of several commercial surveys to assess the impact of print, broadcast, and Internet exposure on political engagement. It is original empirical research that bridges the differential media exposure theory (systematically comparing self-reports on media use with levels of knowledge and political opinions) with the evolving theories about new media, notably the Internet. It is a model of theoretically grounded integrative research. Most of the 200 articles in our data set cited two, or perhaps three, specifically named theories.[5] Shah et al. (2001) are the most expansive; they cite eight.

What the subsample allows us to examine, however, not otherwise available in the raw SSCI master data set, is the structure of cocitation. Are the six clusters of theories intellectually coherent? One principal empirical test here is to compare the average within-cluster pattern of cocitation with the average across-cluster cocitation (is an article in one cluster more likely to cite another theory from the same cluster than any other?).

The answer, as reported in Table 2, is yes, modestly so. We can see that some clusters are much more bibliometrically coherent than others. The interpretive effects cluster is the clearest case of internal coherence with dramatically higher average internal compared with external correlation coefficients. The societal and media theory cluster simply does not hang together—it is our conceptual grouping, and we will show shortly it has unique structural relationships with other clusters; but the scholarship included together here generally does not see itself as part of a whole. Critical scholars analyzing hegemonic structures are not particularly likely to cite McLuhan or his intellectual successors or to cite cultivation theory or vice versa. The other clusters show moderate coherence. The Shannon and Lasswell traditions overlap within the persuasion cluster, the others within that cluster appear not to. Within the active audience, there is evidence of clustering with the notable exception of the more psychologically oriented theories, such as attribution, cognitive dissonance, and the elaboration likelihood model. The weak patterning of clustering (with the exception of the interpretive effects cluster) is not surprising. Our argument has been that the intellectual linkages between these theoretical perspectives have only been fitfully acknowledged by the practitioners and largely missed by historians of the field.