Political Involvement: Characteristics and Categories[1]

Stacey F. Kanihan
University of St. Thomas

Dennis F. Kinsey
Syracuse University

ABSTRACT: Political involvement is conceptualized as an orientation toward a political situation that distinguishes qualitative differences in message processing. This stands in contrast to traditional conceptions of political involvement, which describe deep-seated individual traits that differ little over time. Three categories of situational political involvement are proposed (active involvement, passive involvement, and uninvolved) and accompanying communication patterns are examined with a 52-item Q sample during the 1994 California gubernatorial campaign. The actively involved category indicated different communication behaviors than the passively involved—and especially the uninvolved. The most important behavior distinguishing the actively involved was interpersonal communication—talking about politics.

Author's addresses: *Kanihan*, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of St. Thomas, 2115 Summit Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55105-1096; E-mail: sbkanihan@stthomas.edu; *Kinsey*, S. I. Newhouse School of Public Communications, Syracuse University, 215 University Place, Syracuse, NY 13244-2100; E-mail: dfkinsey@mailbox.syr.edu.

[1]The authors wish to gratefully acknowledge the suggestions of Professor Steven H. Chaffee.

Introduction

Researchers in several social science disciplines now have studied political involvement, leading to various conceptual and operational definitions of the term. Roser (1990) notes that involvement is not a clear-cut concept and calls for thorough explication of the type of involvement under investigation. In political communication research, two separate theoretical traditions have developed in the empirical analysis of involvement: (1) Degree of involvement, a continuous variable ranging from low to high, that describes trans-situational individual differences, which interact with political message variables (Campbell, Converse, Miller, & Stokes 1964); and (2) involvement orientation, a categorical variable that distinguishes qualitative differences in message processing that are stimulated by different political situations.

The purpose of this study is to examine whether qualitatively different categories of involvement do exist. This study proposes that people are either *actively* involved or *passively* involved in a political situation. For completeness in describing a total population, the typology becomes trichotomous. That is, there are people who are *uninvolved* (Hyman & Sheatsley, 1947; Price, 1992). If involvement can be stimulated by a certain political situation, then involvement can change over time for the same individual. This stands in contrast to the conception of involvement as a deep-seated individual trait that differs little over time.

Studies that assume involvement to be an individual trait regard cognition, affect, and behavior as correlated indicators that, when added, measure an exact level of enduring involvement (see Fiske & Kinder, 1981). These indicators include political interest, caring about politics, and campaigning for a candidate, respectively. In contrast, this study proposes cognition, affect, and behavior to be distinct qualities that can differentiate between categories of involvement. That is, "passive involvement" doesn't mean a person is a little less active. Passive involvement suggests a person is *not* active; it describes a distinct way to follow a campaign, for example, in the mass media. Active involvement means active participation, especially interpersonal discussion about politics.

A central focus of this study is the role of interpersonal discussion in the conceptualization of "active involvement." This study proposes that people who are actively involved talk about politics; those who are passively involved or uninvolved do not. In addition, the concept of

advertent media attention will be used to differentiate between the passive and uninvolved categories.

The purpose of this study is to answer the following question: Do three categories of political involvement exist? If so, what are the defining characteristics of each category? In addition, this study will address the following: Is interpersonal discussion about politics the distinguishing communication behavior that differentiates active involvement from the other two categories? Does advertent media attention distinguish passive involvement from the uninvolved category?

Background

Involvement as a Continuous Variable

Campbell *et al.* (1964) define political involvement as an individual-level, psychological engagement with politics that endures over time. Many other scholars follow the Campbell *et al.* concept of involvement, using survey measures from the University of Michigan Center for Political Studies (American National Election Survey) to operationalize involvement (Fiske & Kinder, 1981; Dennis, 1992; Marcus & MacKuen, 1993). The authors of one of the earliest studies of political communication also conceptualized involvement as a stable trait: Lazarsfeld, Berelson & Gaudet (1944) called involvement "political interest." While these scholars and others (Verba & Nie, 1972) do suggest situational influences of involvement, the concept appears to be treated as a trait that remains stable over time.

Involvement as a Categorical Variable

When involvement is a categorical variable it differs in quality instead of amount. Involvement, in this case, takes the form of distinct conditions that will be called active involvement and passive involvement. Each of these is also a variable; for example, one can be actively involved to a greater or lesser extent. But communication is qualitatively a different kind of behavior when one is even slightly active than when one is quite involved, but in a wholly passive orientation to politics. The "uninvolved" category describes the person who is neither actively not passively involved. We refrain from calling this category "low" involvement or "little" involvement, labels that connote one end of a continuum; these terms would suggest that being "little involved" is like being "actively involved," but to a lesser degree.

Some studies indicate that involvement is not a stable personal trait, but a response to a situation, which is more in line with a categorical definition of involvement (Rothschild & Ray, 1974; Milbrath & Goel, 1977; Kanihan & Chaffee, 1996).

Active Involvement

The distinguishing response for an actively involved person is activity or *behavior.* The communication uses and gratifications literature (Katz, 1959; Blumler, 1964) refers to it as "information-seeking" behavior. McCombs (1972) distinguishes between three categories of political involvement and ties this concept with information-seeking behavior. Actively involved people seek political information for their own use or for conversations with others (McCombs, 1972; Atkin, 1973). These studies also indicate that the actively involved selectively attend to political messages to support their views and strengthen their arguments.

Rothschild and Ray (1974) and Garramone (1984) found that actively involved people are less likely to be affected by the media, particularly by direct persuasive effects of a political advertisement. Chaffee and Choe (1980) and Chaffee and Rimal (1996) consider "time of vote decision" as another political outcome influenced by audience involvement. People who are actively involved in an election are likely to make their vote decision before the campaign heats up. Called "pre-campaign deciders," these individuals tend to have strong predispositions toward candidates or issues and are not likely to change their vote decision during the campaign.

In addition to *behavioral* responses such as information seeking, political conversation, decision making, and voting intention, the actively involved also *think* about politics (Lazarsfeld *et al.*, 1944; Levy & Windahl, 1984) and *care* about elections and issues (Gunther & Lasorsa, 1986), cognitive and affective responses, respectively. A person who is actively involved presumably cares a great deal about who wins or loses.

Interpersonal discussion is considered a behavioral component of active involvement and the key distinction between active involvement, passive involvement and the uninvolved. While the communication literature is rich with studies relating interpersonal discussion with diffusion of information (Greenberg, 1964; Chaffee, 1982; Gantz, 1983), few studies address interpersonal discussion and political involvement. In a survey accompanied by structured interviews,

Troldahl and Van Dam (1965) found that one-third of respondents discussed politics; the remaining two-thirds who did not were referred to as "inactives." Tan (1980) found that interpersonal discussion about politics leads to newspaper reading and that discussion was a characteristic of active involvement. Kinsey and Chaffee (1996) found interpersonal discussion to be the strongest correlate of the declining evaluation of a political figure. S. Greenberg (1975) found that when persuasion is attempted in political conversations, references are made to media information.

Passive Involvement

The passively involved are still engaged in the political process, but not in a participatory sense. Political involvement in this category comes primarily in the form of media use: some individuals "seek orientation or vote guidance" (McCombs, 1972; Garramone, 1985) while others follow the campaign in the media as "spectators" (Price, 1992). In "time of vote decision" studies, the passively involved are considered "campaign deciders" (Chaffee & Rimal, 1996). They use the campaign media to inform their vote decision and may change their minds during the course of the race. Moreover, people seeking vote guidance prefer news reports over editorials; that is, they prefer factual information (Garramone, 1985).

Those who are passively involved may be susceptible to persuasion, but this persuasion is grounded in information they have learned from substantive arguments in media messages (Ray, 1973; Chaiken, 1980; Petty & Cacioppo, 1984). While "active" behavior appears to be the hallmark of active involvement, political cognition (influenced by media attention) may be the distinguishing feature of passive involvement. And passive involvement may still contain an affective dimension. Those who follow the campaign on television may care, to some extent, about the outcome of the election.

Advertent media use is the characteristic that distinguishes between the passively involved and the uninvolved. The passively involved advertently use the media: these people either seek vote guidance, or attend to the campaign as spectators. Spectator-like involvement may be characterized by following the campaign on television, an activity that requires less cognitive effort than actively seeking information in a newspaper (see Krugman, 1965); hence, the term "passive involvement." Inadvertent users, in contrast, do not have the same cognitive needs as advertent users (McCombs, 1972). As such, they are not considered part of the passive involvement category. "This voter does

not actively seek [information] out," writes McCombs. "He simply tolerates accidental or inadvertent exposure" (p. 186). Thus the inadvertent user is considered "uninvolved."

Uninvolved

Those who are uninvolved in a political situation lack the cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses that characterize either active or passive involvement. They pay little attention to an election or issue, and are considered politically "apathetic" (Price, 1992). That is, they do not think or care much about politics, and they do not "actively" participate.

McCombs (1972) notes that people who are not involved may be exposed inadvertently to the campaign, especially on television. While exposure is accidental, if it does occur, it can have powerful persuasive effects on a person with little cognitive structure to guide its processing. For example, Rothschild and Ray (1974) found that mere exposure to a political advertisement persuaded people who were not at all involved in a low-visibility campaign to vote for a particular candidate. This persuasion was accomplished according to the "low involvement hierarchy"—without changes in attitude, they found.

Sherif, Sherif, and Nebergall (1965) suggest that people who are less involved with an issue have a wider range of acceptance for different arguments, and thus may be more easily persuaded. While those in the passive involvement category may be persuaded by substantive arguments, people who are not involved may be influenced "peripherally" (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984). Cues such as source credibility, background scenery, or tone of the message may be particularly effective.

Chaffee and Choe (1980) note that the uninvolved often make their vote decisions at the last minute; Bowen (1992) found that such voters are influenced as late as election day by a barrage of "attack ads." Several researchers note that the political behavior of the uninvolved is unpredictable, rather than grounded in deep cognitive thought, and is responsive to idiosyncratic situational pressures (Lazarsfeld *et al.*, 1944; Campbell *et al.*, 1966; Chaffee & Roser, 1986; Krugman, 1965).

Comparing Categories

To determine whether active, passive, and uninvolved categories of involvement exist, the political orientation patterns of people will be

compared. A group of California residents will be asked for their views about a specific political situation: the 1994 primary election for California governor. Topics will relate to political discussion, political interest, and media use.

We propose that three categories of people will emerge. (1) Those who are actively involved will talk about the election, care about the outcome of the election, and pay attention to news accounts about the election. (2) Those who are passively involved will feel an obligation to vote, watch television to advertently keep up with the campaign, and exhibit other characteristics of the passively involved person, as discussed above. (3) Those who are uninvolved will not talk about politics, not care about the election, and not attend to the political media, except inadvertently.

Table 1
Proposed qualities of three involvement categories

	Active	Passive	Uninvolved
Interpersonal discussion	Yes	No	No
Caring about election outcome	Yes	Yes	No
Advertent media attention	Yes	Yes	No

Methodology

Involvement orientation will be assessed using Q technique and its methodology (Stephenson, 1953)—a method that examines the underlying point of view of a person on a given topic, oftentimes regarding politics (Brown, 1980). Q methodology examines these viewpoints by asking respondents to sort a series of opinion statements (Q sample) into piles typically along a disagree/agree scale. The data (Q sorts) are correlated and factor analyzed using people—rather than variables—as elements. Factors represent commonalties among respondents. For more on Q methodology see Brown (1980; 1986) and McKeown and Thomas (1988).

Data were collected from Santa Clara County residents in California one week prior to the June 7, 1994 primary election for governor. Q technique enabled the researchers to administer a fairly time consuming and complex set of questions about political behavior, designed to tap

the underlying political orientations of respondents. A purposive sample of 29 people participated in the Q study. They were chosen to represent a broad range of interest and involvement in politics–from political activists to uninterested citizens. Respondents were asked to sort 52 disagree/agree statements along a -5 (most disagree) to +5 (most agree) scale.

Figure 1
Q Sort Distribution for Political Involvement Q Study

	Most Disagree				Neutral			Most Agree			
Value	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
Frequency	2	4	5	5	6	8	6	5	5	4	2

These statements, based on the literature review and generated by the authors of this study, were used to tap concepts described in this study's background section, including interpersonal conversation, advertent media attention, and caring about the outcome of the election. These statements correspond to the theoretical definitions of active involvement, passive involvement and the uninvolved. Statements are shown in the Appendix and represent roughly equal numbers of theoretically active, passive and uninvolved items. The three types of statements were randomly numbered. The statements were pretested by 10 California residents, some with extensive political backgrounds, others without. Eight redundant or unclear Q statements were dropped before construction of the final 52 item Q sample.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Analysis

The 29 Q sorts were correlated and factor analyzed. Centroid extraction with varimax rotation was performed through the PCQ software program (Stricklin, 1987-1996). Three factors emerged accounting for 41 percent of the variance (See Table 2). The standard

error for a factor loading is calculated by the expression $1/\sqrt{N}$ where N equals the number of statements. For 52 statements, the SE = $1/\sqrt{52}$ = .14. Loadings in excess of 2.58(SE) = .36 are significant at the .01 level. Factors of at least four or five persons each are thought to provide a well-defined orientation, while more subjects are thought to add very little (Brown, 1980).

Interpretation

Respondents should load onto three factors explaining active, passive and uninvolved orientations. Factor interpretation will focus on items that describe interpersonal conversations, advertent media exposure and caring about the election outcome to examine if differences in the way these items are ranked correspond to proposed differences in involvement orientation. The items that comprise the factors should provide a description of each category of involvement: The actively involved will be distinguished by talking about politics, caring about the outcome of the election, and following the campaign in the media, especially the newspaper. The passive involvement factor should be distinguished by items including following the campaign on TV and caring about the election outcome. The uninvolved should be distinguished by not caring about the election and not following the campaign in the media.

Results

Of the 29 participants in our study, 17 were significantly loaded on factor A, 11 were loaded on factor B (which is bipolar), and 10 where significantly loaded on factor C. This adds to more than 29 because of cross-loadings (see Table 2).

Factor A and Factor C: Passive Involved

Respondents who were loaded on factors A and C have to be considered Passive Involved, based on our proposed criteria (i.e., they generally do not talk about politics, but they do care about the election and attend to the media). Factor A and factor C are significantly correlated (r = .55).

Factor A and factor C represent the Passive Involved respondents (see the Appendix)—they pay attention to election coverage to find out where the candidates stand on the issues but they make it clear that they

Table 2
Rotated Factor Matrix for Subjects

	Factors[2]							
Person	A	B	C	Sex	Age	Pol[3]	Vote[4]	Activity[5]
13	70	02	10	F	30	Rep.	Yes	2
23	69	08	23	M	33	Dem.	Und.	5
27	64	06	18	M	46	Dem.	Yes	4
2	57	03	35	F	38	Dem.	Yes	2
25	43	-26	17	F	42	NA	No	2
22	42	01	10	F	NA	NA	No	3
1	37	16	34	F	26	Rep.	No	4
14	36	-04	28	M	57	Rep.	Yes	6
21	09	69	05	M	73	Dem	Yes	4
6	02	57	16	F	33	Dem.	Yes	3
17	30	-44	35	F	26	NA	No	0
9	07	-51	31	F	21	NA	No	0
4	23	-20	64	M	60	Dem.	Yes	2
10	35	-03	62	M	34	Rep.	No	2
18	19	18	57	M	30	Dem.	Yes	4
29	02	-20	55	M	30	NA	No	2
16	01	08	40	F	57	Dem.	Yes	2
26	56	33	38	F	29	Dem.	Yes	5
3	50	-05	49	M	36	Rep.	Und.	2
24	40	36	64	M	53	Dem.	Yes	6
11	36	-14	41	F	32	Dem.	Yes	3
15	51	63	-07	F	32	Dem.	Yes	5
5	45	59	26	M	49	NA	Yes	6
12	08	56	38	F	31	Dem.	Yes	3
28	39	-45	20	F	56	Dem.	Und	3
20	42	-46	24	F	39	Ind.	No	2
8	40	-61	10	F	35	Rep.	No	2
19	35	-16	03	M	29	NA	No	0
7	13	-02	32	F	35	NA	Und.	0
Eigen-value	4.59	3.61	3.66		Total			
% Variance	16	12	13		41%			

[2]Decimals to two places have been omitted. Factor loadings +/ .36 are significant, p. < .01.

[3]Political party registration.

Table 2 (*continued*)

[4]Do you plan to vote in the June 7 primary.

[5]Political Activity Scale. We asked respondents to indicate if they had ever participated in the following six activities: given out campaign leaflets, helped with voter registration, put a bumper sticker on your car, persuaded others to vote for your candidate, voted in a primary election, and voted in a general election. Each item was scored as 1 or 0 and summed; scale ranged from 0-6.

also read other news besides politics. They do not resent the heavy news coverage the election is getting because this information helps them decide for whom to vote (scores in parentheses for factors A, B, and C, respectively):

37. I pay attention to election coverage to learn where the candidates stand on the issues. (5, 2, 4)

30. I read other news in the newspaper besides politics. (5, -2, 5)

6. Information in the news helps me to decide whom I will vote for. (4, -2, 3)

They noted seeing ads and news about the election when watching television. And, in the past few days they have read a newspaper article about the election.

12. I sometimes see ads about the candidates when I'm watching TV. (4, 0, 3)

10. I sometimes see news about this election when I'm watching TV. (4, -2, 2)

49. I have read a newspaper article about the campaign in the past few days. (3, 2, 1)

Although they do not find this election very exciting, respondents on factors A and C indicated that they keep up with the election because it is their civic duty.

22. This election is exciting to me. (-4, 4, -4)

20. It is part of my civic duty to keep up with this election. (2, 3, 5)

Factor A and factor C respondents do not talk about this election much. They do not seek political discussions with others or initiate

conversations. This avoidance of political conversations is especially indicative of factor C.

19. I talk about this election with others. (1, 4, 1)

7. I don't talk about this election very much with others. (-1, -2, 3)

28. I usually initiate conversations about this election. (0, 4, -3)

Not surprisingly, they don't look for information in the newspaper, candidate ads, or polls as fodder for conversations about the election.

34. I read about the election in the paper so I can talk about it later with others. (0, 2, -1)

48. Candidate ads for this election affect how I talk about it with other people. (-3, 1, -2)

46. Polls about this election affect how I talk about it with other people. (-4, 0, -5)

The major difference between factors A and C tends to be in their relative use of television. Respondents on factor A tended to lean heavily on television as a source of campaign news while factor C respondents did not, as scores for statement numbers 2, 52, and 17 indicate.

2. I keep up with this election by watching news on television. (4, -5, -1)

52. I have watched election coverage on TV news in the past few days. (3, -1, -3)

17. Following the campaign on television is sometimes like watching a sporting event. (3, -3, 0)

Factor B: The Active Involved and the Uninvolved

As proposed, the actively involved are distinguished by talking about politics, caring about the outcome of the election, and following the campaign in the media, especially the newspaper. Participants associated with factor B indicated that they care a lot about who wins the election and were very interested in the election as indicated by their high scoring of statements number 25 and 1 (scores in parentheses for

factors A, B, and C, respectively):

25. I care a lot about who wins this election. (2, 5, 4)

1. I am very interested in this election. (-1, 5, -1)

As proposed, these Active Involved respondents participated in interpersonal discussions about the election. They indicated that they talked about this election with others and that they usually initiated these conversations. These respondents were the only ones to say that they try to persuade others to vote for their candidate.

19. I talk about this election with others. (1, 4, 1)

28. I usually initiate conversations about this election. (0, 4, -3)

31. I will try to persuade others to vote for my candidate during this election. (-3, 2, 0)

They also gave high scores to statements indicating that they think about the election a lot and that the election is exciting to them.

2. I think about this election a lot. (-3, 4, -4)

22. This election is exciting to me. (-4, 4, -4)

Not surprisingly, factor B respondents strongly rejected the idea that they may not vote in this election. They indicated that it matters to California and to them personally who wins.

18. I am not sure if I will vote in this election. (-4,-5, -2)

50. No matter who wins this election, California won't be affected much. (-1, -4, -1)

47. No matter who wins this election, my life will be the same. (0, -4, 1)

These are not "last-minute deciders." Factor B respondents rejected the idea that they are likely to decide for whom to vote right before the election or that they may change their mind during the campaign about whom to vote for.

15. I am likely to decide how I will vote right before the election. (1, -

4, -2)

26. I may change my mind during the campaign about who to vote for. (0, -3, 0)

The election medium of choice for these participants appears to be the newspaper. Factor B respondents indicated that following the campaign in the newspaper is interesting, that they keep up with the election by reading the newspaper, and when reading the newspaper they look for articles about the election. Conversely, they strongly rejected the idea that they are keeping up with the election by watching news on television.

14. Following the campaign in the newspaper is interesting. (2, 3, 0)

4. I keep up with this election by reading the newspaper. (1, 3, 1)

16. When reading a newspaper, I look for articles about this election. (-1, 3, 0)

2. I keep up with this election by watching news on television. (4, -5, -1)

Factor B is bipolar. Five people were negatively associated with this factor. That is, their views are opposite of those positively associated with factor B—they do not talk about politics, they do not care about the outcome of the election, and they do not follow the campaign in the media. In other words, these respondents are our described Uninvolved (see Table 1). Although we expected that the uninvolved would comprise their own factor, it makes sense that they actually are the bipolar or negative end of the Active Involved factor.

The Active Involved respondents averaged 4.5 on the 6 point political activity scale compared to the Uninvolved who averaged 1.4 (Table 2). Additionally, all of the Active Involved respondents indicated that they planned on voting in the primary election while none of the Uninvolved planned on voting.

Concluding Remarks

By way of summary, a 52-item Q sample was used with 29 California residents to examine a categorical conceptualization of political involvement. Three factors emerged—one active involvement factor and

two passive involved factors. The active involved factor emerged as hypothesized—characterized by talking about politics, caring about the outcome of the election, and following the campaign in the media, especially the newspaper. This factor was bi-polar. The negative end of this factor represented the Uninvolved.

Evidence of our passive involved category is more complex than previously thought. We proposed the existence of a single passive involved factor—generally not talking about politics, but caring about the election and attending to the media. However, this description extended to not one but two factors. And while these factors were significantly correlated (r = .55), they nevertheless represent two distinct views. Difference in media use seems to distinguish the two passive involved factors. This distinction was not anticipated. A more detailed "media" Q sample may help illuminate what we feel is a subtle difference in our general understanding of passive involvement. Or perhaps a more detailed media Q sample will illuminate distinct involvement categories, based on media preference, that we've not anticipated.

Regardless of whether passive involvement is one or two categories, this research suggests that political involvement can be viewed as categorical and situational. Actively involved citizens are behaviorally different than passively involved citizens and especially uninvolved citizens. One of the most important behavioral distinctions is interpersonal communication—talking about politics. The relationship between interpersonal communication and mass communication is a rich area of research that is starting to attract attention (Chaffee & Mutz, 1988; Kinsey & Chaffee, 1996) and that relationship combined with political involvement offers many research possibilities.

Appendix

	Factor Scores		
Statements	A	B	C
1. I am very interested in this election.	-1	5	-1
2. I keep up with this election by watching news on television.	4	-5	-1
3. I think about this election a lot.	-3	4	-4
4. I keep up with this election by reading the newspaper.	1	3	1
5. I am paying a lot of attention to this			

election in the newspaper.	-1	2	-2
6. Information in the news helps me to decide whom I will vote for.	4	-2	3
7. I don't talk about this election very much with others.	-1	-2	3
8. I am paying a lot of attention to this election on television.	-2	0	-3
9. Following the campaign on television is fun.	0	1	-1
10. I sometimes see news about this election when I'm watching TV.	4	-2	2
11. Following the campaign on television is interesting.	0	1	-5
12. I sometimes see ads about the candidates when I'm watching TV.	4	0	3
13. Once I decide whom to vote for, I am not likely to change my mind.	0	1	4
14. Following the campaign in the newspaper is interesting.	2	3	0
15. I am likely to decide how I will vote right before the election.	1	-4	-2
16. When reading a newspaper, I look for articles about this election.	-1	3	0
17. Following the campaign on TV is sometimes like watching a sporting event.	3	-3	0
18. I am not sure if I will vote in this election.	-4	-5	-2
19. I talk about this election with others.	1	4	1
20. It is part of my civic duty to keep up with this election.	2	3	5
21. I watch political ads on TV for the entertainment value mostly.	-4	0	0
22. This election is exciting to me.	-4	4	-4
23. I am likely to decide whom to vote for during the campaign.	3	0	1
24. I try to avoid talking about politics.	-3	-3	1
25. I care a lot about who wins this election.	2	5	4
26. I may change my mind during the campaign about who to vote for.	0	-3	0
27. Politics is not very exciting.	-3	-1	2
28. I usually initiate conversations about this election.	0	4	-3
29. I find candidate ads on television to be informative.	-2	-2	-2
30. I read other news in the newspaper besides politics.	5	-2	5
31. I will try to persuade others to vote for my candidate during this election.	-3	2	0

32. I am somewhat interested in the outcome of this election.	1	-1	3
33. I don't see much difference between the candidates in this election.	-2	-3	-4
34. I read about the election in the paper so I can talk about it later with others.	0	2	-1
35. I prefer reading news articles, rather than editorials, about the election.	2	1	4
36. I pay attention to campaign ads to learn the strategy of the candidates.	0	0	-3
37. I pay attention to election coverage to learn where the candidates stand on the issues.	5	2	4
38. In this election, I will probably vote for my party's candidate.	1	0	3
39. I pay attention to election coverage to learn what the candidates are like as people.	3	0	0
40. Polls about the candidates might affect how I will vote in this election.	-2	-1	-3
41. I am less interested in political news than other news on TV.	-1	-4	2
42. Ads about the candidates might affect how I will vote in this election.	-2	-3	-4
43. Debates between the candidates might affect how I will vote in this election.	2	-1	2
44. I resent the heavy news coverage this election is getting.	-5	-1	-1
45. If I give money to any candidate this year, it will be for this election.	-5	3	0
46. Polls about this election affect how I talk about it with other people.	-4	0	-5
47. No matter who wins this election, my life will be the same.	0	-4	1
48. Candidate ads for this election affect how I talk about it with other people.	-3	1	-2
49. I have read a newspaper article about the campaign in the past few days.	3	2	1
50. No matter who wins this election, California won't be affected much.	-1	-4	-1
51. Debates between the candidates for this election could affect how I talk about it with other people.	1	1	2
52. I have watched election coverage on TV news in the past few days.	3	-1	-3

References

Atkin, C. (1973). Instrumental utilities and information seeking. In P. Clarke (Ed.), *New models for mass communication research* (Vol. 2). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Bowen, L. (1992). Time of voting decision and use of political advertising: the Slade Gorton-Brock Adams senatorial campaign. Presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Miami, FL.

Blumler, J.G. (1964). British television: The outlines of a research strategy. *British Journal of Sociology, 15*, 223-233.

Brown, S.R. (1980). *Political subjectivity: Applications of Q methodology in political science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Brown, S.R. (1986). Q technique and method: Principles and procedures. In W.D. Berry & M.S. Lewis-Beck (Eds.), *New tools for social scientists: Advances and applications in research methods* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., Miller, W.E. & Stokes, D.E. (1964). *The American voter: An abridgment*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Chaffee, S.H. (1972). The interpersonal context of mass communication. In G. Kline & P. Tichenor (Eds.), *Current perspectives in mass communication research*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Chaffee, S.H. & Mutz, D.C. (1988). Comparing mediated and interpersonal communication data. In R.P. Hawkins, J.M. Wiemann & S. Pingree (Eds.), *Advancing communication science: Merging mass and interpersonal processes*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Chaffee, S.H. & Roser, C. (1986). Involvement and the consistency of knowledge, attitudes and behavior. *Communication Research, 13*, 76-107.

Chaffee, S.H. & Choe, S.Y. (1980). Time of decision and media use during the Ford-Carter campaign. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 44*, 53-69.

Chaffee, S.H. & Rimal, R.N. (1996). Time of vote decision and openness to persuasion. In D.C. Mutz, P.M. Sniderman & R.A. Brody (Eds.), *Political persuasion and attitude change*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic vs. systematic information processing and the use of source vs. message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 752-766.

Dennis, J. (1992). Political independence in America, III: In search of closet partisans. *Political Behavior, 14*, 261-296.

Fiske, S.T. & Kinder, D.R. (1981). Involvement, expertise and schema use: Evidence from political cognition. In N. Canton & J.F. Kihlstrom (Eds.), *Personality, cognition and social interaction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gantz, W. (1983). The diffusion of news about the attempted Reagan assassination. *Journal of Communication, 33*, 56-66.

Garramone, G.M. (1985). Motivation and selective attention to political information formats. *Journalism Quarterly, 62*, 37-44.

Garramone, G.M. (1984). Audience motivation effects: More evidence.

Communication Research, 11, 79-96.

Greenberg, B.S. (1964). Diffusion of news of the Kennedy assassination. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 28*, 225-232.

Greenberg, S.R. (1975). Conversations as units of analysis in the study of personal influence. *Journalism Quarterly, 52*, 128-131.

Gunther, A. & Lasorsa, D.L. (1986). Issue importance and trust in mass media. *Journalism Quarterly, 63*, 844-848.

Hyman, H.H. & Sheatsley, P.B. (1947). Some reasons why information campaigns fail. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 11*, 412-423.

Kanihan, S.F. & Chaffee, S.H. (1996). Situational influence of political involvement on information seeking: A field experiment. Presented at the annual convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Anaheim, CA.

Katz, E. (1959). Mass communication research and the study of culture: An editorial note on a possible future for this journal. *Studies in Public Communication, 2*, 1-6.

Kinsey, D.F. & Chaffee, S.H. (1996). Communication behavior and presidential approval: The decline of George Bush. *Political Communication, 13*, 281-291.

Krugman, H.E. (1965). The impact of television advertising: Learning without involvement. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 29*, 349-356.

Lazarsfeld, P.F., Berelson, B. & Gaudet, H. (1944). *The people's choice*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Levy, M.R. & Windahl, S. (1984). Audience activity and gratifications: A conceptual clarification and exploration. *Communication Research, 11*, 51-78.

Marcus, G.E. & MacKuen, M.B. (1993). Anxiety, enthusiasm and the vote: The emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns. *American Political Science Review, 87*, 672-685.

McCombs, M.E. (1972). Mass communication in political campaigns: Information, gratification, and persuasion. In F.G. Kline & P.J. Tichenor (Eds.), *Current perspectives in mass communication research*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

McKeown, B. & Thomas, D. (1988). *Q methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Milbrath, L.W. & Goel, M. L. (1977). *Political participation: How and why do people get involved in politics* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Petty, R.E. & Cacioppo, J.T. (1984). The effects of involvement on responses to argument quantity and quality: Central and peripheral routes to persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 69-81.

Price, V. (1992). *Communication concepts 4: Public opinion*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ray, M.L. with others. (1973). Marketing communication and the hierarchy-of-effects. In P. Clarke (Ed.), *New models for communication research*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Roser, C. (1990). Involvement, attention and perceptions of message relevance

in the response to persuasive appeals. *Communication Research, 17*, 571-600.

Rothschild, M.L. & Ray, M.L. (1974). Involvement and political advertising effect: An exploratory experiment. *Communication Research, 1*, 264-284.

Sherif, C.W., Sherif, M. & Nebergall, R.E. (1965). *Attitude and attitude change, The social judgment-involvement approach*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.

Stephenson, W. (1953). *The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stricklin, M. (1987-1996). *PCQ: Factor analysis programs for Q-technique* [computer program]. Lincoln, NE: Michael Stricklin.

Tan, A.S. (1980). Mass media use, issue knowledge and political involvement. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 44*, 241-248.

Troldahl, V.C. & Van Dam, R. (1965). Face-to-face communication about major topics in the news. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 29*, 626-634.

Verba, S. & Nie, N.H. (1972). *Participation in America: Political democracy and social equality*. New York: Harper and Row.