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The great problems of life...are always related to the primordial images of the collective unconscious. These images are really balancing or compensating factors which correspond with the problems life presents in actuality. This is not to be marveled at, since these images are deposits representing the accumulated experience of thousands of years of struggle for adaptation and existence.  

Researchers in communication have long been interested in image projection. The type of person a source is perceived to be will have a direct effect on how his message is perceived. Emerson wrote: "Do not say things. What you are stands over you the while, and thunders so that I cannot hear what you say to the contrary."  

An image is "a human construct imposed on an array of perceived attributes projected by an object, event or person." The importance of the study of image can be traced to Aristotle who, although expressing a preference for a speaker's logos, or logical argument, recognized that the speaker's ethos, or image, is perhaps the dominating form of proof in persuasion. A source that can manipulate his image can manipulate his effectiveness.  

The prevalence of the mass media has added the need to study a second, indirect source of image projection; the image projected via the mass media in behalf of a primary source. As we are not able to meet all the "people in the news" personally, we are forced to base our perceptions on what media sources say about such people. This was Lippman's theme when he wrote:
As a result we substitute our images for direct experience of the real environment. It would be a mistake, however, to underestimate the power of these images simply because they are substitutes. Indirect sources insert a "pseudo-environment" between the stimuli—events, people, thoughts, etcetera—that make up our environment, and us. Our actions are a response to the stimuli provided in the pseudo-environment, but they occur in the real world with real effects. Before one can study images and the action that results from them, one must understand this process by which they are created; from source of action, to the pictures in our head, to the resulting response upon the environment.\(^6\)

When images are the result of an indirect projection of reality there is a greatly increased propensity for distortion. Lippman explains by using an example familiar to us all:

> In the same way we can best understand the furies of war and politics by remembering that almost the whole of each party believes absolutely in its picture of the opposition, that it takes as fact, not what is, but what it supposes to be fact.\(^7\)

Of course, these distortions apply to people as well as to events:

> "Great men, even during their lifetime, are usually known to the public only through a fictitious personality."\(^8\)

Although there is little question about the ability of the mass media to distort the material they project, we don't seem to respond to the possibility. Indeed, we probably can't respond in
any effective manner. We know our environment very indirectly and
we don't have the resources or the inclination to do more than a
perfunctory test on the stimuli we receive. We choose instead to
treat what comes to use from our pseudo-environment as fact and
we respond accordingly. People will act according to how they
view the world and the media provides a large part of that view.
As is the case with much of the world, if we can't learn about
it from the media, we don't know anything about it. In this
manner the media provides us with the material for our images.

It is important that the images projected by the media be
measured to determine what kind of message shaping occurs at
that level. This study is concerned with measuring the images pro-
jected by one type of indirect source—the weekly newsmagazine.

Before describing the specific research questions, an
explanation of the general topic area to be studied is in order.
People involved with research in public address often base their
work on the speeches and events that have significance in a
historical perspective. Major and minor historical turning
points are subjects of the bulk of the efforts made in this
field. This paper will be limited in scope to one such sig-
nificant event—peace efforts between Egypt and Israel. The
next few paragraphs will provide a brief description of the
significance of this historic event.

The middle East is an enigma to the United States. There
is no other region in the world where our socio-economic interests
clash as violently with the philosophies of our implied doctrines.
Senator Fulbright provided a concise description of our quandry when he wrote:

The catalogue of our interests is well-known and hardly contested: The survival of Israel; access to oil and friendship of the Arabs; the avoidance of confrontation with the Soviet Union; and the strengthening of the United Nations as an international peace-keeping agency. What we evidently do not agree upon among ourselves is the priority of these interests and the appropriate means of reconciling them where they conflict.9

Our interest in the Middle East should not be based solely on the potential dangers and problems it represents. The United States and the rest of the world have a great deal to gain from peace in the area:

In the Middle East there is more than a conflict to be ended and confrontations to be avoided. Great benefits are waiting to be reaped from a peaceful Middle East, and they can benefit the whole world. One can envision a whole new set of economic and political relationships through which the industrialized world would exchange technology for a steady and reliable supply of oil while developing new energy sources; the Arab countries would be free to devote their new wealth to the development of their societies; and the developing countries might benefit through development programs jointly supported by the industrial and oil producing countries.10

These two statements provide a basis for understanding just how interesting and difficult a study of the Middle East could be. In 1977, two countries in the Middle East initiated actions that make study of the area even more interesting. They are Egypt and Israel.

On November 9, 1977, Egypt was figuratively separated from the body of Arab states by President Anwar Sadat, who announced that he would "go to the ends of the earth"11 to provide peace
for his country. Five days later Sadat told CBS newsman Walter Cronkite that he was "ready to go to Jerusalem."


These actions made Egypt the first—and at the time this paper is being written, the only—Arab nation that recognized Israel as a sovereign state. Other Arab nations believed that the United Nation's partition of Israel in 1948 was not legally binding and that the area called "Israel" is really made up of occupied territories. As one scholar explained: "The Arab rejection of Israel takes the form of pathological hostility which turns into verbal threats of utter annihilation." This hostility gives rise to the Arab "claim that engaging in direct discussion would be giving in, as victims of aggression, to one of the points that should be negotiable—the status of Israel." In his speech, "Arab World Reaction of the Sadat Peace Initiative," the Libyan ambassador to the United Nations provided a typical example of the Arab reaction to Sadat's visit to Israel:

"For us, the Arabs, the question is simple. Palestine is Arab, populated by Arabs—it was never a country without people...."

When the Zionists moved into Palestine, they didn't address the problem of what to do with the displaced Palestinians....

"In their (Zionist) propaganda and with the sympathetic Western public opinion, especially after World War II, they never mentioned what they would do with the Palestinians...."

Egypt...is the leader of the Arab world and 'for the head of the most important Arab state to go to Jerusalem means, the recognition of the state.'

'People who oppose the visit of Sadat aren't opposed to peace, but are a people who understand Zionism; what it means, what these people want and they will not change...."
The Arab world believes that negotiations are equivalent to recognition, and until Sadat's move no Arab country was willing to recognize Israel. The policy of no communication between the Arab world and Israel had to be changed. Foreign Minister Abba Eban explained:

(M)uch could be done if the Governments of the area would embark much more on direct contacts. They must find their way to each other. After all, when there is conflict between them they come together face to face. Why should they not come together face to face to solve the conflict? On some occasions it would not be a bad idea to have the solution before, and therefore instead of, the conflicts.16

Sadat provided the first opportunity for such direct discussion with his peace initiative.

However, Sadat should not receive all of the kudos for the peace initiative. He was not alone in his desire for peace and his willingness to act out that desire. Prime Minister Menachem Begin of Israel took an equally bold stance by inviting Sadat to speak before Israel's Knesset. In the past, Israel had rejected other Arab overtures. For example, in the Spring of 1969 Israel responded to favorable statements issued by King Hussein with charges that they were "pious words" and an "exercise in propaganda."17 Israel could have responded to Hussein with a gesture designed to establish a basis for mutual trust and negotiation but Israel refused to do so. Accordingly, the world was shocked when Begin—historically considered Israel's "number one Hawk"—agreed to receive Sadat.

Begin had traditionally supported the position that Israel should keep any land won in a war with the Arabs. He could easily be termed an expansionist because he encouraged and supported any policy which could be construed as an attack on the Arabs. Therefore,
it was a very significant step toward peace when Begin responded to Sadat's initiative with a formal invitation to visit Israel and the philosophy that "everything is open to negotiation." \(^{18}\)

These two men lifted their countries from the rest of the concerns of the Middle East in order to search for peace—a peace that would benefit themselves the United States and the rest of the world. It is the purpose of this thesis to identify how weekly newsmagazines in the United States treated the two men during the period when peace was the goal of both. The peace movement will be studied from its inception in November 1977 to the first Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories as a result of the treaty in June 1979. This time frame is justified by its auspicious beginning discussed above and its noteworthy conclusion which offers hope for more peace to come.

The idea that the images of Sadat and Begin will be identifiable, interesting and of significant importance in a historical sense is given impetus by a review of media coverage for Sadat and Begin in the *Near East Report*:

The apparent metamorphoses of Sadat and Begin can perhaps be seen best in the way the media portrayed the two men when they took office....

Sadat is an 'intense, impulsive, and deeply religious man who is a bitter foe of Israel and one of the most outspoken critics of the United States,' *The New York Times* proclaimed in October 1970, after Nasser's death. A *Washington Post* headline warned that same month, 'Egyptians regard weak new leader as transitional.'

*The Economist* of London declared a little over a year later, 'Sadat is not the man...Egypt may have to accept that neither war nor a full, signed peace is possible with Israel....It needs a new leader to face that prospect....'

Less than two years ago, U.S. newspapers trumpeted the election of a 'terrorist' as Israel's Prime Minister. *The Wall Street Journal*, for instance, proclaimed that Begin's election 'skews peace hopes....'
Perhaps the most constant critic of Begin was *Time* magazine, which defamed his character almost weekly. A list of *Time*’s adjectives describing Begin over the last two years includes: 'inflexible,' 'hard-line,' 'probably deceptive,' 'unyielding,' 'arrogant,' 'extreme,' 'despised,' 'beyond the pale,' 'nitpicker' and 'the major obstacle to peace....' 19

In accordance with the general purpose of this study, three research questions will be addressed. The first question addresses how the newsmagazines have treated Begin in comparison with Sadat. In other words, what image was projected for each man across all three newsmagazines? The second question compares each newsmagazine to the others in its treatment of Sadat and Begin. Are all three consistent with each other or are there significant variations? The third question concerns any changes in the images projected by the newsmagazines from one event to another and what are these changes. This will be a comparison of the images projected for Sadat and Begin during five separate events in the peace process.

Research question one—how have newsmagazines treated Begin in comparison with Sadat—is suggested by four facts. First of all, Sadat and Begin, the men who were responsible for the initial success of the peace movement, were acting as agents for their respective countries. When speeches are made and policies set, these two men speak not only or even primarily as individuals but rather as the nations they represent. It is clear that the media understands this relationship between leader and country because coverage of one is often listed under the auspices of the other. The reader is encouraged to extend his stereotypes and images from the leader to the country and vice versa.
Emerson writes: "An institution is the lengthened shadow of one man." Both Sadat and Begin fit easily into this analogy. In their respective autobiographies, both men make reference to the fact that they set policies according to the needs and demands of their people. They immerse their identities in that of their country. Sadat even claims that he is the image of Egypt. Therefore, this study is concerned with a comparison between Israel under the guidance of Begin and Egypt under the guidance of Sadat.

Secondly, the United States public and press have traditionally been pro-Israel in their support:

...(T)he Israelis enjoy a high level of general support in American public opinion, and the press both reflects and reinforces this tendency. News in Israel is widely reported, whereas the Arab world is poorly covered in most newspapers. Editorials tend to favor Israel over the Arabs....On the whole....the public and the press are oriented more toward Israel than to the Arabs. This trend to reinforce the pro-Israeli orientation already derived from the American national style.

This past precedent indicates that the media will tend to cover Begin in a more favorable light than Sadat. Such a bias would be identified in this study.

Recent trends in public opinion polls indicate, however, that the American public and press may be ready to balance their support. Fulbright provided the conclusions to some of these polls:

Perhaps, not for the first time, the American people are ahead of their leaders. A poll taken for the Gannett News Service in early September showed 65 percent opposed to the United States compensating Israel for the loss of Egyptian oil. A National Observer 'plebiscite' taken in mid-September showed almost 77 percent opposed to the assignment of American technicians to the Sinai. A poll taken by Congressman McClory in his Illinois district
earlier this year showed 60 percent favoring Israel's withdrawal to secure pre-1967 borders as established by the United Nations, as a condition of continued American military aid. Quandt explained that: "Only 14 percent of the adult population in late 1970 said they would favor sending American troops to help Israel if she were being overrun by Arab forces." He continued with an explanation that in the media "since 1973 there has been a tendency to take into account the Arab view as well." If such a balancing is occurring, it should be identifiable in the newsmagazine treatment of Sadat and Begin during the peace movement.

The last fact which suggests question one is that Sadat was the initiator of the peace movement. Having made the first overt move toward peace it will be interesting to examine the effects of such primacy.

It is obvious that this question could result in any of three answers. (1) Begin was treated more favorably by the media than Sadat. (2) They were treated equally. (3) Sadat was treated more favorably than Begin.

The justification for the second research question—how do newsmagazines compare in their treatment of Sadat and Begin—must be provided in two phases. First of all, newsmagazines will be operationalized as selected issues of the weekly newsmagazines; *Time*, *Newsweek* and *United States News and World Report*. These magazines are edited with a national audience in mind, and studies by Weiss and Rivers indicate that they are the most heavily read magazines by the American public and political leaders. Easy accessability to these magazines makes this study easy to replicate.
These facts help to explain why other studies concerned with analysis of media treatment have used these three sources quite successfully.

Secondly, it is probable that there will be distinct differences in treatment between the three media sources. Merrill explained the propensity for such a difference to occur using *Time* as an example:

The suggestion that *Time* magazine selects, aligns, and explains (i.e. 'subjectivizes') information will certainly not startle many persons. In fact, its editors have insisted from the magazine's founding in 1923 that objectivity in news presentation is impossible and that *Time* writers should 'make a judgment' in their articles.

Wills continues the explanation with the following statement: "*Time* reads men's motives--good for friends, bad for enemies—with that Olympian supremacy and aloofness which prompted Commager to speak of the period 'before *Time* became omniscient.'"

Determining the "ethics" of such "subjectivizing" is not the purpose of this paper. Other authors have filled any void there might be in such regard. Rather, the direction of this study will be determined by a desire to identify source consistency. Since *Time* presents its news in a subjective manner, it is reasonable to assume that the other two media sources do the same. Even if *Newsweek* and *U.S. News* present their information in what they consider to be an objective manner, there are bound to be discrepancies.

Whatever the answer to this question—and there is not any point in making a prediction here—the long term ramifications are clear. Although the evidence is divided as to whether or not media sources change popular opinions, there is little doubt that the media can provide an awareness which, if it does not by monopoly of thought change opinions, will serve to strengthen previously held
convictions. It is certainly one factor in determining how people will respond to political figures. People base their decisions on the images they have. A newsmagazine that can manipulate the image people have of a political figure can also affect the way those people will act toward him. "Boulding maintains that the way people behave depends on the image or images they have. The Corollary to this is that if we change someone's images, we will change his behavior." Indeed, Becker, McCombs and McLeod point to "the ability of the media to structure our world for us." If material on a subject is not available, an opinion-void would ensue. Lippman explains when he writes: "The only feeling that anyone can have about an event he does not experience is the feeling aroused by his mental image of that event." In the case of Sadat and Begin, there is no such void because the newsmagazines have provided a great deal of information about the two men.

The selection of what features will be presented to the public is made by the newsmagazines. This selection is worthy of study because of the tremendous impact the image of an important man can have upon the world. "(H)e who captures the symbols by which the public feeling is for the moment contained, controls by that much the approaches of public policy." Whether the newsmagazines are divided or consistent in their treatment of Sadat and Begin, this study is justified in light of the potential effects the media may have on public opinion. The first step in any effort to measure the effects of media treatment on public cognitions, is to isolate the media's messages and determine the amount of disparity between them.
The last research question—what are the changes in the images projected for Sadat and Begin from one event to another—is important because of the interest expressed by communication researchers in the effects of time on the communication process. It is important to give some thought to this dimension of a research project. "Choosing the most appropriate time scale for the theoretical business at hand has been a neglected area in communication research." This researcher is interested in making observations about relationships between variables with event ordering. The explanations provided for research questions one and two indicate that with images the dimensions projected will be different between events. If such changes occur, they will be identified.
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"Here may lie one of the most important effects of modern mass communication—the ability of the media to structure our world for us."¹ The next few pages will provide a review of the past research efforts most relevant to this paper. Although a general introduction to some of the concepts—images and media bias—is provided in the first chapter, a more in-depth analysis is in order. Specifically, the research in receiver perception of a speaker's image as well as research in the gate keeper and agenda-setting functions of the mass media will be identified. Speaker image will be reviewed first because of its relevance to the literature pertaining to the other concepts.

THE RECEIVER'S IMAGE OF A SOURCE

Two theoretical works in the twentieth century have provided impetus for efforts to delve deeper into the image construct. Lippman—whose ideas are mentioned frequently in chapter one—was concerned with the images created by all sorts of stimuli and from many different sources. Not only were people outside of a speaking format mentioned for their potential to create images, but events and objects were also recognized for the images they create. Lippman recommended expansion of our efforts from the study of directly projected images to those that are indirectly projected by secondary sources.²

Work by Boulding sought to further our theoretical understanding
of the image. Boulding argued that images are a necessity for our very existence when he wrote: "The human imagination can only bear a certain degree of complexity. When the complexity becomes intolerable, it retreats into symbolic images." These words encouraged further study because of the explicit importance they place on the image. The next problem was to find ways to measure and define the components of an image. Again, Boulding provides the base for such efforts when he writes, "it is possible to abstract...a relatively few important dimensions."

As defined in chapter one, an image consists of an array of perceptions about an individual or event. There is, however, no consensus of opinion as to what dimensions make up an image. Many social scientists use the words *ethos* and source credibility as synonyms for the listener's concept of a speaker's image.

The only reasonable approach to the study of speaker images is to isolate the particular, demonstrated features of the image that are interesting and analyze them. This review will be limited in scope to the literature pertaining to the aspects of an image that a careful analysis of the data has indicated will be relevant and interesting.

Any comprehensive review of the literature covering the concept of images must include an explanation of the difficulties in such a study. One of the major problems is in deciding just what is being studied. The concept is either so broadly defined or has so many synonyms—depending on which theoretical position you choose to embrace—that the study of it is plagued by overlaps, ambiguities and
omissions. Baxter reports the most obvious signs of a lack of consensual definition when she lists the various names applied to the construct: "ethos, prestige, status, reputation, authority, image, charisma and source credibility."\(^5\)

Attempts to identify the components of a speaker's image have resulted in anywhere from two to eleven independent dimensions.\(^6\) It seems that ethos has become the repository for any and all discernable source characteristics.\(^7\)

McCroskey and Young have suggested that the reason for these problems is a fundamental error in the research conducted over the past two decades. Instead of testing the credibility construct suggested by theoretical foundations, efforts have been directed toward identification of the dimension from receiver perceptions.\(^8\) This reverses normal scientific procedure, in which the theory is first developed, then appropriate tests of theory are conducted. Unfortunately past research has tended to muddle the antecedent conditions that give rise to a speaker's image with the credibility construct. Consequently, Aristotelian theory has never been put to a severe test.

There is a fundamental need for definitional certainty before proceeding with this thesis. To overload a concept will inevitably reduce its potential utility. Hage explains when he writes:

Primarily because there is an attempt to capture many ideas... a variety of connotations are included at the same time. The concept becomes complicated and thus difficult to work with. Attention becomes deflected from how it relates to other concepts to what is its best definition.\(^9\)
In this study, the dimensions to be included are selected based on the author's perceptions of what will prove to be interesting and of historical significance when applied to the data as well as the conclusions of the best available theoretical and experimental work in the area. It is not to be assumed that limiting the study to four carefully chosen dimensions will reduce its inherent value. Rather, as the methods section will explain, the process that culminated in the choices made is based upon rational thought, good intentions and an exhaustive review of the available tools.

The study of images has its beginning in the works of Aristotle. As explained in chapter one, Aristotle thought that the ethos of a source is the dominant form of proof in a speech. Even at that early date, Aristotle recognized the multi-dimensional nature of the construct he sought to describe. His components of ethos are good sense, good moral character and good will. As Aristotle explained:

Men either form a false opinion through want of good sense; or they form a true opinion, but because of moral badness do not say what they really think; or finally, they are both sensible and upright, but not well disposed to their hearers, and may fail in consequence to recommend what they know to be the best course. These are the only possible cases.10

These are the elements of ethos which are accepted by many contemporary scholars as the dominant form of persuasion.11

Experimental testing of this theoretical construct was slow in materializing. In the twentieth century, however, an ever increasing number of attempts have been made to identify the various components of ethos and to measure their importance to the construct.
Some of the experimental work has seemingly mirrored the conclusions of Aristotle. Hovland, Janis and Kelley suggest expertness, trustworthiness and intention toward the receiver as the dimensions of *ethos*. These three dimensions appear to be very similar to the good sense, good moral character and good will of Aristotle.

Anderson reported semantic differential scales to measure the "authoritativeness" and "dynamism" of a speaker. This effort along with work by such scholars as Berlo and Lemert is important because of the identification of the dimension of dynamism. Many later works identified this as a dimension of source credibility and although there is uncertainty as to its exact place in the study of *ethos* there is little question about its relevance to the image of a source.

Golden, Berquist and Coleman describe dynamism as the power dimension flowing from a speaker's charisma. It is independent of and equal in importance to the other image dimensions.

Other research has involved a variety of tools and yielded a variety of results. For example, Sears and Whitney found that "competence" or "expertness" is a major determinant of political communication effects. This is, of course, also recognized as an important element of source credibility.

Marr used R factor analysis on data collected at different points in time followed by the Q factor analysis technique to study image changes. "Evaluative-trust" was concentrated on as accounting for the most variance in political communication. He studied the image over three sets of variables: between respondents, between images of the
two men studied and between several occasions over time.  

Kjeldahl, Carmichael and Mertz used factor analysis to study the image. "Genuineness"--almost identical to the "trustworthiness" dimension identified in other research--accounted for approximately 50 percent of the variance in all but one case. "Leadership," which accounted for only 9 percent of the remaining variance, was the only other significant dimension identified.

Tuppen used cluster analysis to isolate "trustworthiness," "expertise," "dynamism," "co-orientation" and "charisma" as the five major dimensions of source credibility. This methodology was an attempt to challenge the assumptions made in factor analytical work in the same area.

Thompson provides the findings of six of the principal studies in the area of ethos research: Norman; McCroskey; Berlo, Lemert and Mertz; Bowers and Phillips; Markham; and Whitehead. Thompson writes:

The consistency of the results and the extent to which modern research confirms Aristotle's empirical judgments are striking. Although the words and the numbers of factors vary, one constituent in each of the seven sources is the perception of the speaker as competent, qualified, authoritative, sound in message, or possessed of good sense. Included by six as a factor is the evaluation of the speaker as trustworthy, safe, agreeable, or bearing good will toward his audience. Good moral character, Aristotle's third constituent, is on some of the modern lists but not on others. Finally, modern studies provide evidence for one characteristic that Aristotle did not identify: the quality labeled dynamism, or extroversion, appears in all studies that extracted more than two factors....Competence, trustworthiness, good moral character, and dynamism, as a consensus, are the major elements comprising ethos in most circumstances.

All of these efforts have resulted in an expansion of our know-
ledge about images, but in many cases they also suggest that the theoretical groundwork established by Aristotle has been adequate. In his most recent— to date— review of the literature, McCroskey argues:

( Although much has been written about the source credibility construct and its dimensions... the basic construct as originally defined, has not seriously been challenged in subsequent research and no valid arguments as regards the construct provided by Aristotle and subsequently by Hoyland et al. have been brought forth that warrant revision.  

For instance, such dimensions as the oft-identified "dynamism" may affect a speaker's ethos, but are not a dimension of ethos. Rather, it is probably an aspect of a speaker's style of communicating and is therefore still part of speaker image.

When we limit the scope of our investigation to the ethos or source credibility construct, there is evidence to believe that two dimensions are sufficient to cover the variable. As Thompson explained earlier, good moral character is not included in all of the major experimental works. In fact, only one of the six studies reported in Thompson, identified both a good will and good moral character dimension in the same study. Apparently, the theorists are more discriminating in this area than are the audiences. McCroskey explains when he writes:

It is our conclusion, therefore, that while theoretically there are three dimensions in the source credibility or ethos construct, in terms of empirically based perceptions, these three collapse to two. This is not to suggest that intention is not important, but only that a perception of the source's intention is not independent of a perception of the source's character.
This study will use the two experimentally tested dimensions of ethos—"competence" and "character"—plus dynamism and composure which have been identified as part of a speaker's image and which—based on the author's review of the data to be studied—may prove to be the most interesting and relevant. The remaining pages in this chapter will be devoted to work done with how the media can affect our cognitions and therefore our images of the world.

MEDIA'S EFFECTS ON RECEIVER'S IMAGES

There are three ways—relevant to this research project—that a newsmagazine can affect our cognitions and thereby our images. All newsmagazines perform a process of selection wherein they pick from the various available stimuli the particular events and issues they want to cover. Newsmagazines can affect us by what they print and by what they ignore. The third way newsmagazines can influence us is by putting a slant or bias to the information they pass on.

When these possible influences are taken together—as they automatically are in the real world—the probable result is a directioning factor being exercised by these newsmagazines on how we organize existing functions and opinions in addition to how we will form new functions and opinions. The research in these areas will be reviewed in the next few pages.

The potential for this selection process to affect our cognitions is based on the principle that information provided by media sources must travel through several channels before being received by the public. In each channel there is a person or agency whose
responsibility it is to filter the news. While in this filter, decisions are made about the content, mode of presentation and relative importance of the information. All of these are decisions of selectivity. All of these decisions will have a direct and noticeable effect on the information sent to receivers. The more removed— spatially or chronologically—the original source of the information is from the final receiver, the more important the role of these filters and the greater their power.

Kurt Lewin, a famous social scientist, first developed the analogy of a system of gate keepers to explain this process. The concept of gate keeping was then applied to the mass media in a classic effort by White in which he found that 90 percent of the news potentially available is rejected by media gate keepers. When the implications of a 90 percent discard rate are considered, it is easy to understand why so much importance is attached to the study of communications through the media. Schramm wrote:

(N)0 aspect of communication is so impressive as the enormous number of choices and discards which have to be made between the formation of the symbol in the mind of the communicator, and the appearance of a related symbol in the mind of a receiver.

Perhaps the most helpful work to date when dealing with the gate keeper construct is the model of the communication process created by Westley and MacLean. The authors were attempting to develop a single model of communications that would be helpful in organizing existing research. The result of their efforts was that the authors provided insight into the gate keeper function.
According to Westley and MacLean, the gate keeper is responsible for selecting the abstractions from an object, event or person that are appropriate to the needs of the intended receiver. The gate keeper then transfers the abstractions into a symbol system and transmits them to the receiver over some channel.

At this point, the distinctions between mass and face-to-face communications became clear. In mass communications there are far fewer of the potential stimuli being transferred to the receiver and feedback is at best indirect and delayed.

Obviously, the decisions made by the gate keepers are very important ones because of the sheer number of decisions that we do not have the time or resources to make for ourselves. Lippman pointed out that the person or agency in control of the symbols of our time can move the public. These "indirect" sources of information and various stimuli create a "pseudo-environment" from which we paint the "pictures in our heads"—our images of the world.

These indirect sources are the gate keepers identified by Westley and MacLean. There is no single person, group of people, agency or group of agencies in a better position to control, direct, manipulate and change the vital flow of information from our environment to us from which we create our images and order our existence.

Work by Cohen indicates that reporters try to find out what news is important by reading what other reporters are writing. This is an empirical example of where the gate keepers serve as agents for other gate keepers and thus the process snowballs. Crouse discovered the fact that reporters will try their work out on other
reporters when they are working with difficult material. If the
reporter gets positive reinforcement from his peers he assumes that
he covered the correct material in the proper manner.\textsuperscript{30}

Of course, in the newsmagazine business there are many gate
keepers at various stages of the news gathering and selection process.
In this study, however, only the final product is relevant because
only the final product will carry the potential to affect the audience.
Therefore, concentration will be focused on what the final product is
and which magazine it represents rather than which reporter, editor,
etcetera made the decisions to make it that way.

Once the gatekeeper function was identified, many scholars
set out to define and measure the media's capacity for affecting the
cognitions of the public. There are two general ways that gate
keepers can influence their audience; the research for a third—
bias—will be reviewed at a later point in this chapter. A gate
keeper can provide news or information that a receiver might not
have had access to on his/her own. In this situation, the gate
keeper is the agent of the receiver, responsible for increasing the
level of the receiver's cognitions—which make up his images—and
thus his environment. The second mode of influence stems from the
first. A gate keeper can neglect to divulge certain information
about the environment and thus "set the agenda" for the receiver who
will be forced to concentrate on the news made available to him.

A good empirical example of the way gate keepers influence
us by overlooking some of the available information is White's
"90 percent discard" study mentioned earlier. It is much more
difficult however to measure the effects of these commissions. Roberts reports one such speculative attempt:

William Rivers contends that had the media covered urban ghettos before they erupted in the late 1960's, public awareness and concern might have been mobilized in order to correct intolerable conditions and head off riots. As it was, a large part of the population was taken by surprise; they had received little previous information about conditions in the inner city.31

Perhaps the commissions made would have tremendous influence on the audience, however, it is the intent of this thesis to measure the message that is presented. Research in this area has been much more abundant.

Researchers have often considered gate keepers as the agents of their intended receivers. This is true in obvious cases like foreign affairs, in which we cannot witness what happens from day to day, and in less obvious ones like local news, in which we just have not had time to keep up with it on our own. Gate keepers can extend our environments beyond what we could have made them. We can read about war in the Middle East and see pictures of the floor of an ocean.

Westley and MacLean agreed with the analysis that the gate keepers are the agents of the receivers when they write:

It may be asked why C [the gate keeper] would chose Xs [stimuli] 'appropriate' to the requirements of B [the receiver]. The answer would appear to be that the C role can survive only to the extent that this is true. For B is still a selector among the offerings of various Cs and this means that Cs are in effect competitors for the attention of Bs....32
However, the agent function is only one of the roles that gatekeepers play. They can also provide purposive messages. The stimuli that are chosen as well as the language used to present them will inevitably affect the receiver's perceptions. Two additional roles emerge for the gatekeepers at this point.

The gatekeeper is the selector of the stimuli that will go to a receiver. It would be natural for a gatekeeper to "weed out" the stimuli not inclined to reinforce the philosophies of the receiver. Such attempts to "please" a receiver would result in a less than complete picture of the environment and a distortion of the situation. The receiver is encouraged to direct his attention to a particular set of stimuli and to live in Lippman's "pseudo-environment." In this case, the gatekeeper serves an agenda-setting role. This probability will be elaborated on in the review of the agenda-setting literature later in this chapter.

The second additional role that gatekeepers are likely to play is based on the word "competitors" used by Westley and MacLean in their explanation of the communication model. If there are indeed several gatekeepers trying to gain the ear of a receiver, it is reasonable to assume that they will "dress up" their "product" according to what they believe will interest the receiver. Our experiences with the yellow press, yes-men and sensationalism all indicate the propensity for and effect of such competition. In this case, the gatekeepers fill the role of manipulators of information presentation bias. This probability will be elaborated on in the review of the bias literature later in this chapter.
All of this provides the explanation for why the study of news magazines is so important to the field of communications. If the effect of the magazines is limited to decisions of selectivity they can still have a tremendous effect on the public. The search for these effects has led to a series of "agenda-setting" studies to determine if such effects do occur and to measure them.

The theory behind this research is that the media can change the focus of our attention from the stimuli in the environment that are immediately available, to stimuli in the expanded environment available to us through the resources of our agents the gate keepers. Kneeland provides a graphic example of the results of this process when he writes:

Other issues have become so overriding as to obscure the farmer's problems, even in his own mind. Through some miracle of modern communication and repetition, the farmer lives in rural solitude and dwells upon crime-filled city streets; fiery demonstrations, bloody riots, bearded campus protestors, the frustrating war in Vietnam. And all indications are that those are the images that will fill the farmer's mind when he walks into the voting booth on November 5.33

If the media can have this type of effect then it is certainly setting the agenda by its reports. Benniger defines the construct when he writes: "The agenda-setting hypothesis...implies a relationship between the relative emphasis given by the media to various topics and the degree of salience these topics have for the general public."34 It should be noted here that this marks a relatively recent shift in thinking from the earlier idea that the media con-
trolls cognitions to the idea that the media directs cognitions.

To understand how and why the thrust of theories and research in press effects has shifted toward the agenda-setting construct, one must first delineate between cognitions and attitudes. The old theory held that the media will change attitudes which can be considered evaluations of stimuli upon which we base our thoughts and actions. Cognitions are the result of our information gathering systems. They are our images, and are either a referral device or the basis for our attitudes.

The agenda-setting theory suggests that efforts be focused on the cognitions that make up an image because that is how the media will actually affect us. Lang and Lang write:

> The mass media force attention to certain issues. They build up public images of political figures. They are constantly presenting objects suggesting what individuals in the mass should think about, know about, have feelings about.\(^{35}\)

The key is exposure to the material, not persuasive direction of the material, and as Cohen noted: 

> "[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."\(^{36}\)

In addition to the studies on agenda-setting, a large amount of work has been done to measure the direction of bias that media sources may add to the news. Although social scientists have largely discarded the opinion that the mass media will control the thoughts and actions of the public by telling them what to do and think, we should not ignore potential effects of media manipulation in less obvious
ways. It appears—from research on gate keeping and agenda-setting—that the media is more inclined to make suggestions which we are free to follow or ignore. A very important part of these suggestions—closely related to and yet independent of the concepts discussed earlier—are the bias authors add to the news by "loading" their language.

As explained in chapter one, the editors of newsmagazines sometimes direct their authors to make judgments along with their reporting of the news. Breed has demonstrated that the response of newsmen is to adjust to pressure from the implicit policies of their editors. Becker, et al. reported the results of a study by Cohen that reporters and others among the gate keepers respond more to what their publishers want than to what their audience demands. These "adjustments" will result in subjectivizing the news. Several studies indicate that such manipulations or bias can be measured.

In a very early effort, Kriesberg used a three-point favorableness scale to rate Soviet news as presented in the United States. Unfortunately, he used ad-hoc evaluations of how the reader's would probably perceive the news which left attempts to sophisticate the measuring tool to later scholars. Kriesberg does report his speculation that the slant or bias in the new would affect the audience when he writes:

(Readers would tend to acquire, or to have reinforced, an adverse opinion toward Soviet Russia. This may be expected from the Times' tendency to give more attention to news that is unfavorable to the Soviet Union and to emphasize climactic events in Soviet affairs.

As theories in the area are advanced and measurement devices
become more sophisticated, social scientists have begun to try to measure the overall picture presented by an article. This approach was based on the concept, advanced by Berelson, that meaning resides in, "the totality of impression, the Gestalt, and not in the atomistic combination of measurable units."40

An example of this approach as applied to the study of newsmagazine bias is a study done by Mujahid using Time, U.S. News and Newsweek. Mujahid used a three-point scale of favorableness to rate the "total impression" an article created for his subjects.41

Later studies began to experiment with more sophisticated ways of drawing the data from the original sources. Lowry used a trichotomy of sentence types suggested by Hayakawa42 to operationalize the selection process. Report, inference and judgment sentences were studied based on whether or not they were attributed to a particular source and whether or not they were favorable or unfavorable to the subject matter. This approach required a set of rules to help coders rectify problems caused by the complicated operationalizations.43

Merrill used Hayakawa's work in a different manner to run his study on Time magazine. Merrill separated words into categories of; "attribution bias," "adjective bias," "adverbial bias," "contextual bias," "outright opinion" and "photograph bias." Raters were asked to label each word or phrase as being positive or negative in their bias with all dubious decisions excluded from the study.44

The most recent studies have utilized varied and highly sophisticated methodologies and measuring tools. All of them have been able to identify a leaning or bias in the media source they surveyed.
Zook, for example, used evaluative assertion analysis—a very complex approach suggested by Osgood, Saporta and Nunnally—to gain a quantitative measure of the author's intensity and bias toward his subject matter.

Ernst used a directional code with four categories—"favorable," "unfavorable," "neutral" and "balanced"—to analyze the type of coverage. This work was based on an approach suggested by Tabak.

An important study to this paper was performed by Cole and Shaw who compared statements with neutral verbs—i.e. said—to the same statement with stronger attribution—i.e. argued—and finally to the same statement with both stronger attribution and mention of body language—i.e. gesturing, he argued. Subjects were asked to rate the statements using semantic differential scales—a departure from the narrow scope of many of the earlier efforts. Based on the results of their research, Cole and Shaw were able to conclude that the stronger the verb and body language attributed to a person, the more interesting and exciting the story was to the reader. The article was also less likely to be believed by the receiver.

In an effort to apply the knowledge gained from earlier work, Belkaoui tried to identify general shifts in images projected for foreign countries. Belkaoui used Time, U.S. News and Newsweek and a three-point scale of favorableness to conduct his survey in which the adjectives and phrases were separated from verbs and adverbs and then rated.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS TO PREVIOUS RESEARCH
Past efforts to survey newsmagazines have been extensive in their quantity and variety but must be considered only as foundations for more sophisticated and diverse types of research. One area that demands attention is that of variance between newsmagazine sources. In the past, comparisons have been made with newspapers, newsmagazines and television to identify differences between the various sources. However, very little work has been done on the differences between particular newsmagazines which are by definition much closer to each other in format and mode of presentation.

This thesis represents an attempt to identify differences that may exist between such similar sources. In the past, when Time, U.S. News and Newsweek were used in the same research they were considered a representative sample of the newsmagazine population. Perhaps it was this belief in their appropriateness that led researchers away from efforts to delineate between the three sources. In the study of communications, however, variance between different sources addressing the same subject is considered interesting. This author contends that the more the sources are seemingly the same the more their variances deserve observation and measure. Therefore one of the purposes of this study is to identify any differences in image projection from each of the three magazines for Sadat and Begin.

In addition to just the basic differences between newsmagazine sources on a given event, this thesis will attempt to observe, over time, the various changes that each newsmagazine has in its coverage of a particular event. The newsmagazines and the political leaders will remain the same throughout the study but five different events
that both men are involved with will provide a broader scope to the effort.

The history of interest expressed on the part of communication researchers in the effects of time on the communication process is outlined by Kline when he writes:

The inseparability of the consciousness of time from that of change was not readily agreed upon in early periods. As space was difficult to separate conceptually from its concrete state, so time was similarly difficult to separate conceptually from changes and events 'taking place' in it. Greek, medieval, and modern philosophy center on the contrast between the timeless realm of Being and the temporal realm of change. Thus for Plato the basic reality belongs to the timeless essence while the temporal realm is that of change. In our contemporary work we find that the concern with 'truth' or true knowledge as opposed to mere opinion is the epistemological parallel.51

Other studies have tried to identify general shifts over time in magazine coverage on particular personalities, but these efforts have not contrasted two political leaders and the images projected for each on the same events and issues. Either two people were not contrasted or the contrast was not made over a period of time on the same events. Therefore a second purpose of this study is to identify changes over time in the images projected for Begin and Sadat by each of the three newsmagazines.

Explicit in the above is the study of images. It is now time to apply the study of images to the leaders of foreign countries. The image should be studied between different events, different leaders and different news magazines. An attempt should also be made to compare the favorableness dimension, so popular in media studies, to the image dimension applied almost exclusively to speaker/audience
situations. Such a study would be the logical extension of much of the past research discussed in this chapter. Therefore, it is a final purpose of this study to identify the images of Sadat and Begin as projected by newsmagazines.
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METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology employed by the study. It deals with five procedures: pretesting, selection of subjects, preparation of stimulus materials, collection of data and analysis of data.

PRETEST

The pretest was designed to answer three questions. (1) How many subjects are needed to produce statistically dependable results? (2) In what format should the instructions and stimuli be presented? (3) How should the magazine sample be taken?

Stimulus materials were selected from articles other than those to be used in the final study. From this selection, fifteen statements were collected for the pretest. Each statement was placed on a separate note card for ease in rating. In order to control the bias caused by preexisting political attitudes, all proper nouns, dates, places, references to specific times and religious references were replaced by a single subscript letter and a pronoun descriptive of the type of material removed. Subjects were instructed that using the same subscript twice in one sentence indicated a relationship between the two deleted subjects. For example, the statement, "Carter and Mondale left Washington D.C. to visit Begin in Jerusalem" was changed to "Person X₁ and Person X₂ left Capitol City X to visit Person Y in Capitol City Y." The numerals indicate two different subjects.
In addition to the fifteen note cards, the subjects were presented with a set of semantic differential-type items. The items were selected from research by McCroskey. The dependant variables—each represented by two items on the pretest answer sheet—were (1) favorableness of language bias, (2) competence of the subject, (3) character of the subject, (4) sociability of the subject, (5) extroversion of the subject, and (6) composure of the subject.

The semantic differential-type items were on a seven interval scale with the polarity randomly reversed to reduce the effects of response bias. The stimulus cards and the items were also randomly ordered to minimize fatigue effects. This randomization also insured that raters would not guess the time sequence or source referred to by the stimulus cards.

Four subjects were selected to complete the form. All were native speakers of English. Three of the four had an extensive background in communications and were considered "expert" raters. The fourth subject from an unrelated field—grain science—served as a control to determine the desired level of expertise in the raters.

An SAS analysis of variance program was utilized to run a randomized block design, blocking on rater.

Based on the large degree of variance between all raters and the low level of internal reliability, there were apparently several problems with the pretest which could possibly have reduced its effectiveness. The number of raters was the most obvious source of difficulty. At least fifteen to twenty raters would be required to get the standard error down to a more moderate level. The high amount of error variance identified in the pretest would greatly reduce the
probability of isolating main effects and especially second-order interactions. For instance, in the pretest interrater variance on the favorableness dimension was at an acceptable level but the image dimensions created a tremendous amount of error variance. As a result a decision was made to increase the number of raters.

Although the raters were fairly consistent in their individual performances, the variance between raters was too high to entertain the notion of using a select few "expert" raters in the final study. There was low consistency between raters and no significant differences in the variance between the "experts" and the "lay" rater.

Another problem involved the presentation of the stimulus material. There were two difficulties here. The instructions were difficult to understand—largely because of the complicated system of subscripts—and the stimuli were presented with so little of the original context that raters had difficulty responding to the stimuli they were rating. These problems resulted in simplification of the instructions and of the form of stimulus material presentation.

STIMULUS MATERIALS

One final ramification of the pretest is worthy of note because of its bearing on the selection of the stimulus materials. Instead of randomly selecting issues of newsmagazines printed during the peace process, five events were selected that were considered keys to the process. These events were: (1) Sadat's visit to Israel in November, 1977; (2) The first breakdown in the talks that resulted from Sadat's visit, in January, 1978; (3) The Camp David talks in September, 1978; (4) The final peace treaty in May, 1979; and, (5) The first Israeli
withdrawal from occupied Egyptian territory in June, 1979. The only criteria for the selection of these events were: (1) that both Sadat and Begin participated in the same event; (2) that their participation was recorded in the same article; (3) that all three newsmagazines recorded the same event on the same week; and, (4) that the event signaled a significant change in the momentum of the peace process. All events that met the above criterion were selected for this study.

There were three reasons for this change in stimulus selection. First, it would not have been possible to perform the stimulus collection process as originally intended because both men were not always covered on the same event or in all three newsmagazines in the same week. It was considered impractical to have several statements each for two men from three different magazines over twenty different weeks. This would have resulted in each subject having to rate as many as 1800 different pieces of stimuli, an effort which would have exhausted even the dedicated respondent. A final reason, and perhaps the most important one, for the change is that it improved the study by making it more applicable to the real world. The amount of time or duration between samples should not be artificially determined in research but rather based on the importance of events over time. As Kline explains:

Evaluating individual events or relationships in relation to their larger pattern is often more useful than viewing them as items independent of setting. Thus the use of time in segregate patterns of interactions is an important function for analysis in social research. 4

All of this resulted in a shift of the stimulus pool from the pretest
to the actual study.

To give subjects a better idea of the context in which they were rating the political leaders, a set of sentences was used from each article. This meant that instead of having only one sentence to work with, the raters could get as many as fifteen statements about a political leader before having to rate his image. The fifteen statement limit was set to reduce fatigue effects and was operationalized by randomly selecting fifteen statements about each political leader from each article. If fewer than fifteen statements appeared, all were included.

In addition to the lack of context, pretest raters expressed difficulty with the subscript system. A decision was made to use only one subscript in each set of fifteen statements. The subscript would remain the same throughout and be applied only to the political leader the subjects were to rate. Other references that could draw out preconceived ideas on the part of the subjects were replaced only with pronouns and an explanation of any relationship between the removed material and the political leader being rated. For example, "Sadat was attacked by Begin for damaging the prospects for peace" would be changed to Mr. X was attacked by a foreign leader for damaging the prospects for peace. This also resulted in tremendous simplification of the instructions (See Appendix A).

Subjects were given two books in order to complete the study; a stimulus book and a book filled with answer sheets. The first book contained the sets of statements describing Sadat's or Begin's participation in one of the five events from one of the three news-
magazines. This resulted in a total of thirty sets of statements for each rater—one for each of the two leaders in each of the three magazines for each of the five different events.

In order to reduce the possible effects of preexisting political attitudes, all proper nouns, dates, places, references to specific times and religions were changed to descriptive pronouns. In addition, all material attributed specifically to a source other than the newsmagazine were excluded. Statements using Sadat's or Begin's names only in a descriptive manner—i.e. "Dayan rode Begin's plane to the United States"—were deleted. Statements where the thoughts and actions were attributed to another source—i.e. "Carter made the flight just in time for a hurried trip to Israel where he demanded to speak with Begin"—were deleted.

The most commonly used, neutral sounding attribution words were deleted. These words were excluded unless accompanied by a descriptive modifier—i.e. "Begin said loudly." When the same word was used describing the same man in the same event in the same magazine article twice, that statement was deleted unless something else in the statement was used. All visual form material, visual form text and advertisements were excluded. Only statements mentioning Sadat or Begin by name or directly referring to one of the two men by a personal pronoun were selected. Only statements in the articles selected were used.

The following example is a specific change that was made according to the above operationalization. "Egyptian President Anwar Sadat got a hero's welcome as he paid his first visit the next day to Sinai's caravan city. After flying to El Arish, he prayed in the sands of
the Sinai and placed a wreath on the war tomb in honor of Egyptian soldiers who died in action. Then in a moving ceremony, Sadat kissed a huge Egyptian flag and raised it over El Arish." This paragraph was changed into the following material. Person X got a hero's welcome as he paid his first visit to the city. Person X prayed in the sands of the desert. Person X placed a wreath on the war tomb in honor of his country's soldiers who died in action. In a moving ceremony, Person X kissed a huge flag of his country and raised it over the city.

The sets of statements were randomly ordered to reduce order effects from fatigue as well as to keep subjects from guessing the time sequence or source referred to in the sets of statements. Subjects were instructed to give their first impression of the stimuli. This helped the subjects form a better impression of what they were to do, how they were to do it and why they were doing it.

The second book contained the items used to evaluate Sadat and Begin as well as a favorableness dimension evaluation of each of the leader's participation in the actual event. Twenty semantic differential-type items, were selected from past works on favorableness of language bias, credibility and image. These sets of items were used to rate each set of statements. The polarity of the items was randomly reversed to prevent response bias, and the semantic differential-type items were randomly ordered to reduce fatigue effects.

SUBJECTS

Forty subjects volunteered to take the survey. Because of the nature of the research, only native speakers of English were accepted.
Subjects did record their age, sex, academic classification and frequency of readership in the area of international affairs on the questionnaire.

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Except for the items covering favorableness of language bias, which is not a source image construct—favorableness in language bias is one of the dependent variables but was not considered in the factor analysis—all items comprising the sources' image were submitted to orthogonal, principle components' factor analysis with varimax rotation. The cut-off value for factor extraction was set at the standard eigenvalue of one. This was done to insure that the hypothesized dimensionality of the source's image was borne out in the experiment. For a factor to be considered a viable dimension and to be used in the subsequent analysis, three criteria must have been met: (1) An item must have a primary loading of .60 with no secondary loading .40. (2) At least two items must meet the first criteria for a dimension to be extracted. (3) Each dimension meeting criteria (1) and (2) must have an internal reliability estimate of .60 or above.

The above criteria were met in the following manner. The eighteen items used in the experiment resulted in a three factor synthesis for source image measurement which suggested the three dependent variables for further analysis (See Table 3.1). The first factor was labeled "Credibility" and was composed of the intelligence, virtuous, trained, informed, competent, high character, bright, honest, unselfish, expert and trust items. The second factor was labeled "Extroversion" and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX</th>
<th>COMMUNALITY h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>F₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>0.71740</td>
<td>-0.03217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGHT</td>
<td>0.73359</td>
<td>0.32710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH CHARACTER</td>
<td>0.73069</td>
<td>0.05422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENT</td>
<td>0.75104</td>
<td>0.34597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMED</td>
<td>0.71791</td>
<td>0.36744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSELFISH</td>
<td>0.65619</td>
<td>-0.30096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERT</td>
<td>0.74489</td>
<td>0.37058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONEST</td>
<td>0.75273</td>
<td>-0.05031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINED</td>
<td>0.72684</td>
<td>0.36736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUOUS</td>
<td>0.65953</td>
<td>-0.07705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELLIGENT</td>
<td>0.74576</td>
<td>0.38441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTROVERTED</td>
<td>0.15619</td>
<td>0.66064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGRESSIVE</td>
<td>0.02817</td>
<td>0.81618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLD</td>
<td>0.05431</td>
<td>0.80809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSED</td>
<td>0.30082</td>
<td>0.13077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELAXED</td>
<td>0.21627</td>
<td>0.14178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POISEa</td>
<td>0.36470</td>
<td>0.40048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMPATHYa</td>
<td>0.57633</td>
<td>-0.32207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Common Variance 55% 25% 20% 100%
consisted of the bold, extroverted and aggressive items. The third factor was labeled "Composure" and consisted of the relaxed and composed items. Two items, "Sympathy" and "Poise," were removed after failing to meet the above criteria.

Four composite variables were constructed. Each composite was formed by taking the sum of z-scores for each item included in the factor. This procedure was performed to standardize the unit of measure for each item so that linear additions could be made. The resulting score was divided by the number of items that went into the composite. This final calculation was cosmetic and merely made the resulting means easier to read and understand.

**ANALYSIS OF DATA**

Cronback's alpha coefficient was used to determine the level of interrater reliability, or consistancy across raters in their judgments of the material. Alpha provides the average correlation among the items which is a measure of internal consistency.

When the dependent variables were set and the internal reliability demonstrated, a 2x3x5x40 ANOVA—two political leaders x three newsmagazines x five events x forty raters—blocked on raters was run to identify the level of variance between each of the possible independent variables as well as possible interaction effects. In addition, a 2x3x5x2 repeated measures test (r.m.t.) blocked on sex—male, female—, a 2x3x5x5 r.m.t. blocked on age—17 to 21, 22 to 26, 27 to 31, 32
to 36, 37 to 41—, a 2x3x5x6 r.m.t. blocked on academic classification—freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate, other—and a 2x3x5x3 r.m.t. blocked on frequency of readership of international news—everyday, once or twice a week, once or twice a year—were run. These tests were used to determine the percent of variance accounted for by the model as well as to discover the interaction effects between the various treatments.

Because of the size and nature of this experiment, it was necessary to control for the experiment-wise error rate. As the number of mean contrasts increases in an experiment, there is greater likelihood of more Type I errors if the alpha level remains constant. To guard against such a possibility, all mean contrasts using the "Least Significant Difference" (LSD) test will be applied at a significance level of at least .001. Because there are 70 contrasts for each dependent variable, each contrast must be tested at the .01 alpha level to maintain an experiment-wise error rate of .05.
NOTES


2The items used in the pretest were: "Favorably" and "In a good light"—Favorableness dimension--; "Expert" and "Competent"—Competence dimension--; "Trustworthy" and "Honest"—Character dimension--; "Friendly" and "Good natured"—Sociability dimension--; "Bold" and "Extroverted"—Extroversion dimension--; and, "Poised" and "Relaxed"—Composure dimension.


5The complete list of the words deleted follows: talked, ask, add, term, phoned, step, saw, various tenses of say, met and signed.


7Barr et. al.
RESULTS

This chapter will report the results of the research outlined in Chapter Three. Included with the report are several graphs and tables which the author believes will serve to help the reader understand the findings of this effort. Materials included in this chapter are: (1) The results of a repeated measures ANOVA on individual differences between raters factoring on age, sex, academic classification and readership of international news. This section provides information regarding individual differences between raters that are significant at the .05 level. (2) The results of a randomized block ANOVA blocked on rater factoring on rater, event, magazine and political leader. Interactions between magazine and event; event and political leader; magazine and political leader; and magazine, event and political leader are also reported. Significance levels for the results of this ANOVA are set at .05. (3) The results of mean comparisons made using the LSD on the model described in (2) with significance levels set at .01. Analysis included in this chapter will be organized around the three research questions addressed by the study.

Results of the repeated measures analysis, using age, sex, academic classification and readership frequency as factors, are important—even though there were no hypotheses made regarding the relationship between such rater characteristics and the dependent variables—because these rater factors may have contributed in some way to the model effects. Isolating the rater attributes
which may enter into the various interactions will provide additional information about the model and its usefulness as an image measurement tool in research of this nature. A repeated measures design was used for this test because the underlying assumption is that factoring should be done on specific differences between raters rather than differences in the data—included for analysis in the randomized block model.

Language (F=2.17, df=4/985, P=.0704) and Composure (1.58, 4/986, .1762) were not significantly affected by the rater's age. However, age was an important factor in determining both Credibility (5.96, 4/986, .0001) and Extroversion (7.60, 4/986, .0001). The r² for age was .01 for both Extroversion and Credibility. The means for Credibility and Extroversion were lower in the middle age groups—27 to 31—than in either of the two groups above and below that category.

Although it has been theorized that age may change the perceptions of a receiver, there is no way to make a conclusive statement about the above results. Apparently the perceived credibility and extroversion of a source will vary according to audience age. This conclusion, however, splits the source's image construct without any obvious explanation.

Language (17.92, 1/1072, .0001), Credibility (19.45, 1/1073, .0001) and Composure (7.45, 1/1073, .0065) were significantly affected by the rater's sex. The r² was .01 for Language and Credibility and was .004 for Composure. Sex was not a significant factor in a rater's perception of Extroversion (2.30, 1/1073, .0945). The mean scores were higher for males in all but the Extroversion dimension where females had a higher mean.
It is difficult to attribute a great deal of meaning to these results. Apparently, the language used by newsmagazines is perceived in significantly different ways by the two sexes. Perhaps the language used to develop the credibility and composure of a source is a key to the overall language bias picture. There were no measurement devices included in this study to explain why such differences might occur.

All four of the dependent variables were significantly related to a rater's academic classification—Language (4.41,5/898, .0006), Credibility (13.99,5/899,.0001), Composure (5.41,4/899, .0001) and Extroversion (9.59,5/899,.0001). In addition, Language and Credibility had $r^2$ values of .03, Extroversion had an $r^2$ value of .02 and Composure had an $r^2$ value of .01 in a model that accounted for 52 percent of the total variance. The means were generally lower for the junior year than at the other two ends of the scale—senior, graduate; freshman, sophomore—where means went up as the ends of the scale were reached. Obviously, there is a significant relationship between academic classification and a rater's perception of language bias and the image construct.

The fourth repeated measures analysis resulted in the identification of Extroversion (6.25,1/986,.0126) as the only dependent variable that readership frequency was a factor in determining. Extroversion had an $r^2$ of .004. The greater the frequency of readership the higher the mean on the Extroversion variable. The other three dependent variables, Language (0.37,1/985,.5447), Credibility (0.86,1/986,.3534) and Composure (2.35,1/986,.1255) were not significantly determined by the readership frequency factor.
The measurement device used to delineate between various levels of readership frequency may not have been sophisticated enough to isolate the nuances that may have existed. Also, the raters in this study were fairly equivalent in their readership frequency— all were either daily or biweekly readers— thus making identification of differences, based on readership frequency, difficult if not impossible.

The results of these four repeated measures test indicate that some rater characteristics may have an affect on the perception of language bias and image projected. Academic classification was the most important factor— of the four surveyed— in affecting such perceptions. Age was an important factor in determining perceptions of credibility and extroversion while sex played a significant role in the ratings of language bias, credibility and composure. Readership frequency was a significant factor only to the perceptions of extroversion.

A randomized block ANOVA, blocking on rater, was used to analyze the following factors: rater, event, magazine and political leader. Interaction between magazine and event; event and political leader; magazine and political leader; and magazine, event and political leader were also analyzed. This design allows for testing of the main effects as well as identification of the significant second and third order interactions that may have occurred. The model to be analyzed below measured the significance of each of the factors— listed above— on the four dependent variables for each of the forty raters. The author believes that these factors
included the entire population of the variables that could have significantly affected the perceptions of the dependent variables.

The model used in the randomized block ANOVA, blocked on rater, typically accounted for from 33 to 41 percent of the variance in the system (see Figure I). Rater perceptions of all four dependent variables were significantly affected (P=.0001) by the factors in the model.

Of the main effects, the Rater and Event factors were significant at the .0001 level for all four dependent variables. The sum of the respective $r^2$ values for these two main effects represented well over half of the variance explained by the whole model for each dependent variable. The Magazine factor was significant at the .001 level for Language ($r^2=.03$), Credibility ($r^2=.02$) and Composure ($r^2=.03$) but showed no significant affect on the perception of Extroversion. The Political Leader factor was significant at the .0001 level for Composure ($r^2=.01$) and Extroversion ($r^2=.02$), significant at the .01 level for Language bias ($r^2=.004$) and significant at the .05 level for Credibility ($r^2=.003$).

Other than the main effects—which are expected to account for the greatest percent of the variance in the model—the second order interaction between Event and Newsmagazine was significant at the .0001 level for all four dependent variables and accounted for the most variance of the second order interaction effects (Language $r^2=.06$, Credibility $r^2=.05$, Composure $r^2=.04$, Extroversion $r^2=.05$). The Event and Political Leader interaction was significant at the .0001 level for the perception of Language Bias ($r^2=.01$) and
### FIGURE I
ANOVA SUMMARY FOR LANGUAGE BIAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS^a</th>
<th>MS^a</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
<th>ETA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1029.11</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>R^2=.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>248.13</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>365.04</td>
<td>91.26</td>
<td>56.77</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGAZINE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83.35</td>
<td>41.68</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>0.0106</td>
<td>r^2=.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG*EV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>171.62</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV*P-L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39.23</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG*P-L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.45</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG<em>EV</em>P-L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.73</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1815.00</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>r^2=.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>2844.11</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA SUMMARY FOR CREDIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS^a</th>
<th>MS^a</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
<th>ETA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>380.51</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>R^2=.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>160.27</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>104.25</td>
<td>26.06</td>
<td>54.94</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGAZINE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
<td>r^2=.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG*EV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43.45</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV*P-L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>56.75</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG*P-L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG<em>EV</em>P-L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>r^2=.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>536.57</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>r^2=.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>917.08</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a rounded to nearest hundredth
#### FIGURE I CONTINUED

**ANOVA SUMMARY FOR COMPOSURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>PR-F</th>
<th>r²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>644.20</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>213.73</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>183.12</td>
<td>45.78</td>
<td>38.81</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGAZINE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.04</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG*EV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71.25</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV*P-L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG*P-L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG<em>EV</em>P-L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>1334.06</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>1978.26</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA SUMMARY FOR EXTROVERSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>PR-F</th>
<th>r²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>619.91</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATER</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>308.30</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>111.72</td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td>28.98</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGAZINE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.3910</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL-LDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG*EV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91.86</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV*P-L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.3130</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG*P-L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG<em>EV</em>P-L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55.55</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1090.05</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>1709.95</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rounded to nearest hundredth
Credibility ($r^2=.03$) and was significant at the .05 level for Composure ($r^2=.07$) but was not significantly related to the perception of Extroversion. The Magazine and Political Leader interaction was significant at the .0001 level for Language ($r^2=.02$), Credibility ($r^2=.01$) and Composure ($r^2=.01$) and was significant at the .01 level for Extroversion ($r^2=.007$).

The third order interaction between Event, Political Leader and Magazine was significant at the .0001 level throughout the test and typically accounted for 2 or 3 percent of the model's variance.

The results of the randomized block ANOVA indicate that the model used is extremely important in its relationship to perception of language bias and the image dimensions. Rater, Event and Political Leader were identified as factors that significantly affected perceptions of all four dependent variables and the Magazine factor was important to all but the perceptions of extroversion. The second order interactions between Event and Newsmagazine and between Newsmagazine and Political Leader were significantly related to all four dependent variables. The Event and Political Leader interaction was important to all but the perception of extroversion. The third order interaction significantly affected the perceptions of all four dependent variables.

Analysis of the means of the main effects and second and third order interaction effects using the least significant differences test helped to provide identification of the specific cases, components and interactions that resulted in the above findings.
Mean comparisons will be considered significant only if the relationship is at the .01 level or less. This standard will insure that only important relationships are extracted for further analysis. This section will be organized by the application of the mean comparisons to the research questions addressed in the study.

The first research question is what images are projected for Sadat and Begin. A review of the means for the Language bias dimension (see Figure II) shows that the composite score over all five events and from all three magazines is significantly higher for Begin than for Sadat ($P = .01$). The same composite means for the image construct dimensions (see Figure III for Extroversion, Figure IV for Composure, Figure V for Credibility) show that Begin was also projected significantly higher on the Extroversion (.001), Composure (.001) and Credibility (.01) variables than was Sadat. All of this means that the answer to research question one is that newsmagazine language bias was significantly more in favor of Begin than Sadat and that Begin’s image was portrayed as significantly better than Sadat’s (see Figure VI). The second research question is what differences occur between the three newsmagazines in their coverage of Sadat and Begin. This question will be answered in two phases: (1) A comparison of Sadat and Begin as presented by the three newsmagazines. (2) A comparison of the three newsmagazines across both political leaders together.

The following paragraphs will provide the comparison of Sadat and Begin. A review of the means for the Language bias dimension
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIGURE II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY OF MEANS FOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE BIAS OVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL EVENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Magazine [(n=400, .23 (.01), .3 (.001) significance level]
Pol.Ldr. [(n=600, .19 (.01), .24 (.001) significance level]
P-L*Mag [(n=200, .33 (.01), .41 (.001) significance level]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIGURE III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY OF MEANS FOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTROVERSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL EVENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Magazine [(n=400, .18 (.01), .23 (.001) significance level]
Pol.Ldr. [(n=600, .15 (.01), .19 (.001) significance level]
P-L*Mag [(n=200, .25 (.01), .32 (.001) significance level]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIGURE IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY OF MEANS FOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL EVENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Magazine [(n=400, .2 (.01), .25 (.001) significance level]
Pol.Ldr. [(n=600, .16 (.01), .21 (.001) significance level]
P-L*Mag [(n=200, .28 (.01), .36 (.001) significance level]


FIGURE V
SUMMARY OF MEANS FOR CREDIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL EVENTS</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Magazine [(n=400, .13 (.01), .16 (.001) significance level]
Pol.Ldr. [(n=600, .1 (.01), .13 (.001) significance level]
P=L*Mag [(n=200, .13 (.01), .23 (.001) significance level]

shows that the three newsmagazines did not agree in their presentations of Sadat and Begin even though the composite means across all three magazines—provided earlier—revealed that Begin was

FIGURE VI
COMPOSITE MEANS FOR IMAGE CONSTRUCT ACROSS ALL THREE MAGAZINES AND ALL FIVE EVENTS
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generally favored by newsmagazines. Both Newsweek and U.S. News significantly biased their language more favorably toward Begin (P .001) than Sadat. Time, on the other hand, was significantly more favorable toward Sadat (.01). It is very interesting to note that there were no significant differences between any of the three magazines in their bias toward Begin. Rather, all of the differences in presentation were traceable to Sadat where U.S. News and Newsweek were significantly less favorable than Time (.001). There was no significant difference between U.S. News and Newsweek in the Language bias dimension for Sadat.

The means for the Extroversion variable reveal that both Time and Newsweek presented Begin significantly higher (.001) than Sadat. U.S. News did not project either political leader as more extroverted. Again, there were no significant differences between the three newsmagazines in their presentation of Begin but both Newsweek and Time presented Sadat as significantly less Extroverted (.01) than U.S. News did.

The means for the Composure variable show that both U.S. News and Newsweek portrayed Begin as significantly more Composed (.001) than Sadat. Time did not favor either of the two political leaders in this area. However, Time was significantly higher in its presentation of Sadat (.001) than the other two magazines. There were no differences between the three magazines in their ratings of Begin on the Composure dimension.

Both Newsweek and U.S. News presented Begin as significantly more Credible (.001 for Newsweek, .01 for U.S. News) than Sadat. Conversely, Time was rated as being significantly more Credible
toward Sadat than Begin. As in all other cases, there were no significant differences in the three newsmagazine's presentation of Begin. However *Time* presented Sadat as significantly more Credible (.001) than either of the other two magazines did. These results indicate that the interaction between magazine and political leader is very important in determining the type of image projected.

**FIGURE VII**
COMPOSITE MEANS FOR BEGIN ACROSS ALL FIVE EVENTS BY NEWSMAGAZINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Extroversion</th>
<th>Composure</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although all three magazines treated Begin in somewhat the same manner, *Time* was significantly different than the other two magazines in its treatment of Sadat.
The second part of the answer to research question two will provide a comparison of the three magazines across both political leaders. This review is designed to isolate inherent differences in the general style of presentation between the three magazines. In the Language bias dimension Newsweek was significantly lower than U.S. News (.01) which was significantly lower than Time (.001). There were no significant differences between the three magazines for the Extroversion dimension. Both U.S. News and Newsweek were significantly lower than Time on the Composure variable (.001) and the Credibility variable (.01) although U.S. News and Newsweek were never significantly different than each other on those two variables.

These figures reveal several interesting findings. First of all, there was never any disagreement between the three magazines on Begin (see Figure VII). However, Time was usually more favorable toward Sadat—the sole exception being on the Extroversion dimension where Time and U.S. News traded places—while the other two magazines usually favored Begin (see Figure VIII). This information would tend to indicate that Time represented a different population than U.S. News and Newsweek and that the generic term of "newsmagazine" is not a guarantee of constancy between the individual magazines. In fact, the data provided in section (2) above provides further impetus for such a conclusion by revealing that U.S. News and Newsweek were significantly different—when using a composite of the means for both political leaders—only in their Language bias ratings.
while Time was significantly higher than the other two magazines for all but the Extroversion dimension (see Figure IX).

FIGURE VIII
COMPOSITE MEANS FOR SADAT ACROSS ALL FIVE EVENTS BY NEWSMAGAZINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>NEWSWEEK</th>
<th>U.S. NEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information reviewed in the next few paragraphs will help to answer the third research question; how did Sadat's and Begin's images change over time? Images will be reported on an event by event basis and only those changes that are significant between two events in the order they occurred will be reported as significant. This precaution will remove the possibility of identifying the snowballing that may occur in image projection over several events as a significant and dramatic change.
FIGURE IX
COMPOSITE MEANS FOR ALL DEPENDENT VARIABLES
ACROSS BOTH POLITICAL LEADERS AND ALL FIVE EVENTS

A review of the means for the Language bias dimension (see Table 4.1, Appendix B) for the first event shows that newsmagazines in general—a composite across all three newsmagazines—significantly favored Begin (.001) over Sadat. Begin was also portrayed significantly higher (.001) on the Credibility (see Table 4.4, Appendix B) variable than was Sadat. There were no significant differences for the two men on the Extroversion (see Table 4.2, Appendix B) and Composure (see Table 4.3, Appendix B) dimensions.

The same composite means—across all three newsmagazines—for event two show that there were no significant differences in the
Language bias directed toward Sadat and Begin and no significant differences in the Credibility ratings for the two men. However, Begin was portrayed as significantly more Extroverted (.01) and significantly higher on the Composure variable (.001) than was Sadat. In all but one case—Begin was significantly less Extroverted but only at the .01 level—the two leaders were projected significantly lower (.001) in each of the four dependent variables than they were in event one.

The same composite means for event three reveal that there were no differences in the Extroversion levels attributed to the two men. Begin was portrayed significantly higher (.001) on the Composure variable and was also seen as significantly more (.01) Credible than Sadat. The Language bias directed toward both men was significantly higher (.001) for event three than for event two. Both men were also portrayed as significantly more Composed (.001) and significantly more Credible (.001) in event three than they were in event two. There were no changes between event two and three for the Extroversion dimension for either man.

The same composite means for event four reveal that there were no significant differences for either of the two men on any of the four dependent variables. Although there were no significant changes in Language bias from event three to event four, both Sadat and Begin were portrayed as significantly less Extroverted (.001) in event four. Begin was significantly less Composed (.001) in event four while Sadat had no change in Composure from event three to event four. Begin was also significantly less Credible
in event four while Sadat remained stable on that variable as well.

The same composite means for event five indicate that although there were no differences in the Language bias directed toward both men, Begin was presented as significantly more Extroverted (.001) than Sadat while Sadat was portrayed as significantly more Credible (.01) than Begin. There were no differences between the two men on the Composure variable. The Language bias directed toward Begin did not change between event four and event five but did significantly (.001) improve for Sadat over the same period. Sadat's Extroversion ratings did not change between the two events while Begin's Extroversion rose significantly (.001). Begin's Composure rating was stable between the two events while Sadat's ratings on the same dimension increased significantly (.01). Begin's Credibility dropped significantly (.01) while Sadat's Credibility increased by the same margin (.01).

There is little question that interpretation of these results is quite difficult because of the large number of fluctuations caused by varied events and newsmagazine reports (for an example see Figure X). The ANOVA results reported earlier indicated that such would be the case and that perhaps the most useful information comes from the composite means across all five events. A successful prediction about the mean requires information about the event, magazine and political leader involved and not just one of the three. Begin did appear to be presented more favorably than
FIGURE X
LANGUAGE BIAS MEANS FOR SADAT ACROSS ALL FIVE EVENTS AND THREE MAGAZINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>NEWSWEEK</th>
<th>U.S. NEWS</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVENTS AND MAGAZINES:
- EVENT ONE: NEWSWEEK: 2.95, U.S. NEWS: 2.90, TIME: 2.85
- EVENT TWO: NEWSWEEK: 2.75, U.S. NEWS: 2.70, TIME: 2.65
- EVENT THREE: NEWSWEEK: 2.60, U.S. NEWS: 2.55, TIME: 2.45
- EVENT FIVE: NEWSWEEK: 2.25, U.S. NEWS: 2.20, TIME: 2.15
Sadat in events one, two and three. The means for event four showed that Sadat had closed the gap between the two men and then, in event five, Sadat was portrayed higher than Begin in one of the only two variables where there was a significant difference between the two men. The means from event to event reveal that although the two men seemed to be experiencing the same changes of fortune between event one and event two as well as between events two and three, Sadat's ratings tended to remain stable or improve between events three and four and events four and five while Begin's ratings—with the exception of the Extroversion variable which rose between events four and five—were either stable or dropping during the same period.
"Thrice I tried to clasp...(the) image, and thrice it slipped through my hands, like a shadow, like a dream."  

This chapter will serve two purposes: (1) The results presented in Chapter IV will be discussed and possible interpretations will be suggested. (2) The implications of this study upon future research will be discussed. The chapter will be organized around the factors studied—political leader, magazine and event—and the interactions observed—Magazine X Political Leader, Magazine X Event, Political Leader X Event and Magazine X Political Leader X Event.

The first research question—what images were projected for Sadat and Begin—resulted in the identification of significant differences in the treatment received by each of the two men. Begin was portrayed significantly higher on all four dimensions across the newsmagazines studied. This is noteworthy because it indicates that newsmagazines as a group may favor one political leader over another. However, the survey results reported in Chapter I might well have predicted that Begin would obtain a general edge over Sadat. Therefore, it would be naive to try and generalize a great deal from these figures alone. There is much more going on than just a simple preference being expressed by newsmagazines as a group for one political leader over another. In fact, the ANOVA analysis reported in Chapter IV revealed that Political Leader was the least important of the three factors in predicting the dependent variables. This means that the most important information will be provided by the various interaction effects measured in this thesis and not
by the main effect for Political Leader.

Research Question number two—how did the images projected by each of the three newsmagazines vary—provides a direct comparison between the three magazines. In other words, regardless of the particular political figure, does any one magazine show significantly higher or lower ranges of perception of the four dependent variables than the others? This question is valuable in that the results of this thesis indicate that the Magazine factor was more important than the Political Leader factor in predicting the dependent variables. This means that it is more important to know what magazine is covering a story than it is to know who the story is about if an attempt is to be made to predict the type of coverage provided.

The results across both political leaders indicate that U.S. News and Newsweek are less likely to manipulate the favorableness of their language bias, their perceptions of credibility and their perceptions of composure than is Time. In addition, U.S. News and Newsweek will generally not vary significantly from each other in any of the four dependent variables.

The fact that Time was different than the other two magazines is really not surprising since one of Time's founding principles is that judgements should be made by writers of the news—see Chapter II. Perhaps it is this policy that results in the fact that Time loads its words and phrases more than either of the other two magazines. The results of this thesis indicate that even if Time has modified its policies from those early years when the goal was to make a judgement, it is still distinctly different from other newsmagazines in its perceptions and presentation form.
An even more important finding of this effort is that *Newsweek* and *U.S. News* were very similar in their perceptions and presentations of the Middle East. The fact that two magazines so closely mirror one another is extremely interesting given the tremendous number of potential presentation formats available. Further efforts should take note of these facts and perhaps respond by not lumping the three magazines together under the generic title of "newsmagazines."

Also, the fact that *U.S. News* and *Newsweek* tended to be rated equivalent suggests that perhaps the sample of newsmagazines was biased against *Time*. *Time*'s coverage may have appeared flamboyant only because it was compared to the coverage of *U.S. News* and *Newsweek*. It would be interesting to discover whether *Time* or *Newsweek* and *U.S. News* are closer to the mean scores over all newsmagazines. In short, the results of this part of the study—*Time*'s differences with the other two magazines—provide fertile ground for further research.

The third research question compares Sadat's and Begin's changes in image over time. The ANOVA results reported in Chapter IV indicate the relative importance of the Event factor to rater perceptions. Both men experienced changes in their images as the events changed. The direction—favorable to unfavorable—of these image changes could have been predicted by the nature of the event. For example, event one was the start of the peace talks and would predictably be rated as a positive step toward peace. Consequently both Sadat and Begin enjoyed relatively good image presentation by the three magazines at this point. Event two was the first breakdown of the peace talks. Similarly, this step could predictably be viewed as a negative one, unfavorably oriented toward the goal of peace, and resulting in a generally bad image presen-
tation for Sadat and Begin. In short, there is very little new information to be gained from a simple analysis of the main effect for Event. Rather it merely serves to confirm what could easily have been predicted from the outset of the study. The real story lies in the various interactions that occurred between the factors.

At this point it is important to begin an examination of the interactions that were occurring in the data. These interactions are significant in their ability to predict the dependent variables and they provide more insight into the thesis than the factors alone can provide.

The relative treatment of Sadat and Begin takes on more meaning when the Magazine X Political Leader interaction is scrutinized. This interaction was identified as important in predicting all four dependent variables by the ANOVA reported in Chapter IV. It provides information regarding how the individual magazines treated each of the political leaders. An interaction effect would result in differences in the treatment afforded one of the two political leaders by one of the three magazines.

The results of this thesis show: (1) There was not any significant disagreement between the three magazines in their treatment of Begin. (2) *Time* magazine favored Sadat significantly more than *Newsweek* and *U.S. News* on all but the Extroversion dimension where *U.S. News* projected him higher. (3) *Time* manipulated its Language bias to favor Sadat significantly more than Begin and portrayed Sadat significantly higher on the Credibility variable than Begin. (4) *U.S. News* and *Newsweek* manipulated their Language bias, perceptions of Composure and perceptions of Credibility to favor Begin significantly more than Sadat.

These results demonstrate that newsmagazines will disagree about
some political leaders and agree about others. They also demonstrate that newsmagazines will play favorites with the political leaders they choose to portray favorably and that the concept of similar treatment is only a myth. Therefore, to say that Begin was given a better image by newsmagazines in the United States is to oversimplify the issue and, in fact, to misconstrue the data. It is important to notice that the disagreement between Time and the other two magazines over Sadat was as often a result of U.S. News and Newsweek projecting Sadat significantly lower than Begin as it was a result of Time projecting Sadat significantly higher than Begin.

This information could mean one of two things. Time may simply be manipulating the image of Sadat so that he appears to its readers a better man than he really is. The fact that both U.S. News and Newsweek disagreed with Time would lend credence to this hypothesis. Perhaps this is one example of how Time subjectivizes its news. There is enough information available to conclude that Time selects particular political figures and pumps up their images, but not enough information to explain the reasons for this selection.

A second, equally plausible theory must also be considered. U.S. News and Newsweek may simply be following a traditionally anti-Arab position taken by the United States newsmagazines—see Chapter I. In support of this hypothesis the reader should recall that the differences between the three magazines regarding Sadat were as often a function of U.S. News and Newsweek projecting him in a less favorable way than Begin, as they were a function of Time projecting him more favorably than Begin. If it is valid to hypothesize that Time is biased in favor of Sadat, these results indicate that it is equally valid to hypothesize that the other
two magazines are biased against Sadat and in favor of Begin. In this case, there is enough information available to conclude that both U.S. News and Newsweek select particular political figures for preferential treatment. The reasons for the selection of a particular leader and the fairness of such a biased projection cannot be evaluated any further at this point.

Additional insight into the situation is provided by examination of the Political Leader X Event interaction. This interaction provides a comparison—over all three magazines—of the images projected for Sadat and Begin and is important in the prediction of all but the Extroversion dimension. Since both political leaders played the same or similar roles in each of the events, it would be reasonable to hypothesize that while the direction of the images for both men might change, their specific projected images would at least be similar and move together from favorable to unfavorable events. In fact, such similarity did not result. Each event seemed to affect the two men differently.

In event one Begin had a generally better image than Sadat. In each of the following three events Sadat was slowly presented more and more favorably, so that by the time event four had passed there was very little difference between the two men. This resulted from the fact that Sadat was stable on the image construct dimensions while Begin lost ground on the Composure and Credibility variables. Event five resulted in further equalization. Sadat actually improved his rating on three of the four dependent variables while Begin lost still more ground on Credibility and was significantly higher only on Extroversion. In other words, there was a significant interaction between Event and Political Leader. However, there is too
little information in this interaction to speculate on its causes at this point.

A third interaction between Event and Magazine was by far the most important of the second order interaction effects. With the exception of Extroversion, which was relatively stable, all three magazines fluctuated in their perceptions according to the event being covered. In every event there were significant differences between one or more of the magazines on one or more of the dependent variables.

This information is useful to gate keeper analysts who have always been concerned with the filtering and refining process that occurs between the news event and its presentation to the public. The study indicates that such a process is actively effecting the presentation style that each magazine employs. In addition, the results of White's study—see Chapter II—indicate that 90 percent of the available news is discarded by such publications and it is reasonable to assume that all three magazines do not discard exactly the same material. A review of the data (see Appendix A) indicates that such differences do occur. The next step should be to test the effects each articles' selective coverage has upon the perception of its readers.

The third level interaction effect was important in predicting the magazine's perceptions of all four dependent variables and thus comes closest to explaining what was really happening in the data. A three way interaction results from one of the magazines singling out one of the political leaders during one or more of the events for special treatment. If the catalysts for such activity can be identified, predictions about all three factors involved in similar situations become
possible. With all three factors interacting—as it frequently happens in the real world—further insight can be provided into the processes and circumstances through which newsmagazines paint the pictures in our minds that we refer to as images. Careful scrutiny of this interaction effect provides the most reliable approach available to analyze such data.

The best example of the information to be gained from insight into this third level interaction is provided by the treatment afforded Sadat by Time in each of the five events. After starting the peace process—event one—Sadat withdrew from the resulting talks—event two. This characteristic of being unpredictable may have helped Sadat in diplomatic circles but may conversely have hurt him in the magazines' projections.

Time had just declared Sadat to be "Man of the Year"—in honor of his efforts to obtain peace—a few weeks before he stopped the talks. As a result, Time's Language bias and perceptions of Credibility dropped from the most favorable of all the magazines toward Sadat in event one to the least favorable toward Sadat in event two. It took all five events, the last three of which were positive steps toward peace, for Sadat to regain the highly favorable support of Time that he had enjoyed at the outset.

It is important to note this slow recovery because events three and four were the Camp David accords and the signing of the final peace treaty. These were very significant steps toward peace and yet Time still didn't treat Sadat as favorably as when he started the process. It is reasonable to speculate that the editors of Time may have felt
that they had overstepped themselves with their initial strong support of Sadat without any concrete improvements in the situation as justification for such a position. As a result *Time* was much more cautious with its praise until after the final treaty was signed and implementation had begun—event five.

In this case, the third level interaction has provided two pieces of important information. (1) *Time* magazine may overreact initially to a political leader who seems capable of dramatically changing the politics in one area of the world. Much of *Time*’s coverage was devoted to an heroic portrayal of Sadat before there was any evidence that Sadat was actually heroic material. Certainly *Time* spent a great deal more coverage on Sadat during the initial stage of the peace process than either of the other two magazines. (2) *Time* magazine is reticent with its praise—even after it is obviously earned—when the political leader involved has "let down" the writers of the magazine. Apparently *Time* carries a grudge for those men who don’t meet up to the initial standards that it sets for them. Neither of the other two magazines exhibited this reticence.

The images *Time* projected to its readers are much different than those projected to the readers of *U.S. News* and *Newsweek* as a result of the way *Time* perceives Sadat and the peace process. It might be reasonable to hypothesize that the readers of *Time* were just as disappointed in Sadat after event two as were the authors of *Time*. Further research would be required to determine whether or not such a relationship existed between the perceptions and expectations of a newsmagazine and those of its readers.

It is important to note at this point that the favorable treatment
of Sadat in event one followed by much less favorable treatment of Sadat in event two was not a characteristic of Time magazine alone. Both U.S. News and Newsweek responded in much the same manner to Sadat in event one and event two. However, both U.S. News and Newsweek were significantly more restrained in their initial support of Sadat than Time was and it did not take all five events for Sadat to slowly and systematically recover the good favor of U.S. News and Newsweek. In fact, both U.S. News and Newsweek continued to fluctuate in their favorable treatment of Sadat from event to event: at times apparently having positive impressions of the man and at other times negative ones. In the cases of U.S. News and Newsweek there appears to have been a minimum of residual perceptions from one event to another while Time moved slowly and evenly up and down the favorableness scale, apparently building upon the perceptions of past events.

In highlighting and explaining this distinction between the magazines the third level interaction provides additional important information. Time constantly refers to the past lives of the two men. Perhaps the goal is to take a more historical perspective of each event and political leader involved. Constant references are made to the past so that its specific ramifications to the present are clear. For example, Time used the following statements to describe Sadat at various stages of the peace process. In event one Time wrote: "Once regarded as an imperious dandified mediocrity, he has become more cautious since he succeeded Gamal Abdel Nasser as President in 1970." In event two, Sadat was described by Time in the following manner:

Scarcely two months earlier, Sadat had dramatically transformed the politics of the Middle East with his 'sacred mission' to Israel....By calling Kamel home, the Egyptian President has
transformed the area's politics again, but this time for the worse.3

This pattern was continued throughout the five events and seems to indicate the position that *Time* maintains regarding Sadat's historic role in the Middle East.

In addition, *Time* tends to present the facts while using evocative and dramatic words to further emphasize their importance. For example, *Time* made the following references: "Sadat's visceral reaction,"4 "(Sadat was) almost reverential,"5 "the courageous and moderate Sadat."6 This "language flamboyance" is evident in the projection of both political leaders although Sadat by far was the recipient of most of its strongest and most favorable effects.

In contrast, although *U.S. News* and *Newsweek* made several references to the past and couched some of the facts they presented in what appeared to be dramatic description, this thesis documents the fact that a distinction between the magazines based on their language and presentation styles does exist and is statistically significant. Therefore, it is reasonable to hypothesize that *U.S. News* and *Newsweek* are more concerned than *Time* with the here and now of the news. There are fewer references to the past and more emphasis on a particular political leaders role in a given event. The language is also less flamboyant than that employed by *Time*. Perhaps the philosophy shared by these two magazines is that the news is interesting in and of itself and that each event deserves separate treatment. It is reasonable to speculate that the readers of these magazines have the same perceptions. No decision can be made as to which type of news presentation is more accurate—*Time* with its snowballing of images and events or *U.S. News* and *Newsweek* with their
"this is what happened this week" approach.

Future efforts might well be directed toward measuring the extent and effects of *Time*'s commitment to the past. It would be valuable to know the extent of this relationship and how it effects reader's perceptions of the news and the people involved in the news.

In addition, in as much as *Time* was significantly more flamboyant than the other two magazines in its presentation style, future efforts should be concerned with the effects of these differences. For example, work by Tannenbaum and Lynch suggest that scales for measuring the sensationalism of an article are possible to construct and can provide further information regarding the potential impact of an article. It would be interesting to discover which of the three magazines would be considered the most sensationalistic using such measures. A reasonable hypothesis might be that *Time* is more sensationalistic because it was stronger in its language bias and image construct manipulations. *Time*'s language is certainly more flamboyant than either of the other two magazines. It would also be interesting to discover the effects of these differences in presentation style on believability of the story and the subject portrayed. Research by Cole and Shaw—reported in Chapter II—indicates that there may well be differences in believability between the three newsmagazines.

One additional piece of information provided by this thesis presents an opportunity to apply the facts suggested by this third level interaction. All three magazines fluctuated in their treatment of Begin apparently as a result of the characteristics of the particular event he was involved with.
For *Time* the treatment of Begin—less favorable Language bias and lower Credibility than Sadat—suggests that a value judgement was made that Begin was not as important a figure in a historical sense as Sadat. For *Newsweek* and *U.S. News* the treatment of Begin—generally more favorable in all but the perception of Extroversion than Sadat—suggests that a value judgement was made that Sadat was different than Begin.

In as much as *Newsweek* and *U.S. News* did not appear to project political leaders or events in terms of their historical importance this difference might simply have been a function of a simple attitude more favorably oriented toward Begin and Israel than toward Sadat and the Arab world. At the same time, the difference may have resulted from a judgement about Sadat’s and Begin’s respective roles in the particular events surveyed. Whatever the reason may have been, *U.S. News* and *Newsweek* seem to have given more weight to the events and personalities involved than to the historical drama underlying and uniting them.

In conclusion, the results of this thesis are valuable in making predictions about the way *Time*, *U.S. News* and *Newsweek* will portray the world to their respective readers. It is extremely important that these predictions be made on the basis of the political leader, the event and the magazine involved. Each magazine will paint a different picture of the world depending upon the political leader and event being portrayed. This thesis provides insight into the type of picture each magazine might attempt to project.

It is important that these conclusions be kept in perspective. Little doubt remains that quantitative and qualitative differences exist between newsmagazines in their perceptions of the world. These differences are important because they measure the variety of symbolic
meaning available to the readers of newsmagazines. In a very real sense the symbolic reality presented by these newsmagazines will become the reality of a reader's environment. Meaning is obtained only through the signals which are directly observable and the symbols which are presented in lieu of the actual stimuli. Therefore, the mass media, and more specifically the newsmagazines, will serve a primary role in the fabrication of a person's perceptions of the environment. In addition, a newsmagazine may serve a confirmatory function to a reader looking for additional information regarding a particular attitude. These magazines may very well validate the attitudes they helped create one week earlier. It should be noted that the construction and reinforcement of social reality by the media is an organic process that is constantly changing. However, it is safe to argue that if a person depends on one magazine his/her view of the world will be guided by that magazine. For example, this thesis helps to demonstrate that people who depend on Time may have a more dramatic and heroic view of the world than those depending on U.S. News or Newsweek. In short, our reality is contingent upon our sources of communication. As newsmagazines are a part of the total information received they will also represent a part of the total reality created.
NOTES

1Homer, *The Odyssey*, bk. VII, p. 479.


3*Time*, 30 January 1978, p. 35.


6*Time*, 26 March 1979, p. 13
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APPENDIX A

Instructions and Stimulus Material
INSTRUCTIONS

Please read the following instructions carefully before you start to fill out the survey. This exercise is part of an effort to measure the images projected for political leaders by weekly news-magazines. On the following pages you will find several sets of sentences. Please read the sentences carefully, concentrating on the words used to describe the subject.

All political leaders will be referred to as Mr. X. All of the sentences in one set are about the same individual and they should be considered together when filling out the items. Try to form a whole impression of each individual based on the entire set of sentences. Each different set of sentences is about another political figure so the items following each set should be filled out based only on the words used in that set. In other words, Mr. X is a different individual in each set of sentences.

After reading all of the sentences in one set carefully, fill out the items on one of the answer sheets based on your perceptions of the best answer. Use the answer sheets in order from top to bottom--first to last--making sure that you don't skip any. Your ratings on these answer sheets will show how each set of sentences varies in terms of the items on the answer sheet. The following is an example of how you should fill out your answer sheets:

If you think the sentences portray the subject as very bright, circle:
Bright : 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 : Stupid
If you think the sentences portray the subject as moderately bright, circle:
Bright : 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 : Stupid
If you think the sentences portray the subject as somewhat bright, circle:
Bright : 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 : Stupid
If you think the sentences are neutral on the item, circle:
Bright : 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 : Stupid

Finally, if you think the sentences portray the subject as very stupid, then circle the "7," for moderately stupid circle the "6" and for somewhat stupid circle the "5." Complete all the different items on each answer sheet.

In the upper left hand corner of your answer sheet coverpage put the letter ___. Fill out the cover page and then start on the survey. Work quickly but carefully.
1) Even as a youth, Mr. X had a sense of his own destiny.
2) At 14, Mr. X fell into an irrigation ditch and was saved from drowning.
3) Today, Mr. X governs his country rather like a paternalistic elder of a maxi-village which just happens to have 39 million people in it.
4) Once regarded as an impetuous, dandified mediocrity, he has become more cautious since he became his country's leader.
5) Mr. X usually makes decisions slowly but, as last week's events proved, he can make them very fast as well.
6) Mr. X is a paradoxical mix of East and West.
7) Mr. X likes foreign clothes and enjoys his presidential perquisites—including nine official residences, which he shares with his wife.
8) There Mr. X dons a peasant garment to relax.
9) Mr. X is devoutly religious—he prays often.
1) Shortly after Mr. X was felled by a massive heart attack, he motioned his private secretary to his hospital bedside.

2) Mr. X whispered a compliment.

3) Kind words and old-fashioned courtliness are both part of Mr. X's style.

4) A certain autocratic manner is part of Mr. X's style.

5) There is no mistaking that Mr. X runs his country's Cabinet sessions; smoking is forbidden, aids are barred, ministers are provided top-secret information on a need-to-know basis—and heaven help anyone who leaks to the press.

6) A man of Spartan tastes, Mr. X rises at 5 to pray, eat and read the newspapers; he frequently calls editors to complain about criticism.

7) Mr. X is at his desk by 7.

8) Mr. X's rambling official residence is almost too big for him and his wife.

9) Mr. X also has an apartment where he used to hold open house for friends.

10) It is perhaps Mr. X's only regret as his country's leader that he has had to curtail such evenings.
1) Like an actor in the spotlight, Mr. X is supremely conscious that he has been cast in a historic role.
2) Although Mr. X and a foreign leader have followed different paths, they share a sense of pride and purpose that impels them to play for the highest stakes.
3) Mr. X and a foreign leader have a natural curiosity about each other, and a certain wariness that comes from decades of hostility.
4) A foreign leader told aides that he could not believe that Mr. X was serious in his offer.
5) Mr. X quizzed foreign leaders.
6) For Mr. X, who has the most to lose if the gamble fails, the idea of seeking peace through some dramatic gesture has been growing over the years.
7) Mr. X has a taste for the limelight.
8) Mr. X has shown that he can make tough and bold decisions.
9) Some day, Mr. X added, there would be a leader who would acknowledge reality, and he left no doubt that he intended to become it.
10) Afterward, in a speech that demonstrated his prickly nature, Mr. X declared his position.
11) Mr. X gambled his political life on a venture that nearly ended in disaster.
12) Mr. X is courageous.
13) Mr. X lives grandly with his chic wife in a string of villas.
14) Mr. X has the belief that he is a man of manifest destiny.
15) Mr. X and a foreign leader had a historic meeting.
1) Like an actor in the spotlight, Mr. X is supremely conscious that he has been cast in a historic role.

2) Mr. X and a foreign leader have a natural curiosity about each other, and a certain wariness that comes from decades of hostility.

3) Mr. X told aides he could not believe a foreign leader was serious in his offer.

4) Even when he dispatched his formal invitation, Mr. X still had a feeling of wonderment.

5) Mr. X confided to visitors.

6) A dignified, courteous man, Mr. X prefers a suit and necktie to the open-neck shirts worn by most of his country's leaders.

7) Mr. X's old-world manners are those of a nobleman, according to his people, who also relish his spellbinding oratory.

8) Mr. X has shown that he can make tough and bold decisions.

9) Despite his frail physique and poor health, Mr. X is courageous.

10) As the head of the underground, Mr. X waged guerrilla war.

11) Mr. X is a born authoritarian who demands complete obedience and gets it; his Cabinet meetings are brisk, partly because he allows each minister to speak only once on each subject.

12) But although Mr. X is a zealous nationalist, he knows when to be flexible—shrewdly dropping, for example, his earlier insistence.

13) Mr. X and a foreign leader come from lower-middle-class backgrounds, but they now differ strongly in their personal life-styles.

14) Mr. X and his wife live plainly in the same three-room apartment that they have maintained throughout his political career (as his country's leader he also uses a house in the capitol).

15) Mr. X and a foreign leader had a historic meeting.
1) Mr. X had the ability—and power—to forge peace in his part of the world.
2) Mr. X and a foreign leader have far more in common than their mutual willingness to meet in hopes of changing the adversary relationship that exists between their countries.
3) Mr. X had a flair for the unexpected.
4) Mr. X's power base is his country's leadership.
5) At home, Mr. X is burdened with a shakey economy, political unrest and angry people.
6) Mr. X's military forces are weaker now than when they last fought.
7) The pressures on Mr. X not to talk were formidable.
8) It was the death of his country's leader that moved Mr. X to leadership.
9) One of Mr. X's early surprise moves was to agree that a formal peace was a possibility.
10) Mr. X threw out most of the foreign military advisers based in this country.
11) One of Mr. X's boldest initiatives was launching a war knowing that he and his allies had no chance of winning.
12) Mr. X saw war as the only means to bolster morale while forcing negotiations.
13) Mr. X amazed foreign countries by his actions.
14) Mr. X could argue that he tried.
15) Mr. X could claim that he was genuinely more interested in peace than in another war.
1) Mr. X has the ability—and power—to forge peace in his part of the world.
2) Mr. X and a foreign leader have far more in common than just their mutual willingness to meet in hopes of changing the adversary relationship that exists between their countries.
3) Mr. X has shown courage and a readiness to take big gambles when convinced that his people will benefit.
4) Mr. X's power base rests on his country's military might.
5) It was a bold gamble for Mr. X to make an official invitation to a foreign leader to travel to Mr. X's country to talk about a peace settlement.
6) Mr. X has been full of surprises ever since he became his country's leader.
7) A former guerilla fighter, Mr. X took office with a reputation as a tough unyielding fanatic.
8) But Mr. X has proved to be one of his country's most flexible leaders.
9) Mr. X deftly averted a public clash with a foreign leader.
10) Mr. X's problems at home are inflation and trade difficulties.
11) But critics who once predicted that Mr. X would not last a year in office now say that he has a good chance of finishing out his term.
12) Another reason for Mr. X's steady rise in his country's public-opinion polls is his gift for the dramatic.
13) Mr. X proved that he too, could seize the public-relations offensive.
14) Mr. X could argue that he tried.
15) Mr. X could claim that he was genuinely more interested in peace than in another war.
1) Scarcely two months earlier, Mr. X had dramatically transformed the politics of his area of the world with his "scared mission" to a foreign country.

2) By calling his diplomats home, Mr. X had transformed the area's politics again, but this time for the worse.

3) The most hostility incident, and the one that may well have roused Mr. X's ire beyond control, occurred at a dinner.

4) The radio had broken into its regular broadcast to announce that Mr. X was calling his delegation home.

5) A foreign leader gave a speech in which he denounced Mr. X's insistence that the foreign country should make concessions because Mr. X had recognized its right to exist.

6) Despite the clarifications Mr. X offered in his speech, speculation continued on what his real motives were.

7) Mr. X was obviously not only putting pressure on a foreign country but on another foreign country as well.

8) Mr. X was also signaling to foreign countries that his country was not interested in a separate peace.

9) Observers did not discount Mr. X's visceral reaction to a foreign leader's ill-timed toast.

10) As is his custom in times of crisis, Mr. X had canceled all appointments and interviews and gone into seclusion at one of his many homes.

11) Mr. X may have acted on the basis of inadequate information, and then found he could not reverse his course without losing both face and credibility.

12) Mr. X had run out of concessions.

13) What worried Mr. X was that a foreign country did not seem to understand that after having made an enormous concession, he could not give any more.

14) Mr. X is in no position to wage war.

15) The peace initiative has made Mr. X vulnerable.
1) Mr. X announced that in retaliation his country would not send a delegation to the military talks.
2) With mounting fervor, Mr. X turned to another subject.
3) Mr. X went on to describe a foreign diplomat in comparison with himself, which the foreign diplomats interpreted as a patronizing reference.
4) Mr. X closed the toast by raising his goblet.
5) Mr. X gave a speech in which he denounced a foreign leader's insistence that his country should make concessions.
6) That outrageous comment may have angered a foreign leader more than anything else Mr. X has said or done in the past two months.
7) Some foreign officials complained that the peace package Mr. X had presented was not quite the same one he discussed last month.
8) Mr. X saved those points for a foreign leader—and then asserted that they had another foreign leader's backing, which they did not.
9) Mr. X miscalculated the impact of his speech.
10) Observers did not discount a foreign leader's reaction to Mr. X's ill-timed toast.
11) Mr. X as a leader is under pressure not to sacrifice too much too quickly.
12) An old warrior, Mr. X can seldom resist the chance to give friend and foe alike an extemporaneous lecture on his deep feelings for his people and their history.
13) Mr. X miscalculated the wounding impact in a foreign country of his public statements.
14) Presumably Mr. X believes that if he bargains he will make it harder for his country.
15) But Mr. X must also realize that to remain adamant on so marginal an issue carries enormous risks.
1) Mr. X was breaking off the talks that had just begun.
2) In part, Mr. X was provoked by a tough toast by a foreign leader.
3) But Mr. X wasn't just miffed.
4) Mr. X's walkout was also a slap at a foreign country making a hopeful attempt to keep the talks moving.
5) A foreign leader and Mr. X chatted privately.
6) Mr. X complained.
7) Mr. X also remarked.
8) Nonetheless, Mr. X was anxious to avoid a complete break with a foreign country.
9) Mr. X's speech proved basically conciliatory.
10) Mr. X praised the people of a foreign country.
11) Mr. X's opening to a foreign country has won him fresh sympathy.
12) Mr. X may have expected too much.
13) Mr. X went to a foreign country to demonstrate that he was a man of vision who could sweep away the quibbling of lesser mortals—lawyers, diplomats and politicians.
14) Mr. X misread a foreign leader, but he also failed to plan the successive steps of his offensive.
15) Now Mr. X appeared to have learned the lessons of impetuousness, and he was waiting for a foreign country to make the next move.
1) In part, a foreign leader was provoked by a tough toast by Mr. X.
2) In a series of patronizing remarks to a foreign leader, Mr. X had insisted on his country's position.
3) A foreign leader had grown increasingly irritated with Mr. X's hard line and was dismayed by Mr. X's behavior at the dinner.
4) Foreign officials were puzzled by Mr. X's refusal to compromise further, particularly by his insistence.
5) Mr. X stunned his audience by arguing with the guests of honor during his toast.
6) Mr. X referred to a historic event and many of the guests were embarrassed.
7) Despite Mr. X's undiplomatic toast, negotiations had been getting along surprisingly well.
8) Mr. X was unyielding.
9) Mr. X felt he had already made significant concessions.
10) So far there is not evidence that Mr. X's refusal to make further concessions has seriously harmed his country's standing with a foreign country's public.
11) There are signs that Mr. X's position perplexes some people in a foreign country.
12) Mr. X did seem to be slowing down the peace process.
1) Mr. X abruptly pulled out his delegation in anger over a foreign country's negotiating tactics.
2) Mr. X insists that a foreign country give in to his country's demands.
3) Mr. X wants his point of view.
4) Mr. X presses his demands.
5) Mr. X ordered his delegation to return to their country after two days of talks.
6) Mr. X bitterly condemned a foreign leader.
7) One possibility: a visit to a foreign capital by Mr. X to confer with the foreign leader.
8) One major problem has been the use by Mr. X of press and television as diplomatic channels.
9) In interviews and speeches, Mr. X raised hopes of a quick settlement even while criticizing a foreign leader's proposals.
10) Mr. X has too much to lose to call it off now.
11) For Mr. X, a new confrontation would raise the threat of war and force a reconciliation with foreign countries.
12) Shortly after Mr. X's bombshell announcement, a foreign leader telephoned Mr. X to urge him to reconsider.
13) Mr. X complained but agreed to continue separate talks.
14) Mr. X has shown mounting impatience since his first meeting failed to produce foreign country concessions.
15) Mr. X fears that his drive is bogging down in haggling that exposes him to ridicule from other foreign nations—which oppose his dealings.
1) Mr. X looks to a foreign country to back his own country's proposals and to push another foreign country towards a compromise.

2) Mr. X offers his point of view.

3) Mr. X wants his country to maintain military protection after the area reverts to foreign control.

4) Mr. X made it clear that he would not back down.

5) One possibility: a visit to a foreign capitol by Mr. X to confer with the foreign leader.

6) One major problem has been the use by Mr. X of press and television as diplomatic channels.

7) In interviews and speeches, Mr. X raised hopes of a quick settlement even while criticizing foreign leader's proposals.

8) Mr. X has too much to lose to call it off now.

9) Mr. X would find it hard to explain the loss of what many of his people regard as the best chance their country has had.
1) Mr. X, initially somber, was almost reverential in his praise of a foreign leader.
2) Mr. X made a historic visit.
3) A foreign leader said he and Mr. X were friends anew, and as a now smiling Mr. X nodded in vigorous assent, he challenged Mr. X and himself.
4) Mr. X had wanted an agreement as a prerequisite.
5) Mr. X and a foreign leader somehow managed to laugh.
6) Mr. X had heard something new and wanted to try it out on a foreign leader.
7) Mr. X and a foreign leader had not exchanged a substantial word for days.
8) It took a talk with a foreign adviser and a long walk with a foreign leader before Mr. X cooled down and the crisis passed.
9) Mr. X dined mainly in the privacy of his lodge.
10) Mr. X was unhappy at letting a foreign leader off the hook.
11) Mr. X sent over some autographed pictures of himself with foreign leaders that he dedicated to a foreign leader's granddaughters.
12) In some important aspects, Mr. X had arrived hazardous isolated.
13) Mr. X had angered a foreign country and annoyed other foreign leaders by not consulting with them before he launched his initiative.
14) Mr. X will point out, moreover, that years of reliance did not help.
15) Even in Mr. X's own camp there is contention and bitterness on the grounds that he had given up too much.
1) Mr. X alluded to the difficulties (largely of his making) that had brought all progress to a halt, but waved them away.

2) Mr. X rose to embrace a foreign leader.

3) In an emotional piece of theatre as telling as anything said, Mr. X walked to a foreign leader and the two men embraced, not once but twice.

4) Even Mr. X, whose sartorial formality is one of his trademarks, occasionally shed his coat and tie.

5) At military-buff Mr. X's request, a 3 1/2 hour excursion was organized.

6) Reporters accompanying the entourage noticed a marked lack of warmth between a foreign leader and Mr. X: they barely spoke to each other during the excursion.

7) The problem apparently was a foreign leader's mounting frustration at Mr. X's adamant refusal to accept the principle.

8) Still Mr. X and a foreign leader were no closer to agreement.

9) A foreign leader finally wondered whether Mr. X might not be holding a few concessions in reserve to play, if necessary, in the final, crucial stage of the talks.

10) A foreign leader was unhappy at letting Mr. X off the hook.

11) To reciprocate the gift, Mr. X presented a foreign leader with a medallion.

12) Mr. X suggested his idea.

13) Mr. X of course, could ill afford to antagonize a foreign country which has been providing aid annually to his country.

14) Even though on balance it was Mr. X who conceded the least, he cannot expect a totally euphoric welcome home.

15) Most of his countrymen in the end would likely go along with Mr. X.
1) The agreements contained elements of personal and political peril for Mr. X.
2) Mr. X heaped praise on a foreign leader.
3) Mr. X spoke first in stiff and formal tones and he paid flowery tribute.
4) Personal relations between Mr. X and a foreign leader were strained.
5) Mr. X could have serious trouble with other foreign nations.
6) Mr. X and foreign leaders drove off for a four-hour stroll.
7) Mr. X and a foreign leader were seen chatting with each other.
8) A foreign leader flatly refused to discuss, even in general terms, the subject—Mr. X's key demand.
9) Publicity people discussed plans to have foreign leaders and Mr. X report personally before political leaders and the press.
10) Mr. X held a separate strategy session.
11) The foreign delegation was deeply concerned by sign of a growing personal enmity between Mr. X and another foreign leader.
12) The frostiness between Mr. X and a foreign leader contributed to a noticeable decline in the conviviality that had marked the opening days.
13) There was widespread concern that if Mr. X came away without significant concession, he would abandon the initiative.
1) Mr. X heaped praise on a foreign leader.
2) Mr. X stressed his thoughts.
3) After a few words to his own countrymen, Mr. X finally ended.
4) Mr. X accepted a formula that his country had previously refused to accept.
5) Personal relations between a foreign leader and Mr. X were badly strained.
6) Some members thought a foreign leader had not pushed Mr. X into enough concessions.
7) Mr. X flatly refused to discuss, even in general terms, the subject—a foreign leader's key demand.
8) Mr. X reportedly made two concessions.
9) Publicity people discussed plans to have foreign leaders and Mr. X report personally before political leaders and the press.
10) Mr. X and his staff would refrain from any work in observance or the religious occasion.
11) Mr. X found time for several amicable games of chess.
12) Mr. X—who had headed the underground movement—quipped.
13) A foreign country's feelings of antipathy toward Mr. X came as no real surprise.
14) Mr. X was not the only one with a penchant for putting in an unexpected appearance.
15) Mr. X attended religious service.
1) A foreign leader's minimum goal was to persuade Mr. X to soften his hard-line stand and to agree on a blueprint.
2) Mr. X, already under fire from foreign radicals for talking to a foreign leader, was resolved to re-establish his standing by winning an agreement.
3) Mr. X and a foreign leader were friendly and open outside.
4) Mr. X gave ground only slowly and reluctantly to middleman appeals for compromise and statesmanship.
5) Major sticking points throughout the negotiations: Mr. X's demands.
6) Mr. X and a foreign leader were so far apart that further sessions would have been counterproductive.
7) A vague promise did not satisfy Mr. X.
8) Mr. X wanted a foreign leader to agree flatly.
9) Mr. X made it clear that he would settle for nothing less than a document spelling out concrete agreements.
10) It was Mr. X's demand for sweeping decisions that dragged out discussions.
11) That would mollify foreign countries who suspect Mr. X of selling out their cause.
1) A foreign leader's minimum goal was to persuade Mr. X to soften his hard-line stands and to agree to a blueprint.
2) Mr. X, with almost religious fervor, expressed determination never to yield on any point that he thought would endanger his security or heritage.
3) A foreign leader and Mr. X were friendly and open outside the conference room.
4) Mr. X, particularly, irritated a foreign leader with what was considered excessive nitpicking concentration on relatively minor points.
5) Major sticking points throughout the negotiations: Mr. X's insistence of his country's rights.
6) Mr. X had offered.
7) Mr. X and a foreign leader were so far apart that further sessions would have been counterproductive.
8) Mr. X's attitude often startled a foreign leader.
9) Mr. X yielded ground on some issues that were supposed to be sticky but was surprisingly tough on others expected to be easily solved.
10) Contrary to expectations, Mr. X was adamant in insisting that his country keep some areas.
11) At the same time, Mr. X showed apparent willingness to consider almost immediately his country's control of other areas instead of waiting for five years before tackling the touchy question.
12) A foreign leader wanted Mr. X to agree flatly.
13) Mr. X indicated that he would be satisfied.
14) It was Mr. X's meticulous probing of practically every point that dragged out discussions.
15) The foreign leaders and Mr. X issued a prayer.
1) A foreign leader lavished praise on Mr. X.
2) A foreign leader congratulated Mr. X.
3) A radical assassination squad might murder Mr. X.
4) The disappearance of the courageous and moderate Mr. X could destroy whatever stability has been achieved.
5) Mr. X accepted some of the points, balked at others and offered modifications.
6) What was causing a foreign leader problems was some new demands made by Mr. X.
7) Mr. X called this a means of protecting rights.
8) Mr. X refused.
9) This would offend other foreign states, something Mr. X could scarcely afford.
10) Mr X was concerned.
11) A foreign leader and Mr. X huddled in the pavilion for 2 1/2 hours.
12) After some hesitation, Mr. X replied.
13) Mr. X added that he would trust a foreign leader.
14) When the foreign leader and Mr. X emerged, neither of them displayed much emotion.
15) Foreign leaders who for more than a year have condemned Mr. X for even talking all but declared war on him.
1) A foreign leader congratulated Mr. X.
2) Although rhetorical fireworks are anticipated and Mr. X is certain to come under blistering attack from the ultra-left and ultra-right, there is almost no chance that the measure will fail.
3) Mr. X approved compromise proposals.
4) Mr. X listened quietly.
5) Mr. X bluntly said such a timetable was impossible.
6) In the didactic manner that has antagonized many who deal with him, Mr. X reminded a foreign leader that Mr. X's country was a democracy.
7) Mr. X again refused to sign an agreement.
8) Mr. X insisted on an exchange.
9) The foreign leader then pressed Mr. X hard.
10) Obstreperous deputies subjected Mr. X to prolonged heckling.
11) Mr. X, who used to be quite a heckler himself, seemed almost to relish the rowdiness as a proof of his repeated argument.
12) Mr. X retorted.
13) Mr. X arrived for breakfast, and the foreign leader offered him proposals.
14) Mr. X, who seems to have an exquisite sense of when the breaking point is near, suddenly became conciliatory.
15) Mr. X would be submitting new proposals to the Cabinet.
1) The worst-case nightmares pictured it as a spark for a potential firestorm that could isolate and even destroy Mr. X.
2) The first wave of reaction, To Mr. X's salesmanship, was unsettling—predictably incendiary from hard-liners, uncommonly cold from the moderates.
3) A foreign leader warned Mr. X for his apostasy.
4) Mr. X's response buoyed a foreign leader.
5) A foreign leader was implored to do something—even a ceremonial meeting and handshake with Mr. X.
6) A foreign leader got a somber Mr. X aboard after two and a half hours of persuasion.
1) Mr. X struck a hard-line stance from the beginning.
2) Mr. X was implored to do something—even a ceremonial meeting and handshake with a foreign leader.
3) Mr. X answered huffily.
4) Mr. X declined.
5) Mr. X's response was ambivalent but sounded positive.
1) Mr. X promptly gave his assent to the plan.
2) Mr. X was persuaded to drop his demand, rejected by a foreign country.
3) Mr. X hopes this will enable him to counter foreign country charges that he is betraying the cause.
4) A foreign leader was persuaded to drop his demand, rejected by Mr. X.
5) A foreign country feels it has a vital stake in the survival of Mr. X, who faces powerful pressures from other foreign countries and even the threat of assassination by radical terrorists.
6) What Mr. X needs urgently, these observers say, is evidence of a "dividend" for his people.
7) Mr. X's only hope for producing such a dividend hinges on large-scale foreign aid-vastly more than was allocated to his country this year.
8) Mr. X will expect a foreign country to supply economic support.
9) Mr. X also is relying on a foreign country to re-equip his armed forces, whose weapons are fast becoming obsolete.
10) Radical foreign states are calling for the expulsion of Mr. X's country from the League, and economic sanctions against Mr. X.
1) Mr. X accepted final proposals.
2) Mr. X was persuaded to drop his demand, rejected by a foreign leader.
1) Person X got a hero's welcome as he paid his first visit to the city.
2) Person X prayed in the sands of the desert.
3) Person X placed a wreath on the war tomb in honor of his country's soldiers who died in action.
4) In a moving ceremony, Person X kissed a huge flag of his country and raised it over the city.
5) Person X was scheduled to open an air corridor.
1) Person X was scheduled to open an air corridor.
2) During an emotional Cabinet meeting the Defense Minister and Foreign Minister of Mr. X's country fought successfully to prevent Mr. X from offering his hard-line plan at the start of the talks.
3) Instead, the two ministers won Cabinet approval to use Mr. X's plan only as an informal guideline during the negotiations.
1) The intention of Person X and foreign officials was to give a boost to phase two of the peace process.
2) Person X badly needs a convincing sign of progress.
3) It is Person X's best hope of redeeming himself in the eyes of his hostile brethren.
4) Person X is counting on a foreign government to be a staunch ally.
5) A foreign country has been trying to help lessen Person X's isolation.
6) A foreign ambassador reportedly persuaded Person X and a foreign government leader to tone down their public slanging match.
1) The intention of Person and foreign officials was to give a boost to phase two of the peace process.

2) Person X recently declared his point of view.

3) Even some supporters of Person X conceded that he had set too high an opening bid.

4) The Defense Minister and Foreign Minister threatened to resign from Person X's negotiating team in protest of Person X's hard-line position.

5) They were wooed back after Person X agreed not to confront the foreign government with clearly unacceptable demands at the outset.

6) Person X's tactical retreat was seen as a hopeful sign by some of his country's moderates.
1) With Person X holding a hard-line position, there was little hope of substantive progress anytime soon.

2) Person X is generally seen as knuckling under to a foreign government.

3) Foreign government officials are seriously concerned about the standing of Person X at home as well as among other foreign nations.

4) A major worry is the impact on his country of Person X's almost complete political isolation in wake of economic and cultural boycotts imposed against it.

5) One foreign government's leaders have rejected the treaty accords and joined the boycott against Person X's country, drawing stinging attacks from Person X.

6) Person X is doing his best to convince other neighboring states that he has not sold out to foreign governments.

7) Person X demands that a foreign country agree.

8) Foreign government officials believe that it is virtually impossible for Person X to accept the foreign country leader's formula.
1) With Person X holding a hard-line position, there was little hope of substantive progress anytime soon.
2) Person X's blueprint for autonomy is far more restrictive.
3) Person X rejects a foreign government state and insists that his country gain sovereignty.
4) Person X's tough position even drew protests from some members of his own cabinet, including his Defense Minister and Foreign Minister.
5) Foreign government officials believe that it is virtually impossible for the foreign country's leader to accept Person X's formula.
APPENDIX B

Summary of Means
For Dependent Variables
Over All Events
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 1</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 2</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 3</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 4</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT 5</td>
<td>SADAT</td>
<td>BEGIN</td>
<td>MAGAZINE TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to nearest hundreth

[n = 80, .51 (.01), .66 (.001)]
[n = 120, .42 (.01), .54 (.001)]
[n = 40, .73 (.01), .93 (.001)]
TABLE 4.2
SUMMARY OF MEANS<sup>a</sup>
FOR EXTROVERSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 1</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 2</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 3</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 4</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT 5</td>
<td>SADAT</td>
<td>BEGIN</td>
<td>MAGAZINE TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^rounded to nearest hundredth

[n = 80, .40 (.01), .51 (.001)]
[n = 120, .33 (.01), .42 (.001)]
[n = 40, .57 (.01), .72 (.001)]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 1</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT 2</td>
<td>SADAT</td>
<td>BEGIN</td>
<td>MAGAZINE TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT 3</td>
<td>SADAT</td>
<td>BEGIN</td>
<td>MAGAZINE TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT 4</td>
<td>SADAT</td>
<td>BEGIN</td>
<td>MAGAZINE TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 5</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rounded to nearest hundreth

\[ n = 80, \ 0.44 (0.01), \ 0.57 (0.001) \]
\[ n = 120, \ 0.36 (0.01), \ 0.46 (0.001) \]
\[ n = 40, \ 0.63 (0.01), \ 0.80 (0.001) \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 1</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 2</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 3</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT 4</th>
<th>SADAT</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>MAGAZINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT 5</td>
<td>SADAT</td>
<td>BEGIN</td>
<td>MAGAZINE TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWSWEEK</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NEWS</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL LEADER TOTAL</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^rounded to nearest hundreth

\[n = 80, \ .28 (.01), \ .36 (.001)]

\[n = 120, \ .23 (.01), \ .29 (.001)]

\[n = 40, \ .40 (.01), \ .51 (.001)]
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A major concern in the field of communications is the projection of images from a source to some receiver or set of receivers. Initially, these efforts were focused on a single source in a public address format. However, the scope of the problem was not limited to public address and social scientists soon shifted their attention to include the images projected in all interpersonal communication settings. This attention has resulted in the construction of several sets of scales to measure the image construct in both a public address and interpersonal format. This study applies the image construct scales to a different type of source/receiver relationship—the relationship between newsmagazines and readers.

In order to make the intended measurements, two decisions regarding stimulus material were made. (1) Time, U. S. News and Newsweek were selected as the newsmagazines to be surveyed. This decision was based on the similar intents and formats of the three magazines and also on the high level of readership they enjoy in the United States. (2) Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin were selected as the subjects of the articles to be surveyed. This decision was based on a need for comparison between the coverage afforded two different subjects as well as the fact that Sadat and Begin are typically presented in the same articles concerned with the same issues.

Three research questions were designed to give the thesis direction. (1) What images were projected by the three newsmagazines for Sadat and Begin? (2) How did the three newsm-
on raters with factors of rater, magazine, event and political leader. All four rater characteristics were identified as significantly (at least .01) important in predicting one or more of the dependent variables. The model used in the randomized block ANOVA typically accounted for from 33 to 41 percent of the variance in the system. Rater perceptions of all four dependent variables were significantly (.001) affected by the factors in the model. In addition, significant interaction affects were identified between magazine and event; event and political leader; magazine and political leader; and magazine, event and political leader.

The results of this thesis indicate that the application of image construct scales to news magazine coverage of political and public leaders is a fertile area for future research. The results indicate that a researcher must know something about the magazine, event and person involved to successfully make predictions about the coverage provided.