The Utility of Community Newspapers in a Mayoral Election

Abstract: As major daily newspapers wither across America, other sources of local news – like community newspapers – will become more important to their towns and cities. With this in mind, this article compares coverage of the 2007 Philadelphia mayoral campaign in the city's major daily and community newspapers. The findings show that community newspapers served as a complement to the major dailies – but also proved to be viable sources of campaign information in their own right.

Thomas Jefferson famously wrote, "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter." As major newspapers across America struggle to adapt to the modern media environment, government without local newspapers now seems to be a real possibility. And, not only is newspaper circulation dwindling, ratings for local TV news have dropped precipitously in recent years as well. The drift away from these local media bastions raises an array of compelling questions about the future of democracy in America's communities. How will citizens learn about local politics? Who will produce local political information (LPI)? Who will assume the watchdog role that the local press has long fulfilled?

The downfall of American newspapers has been widely chronicled and many scholars see little hope online or elsewhere.[1] Often lost in this discussion is the plight of newspapers other than dominant major dailies: neighborhood newspapers, the alternative press, the ethnic press, and so on. Community newspapers are all, to some degree, facing the same challenges as major dailies. At the same time, they have different business models and, as smaller and more nimble operations, the potential to adapt to new circumstances. Though the future of such newspapers is in no way guaranteed, many will find ways to survive. And, as major dailies wither across America, other sources of local news online and offline – like community newspapers – will become more important to their towns and cities.

To some extent, the local media environment in every city is unique. But, many cities are facing a similar decline in their major local newspapers. Philadelphia is one such city, as the *Inquirer* and *Daily News* teeter in bankruptcy. Philadelphia also has a robust population of community newspapers: two city-wide entertainment weeklies cover local affairs, several papers target segments of the population by ethnicity, and a dozen neighborhood papers are published at least once a week. In addition, the circulation of the free *Metro* is 120,000 every weekday and the city even has a newspaper dedicated to covering just the public schools – the *Notebook* – that publishes 57,000 copies every-other-month. Given the decline of the city's major daily newspapers and the preponderance of community newspapers, Philadelphia offers an ideal venue to examine the role that both kinds of newspapers play in the local political sphere.

Prior research of changes in local media environments has typically focused exclusively on the contents of major daily newspapers.[2] This article adds to this literature by analyzing the content of both the dailies and the community newspapers, focusing on coverage of Philadelphia's 2007 mayoral campaign. Mayoral campaigns are critical referenda on the direction of communities and guarantee heightened coverage of local affairs. Utilizing the election coverage, this article centers on two straightforward questions: What kinds of mayoral campaign information did local newspapers provide? How did coverage of the mayoral campaign in community newspapers differ from the coverage in major dailies? The findings provide a glimpse into the local political content choices for citizens in post-daily age.

<div align="center">Literature Review</div>

Political Information and its Importance

Research into the role that political information plays in the functioning of democracy is an enduring thread of communication scholarship.[3] This research begins with the notion that

information is necessary grist for effective democracy.[4] Though there are conflicting

perspectives of precisely how much information citizens need or require, there is "clear evidence

that the amount of information one possesses shapes attitudes and behaviors, including such

things as participation, voting behavior, tolerance, and information processing strategies."[5]

This article is concerned with three kinds of political information. First, simple factual

data about election times, registration deadlines, and campaign events is called mobilizing

information (MI) and is vital in alerting and organizing the electorate in advance of the public

undertakings of democracy.[6] "Substantive" political information has two dimensions considered

separately in the analyses below: *issue* coverage of the actions taken by governmental bodies or

the positions and characteristics of representatives and candidates or coverage of the *strategic*

aspects of politics (also known as the 'horse-race') like how popular various ideas, officials, and

candidates are.[7] Citizens can learn about local political affairs through direct experience and

interpersonal interactions, but studies of local political activity confirm that mass media

institutions are critical components of the local landscape.[8]

Despite widespread interest in understanding the role of mass-mediated political

information in the context of national politics, research with LPI at its crux is sparse. The

smattering of such research suggests that the mobilizing and substantive political information

provided by mass media are both necessary components of healthy community democracies.[9]

Studies of recent changes in the information environment – the rise of broadcast media, chain

ownership of newspapers, and cable TV – have typically found that these technological advances

were correlated with a reduction in the accessibility of LPI.[10]

Media and Local Political Information

Examinations of the LPI content of local news are typically limited to electoral periods and have two primary issues of concern: how much LPI exists and what frame (strategy or issue) is most often employed in it. In the past 25 years, four significant projects have analyzed coverage of mayoral elections in local newspapers.[11] Each of these studies drew their sample from the city-at-hand's major daily newspapers – only one included any other paper (the *Chicago Defender*) – and found that coverage was dominated by discussions of political strategy. Notably, one of these projects documented the local media environment in Philadelphia during the 1990s and provides a basis for comparison for the results below.[12] Similar studies of local TV news conclude that it is composed primarily of stories on national topics or local crime and includes very little coverage of local political topics.[13] The consensus of this body of research is that, even if somewhat wanting, the local political content provided by newspapers is an important part of the democratic landscape that is unmatched by any other media.

A clear limitation of previous LPI content analyses is a narrow focus upon the major dailies. Additionally, prior works capture only the broadest strokes of the relevant coverage, sacrificing details such as the prevalence of mobilizing information or of the cross-promotion of other related media. And, the differences between primary and general election cycles has not been thoroughly documented. The primary utility of this extant body of literature is the support it provides for normative arguments that major local media underperform by either not providing enough LPI or skewing too much towards strategic content. This article takes a more practical tack by casting a broad net to evaluate many different newspapers in Philadelphia. Additionally, more aspects of the relevant campaign coverage is detailed – for both a primary and a general election.

Research Questions

Mayoral elections are high-profile, high-stakes events that demand attention. The 2007 Philadelphia campaign was for an open seat, fell in an off-year for national elections, and took place during a period of upheaval in the local media environment. The race paired a competitive Democratic primary in May – won by former city councilman Michael Nutter who surged from behind U.S. Congressmen Chaka Fattah and Bob Brady – with a nearly uncontested general election in which there was only a nominal challenge to Nutter (the eventual victor) from Republican Al Taubenberger.

The circumstances of the 2007 election in Philadelphia provided favorable conditions for the current research for several reasons. First, the off-year timing of the election ensured significant newspaper coverage. Second, because the incumbent was term limited, the campaign for the open seat would be vigorous. Third, Philadelphia's dominant Democratic majority – and a virtually nonexistent Republican challenge – resulted in one competitive election (the primary) and one non-competitive election (the general). Philadelphia is unique in many ways, but the dominance of one party and structure of the local media environment are characteristics shared with many cities across America. So, as a case-study, Philadelphia's 2007 campaign provided the opportunity to zero in on local election coverage in two very different elections that reflect the political happenings of other cities in the United States. Given the paucity of prior research on community newspapers, research questions, rather than hypotheses, are stated to guide the subsequent analyses.

As major local news institutions decline, concern that communities will be without viable suppliers of LPI is increasing. So, the first task of the analysis is to establish a baseline understanding of the amount of LPI available to citizens in print. Accordingly, the first research question is very simple:

RQ1: How much coverage did the 2007 Philadelphia mayoral campaign elicit from the local press?

The next research questions move beyond the amount of LPI to examine the characteristics of the local political content offered by the six newspapers (detailed below) included in this study. The motivation for this task is the possibility that community newspapers provide different kinds of LPI than the major dailies. To assess this, the features of the relevant coverage in the major dailies and in the community papers are contrasted. Hewing to the guidelines established by previous content analyses of political information, three related research questions guide this comparison.

RQ2a: How does the mix of issue and strategy LPI compare between major daily and community newspapers?
RQ2b: How much mobilizing information is provided by major daily and community newspapers?
RQ2c: How frequently do major daily and community newspapers promote other sources of LPI?

The last research question compares the LPI available from the six newspapers during the primary and general elections. Cross-election comparisons have rarely been made and no such work including community newspapers exists. Prior scholarship suggests that less competitive campaigns are accompanied by more issue-oriented coverage – but this conclusion is drawn from the basis of the strategy-oriented coverage that dominates major dailies during competitive races.[14] Community newspapers, which may provide a different content mixture in general, may complicate this conclusion.

RQ3: How does campaign coverage differ across primary and general elections in major daily and community newspapers?

<div align="center">Data & Methods</div>

Data

Coverage of the 2007 Philadelphia mayoral campaign was collected for six weeks in advance of both the primary and general elections from six newspapers: the *Inquirer, Daily News, Tribune, Metro, Northeast Times,* and *Philly Weekly*. The first two papers are the major dailies in Philadelphia, the other four are, respectively, the ethnic paper for the Black community, a free weekday paper, a neighborhood weekly, and an entertainment weekly. In this article, the major dailies are compared to the other four newspapers both individually and as two groups (major dailies and community newspapers).

The sample of mayoral campaign coverage was constructed in several steps. Articles with mayoral campaign content from the *Inquirer, Daily News,* and *Tribune* were captured with keyword searches of the Lexis-Nexis news database. To confirm that the Lexis-Nexis sample was complete, I compared the results from the database on 12 randomly-selected days (one per week of the sample) to the contents of the hardcopy edition of each paper from that day. For the *Tribune*, Lexis-Nexis captured every article across all the days compared. The comparison of the database results to print was not as neat for the *Inquirer* and *Daily News* because Lexis-Nexis does not index the content of graphics or sidebars for these publications. Still, the Lexis-Nexis sample contained 31 of 35 articles from the print edition of the *Daily News* and 35 of 38 articles from the print edition of the *Inquirer*. Because these results indicated that more than 90% of relevant coverage was captured by the Lexis-Nexis searches, I used the database results as my sample for the *Inquirer, Daily News,* and *Tribune.*

For each of the three other papers included in the content analysis – the *Metro, Northeast Times,* and *Philly Weekly* – the sample of articles was collected in a unique way. For the *Metro,* PDF files that were a complete copy of each edition published during the two six-week analysis periods were read and relevant articles, sidebars, and graphics were marked for coding. PDF's

were unavailable for 8 of a possible 60 issues; for these dates, articles were retrieved from the *Metro's* web archive. Articles from *Philly Weekly* were retrieved from the online index Alt-Press Watch and missing pieces from the relevant editions were photocopied from *Philly Weekly's* archives. The *Northeast Times* hosts complete web archives; these pages were browsed and saved when campaign coverage was located. Comparison confirmed that the content did not differ from the print edition.

Methods

Coding for the content analysis was carried out by the author and two undergraduate students (contact the author for a copy of the codebook). Among the categories of analysis, assessing the substantive LPI required the most attention. *Strategy* content was defined as information that "describes the campaign strategies and the competition between the candidates" and five sub-categories (with specific examples) of qualifying information were provided: polling data, campaign funding, advertising strategies, electoral strategies, and endorsements. The presence of strategy content was then calculated on a 0-5 scale for each article by adding the number of sub-categories that were marked positive in a text. Coding for *issue* content proceeded in a similar – but not directly comparable – fashion. Here, nine relevant issues were identified for coders who were also given the leeway to identify other pertinent issues that appeared. After identifying the presence of an issue in an article, guidelines and examples for what constituted meaningful coverage were provided to the coders. Each article was then coded as having no meaningful issue content (0), a small amount of issue content (1), or a large amount of issue content (2); for pieces in which multiple issues were raised, the final 0-5 code reflects an aggregation of the amount of total issue coverage added together and limited to a maximum score of 5. Dichotomous variables set to 1 if strategy or issue content was present and 0 if not

were created by recoding the ordinal variables from 0-5 to 0-1. Coding of the remaining variables – the presence of mobilizing information, the presence of cross-promotion of other media (such as a website) – was dictated by guidelines and examples not described here but straightforward in nature.

[Table 1 about here]

A total of 630 newspaper articles were coded for this study. Intercoder reliability was established by comparing the coding of a random-selected sample of 10% of the articles across all publications using Krippendorff's α as the metric of agreement (Table 1). According to Krippendorff, the ideal level of agreement is greater than .80, but α's above .667 are acceptable.[15] The α's for this content analysis range between .67 and .83 for all variables except the assessment of the presence of mobilizing information (MI). Here, agreement amongst coders was slightly below the acceptable level. After reviewing the reliability scores, the coders conferred about the discrepancies and reached a consensus before proceeding to complete the remaining coding. For the categories discussed below that are not subjective (word count of newspaper articles), the author's code was used.

Findings

[Table 2 about here]

This study finds that the 2007 Philadelphia mayoral campaign resulted in substantial coverage from the city's press (RQ1). Of the 630 relevant pieces, the *Inquirer* published the most articles (189); the *Metro* (141) and *Daily News* (131) printed nearly the same number of pieces (Table 2). In the sample, the major dailies (the *Inquirer* and *Daily News*) published 320 articles and the community papers included 310 pieces. On an article-per-issue basis, the range among the papers was from 1.75 to 3.17 articles per edition, with the *Tribune* and the *Northeast Times*

publishing pieces most frequently. 454 of the articles were printed during the primary period and 176 in the general election period. The decline in coverage was similar for the *Inquirer, Daily News,* and *Tribune* as each printed about one-third as many pieces about the general election as about the primary election. Proportionately, the trend was not as strong for the *Metro* (42% as many pieces during the general election) and *Northeast Times* (81%) but coverage virtually disappeared from the pages of *Philly Weekly* (17%). Articles in the general period were more than 10% shorter as well (Table 4). Across all publications, most relevant articles were hard news coverage (76%). This distinction was particularly pronounced in the *Metro* (91%); about 30% of the coverage in the other publications' was in the form of op-eds or letters.

The mayoral campaign coverage included in this sample contains an array of pertinent LPI (RQ2a-c). More than a third of the articles included MI (37%), 14% contained teasers that offered additional information elsewhere, and about half of all stories included substantial information about campaign strategy (52%) or issues (49%). Analysis shows that the LPI provided by the six newspapers varies in several notable ways (Table 3).

[Table 3 about here]

First, articles in the major dailies were significantly more likely to contain strategy-focused LPI than those in the community newspapers (see Table 3 for all values*).* The major dailies' articles were also significantly longer, more likely to contain MI, and more likely to contain teasers that promoted websites or other related sources of information. Articles in the community papers were more likely to contain issue-focused information, but the difference was not significant. That said, articles in community papers did contain significantly more issue-focused information on average than articles in the major dailies.

Looking at issue and strategy content at a more granular level, half of the publications had a higher proportion of articles with strategic information than issue-related information: the *Inquirer, Daily News,* and *Tribune.* The opposite was true of the other three publications: *Philly Weekly,* the *Northeast Times*, and the *Metro*. The contents of the *Inquirer*, in particular, stand out as rich: MI was included in 50% of its articles and the paper included references to other information resources more frequently (24% of articles) than any other publication.

[Table 4 about here]

Comparing articles published in advance of the primary and general elections adds some nuance to this examination of publications (RQ3). At a basic level, the mix of issue- and strategy-focused information across all papers clearly differs between election periods (Table 4). Before the primary election, 63% of articles included strategy information and 46% contained issue information. Before the general election, 26% of articles included strategy information and 66% contained issue information. Both differences are significant – though the disparity in volume between the periods noted above should be kept in mind.

Turning to comparisons between major dailies and community papers within each period helps further isolate the roles that the newspapers play in the local media environment. Differences between the paper types are much sharper in the primary period than during the general's timeframe (Table 4). During the primary period, articles in major dailies were significantly more likely to contain MI, teasers, and strategic information. Articles in community newspapers, however, were significantly more likely to provide issue information (and more of it as well). During the general election, the only significant difference in these categories was that more of the articles in major dailies included teasers than the articles published by community papers.

Discussion

This article depicts the role played by both major daily and community newspapers in the 2007 Philadelphia mayoral campaign. Three particular points emerge from the findings. First, though Philadelphia's primary daily paper, the *Inquirer,* provided the most coverage, a sizeable amount of nuanced reporting was available from community newspapers. Second, the type of coverage available from major dailies and community newspapers was qualitatively different. Third, the characteristics of the campaign coverage varied dramatically between the two election periods. This section evaluates these findings in greater depth and considers their implications.

The first research question in this article probed the amount of LPI that is available to citizens. In short, as major dailies struggle to stay afloat, it is important to know what other sources of LPI exist. In this case, the major dailies provided more campaign information than the community newspapers, but they were clearly not the only viable source of relevant LPI. Certainly, the collapse of the *Inquirer* or *Daily News* would be a loss for Philadelphia, but the community papers are a viable substitute. In smaller towns and cities, however, this may not be the case.

The LPI provided by community papers did differ in some notable ways from that published by the *Inquirer* and *Daily News*. The data show that the community newspapers published shorter articles with more of an emphasis on issue information. At the same time, their articles offered MI less frequently and did not provide as much strategic information. Given the divergent production schedule of the community papers (none are published seven days a week) and the major dailies, these differences reflect the complementary nature of the various newspapers. Citizens would do best to read a daily paper – which would alert them to campaign events and provide horse-race updates – and a community paper that gave in-depth issue

information. But, to some extent, the community newspapers' coverage – which was especially issue-centric during the primary election – provided the most important information for citizens interested in evaluating candidates. Reading just a community paper would have yielded sufficient issue information to make a knowledgeable choice – provided election day did not slip by unnoticed.

Generally speaking, treatment of the mayoral campaign varied some across the six newspapers examined in this article – but perhaps not as much as might be expected. Community newspapers do complement the major dailies – but they are vital in their own regard. They serve and conform to a particular niche – commuters, a neighborhood, and so on – and in doing so they become useful and unique LPI resources. And, they have another powerful advantage over the major dailies in reaching an audience: they are often free. So, regardless of the fate of the major dailies, the community papers are an important part of the local media environment, reaching segments of the population that may not otherwise consume LPI. Scholars have traditionally ignored community newspapers; this article shows that they contain worthwhile content and warrant further attention in the future.

Turning to the amount and type of LPI available across the election periods, some prior researchers have struck an optimistic note about the mix of issue and strategy coverage in certain campaign circumstances.[16] They suggest that in lightly contested elections, issue-focused coverage comes to the fore – a finding that is partially echoed here. There was a pronounced shift on the surface towards issue-centric coverage between the primary and general election periods. But, this change was much more pronounced in coverage in the major dailies than in the community papers: issue coverage only came to the fore in the *Inquirer* and *Daily News* once

there no longer was a horse race to cover. Meanwhile, it was the center of the community papers' coverage all along.

Additionally, the transition in news focus across time periods was paired with a dramatic reduction in the total amount of relevant coverage between the primary and general elections. To a large extent, the coverage that did exist in the general election period folded the campaign, or its candidates, into existing local political news narratives. Pieces about ongoing debates in the city often assessed Michael Nutter's position and likely impact. These articles – though they are 'campaign coverage' in that the candidates are mentioned – are not comparable to issue-focused reporting before the primary because the candidate (and campaign) is an afterthought. In short, prior scholars' optimism regarding an increased issued-focus in campaign coverage of lightly contested elections understates other significant drawbacks of the reporting in such circumstances.

This content analysis does have limitations and the most notable stem from the construction of the sample. As detailed above, some newspaper articles were not captured by Lexis-Nexis searches. Ideally, the sample would be without omission, but it seems unlikely that the findings of this article are skewed because of these exclusions. Additionally, though this article examines six Philadelphia newspapers, it could have included more. Second, the coding scheme placed some constraints on the analyses that were possible. This content analysis expanded upon the issue-and-strategy approach of similar prior work to include content features like MI. Still, appraisal of the more nuanced aspects of coverage like its tone, the framing of texts, or the kind of MI was left for future research.

Conclusion

Modern, representative democracy in America has always involved newspapers. Citizens need mediated sources of local political information, governments need channels to disseminate information, and communities need a mechanism of oversight of their public officials. Writing about the 1991 Philadelphia mayoral campaign, Kaniss looked extensively at the city's two major daily newspapers which then had a combined circulation over 700,000.[17] Today, the combined circulation of the *Inquirer* and *Daily News* is about 360,000.[18] As the slow-motion collapse of newspapers across America proceeds, it is reasonable to wonder what institutions will connect citizens and representatives in the future. Certainly, daily newspapers have long filled this role, but they are not the only news organizations to do so. This article outlines the contributions of smaller, niche-oriented publications and suggests that they may partially fill the void left by the major dailies.

Though not the dominant institutions that major dailies were throughout the 20th century, community newspapers are an important resource. And, as major dailies collapse under the strain of high cost structures and low advertising and circulation revenue, there is opportunity for other local news organizations to grow in stature. Like the dailies, community papers face significant financial challenges – but they have lower overhead and traditions of thrift. They may not all survive, but the ones that do could be increasingly important to the communities that they serve. Still, in order for community newspapers to survive and thrive, they must carefully consider their audiences and roles. The product they offer – typically an aggregation of geographically-specific information that is not available elsewhere and that is pertinent to a niche audience – must be compelling enough to drive a community's interest. As recent history shows, an available supply of local news is not sufficient to guarantee its consumption. The task that falls to the writers,

editors, and publishers of community newspapers is to induce citizens to read at least one local

paper.

---

[1] Clay Shirky, "Newspapers and Thinking the Unthinkable" 13 March 2009, <http://www.shirky.com/weblog/2009/03/newspapers-and-thinking-the-unthinkable/> (17 August 2009); Paul Starr, "Goodbye to the Age of Newspapers (Hello to a New Era of Corruption)" 4 March 2009, <http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=a4e2aafc-cc92-4e79-90d1-db3946a6d119> (17 August 2009).

[2] George A. Donohue, Clarice N. Olien and Philip J. Tichenor, "Media access and knowledge gaps" *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 4, no. 1 (1987): 87-92.

[3] W. Lance Bennett and Robert M. Entman, *Mediated Politics: Communication in the Future of Democracy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

[4] Stephen C. Craig, J.G. Kane and Jason Gainous, "Issue-Related Learning in a Gubernatorial Campaign: A Panel Study" *Political Communication* 22, no. 4 (2005)*:* 483-503; William P. Eveland, Andrew F. Hayes, Dhavan V. Shah and Nojin Kwak, "Understanding the Relationship Between Communication and Political Knowledge: A Model Comparison Approach Using Panel Data" *Political Communication* 22, no. 4 (2005)*:* 423-446; John S. Mill, *On Liberty.*1859 <http://www.utilitarianism.com/ol/> (22 August 2009).

[5] Philip E. Converse, "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In *Ideology and Discontent,* ed. David E. Apter, (New York: Free Press, 1964); James N. Druckman, "Does Political Information Matter?" *Political Communication* 22, no. 4 (2005)*:* 517; Benjamin I. Page and Robert Y. Shapiro, *The Rational Public* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Michael Schudson, "Why Conversation is Not the Soul of Democracy" *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 14, no. 2 (1997)*:* 297-309; Paul M. Sniderman, R.A. Brody and Philip E. Tetlock, *Reasoning and Choice* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

[6] James B. Lemert, *Does mass communication change public opinion after all? A new approach to effects analysis* (Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1981); Lindsey M. Hoffman, "Is Internet Content Different After All? A Content Analysis of Mobilizing Information in Online and Print Newspapers" *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 83, no. 1 (2006): 58-76.

[7] Joseph N. Cappella and Kathleen H. Jamieson, *Spiral of Cynicism: The Press and the Public Good* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997): Shanto Iyengar, *Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

[8] Sidney Verba and Norman N. Nie, *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972).

[9] Jack M. McLeod, Dietram A. Scheufele and Patricia Moy, "Community, Communication, and Participation: The Role of Mass Media and Interpersonal Discussion in Local Political Participation" *Political Communication* 16, no. 3 (1999)*:* 315-336; Dietram A. Scheufele, James Shanahan and Sei-Hill Kim, "Who Cares About Local Politics? Media Influences on Local Political Involvement, Issue Awareness, and Attitudes Strength" *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 79, no.2 (2002)*:* 427-444.

[10] David P. Demers and Daniel B. Wackman, "Effect of Chain Ownership on Newspaper Management Goals" *Newspaper Research Journal* 9, no. 4 (1988): 59-68; George A. Donohue, Clarice N. Olien and Philip J. Tichenor, "Are rural areas left behind in the age of information? -- more TV and radio, fewer newspapers" *Sociology of Rural Life* 9, no. 4 (1987): 1-8; George A. Donohue, Clarice N. Olien and Philip J. Tichenor, "Effect of use of metro dailies on knowledge gap in small towns" *Journalism*

Quarterly 64, no. 2/3 (1987): 329-336; Stephen Lacy, "Effects of group ownership on daily newspaper content" *Journal of Media Economics* 4, no. 1 (1991), pp. 35-47.

[11] Julio Borquez and Donna Wasserman, "Patterns of Press Coverage of Mayoral Campaigns: Comparing Detroit and Los Angeles" *The Social Science Journal* 43, No. 3 (2006)*:*375-391; Doris Graber, "Media Magic: Fashioning Characters for the 1983 Mayoral Race." In *The Making of the Mayor,* eds. Melvin G. Holli and Paul M. Green, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984); Timothy F. Grainey, Dennis Pollack and Lori Kusmierek, "How Three Chicago Newspapers Covered the Washington-Epton Campaign" *Journalism Quarterly* 61, no. 3 (1984): 354-363; Phyllis Kaniss, *The Media and the Mayor's Race* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995).

[12] Phyllis Kaniss, *The Media and the Mayor's Race.*

[13] Martin Kaplan, Steve Rabinowitz and Jesse F. Derris, "Local TV News Coverage of the 2002 General Election" <http://www.localnewsarchive.org/pdf/LocalTV2002.pdf> (22 August 2009); Martin Kaplan, Ken Goldstein and Matthew Hale, "Local News Coverage of the 2004 campaigns" <http://www.localnewsarchive.org/pdf/LCLNAFinal2004.pdf> (22 August 2009); Jolene Kiolbassa, "Is Local TV News Still Local?" *Harvard International Journal of Press and Politics* 2*,* no. 1 (1997)*:* 79-95; Paul Klite, Robert A. Bardwell and Jason Salzman, "Local TV News: Getting Away with Murder." *Harvard International Journal of Press and Politics* 2*,* no. 1 (1997)*:* 102-112; Daniel Stevens, Dean Alger, Barbara Allen and John L. Sullivan, "Local News Coverage in a Social Capital Capital: Election 2000 on Minnesota's Local News Stations." *Political Communication* 23*,* no. 1 (2006)*:* 61-83.

[14] Borquez & Wasserman, "Patterns of Press Coverage of Mayoral Campaigns: Comparing Detroit and Los Angeles"; Kaniss, *The Media and the Mayor's Race*.

[15] Klaus Krippendorf, *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004)

[16] Borquez & Wasserman, "Patterns of Press Coverage of Mayoral Campaigns: Comparing Detroit and Los Angeles"; Kaniss, *The Media and the Mayor's Race*.

[17] Kaniss, *The Media and the Mayor's Race*.

[18] Audit Bureau of Circulations, "Newspaper Circulation for the period ending September 30, 2009", <http://abcas3.accessabc.com/ecirc/newsform.asp> (13 November 2009).

Table 1: Intercoder Reliability

	Strategy 0-5	Strategy 0/1	Issue 0-5	Issue 0/1	Mobilizing Information	Teaser
Krippendorf's α	0.82	0.67	0.83	0.74	0.59	0.77

N = 62. Strategy 0-5 and Issue 0-5 comparisons are of ordinal scales; all others are for nominal variables.

Table 2: Article Distribution

Newspaper	Primary	General	Articles per Issue	News	Op-Ed	Letters	Other
Inquirer	139	50	2.25	137	37	11	4
Daily News	95	36	1.82	85	28	10	8
Tribune	82	28	3.06	88	19	0	3
Metro	99	42	2.35	128	4	5	4
Philly Weekly	18	3	1.75	10	8	3	0
Northeast Times	21	17	3.17	29	3	6	0
Total	454	176	-	477	99	35	19

Table 3: LPI Content of Newspaper Articles

Newspaper	N	Words	MI %	Teaser %	Strategy %	Strategy 0-5	Issue %	Issue 0-5
Inquirer	189	764	50%	24%	59%	1.04	54%	1.14
Daily News	131	529	28%	11%	55%	1.00	45%	0.95
Tribune	110	741	26%	2%	50%	0.76	49%	1.32
Metro	141	262	34%	13%	43%	0.71	49%	1.01
Philly Weekly	21	767	33%	10%	45%	0.65	60%	1.75
Northeast Times	38	693	47%	16%	61%	1.24	87%	3.24
Major Dailies	320	668**	41%*	36%**	57%*	1.02**	49%	1.06**
Community Papers	310	519**	33%*	17%**	48%*	0.79**	54%	1.46**
All Papers	630	595	37%	14%	52%	0.91	49%	1.25

* Difference between Major Dailies and Community Papers is significant p ≤ .05, two-tailed T-Test.

** Difference between Major Dailies and Community Papers is significant p ≤ .01, two-tailed T-Test.

Table 4: Comparison of LPI Across Primary and General Election Periods

Primary Election	N	Words	MI %	Teaser %	Strategy %	Strategy 0-5	Issue %	Issue 0-5
Inquirer	139	793	56%	42%	71%	1.27	44%	0.9
Daily News	95	538	26%	16%	66%	1.20	38%	0.78
Tribune	82	758	23%	5%	56%	0.90	43%	1.15
Metro	99	265	31%	25%	54%	0.89	47%	1.01
Philly Weekly	18	763	39%	17%	56%	0.76	56%	1.65
Northeast Times	21	767	57%	43%	81%	1.76	95%	3.71
Major Dailies	234	689[**]	44%[**]	31%[*]	69%[*]	0.69[**]	41%[*]	0.85[**]
Community Papers	220	537[**]	31%[**]	18%[*]	57%[*]	0.57[**]	51%[*]	1.39[**]
All Papers	454	616	38%	25%	63%[#]	1.11[#]	46%[#]	1.10[#]
General Election	N	Words	MI %	Teaser %	Strategy %	Strategy 0-5	Issue %	Issue 0-5
Inquirer	50	683	32%	60%	26%	0.38	76%	1.82
Daily News	36	506	31%	36%	25%	0.47	64%	1.39
Tribune	28	690	32%	0%	32%	0.36	68%	1.82
Metro	42	256	40%	0%	19%	0.31	48%	1
Philly Weekly	3	790	0%	17%	0%	0.00	100%	2.33
Northeast Times	17	601	47%	24%	35%	0.59	77%	2.65
Major Dailies	90	609[**]	31%	50%[**]	26%	0.42	71%	1.64
Community Papers	87	474[**]	38%	12%[**]	26%	0.37	61%	1.63
All Papers	176	540	35%	31%	26%[#]	0.39[#]	66%[#]	1.64[#]

[*] Difference between Major Dailies and Community Papers is significant p ≤ .05, two-tailed T-Test.

[**] Difference between Major Dailies and Community Papers is significant p ≤ .01, two-tailed T-Test.

[#] Difference between Primary Election and General Election totals is significant p ≤ .01, two-tailed T-Test.