

Journalism with Restraint: A Comparative Content Analysis of Independent, Government, and Opposition Newspapers in pre-Revolution Egypt.

Mohamad Hamas Elmasry, Ph.D

Assistant Professor

Department of Journalism and Mass Communication

The American University in Cairo

Cairo, Egypt

E-mail: elmasry_m@aucegypt.edu

Abstract

This content analysis examines Egyptian newspaper output during an important period relatively late in the Hosni Mubarak era. Specifically, the study analyses the official *Al-Ahram*, the independent *Al-Masry al-Yom* and the opposition *Al-Wafd*. The coding scheme addressed the three newspapers' choice of news topics, framing of the government and political opposition, and treatment of average Egyptian citizens, among other things. The analysis revealed some similarities, but many differences in the products delivered by the three newspapers. All three papers made regular, frequent mention of the Egyptian government and focused many stories on official concerns and perspectives. However, the government-owned *Al-Ahram*'s reportage often spoke favorably of the government, quoted and paraphrased government sources, and photographed (former) President Mubarak, while omitting news about political opposition groups, crimes and problems in Egypt. The absence of these topics suggests that *Al-Ahram* contributed to the Mubarak government's objective of projecting a stable, secure national image. In contrast, coverage of the Egyptian government by the independent *Al-Masry al-Yom* and the party-owned *Al-Wafd* was more balanced, incorporating both positive and negative news and presenting government issues and actors in a more neutral tone. The study's findings — offering an important Mubarak-era baseline for Egyptian journalism which can be used to compare and contrast with post-Mubarak era news performance — offer a democratic barometer of sorts, underlying areas of need and focus for the new era of Egyptian news.

Keywords: Egypt, media, newspapers, framing, content analysis, Mubarak, Al-Ahram, Al-Masry Al-Youm, Al-Wafd.

Introduction

For many outside Egypt, the 2011 Egyptian revolution demonstrated in poignant detail the extent to which ousted Egyptian president Hosni Mubarak was willing to use an iron fist to suppress opposition and, importantly, control media messages. In addition to directing state-run media to skew realities of the uprising and paint protesters as thugs and outcasts, the Mubarak regime's media control efforts included shutting down the internet, mobile phone networks, and *Al-Jazeera's* Egypt bureau, among other strategies. Most of the reliable news about the 18-day revolt, in fact, came from social media networks, international news sources, and independent and opposition Egyptian press outlets, all of whom fought hard to disseminate accurate information in spite of heavy Egyptian government repression. To be sure, the 2011 Egyptian revolution has put Egyptian media under a global microscope, with observers eager to find out how Egyptian media — tightly controlled during all of Mubarak's 30-year reign — might change in the aftermath of Mubarak's removal from power.

The present analysis takes a historical step back by investigating how Mubarak era media restrictions manifested themselves practically in major Egyptian newspapers. This content study — part of a larger project examining news production late in Mubarak's presidency — is useful in helping to establish a standard against which to measure media reform in post-revolution Egypt. The larger project, findings from which have been presented and published elsewhere (see Elmasry 2011a, 2011b), featured extensive ethnographic observations, interviews, and surveys of Egyptian journalists.

Although a plethora of analyses on Egyptian media during the Mubarak era have been published (see below), most provide overviews of the Egyptian press structure and do not present detailed empirical findings. Empirical studies of Egyptian news content are especially lacking. According to research into national and global press systems, examining content is of critical importance in order to find out how media policies manifest themselves as news products. The current paper describes results of a content analysis of three leading Egyptian newspapers representing the range of Egyptian newspaper ownership categories — independent, government-owned, and opposition party-owned. Specifically, the study examines late 2008 news coverage in the independent *Al-Masry al-Youm*, the opposition-owned *Al-Wafd*, and the

government-owned *Al-Ahram*. The historical data presented here will be useful for media policy makers and activists in Egypt, and scholars interested in media systems in transition. As Nerone (1995) has argued, press systems research must, in the first place, be historically grounded due to the fact that media systems are products of sociopolitical history.

The Arab Press

Numerous studies have examined Arab media environments, with research pointing both to overarching regional commonalities and country-specific nuances. Research has shown that, on the whole, Arab media tend to operate within censorial cultures, with authoritarianism and social responsibility overriding liberalism as media norms (Hafez 2002; Mellor 2005). A handful of studies present evidence that Arab governments use press laws and various forms of intimidation to maintain strict control over media content (Dabbous 1994; Mellor 2005, 2007; Rugh 2004; Sakr 2001, 2005). Predictably, news content in the Arab world tends to be politics-centered and focus much attention on the goings on of government leaders (Mellor 2005).

Despite these tendencies toward authoritarianism, some Arab countries have experienced slow movements toward democratic reform in recent years, allowing more press freedoms and adopting western press principles (Ayish, 2002, 2003; Hafez, 2002; Mellor, 2005; Sakr, 2005). There are two main reasons for the wave of small, yet noticeable, democratic media reforms: first, the advent of the internet and the proliferation of satellite dishes have made it more difficult for Arab regimes to control information (Sakr, 2005; Ayish, 2002; Mellor, 2005); and second, the post-September 11, 2001 American-led campaign for democracy in the Middle East forced some US-allied Arab governments (including the Mubarak regime) to implement democratic reforms. It was American pressure that ultimately forced Mubarak to begin allowing private press ownership licenses (Cooper, 2008), for instance.

Under Mubarak, ambivalence characterized the Egyptian media environment (Goldschmidt, 2008). On the one hand, Mubarak continued to exercise great control over media operations through the 1996 press law, Egyptian penal code, the Egyptian constitution, press licensing laws, and the existence of a stable of government-owned and operated news outlets. On the other hand, the Egyptian press pushed the democratic envelope with increasing success in the later years of

Mubarak's rule, particularly after 2004 when the government allowed a group of private businessmen to establish a daily independent newspaper, *Al-Masry al-Youm* (Cooper, 2008; Elmasry, 2011a; Elsasser, 2010; Hamdy, 2009). Any democratic progress was mitigated, however, by heavy restrictions placed on both independent and opposition publications (Farag, 2004; The People's Assembly, 2007). Moreover, throughout the Mubarak era, Egypt used press laws, licensing laws, and sheer intimidation to silence serious oppositional threats (see Amnesty International, 2009; Human Rights Watch, 2006; Mellor, 2005; Pintak, 2008; Reporters Without Borders, 2003/2006; Sakr, 2001; and the US Department of State, 2009).

While the differences between Mubarak era government, opposition, and independent newspapers have frequently been discussed anecdotally in popular publications and on the Egyptian street, empirical analyses have been rare. The present research attempts to empirically address broad questions about the tangible differences between opposition and independent newspapers, how government papers dealt with information deemed negative by the Mubarak regime, and the willingness of Mubarak era opposition and independent newspapers — constantly operating under a restrictive and risky legal umbrella — to push the envelope in attacking government interests.

Research Question

The following broad research question is posed:

RQ: How did *Al-Ahram*, *Al-Masry al-Youm*, and *Al-Wafd* compare in their topic selection, sourcing, and coverage of the government, political opposition, and average Egyptians late in Hosni Mubarak's presidency?

Method

To answer the research question, a quantitative content analysis of *Al-Ahram*, *Al-Masry al-Youm*, and *Al-Wafd* was carried out. Riffe *et al.* (2005, p. 25) define quantitative content analysis as “the systematic and replicable examination of symbols of communication, which have been assigned numeric values according to valid measurement rules and the analysis of relationships involving those values using statistical methods.” The study was designed to discern what the

news production process actually *produced* and determine whether patterns varied among the different ownership categories. Some of my measures, for instance, indicate the degree to which the newspapers exhibit loyalty or disloyalty to the government, and the extent to which they represent and include non-official voices. This analysis reveals similarities and differences and provides a basis for making inferences about the effectiveness of constraints.

The sampling period corresponds with my fieldwork period in Egypt—July 19, 2008 through December 31, 2008. According to Riffe *et al.* (2005), two constructed weeks are sufficient for representing a year’s worth of news coverage. Since the sampling period here is slightly less than six months (or half a year), one constructed week of content was selected. Thus, one Monday, one Tuesday, one Wednesday, etc., were selected at random. The final randomly selected composite week consisted of the following days:

- Monday November 24, 2008
- Tuesday December 9, 2008
- Wednesday October 22, 2008
- Thursday August 14, 2008
- Friday October 10, 2008
- Saturday July 26, 2008
- Sunday December 28, 2008

On the self-explanatory premise that front-page articles are one of the best measures of what newspaper editors consider important, the study coded only front-page articles (including those that began on the front-page and continued on inside pages as well as those featuring a front-page “teaser” with full text on an inside page). The final sample included 336 news articles — 102 from *Al-Ahram*, 117 from *Al-Masry al-Yom*, and 117 from *Al-Wafd*.

The unit of analysis was the entire news article. Two independent coders fluent in Arabic were presented with a detailed coding guide and trained for approximately three weeks during December 2008 until intercoder reliability pre-testing showed Scott’s Pi levels—according to the guidelines set forth by Shoemaker (2003)—to be “good” (.7) or “very good” (.8) on most variables and at least “adequate” (.6) on all others. Adjustments were made to some of the coding instructions during the training period.

Coding on the actual final sample of articles began at the conclusion of the training period. Intercoder reliability was tested formally on a portion of the final sample using three separate measures: straight percentage agreement, Scott's Pi, and Krippendorff's Alpha. In general, no measure of intercoder reliability is considered sufficient by itself (Riffe *et al.*, 2005). Percentage agreement is not an appropriate stand-alone measure of reliability because it does not account for chance agreement, while on the other hand, Scott's Pi and other stricter measures have been shown to produce excessively conservative results (see Holsti, 1969; Lombard, *et al.*, 2002; Schiff, 2004). Scholars (see Riffe *et al.*, 2005) advise content analysts to use multiple measures to account for the weaknesses associated with individual measures. Researcher Deen Freelon's web-based "Reliability Calculator" system was used to compute intercoder reliability (see the Appendix for intercoder reliability scores).

The study coded for 23 variables addressing placement and prominence, sourcing, article topics, the position of articles toward the government, and the degree to which the newspapers included the voices of government officials, opposition parties, and average citizens.

Results

Manifest newspaper content represents a final product of sorts, the outcome of interactions between constraints exerting themselves on newspapers and the efforts by journalists to negotiate them. In presenting results of my content analysis of *Al-Ahram*, *Al-Masry al-Yom*, and *Al-Ahram*, this section will examine one kind of indicator—that found in the actual news product—of key similarities and differences among papers in different ownership/sponsorship categories.

Bylines

Newspaper bylines can be important indicators of news origins as well as of existence of staff expertise, with a larger proportion of staff-written reports (and smaller proportion of wire service reports) signaling a greater level of professionalism (Cooper, 2008). Of the three papers studied here, *Al-Masry al-Yom* was the most heavily reliant on staff-generated reports, while *Al-Ahram* and *Al-Wafd* often did not list byline sources and relied more on wire services. A chi-square test

showed byline sourcing differences across the three papers to be statistically significant, $\chi^2(8, N = 336) = 65.1, p < .001$. Table 1 displays the results.

Table 1
Bylines

Paper	Staff/ Reporter Only	“Wire Services”	Both Staff & Wire Services	No source	Other	Total
Al- Ahrām	37 (36%)	19 (18%)	7 (7%)	39 (38%)	0 (0%)	102
Al- Masry	94 (80%)	8 (7%)	9 (8%)	5 (4%)	1 (1%)	117
Al-Wafd	74 (63%)	17 (15%)	1 (1%)	22 (19%)	3 (3%)	117
Totals	205 (61%)	44 (13%)	17 (5%)	66 (20%)	4 (1%)	336

$\chi^2(8, N = 336) = 65.1, p < .001$

A total of 80% (n = 94) of *Al-Masry*'s stories listed only staff reporters in the byline. The paper used a combination of staff reporters and wire services as sources for an additional 8% (n = 9) of stories and relied exclusively on wire services for 7% (n = 8). For *Al-Ahrām*, only 36% (n = 37) of stories listed only staff reporters in the byline, 7% (n = 7) listed both staff reporters and wire services and 18% (n = 19) listed exclusively wire services. Sixty-three percent (n = 74) of *Al-Wafd*'s stories listed staff reporters as sources and 15% (n = 17) used exclusively wire services. Importantly, a total of 38% (n = 39) of stories in *Al-Ahrām* and 19% (n = 22) of stories in *Al-Wafd* did not list any source in the byline. These are high proportions, especially when compared with *Al-Masry al-Yom*, which avoided listing byline sources in just 4% (n = 5) of articles.

Overall, then, *Al-Masry al-Yom* newspaper relied more on staff-generated reports and less on wire services, and was the least likely of the three papers to avoid listing byline sources altogether. *Al-Ahrām*, in contrast, was least likely to list staff as sources of articles and most likely to use wire services or not list any source.

Topics

Article topics, a measure of what newspapers emphasize and what editors regard as important, is a major consideration in studying the actual output of any press system. This study found that 35 primary topics – out of a total 54 possible primary topics – appeared in news stories at least once. Primary topics were organized under 16 broad subject areas. The original coding sheet and the revised collapsed categorical scheme for subject area and primary topic are in the Appendix.

As Table 2 shows, the newspapers did not differ significantly with respect to overall subject areas, $\chi^2(14, N = 336) = 20.9, p = .104$. Some important differences do emerge, however, in comparison of frequencies of three specific subjects—the Egyptian government, international relations, and crime. All three newspapers allotted considerable coverage to the Egyptian government, but *Al-Ahram* (48%, $n = 49$) included a heavier array of government-based stories than *Al-Masry al-Yom* (39%, $n = 46$,) and *Al-Wafd* (40%, $n = 47$). *Al-Ahram* also featured more international relations stories (25%, $n = 25$) than *Al-Masry* (11%, $n = 13$) and *Al-Wafd* (19%, $n = 22$). Finally, crime stories were more heavily featured in *Al-Masry al-Yom* (12%, $n = 14$) and *Al-Wafd* (12%, $n = 14$) than *Al-Ahram* (3%, $n = 3$).

Table 2
Subject Area

Subject Area	Newspaper			Total
	<i>Al-Ahram</i>	<i>Al-Masry al-Yom</i>	<i>Al-Wafd</i>	
Egyptian Gov & Parties	49 (48%)	46 (39%)	47 (40%)	142 (42%)
Non-Egyptian Gov Int'l Relations	25 (25%)	13 (11%)	22 (19%)	60 (18%)
Egypt Crime	3 (3%)	14 (12%)	14 (12%)	31 (9%)
Sports	5 (5%)	9 (8%)	12 (10%)	26 (8%)

Egypt Religion	4 (4%)	8 (7%)	5 (4%)	17 (5%)
Health	6 (6%)	8 (7%)	4 (3%)	18 (5%)
Economics	4 (4%)	8 (7%)	3 (3%)	15 (4%)
All Other Categories	6 (6%)	11 (9%)	10 (9%)	27 (8%)
Totals	102	117	117	336

$\chi^2(14, N = 336) = 20.9, p = .104$

Examination of narrower primary topics also revealed key differences, $\chi^2(34, N = 336) = 78.3, p < .001$. Results for several of the most important primary topic categories are in Table 3. While official government news predominated in all three papers, *Al-Ahram* demonstrated more loyalty to the Egyptian government as well as positive orientation toward the government in its selection of news topics; *Al-Masry*'s primary topics highlighted both negative and positive government news; and *Al-Wafd* concentrated on more opposition-centered news topics.

Table 3
Primary Topic

Primary Topic	Newspaper			Total
	<i>Al-Ahram</i>	<i>Al-Masry</i>	<i>Al-Wafd</i>	
Israel-Palestine (Int'l)	10 (10%)	4 (3%)	14 (12%)	28 (8%)
Eg Sports (Sports)	5 (5%)	9 (8%)	12 (10%)	26 (8%)
Eg Gov involvement in Palestine issue (Gov)	12 (12%)	6 (5%)	3 (3%)	21 (6%)
Negative Gov news (Gov)	0 (0%)	10 (9%)	7 (6%)	17 (5%)
Violent Crime (Eg Crime)	0 (0%)	11 (9%)	6 (5%)	17 (5%)
Eg Econ. Policy (Gov)	8 (8%)	3 (3%)	5 (4%)	16 (5%)
Cordial Gov relations w/nations (Gov)	6 (6%)	7 (6%)	2 (2%)	15 (4%)

Opposition Party news (Gov)	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	11 (9%)	14 (4%)
Tensions/Negative int'l relations (Int'l)	7 (7%)	4 (3%)	2 (2%)	13 (4%)
Positive/cordial Int'l relations (Int'l)	5 (5%)	2 (2%)	4 (3%)	11 (3%)
Crime Other (Eg Crime)	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	5 (4%)	10 (3%)
Int'l Other (Int'l)	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	8 (2%)
Egypt econ issues (Econ)	2 (2%)	4 (3%)	2 (2%)	8 (2%)
Islamic Holiday (Religion)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	8 (2%)
Court cases/rulings (Law and Order)	2 (2%)	4 (3%)	2 (2%)	8 (2%)
Gov Achievements-Praise (Gov)	6 (6%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	7 (2%)
Eg Law Changes (Gov)	5 (5%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	7 (2%)
All Other Categories Combined	26 (26%)	40 (34%)	36 (31%)	102 (30%)
Totals	102	117	117	336

$\chi^2(34, N = 336) = 78.3, p < .001$

For example, *Al-Ahram* concentrated six of its 102 front-page stories (6%) on government achievements/praise while, in contrast, *Al-Masry al-Yom* and *Al-Wafd* published just one such report between them. *Al-Masry al-Yom* (9%, n = 10) and *Al-Wafd* (6%, n = 7) published 17 combined front-page articles about negative government news (including government incompetence, anti-government protests, government corruption, and democratic regression), and *Al-Ahram* did not publish any. Also, *Al-Masry* and *Al-Wafd* were more likely to cover crime than *Al-Ahram*, whose lack of attention to crime could project pro-government images of safety and stability. While *Al-Ahram* did not publish any violent crime stories and published only one crime story overall (1%), *Al-Masry al-Yom* published 11 stories about violent crime (9%) and 14 crime stories overall (12%), and *Al-Wafd* published six articles about violent crime (5%) and 11 about crime overall (9%).

Similar topical tendencies are found in coverage of political opposition. *Al-Ahram*, an official paper of the ruling party, did not cover any opposition-centered news, while *Al-Wafd*, the key official opposition group, covered political opposition centrally (9%, n = 11). *Al-Masry*, an independent political actor, focused mainly on opposition groups in 3% (n = 3) of its front-page stories and also published an additional four reports (3% of its total of articles) on Islamist political groups. *Al-Wafd*, which claims a strict policy of separating politics from religion, published no stories about Islamist groups; neither did *Al-Ahram* have any on this topic.

Table 4 shows the three newspapers' relative propensities for covering international news. Not surprisingly, *Al-Ahram* – which is distributed widely throughout the Arab world and positions itself as a purveyor of international events – covered more international news stories than either *Al-Masry al-Yom* or *Al-Wafd*, although differences were not statistically significant, $\chi^2(14, N = 106) = 22.6, p = .067$. In this study sample, the paper carried 49 internationally-focused articles (48% of its total of articles); while *Al-Masry al-Yom* had 28 international stories (24% of its total) and *Al-Wafd* 29 stories (25% of its total). *Al-Ahram*'s heavier focus on international stories helps to partly explain *Al-Ahram*'s reliance on news agencies (see above). Since the paper does not have the financial resources necessary to employ many foreign correspondents, it is forced to rely more on wire services.

Table 4
International Stories

Topic	Al-Ahram	Al-Masry al-Yom	Al-Wafd	Totals
Israel-Palestine issue (from perspective of International news)	10	4	14	28
Egyptian Government involvement in Israel-Palestine issue	12	6	3	21
Cordial Egyptian government relations w/other nations	6	7	2	15
Tensions/Negative int'l relations	5	4	2	11
General/cordial relations between nations	6	0	4	10
Egyptian Government political/legal support for	2	0	2	4

Egyptians abroad				
Int'l gov/administration changes	2	1	0	3
Other	6	6	2	14
TOTALS	49 (48%)	28 (24%)	29 (25%)	106 (32%)

$$\chi^2(14, N = 106) = 22.6, p = .067$$

Note: "International" here refers to anything outside of Egypt.

Note: Percentage totals listed are international articles as a proportion of the total front-page articles published. For example, *Al-Ahram* published 49 international stories out of a total 102 stories (48%).

Coverage of the Egyptian government

Beyond measuring the amount of coverage allotted to the government by *Al-Ahram*, *Al-Masry al-Yom* and *Al-Wafd*, the study looked at *how* the government was treated or discussed in the three newspapers. This section summarizes results for items considering the presence and centrality of government actors and action in news articles; whether government mention is favorable, unfavorable, or neutral in tone; whether articles present government-proposed solutions to sociopolitical problems; whether they quote or cite government officials; and whether they carry photographs of government officials.

On topics covered by all three newspapers, *Al-Ahram* was likely to make the Mubarak government a central actor. Telling in this regard is the way the papers dealt with the Israel-Palestine conflict. On stories about the conflict, many of *Al-Ahram*'s stories were Egyptian government-centered, highlighting the role of the government in dealing with the issue. *Al-Ahram* published 12 stories (12% of its total story count) dealing with the Egyptian government's role in the Israel-Palestine conflict, while *Al-Masry al-Yom* published six such stories (5%) and *Al-Wafd* just three (3%). Meanwhile, fourteen *Al-Wafd* stories dealt with the Israel-Palestine issue from the standpoint of international news without discussing the Egyptian government principally.

All three papers made mention of the Egyptian government in the majority of their front-page news articles. *Al-Ahram* (67%, n = 68) was more likely to mention the government than either *Al-Masry al-Yom* (62%, n = 72) or *Al-Wafd* (54%, n = 63), but the differences did not prove to be statistically significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 336) = 3.8, p = .147$. The fact that *Al-Masry* and *Al-Wafd*, in

addition to *Al-Ahram*, were so likely to mention the government in their reports indicates that findings from research predating the independent newspaper era (see Ayish, 2003; Mellor, 2005) – that Egyptian papers are largely official – extends beyond just the government-owned press outlets.

Table 5
Government Mention

Newspaper	Articles Mentioning Government	Articles Not Mentioning Government	Total
Al-Ahram	68 (67%)	34 (33%)	102
Al-Masry al-Yom	72 (62%)	45 (39%)	117
Al-Wafd	63 (54%)	54 (46%)	117
Totals	203 (60%)	133 (40%)	336

$$\chi^2(2, N = 336) = 3.8, p = .147$$

The three papers talked about the government differently, however, $\chi^2(4, N = 203) = 63.6, p < .001$. The tone of the overwhelming majority of *Al-Ahram* news articles was favorable toward the government, whereas *Al-Masry al-Yom* and *Al-Wafd* were more balanced. Overall, 81% (n = 55) of *Al-Ahram* articles mentioning the government were favorable in tone, while 16% (n = 11) were neutral and just 3% (n = 2) were negative. *Al-Masry al-Yom*'s articles were most likely to be neutral in tone (46%, n = 33) with a roughly even split between favorable (25%, n = 18) and unfavorable (29%, n = 21) content. Fifty-one percent (n = 32) of *Al-Wafd* articles mentioning the Egyptian government were neutral in tone, 21% (n = 13) were favorable and 29% (n = 18) were unfavorable. Table 6 presents the breakdown.

Table 6
Tone of articles toward Egyptian Government

Newspaper	Favorable	Unfavorable	Neutral	Total
Al-Ahram	55 (81%)	2 (3%)	11 (16%)	68
Al-Masry al-Yom	18 (25%)	21 (29%)	33 (46%)	72
Al-Wafd	13 (21%)	18 (29%)	32 (51%)	63
Totals	86 (42%)	41 (20%)	76 (37%)	203

$$\chi^2(4, N = 203) = 63.6, p < .001$$

It is in the interest of governments to project a stable, secure image of their societies. The press, however, is supposed to be a watchdog, an independent institution which keeps the government and other parts of society in check. One issue of interest, then, concerns the degree to which press outlets are willing to expose and discuss societal problems. My content analysis coded for whether problems in Egyptian society were mentioned in news articles and – when problems were mentioned – whether or not government-proposed solutions were offered. Even when problems are mentioned in the news, the problems and the negativity associated with rulers may be mitigated if government-proposed solutions are offered. Results of the problems and solutions measures are presented in tables 7 and 8.

Table 7
Mention of Problems

Newspaper	Problem Mentioned	Problem Not Mentioned	Total
Al-Ahram	31 (30%)	71 (70%)	102
Al-Masry al-Yom	62 (53%)	55 (47%)	117
Al-Wafd	43 (37%)	74 (63%)	117
Totals	136 (41%)	200 (60%)	336

$$\chi^2(2, N = 336) = 12.6, p = .002$$

Table 8
Mention of Government-proposed solutions

Newspaper	Government Solution Offered	Government Solution Not Offered	Total
Al-Ahram	30 (97%)	1 (3%)	31
Al-Masry al-Yom	16 (26%)	46 (74%)	62
Al-Wafd	16 (37%)	27 (63%)	43
Totals	62 (46%)	74 (54%)	136

$$\chi^2(2, N = 136) = 43.7, p < .001$$

Results show that *Al-Ahram* articles were less likely to mention problems than *Al-Masry al-Yom* or *Al-Wafd*, $\chi^2(2, N = 336) = 12.6, p = .002$. Thirty-one out of 102 *Al-Ahram* articles (30%)

mentioned problems in Egyptian society compared with 62 *Al-Masry al-Yom* articles (53%) and 43 *Al-Wafd* articles (37%). Moreover, when problems were mentioned, *Al-Ahram*'s content nearly always mentioned government-proposed solutions, something relatively rare for both *Al-Masry al-Yom* and *Al-Wafd*. In all, of the 31 *Al-Ahram* articles which discussed problems, 30 offered government solutions (97%). Twenty-six percent ($n = 16$) of *Al-Masry* problem-centered articles mentioned government-proposed solutions, compared to 37% ($n = 16$) of *Al-Wafd*'s. These differences were also found to be statistically significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 136) = 43.7, p < .001$.

Sources of information for articles have obvious implications for how stories are framed. Sources can set agendas, and repeated use of particular kinds of sources will give those interests a stronger voice in the news. The content analysis therefore counted how often different types of sources appeared, including people recognized and described as government officials.

All three newspapers quoted and cited government sources more than other people or groups, but *Al-Ahram* was more likely to quote government officials than either *Al-Masry al-Yom* or *Al-Wafd*, $\chi^2(6, N = 336) = 16.0, p = .014$. In all, 46 of 102 *Al-Ahram* articles (46%) quoted government officials, compared to 34% ($n = 40$) for *Al-Masry al-Yom* and 23% ($n = 27$) for *Al-Wafd*. Thirty-two percent ($n = 32$) of *Al-Ahram*'s articles quoted or paraphrased government officials 3 or more times, contrasted with 19% ($n = 23$) of *Al-Masry al-Yom* articles and 12% ($n = 14$) of *Al-Wafd* articles. Table 9 presents the figures.

Table 9
Government quotes

Newspaper	0 Gov quotes	1-2 Gov quotes	3-4 Gov quotes	More than 4 Gov quotes	Totals
Al-Ahram	56 (55%)	14 (14%)	12 (12%)	20 (20%)	102
Al-Masry al-Yom	77 (66%)	17 (15%)	12 (10%)	11 (9%)	117
Al-Wafd	90 (77%)	13 (11%)	6 (5%)	8 (7%)	117
Totals	223 (66%)	44 (13%)	30 (9%)	39 (12%)	336

$\chi^2(6, N = 336) = 16.0, p = .014$

The greater frequency of government quotes in *Al-Ahram* is likely the result of two interrelated factors that emerged from my interviews and will be discussed further in subsequent

chapters: editorial policy and access to government sources. A key feature of *Al-Ahram's* editorial policy is its commitment to government loyalty. Furthermore, *Al-Ahram's* pro-government stance facilitates easier access to sources within government, who are generally more willing to speak with the newspaper than they are with independent and opposition papers. Many *Al-Masry al-Yom* and *Al-Wafd* journalists complained about the unwillingness of government sources to speak with them.

A final measure of how *Al-Ahram*, *Al-Masry al-Yom* and *Al-Wafd* treated the Egyptian government in their news reports was the presence of government officials in photographs (up to two photographs accompanying any article were coded). *Al-Masry al-Yom* generally featured far more photographs than either of the other two newspapers, $\chi^2(2, N = 336) = 29.0, p < .001$. Table 10 shows how many articles had accompanying photos, and Table 11 shows the proportion of articles in each paper which contained 1 photo, 2 photos, or three or more photos.

Table 10
Presence of Photographs

Newspaper	Number of articles with photos	Number of articles without photos	Total number of articles
Al-Ahram	41 (40%)	61 (60%)	102
Al-Masry al-Yom	82 (70%)	35 (30%)	117
Al-Wafd	45 (39%)	72 (62%)	117
Totals	168 (50%)	168 (50%)	336

$\chi^2(2, N = 336) = 29.0, p < .001$

Table 11
Frequency of 1 photo, 2 photo, and 3+ photo articles.

Newspaper	Articles containing only 1 photo	Articles containing 2 photos	Articles containing 3 or more photos	Total number of photos coded
Al-Ahram	27	10	4*	55
Al-Masry al-Yom	59	16	7*	105
Al-Wafd	26	6	13*	64
Totals	112	32	24	224

Note: Coders only coded the first two photographs (from right to left and top to bottom) accompanying an

article.

Overall, *Al-Ahram* was more likely than the other papers to display photos of President Mubarak, shown in Table 12 [$\chi^2(2, N = 224) = 18.1, p < .001$], although there were no statistically significant differences in how often the papers carried photos of his family or other government figures, shown in Table 13 [$\chi^2(2, N = 224) = .73, p = .696$]. *Al-Ahram* photographed the President the most, featuring him in 16% (n = 9) of all coded photographs. *Al-Masry al-Yom* pictured President Mubarak in just 3% (n = 3) of its photos while *Al-Wafd* did not picture the President at all. *Al-Ahram* (4%, n = 2), *Al-Masry al-Yom* (4%, n = 4) and *Al-Wafd* (2%, n = 1) each rarely pictured members of President Mubarak's family. *Al-Ahram* (27%, n = 15) and *Al-Masry al-Yom* (27%, n = 28) were more likely, however, to photograph other members of government than *Al-Wafd* (13%, n = 8).

Table 12
Mubarak Pictured

Newspaper	Photos of Mubarak	Photos not of Mubarak	Total
Al-Ahram	9 (16%)	46 (84%)	55
Al-Masry al-Yom	3 (3%)	102 (97%)	105
Al-Wafd	0 (0%)	64 (100%)	64
Totals	12 (5%)	212 (95%)	224

$\chi^2(2, N = 224) = 18.1, p < .001$

Table 13
Mubarak's Family Pictured

Newspaper	Photos of first family	Photos not of first family	Total
Al-Ahram	2 (4%)	53 (96%)	55
Al-Masry al-Yom	4 (4%)	101 (96%)	105
Al-Wafd	1 (2%)	63 (98%)	64
Totals	7 (3%)	217 (97%)	224

$\chi^2(2, N = 224) = .73, p = .696$

Another measure examined how often the newspapers featured photographs of non-Egyptian government officials. *Al-Ahram* was the most likely paper to feature pictures of foreign

diplomats (18%, n = 10), consistent with this paper's relatively greater focus on international news. Six percent each of *Al-Wafd* (n = 4) and *Al-Masry al-Yom* (n = 6) photographs featured foreign diplomats. Differences between papers were found to be statistically significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 223) = 10.9, p = .028$. Results are presented in table 14.

Table 14
Foreign Diplomat Pictured

Newspaper	Photos of Foreign Diplomat	Photos not of Foreign Diplomat	Not clear	Total
Al-Ahram	10 (18%)	44 (80%)	1 (2%)	55
Al-Masry al-Yom	6 (6%)	98 (94%)	0 (0%)	104
Al-Wafd	4 (6%)	60 (94%)	0 (0%)	64
Totals	20 (9%)	202 (91%)	1 (0%)	223

$\chi^2(4, N = 223) = 10.9, p = .028$

Coverage of political opposition

Another important aspect of the press-government dynamic involves the relationship between press outlets and political opposition groups. Several content analysis items addressed the ways *Al-Ahram*, *Al-Masry al-Yom* and *Al-Wafd* dealt with opposition groups—including how often papers mentioned and how they talked about opposition groups, and how often the groups' members were quoted and depicted in photographs.

None of the three newspapers mentioned opposition groups a great deal. *Al-Masry al-Yom* (15%, n = 17) talked about the political opposition the most, followed by *Al-Wafd* (9%, n = 11), while *Al-Ahram* did not mention political opposition groups in any of the sampled articles, $\chi^2(2, N = 336) = 15.3, p < .001$. The analysis did not distinguish among specific opposition groups, although even a casual reading makes it clear that *Al-Wafd* focuses almost all of its opposition coverage on the opposition party by its sponsoring party of the same name. *Al-Masry al-Yom*, meanwhile, divides coverage among various political opposition groups, including *Al-Wafd*, *Al-Ahram*, and the Muslim Brotherhood. Table 15 shows these findings.

Table 15
Opposition Mention

Newspaper	Number of articles mentioning opposition	Number of articles not mentioning opposition	Total
Al-Ahram	0 (0%)	102 (100%)	102
Al-Masry al-Yom	17 (15%)	100 (86%)	117
Al-Wafd	11 (9%)	106 (91%)	117
Totals	28 (8%)	308 (92%)	336

$$\chi^2(2, N = 336) = 15.3, p < .001$$

Al-Masry al-Yom's tone toward political opposition was relatively balanced, while *Al-Wafd*'s coverage was overwhelmingly favorable, which is logical considering *Al-Wafd*'s concentration on its own party. *Al-Wafd*'s tone toward opposition groups was favorable 73% (n = 8) of the time while *Al-Masry al-Yom* struck a neutral tone in 77% (n = 13) of articles, with no articles treating opposition groups in a predominantly unfavorable tone $\chi^2(1, N = 28) = 6.6, p = .010$. Results are presented in table 16.

Table 16
Tone of articles toward Political Opposition

Newspaper	Favorable	Unfavorable	Neutral	Total
Al-Ahram	-	-	-	-
Al-Masry al-Yom	4 (24%)	0 (0%)	13 (77%)	17
Al-Wafd	8 (73%)	0 (0%)	3 (27%)	11
Totals	12 (43%)	0 (0%)	16 (57%)	28

$$\chi^2(1, N = 28) = 6.6, p = .010$$

Both *Al-Masry al-Yom* and *Al-Wafd* quoted or cited opposition sources in the majority of the articles mentioning the opposition: *Al-Masry al-Yom* did so in 13 out of the 17 articles, or 77% of total articles coded, and *Al-Wafd* in nine out of its 11 articles mentioning them, or 82% of the total $\chi^2(6, N = 336) = 27.8, p < .001$. *Al-Wafd* tended to include more quotes or cites within a single article. *Al-Ahram* did not quote any opposition members. Table 17 presents the results.

Table 17
Opposition quotes and paraphrases

Newspaper	0 Opp quotes	1-2 Opp quotes	3-4 Opp quotes	More than 4 Opp quotes	Totals
Al-Ahram	102 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	102
Al-Masry al-Yom	104 (89%)	5 (4%)	6 (5%)	2 (2%)	117
Al-Wafd	108 (92%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	8 (7%)	117
Totals	314 (94%)	5 (2%)	7 (2%)	10 (3%)	336

$$\chi^2(6, N = 336) = 27.8, p < .001$$

Fourteen percent (n = 9) of *Al-Wafd*'s photographs featured members of opposition groups, compared with 7% (n = 7) of *Al-Masry al-Yom*'s photos. *Al-Ahram* did not photograph any opposition members. Table 18 shows these results.

Table 18
Opposition Pictured

Newspaper	Photos of Opposition	Photos not of Opposition	Not clear	Total
Al-Ahram	0 (0%)	54 (100%)	0 (0%)	54
Al-Masry al-Yom	7 (7%)	96 (91%)	2 (2%)	105
Al-Wafd	9 (14%)	55 (86%)	0 (0%)	64
Totals	16 (7%)	205 (92%)	2 (1%)	223

$$\chi^2(4, N = 223) = 11.0, p = .026$$

Non-official sources and depictions

Al-Ahram, *Al-Masry al-Yom* and *Al-Wafd* claim to represent various constituencies in Egyptian society, and two key content analysis measures considered how often the three papers incorporated non-official sources or photographs of average citizens—defined as random eyewitnesses, passersby, small business owners, employees of businesses, and others not in official categories. Results are in Table 19 and 20.

Table 19
Average Citizen quotes

Newspaper	0 Avg Cit quotes	1-2 Avg Cit quotes	3-4 Avg Cit quotes	More than 4 Avg Cit quotes	Totals
Al-Ahram	98 (96%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	102
Al-Masry al-Yom	92 (79%)	8 (7%)	6 (5%)	11 (9%)	117
Al-Wafd	105 (90%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)	7 (6%)	117
Totals	295 (88%)	15 (5%)	7 (2%)	19 (6%)	336

$$\chi^2(6, N = 336) = 19.3, p = .004$$

Table 20
Average Citizen pictured

Newspaper	Photos of Average Citizen	Photos not of Average Citizen	Not clear	Total
Al-Ahram	7 (13%)	46 (85%)	1 (2%)	54
Al-Masry al-Yom	24 (23%)	79 (76%)	1 (1%)	104
Al-Wafd	17 (27%)	44 (69%)	3 (5%)	64
Totals	48 (22%)	169 (76%)	5 (2%)	222

$$\chi^2(4, N = 222) = 6.2, p = .183$$

Overall, *Al-Masry al-Yom* was most likely to quote or cite average citizens, doing so in 21% (n = 25) of its total sampled articles—and in 9% (n = 11) of the articles, the paper quoted or cited non-official sources five times or more. *Al-Wafd* used average citizen sources in 10% (n = 12) of its total, including more than four times in 6% (n = 7) of articles. *Al-Ahram* rarely quoted average citizens, doing so just 4% (n = 4) of the time. A chi-square test showed the differences between the papers to be statistically significant, $\chi^2(6, N = 336) = 19.3, p = .004$. *Al-Wafd* was the most likely of the three papers to depict average citizens in photographs, with 27% (n = 17) of photographs coded featuring average citizens, compared with 23% (n = 24) for *Al-Masry al-Yom* and 13% (n = 7) for *Al-Ahram*. These differences were not statistically significant, however, $\chi^2(4, N = 222) = 6.2, p = .183$.

Summary

This content analysis of *Al-Ahram*, *Al-Masry al-Yom* and *Al-Wafd* news coverage late in the Mubarak era revealed some similarities and many differences in the product delivered by these three newspapers in different ownership categories.

All three papers made regular, frequent mention of the Egyptian government and focused many stories on official concerns and perspectives. However, the government-owned *Al-Ahram*'s reportage often spoke favorably of the government, quoted and paraphrased government sources and photographed President Mubarak, while omitting news about political opposition groups, crimes and problems in Egypt. The absence of these topics suggests that *Al-Ahram* contributed to the Mubarak government's objective of projecting a stable, secure national image. In contrast, coverage of the Egyptian government by the independent *Al-Masry al-Yom* and the party-owned *Al-Wafd* was more balanced, incorporating both positive and negative news and presenting government issues and actors in a more neutral tone.

Al-Masry al-Yom and *Al-Wafd* were much more likely than *Al-Ahram* to devote space to political opposition groups and average citizens and to quote, cite and photograph them. Of the two papers, *Al-Wafd* provided the more favorable coverage toward opposition groups – not surprising given *Al-Wafd*'s status as an opposition party organ; while *Al-Masry al-Yom* more frequently quoted and paraphrased average Egyptian citizens. *Al-Masry al-Yom*'s reporting was on the whole the most neutral and the paper produced the most staff-generated reports, characteristics that scholars have associated with journalistic professionalism.

On the face of it, all three newspapers exhibited trends in news coverage that reflect their respective affiliations and sponsorship—government ownership, opposition party ownership, and independent ownership. Although no causality is proven, simply by logical deduction, these findings support the expectation that ownership structures and political loyalties constitute a major structural influence on news production. Future research should assess the relative progress and/or regression of Egyptian newspapers in the post-Mubarak era. It will be important to document changes to press content, particularly as the Egyptian legal landscape is altered.

References

- Amnesty International (2009, May 3). No Freedom – Journalists Stopped From Doing Their Jobs. *Amnesty International*. Retrieved May 29, 2009 from <http://www.amnesty.org/en/news-and-updates/feature-stories/no-freedom-journalists-stopped-doing-their-jobs-20090502>
- Ayish, M. I. (2002). Political Communication on Arab World Television: Evolving Patterns. *Political Communication*, Vol 19(2), p137-154.
- Ayish, M. (2003). American-Style Journalism and Television in the Arab World: An Exploratory Study of News Selection at Six Arab Satellite Television Channels. In Kai Hafez (ed), *Media Ethics in the Dialogue of Cultures*, Hamburg: Deutsches Orient-Institut.
- Cooper, K. J. (2008). Politics and Priorities: Inside the Egyptian Press. *Arab Media & Society*, issue 6, fall 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.arabmediasociety.com/?article=689>
- Dabbous, S. (1994). Egypt. In Y. Kamalipour and H. Mowlana (eds). *Mass Media in the Middle East: A Comprehensive Handbook*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Elmasry, M. H. (2011a). Producing News in Mubarak's Egypt: An Analysis of Egyptian Newspaper Production During the Late Hosni Mubarak Era. *Journal of Arab and Muslim Media Research*. Vol. 4, issue 2.
- Elmasry, M. H. (2011b). Before They Were Revolutionaries: Assessing Journalistic Professionalism in Mubarak's Egypt. Presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication annual convention. Saint Louis, Missouri, August 2011.
- Elsasser, S. (2010). Press Liberalization, the New Media, and the 'Coptic Question': Muslim-Coptic Relations in Egypt in a Changing Media Landscape. *Middle Eastern Studies*. Vol. 46, Issue 1, p131-150.
- Farag, A. (2004). *The Internet in Egyptian Society and its use as a News Medium*. Unpublished PhD thesis. McGill University (Canada).
- Goldschmidt, A. (2008). *A brief history of Egypt*. New York: Facts on File.
- Hafez, K. (2002). Journalism Ethics Revisited: A Comparison of Ethics Codes in Europe, North Africa, the Middle East, and Muslim Asia. *Political Communication*, Vol 19(2), p. 225-250.
- Hamdy, N. (2009). Building capabilities of Egyptian journalists in preparation for a media transition. *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research*, vol. 1, issue 3.

- Holsti, O.R. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Human Rights Watch (2006, July 10). Egypt: Journalists Still Risk Jail Under Press Law. *Human Rights Watch*. Retrived May 29, 2009 from <http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2006/07/10/egypt-journalists-still-risk-jail-under-press-law>
- Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., Bracken, C. C. (2002). Content Analysis in Mass Communication: Assessment and Reporting of Intercoder Reliability. *Human Communication Research*, Vol. 28, No. 4.
- Mellor, N. (2005). *The Making of Arab News*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Nerone, J. C. (ed) (1995). *Last Rights: Revisiting Four Theories of the Press*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Pintak, L. (2008). Satellite TV News and Arab Democracy. *Journalism Practice*, Vol. 2, No. 1.
- Reporters without Borders (2003). *Egypt – Annual Report 2003. Reporters Without Borders*. Retrieved May 29, 2009 from www.rsf.org/print.php3?id_article=6687
- Reporters Without Borders (2006). *Egypt – Annual Report 2006. Reporters Without Borders*. Retrieved May 29, 2009 from http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id_article=17186
- Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F.G. (2005). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research, 2nd ed.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rugh, W. (2004). *Arab Mass Media: Newspapers, Radio, and Television in Arab Politics*.
- Sakr, N. (2001). Contested Blueprints for Egypt's Satellite Channels: Regrouping the Options by Redefining the Debate. *International Communication Gazette*. 63;149.
- Sakr, N. (2005). "Media Policy in the Middle East: A Reappraisal." In: James Curran and Michael Gurevitch (eds), *Mass Media and Society*, 4th edition, p234-250, London (Hodder Arnold).
- Schiff, F. (2004). The Dominant Ideology in the Press: Run-of-the-Paper Background Assumptions in 14 Ohio Newspapers. *Quarterly Journal of Ideology*, Vol 27, 3 & 4.
- Shoemaker, P. M. (2003). *Intercoder Reliability*; Retrieved from http://web.syr.edu/~snowshoe/frames/content_analysis/intercoder_reliability.doc

U.S. Department of State (2009, Feb 25). "2008 Human Rights Report: Egypt."
2008 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices. Retrieved May 29, 2009 from
<http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2008/nea/119114.htm>

APPENDIX A
CONTENT ANALYSIS CODING SHEET

Article ID# _____**Newspaper name**

1= Al-Ahram 2= Al-Masry Al Yom 3= Al Wafd

Date of article1= July 26; 2= Aug 14; 3= Oct 10; 4= Oct 22;
5= Nov 24; 6= Dec 9; 7= Dec 28**Where is the story placed on the page?**

1= Top half of page; 2= Bottom half of page

Where is the story located in the paper?

1= Front page; 2= Back page; 3= Inside page

What is the format of the piece?1= news report; 2= opinion; 3= sports news report; 4= sports opinion
5= feature; 6= investigation; 7= news summary**What is the article's size?**1= 1-5 cm squared; 2= 6-9 cm squared; 3= 10-13 cm squared
4= 14-18 cm squared; 5= 19 cm squared or more**What sources are listed in the byline?**1= staff/reporter only 2= AFP 3= AP 4= Reuters; 5= MENA 6= US
Newspaper 7= European Newspaper 8= agencies;
9= combination of staff/reporter and agencies 10= no source 11= other**What is the primary topic of the article?***Egypt Community Relations* (1-3): 1= Muslim/Christian cooperative/good relations;
2= Muslim/Christian conflict; 3= other*Elections* (4-9): 4= Egyptian elections general; 5= Egyptian election rigging/corruption; 6=
US Elections; 7= African country elections; 8= Arab country elections; 9= other country
elections*Egypt Crime* (10-21): 10= violent assault; 11= murder; 12= sexual assault/rape; 13=
prostitution; 14= robbery/theft; 15= illegal drugs; 16= Terrorism; 17=
Hostages/hijacking; 18= bribery/corruption; 19= slander/libel of president or other public
figures; 20= libel/slander of private persons; 21= other*Egypt Education* (22-32): 22= poor education services (bad schools, poor teaching/all
memorization, no labs, etc) or curriculum problems (bad books and materials); 23= good
education services; 24= religion and; 25= private lessons; 26= dropouts; 27= violence by
teachers or students; 28= cheating; 29= cost of private schools; 30= high school tests;
31= college determination/coordination of majors; 32= cost of private colleges; 33= other*Egypt Housing* (34-44): 34= new constructions; 35= new cities; 36= overcrowding; 37=

'ghetto areas'; 38= housing construction problems; 39= violation of housing laws; 40= urban migration; 41= homelessness; 42= lack of housing; 43= cost of housing; 44= other

Egyptian Government and Parties (45-69): 45= news about Egyptian parties and groups; 46= Egyptian democratic progress; 47= Egyptian democratic regression (dictatorship); 48= Egyptian government corruption; 49= Egyptian government incompetence; 50= Egyptian government achievements (political, economic, etc.); 51= anti-Egyptian government protests; 52= general/cordial Egyptian government relations with other countries; 53= Egyptian president meeting with other national leaders; 54= Egyptian trade relations with other countries; 55= Egyptian aid relations with other countries; 56= antagonism between Egypt and other country(ies); 57= Egyptian law changes or new legislation; 58= Egyptian government economic policy/initiative; 59= Egyptian government education policy/initiative; 60= Egyptian government healthcare policy/initiative; 61= Egyptian government environmental policy/initiative; 62= Egyptian government agricultural policy/initiative; 63= Egyptian government public works and water resources policy/initiative; 64= Egyptian government information technology policy/initiative; 65= Egyptian government housing and urban development policy/initiative; 66= Egyptian government tourism policy/initiative; 67= Egyptian government electricity/energy policy/initiative; 68= Egyptian government role in peace process; 69= Egyptian government other

Non-Egyptian International Relations/Issues (70-100): 70= trade; 71= aid; 72= sport; 73= UN; 74= sanctions; 75= cordial relations; 76= antagonism between nations; 77= 'dictatorship'; 78= Islam vs West; 79= 'naked aggression'; 80= occupied territory; 81= international law; 82= peace talks/peace deal; 83= meetings/calls between leaders; 84= environmental issues; 85= actions/policies/initiatives of Int. Leaders; 86= terrorism; 87= charity; 88= Govt. incompetence; 89= illegal weaponry; 90= human rights; 91= Israeli/Palestinian conflict/peace/relations; 92= Palestinian/Palestinian conflict/relations; 93= World Court/International Trials; 94= spying/covert ops; 95= EU; 96= censorship; 97= torture; 98= US wars (Iraq, Afghanistan, etc); 99= international (non-Egyptian) religion issues; 100= other

Egypt Employment (101-107): 101= unemployment levels; 102= job prospects/opportunities; 103= job discrimination/corrupt hiring practices; 104= low salaries; 105= high salaries; 106= layoffs due to privatization; 107= other

Economics (108-121): 108= Egyptian stock market; 109= International stock market(s); 110= Egyptian economic crisis; 111= international economic crisis; 112= Egyptian economic growth; 113= Egyptian debt; 114= Egyptian foreign investment; 115= Int'l foreign investment; 116= Egypt taxes; 117= Int'l taxes; 118= Egypt compensation for accidents; 119= international economic cooperation; 120= Int'l economic investment; 121= other

Egypt Religion (122-140): 122= fatwa; 123= religious lessons; 124= conversions; 125= religious extremism; 126= azhar policy; 127= azhar achievement; 128= azhar mistake; 129= church policy; 130= church achievement; 131= church mistake; 132= reports on religious personalities; 133= religious structures/buildings; 134= differences/conflicts between Islamic sects; 135= defenses of Islam; 136= defenses of Christianity; 137= attack on religion; 138= polygamy; 139= Islamist groups; 140= other

Health (141-153): 141= health problems; 142= cosmetic surgery; 143= cost of health care; 144= natural disaster; 145= rail/air disaster; 146= and organ/blood donorship; 147= health and gender; 148= obituaries; 149= child malnutrition; 150= pollution; 151= quality of hospitals and clinics; 152= health insurance; 153= other

Egypt Policing/Law and order (154-166): 154= selective/target policing; 155= positive relations; 156= negative relations; 157= demonstrations; 158= rioting; 159= court rulings; 160= recruitment of Muslim officers; 161= Execution & 'Islamic Law'; 162= Islamic law, negative; 163= Islamic law, positive; 164= Police racism; 165= court cases; 166= other

Egypt Armed Forces (167-170): 167= achievement; 168= escaping military duty; 169= criticism of; 170= other

Culture/Custom (171-187): 171= westernization; 172= Islam and...; 173= enforced culture; 174= patriarchy and...; 175= Islam/west contrast; 176= food; 177= clothing; 178= film industry; 179= media/ press; 180= fine art; 181= Multi culturalism; 182= Literature; 183= Music; 184= family life; 185= architecture; 186= celebrity news; 187= other

Sport (188-190): 188= general; 189 business interests; 190= other

Business (191-206): 191= general; 192= success; 193= failure; 194= new Egyptian business projects by Egyptian business people – local; 195= new Egyptian business projects by Egyptian business people – abroad; 196= shares; 197= International trade; 198= Financial crisis, international; 199= privatization; 200= OIL; 201= economic talks; 202= agriculture; 203= Economic reform; 204= other privatization general; 205= Egypt mergers; 206= International mergers

Egypt Women (207-216): 207= general; 208= gender inequality; 209= marriage, arranged; 210= marriage, 'forced'; 211= female circumcision; 212= human rights and ...; 213= and Islam; 214= hijab; 215= and jobs; 216= other

Egypt Human Rights (217-223): 217= Detainees' rights; 218= Children's rights; 219= Patient rights; 220= Religious minority rights; 221= Homosexual rights; 222= Journalists' rights; 223= other

Is the Egyptian government mentioned explicitly in this article?

1= Yes 2= no

If the answer to this question is "no" skip the next question

If the Egyptian government is mentioned, is the government talked about favorably, unfavorably, or neutrally?

1= favorably 2= unfavorably 3= neutrally

Are opposition parties or groups mentioned explicitly in this article?

1= yes 2= no

If the answer to this question is "no" skip the next question

If opposition groups/parties are discussed, are they talked about favorably, unfavorably, or neutrally?

1= favorably 2= unfavorably 3= neutrally

Does the article discuss a problem or crisis in Egypt?

1= yes 2= no

If the article does discuss a problem or crisis in Egypt, does the article also mention a solution or potential solution offered by the government?

1= yes 2= no

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

How many times is the government quoted or paraphrased?

1= 0 2= 1-2 3=3-4 4= 4 or more

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

How many times is an opposition party or group member quoted or paraphrased?

1= 0 2= 1-2 3=3-4 4= 4 or more

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

How many times is an average citizen (man/woman on the street, small business owner, etc.) quoted or paraphrased?

1= 0 2= 1-2 3= 3-4 4= 4 or more

Is a photograph included?

1= Yes
2= No

If you answered "yes" to #16, answer the remaining questions. If you answered "no" skip all remaining questions.

What is the size of the photograph?

1= Very small 2= Small 3= Medium size 4= Large 5= Very Large

Is the photo of an individual or a group?

1= Individual 2= Group 3= not applicable

Is President Mubarak, a member of his family, or another member of the NDP pictured in the photo?

1= Yes 2= No 3= Not clear

If you answered yes to question #22, answer #23. Otherwise skip ahead to question #24.

What is the active state of the president, family member or other member(s) of the NDP?

1= angry/disappointed (e.g. yelling, protesting)
2= threatening/aggressor (e.g. occupying army, invading army, intent to injure)
3= victim/sad (crying, wounded, dead, grieving, crying, scared, subject of gunfire or other assault, parent sheltering child, acting in self-defense, etc.)

- 4= Leadership/diplomacy (speaking at a meeting, etc.)
- 5= happy (e.g. smiling, joking, social situations, playing/leisure)
- 6= focused/concentrating (e.g. working hard, studying, listening carefully)
- 7= playing/leisure/social
- 8= worried

Are opposition groups or parties pictured?

- 1= Yes
- 2= No
- 3= Not clear

If you answered "yes" to question #24, answer #25. Otherwise skip ahead to question #26.

What is the active state of the opposition groups or parties?

- 1= angry/disappointed (e.g. yelling, protesting)
- 2= threatening/aggressor (e.g. occupying army, invading army, intent to injure)
- 3= victim/sad (crying, wounded, dead, grieving, crying, scared, subject of gunfire or other assault, parent sheltering child, acting in self-defense, etc.)
- 4= Leadership/diplomacy (speaking at a meeting, etc.)
- 5= happy (e.g. smiling, joking, social situations, playing/leisure)
- 6= focused/concentrating (e.g. working hard, studying, listening carefully)
- 7= playing/leisure/social
- 8= worried

Are average Egyptians citizens pictured?

- 1= Yes
- 2= No
- 3= Not clear

If you answered yes to question #26, answer #27. Otherwise skip ahead to question #28.

What is the active state of the average citizen(s) pictured?

- 1= angry/disappointed (e.g. yelling, protesting)
- 2= threatening/aggressor (e.g. occupying army, invading army, intent to injure)
- 3= victim/sad (crying, wounded, dead, grieving, crying, subject of gunfire or other assault, parent sheltering child, acting in self-defense, etc.)
- 4= Leadership/diplomacy (speaking at a meeting, etc.)
- 5= happy (e.g. smiling, joking, social situations, playing/leisure)
- 6= focused/concentrating (e.g. working hard, studying, listening carefully)
- 7= playing/leisure/social
- 8= worried/scared

Are foreign diplomats pictured?

- 1= Yes
- 2= No
- 3= Not clear

If you answered yes to question #28, answer #29. Otherwise skip the remaining question.

What is the active state of the foreign diplomats?

- 1= angry/disappointed (e.g. yelling, protesting)
- 2= threatening/aggressor (e.g. occupying army, invading army, intent to injure)
- 3= victim/sad (crying, wounded, dead, grieving, crying, subject of gunfire or other assault, parent sheltering child, acting in self-defense, etc.)

- 4= Leadership/diplomacy (speaking at a meeting, etc.)
 5= happy (e.g. smiling, joking, social situations, playing/leisure)
 6= focused/concentrating (e.g. working hard, studying, listening carefully)
 7= playing/leisure/social
 8= worried/scared

APPENDIX B

SUBJECT AREA AND PRIMARY TOPIC CATEGORIES COLLAPSED

Egypt Community Relations (1): 1= Egypt community relations [includes Muslim/Christian conflict and Muslim/Christian cooperative/good relations] 1-3

2-Elections (2): 2= Elections [includes Egyptian elections general, Egyptian election rigging/corruption, USA elections, Arab/Middle Eastern country elections, international organization elections (e.g. the UN), and other country elections] 2-9

Egypt Crime (3-7): 3= violent crime (includes violent assault, murder, and sexual assault); 4= prostitution; 5= robbery/theft; 6= terrorism/hostage taking; 7= crime other [includes illegal drugs; bribery/corruption; libel/slander of private persons; slander/libel of president or other public figures; and illegal immigration] 10-22

4-Egypt Education (8): 8= Egypt education issues [includes poor education services or curriculum problems; good education services; private lessons; cost or problems; dropouts; cheating; cost of private schools; high school tests; college determination/coordination of majors; cost of private colleges] 23-32

5-Egypt Housing and Construction (9): 9= Housing issues [includes new constructions; new cities; overcrowding; 'ghetto areas'; housing/structure/building construction problems; violation of housing laws; urban migration; homelessness; cost of housing/lack of housing; other]

Egyptian Gov and Parties (10-19): 10= News about Egyptian opposition parties and groups; 11= Egyptian opposition parties/groups/persons relations with gov; 12= Egyptian government achievement/praise (includes democratic progress); 13= Negative Egyptian government news (includes democratic regression, Egyptian gov corruption, anti-Egyptian government protests, and Egyptian gov incompetence); 14= general/cordial Egyptian gov relations/cooperation with other countries (includes Egyptian president meeting with foreign leaders, Egyptian gov giving aid/charity, and Egypt government receiving aid/charity from non-Egyptian sources); 15= Egyptian law changes or new legislation; 16= Egyptian gov econ policy/activity/initiative; 17= Egyptian gov education policy; 18= Egyptian gov involvement in Palestine issue; 19= Egyptian government other (includes Egyptian gov political/legal support for Egyptians abroad, antagonism between Egypt and other countries, Egypt gov healthcare policy, Egypt gov agricultural policy, Egypt gov environmental policy, Egypt gov public works and water resources, Egypt gov housing and urban development policy, Egyptian gov information technology or science policy/ initiative/ activity, Egyptian government tourism policy, Egypt gov electricity/energy policy, Egypt gov roads/transport policy, Egypt gov role in peace process, Egypt gov human rights policy initiative.); 65= housing; 68= roads

Non-Egyptian Gov International Relations/Issues (20-23): 20= positive international relations/issues (includes charity/aid, UN, general/cordial relations, peace talks/peace deal, environmental issues, Egyptian citizens/organizations charity, and Egyptian opposition or

average citizen relations with nations); 21= international tensions/negative international relations (includes physical assault of international leader, protests/demonstrations, sanctions, antagonism between nations, dictatorship, nuclear weapons, occupied territory, international law/court/trials, terrorism, gov't incompetence, gov't corruption, illegal weaponry, US wars, and torture); 22= Israeli-Palestinian issue (includes I-P conflict/peace/relations, and Palestinian-Palestinian conflict/peace/relations); 23= int'l other (includes human rights, censorship, governmental/administration changes, international religion issues)

Economics (24-26): 24= Egypt economic issues (includes unemployment levels, stock market, decline/crisis, foreign investment, taxes); 25= int'l economics (includes stock market, decline/crisis, taxes); 26= other

Egypt Religion (27-29): 27= Islamic holidays; 28= Islamist groups; 29= religion other (includes Islamic religious fatwa/lessons, conversions, azhar policy and/or education/curriculum issues, azhar achievement, azhar mistake, church policy, church achievement, church mistake, reports on religious personalities, religious structures/buildings, differences/conflicts between Islamic sects, Christian ruling/lessons, polygamy, and Christian holidays and events).

Health (30-33): 30= health problems (including health advice designed to alleviate health problems/conditions); 31= rail/air/car/sea disaster; 32= quality of hospitals and clinics; 33= other (includes cosmetic surgery, cost of health care, natural disaster, organ/blood donorship, environmental issues, obituary, child malnutrition, pollution, health insurance, Egyptian medicine-science development, accidents, non-Egyptian medicine-science development, and women and health).

Egypt Policing/Law and order (34-35): 34= court cases/rulings; 35= other (includes demonstrations, rioting, Police incompetence, Police/security forces abuse/brutality/corruption, news about judges)

Egypt Armed Forces (36-39): 36= achievement; 37= escaping military duty; 38= criticism of; 39= other

Culture/Custom (40): 40= Egypt culture (includes globalization/westernization, honoring persons, food, clothing/dress, film/television industry, press, art, Multi culturalism, Literature/theatre, Music, family life, history).

Business (41-49): 41= success; 42= failure/failing; 43= new Egyptian business projects by Egyptian business people – local; 44= privatization; 45= agriculture; 46= Egypt mergers; 47= International mergers; 48= technology problems; 49= other

Egypt Human Rights (non-governmental) (50): 50= human rights (e.g. detainees, children, patients, religious minorities, homosexuals)

Sports: (51-52): 51= Egypt sports; 52= international sports

APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTION OF KEY CONTENT ANALYSIS VARIABLES

Variable (4 and 5) – Page Placement and Paper Placement: Article placement is an important indicator of priority and importance. Each article was coded for its location on the page (top-half or bottom-half) and within the newspaper (front-page or inside-page).

With regards to article location on a page, coders were instructed to code articles based on where they began, not where they ended up or where the majority of their text was positioned.

Although only articles with at least some front-page reference were coded in this study, not all articles, for the purposes of coding, were considered front-page. Articles that included some text (at a minimum a title) were coded as being on the front-page, however, articles with only a front-page “teaser” were coded as being on inside-pages.

Variable (6) – format: The coding sheet’s question on “format” asked coders to code articles into categories of either news or opinion/editorial.

Variable (7) – article size: Article size is also an important indicator of importance. Articles were grouped by the researcher into categories of small, medium, and large based on the amount of overall text size included in them. Coders were provided with sample articles organized by size to serve as guides during the coding process.

Variable (8) – byline sources: Byline sources denote the primary journalistic source of news. Generally speaking, a larger proportion of staff-written reports suggests higher quality (Cooper, 2008).

Variable (9) – primary topic: Past research by Cooper (2008) suggests significant differences in topic choices amongst government and independent newspapers in Egypt. Article topics are excellent measures of what newspapers regard as important and also how they align themselves politically. Prior to development of the final coding guide, I closely read issues of *Al-Ahram*, *Al-Masry al-Yom*, and *Al-Wafd* to determine a range of possible topics to include in the coding scheme. Coders were instructed to code articles based on the main topic presented, as suggested by the amount of space allotted and placement of topics within articles. Topics not considered obvious in meaning were defined in the coding guide, and a series of coding rules were provided in order to guide coders on decisions involving articles discussing multiple topics (see Appendix D).

Overall, there were 18 broad subject areas with 192 primary (more specific) topics. That is, the ‘topic’ portion of the coding sheet was divided into 18 broad subject areas, with each category containing several specific, primary topics. For example, the broad area of *Egyptian Government and Parties* included 30 specific primary topics including *Egyptian government economic policy/initiative/activity* and *Egyptian Government Corruption*.

Intercoder reliability results for subject area were better than .80 for both Scott’s Pi and Krippendorf’s Alpha. Reliability scores for primary topics, meanwhile, was .72 for Scott’s Pi and .73 for Krippendorf’s Alpha.

Variable (10 and 12) – mention (of government or opposition parties): This variable measured whether or not the government or opposition parties were mentioned in articles. Differences between newspapers regarding how often they reference the government and opposition groups might indicate the degree to which the papers are willing to include the voices and views of these important groups.

Variable (11 and 13) – direction: This variable measured whether the government and opposition parties were talked about favorably, unfavorably, or neutrally. Favorable, or positive, determinations were made when articles discussed achievements primarily or issued praise without condemnation or criticism. Articles primarily critical in tone were coded as unfavorable, while those discussing both positive and negative attributes about evenly were coded as neutral.

Variables (14 and 15) – problem and solution: Variables 14 and 15 determined in part the

extent to which newspapers covered problems in Egypt and, importantly, how likely the papers were to mention government-suggested solution. Since either excluding problems from news content or mentioning government-proposed solutions to problems are ways of indicating indirect support for the government, these two variables served as important measures of government loyalty.

Variable (16, 17, and 18) – quotes: Measuring inclusion of direct quotes and paraphrases of opposition groups, the government, and average citizens is one way to determine how willing the three newspapers studied were to include the voices of these important groups.

Variables (19 & 22/35 & 24/37 & 26/39 & 28/41 & 30/43 & 32 & 45) – photo: Inclusion of a photographs with news articles is one measure of the importance newspapers give to the topics of the articles and also the subjects discussed in them. Variable 19 determined simply whether any photographs accompanied news articles. Six other variables measured specifically who was pictured. Specifically, these six variables measured whether the president, the president's family, a member of the government, opposition group members, average Egyptian citizens, or foreign diplomats were pictured in photographs accompanying articles.