

**Appendix to Chapter 5**  
entitled  
**“Effects of an Echo Chamber”**  
from  
***Echo Chamber: Rush Limbaugh and the Conservative Media  
Establishment***

[Appendix 5.1](#) (see page 86 of *Echo*)  
Distribution of PTR Listeners: 1996, Waves 1-3

[Appendix 5.2](#) (see page 87 of *Echo*)  
Distribution of PTR Listeners: 1996, Waves 4-5

[Appendix 5.3](#) (see page 88 of *Echo*)  
Adherence to Instructions: PTR 1996 Experiment

## **Appendix 5.1 (see page 86 of *Echo*)**

### **Distribution of PTR Listeners: 1996, Waves 1-3**

#### **PTR Surveys 1996**

##### **Five-Wave Panel Survey**

From February 21 to March 5, 1996, we conducted a survey of regular and non-regular listeners of PTR as a part of a large-scale national study of political talk radio during the presidential election year. The study included a five-wave national survey, content analysis of Rush Limbaugh's talk radio show, examination of 50 political talk shows on each of three days during the Republican primaries, and review of 2,647 print articles mentioning talk radio from fall 1993 to fall 1995 (Cappella, Jamieson, & Turow, 1996).

The talk shows were divided into four groups: Limbaugh, Conservatives, Moderates, and Liberals. Survey respondents were divided into four groups -- (1) non-listeners; (2) regular listeners to Limbaugh only; (3) regular listeners to conservative shows but not to Limbaugh; (4) regular listeners to moderate or liberal shows (and not to Limbaugh). A fifth group of regular listeners -- those listening to Limbaugh and a second show -- was excluded from study. Regular listeners were those who listened to political talk radio at least twice a week. In the initial survey, 1,203 were sampled; an over-sample of regular listeners pushed the final sample to 1666.

Care was taken to define to respondents what we meant by political talk radio -- "where the host talks mostly about politics, government, and public affairs. Sometimes listeners are invited to call in to discuss these issues on the air." Some studies of talk radio have not distinguished political talk radio from other forms of talk radio that can include discussions of health, car maintenance, personal psychology, relationships, and sports, among other topics.

Previous research on PTR identified those listening to Rush Limbaugh and those listening to PTR in general. Our procedures indicate that many regular listeners to Limbaugh are also regular listeners of other PTR. Of the 18% of the initial sample who listen to at least one show regularly, roughly 1 in 6 of these regulars is listening to two or more shows. These findings mean that previous surveys of "Limbaugh listeners" are really surveys of a mix of Limbaugh and other listeners. Also previous surveys of "PTR Listeners" are surveys of Limbaugh listeners and listeners to other hosts.

Those listening to other PTR hosts were further divided into two subgroups: regular consumers of Conservative PTR and regular consumers of Liberal//Moderate PTR (see Cappella, Jamieson, & Turow, 1997, for discussion of how the groups were established). Four groups are studied in our survey: three groups of regular listeners -- Limbaugh only (N=213), Conservative PTR (N=139), and Liberal/Moderate PTR (N=283) -- and a group of non-listeners (N=988). These groups allow us to ask whether distinct audiences of PTR are similar or different in knowledge, political involvement, attitudes, media consumption, attitudes toward media, and so on. The focus in this paper is on interpersonal trust.

Table 1. Distribution of Population and Sample by Regular Talk Radio Exposure

Description of Group (Regular=2X/wk; non:<2X/wk)	% in Population	# in Base Sample	# in Over- Sample	Total # Responses
Regular Listeners Limbaugh only	7%	86	127	213
Regular Listeners Other PTR =	7% =	86	336	422 =
Conservative PTR	2.3%			139
+ Liberal/Moder PTR	+ 4.7%			+283
Regular Listeners Limbaugh and Other Hosts	4%	43	0	43
Non-listeners to PTR	82%	988	0	988
Total	100%	1203	463	1666

**Appendix 5.2 (see page 86 of *Echo*)**  
**Distribution of PTR Listeners: 1996, Waves 4-5**

**Waves 4 and 5**

The three-panel survey of talk radio listeners and their non-listening counterparts was followed during the fall presidential election with two additional waves. The fourth wave took place October 17-27, 1996 immediately following the second presidential debate between Bill Clinton and Robert Dole. The fifth wave was carried out in the period November 12-18, 1996, in the week following the presidential election.

The surveys were coordinated with content analyses of the mainstream media as well as PTR's discussions of the debate and the election. The surveys were on political knowledge, candidate evaluations, judgments about the candidates, performance during the debates, consumption of political information, political participation during the campaign, and respondent's framing of both the debate performances and the election outcome.

The fourth wave surveyed 1,376 people and the fifth included 973. Those agreeing to be surveyed received a \$10 phone card. The survey was carried out by PRSA.

The goal was to follow people from the primaries through the conclusion of the election. In order to be sure that there was a sufficiently large sample to carry out analysis of the election period alone, those sampled during the primary season were supplemented by additional people. Table 2 below indicates how many persons continued from the initial sample and how many were new. Additional sample came from persons who were screened during April 26 to May 10 as a part of a subsidiary methodological study relating to the first three waves. During this component of the survey, a sample of 200 regular Limbaugh listeners was obtained in order to compare them to the earlier sample of Limbaugh listeners and to those remaining in the Limbaugh group at wave 3. In addition, in this group we also screened for those who were not regular listeners and those who were regular listeners but not to Limbaugh. These two groups provided the additional sample during the election resulting from panel attrition.

Table 2. Distribution of subjects in waves 4 and 5 from wave 1 and from oversample.

GROUP	WAVE 4	WAVE 5	FROM OVER SAMPLE	FROM WAVE 1
Non-Listener	858	595	489	369
Limbaugh	207	158	109	98
Reg Conservative	111	83	41	70
Reg Liberal	68	45	24	44
Reg Moderate	132	92	25	107

As in our previous report on PTR, the number of those claiming to be regular listeners of liberal hosts is too small to analyze as a separate group. They will be

grouped with the listeners of moderate hosts and treated as a single group. The definition of non-listener and regular listener depends in part on when the categorization is made, as well as the definition of “regular.” As in our previous surveys a regular listener is one who listens at least two times a week. Obviously people change their listening habits over time and so some criterion needs to be set. (We chose the following times: wave 1 and the Limbaugh oversample at wave 3. At Wave 4 we found that some 32 of our 489 non-listeners were listening regularly and some 31 of our other regular listeners were listening less than twice a week. We retained their initial categorizations as regular listeners or non-listeners because they had so identified themselves at a specified point in the survey. We adopt a “bright line” distinction between groups.)

## **Appendix 5.3 (see page 88 of *Echo*)**

### **Adherence to Instructions: PTR 1996 Experiment**

#### **PTR Experiment 1996**

During the week of May 12-18, 1996, more than 400 people in the Philadelphia metropolitan area participated in research evaluating radio programs. They were offered a cash payment for their participation. Involvement required them to listen to five hours of political talk radio taken off the air. People were randomly assigned to listen to one or another type of PTR ranging from non-political talk (such as NPR's "Car Talk") to the highly partisan Rush Limbaugh). They were surveyed before and after on a variety of issues related to social attitudes, perceptions of the programs and hosts, participation in political matters, and knowledge of politics and social issues.

Although PTR has become one of the most common programming formats in radio today, and one of the most controversial, little is known about its consequences. Much of our information is either anecdotal or based solely on survey results where the directions of causality are impossible to know. Is PTR a polarizing force for social attitudes in modern political media or is it little more than entertainment, easily ignored? Does the audience of PTR add to its political knowledge base because of its listening or is listening a typical behavior of an already knowledgeable audience? Are the messages and attitudes of PTR hosts attractive to those with no prior exposure or do they contain the seeds of their own rejection? Does PTR influence by altering the audience's interpretation or by directly manipulating attitudes?

To answer these and other questions an experiment was undertaken. In the experiment, people listened to five hours of audio tapes -- one each day -- which we gave them. The tapes had been pre-recorded with various types of political talk radio content spanning the spectrum from liberal to conservative. Our intent was to simulate exposure to political talk radio of different types for people who had had experience with PTR and for people who had not. We were especially interested in the effects of different types of PTR on people of different political stripes and with different experience with the format. One of the problems with survey studies of PTR is that the audience that listens to a particular host self selects the program on the basis of content, whether the content is actually sampled by the listener or just presumed. One cannot easily know if the audience is affected by the content or is already disposed toward the host's views and chooses to become a regular member of the listening audience.

An experiment allows us to see if people who would not normally listen to a particular host -- whether liberals listening to Rush Limbaugh or conservatives listening to Mario Cuomo -- are repulsed by or attracted to the contrary voice. The experimental context also allows the possibility of studying change -- toward the host, issues, and in the sense of acquiring information. In many surveys, attempts to study the effects of information are stymied either by the fact that the data are cross-sectional and so no real change is observed or when the data are temporal the issues simply are too stable to exhibit actual change. Experiments offer the opportunity to raise and answer questions that can only be approximated in the survey context.

At the same time experiments create other methodological problems. Most experiments suffer from problems with generalizability. This means that their participants are often unlike the general population or the conditions of the experiment are unnatural or the stimuli used are atypical and so on. We discuss these problems below.

### Participants

People were recruited to participate for pay (\$70) in a study purportedly about the evaluation of radio formats. We solicited participants in a variety of ways including newspaper advertisements, ads on radio stations (both news and weather only and talk radio stations), and at a booth at a health fair sponsored by a local talk radio station. Interested parties called an 800 number and were interviewed electronically to get basic information about radio usage (all types), education, party affiliation, race, ideological leanings, and gender. People were selected from those who called in to maximize generalizability of the sample. The Philadelphia area is heavily African-American and democratic. We tried to create a sample that included both heavy listeners and non-listeners at all points on the political continuum. It was less important to us to make sure that the sample was nationally representative and more important that it represented the full range of listeners and the full range of political ideology.

Over 400 people agreed initially to be in our study (N=442). They were to be paid \$70 upon completion. Some 19 people completed only the first questionnaire and then dropped out. The drop-outs were distributed roughly equally across the six conditions ( $\chi^2$  (df=5, N=442) = 6.18,  $p = .29$ ). The remaining 423 became our experimental sample. Their average age was 41 years; 41.4% were male; 46.8% had never been married; modal income was \$30,000 to \$50,000 per year for the household; 3.8% were Hispanic or Latino, 11.3% African-American, 83.2% Caucasian, and 5.2% Asian and other. The group was predominantly democrat (43%) with 20.6% Republican, and 34% independents. Those identifying themselves as ideologically moderate dominated the group (44.9%) with liberals next (37.8%), and conservatives fewest (15.9%). The sample was highly educated with 41.8% having at least a college degree and 28.8% some college; 19.2% had a high school degree or less. Both heavy and light consumers of PTR were represented with 46.8% listening at least 3 times per week, 42.7% participating two or fewer days per week.

Our sample shows the biases of the Philadelphia area being more democratic and liberal than national norms. It also shows the biases of PTR listeners who tend to be better educated and have somewhat higher incomes.

### Design and Procedure

The design of the experiment was simple. Participants were randomly assigned to one of six conditions. The conditions were created to try to span the ideological spectrum of PTR from liberal to conservative. Each person received five one-hour tapes and an initial questionnaire. After filling out the survey and mailing it back to us, they were to listen to one tape a day for five consecutive days. Anyone needing a tape player was provided one to keep and their payment was reduced by 20 dollars. On Saturday at the week's end, everyone came to the Annenberg School for a final session. They filled out a questionnaire, watched a brief debate taken from C-SPAN on the minimum wage (then being debated in Congress), and read a brief two-sided op-ed on school vouchers taken from *USA Today*. There were two versions of the final

questionnaire – one used a pro-con order on the school voucher op-eds and the other used the con-pro order. Everyone was debriefed, joined our staff for refreshments, and conversed about the study and PTR in general.

Six conditions were created on the basis of the kind of PTR people received. The six groups were:

- Group 1: Control (talk radio which was not political)
- Group 2: Conservative PTR (not including Rush Limbaugh)
- Group 3: Liberal PTR
- Group 4: Rush Limbaugh
- Group 5: Conservative and Liberal Mix (taken from groups 2, 3, and 4)
- Group 6: “Talk of the Nation” (NPR’s political talk radio show)

The design then is a 1 X 6 factorial with pre and post measures and a control group.

People were led to believe that this was a study of radio formats and that we were interested in their evaluations of various types of radio. To encourage this perception, we asked a variety of questions in the initial electronic interviews about their familiarity with different kinds of radio including music, weather and traffic, politics, and news. These questions were reinforced in the first survey by asking about different radio formats and personalities including some local hosts.

Participants were randomly assigned to conditions except that we tried to ensure an equal distribution across conditions of regular and infrequent listeners and conservatives and liberals. Random assignment was successful. There were no mean differences across condition on income, age, education, or ideology ( $p > .20$  in all cases); neither were there any differences in the variance of these measures across conditions. Similarly, political party, frequency of listening to news on radio, frequency of talk radio listening, strength of party identification, Latino or not, race, gender, whether there are children, and marital status were equally distributed across the six conditions (no  $\chi^2$  had a probability less than .59).

In order to determine how closely participants abided by our instructions, we asked a series of follow-up questions. Of the 423, 411 listened to all five tapes with nine others listening to three or four. Everyone was kept in the sample because the one person listening to only one tape was in the control. Eighty-six percent listened to one tape per day as instructed with the remainder listening to two or more tapes per day. People were asked to listen to each tape from beginning to end and 56.5% complied; of the remainder who started and stopped, 56% hardly ever did so. Over 99% listened to all or almost all of every tape. One person admitted to listening to some tape before filling out the first survey. For the most part people listened around the house (63.8%) with the remainder listening while driving, walking, or in transit elsewhere.

The number of tapes, number of tapes per day, and so on described in the prior paragraph did not differ across condition.

The more than 2,000 tapes needed for distribution were reproduced and labeled by a professional duplicating house. The participants judged the tapes to be between adequate and good in “technical quality” (3.3 on a 1 to 5 scale with 5 very good). This is less than desirable but acceptable. Unfortunately, despite spot-checking, one batch of tapes had a distracting background hum that was not evenly distributed across condition. Specifically, the conditions differed on judged technical quality ( $F(5, 415) = 5.28, p < .001$ ) with the Limbaugh condition ( $M = 2.79$ ) differing from the TOTN

condition ( $M = 3.76$ ) significantly by a Scheffe's test. The poor tapes were not the result of the quality of the Limbaugh master tapes. All conditions got the full range of responses from very poor to very good suggesting that there were some problematic tapes within the condition rather than the whole batch.

The technical quality of the tapes did not affect how attentive people were to the programs. Attention was high overall ( $M = 5.24$  on a 7 point scale with 7 strongly agree to "paid more attention than normal"). But attention was nearly identical across conditions ( $F(5, 417) < 1, p = .92$ ) indicating that tape quality did not affect attention in the Limbaugh condition, neither increasing nor decreasing it.

The differences in tape quality are potentially significant in comparisons between the Limbaugh and TOTN programs. However, the magnitude of the effect is not large (less than 6% of the variance) and does not affect reported attention. Tape quality might make learning from the Limbaugh programs more difficult or might depress enjoyment of these tapes at least relative to TOTN. To guard against problems of misinterpreting results from comparisons between Limbaugh and TOTN, we will take the precaution of controlling for judgments of tape quality whenever significant differences between these types of programs are observed.

One possible problem with our procedures was that people would be influenced during the week by other forms of political talk radio than what we had given them. We asked them to reduce their radio listening significantly. People reported listening less or a lot less to other radio during the week (74.2%) with the remainder saying they listened about the same as usual. Regarding PTR programs, 71.9% said they did not listen to any other PTR while 27.4% did. Of those who listened to other PTR than our tapes, 11 people said they listened more than usual, 40 said about the same, and 71 said less or a lot less than usual. Outside listening was distributed equally across conditions ( $p > .57$  in all cases).

### Stimuli

The content of the programming in each condition was selected from PTR shows appearing in the period January 15, 1996 to April 30, 1996. We attempted to control content across conditions by choosing topics that had been treated across the ideological spectrum. Five topics were found: affirmative action (more generally, the role of government in assisting minorities because of past discrimination); assisted suicide; problems in the educational system; the proposal for a flat income tax; the Muslim religion (specifically Minister Louis Farrakhan and NBA player and Muslim Mahmoud Abdul-Rauf). Each of these had been discussed in the period by liberal and conservative hosts, by Rush Limbaugh, and on TOTN. Although other topics could have been chosen, it was not easy to select topics that were the objects of discussion in all of the programming outlets important to us.

The stimulus tapes were not altered in any way that would misrepresent the host's original intent. The stimulus tapes were faithful representations of hosts' and callers' comments. However, we were forced to add and delete content in various ways. For example, if Rush Limbaugh spent 20 minutes discussing the controversy surrounding Abdul-Rauf and then turned to a substantive discussion of Clinton's Middle East policies, we would add discussion about Abdul-Rauf from a different Limbaugh program. Alternately, we would delete the Middle East discussion in favor of PTR "fluff" such as Limbaugh's cat and its eating habits. In effect, a one-hour tape devoted to

affirmative action did not include any other substantive material even though the entire hour may not have been on topic.

The liberal and conservative points of view were represented through the programming of several different hosts including G. Gordon Liddy, Ken Hamblin, Mario Cuomo, and Tom Leykis. Unnatural breaks were avoided. If two different hosts appeared on the same one-hour tape, the “bottom of the hour” break was used as the transition. The table below describes the content of the tapes which people received along with the hosts who were covered.

Table 1. Summary of PTR programs, topics, hosts, and dominant message.

	TOTN <sup>b</sup>	Liberal/Conservative	Liberal	Rush Limbaugh	Conservative	Control
Day 1 Host	Suarez	Leykis Hamblin	Leykis	Limbaugh	Hamblin	Tom & Ray Magliozzi
Topic	Muslims, Islam, & Farrakhan	Rauf	Rauf	Rauf, Muslim, Farrakhan	Rauf	Cars
POV <sup>a</sup>	Democracy & Islam; Farrakhan; pro & con	See cols 3 & 5	Not standing is religious freedom issue	Condemns each	Not a race issue but a character issue	
Day 2 Host	Suarez	Limbaugh Leykis	Leykis	Limbaugh	Liddy	Dr. Dan
Topic	Flat Tax	Flat Tax	Flat Tax	Flat Tax	Flat Tax	Psychological health
POV	Who wins & loses	See cols 3 & 4	Opposes flat tax	Strongly favors	Favors	
Day 3 Host	Suarez	Leykis Hamblin	Leykis	Limbaugh	Hamblin	Steve Freedman
Topic	Race & affirm action	Race	Race & affirmative action	Race & Farrakhan	Race & Farrakhan	Movies
POV	AA & education; Jesse Jackson & son	See cols 3 & 5	Subtle racism continues; opposes changes in AA	Liberals & conservatives treated differently in relationships to Black leaders	U.S. Blacks are free; Farrakhan denounced	
Day 4 Host	Suarez	Limbaugh Cuomo	Cuomo	Limbaugh	Liddy	Dr. Jim Gorry
Topic	Education	Education	Education	Education	Education	Personal Health
POV	Education problems solved thru unifying stories, not skills	See cols 3 & 4	Do more and pay more for better education	Clinton a hypocrite on education	Denounces public schools & teachers	
Day 5 Host	Suarez	Leykis Limbaugh	Leykis	Limbaugh	Liddy	Dr. Laura Schlessinger
Topic	Assisted suicide	Assisted suicide	Assisted suicide	Assisted suicide	Assisted suicide	Relationships
POV	Dialogue on assisted suicide necessary	See cols 3 & 4	Right to die is freedom issue; religious right is evil	Government should not decide who lives and dies	Bad court decision to allow assisted suicide	

The liberal-conservative condition was created as a balanced (two-sided) condition in which each tape had both liberal and conservative points of view on the

<sup>a</sup> POV is dominant point of view during the program

<sup>b</sup> TOTN is NPR's "Talk of the Nation"

topic. Balance was introduced in the court room sense: two strong positions of opposite voice. TOTN was used because it represents a different kind of balance attempting to provide evenhanded treatment of a topic through the host's and guest's comments along with a balanced selection of listeners' questions. This format is closer to standard journalistic practice in the mainstream press. The liberal-conservative and TOTN conditions provide two types of two-sided messages: balanced and partisan. The Control condition was also a talk radio condition but the talk was not about politics or social affairs. Instead, cars, mental health, movies, and sports were the focus.

One way of looking at our experimental conditions is in terms of sidedness and balance. TOTN and the liberal-conservative mix are both balanced programming in the sense of representing both sides of the ideological continuum. The liberal, conservative, and Limbaugh programs are one-sided with Limbaugh clearly politically partisan as well as conservative.

For a given day's tape, all six conditions had the same news and one political ad edited into the top of the hour.<sup>i</sup> Neither the ads nor the news were altered in any way. The news was chosen to be timely. The ads included: one for a conservative politician running in a local primary; an ad for the Libertarian Party of Illinois; an ad for Tom Lingenfelter running in a Congressional primary which is not identified as Republican or Democratic, conservative or liberal; a public service announcement for the NEA about teachers and parents working together; and a PSA from the US Civil Rights Commission discouraging illegal discrimination.

In the follow-up survey, we asked if the content of the programs was balanced, giving both sides of issues. They were not seen as equally balanced ( $F(5,417) = 16.6, p < .0001$ ). Limbaugh ( $M=2.68$ ), conservative ( $M=3.21$ ), and liberal programming ( $M=3.62$ ) were judged to be least balanced and no different from one another (by a Scheffe's test) while TOTN was seen as most balanced ( $M=5.34$ ) differing from all other conditions. The control ( $M=3.97$ ) and conservative-liberal conditions ( $M=4.14$ ) were intermediate.<sup>ii</sup> These results generally confirm our assumptions about the programming our participants heard – balanced discussion from TOTN and one-sided commentary from the left, the right, and from Limbaugh.

In a follow-up study, we also evaluated whether the programming content that we assigned to the conservative, liberal, Limbaugh, and balanced conditions was heard in the same way by an audience of student raters.

A convenience sample comprised of 206 undergraduate students at a large Eastern university was randomly assigned to one of five conditions (four treatment, one control). Each condition contained five text transcriptions taken from a call-in political talk radio program. The topics were consistent across the four treatment messages (both in subject matter and in order). The control condition also used five different topics but these were unrelated to politics or social affairs.

Subjects were recruited from undergraduate courses and were offered extra credit for participation. The total sample consisted of 55 males and 151 females; ages ranged from 18 to over 30 ( $M_{dn}=19$ ). Forty-three percent self identified as liberal or very liberal while 18.5% said they were conservative or very conservative. The remainder indicated they were centrist or had no clear ideology.

Subjects were randomly assigned to one of five conditions (four treatment, one control). Each condition had five messages in written form, which were excerpts from

talk radio programming.<sup>iii</sup> The four treatment conditions contained messages on the following topics: Chris Jackson (the NBA player who refused to stand for the national anthem) and the Nation of Islam, Steve Forbes and his proposed flat tax, Louis Farrakhan and affirmative action, the public school system, and Dr. Jack Kevorkian and assisted suicide. The control condition consisted of five messages on unrelated topics (also taken from talk radio shows, but not political ones). The topics included fixing automobiles, movie selections, psychological health, personal relationships, and physical well-being. Each treatment condition thus contained five messages in the same topical order.

The four treatment conditions employed messages from across the ideological spectrum in political talk radio: the conservative republicanism of Rush Limbaugh; the moderate and liberal shows such as Tom Leykis and Jim Bohannon; the conservative and libertarian programs including especially G. Gordon Liddy and Ken Hamblin. The fourth condition was taken from National Public Radio's (NPR) "Talk of the Nation" (TOTN), an ideologically centrist program (as identified by NPR) that emphasizes a balanced approach contrary to other political talk radio and is more in line with mainstream journalistic practices.

Subjects rated how liberal and conservative they perceived each message to be. These perceptions were compared to the mean perceived liberal tone computed across all five control messages using two-tailed t-tests. Messages in the Limbaugh and conservative conditions should be perceived as less liberal than the control, those in the liberal condition should be more liberal than control, and those messages in the balanced condition should not be significantly different than the control. Of the 20 tests (i.e., five messages across four treatment conditions), all 15 of the messages predicted to be significantly different than the control (those in the Limbaugh, conservative, and liberal conditions) were significant (at  $p < .05$  at least) and in the intended direction. Among the five balanced messages, which were not predicted to be statistically different than the control, three were similar to the control, and two were statistically different than the mean for the control group (one more liberal and one more conservative than the control). These results mean that the set of liberal, conservative, Limbaugh, and TOTN messages were perceived as intended.

Summary. The design and procedures of our experiment in PTR were successful for the most part. People were randomly assigned to condition and generally followed the instructions. Conditions had equal numbers of liberals, conservatives, and moderates, had both heavy and light listeners of PTR in each group, and perceived the program types as intended in terms of partisan versus balanced treatment of issues. In general the group was representative of a cross section of citizens. However, it was more democratic, more liberal, more educated, and included heavier consumers of PTR than a random sample would. The group was like the Philadelphia metropolitan area in terms of ideology and like heavy consumers of PTR in terms of education.

---

Endnotes:

---

<sup>i</sup> For TOTN, news was edited in that was identical to that used for the other programs. This was done for purposes of comparability across conditions even though NPR has its own news format. Political ads and PSAs however were not included in TOTN because we felt this would simply be too far from NPR's norms. The news and the ads gave us comparable target materials for assessing recall and distortion.

<sup>ii</sup> When party, ideology, and prior experience with PTR are entered as covariates, the differences are still significant and the rank order of means is the same.

<sup>iii</sup> The design selected paralleled an earlier field study of political talk radio that employed the same messages in the same order but used their original audio versions. The present study distilled the audio to text and stripped any reference to the source of the message.