USE OF THE BROADCAST MEDIA BY CANDIDATES FOR THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE IN THE ELECTION OF 1970

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Robert H. Prisuta

1971

ABSTRACT

USE OF THE BROADCAST MEDIA BY CANDIDATES FOR
THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE IN THE
ELECTION OF 1970

By

Robert H. Prisuta

This thesis examined the relationship between candidates for the Michigan Legislature in 1970 and the broadcast media.

The survey covered three general areas: 1) the extent of broadcast advertising use among candidates for the legislature, and some of its basic economic, political, and demographic dimensions, 2) the attitudes of the candidates concerning the effectiveness of radio and television advertising, their motivations for using radio-tv, broadcasting's relationship with other advertising media in terms of effectiveness and frequency of use, the candidates' guidelines for determining media effectiveness, and the candidates hypothetical use of radio and television, should certain factors, such as excessive cost, be eliminated, and 3) the relationship of broadcast advertising use to performance of the candidate in the election.

Methodology for the research utilized two approaches: 1) a questionnaire distributed to the candidates, and 2) examination of the statements of expenditures of the

candidates, on file as public record with the Michigan Secretary of State. Cross-indexing of variables was then accomplished through the use of the Michigan State 3600 Computer system.

The findings revealed that use of broadcast media for advertising is somewhat limited at this level. Less than half the candidates used either medium, and less than a third used both. The majority of candidates used broadcasting as a minor media outlet. Also, the majority of candidates utilized only a small number of broadcast outlets within their district.

Use of broadcasting was concentrated in the rural districts of the state, and was used to a greater extent by Republicans than Democrats. There was a strong relationship between candidate wealth and broadcast use, both within districts and among all candidates as a group.

Most candidates reacted favorably to their experiences with broadcasting. Many were relatively disappointed, however, with television use, as they apparently had very high expectations of what it could do for them. Broadcasting ranked behind both newspapers and personal appearances in media effectiveness, although the candidates' guidelines of effectiveness were varied.

The candidates stressed practical considerations, such as geographic coverage or cost efficiency, over more traditional communications variables, such as attitude change or

persuasion, when considering media effectiveness. There was some use of the re-enforcement and mobilization function of broadcasting, however, with some candidates using broadcasting for "get out the vote" campaigns.

Media use considerations were primarily image-oriented, as opposed to issue-oriented. Candidates were primarily interacted in exposure, name identification, and creating a good image, rather than conveying information, discussing issues, or attempting attitude change. Although candidates with more sophisticated and complex campaigns tended to use broadcasting to a greater extent than did others, its users seemed to lack a clear understanding of the characteristics of positive broadcast use.

The candidates did feel, however, that they would like to use broadcasting a great deal more were cost not such a barrier.

While broadcast use per se made little difference in election outcome, a strong relationship existed between a heavily broadcast-oriented campaign and success at the polls.

Expressed in a measure of "cents per vote" spent on broadcasting, it seemed that an expenditure of at least two cents per vote is necessary if a broadcast effort is to have positive results.

USE OF THE BROADCAST MEDIA BY CANDIDATES FOR THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE IN THE ELECTION OF 1970

By

Robert H. Prisuta

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Television and Radio

1971

Accepted by the faculty of the Department of Television and Radio, College of Communication Arts, Michigan State University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree.

Thomas F. Baldwin
Director of Thesis

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank several people for their assistance, without which this project would not have been possible:

Thomas F. Baldwin, my thesis adviser, whose suggestions and comments contributed to improvements in research design and presentation.

My wife Barbara, whose aid with mailing and data processing was invaluable.

The candidates of the 1970 Michigan legislative elections, whose generous cooperation and contributions of information made the study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION.	1
	Statement of Problem and Rationale for Examination	1
	Methodology.	4
II.	FINDINGS.	9
	Characteristics and Dimensions of Broadcast Media Use.	9
	Financial Dimensions.	9
	Use Dimensions.	12
	Users and Non-Users.	16
	Candidate Attitudes Toward Broadcast Media Political Advertising	36
	Broadcast Media Use and Voting Behavior. .	52
III.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY		91
APPENDIX		94

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	Candidate expenditure on broadcasting expressed as a per cent of total budget, distributed by number and percentages.	12
2.	Candidate usage of the broadcasting media as expressed in numbers and percentages according to frequency of use in comparison with other media.	13
3.	Degree of broadcast advertising saturation as expressed in the number of stations utilized by the candidate in his advertising.	14
4.	Candidates financial commitment to broadcast advertising as expressed in terms of amount spent on broadcast advertising per district vote for the legislative office in the last election	17
5.	Party affiliation distribution of candidates using broadcast media in various ways as compared to those not utilizing these media . . .	19
6.	Broadcast use distribution among candidates according to party office.	21
7.	Distribution of candidate broadcasting media use according to candidate's perceived ideology of district.	22
8.	Distribution of candidate's perceived ideology of district according to candidates broadcasting use.	22
9.	Candidate's use or non-use of campaign managers, campaign staffs, professional public relations, and/or professional advertising . .	27
10.	Candidate expenditures on campaign as distributed according to broadcast use.	31

LIST OF TABLES--continued

TABLE		Page
11.	Candidates relative expenses as compared to opponents, distributed according to broadcast media use.	31
12.	District urbanization distributed according to candidate broadcast use within those districts	34
13.	Regional locations of districts, distributed according to candidate media use within those districts.	35
14.	Number of candidates rating a particular medium as their most effective advertising tool	37
15.	Candidate's choice of most effective medium distributed according to broadcast media utilization.	39
16.	Candidate use of broadcast media distributed according to candidate's perception of voter turnout in his district as compared to the national norm.	54
17.	Candidate use of broadcast media distributed according to candidate's perception of his district's voting behavior	56
18.	Candidate's perception of his district's voting behavior, distributed according to candidate broadcast use	56
19.	Candidate use of broadcast media, distributed according to candidate's election outcome. . .	59
20.	Candidate use of broadcast media distributed according to election performance (relative to the average vote total of his party's candidate for that office).	63
21.	Candidate election outcome distributed according to the degree of broadcast media orientation in his campaign (expressed as a percentage of the total budget spent on broadcasting)	63

LIST OF TABLES--continued

TABLE		Page
22.	Broadcast media orientation of candidate (expressed as a percentage of the total budget spent on broadcasting), distributed according to the election outcome.	64
23.	Election outcome for the candidate distributed according to his relative broadcast spending in comparison with his opponent.	66
24.	Candidate's relative broadcast spending (in comparison with his opponent), distributed according to election outcome.	67
25.	Election outcome distributed according to the candidate's relative use of broadcasting in comparison with his opponent	68
26.	Candidate's relative use of broadcasting (in comparison with his opponent), distributed according to election outcome.	68
27.	Candidate broadcast media orientation, distributed according to candidate's election performance (in comparison to the average vote total of his party's candidate for that office).	70
28.	Candidate's relative use of broadcasting (in comparison with his opponent), distributed according to election performance (in comparison to the average vote total of his party's candidate for that office)	71
29.	Candidate broadcast spending (compared with opponent), distributed according to election performance (in comparison to the average vote total of his party's candidate for that office).	72
30.	Amount spent on broadcasting (in terms of suggested federal quidelines), distributed according to election outcome.	74
31.	Election outcome distributed according to amount spent on broadcasting	75

LIST OF TABLES--continued

TABLE Page

32. Amount spent on broadcasting distributed according to candidate election performance (compared to the average vote of his party's candidate for that office). 76

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem and Rationale for Examination

It is the purpose of this research to examine the use of the broadcast media by legislative candidates. The political use of these media has been the subject of increasing concern on various levels.

The rise of radio-tv utilization in election campaigns on the national level has been well documented. Newsweek, for instance, points out that, according to figures published by the Federal Communications Commission, over $58.9 million was spend on broadcast advertising for federal offices in 1968, a 70 per cent increase over the amount spent in 1964. This was the cost of the air time only, with production costs raising the total to the $90 million mark. For 1970, a non-presidential year, costs for House and Senate races alone were estimated to be in the neighborhood of $50 million, with other related costs raising the total to $75 million.[1]

---

[1] "The Selling of the Candidates, 1970," Newsweek, October 18, 1970, pp. 34-35.

Many evaluations have been and are being made regarding the ethical characteristics of such use. Such popular best-sellers as The Selling of the President indicate a national interest and concern over the issue. In addition, the government has shown increasing concern, with various methods of control, and regulation of use of these media for advertising purposes being proposed.[2]

Most examinations of the issue, however, have dealt with it on a national level. Study of the interaction of broadcast media and politics at a state and local level is extremely limited, as was pointed out by Chester in his exhaustive study of the history of this interaction.[3]

This dearth of information comes at a time when an increasing amount of attention is being given to state government and local broadcasting.

On the governmental level, the probability of such new programs as "revenue-sharing" has given rise to an increased focus on the state legislatures. Groups like the newly-formed Center for the Study of State Legislatures have examined the relative efficiency of these bodies, and will attempt to study them further in the future. The rise of the activist/populist "new politics" of the 1960's is centering

---

[2] Ibid., p. 35.

[3] Edward W. Chester, Radio, Television, and American Politics (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969), p. 300.

much of its activity at the "grass-roots" level, with state representative government being very localized in this respect.

From a broadcasting standpoint, both technological and policy changes seem to indicate a more localized broadcast system. The Federal Communications Commission has reduced the number of hours networks may program to their affiliates in prime time. This, coupled with the financial problems of national networks, may lead to an increase in local program emphasis.[4] New directives requiring local Cable TV operations to produce their own programming, plus technical advancements making cablecasting more flexible, also seem to indicate the probability of extremely localized and specialized program forms. The rise of UHF broadcasting, with its non-network affiliated, independent stations, will also probably add to localized emphasis related to state and local politics.

The focus of this study is the interaction between broadcasters and legislative candidates, especially in terms of campaign advertising. It is not meant to be a total representation of the national situation. It is limited, examining some aspects of the situation at this point in time in the state of Michigan. It is hoped that it can serve as a beginning of meaningful national research designed to assess

---

[4] "Network Time," Broadcasting, November 23, 1970, p. 52.

the national status of the interaction between broadcasters and candidates and the directions in which this interaction is moving, so as to be of some positive value to it.

Methodology

Both factual and subjective information was sought in the research. One of the most basic questions was whether or not the candidate used the broadcast media. Also, research centered on the orientation of his campaign to the broadcast media.

For cross-indexing purposes, several socio-political variables were also utilized.

Several questions dealing with value judgments made by the candidate in relation to broadcasting in particular and advertising media in general, and also hypothetical questions dealing with possible broadcast use under certain future conditions were included.

Relative measures were also utilized in an attempt to compare the candidate's political performance, financial status, and broadcast use to his opponent.

The purpose in choosing these variables was to determine if any correlation, tendency, relationship, etc., existed between use of the broadcast media and financial and political campaigning. Thus, it was hoped that some answers could emerge to the questions of who uses these media in their

campaigns, to what extent do they use them, what are their reactions to and judgments of them, and does this use have any effect on the electoral process?

Most of the information was gathered through the use of written questionnaires, computer analysis, and archival research. This was augmented by examination of previously published information, consisting mostly of previous studies, theory, and news accounts dealing with the issue of political and broadcasting interaction.

The most readily available information was that obtained from the office of Secretary of State, Elections Division. State law requires that each candidate for office must file a statement of expenditures. Thus, from these it could be determined how the candidates appropriated various funds to various media in their electoral effort. The voting records of the various legislative districts were obtainable here. In addition to the 1970 records, those of the elections as far back as 1964, when the present districts were created through reapportionment, were utilized in order to provide additional perspective.

The written questionnaire dealt with more subjective and complex elements of media use, which were unobtainable through state records. It questioned the candidate on various political and media use variables, and was helpful in further defining the media's role in these elections.

The questionnaire was sent to all candidates for the legislature in two mailings. The first, in early January,

and the second, to those who had not responded to the first, in mid-February. The questionnaire may be found in the Appendix.

It was felt that, because the questionnaire would be an augmentation to basic archival data, a representative return of at least fifty per cent would be adequate for these purposes. The total was close to what was predicted, as 158 of the 306 candidates, or 51.6% returned completed questionnaires.

The rate of return was fairly consistent over such traditional variables as election outcome and political party. There was slight deviation within the variable of urbanization, geographic location, and media use. Those candidates living in highly urbanized areas, particularly the Detroit metropolitan area, and those who did not utilize the broadcast media, responded to a lesser extent than average, with their opposites within each of the above variables thus tending to respond at a rate higher than average. It should be noted, however, that these variables are consistent. As will be shown in greater detail later, non-use and degree of urbanization are somewhat related. Also, the Detroit metropolitan area is the only major urban area in the state. The overlapping of these variables thus limits somewhat the frequency of response variation.

Computer analysis was used to cross-index various broadcast and political variables to determine the extent of broadcast and political interaction. The Michigan State

3600 computer system was utilized for this research. A pre-established program designed to set up routine crossbreaks on a two-dimensional level was utilized. This program was compiled by the Computer Institute of Social Science Research, and is referred to as a NUCROS program.

This paper will concern itself more with the extent and direction of broadcast use rather than the effectiveness of that use in influencing voter behavior. The latter analysis demands greater resources and complexity than were available if it is to be fully significant and informative.

Fuchs, in his analysis of voter behavior and the broadcasting of election returns, points out that statistical significance, in the traditional research sense, and electoral significance, are not always the same thing. Especially in a close election, the outcome may be shifted by elements making up such a small part of the overall universe that they may not even show up in a statistical analysis.[5]

Also, as Klapper has pointed out, the large number of variables in complex areas such as these make it extremely difficult to isolate variables and develop controls to the extent that it can be determined when, where, how, and to what extent a certain action can produce a certain effect.[6]

---

[5]Douglas A. Fuchs, "Does TV Election News Affect Voters?" Columbia Journalism Review, Fall, 1965, p. 39.

[6]Joseph T. Klapper, "What We Know About the Effects of Mass Communication." Bobbs-Merril Reprint No. s-145, Bobbs-Merril, Inc., Indianapolis, 1959, pp. 453-454.

Some attempt, however, was made to comment on broadcasting's relationship with voting behavior by analyzing the vote in this election in relation to the political make-up of the district, and the voting patterns of previous elections. These factors were compared to various broadcast use variables.

Further analysis should be possible in the future, however, Upon completion of a computerized canvass of votes by the Michigan Department of State, it will be possible to examine the candidates performance within his district in relation to other candidates of his party for other positions and their performance within that district.[7] Thus, a more penetrating analysis will be possible.

---

[7]Interview with Richard K. Horan, Elections Division, Michigan Department of State, March 21, 1971.

CHAPTER II

FINDINGS

Characteristics and Dimensions of Broadcast Media Use

The initial examinations of the study centered on a basic analysis of the role the broadcast media played in the campaign. This analysis focused on such factors as the frequency of radio and television use, the financial commitment made by the candidates in its use, etc.

Financial Dimensions

Overall, rounded off to the nearest dollar, $442,026 was spent on the legislative campaigns of 1970. Of this nearly half a million dollars, $72,730, or approximately 17%, was spend on the broadcast media. This percentage does not seem exceptionally high, especially when one considers the high relative cost of using these media, as compared to some others.

Among individual districts, however, the range of both general expenditures and use and expenditures on broadcasting was extreme. Several candidates spent nothing whatsoever on their campaigns. However, the highest recorded amount was $18,724, thus displaying a huge difference in

financial commitment. Within the district races as a whole the same situation was evident. In many cases, no money was spent by either candidate, while in one district expenses hit $33,263.

The same situation was true in consideration of broadcast media use. Several candidates did not use these media, and a few were able to use them without expense, through time donated by a station, utilization of Federal Communications Commission equal time provisions, etc. However, candidates did spend up to $5,574 on broadcast media advertising alone in their campaigns, with $8,403 being the highest total spent by all candidates within a single district.

Among the two major political parties, Republicans outspent Democrats, $238,119 to $202,244. They also spent more money in broadcast utilization, $37,136 to $34,434. Their concentrations and emphasis on these media was similar. In fact, the Democrats utilized them slightly more, devoting approximately 17% of their funds to them, as opposed to the Republicans 16%. However, as can be seen by the previous figures, the greater expenditures by Republicans enabled them to utilize these media to a greater extent than the Democrats.

On an average basis, the typical legislative candidate spent $1,444 dollars on his legislative campaign. Of this total, an average of $238 was spent on broadcast advertising. The average of the amount spent on broadcasting by

those using it, however, is considerably higher. This group spent an average of $622 on radio-tv advertising, or almost half of the average candidate's expenditure.

The average Republican spent $1,824 on his campaign, as compared to the average Democrats' $I,596, or roughly one-sixth less than the Republican candidate. The average Republican spent $264 on broadcast advertising, as compared to the average Democrats' $233. While the difference in absolute dollars is not that great, the difference as expressed in relative percentages does seem more substantial. Among the candidates in both parties utilizing the broadcast media, the average Republican user spent $619 on radio/tv advertising, while the average Democratic user spent an average of $637 on this type of message. This figure is somewhat misleading, as it seems to indicate that the Democrats utilized broadcasting more than did the Republicans. However, as will be pointed out later, the Republicans had more candidates in more districts utilizing these media. Thus, while the Democrats' use of the broadcast media was more concentrated within certain districts, overall use was more prevalent among Republicans, as the other figures show.

The American Independent Party was not a major factor in the breakdown of broadcast media use. The party fielded only thirteen candidates in the 148 legislative districts, who spent a combined total of $I,763, or $136 per candidate. They spent only $160 on the broadcast media, which averaged

out to $12 per candidate and $53 per broadcast-using candidate, certainly not a major factor in light of the relatively far heavier use among the two major parties.

Use Dimensions

Of the 306 candidates for the 148 state legislative offices in Michigan in 1970, 126, or approximately 41%, utilized either radio and/or television in their campaign efforts. Further analysis of this media use reveals that, of these 126, 67 utilized radio only, 14 utilized tv only, and 45 utilized a mixed campaign of both radio and television. In percentage terms, 22% used radio only, 4.6% used television only, and 14.8% utilized both radio and television.

It was also attempted to determine the extent to which candidates who utilized these media oriented their campaigns to them. One of the variables here was the percentage of the campaign budget put into the broadcast media. Of those responding, the results were as follows.

Table 1. Candidate expenditure on broadcasting expressed as a per cent of total budget, distributed by number and percentages.

Per cent of budget into broadcast advertising	Degree of financial broadcast orientation
Low (Under 25%)	41 (33.1%)
Medium (25%-50%)	48 (38.7%)
High (Over 50%)	35 (28.2%)
Total	124 (100.0%)

The spread of degree of emphasis was fairly diverse. However, it does seem that, in most cases, once a decision to utilize these media has been made, that use goes beyond a mere token effort, and a major commitment is made. It must be remembered, however, that this table represents financial aspects, and thus the expense of broadcasting may distort the level of commitment as one greater than it actually is.

Thus, an additional variable was introduced, questioning the legislators on the emphasis various media were given.

In this instance, the broadcast media were ranked with others in order of frequency of use. Thus, it could be determined how broadcasting compared with other media in the rate they were utilized by the candidate. In calculating this figure, the candidate was asked to consider time, work, effort, and other non-economic variables. Thus, how widely used was broadcasting in comparison to other media could be considered.

Table 2. Candidate usage of the broadcasting media as expressed in numbers and percentages according to frequency of use in comparison with other media.

Degree of broadcast utilization	Number of candidates	Per cent of candidates
High usage (1-2 most frequently used medium)	37	30.1
Moderate usage (3-4 most frequently used medium)	33	26.8
Low usage (sporadically used)	53	43.1
Total	123	100.0

The relative expense of broadcasting is indicated here, as the frequency of broadcast use is somewhat lower than is the percentage of expenditure devoted to it. Thus, while the financial commitment may of necessity be high, the limited financial resources of the candidate often preclude any high degree of saturation in many cases.

This is also indicated to some extent in the next table, which states the number of radio/tv outlets over which the candidates advertising message was heard and/or seen.

Table 3. Degree of broadcast advertising saturation as expressed in the number of stations utilized by the candidate in his advertising.

Number of stations used	Number of candidates utilizing a particular number of stations	
One station	42	(35.0%)
Two stations	26	(21.7%)
Three stations	15	(12.5%)
Four stations	13	(10.8%)
Five stations	6	(5.0%)
Six stations	4	(3.3%)
Seven stations	9	(7.5%)
Eight stations	2	(1.7%)
More than eight stations	3	(2.5%)
Total	120	(100.0%)

It does not appear that the broadcast effort of most candidates is exceptionally complex, as most candidates use

one or a few outlets, while very few utilize diversity or saturation as far as their station utilization is concerned. It cannot be determined directly from these data if this limitation is self imposed, due to a lack of knowledge of the effectiveness of a saturation endeavor, or if financial limitations preclude such an effort. It could not seem that distribution of broadcast outlets is a problem here. In urban areas, many stations, necessary to serve larger audiences, penetrate the small coverage area of the densely populated district. Conversely, while there may be only one station per county or town in rural, sparsely populated areas, apportionment procedure necessitates districts large enough to overlap many such areas, thus providing many broadcast sources within the district. It seems, however, from previous data, that finances rather than strategy exerts the major influence in the decisions.

Because of its present controversial use as a variable for political broadcast advertising regulation, broadcast expenditure in terms of "cents per vote" was also considered. In this case, an analysis of both the overall cents per vote spent on broadcasting, and that of the proposed seven cents per vote limit was instituted. The term "cents per vote" can also be further defined as a measure indicating the amount of money spent on broadcast advertising per each recorded vote within the district in the last election. It is felt by those proposing a limitation on spending in this manner that

it would limit the ability of wealthy candidates to inequitably dominate and saturate the broadcast media. This controversey has centered on federal elective offices.[1] It was felt, however, that an examination of the issue on a state and local level might provide insight into how deep and complex the issue may or may not be.

From the data, it seems that such a limitation instituted on a legislative level would not have a great deal of impact. Of those utilizing the broadcast media, only 8.1% of the candidates spent over seven cents per vote in ratio/tv advertising. This represented 10 candidates out of 306.

Further definition of this variable reveals that the financial commitment of the candidates to broadcast advertising is not exceptionally large. As can be seen in Table 4 (on the following page) almost half the candidates spent less than one cent per vote on broadcast advertising, with the number spending larger amounts (i.e., over two cents per vote) rather limited.

Users and Non-Users

One of the objectives of the survey was to determine the difference, if any, which existed among certain candidate characteristics and broadcast media use. Several of the variables surveyed on the questionnaire were compared

---

[1] "Selling of the Candidates, 1970," Newsweek, October 19, 1970, p. 35.

Table 4. Candidates financial commitment to broadcast advertising as expressed in terms of amount spent on broadcast advertising per district vote for the legislative office in the last election.

Amount spent on broadcast media expressed in "cents per vote"	Number of Candidates
Less than one cent per vote	57 (47.9%)
One cent per vote	16 (13.4%)
Two cents per vote	19 (16.0%)
Three cents per vote	8 (6.7%)
Four cents per vote	6 (5.0%)
Five cents per vote	2 (1.7%)
Six cents per vote	3 (2.5%)
Seven cents per vote	1 (0.8%)
Over seven cents per vote	7 (5.9%)
Total	119 (99.9%)

with the use or non-use of either or both of the broadcast media, in order to determine the directions which this use took.

These variables could basically be broken down into three categories; political, geographic, and economic. These areas were selected because they are, at this time, among the most controversial. It has been suggested, for instance, that broadcast media advertising favors the candidate who can afford to invest the greatest sum of revenue into it.[2] Thus, it was felt that an analysis of media use

[2] Edward W. Chester, Radio, Television, and American Politics (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969), p. 155.

according to expenditures would be appropriate here. It has also been suggested that national politics has a great effect locally, in that it is the party with the most funds available which will enable it to utilize the broadcast media to a greater extent.[3] These funds usually filter down to lower levels from the national party organization, as it has the greatest capacity for fund raising. It is felt that possession of such offices as the Presidency contribute tremendously to the fund-raising ability of the party in power. Thirdly, geographical variables were utilized because it is the opinion of many political theorists that the efficiency of broadcast media use increases as population density declines, and the inefficiency of coverage area overspread is replaced by the efficiency of an interpersonal communication substitute, as personal contact over wide areas is impractical, especially with limited resources.[4]

In considering the political aspects of media use, one of the most basic areas to begin with is that of party affiliation. The table on the following page reveals the relationship between party affiliation and broadcast media use. This table reveals that the tendency to use broadcast media for election advertising was skewed somewhat in the direction of

---

[3] "TV Ads and Elections," Detroit Free Press, June 28, 1970, p. 18-a.

[4] Democratic National Committee, Political Publicity, Washington, p. 7.

Table 5. Party affiliation distribution of candidates using broadcast media in various ways as compared to those not utilizing these media.

Party Affiliation		Media Used by Candidates			
		Radio Only	TV Only	Both	No Radio/TV
Democratic	(147) 48.4%	41.8% (28)	42.9% (6)	46.7% (21)	51.7% (92)
Republican	(143) 47.0%	53.7% (36)	42.9% (6)	53.3% (24)	43.3% (77)
American Independent	(14) 4.6%	4.5% (3)	14.3% (2)	0.0%	5.1% (9)
Total	(304) 100.0%	100.0% (67)	100.1% (14)	100.0% (45)	100.1% (178)

the Republican party, because of its national wealth and Presidential incumbency, tended to use the broadcast media more than did the Democrats.[5]

This tendency is further revealed by a look at the breakdown by party composition (see Table 6, on the following page). Table 6 further supports the finding that a typical candidate who ran for the Michigan legislature in 1970 was more likely to use the broadcast media in his advertising if he was a Republican rather than a Democrat.

Another political aspect considered was the candidates perceived ideology of his district and his media use. This was thought to be of interest to determine if the candidates attached any significance, either directly or indirectly, to the ideological characteristics of messages in certain media. Tables 7 and 8, on page 22, indicate the results of this analysis.

Thus, one finds the use of broadcast media skewed somewhat towards candidates running in conservative, or what they perceive to be conservative, districts. This is further clarified by viewing the breakdown within particular district types, as a very definite relationship is established.

With a few exceptions, an overall relationship between broadcast use and perceived conservative ideology can be

---

[5]"Selling of the Candidates, 1970," Newsweek, October 19, 1970, p. 34.

Table 6. Broadcast use distribution among candidates according to party office.

Party of Candidates	Media Used by Party Candidates			
	Radio Only	TV Only	Both	No Radio/TV
Democratic (147) 100.0%	19.0% (28)	4.1% (6)	14.3% (21)	62.6% (92)
Republican (143) 100.0%	25.2% (36)	4.2% (6)	16.8% (24)	53.8% (77)
American Independent (14) 100.0%	21.4% (3)	14.3% (2)	0.0%	64.3% (77)
Total	22.0% (67)	4.6% (14)	14.8% (45)	58.6% (178)

Table 3. Distribution of candidate broadcasting media use according to candidate's

Table 7. Distribution of candidate broadcasting media use according to candidate's perceived ideology of district.

	Media			
	Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Very Conservative (6) 3.8%	6.0% (3)	8.3% (1)	3.0% (1)	1.6% (1)
Conservative (60) 38.0%	40.0% (20)	8.3% (1)	51.5% (17)	34.9% (22)
Middle of the Road (69) 43.7%	46.0% (23)	58.3% (7)	36.4% (12)	42.9% (27)
Liberal (21) 13.3%	8.0% (4)	8.3% (1)	9.1% (3)	20.6% (13)
Very Liberal (2) 1.3%	0.0%	16.7% (2)	0.0%	0.0%
Total (218) 100.1%	100.0% (50)	99.9% (12)	100.0% (33)	100.0% (63)

Table 8. Distribution of candidate's perceived ideology of district according to candidates broadcasting use.

		Media			
		Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Very Conservative	(100.1%)	50.0% (3)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)
Conservative	(100.0%)	33.3% (20)	1.7% (1)	28.3% (17)	36.7% (22)
Middle of the Road	(99.9%)	33.3% (23)	10.1% (7)	17.4% (12)	39.1% (27)
Liberal	(100.0%)	19.0% (4)	4.8% (1)	14.3% (3)	61.9% (13)
Very Liberal	(100.0%)	0.0%	100.0% (2)	0.0%	0.0%
Total (218) 100.0%)		31.6% (50)	7.6% (12)	20.9% (33)	39.9% (63)

discerned. This is interesting in relation to other findings. Perhaps there is an interaction with party affiliation and degree of urbanization as well, as Conservatives tend to be both Republican and rural.[6]

Another interesting aspect is the indicated lack of familiarity among candidates with modern political and media research findings. This is shown by the lack of attention paid to media use in the middle of the road districts. It could be theorized that these districts would have received the most broadcast media attention. The findings of Campell,[7] in the area of voter behavior, and Klapper[8] and McNeil,[9] in communications, reveal that these areas would be the most effective for broadcast use.

The "swing" voter is usually of the middle-of-the-road ideological position. He is not very committed to his stance, and changes his vote more readily than does the more informed, interested, voter, usually found at one end of the

---

[6]Warren Miller, "The Political Behavior of the Electorate," in E. Dreyer and W. Rosenbaum, eds., Political Opinion and Electoral Behavior (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 85-102.

[7]Angus Campell et al., The American Voter (New York: Wiley, 1960).

[8]Joseph T. Klapper, "What We Know About the Effects of Mass Communication," Bobbs-Merril Reprint no. s-145, Bobbs-Merril, Inc., Indianapolis, 1959.

[9]Robert McNeil, The People Machine (New York: Harper and Row, 1968).

ideological scale or the other.[10]

Broadcasting is not extremely effective in changing basic attitudes over the short run, However, it has been shown and found that it can be effective in producing change where there is a low information level, a low level of commitment, or the issue is a new or non-salient one.[11] Thus, use of the broadcast media among the candidates was somewhat misdirected in light of previous findings, which presents the possibility that those involved in the election were not as familiar with the characteristics of broadcast messages as they should have been for most efficient use of them.

The possibility of social interaction as an important consideration may also be a factor here. In many communities, both media managers and politicians may be considered in the same social circles.[12] Since much of broadcast management and ownership, especially in smaller areas, tend to be Republican and conservative, there may be an initial commonality of interest which facilitates interaction with politicians of similar views and affiliations.[13]

---

[10]E. Burdick and A. J. Brodbeck, American Voting Behavior (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1959), pp. 4-17.

[11]Klapper, op. cit., pp. 457-460.

[12]Elihu Katz, "The Two-Step Flow of Communication" (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, Inc., 1957), pp. 64-68.

[13]Ibid., p. 72.

The use of the media according to the candidate's political affiliation is also interesting in light of previous research. Campell's and the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center data reveal a relationship between the medium used for political information input to the voter and the voter's traditional voting pattern. It was found that those relying on print media tend to be Republicans, while those relying on broadcast media tend to be Democrats,[14] a tendency which runs counter to that revealed here among the candidates themselves in their media choice. The argument that such use was an attempt at attitude change may be a valid one. It remains, however, an indication that those utilizing the broadcast media are not as familiar with them as they should be. Klapper, for instance, indicated that consensus survey findings indicate the effectiveness of mass communication as a re-enforcing and mobilizing agent rather than as an agent for change.[15] Thus, candidate use of broadcast media is somewhat inconsistent with the characteristics of broadcast effectiveness and the characteristics of broadcast audiences.

The use of the broadcast media in Republican, more rural districts by Republicans would seem to fit Klapper's concept. Here, these media could be used to get out the

---

[14]Unpublished data, Compilation of Survey Research Center Data, Ann Arbor, at East Lansing, 1970.

[15]Klapper, op. cit., p. 463.

vote for these Republican candidates. This would preclude voter apathy, preventing a candidate with minority support, but a highly mobilized following from winning.

However, this effect of increased voter turnout would seem to be somewhat blunted by the fact that the audience would tend to be Democratic to a greater extent than the electorate as a whole. To this group the messages may attempt an attitude change, but broadcasting's ability to do this is limited.

One final political comparison is made in relation to the level of sophistication of a campaign and the use of the broadcast media. The popular conception of the slick, sophisticated political machine is one which includes heavy use of the broadcast media for advertising purposes, as was indicated in such popular works as McGinniss' Selling of the President, 1968.[16] Thus, it was attempted to discover whether a correlation existed between the use of broadcast media and the amount of campaign effort, as revealed by candidate's use of campaign managers, campaign staffs, professional public relations, and/or professional advertising (see Table 9, on the following page).

This table, with few exceptions, reveals a general tendency of association between a relatively high level of campaign sophistication and use of broadcast media, and

---

[16]Joe McGinniss, The Selling of the President, 1968 (New York, Trident Press, 1969).

Table 9. Candidate's use or non-use of campaign managers, campaign staffs, professional public relations, and/or professional advertising.

	Media			
	Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Candidates use or non-use of a campaign manager distributed according to broadcast use.				
Used campaign manager (101) 100%	30.6% (32)	5.1% (6)	27.6% (27)	36.7% (36)
No campaign manager (203) 99.9%	17.0% (35)	3.9% (8)	9.1% (18)	69.9% (142)
Total (304) 100.0%	22.0% (67)	4.6% (14)	14.8% (45)	58.6% (178)
Candidates use or non-use of full-time paid campaign staff as distributed according to broadcast use.				
Staff (6) 100.0%	50.0% (3)	33.3% (2)	0.0%	16.7% (1)
No staff (298) 100.0%	21.6% (64)	4.0% (12)	15.1% (45)	59.4% (177)
Total (304) 100.0%	22.0% (67)	4.0% (14)	14.8% (45)	58.6% (177)
Candidates use or non-use of professional public relations services as distributed according to broadcast use.				
Used public relations (17) 100.1%	47.1% (8)	11.8% (2)	5.9% (1)	35.3% (6)
Did not use public relations (281) 100.0%	19.8% (59)	4.1% (12)	16.1% (33)	60.0% (172)
Total (304) 100.0%	22.0% (67)	4.6% (14)	14.8% (45)	58.6% (178)

Candidates use or non-use of professional advertising services as distributed according to broadcast use.

Used advertising (29)	99.9%	37.9% (11)	10.3% (3)	10.3% (3)	41.4% (12)
No advertising (275)	100.0%	20.2% (56)	4.0% (11)	15.3% (42)	60.5% (166)
Total (304)	100.0%	22.0% (67)	4.6% (14)	14.8% (45)	38.6% (178)

vice-versa. While extensive campaigning is limited, as can be seen by the relatively low number of candidates utilizing the aforementioned personnel, the use of the broadcast media is very much associated with this utilization. Thus, the public image of broadcast political advertising as part of a highly sophisticated campaign is to some extent reinforced here. Also, this attitude must be shared, to some extent, by the candidates themselves. Those candidates who used the broadcast media tended to use additional elements of campaign effort. Also, those who ran more complex campaigns tended to make greater use of the broadcast media. Whether broadcasting is felt to be effective only in complex, intensive efforts, or the same motivations and resources which lead candidates to intensive campaigns lead them also to broadcasting is an interesting question which cannot be answered here because of the limited scope of the study.

The second area considered was that of the relation of broadcast media use to campaign economics. It has been the theory of both media critics and researchers that one of the major inequities of broadcast advertising is that it is available in direct proportion to the money invested, with a very large amount necessary for even minor use of radio and television. Thus, it is felt, those with well-financed campaigns are in a highly advantageous position. Thus, broadcast use was compared with two financial variables.

---

[17]Chester, op. cit., p. 158.

The first considered the amount spent by the candidate on his campaign. The second, a more relative variable, compared the amount spent by a particular candidate with his opponent (see Table 10, on the following page).

From Table 10, it appears that there is a definite relationship between the amount of money spent campaigning and the use of the broadcast media. The more a candidate spent in his effort, the more likely he was to utilize either one or both of these media. Also, user distribution according to amount spent was skewed toward high financial amounts for broadcast use, and lower economic categories for non-radio/tv use. Thus, it seems that criticisms directed at broadcast political advertising for its alleged economic discrimination may be valid to some extent, for the correlation does exist.

Further analysis was made in relative economic measurement as well. Broadcast use was compared to the amount a candidate spent in comparison with his opponent. If the results of Table 10 are valid, it would be probable that within a particular district, the candidate with the least resources would be at a considerable disadvantage in his access to radio and television. Conversely, if differences in revenue existed between districts, rather than within them, this financial difference would not be as important as it seems to be in Table 10.

Table 10. Candidate expenditures on campaign as distributed according to broadcast use.

		Media			
		Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Less than $1,000	100.1% (175)	13.7% (24)	4.6% (8)	6.9% (12)	74.9% (131)
$1,000-$5,000	99.9% (104)	34.6% (36)	3.8% (4)	25.0% (26)	36.5% (38)
$5,000 and over	100.1% (19)	36.8% (7)	5.3% (1)	31.6% (6)	26.3% (5)
Total	100.0% (298)	22.0% (67)	4.6% (13)	14.8% (44)	58.6% (174)

Table 11. Candidates relative expenses as compared to opponents, distributed according to broadcast media use.

		Media			
		Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Less than opponent	(110) 100.0%	(24) 21.8%	(6) 5.5%	(16) 14.5%	(64) 58.2%
More than opponent	(100) 100.0%	(31) 31.0%	(4) 4.0%	(16) 16.0%	(49) 49.0%
Total	(210) 100.0%	(55) 26.2%	(10) 4.8%	(32) 15.2%	(113) 53.8%

These tables reveal the relationship between spending and broadcast use in both an absolute and relative sense. The more a candidate spends on his campaign, the more likely he is to utilize radio and television in his campaign. Thus, it seems that access to these media is related to the candidates financial status. To the extent that these media may be effective for the candidate in his efforts (discussed later--Broadcast Media Use and Voting Behavior), this financial criterion of access may be a discriminating factor against poorer candidates, handicapping their efforts solely because of lack of funds.

The latter table reveals that this effect also takes place in a relative sense, when the candidates within a single district are considered. Thus, in absolute terms, whether each candidate is spending little or a great deal, the candidate who spends the most is still more likely to use broadcasting than the one who spends less.

Thus, it seems broadcast use and a high degree of spending are related, at least to some extent.

The financial status of the candidate is not, in itself, however, as strong an influence on media selection and utilization as some critics have stated. There are other variables which influence media choice, as will be seen in the conclusion and other sections of this research. Although it can be said that financial capability within the campaign is an important determinant of media use, and vice-versa, it

is not the only important consideration in the overall relationship.

The third set of variables considered are those concerned with geographic characteristics. For this purpose, media use was compared with the predominant residence structure within the district, and the location of the district within the state (see Table 12, on the following page).

Table 12 shows a relationship between the residence structure of the district and the medium selected. The use of broadcast media increases as density of population decreases. While possible motivations for this correlation will be discussed in another section, it can be said that the correlation is a fairly strong one.

Table 12 dealt with the structure within various districts. However, it is also necessary to consider these trends within the overall context of the state, comparing various geographic areas with media use in those districts (see Table 13, on page 35).

These results re-enforce the trends first noticed in the tables dealing with the structure of individual districts. As population density declines, use of broadcast media increases. Also, the location of the major metropolitan areas is influential. Some of the less dense areas closer to the Detroit Metropolitan Area show relatively little use of the broadcast media, while urban areas further away from the metropolitan influence show relatively high use, despite

Table 12. District urbanization distributed according to candidate broadcast use within those districts.

	Media			
	Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Urban (103) 100.0%	(8) 7.8%	(4) 3.9%	(16) 15.5%	(75) 72.8%
Suburban (125) 100.0%	(25) 20.0%	(7) 5.6%	(14) 11.2%	(79) 63.2%
Rural (74) 100.1%	(33) 44.6%	(3) 4.1%	(15) 20.3%	(23) 31.3%
Total (302) 100.0%)	(66) 21.9%	(14) 4.6%	(45) 14.9%	(177) 58.6%

Table 13. Regional locations of districts, distributed according to candidate media use within those district.

Region	Total	Broadcast Media Use			
		Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Wayne County (Detroit and Immediate Suburbs)	98(100.0%)	4(4.1%)	3(3.1%)	2(2.0%)	89(90.8%)
Southeast Michigan (Oakland and McComb Counties)	52)L00.0%)	8(15.4%)	3(5.8%)	1(1.0%)	40(76.9%)
Outstate Urban Areas (Lansing, Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, Flint, Battle Creek, Saginaw, Bay City, Midland)	58(100.0%)	12(20.7%)	5(8.6%)	18(31.0%)	23(39.7%)
Eastern Outstate (South of Ludington-Saginaw Bay Line and East of a North/South Line Through Lansing)	18(100.0%)	7(38.9%)	0(0.0%)	4(22.2%)	7(38.9%)
Western Outstate (South of a Ludington-Saginaw Bay Line and West of a North/South Line Through Lansing)	43(100.0%)	26(60.5%)	2(4.7%)	3(7.0%)	12(27.9%)
Northern Outstate (North of a Ludington-Saginaw Bay Line)	31(100.0%)	10(32.3%)	0(0.0%)	16(51.6%)	5(16.1%)
Total	300(100.0%)	67(22.3%)	13(4.3%)	44(14.7%)	176(58.7%)

their higher population density. Overall, however, a general trend is established, and will be examined in greater depth at the conclusion.

Candidate Attitudes Toward Broadcast Media Political Advertising

This survey also attempted to discover some of the more subjective elements of candidate interaction with the broadcast media during the campaign. This analysis took the form of requesting subjective evaluations from the candidate regarding his use of these media.

In this context, the candidates were asked which medium they felt was most effective for them in the campaign and why. They also were asked to make the same evaluations in terms of their opponent's campaign.

They also were polled on specific reactions to the broadcast media, evaluating their effectiveness in the campaign. They were asked to evaluate this effectiveness within the context of their expectations of it before the campaign. An additional consideration was a hypothetical one, as candidates were asked to observe what their possible broadcast media use would be were the extreme cost of that use not a factor in their selection of advertising media.

The responses to the question dealing with which medium the candidates felt was most effective are listed in Table 14.

Table 14. Number of candidates rating a particular medium as their most effective advertising tool.

Medium	Number of Candidates	Per cent of Total
Newspapers	36	23.5
Personal appearances	34	22.2
Brochures	25	16.3
Television	17	11.1
Radio	16	10.5
Direct mail	13	8.5
Billboards	7	4.6
None	4	2.6
Entertainment	1	0.7
Total	153	100.0%

Thus, it seems that, while broadcasting was not the predominant choice of the candidates, its showing was fairly strong. This becomes clearer when the two broadcast media are added together, giving both radio and television a combined total of 21.6%, placing it third on the effectiveness scale of the candidates.

The results are fairly interesting when analyzing the level of knowledge and sophistication of candidates with regard to advertising media use. The high ranking of personal communication is consistent with much communication theory, which states that interpersonal communication is among the most effective and persuasive forms, usually

exceeding mass communication in its influence.[18]

However, the heavy reliance on print media is somewhat contrary to the theoretical image of electronisized political advertising, and does not reflect a wholesale flocking to the broadcast media on the state and local levels, as some have claimed.[19] Combining the totals of newspapers, brochures, and direct mail, this represents 48.3%, or almost half of the candidates responding.

It does seem that these media would be more appropriate for political advertising, due to the fact that these media can better handle messages with a high degree of information content.[20] They are also, however, the most susceptible to being ignored. Selective perception becomes a factor here. A commercial integrated into a program has a more or less captive audience, whereas a newspaper ad or flyer is more likely to be ignored by someone of opposition view or someone to whom the message is not salient. Thus, while these media may be important re-enforcing factors, it seems that their value as vehicles for either attitude change or

---

[18]Katz, op. cit., p. 63.

[19]Interview with George Googasian, Chairman, Hart for Senate Committee, Detroit, Michigan, September 10, 1970.

[20]Greenberg, Tannenbaum, and Sullivan, in "The Great Debates," Sidney Kraus, ed., The Great Debates (Bloomington, Indiana: University Press, 1962), pp. 273-286.

salience motivation is limited due to the handicap of selective perception.[21]

It must be remembered, however, that the broadcast media were not as widely used as were some of the others. Thus, the weaker effectiveness rating may be a result of its lesser use, rather than ineffectiveness. For this reason, the ranking of effectiveness was further broken down, according to the broadcast use or non-use of the candidates.

Table 15. Candidate's choice of most effective medium, distributed according to broadcast media utilization.

Medium Effective	Media			
	Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Personal appearance	8(17.0%)	1(11.1%)	8(25.8%)	17(25.8%)
Brochures	4(8.5%)	2(22.2%)	2(6.5%)	17(25.8%)
TV	1(2.1%)	4(44.4%)	9(29.0%)	3(4.5%)
Newspapers	14(29.6%)	1(11.1%)	8(25.8%)	13(19.7%)
Radio	15(31.9%)	0(0.0%)	1(3.2%)	0(0.0%)
Billboards	1(2.1%)	0(0.0%)	1(3.2%)	5(7.6%)
None	2(4.3%)	0(0.0%)	1(3.2%)	1(1.5%)
Direct Mail	2(4.3%)	1(11.1%)	1(3.2%)	9(13.6%)
Entertainment	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(010%)	1(1.5%)
Total	47(100.0%)	9(99.9%)	31(99.9%)	66(100.0%)

Thus, a direct relationship can be noted between use of the broadcast media and their perceived effectiveness.

[21]Samuel Lubell, in "The Great Debates," ibid., p. 329.

The weaker showing of the broadcast media in Table 15 seems to be a result of a cancelling out process between those not using it, thus rating it lower, and those using it, generally rating it very high in effectiveness.

As can be seen from Table 15, those using radio and television were very much inclined to name broadcasting as their most effective medium. It is, in fact, the medium receiving the highest number of votes in each of the three broadcast use categories.

A similar effect can be seen within broadcast media use categories when comparing radio and television. Once television is introduced into the candidates' campaign, he tends to view it as the most effective advertising medium, with radio joining the other non-broadcast media in declining popularity. Overall, however, a very favorable reaction to the broadcast media and their effectiveness can be discerned. Those utilizing them rate them as their most effective media weapon more so than any other medium.

There are, however, two hypotheses which come to mind regarding this relationship. It may be that the candidates do truly perceive these media to be effective, this effectiveness being very clear once they experience it through the utilization of these media. On the other hand, the psychological concept of "balance theory" may be in effect here. It may be that the expensive and dramatic nature of the broadcast media may make the use of them a major

decision in the campaign. Thus, the candidate may be subliminally justifying such a large step, which he may consciously have some reservations about, by relating the high effectiveness of broadcast advertising. Such determinations call for further study, preferably on a more psychological level.

The candidates were also asked to state why they thought the particular medium they named was most effective. The responses then were classified by seven general categories, which are listed below:

Geographical Coverage	24(21.6%)
Name Identification	22(19.8%)
Personal Exposure	21(18.9%)
Financial Efficiency	15(13.5%)
Most Direct	12(10.8%)
Information Transmission	10(9.0%)
Most Persuasive	7(6.3%)

The responses indicate a fairly diverse rationale among the candidates for the medium they felt was most effective. The greatest number of candidates felt that the ability of the medium to cover the district's geographical area efficiently was most important. This may explain to some extent the heavier use of broadcast media in rural areas, where districts are fairly large, and its light use in urban areas, where the radio/tv coverage patterns often go far outside the boundaries of the candidates fairly small district.

A fair level of understanding of political and media realities is also indicated, as the candidates seem to feel that such items as exposure and identification are more

important than information transmission and persuasion. Thus, it seems that the candidates are aware of the importance of the candidate "image," as opposed to the democratic ideal of issue discussion and persuasion. Apparently they feel that the medium most effective in developing a favorable personality image is the most effective medium they can utilize. This perhaps also explains somewhat the high opinion of the broadcast media once its use is experienced, as both media critics and studies have pointed out broadcasting's emphasis on personality orientation and images, rather than substantive information and issues.[22]

This knowledge seems to come from experience rather than previous knowledge, for broadcasting is not as heavily used as one might predict it might be were the candidates familiar with its potential, and a high opinion of it under these categories develops once it is used.

A high degree of practicality is expressed in this analysis, with a large number of candidates placing an emphasis on geographic coverage, as previously related, and also on financial efficiency, as many candidates feel the most effective medium for them is the one which gives them the most for their money. Lack of confidence in the media in general is not too common, as only a small number of candidates felt that it was most important to reach the voter

---

[22]Greenberg, op. cit., pp. 273-286.

directly, with little intervening influence of other media on their message.

The candidates were also asked to make the same evaluation of their opponent's campaign. They were asked to state which medium was most effective for their opponent, and responded as follows:

Newspapers	35 (28.2%)
Radio	18 (14.5%)
Brochures	17 (13.7%)
Personal appearance	15 (12.1%)
Billboards	13 (10.5%)
None	10 (8.1%)
Don't Know	7 (5.6%)
TV	6 (4.8%)
Broadcasting	3 (2.4%)

Overall, the evaluations are fairly similar, with some exceptions. Personal appearances seemed to be more highly valued by the candidate using them than his opponent. Also, mailings seemed to be discounted by opponents, but more highly regarded by those using them. While all categories of broadcasting as a whole are fairly evenly regarded in both areas, there is some differential among the categories within broadcasting. Television is not viewed as having as much effectiveness here as in the earlier tables, while radio enjoys a somewhat higher reputation. Overall, however, the broadcast totals are fairly similar, 21.6% for the individual's own campaign, and 21.7% for the opposition's evaluation of his opponent's campaign. In the consideration of the opponents, broadcasting is viewed to be slightly more of a challenge to counteract than as a positive benefit to those

utilizing it. Radio/tv ranks second only to newspapers for the former, while the latter ranks them third, behind newspapers and personal appearances.

The reasons for a candidate's selection of a particular medium as most successful for his opponent were also requested. They were:

High Exposure	21(24.4%)
Name Identification	18(20.9%)
Financially Efficient	12(14.0%)
Re-enforcement	8(9.3%)
Repetition	7(8.1%)
Distortion	7(8.1%)
Don't Know	7(8.1%)
Attention Getter	4(4.7%)
Information Transmission	2(2.3%)

The responses indicate, both in this and the previous category, that the candidates are surprisingly objective in analyzing their opponents' campaign. The distributions of both medium most effective and reasons why that medium was effective are fairly similar for both the candidate's self-analysis and his analysis of his opponent's campaign. Thus, it does not appear that a subjective double-standard of evaluation is evident, but that overall objective criteria are being utilized.

As with their own campaigns, the candidates have a very favorable reaction to any medium which emphasizes the development of a favorable image and personality. They apparently feel that the key to effective political media advertising is the ability of the medium utilized to place the candidates name before the public, and create a favorable image of that personality.

What is most surprising, however, is that the candidate frankly admits this, even about his own campaign. It is quite common, in many cases, for a politician to claim that his is an informational and issue-oriented campaign, while deriding his opponent for making it a personality-oriented situation.[23] However, the candidates have here stated that the most effective medium, both for himself and his opponent, is the one that favorably communicates a positive personality, image, and identity to the voters.

A strain of the pragmatic is re-enforced by the observation that the medium's financial efficiency, in reaching more people for less money, is also an important factor.

Far down the list are those variables one could usually associate with attitude formation and change in the traditional communication sense. The ability of a medium to transmit information, re-enforce a message, or stimulate behavioral or attitudinal changes, are not considered as important as some of the others previously mentioned. Also, very little hostility toward alleged media bias is displayed, as only a small percentage felt that the ability of his opponent to distort reality through the particular medium he used was an important factor in the election.

This emphasis on image and personality helps to explain the high regard the candidates had for the broadcast media,

---

[23]Interview with James Dougherty, Public Information Director, Republican State Committee of Michigan, Lansing, October 28, 1971.

as many feel that the broadcast message is oriented in this direction. However, to further define the candidates evaluation of broadcasting, they were queried on its effectiveness directly.

Effectiveness of Radio:

Very Effective	22(29.3%)
Somewhat Effective	41(54.7%)
Ineffective	11(14.7%)

Effectiveness of Television

Very Effective	16(44.4%)
Somewhat Effective	14(38.9%)
Ineffective	6(16.7%)

Thus, it can be seen that those candidates utilizing radio and television for advertising were generally favorably impressed with its effectiveness. Although radio received fewer negative responses, the favorable reaction to television was less reserved than it was for radio. In both cases, very few candidates were disappointed with the medium's performance. In the case of television, strong approval was very common, while with radio a reserved approval was the most frequent. The overall effect, however, seems to be one of general positive evaluation of the broadcast media as an effective political advertising tool.

To more fully gauge this response, it was surveyed in relative as well as absolute terms. The respondents were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of the broadcast media in terms of their preconceptions of that effectiveness, in order to discover whether broadcasting was more or less

effective than they thought it would be when they decided to use it.

Effectiveness of Radio Compared to Previous Expectations

Surpassed Expected Effectiveness	5(7.4%)
Equaled Expected Effectiveness	44(64.7%)
Fell Below Expected Effectiveness	19(27.9%)

Effectiveness of Television Compared to Previous Expectations

Surpassed Expected Effectiveness	6(20.7%)
Equaled Expected Effectiveness	11(37.9%)
Fell Below Expected Effectiveness	12(41.4%)

The results are interesting in the context of the previous categories. While most candidates felt that broadcast media were effective, they apparently were not surprised by this fact. Most entered upon the use of these media with preconceptions of them as highly effective vehicles. Thus, many expressed disappointment with the degree of effectiveness they experienced when utilizing them. This was especially true of television, where effectiveness in many cases fell below expectations, although the reaction to the medium itself and its effectiveness was favorable. Thus, it seems that candidates must have entered upon the use of television with extremely high expectations of what it could do, Reaction to radio was not quite so extreme. Many candidates felt that radio lived up to their expectations, without either pleasantly or unpleasantly surprising them. Thus, it seems that moderate expectations were met with moderate effectiveness. However, with television, it seems that even though television was viewed as being strongly effective,

those using it expected even more than this, and were disappointed when it did not materialize.

Perhaps this is due to the present aura and controversy surrounding televised political advertising, which makes television seem more effective than it actually is. On the other hand, it may be that radio, being an older medium, is much more familiar to politicians, especially at this level, whereas television usage is fairly new, and its potential and limitations not as widely known. In any case, it must be remembered that the candidates' judgments of media effectiveness were subjective, and were based on the candidate's own standards, which were very diverse.

The candidates were pooled directly on two additional variables, one evaluative and one hypothetical. In the former, they were asked to comment on the similarity or difference between the percentage of expenses devoted to broadcasting, as compared to other media, and the percentage of time and effort devoted to radio/tv as opposed to other campaign endeavors.

More Effort in Comparison to Cost	15(18.8%)
Cost and Effort About the Same	38(47.5%)
Less Effort in Comparison to Cost	27(33.8%)

The high cost of these media is reflected to some extent here, with few candidates giving more time and effort than money to radio and television in their broadcast efforts. On the other hand, a substantial number (over a third) spent more with broadcasting in terms of finances,

but less of a percentage of campaign time and effort. The majority, however, almost half, divided their expenditures and efforts on a fairly consistent or equal basis. Whether this is an indication of campaign efficiency or not is open to question. However, it does seem that many candidates tend to feel that a consistency of financial and personal activity is a positive value when interacting with the media.

Finally, the candidates were asked to evaluate their hypothetical use of the broadcast media were costs not a factor in media use determination. They were asked what percentage of their campaign efforts would be devoted to broadcasting if various media could be used without financial considerations (i.e., an unlimited budget or access to media at no cost).

Would Use Radio/TV More	43 (53.7%)
Would Use Radio/TV About the Same	27 (33.8%)
Would Use Radio/TV Less	10 (12.5%)

The response seems to indicate both an overwhelmingly favorable response to advertising via the broadcast media, as well as the presence of a tremendous barrier to radio/tv access in terms of its high cost.

In one of the most frequent response categories in the entire survey, over half of those responding indicated that they would increase their use of the broadcast media were cost not such an overriding factor discouraging its use. Only a very small proportion said they would reduce their use of broadcasting in favor of some other medium. Thus, it

seems that the potential of broadcast political advertising is great should rates be lowered.

Several candidates voiced additional responses about their experiences with the broadcast media, both in advertising and non-advertising capacities. Most of these comments centered on either criticisms of certain aspects of the broadcast media advertising effectiveness, other political problems which indirectly related to broadcast ineffectiveness, or general criticisms of broadcasting's role in the election.

Some of these comments were common enough to classify, and tabulate. It must be remembered here that these are unstructured comments by the candidates themselves, not specific responses, and thus may be more strongly felt, as to include them required the extra motivation necessary to write them in separately. The most frequent comments were:

The Broadcast Media are too Expensive to use Effectively	16 (21.3%)
Coverage Patterns Overspread Smaller Urban Districts	12 (16.0%)
The Public is Unreceptive to Radio/TV Messages	10 (13.3%)
Candidate's Radio/TV Image was Counter-productive	9 (12.0%)
Repetitious, Saturation Campaigns are Necessary	7 (9.3%)
Party Organization Apathy Precludes Effective Use	5 (6.7%)
Media Bias Prevented Effecient Use	5 (6.7%)
Inequitable (i.e., favors incumbents, rich, etc.)	4 (5.3%)
Personally Distasteful	3 (4.0%)
Did not allow Feedback	3 (4.0%)
Good for Name Id. Only, not Issue Presentation	1 (1.3%)

In addition, American Independent Party Candidates, while not very numerous, were quite vocal in their criticism of news coverage of the election by their local radio and television outlets. The main conflict centered over the status of their party. While the candidates consider their organization to be a "major" political party, they claim that these media treated them as "minor" candidates, thus giving the bulk of their attention to the Democratic and Republican candidates. While these data do not document their charges, they do seem to have some degree of validity when examined in the context of the broadcaster's eagerness to have Section 315 of the Communications Act (commonly known as the "equal time" provision) repealed, in order that they could allocate time to "serious" candidates at their own discretion, eliminating "minor" candidate obligations.

Once again, it seems that practical criticisms are most common, these being expense and efficient coverage of the district. On the other hand, ethical or ideological considerations were fairly minor. Only one candidate objected to broadcasting's lack of issue-orientation, and only three expressed ethical considerations of radio/tv use in political advertising. The responses were varied, but overall more concern was displayed over practical concerns and image orientation and effectiveness, than those dealing with media characteristics and issues.

Broadcast Media Use and Voting Behavior

This section is designed to survey the effect of broadcast media use on voting behavior. Since no direct measure of this effect is possible within the framework of this study, indirect measurements were used in an attempt to determine whether correlation existed between radio-tv use and voting behavior.

Several variables in both the broadcasting and political areas were considered. Politically, an attempt was made to assess both overt electoral behavior in this particular election and overall political characteristics within the district. The candidate's perception of the degree of voter turnout, and the district's typical voting behavior, were variables utilized to ascertain overall trends. The first was determined by answers given by the candidates on the questionnaire. The second was determined by reviewing the voting records of these districts when electing legislative officials. These dated from 1964, the first year an election was held after the districts were reapportioned to their present boundaries.

Election variables for this particular election were also examined. The outcome of the election was considered, as was the change in the vote distribution as compared with the overall average.

Several broadcast variables were considered as well. The most basic was the use or non-use of these media.

In addition, the emphasis and orientation of the campaign to broadcasting, if used, was considered. This was measured by the candidates evaluation of time and money spent with broadcasting, as compared to other media, as well as state records describing the amount spent for various advertising media. These records were also utilized to determine the amount spent per vote on broadcasting by the candidates. Due to Congressional and critical emphasis on this measure, and its hypothetical political relationship,[24] it was felt it would be interesting to examine the campaign through this perspective.

Also, relative measures were also considered. The candidate's radio-tv spending was compared to his opponents, as was the emphasis broadcasting was given in the campaign. These broadcast use variables were then cross-indexed with the aforementioned political ones, to determine if any correlations did exist. The following table outlines the relationship between voter turnout and broadcast use. The candidates were asked to evaluate the voter turnout in their district and compare it to what they felt was the national average.

The candidates use of the broadcast media was then distributed on this basis, in an attempt to determine whether a relationship between the two existed.

The resulting trend, while rather weak and at times inconsistent, still reveals some efficient political use of

---

[24] Newsweek, op. cit., pp. 34-35.

Table 16. Candidate use of broadcast media distributed according to candidate's perception of voter turnout in his district as compared to the national norm.

Turnout		Media Used			
		Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
High	57 (36.3%)	17 (34.0%)	5 (41.7%)	8 (24.2%)	27 (43.5%)
Average	90 (57.3%)	31 (62.0%)	7 (58.3%)	22 (66.7%)	30 (48.4%)
Low	10 (6.3%)	2 (4.0%)	0.0%	3 (9.1%)	5 (8.1%)
Totals	157 (99.9%)	50 (100.0%)	12 (100.0%)	33 (100.0%)	62 (100.0%)

radio and tv on the part of the candidates. Political research has revealed that the broadcast media are very effective in mobilizing voters and increasing voter turnout.[25] The table reveals that the use of radio and tv seems to be slightly weighted in the direction of lower turnout. Conversely, the non-use seems weighted slightly in the direction of higher turnout. Thus, it seems some use of broadcasting's mobilizing function was made by the candidates.

Tables 17 and 18, which compare broadcast use to the district's typical historical voting behavior, also reveal some interesting results.

The results are consistent both with other findings and characteristics of efficient media use. The districts perceived as Republican were much more heavily saturated with broadcast political advertising messages than were those perceived as Democratic. This is consistent with the results described in the section entitled--Users and Non-users--in this chapter, which indicate that rural and Republican candidates tended to use these media more than more urbanized Democrats.

This seems to indicate a basic candidate understanding of the re-enforcement and mobilization functions of the media previously discussed. The candidates utilizing these

---

[25]Study by William Glaser, in Radio, Television and American Politics, Edward W. Chester, ed. (New York: Sheed and Ward), p. 114.

Table 17. Candidate use of broadcast media distributed according to candidate's perception of his district's voting behavior.

Vote Behavior		Media Use			
		Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Traditional Democratic	129(42.4%)	11(16.4%)	6(42.9%)	10(22.2%)	102(57.3%)
Traditional Republican	115(37.8%)	40(59.7%)	2(14.3%)	22(48.9%)	51(28.7%)
"Swing" District	60(19.7%)	16(23.9%)	6(42.9%)	13(28.9%)	25(14.0%)
Total	304(99.9%)	67(100.0%)	14(100.1%)	45(100.0%)	178(100.0%)

Table 18. Candidate's perception of his district's voting behavior, distributed according to candidate broadcast use.

Vote Behavior		Media Use			
		Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Traditional Democratic	100.1%	8.5%	4.7%	7.8%	79.1%
Traditional Republican	99.9%	34.8%	1.7%	19.1%	44.3%
"Swing" District	100.1%	26.7%	10.0%	21.7%	41.7%

media were Republicans, who used them heavily in Republican districts. Thus, these media were utilized in order to reenforce Republican loyalties and mobilize Republicans to turnout at the polls.

Further consistency with basic characteristics of efficient broadcast media use is evidenced in the strong role the broadcast media played in the "swing" districts. As analysis compiled by McNeil and others shows, it is the voter who changes affiliation from election to election that is most affected by broadcast media advertising.[26] It would seem logical that such a district would contain a larger proportion of swing voters. Thus, broadcast advertising for either candidate would probably be more effective than otherwise would be the case.

While the results seem to indicate a fair level of media use sophistication among the candidates, it is much more difficult to evaluate the reasons for this. Whether the candidates and their advisors were to some degree familiar with previous media research, or whether they arrived at their media allocations through independent judgment must remain a matter of speculation. However, it does seem that their media use decisions were fairly consistent with the guidelines of efficient broadcast media use.

The next step was to determine whether the use of these media was of any benefit to the candidate in terms of a higher

---

[26]Robert McNeil, The People Machine (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 16.

vote total. The next table analyzes the most obvious political variable, the election outcome.

Thus, it seems that use of the broadcast media, by itself, is no guarantee of electoral success. The results show extremely little difference in the distribution of broadcast use or non-use between winners and losers in the 1970 legislative elections. Despite some emotional claims to the contrary, and claims by theorists such as McLuhan, that the specific media used, rather than content of message or other factors, is the basic criteria for determining changes in socio-political effects,[27] it seems that the limitations on broadcasting's potential for attitudinal and behavioral change have once again come to light, as they have in previous research, such as Klapper's aforementioned studies, and Katz' studies of the "two-step flow" theory of opinion leadership and change[28] (i.e., broadcasting's effectiveness as a re-enforcer or a communicator to opinion leaders, who communicate change on a personal level).

McLuhan, in "Understanding Media," devotes considerable attention to the characteristics of media and their effect. Content, he states, is secondary to the medium used to communicate it, thus is developed the "medium is the message" concept. He feels that content is unimportant, and, since

---

[27]Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media (New York: Signet, 1964), pp. 36-44.

[28]Elihu Katz, "Two-Step Flow of Communication" (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1957), p. 61.

Table 19. Candidate use of broadcast media, distributed according to candidate's election outcome.

Outcome		Media Used			
		Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Winner	148 (48.8%)	37 (55.2%)	4 (31.8%)	22 (48.9%)	85 (47.8%)
Loser	155 (51.2%	30 (44.8%)	9 (69.2%)	23 (51.1%)	93 (52.2%)
Total	303 (100.0%)	67 (100.0%)	13 (100.0%)	45 (100.0%)	178 (100.0%)

he also feels broadcast media are more influential than print, it would seem that the use of broadcasting in itself might appear as a stronger variable here if his analysis was accurate.

Even though McLuhan claims that this effect is true in political communication as well as any other form, its electoral manifestations are not present here. The use of broadcasting per se is neither exceptionally rewarding nor counterproductive.

Some of the critics of the slick media "packaging" of candidates have also felt at times that perhaps the mere use of a medium like radio or television may distort the political situation, turning politicians into performers and lessening the prestige of the office being contested. Again, the lack of large differences in election outcome between non-users and users of broadcasting may tend to somewhat discount this fear of a large effect of broadcast use on election outcome. While McLuhan may claim that "the medium is the message," it seems that broadcast media use, by itself, made little difference in the outcome of the election, the variable which the politician would seem to be most interested in.

However, it can be seen that what little differentiation there is seems to be weighted in the direction of favorable results for those using broadcasting. Particularly for those using radio, it seems that, all other things being

equal, they would have a slightly better chance of being elected than those not using it.

It must be remembered, however, that most districts are usually considered "safe" for one party or the other, due to the traditional very strong party loyalties.[29] Also, this election year was an "off," or non-presidential year, in which the party out of the White House traditionally makes substantial gains at all levels. Republicans, however, made up the majority of broadcast users, thus, this vote tendency may have diminished the relationship as it appears in the table while it may actually have been stronger.

Republicans were the party which utilized the broadcast media most, as we have seen previously. This party would predictably have a higher proportion of losers in an off-year election. However, broadcast users were split fairly evenly among winners and losers. Thus, perhaps broadcasting may have blunted the off-year effect somewhat, with Democrats, who tended to use broadcast media less, making fewer gains than usual, while Republicans were able to lose less heavily.

Thus, further analysis of voting behavior was utilized. In this case, broadcast use was compared with the amount of support for a candidate in comparison with the historical average for that office in that district. The percentage

---

[29]Campell, op. cit., pp. 521-534.

of
dis
tic
pa

Th
a
go
ti
re

ta
Ar
bo
re
o
a
m
a
m
c
s
c
c
a

of vote for each party's candidate since 1964, when the districts were apportioned, was averaged, with this election's vote compared to it (see Table 20, on the following page).

These results are consistent with the previous table. They display no correlation between broadcast use per se and a better election showing. The distribution for each category fairly equally parallels the average total distribution. If anything, the table indicates a slight inverse relationship between ratio-tv use and increased voting.

To be more effective, however, any such analysis must take into account variables related to broadcast use itself. An exhaustive study of each candidates messages would have been most appropriate, but far beyond the scope of this research. Thus, more relative measures were utilized. One of these was the degree to which a broadcast user utilized a radio-tv orientation in his campaign. Both the amount of money spent on radio/tv as a percentage of the total spent, and the amount of time, effort, etc., devoted to broadcast media endeavors as a percentage of the total campaign were considered. Also, both the degree of broadcast use and spending by the candidate in comparison to his opponent was considered. This combination was an average of the financial data available on public record, and the candidates own analysis of his activities (see Table 21, page 63).

Table 20. Candidate use of broadcast media distributed according to election performance (relative to the average vote total of his party's candidate for that office).

Relative Performance		Media Used: Radio	TV	Both	No Radio/TV
Better	137 (47.7%)	27 (42.2%)	5 (45.5%)	20 (46.5%)	85 (50.4%)
Consistent	14 (4.9%)	6 (9.4%)	1 (9.1%)	0.0%	7 (4.1%)
Worse	136 (47.4%)	31 (48.5%)	5 (45.5%)	23 (53.5%)	77 (45.6%)
Total	287 (100.0%)	64 (100.1%)	11 (100.0%)	43 (100.0%)	169 (100.1%)

Table 21. Candidate election outcome distributed according to the degree of broadcast media orientation in his campaign (expressed as a percentage of the total budget spent on broadcasting).

Broadcast Orientation		Outcome: Winner	Loser
(25% or less)	37 (30.1%)	12 (20.0%)	23 (37.7%)
(26% - 50%)	33 (26.8%)	19 (31.7%)	14 (23.0%)
(51% or more)	53 (43.1%)	29 (48.3%)	24 (39.3%)
Total	123 (100.0%)	60 (100.0%)	61 (100.0%

The results seem to be weighted in the direction of a correlation between high broadcast media orientation and success at the polls. These results are confirmed by studying the distribution along media use rather than outcome lines.

Table 22. Broadcast media orientation of candidate (expressed as a percentage of the total budget spent on broadcasting), distributed according to election outcome.

Broadcast Orientation		Outcome	
Low	100.0%	32.4%	67.6%
Medium	100.0%	57.6%	42.4%
High	100.0%	54.7%	45.3%
	Total	Winner	Loser

These tables reveal some interesting results, and also help to clarify some of the previous tables. The extent of broadcast use was fairly evenly distributed over the range from low to high. A definite correlation seems to emerge. A candidate utilizing a high broadcast-media orientation in his campaign efforts was more likely to win than one who did not.

In fact, it seems that a light use of broadcast media is not merely less successful than a heavy one, but is actually counter-productive. Perhaps the tables dealing

with broadcast use in general and election outcome can be explained by the fact that the counter-productivity of low media use neutralized the high success correlation of heavier use, thus making broadcast use appear to have little effect. In both areas, distributions of those who used broadcasting lightly or occasionally made up a high proportion of losers, while the reverse was true among those whose campaign was highly broadcast oriented.

The results of this analysis suggest, however, that broadcast use may not be something to be taken lightly by the candidate, for the wrong degree of use may not only not help him, but may in fact hurt him. However, there does appear to be a relationship between a heavy broadcast orientation in the campaign and winning elections.

Only a third of the candidates who used broadcasting lightly or not at all were able to emerge victorious, while a majority of those investing at least a quarter of their time and/or effort into broadcasting were successful.

Distributing in the opposite direction reveals similar results. Of those who won, only 20% were low broadcast users, while those who heavily invested in broadcasting made up almost half of this category.

At this point a consideration of cause and effect is beyond the scope of this analysis. It is difficult to determine, for instance, whether heavy broadcast media use was able to aid the candidates in their bid for election, or

other variables dealing with certain candidates who tended to win also led them to tend to select heavy broadcast use for their campaign effort. It can be definitely stated, however, that a correlation does exist between these variables.

The relative use of the broadcast media among candidates in the same district is also worthy of consideration. Here, the correlation becomes even more apparent, as it is isolated in its normal context.

Table 23. Election outcome for the candidate distributed according to his relative broadcast spending in comparison with his opponent.

Relative Spending		Outcome Winner	Outcome Loser
Higher	64(21.0%)	43(29.5%)	21(13.6%)
Consistent	170(55.7%)	81(55.5%)	86(55.8%)
Lower	71(23.3%)	22(15.1%)	47(30.5%)
Total	305(100.0%)	146(100.1%)	154(99.9%)

The distribution of winners according to relative spending is definitely skewed toward higher spending when compared to the average distribution. Also, losers are more skewed toward the lower spending areas, establishing a fairly consistent correlation between electoral success and outspending

one's opponent in broadcast media advertising. The correlation becomes even more graphic when one considers it as a won-loss distribution of radio-tv expenditure.

Table 24. Candidate's relative broadcast spending (in comparison with his opponent), distributed according to election outcome.

Relative Spending		Outcome Winner	Outcome Loser
Higher	100.0%	57.2%	32.8%
Consistent	100.0%	47.6%	52.4%
Lower	100.0%	31.0%	69.0%

It is also necessary to compare relative radio-tv advertising use as well as expenditures, as a method of compensation for varying degrees of expenditues and media orientation. This was defined by comparing the degree of broadcasting media use of a candidate as expressed in previous tables with that of the candidate's opponent within the district, thus considering the relationship between the two direct competitors. Here the results were very consistent with the previous tables, thus displaying an overall consistency (see Table 25, on the next page).

Again, a very definite weighting of the distribution is evident. Table 25, considering such intangibles as

Table 25. Election outcome distributed according to the candidate's relative use of broadcasting in comparison with his opponent.

Relative Use		Outcome Winner	Outcome Loser
Higher	58(19.1%)	36(24.7%)	22(14.4%)
Consistent	186(61.2%)	89(61.0%)	94(61.4%)
Lower	60(19.7%)	21(14.4%)	37(24.2%)
Total	304(100.0%)	146(100.1%)	153(100.0%)

effort, time, and emphasis, as opposed to those considering financial input into the broadcast media, shows the same basic correlation between broadcast use and electoral success, Also, when examined by distribution according to broadcast media use emphasis, the relationship seems very dramatic.

Table 26. Candidate's relative use of broadcasting (in comparison with his opponent), distributed according to election outcome.

Relative Use		Outcome Winner	Outcome Loser
Higher	100.0%	62.1%	37.9%
Consistent	99.9%	48.3%	51.6%
Lower	100.0%	35.0%	65.0%

Thus, it seems that a candidate using the broadcast media more than his opponent is much more likely to have a favorable outcome in his efforts than is his opponent.

In order to more fully define this trend, the variables of broadcast media orientation, and relative expenditure on the use of the broadcast media, was compared to any change in the average voting behavior of the district for the legislative position in question. An average legislative vote total for each party in each district was utilized here, This was established by averaging the vote totals for the office in question in every election since 1964, when the present district alignments were created. Thus, it could be determined whether or not the candidate had done better or worse than the "average" candidate of his party for that office.

As can be seen in the following three tables, which distributes this shift from average in terms of the above three broadcast variables, the correlation does seem fairly consistent.

Table 27 reveals the same overall trend, although here it is not quite as strong as those concerning election outcome. The correlation, as well as the correlation of counterproductivity with lower radio/tv use, is present. This suggests some hypothesis as to where the voting changes took place. It would seem that the effectiveness in swing districts of radio/tv is a possible explanation here.

Table 27. Candidate broadcast media orientation, distributed according to candidate's election performance (in comparison to the average vote total of his party's candidate for that office).

		Relative Performance		
		Better	Consistent	Worse
High	31(100.0%)	16(51.6%)	1(3.2%)	14(45.2%)
Medium	33(100.2%)	12(36.5%)	2(6.1%)	19(57.6%)
Low	52(100.1%)	23(44.3%)	4(7.7%)	25(48.1%)
Total	116 (99.9%)	51(44.0%)	7(6.0%)	58(49.9%)

Since, on the whole, the vote change was not that great, it would seem probable that this change was enough to make a change in the swing districts, while being less effective in a district overwhelmingly one-party oriented, as many are. Thus, broadcasting's ability to influence the swing vote in the swing districts may be evident here.

Also, evidence of the re-enforcement function is present. The totals under the increase of votes and a consistent vote level are fairly equal to those of the winners level under high broadcast use. Thus, it can be hypothesized that perhaps incumbents or majority party members, utilizing high radio/tv use, were able to maintain their advantage. Thus, this effect would appear under a consistent category, and blunt the favorable effect of broadcast media use. It must also be remembered that primary users were Republican

candidates in Republican districts. Thus, this consistency of vote total in a normally Democratic tending off-year election. It can be seen, also, that the number of candidates receiving the average district vote total increases with lower broadcast use, thus suggesting that as the message influence decreases, the re-enforcement function becomes more dominant, a trend which would certainly hinder a minority party candidate.

It was felt that a relative study along these lines would also be significant, in which the candidates vote performance was distributed according to the broadcast use of his opponent and himself.

Table 28. Candidate's relative use of broadcasting (in comparison with his opponent), distributed according to election performance (in comparison to the average vote total of his party's candidate for that office).

Relative Radio/TV Use		Relative Performance		
		Better	Consistent	Worse
Higher	62(100.0%)	38(61.3%)	5(8.1%)	19(30.6%)
Consistent	167(100.0%)	83(49.7%)	3(1.8%)	81(48.5%)
Lower	64(100.1%)	19(29.7%)	6(9.4%)	39(61.0%)
Total	293(100.0%)	140(47.8%)	14(4.8%)	139(47.4%)

Table 29. Candidate broadcast spending (compared with opponent), distributed according to election performance (in comparison to the average vote total of his party's candidate for that office).

Broadcast Spending		Relative Performance		
		Better	Consistent	Worse
Higher	65 (99.9%)	40 (61.5%)	6 (9.2%)	19 (29.2%)
Consistent	167 (100.1%)	80 (48.5%)	2 (1.2%)	85 (50.4%)
Lower	61 (99.9%)	24 (37.9%)	5 (8.5%)	32 (53.5%)
Total	293 (100.0%)	144 (55.3%)	13 (4.5%)	136 (41.2%)

Once again, as with the tables considering election outcome, the correlation becomes more obvious when isolated into individual districts, with the candidates opposing each other involved in the analysis. The overall trend, revealed from all the tables, is that much of the criticism of broadcast political advertising may have some substance, due to the fact that use of radio and tv correlates favorably with political success, and it is the wealthier candidate who utilizes these media, thus utilizing his economic advantage for political purposes.

Because of the controversy surrounding this issue, and the national government's use of the "cents per vote" figure as an important variable in the proposed regulation of campaign expenditures,[30] an effort was made to analyze the

[30] Newsweek, op. cit., p. 35.

Michigan legislative/broadcast interaction through these variables. These variables were analyzed in two ways; the proposed federal seven cents per vote limit was used as one form of analysis, with a breakdown according to overall cents per vote spent on broadcast media in the campaign as a more definitive variable. These two variables were then cross-indexed with the political variables of election outcome and vote performance as compared with the average historical vote in that district for that office.

This trend exists on a modified level as well. As can be seen, the number of candidates utilizing the expensive campaigns being dealt with at the federal level are small. However, the trend for those investing more heavily in broadcasting to be more successful is evident here as well. An attempt to draw a larger and more meaningful universe was undertaken, utilizing a figure of two cents per vote as the pivotal point. This figure: 1) created more observations in each category; 2) more evenly divided the two groups, and 3) seemed, on an analysis of each level of expenditure (i.e., 1¢ per vote, 2, etc.), to be the pivotal point of electoral success. Most candidates spending more than this amount either won or improved on the average vote totals in their district for that office. Most candidates who spent less either lost or had a worse than average showing.

Amount Spent on Broadcasting by Candidates, Distributed According to Election Outcome

		Less than 2¢ per vote	2¢ per vote or more
Winner	(60)	29(39.7%)	31(67.4%
Loser	(59)	44(60.3%)	15(32.6%)
Total	(111)	73(100.0%)	46(100.0%)

Election Outcome Distributed According to Amount Spent on Broadcasting by Candidate

		Less than 2¢ per vote	More than 2¢ per vote
Winner	(60)	(29)48.3%	(31)51.7%
Loser	(59)	(44)60.3%	(15)39.7%

Table 30. Amount spent on broadcasting (in terms of suggested federal guidelines), distributed according to election outcome.

Outcome		Within 7¢ per vote	Over 7¢ per vote
Winner	61(49.2%)	52(45.6%)	8(80.0%)
Loser	63(50.8%)	62(54.4%)	2(20.0%)
Total	124(100.0%)	114(100.0%)	10(100.0%)

Although the expenditure distribution here is very highly weighted in the seven cents and under area, the distribution of these expenditures, when considered by election

outcome, clearly indicate the greater success of those spending over the proposed limit on broadcast advertising. Thus, this may indicate to some extent the validity of the statements which claim that an expensive, highly saturated broadcast campaign is very effective, thus giving an unfair advantage to those with more money to spend. The same trend is indicated when expenditure is considered among both winners and losers.

Table 31. Election outcome distributed according to amount spent on broadcasting.

Outcome		Within 7¢ per vote	Over 7¢ per vote
Winner	100.0%	86.7%	13.3%
Loser	100.0%	96.8%	3.2%
Total	100.0%	91.9%	8.1%

The same tendency is indicated when overall vote change is considered (see Table 32, on the following page).

Thus, it can be seen that increased economic concentration increases electoral success, with 2¢ per vote being the crucial figure at this level. The trend is similar when one consider's the candidate vote performance as compared to the average. As in other measures of political broadcast advertising, it seems that a token effort in this area is of

Table

Table 32. Amount spent on broadcasting distributed according to candidate election performance (compared to the average vote of his party's candidate for that office).

Relative Performance		Within 7¢ per vote	Over 7¢ per vote
Better	57(47.9%)	51(46.8%)	6(60.0%)
Consistent	7(5.9%)	5(4.6%)	2(20.0%)
Worse	55(46.1%)	53(48.6%)	2(20.0%)
Total	119(99.9%)	(100.0%)	10(100.0%)

relatively little use to the candidate, while a heavier utilization of radio/tv advertising can be extremely effective.

As has been stated previously, the examination of the possibility of a direct cause/effect relationship between the broadcasting and political variables under consideration is beyond the scope of this study. The presence of some correlative factors, however, is indicated by the data. Thus, the theories which consider broadcast advertising highly effective for political purposes, and those which consider the access to and benefits of those media financially discriminatory, are shown to have a substantial degree of validity, as many of their basic assumptions have been established.

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, comments will be made not only on the present situation, but on the situation as it seems likely to be within the next few years, given the data discovered here and a logical progression of current developments. This future consideration must be made because it seems likely that although broadcast use has been somewhat limited in the 1970 election, there are indications that its use may grow in the next few years.

At present, it can be seen that the sophistication of the typical legislative campaign is limited, both in a general and broadcast sense. Less than half of the candidates (41.4%) used the broadcast media, and only about fifteen per cent utilized a mixed campaign of both radio and television. Once utilized, the commitment to broadcasting remained fairly limited, with only 28.2% investing over half of their funds in radio-tv in order to attempt a broadcast oriented campaign. This seems to be a general characteristic of campaigns at the legislative level, rather than a legislative avoidance of broadcasting. Only about a third of the candidates (32.8%) utilized a campaign manager. Less than

a tenth (9.5%) utilized professional advertising agency or advertising advisor-coordinator in their efforts. Only 5.6% utilized professional public relations firms or personnel, and a very small minority of 2% utilized a full-time paid staff.

This, plus the fact that many candidates spent little or no money on their campaign indicates a fairly low degree of effort expended by the candidates for these offices. There are several reasons for this. In many cases, support from the party state organization is either only token or nonexistent. This tendency is especially obvious in those districts in which the party involved is traditionally the distinct minority party, with very little chance of electoral success. In many cases, candidates expressed, in extra comments on the questionnaire, their disenchantment with the party organization for its lack of support. Also, many of the more "modern" forms of advertising require a great deal of money and effort. Although fairly ineffective, because of the strong possibility that they may be ignored, it is easier and cheaper to print up a stack of cards than it is to buy broadcast time or intensively campaign from house to house.

Another factor that must be considered is a relative lack of both political and media sophistication among the candidates. Most comments about their media choices did not center on the traditional media variables, such as

persuasion, effects of exposure to message, distortion of message, media audiences, etc. Most centered on the pragmatic and personal elements of the media. While in some cases some of the observations were quite cogent, it seems that this enlightenment came via the trial and error process of experience, since the candidate, typically, did not bring any great degree of communications and media knowledge with him to his advertising decisions, nor did he consult those who may have been able to aid him in making better allocations of his funds and effort.

Media decisions seemed to center in three areas: 1) geographic coverage, 2) financial efficiency, and 3) image/personality identification. Heavy reliance on the print media which the candidate felt covered his district at efficiently reasonable cost, and personal campaigning which emphasizes personality and personal identity and identification, was evident.

This limited use of broadcasting, and seeming preference for other media in lieu of broadcasting, may seem to indicate that there is little for either government or broadcasting to concern itself with, as far as this interaction of radio/tv and state legislative campaigning is concerned. However, analysis of the distribution among the candidates of broadcast use, its effectiveness, and hypothetical future use of broadcasting indicate that this seeming unimportance of broadcasting and its campaign role is not the case.

The
abou
poli

suc
var
ave
wi
ta
br
w
f
s

The findings of this study raise some significant questions about the ethical, economic, and public service aspects of political broadcast campaigns.

The data revealed that broadcast use and electoral success are indeed somewhat related. By comparing political variables such as election outcome and the deviation from average of the vote totals for the office under consideration with such broadcast variables as use, degree of use, orientation to broadcasting of the campaign, and money spent on broadcasting in absolute and relative terms, a correlation was found between the reliance on broadcasting and a more favorable showing at the polls. This tendency was not very strong with broadcast use per se, however, it was very strong with heavy broadcast use, commitment, and expenditure.

Such use is highly expensive, however. Access to the media, even for a few quick spot announcements, is beyond the reach of many candidates. A heavy saturation broadcast campaign, that which is very effective, is thus virtually impossible for the poorer candidates. This is documented by the data on the distribution of broadcast use and intensity of that use according to the amount of money spent by the candidate in both relative and absolute terms.

Thus, two facts join together in creating a third. The first is that intensive broadcast use is beneficial to the candidate. The second is that available money is a major, if not the major, determinant of who will enjoy the benefits

of b

inat

its

ing

of

an

tu

th

Th

i

b

I

h

of broadcasting. These factors combine to create a discriminatory situation in terms of access to broadcasting and its beneficial effects in campaigns.

Also, the emphasis of the candidates in their advertising rationale does not indicate agreement with the ideals of a democratic society. Supposedly, our system values and attempts to move in the direction of a political structure of rational issue consideration and discussion, rather than emotional involvement with personalities and images. The candidates, however, seem more concerned with the latter in their discussions of media use and effectiveness. It has been discovered in other studies (most notably those of Lang and Lang, and Greenberg, Tannenbaum, et al.) that the broadcast media are more orientated to image, as opposed to issue, presentations. The candidates heavy use of the information-oriented print media is inconsistent with these goals, and these goals are inconsistent with the goals of the political system. Thus, increased use of the broadcast media under this rationale and structure may be detrimental to the public interest.

And, there is every reason to believe the use of these media will increase in the near future. There are several reasons why this is probable.

Some of these are technological. The probable development of Cable TV, UHF, and less expensive and flexible production equipment increase the likelihood of this possibility.

New
wit
hou
ba
wi
pr
p
a
a
t

Newsweek, for instance, in a recent issue, predicted that within the next few years, that at least four United States homes in ten will be equipped with cablevision, with this based on their most conservative findings and predictions, with many large distributors required to produce their own programming.[1] Political advertisers will be able to either produce their own programming at reduced cost, or insert advertising spots in addition to or in place of other similar announcements. More importantly, this innovation will give the legislative candidate the geographic flexibility he feels he needs. Especially in urban areas, neighborhood connections can tailor coverage area to fit district boundaries, thus making cable TV and FM radio the most geographically flexible of the mass media.

Increased attention may be focused on legislative offices from political standpoints as well, thus bringing to them greater controversy and competition. The advent of some form of federal "revenue-sharing" will give legislatures many more fiscal responsibilities, with their elections assuming greater importance. Also, emphasis on local elections as a means of developing a power base seems to be a growing tendency among many groups. Groups of the new left, racial and ethnic minorities, etc., are all attempting to organize at these levels. If they are in any way successful, new levels of competition will emerge for legislative offices.

---

[1] "What's Ahead for TV," Newsweek, May 31, 1971, p. 72.

Increased competition and attention, quite logically, should lead to increased media use as election becomes much more meaningful and desirable.

As experience with the broadcast media becomes more common, a realization of broadcasting's image orientation, as opposed to the issue orientation of print, will probably develop. The desire of candidates to become known and have their name identified will lead them to increased usage. This increased use will not really serve the public in terms of a serious and rational discussion of the issues. It will be, instead, a battle of images and personalities, with little added to public information content.

The reduced cost of cable advertising, and increased competition among UHF's, etc., will also increase the usage of these media. When asked to evaluate the role of broadcasting's high cost, the candidate indicated that these costs were very prohibitive, and would very much like to use these media more if the cost was reduced or eliminated.

There are some tendencies which point to decreased broadcast use, but these are a minority. A large percentage of those utilizing television were disappointed with its effectiveness. This, in spite of the fact that it was rated as being a very effective medium. It seems that many candidates, really not familiar with media characteristics, as previously discussed, were not too familiar with television when they decided to use it. The data suggests that the

great amount of popular publicity and controversy surrounding televised political advertising may have been a factor here. Popular analysis such as The Selling of the President, Congressional debate, news magazine feature stories, etc., may have combined with the traditional aura of "showbusiness" characterizations of television to create an image of television as a vastly powerful and effective medium, which would tie use and success together intimately.

The candidates found, instead, that there is no guarantee of success with TV utilization. Usually, a highly broadcast oriented, saturation campaign is necessary. And, while TV may re-enforce voters already somewhat predisposed in his favor, get people out to vote, and persuade those with little information or interest or commitment in the campaign, its ability to convert those of the opposite persuasion is limited.

This discovery may lead to a disenchantment with television which could reduce its use. However, it is more likely that attitudes may become more similar to those concerning radio, where candidates are more familiar with its characteristics because of longer use.

Here, candidates had more moderate expectations, and were fairly well satisfied that these moderate expectations were achieved. Thus, candidates may come to realize that television is limited, and temper their expectations to match these limitations. Realizing, however, that many of television's effective characteristics are extremely helpful

to them in the type of campaign they wish to run, they will use it more often in this way. This consistency of expectancy and achievement will lead to a higher degree of satisfaction, which will in turn lead to more television usage.

Both broadcasters and government must consider these present and possible future developments in the context of public service and interest. The two biggest problems, both currently, and, probably to be amplified with increased future use of broadcasting, are the economic inequity of the access to the media, and the orientation of the users of the media to personal/image presentations as opposed to issue/informational presentations.

Important considerations must be given to the relatively new area of cablevision. Only very basic regulation has been established so far by the FCC, but specific attention should be given to the role of political broadcasting via this medium. Here, as in regular broadcasting, it should be the goal of broadcaster and government alike to attempt to bring about a situation in which issue orientation and equality of access are the dominant characteristics.

It seems unlikely that the problem of access will be solved in any way other than government regulation. Even though advertising costs may be reduced somewhat in the near future, enabling many candidates now unable to do so the opportunity to compete on a fairly equitable basis, the

costs will still be prohibitive to the poorer candidate and parties, giving the wealthy an advantage. Even in cases where both candidates in a district invested heavily in broadcasting, the one with the most money to spend, most invested in broadcasting, and greatest broadcast campaign orientation usually managed to make a better showing.

One alternative in this direction would be to limit the amount a candidate is able to spend in these media for advertising purposes. Although the federally proposed seven cents per vote limit would not have much effect at this level, because resources are more limited, a lower limit, perhaps at somewhere around two cents per vote, might be more useful, as this figure seems to be a significant one at this level. However, even such a measure as this has its limitations. It would have no effect on the content of the messages, which may then continue to have a detrimental effect on the public's understanding of issues, problems, and the political process. Also, it would not effect those candidates with funds so limited as to prevent them from utilizing these media, no matter what the cost.

A better alternative may be some combination of discouraging or eliminating the use of these media for political advertising, and the encouraging or requiring of these media to devote time to public service oriented presentations of the candidates at no charge to them. Many candidates would probably approve of such a plan. Several candidates reacted

favorably to the existence of this type of program in limited form in some areas. PTV Channel 19 in University Center, Michigan was the one most often mentioned in this context, presenting various eastern Michigan candidates in a fairly informal discussion format entitled "Meet the Candidates." They were disappointed, however, in the small audience and limited audience reaction (although several reported that what little reaction they did get was favorable and enthusiastic). Formats could take many forms, but would be designed for information purposes. Perhaps public funding through production and distribution from public stations could be a primary vehicle.

This type of programming, in addition to emphasizing information and issues over personalities and images, would tend to negate such behavioral aspects as selective perception, and exposure. A viewer would be exposed to opposition as well as favorite candidates, and thus would hear from both. Even when both are presented separately, if viewed on all channels they would be effective because of the tendency of the viewer to watch whatever is on rather than turn the set off. This would also increase political consensus. Lubell,[2] in his study of the Kennedy-Nixon debates, found that the status of the opposition candidate improved through this dual exposure, and though few people changed their minds, many felt that the opposition candidate would still be a capable official should he win.

---

[2]Samuel Lubell, in The Great Debates, Sidney Kraus, ed. (Bloomington, Indiana: University Press, 1962), pp. 151-154.

Probably the only very strong opponents to such a plan would be the broadcasters themselves. This motivation would probably stem more from economic factors than political or public service ones. Revenue considerations seem to override any ethical considerations of commercial broadcasters. As unsophisticated in broadcasting-politics interaction as many of the candidates are, it would seem that Charles Siepmann is correct when he states that politicians are much more knowledgeable in this area than are broadcasters.

In a survey reported in the Journal of Broadcasting, it was revealed that many station managers would not differentiate between a political spot commercial and a political message, grouping both public service and commercial programs under the general heading of "political broadcasting." Differences in content, audience, intent, etc. were either not important to them or they were not known to them. In most cases, there was no clear rationale relating to the purpose and function of political broadcasts (i.e., political spot announcements) other than that of obtaining revenue for the station.[3]

One positive exception, which also seems to have potential for improving the situation, is the policy of WGN radio-tv in Chicago. In the last election year, these stations did not allow candidates to purchase less than five minutes of air time in which to advertise. By eliminating the spot

---

[3]Richard D. Porter, "Some Values to the Broadcaster of Election Campaign," Journal of Broadcasting, VII, Spring 1963, pp. 143-156.

commercial, the management has shown a willingness to sacrifice revenue for the sake of an increased public service orientation.[4] Such a policy was formerly followed by Westinghouse Broadcasting, whose management felt that no political issue could be properly discussed in the time available in a spot-commercial.[5]

It should be remembered, however, that revenues from political advertising are approximately one percent of the average station's revenue.[6] Thus, adverse financial effects for the stations would be slight, while potential beneficial effects for the public seem substantial.

Another issue involved with access to the broadcast media is Section 315 (the Equal Time Provision of the Communications Act), currently being debated within government and the broadcast industry. In light of research data and reactions of candidates, it would seem that it would be in the public interest to keep Section 315 intact. Broadcasters feel, apparently, that they can be the best judge of who receives time and who does not. However, if the accusations of many of the state's American Independent Party candidates are accurate, it would seem that such a move would further establish the two large parties currently popular in the United States and would to some extent limit the expression

---

[4] Interview with Thomas F. Baldwin, Associate Professor of TV-Radio, MSU, East Lansing, Michigan, June 25, 1971.

[5] Edward W. Chester, Radio, Television and American Politics (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969), pp. 86-97.

[6] Porter, op. cit.

of minority viewpoints. The broadcast media do not seem to possess either the inclination or the qualification to determine which voices should be heard in the public interest. The broadcast media channels are public property, and thus access to that property should be readily available to the general public.

An aspect of this issue, debated occasionally over the years, but receiving increased attention from populist and new left groups recently, deals with responsibility of quality access. Is it enough to merely open the access to numerous groups and individuals, or does the broadcast industry and/or government have a responsibility to make sure that all groups have practice and knowledge for using these media effectively, and not counter-productively?

It seems equitable in this instance, from the point of view of both the candidate and the public, that some sort of media orientation would be beneficial, especially if changes in political broadcasting of the type recommended here are carried out. Perhaps this could be most effectively done through an independent foundation, for candidates or others to receive basic background in broadcast characteristics and techniques, in order that use of these media may be structured on a more equitable base.

Thus, hopefully, through these measures, the public service aspects of political broadcasting may be improved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baldwin, Thomas F. Associate Professor of TV-Radio, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, personal interview, June 25, 1971.

Broadcasting, "Network Time," November 23, 1970, p. 52.

Burdick, W. and A. J. Brodbeck, American Voting Behavior. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1959.

Campell, Angus et al. The American Voter. New York: Wiley, 1960.

Chester, Edward W. Radio, Television, and American Politics. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969, p. 300.

Detroit Free Press, "TV Ads and Elections," June 28, 1970, p. 18-A.

Dougherty, James, Public Information Director, Republican State Committee of Michigan, personal interview, Lansing, Michigan, October 28, 1971.

Fuchs, Douglas A. "Does TV Election News Affect Voters?" Columbia Journalism Review, Fall, 1965, p. 39.

Glaser, William, Study in Radio, Television and American Politics, Edward W. Chester, ed., New York: Sheed and Ward, p. 114.

Googasian, George, Chairman, Hart for Senate Committee, Detroit, Michigan, personal interview, September 10, 1970.

Greenberg, Tannenbaum, and Sullivan, in "The Great Debates," Sidney Kraus, ed., The Great Debates, Bloomington, Indiana: University Press, 1962), pp. 273-286.

Horan, Richard K., Elections Division, Michigan Department of State, Lansing, Michigan, personal interview, March 21, 1971.

Hovland, Carl I., "Reconciling Conflicting Results Derived from Experimental and Survey Studies of Attitude Change," Bobbs-Merril Reprint No. p-164, Bobbs-Merrill, Inc., Indianapolis, 1964.

Katz, Elihu, "The Two-Step Flow of Communication." Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, Inc., 1957, pp. 64-68.

Key, V. O., Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups. New York: Thomas Crowell Co., 1958, p. 38.

Klapper, Joseph T. "What We Know About the Effects of Mass Communication." Bobbs-Merril Reprint No. s-145, Bobbs-Merrill, Inc., Indianapolis, 1959, pp. 453-454.

Lang, Kurt, and Lang, Gladys Engel, Politics and Television. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1968.

Lubell, Samuel, in "The Great Debates," Sidney Kraus, ed., The Great Debates. Bloomington, Indiana: University Press, 1962, p. 329.

McGinniss, Joe. The Selling of the President, 1968. New York: Trident Press, 1969.

McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media. New York: Signet, 1964, pp. 36-44.

McNeil, Robert. The People Machine. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Miller, Warren. "The Political Behavior of the Electorate." In E. Dreyer and W. Rosenbaum, eds., Political Opinion and Electoral Behavior. Belmont, Calif: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 85-102.

Newsweek, "The Selling of the Candidates, 1970," October 1970, pp. 34-35.

Newsweek, "What's Ahead for TV," May 31, 1971, p. 72.

Political Publicity, Democratic National Committee, Washington, p. 7.

Porter, Richard D. "Some Values to the Broadcaster of Election Campaigns." Journal of Broadcasting, VII, Spring 1963, pp. 143-156.

Unpublished data, Compilation of Survey Research Center Data, Ann Arbor, at East Lansing, 1970.

Wycoff, Gene. The Image Candidates. New York: Macmillan, 1968.

Zimbardo, Philip, and Ebbe B. Ebbesen. Influencing Attitudes and Changing Behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969.

APPENDIX

ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to the following questions in the indicated manner. If for any reason you do not wish to respond to a particular question, leave it blank and continue to the next one. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

1. Which party ticket were you a member of? (Check One) Democratic_____
   Recpulican_____
   A.I.P._____
   Other (Please Specify) _____

2. What do you consider to be your district's typical voting behavior? (Check One)
   Traditionally Democratic_____
   Traditionally Republican_____
   A "Swing" District_____
   Other (Please Specify)_____

3. What do you consider to be your district's typical predominant political idealogy to be? (Check One)
   Very Conservative_____
   Conservative_____
   Middle of the Road_____
   Liberal_____
   Very Liberal_____

4. What is the primary residence structure of your districe? (Check One)
   Urban_____
   Suburan_____
   Rural_____
   Other (Please Specify)_____

5. In your estimation, what is the typical voter turnout of your district? (Check One)
   Very High Turnout_____
   High Turnout_____
   Average Turnout_____
   Low Turnout_____
   Very Low Turnout_____

6. In your district, how interested would you say the voters usually are in the legislative election campaigns, as opposed to other races being run at the same time? (Check One)
   Very Interested_____
   Somewhat Interested_____
   Neutral_____
   Not Very Interested_____
   Not At All Interested_____

7. What percentage of your campaign funds went into each of the following media? (Please indicate percentage for each catagory)

Radio_____ Magazines_____
Television_____ Signs (includes billboards, lawn signs, etc.)_____
Newspapers_____
Literature (includes handbills, direct mail, etc.)_____ Films (includes slides, etc.)____
Auto Signs_____ Personal Appearances_____
Other (Please Specify)_____

8. What percentage of your campaign endeavors (time, effort, work, etc.), went into each of the following media? (Please indicate percentages for each category. If the same as number 7, leave blank)

Radio_____ Magazines_____
Television_____ Signs (includes billboards, lawn signs, etc.)_____
Newspapers_____ Films (includes slides,etc.)_____
Literature (includes handbills, direct mail, etc.) Personal Appearances_____
_____
Auto Signs_____ Other (Please Specify)_____

9. If financial considerations were not a factor, how would you utilize those media? (Please indicate percentages for each category)

Radio_____ Magazines_____
Television_____ Signs (includes billboards, lawn signs, etc.)_____
Newspapers_____ Films (includes slides, etc.) ____
Literature (includes handbills, direct mail etc.)_____ Personal Appearances_____
Same as before_____
Auto Signs_____
Other_____Please Specify_____

10. Which medium do you think was most effective for you in the past campaign?

_____ Why? _____
_____
(fill in and comment)

11. If you used the broadcast media, how effective do you think they were? (Check One In Each Category and Comment)

	Radio	Television
Very Effective	_____	_____
Somewhat Effective	_____	_____
Ineffective	_____	_____
Not Used	_____	_____

Why? _____

12. Did the effectiveness of the broadcast media surpass, fall below, or equal your expectations of it? (Check One in Each Category and Comment)

	Radio	Television
Surpass	_____	_____
Equal	_____	_____
Fall Below	_____	_____
Not Used	_____	_____

Why? _____

_____

13. In your opinion, which medium/media did your opponet(s) rely on most? (Fill in and comment)

_____ Why? _____

14. In your opinion, which medium/media was most effective for your opponent(s)? (Fill in and comment)

_____ Why? _____

15. Which of the following did you utilize during the campaign? (Check and fill in)

Campaign Manager _____ Professional Advertising _____

Full-time Campaign Staff _____ How Many _____

Professional Public Relations _____