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ABSTRACT

This study examines the impact of Egyptian sports talk shows on audience perceptions of the Port Said massacre. Two consistent theories involve such perceptions: the media framing theory, and the media dependency theory. The study's main hypotheses were: H1: The more audiences watched Sports talk shows throughout the incidents, the more they perceived Port Said residents as the perpetrators of the incidents. H2: Audiences who consider sports talk shows a credible source of information are more likely than other audiences to believe that Port Said residents are the perpetrators of the incidents. Findings: the data collected shows that there is a significant difference between heavy viewers and light viewers in terms of their perception of Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents. Additionally, the second hypothesis was rejected, as the data shows that there is no relation between sports talk shows credibility and people’s perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in Port Said incidents.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the idea of national sports caught on and gained popularity all over the world. Soccer, commonly known in Egypt as football, became an international craze, capturing global attention. Attempts to identify the cause of football’s popularity do not easily yield an adequate answer. Football (soccer) is popular because it is a sport built on technique, strategy, and strength. People believe that football is an enjoyable recreational sport with a low risk of serious injury. Actually, football can affect our lives on a national and international scale, triggering revolutions and even wars as well as having the ability to create peace and raise entire nations or the reverse. What happens on the football pitch can collide dramatically with other aspects of life, especially politics (Weiner, 2012), as countries going to war during football matches, try to prove their nationalism through it. When a sports event becomes a vehicle for political exploitation, however, the implications are both unacceptable and disturbing. The Port Said Incident, referred to in the media as a massacre (BBC, 2012), is a good example of this kind of abuse. On February 1, 2012, a football match between the Al Ahly and Al Masry teams, the regional team of the Port Said governorate, in the coastal city of Port Said in Egypt. However, what initially promised to be an exciting sports event ended up as a massacre: 74 fans were killed, many of whom were crushed to death as they tried to escape a bloodthirsty mob, as rival supporter groups turned on each other after home team al-Masry's victory over Egyptian powerhouse Al-Ahly (Fouad, et. al, 2012). This might
not be the first massacre in the international history of soccer, but it is the first one in Egyptian football history. According to Latham, the tragedy may be considered as yet “another in a long line of soccer matches blighted by hooliganism” and crowd violence (Latham, 2012); however, some strongly suggest that it was a planned massacre (Fouad, et. al, 2012). Suspicious signs include two men holding up a poster with offensive comments about the people of Port Said and a sudden power cut before the match ended. As a result, more than 600 persons penetrated the stadium in darkness. Violence broke out, and, as spectators struggled to run for their lives, it was found that the stadium doors had been locked, allowing dozens of innocent people to be trapped and killed. It was later discovered that white weapons were used to kill 74 Al Ahly fans, and injure more than 377 persons (Fouad, et. al, 2012).

Port Said residents and Al Masry fans went out in marches in Port Said to denounce some anchors of the sports talk shows for distorting the image of Al Masry fans and Port Said residents nationwide (Sobeih, 2012). On the other side of the coin, the Ahly Ultras believe that sports talk shows are a source of trouble since a sizeable number of the anchors tend to be highly critical of the Ahly Ultras (Sharkawy & Shoman, 2012). Actually, the Ultras group has gained significant power as they consider themselves responsible for achieving justice for the slain fans, commonly described as ‘Shohadaa’ or martyrs. On many occasions, the Ahly Ultras have tried to stop the broadcasting of sports shows hosted by Shobeir and Medhat Shalaby, with only partial success; after being discontinued, the shows are put back on the air after a suitable interval (MENA, 2012). Additionally, The committee of the inquiry accused the sports media of fueling events of Port Said.
The Port Said incident of 2012 and the key role played by media, namely, sports talk shows, in shaping public perceptions is an issue that merits close study. This research examines the effect of the media on people’s perceptions of the Port Said Massacre and explores the extent to which people have been affected by media frames of these incidents.

According to the Egyptian State Information Service, the most popular football teams in Egypt are: Al Ahly, Al Zamalek, Almasry and Alitihad. Ahly and Zamalek have their fan base and what is referred to as ‘Ultras’ groups. The Ultras Ahlawy (UA-07) was first launched in April 2007. Their main mission is to provide continuous support of the team regardless of performance or outcomes, and accompany the team wherever it goes and whatever the costs. There has always been tremendous rivalry, if not enmity, between the Al Masry and Al Ahly teams and their respective fans. In fact, many clashes have previously taken place between them; however, the Port Said events transcended any other sport-related outbreak of violence. The police, remnants of the former NDP (National Democratic Party), particularly certain cohorts of Gamal Mubarak (Hussein, 2012), and the SCAF (Supreme Council of the Armed Forces) were widely blamed for planning the attack (Alyoum Channel, 2012), well before an investigation was conducted and an official report submitted.

The committee responsible for investigating the incident announced that the massacre was planned, holding accountable members of the police force (Fouad, et. al, 2012). Given the almost uniform accounts from eyewitnesses and footage of police officers apparently turning a blind eye to the violence, it became clear that “mob rage had been used as a front for the fervor of the supporters' groups was harnessed as a catalyst for the tragedy” (Latham, 2012). Even without provocation, however, the situation was already ripe for violence. Additionally, the Al
Masry Club administration and the Egyptian Football Federation also faced charges as being implicated in the Port Said Massacre. The committee’s report mentioned that inter-team tensions may have escalated the violence, particularly in light of the difficult circumstances facing the Egyptian people in the post January 25 Revolution era.

The evidence points to football fanaticism as one of the principal causes of the massacre (Fathi, 2012). Football fanaticism is considered one of the most commonly occurring phenomena in the world, among different societies regardless of religion, culture, or ethnical backgrounds. A large number of research papers have attempted to analyze the reasons for such a negative phenomenon without reaching any conclusive findings. Football “serves as a surrogate religion which is practiced in cult rituals”, thus sometimes creating intergenerational ties (SIRC, 2008).

The sports media was also convicted by the committee as a prime factor in the Port Said events. Sports talk shows were claimed to provoke fans by generally turning football matches into a battleground (Fouad, et. al, 2012).

Specific sports talk shows were being held by Ahmed Shobeir, Medhat Shalaby, Alaa Sadeq and others were accused by many people for being responsible for the Port Said incidents as they kept playing archival footage to remind Al Ahly fans of the history of ‘bad blood’ between Al Ahly and Al Masry the day before the match. Moreover, following the Port Said incident, a number of sports talk shows depicted Port Said residents, including Al Masry fans, as thugs and perpetrators of the killing of Al Ahly fans (Elnaggar, 2012). It is assumed that political issues should be the discussion points on political talk shows while sports programs should focus on sports issues. In the case of the Port Said massacre, certain sports talk shows have been accused as playing a central role in presenting the event in such a way to incite hatred between
Portsaidis and ‘other’ Egyptians. The presenters of those sports talk shows did not abide by objective presentation of the event; some of them, such as veteran footballer Shobeir, exhibited hysterical behavior on the air while others, notably, Alaa Sadeq, directly accused Port Said residents of this crime, even before any investigations were carried out (Elnaggar, 2012). These examples illustrate how the massacre was framed from individual perspectives.

The aftermath of the Port Said incidents of 2012 is still being felt in 2013. After the death sentence was passed for 21 people and a further 24 received prison terms, all of whom are Port Said residents, a fresh wave of violence hit the city. Fired by feelings of injustice, Port Said residents set loose boats, attempted to block the Suez Canal with ferries, and attacked the city stadium after the verdict (Reuters, 2013). In Cairo, hardcore football fans set fire to a police building and two restaurants, and blocked several roads as well as one of the city's main bridges and asking for arrest to the officers who planned the massacre. These events, dubbed the ‘Port Said Incidents 2’, led to a death toll of 30 people, all of whom are from Port Said (Hafez, 2013).

**Brief background of Fanaticism and hooliganism:**

Sports are considered a medium for the expression of genuineness, enthusiasm, and honesty. Moreover, sports can bring their supporters together to experience the sport through a proper sequence of “public and private rituals”, creating a need to “call sport itself a religion” (Dionísio et al., 2008).

Kenneth Hunt defines the Fan as “an enthusiastic devotee of some particular sports consumptive object” and as a customer or user of the sport incited to participate in actions related to the team or sport (Hunt et.al, 1999). Actually, sports fans fall under several different categories: According to Hunt the “Serious” fan is different from the” Normal” one. Deep fans or
serious fans consider the result of the sports game as all important and have a “ritual identification” with mass media sports making. Sport becomes a form of defining, recognizing, and celebrating social life for deep or serious fans (Hunt et.al, 1999). Hunt describes the remaining five categories of fans as follows:

The Temporary Fan is a fan of a specific event with the time border as the main issue that distinguishes between this kind of fans and the others. Being a temporary fan can last for hours or even years, and becoming a non-fan when the time of the event ends.

The Local Fan is bordered by “geographic” limits since his identification is limited to a geographic location where he was “born or lives”. When traveling to another city, the local fan’s loyalty to his team fades away.

The Devoted Fan can start as local or temporary fan, gaining momentum in parallel with his team’s achievements in the sport, which can actually conquer time and geographical borders. Devoted fans are considered ‘fanatical’ regardless of their team’s performance.

The Fanatical Fan is similar to the devoted one in surpassing time and geographical limitations. Being a fan becomes an ‘identity marker’ for the fanatical fans which becomes a main feature of their lives in the same way family, religious beliefs, or work can be. The fanatical fan’s actions are distinctly different from the normal devoted fan. Going to the game is seen as a life or death issue for the fanatical fans, but for the devoted fans attending the match is not a must.

The Dysfunctional Fan: the state of being a fan becomes the single identifying feature for this kind of fan to the point where he erases his own identify in favor of team loyalty. Dysfunctional fans have the ability to engage in disorderly and violent behaviors which may
disrupt the game and the ‘social exchanges’ around the game. The Dysfunctional fan tends to feel that such behaviors are a necessary part of being a fan.

Manase Chiweshe says that “Being a fan is a historical process in which one makes a commitment to a particular team”. He adds that the fans have a tendency to ‘over-identify’ with their teams and can consider clubs as an addition of the identity and invest a great deal of ‘emotional’ energy into their teams. This can cause a kind of depression or violence in their characters as fans (Chiweshe, 2011). In fact, in extreme case, choosing to be a fan for some people takes over their “character” and “part of their life” (Kaminju, & Ndlovu, 2011), providing support for football teams has become very important since this has a deep impact on the behavior of fans. Football, in particular, seems to lend itself to attracting extreme zeal on the part of fans, to the extent that the sport affects almost every aspect of fans’ lives. Sport ‘fandom’ has become a crucial activity that shapes a vital part of a fan’s life (Chiweshe, 2011). The partnership between fans and their clubs has become important and fans have become useful, effective, and ready to accept ‘the good and the bad’. As a result, they are considered to be ‘friends of football, the real threat to football lying in the danger of fans becoming fanatics rather than friends of football (Mathias, 1991).

Historically, football Fanaticism emerged in Britain and became known in European countries as ‘an English illness. Shortly afterwards, football violence by fans surfaced in European countries as well, including West Germany, Italy, France, and Holland. Football fanaticism violence, characterized by aggressive fighting and acts of random vandalism, also appears to be premeditated and targeted at disrupting the game in order to set the scene for
violence. Furthermore “Football fanaticism is settled where religious fanaticism, national excitement and political passion was seen before” (Ramazanoglu & Coban, 2005).

Police officers are considered a part of the hooliganism problem (Nestor, 1998). The officials, politicians and police usually exclude hooligans as a ‘mindless minority’ (Rookwood & Pearson, 2010). Positioning police close to supporters or ‘videoing’ them does not affect the violent actions of the fans or even reduce them (Gary & Rosemary, 1991). Additionally, hooligans’ hostile attitudes generate negative views of both their opponents and the police. Even when their worst fears do not materialize, hooligans typically latch on to fights. Similarly, the police could have their own ill-intentioned feelings also leading to violence (Maniglio, 2007). Actually, police interference sometimes accelerates violent behaviors in fans. Although the main function of police is to maintain order in the pitches, they can be responsible for violent clashes inside the stadiums as well (Gary & Rosemary, 1991). This might be because of their badly timed or unwarranted interference in situations, thus provoking violent reactions. Some of them (police) say that they might be affected by ‘psychological’ factors such as terror, stress, and irrititability (Nestor, 1998). Also, Tomsaz confirms that skirmishes with police are considered a ‘must’ for every hooligan, with any attempts by police to contain violent actions being viewed as ‘unfair’ by the rival fans (Sahaj, 2009)
Chapter Two

Theoretical Framework

One of the main focal areas in mass communication studies has been the cultural, social, and psychological effects of media content and use. Media does have effects, the study of which may help alleviate the harmful aspects and increase positive ones. Some studies attempt to gain insight into media effects by refining the theoretical explanations of the processes by which media effects take place (Perse, 2001). It is useful here to define theories as common statements that summarize the understanding of the way the world works; more specifically, a communication theory is intended to enhance people’s understanding of the process of mass communication, and provide possible answers to questions about how mass communication works and its effect on our world (Severin & Tankard, 2010). This chapter sheds light on the framing effect and media dependency theory, both of which can seriously explain the effects of media, such as sports talk shows, on people’s perceptions of the Port Said incidents of 2012.

The Concept of Framing:

Over the past few decades, it has become clear that no meaningful human act, significant perception, cognition, or communication can occur in the absence of frames, a pervasive phenomenon which was first conceptualized by Ervin Goffman in the mid-1970s, when he published his 1974 study on frame Analysis. Goffman extended the concept of the cognitive ‘frame’ used by Gregory Bateson within several academic disciplines such as linguistics, sociology, psychology, and psychotherapy (Trevino, 2003). In frame Analysis, Goffman endeavors to classify the range of choices available to people for describing a situation and their
relation to it. The concept of frame is seen as “rendering what would otherwise be a meaningless aspect of the scene into something that is meaningful” (Ytreberg, 2002).

For Goffman, frames mean “schemata of interpretation” that allow people “to locate, perceive, identify, and label” incidents within their life space and the world. Frames help to portray events consequentially, thusworking to systematize experience and guide action (Benford & Snow, 2000). Moreover, Matthes explains that the process of framing involves selection of certain perspectives of a recognized reality in order to make it more prominent in a communicating context, in such a way as to promote a specific problem clarification, causal explanation, moral assessment, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described (Matthes, 2012). Entman also suggests that to frame is to “select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating context” (Entman, 1993, p. 52) while Gamson and Modigliani propose that a frame is a “central organizing idea or story line that provides meaning to an unfolding strip of events, weaving a connection among them (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989).

Generally speaking, frames are common organizing principles that structure and give meaning to the social world. As an integral component of the culture, frames determine how leaders construct information, and influence journalists’ information selection. Given these two vital roles, frames occupy a prominent place in media texts, affecting the perception and attitudes of viewers.

Matthes suggests that there is an enormous disparity between ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ frames and their influence on public opinions or perceptions. ‘Strong’ frames” have a vast effect on people’s opinions by presenting compelling facts, provoking sentiments such as fears or anger.
On the other hand, ‘weak’ frames elicit relatively mild opinions and, in turn, have a weak effect on viewers (Matthes, 2012). Trevino assumes that a frame does not necessarily have to be clearly recognized; in most cases, recognition does not take place. In certain circumstances, such as when there is a lapse in appropriate behavior, a clear description of the frames is offered. (Trevino, 2003)

As mentioned earlier, the concepts of frames and framing have been “widely used in media studies,” although in a way that tends to be loosely based on Goffman’s model. To some extent, this could be explained by the fact that Goffman himself is dealing with matters rather loosely by equating framing with the production of meaning more generally” (Ytreberg, 2002). Millions of people interact with the media every day, and consider it as a part of their life. One significant way that media could form public opinion is by “framing” incidents and problems in specific ways. Framing implies a communication source to present and define an issue. Moreover, the idea of framing gained momentum in the communication field, driving studies of media content as well as the dynamic relationship between media and public opinion (De Vreese, 2005).

The framing theory serves as a “a way to describe the power of a communicating text” and has often been suggested to be an integrative concept (Matthes, 2012). In addition, the Framing Theory proposes that incidents by themselves do not carry a certain significance; it is only when they are put within a frame that they take on meaning. In other words, framing determines, organizes, and gives a degree of consistency by focusing on some aspects of the subject and the omission of other aspects (Mekkawy & Elsayed, 2009).

The possibility of the Framing idea depends on the idea of ‘Communicative processes’ since communication is a dynamic rather than static process that involves frame-building (how
frames emerge) and frame-setting (the interplay between media frames and audience predispositions (De Vreese, 2005).

However, people do not unthinkingly follow the news media’s framing. On the contrary, there are a number of aspects that decide if individuals will be influenced by frames or not. The impact of framing depends on the “selecting and stressing” of specific information and elimination of other information. News frames can shape people’s clarification of events, troubles, and concerns. The effect occurs during discussion of a specific issue when the presenter stresses a specific viewpoint that captures audience attention as they themselves are in the process of formulating their own opinions. For example, it has been found that only those frames that consistently feature on the agenda are likely to provoke an impact by frame repetition. In addition, framing effects tend to diminish when competing frames are present. Finally, framing effects depend on “the credibility of news sources” or previous point of views, and interpersonal communication among people (Matthes, 2012).

A framing effect is said to occur when, in the course of describing an issue or event, a speaker’s emphasis on a subset of potentially relevant considerations causes individuals to focus on these considerations when constructing their opinions. Many argue that framing effects work by passively altering the accessibility of different considerations. On the other hand, some researchers suggest that framing effects do not work by altering the accessibility of different considerations. At the same time, Druckman states that “framing effects work through a psychological process in which individuals consciously and deliberately think about the relative importance of different considerations suggested by a frame. That is, frames work by altering belief importance” (Druckman, 2001, p. 1043).
According to Druckman, “framing effects differ from media priming and persuasion”. That is, framing and priming are substantively different effects: the former deals with the way changes in the content of stories on a single issue affect attitudes toward a relevant public policy while the latter focuses on how changes in the number of stories about an issue affect the criteria of presidential performance evaluations. Druckman further points out that “framing differs both theoretically and empirically from . . . persuasion”. Persuasion works on changing the belief content, but framing focuses on changing in belief importance. Frames can change thoughts that cause overall opinion, but persuasion happens. (Druckman, 2001, p.1044).

**Media Dependency and Crisis:**

People do rely on media coverage as a source of information when forming conclusions, and they do not think of all potentials (Iyengar, 1991). According to Ma, “Both media and crisis are associated with the complexity of human communication, thereby involving various forms of decision making and conflict of interests”. Media offers considerable information for public in crisis circumstances; moreover, in times of crisis, people depend on news coverage to stay updated on the whole information (Ringo, 2005). During crisis, the media has a main role in telling people information about a crisis, and people are more likely to look for fine news sources in a negative and ambiguous condition like during crisis, demanding crisis-related information in the news media (Cho & Gower, 2009).

According to the Media Dependency Theory, public reliance on the media for information is heightened during crises. Moreover, media is relied upon even when the information appears to be misleading (Lowrey, 2004).
Also, Loveless illustrates that Media dependency is a two-step theory: in times of transition, people use more media to look for information; consequently, they become more subject to the effects that the media is said to have on audience members (Loveless, 2008). Emerging from these various hypotheses is the notion that increased media dependency makes audiences more receptive, and thus vulnerable, to the effect of media messages. Moreover, there is increased probability of altering attitudes and behavior in response to dominant media stories about the event. (Lowrey, 2004)

**Source credibility:**

The message itself being used by the communicator affects the credibility of the source. The way that the message has been conveyed influences the degree to which people’s opinions can be shaped or not. (Kiousis, 2001, 383). Even in marketing, source credibility relates to the message framing. Researchers confirm that a positively framed message has a great effect on consumers’ perceptions toward the products. In parallel, negatively framed messages can affect people’s decisions to purchase certain products. Message framing and the credibility of the message source are correlated to each other. (Grewal, D. et al., 1994, 148)

Druckman suggests that “source credibility is a prerequisite for successful framing”. He also states that only an ostensibly credible source can use a frame to alter the perceived importance of different considerations that in turn affect overall opinion. (Druckman, 2001, 1054).

Finally, credibility requires two characteristics: “(1) the speaker's target audience must believe that the speaker possesses knowledge about which considerations are actually relevant to
the decision at hand, and (2) the speaker's target audience must believe that the speaker can be trusted to reveal what he or she knows.” (Druckman, 2001,1045)

This study is depending on media framing theory as some of sports talk shows accused for framed the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents and distort their image in public by claiming that they are the perpetrators of the massacre. Measuring the effect of those talk shows on audience perceptions of the Port Said massacre is turned the framing theory to be used. Moreover, Port Said massacre is a huge crisis happened in Egypt, and measuring how people get their information about it will lead to a significant results in this study. That is why the media dependency theory has been used in this study. Furthermore, measuring how people perceive the performance of sports talk shows anchors and to which extent they are consider these programs as a credible source of information lead to using the source credibility concept in this study.
Chapter Three

Literature Review

Since Port Said massacre happened just one year before this study was launched, there were not enough researches and studies about the issue. The researcher reviewed studies and researchers that studied media role and effect during different crises in nationally and internationally. As Port Said incidents is considered as a significant crisis that the Egyptians have faced, and a tragic number of football fans lost their lives and others were injured, simply because they loved football and wanted to show support for their respective teams. Media, especially the sports media, accused of playing a key role in the Port Said events. Thus, studying the effect of media on people’s perception of this crisis is the major purpose of this study.

1- Media framing and dependency during Crisis:

When scholars talk about media effects, they are considering the social or psychological changes that occur in consumers of media message systems as a result of exposure to, processing of, or acting on these mediated messages. According to Nabi and Oliver, five classifications of media effects on people have been identified: behavioral, attitudinal, cognitive, emotional, and physiological. The researcher suggests that the events happened after Port Said incident were behavioral and attitudinal effects happened as a result of how the sports talk shows portrayed the Port Saidis and Al Masry fans as participants in the massacre; as, behavioral effects result when a media message consumer performs some action presented via media, but attitudinal effects happen when media shapes message consumers’ opinions, beliefs, and values. And this is what exactly happened during and after the Port Said incidents as a result of the media framing and actions of the events. Additionally, Cognitive effects occur when media alters what people think
or know. Emotional effects take place when media produces certain feelings such as fear or anxiety in message consumers. Finally, physiological effects are those changes in arousal or other physical reactions that are derived from media consumption (Nabi & Oliver, 2009). Soule (2004) and Tarrow (1989) confirm that the role of media is not restricted to cognitive effects but also includes creating collective actions.

No one can deny that times of crisis are extraordinary periods marked by instability, uncertainty, stress, and strong emotion due to fear of unwanted outcomes. “Crises are natural or man-made events that pose an immediate and serious threat to the lives and property or to the peace of mind of many” (Bryant & Thompson, 2002). These critical times enhance the importance of the role of the media and its effect in giving information and clarifications. People become stressed and anxious in response to an excess of information during crisis (Perse, 2001).

During crises, the main needs and targets of audiences depending on the media as the main source of information are understanding and orientation. Loges (1994) claims that “When perception of threat in a crisis increases, dependency on newspapers and television for the goals of understanding and orientation also increases” (Lowrey, 2004, p.341). Thus, studying media effects during crisis situations may lead to valuable results, as most people tend to believe in the media during these critical times, altering their perceptions and attitudes toward the issues according to how they are framed in the media (Perse, 2001).

This tendency is obvious in global studies conducted after national and international crises such as the September 11 attacks, and from a local perspective in those after the Luxor massacre of 1997, the Sharm El Sheik’s bombings of 2005, and the 2006 sinking of the Salam ferryboat.
In brief, media covers the crisis as a media event which is then media framed to capture and hold the audience’s attention, shaping specific opinions toward the event. Media frames could be one of the main causes of shaping public opinion towards a specific issue or event. Salah Eldin confirmed that there is a significant relation between media framing of foreign affair issues and audiences’ perceptions of such content. Additionally, Salah Eldin found a strong relation between the causes and solutions of international problems presented on Television programs and those offered by audiences when they were asked about the same issue. This reflects the central role played by media framing in shaping public opinion. (Salah Eldin, 2001). Delshad and Raymond also confirmed that media framing of specific issues could have a powerful effect on people’s opinions in response to specific frames. Moreover, the researchers found that public views could be affected by media frames, especially when the people’s attention is concentrated in the direction of media (Delshad & Raymond, 2013).

People overwhelmingly turn to television media as the most immediate source of information during crisis, boosting the potential of media to affect and alter people’s perception and attitudes about the events. Berger cites the principle of ‘constructing crime, framing disaster to show how Hurricane Katrina was framed by media as well as the consequences of that framing. The coverage of Hurricane Katrina was incorrectly framed, since media placed full blame on the government for this uncontrolled disaster. Moreover, media repeated rumors of meaningless violence as if it were a fact, thus creating a kind of panic in the community. Framing of chaos and crimes can aggravate real chaos and triggering its spread across the country (Berger, 2009). This shows how the media sometimes misframed the incidents and to what extent could that affect people.
According to another study by De Vries, incidents are not only framed by media, but also ‘misframed’. The implication is that media can misrepresent and conceal facts to affect people’s perceptions of certain events. Misframing of events occurs in situations where people are dependent on one or more specific persons as sources of information. Furthermore, the information itself can be controlled or limited by media in some way. The study also claims that an analysis of a series of firework factory explosions occurring in China, Brazil, and the Netherlands revealed that media framed this crisis in both developing and developed countries in practically the same way.

Media initially start by framing the incident in specific planned frames during a crisis; the phenomenon of high dependency on media might indicate that it is the only source of information during crisis; people could be easily affected by media framed messages about the events. In his study on media and crisis, Khadour confirmed that media framing of almost all national crises gives rise to divisions within the society, all of which undergo a continuous conflict before finally reconciling into a state of ‘social cohesion’. Khadour describes these internal crises as “dangerous, deep, and crossing all the red lines”. (Khadour, 1999). This process was clearly illustrated when the Egyptian society was divided into two sections after the massacre: that is, the supporters and opponents of Port Said residents. Berger also agreed on that media framing of a crisis could have consequences detrimental to public security and possibly beyond, making a deep impact on people’s perceptions of the crisis (Berger, 2009).

Many studies show that the television is the most immediate credible source on which Egyptian audiences depend during crises situations. Al- Qelliny claims that Egyptians depended on the television as the main source of information during the 1997 Luxor massacre (Al-qelliny,
1998); similarly, Khallaf confirms the dominant credibility of television in audience reliance during these crises (Kallaf, 1999). Additionally, Guneidy agrees that Egyptian television channels are the main source of information, particularly during national crises (Guneidy, 2002). The Egyptian television channels led the way in covering the 2005 Sharm El Sheik bombings, thus gaining an edge over other Arabic Satellite channels (Abdul Khaliq, 2006). Moreover, Mohamed affirms that audiences usually rely on those channels serving their needs; she adds that the type or the specialization of the channel is considered a main factor in choosing it as a source of information over other channels (Mohamed, 2000). Furthermore, dependency on television channels during crises was clearly revealed during the tragic events of the sinking of the Salam ferryboat in 2006 (Zogheib, 2006). In addition to the previous studies, Abou Zaid confirmed that satellite channels play a vital role in informing audiences, especially in times of crisis. In a survey conducted on 400 individuals ranging in age from 14 to 60 years, results revealed that the percentage of Egyptian audience dependence on Arabic satellite channels during crises reaches 100% (Abou Zaid, 2006). Such conclusive statistical information confirms absolute audience dependency on satellite channels during crisis. In the case of the Port Said incident, the main sources of this dependency were the sports satellite channels such as Modern Sport and Al Nahar Sport as the sports talk shows which accused of distorting the image of Almasry fans and Port Said residents were broadcasting through these channels.

In fact, media framing and dependency during the crises are the issues driving this paper. The Port Said incident is considered a massive crisis occurring in the history of Egyptian sports and football. During the time, sports talk shows were the most important source of information
for many people, as the match between Al Masry and Al Ahly was being broadcast live to the audiences. The incidents were framed by those shows in a specific way. The research conducted in this study measures the extent to which people relied on media during this crisis, and whether or not the audience was affected by media frames.

2- Television talk shows:

Since this research focuses on the effect of sports talk shows on audience’s perceptions during crisis situations, it is useful here to give an overview of talk shows in general. In terms of format, an anchor hosts a discussion with a celebrity or authority figure on topics of general interest to audiences. The format can vary from one or more hosts and one main guest or a group of guests. When they first aired in the 20th century, television talk shows did not attract much attention. In the 1990s, however, the improved content, quality, and anchor appeal of these types of shows began to gain audience popularity. In fact, many talk show hosts have achieved stardom through their programs, depending on their ability to inform, entertain, and, more importantly, engage with viewers. More recently, television talk shows have occupied prime-time slots and achieved unprecedented success. (Timberg, & Erler, 2002).

Rubin and Step in their study entitled “Viewing the Television Talk Shows” found that there are differing motivations for audiences in watching television talk shows. They confirmed that viewers preferred talk shows centering on relationships and personal problems. In other words, viewers have high motivation to watch talk shows that give them exactly the information they need. ‘Pass-time motivation’ merely for the sake of filling one’s leisure time no longer motivate
people to watch a certain television talk show. Audiences are making conscious choices regarding what they want to watch whenever they want (Rubin & Step, 1997)

Varga and others in another study attempt to measure whether or not political talk show hosts have the ability to enhance media credibility. Results confirmed that individual hosting styles can affect people’s perceptions of issues. The “correspondent” host or talk show anchor enhances perceptions of the content and credibility value of the show. On the other hand, hosts who are ‘comedian’ types tend to have less credibility than those taking a ‘combatant’ approach. (Varga et.al, 2012).

Sports programs are considered to enjoy the highest ratings among all television shows. (Dalakas, & Melancon , 2012). Moreover, sports media have become a main agent of change in the world of sport and its conventions. This has been achieved by raising games to global levels, molding the image of the players themselves, highlighting the results, and gauging the perceptions and responses of fans towards the games. The end result of sports shows is to maintain public fascination and engagement with sports events. (Schirato, 2012).

Munson assumes that sports talk shows target young male audiences (Munson, 1993); similarly, Zagacki and Grano emphasize the important role of sports talk show, explaining that such programs open up a public space where the thoughts and opinions of ‘ordinary’ people take on an apparent significance, allowing fans and anchors to engage in a meaningful analysis of the relationship between sport and the public,” whether or not these interpretations correspond to reality.” (Zagacki & Grano, 2005)
Gantz and others found that fans of televised sports talk show were likely to keep following ‘pre-game’ programs and even search for detailed information on the game and its players and coaches. Also, sports programs fans were most likely to offer predictions of game developments and outcomes, maybe even discussing these possible scenarios with their friends. Moreover, sports talk show fans were more inter-active and appeared to be more associated with their favorite programs than other audiences or fans of non-sport-related programs (Gantz et. al, 2006)

3- Media and Fans:

Media have the ability to transform individuals’ “psychologically” from the real world to another fantasy world, totally removed from their ordinary lives. Media develop people’s emotion by giving them insight not only into the political life but into that of sports celebrities, talk show hosts, and other celebrities, all of whom seem to have a profound effect on the thoughts of ordinary people. In addition, media can affect people’s taste in celebrities; who can be loved or detested according to the way they are evaluated in the media (Caughey, 1978).

Bruna and Erich noted that because of the powerful impact of football on people’s lives, the related negative issues of football provoke huge responses in the “mass media”. Clashes between fans of rival teams elevate the phenomenon of violence in the football arena. In a study by Berger, show that media coverage of soccer events is a central factor in increasing fans violence and hooliganism. It was further stated that unemployment among youth under the age of 24 contributes to increasing violent attitudes in fans of this age group (Berger, 2009). In an increasingly violent world, mass media have played a major role in raising outbreaks of violence to the level of a serious social crisis. The rise of violence has become an increasingly noticeable
feature of football matches (Zani & Kirchler, 1991). Moreover, Ramon states that Media has covered almost all the violent actions of fans in the big “sporting events”. Historically, mass violence in sports first emerged to capture attention and “sensationalize” the sport event.

However, media coverage of football violence has evolved over time. (Spaaij, 2011). The danger of the hooliganism phenomenon is often repeated in media, political, and official discourse. Also, comments by politicians and media focus heavily on the negative ramifications of hooliganism, demanding that solid action against hooligans be taken to save the game and the society from its harms (Rookwood & Pearson, 2010).

Port Said incidents created a dramatically change the relation between football fans and media. Alahly and Almasry fans are considering the sports talk as a responsible for distorting their image to the public. This is because the sports talk shows distorted the image of the Port Said incidents and accused them as perpetrators of the massacre (Sobeih, 2012). Moreover, some sports talk shows tend to be highly critical Ahly Ultras.

Amitava Chatterjee explained how the fans perceiving media saying that “Media is an enemy” for fans since it is partially responsible for inciting mass hysteria before, during, and after football games. Chatterjee further mentions that “policing is also considered as one important factor giving way to hooliganism in football, as is media coverage,” particularly British media, which is a powerful factor in shaping the “perception, characteristics and development of football hooliganism” both in the past and the present. From the English perspective, football hooliganism has been viewed from time to time as “a construct of politicians and media” (Chatterjee, 2011).

Chatterjee stresses the “Mediaization” of hooliganism, noting that fans themselves have commented on their own susceptibility to media exposure (Chatterjee, 2011). Similarly, Gary &
Rosemary confirm that media stories have a great effect on both public opinion and police forces. Thus, we can say that media can affect the police and public opinion too. Conversely, fans’ violent behavior can also influence and fire public opinion (Gary & Rosemary, 1991). Spaaij propose that the “mainstream media coverage” of football violence found that mass media frame a condition, episode, person or group of persons defined as a threat to societal values, blowing up in the process ordinary events to national levels, when the matter could have been contained on a local level (Spaaij, 2011).

Ramon stresses that Mainstream media has an obvious role in describing and forming “social problems”; even average coverage and broadcasting of proven stories and news could be enough to cause worry, disquiet, exasperation or “panic” as a process of attracting “the public voice”. This describes exactly how Media has been dealing with the Hooliganism phenomenon, describing football fans prone to hooliganism as ‘thugs’, ‘yobs’, and ‘crazed animals’ whose actions are “meaningless and mindless”. Typical language used in media coverage of football violence contains words ‘fear’, ‘mayhem’, ‘terror’, with descriptions of football fields and stadiums as ‘pitched battles’ while also focusing on the casualties and incidental ‘looting’. Media also attempts to portray over-zealous fans as a ‘threat’ to the society and stressing the urgent need to step up ‘security’. The main target of negative media portrayals of football hooligans seems to be to boost its ‘presence’ while also highlighting and sensationalizing even the most trivial violent actions (Spaaij, 2011).

Vassilis and Joanna emphasize how sports media take advantage of tensions and enmity between rival fans since this kind of hate creates ‘higher ratings’ for the media. Sports media usually benefit from this hatred between fans by attracting people’s attention to the idea of ‘bad blood’ between teams just prior to a match with repeated archival footage of violent behavior in
preceding matches. This media strategy takes place effortlessly, while actually inflaming fan hostility and a sense of ‘Schadenfreude’ or the euphoria felt by one group at the afflictions of another (Dalakas & Melancon, 2012).

4- Fanaticism and Hooliganism:

While Berument M. Hakan claims that fans who have a high level identification with their teams tend to incorporate their team’s characteristics after a win to boosts their confidence, Russell & Goldstein state that fans who are powerfully identified with their team are more likely to express aggression and lapse into disorder especially after their team suffers a loss (Russell, & Goldstein,1995). Typical reactions to such defeats include violent and potentially deadly reactions since “High identification is connected to “higher fan aggression” (Dalakas & Melancon, 2012). Additionally, identification with their team stems from the fans’ identification with the sport and the players (Hunt et.al, 1999). Also, the deepest degree of association represents only a small proportion of the whole fans, leading to a tendency to participate in “antisocial” actions. In other words, this level of fanaticism can push fans to aggression and uncontrolled actions (Thorne & Bruner, 2006).

Hunt, Bristol and Bashaw say that the cause of sports fans behaviors’ is appear to be unconnected to the performance, suggesting that it is a ‘determinant’ rather than a result of the team’s performance (Hunt et.al, 1999). Football fans experience feelings of intense pride and happiness when their team wins; on the other hand, they are plunged into extreme depression and even misery when the team loses (Berument et.al, 2009, 595).
On their part, fans believe that the noise they generate during matches is a critical factor in their team’s victory, which explains why home matches are the preferred type of game. Fans also claim that they have the power to affect referees’ decisions in favor of their team. They also think that they have the ability to inspire team players to win, distract the rivals and affect officials (Anderson et.al, 2012,).

It is no exaggeration to describe football as the only sport supported by the majority of people in addition to being the only sport that can stir them to ‘fanaticism’ (Zani, & Kirchler, 1991). According to Spaij, football hooliganism refers to “football fans behaviors which cause damage to society” (Spaij, 2006, p.11). Furthermore, given the massive appeal and impact of football, its related problems produce urgent and equally massive reactions in the mass media. Skirmishes between fans of rival teams aggravates the phenomenon of football-related violence in the world’s stadiums. Violence has become a serious social crisis which has been enlarged by the mass media. The rise of violence has become a routine event in football matches (Zani, & Kirchler, 1991). Scott Thorne & Gordon C. Bruner claim that fanaticism is the amount of strength to a fan, with the point of association differing from ‘low to high’ strength. Moreover, fanaticism as an expression is regularly used in a negative way. According to Passmore, fanaticism is an “excessive enthusiasm”, and it as an intellectual defect that is usually affected by emotional factors, and the fanatic person is the one whose opinions and views usually carry a lot of exaggerations (Passmore, 2003). The researchers also say that ‘fandom’ refers to a “subculture of like-minded people, characterized by a sense of” closeness” to others with similar concerns and sharing a “subject-specific jargon” (Scott Thorne & Gordon C. Bruner). Within the context of fanaticism, a match is measured as a matter of ‘life or death’ and hatred of rival team’s fans
becomes a given. In addition, the ritualistic violence of fans has evolved to aggressive fanaticism (Zani & Kirchler, 1991).

Fanaticism is considered as a main cause of hooliganism (Al-Shahdy, 2007).

Hooliganism is not an up-to-the-minute problem, but the term itself has evolved over time (Mathias, 1991). Hooliganism is considered a significant “social phenomenon” (Sahaj, 2009). Researches in Hooliganism usually relates it to ‘demographic and social variables’, describing the hooligan as “young, dissatisfied single males, coming from working class backgrounds and usually economically needy” (Russell & Goldstein, 1995). On the other hand, Zani and Kirchler mention that “anybody can be a fanatical” and aggressive fan. Moreover, not all hooligans are impoverished, disenfranchised, or jobless. They appear to be like all other people, but with a more urgent need to express their deep emotions.

Bruna and Erich state that the term ‘hooligan’ has become prominent in many languages, not just in English, and regularly refers to aggressive football fans (Zani & Kirchler, 1991). Tomasz Sahaj states that Hooligans and non-hooligans differ in their commitment to attending matches. Hooligans might feel that they are the ‘representatives of their clubs’ or even of the “country, regions and the whole country” (Sahaj, 2009). Their association with their clubs is a proof of ‘nationalism’, raising fanaticism to the level of religious affiliation. The aim of fights between fanatics is to display superior physical strength, take ownership of the territory, and show which club is superior. In addition, fanatics think that such fights are ‘compulsory’ and must be won at any cost. Fighting, disagreement, and enmity are inevitable, no matter what the result of the match is. One negative outcome is that genuine admiration of the sport for its own sake disappears in the midst of the violence and injuries (Ramazanoglu & Coban, 2005).
Winning this fight means high ‘prestige’ for the winner; at the worst, football-induced violence can extend across the pitch and invade the social argument (Sahaj, 2009). Fanatics of each team may even seek to harm each other by preparing an ambush for their ‘enemies’ outside the football pitch such as on railway tracks or stadium entrances, or even in the street, for example. Harmful and sometimes deadly hoaxes are the main reason why police accompany fans traveling by train or bus. In extreme cases, hooligans might station themselves outside the pitches with dangerous weapons such as baseball bats, knives, and axes, showing their readiness to protect and fight for their team. Acting out all these kinds of violence and dealing with others aggressively has given rise to descriptions of hooligans as ‘the terrorists’ of modern sport (Sahaj, 2009).

Although some researchers describe hooliganism as a ‘cancer in an otherwise healthy body’, some football fans perceive a positive role of hooligans during football matches to help distract the opponent hooligans. Moreover, non-hooligan fans believe that hooligans play an essential roles in protecting teams and fellow fans and safeguarding their reputation for them, despite some fans’ disapproval of hooligan behavior for ‘practical’ rather than ‘moral’ reasons”.
(Rookwood & Pearson, 2010)

Ramazanoglu and Coban confirm that fans perceive other team fans as the ‘enemy’ (Ramazanoglu & Coban, 2005). Also, Dalakas and Melancon propose that Fans feel happy when their team wins and also when the detested opponent loses. ‘Schadenfreude’ is the German word describing the happiness that one group feels at the afflictions of another group. It is expected to happen when the relationship between groups is aggressive and full of violence. In
addition, the ‘competitive nature’ of sports and lengthy duration of the game help to build enmity toward other teams, and this enmity comes from the “fan identification”. Schadenfreude can manifest itself in different ways ranging from mild feelings of happiness when an opponent loses to malicious satisfaction at serious injuries sustained by competing players (Dalakas & Melancon, 2012).

The causes of hooliganism can be summarized in several points, namely, the highly competitive nature of certain violent sports, watching violent behaviors, and mutual feelings of ‘panic and deindividuation’, all of which are considered the main factors leading to hooliganism. With “deindividuation” people can act very aggressive in nameless states, and their tendencies to aggression increase when the violent actions are considered socially acceptable. On the other hand, people tend to be less violent when the violence is being abnormal (Zani & Kirchler, 1991). It should be pointed out that violence can be ‘verbal or physical’. Verbal violence is more common than physical violence; however, physical violence usually results from verbal violence. Physical violence can be defined as an aggressive assault on an individual by “using some parts of the body (organs, teeth) or weapons (knife, truncheon, gun) with similar violent behavior displayed by the person being attacked. The two types of aggression are considered anti-social and harmful. Advance preparation for radical violence is not easily achieved (Ramazanoglu & Coban, 2005). The fans’ identity determination is a desirable factor since understanding their identity can restrain violence during the match. Identity could be used to absorb anger away from fans and decrease their violent reactions as well. Zani & Kirchler add that football matches now include ‘two matches at the same time’, one between the real players
of the teams in the playground, and another one between the fanatical fans of each team who come to the pitch to fight rather than support the team. (Zani & Kirchler, 1991)

5- **Celebrities and Source Credibility:**

This study is discussing how the audience will adopt the opinions of the sports talk shows presenters who are considered celebrities in their own right.

With the growth and prevalence of mass media in whole cultures, celebrities have become an aspect of the family unit and a daily part of the culture with a wide fan base. A fan here can be described as someone with lasting association with a celebrity, a sport, TV show, and so forth (Thorne & Bruner, 2006). The literature shows that the audience, especially adolescents and young adults, are more likely to imitate celebrities as they consider them idols (Chan, 2007). Also, some writers confirm that people might attempt to model themselves after certain celebrities soon after media exposure. Interestingly, this kind of imitation is not limited exclusively to the young people, but also includes adults (Caughey, 1978). Additionally, Caughey found that younger fans look on celebrity idols as their idealized self-images. That is, admirers want to develop or refine personality traits that are similar to their idols. Even in the case of diffusion of innovations, the literature shows that opinion leaders are more effective in exerting a powerful impact on the audience to the extent that they imitate those opinion leaders (Rogers, 1976).

**Source Credibility:**

The concept of source credibility is related to this study since many people consider sports show hosts such as Medhat Shalaby, Ahmed Shobeir, and Alaa Sadeq as credible sources
of information to them. Framing the Port Said incidents by those anchors may affect the perception of a larger percentage of people who consider them as ‘highly credible’ as compared to those who feel these programs are ‘low credibility’ sources of information.

Many people consider the mass media as a main source of information, placing a responsibility on the media to uphold the credibility of what they present to the audiences. ‘Media credibility’ is a well-known concept which has been the focus of many studies. Recently, however, public attention has shifted from media credibility to source and message credibility (Johnson & Kaye, 1998).

Lee states that "Credibility is a multidimensional concept that may be measured by multidimensional means” (Lee, 1978, P. 284). While Johnson and Kaye suggest that credibility is usually defined in terms of “worthiness of being believed”, it is in general measured as a” multidimensional construct”. Media credibility has been measured in many different ways, and studies recommend that how credibility is measured should affect the degree to which people evaluate the media as credible. (Johnson & Kaye, 1998, 328)

Abdulla, Garrison others analyzed people’s perceptions of the credibility of news on television, newspapers and online websites in 2002, using a telephone survey to collect data. They found that participants’ evaluations of newspaper and television credibility were more similar than those of online news. The researchers added that the credibility of television news not only depends on the fairness of anchors but also on “accuracy, objectivity, believability, honesty and trustworthiness as aspects of fairness” (Abdulla, et. al, 2002)

Kiousis confirmed that the concept of credibility has been investigated in two areas: medium and source. Studying source credibility is important because it affects message
credibility as well. Source credibility refers to how the communicator or the sender of the message can affect the “processing of the messages”. (Kiousis, 2001, P. 382)

Sternthal, Dholakia and Leavitt in their study about the persuasive effect of the source credibility confirm that “Highly trustworthy and expert spokespeople induce a greater positive attitude toward the position they advocate than do communicators with less or moderate credibility”. They add that it is very important to be aware that the initial response of the message’s receiver is the main factor causes the influence. Negative responses to messages are provoked when people are in some way biased against the sender or the communicator review counter arguments to claims made to message. If a highly credible source controls counter arguing, while a less credible source does not, cognitive response expects the higher power of a highly credible communicator (Sternthal, et al., 1978, p. 252).

For decades, marketers, advertisers, politicians, professionals in various areas, and researchers in many fields have tried to gauge the effectiveness of high or low-credibility sources in changing beliefs, attitudes, or behaviors of the audience. Heesacker and others assume that highly credible source have the ability to persuade, leading to attitude change. Message quality and degree of credibility are the two major factors in persuading or altering public attitudes (Heesacker, et al., 1983).

In their study about the effects of source credibility on persuasion, Heesacker and others found that a speaker with high credibility is more persuasive than one with low credibility. They confirmed that source credibility can increase “message –relevant” thinking for people who in general do not examine the message content (Heesacker, et al., 1983, p. 653). In addition, Kiousis states that source credibility, which has been investigated in interpersonal,
organizational, and mass-mediated contexts, determines how dissimilar communicator
personalities can affect the processing of messages. Accordingly, objectivity, safety,
qualifications, and dynamism were later added after by many researchers to provide vital
components of source credibility (Kiousis, 2001).

Pornpitakpan found that source credibility have a direct effect on the persuasion process
from the perspective of recreation behavior management. Furthermore, it was found to influence
behavioral reaction. He added that a high-credible source is more ‘persuasive’ than a low
credibility one in the ability to ‘change attitudes and gain behavioral compliance’, and only a few
studies found little or no difference between low and high credibility sources in the process of
“persuasiveness” (Pornpitakpan, 2004, p.266)

The literature on credibility tells us how differences in source characteristics affect
people’s readiness to change their attitudes towards specific issues. A speaker's or
communicator’s credibility is verified by both the ‘source's trustworthiness and expertise’
(Grewal, D. et al., 1994, 148). In addition, the dimensions of source credibility have been
commonly identified to consist of expertise and trustworthiness. Expertise refers to the extent to
which a speaker is perceived to be capable of making correct assertions, and trustworthiness
refers to the degree to which an audience perceives the assertions made by a communicator to be
ones that the speaker considers valid (Pornpitakpan, 2004).
6- The Relationship between Sports and Politics:

George Orwell said that ‘Sport is war . . . minus the shooting’. Actually, sport is regarded as the best example of how the world works and how countries interact by means of sports events. Such is the impact of sports on human life that countries might go to war for its sake or fight for superior detection (Cha, 2009). Orwell’s comment provides an apt description of the relationship between sports and politics.

Bergsgard and Norberg confirm that sports and politics overlap to some extent, adding that in Scandinavia state support and sponsorship of sports is illustrated by funding of voluntary sports organizations and sporting facilities. This shows that the government is a visible presence in the empowerment of voluntary, non-governmental organizations while also controlling and limiting the role of official ones. The researchers conclude that “sport constitutes an arena where government authorities have consciously restricted their influence to benefit voluntary, non-governmental organizations with a high degree of autonomy” (Bergsgard & Norberg, 2010, P. 57).

Cha mentions three schools of international relations which try to explain how sport strengthens its specific characteristic of how the world works. One school stresses the notion of ‘State power’ as a base to recognizing ‘international relations’. For this worldview, newspaper’s events are created by governments opposing each other because of their superior use of national armies and economic resources. Sport is one more arena for either ‘inter-state’ rivalry or collaboration. Teams and sports personalities both represent their own countries. From the ‘power’ point of view, the outcomes of international sporting rivalry are considered a reflection of the entire nation’s power and prosperity. For example, it was no shock when Soviet and American athletes aggressively competed against each other throughout the period of the Cold
War as an extension of geopolitical competition. More recently, the Olympic victories of Chinese players reflect the superior power of their country.

The second school regards ‘world politics’ as dominant states complemented by a number of ‘non-state actors’, institutions, and corporations unconnected with their respective governments. International organizations are independent and have their own decisions which could be critical to world politics. Sport is a completely separate area from the national government given its status as a mirror of the wealthy ‘interconnectedness of the world’. FIFA, for example, represents actual actors with global ties rather than affiliation to any specific country; it can also force modifications in ‘policies’. This school confirms that governments might not prevent their sport institutions from making specific decisions even if these decisions are not compatible with the policies.

The third school of ideas stresses the importance of principles, notions, and ‘national identity’ worldwide. According to this school, sport is not just a ‘game’, but rather, a style of public communication between peoples of the world resulting in either collaborations or clashes. States regard the functioning of sport as a source of pride with sport emerging as an integral part of prominence, nationalism and prestige in world politics.

The forth group contains a number of professionals who warn against the deficiencies in each of the three schools of thoughts. Here sport is just a model of how an international phenomenon can describe an international system more effectively than do the established models. Sport can simply help in strengthening global ties due to its importance as part of the system.
Susann Bailer assumes that football fields are not only places for the game, but also for the construction of public realm and fantasy spaces where ‘political and cultural’ practices and dialogues are shaped and settled. “Football is thus played both on the pitch and beyond”. A football match relies on the strategic proficiency of players, training techniques of the coach, and the end results of the game. Politicians, journalists, fans, sports officials and sponsors can choose to be in the region of the pitch or away from it to support their team, disagree over results, and struggle to utilize the sporting success for their individual aims (Bailer, 2006). Football matches are described in many several ways: as a parable of life and strong feeling; as a play of victory and defeat; and as a strange mystery.

Sports and politics are sometimes colliding, but usually the politics using the sport as a tool of achieve specific goals. Gray and Rosemary Many study describe hooliganism as a model of ‘moral panic’ basically connected to disaster in ‘capitalist hegemony’. The major impact of hooligan behavior is ‘political’, and is thus exploited as a way to scare people from taking any opposing positions. Hooliganism has been tagged as a source of violence, generating over time public fears over such violence. The more people fear hooligan violence, the greater the likelihood of public acceptance of ‘draconian’ measures by the state (Gary &Rosemary, 1991).

7- **Sports and Politics in the Arab World:**

Because of the scarcity of researches that examining the relation between the sports and politics in the Arab countries, the researcher depended on this source only to get the information from. It is almost the first book which discussed the sports and politics in the Arab world after the Arab spring.
Amara said that sport and nation-building appear to be closely connected with respect to ideologies of development in the Arab World, a region where nationalism is emerging as a vital force that can gain momentum through sport. Throughout the colonial era a large number of Arab countries witnessed the context of sport as a vehicle for allowing the natives to co-exist with the colonial masters. Later on, sport shifted to a more significant role of expressing resistance against colonial forces while also safeguarding the Arab character on the world stage. (Amara, 2012).

A salient example of Arab exploitation of sports to express nationalist sentiments is the boycotting of the 1956 Melbourne Olympic Games by Egypt, Lebanon, and Iraq in protest against the tripartite invasion of Egypt by British, French, and Israeli forces. This act serves as the earliest example of concerted non-aggressive diplomatic action against external military offensives in the Arab region. Moreover, national sports clubs in the Arab World such as the Egyptian Al-Ahly launched in 1907, Mouloudia in Algeria in 1927, Esperance in Tunisia in 1919, and others formed the groundwork of emerging Arab nationalist movements (Amara, 2012).

Once independence was achieved and the colonial masters overthrown, sport became the mouthpiece of the people’s goals and Arab unity. This development occurred first in the North Africa and the Middle East area, after which it spread to the Gulf countries. National figureheads such as Saddam Hussein, Gamal Abdel Nasser, Mu’amar Gaddafi, King Hussein II, amongst others, embodied the newly-emerging nation states which witnessed the incorporation of public mobilization and sport. The process of expanding national prestige and building global relations involved organizing continental and regional events such as the All-African
Games and the Mediterranean Games and setting up international sport organizations (Amara, 2012).

In the Arab World sport serves a three-fold purpose: nation-building, political legitimization, and image-making. The Gulf countries have taken things a step further by merging the world of sport with economic concerns and political and corporate power groups. Policy-makers in the region rely on sport to facilitate transition in the direction of a post-oil period conducive to emerging business activities in business banking, tourism, retail and hospitality, and global networking, with the inclusion of the entertainment and sport industries. The United Arab Emirates and Qatar are prominent examples of this trend by sponsoring large-scale sports events and clubs with a view to inviting new investment opportunities and also to put themselves on the global map as prime locations of high-profile international sports events. This demonstrates how a multi-layered form of sport is furthering the nationalist, economic, and political ambitions of Arab leaders (Amara, 2012).

At another level, sport has also provided an opportunity for increasing ‘ethnic nationalist rivalries between clubs’, giving rise to occasional outbreaks of violence both inside and outside the playing fields. Examples abound of this type of inter-club violence, as seen during football matches between Egyptian and other North African clubs and national teams. Sport, especially football, seems to function as a conflict zone for contests over superiority and identity. In fact, the sports context offers one of the limited opportunities allowing segments of the Arab population, particularly young people, to celebrate a symbolic victory, make fun of the rulers and elite groups, and find an outlet for their anger at all the socio-economic hardships and political injustice facing them. Football also stands apart from other sport forms as a platform for
expressing hostilities over political, ethnic, or religious divides both internally and between Arab countries.

An appalling incident of inter-Arab football tensions took place during the 2010 FIFA World Cup qualifying matches between Egypt and neighboring Algeria. With both countries vying for the role of sole representatives of the Arab world in South Africa, hundreds of insulting videos were posted by both Egyptian and Algerian fans with the purpose of making a mockery of the rival country’s linguistic, cultural, and historical features. The game rapidly disintegrated into a war zone between the two national teams, triggering a near-diplomatic crisis between Egypt and Algeria, both of whom are members of the Arab League. During the violence and its aftermath, many Algerian supporters sustained serious injuries with Algerian students’ educational activities in Egypt disrupted and an angry mob surrounding the Algerian Embassy in Cairo. In Algeria, Egyptian companies were the scene of vandalism and mass violence to the point where Egyptian workers had to be evacuated out of the country. This incident shows that hooliganism and violence are becoming standard behavior in key football stadiums in the Arab World, fuelling a series of tensions between neighboring nation states (Amara, 2012).

In the wake of the so-called Arab Spring, sport is becoming a controversial topic in post-Bin Ali Tunisia and post-Mubarak Egypt. All aspects of sport in the Arab World are now being subjected to public scrutiny, particularly the actions and attitudes of sports clubs’ chiefs. The time seems to have come to judge perceived beneficiaries of previous regimes and also to determine the degree of intervention by power groups in corrupting the national sport system. To give an example, in Egypt a blacklist of counter-revolutionary individuals from the field of media, art, and sport was posted on the Internet. This list includes football stars such as Hassan Shehata, the famous Hossam and Ibrahim Hassan brothers, and Zamalek Football Club coaches,
all of whom had made a public show of support for Mubarak during the protests. Also named was Samir Zaher, head of the Egyptian Football Federation, Ahmed Shobeir, former goalkeeper of Al-Ahly and the Egyptian national team in the 1990s, currently a top sport media personality, and other commentators. Compiling a blacklist can be seen as a large-scale movement against sport corruption with the participation of 250 sport personalities and key figures of the January 25 Youth Revolution. In addition, the Military Council in charge of Egypt’s transitional period was requested to conduct an official investigation of sport corruption during Mubarak’s rule. (Amara, 2012)

The interplay of sport and politics is a complex one whose workings do not easily yield a clear interpretation. In recent years, football has acquired an increasingly political dimension while the abuse of sport is on the rise across the world, underscoring the fact that politics can directly affect sport inasmuch as sport can shape political developments.

8- Gender and Football Fans

Female fandom is thought of as a narrow segment of the sport scene, to the point that women are often marginalized by researchers of sports fandom. Moreover, the lack of research on female fans’ involvement in hooliganism is unsurprising since this is usually an all-male issue. Female fans may be aware that they are not seriously regarded by male fans as real supporters with allegations of their being present merely due to a sexual interest in players. Increasing participation of teenage girls in football audiences is attributed to the glamorized image of the teams’ star players (King, 2002). Labeling females as emerging consumer fans implies that they have weaker identification with their club. Sports fan studies have revealed that, despite globalization, localism is still an important factor in building
sports club support (Mewett & Toffoletti, 2008). Additionally, it becomes clear even from this brief review that the phenomenon of ‘feminisation’ in sports spectators may mean different things according to cultural perceptions (Crawford & Gosling, 2004).

Despite the rise of more messages and images centering on female athletes than ever before, sports continue to be regarded as predominantly male spheres (Hardin & Greer, 2009). Many young men in the United States indulge in some form of sports, with a substantial number subsequently becoming regular spectators of men’s sports. Over the past three decades, however, equal numbers of female athletes have been taking part in sports, but have not necessarily become women’s sports spectators. For this reason, the general assumption is that women are negligible followers of sport programs. To explain this imbalance, sports enthusiasts propose two main arguments: first, limited exposure to women’s sports hampers its ability to win a devoted audience; and, second, the resulting ‘symbolic annihilation’ suggests women’s unimportance in the wider sports context. Women have the tendency to short-change their pursuit of sport-based entertainment, exposing themselves to sports programs only in their limited leisure time. This might be because women are traditionally domestic figures and care givers. As such, female viewership of sports events is determined by free slots in women’s traditional pursuits and tasks rather than specific sports events or schedules. Women also tend to eschew sustained viewing of a specific game from start to finish, experiencing sports media by means of a series of continual interruptions. Despite occasional genuine interest in a sports event, a number of women mention they make use of sports media not for enjoyment but as a way of bonding with their men folk and loved ones (Whiteside & Hardin, 2011).
9- Sports Talk Shows and the Port Said Massacre

A number of sports talk shows generated negative public opinion towards Port Said residents and their team Al Masry (Sobeih, 2012). This message was clear in some popular talk shows hosted by Ahmed Shoubeir, Alaa Sadeq, and Medhat Shalaby. In his program on the Modern Sport Channel, Shoubeir displayed hysterical behavior and made insulting remarks about Port Said residents, saying that "during the former regime, the police was able to keep security, and that would never have happened during this period". Shoubeir added that the January 25 Revolution has brought on the present chaos (Shoubeir, 2012, February 1). In addition, some sports presenters were not objective at all, passing judgments and making generalizations even before the Inquiry Committee released its results. Alaa Sadeq even went so far as to describ Port Said as ‘the killing city’ and Almasry fans as “thugs”. He added that every single Port Saidi was implicated in the event, accusing them all of killing innocent Ahly fans (Sadeq, 2012, February 2).

According to the report submitted by the Inquiry Committee, the Al Masry Club administration was involved in this crime, as the lights were switched off earlier than usual, the speakers were turned up to maximum volume to cover up the screams of the victims, and, finally, the doors of the stadium had been bolted to prevent the audience from escaping. The same committee confirmed the involvement of security forces in the crime due to footage of deliberate non-action during the attack. All these points show that the sport talk shows turned public opinion against the people of Port Said and Al Masry team, branding them as perpetrators of the crime, even before an official report had been drawn up (Fouad, et. al, 2012).
Chapter four

Methodology

In the aftermath of the Port Said massacre, a horrifying event in the history of Egyptian football, many people are still questioning the identity of its perpetrators. Given the tragic loss of life incurred during and even after the incidents, people have every right to learn the truth. Unfortunately, the media perhaps are no longer being trusted to fulfill its main functions, which are to inform accurately and fairly. Media (sports talk shows) maybe loss of credibility in terms of the Port Said tragedy and it is due to the questionable role played by high profile sport media presenters. In fact, some perceive that the media was actually guilty of stirring up the violence in the first place. Measuring public perceptions of the Port Said massacre as well as the effects of media framing of the events drive this study.

Research Problem:

Since the 2012 Port Said football attack has become a crucial public opinion issue, and given the powerful impact of television on people’s perceptions during crisis situations, the researcher focuses on the effect of sports talk show viewership on audience’s perceptions of the Port Said massacre.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To measure and analyze the perceptions of sports talk show audiences of the Port Said events.
2. To examine the relation between fans’ team identifications and the Media.
3. To examine fans’ perceptions of the Port said incidents in terms of media framing.
4. To evaluate the performance of sports talk show anchors.
5. To examine sports talk show credibility and audience’s perceptions of the Port Said incidents.
6. To identify audiences’ source of information during the incidents.

Significance of the Study:

- The study examined the media framing effect on audience’s perceptions of the Port Said incidents. This practice can be considered one of the least explored focus of studies in the Arab world since it includes a complex mix of elements: sports, politics, and media.

Although a large number of researchers have discussed the relation between sport and politics, or between sport and media, few studies in the Middle East, especially in Egypt, have attempted to determine or discuss the relation between media, sports and politics.

Method of Data Collection:

This study is a quantitative research attempting to determine the effect of sports talk show viewership on audience's perceptions of the Port Said incidents.

A self-administered survey by the researcher was distributed among the sample; this survey included filtering questions on viewership of sports talk shows throughout the Port Said incidents (2012). The survey questionnaire contains 35 items according to four key categories which are: perception so participants of the Port Said incidents, audiences’ perceptions of anchors’ performance during the incidents, sports talk show credibility and the demographics of the participants. The respondents were informed that their participation is totally voluntary and anonymous.
The survey mainly includes questions that help in determining sports talk show audiences and their perceptions of the Port Said events. The questionnaire includes some questions and phrases designed to evaluate audience’s perception. These questions are based on the researcher’s findings in the Literature Review and the overall objectives of the study. Also included in the survey are several questions about television viewership and people’s dependence on it during this crisis. In addition, the survey feature a Likert scale containing five points ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree as well as a neutral option. Questions on demographics were added to the questionnaire due to their importance and indications in the results of the study. Also, some other questions were added to measure different football fan tendencies regarding the Port Said events.

A pilot study, conducted on 20 participants, was conducted in order to show the reliability and internal validity of the study. Almost all the participants were able to fill in the information on the Likert scale (and other items); thus, the researcher did not need to modify any questions in the survey.

There were question about demographics (gender, age, sex, income, place of residence); addition to questions to identify team identification of participants to determine whether or not this factor affects their attitudes or perceptions toward the incidents. The questionnaire was intentionally designed in Arabic in order to guarantee diversity of participants’ educational and socioeconomic levels.
Sample:

A purposive sampling technique was used to obtain the data. The questionnaire was conducted on 465 respondents made up of both Cairo and Port Said residents, and stratified to 193 Al-Ahly fans, 115 Al Masry fans, 83 neutral fans who are Zamalek Club fans, and the remainder belonging to other teams including (AlItihad Alsakandary” Alexandrian Union”, Ismaili, Haras Hodod (Borders Guard), Chelsea, and the Egyptian national team) in order to compare and contrast their tendencies and perceptions.

As mentioned above, the researcher deliberately chose Al Ahly and Al Masry fans as the Port Said bloodbath was staged inside the Port Said Stadium in the context of a high-stakes match between the two teams supported by these fans, whose opinions would be diametrically opposed to each other. In addition, the researcher included fans from Al Zamalek or other teams to guarantee an element of neutrality, and also distance, in opinion.

The questionnaire was tested with a pilot study before it was distributed anonymously by the researcher. It includes filtering questions on viewership of sports talk shows during the Port Said incidents. After answering the filtering questions, 22 questionnaires were excluded, so the valid sample totalled 443 respondents. The participants' ages range from 16 - 75 years, representing both males and females.

The researcher noticed that a large number of females refused to fill out the survey when they found out that it centered on football, claiming that they are not interested in football and strongly object to even discussing this topic. Accordingly, the response rate was higher among males, the majority of whom were enthusiastic about responding to the questionnaire.
Collecting responses directly from Port Said residents is expected to enrich the study and its results, as their feedback represents a unique perception that is far different from that Al Ahly fans or Cairo residents. To achieve diversity, the researcher collected data in Cairo and Port Said as well as selecting respondents from different educational and socioeconomic levels. In order to facilitate completion of the survey, it was conducted in Arabic.

**Hypotheses:**

Based on the Literature Review, the researcher formulated the study hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis 1 is based on the framing theory which means that media select certain aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicative context to affect peoples’ perceptions and attitudes toward specific issues (Entman, 1993). Furthermore, according to Salah Eldin media frames could be one of the main causes of shaping public opinion towards a specific issue or event (Salah Eldin, 2001).

H1: The more audiences watched Sports talk shows through the incidents, the more they perceived Port Said residents as the perpetrators of the incidents.

Independent variable: Sports Talk show viewership

Dependent variable: Audience’s perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the port said incidents
While Abdulla and others described the media credibility as “a complex content” (Adulla, et. al, 2002), Johnson and Kaye assumed that credibility is in general defined in terms of “worthiness of being believed”, it is characteristically measured as a “multidimensional” construct. Media credibility has been measured in different ways; how credibility is measured affect the degree to which people evaluate the media as credible (Johnson & Kaye, 1998).

Hypothesis 2 has been postulated depended on the above researches:

H2: Audiences who consider the sports talk shows a credible source of information are more likely than other audiences to believe that Port Said residents are the perpetrators of the incidents.

Independent variable: Source credibility (sports talk shows)

Dependent variable: Audiences’ perception of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the port said incidents

The following research questions guided this study:

RQ1: Are Ahly fans more likely than other fans to believe that the media distorted their image?

RQ2: Are Al Masry fans are more likely than other fans to believe that the media distorted their image.

RQ3: Are Al - Ahly fans are more likely than other fans to perceive Port Said residents as perpetrators of the massacre?

RQ 4: Where did the people get their information about the Port Said incidents?

RQ5: How do people perceive the anchors’ performance during the events?
Operationalization of the study variables:

- **Audience’s perceptions of the Port Said events:**

  Perceptions of sports talk show audiences describe the attitudes or impressions of audiences towards the Port Said incidents. In other words, the way sports talk shows audiences perceive the Port Said events.

  Perception was measured by a set of sentences on a Likert scale in order to determine the strength of these attitudes and opinions. Independent variables such as talk show viewership, and talk show credibility were compared with audiences’ perceptions as a dependent variable, thereby forming an index in order to assess its impact later on.

  The Literature Review and Introduction served as a guide to the researcher’s wording of certain sentences to include an explanation and expectations of audience’s opinions about the Port Said incidents.

  Sentences measuring perception were as follows:

  - Port Said residents are responsible for the killing of the victims.
  - Al Ahly Ultras provoked Al Masry Fans.
  - I think that some Port Said residents are thugs.
  - I think that Al Masry fans are innocent of committing the Port Said incidents.

- **Source Credibility:**

  This study measures the credibility of sports talk shows covering the Port Said events.

  Credibility is measured by a set of sentences as follows:

  - Sports talk shows covered the whole story on the Port Said incidents
- Sports talk shows were honest in their coverage of the incidents.

- Coverage of sports talk show presenters of the Port Said incidents was biased and lacked professionalism.

- Sports talk shows demonstrated concern for the community during their coverage of the Port Said events.

- Sports talk shows were accurate while covering the Port Said events.

- Sports talk shows are considered trustworthy following their coverage of the Port Said events.

- Sports talk shows dealt fairly with all parties on the issue of the Port Said incidents.

- Presenters of sports talk shows separated the facts from their personal opinions in their coverage of the Port Said incidents.

- **Perceptions of anchors’ performance:**

  This perception describes the attitudes or impressions of audiences towards the performance of sports talk show anchors during the Port Said incidents. In other words, how sports talk show audiences perceive the performance of anchors such as Shobeir, Shalaby, Sadeq, and El Ghandour throughout the events in Port Said.

  - I think that Shobeir’s coverage of the incidents fueled the Port Said massacre.

  - Sadek was neutral in his coverage of the Port Said incidents.

  - Shalaby presented the events in an objective manner.

  - El Ghandour covered the Port Said incidents without voicing his personal opinion.
- Sports talk show anchors incited hatred between the majority of Egyptians and Port Said residents.

- Sports talk show anchors have the opportunity to express their political opinions and analyses of events through their programs.

- In order to obtain accurate results for this study, the researcher defined the terms and several of the variables used; the key terms of the study are: Sports talk shows, Fans, Fanaticism, Hooliganism, and Source Credibility.

Sports Talk Shows:

Sports television programs involve one person (or group of people) discussing various topics put forward by a talk show host. In this study the researcher refers to the Ahmed Shobeir, Medhat Shalaby, Alaa Sadeq, and Khaled El Ghandour sport shows, widely viewed as being the most popular sports programs among Egyptians.

Fan:

Kenneth Hunt defines the Fan as “an enthusiastic devotee of some particular sports consumptive object” and as a customer or user of the sport incited to participate in actions related to the team or sport (Hunt et.al, 1999.).

Fanaticism:

Since Passmore defines the fanaticism as “excessive enthusiasm”, and added that it as an intellectual defect that is usually affected by emotional factors, and the fanatic person is the one whose opinions and views usually carry a lot of exaggerations (Passmore, 2003). Fanaticism is a main cause of hooliganism (Al Shahdy, 2007)
Hooliganism:

According to Spaij, football hooliganism refers to “football fans who cause damage to society” (Spaij, 2006). Hooliganism refers to disorderly, violent, and damaging behavior by football fans who associate themselves to an extreme degree with their teams.

Source Credibility:

Source credibility is a term describing a speaker or a communicator with high credibility, whose powers of more persuasion are stronger than someone with low credibility. In this study, the researcher refers to the sports talk shows as a source and attempts to measure their credibility on a scale to examine to determine their degree of credibility as sources. The credibility scale consists of fairness, lack of bias, whole story inclusion, accuracy, the interests of others, community-mindedness, concern for community well-being, separation of fact and opinion, trustworthiness, and factuality.

**Instruments:**

The questionnaire was designed and distributed in the Arabic language. It included filtered questions on sports talk show viewership during the Port Said incidents. Those who did not watch sports talk shows while the events were in progress were excluded and their answers cancelled. The questionnaire begins with a question on information sources on which audiences depended during the events, in order to examine the “media dependency theory” and its validity. In addition, many of the questions were closed ended questions on sports affiliations of participants and how they personally perceive the incidents.
Demographic questions, such as gender, age, income, and educational level, were deliberately placed at the end of the 5-page questionnaire to ensure that respondents filled out all the questions prior to submitting the completed questionnaire. The researcher chose this design to yield more meaningful results.

**Statistical Analysis:**

SPSS was used to analyze the data collected. In order to achieve the main objectives of the study, several statistical techniques were used such as frequencies, means, and percentages, Chi-Square, T-Test, Anova, and Pearson R correlation all of which were used to examine the significance of the results. Microsoft Excel was used in some calculations.
Chapter Five

Results

The research questions and hypotheses of the study measure the effect of sports talk shows on audiences’ perceptions of the 2012 Port Said incidents. They test whether framing of the events has affected people negatively or positively and altered their attitudes toward the incidents. Perceptions were measured by a number of sentences describing the Port Said incidents. In addition, a Likert scale was used to measure the perceptions of audiences of the incidents.

The study attempts to investigate other issues relating to team identification and fanaticism and how they affect participants’ perceptions. The credibility of sports talk shows and anchors’ performance were also measured in this research.

Description of the Sample:

The sample included 443 participants affiliated to different football teams. The majority (47.7%) of the participants were Al Ahly fans due to the popularity of this club nationwide, (20.5%) of the sample were El Zamalek Fans, 28.4% of the sample were Almasry Fans, and (3.4%) of the sample belonged to other teams including (Alltihad Alsakandary” Alexandrian Union”, Ismaili, Haras Hodod (Borders Guard), Chelsea, and the Egyptian national team) of the total respondents, 24.1% belonged to one Ultras groups, and 75.9% had no affiliations with any Ultras groups. Most of the Ultras belonged to Almasry fan base, since many Ahly Ultras refrained from answering the questionnaire on the grounds of their decision not to answer any media-related questions in light of the acrimonious relationship between them.
The set of respondents was comprised of 76.9% males and 23.1% females. The vast majority of the respondents, 68.0%, were college graduates, 21.2% were High School Diploma holders (Thanaweya a’ma or equivalent), 6.6% were M.A holders, 2.3% were Ph.D. holders, and 0.8% checked “other”.

The results show that the media usage of the sample of media users during the Port Said incidents was as follows: 28.2% print media, 33% electronic journalism, 79.9 TV channels, 7.9% Radio, 24.8% - social media (Facebook and Twitter), and 0.2% were Other citing friends from Ultras groups, friends in Port Said, and first hand accounts from the stadium. Many participants were using more than one media at the same time as a source of information.

The participants’ media habits during the Port Said incidents were different. 38.1% of the respondents were heavy viewers of sports talk shows and channels, spending over four hours daily in watching sports talk shows. 31.7% of the sample was moderate viewers of sports talk shows and channels, spending more than two to four hours per day in watching sports talk shows. The remaining 30.2% were considered light viewers of sports talk shows and channels as they spent (0-2) hours per day in watching sports talk shows.

Details of Respondents’ Perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents:

When the respondents were asked their opinion about the possibility that the Ports Said events had been planned, 64.0% of the whole sample answered (Yes), they agree that it was planned, 25.4% of the sample answered (No) that it was not planned, and 10.6% of the sample said (Maybe) it was planned.
The opinion of the Ultras group about the Port Said incidents. 52.1% of Ultras groups think it was planned, 42.7% of the Ultras group think (no) it was not planned, and 5.2% of the respondents belonging to Ultras answered that (may be) it was planned. Results shows that there is a significant difference between the participants of Ultras group’s opinion and the normal fans toward the question about if the Port Said incidents were planned with a significant level(p=0.000).

Who is responsible for the Port Said incidents?

When participants were asked about the identity of the perpetrators of the Port Said residents, they gave mixed responses.

39.3% of the whole sample believes the police was responsible for what happened in Port Said, 18.7% thinks that both Al Ahly fans and their Ultras were responsible for the incidents, 9.3% cited remnants of the former NDP (Feloul), 7.7% agreed that the SCAF (Supreme Council of the Armed forces) was responsible while 5% held Port Said residents and Al Masry Ultras accountable.

and 2.6% blamed media and sports programs. The remaining 17.8% of the sample mentioned different agents such as fanaticism, thugs, ignorance, chaos, corruption, and so on.

Testing the Study Hypotheses:

To measure the effect of sports talk show viewership on audience’s perceptions of the Port Said massacre, the perception of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents was measured by four sentences on a Likert scale containing five points ranging from (1) refers to strongly disagree to (5) refers to strongly agree as well as a neutral option in order to determine the strength of audiences’ attitudes and opinions.
Table 1: Mean score of different sentences of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Port Said residents are responsible for the killing of the victims</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultras Ahlawy provoked Al Masry Fans</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that some of the Port Said residents are thugs</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that Al Masry fans are innocent of committing the Port Said incidents</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summated mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.60*</td>
<td>.81124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item 2 and 4 is reverse coded

Table 1 shows the mean score of the participants with the every sentence that measuring the perception of the Port Said incidents Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents on the likert scale. The mean score of the total sample toward the first sentence (The Port Said residents are responsible for the killing of the victims) is M=2.09, the mean score of the total sample toward the second sentence (Ultras Ahlawy provoked Al Masry Fans) is M=3.33, the mean score of the total sample toward the third sentence (I think that some of the Port Said residents are thugs) is M=2.48, and the mean score of the total sample toward the fourth sentence which was reverse coded (I think that Al Masry fans are innocent of committing the Port Said incidents) is M=2.52.
The summated mean (index) has been used using the combine score of the four sentences to measure audience’s perception of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents.

The mean score audience’s perception of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents among the whole sample watching sports talk shows M=2.60. This means that the participants do not perceive the Port Said residents as thugs or perpetrators of the massacre.

Hypothesis 1 is based on the framing theory which means that media select certain aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicative context to affect peoples’ perceptions and attitudes toward specific issues (Entman, 1993). Since some of the sports talk shows portrayed the Portsaidis and Al Masry fans as killers and perpetrators of the massacre, like Alaa Sadeq (El Naggar, 2012), this hypothesis tested whether the participants were affected by the anchor’s opinions or not.

**H1**: The more audiences watched sports talk shows throughout the Port Said incidents, the more they perceived Port Said residents as the perpetrators of the incidents.

**Table 2**: Average number of hours spent by audiences in watching sports talk shows throughout the Port Said incidents per day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-2 hours)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(more than 2-4 hours)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(over 4 hours)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows that 38.1% of the respondents were over 4 hours watching sports talk shows during the crisis phase of the Port Said incidents. Another 31.7% of the sample depended on talk shows, they can only be considered as moderate viewers spent 2-4 hours per day watching sports programs. The remaining 30.2% of the respondents watched sports talk shows during the Port Said Massacre 0-2 hours per day.

Table 3: ANOVA Test to Measure the effect of watching sports talk shows on audience’s perception of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of the Port Said events</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.370</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.685</td>
<td>12.313</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>240.903</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>256.272</td>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that there is a significant difference between the three groups of audiences in terms of their perception of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents as a significant level is (p= 0.000). This means that people who watched sports talk shows more than others have different perceptions of the Port Said events than do light or moderate viewers of sports talk shows during the incidents.
Table 4: T-Test test the effect of watching sports talk shows on audience’s perception of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many hours did you spent in watching sports talk shows throughout the Port Said incidents per day?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Port said incidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 hours</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.7507</td>
<td>.67094</td>
<td>.06284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More 4 hours</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2.9014</td>
<td>.48979</td>
<td>.03960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A paired-samples t test was used to test the effect of watching sports talk shows on audience’s perception of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents, revealing a significant difference only between audiences who watched the sports talks shows from 0-2 hours as a light viewers and the audiences who watches these programs during the events more than 4 hours as a heavy viewers, t=2.12, p=0.35. On average, the audiences who are high viewers of the sports talk shows perceived port said residents more negatively than the heavy viewers of the those sports talk shows (heavy viewers: M= 2.90, SD= 0.48; low viewers: M=2.75, SD= 0.67).

Consequently, the hypothesis1 is supported by a significant difference between the audiences who watched the sports talk shows from 0-2 hours (light viewers) and the audiences who watched these programs more than 4 hours( heavy viewers) in terms of the perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents.

In order to measure to which extent do the participants think that the sports talk shows distort the image of Al Ahly, the participants were asked to mark on a Likert Scale consists of 5 degrees the following sentence: “Sports talk shows distorted the image of Ahly fans”. Whereas 5 was strongly agree and 1 was strongly disagree.
**RQ1**: Are Al Ahly fans more likely than others to believe that the media distorted their image?

The RQ 1 was asked and the answers were as the following:

Table 5: Mean score of fan groups’ perceptions in terms of distorting the image of Al Ahly Fans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team identification</th>
<th>Sports talk shows distorted the image of Ahly fans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean 3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahly fans</td>
<td>N 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 1.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamalek fans</td>
<td>Mean 3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 1.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Masry Fans</td>
<td>Mean 1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 1.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 5, Al Ahly fans are more likely than other fan groups to perceive that Sports talk shows distorted their image with average mean $M=3.36$, while Al Zamalek fans who are considered neutral fans did not have a specific attitude $M=3.06$. On the other hand, the mean score of Al Masry fans, considered as rivals of Al Ahly team, is $M=1.88$
**Table 6:** Anova Test to measure the differences between the perceptions of the club fan groups in terms of distorting the image of Al Ahly fans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team identification</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>153.552</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51.184</td>
<td>33.903</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>573.687</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>727.240</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that the data collected shows that there is a significant difference in the perceptions of the different fan groups regarding the distortion of Al Ahly fans’ image (p=0.00).

**Table 7: T-Test to measure the difference between Alahly and Al zamalek in terms of that the media distorted the image of Al ahly fans.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team identification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media distorted the image of Alahly fans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahly</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamlek</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.345</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results show that the mean score of Alahly fan is M=3.36, and the mean score of Alzamalek fans is M=3.06. A paired-samples t-test was used, revealing that there is no significant difference between Ahly and Zamalek fans in terms of that the media distorted the image of Alahly fans, $t=1.69$, $p=0.092$

**Table 8:** T- Test to measure the difference between Alahly and Al Almasry in terms of that the media distorted the image of Alahly fans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Identification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media distorted Alahly fans’ image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahly</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almasry</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows that the mean score of Alahly fan is M=3.36, and the mean score of Almasry fans is M=1.88. There is a significant difference between Ahly and Almasry fans in terms of that the media distorted the image of Alahly fans, $t=10.3$, $p=0.00$. Alahly fans are more likely than Almasry fans to believe that the media distorted the image of Alahly fans.
Table 9: T-Test to measure the difference between Alzamalek and Al Almasry in terms of that the media distorted the image of Al ahly fans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Identification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media distorted Alahly fans’ image</td>
<td>Alzamalek</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almasry</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows that the mean score of Alzamalek fan is M= 3.06 and the mean score of Almasry fans is M=1.88. Table 18 shows that there is a significant difference between Alzamalek and Almasry fans in terms of that the media distorted the image of Alahly fans, $t=6.89$, $p=0.00$. Alzamalek fans are more likely than Almasry fans to believe that the media distorted the image of Alahly fans.

The participants were asked to mark on a Likert Scale consists of 5 degrees the following sentence: “Sports talk shows distorted the image of Almasry fans”. Whereas 5 was strongly agree and 1 was strongly disagree in order to measure to which extent do the participants think that the sports talk shows distort the image of Almasry.

**RQ2**: Are Al Masry fans more likely than others to believe that the media distorted their image?

The RQ 2 was asked and the answers were as the following:
Table 10: Mean score of fan groups’ perception in terms of distorting the image of Al Masry fans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team identification</th>
<th>Sports talk shows distorted the image of the Al Masry fans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahly fans</td>
<td>Mean 3.45, N 178, Std. Deviation 1.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamalek fans</td>
<td>Mean 3.63, N 80, Std. Deviation 1.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Masry Fans</td>
<td>Mean 4.81, N 112, Std. Deviation .562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows that Al Masry fans are more likely than other fan groups to perceive that sports talk shows distorted their image with average mean $M=4.81$, while Al Zamalek fans who are considered neutral fans did not have a specific attitude $M=3.63$. In spite of this, the mean score of Al Ahly fans, considered rivals of Al Masry team, is $M=3.45$. 
Table 11: Anova Test to measure The significance between the perceptions of fan groups in terms of distorting the image of Al Masry fans

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports talk shows distorted the image of Almasry fans</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q20-I think that the media distorted the image of Almasry fans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>135.577</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.192</td>
<td>41.900</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>409.857</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545.435</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 11, there are significant differences in the perceptions of the different fan groups in terms of their perception of image distortion of Al Masry fans, p=0.000.

Table 12: T-Test to measure the difference between Alahly and Al zamalek in terms of that the media distorted the image of Al masry fans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team identification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media distorted the image of Almasry fans</td>
<td>Ahly</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zamlel</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows that the mean score of Alahly fan is M=3.45, and the mean score of Alzamalek fans is M=3.63. A paired-samples t-test was used, revealing that there is no significant difference between Ahly and Zamalek fans in terms of that the media distorted the image of Almasry fans, p=0.27.
Table 13: T-Test to measure the difference between Alahly and Almasry in terms of that the media distorted the image of Al masry fans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team identification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media distorted the image of Almasry fans</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = -11.3 \]

\[ p = 0.00 \]

Table 13 shows that the mean score of Alahly fan is \( M = 3.45 \), and the mean score of Almasry fans is \( M = 4.81 \). Al masry fans are more likely than Alahly fans in terms of believing that the media distorted the image of Almasry fans. Results show that there are significant differences between Almasry and Alahly fans in terms of their perception of image distortion of Al Masry fans, \( t = -11.3 \), \( p = 0.000 \).

Table 14: T-Test to measure the difference between Alzamalek and Almasry in terms of that the media distorted the image of Al masry fans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team identification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media distorted the image of Almasry fans</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = -11.3 \]

\[ p = 0.00 \]
Table 14 shows that the mean score of Almasry fan is $M=4.81$, and the mean score of Alzamalek fans is $M=3.63$. This shows that Almasry fans are more likely than Alzamalek fans to believe that the media distorted the image of Almasry fans. There are significant differences between Alzamalek and Almasry fans in terms of their perception of image distortion of Al Masry fans, $t=-11.3$, $p=0.00$.

In order to measure to which extent Alahly fans are more likely than other fans to perceive Port Said residents as perpetrators the participants were asked to mark the four sentences of the perception of the port said incidents -which mentioned above -on the likert scale.

**RQ3:** Are Al - Ahly fans are more likely than other fans to perceive Port Said residents as perpetrators of the incidents?

The answers were as following:

**Table 15:** Mean score of Al-Ahly and other fans’ perception of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your favorite team Perceptions of Port Said Events</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Ahly</td>
<td>2.8671</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.85310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Zamalek</td>
<td>2.7754</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.88004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Masry</td>
<td>2.0536</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.23513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows that on average Al Ahly perceived the Port Said incidents negatively with an average mean $M=2.86$ and consider the Port Said residents and Al Masry fans perpetrators of the massacre more than other fans. The Alzamalek mean score is $M=2.77$ compared to Almasry mean score is $M=2.05$. The team identification and that the effect of
fanaticism is stronger on Al Ahly fans than on other fans in terms of the perceptions of the Port Said events.

**Table 16:** Anova Test to measure the significance between club fans in terms of the perception of Port Said incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port Said events perception * Favorite team</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>49.170</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.390</td>
<td>30.430</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>206.825</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>255.995</td>
<td>387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that there are significant differences between club fans identification in terms of their perception of the Port Said incidents (p= 0.000).

A paired-samples *t* test was used to test the different fan groups’ perceptions of Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents, revealing a significant difference between Alahly and Almasry fans, *t*=-3.82, *p*=0.000. On average, Alahly fans are more likely than almasry fans to perceive the Port Said residents as perpetrators of the massacre (Alahly: M=2.7, Almasry: M= 3.0).

Also, there is a difference between Alzamalek and Almasry fans in terms the perception of Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents fans as a significant level is  *t* = -2.83, *p* = 0.005. On average, Alzamalek fans are more likely than almasry fans to perceive the Port Said residents as perpetrators of the massacre (Alzamalek: M=2.82, Almasry: M= 3.01).
Johnson and Kaye assumed that credibility is in general defined in terms of “worthiness of being believed”, it is characteristically measured as a “multidimensional” construct. Media credibility has been measured in different ways; how credibility is measured affect the degree to which people evaluate the media as credible (Johnson & Kaye, 1998). Source credibility refers to how the communicator or the sender of the message can affect the “processing of the messages”. (Kiousis, 2001, P. 382)

Depends on the above researches, this hypothesis was postulated.

**H2: Audiences who consider the sports talk shows a credible source of information are more likely than other audiences to believe that Port Said residents are the perpetrators of the incidents.**

The credibility of sports talk shows was measure by Credibility is measured by a set of sentences on a likert scale and audience were asked to rate their answers from 1 refers to Strongly disagree to 5 refers to strongly agree. Additionally, the summated means of the perception of the credibility used to get the combine score of the whole sentences. The sentences were as follows:

- Sports talk shows covered the whole story on the Port Said incidents.

- Sports talk shows were honest in their coverage of the incidents.

- Coverage of sports talk show presenters of the Port Said incidents was biased and lacked professionalism.

- Sports talk shows demonstrated concern for the community during their coverage of the Port Said events.
- Sports talk shows were accurate while covering the Port Said events.
- Sports talk shows are considered trustworthy following their coverage of the Port Said events.
- Sports talk shows dealt fairly with all parties on the issue of (the Port Said incidents)
- Presenters of sports talk shows separated the facts from their personal opinions in their coverage of the Port Said incidents.

Table 17: the correlation between sports talk shows credibility and perception of port said incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of port said incidents</th>
<th>index1</th>
<th>index3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of port said incidents Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports talk shows credibility    Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 5 is rejected. Table 17 shows that there is no statistically significant correlation between sports talk show credibility and perceptions of the Port Said incidents as the (R=0.095). This means that there is no relation between perceive sports talk shows as a credible source of information and perceive the Port Said residents as perpetrators of the massacre. Moreover, the table shows that there are no significant difference between sports talk shows credibility and audiences’ perceptions of the Port Said massacre as the (p=0.060).
RQ 4:

Where did the people get their information about the Port Said incidents?

According to the media dependency theory, people’s reliance on the media for information is heightened during crises. Moreover, they rely on media even when the information seems to be misleading. Abou zaid, 2006 and Al-Qeliney 1998 have also shown that dependency on Television during a community crisis increases goals of social and self-understanding.

Table 18: The distribution of the sample according to the type of media they watch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>newspapers</th>
<th>Electronic journalism</th>
<th>TV channels</th>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>Social media</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of that study show that 79.9% of the participants depended on television channels as a main source of information throughout the Port Said incidents more than other media, as the pervious table shows.
Table 19. Average number of hours per week that participants usually spend in watching television

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 3 Hours</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3-6 hours</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 hours</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 shows that 45.8% of the total sample was heavy viewers of television, spending more than 6 hours per week watching it. Also, 30.9% of the samples were moderate television viewers with an average of more than 3-6 hours per week of viewing time. Besides, 23.3% of the sample was light viewers of television with averages of 0-3 hours of weekly viewing time.

As mentioned in the literature review section, effects of media messages are more likely to take place in concurrence with a stronger dependency on media. In addition, media dependence during a crisis increases the probability of altering attitudes and behaviors in response to dominant media stories about the incident (Cho & Gower, 2009).
Table 20: T-Test to Measure the Relation between Television Dependency and Perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Television Channels</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not Watch TV</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.6704</td>
<td>.91027</td>
<td>.11121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watched TV</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>2.5965</td>
<td>.79017</td>
<td>.04390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 shows that people who chose television as a main source of information throughout the Port Said incidents do not perceive Port Said residents as perpetrators of the massacre with an average mean of M=2.59. People who did not depend on television as a main source of information during the events an average mean M=2.67. The result shows that there is no significant difference between television dependency as a main source of information throughout the Port Said incidents and perceptions of these events at a significant level is (p=0.498).

Both dependent and non-dependent people on Television as a main source of information throughout the Port Said incidents perceive them in a generally are tending not to consider Port Said residents and Al Masry fans as perpetrators of the incidents.
The researcher chose the four sports talk shows to be able to measure the perception of audiences toward the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents and determine whether or not these programs have affected people’s perceptions. Ahmed Shobeir, Alaa Sadeq, Medhat Shalaby, and Khaled El Ghandour were selected by the researcher given their status as Egypt’s sports talk show hosts.

The results show that Ahmed Shobeir was the most watched anchor with 42.7% of the participants watching his program during the Port Said incidents. Medhat Shalaby came second at 34.5% of respondent watching his program throughout the Port Said incidents. Viewership of Khaled El Ghandour stood at 18.1% of participants with Alaa Sadeq occupying the last place at 17.8%. 7.9% of the total sample reported watching other anchors such as Karim Shehata, Amr El Leithy, Mona El Shazly, Nader El Sayed, Moatez Matar, Mohamed Ramadan, and Hazem Imam.

This study measures the effect of watching the above anchors’ programs during the Port Said events on audiences’ perceptions.

Results show the average mean of perceptions of respondents watching Shobeir during the incidents with a score of M=2.54 and also perceptions of participants not watching Shobeir throughout the events with a score of M=2.66. This indicates that respondents did not perceive the Port Said residents perpetrators of the events. Additionally, there is no significant difference between watching Shobeir’s show and perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in Port Said incidents, as the significance level is p=0.178.
Also, shows the average mean of perceptions of respondents who watched Medhat Shalaby during the incidents with a score of M=2.61 against those not watching Shobeir throughout the events with a score of M=2.60. This indicates that respondents do not consider Port Said residents perpetrators of the events. And there is no significant difference between watching Shalaby’s show and perceptions of the Port Said incidents, as the significance level is p= 0.840.

Moreover, the average mean of perceptions of respondents who watched Khaled El Ghandour during the incidents with a score of M=2.53 and those not watching El Ghandour throughout the events with a score of M=2.62. This indicates that neither group of respondents perceived the Port Said incidents negatively nor did they consider Port Said residents as perpetrators of the events. Besides, results show that there is no significant relationship between watching El Ghandour’s show and perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in Port Said incidents, as the significance level is p= 0.398. People who watched the program have approximately the same perceptions as those who did not watch it and there is no significant difference between the two perceptions.

Results also show that the average mean of perceptions of respondents who watched Alaa Sadeq during the incidents with a score of (m=2.58) and those of participants who did not watch Alaa Sadeq throughout the events with a score of (m=2.61). This indicates that neither groups of respondents perceived the Port Said residents as perpetrators of the events. There was no significant relationship between watching Alaa Sadeq’s show and perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in Port Said incidents, as the significance level is (p=723). Although Alaa Sadeq tended to frame Port Said residents as murderers more than other anchors (Elnaggar,
the results show that people who watched the program had roughly the same perceptions as those who did not watch it and there is no significant difference between the two perceptions.

**Perceptions of Anchors’ Performance:**

This perception describes the attitudes or impressions of audiences towards the performance of different sports talk show anchors during the Port Said incidents. That is, they reveal how sports talk show audiences perceive the performance of anchors such as Shobeir, Shalaby, Sadeq and Elghandour throughout the events in Port Said.

**RQ5:** How do people perceive the anchors’ performance during the events?

Anchors’ performance was measured by many sentences on the likert scale consisted of 5 points, where 1 referred to strongly disagree and 5 referred to strongly agree. The sentences were combined and summated mean was use to get the score. The sentences were as following:

- I think that Shobeir’s coverage of the incidents fueled the Port Said massacre.
- Sadek was neutral in his coverage of the Port Said incidents.
- Shalaby presented the events in an objective manner.
- El Ghandour covered the Port Said incidents without voicing his personal opinion.
- Sports talk show anchors incited hatred between the majority of Egyptians and Port Said residents.
- Sports talk show anchors have the opportunity to express their political opinions and analyses of events through their programs.

-
Table 21: Mean of Participants’ Perceptions of Anchors’ Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Anchors’ Performance</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.3928</td>
<td>.66469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 shows perceptions of anchors’ performance was negative among the whole sample who watched sports talk shows as the average mean of participants’ perceptions was (m=2.39). This indicates that participants who watched sports talk shows, regardless of team identification, displayed a negative perception of anchors’ performance during the incidents.

Table 22:

Mean Score of Al-Ahly Fans’ Perceptions of Anchors’ Performance during the Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Al Ahly Fans</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other fans</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2.1846</td>
<td>.64315</td>
<td>.04459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahly</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.6215</td>
<td>.61039</td>
<td>.04550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-6.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 shows that there is a significant difference between Al Ahly fans and others in terms of perceptions of anchors’ performance, t=-6.83, p=.000. On average, Ahly fans perceived anchors’ performance negatively M=2.62 considering their performance biased and unfair. Consequently, in terms of team identification, Al Ahly fans perceived the performance of sports talk shows anchors in a negative way.
Results show that Al Zamalek fans perceived the anchors’ performance negatively with an average mean of $M=2.48$ and consider these anchors a source of troublemaking throughout the Port Said events. Moreover, there is no significant difference between Al Zamalek fans and other in terms of perceptions of anchors’ performance $p=.0.201$. These results seem to be significant as they indicate that Zamalek fans are neutral in opinion and attitude.

Table 23:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Al Masry Fans</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of anchors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fans</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>2.5807</td>
<td>.65928</td>
<td>.03968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almasry</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.9107</td>
<td>.37297</td>
<td>.03524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 shows that Al Masry fans perceived the performance of presenters negatively with an average mean of $M=1.91$ and consider those anchors’ performance biased and one of the main causes of the Port Said incidents. Result of the mean score accurately reflect the true situation since Al Masry fans believe that these anchors have been instrumental in distorting the image of both Port Said residents and Al Masry fans nationwide. This is why the mean is an accurate reflection of Al Masry fans’ negative perceptions of anchors’ performance.

Additionally, there is a significant difference between Al Masry fans and others in terms of perceptions of anchors’ performance ($p=.000$). Consequently, in terms of the team identification, Al Masry fans perceived the performance of sports talk show’ anchors in a highly negative way.
Demographics and Different Perceptions:

Demographics:

- Gender:

  The results show that there is no significant difference between males and females in terms of perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents, with both genders exhibiting Port Said residents as perpetrators of the massacre.

  Although both genders have a negative perception of anchors’ performance, there is a significant difference between males and females in terms of perceptions of anchors’ performance.

  Both genders consider sports talk show non-credible sources of information. There is a significant difference between both genders in terms of these perceptions.

- Educational level:

  The sample included different levels of education starting with those who are completely illiterate to PH.D holders. The results show that there is no significant difference between education and perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents. Almost all participants with their different level of education tend to not consider Port Said residents as perpetrators of the events.

  The results indicate that there is a relationship between the level of education and perceptions of anchors’ performance. Participants with different levels of education tend to
perceive anchors’ performance negatively and consider them biased. They also believe that anchors fueled the incidents in Port Said.

Results show that there is no relationship between education and perceptions of sports talk shows as non-credible sources of information. This means that different educational levels do not affect perceptions of sports talk shows as non-credible sources of information among the sample.

- Age:

The sample included different age groups ranging from 16 to 75 years. The results show no significant difference between the three age groups and their perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents. None of the three age groups perceived the residents of Port Said as perpetrators of the crime.

There is no significant difference between age and respondents’ perceptions of anchors’ performance during the incidents. This means that almost all age groups of respondents tend to believe that anchors were biased and unfair.

There is no significant difference between age and respondents’ evaluation of the credibility of sports talk shows. This means that almost all age groups of respondents tend to consider these sports programs non-credible sources of information.

- Income:

The results show that there is a relationship between income levels and perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the Port Said incidents among the different economic levels of the participants. Almost all the socioeconomic levels tend not to perceive Port Said residents
were perpetrators of the massacre. This might be because people from different socioeconomic levels own television sets at home and have access to all the different points of views, enhancing and refining their exposure according to needs.

Nearly all socioeconomic levels tend to perceive anchors’ performance negatively and believe that these programs are responsible for the incidents because of their unfair coverage of events.

There is a relationship between income levels and sports talk show credibility among the different economic levels of participants. Respondents from different socioeconomic levels tend to perceive sports talk shows negatively and believe that they are non-credible sources of information.
Chapter Six

Discussion

The Port Said incidents are an unprecedented event in the history of Egyptian football, capturing public attention for the duration of the events and beyond. A detailed study of these events is a worthwhile endeavor which has yielded valuable results. In brief, the football match itself initially seemed to be a high-stakes game between keen adversaries; however, in reality it represented a match between the political forces, key sports figures, and the media.

The first hypothesis postulates that the more audiences watched sports talk shows during the Port Said incidents, the more they perceived Port Said residents as perpetrators of these incidents. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that segments of audiences with high viewership of sports talk shows during the crisis have different perceptions of the incidents than do low viewers. The audiences who are watched the programs more than 4 hours per day during the incidents tend to perceive Port Said residents as thugs and perpetrators of the massacre more than the low viewers who watched the programs from 0-2 hours only per day. Some people may be affected somehow by sports talk shows framing of the Port Said residents’ involvement in Port Said incidents. People were depending on the sports talk shows during the incidents as the events started as a sports event, so maybe people thought that watching these programs will give them accurate or obvious information of the massacre.

Al Ahly fans are more likely than others to believe that the media distorted their image. That well-documented ill feeling between football fans and the media, and also with fans who tending to regard the media as an enemy and holding it partially responsible for distorting their image in public. The data collected shows that there is a
significant difference in perceptions of different fan groups regarding media distortions of the image of Al Ahly fans. The researcher suggests that Al Ahly fans tend to believe that the media distort their image more than their counterpart fan bases of Al Zamalek and Al Masry teams. This view is supported by the highly critical comments and attitudes of sports talk show hosts Medhat Shalaby and Ahmed Shobeir regarding the Ahly Ultras after the incidents (Sharkawy & Shoman, 2012). On the other hand, Al Masry fans, as a rival team of Al Ahly, are inclined to believe more than other fans that the media did not distort the image of Al Ahly fans, given the traditional rivalry, between the two team fans.

Al Masry fans are more likely than other fans to believe that the media distorted their image. This was confirmed since fans regard the media accused as they are partly responsible for distorting their image in public. The results show that there is a significant difference between perceptions of Al Masry and other fan respondents regarding media distortion of their image. Al Masry fans feel that the media distorted their image more than other fans. The researcher suggests that Al Masry fans strongly agree more than other fans that the media distorted their image because some sports programs accused Port Said residents and Al Masry fans as perpetrators of the massacre (Al -Hakika, 2012).

Al Ahly fans are considered more likely than others to perceive Port Said resident as perpetrators of the incidents. The results say that Al Masry and Al Zamalek fans are more inclined than Al Ahly fans to believe that Al Masry fans and Port Said residents are not the perpetrators of the massacre. However, Al Ahly fans tend to believe that Port Said residents are the perpetrators of the incidents. The
researcher suggests that maybe Al Ahly fans tend to believe that because the massacre took place right there in Port Said with all the victims comprising Alahly fans.

The second hypothesis postulates that audiences who consider sports talk shows as credible sources of information are more likely than others to believe that Port Said residents are the perpetrators of the incidents. This hypothesis is rejected, as the results show that there is no correlation between sports talk shows credibility and people’s perceptions of the Port Said incidents. Additionally, almost all respondents tend to consider sports talk shows non-credible sources. During the incidents, people were watching sports talk shows and depending on them as a main source of information despite their awareness of their non-credible status and misleading content. The researcher suggests that audiences may have counted on these programs since the incidents had occurred within a sports event frame. Moreover, the incidents were broadcast live on these shows, capturing audience sustained attention thanks to a heightened sense of immediacy and reality not available on other programs.

Watching specific programs or anchors was not found to affect peoples’ attitudes toward the credibility of these sports talk shows. Nearly all respondents who watched Ahmed Shobeir, Medhat Shalaby, Alaa Sadeq, and Khaled El Ghandour perceived these talk shows as non-credible sources of information. Also, entire fan bases with different team identification perceive sports talk shows as non-credible source of information. Al Ahly, Al Masry, and Al Zamalek fans have partially similar perceptions of the credibility of these sports programs. Al Masry fans tend to consider these talk shows non-credible more than other fans do. This is because some of those
sports talk shows have been accused of distorting the image of Almasry fans and Port Said residents by describing them as perpetrators of the massacre.

The respondents were dependent on media, especially television, throughout the Port Said incidents. The results of this study show that 79.9% of participants depended on television channels as a main source of information throughout the events. However, although the participants relied on television (to varying degrees) as a main source of information for the duration of the crisis and beyond, practically it does not seem that respondents were affected by these programs’ frames of the incidents, despite the fact that most respondents watched sports talk shows. This study was conducted one year after the massacre, and people maybe changes their attitudes and opinions specially after the investigations of the massacre ended and the court said its final verdict. There is no relation between the dependency on television as a main source of information during the crisis and altering the perceptions and attitudes of people toward the incidents.

Watching specific sports talk shows anchors does not appear to affect audiences’ perceptions of the Port Said residents’ involvement in the port said incidents. People who watched Shobeir, Shalaby, Sadeq, and El Ghandour retained the same perceptions of events and did not perceive Port Said residents as perpetrators of the incidents.

The perception of anchors’ performance was negative among the whole sample who watched sports talk shows. This means that the participants who watched the sports talk shows, regardless of team identification, carried negative perceptions of anchors’ performance during the incidents. Even when comparing the three kinds of
fans in the sample, the results show that Al Ahly, Al Zamalek, and Al Masry fans
negatively perceived the performance of the sports talk show anchors. Al Masry fans,
in particular, perceived the anchors’ performance negatively more than other fans.
This is because some sports talk shows were accused of distort the image of Almasry
and Port Said residents.

**Limitations**

This research faced some limitation including:

- **Timing:**

  The research was conducted one year after the incidents. It would have been more
  reliable if it had been conducted directly after the incidents.

  **Time limitations:**

  The research was conducted within 4 months since the CAPMAS approval takes about
  one month to process, a required step since officials there regarded the topic as a sensitive
  one; in fact, the researcher was asked to remove and modify certain questions in the survey in
  order to obtain approval. The data was collected within only one month.

  Questionnaire distribution in Port Said lasted one day only due to security issues and the
  incidents which called Port Said incidents two in 2013 after the death sentence was passed for
  21 people and a further 24 received prison terms. Also, the distribution time was short
  because of the sensitivity of the topic for the Port Said residents. The percentage of Al Masry
  fans was thus lower than its rival Al Ahly fans.
Sample:

The (76.9%) of the sample are males, and this is because of the specialty of the study. It is related to football match or sports event, and the majority of football fans are males.

The female response was limited as many females refused to fill out the survey once they found out it was related to a sports or football topic, explaining that they had no interest in football.

Recommendations:

The researcher suggests that policy-makers in the media to direct media institutions to play a significant role in organizing and managing the sports media. This issue has become especially important given the huge surge of interest in and demand for sports coverage worldwide as well as unprecedented attention being given to sports media personalities.

Sports media should emphasize the positive features of friendship shown by groups of fans at football matches in order to counter incidents of violence and bloodshed.

Suggestions for Further Research:

The researcher suggests conducting a Content Analysis Study of back episodes of sports talk shows covering the Port Said massacre given its potential as a valuable model for media studies. The researcher also suggests conducting a similar study of sports talk shows featuring a political dimension.
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Appendix
Dear Participant:

Thank you very much for your cooperation with the researcher to complete its mission in the completion of this research; we are fully appreciating your precious time which you will spend to fill this form. This research is about the effect of the sports talk shows viewership on the audience's perception towards Port Said Incidents in 2012. Please be accurate in your responses in order to help the researcher to produce accurate results. Once again, thank you for your cooperation and you have our full appreciation. Please be advised that the all data of this study are confidential, and will be only used in scientific research purposes.

Thank you,

Researcher

1- During the Incidents of Port Said I did get my information from: (You can choose more than one option)
   a - Printed Journalism
   b - Electronic Journalism
   c - TV channels
   d - Radio
   e - social media (Facebook + Twitter)
   f - Other specify ( ………………………)

2- Do you followed the Port Said incidents (February, 2012) in on the sports channels?
   a- Yes
   b- No. (Thank you. Kindly, do not complete the questionnaire)

3- What is the average number of hours that you usually spend to watch television weekly?
   a- 0 – 3 hours.
   b- More than 3 – 6 hours
   c- More than 6 hours

4- How many hours did you spent in watching sports talk shows throughout the Port Said incidents per day?
   a- 0 – 2 hours
   b- More than 2 – 4 hours
c- More than 4 hours

5- Which sports commentator did you follow throughout and after the Port Said incidents? (You can choose more than one option)
   a- Ahmed shobeir
   b- Alaa Sadek
   c- Medhat Shalaby
   d- Khaled Elghandour
   e- Other specify (…………………………………………..)

6- What is your favorite football team?
   a- Al Ahly
   b- Al Zamalek
   c- Al Masry
   d- Other specify (……………………………………………..)

7- Are you belonging to any Ultras group?
   a- Yes
   b- No

8- Do you think that the Port Said incidents were planned?
   a- Yes
   b- No
   c- Maybe

9- In your personal opinion, who is responsible for the Port Said incidents?

10- Do you think that sports Talk shows contributed to fuel the sedition between Al ahly and Al masry fans?
   a- Yes
   b- No
11- Do you think that the sports talk shows have distorted the image of the Al Ahly fans?
   a- Yes
   b- No

12- Do you think that the sports talk shows have distorted the image of the Al Masry fans?
   a- Yes
   b- No

13- The following statements are about Upper Egypt and its residents. Kindly, pick the most suitable answer from your point of view:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 disagree</th>
<th>3 neutral</th>
<th>4 agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- The police is responsible for the Port Said incidents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- The Port Said residents are responsible for the killing of the victims.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Ultras Ahlawy provoked Al Masry Fans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- I think that some of the Port Said residents are thugs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- The remnants of the former NDP(Feloul) planned the Port Said incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- The Supreme Council of the Armed forces was drooped to take a deterrent measures against the mastermind of the Incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- I think that the Shobeir coverage of the incidents fueled the Port Said Incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Alaa Sadek was neutral in presenting the Port Said incidents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-</td>
<td>Medhat Shalaby presented the events by an objective way</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-</td>
<td>Khaled Elghandour presented the Port Said incidents without saying his personal opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-</td>
<td>Sports talk shows announcers raised sedition between the whole Egyptians and the Port Said residents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-</td>
<td>The announcers of the sports talk shows can provide their political opinion and analysis of the events through their sports programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-</td>
<td>The sports talk shows have distorted the image of Al Ahly fans(Ultras)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-</td>
<td>I think that Al Masry fans are innocent of committing the Port Said incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-</td>
<td>The sports talk shows have distorted the image of Al Masry fans(Ultras)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-</td>
<td>I depended on sports Talk shows as a primary source of news during the events of Port Said</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-</td>
<td>The sports talk shows presented the whole story about Port Said incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-</td>
<td>The sports talk shows were honest in its presenting to the incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-</td>
<td>The coverage of sports talk shows presenters to Port Said Incidents was Biased and lack of professionalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-</td>
<td>Sports talk shows were concerning for community during their coverage of the Port Said events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-</td>
<td>Sports talk shows were accurate during the presenting of the Port Said events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-</td>
<td>Sports Talk shows are considered trustworthy after what they presented during the events of Port Said</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-</td>
<td>Sports talk shows dealt fairly with all parties to the issue of (the Port Said incidents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-</td>
<td>The presenters of sports Talk shows separated the facts from their personal opinions in their coverage of the Port Said incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14- Kindly, fill out the following information:

- **Age:** ………………………………………..
- **Gender:**
  1- Male
  2- Female

- **The educational level:**
  1- Thanaweya A'mma (High school) or equivalent
  2- University degree
  3- Master Degree
  4- Ph.D. Degree
  5- Other specify (………………………………………..)

- **The average income of the family:**
  1- Less than 1000 L.E.
  2- 1000 – 2000 L.E
  3- More than 2000 – 5000 L.E
  4- More than 5000 L.E

- **The Governorate that you live in:** ………………………………
استمارة استبيان

عزيزي المشاركة:
شكراً جزيلاً لتعاونك مع البحثة لأكمال مهمتها في اتمام هذا البحث، فنحن نقدر تماما وقتك الثمين الذي سوف تبذله في هذه الاستمارة. يدور هذا البحث حول مشاهدة البرامج الحوارية الرياضية وتأثيرها على الصورة الذهنية لدى الجمهور عن أحداث بورسعيد. نرجو تحرير الدقة في إجاباتكم و ذلك لمساعدة البحثة في الخروج بنتائج دقيقة. و مرة أخرى، نشكركم على حسن تعاونكم و لكم منا كل تقدير.
يرجى العلم بأن جميع بيانات هذه الدراسة سرية، ولا تستخدم الا في أغراض البحث العلمي.
شكراً جزيلاً،
الباحثة

---

1- أثناء أحداث استاد بورسعيد (2012) كنت أستمدم معلوماتي من (يمكنك اختيار أكثر من بديل):
   - الصحافة الورقية
   - الصحافة الالكترونية
   - القنوات التلفزيونية
   - الراديو
   - وسائل الإعلام الاجتماعي (فيس بوك + تويتر)
   - أخرى تذكر

2- هل تابعت أحداث مذبحة بورسعيد على القنوات الرياضية؟
   - نعم
   - لا (شكراً جزيلاً برجاء عدم اكتمال ملء الاستمارة)

3- كم من الوقت تقضي في مشاهدة التلفزيون أسبوعياً?
   - 0 - 3 ساعات
   - أكثر من 3 - 6 ساعات
   - أكثر من 6 ساعات

4- كم عدد الساعات التي قضيتها يومياً وقت أحداث بورسعيد في مشاهدة البرامج الرياضية؟
   - 0 - 2 ساعات
   - أكثر من 2 - 4 ساعات
   - أكثر من 4 ساعات

5- من المعلق الرياضي الذين تابعته أثناء و بعد أحداث مجزرة بورسعيد؟ (يمكنك اختيار أكثر من بديل)
   - أحمد شوثير
6- ما هو فريق الكرة المفضل لديك؟
   أ - الأهلي
   ب - الزمالك
   ت - المصري
   ج - آخر تذكر (..............................)

7- هل تنتمي الي أي رابطة من روابط الأئتراس؟
   أ - نعم
   ب - لا

8- هل تعتقد أن أحداث بورسعيدي كانت مدمرة؟
   أ - نعم
   ب - لا
   ت - ربما

9- في رأيك الشخصي، من المسؤول عن مذبحة بورسعيدي؟

10- هل تعتقد أن البرامج التلفزيونية الرياضية ساهمت في اشعال الفتنة بين جمهور الأهلي ومصرى؟
   أ - نعم
   ب - لا

11- هل تعتقد أن البرامج الرياضية قد شوهت صورة مشجعي النادي الأهلي؟
   أ - نعم
   ب - لا

12- هل تعتقد أن البرامج الرياضية قد شوهت صورة مشجعي النادي المصري؟
   أ - نعم
   ب - لا
ت- برامج توضيح مدى اتفاقك أو إتفاقيك مع الجمل التالية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الجملة</th>
<th>ارفض بشدة</th>
<th>أتفق بشدة</th>
<th>محايد</th>
<th>اتفق</th>
<th>أرفض</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الأمر هو المسؤول عن أحداث بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أهل بورسعيد هم المسؤولين عن قتل الضحايا</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الالتماس أهلًا استفز جمهور المصري البورسعيدي</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اعتقد بأن بعض أهل بورسعيد بطنجة</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فلول الحزب الوطني هم من دبوا أحداث بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اتخذ المجلس العسكري اجراءات رادعة ضد مدبري المجازرة</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اعتقد بأن تغطية شوبير للأحداث أشعلت أحداث بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كان تناول علاء صادق للأحداث حياديا</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قدم منحت شباب الأحداث بطريقة موضوعية</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قدم خالد الغندور أحداث بورسعيد دون تدخل برأيه الشخصي</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اثار مقدمي البرامج الرياضية الفتنة بين الشعب المصري كله وأهل بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يمكن لمقدمي البرامج الرياضية أن يقدموا تحليلهم ورأيهم السياسي للأحداث من خلال برامجهم الرياضية.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شوهدت البرامج الرياضية صورة مشجعى الأهلي (الألتراس)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اعتقد أن مشجعى النادي المصري أتربى من ارتكاب مذبحة بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شوهدت البرامج الرياضية صورة مشجعى المصري (الألتراس)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اعتمد على البرامج الرياضية كمصدر أساسي للأخبار أثناء أحداث بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الرقم</td>
<td>مرتبة</td>
<td>القيمة</td>
<td>التصنيف</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

قامت البرنامج الرياضية بتغطية كافة جوانب أحداث بورسعيد

كانت البرنامج الرياضية صادقة في سردها لأحداث بورسعيد

كانت تتغطى مقدمي البرنامج الرياضية لأحداث بورسعيد متميزة ومقترنة للمهنية

اهتمت البرنامج الرياضية بمصلحة المجتمع أثناء عرضها لأحداث بورسعيد

تحترم البرنامج الرياضية الدقة في نقلها لأحداث بورسعيد

البرنامج الرياضية تعتبر جديرة بالثقة بعد ما قامت بسرده أثناء أحداث بورسعيد

تعاملت البرنامج الرياضية بالصفح مع جميع أطراف قضية (أحداث بورسعيد)

قام مقدمي البرنامج الرياضية بفصل الحقائق عن أراءهم الشخصية في عرضهم لأحداث بورسعيد

يرجى ملء البيانات التالية:

- السن: ..................................
- الجنس:
  - ذكر
  - أنثى
- المستوى التعليمي:
  - أمي
  - ثانوية عامة أو ما يعادلها
  - شهادة جامعية
  - ماجستير
  - دكتوراة
  - أخرى تذكر (..................)
- متوسط دخل الأسرة شهرية:
  - أقل من 1000
  - 1000 – 2000
  - 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرقم</th>
<th>مرتبة</th>
<th>القيمة</th>
<th>التصنيف</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3- أكثر من 2000- 5000
4- أكثر من 5000

المحافظة التي تسكن بها: 

•
To: Yassmin Kamel Elsayed  
cc:Nesrin Azmy  
From: Atta Gebril, Chair of the IRB  
Date: March 5, 2013  
Re: Approval of study  

This is to inform you that I reviewed your revised research proposal entitled “Sports Talk Shows viewership and the Perception of Port Said Incidents,” and determined that it required consultation with the IRB under the "expedited" heading. As you are aware, the members of the IRB suggested certain revisions to the original proposal, but your new version addresses these concerns successfully. The revised proposal used appropriate procedures to minimize risks to human subjects and that adequate provision was made for confidentiality and data anonymity of participants in any published record. I believe you will also make adequate provision for obtaining informed consent of the participants.  

Please note that IRB approval does not automatically ensure approval by CAPMAS, an Egyptian government agency responsible for approving much off-campus research involving surveys and interviews. CAPMAS issues are handled at AUC by the office of the University Counsellor, Dr. Amr Salama. The IRB is not in a position to offer any opinion on CAPMAS issues, and takes no responsibility for obtaining CAPMAS approval.  

This approval is valid for only one year. In case you have not finished data collection within a year, you need to apply for an extension.  

Thank you and good luck.  

Atta Gebril  
IRB chair, The American University in Cairo  
2046 HUSS Building  
T: 02-26151919 Email: agebril@aucegypt.edu
To: Yassmin Kamel Elsayed  
cc:Nesrin Azmy  
From: Atta Gebril, Chair of the IRB  
Date: March 5, 2013  
Re: Approval of study

This is to inform you that I reviewed your revised research proposal entitled “Sports Talk Shows viewership and the Perception of Port Said Incidents,” and determined that it required consultation with the IRB under the "expedited" heading. As you are aware, the members of the IRB suggested certain revisions to the original proposal, but your new version addresses these concerns successfully. The revised proposal used appropriate procedures to minimize risks to human subjects and that adequate provision was made for confidentiality and data anonymity of participants in any published record. I believe you will also make adequate provision for obtaining informed consent of the participants.

Please note that IRB approval does not automatically ensure approval by CAPMAS, an Egyptian government agency responsible for approving much off-campus research involving surveys and interviews. CAPMAS issues are handled at AUC by the office of the University Counsellor, Dr. Amr Salama. The IRB is not in a position to offer any opinion on CAPMAS issues, and takes no responsibility for obtaining CAPMAS approval.

This approval is valid for only one year. In case you have not finished data collection within a year, you need to apply for an extension.

Thank you and good luck.

Atta Gebril

IRB chair, The American University in Cairo  
2046 HUSS Building  
T: 02-26151919  
Email: agebril@aucegypt.edu
استمارة استبان

عزبي المشارك:
شكرا جزيلا لتعاونك مع الباحثة لإكتمال مهمتها في اتمام هذا البحث، فنحن نقدر تماما وقتكم الثمين الذي سوف تبذله إملاء هذه الاستمارة، يدور هذا البحث حول مشاهدة البرامج الحوارية الرياضية وتأثيرها على الصورة الذهنية لدى الجمهور عن أحداث بورسعيد. نرجو تحرير الدقة في إجاباتكم و ذلك لمساعدة الباحثة في الخروج بنتائج دقيقة، ومرة أخرى، نشكركم على حسن تعاويكم ولكم منا كل تقدير.
يرجى العلم بأن جميع بيانات هذه الدراسة سرية، ولا تستخدم إلا في أغراض البحث العلمي شكرًا جزيلاً،

الباحثة

1- أثناء أحداث استاد بورسعيد (2012) كنت أستمد معلوماتي من: (يمكنك اختيار أكثر من بديل)
أ- الصحافة الورقية
ب- الصحافة الإلكترونية
ت- القنوات التلفزيونية
ث- الراديو
ج- وسائل الإعلام الاجتماعي (فيس بوك + تويتر)
ح- أخري تذكر

2- هل تابعت أحداث مذبحة بورسعيد على القنوات الرياضية؟
أ- نعم
ب- لا (شكرا جزيلا، برجاء عدم اكتمال ملء الاستمارة)

3- كم من الوقت تقضي في مشاهدة التلفزيون أسبوعيا؟
أ- 0 - 3 ساعات
ب- أكثر من 3 - 6 ساعات
ت- أكثر من 6 ساعات

4- كم عدد الساعات التي قضيتها يوميا وقت أحداث بورسعيد في مشاهدة البرامج الرياضية؟
أ- 0 - 2 ساعات
ب- أكثر من 2 - 4 ساعات
ت- أكثر من 4 ساعات

5- من المعلق الرياضي الذين تابعته أثناء و بعد أحداث مجزرة بورسعيد؟ (يمكنك اختيار أكثر من بديل)
أ- أحمد شوبي
ب- علاء صادق
ت- منحت شلبي
ث- خالد الفندور
ج- أخري تذكر (..........................)

6- ما هو فريق الكرة المفضل لديك؟
أ- الأهلي
ب- الزمالك
ت- المصري
ث- أخري تذكر (..........................)

7- هل تنتمي الي أي رابطة من روابط الأثراض؟
أ- نعم
ب- لا

8- هل تعتقد أن أحداث بورسعيد كانت مدمرة؟
أ- نعم
ب- لا
ت- ربما

9- في رأيك الشخصي من المسئول عن مذبحة بورسعيد؟

10- هل تعتقد أن البرامج التلفزيونية الرياضية ساهمت في اشتعال الفتنة بين جمهور الأهلي و المصري؟
أ- نعم
ب- لا

11- هل تعتقد أن البرامج الرياضية قد شوهت صورة مشجعي النادي الأهلي؟
أ- نعم
ب- لا

12- هل تعتقد أن البرامج الرياضية قد شوهت صورة مشجعي النادي المصري؟
أ- نعم
ب- لا
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الجملة</th>
<th>افق بشدة</th>
<th>افق</th>
<th>محايد</th>
<th>رفض</th>
<th>افق بشدة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الأمن هو المسئول عن أحداث بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أهل بورسعيد هم المسئولين عن قتل الضحايا</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الانتقاس اهلاوي استفز جمهور المصري اللورد بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اعتقدين بعض أهل بورسعيد بلطفية</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فلو الحزب الوطني هم من دبرا أحداث بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اتخذ المجلس العسكري إجراءات رادعة ضد مدني المجزرة</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اعتقدين أن تغطية شوبير للأحداث أشعلت أحداث بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كان تداول علاء صادق للأحداث حياديا</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قدم منحت شابي الأحداث بطريقة موضوعية</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قدم خالد الفنودر أحداث بورسعيد دون تدخل مباهه الشخصي</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آخر مقدمي البرامج الرياضية القتنة بين الشعب المصرى كله وأهل بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يمكن لمقدمي البرامج الرياضية أن يقدموا تحليلهم و آرائهم السياسي للأحداث من خلال برامجهم الرياضية.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شوهدت البرامج الرياضية صورة مشجعى الأهلي (الانترس)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اعتقدين أن مشجعى النادي المصري أبرياء من ارتكاب مذبحة بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شوهدت البرامج الرياضية صورة مشجعى المصري (الانترس)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اعتمدت على البرامج الرياضية كمصدر أساسي للأخبار أثناء أحداث بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قامت البرامج الرياضية بتغطية كافة جوانب أحداث بورسعيد</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
بُرِجاء ملء البيانات التالية:

• السن:

• الجنس:
  - ذكر
  - أنثى

• المستوى التعليمي:
  - أمي
  - ثانوية عامة أو ما يعادلها
  - شهادة جامعية
  - ماجستير
  - دكتوراة
  - أخرى (_______________)

• متوسط دخل الأسرة شهرياً:
  - أقل من 1000
  - 1000 – 2000
  - أكثر من 2000- 5000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>السن</th>
<th>الجنس</th>
<th>المستوى التعليمي</th>
<th>دخل الأسرة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
أكثر من 5000

• المحافظة التي تسكن بها: ..........................
Questionnaire

Dear Participant:

Thank you very much for your cooperation with the researcher to complete its mission in the completion of this research; we are fully appreciating your precious time which you will spend to fill this form. This research is about the effect of the sports talk shows viewership on the audience's perception towards Port Said Incidents in 2012. Please be accurate in your responses in order to help the researcher to produce accurate results. Once again, thank you for your cooperation and you have our full appreciation. Please be advised that the all data of this study are confidential, and will be only used in scientific research purposes.

Thank you,
Researcher

1- During the Incidents of Port Said I did get my information from: (You can choose more than one option)
   a - Printed Journalism
   b - Electronic Journalism
   c - TV channels
   d - Radio
   e - social media (Facebook + Twitter)
   f - Other specify ( ……………………..)

2- Do you followed the Port Said incidents (February, 2012) in on the sports channels?
   a- Yes
   b- No. (Thank you. Kindly, do not complete the questionnaire)

3- What is the average number of hours that you usually spend to watch television weekly?
   a- 0 – 3 hours.
   b- More than 3 – 6 hours
   c- More than 6 hours

4- How many hours did you spent in watching sports talk shows throughout the Port Said incidents per day?
   a- 0 – 2 hours
5- Which sports commentator did you follow throughout and after the Port Said incidents? (You can choose more than one option)
   a- Ahmed Shobeir
   b- Alaa Sadek
   c- Medhat Shalaby
   d- Khaled Elghandour
   e- Other specify (…………………………………………..)

6- What is your favorite football team?
   a- Al Ahly
   b- Al Zamalek
   c- Al Masry
   d- Other specify (…………………………………………..)

7- Are you belonging to any Ultras group?
   a- Yes
   b- No

8- Do you think that the Port Said incidents were planned?
   a- Yes
   b- No
   c- Maybe

9- In your personal opinion, who is responsible for the Port Said incidents?

10- Do you think that sports Talk shows contributed to fuel the sedition between Al ahly and Al masry fans?
    a- Yes
    b- No

11- Do you think that the sports talk shows have distorted the image of the Al Ahly fans?
12- Do you think that the sports talk shows have distorted the image of the Al Masry fans?
   a- Yes
   b- No

13- The following statements are about Upper Egypt and its residents. Kindly, pick the most suitable answer from your point of view:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 disagree</th>
<th>3 neutral</th>
<th>4 agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- The police is responsible for the Port Said incidents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- The Port Said residents are responsible for the killing of the victims.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Ultras Ahlawy provoked Al Masry Fans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- I think that some of the Port Said residents are thugs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- the remnants of the former NDP(Feloul) planned the Port Said incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- The Supreme Council of the Armed forces was drooped to take a deterrent measures against the mastermind of the Incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- I think that the Shobeir coverage of the incidents fueled the Port Said Incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Alaa Sadek was neutral in presenting the Port Said incidents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Medhat Shalaby presented the events by an objective way</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Khaled Elghandour presented the Port Said incidents without saying his personal opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sports talk shows announcers raised sedition between the whole Egyptians and the Port Said residents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The announcers of the sports talk shows can provide their political opinion and analysis of the events through their sports programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The sports talk shows have distorted the image of Al Ahly fans(Ultras)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I think that Al Masry fans are innocent of committing the Port Said incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The sports talk shows have distorted the image of Al Masry fans(Ultras)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I depended on sports Talk shows as a primary source of news during the events of Port Said</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The sports talk shows presented the whole story about Port Said incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The sports talk shows were honest in its presenting to the incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The coverage of sports talk shows presenters to Port Said Incidents was Biased and lack of professionalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sports talk shows were concerning for community during their coverage of the Port Said events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sports talk shows were accurate during the presenting of the Port Said events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sports Talk shows are considered trustworthy after what they presented during the events of Port Said</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sports talk shows dealt fairly with all parties to the issue of (the Port Said incidents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The presenters of sports Talk shows separated the facts from their personal opinions in their coverage of the Port Said incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14- Kindly, fill out the following information:
- Age: .................................................
• Gender:
  1- Male
  2- Female

• The educational level:
  1- Thanaweya A'mma (High school) or equivalent
  2- University degree
  3- Master Degree
  4- Ph.D. Degree
  5- Other specify (………………………………………..)

• The average income of the family:
  1- Less than 1000 L.E.
  2- 1000 – 2000 L.E
  3- More than 2000 – 5000 L.E
  4- More than 5000 L.E

• The Governorate that you live in: ………………………………………..