

- 5 Twenty-three articles were coded as citing none of the 29 theories. We looked more closely at these articles to see why. Three main reasons they did not fall into the coding scheme became evident: First, some of the articles fell into different fields or utilized theories from fields other than communications; second, several of the articles were based on other types of communication that did not fall within the purview of the study, such as interpersonal or organizational communication; third, a few of the articles were descriptive in nature and did not employ any of the theories in our coding scheme. More specifically, 10 articles were related to other fields, mostly political science and social psychology, 9 articles were other types of communication, and 4 articles were descriptive. An example of the latter is an article by Tankard and Ryan (1974), which involved interviewing scientists for the accuracy of science stories in the news.
- 6 Four of the theories (disposition theory, hegemony, social construction of reality, and ELM) were dropped at the outset because they rarely appeared in the data set, therefore having very low variance. HCI was also dropped, in keeping with the other analyses.
- 7 We saw excellent fit measures, based on Kruskal's stress (formula 1) and R^2 ; however, the fit measures were probably inflated (i.e., low stress and high R^2) because, with five variables, there were few variables in relation to the two dimensions. On the other hand, achieving appropriate results only requires more variables than dimensions, a criterion our analysis met, and thus we have confidence in our solution, despite lacking fit measures.