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This study seeks to determine, through content analysis, whether there was evidence in news magazines during the 1980 presidential campaign to support the claim that Anderson was a "media-created candidate."

Studying weekly issues of Time, Newsweek, and U. S. News & World Report from April 28, 1980 through November 3, 1980, it was found that (a) Anderson received 17 per cent of the total campaign coverage, compared to Reagan's 42 per cent and Carter's 37 per cent, and (b) overall, Anderson's coverage was mildly negative in all magazines.

The study concludes that rather than "creating" Anderson, news magazines may have undercut his viability by restricting the length and number of stories about him.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. DATA AND EVALUATION</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Campaign Coverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Campaign Stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic Coverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine Covers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon Coverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction of Anderson Coverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of Assertions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes of Coverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Further Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table                                                                 | Page |
---                                                                   |------|
I. Amount of Space Allotted Presidential                          | 25   |
    Candidates by News Magazines (Expressed in Square Inches and  |
    Percentages)                                                   |      |
II. Total Campaign Stories for Each Candidate in News               | 28   |
    Magazines                                                      |      |
III. Total Number of Photographs for Each Candidate in News        | 33   |
    Magazines                                                      |      |
IV. Number of Full-Page News Magazine Covers of Candidates,         | 38   |
    Including Percentages                                          |      |
V. Number of Cartoons Devoted to Candidates in News Magazines,     | 41   |
    Including Percentages                                          |      |
VI. Direction of Assertions About Anderson in Weekly Issues of     | 45   |
    News Magazines                                                 |      |
VII. Number of Scores in Different Intensity Levels in News        | 49   |
    Magazines                                                      |      |
VIII. Coverage of the Anderson Campaign in News Magazines During    | 55   |
    the First Ten Weeks and the Last Ten Weeks, Including Range     |      |
    of Intensity of Mean Scores                                    |      |
IX. Distribution of Positive, Negative, and Neutral Assertions     | 58   |
    About Anderson in News Magazines, in Percentages               |      |
X. Common Themes of Anderson Coverage in                           | 61   |
    News Magazines                                                 |      |
### LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ranking of Mean Scores</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Comparison of Mean Scores for Anderson stories with Mean Scores for All Stories</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In August, 1980, the League of Women Voters, sponsor of the first presidential debate, announced that independent candidate John B. Anderson would be invited to debate President Jimmy Carter and Republican candidate Ronald Reagan if Anderson could show a 15 per cent rating in the national opinion polls by September 10. To the surprise of many political analysts, Anderson met the League's criterion for consideration as a significant candidate, and he accepted the invitation to the debate scheduled for September 21 in Baltimore, Maryland. Shortly thereafter, Carter repeated what Press Secretary Jody Powell had announced as early as May 27, 1980: the president would take part in a three-way debate only after a first debate with the Republican candidate (11, p. 8).

Political analysts reasoned that the president had more to lose in a three-way debate than Reagan, since Anderson had been drawing support from disgruntled Democrats and thus could give key states, and the election, to Reagan (7, p. 8). The president himself had admitted this on May 28, saying, "Whatever strength Anderson has in November . . . will be more at my expense than at Reagan's expense" (11, p. 8).
By September, however, Carter's reasoning had changed, at least publicly. Campaigning in New Jersey, he said of Anderson:

He just doesn't deserve it. It's a farce. I think Anderson is primarily a creation of the press. He's never won a primary, even in his home state. He ran as a Republican, and he's still a Republican. He hasn't had a convention. He doesn't have a party. He and his wife picked his vice presidential nominee (7, p. 8).

Carter's remarks touched on a controversy that had been brewing about the role of the press in the Anderson campaign. David Broder, Washington Post political columnist, said one week earlier on NBC's "Phil Donahue Show":

John Anderson is not lacking from attention in the press. Of all the candidates running this year, he has probably most successfully carried his campaign to the press. If he were as successful in reaching people as he has been in reaching reporters and editorial writers, he'd be home free (20, p. 16).

Presidential news media consultant Greg Schneiders, appearing on PBS's "MacNeil/Lehrer Report," said the news media had gone beyond objective reporting of the Anderson campaign and had, in fact, created the impression that the independent candidate stood a good chance of winning the presidency, instead of acting as a spoiler (19, p. 2).

Speaking of the print media in particular, Schneiders said, "I think that there are examples . . . where his [Anderson's] candidacy has been given far more attention and more favorable treatment than, I think, on the objective facts, it has deserved" (19, p. 2).
Schneiders charged that the news media had become participants in the political process rather than observers and because of that, had altered the course of events. If the news media were to stop covering Anderson, Schneiders said, he would "cease to exist," whereas Carter and Reagan would continue to exist within the two-party system, with or without news coverage (19, pp. 6-7).

The news media would have given Anderson less coverage, Schneiders said, if they had first considered the following questions: (a) Does he have the endorsement of a major party? (b) Does he have millions of loyal supporters? (c) Does he have a significant amount of campaign funds to wage a contest? (d) Does he have a chance of winning, or is he a spoiler? (19, p. 2).

In addition, on the basis of an anonymous poll of journalists taken by the president's pollster, Patrick Caddell, Schneiders said that most journalists were pro-Anderson and had allowed their personal biases to enter into their stories (19, p. 2).

Representing the print media in the discussion, Newsweek correspondent James Doyle said Anderson had been covered by that magazine only to the extent that the candidate was newsworthy. Newsweek's decisions about coverage were made on a weekly basis, he explained, with no set policy at the magazine regarding independent or minority candidates. Doyle said further that Newsweek's coverage of Anderson had been
fair and objective, pointing out the candidate's weaknesses as well as his strong points (19, pp. 4-5).

The selection of Doyle and Newsweek as representative of the print media may be an indication of the increasing importance attached to news magazines as information sources. Charges of press bias have been a regular part of every presidential campaign since President Harry Truman labeled newspapers the "one-party press" in 1948 (4, p. 645). Until 1968, newspapers had been the primary target of such charges, but since that time criticism has spread to other news media, including news magazines (4, p. 645).

News magazines have been shown to play an important part in the dissemination of political information, with their influence extending well beyond their primary audience. In a study of the Washington press corps, reporters listed Time, Newsweek, and U. S. News & World Report, in that order, as the periodicals used most often in their work (12, p. 55).

A study by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan found that, although only 5 per cent of the people responding to one survey listed news magazines as their primary source of information, this same 5 per cent scored highest in both issue familiarity and political activity (8, pp. 347-348). These respondents provide a good example of Donald J. Devine's "attentive public," those politically involved voters who work actively for a candidate, write letters to congressmen, canvass neighborhoods, and take part
in political discussions (2, p. 24). Because this group represents a direct link between the general public and the elites and leaders in a democracy, Devine sees it as one of the most important elements in the political process (2, p. 127).

Since it has been shown that reporters use information from news magazines in their work and that politically active voters use them as primary news sources, the study of political coverage in news magazines seems essential. For if a news medium offers biased, distorted, or incomplete information to those capable of passing it on to the public, the result can only be an ill-informed electorate, forced to make decisions based on a synthetic reality.

Statement of the Problem

Were news magazines biased in favor of John Anderson? Specifically, what percentage of total campaign coverage did Anderson receive compared with that received by his two opponents, and what was the direction of that coverage?

Purpose of the Study

This study attempted to (a) determine the amount of coverage given to all three presidential candidates in Time, Newsweek, and U. S. News & World Report; (b) measure the direction of assertions about Anderson in the three news magazines; and (c) compare the direction of Anderson coverage in the three news magazines.
Hypotheses

On the basis of a literature review and a scan of the magazines in the study, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Anderson received less campaign coverage in all three news magazines than his two opponents.

2. Anderson received less favorable coverage in U. S. News & World Report than in Time or Newsweek.

3. Coverage of Anderson in the first ten weeks of his campaign was more favorable than in the last ten weeks.

4. Anderson stories yielded directional values that were more positive than those found in other story categories.

5. Themes most often providing negative coverage of Anderson were his role as a spoiler, his doubtful chances of winning, and his unsuccessful campaign efforts.

6. Themes most often providing positive coverage of Anderson were his image, his personal characteristics, and his campaign successes.

Review of Literature

Guido Stempel's 1968 study of campaign coverage by fifteen major newspapers found that although equal space was still the practical norm for a two-party campaign, third-party candidate George Wallace received less coverage for the most part than did his two opponents (18). Four of the newspapers studied gave Wallace about as much space as
the other candidates, but coverage by eleven newspapers indicated that, from a news standpoint, he was not considered a major candidate. Stempel measured coverage in terms of space and display, but "made no conclusions regarding bias or adequacy of coverage" (18, p. 700). Of the varied results regarding treatment of Wallace, Stempel predicted that the response could be expected "to vary less if third-party candidates become a regular occurrence in presidential campaigns" (18, p. 706).

The 1976 presidential election saw the participation of another strong minority candidate, Eugene McCarthy, who said his efforts to attract news media attention were like "walking through deep snow" (3, p. 102). E. F. Einsiedel and M. Jane Bibbee (3) found that McCarthy was largely ignored in news magazines. From the first week in September to election day, Time carried two McCarthy stories in a total of forty-four election stories, Newsweek had one in forty-two stories, and U. S. News & World Report had none in forty-four stories (3, p. 104). McCarthy received 1 percent of the 14,000 square inches of space devoted to the campaign. When the McCarthy stories were measured for direction, a preponderance of neutral assertions was found: Only one third of the assertions were positive or negative (3, p. 104). Negative assertions dealt primarily with McCarthy's role as a spoiler, and positive assertions dealt with his personal characteristics. The results of this
study were similar to Stempel's finding that the news media showed little bias in coverage of third-party candidates; however, McCarthy's complaints about being ignored by the news media were shown to have a strong basis in fact. Einsiedel and Bibbee concluded, "One need not look as far as biased coverage to assess the impact of media coverage; . . . the attention given a story and its play may also influence perception of events" (3, p. 105).

John P. Robinson found that news magazines were second only to newspapers in perceived bias during the 1968 presidential campaign (13, p. 240). In response to questions about which news medium had taken sides for or against a candidate, 50 per cent of the respondents listed newspapers, 29 per cent listed news magazines, 22 per cent listed network news programs, and 18 per cent listed radio news programs. Surprisingly, a newspaper's perceived support of a candidate was associated with a 6 per cent edge in the vote for that candidate (13, p. 246). Robinson conjectured that a newspaper's traditional partisanship had become so widely expected by the public that bias in that medium was seen as legitimate, and had, in fact, played a role in helping voters make up their minds (13, p. 246). Additional audience studies are needed to determine whether overt political allegiances in news magazines have come to be expected by news consumers, as well as to determine the effect of that perceived bias on voter behavior.
In their study of coverage of the 1972 presidential campaign by newspapers, television, and news magazines, Dru Evarts and Guido Stempel found that bias was evident only in the three news magazines, all of which favored the Republicans (4). *Newsweek* showed the greater range between the number of sentences favorable to Republicans compared with the number of sentences favorable to Democrats: 57.6 per cent pro-Republican and 42.4 per cent pro-Democrat \((N = 831)\). *Time* had the smaller range: 52.3 per cent pro-Republican and 47.7 per cent pro-Democrat \((N = 1,320)\). *U. S. News & World Report* was in between: 56.9 per cent pro-Republican and 43.1 per cent pro-Democrat \((N = 1,689)\) (4, p. 647).

However, when attributed sentences were compared with unattributed sentences, the same study found that in unattributed sentences, *Newsweek* favored the Democrats, *U. S. News & World Report* favored the Republicans, and *Time* was in between, but with a slight edge toward the Republicans (4, p. 648). This lack of consistency suggested an absence of bias to the researchers; however, on the basis of results for all news media studied, they concluded that "the only indication of bias in this study was one of a slight pro-Republican bias on the part of news magazines" (4, p. 676).

Robert W. Hunnicutt's study of magazine coverage of the 1973 Chilean military junta found that *U. S. News & World Report* was the most conservative of the three news magazines
in its reporting of that event (6). In fact, only one magazine of the ten studied (which included business, religious, opinion, and news magazines) was more positive in its coverage than *U. S. News & World Report* (6, p. 25). On a scale of mean scores ranging in value from -1.00 to +1.00, with the limits of objectivity set at ±.05, *U. S. News & World Report* gave moderately positive coverage to the coup, with a value of +.4101; *Time* gave mildly positive coverage, with a value of +.1795; and *Newsweek* gave mildly negative coverage, with a value of -.1288 (6, p. 25). Although, based on those results, *Time* and *Newsweek* could be considered mildly conservative and mildly liberal, respectively, it was found that those magazines did achieve a measure of objectivity over a period of time, when the total number of stories, rather than individual stories, was considered (6, p. 29). However, based on the greater intensity of its pro-coup coverage, *U. S. News & World Report* was redefined as a "special interest magazine," aimed more at the business community than at straight news consumers (6, p. 28).

In 1977, James B. Fredd found *U. S. News & World Report* to be the more conservative magazine, in his study of the use of leaks in news magazine coverage of the investigation and subsequent resignation of Republican Vice President Spiro Agnew (5). *Time* and *Newsweek* used a greater amount of information leaked from sources hostile to Agnew than did *U. S. News & World Report*. This seems to be in at least
partial agreement with Evarts and Stempel's data regarding the three magazines' biases in unattributed sentences (4, p. 648). In addition, *Time* and *Newsweek* editorially defended the use of leaks; *U. S. News & World Report* editorially condemned their use (5, pp. 56-57). For the purposes of Fredd's study, *U. S. News & World Report* was, overall, more favorable to Agnew than either *Time* or *Newsweek* (5, p. 61).

While this examination of news magazine coverage of the Anderson campaign was still in its formative stages, partial results were in from a study of the CBS Evening News. Researchers at George Washington University found that from January 1 to July 4, 1980, Anderson was the only candidate among the top ten in the primaries to have received favorable coverage in both his "electoral success index" and "personal qualities score" (16, p. 44). In fact, Anderson had a higher success index than any candidate other than Reagan or Carter, despite the fact that he had never won a primary or a caucus (16, p. 44).

Michael Robinson, heading the research, attributed the results to the network's fascination with underdogs:

If one accepts the idea that the press is tougher on front-runners because they know one of these guys might be president someday . . . , then it seems logical that the press also feels less inclined to be tough on somebody who hasn't got a prayer--especially if that guy says what one likes to hear. As long as it remained the impossible dream, but did better than expected, Anderson's campaign was probably fated to get the best press around (16, p. 45).
Although results of the study from July 5 to November 4 had not been published at this writing, Robinson indicated that toward the end of the campaign, Anderson was receiving the most negative coverage of the three candidates (15).

There apparently has been no other effort to review news magazine coverage of Anderson's independent bid for the presidency. Although the news media have been accused of bias, superficiality, and arrogance in their campaign coverage and have become, to some analysts, "the new kingmakers in American politics" (17, pp. 69-70), no attempt has been made as yet to apply quantitative content analysis to the material covered in this study.

Limitations of the Study

This study did not seek to cover material written about Anderson prior to his announcement, on April 24, 1980, that he would run as an independent candidate. Therefore, issues of magazines published before the fourth week in April and after Election Day, November 4, were not included in the sample.

Placement of stories and headline size were not included in the sample, since most political articles appear within the same section of a given magazine each week, and headlines are customarily chosen for eye appeal rather than importance of topic.

Direction of assertions about Reagan and Carter were not included, except as they applied directly to Anderson.
Direction of political cartoons and photographs were not within the scope of this study, although the sizes of these were used to tabulate the total amount of space given to each candidate in news magazines.

News magazine editorials were not included, since a scan of these revealed very few references to individual candidates and their qualifications. *U. S. News & World Report*, in fact, was the only magazine that had editorials devoted to individual candidates: one about Carter and two about Reagan. No editorials were written about Anderson during the time period studied.

Stories discussing Carter in his role as president, Reagan in his role as governor, and Anderson in any role other than that of candidate, were not included in the sample.

Methodology

The sample for this study included all issues of *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U. S. News & World Report* from the fourth week in April, when Anderson announced his intention to run as an independent, to the first week in November, the week of the election. Each magazine published twenty-eight issues during that period.

All election stories in news magazines about presidential candidates Reagan, Carter, and Anderson were included in the study. Election stories were identified by the amount of space within the story dealing with a particular candidate.
Stories about issues, rather than about candidates, were counted as election stories if at least half the story dealt with one or more candidates (3, p. 103). Election stories in each magazine were measured first by column inch, then by column width in inches to determine area; therefore, story size was tabulated in total square inches. Photographs of and cartoons about a candidate situated within a story about another candidate were measured and included in the photographed candidate's total column inches for that issue (3, p. 103).

Stories were categorized by content as (a) Anderson election stories, (b) Carter election stories, (c) Reagan election stories, (d) Reagan-Carter election stories, and (e) Reagan-Carter-Anderson election stories. Stories in the Reagan-Carter and Reagan-Carter-Anderson categories dealt with each candidate about equally (3, p. 103). There were no Carter-Anderson or Reagan-Anderson categories, because in stories where Anderson received equal coverage, both Carter and Reagan were always included. The amount of coverage devoted to Reagan and Carter was included in this study simply as a basis for comparison. No attempt was made to measure the total direction of Reagan and Carter stories.

Other items measured, using the same categories, were the number of stories, cartoons, and magazine covers. Photographs were measured in the same way, although it was necessary to include two additional categories: Reagan-Anderson
and Carter-as-president. Reagan-Anderson photographs were found in issues covering the first debate, in which Carter declined to participate. Photographs of Carter in his role as president were counted separately because these photographs were given a great deal of play from April to August. Although Carter-as-president photographs could not be classified as campaign photographs in the same way as Reagan's and Anderson's were, they represented valuable exposure for the president during that time period. To omit them would have distorted the results of the study by discounting the importance of incumbency in a political campaign.

Additionally, including Carter-as-president photographs enabled researchers to conjecture about whether basic news value judgments had been exercised during the early part of the campaign. For example, if Carter received a large number of Carter-as-president photographs in an issue and the number of his campaign photographs was reduced accordingly, this could be seen as a conscious effort on the part of news magazine editors to keep the number of photographs about equal among the candidates. It should be noted, however, that Carter-as-president photographs rarely were measured and included in Carter's square inch totals. This is because photographs of each of the candidates in roles other than that of candidate were counted as campaign photographs only if they accompanied campaign stories. Therefore, a photograph of Carter standing with other world leaders in a story about
a summit conference would be counted only as a Carter-as-
president photograph and would not be measured. However,
if the same photograph appeared in a subsequent issue and
accompanied a campaign story, it would be included in Car-
ter's square inch totals.

Photographs of more than one candidate were measured
in square inches and then divided equally among the number
of candidates in the photograph.

Anderson stories in news magazines, as well as all sto-
ries in which fifteen or more thought units about the inde-
pendent candidate were found, were subjected to assertion
analysis, to determine the direction of thought units used
to describe the candidate and his campaign.

A list of content categories was constructed, using most
of the major themes found in the magazines' coverage of the
Anderson campaign. Themes were listed in mutually exclusive
pairs of assertions, or thought units, which corresponded to
most of the possible statements that might be made about An-
derson (1, p. 41). A thought unit was defined as a phrase
or statement expressing a single idea, for example, "The
house is white." A sentence can contain more than one thought
unit: "The house is white, and the garage is brown."

The direction of each thought unit was determined.
Direction was defined as the attitude expressed within a
thought unit about Anderson and his candidacy. Direction
can be positive, negative, or neutral.
A table of the content categories used in this study is listed in Appendix A.

There were no signed columns in the three news magazines written solely about Anderson during the time period studied. However, Anderson was mentioned in columns (eight times in Newsweek, twice in Time, and once in U. S. News & World Report), and some of those statements were determined to be other than neutral in direction. Anderson's name appeared in these columns so sporadically, however, that separating them from "news" would have yielded little in the way of significant results. For that reason, they were included along with news stories in the sample.

To minimize bias on the part of the researcher, three coders were used. To further promote coder objectivity, a schedule was constructed whereby each coder studied three weekly issues of one magazine, then changed to three issues of the next magazine on the schedule, then to the next, etc. The schedule of coder assignments is listed in Appendix B.

Coders were instructed to scan each issue carefully, categorize the election stories, and code as positive, negative, or neutral every thought unit about Anderson. When a thought unit did not fall into one of the categories listed on the category table, it was classified as neutral, unless it was obviously pro- or anti-Anderson. In that case, it was included on the category table under "Other Themes--Positive" or "Other Themes--Negative."
Compound sentences were divided into individual thought units. As an example, consider the following sentence:

Anderson has remained true to himself: erratically ebullient, enthused, inspiring, as well as dour, bored, cranky and preachy (9, p. 26).

The thought units in this sentence are as follows:
(a) Anderson has remained true to himself, (b) Anderson is erratic, (c) Anderson is ebullient, (d) Anderson is enthused, (e) Anderson is inspiring, (f) Anderson is dour, (g) Anderson is bored, (h) Anderson is cranky, and (i) Anderson is preachy. Each thought unit was measured as having positive, negative, or neutral direction.

The direction of an entire article was determined by calculating the ratio of pro-Anderson thought units to the total and subtracting from that the ratio of anti-Anderson thought units to the total (6, p. 11). For example, if an article had a total of 100 thought units, 60 pro-Anderson, 35 anti-Anderson, and 5 neutral, the article would have a value of +25/100, or +.2500, the calculation being made as follows:

\[
\frac{60 \text{ pro-Anderson thought units}}{100 \text{ total thought units}} - \frac{35 \text{ anti-Anderson thought units}}{100 \text{ total thought units}} = \frac{25}{100} \text{ net}
\]

If the proportions were reversed, the article would have a value of -.2500. Once values for all items were calculated, they were plotted on a scale on which the maximum value was +1.00 and the minimum value was -1.00.

Since, for all practical purposes, the theoretical value of objectivity (zero) is unattainable, the limits of
objectivity were set at between -.05 and +.05 for this study. Items with values between +.05 and +.3332 were categorized as having mild intensity, those between +.3333 and +.6665 as having moderate intensity, and those between +.6666 and +1.00 as having strong intensity (6, p. 11).

In Reagan-Carter-Anderson stories, statements favorable or unfavorable to Anderson's opponents were not automatically classified as negative or positive statements about Anderson. If, however, statements about Reagan and Carter were directly related to or compared with statements about Anderson, then positive or negative statements pertaining to the other candidates were included in the sample.

The category table was pretested twice before beginning final research. Reading issues of Time and U. S. News & World Report published before April 28, coders were able to point out inconsistencies, redundancies, and omissions in the table. Pretesting served two useful purposes in this case: The table itself was refined, and the coders, through trial and error, became familiar with the research tool and its use. They were, therefore, more capable and efficient researchers when study of the sample material began.

Significance of the Problem

News magazines have played an increasingly important role over the past twenty years in distributing political messages to the voting public, and those messages "eventually filter into public consciousness" (14, p. 97).
The news media have been shown to play a significant agenda-setting function in political campaigns, influencing the salience of attitudes toward issues (10, p. 177). It stands to reason, then, that this same function could be applied to the candidates themselves, especially third-party or independent candidates. A candidate's importance, or viability, could be established by the type and amount of coverage he receives from the news media.

Since it was still being claimed that Anderson was the darling of the news media as late as mid-September, five months after he declared his independent candidacy, it is necessary to determine whether that charge had any basis in fact. If it could be shown that Anderson did have a disproportionately large share of the total campaign coverage, and if that coverage were mostly positive in direction, then news magazines would have gone against the traditional treatment of third-party or independent candidates (3, 18). If, true to the norm, it could be shown that Anderson received only a small share of total coverage, news magazines then might face a re-examination of the methods by which individuals and events are assigned news value (3, p. 105). Finally, if Anderson were to receive an overabundance of negative coverage rather than the usual scanty-but-neutral coverage, the question then would be, why? Why would this candidate be treated differently from minority candidates in the past? In any event, answers to these questions are important to the news
media in their efforts to upgrade standards and performance during a time when the public appears to be increasingly critical of the product provided by the press.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I has provided an introduction; Chapter II will provide the data and evaluation; and Chapter III will provide summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
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CHAPTER II

DATA AND EVALUATION

Total Campaign Coverage

In the twenty-eight-week period from April 28, 1980 through November 3, 1980, Time, Newsweek, and U. S. News & World Report devoted 21,905 square inches to coverage of the presidential campaigns of Anderson, Reagan, and Carter. Of that total, Reagan received 9,209 square inches (42 per cent), Carter received 8,112 square inches (37 per cent), and Anderson received 3,622 square inches (17 per cent). Four per cent of total coverage constituted information within categorized stories about campaign staff members, running mates, and wives of the candidates.

The three news magazines provided approximately the same amount of coverage during the period of the study, although Newsweek devoted slightly more coverage (7,789 square inches) to the campaign than did the other magazines. Time was second, 7,225 square inches, and U. S. News & World Report had the least amount of coverage, 6,891 square inches. (See Table I.) Newsweek's slightly higher total can be attributed to the fact that during the time period studied, every weekly issue of that magazine contained at least some information about the campaign. Time, by comparison, had two issues, and U. S. News & World Report had four issues in which there was no mention of the campaign.
### Table I

**Amount of Space Alotted Presidential Candidates by News Magazines (Expressed in Square Inches and Percentages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>News Magazines</th>
<th>Reagan</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Carter</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Anderson</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>2,781.27</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3,048.00</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>977.16</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>418.72</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7,225.15</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newsweek</strong></td>
<td>3,603.44</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>2,481.83</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1,403.54</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>300.07</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7,788.88</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. News &amp; World Report</strong></td>
<td>2,824.16</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>2,582.01</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1,241.73</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>242.84</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6,890.74</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9,208.87</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>8,111.84</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>3,622.43</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>961.63</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21,904.77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the first eighteen weeks of the study period, from April 28 through August 25, Newsweek had more coverage than the other news magazines. However, that magazine had less coverage than Time or U. S. News & World Report during the ten-week period from September 1 through November 3, the period when campaign activities normally are at their peak. During the first eighteen weeks, Newsweek's campaign coverage averaged 281 square inches per issue, compared to U. S. News & World Report's 228 square inches and Time's 184 square inches. After September 1, however, when the assumption had been that campaign coverage would increase, Newsweek's average weekly coverage slipped to 274 square inches per week, U. S. News & World Report's increased to 278 square inches, and Time's increased to 392 square inches. It appears, then, that Newsweek, more than the other news magazines, devoted slightly more coverage to events surrounding the candidate selection process than it did to the actual campaign, which traditionally gets under way on September 1.

Number of Campaign Stories

During the time period studied, 195 stories fell within categories outlined for this study: 49 Reagan stories, 50 Carter stories, 25 Anderson stories, 47 Reagan-Carter stories, and 24 Reagan-Carter-Anderson stories. Reagan and Carter stories made up one half of all stories, the Republican and Democratic candidates dividing that amount about equally.
Anderson stories made up one eighth of all stories, Anderson receiving half the number of stories received by either of his opponents.

In addition, there were twice as many Reagan-Carter stories as there were Reagan-Carter-Anderson stories. This means that whereas Reagan and Carter appeared in all multiple-candidate stories, Anderson appeared in one third of them; and when he did, the structure of Reagan-Carter-Anderson stories, by definition, dictated that he could receive no more than one third of the coverage within each story.

The number of stories in each news magazine was surprisingly equal for the twenty-eight-week period: Time had sixty-six campaign stories, U. S. News & World Report had sixty-five, and Newsweek had sixty-four. This similarity was evident within the individual candidates' categories as well. Time had seventeen Reagan stories, twenty Carter stories, seven Anderson stories, fifteen Reagan-Carter stories, and seven Reagan-Carter-Anderson stories. Newsweek differed only slightly in its totals, although it had more Anderson stories than either of the other news magazines. Newsweek had sixteen Reagan stories, seventeen Carter stories, ten Anderson stories, fifteen Reagan-Carter stories, and six Reagan-Carter-Anderson stories. U. S. News & World Report had sixteen Reagan stories, thirteen Carter stories, eight Anderson stories, seventeen Reagan-Carter stories, and eleven Reagan-Carter-Anderson stories. (See Table II.)
TABLE II
TOTAL CAMPAIGN STORIES FOR EACH CANDIDATE
IN NEWS MAGAZINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. News &amp; World Report</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| %       | 25%    | 26%    | 13%      | 24%           | 12%                    | 100%  |

Carter received three more stories than Reagan in Time, one more story than Reagan in Newsweek. However, Reagan received three more stories than Carter in U. S. News & World Report. This was not unexpected, since U. S. News & World Report has been shown in past studies to be the most conservative of the three news magazines (5, p. 648; 9). U. S. News & World Report also differed slightly from Time and Newsweek in the
number of multiple-candidate stories, with a higher number of Reagan-Carter and Reagan-Carter-Anderson stories.

It appears that there was a direct correlation between the number of Anderson stories and the amount of coverage Anderson received in the three news magazines. As discussed, Newsweek had the most Anderson stories and the most square inches (39 per cent of Anderson's total coverage). U. S. News & World Report was second in the number of stories and in square inches (34 per cent); Time was third in the number of stories and in square inches (27 per cent).

Anderson's square inch totals in each news magazine could be interpreted as fifty square inches of copy per week in Newsweek, forty-four square inches per week in U. S. News & World Report, and thirty-five square inches per week in Time. However, a closer examination of Anderson's weekly totals reveals that Time actually mentioned Anderson on a more regular basis than did the other news magazines. For example, in a total of twenty-eight issues, there were only four issues of Time in which Anderson was not mentioned. Newsweek and U. S. News & World Report, by comparison, each had seven issues with no mention of Anderson.

This means that Time covered Anderson more often than did the other news magazines, but devoted less space; U. S. News & World Report covered Anderson less often, but devoted more space than Time; and Newsweek covered Anderson less often than Time and as often as U. S. News & World Report, and devoted more space than did either of the other magazines.
A correlation was not found, however, between the number of Reagan and Carter stories and the amount of coverage Reagan and Carter received. Although Reagan received more stories than Carter in only *U. S. News & World Report*, he nevertheless received more total coverage than Carter. The number of stories Reagan and Carter received in each news magazine appeared to have no direct bearing on the amount of coverage devoted to them. For example, although Reagan received three more stories than Carter in *U. S. News & World Report*, the difference between the two candidates' square inch totals in that magazine was only 242 square inches. Reagan received 2,824 square inches, and Carter, 2,582 square inches in *U. S. News & World Report*.

The same was true for *Time*, where Carter received three more stories than Reagan, but had only 267 square inches more in actual coverage than Reagan. In *Time*, Carter's 3,048 square inches and Reagan's 2,781 square inches represented nearly equal coverage, as did the two candidates' totals in *U. S. News & World Report*.

Although the number of stories in *Time* and *U. S. News & World Report* was not, perhaps, the best indicator of actual coverage received by the two candidates, the number of stories in *Newsweek* was actually misleading. In *Newsweek*, Carter received one more story than Reagan, but had 1,121 square inches less than Reagan. The substantial difference in the two candidates' square inch totals belied the impression
created by the number of stories, that is, that Carter had received more coverage. Reagan received 3,603 square inches of coverage in Newsweek, and Carter received 2,482 square inches.

The conclusion was, then, that when Newsweek covered Reagan, it covered him at length, especially during the two weeks of Republican convention coverage. For example, in the July 21 issue, which came out the week before the convention, one Reagan story (12) was thirty-one pages in length, with wide columns of solid copy and thirty-six photographs. The story covered Reagan from his beginnings to his imminent nomination and provided a great deal of background information on him. Readers were provided the means by which they could judge the man and his politics. Because the length and depth of this story were unusual, the absence of a similar Carter story during the Democratic convention was all the more noticeable. Whereas Reagan received 1,997 square inches of coverage in Newsweek during the two weeks of that magazine's coverage of the convention, Carter received a combined two-week total during the Democratic convention of 507 square inches, 1,490 square inches less than his opponent. If Carter had received, in some other issue during the period of study, a similar amount of coverage, the difference between the convention coverage of the two candidates would have been unimportant. But Carter's highest weekly total in Newsweek was 325 square inches, and this occurred, surprisingly, in the
July 28 issue that covered the events of the Republican convention. In that issue, *Newsweek* devoted 561 square inches to Reagan, more coverage in one week than Carter received in August during the two weeks of Democratic convention coverage.

Compared with *Newsweek*, the other news magazines' coverage of the two conventions yielded no significant difference between Reagan's and Carter's totals. *Time* gave Carter slightly more coverage during the two weeks of the Democratic convention than it gave Reagan during the Republican convention. Carter's combined total for the two weeks of coverage was 887 square inches, compared to Reagan's 582, making the difference in coverage 305 square inches. *U. S. News & World Report* gave Carter slightly more coverage than Reagan, but the totals for both candidates were so similar that it appears to have been the result of a conscious effort at objectivity by the editorial staff of *U. S. News & World Report*. Carter's combined total was 889 square inches, compared to Reagan's 848, a difference of 41 square inches.

**Photographic Coverage**

During the twenty-eight-week period, news magazines had 183 campaign photographs of Reagan, 121 photographs of Carter, and 71 photographs of Anderson. There were four photographs in the Reagan-Carter category and four in the Reagan-Carter-Anderson category. During the Reagan-Anderson debate in September, *Newsweek* had one Reagan-Anderson photograph, as did
U. S. News & World Report; *Time* had no photographic coverage of the Reagan-Anderson debate. (See Table III.)

### TABLE III

**TOTAL NUMBER OF PHOTOGRAPHS FOR EACH CANDIDATE IN NEWS MAGAZINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newsweek</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U. S. News &amp; World Report</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>81*</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures not included in totals for campaign photographs.*

Anderson received more photographic coverage in *Newsweek* (twenty-eight photographs) than in *Time* or *U. S. News & World Report*. *U. S. News & World Report* was second (twenty-five photographs) and *Time* was third (eighteen photographs). *Newsweek*, in addition, had more Reagan photographs than the other news magazines (seventy-two). Again, *U. S. News & World Report*
was second (fifty-seven Reagan photographs) and Time was third (fifty-four Reagan photographs). Newsweek and Time each had two Reagan-Carter photographs; U. S. News & World Report had none. Time carried no photographs in which all three candidates were pictured; Newsweek had one; U. S. News & World Report had three.

The number of Carter campaign photographs was about equal with Reagan in both Time and U. S. News & World Report. Carter had fifty-one campaign photographs to Reagan's fifty-four in Time and forty-five to Reagan's fifty-seven in U. S. News & World Report. However, in Newsweek, Carter campaign photographs totaled twenty-five to Reagan's seventy-two. This may have been the result of an effort on the part of Newsweek editors to decrease the number of Carter campaign photographs in issues where Carter was featured photographically and editorially as president.

In addition to campaign photographs, Carter received eighty-one presidential photographs in the three magazines. Carter-as-president photographs were found to be more evident in the early months of the campaign, due to coverage of the summit conference in Venice and the American hostage crisis in Iran. Carter-as-president photographs combined with Carter campaign photographs totaled 202 in all magazines, 19 more than Reagan's total, and 131 more than Anderson's. However, when considered on a per-week basis, there does seem to be evidence in certain instances indicating that news magazines
attempted to keep Carter-the-president and Carter-the-campaigner from appearing in the same weekly issue. In *Time*, photographs appeared in the Carter-as-president category or the Carter-as-campaigner category, but not both categories, in twenty-one issues (two issues had no photographic coverage of Carter). This means there were five issues in which Carter received double coverage, as president and as campaigner. In *U. S. News & World Report*, Carter photographs appeared in one or the other category, but not both, in nineteen issues (four issues had no coverage). Therefore, *U. S. News & World Report*, like *Time*, had five issues in which Carter received photographic coverage in both categories.

*Newsweek* may have carried the attempt to separate Carter's photographs to the extreme. For example, in *Time*, Carter's combined photographs totaled seventy-one, compared to Reagan's fifty-four campaign photographs. In *U. S. News & World Report*, his combined photographs totaled seventy-nine to Reagan's fifty-seven campaign photographs. In *Newsweek*, Carter's combined photographs totaled fifty-two to Reagan's seventy-two campaign photographs, indicating that Carter received substantially less photographic coverage than his opponent in *Newsweek*. Carter appeared in *Newsweek* in one or the other category, but not both, twenty-two times (two issues had no coverage), which means he received photographic coverage in both categories in four issues in twenty-eight. Although this indicated an effort at objectivity by *Newsweek*, Carter may have actually suffered from his role as president, rather than having had the advantage.
Indeed, in *Newsweek*, Anderson had more campaign photographs than Carter had in either category, although, of course, when Carter's totals were combined, the president had twenty-four photographs more than Anderson.

In summary, then, and when speaking only in terms of campaign photographs, Reagan was clearly the most photographed candidate of the 1980 election year. The Republican candidate received a 48 per cent share of all categorized campaign photographs in news magazines from April 28 through November 3. Carter received 31 per cent, and Anderson, 18 per cent. Multiple-candidate photographs made up the remaining 3 per cent, 1 per cent in each category.

Reagan received 39 per cent of his photographs in *Newsweek*, 31 per cent in *U. S. News & World Report*, and 30 per cent in *Time*. Carter received 42 per cent of his photographs in *Time*, 37 per cent in *U. S. News & World Report*, and 21 per cent in *Newsweek*. Anderson received 39 per cent of his photographs in *Newsweek*, 35 per cent in *U. S. News & World Report*, and 25 per cent in *Time*.

If Carter-as-president photographs had been included in the overall total number of campaign photographs, the president would have come out ahead, receiving 43 per cent of the total. Reagan would have had 39 per cent, and Anderson, 15 per cent. However, since it has been shown that news magazines did not run photographs in both Carter categories in the same issues on a regular basis, the conclusion of this study remains that Reagan received the most photographs during the period.
In addition, another important aspect of the candidates' photographic coverage was found. When an Anderson photograph accompanied a story in which Reagan and Carter photographs were featured, on most occasions Anderson's photograph was noticeably smaller than those of his opponents. Customarily, Reagan and Carter photographs were about equal in size, and Anderson photographs were one half to one third the size of either of his opponents' photographs. This study made no attempt to determine the effects of photo size and placement on voter behavior; however, for purposes of this study, the relatively small size of Anderson's photographs was worthy of mention because this affected his overall square inch totals. Had his photographs been equal in size to Reagan's and Carter's, his percentage of total coverage would have been higher.

Magazine Covers

Full-page magazine covers of the candidates made up 25 per cent of all news magazine covers during the period of the study. Overall, Carter appeared alone on covers of news magazines more often than did Reagan or Anderson; one time more than Reagan, and six times more than Anderson. Carter had a total of seven covers during the period of study; three of those covers were the result of the president's handling of the American hostage crisis in Iran. Since they were full-page covers, however, and represented valuable exposure for the president, they were included in the totals. Reagan had six covers; Anderson had one. Reagan and Carter shared covers
three times, and all three candidates appeared together four times. Carter, therefore, received 8 per cent of the eighty-four magazine covers during the period of study; Reagan received 7 per cent; Anderson, 1 per cent. Reagan-Carter covers made up 4 per cent of the total number of covers, and Reagan-Carter-Anderson covers, 5 per cent. (See Table IV.)

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF FULL-PAGE NEWS MAGAZINE COVERS OF CANDIDATES, INCLUDING PERCENTAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. News &amp; World Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U. S. News & World Report and Time had the same number of presidential-candidate covers, picturing candidates alone or together eight times. Time pictured Reagan alone twice and Carter alone four times; Anderson was not pictured on the
cover of *Time* during the study period. *U. S. News & World Report* showed Reagan alone on three covers, Carter alone on two covers, and Anderson alone on one. *U. S. News & World Report* was the only magazine to devote one full cover to Anderson. In addition, *U. S. News & World Report* featured Anderson on its May 19 issue, in a small space at the top of a cover featuring Fidel Castro and the renewed Cuban threat to the United States.

*Newsweek* had five full covers of candidates; of those five, Reagan was pictured once and Carter, once; Anderson was not pictured alone on the cover of *Newsweek* during the study period. Reagan and Carter were pictured together on one *Newsweek* cover, and the three candidates shared two covers.

All three magazines had Reagan-Carter covers in October: *U. S. News & World Report* on October 6, and *Time* and *Newsweek* on October 13. All three of the magazines' November 3 issues showed Reagan, Carter, and Anderson together and, on each cover, Anderson's picture or photograph was one third the size of his opponents'. *Time's* November 3 cover pictured Reagan and Carter encircled in the middle of the page and Anderson, in a smaller circle, at the bottom of the page. *U. S. News & World Report* had four campaign buttons on its November 3 cover, with Reagan and Carter represented in equal proportions, Anderson smaller, and a button inscribed, "UNDECIDED" the largest on the page. *Newsweek* had the candidates caricatured as runners in a footrace, with Reagan and Carter in the lead and Anderson bringing up the rear.
Newsweek, however, did have one magazine cover showing all three candidates, in which Anderson was larger than Reagan or Carter. This cover appeared early in the campaign, however, and depicted Anderson as a wild card, with his opponents pictured as a king and jack in the deck of cards. The story in June was about Anderson and the unknown effect he would have on the election. The story in the November 3 issue was: One of the men pictured will be president. Anderson was not seen as a contender by that date, and thus the size of his photograph or picture depicted his status.

In addition to the covers of news magazines that fell into this study's categories, in Newsweek Carter shared one cover with Edmund Muskie and Cyrus Vance (shortly after Vance resigned as Secretary of State), and one cover with Edward Kennedy. Reagan shared one cover of Newsweek with George Bush and Gerald Ford. Therefore, Newsweek did picture the candidates the same number of times as the other news magazines, only these three were not full-page pictures of an individual candidate or a combination of the candidates in this study. Although these covers were not included in totals for this study, they are worthy of mention because they represented additional exposure for Anderson's opponents; a shared cover, after all, would be better than no cover, and the dearth of Anderson covers and his treatment indicated that he was not considered a serious candidate by news magazines.
Cartoon Coverage

Political cartoons have been described as "ridicule and satire by definition; a negative attitude is the nature of the art" (6, p. 83). That being the case, a perverse sort of logic would hold that Carter was the big loser in 1980 and that Anderson was the winner, because Carter was certainly the candidate most often "ridiculed," and Anderson was largely ignored. (See Table V.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF CARTOONS DEVOTED TO CANDIDATES IN NEWS MAGAZINES, INCLUDING PERCENTAGES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. News &amp; World Report</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| %        | 22%    | 38%    | 12%      | 16%           | 12%                    | 100%  |

Of a total of seventy-four cartoons in all news magazines,
Carter was the subject of twenty-eight, Reagan, of sixteen, and Anderson, of nine. Twelve cartoons were categorized as Reagan-Carter cartoons, and nine cartoons depicted all three candidates. The percentages for each category were: Carter, 38 per cent; Reagan, 22 per cent; Anderson, 12 per cent; Reagan-Carter, 16 per cent; and Reagan-Carter-Anderson, 12 per cent.

*Newsweek* used cartoons more often than the other news magazines, thirty-five during the period. *U. S. News & World Report* was second, twenty-nine cartoons, and *Time* was third, twelve cartoons.

Although being ignored by political cartoonists could be seen as an endorsement, it is doubtful that this was the case with Anderson; in fact, as *Newsweek* noted in early October, Anderson's few cartoons resulted more from his "insignificance than from his sterling qualities" and that when he appeared at all, he was "even smaller than his poll percentages" (6, p. 76). *U. S. News & World Report* had the most cartoons of Anderson, five during the period. *Newsweek* had four cartoons, and *Time* had none.

By comparison, *Newsweek* had seventeen Carter cartoons, *U. S. News & World Report* had eight, and *Time* had three. *U. S. News & World Report* had eight Reagan cartoons, *Newsweek* had six, and *Time* had two. There were five Reagan-Carter cartoons in *U. S. News & World Report*, four in *Newsweek*, and three in *Time*. *Newsweek* and *Time* each had four Reagan-Carter-Anderson
It appears, again, that Carter may have suffered from incumbency, something that, in itself, "tends to trigger outrage in cartoonists" (6, p. 75). *Newsweek*, in a story about the 1980 political cartoonists, explained it as follows:

Carter in particular has withered under the cartoonists' hot light. The toothy grin that was his trademark in the 1976 campaign has been wiped from his face; the exuberant blond thatch has been tamed. As he has declined in Presidential stature, he has shriveled on the page (6, p. 78).

In the same article, an analysis of Reagan cartoons showed that the oldest candidate had actually grown younger in cartoons, the result of a backlash by elderly citizens coupled with the fact that Reagan's wrinkles did not reproduce well in newspapers. Reagan's wrinkles faded as the campaign progressed and were replaced by the glossy pompadour that would become his new trademark. One cartoonist said it was difficult to depict Reagan in the same harsh light in which Carter had been placed because "despite his age, he is still a very good looking man" (6, p. 78). Cartoonist Jeff MacNelly of *The Richmond News Leader* gave a different reason: "You hammer at what outrages you that day... I think that basically Reagan hasn't outraged me as much as Carter" (6, p. 75).

Anderson triggered very little outrage in cartoonists. Since cartoonists work with images and perceptions already present in the mind of the electorate, Anderson's image as an insignificant candidate was evident in the few cartoons devoted to him in news magazines. He was usually depicted as
very small in stature, with a forlorn expression, and without any objectionable characteristics.

Additionally, placement of an Anderson cartoon may have been as effective in portraying his insignificance as the message of the cartoon itself. In October, a cartoon accompanied an Anderson story in *Newsweek* (2) that followed directly after a Reagan-Carter story (4), which had featured photographs of the two candidates. On another occasion, a story in *U. S. News & World Report* about the three candidates was accompanied by Reagan and Carter photographs and an Anderson cartoon (13).

Conclusions about placement and content of cartoons, however, must be left to future research. For the purposes of this study, it is sufficient to say that Anderson received little more than half the number of cartoons devoted to Reagan, less than a third of Carter's total, and that he appeared in less than half of all cartoons in which more than one candidate was pictured.

**Direction of Anderson Coverage**

Ninety stories in news magazines were measured to determine the direction of Anderson assertions. All three news magazines had exactly the same number of stories (thirty each) with a sufficient number of thought units to warrant measurement (fifteen or more thought units per story).

Table VI lists the measured direction of Anderson thought units found in campaign stories during the twenty-eight-week period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Newsweek</th>
<th>U. S. News &amp; World Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-28</td>
<td>+.0244*</td>
<td>-.1818*</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-5</td>
<td>+.0690*</td>
<td>-.1826*, -.4737*</td>
<td>-.4545*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-12</td>
<td>-.2500</td>
<td>+.0250*</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>+.2301*, +.4138*, +.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-26</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>-.1250</td>
<td>-.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>-.2500</td>
<td>-.0372*</td>
<td>-.0833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-16</td>
<td>-.2000</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>-.0952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-23</td>
<td>-.1500</td>
<td>+.1388</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>-.0381*</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>-.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-7</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>+.2308*</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-14</td>
<td>+.6666</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>-.0227*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-28</td>
<td>+.0962*</td>
<td>-.1786*</td>
<td>-.2647*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-4</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>-.0682*</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>+.1888*, +.3723*, -.8666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-18</td>
<td>-.5000</td>
<td>-.0769</td>
<td>-.1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-25</td>
<td>-.5000</td>
<td>-.3571, -.1786</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1</td>
<td>-.3000</td>
<td>-.3684*</td>
<td>-.2308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-8</td>
<td>-.2442*, -.1750</td>
<td>-.2941</td>
<td>-.3636, +.0952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>+.1746</td>
<td>+.1220</td>
<td>-.2222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-22</td>
<td>-.1111</td>
<td>-.1429, +.0555</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-29</td>
<td>-.0500</td>
<td>-.4286</td>
<td>-.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-6</td>
<td>+.2222</td>
<td>-.3888</td>
<td>+.2093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>-.7083, +.0275*</td>
<td>-.0723*, -.1071, -.5000</td>
<td>-.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>-.3125</td>
<td>-.1250</td>
<td>-.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-27</td>
<td>+.0588</td>
<td>-.1786, -.3333, +.0727*, -.0357</td>
<td>-.1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-3</td>
<td>+.0333, 0, 0, -.7143, -.7500</td>
<td>-1., -.2667*, 0, -.3571, 0, 0, -.2857</td>
<td>-.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-3.9491</td>
<td>-5.9220</td>
<td>-3.2071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-.1316</td>
<td>-.1974</td>
<td>-.1069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Anderson stories
During the period of study, weekly directional values fluctuated from negative to positive in all three news magazines. In addition, although coverage of Anderson was mildly negative overall, none of the magazines' mean scores came near the moderate or strong levels of intensity that had been outlined for this study. Mean scores were in the mild level of intensity and were much closer to the limit of objectivity than had been expected. Figure 1 ranks the news magazines' mean scores on a scale from -1.00 to +1.00, with the limits of objectivity set at ±0.05.

Fig. 1--Ranking of mean scores
The fact that mean scores were lacking in intensity was a surprising discovery, given the results of research upon which assumptions were made for this study. Even more surprising was the mean score of *U. S. News & World Report*, the magazine that had been expected to have more negative coverage of Anderson than the other news magazines. *U. S. News & World Report*'s mean score of -.1069 came closer to the limits of objectivity than did *Time*'s -.1316 and *Newsweek*'s -.1974. Additionally, *Newsweek*'s more intense negative score came as a surprise, since that magazine had been expected, at the least, to have more positive coverage of Anderson than *U. S. News & World Report*.

*Newsweek* provided less in the way of neutral coverage as well. Of the ninety measured stories in the three news magazines, nine were determined to have scores of zero, signifying absolute neutrality. This does not mean that only nine stories fell within the limits of objectivity (±.05), only that these were stories that contained no positive or negative assertions about Anderson. The score of zero, in other words, was not the result of a balancing between positive and negative assertions. Although it had been considered theoretically impossible to have absolute neutrality in a story, it was found that certain types of stories could yield neutral scores. These stories comprised straightforward accounts of (a) platforms, (b) issues, (c) the candidates' voting records (without analysis by reporters), (d) medical
histories, and (e) personal finances of the candidates. The fact that Anderson assertions were found in only one neutral story in *Newsweek* and in four each in *Time* and *U. S. News & World Report* indicates that the bulk of Anderson coverage in *Newsweek* dealt less with what the candidate stood for and more with the race, that is, who was ahead and who would win.

In addition to *U. S. News & World Report*’s four neutral stories, eight stories in that magazine yielded positive directional scores. None of the eight scores fell into the limits of objectivity; six were mildly positive and two were moderately positive toward Anderson. There were more than twice as many negative scores as positive scores in *U. S. News & World Report*, eighteen in all. Again, none of those negative scores fell within the limits of objectivity; twelve were mildly negative, five were moderately negative, and one was strongly negative.

A breakdown of the measured stories in *Time* shows that in addition to four neutral scores, there were nine positive scores, three of which fell within the limits of objectivity, five of which were mildly positive, and one which was strongly positive. There were almost twice as many negative scores in *Time* as there were positive scores. Seventeen negative scores were recorded: two within the limits of objectivity, ten mildly negative, two moderately negative, and three strongly negative.
Table VII compares the number of scores within different intensity levels for each news magazine.

**TABLE VII**

**NUMBER OF SCORES IN DIFFERENT INTENSITY LEVELS IN NEWS MAGAZINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Intensity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Newsweek</th>
<th>U. S. News &amp; World Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective + *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild +</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total +</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective - *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild -</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate -</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong -</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total -</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (0)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Objective scores were those between 0 and ±.05

A close analysis of Table VII shows that, although the total number of positive and negative scores was nearly the same in *Time* and *U. S. News & World Report*, *Time* had five scores that could be considered objective; *U. S. News & World*
Report had none. However, Time's mean score for all stories was slightly more negative than U. S. News & World Report's because of the amount of strong-intensity scores in Time. There was one strongly positive score in Time, none in U. S. News & World Report; Time had three strongly negative scores and U. S. News & World Report had one.

In addition to Newsweek's one neutral score, five stories were found to have positive direction in that magazine; one was within the limits of objectivity and four were mildly positive. As with Time and U. S. News & World Report, Newsweek had more negative scores than positive scores. However, whereas the other news magazines had twice as many negative as positive scores, Newsweek had more than four times as many.

There were twenty-four negative scores in Newsweek; one fell within the limits of objectivity, fifteen were mildly negative, seven were moderately negative, and one was strongly negative.

Had the results of this study been based on assertion analysis of Anderson stories alone, U. S. News & World Report would have been the only news magazine with a positive mean score, and the direction of Anderson's coverage would have improved slightly in the other news magazines as well.

Figure 2 shows, on a scale from -1.00 to +1.00, how mean scores for Anderson stories compared with those for all stories.
Fig. 2--Comparison of mean scores for Anderson stories with mean scores for all stories.

When only the scores of Anderson stories were totaled, it was found that U. S. News & World Report had five positive scores (three mildly positive and two moderately positive), and three negative scores (two mildly negative and one moderately negative). It appears, then, that in U. S. News & World Report, Anderson fared far better in his own stories than he did in multiple-candidate stories. For Anderson
stories alone, *U. S. News & World Report* had a mildly positive mean score of +.0670, compared to that magazine's mildly negative overall score of -.1069.

When *Time*’s Anderson stories were totaled and averaged, Anderson again received more favorable coverage in his own stories than he did in all stories. *Time* had four positive scores (two within the objectivity limit and two mildly positive), and three negative scores (one within the objectivity limit and two mildly negative). *Time*’s mean score for Anderson stories was -.0190, falling within the limits of objectivity and comparing favorably with *Time*’s overall mean score of -.1316, which was in the mildly negative range.

Anderson received slightly more favorable coverage in his own stories in *Newsweek*, too, with a mean score of -.1510 compared to an overall mean of -.1974. However, even in Anderson stories, *Newsweek*’s negative coverage was stronger in intensity than that in the other magazines because there were more negative stories. Of the ten Anderson stories in *Newsweek*, two were positive (one in the objectivity limits and one mildly positive), and eight were negative (one objective, five mildly negative, and two moderately negative). Although the mean score for Anderson stories did come closer to the limits of objectivity than did the mean score for all stories, *Newsweek*’s direction of coverage remained in the mildly negative range.

The data were analyzed further to determine whether
Anderson received coverage that was more positive in direction during the first ten weeks than during the last ten weeks of his campaign. The assumption was that in the weeks immediately following his announcement to run as an independent, news magazines still may have been fascinated with Anderson as the underdog fighting against the odds, whereas in the last ten weeks Anderson may have been perceived as a hanger-on, with no hope of winning and with no role to play but that of a spoiler.

When scores for both periods were tabulated for all story categories, there was evidence that news magazines gave slightly more favorable coverage to Anderson in the first ten weeks of the campaign than in the last ten weeks. For example, from April 28 through June 30, Time’s mean score was -.0993, compared to -.1780, the score for the period from September 1 through November 3. Although both mean scores fell in the mildly negative range, the score for the first ten weeks of the campaign was less intensely negative and closer to the limits of objectivity.

Likewise, in Newsweek, scores for both periods remained in the mildly negative range, but there was evidence of a slight degeneration in the direction of Anderson assertions during the last ten weeks. Newsweek’s first-period score was -.1195, compared to -.2514, the mean score during the last period.

U. S. News & World Report was the only magazine in which
the scores of the two periods were in different intensity levels. The mean score for the last ten weeks in that magazine was \(-.1487\), signifying mildly negative coverage; however, during the first ten weeks, *U. S. News & World Report* had a mean score, \(-.0266\), that fell well within the limits of objectivity. This indicated that coverage in the early stages of Anderson's campaign was more favorable in *U. S. News & World Report* than during the ten weeks before the election.

Anderson stories were again tabulated to determine how Anderson's coverage in his own stories compared with coverage in multiple-candidate stories. Table VIII compares coverage in news magazines in the first ten weeks of the study period with that in the last ten weeks, showing scores from all story categories as well as scores from Anderson stories alone.

*Time*'s mean score for Anderson stories went from the positive side during the first ten weeks (although within the range of objectivity) to the negative side during the last ten weeks (the score falling in the mild intensity range). The first-period score for *Time* was \(+.0184\), compared to \(-.1084\) during the last ten weeks of the campaign.

Mean scores for *Newsweek* remained in the mildly negative range, but the first-period score was closer to the limits of objectivity than the last-period score. *Newsweek*'s mean score for the first ten weeks was \(-.1701\); for the last ten weeks, \(-.2358\). Therefore, the direction of coverage
TABLE VIII

COVERAGE OF THE ANDERSON CAMPAIGN IN NEWS MAGAZINES
DURING THE FIRST TEN WEEKS AND THE LAST TEN WEEKS
INCLUDING RANGE OF INTENSITY OF MEAN SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Type and Time Period</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Intensity Range</th>
<th>Time Weight</th>
<th>U. S. News &amp; World Report</th>
<th>Intensity Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Stories:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 10 Weeks:</td>
<td>-.0993</td>
<td>Mildly Negative</td>
<td>-.1195</td>
<td>-.0266</td>
<td>Mildly Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last 10 Weeks:</td>
<td>-.1780</td>
<td>Mildly Negative</td>
<td>-.2514</td>
<td>-.1487</td>
<td>Mildly Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Stories:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 10 Weeks:</td>
<td>+.0184</td>
<td>Objective (Positive)</td>
<td>-.1701</td>
<td>+.1894</td>
<td>Mildly Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last 10 Weeks:</td>
<td>-.1084</td>
<td>Mildly Negative</td>
<td>-.2358</td>
<td>+.0727</td>
<td>Mildly Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in Anderson stories stayed within the same mildly negative range in *Newsweek*, but increased in intensity. In other words, coverage was slightly more negative during the last ten weeks of the campaign.

Anderson stories in *U. S. News & World Report* yielded scores on the positive side of the scale compared with that magazine's coverage of Anderson in all stories, which yielded scores on the negative side. However, a slight decrease in the intensity of the first-period positive score was evident by the score for the last ten weeks. *U. S. News & World Report*'s mean score for Anderson stories went from a mildly positive $+.1894$ to $+.0727$, still in the mildly positive range, but nearer the limits of objectivity. This indicated a decrease in the intensity of favorable coverage toward the end of the campaign.

What the data show, then, is that (a) Anderson received slightly more favorable coverage in stories written solely about him, and (b) coverage of Anderson in all magazines was less favorable by the last ten weeks of the campaign than it was during the first ten weeks; this was true regardless of story type.

One reason that Anderson stories yielded more favorable directional values than other types of stories was that there were more assertions about Anderson in his own stories than there were in stories he shared with other candidates. This meant that there were usually more neutral thought units to
be figured into the mean score and that positive and negative assertions could lessen the intensity of the score by cancelling themselves out.

As an example, consider the following statements in an Anderson story in *Newsweek*; the article had 296 thought units and had a value of -.0372, making it an objective story:

The Anderson adventure was born in part of his own alienation from workaday politics—from the claustrophobic Main Street conservatism of his home district... and the clubby, go-along atmosphere of the House Republican cloakroom (8, p. 29).

... There remains a vein of quixotism in Anderson's quest... Yet there is something beguiling about Anderson, caught in the spell of history and the flattery of his adoring crowds, daring to dream that a maverick congressman from the provinces can be President (8, p. 38).

Had one of those paragraphs appeared in a non-Anderson story, where there were fewer assertions about Anderson, its impact would have been much greater. Not only did Anderson receive less coverage in other-candidate stories, but the assertions about him in those stories were more often negative than positive. For example, assertions about Anderson's role as a spoiler appeared in almost every story measured. Although this was mentioned in Anderson stories with the same degree of frequency, in non-Anderson stories this was often the entire thrust of his coverage. With fewer assertions in those stories to ameliorate the impact of negative coverage, the case could be made that Anderson would have been better off being ignored in multiple-candidate stories; as it stands, he may have lost more than he gained by his inclusion.
Distribution of Assertions

In the ninety stories measured for direction, 4,162 assertions about Anderson were found. Of that, 1,194 were positive (28.7 per cent), 1,435 were negative (34.5 per cent), and 1,532 were neutral (36.8 per cent). This distribution differed markedly from that of McCarthy's coverage in news magazines in 1976. Whereas Einsiedel and Bibbee found that neutral assertions made up two thirds of McCarthy's total coverage (3, p. 104), neutral assertions made up little over one third of Anderson's. Table IX shows the overall distribution of Anderson assertions and the distribution within each news magazine.

TABLE IX

DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIVE, NEGATIVE, AND NEUTRAL ASSERTIONS ABOUT ANDERSON IN NEWS MAGAZINES, IN PERCENTAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>News Magazine</th>
<th>Assertions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. News &amp; World Report</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Distribution</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the overall distribution, neutral assertions made up slightly more than negative assertions (2.3 per cent more), and negative assertions made up slightly more than positive assertions (5.8 per cent more). However, the distribution of assertions differed among individual news magazines. Time and Newsweek each had more negative than positive assertions, Newsweek having the greater range between the two (11.8 per cent difference compared to Time's 6.8 per cent). In both Time and Newsweek, negative and neutral assertions were distributed in nearly equal proportions, Newsweek having slightly more negative than neutral assertions, and Time having slightly more neutral than negative assertions. U. S. News & World Report had more positive than negative assertions about Anderson (3.6 per cent difference between the two), and had more neutral than positive or negative assertions.

These differences were slight, however, and overall, assertions about Anderson in all three news magazines were distributed in nearly equal proportions, each directional category constituting approximately one third of the coverage.

Themes of Coverage

Themes providing negative and positive coverage of Anderson were, for the most part, those that had been expected. The most common negative theme was, simply, that Anderson could not win. In every story measured, one of the following was mentioned: (a) obstacles to Anderson's campaign, (b) the history of other failed third-party attempts, and (c) the
inevitable failure of an independent presidential candidate. Can't-win assertions represented 10.8 per cent of all Anderson assertions, the largest percentage in any category. The following excerpts from *U. S. News & World Report* and *Time* provide examples of the most common theme of Anderson's coverage during the twenty-eight-week period:

History, money problems and difficulties getting his message across, experts argue, will prevent Anderson from winning the White House.

Anderson's campaign has faced nothing but hurdles. He has had to fight just to get his name on state ballots. Moreover, while public-opinion polls show that third-party candidates enjoy support during campaigns, the backing usually wanes by Election Day when voters tend to vote Democratic or Republican for fear of voting for a loser (7, p. 25).

The independent candidacy of John Anderson has always faced a kind of Catch-22 dilemma: millions of Americans were not prepared to vote for him unless they were convinced that he had a chance to win. But he had no chance to win unless enough Americans backed him in the polls so that the voters thought he could win (10, p. 26).

Table X lists the themes of negative and positive coverage of Anderson during the period of the study.

That Anderson would probably be a spoiler was the second most common theme of negative coverage (7.4 per cent of total Anderson assertions). That Anderson's money and support were dwindling was the third most common negative theme (4.4 per cent). Statements about Anderson's image constituted the fourth most common negative theme (2.8 per cent). Assertions about Anderson's image had not been expected to provide negative coverage. There were 117 negative assertions about
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction and Theme*</th>
<th>Number of Assertions</th>
<th>Per cent of Total Assertions**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Themes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson cannot win</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson is a spoiler</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson's money/support is dwindling</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson has image/personality problems</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson's campaign has been unsuccessful</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters are more dissatisfied with Carter and Reagan than they are satisfied with Anderson</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Themes--Negative</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Themes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson's image/personality is an asset</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson's campaign has had successes</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson's money/support is on the rise</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson can win</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Themes--Positive</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Themes yielding less than 1 per cent of total assertions were not included in the table.

**Total number of assertions: 4,162.
Anderson's image, including statements about his "Parson Weems manner" (11, p. 41), his vagueness, stiffness, self-righteousness, and lack of a sense of humor. In addition, his image as a religious zealot was brought up in discussions about his attempt, in 1965, to have the Constitution amended to recognize Christianity as the national religion (1, p. 50).

Finally, the assertion that voters were not necessarily for Anderson, but were against his opponents was the fifth most common theme of negative coverage (1.5 per cent).

It may seem curious at first that the fourth most common negative theme, Anderson's image, was the theme that provided the most positive coverage of him as well. There were 405 positive assertions about Anderson's image, making this the second most common theme of coverage overall (9.7 per cent of the total).

That this theme provided both positive and negative coverage was a reflection of Anderson's dichotomous nature. On one hand, he was admired in news magazines for playing the maverick's role, for having the courage to tell voters what they did not want to hear (for example, advocating a 50-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax to encourage conservation). He was characterized as a scholar, a brilliant orator, and as a candidate who eschewed easy answers to complex questions.

On the other hand, assertions about the flaws in his character already mentioned were present in every story in which positive aspects of his personality were discussed.
Both positive and negative image statements usually were distributed equally within individual stories. Covering Anderson's good and bad sides often produced a sequence of statements such as the following, from a May issue of *Newsweek*:

Anderson must overcome a strain of preachy moralizing that has afflicted him almost since he was "born again," at the age of 9, during a religious tent meeting in his native Rockford, Ill.

... His intellectual and oratorical gifts have long been acknowledged even by House colleagues who sharply disagree with him.

... Another longtime associate sees Anderson's independent candidacy more as an expression of his strident self-righteousness. "I think he's got one of those messianic complexes. . . . He thinks he's a political messiah" (1, p. 49).

Assertions about Anderson's campaign successes provided the second most common theme of positive coverage (6.3 percent). Statements in this theme dealt with Anderson's triumphs over what had been considered almost insurmountable obstacles; the most often mentioned was his successful legal battle to be included on the ballot in all fifty states.

The third most common theme, although it fell well below percentages for the themes of image and campaign successes, dealt with Anderson's increasing money and support (3.5 percent). Paradoxically, the reverse of this theme, that his money and support were dwindling, made up the third most common negative theme as well.

Assertions that Anderson could win made up the fourth most common positive theme (2.6 percent). These assertions,
however, were found only in statements made by staunch Anderson supporters and by the candidate himself.

Themes of coverage of the Anderson campaign were similar to the themes found in news magazine coverage of McCarthy in 1976, only with one minor difference: Assertions about image, money, and support were not mentioned in Einsiedel and Bibbee's study as themes that provided negative coverage (3, p. 104).

For the most part, themes providing positive and negative coverage of Anderson were very much in line with that which had been expected. The most common negative themes dealt with Anderson's doubtful chances of winning and his role as a spoiler. The most common positive themes were those concerning Anderson's image and personal characteristics, and the few successes of his campaign.
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CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Overall, news magazines devoted less space to the coverage of the campaign Anderson waged as an independent than they devoted to the campaigns of Reagan and Carter. Anderson received approximately 17 per cent of the total square inches of coverage, compared to Reagan's 42 per cent and Carter's 37 per cent. Anderson stories made up one eighth of all stories, or about half the number of stories devoted to either of his opponents. In addition, Anderson received fewer photographs during the period than his opponents received. However, one magazine, Newsweek, devoted more campaign photographs to Anderson than to Carter. This may have been the result of that magazine's attempt to decrease the amount of Carter's campaign photographs in issues where he received presidential photographic coverage.

Of the eighty-four issues of three news magazines in the study, Anderson appeared alone on the cover of only one: U. S. News & World Report's August 11 issue. Carter appeared alone on seven covers, Reagan alone on six. On all but one multiple-candidate magazine cover, Anderson's photograph or picture was smaller than those of his opponents. Anderson appeared in political cartoons less often than his opponents; in fact,
he was largely ignored by cartoonists during the twenty-eight-week period: nine Anderson cartoons compared to twenty-eight Carter cartoons and sixteen Reagan cartoons.

Overall, in coverage of Anderson, *Newsweek* provided the most space, *U. S. News & World Report* was second, and *Time* provided the least.

When all stories were measured to determine direction, coverage of Anderson was found to be mildly negative. However, none of the magazines' mean scores fell into the moderate or strong ranges of intensity, as had been expected. Although mean scores for all news magazines fell within the same mildly negative range, *U. S. News & World Report*’s directional value was slightly more favorable than *Times*’s, and *Time*’s was slightly more favorable than *Newsweek*’s.

Mean scores for Anderson stories compared to mean scores for all stories were more favorable in each news magazine, although by only a small amount. *U. S. News & World Report*’s mean score for Anderson stories fell into the mildly positive range; *Time*’s score for Anderson stories fell within the limits of objectivity. *Newsweek* was the only magazine of the three to remain in the mildly negative range.

Anderson received slightly more favorable coverage during the first ten weeks of his campaign than during the last ten weeks in all news magazines. This was true when all stories were measured, as well as when Anderson stories alone were measured.
Positive, negative, and neutral assertions about Anderson were distributed nearly equally, each category constituting one third of the total coverage. Themes providing positive coverage of Anderson dealt with his image and personal characteristics, and his campaign successes. Themes providing negative coverage dealt with Anderson's doubtful chances of winning and his role as a spoiler.

Conclusions

Anderson's 17 per cent of total campaign coverage in news magazines provides little basis for the assertion that he was a media-created candidate.

Hypothesis 1, that Anderson received less campaign coverage in all three news magazines than his two opponents, was supported, because Anderson received substantially less coverage than the Democratic and Republican candidates. Whereas Reagan and Carter received nearly equal coverage in news magazines during the twenty-eight-week period, the amount of coverage received by Anderson indicated that he was not considered a serious candidate from a news standpoint. It is not enough to say that Anderson merely received fewer square inches during the period or to say that he received fewer stories, photographs, cartoons, and magazine covers. It should be noted that there were instances where cartoons were used to depict Anderson in stories where Reagan and Carter were shown in photographs. It should be noted that Anderson's photographs were consistently smaller than those of his opponents in
stories where all three candidates were featured photographically. Although this study sought only to determine the amount of coverage Anderson received, these things must be mentioned because treatment of this kind in the news media, it is assumed, could have had a reinforcing effect on the perception that Anderson was not to be taken seriously.

The fact that Anderson received more campaign photographs than Carter in Newsweek, it must be remembered, is more the result of this study's definition of terms than evidence that Anderson received more photographic coverage. As there was evidence that Carter's few campaign photographs resulted from an effort by Newsweek to reduce the number of his campaign photographs in issues where he was featured photographically as president, the president's campaign photographs (by definition) were fewer in number than either of his opponents'. Had news magazines shown no tendency to separate Carter's photographs, that is, if his campaign photographs had consistently appeared in the same issues as his presidential photographs, it would have been an indication that news magazines were either unaware of, or chose to ignore, one of the greatest political advantages of an incumbent: the ability to appear in the news media simply by virtue of being president. Therefore, Anderson's slightly higher number of photographs in Newsweek could be explained by a more pronounced effort (perhaps an overexuberant effort, compared with the other two magazines) on the part of Newsweek to keep the president separate from the campaigner in weekly issues.
Hypothesis 2, that Anderson received less favorable coverage in *U. S. News & World Report* than in *Time* or *Newsweek*, was rejected, because that magazine was found to have more favorable coverage than the other two news magazines. When all stories were measured, *U. S. News & World Report*'s mean score came the closest to the limits of objectivity; when Anderson stories alone were measured, *U. S. News & World Report* was the only magazine of the three to have a positive mean score. This came as a surprise, since *U. S. News & World Report* had been considered the most conservative of the three news magazines and, therefore, had been expected to provide the least favorable coverage of Anderson.

An explanation for this outcome may lie more in style than in bias. *Newsweek* and *Time* place greater emphasis on the use of detail in the reporting of events than does *U. S. News & World Report*; this tends to produce assertions that are other than neutral in direction. For example, in a typical story about an Anderson rally, *U. S. News & World Report* was more likely to offer information about what the candidate said, whereas *Time* and *Newsweek* not only would have given the reader that information, but also would have described how the candidate looked when he said it, whether he was nervous or self-assured, and whether the crowd reacted favorably to him. The editorial nature of *Time* and *Newsweek*, therefore, may actually work against the ideal of unbiased reporting. Since neither of the magazines could be expected to change a commercially
successful formula, it is hoped that voters who take their political cues from news magazines can be made aware that the greater use of detail results in a greater chance that a reporter's biases will appear in the story.

Hypothesis 3, that coverage of Anderson in the first ten weeks of his campaign was more favorable than that of the last ten weeks, was supported, because in all three news magazines, directional values were more favorable during the first ten weeks of Anderson's campaign. This appears to support the assumption that, in the beginning, Anderson was admired as a capable underdog who was doing better than expected (1), and that this admiration diminished as the election drew near and Anderson's role as a spoiler became more evident.

It should be mentioned, however, that even though the results of this study were sufficient to retain the hypothesis, the differences in directional values for the two periods were very slight. In fact, in multiple-candidate stories, U. S. News & World Report was the only magazine with a directional value that moved from one range (objective) during the first ten weeks, to another (mildly negative) during the last ten weeks. In Anderson stories alone, only Time went from one range to another (objective during the first ten weeks to mildly negative during the last ten weeks). In other words, it cannot be maintained, based on the results of this study, that Anderson received markedly more favorable coverage in the first ten weeks of his campaign than he received in the last ten weeks. In fact, to use the terms "favorable" or
"positive" could be considered misleading, since directional values for only one magazine, U. S. News & World Report, fell in the mildly positive range. It would, perhaps, be more accurate to say that Anderson's coverage during the first ten weeks was slightly "less negative" than it was during the last ten weeks. In any case, it is difficult to claim that any of the news magazines in this study showed a bias for or against Anderson during the time period studied; the differences in directional values for the two periods are too small and all values are too near the limits of objectivity to justify that kind of conclusion.

Hypothesis 4, that Anderson stories yielded more positive directional values than multiple-candidate stories, was supported, because in all three magazines, Anderson received slightly more favorable coverage in stories written solely about him. One explanation for this has been mentioned in Chapter II: that the greater number of assertions about Anderson in his own stories provided a better opportunity for positive and negative assertions to cancel themselves out, producing less negative directional values than those found in multiple-candidate stories. In addition to that explanation, the "personality profile" nature of an individual-candidate story could have produced more assertions about Anderson's image and personal characteristics. Since it has been determined that image statements provided Anderson with the most positive coverage, it is not unusual that stories focusing
more on the man than on the campaign would yield more favorable directional values. A similar correlation between individual stories and favorable coverage might have been found in Carter and Reagan coverage, had assertions about the two candidates been subjected to analysis.

Hypothesis 5, that the most common negative themes of Anderson coverage dealt with his role as a spoiler, his doubtful chances of winning, and his unsuccessful campaign efforts, was rejected, because, although Anderson's unsuccessful campaign efforts did provide 2.4 per cent of total assertions, it was not the third most common negative theme of coverage. That Anderson could not win was the most common negative theme in the three news magazines and, in fact, was the most common assertion about Anderson overall. Anderson's role as a spoiler was the second most common negative theme, and statements about Anderson's dwindling money and support made up the third most common theme. Although loss of support could, of course, be considered in the same category as "unsuccessful campaign efforts," actual assertions about the failures of Anderson's campaign provided the fifth most common negative theme, behind image and personality assertions. Statements about Anderson's image had not been expected to provide as much negative coverage as the results indicated. Anderson's inconsistency, already mentioned in the previous chapter, was largely responsible for the fact that this theme provided both positive and negative coverage.
Hypothesis 6, that the most common positive themes surrounded Anderson's image, personal characteristics, and campaign successes, was supported, since these themes provided the bulk of Anderson's favorable coverage.

That Anderson's coverage was largely unbiased provides reassuring evidence that news magazines performed in a manner expected of a responsible press in a democratic society. However, the results of this study do indicate that the independent candidate faces an uphill struggle to gain news media attention comparable to that given major-party candidates. Far from helping to create Anderson, news magazines may have indirectly helped to undercut his "viability," by restricting the length and number of stories about him.

The presidential candidate who chooses to run outside the established political system creates a problem for the news media that cannot be ignored. The results of this study indicate, if nothing else, a continued need to examine the methods by which minority candidates are assigned news value; specifically, efforts must be made to determine what is "too much" and what is "not enough" campaign coverage.

Recommendations for Further Study

Research studies often raise more questions than they answer, and this study appears to be no exception. For example, it was suggested that additional audience studies are needed to determine whether overt political allegiances in news magazines have come to be expected by news consumers, and if so,
what effect those perceived biases have on voter behavior.

The discussion of photographic coverage raised new questions, specifically those arising from Carter's presidential and campaign photographs. Do readers distinguish between presidential and campaign photographs, and does the incumbent have the advantage over his opponents in photographic coverage?

Questions were raised about the effect of size and placement of photographs within campaign stories. Do smaller photographs reflect a candidate's status? What was the effect on voters who consistently saw smaller or less prominent Anderson photographs in multiple-candidate stories? Audience studies conducted during future presidential campaigns could provide answers to these questions.

The content of political cartoons offers another intriguing area of study. For example, in 1976, Carter was depicted by cartoonists as a freckled farm boy with a toothy grin; by 1980 he had evolved into a small-eyed, liver-lipped creature. Since political cartoonists work with images present in the mind of the electorate, an analysis of the changes in a candidate's cartoon coverage over a period of time could provide insight into the way a candidate changes in the public eye.

Placement of political cartoons would provide another area of interest for future research. Cartoons of Anderson were placed in multiple-candidate stories where Reagan and Carter were represented by photographs, and an Anderson story with a cartoon followed a Reagan-Carter story with photographs
of the two candidates. If 1984 produces another independent candidate, researchers could seek to determine how placement of the minority candidate's cartoons affected voter behavior.

Can an independent candidate's coverage be anything but negative? Since the news media have historically concentrated more on the campaign than on issues and platforms, it stands to reason that coverage of an independent candidate focuses on his slim chances of winning. The question arises: What kind of coverage did Anderson receive in news magazines prior to his announcement that he would run as an independent? A study similar to this one could be conducted from the time Anderson announced he would seek the Republican nomination to the time he declared himself an independent candidate. If it were found that Anderson received substantially more favorable coverage during that time period, then the charge that he was a "media-created candidate" would have to be reconsidered.

Finally, an important study that could directly affect the conclusions of this one would be an assertion analysis of Reagan and Carter coverage in news magazines. This study sought to determine the amount of coverage the three candidates received and to compare the direction of Anderson coverage found in the three news magazines. Would U. S. News & World Report remain the news magazine that gave Anderson the most favorable coverage, if Reagan and Carter coverage were assessed? How would Anderson's coverage compare with that of his opponents, whose coverage might have been strongly positive or strongly
negative? A determination of the direction and intensity of Reagan and Carter coverage would provide a better idea of who was "favored" in news magazines in 1980 and who was not.
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### APPENDIX A

### CATEGORY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Story Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements in opposition to Anderson:</td>
<td>Statements in support of Anderson:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed:</td>
<td>Attributed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattributed:</td>
<td>Unattributed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements opposing an independent candidacy</td>
<td>Statements in support of an independent candidacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson's money/support is dwindling</td>
<td>Anderson's money/support is increasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson is a spoiler (consequences of his campaign)</td>
<td>Anderson's not a spoiler (a vote for Anderson)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson cannot win (obstacles, history of other minority candidates)</td>
<td>Anderson can win (he's a major factor, can rise above history, obstacles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His campaign mistakes/organizational problems</td>
<td>His campaign successes/good organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson has image/personality problems</td>
<td>Anderson's image/personality is an asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucey will hurt/not help Anderson</td>
<td>Lucey will be a help to Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keke is a liability</td>
<td>Keke is an asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson hasn't shown that he could work with Congress</td>
<td>Anderson's experience would help him work with Congress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was not well received</td>
<td>He was well received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary results should have discouraged Anderson
Primary results were encouraging, showed him to be competitive

Polls reflect dissatisfaction with other candidates, "protest vote"
Polls reflect hard-core support of Anderson

His supporters are disaffected, disorganized, few
His supporters are educated, intelligent, many, loyal

Anderson did poorly at the debate/debate did not help him
Anderson did well at the debate/debate helped him gain support

Other Themes--Negative
Other Themes--Positive

Other Themes--Neutral

Campaign draws to close
Issue comparisons
Poll results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT TOTALS</th>
<th>STORY TYPE</th>
<th>COVER PHOTO</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PHOTOS</th>
<th>TOTAL TABULATED SPACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>A A A A A</td>
<td>A A A A</td>
<td>A A</td>
<td>A A sq. inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R sq. inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>C C C C C</td>
<td>C C C C</td>
<td>C C</td>
<td>C C sq. inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>R-C R-C R-C</td>
<td>R-C A A A</td>
<td>R-C A A A</td>
<td>R-A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

### CODER ASSIGNMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Dates</th>
<th>Coder A</th>
<th>Coder B</th>
<th>Coder C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-28, 5-5, 5-12</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>U. S. News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19, 5-26, 6-2</td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>U. S. News</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9, 6-16, 6-23</td>
<td>U. S. News</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-30, 7-7, 7-14</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>U. S. News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-21, 7-28, 8-4</td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>U. S. News</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11, 8-18, 8-25</td>
<td>U. S. News</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1, 9-8, 9-15</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>U. S. News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-22, 9-29, 10-6</td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>U. S. News</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13, 10-20, 10-27</td>
<td>U. S. News</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-3</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>U. S. News</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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