

By the People

— Becoming Informed

Citizens are not just required to participate or to exercise choice, they must also do so in an informed way. How can they be responsible citizens if they do not know the issues, if they do not know the differences between the candidates? Is it irresponsible to vote based on personality without any consideration for what candidates will do? This point of view sees making an informed choice about issues, policy positions and their consequences, as a necessary part of citizenship. Citizens have an obligation to become informed before they vote or participate. Only then will democracy produce a meaningful expression of the “will of the people.”

Americans currently score pretty low on levels of political knowledge, as demonstrated by many studies. In a 2007 study by the Pew Research Center, for example, only 49% could correctly identify Nancy Pelosi as the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and only 37% knew that the current Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is a conservative. 45% were unable to correctly identify the approximate number of American military personnel killed so far in Iraq.

The media are often blamed for the lack of political knowledge among American citizens. American television news programs – especially local TV news, which is watched by

more people than watch the network newscasts – tend to focus on stories that are dramatic or sensational in order to appeal to a wider audience. Political stories are considered boring and garner little media attention. During major political campaigns, when it is harder to ignore politics completely, the media tend to focus on superficial topics such as the horse race (who’s ahead, who’s behind) and candidates’ personal lives (will a candidate’s husband or wife hurt or help their chances?). There is very little in-depth coverage of issues or candidates’ positions on them. Other countries place stricter public interest demands on television networks that use the public airwaves, and consequently have higher levels of political coverage. Some argue that one way to increase levels of political

information among citizens is to increase the public interest obligations of broadcasters. For example, many countries require their broadcasters to devote a minimum percentage of their airtime to public affairs programming, or to provide coverage of minority as well as majority viewpoints on political issues.

Because American campaigns are conducted almost entirely through the media, candidates are also very dependent on TV commercials to




attract voters. Some argue that a 30-second TV spot is hardly an ideal format for candidates to share information about their policy positions. Instead, candidates aim to come up with ads that either attract voters through basic appeals (creating an image as a “family man,” for example) or that try to turn off an opponent’s supporters through the use of negative tactics (“my opponent is untrustworthy”). While these ads may provide some information, they fail to address the policy issues at hand. In many other democracies, candidates are given blocks of free airtime on television. This allows for presentations that focus on the issues than can be crammed into a 30-second slot, proponents say. It allows candidates to cover serious topics that are regarded as too boring by the news media.

Other people argue that the reason for low levels of political knowledge might not be the supply of information, but rather with unequal opportunities for citizens to take advantage of it.

These people note that there are differences between citizens with high levels of knowledge and those with low levels of knowledge. For example, wealthier people tend to be considerably more informed than poor people. One contributing factor to this might be that poor people are less likely to have internet access; 76% of people with an income over \$75,000 have a broadband connection at home,

while only 30% of those with an income under \$30,000 have one. There is now a huge quantity of political information available on the web (candidate websites listing issue positions and providing text of speeches, for example), but this is of no use to people who do not have internet access. One way to reduce the inequality of information between wealthy and poor people would be to provide all citizens with easy access to the internet.

Reformers have suggested that we need to find new ways of engaging all citizens and helping them learn about politics. One proposal is to



provide public funding for **non-partisan** voter information groups who aim to help voters become informed. There are, for example, organizations that gather information about candidates' issue positions, voting records, campaign financing, interest group support, and/or public statements. This information is in many cases made available on the web. Some organizations even offer a toll free phone number that citizens can call to get information about the candidates in their area. Providing public funding for these and other civic education initiatives would allow such efforts to become more widespread and to come up with

Non-Partisan: not associated with any political party

novel ways to share information with citizens.

There are others who argue that Americans' low levels of political knowledge don't matter and that voters can still make good decisions without having to learn in-depth about the candidates and their issue positions. These people argue that citizens can successfully approximate their "correct" voting decisions (i.e., the decisions they would take if they were fully informed) by using shortcuts; voters can rely on a candidate's party identification and on endorsements by public officials they trust, for example. In this view, citizens have plenty of information to make the correct voting decisions without ever needing to know who the Speaker of the House is.

Discussion Questions

- What sources do you use to get news about current events? How reliable do you think they are?
- What do you think about political advertisements? Do you think they help people make informed political decisions?
- Do you think it is necessary to know a politician's view on every issue in order to make an informed vote, or could you decide based on other factors? What would they be?

 **Some Proposals:**

Fill in the chart below with arguments for and against the following proposals

	Approaches: Becoming Informed	
	Arguments for	Arguments against
Increase opportunities for citizens to become informed by increasing public interest requirements of broadcasters.		
Increase the opportunities for citizens to become informed by providing free air time to candidates		
Decrease the gap in political knowledge between wealthy and poor people by using public funding to make sure that all citizens have access to the internet.		
Provide public funding for non-partisan civic education groups that gather relevant political information and make it available to the citizens who need it.		
It is not necessary to increase opportunities for citizens to become informed.		



This background was prepared for *By the People* by the Center for Deliberative Democracy. BTP is partnering with the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation on the *Dialogue in Democracy* project. Ongoing BTP project funding partners include the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.



© 2007 MacNeil/Lehrer Productions. All rights reserved. Any publication or use of this material without the express permission of MacNeil/Lehrer Productions is strictly prohibited.