Framing the Right Suspects: Measuring Media Bias

Wayne R. Dunham^{*} Dept. of Justice – Antitrust Division 450 5th Street NW Washington DC 20530 Email – Wayne.Dunham@usdoj.gov

Abstract:

This paper empirically examines how political bias affects content in large daily newspapers and the source of the demand for that bias. Consistent with prior research, this paper finds media bias. The media examined are three to six times more likely to associate ideological labels with conservative think tanks than liberal think tanks. This tends to frame the analysis done by conservative think tanks as being less objective than the analysis done by liberal think tanks. A major contribution of this paper is identifying the source of bias. A detailed examination of the differences in the citation patterns across publications suggests that the sources of the bias are reporter/editor preferences rather than the preferences of publishers or customers.

^{*} Economist, Antitrust Division, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530. The Antitrust Division encourages independent research by its economists. The views expressed herein are entirely those of the author and are not purported to reflect those of the United States Department of Justice. I would like to thank Alexander Raskovich for very useful comments and the blizzard of 2010 in Washington DC for providing the necessary free time to complete this.

Public opinion is formed and expressed by machinery. The newspapers do an immense amount of thinking for the average man and woman. In fact, they supply them with such a continuous stream of standardized opinion, bourne along upon an equally inexhaustible flood of news and sensation, collected from every part of the world every hour of the day, that there is neither the need nor the leisure for personal reflection. All this is but part of a tremendous educating process. It is an education at once universal and superficial. It produces enormous numbers of standardized citizens, all equipped with regulation opinions, prejudices and sentiments according to their class or party.¹

– Winston S. Churchill

I. Introduction

Outside of the economics profession there has long been an interest in and allegations of bias in whatever was the dominant media. For instance, Accuracy in Media, a conservative-oriented media watchdog group was formed in 1969.² Another conservative-oriented media watchdog group, the Media Research Center, was formed in 1987 and currently operates with a \$10 million budget.³ Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR) is a liberal media watchdog that was formed in 1986.⁴ In all likelihood, there have been other such groups of differing orientations that have since formed. These groups produce an impressively large stream of anecdotes that, unfortunately, do not lend themselves to empirical analysis. However, the economics profession has recently taken much of an interest in media bias.

Much of the economics literature on this topic has been published since 2000. This literature has primarily been theoretical. These researchers have tried to understand the conditions under which a biased media could continue to exist in equilibrium and what effects such bias might have on opinions in general, and elections, in particular. There have been some, but fewer, empirical articles on the existence and effects of media bias. These articles suggest the existence of a liberal media bias.

This paper leverages the past research on media bias, in particular a paper by Groseclose and Milyo, which compared references by members of the U.S. Congress and specific news media outlets to various think tanks to infer an Americans for Democratic Action liberal index score for various news media outlets.⁵ This paper uses a different dataset compiled by the author and limited to six newspapers and the Associated Press Newswires. The rates at which these publications attach ideological labels (or frames) to think tanks of differing ideological orientations are compared. This comparison indicates that these newspapers associated ideological labels with conservative (or libertarian) think tanks three to six times as often as they did with liberal think tanks. Consistent with much of the prior research, this suggests a liberal bias. The principle contribution of this paper is the implication that the source of bias may be the preferences of reporters/editors

¹ Churchill, Winston S., "Mass Effects of Modern Life," in <u>Thoughts and Adventures</u> edited by James Muller, p. 271 – 72.

 $[\]frac{2}{2}$ <u>http://www.aim.org/about/history-of-aim/</u> (all web site references were current as of 02/15/2010)

³<u>http://www.mrc.org/about/about.aspx</u>

⁴ http://www.fair.org/index.php?page=100

⁵ Groseclose, Tim and Milyo, Jeffrey, "A Measure of Media Bias," Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. CXX, November 2005.

rather than the preferences of owners or customers. The most surprising result is that the self-identified conservative newspaper The Washington Times attaches ideological labels to conservative think tanks at a higher rate than it does to liberal think tanks. This is consistent with a principal-agent problem where a publisher cannot cost-effectively control the effect of the bias of the reporters/editors on the publication's content.

In the next section, the existing economics literature on media bias is discussed. After that, the data collection and classification methodology used in this paper is discussed. The results and implications are discussed in the fourth section. A small concluding section ends the paper.

II. Economic Research on Media Bias.

Economists have only turned their attention to the issue of media bias recently. The literature, while robust, has remained fairly limited. Papers with a theoretical orientation have examined the reasons why, despite presumed competitive pressures for objective information, bias might occur in equilibrium. The empirical literature has been a bit more limited because bias is by its very nature subjective, making it difficult to quantitatively analyze. Recently several papers have tried to address the problem of subjectivity and empirically assess whether media bias exists. Other papers have assumed the existence of bias and attempted to analyze its effects.

A. Theoretical Models of Media Bias

Much like the explanations for the persistence of race-based discrimination in labor markets, the persistence of media bias can be attributed to the preferences of owners (publishers), employees (reporters/editors) and customers (readers/advertisers). In all cases, for such preferences to have a persistent economic effect the agents must be willing to expend real resources in order to have their preference for bias indulged.

Anand, Di Tella and Galetovic examined the impact of owner preferences on bias in the context of a model of product differention.⁶ In their model, owner bias is costly because some consumers demand news that is unbiased. They find that owner preferences can only matter in a model in which there are both some consumers who share the owners' ideological preferences and sunk costs to entry. In such a model, the owner will locate as near to his own preferences as possible while still deterring entry. Without sunk costs, competition will make it impossible for the owner to sustain bias in equilibrium.

Bias may occur because customers demand it. This demand for bias may come from either advertisers or readers. Sutter (2002) examined the possibility that advertisers might demand bias in favor of business interests generally or themselves, specifically.⁷

⁶ Anand, Bharat; Di Tella, Rafeal; and Galetovic, Alexander, "Information or Opinion? Media Bias as Product Differentiation," Journal of Economics and Management Strategy, Volume 16, Number 3 (Fall 2007) Pages 635 – 682.

⁷ Sutter, Daniel, "Advertising and Political Bias in the Media: The Market for Criticism of the Market Economy," American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Volume 61 (July 2002) Page 725 – 745.

Sutter argues that advertisers are unlikely to engage in any costs to demand bias in favor of business interests generally. The effects of such bias would be a "public good" for the business community generally, and individual advertisers would not be willing to incur private costs to support it. He also argues that an advertiser demanding bias in favor of that advertiser's company is unlikely to succeed when consumers demand unbiased news and the market for advertising is reasonably competitive. Any effort to punish a particular outlet would be ineffective and costly. The publisher would simply find other advertisers, while the advertiser would no longer be able to deliver its message to certain consumers it valued. Sutter then presents some examples where firms attempted – and failed – to punish publishers that had written very critical or damaging articles.

Mullainathan and Shleifer discuss the impact of readers demanding bias in the news content. They view these consumers as preferring media outlets that confirm their priors and examine how the media would perform under various market structures.⁸ They find that under competition, media outlets are more likely to provide biased news than they would in less competitive markets.⁹

Gentzkow and Shapiro (2006) also examined these issues under similar market structures. In their model there is some *ex post* verification of the information provided by the media. Consumers value correct information positively even if it is inconsistent with their biases.¹⁰ The existence of *ex post* feedback reverses the Mullainathan and Shleifer results. In those markets with more reliable *ex post* feedback, increases in media competition will lead to less bias even if readers have some preference for bias.

Following up on this, in a 2010 Econometrica paper Gentzkow and Shapiro develop a measure of the ideological slant of a newspaper's news coverage using a methodology similar to that used by Groseclose and Milyo, discussed below. Gentzcow and Shapiro create a left/right ideological index based on the differing frequency of two and three word phrases used by members of Congress of different parties.¹¹ As in Grosclose and Milyo, the frequency of usage is then compared to the frequency of usage of those same phrases to create a left/right index of the relative ideological slant of 433 local U.S. newspapers. This index is used in regression analysis to determine the effect of ownership and customer bias on the ideological slant of newspapers. The results suggest that the ideological slant of newspapers is related to the political biases of its readers. This paper provides no evidence that ideological slant of a newspaper is related to its owners ideological biases.¹²

⁸ This assumption is consistent with the work of Goff and Tollison. They assumed a liberal media bias and estimated the demand for newspapers. They found that demographic indicators consistent with consumers holding liberal views resulted in an increase in the demand for newspapers. See Goff, Brian and Tollison, Robert., "Why is the Media so Liberal?" Journal of Public Finance and Public Choice, (1990) Pages 13-21. ⁹ Mullainathan, Sendhil and Shleifer, Andrei, "The Market for News," American Economic Review, Volume 95 (2005) 1031 – 1053.

¹⁰ Gentzkow, Matthew and Shapiro, Jesse, "Media Bias and Reputation" Journal of Political Economy. (2006) Vol. CXIV Pages 280 – 316.

¹¹ Gentzkow, Matthew and Shapiro, Jesse, "What Drives Media Slant? Evidence from U.S. Daily Newspapers," Econometrica. (2010) Vol. 78, No. 1 Pages 35 – 71.

¹² Gentzkow, Matthew and Shapiro, Jesse, (2010).

Much like discrimination in employment, media bias may occur because reporters and editors find the workplace more congenial if they can shape the output in a way that is consistent with their preferences. With respect to media bias, this would occur through using the media for which they work as a podium to disseminate their political views. Baron examines this in a model where reporters and editors are willing to accept lower wages in exchange for the ability to bias news content.¹³ It is assumed that consumers value objective news. Such bias continues in equilibrium because the owners' losses through lower circulation are offset by lower labor costs. Bias will be observed in equilibrium. Among its effects will be a reduced demand for news and lower prices. This model also predicts that increased competition tends to result in more bias as the influence of cost on price becomes more important in competing for customers.

B. Does Bias Matter?

In a sense, any research into whether bias exists would be pointless if bias had no real world effects. Indeed, DellaVigna and Kaplan argue that bias should not matter in the long run if consumers are rational.¹⁴ Rational news consumers would adjust their interpretations of the media to account for the perceived bias of that media. Several articles have attempted to assess whether media bias affects election or policy results. In a stylized model, Besley and Prat show that "media capture" by the government can affect the accountability of government and government agents.¹⁵ Letellier estimates the effect of several factors, including media bias, on presidential elections.¹⁶ He finds that as the media bias tends to more closely conform to the views of the median voter, incumbency becomes a much more important factor in elections. Lott and Hassett examine whether the coverage of economic events was politically biased. In that study, they found such bias and that it affects how people perceived the strength of the economy.¹⁷

Perhaps the most interesting study of the effect of media bias on political outcomes is by DellaVigna and Kaplan (2007). They examine the impact of Fox News' entry into various local cable markets between 1996 and 2000 on voting patterns in the 2000 presidential election and the senatorial races that same year. They assume that Fox News is more conservative than other cable television news channels. They test whether local availability of Fox News increased the share of the vote the Republican presidential or senatorial candidate received. They find that Fox News coverage tends to increase the Republican candidates' vote by 0.4 to 0.7 percentage points. This increase was

 ¹³ Baron, David P., "Persistent Media Bias," Journal of Public Economics, Volume 90, (2005) Pages 1 –
 36.

¹⁴ DellaVigna, Stefano, and Kaplan, Ethan, "The Fox News Effect: Media Bias and Voting," Quarterly Journal of Economics, August 2007, p. 1190.

¹⁵ Besley, Timothy and Pratt, Andrea, "Handcuffs for the Grabbing Hand? Media Capture and Accountability," The American Economic Review, Volume 96, Number 3 (June 2006), Pages 721 – 736.

¹⁶ Letellier, Travis L., "From Media Control to Voting for President: Extending the Media Politics Theory," Manuscript, Florida International University. Fall 2008.

¹⁷Lott, John R. Jr., and Hassett, Kevin A., "Is Newspaper Coverage of Economic Events Politically Biased?" Working Paper, American Enterprise Institute, October 2004.

composed of two parts. Some viewers who would have voted for a Democrat candidate choose instead to vote for a Republican candidate. The second part was the result of increased turnout by Republican-leaning voters. The latter effect appears to be stronger in areas of the country that historically leaned toward Democratic candidates.¹⁸

C. Empirical Estimates of Bias

As noted in the introduction, much of the popular literature on media bias relies on anecdotes or non-rigorous and somewhat subjective evidence for the existence of bias. Surveys of the voting or political contribution patterns of reporters or media executives are not convincing evidence of bias in markets when there is some demand for news stories that present all of the relevant facts concerning a particular event.¹⁹ Likewise, examples of omitted facts or stories that seemingly do not get the placement that an *ex post* assessment of their importance are mere anecdotes, may have alternative explanations other than bias.²⁰

As a result, most research only focuses on relative biasedness. For instance, in the Letellier paper discussed above, a measure of bias was created that only indicated whether the media was biased relative to other media outlets.²¹ In the DellaVigna and Kaplan article regarding Fox News discussed immediately above, they only make the claim that Fox News is conservative relative to other broadcast outlets. The question of whether the media is liberal or conservative overall is irrelevant to their study.²²

The two most thorough empirical studies of media bias in the economics literature are Lott and Hassett, and Groseclose and Milyo. Lott and Hassett examine whether media outlets tend to favor Republicans or Democrats in their coverage of economic events.

Lott and Hassett used research assistants to characterize the headlines of 389 newspapers for four types of economic statistics: GDP, Durable Goods, Retail Sales and Unemployment. Based on a set of criteria given the research assistants, the headlines describing these statistics on the day after their public reporting are classified as positive, negative or mixed. They use a Tobit procedure to estimate the probability that a given statistic will be classified as positive or negative. They find that, after controlling for other relevant factors, during Republican administrations economic news is twenty to thirty percent more likely to be characterized as negative than the same news would be characterized if it occurred during a Democrat administration.²³

¹⁸ DellaVigna and Kaplan (2007), p. 1228.

¹⁹ See Lott and Hassett (2004), p. 1 - 6 for a summary of these types of studies.

²⁰ This is not to say that anecdotes cannot be motivators used in the process of asking questions or explaining a phenomenon.

²¹ Letellier, (2008) p. 9 – 11.

²² DellaVigna and Kaplan (2007), p. 1188. "This is true whether Fox News represents the political center and the rest of the media the liberal wing, or Fox News represents the right and the rest of the media the middle."

²³ Lott and Hassett (2004), p. 28.

Groseclose and Milyo developed an empirical test of media bias where bias is measured relative to the median senator or representative. They argue that more liberal legislators receive more utility in speeches from citing more liberal think tanks (presumably because such think tanks highlight evidence that supports the liberal legislator's preferred legislative goals) than such a legislator would get from citing a conservative think tanks. This will lead liberal (conservative) legislators to cite liberal (conservative) think tanks more often. This allows Groseclose and Milyo to associate the relative number of cites to 200 think tanks with the legislative rankings of those legislators generated by the Americans for Democratic Action, a liberal lobbying group that scores legislators on their liberalism based on their legislative votes.

For the period January 1993 through December 2002 Groseclose and Milyo also collected information on the citations of 24 media outlets including newspapers, magazines, network newscasts and cable news channels for those the same think tanks. They specifically exclude editorial content, which expresses the view of the publisher and is by definition biased. They also exclude any citations in the news portions of the content that attaches an ideological label to the think tank.

They argue that the attachment of such a label undermines the implication that the think tank is a disinterested expert.²⁴ They use the information on citations to various think tanks by these news outlets to impute ADA scores to each of the media outlets. These scores are compared to the ADA score of the median legislator. Any news media with a score higher than the score of the median legislator is liberal.

Based on this methodology, they find that all media sources, with exception of Fox News and The Washington Times, are more liberal than the median legislator. They conclude on this basis that the news content of the media in general has a liberal bias. However, they do note that some of these sources, including Good Morning America, CNN Newsnight with Aaron Brown and Newshour with Jim Lehrer, while having imputed ADA scores that placed them in the liberal range, did have scores that suggested they were fairly close to the median legislator.

III. Methodology

Like the Groseclose and Milyo described above, this paper examines media mentions of think tanks in news articles. However, it relies on a different data set and examines the phenomena that Groseclose and Milyo specifically omitted from their study; the rate at which reporters and editors attach ideological labels or frames to specific think tanks. As noted previously, Groseclose and Milyo excluded these references from their data because they believed that the attachment of such labels suggests that the think tank is not a disinterested expert and its conclusions may not necessarily be taken at face value.²⁵

By not analyzing the decision to attach labels to think tanks, Groseclose and Milyo essentially threw out relevant evidence on the question of media bias. The decision to

²⁴ Groseclose and Milyo (2005), p. 1198.

²⁵ Groseclose and Milyo (2005), p. 1198.

attach an ideological to a think tank when reporting a controversy, in which multiple perspectives on a story must be reported, allows the reporter to frame one perspective as driven by an ideological/partisan agenda rather than the conclusion of a neutral or disinterested study. Bias among reporters or editors could be reflected in how stories are framed in this manner.²⁶ This would result in think tanks associated with particular ideologies, not shared by the newspaper, being identified by an ideological label in news articles more often than those think tanks whose perspective more closely conforms to that of the reporter/editor or newspaper.²⁷

The decision to use framing is not criticized. Indeed, using such signals to convey information and ideas is simply a mode of communication and can properly be used to enhance the comprehension of the target audience.²⁸ The issue examined is how the media chooses to frame the reliability of various think tanks and whether the framing indicates a bias in favor of a particular view or ideology.

A. Content Analysis is a Commonly Used Mode of Analysis

The analysis of news content to determine how the media choose to frame issues is considered a valid research technique across a number of fields, including speech communications, legal studies and, more recently, economics. For instance in the speech communications literature, Groshek examines the differences in the content on the CNN web site (intended for U.S. audiences) and the CNN International site (intended for non-U.S. audiences) to determine whether the two web sites frame issues differently for different audience. He finds that while the international web site covered more topic areas and had a less U.S.-oriented focus, there was not much difference in how they framed issues.²⁹

Kuypers examines how the media framed the major speeches of President George W. Bush regarding the various elements of the War on Terror. He compared the content of those speeches to the content the media choose to emphasize when reporting on those speeches. Through word choice and framing analysis, Kuypers (2006) identified the main theme of five of President Bush's speeches relating to the War on Terror. These themes were compared to the themes emphasized in the coverage of those speeches. He concludes that the media failed to objectively report on the contents of those speeches. The divergence between the content of those speeches and what the media reported as their content increased over time.³⁰

 $^{^{26}}$ This is not to suggest that bias in the framing of think tanks is the only or the only important manifestation of bias. This is simply one that can be measured and used in empirical testing.

²⁷ See Kuypers, Jim A., <u>Bush's War: Media Bias and Justifications for War in a Terrorist Age</u>. (Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham MA, 2006), p. 14 for a discussion of how word choice, in particular, labels in news articles reflects the presence of a particular frame.

 ²⁸ Fairhurst, Gail T. and Sarr, Robert A., The Art of Framing, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco CA, 1996.

²⁹ Groshek, Jacob, "Homogeneous Agendas, Disparate Frames: CNN and CNN International Coverage Online," Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media. Volume 52, Number 1, March 2008. Pages 52 – 68.

³⁰ See Kuypers (2006), chapters 1 and 8

In the field of legal studies, framing and content analysis is used to examine how news coverage may stereotype participants in the legal system and affect the resolution of legal claims of various types. For instance, Entmann and Gross examine the media coverage in the Duke University lacrosse/rape case to determine whether it was slanted in favor of the accuser or the defendants.³¹ Entmann and Gross examine the news articles on the case for prejudicial terms regarding the defendants and the woman who claimed she was raped. They found that the coverage had a pro-prosecution slant throughout most of the early coverage. This positive coverage continued even after public presentation of DNA evidence strongly suggested that the lacrosse players were innocent. It was only much later in the process that the coverage shifted to present a frame that suggested the players were innocent.³²

Content analysis is also used in economics. Three of the economics articles mentioned above use some form of content analysis to assess media bias. Letellier uses 1000 two and three-word phrases classified as either "right leaning" or "left leaning" to assess the relative bias of 433 local and regional newspapers in creating his media bias variable.³³ Gentzcow and Shapiro combined Letellier's use of particular two- and third-word phrases with Groseclose and Milyo's ideological scoring or media outlets methodology to develop an index for the relative ideological ranking of newspapers.³⁴ Lott and Hassett examine the headlines of newspapers related to the release of information about four data series related to the performance of the economy; durable goods, Gross Domestic Product, retail sales and unemployment. Based on predetermined criteria, these headlines are classified by research assistants as positive, neutral or negative. The resulting classifications are used in a regression analysis to estimate the amount and direction of media bias.³⁵ Finally, Groseclose and Milyo used the frequency of references to various think tanks to assess the bias of various media outlets.

B. Data Collection and Classification

As noted above, the empirical tests in this paper rely on the Groseclose and Milyo observation that the application of ideological labels (or frames) to the identification of a think tank is a form of media bias as a starting point. To be clear, there is no claim that the use of ideological labels are never appropriate in the context of a story or that any particular instance of the application of an ideological label is evidence of bias. Given that ideological framing of a think tank in a story may sometimes be appropriate, a reporter or editor will use individual judgment to determine when such labels are warranted. It is assumed that a biased reporter or editor (or one working for a biased

³¹ The Duke lacrosse/rape case relates to allegations by an exotic dancer that members of the Duke lacrosse team raped her. These allegations generated a massive amount of media coverage and were eventually shown to be fraudulent, resulting in sanctions on the district attorney who pursued the case.

³² Entman, Robert M. and Gross, Kimberly A., "Race to Judgement: Stereotyping Media and Criminal Defendants," Law and Contemporary Problems. Autumn 2008. Volume 71, Pages 93 –133.

³³ Letellier (2008), p.9.

³⁴ Gentzkow, Matthew and Shapiro, Jesse, (2010).

³⁵ Lott and Hassett (2004), p. 9 – 11, 33 – 35.

publication) would be more likely to judge that an ideological label is appropriate for those think tanks whose conclusions they disagree with. It does not matter whether the reporter or editor makes a conscious decision to use an ideological label for the purposes of framing or biasing the news.

A key assumption of this analysis is that framing through the attachment of ideological labels to think tanks is not objectively more appropriate for think tanks of any particular ideology. Perfectly objective reporting would mean that the underlying ideology of a think tank would have no effect on the rate at which ideological frames are used. This suggests the test for bias used in this paper. Bias against a particular ideological perspective is said to exist if reporters (and editors) conclude that ideological labels are appropriate for think tanks of that ideological perspective at greater rates than other ideological perspectives.³⁶

1. Selection of Publications

This question is answered by analyzing the content of the six large daily newspapers (The Los Angeles Times, The New York Times, USA Today, The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Post, and The Washington Times) selected on the basis of their inclusion in the Groseclose and Milyo study.³⁷ All of these papers have national reach and provide much of the original reporting for national political news. In addition, The Associated Press Newswires is also included as they provide much of the national political coverage to regional and local papers throughout the country.³⁸

The content of these seven publications are contained in three different databases. The Associated Press Newswires, The Los Angeles Times, The New York Times, USA Today and The Washington Times were found in a West Corporation's database called Westnews. The Washington Post content was accessed through Lexus/Nexus. The Wall Street Journal (Eastern Edition) was accessed through ProQuest. Each of these databases requires the use of different syntaxes for queries.

2. Selection of Think Tanks

 $^{^{36}}$ Groseclose and Milyo (p. 1204 – 1207) and others distinguish between slanting coverage and bias. They define slanting as deliberately choosing a viewpoint orientation for the story regardless of the underlying facts. Bias is considered to be more of a subconscious reflection of the media's general ideological orientation without a deliberate decision to present a story from anything but a neutral or objective viewpoint. This paper cannot distinguish between these possibilities. For the sake of argument (and because the author is married to a journalist), it is assumed that reporters generally engage in good faith when reporting stories and any evidence of a particular ideological orientation is due to subconscious bias rather than a decision to deliberately slant the reporting to favor a particular viewpoint. Even if the decision to attach labels is made less purposefully and a subconscious reaction to the conclusions of differing think-tanks, they still represent the bias animating the perspective of the reporter and *still* has the framing effect discussed above.

³⁷ Groseclose and Milyo, p. 1212 (Table III).

³⁸ Even though the Associated Press is a wire service, it will be referred to as a publication throughout the rest of a paper to simplify the language.

Because the data collection methods are time consuming, the study was limited to only twelve think tanks. These think tanks were identified by FAIR as the twelve most popular think tanks ranked by citations in the U.S. print and broadcast media in 2007.³⁹ In the order of their popularity, these think tanks are The Brookings Institution, The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), The American Enterprise Institute (AEI), The Heritage Foundation, The Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), RAND Corporation, The Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF), The Center for American Progress (CAP), CATO Institute, The Urban Institute, Hoover Institution and The Manhattan Institute. The Council on Foreign Relations and The Center for Strategic and International Studies focus solely on foreign policy issues. The Kaiser Family Foundation focuses primarily on health care. The nine other think tanks do research, produce reports, and comment on a broad range of domestic and foreign policy issues.⁴⁰

This paper uses the results from Groseclose and Milyo to classify ten of the twelve think tanks' political orientations.⁴¹ Of those think tanks that can be classified on the basis of the results from Groseclose and Milyo, six are on the right and four are on the left. The American Enterprise Institute, The Center for Strategic and International Studies, CATO Institute, The Heritage Foundation, Hoover Institution, and the Manhattan Institute are classified in the Groseclose and Milyo scale as being on the political right, although CATO Institute tends to classify itself as libertarian.⁴²

The Brookings Institution, The Council on Foreign Relations, RAND Corporation and The Urban Institute are placed on the political left by Groseclose and Milyo. The Kaiser Family Foundation and The Center for American Progress are not mentioned in Groseclose and Milyo. The Center for American Progress did not exist at the time of the Groseclose and Milyo study but has billed itself as a 'progressive' think tank so it is appropriate to place on the political left.⁴³ Because of its narrow focus on health care issues, the empirical results related to The Kaiser Family Foundation are only discussed in a cursory fashion there was no attempt to assess its ideological leanings.⁴⁴

3. Selection of Framing Terms

The selection of framing terms was more difficult. The choice of relevant ideological labels seems to be affected by ideology. For instance, in the classification of the ideology of think tanks, FAIR does not seem to think the term 'liberal' as a contemporary political

³⁹ FAIR, "The Incredible Shrinking Think Tank," March/April 2008.

http:www.fair.org/index.php?page=3322&printerfriendly=1

⁴⁰ The Kaiser Family Foundation started providing policy related information to journalists in 1993 and does not appear in the first time period in Table 3 below. Similarly, The Center for American Progress was established in 2003 only appears in the last time period listed in Table 3.

⁴¹ Groseclose and Milyo (2005) p. 1201 – 02 (Table 1).

⁴² <u>http://www.cato.org/about.php</u>. "The Jeffersonian philosophy that animates CATO's work has increasingly come to be called 'libertarianism' or 'market liberalism.' "

⁴³ <u>http://www.americanprogress.org/aboutus/</u>.

⁴⁴ However, in the FAIR study mention previously it was classified as "centrist," which probably means it is on the left like the other think tanks, such as Brookings Institution, RAND Corporation and Council on Foreign Relations, FAIR labeled as "centrist."

description exists. Because of the use of Americans for Democratic Action scores to assess ideology, Groseclose and Milyo define ideology on a single right-left axis. Other sources use a similar right-left axis or choose to exclude potentially relevant descriptors like "libertarian." As result and in the interest of being as comprehensive as possible, a list has been created of terms that seem to be used in common parlance. These terms also appeared in some of the test searches done on the newspaper content databases.⁴⁵ The ideological descriptors included in this study are left, liberal, centrist, moderate, conservative, right, libertarian and free market. Two additional terms that describe the legal status of a think tank; non-partisan and non-profit were also included.⁴⁶ These frames are often used by the think tanks, or their members, to describe themselves.⁴⁷ Given how they are generally used, both of these terms appear to represent positive frames as they reinforce the neutrality or objectivity of the think tank.

4. Determining the Relevant Time Frames for the Analysis

Groseclose and Milyo noted that their paper was criticized for limiting the period of their study to one in which the same party dominated Congress.⁴⁸ In order to avoid this potential criticism, the study examines five different time periods. These are the first two years of George H. W. Bush's presidency, and the first two years of each term of Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush. This allowed the test to be conducted under a variety of political configurations, allowing for the possibility that the relevancy of the ideological orientation of a think tank would change depending on which political party controls the Presidency and Congress.

Table 1 - Sample Periods

			-		
	BUSH I	CLINTON I	CLINTON II	BUSH II	BUSH III
START	1/1/1989	1/1/1993	1/1/1997	1/1/2001	1/1/2005
END	12/31/1990	12/31/1994	12/31/1998	12/31/2002	12/31/2006
PRESIDENT	Republican	Democrat	Democrat	Republican	Republican
CONGRESS	Democrat	Democrat	Republican	Mixed	Republican

There are two periods in which there was unified partisan control of the political branches of the government, one Democrat and one Republican. There were also two periods of divided government, one in which the President was a Democrat and one in which the President was a Republican. Finally, there is George W. Bush's first term. The President was a Republican. Congress began the term under control of the Republicans but Senator James Jefford's decision in May 2005 to leave the Republican caucus led to Democrat control of the Senate for the remainder of the term.

⁴⁵ All test searches were done for time periods not included in this study. See Table 1 below.

⁴⁶ The use (or lack) of hyphens in the terms "free market," "non-partisan," and "non-profit" did not affect the search results. The search engines would automatically include both the hyphenated and non-hyphenated version of the terms.

⁴⁷ As it turns out, these last two terms are rarely used in news content. They appear more often in editorials when identifying a think tank as an information source or in an op-ed's author's biographical information. ⁴⁸ Groseclose and Milyo (2005), p. 1223.

5. Restricting the Analysis to Only News Content

As with Groseclose and Milyo, the data was filtered to eliminate everything that was not news coverage.⁴⁹ This meant that editorials, opinion columns, letters to the editor and other content (TV listings for example) that do not qualify as news reporting was excluded from the analysis. However all of the databases relied on the content classification systems used by the newspapers. These classification systems were not stable over time.⁵⁰ For some databases and some news sources this meant excluding certain content classifications (op-eds, editorials, letters, etc.). In other cases, it meant only including certain classifications (news). This filtering process to exclude editorial and other "non-news" content resulted in the exclusion of up to half of the references to the think tanks in those publications.

6. Constructing the Search Terms⁵¹

Identifying the number of articles that reference each think tank merely required searching for the quoted "name" of the think tank that appeared in the content of the article. If "name of the think tank" or any other search term only appeared in the "tags" it was excluded from the search results by the search algorithm. In some cases, such as when searching for the Hoover Institution, the think tank had to be searched under the multiple names (i.e. both "Hoover Institution" and "Hoover Institute"). These searches produced the number of news articles in which each think tank was cited in the newspaper during the relevant time period. The search program for each of the databases had a mechanism for eliminating duplicate articles in a single search and such duplicates were eliminated.⁵² The search for each think tank was done individually. Articles that reference two or more think tanks are counted as a separate observation for each think tank referenced. However, if a particular think-tank's name appears in an article multiple times, that article would count as one observation.

It would have been impossible to review each of the more than 25,000 articles found in the searches described above to determine which ideological frames were used to describe the various think tanks. Instead, the search program was used to determine the number of times a think tank was associated with a particular frame. Searches for various sample periods were run in which both the think tank's name and the relevant adjective appeared in the same article, in the same paragraph or in the same sentence.⁵³ These articles were then reviewed to determine whether the searches had superfluous hits or excluded relevant hits.

⁴⁹ Groseclose and Milyo (2005), p. 1192, 1199.

⁵⁰ For instance, The Washington Post completely changed its classification system in the late 1990's (in the middle of one of the two year periods in which data was not collected).

⁵¹ Appendix A has a step-by-step procedure on how the data was generated. The entire set of results would take fifty journal pages to print and is available to interested readers in a PDF file.

⁵² A duplicate citation might occur when an article was updated multiple times, included in multiple publications or included a correction. The largest impact was on the citation count for The Associated Press.

⁵³ The test searches were done for the years that were excluded from the study. See Table 1 above.

Quite often the think tanks are used in news content because there is some partisan or ideological divide with respect to the issue being discussed. This meant that searches looking for both the name of a think tank and an ideological descriptor appearing in the same *article* produced a huge number of superfluous hits. By contrast, limiting the searches to the same *sentence* of text would exclude relevant hits as the database search engines would sometimes treat a comma as a period and exclude relevant hits such as a sentence that says something like "…according to the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank…".

Expanding the search to generate a hit only when the two relevant terms appeared in the same *paragraph* seemed to catch all of the cases in which the adjective was used to describe the think-tank's orientation and generated relatively few superfluous hits. Indeed, paragraphs in news articles are generally short. Those containing a reference to a think tank would include the think-tank's statement or position, the name of the think tank and, in some cases, its ideological orientation.

Table 2 lists the seven publications examined in the study, the database through which the news content produced were accessed and a sample query. This query would return the number of articles in which the term "Heritage Foundation" appears in the same paragraph with "conservative" in the news content of the publications.^{54,55}

{Place Table 2 Here}

With the limitations described above, the data used in this study was generated by an automated search of the news content of each of seven publications for the names of each of the 12 think tanks. This generated a base number of references to that think tank by that publication in each period. If the think tank was referenced fewer than ten times in that publication in any period, no further searches were done for that think tank for that period. Additional searches of the database were done to find the number of articles in which each of the ten ideological labels appeared in the same paragraph with the name of that think tank. For instance, between January 1, 2005 and December 31, 2006, the Brookings Institution appeared in 251 articles in the news content of the New York Times. In 19 of those articles, the term "liberal" appeared in the same paragraph as the name "Brookings Institution."

In the discussion of the empirical results below, aggregated results across newspapers, think tanks and time periods are presented in order to give the reader an understanding of why more detailed results for those think tanks and framing terms are not being presented.

⁵⁴ If that think-tank's name is included in the article multiple times and that name appears in the same paragraph with one of the ideological identifiers at least once, that article will be counted as one observation, no matter how many additional times that think-tank's name appears with (or without) that identifier in the article.

⁵⁵ The Proquest [Wall Street Journal (Eastern Edition)] database uses check boxes to limit the search to only news content. As a result the search phrases used with the Wall Street Journal appear in Table 2 to capture information broader than just news content but the searches were limited to only the news content.

IV. Empirical results

Tables 3 and 4 include the reference counts aggregated across all of the newspapers included in this study. Although articles may be categorized differently for the different newspapers and may not be perfectly comparable, much of the individual newspaper level data is substantively the same with regard to certain think tanks and framing terms. With the understanding that the disaggregated data imply the same thing as the aggregated data in the discussion of Tables 3 and 4, some results will be presented only in aggregated form. The purpose of the analysis contained in Tables 3 and 4 is to explain why the main analysis only focuses on three framing terms and nine think tanks. The primary publication-level results most relevant to answering the questions related to media bias are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

A. Table 3 – Excluding Specialist Think Tanks

Table 3 presents the results from the entire dataset aggregated across all periods and publications. It shows the overall rate at which each think tank was associated with each ideological frame. The bottom line gives the total number of references to that think tank in the news content across all publications considered. In each cell, the percentage of references to that think tank that were associated with that ideological frame is given. The number in parenthesis gives the total number of references with that ideological frame is given. All other tables in this paper use this format.

The Kaiser Family Foundation, which specializes in health care issues, is rarely associated with ideological labels. Indeed as seen in Table 3, it is most often associated with the description of its legal status, "non-profit." The Kaiser Family Foundation will be excluded from further analysis because of its narrow policy focus and lack of an association with any particular ideology or framing term.

{Insert Table 3 Here}

The two think tanks that specialize in foreign policy (Council on Foreign Relations and Center for Strategic and International Studies) are rarely associated with ideological labels. The term most commonly associated term with both think tanks is "right." It occurs, at most, in four percent of the references to either think tank. It is unlikely that this term is an ideological descriptor of either think tank. Rather the term is likely to be referencing political or economic rights. A review of searches of excluded time periods suggests that the lack of ideological labels of both think tanks may occur because many of the stories are quoting a particular individual from the think tank. The description of that individual often includes the administration for which that individual worked. Perhaps this was sufficient framing. Regardless, like the Kaiser Family Foundation, these two think tanks will also be omitted from the more detailed discussion below, as a finer grained analysis of the references is not substantially different from the discussion above.

B. Tables 4 – Narrowing the Analysis to Three Ideological Labels.

Tables 4A and 4B present the same data as Table 3, aggregated over all of the news sources but separately for each of the five time periods. It excludes the three think tanks discussed above. The results at this level of analysis suggest that there are a number of terms that simply are not associated with any particular think tank in any substantial proportion of the references to that think tank.

{Insert Tables 4}

The terms "right" and "left" generate white noise. They have too many uses in political contexts. Besides describing a political orientation, the term "right" also applies to something individuals ought to have an inherent expectation to and appeared quite often in that context. The term "left" also had multiple meanings, especially as an adverb, used to describe, "left behind," "left out," or "left field."

As Table 4A suggests, the term "right" appears somewhat more often in association with the names of conservative/libertarian think tanks, ranging from three to five percent of references, than occurs with liberal think tanks, ranging from one to three percent. This difference is not substantial enough to draw any firm conclusions about the use of the term "right" as an ideological frame.

A similar pattern holds with the term "left," with all think tanks associated with that term from one to three percent of the time. A more disaggregated analysis by publication generally produces similar results. The differences are not substantial enough to draw any conclusions about the differential use of these terms as ideological frames.

Similarly, the generally positive or neutral terms ("centrist," "moderate," "non-profit" and "non-partisan") in Table 4B are typically not associated with the any of the think tanks in more than two percent of the references. The only exception was the Urban Institute, where it was associated with the term "non partisan" in approximately seven percent of its references over the two terms of President George W. Bush's administrations. The differences across think tanks are simply not substantial enough to draw any strong conclusions regarding the use of these terms for framing purposes.

The term "free market" was not associated strongly enough with any of the think tanks to draw any firm conclusions regarding its use as a framing device. As can be seen in Table 4A, other than the CATO Institute, most think tanks were associated with this term less than one percent of the time. CATO is associated with term "free market" approximately five percent of the time. Because of the relatively low usage of this term and the variability across publications in its use with CATO and other think tanks, it is difficult to establish that there are substantial differences in these rates across think tanks. As a result, the term "free market" is excluded from the detailed discussion of results below.

Only three framing terms in Table 4A, "conservative," "liberal," and "libertarian," are strongly associated with any think tank. The term "libertarian" is only associated with the CATO Institute and rarely appears in conjunction with any of the other eight think tanks.

The four conservative think tanks with a broad policy focus (American Enterprise Institute, Heritage Foundation, Hoover Institute, and Manhattan Institute) are, at least at times, associated with the "conservative" frame. Depending on the think tank and the year, they are associated with the term "conservative" in fourteen to fifty percent of the articles referencing them. Interestingly, the libertarian-oriented CATO Institute is also associated with the term "conservative" in a substantial percentage of references. That proportion decreases to approximately ten percentage points over time. The libertarian frame could have been displacing the conservative frame over time as journalists begin to perceive policy differences between conservatives and libertarians.⁵⁶

Among conservative think tanks, there seems to be fairly consistent differences in the association of the framing term "conservative" with a think tank. The strongest association is with the Heritage Foundation. Depending on the period, Heritage is associated with the term "conservative" in thirty-four to fifty percent of the news articles that reference it. By contrast Hoover Institution is associated with the term "conservative" in the articles it is cited, a percentage that may be constant or declining slightly over time. The American Enterprise Institute is associated with the term "conservative" in fourteen to twenty-six percent of the articles it is cited in.

Of the liberal think tanks, The Center for American Progress has the most substantial association with the term "liberal" appearing in approximately half of the articles that refer to it. None of the other think tanks – liberal, conservative, or libertarian – are associated with the "liberal" term more than six percent of the time. The four conservative think tanks were associated with the term "liberal" in one to four percent of their mentions in the news content. Other than the anomalous Center for American Progress mentioned above, the media's citation pattern using the term "liberal" with regard to the other liberal think tanks is almost the same as it is with regard to the conservative think tanks.

Because the only frames that are strongly associated with any of the think tanks are 'conservative,' 'liberal,' and 'libertarian,' the analysis below will only focus on these three frames. The other seven terms appear to generate only a low percentage of matches, consistent with these terms not being an important element in framing the objectivity of the think-tank's analysis.

C. Table 5 – Empirical Results

⁵⁶ A casual reading of some of the articles suggests that journalists became more broadly aware of these differences in the aftermath of the 911 attacks, where conservative and libertarian think tanks took broadly different stances on the proper foreign policy and domestic security responses to those attacks.

As noted above, the decision to attach an ideological label to a think tank frames that think tank in that particular reference as being less than an objective source of information. This applies to any ideological label, even an incorrect one. Table 5 below contains each think tank and the frequency of the ideological frame most often associated with that think tank for all of the publications in each of the periods examined. To aid the reader in understanding which ideological frame was most frequent for each think tank, the type face is standard if the frame was "liberal,' bolded if the frame was 'conservative' and italicized if the frame was 'libertarian.'

[Insert Table 5 Here]

The results illustrated in Table 5 are striking. The think tanks that are generally thought to be on the 'right' are consistently associated with an ideological frame with that frame being either 'conservative' or 'libertarian.' Depending on the think tank and the period these think tanks are associated with an ideological frame in twelve to fifty percent of the references made to them. Heritage Foundation, Manhattan Institute and CATO Institute show the highest propensity to be associated with an ideological frame, generally being associated with one in thirty to forty percent of the references to these think tanks.

This stands in stark contrast with the think tanks generally associated with the left. Only The Center for American Progress is associated with an ideological frame, with fortyseven percent of the references to that think tank in the one period in which it appears. The other three think tanks are associated with any of these three ideological frames in no more than five percent of the references to these think tanks.

These results suggest that these seven publications as a group are more likely to associate think tanks on the right with an ideological frame than they do with think tanks on the left. If the media were unbiased, one would expect similar patterns of the usage of ideological frames across both liberal and conservative (or libertarian) think tanks. The difference in the usage of ideological frames suggests a media bias generally in favor of the left or liberal side of the political spectrum.⁵⁷ In the next section, a publication-level analysis supports these conclusions and suggests that the source of this bias is due to reporter/editor preferences.

D. Detailed Results

⁵⁷ Statistical tests for a difference in proportions show that in the first four periods the proportion of references to any right-leaning think tank being associated with a framing term is significantly greater than the proportion of left-leaning think tanks being associated with a framing term. These results hold generally at either the five or one percent significance level. As illustrated in Appendix B, in the last period, these results also hold with regard to all of the liberal think tanks except The Center for American Progress. There is no statistically significant difference with regards to the Heritage Foundation and the Manhattan Institute. Otherwise, The Center for American Progress is statistically significantly more likely to be associated with a framing term.

The examination of the results broken down by publication, given in Tables 6A through 6G, shows that even at the individual newspaper level, this pattern is roughly the same.⁵⁸ Surprisingly, even the The Washington Times, which is a self-proclaimed conservative newspaper, has the same, though less pronounced, tendencies. The rough similarity of the results for the conservative The Washington Times to the other publications suggests that the cause of the bias is a factor that is common to all of the publications; it is the preferences of the reporters/editors rather then the preferences of either the publishers or the readers.

All of the data in Tables 6 represent the entire population of news articles for these seven publications. As a result the calculated proportions represent the population proportion rather than an estimated proportion based on only a sample of the relevant population. Test for statistical significance are not relevant. All results and all differences are statistically significant. However, it is possible to posit a random process that selects stories, think tanks and/or framing descriptors for those stories. The data discussed in this paper under those circumstances would be a random selection of combinations of think-tank names and framing words among an infinitely large set. The results presented in Tables 6 would then represent the sample proportions from a random process. The differences discussed between the various proportions in Tables 6 are still statistically significant. In Appendix B, several tables showing these tests for the second term of the President George W. Bush will be presented for the curious.

{Insert Tables 6A through 6G here}

As with the results presented in Table 5, even at the individual publication level, The Center for American Progress is unique among the liberal think tanks as being consistently associated with the frame "liberal." This occurs at a rate ranging between thirty-five and sixty-four percent. The Associated Press (Table 6A) has the highest tendency at sixty-seven percent, with 47 of the 64 articles that reference that think tank including the 'liberal' frame. The Los Angeles Times (Table 6B) is the next largest, associating the Center for American Progress with the term "liberal" in fifty-six percent of its 32 citations. The Wall Street Journal (Table 6E) only cites the Center for American Progress ten times but associates it with the term "liberal" in half of those references. The Washington Times (Table 6G), and The Washington Post (Table 6F) associates it with the term "liberal" at about the same rate, forty-one and thirty-nine percent respectively, with The Washington Post referencing the Center for American Progress about two and a half times as often.

The Brookings Institution is the most cited liberal think tank. For four of these newspapers (The Associated Press, The Los Angeles Times, The New York Times and the The Washington Post), Brookings was mentioned in more than 200 articles in each period. The Urban Institute was generally the third most referenced of these think tanks, with approximately one-tenth to one-fourth as many citations as Brookings. The RAND

⁵⁸ Except in periods in which none of these frames are used, the results for the most frequent framing term for each think tank in each period are in bold. If two terms have the same number of references for a particular think tank in a particular period both references are bolded.

Corporation was generally garnered the second most number of mentions. With USA Today (Table 6D) and The Washington Post, RAND was mentioned at about the same or lower rate than the Urban Institute. The pattern in which these three liberal think tanks (RAND Corporation, Brookings Institution and the Urban Institute) are associated with the term "liberal" or any of the other ideological frames is fairly consistent across all of the publications.

Brookings Institution is associated with the term "liberal" a greater percentage of the time than either RAND Corporation or the Urban Institute. The highest percentage of any publication in any period occurs in the Associated Press during the first Bush presidency, where Brookings was associated with the term "liberal" in one-eighth (12.5 percent) of the articles it is mentioned. Otherwise the Associated Press never associated Brookings with the term "liberal" in more than seven percent of the articles mentioning Brookings. This is similar to the pattern for most other publications. The other publications typically associate Brookings with the term "liberal" in less than six percent of its mentions. ⁵⁹ More generally though, Brookings was associated with the term "liberal" less than two percent of the times it was mentioned.

The RAND Corporation is almost never associated with any ideological frame, including "liberal" in any publication. Indeed, it appears to be associated with a "conservative" frame more than any other, but the rates are low enough that it may reflect something other than actual descriptions of the think-tank's ideology. This could occur for a number of reasons including its former association with the U.S. military or its generally more conservative take on foreign and military policy as discussed by Groseclose and Milyo.⁶⁰

The Urban Institute displays a slightly less stark but similar pattern. The percentage of articles in which it is associated with the term "liberal" is, with one exception, generally quite low. It only exceeds five percent in four periods across all publications and exceeds eight percent only once. In one period the Associated Press associates the term "liberal" with the Urban Institute in five (fourteen percent) of the thirty-six articles it references the Urban Institute. Regardless of some variability that is not visible at a more aggregated level, none of these publications show any sustained propensity to associate the Urban Institute with the "liberal" frame.

The most commonly referenced conservative think tank by most newspapers is the Heritage Foundation. Depending on the period and the newspaper, Heritage is associated with the term "conservative" in approximately thirty to eighty percent of its references. The two Washington papers are on the low end of these percentages. The Post tends to associate the term "conservative" with the Heritage Foundation in approximately thirty to forty percent of the articles in which the think tank is referenced. The Washington Times is less likely to do so, associating "conservative" with The Heritage Foundation in fifteen to twenty-two percent of references. Surprisingly though, it associates Heritage with the

⁵⁹ The two exceptions are The New York Times which associated Brookings with the term "liberal" in eight percent of its mentions in the second Bush term and USA Today which associated Brookings with the term "liberal" in nine percent of its mentions during the first Clinton administration.

⁶⁰ Groseclose and Milyo (2005), p. 1200.

term "conservative" at a greater rate than it associates the term "liberal" with three of the four liberal think tanks examined – Brookings Institution, RAND Corporation and Urban Institute. A similar pattern, at a lower association rate of fifteen to forty percent, occurs between the American Enterprise Institute and the term "conservative." As with the Heritage Foundation, the two Washington newspapers were less likely to associate these think tanks with the term "conservative" than the other publications examined.

The CATO Institute presents an interesting example of where the terms associated with a think tank change over time. During the earlier periods, especially the first Bush administration and the first term of the Clinton administration, CATO appears to have been more strongly associated in some of these publications (except the The New York Times and the The Washington Times) with the term "conservative" rather than "libertarian," its claimed affiliation. For instance, in the Associated Press Newswires CATO was associated with the term "conservative" more than thirty percent of the time in the first two periods but never more than eleven percent of the time in the later periods.

By contrast, CATO was associated with the term "libertarian" in ten and twenty-five percent of all articles in which it was mentioned in the early periods. This association jumped to thirty to sixty percent in the latter three periods. In any event, CATO Institute tended to be associated with an ideological frame of either "conservative" or "libertarian" in more than thirty to sixty percent of its references.⁶¹

There are fewer articles where The Manhattan Institute and the Hoover Institution are referenced. This causes a greater variation in percentage of articles in which either of these think tanks is associated with any frame including "conservative." However, neither think tank is associated with any other ideological frame in any substantial number of articles. There also appears to be a geographic pattern to the citations, where the The New York Times tends to cite The Manhattan Institute more than other outlets and the The Los Angeles Times tends to cite Hoover Institution more than other publications. Regardless of the number of references though, the Manhattan Institute is associated with the term "conservative" at rates similar to the Heritage Foundation. The Hoover Institution is more variable but appears to be associated with the term "conservative" at rates similar to the American Enterprise Institute.

D. Results by Publication Support Bias Inference.

⁶¹ There are several possible explanations for these changes. It is clear that across all of these publications, the number of times that the CATO Institute is mentioned is generally increasing over time. As a result, reporters/editors may be learning to more accurately place CATO within the ideological spectrum. Closely related to this, may be a change in the mix of newsworthy policy issues. With regard to many regulatory and tax policy issues, conservatives and libertarians have similar, but not identical, policy positions. These issues may have dominated political news during the earlier periods, making the distinction between conservative and libertarian less important and less apparent to casual political observers. However, as foreign policy issues became more important, the larger differences between conservatives and libertarians (or judged that difference was now worth noting) and a change in ideological frames occurred. Possibly because of these policy differences, the CATO Institute may have become more explicit in ideologically separating itself from the conservative think tanks and pushed to have a different ideological frame associated with itself in news articles.

Despite being collected across three different databases and reliance on seven or more different methods of content classification into news articles and other categories, the empirical results at the publication level are strongly consistent with the aggregate results presented in Table 5. These publications have a much greater propensity to associate conservative and libertarian think tanks with ideological frames than they do with liberal think tanks.

Three of the four conservative think tanks (excluding Hoover) are generally associated with the term "conservative" in twenty to fifty percent of the articles that cite them. The libertarian think tank – CATO Institute – is associated with either the term "conservative," or in later periods, "libertarian" in about twenty to forty percent of the articles in which it is mentioned. The less often referenced Hoover Institution is only associated with the term "conservative" in about one-sixth of the articles it is mentioned across all of these publications. However, this is still substantially more than occurs with the three of the four liberal think tanks.

There is only one liberal think tank, The Center for American Progress, which is consistently associated with the term "liberal."⁶² By contrast, the other three liberal think tanks are only rarely associated with any frame including "liberal." RAND is associated with "liberal" less than one percent of the time. Urban Institute is associated with "liberal" approximately two percent of the time. Finally, Brookings is associated with "liberal" in approximately three percent of the articles that reference it.

This is consistent with the implication of Table 5 above that there is some form of bias that causes these publications to allow that ideological labels or frames are generally more appropriate for conservative/libertarian think tanks than they are for liberal think tanks.

E. Implications about the Source of Bias.

The theoretical economics literature discussed above does not associate bias in the form of framing with any particular source; owner preferences, reporter/editor (employee) preferences, or consumer preferences. However, the possibly anomalous results with respect to The Washington Times may suggest a source. As noted in the discussion above, The Washington Times is generally more likely to associate conservative and libertarian think tanks with an ideological frame than liberal think tanks. However, that tendency to associate an ideological frame with conservative think tanks is less pronounced than other publications.⁶³ Because The Washington Times was explicitly created to be a conservative paper, ownership bias can be ruled out. The readership

⁶² It is unclear why the Center for American Progress is different from other liberal think-tanks in this regard, It may be because it is a relatively new think-tank or it is viewed by reporters and editors as significantly more liberal than the other three liberal think-tanks. ⁶³ See Appendix B for statistical tests of some of these differences.

profile of the Washington Times also suggests that the bias is not due to reader preferences.⁶⁴

However, the manifestation of bias examined in this paper is consistent with reporter/editor bias in conjunction with some type of principal-agent problem. Word choice is, in the first instance, at the control of the reporter and only subject to the direct supervision of the editor. Reporters generally have more control over word choice than other factors, such as what stories are covered or the resources dedicated to those stories. Consciously or not, word choices reflect the judgments of reporters with regard to the relevance of attaching an ideological frame to the mention of a think tank in a story. If the reporter believes that an ideological frame is more relevant for conservative think tanks than for liberal think tanks, that bias will be reflected in the newspapers content. Unless supervisors, such as publishers, are perfect monitors such bias will remain even if they try and partially succeed in efforts to eliminate such bias.⁶⁵

The Washington Times results are consistent with reporter bias affecting the news content. Despite the preference of the owner to create a publication that is conservative, some ideological framing of think tanks consistent with a liberal bias remains. This bias occurs despite, presumably, attempts by the owners and managers to rid the paper of the manifestations of liberal bias originating with its reporters and editors.

The cost of monitoring and eliminating such bias may be high enough that the preferences of the employees are reflected in the final product but not to the degree that might occur with other publications. In other publications where the publication's ideological orientation is a less important element of its identity, the benefits of eliminating bias may be perceived as less.

As a result the publication may tolerate more bias being incorporated into the final product by its employees, thus explaining why there is still some evidence of ideological framing of conservative think tanks in The Washington Times, even though it occurs at a lower rate than other publications in this study. These results are consistent with Baron's paper discussed above where bias due to the preferences of reporters/editors is more likely in competitive markets where costs have a substantial impact on price.⁶⁶

V. Conclusion.

Drawing any final conclusions in an area like media bias is difficult when both the subject and the issue turn somewhat on subjective issues. In order to analyze this difficult area, this paper has attempted to reduce that subjectivity by focusing on content that is repeated in publications a significant number of times rather than analyzing coverage of a few specific events. The ideological frames associated with more than

⁶⁴ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The Washington Times.

⁶⁵ This conclusion is not inconsistent with Gentzcow and Shapiro (2010) results attributing relative slant to customer preferences. These results could be consistent with an overall liberal bias where customer preferences constrain the degree of bias. ⁶⁶ Baron (2005), p. 29.

25,000 references to 12 different think tanks across seven different publications were examined. It was found that all publications, including the conservative Washington Times, had a much higher propensity to associate ideological frames with think tanks associated with the right or conservative side of the political spectrum. The belief that such frames are more appropriate for right-leaning think tanks than for left-leaning think tanks suggests a liberal bias. Indeed, two articles, a decade apart, by two different Washington Post Ombudsmen (reader advocates) suggest that a differential in the association of ideological labels with think tanks reflects bias and is inappropriate.⁶⁷ The similarity of these citation patterns across all publications including the conservative Washington Times suggests that the source of bias is reporter/editor (or employee) preferences rather than owner or customer preferences.

⁶⁷ See Overholser, Geneva, "Holes in the Coverage," Washington Post, December 10, 1995. Page C5. and Howell, Deborah, "The Sins of Leaving Something Unsaid," Washington Post, December 4, 2005. Page B6. Both addressed the issue that Heritage Foundation and the Brookings Institution were associated with ideological frames at different rates. The second expressed the view that the appropriate ideological label should be attached in all stories. The first suggested only that consistency across think tanks was appropriate.

Appendix A: Data Collection Methodology (Explaining Table 2)

In the main text above, the criteria for selecting the publications, framing terms, and periods examined were discussed. In this appendix, detailed information on how the search phrases were constructed is explained.

Table 2 above includes a list of publications, the services and databases searched for the content of that publications and a sample search phrase. As noted above, the publications were selected on the basis of their use in prior research in media bias. The services (i.e Westlaw, Lexus and Proquest) and databases were selected on the basis of availability and content contained.

The search phrase in the Westlaw searches consists of three parts: The first part is the terms searched for and their context, such as all instances of where "Heritage Foundation" appears in the same paragraph as the word "conservative;" the second part is the date of the publications searched; and the third part is the type of content such as news, editorial, letters to the editor, etc. Capitalization in the sample search phrase does not affect the results. The connectors in the search phrase are "and," "&" and "%." The first two connectors mean the same thing and require that an article meet both criteria to be counted. The final connector means "but not" and excludes all articles that meet those criteria following that symbol from the count. Finally, a check box was used to exclude all duplicate content.

The first part of the phrase contains the content terms. As shown in Table 2, it is of the form "te('think tank name' /p 'framing term')." The limiter "te" at the beginning of the search phrase instructs the search program to only search the content of the article and exclude from results any tags such as subject tags that do not appear in the article as published. The connector "/p" means "in the same paragraph as." The quotation marks require that the search engine only include an article in the final count if it appears in that order. The search engines used with these databases will automatically include plural forms. It will also include the non-hyphenated version of terms. For instance, searching for the term "non-profit" will also capture all the articles in which the word is written "nonprofit" or "non profit." When searching for the total number of articles that reference a think tank, the "/p 'framing term' "portion of the search query was omitted.

The think tanks were searched on their full names such as Brookings Institution, Heritage Foundation, CATO Institute, etc. Searching only on the first name of the think tank would generate a number of superfluous hits. The number depended on the institution. For instance, a search on "CATO" generated far fewer irrelevant hits than a search on "Heritage" or "Hoover."

One concern was that reporters would use the names of the think tanks incorrectly, especially when a think tank included "institute" or "institution" in its name. A large number of test searches were done to determine whether this was problematic. The only think tank where this generated the possibility of problems was The Hoover Institution

where it had been referred to as The Hoover Institute in up to one-fourth of all results. This meant the basic search phrase for The Hoover Institution differed slightly from all of the other search phrase and structured as "te(('Hoover Institution' 'Hoover Institute')/p 'framing term')." This search phrase results in the article being included in the sample if either the term "Hoover Institution" or the term "Hoover Institute" is in the same paragraph with the "framing term."

The dates to which the search is limited are given in the second part of the search term. For example the phrase "da(aft 1/1/2005 & bef 12/31/2006)," instructs the search engine to only search articles dated on or after January 1, 2005 and on or before December 31, 2006. This phrase is relatively simple. The term "da" instructs to the database search engine that the next term refers to a date. Everything in the parenthetical is included as part of the next term. "[A]ft," means "on or after" the given date. The term "bef" means "on or before" the given date.

The type of content excluded from the search is given in the next term. It is unclear why, but the Westnews database has two different fields in which a publication may classify content. The terms "pr" and "oi" are the names of these fields. The terms "letter," "oped" "op" "editorial" "commentary" and "opinion" all represent terms that the differing publications used to identify opinion articles rather than news articles. As noted above, the "%" instructs the database search engine to exclude all of the articles that fit in any of those classifications. These classifications were made by the publications for their internal purposes rather than as part of the database.

The Lexus database uses different search syntax. There are only two parts to the search. The first is the search terms and the second is the types of content searched. Drop down menus were used to limit the search to particular time periods and to limit the search to only the published content. The first search term indicating what terms should be used in the search is otherwise identical to what is done with the Westlaw database. The only difference is that the "w/p" instruction is used to indicate that only those articles where the two terms should be included in the same paragraph should be included in the search results.

The classification method used by The Washington Post changed sometime in 1995 or 1996. To isolate only news content all searches of The Washington Post content prior to 1995 required that the article classification (i.e. "type") be "News." This is represented by the term "and type (news)" in the search phrase. Starting in 1995 all articles where the subject of the articles was opinions, editorial or TV programming was excluded from the results. This is represented by the term "and not (subject(opinion) or subject(editorial) or subject('television programming'))."

The search of the ProQuest database for The Wall Street Journal articles was much simpler. Drop down menu boxes were used to limit the search to the appropriate publications (Wall Street Journal-Eastern Edition), the appropriate content and the appropriate time periods. As with the other searches, duplicate articles were eliminated from the search results. The only difference was in the syntax of the request where Westlaw used "/p," and Lexus used "w/p" to limit the results to where both search terms appeared in the same paragraph, ProQuest used "w/para."

Appendix B: Statistical Tests for Differences in Proportions

As argued above, all of the results in Tables 6 represent the entire population of relevant articles. This implies that a statistical test is not needed to determine whether there is a difference in the population proportions. However, it is possible to postulate that there is an infinite number of possible articles and the published articles represent a random sample of that universe. In those circumstances, the data collected for this paper represents one sample generated by a random process with a given proportion. Statistical tests for determining the difference in proportions would then be relevant.

The five tables below represent such tests for a number of differences between proportions discussed in this paper. All of them relate to the final period, the first two years of the second term of President George W. Bush. In each table, the estimated proportions for each think tank are given, the Z-value from a test for the difference in proportions⁶⁸ and whether the null hypothesis of identical proportions can be rejected in a two-tailed test at the five and ten percent significance levels. The relevant sample sizes may be found in Tables 6.

Table B1 contains the results from the tests of whether The Washington Times is more likely to associate The Center for American Progress with a liberal frame than other publications. If The Washington Times were to treat The Center for American Progress differently than other publications, it would suggest that its general conservative orientation affected its content. The tests show that the null hypothesis of no difference can only be rejected with regard to The Associated Press, and they have a higher propensity to associate The Center for American Progress with a liberal frame than The Washington Times.

				0		
	Wa	ashington Times ver	sus Other Publications			
	Proportion of A Framin	rticles Including g Term	Z-Score for Null of	Two Tailed Test For Difference in Proportions		
Comparison Publication	Washington Times	Comparison Pub.	No Difference in Proportions	Reject Null - 5%	Reject Null - 10%	
Associated Press	41.30%	67.19%	-2.77	Reject	Reject	
Los Angeles Times	41.30%	56.25%	-1.31	Not Reject	Not Reject	
New York Times	41.30%	42.86%	-0.14	Not Reject	Not Reject	
USA Today	41.30%	35.29%	0.44	Not Reject	Not Reject	
Wall Street Journal	41.30%	50.00%	-0.50	Not Reject	Not Reject	
Washington Post	41.30%	39.32%	0.23	Not Reject	Not Reject	

Table B1: Test for differences in use of liberal frame for Center for American Progress

Table B2 contains the results from the tests that the seven publications examined in this paper are differentially likely to associate The Heritage Foundation and The Center for American Progress with ideological frames. These two are the conservative and liberal

⁶⁸ Hogg, Robert V., and Tannis, Elliot A., <u>Probability and Statistical Inference</u>. Second Edition. (Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc. New York NY, 1983) Pages 341 – 42.

think tanks most likely to be associated with an ideological frame. The results indicate that there was no statistically significant difference between the treatments of these two think tanks in four publications. These publications are The Los Angeles Times, The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal and The Washington Post. Two publications, The Washington Times and The Associated Press, were more likely to associate The Center for American Progress with an ideological frame. One, USA Today, was more likely to associate The Heritage Foundation with an ideological frame.

	Table B2: Test for (w	ithin same pub.) diffe	rential use of framing ter	ms across think tank	S	
	Heritage Foundation	on (Conservative) ve	rsus Center for Americar	n Progress (Liberal)		
	Proportion of Fram	Articles Including ing Term	Z-Score for Null of	Two Tailed Test For Difference		
Publication	Heritage Found.	Center for Am. Prog.	No Difference in Proportions	Reject Null - 5%	Reject Null - 10%	
Associated Press	44.08%	67.19%	-3.32	Reject	Reject	
Los Angeles Times	s 68.55%	56.25%	1.27	Not Reject	Not Reject	
New York Times	53.75%	42.86%	1.16	Not Reject	Not Reject	
USA Today	73.91%	35.29%	3.14	Reject	Reject	
Wall Street Journa	l 65.79%	50.00%	0.90	Not Reject	Not Reject	
Washington Post	33.61%	39.32%	-1.05	Not Reject	Not Reject	
Washington Times	22.34%	41.30%	-2.42	Reject	Reject	

Table B3 shows the results from the statistical tests for each of these seven publications that they are differentially likely to associate the most cited conservative think tank (The Heritage Foundation) and the most cited liberal think tank (The Brookings Institution) with ideological frames. The results indicate that there was a statistically significant difference in the treatment of these two think tanks. The Heritage Foundation is more likely to be associated with an ideological frame. As noted in the text, the difference is striking with The Heritage Foundation ten times more likely to be associated with an ideological frame.

Table B3: Test for (within same pub.) differential use of framing terms across think tanks Heritage Foundation (Conservative) versus Brookings Institution (Liberal)

		(,	(,	
	Proportion of Fram	Articles Including	Z-Score for Null of	Two Tailed Te in Pro	st For Difference portions
Publication	Heritage Found.	Brookings Inst.	No Difference in Proportions	Reject Null - 5%	Reject Null - 10%
Associated Press	44.08%	6.54%	9.12	Reject	Reject
Los Angeles Times	68.55%	1.84%	15.51	Reject	Reject
New York Times	53.75%	7.57%	10.00	Reject	Reject
USA Today	73.91%	4.35%	16.05	Reject	Reject
Wall Street Journal	65.79%	3.92%	7.80	Reject	Reject
Washington Post	33.61%	2.42%	10.03	Reject	Reject
Washington Times	22.34%	2.15%	6.07	Reject	Reject

Table B4 contains the results from the statistical tests that these seven publications are differentially likely to associate The American Enterprise Institute and The Brookings Institution with ideological frames. This comparison is included because these two think tanks at one time collaborated to create the now defunct AEI-Brookings Joint Center on Regulatory Studies. This collaboration might suggest that these are the two most centrist of the right-oriented and left-oriented think tanks. While the results are not as stark as the

difference between The Heritage Foundation and The Brookings Institution, they still indicate that there was a statistically significant difference in the treatment of these two think tanks. The American Enterprise Institute is four to five times more likely to be associated with an ideological frame.

	Table B4: Test for (w	ithin same pub.) diffe	rential use of framing term	s across think tanks	6	
	American Enterpr	ise Institute (Conserv	vative) versus Brookings Ir	stitution (Liberal)		
	Proportion of Fram	Articles Including	Z-Score for Null of No Difference in	Two Tailed Test For Difference in Proportions		
Publication	Am. Ent. Inst.	Brookings Inst.	Proportions	Reject Null - 5%	Reject Null - 10%	
Associated Press	31.02%	6.54%	6.17	Reject	Reject	
Los Angeles Times	s 45.22%	1.84%	9.12	Reject	Reject	
New York Times	31.13%	7.57%	5.72	Reject	Reject	
USA Today	43.10%	4.35%	8.05	Reject	Reject	
Wall Street Journa	44.23%	3.92%	5.64	Reject	Reject	
Washington Post	11.36%	2.42%	4.36	Reject	Reject	
Washington Times	7.03%	2.15%	1.80	Not Reject	Reject	

Table B5 contains the results from the statistical tests that these seven publications are differentially likely to associate The American Enterprise Institute and The Urban Institute with ideological frames. These results indicate that there was a statistically significant difference in the treatment of these two think tanks. The American Enterprise Institute is significantly more likely to be associated with an ideological frame.

Table B5: Test for (within same pub.) differential use of framing terms across think tanks American Enterprise Institute (Conservative) versus Urban Institute (Liberal)

	American Enter										
	Proportion of A Framin	Articles Including	Z-Score for Null of No Difference in	Two Tailed Test For Difference in Proportions							
Publication	Am. Ent. Inst.	Urban Institute	Proportions	Reject Null - 5%	Reject Null - 10%						
Associated Press	31.02%	5.00%	4.30	Reject	Reject						
Los Angeles Times	45.22%	0.00%	9.74	Reject	Reject						
New York Times	31.13%	1.27%	7.52	Reject	Reject						
USA Today	43.10%	6.12%	6.45	Reject	Reject						
Wall Street Journal	44.23%	0.00%	6.42	Reject	Reject						
Washington Post	11.36%	0.00%	5.92	Reject	Reject						
Washington Times	7.03%	0.00%	3.11	Reject	Reject						

There is not enough space to repeat these tests for every comparison (or for every period) made in this paper. In most cases, where the sample size is large enough, substantial differences in the estimated proportions are also statistically significant. Using the formula for testing the difference in proportions, the maximum non-statistically significant difference between two proportions can be calculated based on the sample size. Interested readers can apply this to any differences in Tables 6 above. This test is one way. It can indicate that there is a statistically significant difference but a difference may still be statistically significant even if Table B6 suggests it is not.

Table B6: Maximum Difference in PorportionsFor Five Percent Significance Level Test

		Sample Size 1								
Sample Size 2	50	100	150	200	250	300	350			
50	19.60%	16.97%	16.00%	15.50%	15.18%	14.97%	14.82%			
100	16.97%	13.86%	12.65%	12.00%	11.60%	11.32%	11.11%			
150	16.00%	12.65%	11.32%	10.59%	10.12%	9.80%	9.56%			
200	15.50%	12.00%	10.59%	9.80%	9.30%	8.95%	8.69%			
250	15.18%	11.60%	10.12%	9.30%	8.77%	8.39%	8.12%			
300	14.97%	11.32%	9.80%	8.95%	8.39%	8.00%	7.71%			

Percentage represents maximum difference for less than five percent significance level

Bibiliography:

Anand, Bharat; Di Tella, Rafeal; and Galetovic, Alexander, "Information or Opinion? Media Bias as Product Differentiation," Journal of Economics and Management Strategy, Volume 16, Number 3 (Fall 2007) Pages 635 – 682.

Baron, David P., "Persistent Media Bias," Journal of Public Economics, Volume 90, (2005) Pages 1 – 36.

Besley, Timothy and Pratt, Andrea, "Handcuffs for the Grabbing Hand? Media Capture and Accountability," The American Economic Review, Volume 96, Number 3 (June 2006), Pages 721 – 736.

Churchill, Winston S., <u>Thoughts and Adventures</u> edited by James Muller, ISI books.

DellaVigna, Stefano, and Kaplan, Ethan., "The Fox News Effect: Media Bias and Voting," Quarterly Journal of Economics, August 2007, Pages 1187 – 1234.

Dolney, Michael, "The Incredible Shrinking Think Tank." <u>www.fair.org/index.php?page=3322&printer_friendly=1</u>, Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting. March/April 2008.

Djankov, Simeon; McLiesh, Caralee; Nenova, Tatiana; and Schleifer, Andrei, "Who Owns the Media," Journal of Law and Economics, Volume XLVI (October 2003) Pages 341 – 381.

Entman, Robert M. and Gross, Kimberly A., "Race to Judgement: Stereotyping Media and Criminal Defendants," Law and Contemporary Problems. Autumn 2008. Volume 71, Pages 93–133.

Fairhurst, Gail T. and Sarr, Robert A., The Art of Framing, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco CA, 1996.

Gentzkow, Matthew and Shapiro, Jesse, "Media Bias and Reputation" Journal of Political Economy. (2006) Vol. CXIV Pages 280 – 316.

Gentzkow, Matthew and Shapiro, Jesse, "Competition and Truth in the Market for News," Journal of Economic Perspectives. Volume 22. Number 2 (Spring 2008) Pages 133 – 154.

Gentzkow, Matthew and Shapiro, Jesse, "What Drives Media Slant? Evidence from U.S. Daily Newspapers," Econometrica . Volume 78. Number 1 (January, 2010) Pages 35 – 71.

Goff, Brian and Tollison, Robert., "Why is the Media so Liberal?" Journal of Public Finance and Public Choice, (1990) Pages 13-21.

Groseclose, Tim and Milyo, Jeffrey, "A Measure of Media Bias," Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. CXX, November 2005, Pages 1191 – 1237.

Groshek, Jacob, "Homogeneous Agendas, Disparate Frames: CNN and CNN International Coverage Online," Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media. Volume 52, Number 1, March 2008. Pages 52 – 68.

Hamilton James, <u>All the News That is Fit to Sell: How the Market Transforms</u> <u>Information into News.</u> (Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ, 2004)

Hogg, Robert V., and Tanis, Elliot A., <u>Probability and Statistical Inference</u>. Second Edition. (Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc. New York NY, 1983)

Howell, Deborah, "The Sins of Leaving Something Unsaid," Washington Post, December 4, 2005. Page B6.

Kuypers, Jim A., <u>Press Bias and Politics: How the Media Frame Controversial Issues</u>. (Preager Publishers, Inc., Westport CN, 2002)

Kuypers, Jim A., <u>Bush's War: Media Bias and Justifications for War in a Terrorist Age.</u> (Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham MA, 2006)

Leeson, Peter T., "Media Freedom, Political Knowledge and Participation," Journal of Economic Perspectives, Volume 22, Number 2, Spring 2008, Pages 155 – 169.

Letellier, Travis L., "From Media Control to Voting for President: Extending the Media Politics Theory," Manuscript, Florida International University. Fall 2008.

Lott, John R. Jr., and Hassett, Kevin A., "Is Newspaper Coverage of Economic Events Politically Biased?" Working Paper, American Enterprise Institute, October 2004.

Mullainathan, Sendhil and Shleifer, Andrei, "The Market for News," American Economic Review, Volume 95 (2005) 1031 – 1053.

Overholser, Geneva, "Holes in the Coverage," Washington Post, December 10, 1995. Page C5

Sutter, Daniel, "Can the Media Be So Liberal? The Economics of Media Bias," The CATO Journal, XX (2001) Page 431-451.

Sutter, Daniel, "Advertising and Political Bias in the Media: The Market for Criticism of the Market Economy," American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Volume 61 (July 2002) Page 725 – 745.

D 111	a •	D 1	
Publication	Service	Datebase	Sample Search Phrase
NY Times	Westlaw	NYT	TE("HERITAGE FOUNDATION" /P "CONSERVATIVE") & DA(AFT 1/1/2005 & BEF 12/31/2006) % OI(LETTER OP-ED " OP " EDITORIAL)
AP	Westlaw	APWIRES	TE("HERITAGE FOUNDATION" /P "conservative") & DA(AFT 1/1/2005 & BEF 12/31/2006) % OI(LETTER OP-ED " OP " EDITORIAL)
Washington Times	Westlaw	WATIMES	TE("HERITAGE FOUNDATION" /P "CONSERVATIVE") & DA(AFT 1/1/1989 & BEF 12/31/1990) % PR(LETTERS OPED COMMENTARY EDITORIALS)
USA TODAY	Westlaw	USATD	te("heritage foundation" /p "conservative") & da(aft 1/1/2005 & bef 12/31/2006) % oi(letter op-ed " op " editorial)
Los Angeles Times	Westlaw	LATIMES	te("heritage foundation" /p "conservative") & da(aft 1/1/2005 & bef 12/31/2006) % pr(opinion)
Washington Post	Lexus	Pre-1995	("Heritage Foundation" w/p "conservative") and type(NEWS)
Washington Post	Lexus	Post-1995	("Heritage Foundation" w/p "conservative") and not (subject(opinion) or subject(editorial) or subject("television programming"))
Wall Street Journal	ProQuest	WSJ - Eastern Edition	("Heritage Foundation" W/PARA "conservative")

Table 2: Data Sources and Search Queries

	American Enterprise Institute	Heritage Foundation	Hoover Institution	Manhattan Institute	CATO Institute	RAND Corporation	Brookings Institution	Center for American Progress	Urban Institute	Center for Strategic and International Studies	Council on Foreign Relations	Kaiser Family Foundation
Centrist	0.25% (9)	0.32% (14)	0% (0)	0.17% (1)	0.16% (3)	0.07% (2)	0.77% (56)	0.62% (2)	0.33% (5)	0.2% (6)	0.08% (2)	0.08% (1)
Conservative	19.15% (673)	42.37% (1837)	15.88% (154)	36.73% (220)	14.52% (271)	0.52% (14)	1.41% (102)	5.92% (19)	0.53% (8)	0.86% (26)	0.48% (12)	0.63% (8)
Free-Market	0.45% (16)	0.81% (35)	1.13% (11)	1.17% (7)	4.02% (75)	0.07% (2)	0.22% (16)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.07% (2)	0.12% (3)	0.08% (1)
Left	2.11% (74)	1.85% (80)	2.16% (21)	2.84% (17)	2.47% (46)	1.36% (37)	1.27% (92)	6.54% (21)	2.13% (32)	0.96% (29)	1.62% (41)	0.78% (10)
Liberal	1.94% (68)	2.65% (115)	2.37% (23)	2.5% (15)	1.88% (35)	0.07% (2)	3.02% (218)	47.35% (152)	2.07% (31)	0.1% (3)	0.55% (14)	0.08% (1)
Libertarian	0.60% (21)	0.67% (29)	0.62% (6)	0.83% (5)	33.6% (627)	0% (0)	0.07% (5)	0.31% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.04% (1)	0% (0)
Moderate	0.68% (24)	0.53% (23)	0.52% (5)	1.17% (7)	0.27% (5)	0.29% (8)	0.71% (51)	0% (0)	0.67% (10)	0.36% (11)	0.4% (10)	0.08% (1)
Non-Partisan	0.23% (8)	0.09% (4)	0% (0)	0.17% (1)	0.16% (3)	0.4% (11)	1.49% (108)	0.93% (3)	4.06% (61)	0.6% (18)	1.07% (27)	2.04% (26)
Non-Profit	0.17% (6)	0.99% (43)	0.41% (4)	1.67% (10)	0.21% (4)	2.28% (62)	0.64% (46)	0% (0)	2.53% (38)	0.4% (12)	0.44% (11)	8.77% (112)
Right	4.84% (170)	5.77% (250)	3.2% (31)	7.51% (45)	5.52% (103)	1.69% (46)	2.89% (209)	4.67% (15)	2.27% (34)	2.49% (75)	3.17% (80)	2.58% (33)
Total	(3513)	(4336)	(970)	(599)	(1866)	(2717)	(7228)	(321)	(1501)	(3016)	(2526)	(1277)

Table 3: Percentage of Labeling for Top 12 Think tanks -- All Periods, All Frames Considered.

Framing Term	Period	American Enterprise Institute	Heritage Foundation	Hoover Institution	Manhattan Institute	CATO Institute	RAND Corporation	Brookings Institution	Center for American Progress	Urban Institute
Right	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	4.93% (34)	7.96% (65)	5.45% (15)	6.90% (2)	5.45% (9)	1.22% (9)	2.74% (40)		3.46% (8)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	4.59% (26)	3.58% (25)	3.21% (5)	7.84% (8)	6.04% (11)	2.4% (12)	4.13% (46)		2.67% (8)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	2.97% (16)	6.03% (48)	0.88% (1)	7.14% (6)	6.39% (26)	1.17% (4)	2.93% (38)		3.49% (9)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	4.88% (35)	5.95% (59)	1.51% (3)	5.11% (7)	4.57% (25)	0.98% (5)	2.88% (54)		1.11% (4)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	5.89% (59)	5.18% (52)	3.07% (7)	8.91% (22)	5.66% (32)	2.55% (16)	2.09% (31)	4.67% (15)	1.42% (5)
Conservative	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	15.94% (110)	46.88% (383)	18.18% (50)	20.68% (6)	18.79% (31)	0.68% (5)	2.53% (37)		0.43% (1)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	17.14% (97)	49.11% (357)	14.74% (23)	14.7% (15)	26.37% (48)	0.2% (1)	0.45% (5)		0.67% (2)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	14.1% (76)	37.31% (297)	15.04% (17)	33.33% (28)	16.71% (68)	0.58% (2)	1.08% (14)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	17.71% (127)	34.27% (340)	18.18% (36)	36.49% (50)	9.69% (53)	0.59% (3)	1.17% (22)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	26.27% (263)	45.82% (460)	12.28% (28)	48.98% (121)	12.57% (71)	0.48% (3)	1.62% (24)	5.92% (19)	1.42% (5)
Left	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	2.32% (16)	1.71% (14)	2.91% (8)	6.90% (2)	3.03% (5)	1.09% (8)	1.51% (22)		1.3% (3)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	2.12% (12)	1.1% (8)	1.28% (2)	0.98% (1)	1.1% (2)	1.2% (6)	1.17% (13)		2% (6)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	1.67% (9)	1.88% (15)	4.42% (5)	2.38% (2)	2.95% (12)	2.33% (8)	1.08% (14)		1.55% (4)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	1.81% (13)	1.51% (15)	1.51% (3)	2.19% (3)	2.38% (13)	1.76% (9)	0.91% (17)		1.94% (7)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	2.4% (24)	2.79% (28)	1.32% (3)	3.64% (9)	2.48% (14)	0.96% (6)	1.75% (26)	6.54% (21)	3.41% (12)
Liberal	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	2.9% (20)	3.06% (25)	3.64% (10)	0% (0)	5.45% (9)	0.27% (2)	4.25% (62)		2.12% (5)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	1.77% (10)	2.48% (18)	1.28% (2)	1.96% (2)	1.65% (3)	0% (0)	2.88% (32)		1.67% (5)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	1.11% (6)	3.02% (24)	0.88% (1)	3.57% (3)	2.21% (9)	0% (0)	1.77% (23)		0.39% (1)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	2.09% (15)	1.81% (18)	1.01% (2)	1.46% (2)	1.1% (6)	0% (0)	2.08% (39)		4.17% (15)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	1.7% (17)	2.99% (30)	3.51% (8)	3.24% (8)	1.42% (8)	0% (0)	4.18% (62)	47.35% (152)	1.42% (5)
Free-Market	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0.14% (1)	0.73% (6)	2.18% (6)	3.45% (1)	3.64% (6)	0% (0)	0.41% (6)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0.18% (1)	1.51% (11)	1.92% (3)	0.98% (1)	5.49% (10)	0.2% (1)	0.09% (1)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0.19% (1)	1.01% (8)	0.88% (1)	0% (0)	2.46% (10)	0.29% (1)	0.39% (5)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	0.84% 6)	0.2% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	4.02% (22)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0.7% (7)	0.8% (8)	0.44% (1)	2.02% (5)	4.78% (27)	0% (0)	0.27% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Libertarian	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0.43% (3)	0.86% (7)	0.73% (2)	3.45% (1)	28.48% (47)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0.18% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	18.13% (33)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	1.3% (7)	0.88% (7)	0.88% (1)	2.38% (2)	31.45% (128)	0% (0)	0.08% (1)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	0.7% (5)	0.3% (3)	0.51% (1)	0% (0)	35.1% (192)	0% (0)	0.11% (2)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0.5% (5)	1.2% (12)	0.88% (2)	0.81% (2)	40.18%(227)	0% (0)	0.13% (2)	0.31% (1)	0% (0)
Total References	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	690	817	275	29	165	735	1460	0	231
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	566	727	156	102	182	501	1113	0	300
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	539	796	113	84	407	343	1296	0	258
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	717	992	198	137	547	510	1874	0	360
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	1001	1004	228	247	565	628	1485	321	352

Table 4A: Percentage and (Number) of Ideological References to Think Tanks by Think Tank, Period and Frame

Framing Te	rm Period	American Enterprise Institute	Heritage Foundation	Hoover Institution	Manhattan Institute	CATO Institute	RAND Corporation	Brookings Institution	Center for American Progress	Urban Institute
Centrist	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0.14% (1)	0.12% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.27% (2)	0.07% (1)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0.53% (3)	0.41% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.18% (2)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0.56% (3)	0.38% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.49% (2)	0% (0)	0.31% (4)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	0.28% (2)	0.3% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.18% (1)	0% (0)	1.55% (29)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0.00% (0)	0.4% (4)	0% (0)	0.4% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1.35% (20)	0.62% (2)	1.42% (5)
Moderate	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0.58% (5)	0.73% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.68% (5)	0.41% (6)		0.43% (1)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	1.41% (8)	0.69% (5)	0% (0)	0.81% (1)	0.55% (1)	0.2% (1)	1.8% (20)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0.93% (5)	0.38% (3)	1.77% (2)	3.49% (3)	0% (0)	0.29% (1)	0.62% (8)		0.39% (1)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	0.56% (4)	0.4% (4)	0% (0)	1.23% (2)	0.18% (1)	0.2% (1)	0.43% (8)		1.39% (5)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0.3% (3)	0.5% (5)	1.32% (3)	0.4% (1)	0.53% (3)	0% (0)	0.61% (9)	0% (0)	0.85% (3)
Non-Partisan	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0.14% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.14% (0)	0.21% (3)		1.30% (3)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0.18% (1)	0.14% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.35% (4)		1% (3)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0.19% (1)	0.25% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1.00% (13)		1.94% (5)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	0.14% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.73% (1)	0.37% (2)	0% (0)	3.74% (70)		7.5% (27)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0.4% (4)	0.1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.18% (1)	1.59% (10)	1.21% (18)	0.93% (3)	6.53% (23)
Non-Profit	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0.43% (3)	0.61% (5)	0.36% (1)	6.90% (2)	0% (0)	2.31% (17)	0.07% (1)		3.03% (7)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0% (0)	0.28% (2)	0.64% (1)	0.98% (1)	0% (0)	0.6% (3)	0.35% (4)		3.33% (10)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0.19% (1)	2.01% (16)	0% (0)	2.38% (2)	0.25% (1)	0.29% (1)	0.62% (8)		1.94% (5)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	0.14% (1)	0.71% (7)	0% (0)	0.73% (1)	0.37% (2)	1.37% (7)	1.01% (19)		2.78% (10)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0.1% (1)	1.29% (13)	0.88% (2)	1.62% (4)	0.18% (1)	5.41% (34)	0.94% (14)	0% (0)	1.7% (6)
Total Reference	ces Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	690	817	275	29	165	735	1460	0	231
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	566	727	156	102	182	501	1113	0	300
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	539	796	113	84	407	343	1296	0	258
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	717	992	198	137	547	510	1874	0	360
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	1001	1004	228	247	565	628	1485	321	352

Table 4B: Percentage and (Number) of Neutral (Positive) References to Think Tanks by Think Tank, Period and Frame

Table 5: Frequency of Most Common Framing Term for Each Think Tank by Period.										
Period	American Enterprise Institute	Heritage Foundation	Hoover Institution	Manhattan Institute	CATO Institute	RAND Corporation	Brookings Institution	Center for American Progress	Urban Institute	
Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	15.94% (110)	46.88% (383)	18.18% (50)	20.68% (6)	28.48% (47)	0.68% (5)	4.25% (62)		2.12% (5)	
Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	17.14% (97)	49.11% (357)	14.74% (23)	14.7% (15)	26.37% (48)	0.2% (1)	2.88% (32)		1.67% (5)	
Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	14.1% (76)	37.31% (297)	15.04% (17)	33.33% (28)	31.45% (128)	0.58% (2)	1.77% (23)		0.39% (1)	
Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	17.71% (127)	34.27% (340)	18.18% (36)	36.49% (50)	35.1% (192)	0.59% (3)	2.08% (39)		4.17% (15)	
Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	26.27% (263)	45.82% (460)	12.28% (28)	48.98% (121)	40.18%(227)	0.48% (3)	4.18% (62)	47.35% (152)	1.42% (5)	
Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	690	817	275	29	165	735	1460	0	231	
Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	566	727	156	102	182	501	1113	0	300	
Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	539	796	113	84	407	343	1296	0	258	
Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	717	992	198	137	547	510	1874	0	360	
Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	1001	1004	228	247	565	628	1485	321	352	
Bold - Conservative, /	talics - Liberta	rian, Standard	- Liberal							

Framing Term*		American Enterprise Institute	Heritage Foundation	Hoover Institution	Manhattan Institute	CATO Institute	RAND Corporation	Brookings Institution	Center for American Progress	Urban Institute
Conservative	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	31.67% (38)	74.29% (130)	8.77% (5)		30.77% (8)	0% (0)	2.94% (8)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	21.43% (21)	80% (112)	8.7% (2)		38.1% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)		1.96% (1)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	16.28% (14)	55.56% (65)	36.36% (4)		10.61% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	20.93% (18)	35.23% (68)	7.69% (1)		7.89% (6)	4.44% (2)	1.75% (5)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	30.72% (51)	44.08% (67)	0% (0)	73.91% (17)	3.13% (2)	0% (0)	0.93% (2)	10.94% (7)	0% (0)
Liberal	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	2.5% (3)	4% (7)	0% (0)		3.85% (1)	0% (0)	12.5% (34)		4.17% (2)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0% (0)	2.86% (4)	4.35% (1)		4.76% (1)	0% (0)	2.54% (5)		1.96% (1)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	1.16% (1)	2.56% (3)	0% (0)		1.52% (1)	0% (0)	5.65% (13)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	2.33% (2)	0.52% (1)	0% (0)		1.32% (1)	0% (0)	3.16% (9)		13.89% (5)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0.6% (1)	3.29% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	6.54% (14)	67.19% (43)	5% (1)
Libertarian	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)		23.08% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)		9.52% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)		46.97% (31)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)		31.58% (24)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0.6% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	57.81% (37)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	120	175	57	4	26	113	272	0	48
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	98	140	23	5	21	91	197	0	51
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	86	117	11	0	66	45	230	0	16
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	86	193	13	7	76	45	285	0	36
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	166	152	23	23	64	107	214	64	20

Table 6A: Associated Press Newswires

Framing Term*		American Enterprise Institute	Heritage Foundation	Hoover Institution	Manhattan Institute	CATO Institute	RAND Corporation	Brookings Institution	Center for American Progress	Urban Institute
Conservative	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	14.77% (13)	52.78% (38)	35.42% (17)		36.84% (7)	0.72% (2)	1.48% (4)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	20% (16)	62.65% (52)	13.11% (8)	0% (0)	42.86% (9)	0.55% (1)	0.5% (1)		1.52% (1)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	21.88% (14)	54.05% (40)	5.88% (2)		28.21% (11)	0% (0)	1.1% (2)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	42.37% (25)	72.83% (57)	5.56% (2)		7.04% (5)	0.61% (1)	1.85% (5)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	45.22% (52)	68.55% (85)	19.15% (9)	44.44% (16)	13.33% (10)	0.53% (1)	0.61% (1)	3.13% (1)	0% (0)
Liberal	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0% (0)	0% (0)	6.25% (3)		10.53% (2)	0.36% (1)	1.48% (4)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	3.75% (3)	4.82% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	3.98% (8)		3.03% (2)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0% (0)	2.7% (2)	0% (0)		2.56% (1)	0% (0)	0.55% (1)		2.08% (1)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	6.78% (4)	4.35% (4)	0% (0)		1.41% (1)	0% (0)	1.11% (3)		1.67% (1)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	1.74% (2)	0.81% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2.67% (2)	0% (0)	1.84% (3)	56.25% (18)	0% (0)
Libertarian	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0% (0)	0% (0)	2.08% (1)		26.32% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	28.57% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)		33.33% (13)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	1.69% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)		64.79% (46)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0% (0)	0.81% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	48% (36)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	88	72	48	2	19	276	270	0	39
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	80	83	61	11	21	182	201	0	66
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	64	74	34	1	39	140	182	0	48
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	59	92	36	8	71	165	271	0	60
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	115	124	47	36	75	190	163	32	35

Table 6B: Los Angeles Times

Framing Term*		American Enterprise Institute	Heritage Foundation	Hoover Institution	Manhattan Institute	CATO Institute	RAND Corporation	Brookings Institution	Center for American Progress	Urban Institute
Conservative	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	20.56% (22)	67.86% (57)	17.78% (8)	41.67% (5)	9.09% (1)	2.38% (3)	3.31% (11)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	21.3% (23)	63.64% (28)	26.67% (8)	18.97% (11)	21.05% (4)	0% (0)	0.56% (1)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	17.11% (13)	44.93% (31)	14.29% (4)	40.91% (18)	28.95% (11)	1.45% (1)	0.5% (1)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	36.19% (38)	53.93% (48)	15.63% (5)	52.44% (43)	19.3% (11)	0% (0)	0.74% (2)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	31.13% (47)	53.73% (72)	23.08% (9)	63.39% (71)	20% (17)	1.06% (1)	2.39% (6)	5.71% (2)	0% (0)
Liberal	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	9.35% (10)	5.95% (5)	2.22% (1)	0% (0)	9.09% (1)	0.79% (1)	1.2% (4)		1.85% (1)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	4.63% (5)	2.27% (1)	0% (0)	3.45% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.56% (1)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	1.32% (1)	4.35% (3)	0% (0)	6.82% (3)	5.26% (2)	0% (0)	0.5% (1)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	0.95% (1)	3.37% (3)	3.13% (1)	2.44% (2)	3.51% (2)	0% (0)	3.7% (10)		1.54% (1)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	2.65% (1)	5.22% (3)	0% (0)	4.46% (5)	3.53% (3)	0% (0)	7.57% (19)	42.86% (15)	1.27% (1)
Libertarian	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0.93% (1)	1.19% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	54.55% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	15.79% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	2.63% (2)	1.45% (1)	0% (0)	4.55% (2)	39.47% (15)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	38.6% (22)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	1.99% (3)	1.49% (2)	2.56% (1)	0.89% (1)	45.88% (22)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	107	84	45	12	11	126	332	0	54
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	108	44	30	58	19	86	178	0	53
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	76	69	28	44	38	69	202	0	49
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	105	89	32	82	57	95	270	0	65
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	151	134	39	112	85	94	251	35	79

Table 6C: New York Times

Framing Term*		American Enterprise Institute	Heritage Foundation	Hoover Institution	Manhattan Institute	CATO Institute	RAND Corporation	Brookings Institution	Center for American Progress	Urban Institute
Conservative	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	7.59% (6)	27.56% (35)	5.56% (1)		10.71% (3)	0% (0)	0.65% (1)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	20.83% (10)	70.37% (76)			16% (4)	0% (0)	0.77% (1)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	25.93% (7)	63.16% (36)			17.39% (4)	0% (0)	0.7% (1)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	14.93% (10)	40.38% (21)	20.83% (5)		4.17% (2)	0% (0)	0.00%		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	43.1% (20)	73.91% (85)	0% (0)	22.22% (4)	19.23% (10)	0% (0)	3.38% (7)	0% (0)	10.2% (5)
Liberal	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	1.27% (1)	1.57% (2)	0% (0)		0.00%	0% (0)	5.88% (9)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	2.08% (1)	2.78% (3)			0.00%	0% (0)	9.23% (12)		2.86% (1)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0% (0)	1.75% (1)			4.35% (1)	0% (0)	1.41% (2)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	1.49% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)		2.08% (1)	0% (0)	2.76% (4)		7.41% (2)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0.86% (1)	2.61% (3)	19.05% (4)	5.56% (1)	1.28% (1)	0% (0)	4.35% (9)	35.29% (6)	6.12% (3)
Libertarian	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0% (0)	1.57% (2)	0% (0)		7.14% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0% (0)	0% (0)			24% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	3.7% (1)	1.75% (1)			34.78% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)		29.17% (14)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0% (0)	1.74% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	57.69% (45)	0% (0)	0.48% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	79	127	18	1	28	70	153	0	11
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	48	108	6	3	25	24	130	0	35
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	27	57	2	1	23	10	142	0	13
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	67	52	24	8	48	24	145	0	27
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	116	115	21	18	78	41	207	17	49

Table 6D: USA Today

Framing Term*		American Enterprise Institute	Heritage Foundation	Hoover Institution	Manhattan Institute	CATO Institute	RAND Corporation	Brookings Institution	Center for American Progress	Urban Institute
Conservative	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	16.46% (13)	53.75% (43)	18.42% (7)	5.88% (1)	18.52% (5)	0% (0)	6.33% (5)		4.55% (1)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	21.43% (6)	63.64% (14)			33.33% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	14.29% (4)	51.43% (18)			26.09% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	20.51% (8)	77.27% (17)			10.53% (2)	0% (0)	4.17% (3)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	44.23% (23)	65.79% (25)	0% (0)		12.9% (4)	0% (0)	1.96% (2)	10% (1)	0% (0)
Liberal	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	3.8% (3)	7.5% (6)	13.16% (5)	0.00%	11.11% (3)	0% (0)	3.8% (3)		4.55% (1)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0% (0)	4.55% (1)			0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0% (0)	0% (0)			0% (0)	0% (0)	1.41% (1)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	2.56% (1)	4.55% (1)			0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)		7.69% (2)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	3.85% (2)	2.63% (1)	0% (0)		0% (0)	0% (0)	3.92% (4)	50% (5)	0% (0)
Libertarian	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	5.88% (1)	25.93% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0% (0)	0% (0)			50% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0% (0)	0% (0)			43.48% (10)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	2.56% (1)	0% (0)			63.16% (12)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0% (0)	2.63% (1)	0% (0)		51.61% (16)	0% (0)	0.98% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	79	80	38	17	27	48	79	0	22
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	28	22	5	7	12	42	64	0	11
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	28	35	3	0	23	11	71	0	13
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	39	22	6	3	19	24	72	0	26
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	52	38	15	5	31	44	102	10	40

Table 6E: Wall Street Journal (Eastern Edition)

Framing Term*		American Enterprise Institute	Heritage Foundation	Hoover Institution	Manhattan Institute	CATO Institute	RAND Corporation	Brookings Institution	Center for American Progress	Urban Institute
Conservative	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	14.08% (10)	41.84% (41)	27.27% (6)		15.79% (3)	0% (0)	1.97% (5)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	17.57% (13)	50.75% (34)			58.33% (14)	0% (0)	0.52% (1)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	18% (18)	37.21% (48)	18.18% (2)	35.29% (6)	25% (18)	0% (0)	2.33% (7)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	9.85% (20)	28.24% (72)	28% (14)	17.14% (6)	13.99% (20)	0% (0)	0.93% (6)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	11.36% (31)	33.61% (82)	9.76% (4)	30.3% (10)	10.88% (16)	0.79% (1)	1.32% (6)	5.13% (6)	0% (0)
Liberal	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	1.41% (1)	1.02% (1)	0% (0)		5.26% (1)	0% (0)	1.18% (3)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0% (0)	2.99% (2)			0% (0)	0% (0)	1.57% (3)		1.54% (1)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	2% (2)	4.65% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)	4.17% (3)	0% (0)	0.66% (2)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	1.48% (3)	1.57% (4)	2% (1)	0% (0)	0.7% (1)	0% (0)	0.93% (6)		1.82% (2)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	1.83% (5)	2.87% (7)	7.32% (3)	3.03% (1)	1.36% (2)	0% (0)	2.42% (11)	39.32% (46)	0% (0)
Libertarian	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	0% (0)	1.02% (1)	0% (0)		26.32% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0% (0)	0% (0)			4.17% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	0% (0)	2.33% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	38.89% (28)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	1.48% (3)	1.18% (3)	2% (1)	0% (0)	39.16% (56)	0% (0)	0.31% (2)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0.37% (1)	1.64% (4)	2.44% (1)	3.03% (1)	25.17% (37)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.85% (1)	0% (0)
Total	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	71	98	22	0	19	73	254	0	57
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	74	67	8	6	24	50	191	0	65
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	100	129	11	17	72	50	301	0	97
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	203	255	50	35	143	121	644	0	110
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	273	244	41	33	147	127	455	117	109

Table 6F: Washington Post

Framing Term*		American Enterprise Institute	Heritage Foundation	Hoover Institution	Manhattan Institute	CATO Institute	RAND Corporation	Brookings Institution	Center for American Progress	Urban Institute
Conservative	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	5.48% (8)	21.55% (39)	12.77% (6)		11.43% (4)	0% (0)	3% (3)		
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	6.15% (8)	15.59% (41)	7.14% (3)	3.03% (1)	8.33% (5)	0% (0)	0.66% (1)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	3.8% (6)	18.73% (59)	10.34% (3)	17.39% (4)	7.53% (11)	5.56% (1)	1.79% (3)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	5.06% (8)	16.26% (47)	16.28% (7)	5% (1)	5.26% (7)	0% (0)	0.53% (1)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	7.03% (9)	22.34% (44)	14.29% (6)	12% (3)	8.24% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	4.35% (2)	0% (0)
Liberal	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	1.37% (2)	2.21% (4)	2.13% (1)		2.86% (1)	0% (0)	5% (5)		
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0.77% (1)	1.14% (3)	2.38% (1)	0% (0)	3.33% (2)	0% (0)	1.97% (3)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	1.27% (2)	2.86% (9)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0.68% (1)	0% (0)	1.79% (3)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	1.9% (3)	1.73% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	3.74% (7)		5.56% (2)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	1.56% (2)	3.05% (6)	2.38% (1)	4% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2.15% (2)	41.3% (19)	0% (0)
Libertarian	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	1.37% (2)	1.66% (3)	2.13% (1)		45.71% (16)	0% (0)	0% (0)		
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	0.77% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (9)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	2.53% (4)	0.63% (2)	3.45% (1)	0% (0)	15.75% (23)	0% (0)	0.6% (1)		0% (0)
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	13.53% (18)	0% (0)	0% (0)		0% (0)
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	0% (0)	1.02% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (17)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total	Bush 1: 01/89 - 12/90	146	181	47	7	35	29	100	-	6
	Clinton 1: 01/93 - 12/94	130	263	42	33	60	26	152	-	19
	Clinton 2: 01/97 - 12/98	158	315	29	23	146	18	168	-	22
	Bush 2: 01/2001 - 12/2002	158	289	43	20	133	36	187	-	36
	Bush 3: 01/2005 - 12/2006	128	197	42	25	85	25	93	46	20

Table 6G: Washington Times