

Constructing a Comprehensive Coverage Criterion of Indian States and Union Territories News

UMESH ARYA

Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, India

The study posits a twelve pronged formulation of indices to measure the over coverage and under coverage of the Indian states and union territories by newspapers on socio-economic, demographical and political aspects. Union territories (UT), mainly Delhi and Chandigarh were unjustifiably favoured on all twelve counts which clearly points out media's biased leanings to cater to the regional aspirations and preference to the power center. Northern states were most favourably covered and the coverage reduced with increasing distance of the state from the power center i.e., the capital of India whereas north eastern states suffered severe coverage blackout. Quantitative and spatial indices were developed to see news coverage in a new perspective.

Keywords: Indian states, union territories, press coverage, media research

India is the biggest democracies in the world which has a unique culture and is one of the oldest and greatest civilizations of the world (Publication, 2010). It is federal in character, like most democracies. Such administrative division, which was effected on the basis of languages spoken in India, has some bearings on its socio-cultural and political fabric which, in turn, affects their media coverage (Arya, 2011a). It is a sovereign, socialist secular democratic republic with a parliamentary system of government which is federal in structure with certain unitary features (India, 2008). It has a unique blend of traditionality and modernity. It is also known as "*Bharat*" and it is a union of twenty nine states and seven union territories (Constitution of India, 2011). It has 640 districts, 5,924 sub-districts, 7,935 towns and 6,40,867 villages (Census post, 2011). A state is defined as politically organized body of people usually occupying a definite territory; especially one that is sovereign (State, 2011). The centrally administered territories are called union territories (Constitution, 2011). There are three pillars of the constitution: executive, legislative and judiciary. The press has the coveted place of serving as the fourth pillar which helps to strengthen the democratic fabric. Very soon, a fifth pillar may solidify the structure of the constitution in the form of "citizen journalism" (Arya, 2008b).

In January 2011, India assumed a nonpermanent seat in the UN Security Council for the 2011-12 term (Central Intelligence Agency, 2011) which reflects its growing clout on world's stage and imminent superpower. Indian press is regarded as the 'free press' and it

Correspondence to: Umesh Arya, Chairman, Department of Advertising Management & Public Relations, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar-125 001, Haryana, India. E-mail: umesharya1973@gmail.com

derives its freedom of expression enshrined in the fundamental rights under article 19 (b) of the Constitution. Freedom of speech and expression includes right to impart and receive information which includes freedom to hold opinions” (Union of India, 2002). But sometimes this right is exercised in a partisan manner by the media. There seems to be a relation between the health of the democracy and the media coverage. The Indian Supreme Court observed “One-sided information, dis-information, mis-information and non-information, all equally create an uninformed citizenry which makes democracy a farce (ibid). The media’s role as the agent of development and purveyor of knowledge are widely acknowledged.

The media is an important source of information and exposure to new ways of thinking and doing things (Kishore & Gupta, 2009). Various media accomplishes several tasks, using influence to shape perceptions or opinions, persuasion to convince audiences that certain messages are true, straight information delivery that directly affects attitudes. (Perse, 2001) Ideally, the media should serve as purveyors of egoless egalitarianism and modesty and strive to engender a “saner” national discourse (Dwivedi, 2007). But this idea does not hold good from the perspective of plurality. We seem to be painting a jaundiced view of society, which is already marred by innumerable fissures and sociopolitical divides (ibid). Daniel Learner (1958), in his book *The Passing of the Traditional Society*, mentions that there is a strong correlation between the indices of the mass media and the socio-economic and political development of a nation. Hence it is appropriate to map the coverage patterns in the above mention area.

Literature Review

The coverage aspect of the states has not been studied so extensively in media research. Not much literature is available on the representation of states in the Indian news media. However, a few studies relevant within the adopted framework are mentioned in this study. A content analysis by Whitney et al. (1989) of 5,190 network evening news stories appearing between May 1982 and April 1984 revealed two sorts of biases: (i) Geographical bias, whereby some geographical areas receive far more news coverage than is due to them on the basis of their population density; and (ii) Source bias, showing that governmental agencies and major institutions, particularly the business and major political parties, are the most frequent sources of news. Dominic (1977), in his study on the amount of network news time devoted to various states, reported that the ‘attention index’ showed ‘over coverage’ and ‘under coverage’ for some states in the United States. Arya (2008b) developed the economic attention index (EAI) to assess the coverage of the Indian states and union territories’ news in English dailies and concluded that a positive correlation existed between the GDP of the states and UTs and the percentage of their news coverage. He argued that the coverage of Indian states and UTs in the news media varied not only in terms of their economic status but also in those of their political consciousness and their proximity to the power center (ibid).

Arya (2011a) developed the coverage parity index (CPI) by subtracting the percentage of news coverage from the space coverage, density attention index (DAI) by subtracting the density percentage of each state from its news coverage and the political attention index (PAI) by subtracting the share (in percentage) of a state or UT in parliament

seat(s) from the percentage of state and UT's coverage. News coverage clearly reflects the media's grossly unbalanced representation, highlighting some states disproportionately and neglecting others partially or totally (*ibid*).

On the similar lines Arya (2011) developed geographical attention index (GAI), literacy attention index (LAI), voters' attention index (VAI) and state legislative attention index (SLAI). He found that all states, except the northern states, lost heavily on the above four indices and the loss exceeded as the state moved away from the 'power center' and the 'place of publishing', the capital of India. UTs emerged as clear gainer with tremendous over coverage. Arya (2011) developed quantitative and spatial versions of human development attention index (HDAI), media exposure attention index (MEAI) and income attention index (IAI) by subtracting their proportionate scores from the per cent coverage received in frequency and space aspects. Madhya Pradesh got the honour of being the only state to be grossly over covered quantitatively whereas Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh got their highest places in spatial category. UTs were showered with stupendous over coverage on all counts.

The Study

The scientific research studies on media coverage of geographical entities like states and UTs are relatively unknown phenomenon. The study borrows heavily from Daniel Learner (1958) and amplification effect of media. Learner mentions that there is a strong correlation between the indices of the mass media and the socio-economic and political development of a nation. Watson (1998) discusses amplification effect of media which says that by giving intensive coverage to certain stories and issues, their importance is amplified. The overall coverage intensity of northern, central, southern and north eastern states would project a region wise status of coverage in order to represent the data in a more comprehensive and lucid way. Various indices represent an individual and cumulative news coverage criterion on every possible dimension which deserve the media attention. All the indices' quantitative and spatial variants would highlight the frequency coverage and the given space respectively. Correlation between all the indices reflect a kind of association, positive or negative and forms an idea about the concentration of coverage parameters. The study was necessitated in view of the lack of body of literature on the coverage aspect of administrative units i.e. states and UTs. The present study illuminates the full spectrum of factors which deserve to be counted in order to estimate the over coverage and the under coverage.

Objectives

The overall objective of the study was to measure the quantum of over coverage and under coverage of all Indian states and union territories on various socio-political and economic parameters. Following are specific objectives posed to guide the study.

- (i) What are the region-wise over coverage and under coverage of northern, central, southern and north eastern states on all twelve indices
- (ii) What are the composite over coverage and under coverage of states and UTs on all indices
- (iii) What are the statistical correlation between all the indices

Theoretical Framework

The framework of this study is based on the agenda setting theory (Shaw & McCombs, 1977) and the attention index (Dominic, 1977). The agenda setting theory states that the mass news media have a large influence on the audience by their choice of what stories to be considered newsworthy and how much prominence and space be allocated to them. The theory then leads us to classification, where the agenda can be of two types: the first being public agenda, which consists of issues that are relevant to the large population or public; and the other being policy agenda, which consists of issues that are important from policymakers' point of view. Two more components of the theory further guiding the study such as (i) Public agenda: issues discussed and personally relevant to members of the public; and (ii) Policy agenda: issues that policymakers (legislators) consider important.

The attention index was developed by Dominic (1977) to measure television news coverage allocation to the different states in the United States of America. Each state's relative news time was compared to its population and an 'attention index' was created by subtracting the ratio of each state's population to the national population from its percentage of news coverage. Dominic's framework underpins various indices developed out of this study. As discussed earlier, Whitney et al. (1989) argument of geographical biases also support the framework partially. (Media Asia, 2011)

Methodology

The researcher employed quantitative content analysis to fulfill the objectives. Content analysis may be defined as a methodology by which the researcher seeks to determine the manifest content of the written, spoken or published communications by a systematic, objective and quantitative analysis (Zito, 1975: 27). As it is clear from the definition, this process is basically descriptive and certain well-defined textual codes or elements are teased out by measuring the occurring frequency.

Selection of newspapers : The three highest circulated and read English dailies, *The Times of India* (TOI), *The Hindu* and *Hindustan Times* (HT), were selected for the study. TOI has a circulation of 11,02,521 and a readership of 7.4 million, *The Hindu* has an 11,68,042 circulation and 4.05 million readership, and HT has a circulation of 11,03,644 and a readership of 3.85 million. These are the three largest nationally circulated and read English newspapers.

Reference period: The study's reference period was the months of July, August and September 2007. This period was chosen in view of the non-occurrence of any special event like elections and major sports event, which would have adversely affected the sample's quality.

Sample selection: Newspaper content analysis results based on a 12-day sample would be quite similar to those available from a sample of more than 12 days (Ahmed, 1996, quoted in Bansal, 2002). Accordingly, a random sample of 36 editions out of 273 editions of newspapers were taken, which resulted in the collection of 1,243 observations. The rationale behind the sample selection is supported by the fact mentioned by Dominick and Wimmer (1994: 170) that the number of dates should be a function of the incidence of the phenomenon in question. More the occurrence less the sample size and vice versa. The newspapers' special pages on regions and states were taken as the universe. The unit of analysis was a single news item from these pages.

Operationalising variables: Human development index is defined as the measurement of development by combining indicators of life expectancy, educational attainment and income into a composite index (Human Development Reports, 2011). Media exposure is defined as the percentage of people in exposed to the media (National Family Health Survey III, 2006). Per capita income was computed by dividing the total income with population size. The quantitative coverage parity index (CPI) was developed by subtracting the per cent share of news coverage from the per cent space coverage (Arya, 2011a). Apart from mapping the coverage intensity on above 4 indices, a comprehensive list of 8 more indices¹, thus totalling 12, were drawn by subtracting the concerned parameter's proportionate share from percentage news share.

Area attention index (AAI) = percentage coverage – states proportionate geographical area, literacy attention index (LAI) = percentage coverage – proportionate literates in states, voters attention index (VAI) = percentage coverage – proportionate voters in states, population attention index (PAI) = percentage coverage – proportionate population, economic attention index (EAI) = percentage coverage – proportionate GDP, human development attention index (HDAI) = percentage coverage – proportionate HDI score, media exposure attention index (MEAI) = percentage coverage – proportionate MEAI score, income attention index (IAI) = percentage coverage – proportionate per capita income, density attention index (DAI) = percentage coverage – proportionate population density of area, legislative attention index (LAI) = percentage coverage – proportionate assembly seats of states and political attention index (PAI) = percentage coverage – proportionate parliamentary seats . Quantitative attention indices were developed by subtracting index's parameter's proportionate per cent values of from percentage news coverage. Similarly, spatial attention indices were developed by subtracting the individual index's parameter's proportionate per cent values from percentage space coverage.

Statistical methods: The data was subjected to the frequency and percentage analysis along with the Pearson correlation in Excel Stat software between all eleven indices.

Findings and Discussion

A hypothetical scale ranging from 0 to 6 points has been devised in order to better understand and standardise the under coverage and over coverage phenomenon on a common platform. The states having score of 6 or more are categorised as 'grossly covered', between 3 to 6 as 'mildly over covered', between 0.5 to 3 as 'feebly over covered' and between 0 to ± 0.5 (zero) as flatly covered. Those under zero had similar classification in negatives. The positive and negative scores indicate over coverage and under coverage respectively.

Region-wise score: For arriving at a snapshot of the region wise over coverage or under coverage (Table 1), four categories of the states were formed (i) *northern states:* Haryana, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand; (ii) *North eastern states:* Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland and Tripura, including Sikkim as eighth one; (iii) *Central states:* Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Orissa, Bihar, Jharkhand and West Bengal; and (iv) *Southern states:* Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Goa, Kerala, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu. Union territories gained the lion's share i.e. highest CPI (138 per cent), though central states got slightly more (150

per cent) but with unequal values, which translates into less number of news items and correspondingly more space in column centimeters. Southern states followed the scene with exactly equal CPI (flatly covered) which in turn was trailed by north eastern states (-2.64 per cent), central states (-22.5 per cent) and loss making northern states (-44 per cent). Quantitatively, biggest over covered were northern states (27 per cent) with central and southern states extremely heavily under covered (-143 per cent and -112 per cent respectively) and huge loss to north eastern states (-102 per cent). Biggest spatial over coverage went to northern states (13 per cent) and central states (7 per cent) and rest of the states got a raw deal pioneered by north eastern states (-104 per cent) and highest negative spatial penchant for southern states (-113 per cent). Northern states emerged as overall gainer on both counts whereas north eastern states were overall losers.

Northern states: Northern region got extremely high quantitative over coverage on density attention index (21.5 per cent), human development attention index and income attention index (8 per cent each) and mild over coverage on economic attention index (5.6 per cent) and media exposure attention index (4 per cent) and as shown in (Table 2A),. Feebly over coverage was on legislative attention index (3 per cent). The indices' spatial versions had negative under coverage with the only exception for legislative attention index (18 per cent), human development index (4.07 per cent) and income attention index (0.58 per cent) (Table 2B). The states suffered gross under coverage for area attention index (-9.6 per cent), population attention index (-7.4 per cent) and literacy attention index and voters' attention index (-6.5 per cent each). Thus the aggregate coverage parity index for was in positive (22.5 per cent) for spatial category which simply means northern states got 22.5 per cent space over quantity.

Central states: The coverage picture was not rosy for central states on both, quantitative and spatial aspects (Table 3A). The states gained extensive over coverage only on quantitative density attention index (7.5 per cent) and flat on income attention index and almost flat (0.10 per cent) on income attention index. All states lost heavily with gross under coverage on population attention index (-18.2 per cent), area attention index (-15.48 per cent) followed by almost similar gross under coverage for, literacy attention index (-17.24 per cent), political attention index and voters attention index (average - 16.64 per cent), area attention index (-15.5 per cent) and legislative attention index (-14 per cent). The states spatially gained mildly (1.5 per cent) only on density attention index whereas the spatial coverage versions of indices proved costly for central states to the tune of -24 per cent for population attention index, average near about -23 per cent for literacy attention index and voters attention index, political attention index and legislative attention index (Table 3B). Media exposure attention index suffered grossly with -10 per cent, human development attention index and income attention index lost grossly with -9 per cent and mildly with -6 per cent share respectively. Here, the central states were over covered only on 1 index both quantitatively and spatially through weighing heavily for the former.

Southern states: These states were grossly over covered with equal quantitative and spatial scores (9.70 per cent) for density attention index only whereas coverage on all other indices ended up in red (Table 4A). Southern states had the uniqueness of having nearly equal or

largely identical values of quantitative and spatial versions vis-a-vis other states. Maximum quantitative coverage loss accrued to the economic attention index (-23.47 per cent) followed by political attention index, literacy attention index and voters attention index (average -15.20 per cent each), legislative attention index (12 per cent), population attention index (-13.6 per cent) and area attention index (-11.21 per cent). The states lost least on media exposure attention index (-7.56 per cent) and income attention index (-6.17 per cent). Same coverage scene was visible for the spatial indices which exactly tread the quantitative line. Hence only one index carried positives (Table 4B).

North eastern states: All seven sister states plus Sikkim proved to be unluckiest with negatives for all indices and for both versions (Table 5 A). Media exposure attention index and human development attention index turned out to be costliest coverage propositions (-28 per cent and -25 per cent respectively). Economic attention index, literacy attention index and voters' attention index saw minimum coverage loss with (-1 per cent, 2.8 per cent and 2.6 per cent). The study also found no significant difference existed between the values of quantitative and spatial indices (Table 5 B).

Coverage of all Indices

All these eleven indices tend to represent the whole gamut of coverage parameters which are based on different rationale which justify media coverage expectations by the states. It shows that northern states snatched the biggest quantitative gross coverage pie lead by Haryana (59 per cent), Uttar Pradesh (12.53 per cent) and Jammu & Kashmir (8.67 per cent). The only exception was a central state Madhya Pradesh with second highest over coverage (56 per cent). Mildly over covered were also the northern states of Uttarakhand and Rajasthan with 5.4 per cent share each. Only one southern state Kerala was feebly over covered (1.31 per cent). No state was flatly covered quantitatively on all eleven indices. Quantitative scores were quite surprisingly as 20 out of 28 states showed gross under coverage by unusually high margins like West Bengal (-52 per cent), Gujarat (-38 per cent), Maharashtra (-32 per cent); Orissa (-28 per cent); Assam and Karnataka (-24 per cent each); Tamil Nadu (22 per cent); Andhra Pradesh and Bihar (-19.54 per cent each); Jharkhand and Punjab (-17.9 per cent); Chhattisgarh, Manipur, Mizoram and Tripura (average -12.8 per cent); Nagaland and Himachal Pradesh (11 per cent each); Goa (-16 per cent); Arunachal Pradesh (-13.35 per cent); Meghalaya (-9.86 per cent); and Sikkim (-6.89 per cent). No state was mildly or feebly over covered.

All states benefitted in space wise coverage scenario with a leading pack of six states cornering stupendous gross over coverage chunks lead by West Bengal (50 per cent) and trailed faintly by Uttarakhand and Bihar (36 per cent each), Rajasthan (23 per cent), Haryana and Jharkhand (20 per cent each). Like quantitative version, here also 19 out of 28 states were in the red zone of gross under coverage by unusually high margins lead by Gujarat (-36 per cent), Andhra Pradesh and Orissa (31.3 per cent each), Tamil Nadu (-26 per cent), Assam (-24 per cent), Punjab (-22 per cent), Karnataka (19 per cent), Goa and Maharashtra (18.3 per cent each), Himachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Arunachal Pradesh and Tripura (-13.35 per cent each), Madhya Pradesh, Manipur and Mizoram (12.26 per cent each), Meghalaya and Nagaland (-10.7 per cent each). Sikkim lost by least margin (-8 per cent).

From CPI point of view, West Bengal (96 per cent) and Bihar (80 per cent) got topmost rank in securing more space to less number of news items whereas this was just opposite in case of Madhya Pradesh (-69 per cent) and Haryana (-40 per cent) which means quantitative coverage exceeded very much out of proportion than the spatial one. All north eastern states other than Sikkim and Tripura got zero value which means a perfect harmony between news quantity and space. Further elaboration revealed positives on Uttarakhand (57 per cent), Jharkhand (43 per cent), Rajasthan (18 per cent), Maharashtra (14 per cent) Karnataka (5 per cent) and Gujarat (2.40 per cent) which effectively means that only 8 out of 28 states reported over spacing for news that too by astronomically high magnitude. Fifteen states showed reddish CPI values mainly Andhra Pradesh (-12 per cent), Uttar Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir (average -8.34 per cent), Tamil Nadu and Punjab (-4.38 per cent), Goa and Himachal Pradesh (average -1.86 per cent), Sikkim, Kerala and Orissa (-1.20 per cent each), Meghalaya, Tripura and Chhattisgarh (-0.72 per cent).

Quantitative correlations between different indices

Pearson's correlation revealed a highly strong positive correlation between human development attention index and media exposure attention index (0.99), density attention index (0.92) and income attention index (0.90) as seen in Table 6. Media exposure attention index was correlated to income attention index (0.90) and density attention index (0.93). Income attention index was correlated with density attention index (0.83). Similarly, literacy attention index was positively correlated to population attention index (0.99), political attention index (0.98), legislative attention index (0.85) and economic attention index (0.82). Area attention index was positively correlated with legislative attention index (0.56), economic attention index (.55), literacy attention index (0.43) and population attention index (0.42). Voters' attention index had a mild positive correlation with legislative attention index and economic attention index (0.45 each). Population attention index had correlation with only one index i.e., economic attention index (0.74). The correlation phenomenon suggests a strong relationship between the particular indices and the nature of relationship is beyond the scope of this study.

Spatial correlations between different indices

Table 7 shows that the spatial correlation phenomenon had 18 instances of negative correlations and 16 instances of positive ones. Strong positive correlation existed between population attention index and literacy attention index (0.98), political attention index (0.97), legislative attention index (0.79) and economic attention index (0.65) whereas it was negatively correlated with human development attention index (-0.37), media exposure attention index (-0.37), income attention index (-0.38) and density attention index (-0.15). Similarly, economic attention index was correlated to literacy attention index (0.75), political attention index (0.69) and legislative attention index (0.65). On the flip side, negative correlation existed between economic attention index and human development attention index (-0.17), media exposure attention index (-0.15) and density attention index (-0.11). Human development attention index was found to be strongly positively correlated with media exposure attention index (0.98), density attention index (0.92), income attention index (0.87) and negatively correlated with literacy attention index (-0.33), political attention index (-0.20) and area attention index (-0.11). Media exposure attention index had positives with income attention

index (0.86) and density attention index (0.89) and negatives with literacy attention index (-0.34) and political attention index (-0.20). Area attention index didn't have any positive correlation with any index but only negatives for density attention index (-0.19) and income attention index (-0.11). Legislative attention index was correlated to political attention index (0.87) whereas income attention index had strong positives for density attention index (0.78). Hence it can be inferred that the spatial versions had more uneven correlations vis-a-vis quantitative which indicates a kind of coverage uniformity for the latter.

Conclusion

The national media coverage scene acts like a stage for the states where agenda is set in the readers' mind. It is the duty of the public relations officers of the governments concerned to project their side of the imagery before external and internal publics. However, many-a-times media's agenda takes its own course independent of the attempted versions by the government mouthpiece. Ideally, the media should serve as purveyors of egoless egalitarianism and modesty and strive to engender a "saner" national discourse (Dwivedi, 2007). But media's subliminal coverage proclivities combined with regional coverage obligations paint a different picture.

The eleven pronged coverage measurement approach along with the twelfth CPI encapsulates the complete coverage compendium in order to arrive at a mapping of states and UTs position based on every possible indicator of socio economic, demographical and political aspects. UTs, mainly Delhi and Chandigarh were unjustifiably favoured on all twelve counts which clearly points out media's biased leanings to cater to the regional aspirations and 'preference to the power center. This phenomenon is further supported by the exceptional positive gross quantitative and spatial over coverage to all indices of the northern states mainly lead by Haryana and Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. Maximum number i.e. eight instances of over coverage on different indices occurred in the northern states which is a highly favourable treatment by all measurement standards.

Central states were accorded the coveted treatment positive CPI which translates into the 'detailed news' in contrast to the northern states where quantity of the news item was more than the corresponding amount of space. The quantitative legislative attention index was found to be most positively related to maximum number of other indices which again indicates the importance of the limelight and highlight which the states deserve in the media reportage. However, the spatial scene was fragmented where population attention index was having maximum correlations than other indices. The rate of coverage fall was directly proportional to the distance from the power center i.e. New Delhi. The states farthest from the national capital suffered coverage loss and this is true for all the states namely central, southern and north eastern states. Even the UTs other than northern Chandigarh and New Delhi were not covered at all which conclusively points out towards the 'concentrated coverage culture' and 'power center' proposition.

North eastern states were nearly blacked out, some totally and others partially, from the Indian media coverage scene. Though a few states like Assam, Manipur, Sikkim etc received some coverage but that too was totally negatively skewed focusing on terrorism, separatism, bomb blasts, blockades and military interventions. This selective and biased coverage is projecting the all seven sister states in poor light before the rest of the India and

vice versa which is not in alignment the spirit of the constitution. The findings are in concurrence with Whitney et al. (1989). In a nutshell, this overall media performance undermines the role of media as the purveyor of knowledge, awareness and education thus ensuring an egalitarian society. More such studies are recommended to uncover the further deeper roots of media bias to standardize the process of media coverage.

Note

¹ Coverage parity index was excluded from the overall score due to its nature of being an outlier parameter.

References

- Ahmed, A. (1996). Quoted by Bansal, K. (2002). International news coverage in four Indian newspapers: A content analysis study. *Media Asia* 29(3), 31–40.
- Arya, U. (2011a). Uneven Cultivation of states and union territories' news coverage on Indian print media landscape. *Media Asia*, 38(2), 98-109.
- Arya, U. (2008b). Economics dictating representation: news coverage of states and union territories in Indian print media. *Media Asia*, 35(4), 250–258.
- Background note (2007), Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/3454.htm>.
- Constitution of India (2011), Retrieved from http://india.gov.in/govt/constitutions_india.php
- Census post (2011). Govt of India. Retrieved from <http://censusindia.gov.in/>
- Central Intelligence Agency (2011). The World fact book. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/in.html>
- Dominick, R., & Wimmer, D. (1994). Mass media research: An introduction. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Dwivedi, M. (2007). The media charade: “We” are also part of the world simulacra. *Communication Today*, 10(3), 1–7
- India (2008). A reference manual. Retrieved from www.publicationsdivision.nic.in/others/india_2008.pdf
- Kishore, S., & Gupta, K. (2009). Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in India. Retrieved from http://www.nfhsindia.org/a_subject_report_gender_for_website.pdf.
- Lerner, D. (1958). The passing of traditional society, modernizing the Middle East. New York: Free Press.
- Perse (2001). Quoted by Mosebach, J. I., & University of Nevada, R. J. (2007). A content analysis of gender differences in newspaper book reviews: University of Nevada, Reno.
- Publication Division. (2010). *India 2010: A Reference Annual*. Retrieved from www.publicationsdivision.nic.in/others/india_2010.pdf.
- Whitney, F., Jones M., & Rakow (1989). Geographic and source biases in network television news 1982– 1984. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 33(2), 159–174.
- Watson, J. (1998). Media communication: an introduction to theory and process, St. Martin's Press.
- Shaw, D., & McCombs, M. (1977). The emergence of American political issues. St. Paul, MN: West Group.
- State (2011). Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/bps/dictionary?query=state>
- Union of India (2002). Union of India. Retrieved 17 November, 2011 from <http://www.rishabhdara.com/sc/view.php?case=18061>
- Zito, G. (1975). Methodology and meanings: varieties of sociological inquiry. New York: Praeger. 1. Author biodata (2-3 lines)

Table 1. Region wise compendium

States	Total quantitative index value (A)	Total spatial index value (B)	Coverage parity index (B-A)
Northern states	27.01	49.50	-22.48
North Eastern states	-101.70	-104.34	-2.64
Central states	-142.81	71.4	149.94
Southern states	-112.47	-112.99	-0.72
Union Territories	267.87	405.91	138.04

Northern States - Table 2 A Quantitative

State	% Coverage	% Spatial coverage	Population attention index	Economic attention index	Area attention index - AAI	Literacy attention index - LAI	Voters attention index - VAI	Legislative attention index - LAI	Human development attention index - HDAI	Media exposure -attention index - MEI	Income attention index	Density attention index	Political attention index
Haryana	7.6	4.31	5.55	4.45	6.26	5.43	5.92	5.42	4.45	4.15	2.59	6.12	5.7
Himachal Pradesh	0.6	0.44	0.01	-0.12	-1.09	-0.06	-0.03	-1.05	-2.67	-3.35	-2.84	0.27	-0.29
Jammu and Kashmir	2.8	2.09	1.82	2.06	-3.96	1.87	1.87	0.69	-0.09	-1.22	0.73	2.66	1.53
Punjab	1.1	0.76	-1.27	-2.49	-0.43	-1.34	-1.26	-1.74	-2.17	-3.04	-2.70	-0.4	-1.44
Rajasthan	5.1	6.61	-0.4	0.12	-5.31	0.09	-0.04	0.25	2.45	2.24	3.16	3.62	0.66
Uttarakhand	3.4	2.45	1.62	1.66	0.82	1.55	-13.98	0.75	0.81	-0.31	-0.41	2.91	1.43
Uttar Pradesh	8.5	7.82	-7.07	-0.62	1.20	-6.71	7.68	-1.28	5.91	5.45	7.12	6.36	-5.59
Total	29.1	24.48	-4.34	5.06	-2.52	0.84	0.13	3.03	8.69	3.92	7.65	21.54	2

Northern States - Table 2 B Spatial

State	% Coverage	% Spatial coverage	Population attention index	Economic attention index	Area attention index - AAI	Literacy attention index - LAI	Voters attention index - VAI	Legislative attention index - LAI	Human development attention index - HDAI	Media exposure -attention index - MEI	Income attention index	Density attention index	Political attention index
Haryana	7.6	4.31	2.26	1.16	2.97	2.14	2.63	2.13	1.16	0.86	-0.70	2.83	2.41
Himachal Pradesh	0.6	0.44	-0.15	-0.28	-1.25	-0.22	-0.21	-1.21	-2.83	-3.51	-3.00	0.11	-0.45
Jammu and Kashmir	2.8	2.09	1.11	1.35	-4.67	1.16	1.16	-0.02	-0.8	-1.93	0.02	1.95	0.82
Punjab	1.1	0.76	-1.61	-2.83	-0.77	-1.68	-1.60	-2.08	-2.51	-3.38	-3.04	-0.74	-1.78
Rajasthan	5.1	6.61	1.11	1.63	-3.80	1.60	1.47	1.76	3.96	3.75	4.67	5.13	2.17
Uttarakhand	3.4	2.45	-1.78	-1.74	-2.58	-1.85	-17.38	-2.65	-0.14	-1.26	-3.81	2.91	2.38
Uttar Pradesh	8.5	7.82	-0.35	1.3	0.52	7.39	7.00	1.96	5.23	4.77	6.44	5.68	-6.27
Total	29.1	24.48	-7.41	-2.01	-9.59	-6.23	-6.94	-4.04	4.07	-0.7	0.58	17.87	-0.72

Central States - Table 3 A Quantitative

State	% Coverage	% Spatial coverage	Population attention index	Economic attention index	Area attention index - AAI	Literacy attention index - LAI	Voters attention index - VAI	Legislative attention index - LAI	Human development attention index - HDI	Media exposure attention index - MEI	Income attention index	Density attention index	Political attention index
Chattisgarh	1	0.94	-1.02	-0.53	-3.11	-1.00	-1.16	-1.18	-1.69	-1.86	-0.73	0.53	-1.03
Gujarat	1	1.2	-3.93	-6.54	-4.96	-4.39	-4.23	-3.42	-2.11	-2.69	-2.92	0.2	-3.7
Madhya Pradesh	9.1	3.36	3.22	4.65	-0.27	3.47	4.02	3.52	6.51	6.22	6.62	8.49	4.02
Bihar	2.7	2.22	-5.85	-0.56	-0.64	-4.77	-5.37	-3.68	0.22	0.03	1.31	-0.04	-4.41
Jharkhand	0.7	0.68	-1.94	-1.22	-1.74	-1.73	-1.82	-1.29	-2.11	-1.59	-2.36	-0.35	-1.84
West Bengal	1.7	1.94	-5.87	-6.65	-0.76	-6.10	-5.38	-5.20	-1.45	-1.59	-0.78	-1.11	-5.66
Orissa	0.5	0.4	-3.07	-1.79	-4.24	-2.98	-3.30	-3.07	-2.13	-2.71	-1.50	-0.23	-3.69
Total	16.7	10.74	-18.2	-12.38	-15.48	-17.24	-16.99	-14.05	-2.76	-4.19	-0.10	7.49	-16.31

Central States - Table 3 B Spatial

State	% Coverage	% Spatial coverage	Population attention index	Economic attention index	Area attention index - AAI	Literacy attention index - LAI	Voters attention index - VAI	Legislative attention index - LAI	Human development attention index - HDI	Media exposure attention index - MEI	Income attention index	Density attention index	Political attention index
Chattisgarh	1	0.94	-1.08	-0.59	-3.17	-1.06	-1.22	-1.24	-1.75	-1.92	-0.79	0.47	-1.09
Gujarat	1	1.2	-3.73	-6.34	-4.76	-4.19	-4.03	-3.22	-1.91	-2.49	-2.72	0.4	-3.5
Madhya Pradesh	9.1	3.36	-2.52	-1.09	-6.01	-2.27	-1.72	-2.22	0.77	0.48	0.88	2.75	-1.72
Bihar	2.7	2.22	-8.55	-3.26	-3.34	-7.47	-8.07	-6.38	-0.26	-0.45	-1.39	-0.04	-4.41
Jharkhand	0.7	0.68	-2.64	-1.92	-2.44	-2.43	-2.52	-1.99	-2.13	-1.61	-3.06	-0.35	-1.84
West Bengal	1.7	1.94	-7.57	-8.35	-2.46	-7.80	-7.08	-6.90	-1.21	-1.35	-2.48	-1.11	-5.66
Orissa	0.5	0.4	-3.17	-1.89	-4.34	-3.08	-3.40	-3.17	-2.23	-2.81	-1.60	-0.33	-3.79
Total	16.7	10.74	-24.16	-18.34	-21.44	-23.20	-22.95	-20.01	-8.72	-10.15	-6.06	1.53	-22.27

State	% Coverage	% Spatial coverage	Population attention index	Economic attention index	Area attention index - AAI	Literacy attention index - LAI	Voters attention index - VAI	Legislative attention index - LAI	development attention index - HDAI	Media exposure attention index - MEI	Income attention index	Density attention index	Political attention index
Andhra Pradesh	4	3.03	-3.37	-4.12	-4.37	-2.61	-4.18	-3.14	1.13	-0.1	1.08	3.14	-3.61
Goa	0.3	0.15	0.17	0	0.19	0.15	0.16	-0.67	-3.44	-4.1	-7.93	-0.83	-0.08
Karnataka	2.4	2.83	-2.73	-3.94	-3.43	-2.87	-3.28	-3.04	-0.65	-1.58	-1.18	1.54	-2.68
Kerala	3.2	3.1	0.1	-0.46	2.02	-0.43	0.15	-0.20	-0.54	-1.25	1.65	0.65	-0.48
Maharashtra	4.7	3.82	-4.72	-10.46	-4.66	-5.90	-5.43	-2.29	1.32	0.8	0.50		
Tamil Nadu	3	2.61	-3.05	-4.49	-0.96	-3.73	-2.74	-2.68	-0.26	-1.33	-0.30	1.51	-4.23
Total	17.6	17.54	-13.6	-23.47	-11.21	-15.39	-15.32	-12.01	-2.44	-7.56	-6.17	9.73	-14.88

State	% Coverage	% Spatial coverage	Population attention index	Economic attention index	Area attention index - AAI	Literacy attention index - LAI	Voters attention index - VAI	Legislative attention index - LAI	development attention index - HDAI	Media exposure attention index - MEI	Income attention index	Density attention index	Political attention index
Andhra Pradesh	4	3.03	-4.34	-5.09	-5.34	-3.58	-5.15	-4.11	0.16	-1.07	0.11	2.17	-4.58
Goa	0.3	0.15	0.02	-0.15	0.04	0.00	0.01	-0.82	-3.59	-4.25	-8.08	-0.98	-0.23
Karnataka	2.4	2.83	-2.3	-3.51	-3.00	-2.44	-2.85	-2.61	-0.22	-1.15	-0.75	1.97	-2.25
Kerala	3.2	3.1	0	-0.56	1.92	-0.53	0.05	-0.30	-0.64	-1.15	1.55	0.55	-0.58
Maharashtra	4.7	3.82	-3.6	-9.34	-3.54	-4.78	-4.31	-1.17	2.44	1.92	1.62	4.84	-2.68
Tamil Nadu	3	2.61	-3.44	-4.88	-1.35	-4.12	-3.13	-3.07	-0.65	-1.72	-0.69	1.12	-4.62
Total	17.6	17.54	-13.66	-23.53	-11.27	-15.45	-15.38	-12.07	-2.5	-7.62	-6.23	9.67	-14.94

North Eastern states - Table 5 A Quantitative

State	% Coverage	% Spatial coverage	Population attention index	Economic attention index	Area attention index - AAI	Literacy attention index - LAI	Voters attention index - VAI	Legislative attention index - LAI	development attention index - HD/AI	Media exposure attention index - MEI	Income attention index	Density attention index	Political attention index
Arunachal Pradesh	0	0	-0.11	0	-2.55	-0.10	-0.11	-1.46	-3.17	-3.24	-2.35	0	-0.38
Assam	0.2	0.2	-2.39	-1.38	-2.19	-2.31	-2.28	-2.86	-2.71	-3.09	-1.64	-0.85	-2.46
Manipur	0.1	0.1	-0.13	-0.06	-0.58	-0.14	-0.14	-1.36	-3.34	-4.3	-1.55	-0.2	-0.28
Meghalaya	0.2	0.16	-0.02	-0.02	-0.48	-0.03	0.02	-1.26	-2.88	-2.85	-2.08	-0.12	-0.18
Mizoram	0	0	-0.9	0	-0.64	-0.11	-0.09	-0.97	-3.37	-4.24	-2.35	0	-0.25
Nagaland	0	0	-0.16	0	-0.50	-0.17	-0.18	-1.46	-3.43	-3.26	-1.79	0	-0.25
Sikkim	0.4	0.3	0.35	0.341	0.18	0.34	0.36	-0.38	-2.86	-3.17	-2.47	0.17	0.15
Tripura	0.1	0.02	-0.21	0.1	-0.22	-0.26	-0.19	-1.36	-3.15	-3.61	-2.37	-0.84	-0.28
Total	1	0.78	-3.57	-1.02	-6.98	-2.79	-2.61	-11.09	-24.91	-27.76	-16.60	-1.84	-3.93

North eastern states - Table 5 B Spatial

State	% Coverage	% Spatial coverage	Population attention index	Economic attention index	Area attention index - AAI	Literacy attention index - LAI	Voters attention index - VAI	Legislative attention index - LAI	development attention index - HD/AI	Media exposure attention index - MEI	Income attention index	Density attention index	Political attention index
Arunachal Pradesh	0	0	-0.11	0	-2.55	-0.10	-0.11	-1.46	-3.17	-3.24	-2.35	0	-0.38
Assam	0.2	0.2	-2.39	-1.38	-2.19	-2.31	-2.28	-2.86	-2.71	-3.09	-1.64	-0.85	-2.46
Manipur	0.1	0.1	-0.13	-0.06	-0.58	-0.14	-0.14	-1.36	-3.34	-4.3	-1.55	-0.2	-0.28
Meghalaya	0.2	0.16	-0.06	-0.06	-0.52	-0.07	-0.02	-1.30	-2.92	-2.89	-2.12	-0.16	-0.22
Mizoram	0	0	-0.9	0	-0.64	-0.11	-0.09	-0.97	-3.37	-4.24	-2.35	0	-0.25
Nagaland	0	0	-0.16	0	-0.50	-0.17	-0.18	-1.46	-3.43	-3.26	-1.79	0	-0.25
Sikkim	0.4	0.3	0.25	0.241	0.08	0.24	0.26	-0.48	-2.96	-3.27	-2.57	0.07	0.05
Tripura	0.1	0.02	-0.29	0.02	-0.30	-0.34	-0.27	-1.44	-3.23	-3.69	-2.45	-0.92	-0.36
Total	1	0.78	-3.79	-1.24	-7.20	-3.01	-2.83	-11.31	-25.13	-27.98	-16.82	-2.06	-4.15

Table 6. Quantitative correlation matrix (between indices)

	AAI	LAI	VAI	LAI	PAI	EAI	HDAI	MEAI	IAI	DAI	PAI
AAI	1.000										
LAI	.438	1.000									
VAI	.321	.283	1.000								
LAI	.558	.856	.452	1.000							
PAI	.425	.988	.242	.839	1.000						
EAI	.550	.826	.454	.778	.748	1.000					
HDAI	.208	.072	.310	.495	.023	.203	1.000				
MEAI	.220	.068	.344	.496	.016	.219	.988	1.000			
IAI	.154	.005	.309	.376	-.054	.232	.903	.901	1.000		
DAI	.186	.245	.379	.628	.212	.283	.949	.928	.835	1.000	
PAI	.450	.978	.318	.911	.976	.787	.174	.177	.087	.350	1.000

Table 7. Spatial correlation matrix (between indices)

	AAI	LAI	VAI	LAI	PAI	EAI	HDAI	MEAI	IAI	DAI	PAI
AAI	1.000										
LAI	.648	1.000									
VAI	-.370	-.172	1.000								
LAI	-.377	-.146	.982	1.000							
PAI	.247	.365	-.116	-.097	1.000						
EAI	.984	.750	-.338	-.340	.244	1.000					
HDAI	.075	.316	.121	.168	.172	.111	1.000				
MEAI	.789	.649	.177	.183	.364	.797	.297	1.000			
IAI	-.382	-.055	.870	.867	-.109	-.336	.157	.084	1.000		
DAI	-.151	-.110	.922	.890	-.195	-.138	.196	.353	.778	1.000	
PAI	.970	.689	-.209	-.200	.253	.970	.149	.876	-.240	.004	1.000

Dr. Umesh Arya is an associate professor in the Department of Advertising Management and Public Relations at Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar-125 001, Haryana, India. His research interest include computer mediated communication, ICT-related issues and corpus linguistics.