

**This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:**

"According to the polls..." : opinion poll coverage in network evening news during the 2020 U.S. election campaign

**Reference:**

Beckers Kathleen.- "According to the polls..." : opinion poll coverage in network evening news during the 2020 U.S. election campaign  
International journal of public opinion research - ISSN 1471-6909 - 33:4(2021), p. 1050-1061  
Full text (Publisher's DOI): <https://doi.org/10.1093/IJPOR/EDAB019>  
To cite this reference: <https://hdl.handle.net/10067/1808630151162165141>

### **Abstract**

After news media and pollsters were unsuccessful in predicting recent political outcomes such as the 2016 US election, opinion polls came under scrutiny. Journalists were accused of not providing audiences the tools to correctly interpret poll information. Using a content analysis of all evening news items from CBS, ABC and NBC from the final two months before the 2020 US general election, we analyzed the quality of poll coverage. We find that half of the references to election polls are ‘diffuse,’ in which journalists refer to ‘the polls’ in a general manner. When news items do cover specific poll results, media often disclose the absolute minimal essential information (e.g., population and error margin), but fail to provide additional methodological details.

*Keywords:* 2020 US election; content analysis; news media; opinion poll; methodological transparency

**“According to the Polls...”****Opinion Poll Coverage in Network Evening News During the 2020 US Election Campaign**

After several news media, political analysts and pollsters were taken by surprise by the outcome of recent political events such as Brexit and the 2016 US presidential election, opinion polls came under intense scrutiny. Reflections on what went wrong followed and headlines such as “News Outlets Wonder Where the Predictions Went Wrong” (*New York Times*, Nov. 9, 2016), “How the Media’s Election Predictions Badly Missed the Mark” (*Wall Street Journal*, Nov. 9, 2016), “How the pollsters got it wrong on the EU referendum” (*The Guardian*, June 24, 2016) were all over the news. Additionally, journalists have been criticized for not always providing audiences with the right tools to correctly understand or interpret poll results (Brettschneider, 2008b). Yet if conducted well, opinion polls are still the most valid manner by which journalists can portray public opinion in the news.

Together with the rise of modern-day election campaigns, attempts to predict their outcome have grown. As a result, opinion polls take up a central space in election news coverage. The horse race, i.e. who’s winning, who’s losing and who’s gaining ground becomes increasingly newsworthy as election day nears (Aalberg et al., 2012; Brettschneider, 2008a; Cushion & Thomas, 2018). During US presidential general elections, days without poll reports are rare (Rosenstiel, 2005; Searles, 2016). Several news media and renowned public opinion organizations have published guidelines for journalists on how to qualitatively report poll results so that audiences have all the information they need to interpret and evaluate the results (e.g., ESOMAR/WAPOR, 2020). Nonetheless, numerous studies across country contexts have concluded that journalists often fail to do so (e.g., Bhatti & Pedersen, 2016; Strömbäck, 2012; Vögele & Bachl, 2019).

However, we do not know much about election poll reporting in the current US context. The 2020 presidential election between Biden and Trump was followed closely by people all over the world and was expected to be a close race. Given the increased attention towards opinion polling (e.g., Kennedy, 2018) and an increased sense of awareness among journalists of potential biases in their interpretations of public opinion (Beckers et al., 2019), it might be that in the 2020 US general election campaign, journalists paid attention to the methodological quality of their poll reports. We will not focus on whether the polls were “wrong” or not, but on whether journalists provided their audiences with all the information to assess the poll results themselves and help them understand and interpret these results. To do so, this study investigates how the three main US news networks (ABC, CBS and NBC) covered opinion polls during the final months of the general election campaign between Biden and Trump (September 7 – November 2, 2020) in their evening newscasts. All 1825 news items from this period were included in our analysis.

### **The Quality of Poll Reports**

Several guidelines exist for journalists on how to report on poll results. *The World Association for Public Opinion Research* (WAPOR) and the *European Society for Market and Opinion Research* (ESOMAR) have published international guidelines for published polls. Their starting point is that journalists and the public need to be able to assess whether a reported poll is methodologically sound. As polling in recent years has become more complex and diverse, pollsters and journalists need to provide a higher level of methodological transparency and, next to the minimal essential information, provide audiences with the opportunity to search for further information (ESOMAR/WAPOR, 2020). Several news outlets also have their own guidelines in place on how to report poll results in a qualitative manner (see, for instance, BBC, 2019). In most of these guidelines, it seems to be

agreed upon that poll reporting should be transparent about who has carried out the poll and who has commissioned it, as well as giving information about the sample size, response rate, the margin of error and the dates of fieldwork.

Previous research that studied the content of polls in the news found that in reality, news media do not always adhere to these guidelines. Across countries and media contexts, research has found that media frequently refer to results of undifferentiated and vague polls (for instance: “according to polls, people support the policy”; Andersen, 2000; Brettschneider, 2008b). These diffuse poll reports are very broad and vague, so it is difficult—if not impossible—for audiences to know the source or verify the validity of the information. By using polls in such a casual manner, journalists often portray their own interpretation of poll results. Previous research found that journalists mostly rely on their own interpretation of events when reporting public opinion (King & Schudson, 1995; Lewis et al., 2005).

Hence, journalists do not always disclose methodological or contextual information on poll results. When they do, large variations exist in the amount of details given in the portrayed poll results. In an analysis of election coverage in German print media, Brettschneider (2008b) found that the most frequently mentioned poll technicalities are the executor, the institution that commissioned the poll, and the time of data collection. Only two percent of the polls reported the margin of error of the results, and rarely could information be found about the methods of data collection or question wording. Welch (2002) focused on local and national newspaper coverage during the 2000 US election and found that news media did a much better job of reporting more detailed information on in-house polls compared to “outside” polls (conducted by other news media or polling agencies). They found that all newspapers in their analysis almost systematically reported the poll sponsor, results and to a lesser degree the polled population, but in general failed to present any more

methodological information. Welch, however, did not include stories containing polls that were only referred to in a diffuse manner (such as “most polls show the race is tied”), so in reality, probably even less poll references included methodological information. Similar results were found in Switzerland (Hardmeier, 1999), Canada (Andersen, 2000), Sweden (Oleskog Tryggvason & Strömbäck, 2018), Poland (Szwed, 2011), and in more recent German research (Vögele & Bachl, 2019). With some exceptions, few of these studies focused on television news, though.

A more recent study of the US context on the 2016 primaries (Turcotte, Medenilla, Villaseñor, & Lampwalla, 2017) found that broadcast news outlets were more transparent in their poll reporting (i.e., in providing more methodological details) compared to print and online news. Transparency decreased as election day neared, however. But how did the evening newscasts do this election campaign? Did they provide the methodological information needed for audiences to understand them and did they stress potential uncertainties? Using an extensive manual content analysis of network evening news, we propose the following research question:

**RQ.** What is the methodological quality of poll reporting in 2020 US election evening television news?

### **Method**

To study this, we analyze the evening newscasts from three major US television networks: *CBS Evening News*, *ABC World News Tonight* and *NBC Nightly news*. Even though general trust in the news media is low, these networks are still among the most trusted news sources for many Americans (Jurkowitz, Mitchell, Shearer, & Walker, 2020) and their evening newscasts are among the most watched television news shows across party lines

(Pew Research Center, 2019). All three evening newscasts are comparable in scope and length with on average 12 news items per day ( $M = 11.49$ ,  $SD = 2.36$ ).

All news items from the final phase of the US election campaign were coded, from September 7, 2020 (Labor Day; typically seen as the moment the election campaign enters its homestretch) to November 2, 2020, the day before the election. In total, 1825 news items were analyzed. For every news item, the network (*CBS*, *ABC*, *NBC*), title and subject were coded (see codebook in Appendix A). If a news item was linked explicitly to the US election of November 3<sup>rd</sup> 2020, this was also indicated ( $KALPHA = 0.85$ ). All news items were coded manually by two coders as they appeared on television in order to include all references to opinion polls (often, polls were referred to verbally in a diffuse manner while specific results were shown solely on-screen; e.g., “Right now he's [Trump] trailing Biden, but only slightly”, while on-screen the poll results are displayed, *CBS Evening News*, 10/29). All opinion polls—both those referred to by the news anchor, journalists or a voice-over, and those shown on-screen—were included in our analysis ( $KALPHA = 0.78$ ). 7.8% of the news items were coded twice to calculate intercoder reliability at the level of the news item. Additionally, a random sample of 53 election polls (25.7%) was double-coded to calculate intercoder reliability for the specific poll variables. All coding was found to be reliable (Krippendorff's Alpha/ $KALPHA > 0.70$ ).

For every poll, we coded the literal reference to the poll and the type of poll (election or issue poll). Dichotomous variables (present = 1; absent = 0) were assigned to each respective measure of methodological transparency. For every poll, we coded the presence/absence of a reference to the executor ( $KALPHA = 0.93$ ), polled population ( $KALPHA = 0.81$ ), poll results ( $KALPHA = 0.92$ ) margin of error ( $KALPHA = 1.00$ ), population size ( $KALPHA = 1.00$ ), weighing procedure ( $KALPHA = 1.00$ ), dates of data

collection (KALPHA = 1.00), non-response or refusal rate (KALPHA = 1.00) and exact question wording (KALPHA = 1.00).

While in news not linked to the elections, only 1.15% of the news items includes one or more opinion polls, in election news this is 29.0%,  $t(548) = -13.88$ ,  $p < .001$ . The type of poll also varies between election and non-election news. In non-election news, 86.7% of all polls are issue polls ( $N = 13$ ), and only 13.3% election polls ( $N = 2$ ). In election news, we find the exact opposite: 88.3% are election polls ( $N = 204$ ), 11.7% are issue polls ( $N = 27$ ),  $\chi^2 = 58.15$ ,  $p < .001$ .

### Results

In our study, we focus specifically on election poll coverage, so the analyses include the 206 election polls in our sample. There were more poll reports on *CBS* ( $N = 89$ ) than on *ABC* ( $N = 56$ ) and *NBC* ( $N = 61$ ). Looking at the evolution of poll coverage over time as visualized in Figure 1, we find that the number of polls covered on a daily base increases as election day nears, with a similar trend on all three media,  $F(2, 42) = 9.72$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = 0.34$ ;  $\beta = 0.582$ . This increase happens rather gradually over time, but peaks in the days before the election. No day in the final two months before election day went by without a poll report in one of the newscasts. On November 2<sup>nd</sup>, a total of 22 references to election polls were made on the three broadcasters.

[Figure 1 around here]

Taking a closer look at the information disclosed in these poll reports, the first thing that stands out is the overall lack of information. Almost half (46.1%) of all references to election polls are diffuse, providing no information whatsoever. With these diffuse polls, it is



impossible to know the source of the information or what the interpretation of the poll data was based on. Some examples include:

“Polls show the former vice-president leading nationwide” (*CBS Evening News*, 09/09)

“The president according to most polls going in as the underdog” (*NBC Nightly News*, 09/29)

“Down in the polls, tomorrow night’s debate could be Trump’s last best chance to change the direction of this race” (*ABC World News Tonight*, 10/21)

Regarding methodological poll information, the first thing we coded for every poll was the executor or commissioner of the poll. We took the two together as often there was no explicit distinction made between them in the newscasts, and the exact role of the different actors could not always be identified. 41.7% of the polls were commissioned or executed by the medium itself (sometimes in collaboration with another actor, such as the *CBS News Battleground tracker* in collaboration with *YouGov*, the *ABC News/Washington Post* poll and the *NBC News/Wall Street Journal* poll), 8.7% of the polls came from an outside source (e.g., *Fox News*, *Real Clear Politics*, *FiveThirtyEight*) and 49.5% of the poll reports did not contain an identifiable source.

[Table 1 around here]

When comparing the three broadcasters in Table 1, we find some differences, though. *CBS* reports more in-house polls than *NBC* and *ABC*. *ABC*, on the other hand, refers more to polls without mentioning the source compared to *NBC* and *CBS*. As previous research found different patterns based on poll source, we also split up our results on methodological

information disclosure below based on whether the poll was in-house, from an outside source or whether the source of the information was unknown.

First, for every type of methodological information, we analyzed whether it was present (1) or absent (0) in the poll report. When looking at the sum of these types of information, indeed, poll reports without source contained on average less ( $M = 0.79$ ,  $SD = 0.60$ ) methodological information than outside ( $M = 2.61$ ,  $SD = 0.98$ ) and in-house polls ( $M = 3.29$ ,  $SD = 0.92$ );  $F(2, 203) = 242.84$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = 0.71$ .

Table 2 presents the prevalence of the different types of methodological information based on type of poll source. If the source of the poll was unknown, the journalist often did provide some sort of reference to the polled population, such as “In battleground Florida, polls show a tight race” (*NBC Nightly News*, 10/05), or references to “nationwide” polling. Journalists also sometimes referred to poll results, which were coded rather conservatively: e.g., “Biden trails by just four points in the polls” (*ABC World News Tonight*, 10/28), as this provides the audience with some reference to the scope of the poll outcome. Poll reports for which the source is unknown never disclosed any more methodological details.

For in-house and outside polls, our findings are a bit more encouraging. The large majority of these polls were presented together with the population that was surveyed and specific poll results (often as percentages: e.g., “Pennsylvania likely voters. Biden 51%; Trump 44%”, *ABC World News Tonight*, 11/01). The dates of data collection were present for almost sixty percent of in-house polls and twenty percent of outside poll reports. Reports of the sample size, however, were rare. In none of the news items was the exact question wording provided. Sometimes the items showed a summarizing statement on-screen, such as “choice for president” or “presidential race.” Additionally, none of the polls were presented with detailed methodological information about weighing procedures or the response rate. One news report mentioned “other/no opinion not shown” on screen (*NBC Nightly News*,

10/12). Without all these methodological details, it is difficult for audiences to evaluate the soundness and meaning of the poll results.

Even though it was often presented in small letters on-screen, the margin of error was provided in three out of four reports of in-house polls. This number was lower for outside polls, where forty percent of the reports mentioned the error margin. In only six instances (2.9%), journalists explicitly referred to the error margin as context while explaining the poll results; e.g.,: “Our latest NBC news/ Marist poll now has Biden with a slight 4-point lead over Mr. Trump in the state, 51 to 47%, that's within the margin of error.” (*NBC Nightly News*, 10/29). Additionally, 17% of all poll outcomes were presented as a toss-up, which was often an interpretation by the journalists when the results were within the margin of error.

Lastly, we investigate the influence of time on the disclosure of methodological poll details. As attention for election polls increases as election day nears, so might journalists’ attention for methodological transparency in their poll reporting. However, this is not the case. The date of the poll report has no influence whatsoever on the tendency of journalists to report more methodological details. On the contrary, the sum of methodological details even decreased over time, although the finding is not significant;  $F(1, 204) = 1.12, p = .29, R^2 = 0.005; \beta = -0.074$ .

[Table 2 around here]

## Discussion & Conclusion

In the context of what was often referred to as “the most important election of a lifetime” and the expectation that it was going to be a close race (Montanaro, 2020), we studied the coverage of election polls in US network evening news during the final phase of

the 2020 US election campaign. More precisely, this research note analyzes to what degree these news media provided methodological transparency when covering election polls.

The first thing that stands out in our data is that almost half of the references are “diffuse” (Brettschneider, 2008b), without *any* information about the source or results the journalists based the poll reference on. Such diffuse references to “the polls” seem to be used by journalists to support their own interpretation of the election campaign. In these instances, there are no opportunities for the audience to interpret or assess the poll data themselves. However, previous research found that even these more diffuse polls without specific cues about the majority share can be quite consequential and influence people’s perceptions of public opinion (Daschmann, 2000).

More promising results were found for news reports on specific in-house or outside polls, in line with earlier findings of Welch (2002). The large majority of these polls mentioned the population and specific results, and still a significant share the margin of error, which is crucial to interpret the meaning of poll results, and which is considered as part of the “minimal indispensable information” for published polls (ESOMAR/WAPOR, 2020). Less frequent were the dates of fieldwork and sample size. Other methodological information was completely absent. So, although the networks did a relatively good job at presenting information that might help audiences to evaluate the data (such as the error margin), still very little information was present overall. There were differences between the broadcasters, though, with *CBS Evening News* reporting more in-house polls accompanied with more methodological disclosure, but even here diffuse poll references were still common.

This study has some limitations we need to address. The analysis only investigated poll reports in traditional network evening news. Many other news outlets and sources also played a central role during the 2020 election campaign, each with their specific characteristics (Jurkowitz et al., 2020). The 24-hour news environment of cable news, for

instance, might result in an even greater reliance on opinion polls and horse race coverage (Searles et al., 2016). Additionally, future studies of online news media, which are quickly gaining ground over traditional media, might also find different patterns. However, network evening newscasts are relevant outlets to study as they are among the most watched news shows across party lines and reach a large audience share during elections (Jurkowitz et al., 2020; Pew Research Center, 2018). Another limitation is that our study only comprises the US context, which is characterized by highly mediatized elections and a strong focus on horse race news coverage (Cushion & Thomas, 2018; Searles, 2016). Election polls have been found to play a smaller role in other countries (Beckers, 2020; Brookes et al., 2004). However, similar tendencies regarding the (lack of) methodological transparency in poll reporting have been found across political and media systems (e.g., Bhatti & Pedersen, 2016; Oleskog Tryggvason & Strömbäck, 2018; Vögele & Bachl, 2019).

The general lack of methodological information in election poll reporting might have several implications. In the light of decreased trust in the mainstream news media and increased levels of perceived media bias by members of the public (Gallup, 2020), news media not being transparent when reporting polls might increase these perceptions among the audience. Methodological caveats might make people more aware of the uncertainty related to poll reports and take this into account. Furthermore, extant research already found poll reports to influence people's perceptions, attitudes and sometimes even (voting) intentions and behavior (Hardmeier, 2008; Moy & Rinke, 2012), so we know poll reports are not without consequences, even when they are diffuse (Daschmann, 2000). A side-note has to be made, though: even if news outlets would provide greater context and methodological information, this would not automatically result in a better public understanding. Audiences may not possess the cognitive tools or motivation to process stories that offer a lot of

methodological details, which could reduce audience recall of specific poll outcomes (Wichmann, 2010).

The challenge for journalists is thus to guide their audiences through the poll results and help audiences to interpret them. Simple mentions of the fact that the results are within the margin of error or about the representativeness of the survey, for instance, might be a good starting point. Pollsters, for their part, could increase their efforts to educate journalists about methodological details and uncertainty in the provided results. In races in which the election outcomes are close—as was the case for many states in the 2020 US general election—, this might be particularly important.

### References

- Aalberg, T., Strömbäck, J., & De Vreese, C. H. (2012). The framing of politics as strategy and game: A review of concepts, operationalizations and key findings. *Journalism*, 13(2), 162-178. doi: 10.1177/1464884911427799
- Andersen, R. (2000). Reporting public opinion polls: The media and the 1997 Canadian election. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 12(3), 285-298. doi: 10.1093/ijpor/12.3.000285
- BBC. (2019). *Guidance: Opinion polls, surveys, questionnaires, votes and 'straw polls'*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/editorialguidelines/guidance/surveys>.
- Beckers, K. (2020). The Voice of the People in the News: A Content Analysis of Public Opinion Displays in Routine and Election News. *Journalism Studies*, 21(15), 2078-2095. doi: 10.1080/1461670X.2020.1809498
- Beckers, K., Walgrave, S., Wolf, H. V., Lamot, K., & Van Aelst, P. (2021). Right-wing bias in journalists' perceptions of public opinion. *Journalism Practice*, 15(2), 243-258. doi: 10.1080/17512786.2019.1703788
- Bhatti, Y., & Pedersen, R. T. (2016). News reporting of opinion polls: Journalism and statistical noise. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 28(1), 129-141. doi: 10.1093/ijpor/edv008
- Brettschneider, F. (2008a). Horse race coverage. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. doi: 10.1002/9781405186407.wbiech022
- Brettschneider, F. (2008b). The news media's use of opinion polls. In W. Donsbach & M. W. Traugott (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of public opinion research* (pp. 479-486). London: Sage.

- Brookes, R., Lewis, J., & Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2004). The media representation of public opinion: British television news coverage of the 2001 general election. *Media, Culture & Society*, 26(1), 63-80. doi: 10.1177/0163443704039493
- Cushion, S., & Thomas, R. (2018). *Reporting Elections: Rethinking the Logic of Campaign Coverage*. London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Daschmann, G. (2000). Vox pop & polls: The impact of poll results and voter statements in the media on the perception of a climate of opinion. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 12(2), 160-181. doi: 10.1093/ijpor/12.2.160
- ESOMAR/WAPOR. (2020). ESOMAR/WAPOR guideline on opinion polls and published surveys. Retrieved from <https://www.esomar.org/what-we-do/code-guidelines/esomarwapor-guideline-on-opinion-polls-and-published-surveys>
- Gallup, K. F. (2020). *American Views 2020: Trust, Media and Democracy. A Deepening Divide*. Retrieved from <https://knightfoundation.org/wpcontent/uploads/2020/08/American-Views-2020-Trust-Media-and-Democracy.pdf>
- Hardmeier, S. (1999). Political poll reporting in Swiss print media: Analysis and suggestions for quality improvement. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 11(3), 257-274. doi: 10.1093/ijpor/11.3.257
- Hardmeier, S. (2008). The effects of published polls on citizens. In W. Donsbach & M. W. Traugott (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of public opinion research* (pp. 504-513). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Jurkowitz, M., Mitchell, A., Shearer, E., & Walker, M. (2020). Democrats report much higher levels of trust in a number of news sources than Republicans. Retrieved from <https://www.journalism.org/2020/01/24/democrats-report-much-higher-levels-of-trust-in-a-number-of-news-sources-than-republicans/>



- Kennedy, C. (2018). Can we still trust polls? *Pew Research Cente*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/05/14/can-we-still-trust-polls/>
- King, E., & Schudson, M. (1995). The press and the illusion of public opinion: The strange case of Ronald Reagan's "popularity. In T. L. Glasser & C. T. Salmon (Eds.), *Public opinion and the communication of consent* (pp. 132-155). New York: Guilford.
- Lewis, J., Inthorn, S., & Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2005). *Citizens or consumers? What the media tell us about political participation*. London: McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Montanaro, D. (2020). The most consequential election in a lifetime (And this time they mean it). *NPR*. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2020/11/02/930077437/the-most-consequential-election-in-a-lifetime-and-this-time-they-mean-it?t=1612543628675>
- Moy, P., & Rinke, E. M. (2012). Attitudinal and behavioral consequences of published opinion polls. In C. Holtz-Bacha & J. Strömbäck (Eds.), *Opinion polls and the media: Reflecting and shaping public opinion* (pp. 225-245). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Oleskog Tryggvason, P., & Strömbäck, J. (2018). Fact or fiction? Investigating the quality of opinion poll coverage and its antecedents. *Journalism Studies*, 19(14), 2148-2167. doi: 10.1080/1461670X.2017.1330665
- Pew Research Center. (2018). Americans still prefer watching to reading the news – and mostly still through television. Retrieved from <https://www.journalism.org/2018/12/03/americans-still-prefer-watching-to-reading-the-news-and-mostly-still-through-television/>
- Pew Research Center. (2019). State of the news media: Network news fact sheet. Retrieved from <https://www.journalism.org/fact-sheet/network-news/>
- Rosenstiel, T. (2005). Political polling and the new media culture: A case of more being less. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 69(5), 698-715. doi: 10.1093/poq/nfi062

- Searles, K., Ginn, M. H., & Nickens, J. (2016). For Whom the Poll Airs. Comparing Poll Results to Television Poll Coverage. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 80(4), 943-963. doi: 10.1093/poq/nfw031
- Stromback, J. (2012). The media and their use of opinion polls: Reflecting and shaping public opinion. In C. Holtz-Bacha & J. Strömbäck (Eds.), *Opinion polls and the media: Reflecting and shaping public opinion* (pp. 1–23). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Szwed, R. (2011). Printmedia poll reporting in Poland: Poll as news in Polish parliamentary campaigns, 1991–2007. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 44(1), 63-72. doi: 10.1016/j.postcomstud.2011.01.001
- Turcotte, J., Medenilla, K., Villaseñor, K., & Lampwalla, S. (2017). All the polling (data) that's fit to print? An analysis of online news coverage of 2016 primary polls. *Communication Research Reports*, 34(3), 191-200. doi: 10.1080/08824096.2017.1282856
- Vögele, C., & Bachl, M. (2019). The quality of public opinion poll coverage in german national newspapers during federal election campaigns. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. doi: 10.1093/ijpor/edz024
- Welch, R. L. (2002). Polls, polls, and more polls: An evaluation of how public opinion polls are reported in newspapers. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 7(1), 102-114. doi: 10.1177/1081180X0200700107
- Wichmann, W. (2010). Too many technical details hinder recall of poll results. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 31(3), 36-49. doi: 10.1177/073953291003100304