Abstract

Performance of a subject has been argued to be an influencing quotient in the discourse of perception. However, these defining variables, despite agreed roles and influences, were found out in this study to have correlated effects and relationships at different levels and dyadic nature on the frame of perception. These influences and roles were seen after a test of three hypotheses which varied media coverage, awareness and performance as the dependent variables against ‘perception’ using the Pearson ‘r’ on a sample of 130 drawn on a quota and purposive basis to be positively correlated, linear and strong. The study thus proposes the model of perceptual equilibrium as a base to manage the level of intervening influences among the frames discussed.

The defining frames inherent in the discourse of perception have had cause to be varied at one point or the other in terms of influences and roles. Among these frames are the elements of media coverage, awareness level and performance of the subject. The intensity of media coverage for instance is likely to contour the perceptual map of the preceptor; while awareness level is seen to have defining roles. Consequent on the above, there is the need to fashion the defining points. This piece thus takes a holistic approach to the discourse of perception and how the defining frames contrive to influence or decipher the nature of perception based on empirical data.

Review of Basic Concepts

Perception according to Fill (2006, p.122) is “concerned with how individuals see and make sense of their environment. It is all about the selection, organization and interpretation of stimuli by individuals so that they can understand the world”. The individual perceptual map is flooded with stimuli, some dominant and others less dominant, but he needs the process of selecting, organizing and interpreting to track and make effective use of these stimuli and accord meaning to them. The essence of selection is for attention to be given to the stimuli; this is complemented by a process of organizing them into a comprehensible unit for meaning to be ascribed to them and then, these are interpreted with burgeoning influences from attitudes, values, motives and past experiences as well as the character of the stimuli.
Perception is equally subjective, oftentimes idiosyncratic and peculiaristic. Hence, whatever colourations are ascribed to a subject as emanating from the perceptions of people would be adjudged to have the same values that tie on the needs, expectations, past experiences and attitudes of the study focus. But then, wrong perceptions or miscomprehensions might occur and are typically done in what Shimp (2000, p.139) describes as “without conscious awareness”. It is fitting to draw on the work of Carr (1979, p.25) which advances three (3) basic characteristics that help in distinguishing perception. First, it is selective as it has to do with people’s personal needs, motives, interests, beliefs and leaning as people rely on evidences of past experience to give credence to what they support or reject. Next are the socio-cultural affinity and environmental factors; and then the influence by six things in the environment. These are changes, reputation, intensity, contrast, novelty and distraction. Giles and Powersland (1995) added the fourth and fifth characteristics. They assert that perception is active and not fixated because it is capable of being modified at any point in time on the basis of newer information released from any medium and conviction, forcing the perceiver to evaluate his/her position, opinion, meanings and interpretations. The last characteristic is the relativity of the concept of perception to objects, events, issue, situations etc. Accordingly, Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1992, p.64) conclude that perception is influenced by three sets of determinants. These are physical stimuli falling upon the eyes, ear, nose, and skin of the perceiver; the psychological state of the perceiver and the physiological equipment of the organism. Perception, therefore, gives the basic framework for interpreting experiences, and the environment play significant roles.

This perceptual process follows from stimuli to attention, interpretation to cognition, while Batra, Meyers and Aaker (1996, p.220) suggest that the major determinants of the process are intensity, size, message, novelty, position and context when in the stimulus condition. Information-needs, attitudes, values, interest, confidence, social context and cognitive style are all holed up in the audience schemata.

**Media Coverage, Attention and Awareness**

Relative to this study, media coverage implies the rate and volume of information carried by any of the categories of the mass media and other forms of media. Adequate media coverage refers to giving at least a positive mention of the subject in the media on a daily basis and should be rated from good to excellent. This frame is hedged against the back drop that frequency of reportage/coverage of a subject, prominence as well as degree of conflict generated in the reports are likely to make people think about it more than they ordinarily would have done (Folarin, 1998, p.65). Basically, it is within the purview of attention and awareness as intensity of media coverage is likely to influence the kind of attention paid to the media content on the one hand and the degree of awareness.

The need to make sense out of experiences prompts Folarin (1998, p.63) to subsume that perception depends on:

A complex of variables such as psychological disposition, past experiences, cultural expectations and social relationships. All these in conjunction with language constraints and the ‘limited experience factor’ result in the selective perception process, which takes place in a ‘stop-gate’ fashion with selective exposure, attention and retention. In other words, you have to be exposed to a message before you can attend to it, you have to pay attention before you can perceive the message, and you have to perceive it before you can retain it for later recall.

The substance of Folarin’s (1998) analysis is rooted in the fact that at whatever position in the stop-gate-latch of the ‘selectivities’, some variables conspire at even and uneven scales to influence the level of exposure, attention, perception and retention. Several decimators tend to either positively or
negatively circumscribe our perceptual processes. Very germane to this study is the issue of selective perception.

Several stimuli strive for attention of the individual. Studies by De Chernatony (1993), Lasn (1999) and Dahl, Frankenberger and Manchanda (2003) suggest that consumers of stimuli are exposed to 550 advertisements, 3,000 advertisements and 3,500 advertisements daily in that order. Despite the saturation of the stimuli spectrum, ‘attention’ becomes the determining factor in the interaction. In relations to this, Fill (2006, p.123) states that attention can come through “intensity and size, position, contrast, novelty, repetition and movement”. Others are sexual attraction, expectations to be met, needs and motives of the individuals. Hence when these are cocooned, the level of dissonance is reduced and perception is high; but when there are less attention, then the level of dissonance is high and perception of the stimuli is low.

Determinants and Barriers Relative to Perception

Three obstacles present themselves in slowing the perceptual train. These are cognitive consistency impetus, advertising clutters and selective attention with cognitive responses sealing it up as well as conspiring to reduce the efficiency of the process. All these draw on the mental model. The perceiver is a social being and cannot be isolated from the psychology of the social mechanism that defines his environment or behaviour. The consumer should not be seen as purely utilitarian, overtly rational, but should be viewed as a subjective whole whose decision making process and perceptual frames are harped majorly by certain contravening variables very complex to define.

Culture is another determinant of perception. Gamble and Gamble (2002, p.86) stress this fact by advancing that “whether we are judging beauty, describing snow, or evaluating a child’s behaviour, our culture influences our assessment of reality” as individuals from “different cultures are simply trained to regard same cues differently”, giving interpretation to stimuli through the cultural lens. Gender has its own role to play.

Another argument by Schul and Vinokur (2000) is hinged on the various kinds of information entered into our memory for recall purposes. Whatever impressions we have will depend, to a greater degree on our own characteristics as we end up seeing others (organizations) through the lens of our own traits, motives and desires. There are several other barriers to perception identified by Gamble and Gamble (2002, p.90-99). These are perceptual sets; selective exposures; selective perception and closure; first impressions; stereotypes; prejudices; allness; blinding and inferences. Following closely to first impression is stereotypes. Gamble and Gamble (2002, p.94) see it as “a generalization about people, places or events held by many members of a society”. Stereotypes are double edged. Stereotypes produce prejudice which is a biased, negative attitude towards a stimulus; a sort of negative prejudgment. Allness as a barrier is that an individual could know all that there is to know about anything, while blinding involves unconsciously adding restrictions that limit one’s perceptual capabilities.

These barriers are not an end to themselves. Gamble and Gamble (2002, p.103) suggest ways of dealing with them to increase the accuracy of perception. They note that the perceptual processes should be personally based, to ensure that the person perceiving recognizes specific biases which are determined by physical limitation, experience, needs, fears, desires and interests, as well as the need for time bidding in the processing of information simply because impulsive reactions contribute to faulty perceptions and compel people to act on inferences rather than on facts. Finally, perceivers are urged to take steps to become more observant and broaden expectations by trying to be very open.

Lambert and Lambert (1993) emphasize the fact that “great individual differences exist in the speed and accuracy of spotting social events or a change in situation because such judgment rests to so great a degree on past learning”. They state that our various everyday judgments are shaped in differing colours by the immediate information available to us in a situation; our assumption or habit of judgments
Tying this postulations to the Individual Difference hypothesis, De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach (1993, p.121) contend that since human beings vary greatly in their personal psychological organization; that since biological endowment and differential learning contribute to individual differences and that since individual’s psychological make-up that sets him or her apart from others grow out of a set of attitudes, values and belief acquired from learning environments, then, perceptions are likely to vary from individual to individual as much the same way as the social category determined by sex, age, socio-economic status influence and group similar preferences together. Thus, addressing these barriers requires enhancement efforts from both the organization and the perceiver in the area of impression management which is the contribution of media coverage to the discourse of perception. These enhancements include boosting of organizational appearances; describing the organization in positive terms; inducing positive moods and reactions in others and so on (Terry and Krantz, 1993; Stevens and Kristof, 1995; and Rowatt, Cunningham and Druen, 1998) mainly through media coverage.

**Influences on Perception and the Gestalt Psychology**

Arens (2002, p.136) argues the fact that perception increases at the same direction of the level of consumers/perceivers needs, wants and objectives. This is instructive in defining the reasons behind the perceptual frame of the perceiver. It equally draws extensively from various theoretical frames. For instance, McShane and Von Glinow (2003, p.67) while espousing the mental models of perception stated that it helps us make sense of our environment, but equally may blind us to seeing that world in different ways. The correlation is that because we are blinded by the preoccupation of our needs, wants and objectives, any stimuli or secondary data that conforms to it is well perceived while at the other end, those that do not conform are not attended to. In this light perception could be said to be everything that has been personalized.

Despite these contributions, Hanna and Wozniak (2001, p.115) assert that “there are factors above and beyond the characteristics of the stimuli which affect the situation in which products are utilized and used. These factors include physical surroundings, social surroundings, task definition, time and antecedent states”. Collectively, these factors are referred to as situational influences on perception. Of these factors, social surroundings and antecedent states are germane to this study. In social surroundings, the denominator is the attitude and preconception of other people around the perceiver whose interactions can greatly affect his own selecting, organization and interpretation of the stimuli. For the antecedent states, Hanna and Wozniak (2001, p.116) “say is the physical or psychological state of an individual immediately preceding his or her current state”. These are however temporary and can exert great pressure on the perceiver. These states are classified as momentary moods or momentary conditions. Momentary moods are state like being happy or sad, calm or angry, relaxed or excited. Momentary conditions include circumstances as being exposed to corrupt acts or not.

In contorting the principles of perceptual organization, Batra, Meyer, and Aaker (1996, p.238) equally identify an important tenet of the Gestalt psychology. This tenet advances that “there is a cognitive drive to obtain a good Gestalt or configuration, one that is simple, familiar and regular, meaningful, consistent and complete” as the human mind is not above making minor or even major distortions of the stimulus to accomplish this purpose.

Deducing from the above, the conception of perception could be seen differently as suggested by Gestalt psychologists. Gestalt is a German word, roughly meaning whole or total impression. Kanizsa (1994) like other Gestalt psychologists noted that at no point in time do we perceive or notice solitary stimulus, but that these stimuli are perceived as part of an overall pattern or gestalt, most times created by the medium conveying the stimuli. The arguments rave on to conclude that when there is a cohesive perception of wholes and making of meaningful patterns, it becomes complete and simple rather than doing it as discrete components.
In their contribution to the Gestalt principles, Hanna and Wozniak (2001, p.118-120) identified concepts like perceptual categorization, surrogate indicators, prototype matching, perceptual inferences, schema and scripts as elements responsible for factoring perception. In organizing the stimuli for interpretation, there is the need to involve the schema which is “a structure for the understanding and interpretation of new information” and the script which is the “procedures to follow in reoccurring situations”. Scripts include a lot of indexes as locations, situations, people, specific behaviours to perform and outcomes of such behaviours. These in turn guide either deliberately or indeliberately the whole process of organizing and interpreting stimuli. When aligned, there is no contending the facts that when an impression is made, and because no situation calls for their interacting with issues on subject, a perceptual gulf is created. But whichever way, the literature above tend to follow or advance, especially on defining what actually influences perceptual frames, there is the need to evaluate these frames which require a balancing act.

**Agenda Setting Model**

The theory attributed to Walter Lippman (1922) in his famed work on *Public Opinion*, indicates that the mass media create images of events in people’s mind that help them in forming perception about the subject. This effort prompts Cohen (1963, p.13) to argue that:

*The press may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about. And it follows from this that the world looks different to different people depending not only on their personal interest, but also on the map that is drawn for them by the writers, the editors and the publishers of the papers they read.*

These views of Cohen were significantly shaped by the predominance of the media at the time, the print medium; while the media is said to draw maps in the mental spleen of its consumers in a stunningly successful manner. In describing the Agenda Setting approach, two views present themselves, the broad and the narrow sense.

*Performance and Perception: Defining…*

The point of emphasis for the broad sense according to Miller (2002, p.258) is in terms of three independent but related agenda. These are the media agenda, the public agenda and the policy agenda. The media agenda is seen as a set of topics addressed by media sources as newspapers, television, radio, magazines; the public agenda sets topics that members of the public believe are hegemonically important to public discourse while the policy agenda represents issues that policy makers or decision makers believe are particularly salient and definitive of a society. In its narrow sense, it concentrates on the link between the media agenda and the public agenda, stemming out of the work of McCombs and Shaws (1972).

While Zhu and Blood (1997) see the agenda setting game as being played in the mind of the public by leading them to assign relative importance to various public issues; Folarin (1998, p.68) says the elements involved include the quantity or frequency of reportage, the prominence given to the reports through all forms of audio visual displays and timings, the degree of conflict generated and the cumulative media specific effects over time. The theory finds relevance in this study in that there is a strong correlation between media coverage about the subject and the perception people hold of the subject. There is the likelihood to suggest that the extent of media coverage as depicted by the intensity, frequency, content and frames which are index in measuring agenda setting is directly related to the degree of perception generated.

**Problem Statement**

Having established the frames above, and against the backdrop of the agenda setting model which defines the overwhelming role of the media in influencing opinion of the respondents about an issue, this
piece queries the roles of media coverage through awareness level and performance in the discourse of perception to see if there are influences from one on the other?

**Methodology**

In the light of the foregoing, three hypotheses were raised, while data was drawn from a pool of 130 respondents in Ogwashi-Uku, Asaba and Agbor all in Delta North using the quota and purposively sampling designs. A quota of 50, 40 and 40 sample size was given to Asaba, Ogwashi-Uku and Agbor in that order. Asaba got 50 because of its strategic location and role as state capital. The purposive technique was employed to mitigate the problem of getting a sampling frame, as such subjects which indicate interest in the study after the initial interaction was administered the questionnaire which was the research instrument employed. The design for this study is the survey design. All 130 copies of the questionnaire were duly returned and valid for analysis. The sample was drawn without bias for gender, educational qualification, contact with the subject of study and exposure to media. Data generated were analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. To elicit data for the study, a subject was adopted. This subject is the Delta State Government.

**Academic Excellence**

**Discussions**

Ho 1: There is no significant relationship between the performance of the Delta State Government as presented in the media and the perception Deltans hold of her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Perception [x]</th>
<th>Performance [Y]</th>
<th>x y</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>y²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2933</td>
<td>3116</td>
<td>2882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated $r = 0.9337$

The independent variable is perception; it is here measured and tested as ‘x’, while performance is tested as ‘y’. The decision rule stated earlier was if sampled calculated correlation of $r (0.9337)$ is equal to or larger than ($\geq$) critical $r (0.7067)$, the null hypothesis (Ho) should be rejected and the alternate hypothesis adopted and vice versa. Therefore, since calculated ‘r’ is greater than the critical ‘r’, the null hypothesis stated above, that, there is no significant relationship between the performance of the Delta State Government as presented in the media and the perception Deltans hold of the government is rejected for the alternate unstated hypothesis that a relationship exists. However, what the data above does not suggest is that an increase in performance will make the respondents to rate the performance of the government as excellent. Nevertheless, those that rated the government’s performance as substantial were above 71 or 54.6%.

The conclusion is that there is a direct relationship that is positively correlated between the performance of the state government as presented in the media and the perception held of her by Deltans. The relationship is linear, that is, as the value of one variable increases, the other increases. If the performance of the state government increases, the strong positive perception that Deltans hold of her will
equally increase, but at a point seen as the equilibrium point, adequate performance will produce optimum perception. See the graph below.

*Performance and Perception: Defining…*

Trend Graph for Table 1

The magnitude of the correlation coefficient is so strong that the range between the linear trend of ‘x’ and ‘y’ has the same strength of narrowness at the extreme and gradually closes in at equilibrium. The degree of narrowness at the extreme suggests a very close correlation. This, thus, assert that performance is positively correlated to perception, while influences are at reversal angles. Therefore, performance of a subject can be said to positively influence the way the subject is perceived.

Ho 2: There is no significant relationship between awareness created by media coverage on the activities of the Delta State Government and the perception Deltans hold of her.

Table 2: Correlation between Awareness and Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Perception [x]</th>
<th>Awareness [Y]</th>
<th>x y</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>y²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2738</td>
<td>3116</td>
<td>2870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated $r = 0.7174$
**Academic Excellence**

Again ‘x’ is the independent variable and ‘y’ is the dependent variable. The hypothesis sought to evaluate if there is any relationship between awareness level of the respondents and the perception they hold of the Delta State Government, it is a null hypothesis. The decision rule stated earlier was if sampled calculated correlation of r (0.7174) is equal to or larger than (≥) critical r (0.7067), the null hypothesis (Ho) should be rejected and the alternate hypothesis adopted and vice versa.

From the calculation of the Pearson ‘r’, it was found out that calculated ‘r’ is greater than the critical ‘r’; therefore the null hypothesis stated is rejected. The submission is that there is a direct relationship between awareness created about the Delta State Government in the media and the perception Deltans hold of her that suggests it is positive. As could be deduced from the graphical representation of the data below, the trend analysis or magnitude of the correlation coefficient indicates a linear relationship, that is, as one variable (awareness) increases, the other (perception) increases. This is however likely to be up to a point. At the onset, where the frequency was high, the range was large at the extremes, but as the frequency decreases, the range equally decreases to equilibrium point and reverse the trend of influence. First, awareness influences perception and later perception of the Delta State Government later influenced awareness level. Significantly is that the trend above was achieved with maintaining an almost uniform level of awareness influenced by media coverage; how possible is this?

![Trend Graph for Table 2]

**Ho 3** Media coverage of the activities of the Delta State Government do not significantly shape the way Deltans perceive the Government.

---

**Performance and Perception: Defining…**

**Table 3: Correlation between Media Coverage and Perception**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Perception [x]</th>
<th>Performance [Y]</th>
<th>x y</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>y²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The thrust of this hypothesis is to appraise if there is any correlation between media coverage of the activities of the government and how Deltans perceive the State Government. Consequently, data for ‘media coverage’ was classified as ‘y’ (dependent variable), while data for ‘perception’ was coded as ‘x’ (independent variable). Decision taken was hedged on the premise that if sampled calculated correlation of r (0.9117) is equal to or larger than (≥) critical r (0.7067), the null hypothesis (Ho) stated should be rejected and the alternate hypothesis adopted and vice versa.

From the values presented in the table above, the calculated ‘r’ is greater than the critical ‘r’, thus the proposition that media coverage of the activities of the Delta State Government do not significantly shape the way Deltans perceive the government is rejected. We can assert for sure that there is a positive direct relationship between what the media do with the activities of the Delta State Government and what perception Deltans hold of her. Recall that there was an overwhelming record of media patronage by the respondents who equally argued that the coverage by the media of the activities of the state government is significant in shaping their opinion.

From the graph above, the strength of this relationship is seen as positive while the magnitude of correlation coefficient is linear. Interestingly, as with the first hypothesis, is that at a point, midway in
varying one variable proportionately with the other, the trend is likely to change, that is the independent variable becoming the dependent and vice versa. The submission is that while media coverage will influence perception, at a point, the degree of perception held of the stimuli/subject will in-turn influence the intensity of the media coverage. It equally suggests that there is a point of equilibrium between media coverage and perception. At a point too, when a variable is proportionately varied with the other or becomes too much, it affects the other, and when too small it affect the other.

In the build up to this conclusion, the study contends that the more appropriate the media of coverage, the awareness level of the respondents towards the stimuli and the performance of the subject, the stronger the degree of positive perception and vice versa. But when inappropriate media is employed, a perceptual gulf is likely to eschew. This is occasioned by lack of information or too much information about the subject. Media coverage influences or shapes perception of the subject at the onset, but at a point, media coverage of the subject is in turn influenced by the way the public perceive the stimuli about the subject. In between these variegated positions is the perceptual equilibrium. For instance, media coverage of the Delta State Government can swing positive or negative perception on the state government, but at a point which is yet to be determined, the way the public perceives the Delta State Government will influence the degree and level of media coverage. This position expands the premise of the Gestalt principle, that is, the perception of the state government is part of a whole process in the activities of the Delta State Government as presented in the media and influenced by the preoccupation of the stimuli and the respondents experience.

It is this frame that informs the proposition of a model termed the Model of Perceptual Equilibrium. It is graphically presented overleaf with attendant comments. The positive and negative signs only indicate direction of increase and decrease. No specific value was attached because it is a social phenomenon. It is equally difficult to establish at which point or at what scales it should be graduated because media coverage is not readily quantified.

**Model of Perceptual Equilibrium**

For perception, rating it high, low or medium would have sufficed, but against that the import from the graphical presentation indicate that perception should travel along the same vector of media coverage at a linear direction, that is increase in one is proportionately corresponded to the other, and at opposition to this principle is that more than required media coverage will result in low perception; this
possibility arises when the object of perception is not of mass appeal, for instance a candidate for elections, a product with selected class usage etc. What the model puts forward is that there is leverage between information overload and information under-load where the intensity of media coverage, awareness and performance drift away from each other to create perceptual gulf on the one end, and on the other, drifts towards each other to optimally correspond with the perceptor’s perceptual spleen in achieving perceptual equilibrium. It implies that the level of stimuli available from the subject corresponds to the degree of perception. However, because of the social dynamics of the perceptor, the stimuli and subject, the shaded area is seen as comfort zone. Perceptual gulf will only occur when the degree of stimuli continuously drag away from the equilibrium point or the comfort zone either upwards or downwards. It is a situation where disparity occurs between stimuli and subject of interest. When this model is applied to the interplay of relationships in the hypotheses, there is the tendency to find cases of information overload and under-load as the case might present themselves.

Conclusion

Media coverage of events about a subject, the performance of such subjects and the awareness that perceptrons have about the subject are frames that help to influence the perception process. After a review of literature in this regards, the study tested three hypotheses that dwell on the subject of discourse, basically on whether performance is significantly related to perception; whether media coverage is significantly related to a perception; and whether awareness level is related to perception. The data tested using the Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient revealed that there are domineering influences among the frames tested, and that the influences and defining roles are not just in one direction but in a dyadic fashion, thus amplifying the hold of communication in the discourse of perception.

However, despite the variability of the frames; that is the need for ample media coverage on the performance of the subject to create awareness, the tested data suggest that information overload and under-load are most likely and therefore care should be taken to achieve perceptual equilibrium as well as avoid perceptual gulf.
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