit

herausgegeben von
Prof. Dr. Frank Marcinkowski
Prof. Dr. Barbara Pfetsch
Prof. Dr. Gerhard Vowe

Band 1

Daniela Floß

The Impact of Mass Media on Political Support

A Preferences-Perceptions Model of
Media Effects



Nomos
Edition Reinhard Fischer

This thesis was accepted as a doctoral dissertation by the Faculty of Arts of the University of Zurich in the fall semester 2009 on the recommendation of Professor Dr. Frank Marcinkowski and Professor Dr. Werner Wirth.

Foto: Stephan Floß

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Zugl.: Zurich, Univ., Diss., 2009

ISBN 978-3-8329-5387-4

1. Edition 2010

© © Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft/Edition Reinhard Fischer, Baden-Baden 2010.
Printed in Germany.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically those of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, broadcasting, reproduction by photocopying machine or similar means, and storage in data banks. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to »Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort«, Munich.

To my family

Acknowledgments

This thesis is the result of four years of work. Working on a dissertation is an intensive and challenging process. First and foremost, however, these were exciting and stimulating four years. During this time, I have been able to draw on the support and encouragement of my colleagues, friends and family. I am pleased to have the opportunity to express my gratitude to all of them now.

This study was conducted within the framework of the project “The Dynamics of Political Institutions in Mediated Democracies: Political Bargaining and the Transformation of the Public Sphere”, led by Frank Marcinkowski. The project is embedded in the National Centre of Competence in Research: Challenges to Democracy in the 21st century (NCCR Democracy). The work was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

I am indebted to my Ph.D. supervisor Frank Marcinkowski for his encouragement and guidance throughout this project. The invaluable discussions during the work leading to this dissertation have been of great value for me. His sense of logical thinking inspired this work in many ways.

I owe my most sincere gratitude to Werner Wirth for his valuable comments on the empirical parts of this study. The discussions with him on methodological issues towards the end of the project have been inspiring and encouraging.

I benefited a great deal from comments on the research design by Bill Yeaton. Abraham Vinokur provided invaluable help with statistical questions. I thank Jörg Matthes and Christian Schemer; the conversations with them were extremely informative and taught me a lot.

I am very grateful to everyone who has read earlier drafts or parts of the manuscript, especially Jan Kleinnijenhuis, Doreen Spörer, Anne Wetzel, Michel Wenzler, and Annegret Spranger. Their comments were of great value for this work. I also extend my thanks to Hillary Crowe who made the work more fluent to read and corrected mistakes in writing.

I am also very grateful to Jan Fivaz from “Smartvote Barometer” for support with the recruitment of participants for this study. I thank the journalists who edited the news articles which were used as stimulus material in the present work. Thanks also to the four students from the University of Zurich who coded the news coverage of political decision-making procedures. My sincere thanks are due to the Swiss citizens who participated in the surveys and devoted their valuable time to my research interests.

I am grateful to Doreen Spörer who, as coordinator of the doctoral programme, made every effort to make the time spent on this dissertation an efficient and enjoyable period. Thanks to my fellow doctoral students in the programme, the doctoral school of the NCCR Democracy provided a stimulating environment. Additional

impetus for this research was provided by participation in a summer school and conferences, partly funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation. Without the support of my family, I would never have been able to finish this work. I owe warm thanks to my parents for their boundless support. My loving thanks are due to my husband Stephan for his invaluable encouragement and understanding. Although this work has benefited greatly from so many people's support and guidance, any mistakes that remain are my own.

Zürich, February 2010

Daniela Floß

Contents

1.	Political Support and Mass Media: Relevance and Objectives of this Study	17
2.	The Impact of Mass Media on Political Attitudes	23
2.1.	Political Media Information as a Predictor of Political Attitudes	24
2.1.1.	The Impact of Routine Use of Political Media Information	24
2.1.2.	The Impact of Certain Aspects of News Coverage	27
2.1.3.	The Impact of Media Strategy Frames	30
2.1.4.	Summary and Conclusion	32
2.2.	Mechanisms by which Media Information has an Impact on Political Attitudes	34
2.2.1.	Trough Effects on Social Reality Perceptions	35
2.2.2.	Trough Effects on Issue Accessibility or Perceived Issue Importance	36
2.2.3.	Trough Effects on Emotions	37
2.2.4.	Trough Effects on Political Knowledge	37
2.2.5.	Summary and Conclusion	38
2.3.	Conditionality of the Media's Impact on Political Attitudes	39
2.3.1.	The Role of Media Trust and Media Credibility	39
2.3.2.	The Role of Political Sophistication	40
2.3.3.	The Role of Intensity of General Media Use	42
2.3.4.	The Role of Information Processing Strategies	43
2.3.5.	The Role of Individual Predispositions	43
2.3.6.	Summary and Conclusion	45
2.4.	Summary and Suggestions for the Present Study	47
3.	A Preferences-Perceptions Model of Media Effects on Political Support	50
3.1.	The Preferences-Perceptions Relationship as Predictor of Political Support	52
3.2.	The Media's Impact on the Preferences-Perceptions Relationship	56
3.2.1.	The Media's Impact on the Perception of Political Processes	57
3.2.2.	The Media's Impact on Preferences Regarding Political Processes	60
3.2.3.	The Media's Presentations of Political Processes	61
3.3.	Outline of the Preferences-Perceptions Model of Media Effects	63
3.4.	This Study's Empirical Program to Test the Model	71

4.	Media Presentations of Political Decision-Making Processes	74
4.1.	Research Question	74
4.2.	Method	75
4.2.1.	Content Analysis Sample	75
4.2.2.	Codebook and Reliability	77
4.2.3.	Procedure	79
4.3.	Results	80
4.3.1.	Characteristics of the Media's Presentations of Political Processes	80
4.3.2.	Identifying Presentation Patterns	85
4.4.	Summary and Discussion	86
5.	Measuring Citizens' Process Preferences and Perceptions	88
5.1.	Hypotheses	88
5.2.	Method	90
5.2.1.	Variables and Operationalization	91
5.2.2.	Participants and Procedures	93
5.2.3.	Data Analysis	95
5.3.	Results	95
5.3.1.	Process Preferences: Model Development and Validation	96
5.3.2.	Measuring Process Perceptions	101
5.3.3.	Discriminant Validity of Preferences and Perceptions Scales	104
5.3.4.	Test of Cultural Invariance of Process Preferences Scale	105
5.3.5.	Process Preferences: Test of Invariance Regarding Objects of Assessment	107
5.3.6.	Construct Validity of the Scales	112
5.4.	Summary and Discussion	118
6.	Short-Term Effects of Media on Process Perceptions and Political Support	121
6.1.	Research Questions and Hypotheses	121
6.2.	Method	123
6.2.1.	Experimental Design and Participants	123
6.2.2.	Procedures	124
6.2.3.	Stimulus Material	131
6.2.4.	Variables and Operationalization	134
6.2.5.	Data Analysis	136
6.3.	Results	136
6.3.1.	Treatment and Manipulation Checks	136
6.3.2.	Impact of Stimulus Articles on Process Perceptions	138
6.3.3.	Effect of Stimulus Articles on Political Support via Effects on Accessibility	143

6.4. Summary and Discussion	144
7. Long-Term Effects of Media on Process Perceptions and Political Support	148
7.1. Research Questions and Hypotheses	148
7.2. Method	151
7.2.1. Variables and Operationalization	151
7.2.2. Participants and Procedure	154
7.2.3. Data Analysis	156
7.3. Results	159
7.3.1. The Impact of Television Use on Process Perceptions and Political Support	160
7.3.2. The Impact of Television Use on Process Preferences and Political Support	163
7.3.3. The Role of Process Preferences as Moderator of Effects on Political Support	167
7.3.4. Chronical Accessibility as Moderator	171
7.3.5. The Joint Impact of Media Use and Situational Exposure	172
7.4. Summary and Discussion	174
8. Conclusions	178
9. References	187
10. Appendix	203
10.1. Overview of Items Included in the Literature Review	203
10.2. Overview of Items Used in the Study	212
10.3. Measurement Models of Latent Factors Used in the Analyses	216

Figures

3.1.	Flow Diagram of the Preferences-Perceptions Model of Media Effects	69
3.2.	Empirical Parts of the Study	73
5.1.	Modified Measurement Model of Process	98
5.2.	Correlated Uniqueness Model of Preferences Regarding Different Objects	109
6.1.	The Impact of Stimulus Articles on Process Perceptions	142
7.1.	Process Preferences as Moderator of Television Use-Support Relationship	150
7.2.	The Impact of Media Use on Process Perceptions and Political Support	161
7.3.	The Impact of Media Use on Process Preferences and Political Support	164
7.4.	The Impact of Media Use on Discrepancies and Support	166
7.5.	Differential Effects on Political Support Depending on Process Preferences	170
7.6.	The Joint Impact of Media Use and Stimulus Articles on Support	173

Tables

4.1. Content Analysis Sample	77
4.2. Intercoder Reliability	79
4.3. Presentation of Political Processes in Articles about Government and Parliament	81
4.4. Presentation of Political Processes in Different Newspaper Types	82
4.5. Presentation of Political Processes at Different Points in Time	83
4.6. Presentation of Political Processes in Television and Press	84
4.7. Correlation between Variables Measuring the Media's Presentation of Processes	85
5.1. Comparison of Alternative Measurement Models of Process Preferences	99
5.2. Items, Factor Loadings, and Indicator Reliabilities of Process Preferences Scale	101
5.3. Items, Factor Loadings, and Indicator Reliabilities of Process Perceptions Scale	103
5.4. Process Preferences and Process Perceptions as Distinct Concepts	105
5.5. Cultural Invariance of Process Preferences	107
5.6. Results for the Correlated Uniqueness Model	110
5.7. Comparison between Preferences Regarding Parliament and Government	112
5.8. Mean Process Preferences – Perceptions Differentials	113
5.9. Relationship between Process Preferences and Perceptions	114
5.10. Respondents' Level of Political Support	116
5.11. Factor Analysis of Perceptions, Preferences, and Discrepancies Items	117
6.1. Results of Randomization Check	128
6.2. Adjusted Means for Process Perceptions in Experimental Groups	139
7.1. Intercorrelations between Manifest and Latent Variables Included in the Study	152
7.2. Predicting Support for Different Objects of Evaluation	163
7.3. Perception-Support Relation Moderated by Preferences	169
7.4. Television-Support Relation Moderated by Preferences	171

