

## عنوان البحث باللغة الإنجليزية

# Voting in the Light of Attention to Counter-Attitudinal Content in Journalism Coverage of Egyptian Presidential Election Campaign

Prepared by  
Dr. Mohamed Ahmed Fadl Elhadidi

(Department of Mass Communication, Faculty of Arts, Damietta University, Egypt)

[Mohamed\\_elhadidi@yahoo.com](mailto:Mohamed_elhadidi@yahoo.com)

## Abstract

A field study was conducted on a sample of Egyptian respondents two weeks after the completion of the Egyptian presidential election in June 2012 to test the differences between voters' attention to counter vs. consistent-attitudinal messages in journalism coverage of the campaign in its two stages. The study also tested the factors (party affiliation, independency, candidate preference, and candidate sympathy) which predicted these kinds of attention and their relationships to the voting decision. The findings shed light on the motivated reasoning process as an interpreter of selective exposure model to explicate whether the goals of information seeking for the candidates were accuracy or directional.

**Keywords:** *counter-attitudinal messages, selective exposure, motivated reasoning, political campaign.*

## Published In:

**The first International Conference on Communication and Media Studies: Media Industry; Trends, Dynamics and Challenges.**  
*Hëna e Plotë Bedër University, Tirana, Albania March 25-27, 2015*

## References

- Chaffee, S., Saphir, M. N., Graf, J., Sandvig, C., & Hahn, K. S. (2001). Attention to counter-attitudinal messages in a state election campaign. *Political Communication*, 18, 247-272.
- Donsbach, W. (1991). Exposure to political content in newspapers: The impact of cognitive dissonance on readers' selectivity. *European Journal of Communication*, 6, 155-186.
- Edwards, K., & Smith, E. E. (1996). A disconfirmation bias in the evaluation of arguments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 5-24.

- Fischer, P., & Greitemeyer, T. (2010). A new look at selective exposure effects: An integrative model. *Psychological Science*. 19(6), 384-389.
- Frey, D. (1986). Recent research on selective exposure to information. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. (Vol. 19, pp. 41-80). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Garrett, R. K. (2009). Politically motivated reinforcement seeking: Reframing the selective exposure debate. *Journal of Communication*. 676-699.
- Goldman, S., & Mutz, D. (2011). The friendly media phenomenon: A cross-national analysis of cross-cutting exposure. *Political Communication*. 28(1), 42-66.
- Iyengar, S., & Hahn, K. S. (2009). Red Media, Blue Media: Evidence of Ideological Selectivity in Media Use. *Journal of Communication*. 59 (1), 19-39.
- Iyengar, S., Hahn, K. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Walker, J. (2008). Selective exposure to campaign communication: The role of anticipated agreement and issue public membership. *Journal of Politics*. 70, 186-200.
- Jonas, E., Greenberg, J., & Frey, D. (2003). Connecting terror management and dissonance theory: Evidence that mortality salience increases the preference for supporting information after decisions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 29, 1181-1189.
- Jonas, E., Schulz-Hardt, S., Frey, D., & Thelen, N. (2001). Confirmation bias in sequential information search after preliminary decisions: An expansion of dissonance theoretical research on selective exposure to information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 80, 557-571.
- Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*. 108, 480-498.
- Ladd, J. M., & Lenz, G. S. (2008). Reassessing the Role of Anxiety in Vote Choice. *Political Psychology*. 29 ( 2),275-296.
- Lau, R. R., & Redlawsk, D. P. (2006). *How voters decide: Information processing in election campaigns*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lebo, M., & Cassino, D. (2007). The aggregated consequences of motivated reasoning. *Political Psychology*. 28, 719-746.
- Lodge, M., & Taber, C. S. (2000). Three steps toward a theory of motivated political reasoning. In A. Lupia, M. McCubbins, & S. Popkin (Eds.), *Elements of reason: Cognition, choice, and the bounds of rationality*. (pp. 183-213). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marcus, G. E., & MacKuen, M. B. (1993). Anxiety, enthusiasm, and the vote: The emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns. *American Political Science Review*. 87 (3), 672-685.
- Marcus, G. E., & MacKuen, M. B. (2001). Emotions and politics: The dynamic functions of emotionality. In J. H. Kuklinski (Ed.), *Citizens and politics: Perspectives from political psychology*. (pp.41-67). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marcus, G. E., Neuman, W. R., & MacKuen, M. (2000). *Affective intelligence and political judgment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Matthes, J., & Valenzuela, S. (2012). Who Learns from Cross-Cutting Exposure? Motivated Reasoning, Counterattitudinal News Coverage, and Awareness of Oppositional Views. *Paper presented at the annual International Communication association conference in Phoenix, Arizona, May 24-28*.
- McClurg, S. D. (2006). Political disagreement in context: The conditional effect of neighborhood context, discussion, and disagreement on electoral participation. *Political Behavior*. 28, 349-66.
- Meffert, M. F., Chung, S., Joiner, A. J., Waks, L., & Garst, J. (2006). The effects of negativity and motivated information processing during a political campaign. *Journal of Communication*. 56, 27-51.
- Meffert, M. F., & Gschwend, T. (2011). Polls, coalition signals and strategic voting: An experimental investigation of perceptions and effects. *European Journal of Political Research*. 50 (5): 636-667.
- Meffert, M. F., & Gschwend, T. (2012). When party and issue preferences clash: Selective exposure and attitudinal depolarization. *Paper presented at the annual International Communication association conference in Phoenix, Arizona, May 24-28*.
- Mutz, D. C., & Martin, P. S. (2001). Facilitating communication across lines of political difference. *American Political Science Review*. 95, 97-114.
- Nir, L. (2011). Motivated reasoning and public opinion perception. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 75, 504-532.
- Nir, L. & Druckman, J. N. (2008). Campaign mixed-message flows and timing of vote decision. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. 20, 326-346.

- Redlawsk, D. P. (2002). Hot cognition or cool consideration? Testing the effects of motivated reasoning on political decision-making. *Journal of Politics*. 64, 1021–1044.
- Redlawsk, D. P. (2001). You must remember this: A test of the On-Line Model of voting. *Journal of Politics*. 63 (1): 29-58.
- Schemer, C., Matthes, J., Wirth, W. (2008). Toward improving validity and reliability of information processing measures in surveys. *Communication Methods and Measures*. 2, 1-33.
- Schmitt, K. M., Gunther, A. C., & Liebhart, J. L. (2004). Why Partisans See Mass Media as Biased.” *Communication Research*. 31 (6), 623-641.
- Taber, C. S., & Lodge, M. (2006). Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science*. 50, 755–69.