

Agenda Setting Media Effects and Political Persuasion in Western Democracies

Jianing Lu^{*}

Christ's Hospital School, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 0LJ

^{*}Corresponding Author: amy.lu7268@outlook.com

Abstract

This critical review examines the extent to which agenda setting and selected media-effect theories can explain political persuasion in Western democracies, with particular attention to the United States. It synthesizes foundational work on agenda setting, agenda building, strategic public relations, emotional mediation, and the spiral of silence. The evidence supports a qualified conclusion. Political actors, interest groups, and media organisations can influence which issues receive sustained attention and how those issues are interpreted. Agenda setting is therefore relevant to political persuasion, especially when institutional access, professional communication resources, and emotionally salient frames reinforce one another. However, the evidence does not justify the stronger claim that a single Western media system uniformly controls public opinion. Media systems are plural, audiences are selective, and digital platforms enable both elite amplification and counter-agendas. The review argues that agenda-setting theory is most useful when treated as a framework for studying uneven influence over issue salience rather than as proof of direct manipulation. It concludes that critical media literacy and transparent political communication are important safeguards, while future research should examine how platform recommendation systems redistribute agenda-setting power.

Key words

agenda setting, political communication, media effects, propaganda, public opinion

1. Introduction

Political communication takes place in an environment where attention is scarce. Governments, political parties, advocacy organisations, journalists, and platform operators cannot make every issue equally visible. Their choices about topic selection, repetition, sources, and

framing influence the public agenda: the set of issues that citizens and decision-makers regard as important. This review asks to what extent agenda-setting and related media-effect theories help explain political persuasion in Western democracies. It focuses on the United States because much of the foundational literature and many widely discussed cases emerge from that context.

The question requires caution. Agenda setting does not state that media actors can dictate citizens' beliefs. The classic formulation is narrower: sustained media emphasis can influence perceived issue importance [1]. Nor should the term propaganda be used as a synonym for all political communication. In this paper, it refers to purposive communication that seeks to shape political attitudes or behaviour through selective emphasis, framing, and distribution. The purpose is not to portray Western media as a single coordinated actor, but to evaluate how specific mechanisms can concentrate influence under identifiable conditions.

The paper proceeds as a critical narrative review. It first establishes the conceptual distinction between agenda setting, agenda building, and framing. It then assesses the evidence for emotional mediation and the spiral of silence, before considering how institutional resources and media diversity qualify claims about political control. The final section identifies implications for democratic debate and research on algorithmically curated platforms.

2. Conceptual Framework and Evidence Base

Agenda-setting research began with the observation that patterns of media attention can be associated with the public's ranking of issue importance. McCombs and Shaw's study of the 1968 United States presidential election linked voters perceived key issues to the content

emphasis of campaign news [1]. The theory is concerned with issue salience, often summarized as an influence on what people think about, rather than a direct determination of what they think. Subsequent work has examined how this effect varies across topics, audiences, and media environments.

Agenda building moves one stage earlier. It asks how an issue reaches the media or policy agenda in the first place. Cobb and Elder argue that access to institutions, organisational capacity, and conflict strategies affect the movement of issues from private concerns to public and governmental attention [2]. This perspective is particularly relevant to political persuasion because it highlights unequal resources. Actors with professional communication teams, policy networks, or established credibility are more likely to obtain sustained visibility than dispersed groups with limited access.

Media effects are also shaped by presentation. Miller's experiment suggests that emotional reactions may mediate the relationship between issue coverage and perceived importance [4]. The spiral-of-silence account adds a social dimension: people who believe that their view is unpopular may withhold it to avoid isolation, which can make a perceived majority appear stronger than it is [5]. These mechanisms are analytically distinct. Agenda setting concerns prominence; emotional framing concerns interpretive cues and affect; the spiral of silence concerns the willingness to speak. Together, they offer a more precise account of how political messages may acquire influence.

Table 1 Evidence base and analytical contribution

Source	Contribution	Key limitation
Agenda setting [1]	Establishes the relationship between media emphasis and perceived issue salience.	The original study predates fragmented digital media.
Agenda building [2]	Explains how organised actors and institutions influence which issues acquire policy attention.	It is a framework for analysing power, not proof of uniform control.
Public relations [3]	Shows how strategic communication can alter the visibility and tone of international news coverage.	Evidence is historical and based on a single newspaper.
Emotional effects [4]	Demonstrates that affect can mediate agenda-setting effects.	The experiment cannot represent every political issue or audience.
Spiral of silence [5]	Accounts for self-censorship where people perceive their view as socially isolated.	The mechanism is contingent on context and perceived opinion climates.

This evidence base supports neither a claim of universal manipulation nor a claim that media influence is insignificant. Most cited studies specify particular settings, media outlets, or experimental designs. A rigorous interpretation must preserve those boundaries. The strength of the literature lies in identifying plausible mechanisms; its limitation is that mechanisms do not operate with the same intensity across all countries, elections, topics, or audiences.

3. Review Method and Analytical Boundaries

The study uses a critical narrative review rather than an original quantitative test. The material was selected to represent five linked strands of research: the agenda-setting tradition, agenda building, strategic public relations, affective mediation, and the spiral of silence. Foundational studies were retained because they define the mechanisms under examination. They were read alongside more recent discussion of digital political communication in order to assess what may have changed in the movement from a broadcast-centred to a platform-centred information environment.

The analysis applies three questions to each source. Firstly, what form of influence is identified: issue prominence, evaluative framing, access to media attention, or willingness to express an opinion? Secondly, what is the unit of analysis: news content, public perceptions, institutional actors, or social interaction? Thirdly, what limits the inference? A study of one election, outlet, or experiment can identify a mechanism but cannot demonstrate that every Western society operates in the same way. This procedure is intended to prevent theoretical claims from becoming broader than their supporting evidence.

The term Western democracies are therefore used as a broad comparative label, not as a claim of institutional uniformity. The United States receives most attention because it is central to the cited literature and has a highly visible relationship among campaigning, lobbying, professional public relations, and commercial media. The review does not measure whether any individual statement is true or false, and it does not infer a hidden coordinated plan from the existence of common media frames. Its purpose is to explain how recurring

structural conditions can make some political messages more visible and persuasive than others.

4. Agenda Building and Strategic Political Communication

Political actors do not enter the public sphere with equal opportunities. Agenda building explains why some issues are repeatedly available for journalistic coverage while others remain marginal. A well-resourced campaign or interest group can commission research, stage events, provide expert spokespeople, and supply newsworthy material. These activities do not guarantee favorable coverage, but they increase the likelihood that an issue is defined, sourced, and timed in ways that fit established media routines. The relevant political effect is therefore often indirect: organized actors shape the supply of communicable events and arguments from which media agendas are constructed.

Manheim and Albritton's analysis of international public relations provides a useful illustration. Examining New York Times coverage of countries using United States public-relations firms, they found that strategic public relations were associated with changes in coverage and tone [3]. The study does not show that public relations companies controlled the press, nor can a historical analysis of one newspaper be treated as a general model of contemporary digital media. Nevertheless, it demonstrates that political communication resources can alter the visibility and evaluative context surrounding an issue.

The same logic appears in domestic politics. Lobbying, party communication, and issue advocacy can promote certain policy problems as urgent, feasible, or nationally symbolic. Security, immigration, taxation, and welfare can each become highly salient when political actors connect them to values such as safety, fairness, economic competence, or national identity. Yet salience is not simply imposed from above. Journalists use independent news judgments; opposition groups contest dominant narratives; and citizens may reject, reinterpret, or ignore the messages they encounter. Agenda building should therefore be understood as competition over access and emphasis rather than as a one-directional chain of command.

5. Illustrative Political Contexts

Election campaigns make the relationship between agenda building and agenda setting especially visible. Candidates need to persuade voters that their preferred issues deserve priority. They do so through speeches, debates, advertising, policy announcements, and responses to events. Media organisations then select which claims to repeat, fact-check, contrast, or place alongside other concerns. A message may fail to gain traction if it lacks a credible source, a recognisable conflict, or a connection to events that audiences already regard as important. Conversely, a message can gain visibility when it is supported by institutional authority, an established party network, or a stream of vivid examples.

Immigration and national security are often used to illustrate this process because both topics can be narrated through highly salient frames of risk, control, economic pressure, humanitarian duty, or national identity. The same underlying event can consequently be understood in different ways. A security-focused account may emphasise borders and threat; a humanitarian account may emphasise vulnerability and legal responsibility; an economic account may emphasise labour markets and public services. The agenda-setting question is not which frame is automatically correct, but which frame receives repeated visibility, which sources are treated as authoritative, and which policy options become thinkable as a result.

Digital activism provides an important counterexample to a purely elite-driven account. Hashtag campaigns and networked advocacy can bring experiences ignored by traditional gatekeepers into public discussion. The online mobilization around Ferguson and Black Lives Matter demonstrates how connected publics can circulate evidence, organise attention, and connect online discussion to offline action [7]. Yet counter-agendas remain vulnerable to platform moderation, uneven visibility, misinformation, and the need for sustained organisational capacity. Their existence changes the distribution of agenda-setting power; it does not remove competition over whose messages are amplified.

These contexts also show why political persuasion cannot be reduced to message exposure. The persuasive force of an issue depends on its relationship to lived ex-

perience, social identity, party cues, trust in institutions, and the availability of alternative explanations. Agenda-setting theory is most useful as one part of a broader model of political communication. It identifies the struggle over attention that occurs before citizens make up their minds, while other theories are needed to explain belief formation, policy preferences, and actual voting behaviour.

6. Emotional Framing and the Perceived Opinion Climate

The political significance of an agenda is affected by how it is framed. A topic presented through threat, loss, conflict, or moral urgency can prompt stronger emotional engagement than the same topic presented as a technical policy question. Miller's work indicates that emotion can help explain why media emphasis changes judgments of issue importance [4]. For political communicators, this creates an incentive to use memorable examples, visual imagery, and language that makes a distant issue feel immediate. Such strategies can support democratic mobilization, but they can also simplify complex choices and privilege high-arousal messages over careful comparison of evidence.

The spiral of silence provides a related explanation for why apparent consensus may become politically consequential. When people perceive their opinions as socially isolated, they may remain silent rather than risk disapproval [5]. Repetition of a particular frame across high-visibility outlets can contribute to this perception, particularly where alternative views receive less prominence or are represented as deviant. This does not mean that dissent has disappeared; it means that people may misjudge the distribution of opinion. Contemporary social media complicate the mechanism because users can find supportive communities quickly, but platform visibility and harassment risks may also intensify perceived opinion climates.

It is important not to confuse emotionally framed communication with evidence of propaganda in every case. Political debates often involve genuine risks and morally consequential choices. The analytical question is whether framing is proportionate to the evidence, whether competing interpretations remain accessible, and whether the message is designed to inform deliber-

ation or to close it. This distinction allows the theory to be used critically without assuming that all persuasive communication is illegitimate.

7. Limits to Claims of Media Control

The literature supports a qualified account of influence, not a claim that Western publics are passively controlled. Firstly, Western media systems contain commercial, public-service, partisan, local, and transnational outlets that frequently disagree. Secondly, audiences select sources through prior beliefs, social networks, and practical attention constraints. Thirdly, digital platforms enable rapid counter-agendas, including activist campaigns and citizen journalism. These features can disrupt elite narratives, even when their effects are uneven and short-lived.

The historical scope of several foundational studies also matters. Studies based on legacy newspapers or broadcast environments cannot be transferred without adjustment to a platform ecosystem in which ranking, recommendation, and sharing influence what becomes visible. Digital systems may decentralize agenda setting by lowering entry barriers, while simultaneously re-centralizing it through platform design and data-driven amplification. The appropriate contemporary question is therefore not whether traditional media still monopolise attention, but how agenda-setting power is distributed among political elites, news organisations, online communities, and platforms.

A further limitation concerns evidence quality. The original project drew on some secondary commentary and news material alongside scholarly work. This revised review gives greater weight to peer-reviewed and foundational sources, and treats media examples as illustrative rather than conclusive. Stronger future research would compare issues across multiple countries and platforms, combine content analysis with audience data, and test whether exposure produces durable changes in political judgement rather than short-term salience alone.

8. Implications for Democratic Practice and Research

The review has practical implications for citizens, journalists, and political institutions. Citizens need to distinguish issue salience from issue importance: a subject that receives constant attention may be urgent, but its visibility can also reflect strategic communication, news values, or platform incentives. Comparing coverage across outlets, checking the origin of claims, and asking which voices are absent can reduce the risk of treating a prominent narrative as the only available account. These habits do not require mistrust of all media; they require an awareness that every information environment contains choices about emphasis and representation.

For journalists and editors, the relevant responsibility is not to eliminate framing, which is impossible, but to make framing more transparent. News organisations can contextualise emotionally charged claims, disclose the interests of campaign sources, seek evidence that challenges dominant storylines, and distinguish reporting from political advocacy. Professional standards of verification remain especially important where an issue has high emotional intensity. Such practices do not make journalism politically neutral in an absolute sense, but they can widen the range of accessible interpretations and strengthen public deliberation.

Future research should connect content, platform, and audience evidence. Cross-national designs could compare whether similar issues become salient under different media systems. Longitudinal studies could assess whether a short-term increase in salience produces enduring changes in policy priorities or voting behaviour. Platform research should examine how recommendation systems rank political content, whether those rankings reproduce established inequalities in voice, and how users perceive the resulting opinion climate. These questions are essential because contemporary agenda setting increasingly occurs through an interaction between institutions, media professionals, and automated systems rather than through any one actor alone.

9. Conclusion

Agenda-setting and media-effect theories offer a

useful explanation of how political persuasion can occur without direct censorship or explicit instruction. Agenda building helps explain why powerful actors obtain access to public attention; agenda setting explains how repeated emphasis can raise perceived issue importance; emotional framing can intensify engagement; and the spiral of silence can affect willingness to express minority views. Taken together, these mechanisms show why political communication is not a neutral distribution of information.

However, the extent of this influence should not be overstated. The reviewed evidence does not establish a uniform Western propaganda system or a public that simply absorbs elite messages. Media pluralism, audience agency, institutional contestation, and digital counter-publics impose meaningful constraints. The most defensible conclusion is that political actors can shape the conditions of public attention, especially when resources and emotional frames align, but they cannot fully determine public belief. Critical media literacy, source transparency, and continued research into platform recommendation systems are therefore central to evaluating political persuasion in contemporary democracies.

References

- [1] McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176-187. <https://doi.org/10.1086/267990>
- [2] Cobb, R. W., & Elder, C. D. (1971). The politics of agenda-building: An alternative perspective for modern democratic theory. *The Journal of Politics*, 33(4), 892-915. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2128415>
- [3] Manheim, J. B., & Albritton, R. B. (1984). Changing national images: International public relations and media agenda setting. *American Political Science Review*, 78(3), 641-657. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1961834>
- [4] Miller, J. M. (2007). Examining the mediators of agenda setting: A new experimental paradigm reveals the role of emotions. *Political Psychology*, 28(6), 689-717. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2007.00598.x>
- [5] Noelle-Neumann, E. (1974). The spiral of silence: A theory of public opinion. *Journal of Communication*, 24(2), 43-51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1974.tb00367.x>
- [6] Jowett, G. S., & O'Donnell, V. (2019). *Propaganda and persuasion* (7th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [7] Freelon, D., McIlwain, C. D., & Clark, M. D. (2016). Beyond the hashtags: #Ferguson, #BlackLivesMatter, and the online struggle for offline justice. Center for Media & Social Impact, American University.