The 2005 MAPOR conference promises to be an exciting one. The theme this year is “Messages for the Masses: Measuring Public Opinion in Modern Democracies.” The call for papers asked authors to consider the social, technological, and political forces that are affecting the formation and measurement of public opinion today. Researchers responded well to the call, submitting a wide array of proposals.

At the heart of many of the papers accepted to the conference are concerns about the communication processes that are influencing contemporary opinion. For example, a number of papers look at the source and impact of messages that audiences receive from the news and in online settings. Conference presenters will address how relationships among citizens and between citizens and elites are driving and reacting to changes in media systems.

At the same time, the quality of opinion measurement continues to be a concern in the field, and this is reflected in work we will discuss at the conference. The ability of researchers to measure public opinion today is threatened by changes in communication technology and its use and by ongoing shifts in the nature of the American political landscape. When combined with perennial measurement problems, these changes may seriously threaten the validity of survey research. A number of sessions this year are focused on survey quality and its improvement.

In addition to paper sessions, we have two panels specifically focused on the conference theme this year. The first is “’Private’ vs. ‘Personal’, ‘Crisis’ vs. ‘Problems’: Elite, Media, and Public Framing of the Social Security Debate, organized by Weiwu Zhang, Austin Peay State University. The panel will consider the source, effectiveness, and traction of the ways social security reform has been framed for citizen audiences. Among the panelists will be Doris Graber, University of Illinois-Chicago and Zhongdang Pan, University of Wisconsin-Madison. The second panel will take up a discussion of George Bishop’s new book, The Illusion of Public Opinion (2005, Rowman & Littlefield). In his book, Bishop raises questions about the ability of survey questions to accurately measure public opinion. Panelists will examine this argument and the available evidence.

As is typically the case, the luncheon is a pre-paid event (buy your tickets with your registration) that features a noted speaker and the presentation of the MAPOR Fellow and MAPOR student paper competition winners. The luncheon speaker this year is Don A. Dillman of the Social & Economic Sciences Research Center at Washington State University. He is a widely respected expert in survey research, having taught and conducted research in the field for over 36 years. He is a past president of AAPOR and in 2003 received the AAPOR Award for Exceptionally Distinguished Achievement. The topic of his presentation is “Visual Design Effects in Web and Mixed Mode Surveys.”

Our pedagogy speaker this year is Colm O’Muircheartaigh of the National Opinion Research Center and the Harris School of Public Policy Studies at the University of Chicago. The title of his talk is “Sample Design in 7 + 2 Constructs.” Professor O’Muircheartaigh is an internationally recognized expert in survey research and social science research methodology. He is a former president of the International Association of Survey Statisticians and is active in the international community, consulting for the United Nations, the Commission of the European Community, and the International Association for Educational Assessment.

On an administrative level, we have made a few small changes to the conference; the MAPOR executive board hopes the changes will improve the flow of events this year. The poster session now runs concurrently with the cocktail set-up in the mezzanine on Friday afternoon. In addition, the president’s “Dutch treat” dinner on Friday night is now a ticketed event. We think this will simplify the dinner for everyone. Diners will be able to choose from a number of options when they visit the Weber Grill restaurant a few blocks from the hotel. Tickets for the dinner must be purchased in advance via the pre-registration process.

See Masses on page 4
An Adversarial Press?

*The President's Column* by Douglas Blanks Hindman

Having lived through a flood that resulted in the evacuation of an entire city, I’ve been struck by the differences and similarities between the Red River Valley floods of 1997 and the current events on the Gulf Coast.

On first glance, the media coverage of the two disasters appears to be quite different. Some claim that an emboldened, critical, and adversarial press has emerged following Hurricane Katrina. In North Dakota, the disaster coverage was decidedly consensus-oriented.

On closer examination, however, the similarities in news media coverage of the disasters outweigh the differences. In both cases, the news media played important roles while reflecting social conditions unique to each disaster.

During the 1997 floods in North Dakota, 100 miles west of the headwaters of the Mississippi River, leaders, citizens, and local mass media fell in line with expected behaviors.

Local public officials in Fargo and East Grand Forks were visible, decisive, and effective. Citizens in neighborhoods threatened by the flooding Red River mobilized to build massive sandbag dikes. When the levees were ready to fail, the residents evacuated, as ordered.

Local broadcast media, particularly a Fargo news-talk radio station, opened their airwaves to continuous coverage of the disaster, earning numerous awards, and eventually launching the national career of progressive talk radio personality Ed “the gun-totin’, red-meat-eatin’ liberal” Schultz.

Twenty-three hundred miles down the Mississippi River, things were much different.

In the build-up to and recovery from the nation’s worst natural disaster, federal, state, and local public officials were detached, inconsistent, and ineffective. Public approval of President Bush fell to an all-time low. A wide gap developed between black and white perceptions of governmental response to the disaster.

News media coverage of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita was riveting, and is also likely to win heaps of awards. Television live shots were meaningful and informative. Reporters showed what they saw rather than what officials told them to see. Victims told gripping stories of survival and death. Television viewers knew more about the plight of those stranded in New Orleans than did the Director of Homeland Security.

Local and national news media consistently turn disaster into opportunity. The media provide citizens with both information and connection during what DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach call periods of media system dependency. For that role, news media coverage of all disasters tends to be widely praised.

News coverage of disasters can also be faulted for falling into common patterns.

As E. L. Quarantelli has pointed out, the news media tends to rely exclusively on information from the ‘command post’ of local, state, and federal officials charged with coordinating disaster response. Public officials from the command post present themselves as competent and functional, while portraying the public as infantile, disorganized, and prone to looting.

In North Dakota, the command post was firmly in place. Local news media dutifully passed along word of official competence, and stern warnings to public “gawkers”.

In New Orleans, the command post was first non-existent, and then disorganized. News coverage reflected these changes by first reporting stories about stranded citizens, then reporting rooftop rescues, and finally stories about looting and mayhem. These changes in coverage reflected command post changes from an emphasis on rescue to an emphasis on the protection of private property.

The claim that the news media following Hurricane Katrina became adversarial is greatly exaggerated. True, newspaper opinion pages across the country ran pointed attacks on the administration. Normally conservative cable news networks ran rare, on-air editorials such as Keith Olbermann’s Sep. 5 tirade (also on Olbermann’s MSNBC “Countdown” Web site).

News media may appear to be critical, but are only reflecting the ambiguity and conflict among elites. As Phil Tichenor wrote, when the family is fighting, the guard dogs start to bark.

Critical media coverage in the wake of the Gulf Coast Hurricanes of 2005 is less the result of media initiative than the result of in-fighting across local, state, and federal levels of government. That division thrives in the current climate of partisan differences, public frustration with rising gas prices, and growing skepticism about the War in Iraq.

DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach have written that the public seeks stability following disasters, and looks to officials, via the mass media, for reassurance. When officials are divided, the media report conflict, and the public has to look elsewhere for comfort. The good thing is, properly channeled, conflict can stimulate the search for solutions, can mobilize citizens into action, and can increase political involvement.

If Hurricanes Katrina and Rita have washed away whatever gravitas the current administration earned following 9/11, it is not because of media coverage.

What news media can claim are important and unique roles in alerting the public about impending disasters, and in helping to unite citizens in their concern about victims. For that, we are grateful.
Explicate, Please

MAPOR Newsletter Column by Sharon Dunwoody

I am about to endorse a term I have detested for almost 30 years: explication.
Frankly, I have spent my career trying to relegate the word to the dust bin. It has long been one of a subset of awkward scholarly terms that I keep in a "file of the banned" (among them "loomingness," a personal favorite from the geography literature that at least has the endearing characteristic of seeming a bit nutty).

But I write this column as a kind of apology to the term, as a mea culpa to my present and former students, and to urge on my MAPOR colleagues the extraordinarily difficult task of explication.

My historic arguments against explication have been two in number. One has proved to be wrong and the other, while still correct in my view, actually serves as the catalyst for the plea that dominates this column.

I have always argued that explication is just an unpronounceable synonym for "explanation" and have advised my students to abandon the former in favor of the latter.

Wrong. Explication is a type of explanation but not an exact replica. It is an incredibly comprehensive, detailed, full rendering of a concept or process. As former friend and colleague Steve Chaffee noted in his "explication" of the concept in the Sage monograph Explication, the term "embraces both the conceptual world and the real world, crossing those lines repeatedly as the student attempts to improve conceptualization through research" (Chaffee, 1991:5). In other words, explicating a concept or process is likely a career-long adventure. It is an ongoing conversation between concepts and data in service to a deep conceptual understanding of something. It is what scholars are supposed to do.

But do we? That brings me to my second historical argument, that explication is an academic non-starter because researchers never do it. At best, we grapple superficially with concepts, wrangle them into hypotheses, and then see if we guessed right. In the course of that (admittedly important) work, we have no time to explicate; we only have time to explain.

I see this kind of conceptual satisficing in most of my work, and I am beginning to feel great frustration with it. Let me give you a quick example:

For some 15 years now, I have worked with a variety of colleagues (including MAPOR members Robert Griffin and Kurt Neuwirth) to better understand how individuals use information to make risk judgments. In the course of that, we have employed the concept of uncertainty, primarily to understand how perceptions of what scientists don’t know about a risk influence a person’s reactions to that risk.

At least that’s what we thought we were measuring when we asked respondents about their levels of uncertainty. But more recently, in collaboration with former graduate student Maria Powell (now a postdoc at University of Wisconsin-Madison), we have come to realize that our explanation of uncertainty is far too narrow.

For example, Dr. Powell found in her dissertation research that, when asked to explain what they meant when expressing feelings of uncertainty about the risk of eating possibly contaminated fish from the Great Lakes, respondents overwhelmingly indicated that uncertainty reflected not what scientists didn’t know but what they—the respondents—didn’t know. Such a distinction mirrors a longstanding dichotomy in the concept of uncertainty (see, for example, Kahneman & Tversky, 1982), but Dr. Powell’s work contributes to the explication of the term in a way that will advance our understanding of it within the context of risk perception and communication.

So although I continue to believe that most of us fail to explicate, let me urge all of us in the knowledge generation business to renew our allegiance to such a goal. I myself make such a pledge. Although the term will never flow off my tongue easily, I hope I can make the truly hard work of explication a conscious goal of my scholarly work.

Masses continued from front page.

The conference dates are November 18 and 19, 2005. A copy of the registration form is included with this newsletter. The form allows you to pay for membership in MAPOR, conference registration, and specific events. Again, please note that tickets for the Friday night dinner must be purchased in advance. Please complete the registration form and submit it to Teresa Mastin at your earliest convenience. There is an “early bird” registration rate available, if you submit the form and payment by November 1. Student authors, please note that you are eligible for special rates for the conference registration and the Friday luncheon.

The conference is held at the Radisson Hotel & Suites in downtown Chicago (http://www.radisson.com/chicagoil). The room rates are again $152 for a single and $172 for a double. To receive the conference rate, make sure that you mention MAPOR when you make your reservation. All hotel reservations must be made by October 19, 2005; after that the hotel cannot guarantee our rates. Please contact the Radisson directly at:

Phone: (312) 787-2900  
Fax: (312) 787-5158  
Email: radchicago@ihrco.com

I look forward to seeing you all on the weekend before Thanksgiving in Chicago!

2005-2006 MAPOR Officers

President  
Douglas Blanks Hindman  
Washington State University  
dhindman@wsu.edu

Past President  
Allan McCutcheon  
University of Nebraska - Lincoln  
amccutcheon1@unl.edu

Vice President  
Dietram Scheufele  
School of Journalism UW-Madison  
scheufele@wisc.edu

Conference Chair  
David Tewksbury  
Dept. Of Speech Communication  
University of Illinois  
tewksbur@uiuc.edu

Conference Co-Chair  
Ward Kay  
Adirondack Communications  
wkay@adirondack-inc.com

Secretary - Treasurer  
Teresa Mastin  
Department of Advertising  
mastinte@msu.edu

Don’t forget to cast your 2005 ballot!  
You can find your ballot attached with this newsletter!

MAPOR 2005 Conference  
November 18-19 2005  
Radisson Hotel & Suites Chicago  
Please contact the Radisson to make your reservations for the conference:  
Phone: (312) 787-2900  
Web: www.radisson.com/chicagoil

MAPOR members attend WAPOR in Cannes, France, from the left to right are Trevor Tompson, George Bishop, Patricia Moy, Mike Traugott, Allan McCutcheon, Tom Smith, John Miller and Tom Johnson.
2005 MAPOR Conference Sponsors

To keep conference costs reasonable, MAPOR depends upon the generous sponsorship of outside firms and organizations. Here’s a current list of the firms underwriting our conference next month:

**Event Sponsors**

Marketing Systems Group  
The Everett Group and Draughon Research

**Major Sponsors**

Arbitron  
On-Line Communications, Inc.  
Research Solutions, Inc.  
RTI International

**Industry Sponsors**

CFMC  
Survey Service, Inc.

**Academic Sponsor**

Gallup Research Center, Univ. Of Nebraska Lincoln

If your organization would like to join these sponsors to help defray MAPOR’s conference costs, please contact Steve Everett for more information:

(steve@everettgroup.com)
Friday, Nov. 18

8:30 am – 5 pm (Intermezzo)  Registration (coffee, tea, bakery)

10 am – 11:30 am (Symphony A)  Paper Session 1

Causes of Media Effect Perceptions

Moderator:

"Self vs. (Which) Others: An Examination of How Defining Others Influences Third-Person Perception," H. Allen White, Murray State U; Julie L. Andsager, U of Iowa; James T. Crawford, Murray State U

"Social Distance and Self-Categorization in the TPE," H. Allen White, Murray State U; Julie L. Andsager, U of Iowa


Discussant: Matthew Nisbet, The Ohio State U

10 am – 11:30 am (Symphony B)  Paper Session 2

Roots and Effects of Trust in Media and Government

Moderator: Yung Soo Kim, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale

"Societal Impact of Nanotechnology: Testing the Political Acceptance of the 'Next Economic Revolution,'” Patricia Gross, Metro Chicago Information Center; Ravishankar Anand, Blackstone Advanced Analytics Group; Dan Lewis, Northwestern U; Woody Carter, Metro Chicago Information Center


"Web Credibility: How College Students Perceive Online News Sources Compared to Their Traditional Counterparts," Daekyung Kim, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale

"Media Use, Media Credibility and Public Trust,” T. Maggie Zhang, Syracuse U; Grace Han Yao, Syracuse U

"Mass Media, Interpersonal and Institutional Trust and Participation,” Ellen Kanervo, Austin Peay State U; Weiwu Zhang, Austin Peay State U

Discussant: Patricia Moy, U of Washington

Continued...
10 am – 11:30 am
(Symphony C)
Paper Session 3
Survey Administration Effects

Moderator:

“A better Correction for Non-Response Bias? The Advantages of a Mixed Mode Survey for Analysis of and Correction for Non-Response Bias Using the Continuum of Resistance,” Alisha Baines, Minneapolis VA Medical Center; Michael Davern, U of Minnesota; Melissa R. Partin, Minneapolis VA Medical Center

“Implications and Consequences of Email Versus Other Methods of Recruitment for Focus Group Participants,” William L. Rosenberg, Drexel U

“Application of an Online Electronic Survey: Insights to Behavior or Marginal Data?” Fiona Chew, Syracuse U; Grace Han Yao, Syracuse U

“Bilingual Interviewers and Data Quality: Clues from the Survey of Consumer Finances,” M. Mandy Sha, NORC/U of Chicago; Yongyi Wang, NORC/U of Chicago

Discussant: John Loft, RTI International

11:45 am – 1:15 pm
(Encore, 13th floor)
Luncheon (ticket required)

Presiding: Douglas Blanks Hindman, MAPOR President
MAPOR Fellows
Top Student Paper Award

Speaker: Don Dillman
“Visual Design Effects in Web and Mixed Mode Surveys.”
Social and Economic Research Center
Washington State University

Sponsors: The Everett Group and Draughon Research

1:30 pm – 3 pm
(Symphony A)
Paper Session 4
The Effects of Third-Person Perception

Moderator:

“Content-specific Influences on Third-person Effects and Behavioral Components,” Julie Andsager, U of Iowa; H. Allen White, Murray State U; Rob Kuennen, U of Iowa

“Consecrating the Bully Pulpit: Using Presumed Influence to Model Evangelical Voting Behavior,” Ken Blake, Middle Tennessee State U; Marcie Hinton, Middle Tennessee State U; David Pernell, Middle Tennessee State U; Robert O. Wyatt, Middle Tennessee State U


Discussant: David Tewksbury, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Moderator/Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1:30 pm – 3 pm | Paper Session 5 | The Bases and Components of Candidate Evaluations | Moderator: Aaron S. Veenstra, U of Wisconsin-Madison  
“Sound and Fury: Discovering Empty Language in Political Communication,”  
“The Effects of TV News Style on Viewers’ Political Evaluations,” Ben Sayre, U of Wisconsin-Madison; Lucy Atkinson, U of Wisconsin-Madison  
“The Role of Sponsorship in Negative Political Advertising On Audiences’ Attitude Toward Candidates,” Yanjun Zhao, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale; Thomas Johnson, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale  
Discussant: Young Mie Kim, The Ohio State U |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Moderator/Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1:30 pm – 3 pm | Paper Session 6 | Improving Survey Quality to Improve the Information for Democracies: The Collection and Analysis of Process to Improve Survey Outcomes | Moderator:  
“Statistical Propensity Models to Predict Likelihood of Survey Response Compared to Interviewer Judgments of Likelihood of Response,” James Wagner, U of Michigan; Heidi Guyer, U of Michigan  
“Toward an Understanding of Survey Breakoffs,” Andy Peytchev, U of Michigan  
Discussant: Rob Daves, Minneapolis Star Tribune |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Moderator/Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3:15 pm – 4:45 pm | Paper Session 7 | Issues in Measurement and Response Rates | Moderator:  
“The Gender Gap and Question Interpretation in Presidential Approval Measures,” Jessica H. Johnson, U of Cincinnati  
“Understanding Vote Over-Reporting, A Case Study: British General Elections 1992, 1997 and 2001,” Ipek Bilgen, U of Nebraska-Lincoln/Gallup Research Center; Allan McCutcheon, U of Nebraska-Lincoln/Gallup Research Center; Rene Bautista, U of Nebraska-Lincoln/Gallup Research Center  
“Current Issues in Response Rates in Physician Surveys,” Sean O. Hogan, RTI-International; John D. Loft, RTI-International  
Discussant: Ward Kay, Adirondack Communications, Inc. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Moderator/Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3:15 pm – 4:45 pm | Paper Session 8                              | Censorship and Support for Free Expression                            | **Moderator:** *Trust in Government and Freedom of the Press,* Bruce W. Hardy, U of Pennsylvania  


“Protecting Others or Supporting Rights?: Willingness to Restrict the Media,” Julie Andsager, U of Iowa; H. Allen White, Murray State U  

“Stability and Change in Support for Free Expression among Those Preparing for Careers in Communication Occupations,” Tudor Vlad, U of Georgia; Lee B. Becker, U of Georgia  

**Discussant:** Ken Blake, Middle Tennessee State U |
| 3:15 pm – 4:45 pm | Panel 1                                      | 'Private' vs. 'Personal', 'Crisis' vs. 'Problems': Elite, Media, and Public Framing of the Social Security Debate | **Moderator:** Weiwu Zhang, Austin Peay State U  

Panelists: Doris Graber, U of Illinois-Chicago  

Dietram Scheufele, U of Wisconsin-Madison  

Zhongdang Pan, U of Wisconsin-Madison |
| 4:45 – 6 pm     | Cocktail Hour and a Quarter                  |                                                                      |  

| 4:45 – 6 pm     | Poster Session                              |                                                                      |  

“Writing about Women: Community and Organization Determinants of News Coverage,” Cory L. Armstrong, U of Florida  

“A Blog Revolution?: Potentials and Constraints of Blogging as a Mode of Public Discourse,” Eunseong Kim, Indiana U-Bloomington  

“Regression Diagnostics for Survey Data: Identifying Influential Observations,” Jianzhu Li, U of Maryland  

“Blogging and Public Opinion,” Leo Chan, U of Wisconsin-Whitewater  

“Managing Balance,” Lewis Horner, The Ohio State U  

“Coorientation in a Public Opinion Context: Predicting Accurate Perceptions of Community Opinion,” Lindsay Hoffman, The Ohio State U; Jason B. Reineke; The Ohio State U  


“A Rumor of War: Knowledge Gap and Saddam’s Misalleged Role in 9/11,” Shelley Madison, Middle Tennessee State U; Ken Blake, Middle Tennessee State U; Robert O. Wyatt, Middle Tennessee State U  

“Assessing College Students’ Attitudes toward Search Engine Sponsored Links: An Exploratory Study,” Xingpu Yuan, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale  

“A Relationship between Public Opinion and Internet Usage of Korean Internet Users,” Yung Soo Kim, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale
**5:30 – 6:30 pm**  
*Pedagogy Hour*  
*(Symphony A)*  
  
*Presiding:* Douglas Blanks Hindman, MAPOR President  
  
*Speaker:* Colm O’Muircheartaigh  
“Sample Design in 7 +- 2 Constructs.”  
NORC  
University of Chicago  
  
*Sponsor:* Marketing Systems Group  

**7 pm**  
*Welcome Dinner (ticket required)*  
*(Hotel Lobby)*  
New and longtime members are invited to joint MAPOR’s President, Douglas Blanks Hindman, and other MAPOR members for dinner at the Weber Grill Restaurant. Menu choices will include grilled salmon, pork chops, ribs, vegetable plate; salad; dessert; soft drinks; $40 per person. Wine and beer can be ordered separately. Meet in the lobby for a stroll to the restaurant. Tickets for this event must be purchased in advance.

**Saturday, Nov. 19**  

**8:00 am – noon**  
*Registration (coffee, tea, fruit, bakery)*  
*(Intermezzo)*  

**8:30 am – 10 am**  
*Paper Session 9*  
*Issues in the Spiral of Silence*  
  
*Moderator:*  
“A Unified Model for the Diffusion of Innovations and the Spiral of Silence Within the Framework of Paradigms,”  
David Fan, U of Minnesota; Haoyu Yu, U of Minnesota  
  
“Conformity and Debate about Abortion: The Spiral of Silence in Multiple Contexts,” Kurt Neuwirth, U of Cincinnati; Sarah Curry, U of Cincinnati; Edward Frederick, U of Wisconsin-Eau Claire; Won Yong Jang, U of Wisconsin-Eau Claire; Jack Kapfer, U of Wisconsin-Eau Claire; Michael Dorsher, U of Wisconsin-Eau Claire; Charles Mayo, U of Southern Mississippi  
  
“Voicing Complaints in the Public Arena,” Leo W. Jeffres, Cleveland State U; Guowei Jian, Cleveland State U; David Atkin, Cleveland State U  
  
“Who Cares About What Others Think? Moderating Factors of the Spiral of Silence,” Nicole Cann, Auburn U; Martha Isom, Auburn U; Sei-Hill Kim, Auburn U  
  
*Discussant: Weiwu Zhang, Austin Peay State U*  

**8:30 am – 10 am**  
*Paper Session 10*  
*War Coverage*  
  
*Moderator: Jounghwa Choi, Michigan State U*  
  
“Ohio Newspaper Editorials Follow the Lead of President Bush Following September 11th;,” David Hutchinson, The Ohio State U  
  
  
“Sanctioning Torture: Power Indexing in the Confirmation of Alberto Gonzales,” Andrea Hickerson, U of Washington; Patricia Moy, U of Washington; Kate Dunsmore, U of Washington  
  
“Media framing: Abu Ghraib Prisoner Abuse Story in the News and Consensus on Iraq War;” Anup Kumar, U of Iowa  
  
*Discussant: Ed Horowitz, Cleveland State U*
8:30 am – 10 am  
(Symphony C)  
Paper Session 11  
Public Opinion in International Contexts  
Moderator:

“Constructing an Intifada for Statehood: Palestinian Political Violence in U.S. News,” Amani Ismail, U of Iowa  

“An Audience Survey of News Coverage of the Transatlantic Relationship by American Media,” Dorothy Njoroge, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale  

“Searching for a Global Elite: Have Elites become Cosmopolitan while People Have Remained Local?“ Roei Davidson, U of Michigan; Nathaniel D. Poor, U of Michigan, Ann E. Williams, U of Michigan  

“Cyber-rule in Pan-Asia: Users’ Perspectives,” Yong Jin Park, U of Michigan  

Discussant: Barbara Burrell, Northern Illinois U  

10:15 am – 11:45 am  
(Symphony A)  
Paper Session 12  
Health Issues in Public Opinion and in the News  
Moderator: George Anghelcev, U of Minnesota  

“Assessments of Public Opinion about Cigarette Smoking Using Survey Essays,” David Fan, U of Minnesota; Thomas J. Ernste, U of Minnesota  


“Cross-National Study in Danger Perception of Drug Use Among Youth in 15 Veteran Countries of the European Union,” Xiaoming Liu, U of Nebraska-Lincoln/Gallup Research Center; David Palmer, U of Nebraska-Lincoln/Gallup Research Center  

Discussant: Dominique Brossard, U of Wisconsin-Madison  

10:15 am – 11:45 am  
(Symphony B)  
Paper Session 13  
Effects of War Coverage  
Moderator: Teresa Mastin, Michigan State U  

“Picturing the Iraq War: Identification of Casualties and Viewer Reaction,” Edmund Lo, San Antonio College; Steve Hallock, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale; Liliana Serban, Ohio U; Hong Ji, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey; Daniel Riffe, Ohio U  

“2003 Iraq War Opinion: Were American Citizens in Favor or Opposed and did it Matter?“ Kevin D. Navratil, U of Illinois-Chicago  


“Visions of Iraq War: U.S. Coverage and Audience’s Interpretations,” Yanjun Zhao, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale  

Discussant: Cory Armstrong, U of Florida
10:15 am – 11:45 am
(Symphony C)

Paper Session 14
Factors Related to Democratic Participation

Moderator: Daekyung Kim, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale

“Structure or Predisposition? Exploring the Interaction Between Discussion Orientation and Structural Features of Political Discussion on Political Participation,” Eunkyung Kim, U of Wisconsin-Madison; Dietram Scheufele, U of Wisconsin-Madison; Jeong Yeob Han, U of Wisconsin-Madison

“Theorizing Social Capital and Civic Engagement,” Weiwu Zhang, Austin Peay State U; Ellen Kanervo, Austin Peay State U

“Reading Political Blogs During the 2004 Election Campaign: Correlates and Consequences,” William P. Eveland, Jr., The Ohio State U

Discussant: Thomas Johnson, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale

11:45 am – 1:45 pm

Lunch (on your own)

1:45 pm – 3:15 pm
(Symphony A)

Paper Session 15
Seeking and Acquiring Political Information

Moderator:

“Narrowing Political Knowledge Gaps: Investigating the Role of Motivations in Producing Differential Learning from the News,” Clarissa David, U of Pennsylvania


Discussant: William P. Eveland, Jr., The Ohio State U

1:45 pm – 3:15 pm
(Symphony B)

Paper Session 16
Religion and Morality in America and Abroad

Moderator: Woody Carter, Metro Chicago Information Center


“Issue Framing and the 2004 Election,” Jim Hale, Southern Illinois U-Carbondale

“Islam, Christianity and Media Coverage: A Content Analysis of Four Nations’ Newspapers,” Mark Hungerford, U of Texas-Austin

“Ethnic and Religious Diversity in America,” Tom W. Smith, NORC/U of Chicago

Discussant: Douglas Blanks Hindman, Washington State U
1:45 pm – 3:15 pm
(Symphony C)
Paper Session 17
Private Discussion and Public Expression

Moderator:

“Citizen Journalism and the Expression of Public Opinion,” Limor Peer, Northwestern U


“The Discursive Model of Public Opinion,” Won Yong Jang, U of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

Discussant: Dietram A. Scheufele, U of Wisconsin-Madison

3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
(Symphony A)
Paper Session 18
New Directions in Media Effects Theory

Moderator:


“Is the Media Fostering Learned Helplessness in the Obese?” Juli Hinds, U of Wisconsin-Madison

“When a Company ‘Dies,’ is Anyone Responsible? The Effect of Anthropomorphizing Metaphors on Responsibility Attributions,” Roei Davidson, U of Michigan; Emily Chivers-Yochim, U of Michigan; Ann Williams, U of Michigan

“How Does Individual Partisanship Influence the Agenda-Setting Function?” Yue Tan, Indiana U

Discussant: Zhongdang Pan, U of Wisconsin-Madison

3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
(Symphony B)
Panel 2
Discussion of The Illusion of Public Opinion (George F. Bishop, 2005, Rowman & Littlefield)

Moderator:

Panelists:

3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
(Symphony C)
Paper Session 19
The Framing of Issues in the Press

Moderator:


“Managing the Scope of Participation: Attention Cycles and Frames in the Debate Over Agricultural Biotechnology,” Matthew C. Nisbet, The Ohio State U

“The Story of ‘Us’: Negotiating National Identity on Opinion Pages in Times of Crisis,” Mervat Youssef, U of Iowa

“Michigan Gaming Law and the Battle for Public Opinion,” Teresa Mastin, Michigan State U; Andrew Corner, The Rossman Group; Jounghwa Choi, Michigan State U; Yu-Shiuan Chiou, Michigan State

Discussant: David Fan, U of Minnesota

5:00 pm – 5:30 pm
(Symphony C)
Business Meeting

5:30 pm – 6:30 pm
(Intermezzo)
Social Hour