

Political Landscape of Pakistan and Emerging Space for Deliberative Democracy: Analyzing the Role of Political News Consumption in Developing Deliberative Sphere

Dr. Muhammad Zahid Bilal^{1*}, Dr. Fakhara Shahid², Dr. Arfan Latif³, Mr. Adil Ahmad⁴

^{1*}Assistant Professor, Department of Media & Communication Studies, University of Okara, Email: zahid.bilal@uo.edu.pk

²Lecturer International Relations, University of Okara, Email: akhara.shahid@uo.edu.pk

³Assistant Professor Sociology, University of Okara, Email: arfanlatif9292@uo.edu.pk

⁴Visiting Lecturer International Relations, University of Okara, Email: adil.ak.1915@gmail.com

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. Muhammad Zahid Bilal

*Assistant Professor, Department of Media & Communication Studies, University of Okara, Email: zahid.bilal@uo.edu.pk

Abstract

Deliberative theorists believe that political news is essential for the development of deliberative democracy. Political news is considered a central source of political information for the public which may provide them a ground to have more connected, interactive and effective role in political discussion environment. This endeavor aimed at examining relationship of political news consumption and political deliberation among a key group of voters during an election campaign in Pakistan. It explores the process by which political news consumption operate in a friends and family circles. A Cross sectional survey was used to collect data from the shopkeepers of Lahore during general elections 2013 in Pakistan. Sample of the voters was taken employing multistage purposive sampling technique. Data analysis was done using multiple regression analysis to gauge the variance shared by the political news and political deliberation. Results provide an exploratory understanding of relationship between political news consumption and political deliberation.

Keywords: *Political News Consumption, Political Deliberations, Deliberative Democracy*

Political Deliberations

Political conversation has long been studied as an important factor for the understanding of political system among the political communication scholars. They started utilizing deliberative theories of democracy, developed under political science scholarship (Fishkin, 1991), to understand the effects of political conversation and discussion (Eveland, Morey & Hutchens, 2011, p. 1082). This theoretical approach provided a framework for the communication scientist to organize the network of discussion that have gone through the various changes from 'filter hypothesis' of Elihu Katz, 'Public Sphere' of Habermas, to Page's concept of 'mediated deliberation'.

Mass communication passes through the filters of interpersonal conversation and discussion. This hypothesis later on called as "Filter Hypothesis". The roots of filter hypothesis are embedded in the work of Katz (1955). He explained the minimal effects of mass media by introducing interpersonal communication as an alternative to mass communication (McLeod, Kosicki & McLeod, 2008). Decatur study on personal influence by Elihu Katz provided an empirical validation for the earlier work of Columbia school and found that effectiveness of mass media is dependent on the "supplementation" of interpersonal influence (Katz, 2006). These findings directed the communication researchers toward interpersonal conversation and discussion. This line of thinking made it clear that people cannot be influenced directly by the mass media. They have the ability to analyze it and interpret the media provided information in their discussion network.

Hence, indirect route provided power to the interpersonal conversation by which media information could be evaluated through some filters. This approach of Elihu Katz on the basis of Lzarsfeld and his colleagues, come up with the idea of "Filter Hypothesis". This idea argue that personal communication mediates the influence of mass communication on individual voters, reinforcing or blocking the impact of media information, depending on the evaluative implications of that information and on the political composition of voters' discussant networks (Schmitt-Beck, 2004). According to Katz, this idea is the extension of the classic study of Trade, 1898 who studied the role of conversation in aggregation of public opinion. These research projects revealed that before political decisions and participatory behavior occur, media content passes through interpersonal networks, social norms, and social networks, for evaluation. Here, in this study, this development is viewed as start of deliberation thoughts within communication scholarship.

Discussion on the socio-political issues has also been taken as an important element of the society by Habermas in his idea of "Communicative Action" and "Public Sphere". Habermas (1984) discussed that through political conversations and discussions citizen produce communicative reasons and get mutual understanding of the self and others. He stressed that chatting, conversing and arguing is the real form of communicative action that forms interpretive community which leads toward rationality. He conceptualized the communicative action as an interaction between two subjects capable of speech and action which establish interpersonal relations.

His theory of communicative action suggests that everyday political talk is the fundamental basis of rational public deliberation. The theory maintains that reason is not given from outside the society nor does it pre-exist in individuals' subjective minds; rather, reason is to be produced by non-purposive, nonstrategic, non-success-oriented social interactions called communicative

action. The best example of communicative action is informal and spontaneous conversations through which people establish interpersonal relations. According to him deliberation have an impact on the “formation of considered political opinion” (p. 414) but that reasons are produced through everyday political talk (Habermas, 2006). In Habermas’s (1991) definition of the public sphere, we can see that the three elements—media, conversation, and public opinion—are tightly associated. When the public is large, this kind of communication requires certain means of dissemination and influence; today, newspapers and periodicals, radio, and television are the media of the public sphere. (p. 398).

Media and Democratic Deliberative Theory

Deliberation through media is being considered alternative of deliberative forums to represent masses. Public deliberation is central to the deliberative democratic theory. This sort of deliberation has some limitations. Xenos (2008) discussed these limitations of the deliberative democracy lies in its small-scale structured sessions. He argued that these small discussions settings were justifiable in traditional town hall meetings in England but it is difficult to apply deliberative democracy approaches, at the national level in mass societies. He noted that these limitations can be solved by employing the Page’s concept of mediated deliberation. As Page (1996) also have discussed that the public at large should be well informed collectively to overcome controlled environment under government. Reliance only on the face-to-face discussion and public officials could weaken the public’s accountability power (p.5). Therefore, whole citizenry could account for the deliberation which is possible through the media.

Another strand of deliberation is the deliberation in which media play central role to facilitate the audience with information on particular issues and their contextual background highlighting different viewpoints. Audience takes these viewpoints as their discussion point to reach on some decision or opinion. Page (1996) calls this deliberation “mediated deliberation” that, according to him, follow the division of labour between mass public and media professionals. Professional communicators conduct discussions on political issues using the mass media platform. These professional communicators include “reporters, writers, commentators, and television pundits, as well as public officials and selected experts from academia or think tanks” (Page, 1996, p. 6). They carry out deliberation process and provide different perspectives to the audience on the issues (p.4). in this way media could be taken as key player of indirect deliberation as Gastil (2008) argued that through mass media, “these communication professionals convey information, values, and diverse points of view to the mass public, which then deliberates vicariously through the give-and-take and to-and-fro of these various professionals” (p. 50).

Audience takes cues from the information provided by media pundits’ discussion on media. These cues become conversation points for the audience to each other in their daily life (Page, 1996; p.4). Taking this view deliberative media in a political system, much significant should be given to the nature of political discussions and information cues provided by the mass media. This study takes the view that for the promotion of well argumentative, reasoned and sophisticated political discussion in the society which ultimately lead toward deliberative democracy depend upon the deliberation carried out on mass media. Gastil (2008) viewed modern deliberative theory as an extension of Habermas’s “Ideal Speech Situation” and discussed his arguments build on the idea that no political system could proceed without the “professionals of the media system” and the deliberation can bring improvement in the development of legitimate argument.

Research Questions Hypotheses

Keeping in view these theoretical underpinnings, this research is an enquiry into the media exposure of the small business community of Lahore during Election 2013, their level of political news consumption and deliberation.

RQ1: Is there a relationship between respondent’s political news consumption and their political information seeking?

RQ2: Is there a relationship between respondent’s political news consumption and their political discussion?

H1: More the level of political news consumptions among the shopkeepers of Lahore, more will be their level of political information seeking behavior

H2: More the level of political news consumptions among the shopkeepers of Lahore, more will be their level of political discussion

Methods and Measures

In the present study, the research questions and hypotheses were derived from the theoretical literature. The questions and hypotheses were examined using a cross sectional, structured survey of a sample of the small business community of Lahore. Gallup-Pakistan conducts very seminal surveys about elections but media consumption is not measured so it can’t assess media influence; (d) previous surveys done in Pakistan to study the relationship of media and political behavior were successful and had acceptable response rates (e.g; Mushtaq, Abiodullah & Akber, 2011).

The survey was administered in Urdu i.e. national language of Pakistan to facilitate the small business community to comprehend it. A master questionnaire was developed in English and then translated into Urdu. This survey was conducted during May 1, 2013 to May 7, 2013 in the main markets of Lahore. In present study, Qualitative sampling techniques was used and a multistage, purposive sample of 482 small business community members (i.e. shopkeeper respondents) was chosen in 9 selected markets of Lahore. Purposive sampling is a type of sampling in which a researcher attempts to select individuals which are typical of a larger population. The data used in this study was collected from a purposive sample of small business persons distributed among 9 different main markets in accordance to the number of general shops in each market. Markets were chosen that were typical of different types of markets and variation has been taken into account by taking different markets of Lahore.

Selection of the small business community strata was made keeping in view the Pakistani context and theoretical approaches used in this study (e.g., political deliberation and public sphere). In Pakistan the small business community has always been

providing a forum for discussion where customers do not only make a purchase but also routinely interact on social and political issues. This interaction makes these places a hub of political activity similar to the coffee houses described in Habermas' Public Sphere. Wyatt, Katz and Kim's (2000) nationwide survey found that people talked about personal as well as political topics most frequently at home and at work, and then in civic organizations, restaurants and bars, shopping malls, and elsewhere. On the other hand, citizen deliberation i.e. utilization of reasoning and purposeful discussion on the political issue to reach at the correct political decision by the people, has a long history started from the city states of ancient Greece to the town hall meetings in England the salons and cafes of Paris (Carpini, Cook & Jacobs, 2004).

As aforementioned, political information seeking from the news media leads people towards discussion as evidence confirms a close relationship not only between News media and conversation but also between those and public opinion (Gamson, 1992; Moy & Gastil, 2006). Newspapers (Katz, 1992) and Television (Carpini & Williams, 1994) fuel conversation. The relationship of political news use and political discussion among the small business community in Pakistan makes this community a useful place to conduct research that explores democratic deliberation and communication mediation.

Lahore is the capital of Punjab province of Pakistan. It is considered to be the second most populated city of Pakistan and ranked fortieth in the world due its historical, cultural roots (World's Largest Cities, 2011). A BBC survey report (2008) presented the media usage in Punjab province. According to the report in Punjab people having television at their home is 96% in urban areas while 86% in rural areas. But when it comes to the availability of satellite cable TV the percentage among the rural population goes down significantly. People in urban areas who have access to satellite cable TV are 77% while in rural only 20% have the access to cable TV. This difference seems low for radio is 56% in urban and 47% in rural while internet access is 25% to 3%.

Murthy (2014b) provided an analysis based on the different survey results in Pakistan that focuses on high usage of news and current affairs of media content in which Pakistanis are interested tended to be urban, educated and of high income. According to this survey people who have an access to any news and current affairs at least once a day (every hour, 2-3 times a day or once a day) were defined as High news consumers while those who use less than that were defined as Low news consumers. 46% of the survey respondents were High news consumers and 37% were Low news consumers. As this study is an attempt to analyze the impact of political news consumption, so the respondent's access to the media of mass communication for news and current affairs is required for the development of valid scales. Cable television channels and satellite televisions are more likely accessible for the people of urban community due to their higher socio-economic status. Thus, the uneven access to cable TV among rural and urban community is a reason to limit this study limited to the urban community.

Due to the time and budgetary limitations, the total area covered by the study was Lahore city only. Wimmer and Dominick (1994) define population as "A group or a class of subjects, variables, concepts or phenomena." In the light of the above definition, total population of this study comprises all small business people aged 18 to more than 50 years who are registered voters and run shops in Lahore. The researcher preferred to this age group because according to the constitution of Pakistan the minimum age is 18 years to get the voter registered. So, the business people who are registered voter are considered more effective subjects for research on political behavior as compared to the non-registered voters. Business people in Pakistan are considered to be more mature business persons when they get older and effectively run the shops utilizing their experience. Therefore, maximum age category was more than 50 years.

During the second stage of the sampling strategy, the Lahore city was divided into nine towns. This division was made according to the political administrative division of Lahore in 2001. Mazhar and Jamal (2009) has described that the Districts, city districts, Towns/ Tehsils and Unions Councils administration have been created after the promulgations of Local Government Ordinance 2001. Under this ordinance Lahore was divided into Six Towns. In 2005, three more towns were added dividing it into nine towns including: Data Ganj Bukhsh Town; Gulberg Town; Nishtar Town; Saman Abad Town; Aziz Bhatti Town; Wahga Town; Shalimar Town; Iqbal Town; Gulberg Town and Ravi Town.

These towns have a demographically diverse population including: traditional class; middle class; elite class. This division was used as the reasonable number of business markets are available in these regions and seems appropriate division to capture the equal representation of the diverse respondents. Respondents were selected in the 18 Main Markets of Lahore located in the 9 towns. From each selected market of Lahore 55 respondents were selected by applying a non-probability quota sampling scheme.

Measures of the Study

Variables in this study were measured using Likert scales. Several questionnaire items were created to measure different aspects of each variable and then the responses to these items were added together to create overall measures. The reliability of each of these scales was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha α . Key variables are described below along with a description of how each was measured.

Political News Consumption

Political news consumption was conceptualized as a combination of the following variables: time spent for political news on different mass media, frequency of TV news bulletin watching, frequency of Radio news bulletin listening, frequency of Newspaper reading, frequency of using the Internet and Facebook. Time spent on different types of media provides the daily exposure of the respondent with the media to get the political news while other variables have focused on the respondent's attention to the different parts of news genres that provide in-depth picture of the political news exposure. Scales were created to measure each of these aspects of political news consumption. The scales are described below.

TV watching for political news

TV news watching was measured against four items consisting on 'how frequently you watch the breaking news, headlines, Detail of news and news report or news package in TV news bulletins to get the news about politics? Responses were collected

on a six-point scale ranging from very often to don't know coded from 6 to 1 respectively (Cronbach's Alpha $\alpha = .796$, $M = 12.86$, $SD = 3.86$ see appendix B).

Radio listening for political news

This was a three items scale in response to 'how frequently you listen to the breaking news, headlines, and details of the news in radio news bulletins to get the political news? Six-point scale from very often to don't know was used to collect responses (Cronbach's Alpha $\alpha = .926$, $M = 4.76$, $SD = 3.04$ see appendix B).

Newspaper reading for political news

This scale was constructed by combining three items asking the questions 'To what extent you read headlines in newspaper to get the political news?', 'To what extent you read news details in newspaper to get the political news?', 'To what extent you read remaining news in newspaper to get the political news?' A 6 point response scale was used. (Cronbach's Alpha $\alpha = .877$, $M = 9.010$, $SD = 3.85$ see appendix B).

Social media use for political news

A four item scale was used to assess the frequency of social media use for political news. A six-point response scale was used ranging from very often to don't know. Respondents were asked that to get the political news how frequently they did do the following on Internet and social media: share content, post on Facebook, liking on Facebook, link on social media. (Cronbach's Alpha $\alpha = .947$, $M = 7.08$, $SD = 4.325$ see appendix B).

Frequency of News Provision

Scale was constructed consisting of four items asking how frequently TV, Radio, newspaper and social media provide you political news during election. Respondents were given six-point scale based on the following categories: never, rarely, seldom, sometimes, often, and always. Response scale was reversely coded from 1 to 6 (Cronbach's Alpha $\alpha = .682$, $M = 12.19$, $SD = 4.093$ see appendix B).

Political Deliberations

Two variables, interpersonal information seeking and political discussion were assessed as an outcome of the news use. These two variables were considered as political deliberations.

Interpersonal information seeking

Interpersonal information seeking variable was measured by adding two items. Respondent were asked two questions: one question was 'how much time do you spend with family, relatives and friends to get political news?' Response to this was collected on six-point scale ranging from very much, much, somewhat, little, never and don't know. Second question was 'how frequently family, relatives and friends provide you political news during election campaign?' this question was provided with the six-point frequency scale (Cronbach's Alpha $\alpha = .732$, $M = 5.17$, $SD = 2.59$ see appendix B).

Political discussion

Four questions asked about the discussion on political news 'To what extent you discuss the political news with the following: family, relatives, friends, co-workers, members of political parties, community leader?' and two questions asked about the discussion on political issues as 'To what extent you discuss the political issues with the family and friends?' The response scale was identical to the six-point frequency scale. Overall scale was constructed by combining the eight items (Cronbach's Alpha $\alpha = .864$, $M = 16.56$, $SD = 5.38$ see appendix B).

Results of Political News Consumption

This part of the results covers the descriptive statistics about the consumption of news about politics on different media including television, radio, newspaper, and social media.

Table 1.1: Frequency of Political News Consumption on TV, Radio, Newspaper and Social Media (N=483)

Response Category	TV	Radio	Newspaper	Social Media
Don't know	9.1	12.8	10.1	18.8
Less than 30 minutes	7.0	58.8	25.5	41.6
30 minutes	16.6	19.5	26.1	14.9
1 Hour	25.1	4.6	21.9	10.6
2 Hour	14.1	2.5	9.9	5.6
More than 2 hour	28.2	1.9	6.4	8.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	483	483	483	483

The table 1.1 provides a detailed picture of the time spent for media by shopkeepers of the nine towns of Lahore to get the political news during election campaign period in general election 2013 in Pakistan.

Most of the time (More than 2 hour) was spent on TV by most of the shopkeepers 28.2%, while least (less than 30 minutes) was spent by few shopkeepers 7.0%. Most of the shopkeepers 58.8% spent least of the time (less than 30 minutes) while listening to the Radio. Most of the shopkeepers 26.1% spent 30 minutes on reading the newspapers. Most of the shopkeepers 41.6% spent less than 30 minutes on social media, while 18.8% didn't know about it.

Results to Political News Consumption and Political Deliberation

Table 1.2 and Table 1.3 report the findings of relationship between political news consumption and political deliberation. Political news consumption include consumption on TV, Radio, Newspaper and Social Media while political deliberation include interpersonal information seeking and political discussion.

Table 1.2: Relationships of Political News Consumption and Interpersonal Information Seeking

Correlations									
		TWatchPolNewsM	RadioListenPolNewsM	NspReadPolNewsM	SocialMedUsePolNewsM	FreqNewsProvM	Do you meet with family,Relatives and friends to get political news?	How frequently family,relatives and friends provide you political news during election?	How much time do you spend with family,relatives and friends to get political news?
TWatchPolNewsM	Pearson Correlation	1	.200**	.405**	.106*	.413**	.269**	.294**	.185**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.020	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	483	482	482	483	480	477	483	483
RadioListenPolNewsM	Pearson Correlation	.200**	1	.170**	.167**	.277**	.106*	.131**	.098*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.021	.004	.032
	N	482	482	481	482	479	477	482	482
NspReadPolNewsM	Pearson Correlation	.405**	.170**	1	.051	.365**	.070	.142**	.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.267	.000	.125	.002	.235
	N	482	481	482	482	479	476	482	482
SocialMedUsePolNewsM	Pearson Correlation	.106*	.167**	.051	1	.169**	.002	.068	.024
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.020	.000	.267		.000	.960	.137	.594
	N	483	482	482	483	480	477	483	483
FreqNewsProvM	Pearson Correlation	.413**	.277**	.365**	.169**	1	.197**	.514**	.233**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	480	479	479	480	480	474	480	480
Do you meet with family,Relatives and friends to get political news?	Pearson Correlation	.269**	.106*	.070	.002	.197**	1	.505**	.565**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.021	.125	.960	.000		.000	.000
	N	477	477	476	477	474	477	477	477
How frequently family,relatives and friends provide you political news during election?	Pearson Correlation	.294**	.131**	.142**	.068	.514**	.505**	1	.577**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.004	.002	.137	.000	.000		.000
	N	483	482	482	483	480	477	483	483
How much time do you spend with family,relatives and friends to get political news?	Pearson Correlation	.185**	.098*	.054	.024	.233**	.565**	.577**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.032	.235	.594	.000	.000	.000	
	N	483	482	482	483	480	477	483	483

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 1.2 shows the relationships among political news consumption on television, radio, newspapers, social media and frequency of political news consumption, meet FRF for getting news, political news from FRF, and time spent with FRF for political news (For descriptive statistics see Appendix D).

The table reports that Television watching has strong relationship with meetings of family members, Relatives and friends for getting news ($r=.269$, $n=477$, $p=0.000$), political news from FRF ($r=.294$, $n=483$, $p=0.000$), and time spent with FRF for political news ($r=.185$, $n=483$, $p=0.000$). Whereas, the relationship of Radio Listening for political news and meeting with FRF for getting news has weak relationship as compared to TV ($r=.106$, $n=477$, $p=0.021$). Frequency of News Provision (FNP) has strong relationship with meetings of FRF for getting news ($r=.197$, $n=474$, $p=0.000$), political news from FRF ($r=.514$, $n=480$, $p=0.000$), and Time spent with FRF for political news ($r=.233$, $n=480$, $p=0.000$). Meetings with FRF for getting news has also strong relationship with political news from FRF ($r=.505$, $n=477$, $p=0.000$), and Time spent with FRF for political news ($r=.565$, $n=477$, $p=0.000$). Whereas, getting political news from FRF has also

1781 Political Landscape of Pakistan and Emerging Space for Deliberative Democracy: Analyzing the Role of Political News Consumption in Developing Deliberative Sphere

strong relationship with time spent with FRF for political news ($r=.577$, $n=483$, $p=0.000$).

Table 1.3: Relationships of Political News Consumption and Political Discussion

		Correlations													
		TVWatchPolNewsM	RadioListenPolNewsM	NspReadPolNewsM	SocialMedUsePolNewsM	FreqNewsProvM	To what extent do you discuss political issues with your friends?	To what extent do you discuss political issues with your family members?	To what extent do you discuss political with your family members?	To what extent do you discuss political with your friends?	To what extent do you discuss political with your coworkers?	To what extent do you discuss political with your relatives?	To what extent do you discuss political with members of political parties?	To what extent do you discuss political with Local community leader?	PolDiscussionM
TVWatchPolNewsM	Pearson Correlation	1	.200	.405	.106	.413	.364	.289	.237	.343	.319	.265	.228	.226	.394
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.020	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	483	482	482	483	480	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483
RadioListenPolNewsM	Pearson Correlation	.200	1	.170	.167	.277	.082	.121	.146	.122	.144	.184	.112	.084	.170
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.071	.008	.001	.007	.001	.000	.014	.066	.000
	N	482	482	481	482	479	482	482	482	482	482	482	482	482	482
NspReadPolNewsM	Pearson Correlation	.405	.170	1	.051	.365	.323	.127	.105	.327	.298	.195	.189	.180	.304
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.267	.000	.000	.005	.022	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	482	481	482	482	479	482	482	482	482	482	482	482	482	482
SocialMedUsePolNewsM	Pearson Correlation	.106	.167	.051	1	.169	.026	.108	.114	.066	.091	.066	.018	-.034	.100
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.020	.000	.267		.000	.574	.018	.013	.145	.046	.146	.695	.458	.028
	N	483	482	482	483	480	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483
FreqNewsProvM	Pearson Correlation	.413	.277	.365	.169	1	.287	.246	.272	.370	.284	.294	.178	.191	.379
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	480	479	479	480	480	480	480	480	480	480	480	480	480	480
To what extent do you discuss political issues with your friends?	Pearson Correlation	.364	.082	.323	.026	.287	1	.600	.362	.655	.591	.367	.412	.408	.783
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.071	.000	.574	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	483	482	482	483	480	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483
To what extent do you discuss political issues with your family members?	Pearson Correlation	.289	.121	.127	.108	.246	.600	1	.513	.416	.439	.495	.393	.407	.735
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.008	.005	.018	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	483	482	482	483	480	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483
To what extent do you discuss political with your family members?	Pearson Correlation	.237	.146	.105	.114	.272	.362	.513	1	.474	.448	.557	.354	.334	.711
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.022	.013	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	483	482	482	483	480	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483
To what extent do you discuss political with your friends?	Pearson Correlation	.343	.319	.327	.066	.370	.655	.416	.474	1	.717	.538	.511	.490	.836
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.145	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	483	482	482	483	480	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483
To what extent do you discuss political with your coworkers?	Pearson Correlation	.319	.265	.298	.091	.284	.591	.439	.448	.717	1	.551	.503	.503	.820
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000	.046	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	483	482	482	483	480	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483
To what extent do you discuss political with your relatives?	Pearson Correlation	.265	.228	.189	.066	.294	.367	.495	.557	.538	.551	1	.537	.568	.741
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.146	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	483	482	482	483	480	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483
To what extent do you discuss political with members of political parties?	Pearson Correlation	.228	.112	.189	.018	.178	.412	.393	.354	.511	.503	.537	1	.838	.584
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.014	.000	.695	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	483	482	482	483	480	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483
To what extent do you discuss political with Local community leader?	Pearson Correlation	.226	.084	.180	-.034	.191	.408	.407	.334	.490	.503	.568	.838	1	.583
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.066	.000	.458	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	483	482	482	483	480	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483
PolDiscussionM	Pearson Correlation	.394	.170	.304	.100	.379	.783	.735	.711	.836	.820	.741	.584	.583	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.028	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	483	482	482	483	480	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483	483

**, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 1.3 shows the relationships among political news consumption on television, radio, newspapers, social media and frequency of political news consumption, discussion on political issues with friends, discussion on political issues with family members, discussion on political news with family members, discussion on political news with friends, and discussion on political news with co-workers.

The table reports that Political Discussion has strong relationship with TVWPN ($r=.394$, $n=483$, $p=0.000$), RLPN ($r=.170$, $n=482$, $p=0.000$), NRPN ($r=.304$, $n=482$, $p=0.000$), and SMPN ($r=.100$, $n=483$, $p=0.028$), shopkeepers are frequently consume media for political discussion ($r=.379$, $n=480$, $p=0.000$). As compared to Radio, Newspaper and Social media, Television has the most significant relationship with political discussion. Their Political Discussion has also strong relationship with discussion on political issues with friends ($r=.783$, $n=483$, $p=0.000$), and discussion on political issues with family members ($r=.735$, $n=483$). They frequently discussed political news with family members ($r=.711$, $n=483$, $p=0.000$), friends ($r=.836$, $n=483$, $p=0.000$), co-workers, ($r=.820$, $n=483$, $p=0.000$), relatives ($r=.741$, $n=483$, $p=0.000$), members of political parties ($r=.584$, $n=483$, $p=0.000$), and with local community leader ($r=.583$, $n=483$, $p=0.000$).

However, there is a negative correlation between political news consumption on social media and discussion on political news with local community leader ($r=-.034$, $n=483$, $p=0.458$). It means that the shopkeepers who have more inclination to use social media to consume political news will have a less interaction with community leaders as compared to traditional media users.

Results of Correlation of Political News Consumption and Political Deliberations

Table No. 1.4 and 1.5 report the demographics, predispositions and political news consumption as predicting factors of political deliberation which include political information seeking and political discussion

Table 1.4: Demographics, Predisposition, and Political News Consumption as Predictors for Interpersonal Information Seeking

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.170a	.029	.025	1.28002
2	.468b	.219	.209	1.15265
3	.484c	.234	.219	1.14548

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent, Ethnic Values, Family Political Orientation, Past Participation, Political Interest

c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent, Ethnic Values, Family Political Orientation, Past Participation, Political Interest, Radio News Consumption, Newspaper News Consumption, TV News Consumption

ANOVA^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	23.240	2	11.620	7.092	.001b
	Residual	779.900	476	1.638		
	Total	803.140	478			
2	Regression	176.040	6	29.340	22.083	.000c
	Residual	627.100	472	1.329		
	Total	803.140	478			
3	Regression	187.754	9	20.862	15.899	.000d
	Residual	615.386	469	1.312		
	Total	803.140	478			

a. Dependent Variable: Interpersonal Information Seeking

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent

c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent, Ethnic Values, Family Political Orientation, Past Participation, Political Interest

d. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent, Ethnic Values, Family Political Orientation, Past Participation, Political Interest, Radio News Consumption, Newspaper News Consumption, TV News Consumption

Coefficients ^a					
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t
		B	Std. Error	Beta	
1	(Constant)	2.104	.186		11.328
	Age of Respondent	.230	.061	.171	3.766
	Education	.018	.055	.015	.326
2	(Constant)	.296	.258		1.150
	Age of Respondent	.147	.057	.109	2.589
	Education	-.005	.051	-.004	-.106
	Past Participation	.146	.056	.124	2.617
	Family Political Orientation	.206	.075	.135	2.749
	Ethnic Values	.234	.035	.288	6.759
	Political Interest	.085	.053	.080	1.624
3	(Constant)	.076	.272		.279
	Age of Respondent	.142	.056	.105	2.512
	Education	-.009	.051	-.008	-.180
	Past Participation	.134	.055	.114	2.408
	Family Political Orientation	.176	.076	.116	2.331
	Ethnic Values	.225	.035	.277	6.436
	Political Interest	.064	.054	.059	1.174
	TV News Consumption	.178	.064	.133	2.790
	Radio News Consumption	.037	.053	.029	.685
	Newspaper News Consumption	-.060	.046	-.060	-1.304

a. Dependent Variable: Interpersonal Information Seeking

Table 1.5 shows that Age significantly predicted Interpersonal Information Seeking for Political News ($\beta = .105, p < .05$). Demographics explained a significant proportion of variance in Interpersonal Information Seeking for Political News, $R^2 = .029, F(2, 476) = 7.092, p < .001$.

Past Participation ($\beta = .114, p < .05$), Family Political Orientation ($\beta = .116, p < .05$), and Ethnic Values ($\beta = .277, p < .001$) also significantly predicted Interpersonal Information Seeking for political News. Political Predisposition also explained a significant proportion of variance in Interpersonal Information Seeking for Political News, $R^2 = .219, F(6, 472) = 22.083, p < .001$. TV Watching for Political News ($\beta = .133, p < .05$) significantly predicted Interpersonal Information Seeking for political News. Political News Consumption also explained a significant proportion of variance in Interpersonal Information Seeking for Political News, $R^2 = .234, F(9, 469) = 15.899, p < .001$.

The standardized beta values of Past Participation, Family Orientation, and Ethnic Values showed that Ethnic Values had slightly more impact than Family Orientation and Past Participation on Interpersonal Information Seeking for Political News.

Table 1.5: Demographics, Predisposition, and Political News Consumption as Predictors for Political Discussion

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.128a	.016	.012	.89200
2	.726b	.526	.520	.62156
3	.733c	.537	.528	.61660

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent, Ethnic Values, Family Political Orientation, Past Participation, Political Interest

c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent, Ethnic Values, Family Political Orientation, Past Participation, Political Interest, Radio News Consumption, Newspaper News Consumption, TV News Consumption

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6.311	2	3.156	3.966	.020b
	Residual	378.736	476	.796		
	Total	385.047	478			
2	Regression	202.698	6	33.783	87.445	.000c
	Residual	182.349	472	.386		

	Total	385.047	478			
	Regression	206.736	9	22.971	60.419	.000d
3	Residual	178.310	469	.380		
	Total	385.047	478			

a. Dependent Variable: Political Discussion

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent

c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent, Ethnic Values, Family Political Orientation, Past Participation, Political Interest

d. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age of Respondent, Ethnic Values, Family Political Orientation, Past Participation, Political Interest, Radio News Consumption, Newspaper News Consumption, TV News Consumption

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.416	.129		18.665	.000
	Age of Respondent	.082	.043	.088	1.923	.055
	Education	.084	.038	.100	2.194	.029
2	(Constant)	.190	.139		1.366	.172
	Age of Respondent	-.009	.031	-.009	-.287	.774
	Education	.020	.027	.024	.738	.461
	Past Participation	.080	.030	.099	2.676	.008
	Family Political Orientation	.456	.040	.433	11.313	.000
	Ethnic Values	.090	.019	.161	4.838	.000
	Political Interest	.210	.028	.282	7.397	.000
3	(Constant)	.039	.147		.267	.789
	Age of Respondent	-.014	.030	-.015	-.451	.652
	Education	.009	.027	.010	.315	.753
	Past Participation	.080	.030	.099	2.685	.008
	Family Political Orientation	.434	.041	.412	10.663	.000
	Ethnic Values	.081	.019	.144	4.317	.000
	Political Interest	.184	.029	.247	6.278	.000
	TV News Consumption	.079	.034	.085	2.295	.022
	Radio News Consumption	.004	.029	.005	.144	.885
	Newspaper News Consumption	.037	.025	.053	1.488	.137

a. Dependent Variable: Political Discussion

Table 1.5 shows that Age and Education did not significantly predict Political Discussion for political news. Demographics explained a significant proportion of variance in Political Discussion for Political News, $R^2 = .016$, $F(2, 476) = 3.966$, $p = .020$. Political Interest ($\beta = .247$, $p < .05$) Past Participation ($\beta = .099$, $p < .05$), Family Political Orientation ($\beta = .412$, $p < .001$), and Ethnic Values ($\beta = .277$, $p < .001$) significantly predicted Interpersonal Information Seeking for political News. Political Predisposition also explained a significant proportion of variance in Interpersonal Information Seeking for Political News, $R^2 = .526$, $F(6, 472) = 87.445$, $p < .001$. TV Watching for Political News ($\beta = .085$, $p < .05$) significantly predicted Interpersonal Information Seeking for political News. Political News Consumption also explained a significant proportion of variance in Interpersonal Information Seeking for Political News, $R^2 = .537$, $F(9, 469) = 60.419$, $p < .001$.

The standardized beta values of Past Participation, Family Orientation, and Ethnic Values showed that Ethnic Values had slightly more impact than Family Orientation and Past Participation on Interpersonal Information Seeking for Political News.

Findings and Discussion for the Political News Consumption and Political Deliberations

Political news uses and effects in political process has always remained an area of inquiry for political as well as communication scholars (Schmitt-Beck, 2004; Cho et al., 2009; McLeod, Scheufele, & Moy, 1999; Moy et al., 2005; Shah et al., 2005; Scheufele & Nisbet, 2002). Its importance for deliberative democracy has been acknowledged by various empirical studies (Waldman, 2000; Kim, Wyatt, & Katz, 1999; McLeod, Scheufele & Moy, 1999; Carpini & Williams, 1994). However, it is worth mentioning here that most of the studies on political news consumption were conducted in American or Western context (Cho et al., 2009; McLeod, Scheufele, & Moy, 1999; Moy et al., 2005; Shah et al., 2005; Scheufele & Nisbet, 2002; Jung, 2010).

Present study was conducted to explore and examine the effects of political news on the shopkeepers of Lahore, Pakistan. Interestingly, this study found majority of shopkeepers from Lahore consume political news on TV and newspaper. However, radio is not much used for political news consumption (Table 5.2). According to Western studies, social media has become an important source for political news (Shah et al, 2007; Cho et al, 2009), contrastingly, social media is not much popular among shopkeepers' community of Lahore for political news till 2013. Hence, until 2013 TV and Newspapers were the most popular medium for political news consumption rather than radio and social media. Therefore, it implies that TV and Newspaper still

seems more popular among shopkeepers. This factor should be taken under consideration for influencing political behavior of shopkeepers' community of Lahore for the better understanding of media politics and democracy.

Political deliberation is the central focus of present study. Its importance and connotation for the study of political behavior is scholastic tradition (Lee, Shah and McLeod, 2013; Gastil and Dillard, 1999; McLeod, Scheufele & Moy, 1999; Mutz & Mondak, 2006; Wyatt, Katz & Kim's, 2000; Moy & Gastil, 2006). It is the key to contour public sphere (Habermas, 1984; Habermas, 1989; Habermas, 1991). Political communication scholars argued that media political news consumption significantly increases the political deliberation; political discussion, interpersonal information seeking, political conversation, and political talk (McLeod et al., 2001; Carpini & Williams, 1994; Gamson, 1992; Waldman, 2000; Kim, Wyatt, & Katz, 1999; McLeod, Scheufele & Moy, 1999), among individuals of society. Findings provide evidence from the Pakistani society, that political news consumption on TV and Radio increases the level of political deliberation among shopkeepers of Lahore. Newspaper also contributes in increasing the level of political discussion among shopkeepers. It encourages to argue that main stream electronic media has strong relationship with political deliberation rather than Print media. On contrast to Western societies (Shah et al, 2007; Cho et al, 2009), In Pakistan, social media does not have substantial role in increasing political deliberation among shopkeepers of Lahore . Therefore, electronic media can be used more effectively for achieving political or democratic causes in comparison to print or online media. These findings provide more insight that political news consumption through TV, radio and newspaper have strong relationship with political deliberation of respondents.

Findings and Discussion for the Effects Hypotheses

Pakistani democracy is in its early phases and it is weak (Rizvi, 2013), and transitory (Khan, 2009). Hence, political conversation, political discussion and political deliberation can be an effective way for strengthening democratic structure of Pakistan. We found evidence that political news consumption on TV has strong effect on political discussion and interpersonal information seeking. However, other mass media; radio, newspapers and social media don't have effect on political deliberation. Therefore, it is argued that TV is the most effective medium for enhancing political deliberation among individuals of Pakistan as it has been noted in western societies (McLeod, Scheufele & Moy, 2009; Carpini & Williams, 1994). **Hence, H₂ of study finds partial support that escalation in the respondent's levels of political news consumption effect the level of political deliberation. It is only supported for political news consumption on TV. It is not supported for political news consumption on Radio, newspaper, and social media.** So, it implies that TV is playing more crucial role in strengthening democratic structure of Pakistan by promoting political deliberation among shopkeepers of Lahore.

Furthermore, findings support the arguments of public sphere (Habermas, 1984; Habermas, 1989; Habermas, 1991), filter hypothesis (Katz, 2006; McLeod, Kosicki & McLeod, 2008), democratic deliberation theory (Cho et al., 2009; Eveland, 2004; Shah et al., 2005; Waldman, 2000) by indicating that political news consumption don't have direct effect on political participation, rather it is filtered through interpersonal communication and discussion . Findings clearly show that political news consumption accelerate political deliberation among shopkeepers of Lahore, and this deliberation further accelerate political participation of shopkeepers. Therefore, interpersonal channels and discussion is the key for increasing political participation in Pakistani society, and media can play a significant role in effecting these interpersonal communication channels and discussion.

Conclusion

Development of democracy interlinked with democratic media and political awareness and deliberation of society. In developed democracies, media are expected to perform their role for shaping public sphere by empowering people politically through awareness and motivation. Public fruitful discussions on politics and their interpersonal political talks are considered the beauty of deliberative democracies. Democracy in Pakistan is weak, fragile and transitory. We have been witnessing long Martial Laws intervals since its birth in 1947. However, this study evident that motivation for politics, political awareness, political discussions, conversations, and political news consumption have increased rapidly among Pakistani public. Therefore, we argued that deliberative democracy in Pakistan is getting stronger than past. Political discussions and conversations have the direct influence on political participation of small business community of Lahore and media contributes significantly in raising these discussions.

References

1. BBC Survey (2008). *Regional and Linguistic Diversity in Pakistan and Its Impact on Media and ICT Use*. Retrieved from: <http://www.audiencescapes.org/country-profiles-pakistan-communication-habits-demographic-groups-regional-diversity-language-linguistic-urban-rural>
2. Carpini, D. M. X. & Williams, B. (1994). Fictional' and 'Non-Fictional' Television Celebrates Earthday. *Cultural Studies*, 8, 74-98
3. Carpini, M.D., Cook, F.L., & Jacobs, L.R. (2004). Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation, and Citizen Engagement: A Review of the Empirical Literature. *Annual Review Political Science*, 7, 315-44. Doi: 10.1146/Annurev.Polisci.7.121003.091630
4. Cho, J., Shah, D., McLeod, J. M., McLeod, D. M., Scholl, R. M., & Gotlieb, M. R. (2009). Campaigns, Reflection, and Deliberation: Advancing an O-S-R-O-R Model of Communication Effects. *Communication Theory*, 19, 66-88.
5. Eveland, W. P., Jr. (2004). The effect of political discussion in producing informed citizens: The roles of information, motivation and elaboration. *Political Communication*, 21, 177-193.
6. Eveland, W.P., Morey, A.C. & Hutchens, M.J. (2011). Beyond Deliberation: New Directions for the Study of Informal Political Conversation from a Communication Perspective. *Journal of Communication*, 61, 1082-1103.

7. Fishkin, J. S. (1991). *Democracy and deliberation. New Directions for Democratic Reform*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
8. Gamson, W. A. (1992). Media Images and the Social Construction of Reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18: 373-393. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.so.18.080192.002105
9. Gastil, J. & Dillard, J. P. (1999). Increasing Political Sophistication through Public Deliberation. *Political Communication*, 16, 3-23.
10. Gastil, J. (2008). *Political communication and deliberation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
11. Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Vol. 1. Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.)
12. Habermas, J. (1989). The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, trans. Thomas Burger. *Cambridge: MIT Press*, 85, 85-92.
13. Habermas, J. (1991). A Reply, in Axel Honneth and Hans Joas, eds., *Communicative Action: Essays on Jürgen Habermas's The Theory of Communicative Action*, translated by Jeremy Gaines and Doris L. Jones. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, pp. 214-264 (first published in German in 1986; book also published in English in 1991 by Polity Press, Cambridge, UK)
14. Habermas, J. (2006). Political communication in media society: Does democracy still enjoy an epistemic dimension? The impact of normative theory on empirical research. *Communication Theory*, 16, 411-426.
15. Jung, N. W. (2010). *Explicating the central role of news media use in the process of political participation*. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.
16. Katz, E. (2006). Introduction to the Transaction Edition Lazarsfeld's Legacy: The Power of Limited Effects. In Katz, E., Lazarsfeld, P.F. (authors), *Personal Influence, The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communication*. New Jersey: Transaction,
17. Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1955). *Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communication*. Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press.
18. Katz, R. S. (1992). *Party Organizations: a Data Handbook*. London: Sage Publications.
19. Kim, J., Wyatt, R.O. & Katz, E. (1999). News, Talk, Opinion, Participation: the Part Played by Conversation in Deliberative Democracy. *Political Communication*, 16, 361-385.
20. Lee, N. J., Shah, D. V., & McLeod, J. M. (2013). Processes of Political Socialization A Communication Mediation Approach to Youth Civic Engagement. *Communication Research*, 40(5), 669-697.
21. Mazaher, F. & Jamal, T. (2009). Temporal Population Growth of Lahore. *Journal of Scientific Review*, (1).
22. McLeod, J. M., Kosicki, G. M., & McLeod, D. M. (2008). The expanding boundaries of political communication effects. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (Eds.), *Media effects: advances in theory and research* (pp. 123-162). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
23. McLeod, J. M., Scheufele, D. A., & Moy, P. (1999). Community, Communication, and Participation: The Role of Mass Media and Interpersonal Discussion in Local Political Participation. *Political Communication*, 16, 315-336.
24. McLeod, J. M., Zubric, J., Keum, H., Deshpande, S., Cho, J., Stein, S., et al. (2001). *Reflecting and connecting: Testing a communication mediation model of civic participation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.
25. Moy, P. & Gastil, J. (2006). Predicting Deliberative Conversation: The Impact of Discussion Networks, Media Use, and Political Cognitions. *Political Communication*, 23: 443-460.
26. Moy, P., Torres, M., Tanaka, K., & McCluskey, M. R. (2005). Knowledge or trust?: Investigating linkages between media reliance and participation. *Communication Research*, 32, 59-86.
27. Murthy, J. (2014). *High News Consumers: A Profile* Retrieved from <http://www.audiencescapes.org/country-profiles-pakistan-high-news-consumers-profile-cable-news-state-news-radio-television-trust-source>
28. Mushtaq, I., Abiodullah, M. & Akber, R. A. (2011). Political Participation of the Educated in Pakistan. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 21(1), 25-42.
29. Mutz, D. C., & Mondak, J. J. (2006). The workplace as a context for cross-cutting political discourse. *Journal of Politics*, 68, 140-155.
30. Page, B. I. (1996). *Who deliberates? Mass media in modern democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
31. Rizvi, H.A. (2013). A Narrative of Pakistan's 10 General Elections: 1970-2013. In *The First 10 General Elections of Pakistan a Story of Pakistan's Transition from Democracy Above Rule of Law to Democracy Under Rule of Law: 1970-2013* (Part-1). Retrieved from <http://www.pildat.org/publications/publication/elections/First10GeneralElectionsofPakistan.pdf>
32. Scheufele, D. A., & Nisbet, M. C. (2002). Democracy online: New opportunities and dead ends. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 7, 55-75.
33. Schmitt-Beck, R. (2004). Political communication effects: The impact of mass media and personal conversations on voting. *Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges*, 293-324. UK: Cambridge University Press.
34. Shah, D. V., Cho, J., Nah, S., Gotlieb, M. R., Hwang, H., Lee, N., Scholl, R. M., & McLeod, D. M. (2007). Campaign ads, online messaging, and participation: Extending the communication mediation model. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 676-703.
35. Shah, D., Cho, J., Eveland, W. P., & Kwak, N. (2005). Information and expression in a digital age: Modeling internet effects on civic participation. *Communication Research*, 32, 531-565.
36. Waldman, P. (2000). *Deliberation in Practice: Deliberative Theory, News Media, and Political Conversation*. PhD Thesis in Communication, University of Pennsylvania.
37. Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (1994). *Mass media research: An introduction*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
38. Wyatt, R. O., Katz, E., & Kim, J. (2000). Bridging the spheres: Political and personal conversation in public and private spaces. *Journal of Communication*, 50, 71-92.
39. Xenos, M. (2008). New mediated deliberation: Blog and press coverage of the Alito nomination. *Journal of Computer-mediated communication*, 13(2), 485-503.