Was Coverage of the 1988 Presidential Race by Washington’s Two Major Dailies Biased?

By Keith Kenney and Chris Simpson

A content analysis of stories and photographs about 30 events in the 1988 presidential campaign found that the Washington Post’s coverage was balanced and neutral, but the Washington Times’ coverage favored the Republicans. More than one-third of the Times’ headlines and stories were biased, and each time, they were biased in favor of the Republicans. These findings are important because they support Shoemaker and Reese’s theory of news content, which states that ownership and financing determine news content.

In the past 30 years, numerous studies of presidential campaigns have indicated that major political parties and presidential candidates received equal news space by the prestige press, a group of 15 newspapers recognized for superior news coverage, integrity and public service.¹ This equality holds true despite the presence of an incumbent or a third-party presidential candidate and despite the issues raised in the campaign.² According to Hackett, “the partisan traditions of press reporting have withered under broadcasting’s impact on audience expectations of the news, increasingly anonymous corporate ownership, the extensive reliance on news agency reports, and the economic need to reach as broad a market as possible.”³

A few studies, however, have found that one political party received more and/or better newspaper coverage than the other. In a study of 49 dailies, newspapers’ partisanship was attributed to the “newsworthiness” advantage Ronald Reagan seemed to have over Walter Mondale in 1984.⁴ A study of the prestige press found that when newspapers endorsed a candidate on their editorial pages, their news coverage favored the endorsed candidate.⁵ In a study of eight Colorado dailies, biased political news reporting was attributed to “management attitudes.” Political orientation of editors and publishers correlated with three different measures of bias.⁶

The purpose of this study is to learn if two particular newspapers, the Washington Post and the Washington Times, avoided bias in their news coverage of the 1988 presidential campaign.

In Washington, D.C., charges of bias have flourished during the past nine years, as the Washington Post and the Washington Times fought a spirited “newspaper war.” Since catapulting to prominence in the 1960s, the Washington Post...
Post has been criticized as being a product of the "liberal left." After the Washington Star ceased publishing, the Post was the only major local daily newspaper in the capital. Then in May 1982, the Washington Times was launched in order to provide a self-proclaimed "conservative alternative voice." In 1984, a former Washington Times reporter summed up management's philosophy this way: "Times' management argues that the news pages of Washington's other daily reflect a liberal bias and that it is high time Washington readers have access to a paper with news pages that reflect a conservative bias."7

Counter-charges of conservative bias by Post journalists are bolstered by coverage given to denunciations by former employees of the Washington Times, such as a former political reporter's comment that the Times' newsroom was "a smoldering ethical fire" rooted in the Times' "conservative bias" that frequently led to "abrupt resignations on matters of principle."8 This was not an isolated incident. Former editor and publisher James Whelan resigned in 1984 after charging that the newspaper's owners, the Unification Church, meddled in news policy.9 Editorial page editor William Cheshire and several of his editorial writers resigned in 1987 after alleging that Arnaud de Borchgrave, the editor in chief, suggested an editorial be written more favorably toward the South Korean government, where the Unification Church has close ties.10 All of these episodes were well covered in the news pages of the Post.

Despite persistent charges of bias in the two influential dailies, no research has been conducted to test the presence of bias in the Washington newspapers. Bias is defined as a pattern of constant favoritism. Bias occurs when one candidate or party receives more news coverage and more favorable coverage over an extended period of time. Suppression of political leanings in news stories is a mandated ethical obligation of the modern American press because newspapers, especially elite newspapers such as the two in Washington, play a central role in providing information for decision-makers throughout the federal government and the general public. Regularly biased news accounts may contribute to inappropriate decisions and policies.

This study was also undertaken to test a theory of news content. According to Shoemaker, news content is determined in part by the ideologies of people who finance the media. She believes that the personal attitudes and values of news media owners may be reflected not only in editorials and columns, but also in news and features.11

Shoemaker assumes that the ultimate power in a media organization comes from the owners. Media owners or their appointed top executives can hire and fire editors, columnists and reporters according to their stated political beliefs. In addition, owners can cause subtle "slants" in coverage as the employees try to anticipate what the owner wants.12

Shoemaker also assumes that control of news media is exerted through media financing. For most publicly traded media companies, the primary goal is economic, to make a profit. Other goals are built into this overarching objective, such as to produce a quality product, serve the public and achieve professional recognition.13

Examination of the news content of the two largest Washington dailies offers a good test of Shoemaker's theory because they have different types of ownership and financing.

The Washington Times is owned by News World Communications, a conglomerate bankrolled by the Unification Church, directed by the Reverend Sun Myung Moon. The church is a sprawling empire of commercial industries.
and businesses that range from fishing interests in the United States to the huge Tong II Co. Ltd., a manufacturing plant in South Korea that produces machine tools and automobile parts.14

The owners attempt to promote conservative values and anti-communist views among Washington leaders by controlling the news content in the Times. Robert Spitz, general counsel to News World Communications, said the newspaper hired James Whelan, editor and publisher from 1982 to 1984, "because we felt his editorial and philosophical perspective were very close to ours and that he'd hire a staff that would do things like support conservative government."15

In addition, the organization sponsors all the costs of "media conferences" and "fact-finding tours" for several thousand journalists each year in order to promote its conservative values to journalists. The church also spends $1.5 million a year to run a Washington-based think tank that underwrites conservative research and seminars around the nation.16

What is unusual is that Reverend Moon has bankrolled the Washington Times for years in spite of its heavy financial losses. According to Time magazine, the paper had lost $250 million by 1987.17 The Washington Post reported that the church poured at least $800 million into its United States operations, including the Times, from 1975 to 1984.18 The owners are willing to accept such losses in order to influence the White House and Congress, to serve as a rallying point for other anti-communists, and to give church leaders respectability and access to top government leaders in Washington.19 In the 1988 campaign, the Times endorsed George Bush for president.

The Washington Post, on the other hand, is a publicly-owned company, and according to Shoemaker and Reese, when a media firm is owned by stockholders, economic objectives become more important, and political or ideological objectives become less relevant. In order to make a profit, media companies attempt to serve audiences and advertisers. Journalistic objectivity becomes very important because objective information appeals to a broader audience and it is easier to market to other mass media. In addition, journalists must maintain objective standards in order to protect themselves from criticism from all the diverse vested interests among audiences and advertisers who finance the publication.20 The Washington Post endorsed neither the Republican nor the Democratic ticket in 1988.

The Post is largely controlled by the Graham family, which has generally supported liberal causes and the Democratic Party.21 Because of the Graham's influence, the Post may support Democrats more than Republicans. Studies of newspaper coverage of the 1988 presidential campaign that included the Washington Post found that the Democratic Party received slightly more column inches of news coverage than the Republican Party (4493 vs 4332)22 and slightly more stories (52.9 percent vs 47.1 percent).23 The Post also had the least favorable coverage of Dan Quayle of 17 major newspapers.24

In summary, based upon Shoemaker's theory of news content, the Washington Post should have presented relatively balanced and neutral coverage of the presidential campaign. This theoretical expectation may be modified because of the personal attitudes of the Graham family, in which case a slight tilt toward the Democrats would result. The Washington Times, on the other hand, should have been more biased. It would have been expected to give prominence to favorable news serving George Bush and Dan Quayle. The Times would also have been expected to slant headlines, stories and photographs to favor the Republicans.
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Method

The study includes all issues of the two Washington newspapers from September 1, 1988, just before the Labor Day kickoff of the campaign, until November 10, just after Election Day.

This study not only compares news coverage in the Post with coverage in the Times, but it also compares both newspapers’ coverage with a non-newspaper standard. Simply comparing column inches devoted to each political party is inadequate because events drive news and events don’t always occur in balanced amounts. Comparing column inches is also inadequate because all the media may neglect some events and over-report others. A convincing case of bias requires that media reports be compared with nonmedia reports of “social reality” – a view of the world that is socially derived; that is, what society knows about itself.

As a measure of social reality, a list of 30 campaign highlights during this period was obtained from Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report. All 30 events were not equally important, but it is difficult to scale the importance of news events. First, for a daily newspaper editor, the importance of an event is relative to the news value of other events that occurred during the same 24-hour time period. Second, the importance of an event depends upon which day of the week the event occurred – newspapers have more advertising on some days and therefore more news stories and photographs. Third, an event’s news value must be judged by editors in a split second, and its importance may be revised when considered in historical context by people who are removed from the day-to-day work of editing a newspaper. Although the Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report’s list of 30 events does not take into account the first and second points, it serves as the best objective nonmedia source. Lists of campaign highlights published by individual newspapers and magazines immediately following the election were judged to be less objective; therefore, they were not used. Earl Black, a respected political science scholar, then classified each event as “favoring Republicans,” “favoring Democrats” or “neutral.”

News items concerning these 30 events were coded in each newspaper for the entire period. News stories, including “news analysis” stories, sidebars and follow-up stories directly related to the events were coded. Photographs directly related to the events and photographs accompanying stories about one of the 30 events were coded. Columns, editorials, letters and other forms of opinion were excluded.

Balance of news coverage was determined by comparing the prominence given Republican and Democratic events by each newspaper. The prominence of each story and photograph was indicated by classifying its location as “front page” or “inside pages.” Prominence was also indicated by headline size and picture size. Headlines were classified into four categories of size: streamers, spread heads, two-column heads and one-column heads. Streamers are heads that go across the entire page. Spread heads are more than two-columns wide but less than a streamer. Two-column and one-column heads are self-explanatory. After the average size of all photographs had been calculated, four picture size categories were established, with each category containing a fourth of the pictures. Picture size categories were: 1-16 inches, 17-24 inches, 25-33 inches and more than 34 square inches.

Balance of coverage was also determined by calculating “news story generation rates” and “news picture generation rates.” News generation
rates are calculated by dividing the number of stories (or pictures) favoring a political party by the number of events favoring the party. Use of news generation rates takes into account that events drive news—that there should be more stories/pictures about the Republicans, if the Republicans were involved in more news events. For example, if a newspaper published 210 stories about 30 events favoring Democrats, then the news story generation rate for the Democrats would be 7. If the same paper published fewer stories about Republicans (200 stories), but fewer events favored Republicans (25 events), then the story generation rate for the Republicans would actually be higher (8). In this case, either the newspaper would be biased towards Republicans, or the Republican events were more important (and newsworthy) than the Democratic events.

In order to determine the frequency of bias in news coverage, each headline, story and photographic caption was coded as biased for the Republicans, objective or biased for the Democrats. Coders were told that the nature of an event may favor one political party or the other, but that does NOT mean the news items are biased. In a detached manner, coders decided if headlines, stories and captions were neutrally presented, as truthful as possible and relevant. These terms came from Westerstahl’s definition of objectivity. A headline/story/caption was “neutrally presented” if it was free of opinion and sensational language. It was “truthful” if the information reflected the facts of the situation and avoided any intention to mislead. It was “relevant” if it avoided trivial details and emphasized items of significance. When evaluating stories, coders also considered a fourth concept in Westerstahl’s definition of objectivity: balance. A story was “balanced” if it gave a more-or-less equal account of the alternative points of view. It did not have to strictly follow a “one said..., the other said” format, but all quotes supporting one political party should not appear at the beginning of a story with the opposing view at the end.

It is difficult to determine if a photograph of politicians is biased or objective. Photos that make a candidate appear favorable are routine because politicians have so much control over how they present themselves to the media. We expect to see candidates smiling, waving and flashing signs of victory. Publication of photographs that make a candidate appear unfavorable, therefore, are unusual. When editors select an image that makes a candidate look weak, immoral or inactive, then readers should question why that particular image was published. When a pattern develops of negative images of one political party and not of the other, then photographic bias occurs.

Coders were asked to evaluate whether an image made a candidate appear favorable, neutral or unfavorable. To determine the direction of photographs, coders examined candidates’ facial expressions, body postures and interaction with others, as well as the setting of each photograph. In addition, they considered the camera angle used to photograph the candidates. For example, an unhappy or worried facial expression, bowed torso and inattentive crowd may lead to negative evaluations. Above-eye-level camera shots also have been found to produce lower evaluations of people.

Three coders were used. One coder was a registered Democrat in 1988, one was a nonpartisan, international graduate student and the third was a registered Republican. A training session was conducted, and one week’s newspapers were coded to test reliability. Results of this pretest found intercoder agreement was 85 percent or higher for each of the coding decisions. Each coder worked with approximately one-third of the sample of each newspaper in order to minimize the effects of any possible coder prejudices.
Findings

Two of the 30 key events in the 1988 presidential campaign were slighted by both Washington newspapers. A separate story or photograph was not published when the National Education Association endorsed Dukakis or when Bush and Quayle attended a rally in Jackson, Tennessee. The Washington Post, however, published a news item about 26 of the other 28 campaign events, while the Times only covered 18 events. The Post overlooked the September Boston Herald poll showing Bush even with Dukakis and Dukakis' counter-rally with law enforcement officers later in the month.

The Times was most likely to overlook events that injured Republican candidates' political reputations or that helped the Democrats. For example, the newspaper did not report that Quayle was accepted into law school under a program designed in part to aid minorities and the poor. Nor did it report the resignation of Bush adviser Frederic Malek, who appeared to blacklist Jews. When Dukakis blasted the GOP campaign literature on Massachusetts' prison-furlough program, the Times was silent. Overall, the Times overlooked six of the 10 events favoring the Democratic Party, two of the five neutral events and two of the 15 events favoring the Republican Party.

The balance (or imbalance) of news coverage becomes clearer when the news generation rates are examined. The Washington Post published a proportionate number of stories and photographs about events favoring each political party. It published 35 stories about 15 Republican events for a news story generation rate of 2.3, and it published 22 stories about 10 Democratic events for a rate of 2.0. The news picture generation rate for Republicans was 2.5, and for Democrats it was 2.2. The Washington Times, on the other hand, gave far more news coverage to Republicans than Democrats. An average of 1.7 stories were published for each Republican event, while only .5 stories concerned Democratic events. News picture generation rates were eight times higher for Republicans than Democrats (see Table 1).

Placement of the 195 news items included in this study was balanced in both newspapers. There was no pattern indicating the Republican events appear on front pages, while Democratic events are relegated to inside pages, or vice versa.

For the 69 Post stories, when events favored Republicans, headlines were relatively large, and when events favored Democrats, headlines were smaller. A similar pattern occurred in the 38 Times stories. Streamer headlines about Bush's election explain this imbalance to some extent.

For the 74 Post photographs, the size of pictures was relatively balanced for both parties. In the Times, almost all of the 14 photographs concerned events favoring the Republicans, so it is impossible to determine if photographic size was balanced.

In addition to measuring the frequency, placement and size of news items, this study also looked for the presence of bias favoring either political party. In the Post, 91 percent of the headlines and 84 percent of the stories were objective. When bias was found, it favored Democrats more than Republicans. In the Times, however, only 68 percent of the headlines and 65 percent of the stories were objective. Not only were more than one-third of the headlines and stories biased, but the bias was always in favor of the Republicans (see Table 2).

Some Times' headlines failed the "neutral presentation" test. For example: "Dukakis finally vows to avenge, maybe, an attack on wife, Kitty" contains the loaded words: "finally" and "maybe." Bias against Democrats also
### TABLE 1

**Balance of News Coverage of the Republican and Democratic Parties in the Washington Dailies During the 1988 Presidential Election Campaign**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Washington Post</th>
<th></th>
<th>Washington Times</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>Neut</td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of events</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stories</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pictures</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>News story generation rate</em></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>News picture generation rate</em></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement of news items (N=)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front page (percent)</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside pages (percent)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headline Size (N=)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamer (percent)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread (percent)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Column (percent)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Column (percent)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Size (N=)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;34 sq. inches</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-33 sq. inches</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-24 sq. inches</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-16 sq. inches</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Difference between the Washington Post and the Washington Times significant >.05 level

### TABLE 2

**Frequency of Biased News Coverage in the Washington Dailies During the 1988 Presidential Election Campaign (in percent)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Washington Post</th>
<th></th>
<th>Washington Times</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Headlines and Subheads</em></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Overall Stories</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic Captions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Difference between the Washington Post and the Washington Times significant >.001 level*
TABLE 3
Direction of Photographs in the Washington Dailies
During the 1988 Presidential Election Campaign (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Washington Post</th>
<th>Washington Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=74)</td>
<td>(N=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows Democrats Favorably</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows Democrats Unfavorably</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows Republicans Favorably</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows Republicans Unfavorably</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photographic captions were written in an objective manner at both newspapers. Of the 72 captions in the Post, 92% were objective and the remainder were split equally for each party. All 14 captions in the Post were objective (see Table 2).

As expected, a substantial percentage of photographs showed candidates favorably in both newspapers. Democrats appeared favorably in 11% of the Post’s pictures and 14% of the Times’ pictures. Republicans were more likely to appear favorably in the Times (43% of the pictures) than the Post (18%). (See Table 3)

Of most significance, however, are the photographs that show candidates unfavorably. Democrats appeared unfavorably in 7% of Post photos and Republicans appeared unfavorably 5% of the time. For example, after the first debate, the Post ran a photo showing Dukakis holding boxing gloves, but the Democratic candidate looks defeated. Dukakis also appeared unfavorably when a debate photo of Bush aggressively pointing was juxtaposed with a photo of Dukakis holding up both hands, appearing to cower defensively. Sometimes Quayle also appeared poorly in Post photographs. After the vice-presidential debate, a picture showed Quayle with his tongue visible, his hand in a claw-like gesture and his eyes desperate. None of the Times photos showed candidates in an unfavorable way.

Discussion

This study shows that the Washington Times was far more biased in its 1988 presidential election coverage than the Washington Post. It should intrigue people who are interested in the agenda-setting influence of media located in the nation’s capital. Both newspapers are widely read and commonly quoted by opinion leaders and decision makers in Washington, D.C.

News generation rates show that Republicans and Democrats received balanced news coverage in the Post. The placement of news items was also balanced, and although Republicans received larger headlines, Democrats had large pictures. Headlines, stories and photographic captions were generally objective, and when bias did occur, it favored the Democrats more than the Republicans. Photographic coverage was also fair. Republicans were shown favorably slightly more often than Democrats, but this is probably because George Bush won the election and not Michael Dukakis.
A slight leaning toward Democrats by the Post was not found in this study, but was present in previous studies of the 1988 campaign. One explanation is that this study examined news items concerning 30 campaign highlights, not all news items. An advantage of this approach is that one can learn which events are omitted as well as which events are included. Newspaper coverage can be compared to a non-newspaper standard. A disadvantage is that many of the stories published by newspapers are issue-oriented, rather than event-oriented, and these "excluded" stories may be unbalanced or slanted to favor one political party. A possible follow-up study would examine the news items NOT related to the 30 campaign highlights to determine if they were equally objective in the Post.

Those leaders who relied upon the Washington Times for their news received an incomplete account of important events during the campaign and both stories and headlines were frequently biased. It ignored events favoring the Democrats and highlighted events favoring the Republicans. More than one-third of its headlines and stories were biased, and each time, they were biased in favor of the Republicans.

Some people may believe that the Washington Times covered only 18 of the 30 campaign events because it had a limited news hole and a smaller news staff. At the time, the paper was not published on Saturdays or Sundays, and it did not have as many pages as the Post during the week. Although the Times had less space and fewer resources, the total quantity of stories and photographs concerning the 1988 presidential campaign was quite high. Many of these stories and photographs were not coded because they did not concern one of the 30 campaign highlights. It was the impression of all three coders that stories and photographs not coded for this study favored Bush, defended Quayle and attacked the Democrats.

One of the limitations of this study was that only one political scientist evaluated the 30 campaign events. After the study was completed, we asked another distinguished scholar, E. Terrence Jones, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Missouri in St. Louis, to independently evaluate the same events. He has been a political consultant for more than 20 years, and his evaluations of the events were very similar to that of Earl Black.

Another limitation was that only two newspapers were used to test Shoemaker's theory of news content. The Post and Times were studied because they have different types of ownership and financing and so their news content was expected to differ. The results were consistent with the theory. As a publicly owned company concerned with making profits, the Post provided objective news that appeals to a large market of readers and advertisers. The Times, on the other hand, is a privately owned company concerned with promoting conservative, anti-communist views, so it gave more news to the Republicans and it slanted headlines and stories to favor the Republicans. In order to better test Shoemaker's theory, future studies should include a larger sample of newspapers with different types of ownership and financing.
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