U.S. Media Objectivity and Arab Issues: A Content Analysis of Coverage of the Proposed "Ground Zero Mosque"

Hannah G. Simpson
University of North Carolina at Pembroke
Faculty Mentor: Judy Curtis
University of North Carolina at Pembroke

ABSTRACT

This study examines whether national television and newspaper media is biased in favor or opposition to the proposed Cordoba Project, also known as the "Ground Zero Mosque". The content and headlines of news articles from five national newspapers and two networks were studied to determine if there was a bias. This study analyzes the number of graphs dedicated to the sides in opposition and in favor of the Cordoba Project; the number of persons mentioned or quoted in favor or opposition; the type of person mentioned, be it a citizen, national politician, city official or organization; the number of stories that appeared to favor a single side; and the neutrality of the headline. The study finds that a majority of the news organizations appear to cover the opposition more often than supporters, regardless of the organization's perceived political stance. It is not immediately clear if this is due to the bias of the news organization or to boost ratings. This study also finds the debate is not as prominent in the media as first perceived.

The proposed New York community center, dubbed the Cordoba Project and located in lower Manhattan two blocks from where the World Trade Centers stood, has captured media attention since its announcement in early 2010. The media have reported on questions raised concerning the intrinsic right to locate in such an area, from where the funding would be derived, as well as the political and ideological affiliations of the main Arab backers of the community center. The question arises whether the media are biased in its coverage of this issue and if it is truly of national importance, as network hype might lead one to believe. A content analysis of news articles from various media organizations can attempt to answer these questions.

The first section of this paper discusses previous studies on media bias and a history of prejudice against minorities, specifically Arabs and Muslims in the United States. The second section discusses the methodology by which this content analysis is conducted. The third section provides the data from the content analysis, and the fourth section summarizes the findings in respect to the historical treatment of Muslims and Arabs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Media Bias

Studies on media bias reveal relative equality in coverage of political parties, but omission or negative coverage pertaining to gender and race. Studies that look at election coverage for Republicans versus Democrats typically find that both sides were represented equally (Niven, 2003, p. 313; see also Niven, 2004; Hofstetter, 1972; Domke et al., 1996). While some studies have found bias in favor of one party or another, a meta-analysis of studies of election coverage reveals almost total equal coverage for each candidate in all cases (D'Alessio, & Allen, 2000). Although Niven (2004) found similar treatment of coverage for Republicans and Democrats, his study found whites and males typically receive more favorable coverage than African Americans and women. Election coverage has also been proven to be stereotypical of gender and race of non-white candidates pursuing an office against a white male candidate (Major, & Coleman, 2008; for a list of other relevant studies, see Major, & Coleman, 2008, p. 315).

Beyond politics, studies show that minorities are either ignored or depicted negatively, typically in stories of criminal or violent acts (Avraham, 2003). An example of bias via omission includes studies on missing children, where it has been found that white children, particularly females, receive the most coverage despite a nearly 50/50 ratio of missing white and minority children (Min, & Feaster, 2010).

Arabs in the Media

There do not appear to be many journal articles contrasting media bias against Muslims prior to and following Sept. 11, although many studies exist concerning public opinion.

According to Weston (2003), newspaper articles about Arabs prior to Sept. 11, 2001, were few and generally stereotyped Arabs negatively. The images of Arabs prior to 9/11 were reinforced by events that occurred in the Middle East but were reported in the U.S., such as car bombings. Events in the U.S., such as the hijacking of PanAm 109 in 1988 and the initial attack on the World Trade Center in 1993, led many of the media to inappropriately assume Arabs were responsible for the Oklahoma City bombing (Weston, 2003, p. 3). Following 9/11, Weston found newspapers tended to focus on local Arab communities and represent Arabs as "doubly victimized" as both Americans mourning the loss of loved ones killed in the attack and as persons discriminated against by their neighbors and the government (pp. 1, 3).

Nacos and Torres-Reyna (2007) note that positive depictions of Arabs in the media following Sept. 11 experienced an eight percent increase, revealing the desire to depict Arabs and Muslims as patriotic and victims of hate crimes (pp. 11-12, 15). Prior to 9/11, "twice as many" news articles tended to allege a support by Arab Americans for terrorism than those that didn't. Following Sept. 11, this reversed, with two times the number of articles refuting Arab Americans' support of terrorism (p. 14). Studies of editorial coverage of Arabs and Muslims have found that editorials have been "more fair minded and measured" in discussion on Muslims and Arabs following Sept. 11 than prior (Trevino, Kanso, and Nelson, 2010, p. 14).

Ross and Lepper (1985) posit that media bias may be individual perception, which creates a "hostile media phenomena". In an analysis of pro-Israeli and pro-Arab supporter reactions to television coverage of the 1982 Beirut massacre, each group perceived biases against their ideology in the form of more negative references; those with greater knowledge of the massacre exhibited a greater degree of belief in media bias (p. 1). The "results provide a compelling demonstration of the tendency for partisans to view media coverage of

controversial events as unfairly biased and hostile to the position they advocate," the study concluded (p. 584).

Methodology

This study examined whether or not coverage through news articles from various media organizations of the proposed New York community center was biased by conducting a content analysis of the coverage. The content analysis was conducted on the following newspapers: perceived liberal newspapers The New York Times, the LA Times and the Washington Post, and perceived conservative newspapers the New York Post and the Chicago Tribune. Articles from the following networks were also studied: perceived conservative Fox News and perceived liberal CNN. The specific articles were found online using Google Search and each media organization's individual website.

The first five articles on the topic of the Cordoba Project, Park 51 or the "Ground Zero Mosque" were chosen as a sample of each network's coverage. Originally, ten stories were to be chosen from each newspaper or television network; however, more than five articles could not be found in most papers. Some, notably the Chicago Tribune and the LA Times, did not have more than two or three news stories.

Articles were found by searching the website of a news organization and by using search engines. The Google search for news stories were generally conducted with the key words "New York Mosque," "Ground Zero Mosque," or the street-name-turned-nick-name "Park 51" in conjunction with the name of a specific news organization. The first five articles written about the community center were selected in an attempt to discover uniformity in the content covered among the news organizations. Articles from wire sources such as the Associated Press, editorials, and columns or opinion pieces were ignored in an attempt

to study hard-news and purely journalistic work. The study also attempts to ignore articles that were not directly related to the community center or the debate concerning the project or the site.

Each of the stories was examined applying the following criteria:

• Headline bias. This study attempts to identify bias in two ways: first,

intent to mislead by choice of words; second, the use of unnecessary adjectives,

• If the coverage appeared biased. This is determined by the number of paragraphs dedicated to each side,

• The number of persons mentioned and/or quoted in favor of or opposition to the location or project,

• Whether the person quoted/mentioned is a citizen, a national politician, a representative of an organization or a New York City official, and

• The number of stories by the same news organization that are positive or negative

The breakdown of peoples mentioned/quoted is meant to reveal trends in reporting content bias and is useful as a measure in the following way: citizens lend emotional power to the story. It is assumed those who are mentioned will likely be those who are connected to the Sept. 11, 2001 attack, either as a public servant or family of a lost loved-one, thus lending emotional power to the article. Nationally recognized politicians hold sway over the opinions of the mass population. In this way, the use of politicians may be a means by which the media attempt to set a national agenda. New York City officials represent the "control group" such that s/he will be representative of the city population and local government apart from the selected citizens mentioned in the article and national politicians with larger agendas; the organizations represent civil society-actors that have the ability to influence government and citizens separately. Non-profits have no direct emotional effect or political power, but can be influential.

Definition of Terms

Bias

D'Angelo and Kuypers (2010) define content bias as: "consistent patterns in the framing of mediated communication that promote the influence of one side in conflicts…" (p. 338). Thus, for the media to be biased, a consistent trend of framing content to influence audiences must be identifiable. This definition is an amalgamation of other definitions, such as bias based on perception (Ross, & Lepar, 1985; Watson, & Hill, 2000); the idea that there is not one definition of bias, but various types and thus various definitions (Baker, 2004); and that the news creates a misperception about reality, favors one side of a conflict over another, or that journalists choose to produce biased material (D'Angelo, & Kuypers, 2010).

D'Angelo and Kuypers (2010) define framing communications as the conscious or unconscious effort to present a story in a specific light. Sources present information to the media in a certain perspective, which is then passed on via the media to a broader audience; the media may or may not impose its own slant (p. 1). An example of story framing would be defining the Cordoba Project community center as the "Ground Zero mosque" when it is neither located at Ground Zero nor a mosque. Depicting the community center as solely a Muslim house of worship at what many consider a sacred site frames the story in a negative light.

Despite sticking to an overarching definition, it may be important to note this study does focus on types of bias, including source selection, which attempts to cite specific sources that align with the story's intended angle. It is also important to reiterate that not all, or perhaps even most, bias is intentional. Goffman (1974) argues that framing is a cognitive function that guides perceptions of reality in which all humans unconsciously participate. In this light, all news is unconsciously framed according to the perceptions of journalists, media organizations and the audience.

Liberal/Conservative Bias

Webster's Dictionary defines "partisan" as "adherent, often prejudiced, of a party or cause," and "adhering to a faction" (2001). Thus, politically partisan bias in the media is the selection or distortion of information motivated by politically ideological views. A liberal bias would be a bias that favored "liberal", "left" or "Democrat" beliefs. A conservative bias would be one that favored the views and opinions of the "conservatives", "right-wing" or "Republicans". In this study, liberal bias would correlate with favorable views of the Cordoba Project, while conservative bias would be in opposition to the project.

Content Analysis

Krippendorff (2004) describes content analysis as "a systematic reading of a body of texts, images and symbolic matter, not necessary from an author's or user's perspective" (p. 3). Thus, it is the analysis of a collection of material such that the content is deciphered and categorized to determine certain trends or patterns within the material.

Assumptions

At the beginning of this study, the amount of attention this issue received by both liberal and conservative networks such as Fox and CNN led to the assumption that the issue truly was a national debate. A look into newspapers across the nation found that this was not so: the LA Times and Chicago Tribune were slated to be used in the study, but more than a couple original stories (i.e. articles written by staff as opposed to wire stories) could not be found. This was found to be true for major newspapers in U.S. with the exception to those in proximity of the Cordoba Project. This made it difficult to find an equal number of newspapers to represent both the conservative and liberal

bias and leads to the conclusion that the issue did not receive as much national attention as first assumed or perhaps as the media would lead one to believe.

The number of articles used in this study also changed; at one point, the objective was to find ten articles to analyze. Unfortunately, this number of news articles was hard to find, as they were quickly replaced with blogs or columns. Thus, the newsworthiness of the story lessened over time or that the organization wanted to present a more opinionated approach than a news article would ethically allow.

RESULTS

This section analyzes the articles of the previously mentioned news organization under the aforementioned criteria.

Network: Fox

As Table 1 portrays, Fox consistently referenced opposition more than support in both the number of graphs and the persons quoted or mentioned. In five stories, 11 people were mentioned or quoted in support of the community center, while 18 were mentioned or quoted in opposition. Also interesting is who was chosen to represent each side: those mentioned in support were typically President Barack Obama, New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg and persons directly related to the Cordoba Project (labeled as organization representatives). Several other organizations were mentioned in support, but no citizens were mentioned. In contrast, politicians, most notably Sarah Palin and Newt Gingrich, most often represented the opposition. Organizations were the second largest party mentioned in opposition, with only two citizens mentioned.

Network: CNN

CNN also dedicated more paragraphs to the opposition, and quoted or mentioned more persons in opposition than in support of the project. As Table 2 shows, more citizens were mentioned in opposition than in favor, as well as more politicians. Only non-profit organizations were mentioned more in support of the project and city officials were not mentioned at all.

These findings are surprising; despite the liberal stereotype, CNN dedicated more space to those who opposed the project than to those who supported it. CNN did use citizens more often as representatives of the opposition, followed closely by politicians.

Newspapers: New York Times

The New York Times' articles were far lengthier than those of the other media organizations used in this study. Table 3 reveals the number of graphs dedicated to each side is practically even, but the Times mentioned more persons in opposition than in support for the project. The Times preferred to mention the numerous politicians who opposed the project above the other groups recorded, followed by citizens and organizations. While organizations were overwhelmingly mentioned in support, more than 50 percent of persons mentioned or quoted were representatives of the Cordoba Project. Only two politicians were mentioned in support throughout the five stories.

Newspaper: The Washington Post

The Post's coverage appears to lean in favor of the support for the community center. The number of persons in favor tends to be higher than those who oppose, and the number of graphs in support is equal to or higher than the graphs in opposition. Table 4 reveals politicians were still mentioned most often for both opposition and support. What is most interesting, though, comes in the stories written for 8/20/10. In 8/20/10_1, the number of graphs in support or opposition is misleading: the article spent 13 paragraphs chastising politicians for their rhetoric against the community center. This includes not only their stance against the project, but also specific instances of speech. The nature of the article

criticized only Republicans, showing a bias towards support for the project, but not in a way this study was prepared to measure.

The story on 8/20_2 had similar findings. Nearly every graph was a criticism of the "Republican" rhetoric, including the term "Ground Zero Mosque." Clearly biased in favor of the Cordoba Projects' location, it was not a bias measurable in the criteria used for this study. The ridicule on the attack of the Cordoba Project was blatant, although the article was without quotes from any parties, and there were no graphs dedicated to the opposition of the debate.
Newspaper: The New York Post

The New York Post appears to favor supporting the community center. Table 5 notes the first three articles feature more graphs in favor and/or more persons mentioned or quoted in favor of the project. The Post typically featured a person from the Cordoba Project to represent the supportive side. Politicians were cited most in opposition, although this occurred in only the story written on 8/19/10. No other articles mentioned opposition.

The article on 9/10/10 was almost perfectly balanced, only noting three persons who disagreed with the protests set to take place at Ground Zero for the anniversary of Sept. 11, 2001. There was little mention of support or opposition for either side of the debate, as the story centered mostly on facts about the protests. The article on 9/24/10 was in favor of the community center and was dedicated to a group of Muslims who met to discuss the perception of Muslims in the U.S. and to issue a call of support for the Cordoba Project. Five organizations were mentioned in support; no opposition was mentioned.
Newspaper: The LA Times

The LA Times had only two original articles that could be found at the time of this study. As Table 6 shows, the Times referenced support slightly more than opposition to the project in both cases; it also

mentioned more persons in favor of the site or project than against, although both sides of the debate were represented solely by citizens and politicians. It is difficult to make conclusions with only two articles from which to draw information.
Newspaper: The Chicago Tribune

The Tribune also had only two original articles found at the time of this study. Table 7 shows the Tribune dedicated more space to the opposition than the support, but mentioned more persons in favor with the project than against. Those mentioned in support were citizens and politicians in equal number, followed by organizations. Only politicians were mentioned in opposition. As mentioned with the LA Times analysis, it is difficult to draw conclusions with only two articles.

HEADLINES

As noted previously, bias is measured in two ways: first, intent to mislead, and second, unnecessary use of adjectives. There are several instances in which a headline may be deemed biased pertaining to intent to mislead. One such possible bias is the term "Ground Zero Mosque", which is used by most of the news organizations, with exception to the New York Times and the Washington Post. Shown in Table 8, each of the news organizations cited it as "the mosque near Ground Zero" prior to removing the word "near". The site is five city blocks from Ground Zero site.

Furthermore, terming the community center a "Mosque" could be considered biased, as well. The project is described as a "community center" which will include a "prayer space…500-seat performing arts center, a culinary school, a swimming pool, a restaurant and other amenities" (Hernandez, 2010a, para 8).

Concerning unnecessary use of adjectives, CNN's headlines appear neutral individually, as each lack emotionally charged or opinionated language. When

placed together, a trend is noticed: four of the five headlines focus on the opposition. The New York Post headlines don't appear to be particularly biased individually or grouped. The New York Times also appears neutral. It refrains from calling the project the "Ground Zero Mosque" and has no signs of words to incite emotion. The Washington Post is supportive of the project in the headline on 9/10/10. It also calls the inclusion of non-New Yorkers in the debate as "rabble-rous[ers]" on 8/20/10_1, revealing a negative perception of outside debate. Other headlines appear neutral.

End Results

Table 9 displays the summary findings concerning coverage and paragraph usage, which notes that four organizations – Fox News, CNN, The New York Times and the Chicago Tribune - gave greater coverage to the opposition, although it was sometimes by a slim margin. The Washington Post, The New York Post and the LA Times were more supportive of the project, although also by slim margins. With only two stories to analyze, the results from The Chicago Tribune and LA Times should be considered inconclusive. Regardless, opposition was covered more by the media regardless of perceived political affiliation.

Summarized in Table 9, those most notably mentioned in opposition were politicians, followed by citizens. Those most mentioned in support included organization representatives (many of which belonged to the organization over the Cordoba Project), followed by citizens. The city officials were consistently in support, with the exception to one Fox article, when the former mayor of New York stated his opposition to the location of the center.

Independently, most headlines appear unbiased. It is worth noting that many of the headlines can be considered misleading – or, at the very least, inaccurate - when considering the term "Ground Zero Mosque", suggesting the project is located at the site of the attacks, and describing the community center as solely a mosque. Use of adjectives to incite does not occur often, with exception to the Washington Post which calls non-New Yorkers "rabble-rousers". Grouped, however, the study finds that the headlines mostly trend coverage of the opposition.

Upon examination, it became apparent that original stories concerning the Cordoba Project were limited to only select newspapers in the U.S., typically those within a close proximity of the site, and that the coverage in the form of news articles diminished and switched to blogs or columns by August 2010. As noted previously, the lack of news coverage by individual organizations suggests the debate was not as prominent as initially believed. The fact that five news stories could not be found in the Chicago Tribune or the LA Times at the time of this study suggests that the issue did not gain national importance. This leads to the conclusion that the issue did not sustain a national following as initially perceived and the newsworthiness diminished overtime.

While this study reveals a television and newspaper trend of discussing the opposition, it is important to note that this does not necessarily mean the news organization is biased. More coverage of the opposition may occur due to the contentious nature of the story, which will assist ratings and readership numbers. If the coverage bias were intentional due to the ideology of the news organization itself, it would be a continuation of the findings of earlier studies concerning perceptions and portrayal of Arabs and Muslims in the U.S. This determination is inconclusive, however; another study focused specifically on bias, as opposed to simply coverage, will shed greater light on the media's intent concerning this story and the treatment of Arab and Muslim issues.

REFERENCES

Avraham, E. (2003). Press, politics, and the coverage of minorities in divided societies: The case of Arab citizens in Israel. Harvard International Journal of Press and Politics, 8(4), 7_27.

Baker, B. (2004) How to identify, expose and correct liberal media bias. Alexandria, VA: Media Research Center.

Barbaro, M., & Hernandez, J. (2010, August 4). Mosque plan clears hurdle in New York. The New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/04/nyregion/04mosque.html?_r=1&ref=us on November 10, 2010.

Barbaro, M. (2010, July 21). Debate heats up about mosque near ground zero. CNN. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/31/nyregion/31mosque.html?ref=park51 on November 10, 2010.

Bennett, C. (2010, September 10). Army of NYPD cops to try to keep peace at opposing 9/11 rallies near mosque site. The New York Post. Retrieved from http://www.nypost.com/p/news/local/manhattan/nypd_army_for_protests_GRKi9cUIam9RT8ZUayUHxM on November 15, 2010.

Berelson, B. (1952). Content Analysis in Communication Research. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bliman, N. (2010, May 7). Mosque to go up near New York's ground zero. CNN. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2010/US/05/07/new.york.ground.zero.mosque/index.html?iref= storysearch on November 14, 2010.

Brachear, M., & Garcia, M. (2010, August 20). Leave mosque debate out of politics, Muslims urge Quinn. The Chicago Tribune. Retrieved from http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/ct-met-quinn-mosque-reaction-20100820,0,488763.story November 15, 2010.

D'Alessio, D., & Allen, M. (2000). Media Bias in Presidential Elections: A Meta-Analysis. Journal of Communication, 50(4), 133. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

D'Angelo, P., & Kuypers, J.A. (2010). Doing news framing analysis. New York, NY: Routledge.

Daragahi, B. (2010, August 23). New York mosque controversy worries Muslims overseas. The Los Angeles Times. Retrieved from http://articles.latimes.com/2010/aug/23/world/la-fg-0823-mosque-muslim-react-20100823November 15, 2010.

Domke, D., Fan, D., Fibison, M., Shah, D., Smith, S., & Watts, M. (1997). News media,

candidates and issues, and public opinion in the 1996 presidential campaign. Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 74, 718-37.

Goodstein, L. (2010, August 7). Across Nation, Mosque Projects Meet Opposition. The New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/08/us/08mosque.html on November 10, 2010.

Goffman, E. (1974). Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. New York, NY et al.: Harper & Row.

Gowen, A. (2010a, September 11). Crowds face off at ground zero. The Washington Post. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/09/11/AR2010091102192.html on November 15, 2010.

Gowen, A. (2010b, September 10). Near ground zero, mosque supporters gather to show their support. The Washington Post. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp- dyn/content/article/2010/09/10/ AR2010091007132.html on November 15, 2010.

Green, L. (2010, August 14). Plan to build mosque near ground zero riles families of 9/11 victims. Fox News. Retrieved from http://www.foxnews.com/us/2010/05/14/plan-build-mosque-near-ground-zero-riles-families-victims/ on November 14, 2010.

Ground zero mosque developers deny talk of relocation. (2010, August 17) Fox News. Retrieved from http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/08/17/ny-governor-meet-nyc-mosque-developers/ on November 14, 2010.

Hernandez, J. (2010a, May 26). Vote endorses Muslim center near ground zero. The New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/26/nyregion/26muslim.html?ref=park51 on November 10, 2010.

Hernandez, J. (2010b, July 14). Planned sign of tolerance bringing division instead. The New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/14/nyregion/14center.html?ref=park51 on November 10, 2010.

Hook, J., & Hamburger, T. (2010, August 18). New York mosque debate splits GOP. The Chicago Tribune. Retrieved from http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nation-world/la-na-mosque-politics-20100818,0,210546.story on November 10, 2010.

Hostetter, C.R. (1972). Bias in the news: network television coverage of the 1972 campaign. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Horowitz, J. (2010, August 19). Mosque debate: New Yorkers take dim view of rabble-rousing outsiders. The Washington Post. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/08/19/AR2010081906580.html on November 15, 2010.

Imam: I wouldn't have picked the mosque site if I'd known fight it would cause. (2010, August 12). FoxNews. Retrieved on http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/09/12/imam-wouldnt-picked-mosque-site-id-known-fight-cause/ October 20, 2010.

In battle to build mosque near ground zero, opponents ask 'why there?'. (2010, July 21). CNN. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2010/US/07/14/new.york.ground.zero.mosque/index.html?iref=storysearch on November 10, 2010.

Islamic leaders not abandoning ground zero mosque plans, says property owner. (2010, August 16). The New York Post. Retrieved from http://www.nypost.com/p/news/local/Islamic_leaders_owner_abandoning_kG0XF7BKAXIjStoNC-SxKpL on November 14, 2010.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology. London, England: Sage Publications.

Mann, J. Manhattan mosque plan stokes controversy. (2010, August 6). CNN. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2010/POLITICS/08/06/mann.mosque.ground.zero/index.html?iref=storysearch on November 14, 2010.

Major, L., & Coleman, R. (2008). The Intersection of Race and Gender in Election Coverage: What Happens When the Candidates Don't Fit the Stereotypes?. Howard Journal of Communications, 19(4), 315-333. doi:10.1080/10646170802391722

Min, S., & Feaster, J.C. (2010). Missing children in national news coverage: racial and gender representations of missing children cases. Communications Research Reports, 27(3), 207-216.

Nacos, B., & Torres-Reyna, O. (2007). Fueling our fears: stereotyping, media coverage, and public opinion of Muslim Americans. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

New York City panel clears way for mosque near ground zero. (2010, August 3). Fox News. Retrieved from http://www.foxnews.com/us/2010/08/03/new-york-city-panel-clears-way-mosque-ground-zero/ on November 14, 2010.

Nicholas, P., & Love, J. (2010, August 14). Obama supports plan for mosque near ground zero. The Los Angeles Times. Retrieved from http://articles.latimes.com/2010/aug/14/nation/la-na-obama-mosque-20100814.

Niven, D. (2003). Objective evidence of media bias: newspaper coverage on congressional party switchers. Journalism and Mass Communications Quarterly, 80(2), 311-326.

Niven, D. (2004). A fair test of media bias: party, race and gender in coverage of the 1992

house banking scandal. Polity, 36(4), 637-649.

Offer rejected to move mosque away from ground zero to 'state property'. (2010, August 11). FoxNews. Retrieved from http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/08/11/ny-governor-offer-state-property-mosque-built-farther-away-ground-zero/ on November 10, 2010.

Pereira, I. (2010, September 24). Muslim leaders meet in queens to discuss park51 Islamic center. The New York Post. Retrieved from http://www.ny-post.com/p/news/local/queens/muslim_leaders_meet_in_queens_to_WoM7nM1rPqEiFtQAMwsolL on November 15, 2010.

Protesters descend on ground zero for anti-mosque demonstration. (2010, June 6). CNN. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2010/US/06/06/new.york.ground.zero.mosque/index.html?iref=storysearch on November 14, 2010.

Rauf: move would spur a Muslim backlash. (2010, September 9). The New York Post. Retrieved from http://www.nypost.com/p/news/local/manhattan/rauf_move_would_spur_muslim_backlash_vHnEtuAvT4ZAatCuzXDuGM on November 10, 2010.

Sonmez, F. (2010, August 15). Democrats, republicans spar over mosque near ground zero. The Washington Post. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/08/15/AR2010081502756.html on August 24, 2010.

Trevino, M., Kanso, A. M., & Nelson, R. (2010). Islam through editorial lenses: How American elite newspapers portrayed Muslims before and after September 11, 2001. Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research, 3(1/2), 3-17. doi:10.1386/jammr.3.1-2.3_1

Vallone, R., Ross, L., & Lepper, M. (1985). Hostile media phenomenon: biased perception and perceptions of media bias in coverage of the Beirut massacre. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology , 49(3), 577-85.

Watson J., & Hill, A. (2000). Dictionary of Media & Communication Studies, 5th edn. London: Oxford University Press.

Partisan. (10). (2001). Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, MA: Encyclopedia Britannica.

Weston, M. (2003). Post 9/11 Arab American coverage avoids stereotypes. Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3677/is_200301/ai_n9224266/ on November 14, 2010.

Zeiger, E. (2010, August 4). Lawsuit challenges ground zero mosque. CNN. Retrieved from http://cnn.com/2010/08/04/

Table 1   *Fox News Article Analysis*

	5/14/10	8/3/10	8/11/10	8/18/10	9/12/10
# of graphs dedicated to each side	Pro: 3 Con: 16 Total: 24	Pro: 4 Con: 6 Total: 20	Pro: 2 Con: 5 Total: 17	Pro: 5 Con: 12 Total: 23	Pro: 7 Con: 4 Total: 15
# of persons quoted/mentioned in favor or opposition	Pro: 2 Con: 4 Total: 6	Pro: 5 Con: 5 Total: 10	Pro: 2 Con: 5 Total: 7	Pro: 1 Con: 2 Total: 3	Pro: 1 Con: 2 Total: 3
Who supported	C: 0 CO: 1 POL: 0 ORG: 1*	C: 0 CO: 1 POL: 0 ORG: 4‡	C: 0 CO: 1 POL: 0 ORG: 1	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 1*	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 1*
Who opposed	C: 1 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 3	C: 1 CO: 0 POL 3 ORG: 1	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 4 ORG: 1	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 2 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 1 POL: 1 ORG: 0

Key: *C*- Citizens, *CO*- City Officials, *POL*-Politicians, *ORG*- Organizations/organization representatives
* Denotes the Imam directing the project.
‡ Two of these are representatives of the Cordoba Project.

Table 2   *CNN Article Analysis*

	5/7/10	6/6/10	7/21/10	8/4/10	8/6/10
# of graphs dedicated to each side	Pro: 6 Con: 4 Total: 23	Pro: 4 Con: 7 Total: 23	Pro: 6 Con: 2 Total: 24	Pro: 0 Con: 7 Total: 14	Pro: 2 Con: 4 Total: 13
# of persons quoted/mentioned in favor or opposition	Pro: 3 Con: 2 Total: 5	Pro: 1 Con: 4 Total: 5	Pro: 2 Con: 3 Total: 5	Pro: 0 Con: 2 Total: 2	Pro: 1 Con: 3 Total: 4
Who supported	C: 2 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 1	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 1	C: 1 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 1	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 1 POL: 0 ORG: 0
Who opposed	C: 2 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: 3 CO: 0 POL: 1 ORG: 0	C: 1 CO: 0 POL: 1 ORG: 1	C: 1 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 1	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 3 ORG: 0

Key: *C*- Citizens, *CO*- City Officials, *POL*-Politicians, *ORG*- Organizations/organization representatives

Table 3	*New York Times Article Analysis*				
	5/26/10	**7/14/10**	**7/31/10**	**8/4/10**	**8/7/10**
# of graphs dedicated to each side	Pro: 6 Con: 5 Total: 22	Pro: 6 Con: 7 Total: 28	Pro: 10 Con: 15 Total: 32	Pro: 14 Con: 9 Total: 31	Pro: 7 Con: 10 Total: 33
# of persons in favor or opposition	Pro: 4 Con: 3 Total: 7	Pro: 3 Con: 3 Total: 6	Pro: 4 Con: 6 Total: 10	Pro: 2 Con: 6 Total: 8	Pro: 3 Con: 6 Total: 9
Who supported	C: 1 CO: 3 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: 2* CO: 0 POL: 1 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 1 POL: 0 ORG: 3*	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 1 ORG: 0	C: 1 CO: 1 POL: 0 ORG: 1
Who opposed	C: 2 CO: 0 POL: 1 ORG: 0	C: 1 CO: 0 POL: 2 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 5 ORG: 1	C: 2 CO: 0 POL: 3 ORG: 1	C: 3 CO: 0 POL: 2 ORG: 1
Key: *C*- Citizens, *CO*- City Officials, *POL*-Politicians, *ORG*- Organizations/organization representatives *At least one person is a representative of the Cordoba Project.					

Table 4	*Washington Post Article Analysis*				
	8/16/10	**8/20/10_1***	**8/20/10_2***	**9/10/10**	**9/11/10**
# of graphs dedicated to each side	Pro: 3 Con: 2 Total: 8	Pro: 7 Con: 3 Total: 38	Pro: 0 Con: 0 Total: 16	Pro: 7 Con: 1 Total: 8	Pro: 6 Con: 7 Total: 33
# of persons quoted/mentioned in favor or opposition	Pro: 2 Con: 2	Pro: 7 Con: 5	Pro: 0 Con: 0	Pro: 3 Con: 0	Pro: 5 Con: 6
Who supported	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 2 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 2 POL: 4 ORG: 1	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: 1 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 2	C: 3 CO: 0 POL: 2 ORG: 0
Who opposed	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 2 ORG: 0	C: 1 CO: 0 POL: 4 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: 3 CO: 0 POL: 2 ORG: 1
Key: *C*- Citizens, *CO*- City Officials, *POL*-Politicians, *ORG*- Organizations/organization representatives *The articles attacked Republican rhetoric against the Cordoba Project.					

Table 5   *New York Post Article Analysis*

	8/16/10	8/19/10	9/9/10	9/10/10	9/24/10
# of graphs dedicated to each side	Pro: 1 Con: 1 Total: 5	Pro: 4 Con: 6 Total: 15	Pro: 2 Con: 0 Total: 11	Pro: 0 Con: 0 Total: 10	Pro: 4 Con: 0 Total: 8
# of persons in favor or opposition	Pro: 3 Con: 0	Pro: 2 Con: 3	Pro: 1 Con: 0	Pro: 0 Con: 0	Pro: 0 Con: 0
Who supported	C: 1* CO: 1 POL: 1 ORG: 0	C: 1* CO: 0 POL: 1 ORG: 0	C: 1* CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 5
Who opposed	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: 1 CO: 0 POL: 3 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 0 PO: 0 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0

Key: *C*- Citizens, *CO*- City Officials, *POL*-Politicians, *ORG*- Organizations/organization representatives
* Representative of the Cordoba Project.

Table 6   *LA Times Article Analysis*

	8/14/10	8/23/10	*	*	*
# of graphs dedicated to each side	Pro: 4 Con: 3 Total: 13	Pro: 5 Con: 4 Total: 11	Pro: Con: Total:	Pro: Con: Total:	Pro: Con: Total:
# of persons in favor or opposition	Pro: 2 Con: 1	Pro: 6 Con: 2	Pro: Con:	Pro: Con:	Pro: Con:
Who supported	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 2 ORG: 0	C: 4 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: CO: POL: ORG:	C: CO: POL: ORG:	C: CO: POL: ORG:
Who opposed	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 1 ORG: 0	C: 1 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 0	C: CO: POL: ORG:	C: CO: POL: ORG:	C: CO: POL: ORG:

Key: *C*- Citizens, *CO*- City Officials, *POL*-Politicians, *ORG*- Organizations/organization representatives
*More original news articles from this organization were not found.

Table 7	Chicago Tribune Article Analysis				
	8/17/10	**8/20/10**	*	*	*
# of graphs dedicated to each side	Pro: 5 Con: 8 Total: 27	Pro: 2 Con: 4 Total: 9	Pro: Con: Total:	Pro: Con: Total:	Pro: Con: Total:
# of persons in favor or opposition	Pro: 5 Con: 4	Pro: 2 Con: 1	Pro: Con:	Pro: Con:	Pro: Con:
Who supported	C: 3 CO: 0 POL: 2 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 0 ORG: 2	C: CO: POL: ORG:	C: CO: POL: ORG:	C: CO: POL: ORG:
Who opposed	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 4 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 1 ORG: 0	C: CO: POL: ORG:	C: CO: POL: ORG:	C: CO: POL: ORG:

Key: *C*- Citizens, *CO*- City Officials, *POL*-Politicians, *ORG*- Organizations/organization representatives

*More original news articles from this organization were not found.

Table 8	Headline Review
Fox News	5/14: Plan to Build Mosque near Ground Zero Riles Families of 9/11 Victims 8/3: New York City Panel Clears Way for Mosque Near Ground Zero 8/11: Offer Rejected to Move Mosque Away From Ground Zero to 'State Property' 8/18: Ground Zero Mosque Developers Deny Talk of Relocation 9/12: Imam: I Wouldn't Have Picked the Mosque Site If I'd Known Fight It Would Cause
CNN	5/7: Mosque to go up near New York's ground zero 6/7: Protesters descend on Ground Zero for anti-mosque demonstration 7/21: In battle to build mosque near Ground Zero, opponents ask 'why there?' 8/4: Lawsuit challenges ground zero mosque 8/6: Manhattan mosque plan stokes controversy
NY Times	5/26: Vote Endorses Muslim Center near Ground Zero 7/14: Planned Sign of Tolerance Bringing Division Instead 7/31: Debate Heats up about Mosque near Ground Zero 8/4: Mosque Plan Clears Hurdle in New York 8/8: Across Nation, Mosque Projects Meet Opposition
Wash Post	8/16: Democrats, Republicans spar over mosque near Ground Zero 8/20_1: Mosque debate: New Yorkers take dim view of rabble-rousing outsiders 8/20_2: What's in a name? Far more than Lower Manhattan mosque planners thought about 9/10: Near Ground Zero, mosque supporters gather to show their support 9/11: Crowds face off at Ground Zero
NY Post	8/16: Islamic leaders not abandoning Ground Zero mosque plans, says property owner 8/19: Iran cash might fund Ground Zero mosque 9/9: Rauf: Move would spur a Muslim backlash 9/10: NYPD 'army' for protests 9/24: Muslim leaders meet in Queens to discuss Park51 Islamic center
LA Times	8/14: Obama supports plan for mosque near ground zero 8/23: New York mosque controversy worries Muslims overseas
Chicago Tribune	8/17: New York mosque debate splits GOP 8/18: Leave mosque debate out of politics, Muslims urge Quinn

Note: All articles were written in 2010.

Table 9	*Summary of Findings*						
	Fox	**CNN**	**NY *Times***	**W *Post***	**NY *Post***	**LA *Times***	**C *Tribune***
# of graphs dedicated to each side	Pro: 18 Con: 24 Total: 42	Pro: 18 Con: 24 Total: 42	Pro: 44 Con: 46 Total: 90	Pro: 23 Con: 13 Total: 36	Pro: 11 Con: 8 Total: 19	Pro: 9 Con: 7 Total: 24	Pro: 8 Con: 15
# of persons in favor or opposition	Pro: 11 Con: 18 Total: 29	Pro: 7 Con: 14 Total: 21	Pro: 16 Con: 24 Total: 40	Pro: 16 Con: 13 Total: 29	Pro: 8 Con: 4 Total: 12	Pro: 8 Con: 3	Pro: 8 Con: 6
Who supported	C: 0 CO: 3 POL: 0 ORG: 8‡	C: 3 CO: 0 POL: 1 ORG: 3	C: 5 CO: 5 POL: 2 ORG: 4	C: 4 CO: 2 POL: 8 ORG: 3	C: 3‡ CO: 1 POL: 2 ORG: 2	C: 4 CO: 0 POL: 2 ORG: 0	C: 3 CO: 0 POL: 3 ORG: 2
Who opposed	C: 2 CO: 1 POL: 10 ORG: 5	C: 7 CO: 0 POL: 5 ORG: 2	C: 8 CO: 0 POL: 13 ORG: 3	C: 4 CO: 0 POL: 8 ORG: 1	C: 2 CO: 0 POL: 2 ORG: 0	C: 1 CO: 0 POL: 1 ORG: 0	C: 0 CO: 0 POL: 6 ORG: 0
Key: *C*- Citizens, *CO*- City Officials, *POL*-Politicians, *ORG*- Organizations/organization representatives ‡ A representative of the Park51 project is more than 50 percent of this number.							