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HOW TELEVISION NEWS AFFECTS VOTERS: FROM SETTING AGENDAS TO DEFINING STANDARDS

Shanto Iyengar*

For better or worse, electoral success in the United States is increasingly contingent upon candidates' media strategies and media treatment of political events. Candidates allocate huge sums to campaign advertising and they rely heavily on general news coverage to communicate with voters. Television news in particular has emerged as the crucial "medium of record." Most Americans encounter political campaigns only in the *son et lumiere* of television presentations.

The prominent role of television in contemporary electoral campaigns has important consequences for voters' beliefs, attitudes and actions. First, as the public's "mind's eye," television effectively sets the campaign agenda—the themes and issues that are highlighted in television news coverage become the priorities of viewers and provide criteria for evaluating and choosing between candidates. In addition, there is evidence that the manner in which television news "frames" issues affects viewers' attributions of political responsibility. Attributions of responsibility in turn influence evaluations of political leaders. This article summarizes the research bearing on these various effects of television news and considers the implications of these effects for the democratic process.

**Shaping the Campaign Agenda**

Issues enter and leave the center stage of American politics with remarkable speed. When President Bush took office in 1989, the problem of illegal drug usage was foremost in Americans' minds and the Administration was prompted to announce a major initiative to deal with this problem. One year later, however, illegal drug usage was mentioned by too few Americans to even warrant inclusion in pollsters' lists of "major problems" facing the country. The most plausible explanation of such dramatic shifts in political priorities is couched in terms of patterns of news coverage. In particular, the amount of
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news coverage accorded to political issues is thought to dictate the degree of importance the public accords these issues. This argument is referred to as media "agenda-setting."

Early agenda-setting studies (conducted in the 1960s) were plagued by a number of conceptual and methodological difficulties, including most notably confusion between cause and effect. Did the convergence of newspaper readers' political concerns and newspaper content mean that news coverage had set the audience agenda, or did it mean that editors and journalists had tailored their news coverage to appeal to the political concerns of their readers? In response to such ambiguities, communications researchers began to track the rise and fall of public concern for particular issues and events in relation to changes in the pattern of news coverage. With few exceptions, these time-series studies uncovered evidence of significant media agenda-setting effects.

The time series analyses further refined the agenda-setting paradigm by incorporating measures of the actual severity of issues (i.e., "real world cues"), in addition to the level of media coverage as potential determinants of the public agenda. In the case of relatively obtrusive issues (such as energy, inflation, or unemployment), the evidence indicated that the public did in fact respond directly to changes in national conditions. As the level of unemployment increased, for instance, more people mentioned unemployment as a major national problem independently of how much news coverage the media provided. In addition to the state of economic conditions, the level of presidential rhetoric was also found to influence the public's issue agenda. When the President addressed the nation on a particular problem and the address was televised nationwide, he was able to boost public concern independently of the amount of other news coverage accorded that problem. Finally, in a further elaboration of the interrelationships between events, network news and public opinion, Behr and Iyengar demonstrated that agenda-setting was generally unidi-

3. See Behr & Iyengar, supra note 2.
4. Id. at 39-40.
rectional—news coverage affected the level of public concern, but public concern did not, in turn, affect the focus of television news.

The most recent evidence on agenda-setting provides the strongest support to date for the proposition that agenda-setting is unidirectional. Using laboratory experiments to manipulate the content of television newscasts, Iyengar and Kinder found that relatively small exposures to news coverage of particular issues were sufficient to induce significant shifts in viewers' beliefs about the relative importance of various issues.\(^5\)

Agenda-setting effects have been captured for all forms of mass media coverage, in both experimental and survey-based studies, and with open-ended indicators in which respondents identify the “most important problems facing the country” as well as with closed-ended items in which they rate the importance of particular issues. These effects have been observed for both local and national “problems.” In all these areas, research has shown that individuals habitually refer to issues or events “in the news” when diagnosing current social and political ills.

In addition to documenting the effects of news coverage on levels of issue salience, researchers have also investigated specific elements or mechanisms of agenda-setting. In the case of television news, these mechanisms concern particular characteristics of news stories, variations in the composition of the audience, and the nature of the issue.

Television news stories may be classified according to several features. Two features that influence the agenda-setting power of news stories are position within the newscast and vividness. Lead stories are especially strong cues. Behr and Iyengar's longitudinal analysis\(^6\) found that lead stories exerted much stronger agenda-setting effects than stories appearing in the middle of the newscast.\(^7\) This difference was also detected in Iyengar and Kinder's experimental studies.\(^8\)

In addition to placement within the newscast, it is generally assumed that “vivid” news items are particularly persuasive. Iyengar and Kinder tested this assumption by comparing television news stories that focused on people and their
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7. In fact, after controlling for the effects of lead stories, Behr and Iyengar found that other stories exerted no agenda-setting effects at all.
problems (vivid coverage) with stories that focused on abstract concepts and collectivities (non-vivid coverage). In the case of unemployment, for instance, Iyengar and Kinder compared stories that provided close-up coverage of an unemployed worker and his family with stories describing the latest unemployment statistics and trends nationwide. Their results suggested that vivid coverage was in fact less likely to alter viewers' political priorities than non-vivid coverage.9

Of course, media agendas are not adopted uniformly by all members of an audience. The progressive refining of agenda-setting research has included efforts to identify segments of an audience that are likely to be more or less vulnerable to agenda-setting. In Iyengar and Kinder's experiments, the agenda-setting effect was magnified among individuals with lower levels of education, political interest, and political participation.10 The less educated, interested, and involved segments of the audience are, presumably, less able to retrieve independently derived information that might cast doubt on the message contained in news reports. The availability of information that permits critical analysis of media presentations is an important factor affecting ability to resist media influence, either in the form of agenda-setting or persuasion.11

Erbring and his collaborators12 were the first to suggest that individuals differed in their receptivity to news about particular issues. Elderly people may be more attentive to news about crime, while people working for defense contractors may be first to respond to news coverage of impending layoffs and unemployment. Iyengar and Kinder's experiments confirmed that news coverage and the personal circumstances of the audience interactively shape perceptions of national issues. Retired viewers of television news reports were more likely than other members of the audience to mention social security as a pressing problem following exposure to news reports on social security; blacks cited racial discrimination as a significant problem more frequently than whites after watching news coverage of the issue.13

9. Id. at 36-42.
10. Id. at 59.
13. See News That Matters, supra note 5; see also Tom R. Tyler, Impact of Directly and Indirectly Experienced Events: The Origins of Crime-Related Judgments
Finally, the ability of the media to set the public agenda differs across issue areas. The agenda-setting effect tends to be more pronounced for "rapid onset" issues that attract sudden bursts of extended news coverage (recent examples would include the Iran-Contra affair, the Alaskan oil spill, the toppling of the communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait) and less pronounced for gradually evolving or slow-onset issues. Issues in the latter category typically require a dramatic event to trigger news coverage. In the case of AIDS, for example, it was only after the death of Rock Hudson that the issue received sustained attention in the national media.14

**SETTING THE STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING CANDIDATES**

While the term "agenda-setting" reflects the impact of news coverage on the importance accorded to issues, the term "priming effect" refers to the ability of news programs to affect the criteria by which political leaders are judged.15 Priming is really an extension of agenda-setting, and addresses the impact of news coverage on the weight assigned to specific issues in making political judgments. In general, the more prominent an issue is in the national information stream, the greater its weight in political judgments.

In the context of election campaigns, priming means that voters' preferences for political candidates are likely to be based on an analysis that provides greater weight to issues that receive heavy news coverage than to less "newsworthy" issues. For example, in a study of the 1982 election in the third congressional district of Connecticut, researchers found that voters who were more optimistic about national economic conditions were more supportive of the Republican incumbent. However, when primed with economic news, the effect of economic optimism on voting preferences was more than tripled! An even stronger priming effect emerged with respect to participants' perceptions of the personal traits of the candidates. Viewers generally felt more positive toward the candidate in whom they saw more positive personal characteristics. But when voters were exposed to news reports about the candi-
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dates' characters, the relationship was increased nearly five-fold.\(^{16}\)

Priming by television news has been established in several experiments, for evaluations of both presidents and congressmen and across a wide range of political judgments including evaluations of political performance and assessments of political leaders' personal traits. In general, news coverage of political issues induces stronger priming effects in the area of performance assessments and weaker priming effects in the area of personality assessments.\(^{17}\)

The evidence demonstrating the existence of priming is not drawn exclusively from laboratory experiments. In a recent study based on national survey data, Krosnick and Kinder found that the public's support for U.S. intervention in Central America became twice as influential as a determinant of President Reagan's popularity in the period immediately following the disclosure that funds from the sale of arms to Iran had been used to finance the Contras.\(^{18}\)

Priming is especially important in the context of primary election campaigns.\(^{19}\) Recent analyses have centered specifically upon the effects of "horse race" coverage in the making and unmaking of American presidential candidates. As countless studies of campaign journalism have shown, stories detailing the candidates' electoral prospects—their poll standings, delegate counts, fund raising efforts, and related campaign indicators—have become the staple of campaign reporting and frequently dwarf coverage of more relevant facets of the campaign. As Robinson and Sheehan summed up their exhaustive comparison of CBS News' and United Press International's treatment of the 1980 campaign, "'Horse race' [coverage] permeates almost everything the press does in covering elections and candidates.'\(^{20}\) The prominence of information about the viability of a candidate in the news stream during primary campaigns virtually guarantees that perceptions of the candidates'
electoral viability will provide a strong evaluative impetus. Bartels has demonstrated not only that voters prefer the candidate who is deemed more viable, but that voters with positive feelings towards a particular candidate are especially likely to vote accordingly if they consider the candidate viable.

Because horse race coverage is so prevalent, primary voters are likely to be heavily primed with information about the candidates’ electoral viability. Bartels has provided a powerful illustration of the prominence of viability in the electorate’s image of candidates. Virtually all Democrats interviewed after the 1984 New Hampshire primary who had heard of Gary Hart offered an opinion on his prospects for gaining the nomination. However, one out of every four such Democrats failed to offer an opinion concerning Hart’s position on the issue of cutting social programs.

Not surprisingly, the public’s perceptions of the candidates’ electoral strength are significantly affected by news coverage, and this effect is independent of candidate preferences. Brady has provided striking experimental evidence documenting the impact of media coverage on perceptions of candidate viability. By exposing his respondents to either “encouraging” or “discouraging” news about the standing of various candidates for the 1984 Democratic presidential nomination, Brady was able to induce significant shifts in perceptions of viability. These experimental results were corroborated by Bartels’ survey analyses of both the 1980 and 1984 presidential campaigns in which voters who were more attentive to the media were found to be the first to assimilate information about candidate viability.

21. While the tide of horse race coverage naturally tends to boost front-runners, there is also a bonus for candidates who exceed journalistic expectations, that is, candidates who perform better than expected in the race. Gary Hart, for instance, ran third in the 1984 New Hampshire Democratic primary; since at that time he was quite obscure, this outcome itself induced a tremendous outpouring of media attention.


23. Id. at 42.


Just as the ability of news coverage to set the public agenda depends on characteristics of news stories and the composition of the audience, the ability of the news to prime political evaluations is tempered by characteristics of news reports themselves and characteristics of the audience. Priming is significantly strengthened when news reports explicitly link politicians' actions or statements with the state of national problems. For example, among individuals who watched news stories suggesting that Reaganomics was the principal cause of rising unemployment, evaluations of President Reagan's overall performance and competence were more strongly colored by assessments of his performance concerning unemployment than were the evaluations of a control group who watched news stories that suggested alternative causes of unemployment.27

Priming depends not only on the extent to which news reports attribute political responsibility to the president, but also upon the particular substantive issues highlighted by the media. For issues of relatively recent origin (e.g., novel issues such as the energy crisis in the 1970s) the priming effect is especially potent; for relatively longstanding issues (e.g., inflation) the effect is faint.

Finally, the priming effect is triggered by both news of political failures and news of political accomplishments. Depending upon the circumstances, therefore, priming can either help or harm incumbent officials.28 Overall evaluations of President Carter, for example, were equally primed (i.e., equally influenced by assessments of Carter's performance in foreign affairs) by news coverage of the Carter Administration's major foreign policy debacle—the Iranian hostage crisis—and by news coverage of the Administration's major foreign policy success—the Camp David Accords.

As is the case with agenda-setting, individuals differ in their susceptibility to priming. Iyengar and Kinder found that Democrats and Republicans differed sharply in the issues with which they could be primed. Democrats tended to be most susceptible to priming when the news covered traditional Democratic issues such as civil rights or unemployment while Republicans were most receptive when the news focused on traditional Republican issues such as national defense and inflation. Iyengar and Kinder also found that individuals with built-in "schemas" or theories of responsibility that suggest a

27. For further discussion, see News That Matters, supra note 5.
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high level of presidential blame for particular issues were most likely to be primed by news coverage of these issues.29

Framing Attributions of Responsibility for Political Issues

The effects of television news coverage on citizens’ attributions of responsibility for political issues is of interest for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is that the concept of responsibility embodies an especially powerful psychological cue. As the research on priming suggests, evaluations of political leaders are sensitive to attributions of responsibility in the news. More generally, social psychologists have demonstrated that attitudes and actions within a wide variety of areas are altered by the manner in which individuals attribute responsibility.30

Attributions of responsibility are generally divided into causal and treatment dimensions. Causal responsibility focuses on the origin of the issue or problem, while treatment responsibility focuses on who or what has the power either to alleviate or to forestall alleviation of the issue.31 To illustrate with the issue of poverty, causal responsibility concerns the processes by which people become poor while treatment responsibility would seek to establish what could be done to alleviate (or perpetuate) poverty.

The significance of causal and treatment attributions is clear to politicians: witness the alacrity with which they claim responsibility for favorable outcomes and deny or shirk responsibility for unfavorable outcomes.32 By focusing public attention on Willie Horton and the state of Boston Harbor, President Bush’s famous campaign advertisements effectively suggested that Governor Dukakis was a cause of crime and pollution, rather than an agent of treatment or control.

29. See id.
I have examined the connection between television news coverage of political issues and attributions of causal and treatment responsibility through studying the effects of alternative news "frames." Typically, the networks frame issues in either "episodic" or "thematic" terms. The episodic frame depicts public issues in terms of concrete instances or specific events—a homeless person, an unemployed worker, a victim of racial discrimination, the bombing of an airliner, an attempted murder, and so on. Visually, episodic reports make for "good pictures." The thematic news frame, by contrast, places public issues in some general or abstract context. Reports on reductions in government welfare expenditures, changes in the nature of employment opportunities, the social or political grievances of groups undertaking terrorist activity, changes in federal affirmative action policy, or the backlog in the criminal justice process are examples of thematic coverage. The thematic news frame typically takes the form of a "takeout" or "backgrounder" report directed at general outcomes or conditions and frequently features "talking heads."


34. In practice, very few news reports are "purely" episodic or thematic. Even the most detailed, close-up look at a poor person, for instance, might include lead-in remarks by the anchorperson or reporter on the scope of poverty nationwide. Conversely, an account of the legislative
Given the nature of television news—a twenty-one minute “headline service” operating under powerful commercial dictates, it is to be expected that the networks rely extensively on episodic framing to report on public issues. Episodic framing is visually appealing and consists of “on-the-scene,” live coverage. Thematic coverage, which requires interpretive analyses, would simply crowd out other news items. In fact, television news coverage of political issues is heavily episodic. Two-thirds of all stories on poverty broadcast between 1980 and 1986 concerned a particular poor person. The subject of crime reports over the same period was invariably (in eighty-nine percent of all stories) a specific perpetrator, victim, or criminal act. Of the nearly two thousand stories on terrorism, seventy-four percent consisted of “live” reports of some specific terrorist act, group, victim, or event while twenty-six percent consisted of reports that discussed terrorism as a general political problem.

The effects of the episodic and thematic news frames on viewers’ attributions of responsibility for various political and social issues (including poverty, unemployment, crime, terrorism, racial inequality, and the Iran-Contra affair) were investigated in a series of experimental studies. Under thematic framing, viewers tended to assign responsibility to general societal factors including cultural norms, economic conditions, and the actions or inactions of public officials. When television struggle over budgetary cuts in social welfare might include a brief scene of children in a day care center scheduled to shut down as a result of the funding cuts.


37. The coding of each news story was based on the number of lines devoted to thematic or episodic coverage in the transcribed Abstracts of the nightly newscasts. This coding is therefore textual and not a direct measure of the amount of news time. In order to assess the validity of this method, every story related to the issue of poverty broadcast by CBS News between January, 1981 and December, 1986 was viewed and classified on the basis of actual air time. The results of this more precise “visual” coding corroborated the coding based on the Abstracts.

This evidence is consistent with several previous studies which have documented a clear “event” bias in the networks’ treatment of public affairs. See Doris A. Graber, Crime News and the Public (1980); David Paletz et al., Terrorism on TV News: The IRA, the FALN, and the Red Brigades, in Television Coverage of International Affairs 143 (William Adams ed., 1982); David L. Altheide, Format and Symbol in Television Coverage of Terrorism in the United States and Great Britain, 31 Int’l Stud. Q. 161 (1987).
news coverage presents a general or analytic frame of reference for national problems, the public's reasoning about causal and treatment responsibility is societal in focus. Following exposure to news reports about increases in malnutrition nationwide, poverty becomes a matter of inadequate social welfare programs; confronted with news accounts of the shrinking demand for unskilled labor, unemployment becomes a matter of inadequate economic policies or insensitive public officials; provided with news reports on deteriorating conditions in the inner cities, individuals cite increased economic opportunities for the underprivileged as the appropriate remedy for crime, and so on.

Under episodic framing, however, viewers attributed responsibility not to societal or structural forces, but to the actions of particular individuals or groups. For example, when poverty, crime, and terrorism were depicted in episodic terms, viewers attributed causal and treatment responsibility primarily to poor people, criminals, and terrorists. Confronted with a parade of news stories describing particular instances or illustrations of national issues, viewers focus on individual and group characteristics rather than historical, social, political, or other such general forces. In this respect, episodic framing encourages reasoning by resemblance—people settle upon causes and treatments that "fit" the observed problem.

While television news frames play an important role in shaping attributions of political responsibility, the impact of the alternative frames was far from uniform across the various issue areas investigated. For certain issue areas such as poverty and terrorism, episodic coverage tended to produce individualistic attributions without regard to the particular subject matter focus of the news stories. On the other hand, for the issue of crime, episodic framing proved secondary in its effect on attributions to the particular subject matter under discussion. Stories dealing with the issue of illegal drugs were likely to produce individualistic causal attributions, no matter how framed, while stories dealing with white-collar crime were likely to produce societal causal attributions, no matter how framed.

The importance of episodic and thematic news frames is not limited to attribution of political responsibility. In each of the framing experiments (and in replications with national survey data), individuals who attributed responsibility for political issues to societal factors were found to be significantly more critical of the performance of elected officials than individuals who attributed responsibility to non-societal factors. Because attributions of responsibility prove to be such potent opinion
cues, network news tends to preserve the image of political elites (at least those who are not the subject of scandal). In the context of campaigns, television news is thus a significant resource for incumbents; event-oriented and case-study news coverage effectively insulates them from any rising tide of disenchantment over unemployment, poverty, the savings and loan debacle, or other such problems.

**Conclusion: Television News and Democratic Politics**

The exercise of enlightened citizenship demands that individuals somehow choose between competing candidates, parties, or platforms. The extent to which television news contributes to the attainment of this ideal depends upon how well the “pictures in their heads” help citizens realize the “right” choices. Would a voter acting according to the information relayed by television arrive at the same result if endowed with perfect information? The normative implications of television campaigns therefore hinge on the determinants of news coverage. Do the issues selected by television and the news frames by which issues are covered correspond to the “real-world,” or even the world as defined by political candidates and their media managers? If this correspondence is loose, the democratic process is likely to be distorted. Voters are not only deflected from their personal interests, they are led down an illusory pathway of judgment, one defined by organizational, commercial, or other such idiosyncratic determinants of news coverage.

Ideally, the mass media in a democratic society should furnish a “mirror image” of political reality, and should assist voters in seeing the connections between the actions of their elected representatives and the state of national problems. For a number of reasons, however, American network news fails to live up to this ideal. First, the networks’ news agenda is heavily influenced by political leaders and their “handlers” who prefer to campaign over issues that, historically, have worked to benefit their candidates. It is unlikely that the actions of Mr. Willie Horton or Governor Dukakis’ drive in a tank would have been


considered newsworthy were it not for the "media management" strategies of the 1988 Bush campaign.

Not only do campaign operatives and their clients impart a particular flavor to news reports, television news is inherently episodic because of a plethora of editorial influences including organizational norms and commercial imperatives. Journalistic values such as "objectivity" place a premium on the reporting of "hard" news such as specific events. Interpretive, "subsurface" reporting is much more vulnerable to charges of bias and editorializing. Moreover, within the constraints of a twenty-one minute "headline service," in-depth, analytic, or interpretive reports on national issues would leave little room for other news items. Finally, there is the all-powerful commercial imperative; audience ratings points and the advertising dollar are critical. Episodic reporting, which typically features "good pictures," is likely to attract and keep viewers' attention. Thematic reporting, on the other hand, tends to be dull and slow-paced, characteristics that are not likely to strengthen viewer interest. The distinguished scholar of American journalism, Ben Bagdikian, has argued that the commercial dictates of news programming represent the root cause for the prominence of the episodic frame in American public affairs journalism. In discussing concentrated corporate control over news organizations, Bagdikian identifies several consequences for news programming including the distinctive episodic nature of American news programs: "What is weak in U.S. journalism, compared to the best journalism in other democracies, is systematic political and social analysis that indicates the sources, relationships, and consequences of individual events." In short, there are powerful organizational pressures that lead television news reporters and editors to seize upon specific events and particular episodes for representing political issues.

The premium placed on episodic framing means that many issues of significance have not received and will not receive the news coverage necessary to permit the public to become critical
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40. For a detailed analysis of the importance of these factors in influencing the content of the news, see Edward J. Epstein, News From Nowhere (1973). See also Herbert Gans, Deciding What's News (1979); Gaye Tuchman, Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality (1978); Av Westin, Newswatch: How Television Decides the News (1982).


observers of national affairs. Many contemporary problems tend to be invisible because they lack immediate or readily traceable symptoms. These subjects have been deemed less newsworthy by journalists hungry for "good pictures." For example, deficiencies in public education, the emergence of a large and seemingly permanent underclass, and gradual environmental degradation do not typically manifest themselves as specific events, and stories on these issues are infrequent. Similarly, the corruption in and mismanagement of savings and loan institutions failed to attract media attention until politicians were forced to acknowledge the true impact of the losses on the federal budget.

Nowhere is the debilitating influence of episodic framing on political accountability more apparent than in presidential election campaigns. The tendency to reduce a political campaign to daily ten-second "sound bites," and the unending focus on the "horse race" is a powerful disincentive for candidates to take national issues seriously. When the Dukakis campaign issued a series of detailed proposals designed to protect middle-income families from the skyrocketing costs of college tuition, these proposals were virtually ignored by the networks. Under the present system of allocating news coverage, issue-oriented candidates are clearly the losers.

Instead of forcing the candidates to confront issues of clear social or economic significance, television news coverage of the 1988 campaign focused on the Pledge of Allegiance, patriotism, prison furlough programs, flag desecration, membership in the American Civil Liberties Union, and other issues more symbolic than substantive. Moreover, when the candidates did address issues of substance, their rhetoric and arguments were far from compelling. George Bush committed himself to an "education presidency" while simultaneously, and seemingly inconsistently, opposing tax increases; Michael Dukakis attributed Massachusetts's economic growth in the 1980s entirely to his superior leadership skills. Summing up their impressions of the victorious Bush campaign, the veteran journalists, Jack Germond and Jules Witcover, noted that the campaign process in general and patterns of television news coverage in particular "enabled Bush to finesse the truly serious issues facing the country, setting up a smokescreen behind which he was able to speak in vacuous generalities about 'val-

43. See Germond & Witcover, supra note 39, at 405-06.
ues' and avoid programmatic specifics that voters had a right to expect . . . .”

All told, therefore, the correspondence between television news coverage and political "reality" is inevitably loose. Voters are led down pathways of judgment either defined by the news strategies of candidates (and their partisan biases) or by the internal dynamics of news organizations which produce a dominance of episodic over thematic news coverage. The portrayal of recurring issues as unrelated events prevents the public from cumulating the evidence toward any logical ultimate consequence. By diverting attention from societal and governmental responsibility, television glosses over national problems, and allows elected officials to ignore problems whose remedies entail burdens to their constituents. In the long run, therefore, television news contributes to the trivialization of campaign discourse and the erosion of electoral accountability.

44. *Id.* at 459.