Does Policy Lead Mainstream Media? How Sources Framed the 2011 Egyptian Protests

by

Kristen E. Grimmer

Submitted to the William Allen White School of Journalism and Mass Communication and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science

_____

Scott Reinardy Associate Professor

Chairperson

Committee Members#

_____*

Barbara Barnett Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies

_____*

Doug Ward Associate Professor

Date defended: ___04/09/2012_____

The Thesis Committee for (Kristen E. Grimmer) certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

Does Policy Lead Mainstream Media? How Sources Framed the 2011 Egyptian Conflict

Committee:

_____

Scott Reinardy, Associate Professor

Chairperson*

Barbara Barnett, Associate Dean

Doug Ward, Associate Professor

Date approved: __05/01/2012__

Abstract

This study uses a quantitative content analysis to determine the framing used by U.S. mainstream newspapers in media coverage of the 2011 Egyptian protests. The study examined 153 stories from *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. The study focuses on how sources framed the protests, former President Hosni Mubarak, and the effects the protests had on both Egypt and the United States. The analysis reveals that the viewpoints of U.S. official sources were overrepresented in news coverage and framed the conflict overall in a neutral light. The analysis also revealed that U.S. foreign policy towards Egypt and the remedies endorsed by U.S. official sources during two-weeks of news coverage was uncertain.

Table of Contents

Introduction

When a specific event receives a vast amount of media coverage, it is likely to be a major shift in public opinion, how the media portrays the individuals and issues that were involved, and even how history is interpreted (Avraham, Wolfsfeld, & Aburaiya, 2000; Donnelly, 2000; First, 2002; Levin, 2003; Vraneski & Ritcher, 2002). In January 2011, political unrest in Egypt gained force climaxing in public protests that ended with the resignation of President Hosni Mubarak on February 11, 2011 (Sharp, 2011).

International affairs coverage is often lacking in U.S. mainstream media, unless a crisis or disaster is present (Underwood, 2001). Bennett (2007) states that "international news seems to be of little interest for key demographic audiences," which usually results in news corporations closing "expensive international news bureaus," thus limiting Americans from being alert to international developments (p. 225). However, according to reports by *Project for Excellence in Journalism,* the conflict in Egypt was the salient issue in the U.S. media agenda, accounting for 56 percent of the news coverage from January 31 – February 6, and 40 percent from February 7 – 13 (Jurkowitz, 2011a,b). The report said "turmoil in the Middle East registered as the biggest international story in the past four years surpassing any coverage of the Iraq war, the Haiti earthquake and the conflict in Afghanistan" (p. 1). Although the protests in Egypt could be deemed a crisis for those in the country, it was a crisis that did not directly involve the United States. The 2011 Egyptian protests defied the laws of foreign news in the United States and captivated mainstream media because generally U.S. mainstream media do not report upon events that happen outside the United States with such depth for very long.

As weeks passed, it soon became clear that the 2011 Egyptian uprising was part of a larger revolution in the Middle East, later named the Arab Spring by the media. While the shift in Egypt did not have direct implications for the United States, government leaders were on edge and hesitant to give opinions about the conflict until they felt sure about the changes happening to Egypt's foreign policy. Instead, U.S. leaders waited to see how such a dynamic power shift in the Middle East would impact the Western world.

Mainstream media became fully acquainted with the situation in Egypt in a matter of days from the time the first protests began, and in the United States it became crucial for journalists to get in touch with a variety of sources; those who could speak directly about the situation overseas and those who could analyze what the power play in the Middle East could mean for the United States. In order to cover the Egyptian conflict in depth, mainstream media interviewed experts, from government spokespeople to high-level think-tankers to those who were at ground zero in Egypt. Examining national newspaper coverage to see how those sources framed the conflict will give insight about the experts mainstream journalists rely on to give their stories credibility and accurate information when the action is taking place overseas in a country the U.S. government does not have a military presence in. It will also show the bias sources brought to the conflict and highlight the shifting in frames overtime as the situation in Egypt progressed.

This study will rely upon media framing literature in order to explore the media coverage of this international event. Framing started as a way to explain how individuals learn to put their social world into perspective (Goffman, 1974). Since then, framing has been expanded to include how journalists and news organizations make sense of newsworthy events for the public (Gitlin,

1980; Tuchman, 1978). While framing has been applied to many conflicts (Evans, 2010; John, Domke, Coe, & Graham, 2007; Robinson, Goddard, Parry, & Murray, 2009), frame shifts have mostly been examined in conflicts where the United States was directly involved (Ross & Bantimaroudis, 2006). Frame shifting has not been examined in the context where a conflict excluding the United States took place but dominated the U.S. media agenda. It has also not been looked at by purely observing the sources journalists' use. The purpose of this study is to add to the understanding of the role sources play for journalists and the bias and permanence of frames that sources bring to the media.

This study was also important because while both journalists and their editors may be gatekeepers when releasing information to the public (Bennett, 2007), sources contribute greatly to how a story is framed for the public and the credibility of that story. Newhagen and Nass (1989) defined credibility as "the perception of news messages as a plausible reflection of the events they depict" (p. 278). This study showed that sources used by journalists are indeed a part of any story's credibility, providing the audience with information they can trust. The frames used by sources in this study showed presidential voices dominating the media and the confusion those voices had in the frames they employed over a two-week period. This study used a textual analysis to identify and analyze sources in articles from both *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*.

Literature Review

Background on the Crisis in Egypt

Hosni Mubarak became president of Egypt on October 16, 1981, after Anwar el-Sadat was assassinated. For 30 years Mubarak maintained control and kept Egypt under Emergency Law giving power to the police (Sharp, 2011). However, President Mubarak was ousted at the

will of his people, but his autocratic rule was not the only reason Egyptians demanded a regime change.

Egypt has a population of 81 million, but half the population is under 25 years old. Unemployment is about 10 percent with about 600,000 people entering the work force each year (Giplin, Kandeel, & Sullivan, 2011). Although Egypt has had a GDP growth rate above 4 percent throughout the past 10 years, it is clear the recent global economic slump has affected the country since "investment inflows rose from an annual average of $1.5 billion from 1995-2005 to $10 billion in 2006, before dipping to $6.7 billion in 2009" (Giplin, Kandeel, & Sullivan, 2011, p. 1). Now, the distance between the poor and rich is widening each year with the middle class nearly disappearing. The rising cost of basic items, such as food and fuel, has only helped to divide the country's social classes further (Adams, 2011; Even, 2011; Rubin, 2011).

Despite the economic and social troubles plaguing Egypt, which have added pressure for change:

> …the catalyst was fellow Arabs in Tunisia successfully overthrowing their autocratic ruler, Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali, with a popular uprising on 14 January. Popular anger was fuelled by dozens of deaths at the hands of the security forces, while protesters' voices have been heard thanks to social media and the presence of independent news broadcasters at the scene (Asser, 2011, p. 2).

On January 25, 2011, thousands of Egyptians stood publically in protest to the government, causing Mubarak to resign his position as president on February 11 after 18 days of a popular uprising (Sharp, 2011). Throughout the days of protest, the Obama administration urged Mubarak to treat the protests with a proper response. However, the Obama administration was hesitant to define what that response should be:

Since taking office, President Obama has devoted greater time and attention to the

pursuit of Middle East peace than to efforts to promote reform and democracy in

the Arab world. This has been a deliberate tactic of the Obama Administration,

designed to differentiate itself from the Bush Administration by giving priority to

what President Obama believes is a core national interest – the solution to the

Arab-Israeli conflict (Sharp, 2011, p. 11).

Because of the regime shift of the Obama administration, putting overt pressure for

Egypt's reform on Mubarak's shoulders has been avoided (Sharp, 2011). Criticism for being too

hesitant to support protestors' wishes came from Dr. Mohammad El Baradei, former head of the

International Atomic Energy Agency, who said, "The American government cannot ask the

Egyptian people to believe that a dictator who has been in power for 30 years will be the one to

implement democracy….You are losing credibility by the day" (Sharp, 2011, p. 11).

Criticism for advice offered from U.S. Vice President Joe Biden came from Egyptian

foreign minister Ahmed Aboul Gheit, according to a transcript of an interview with *PBS.*

Gheit said U.S. advice is "not at all helpful" and when asked why, said:

Because when you speak about prompt, immediate, now – as if you are imposing

on a great country like Egypt, a great friend that has always maintained the best of

relationship with the United States, you are imposing your will on him (as cited in

Egypt rejects US advice on reforms, 2011, p.1).

Egypt has been an important ally to the United States for many years, so much so that the

U.S. government has allocated $2 billion annually since 1979 to the Egyptian government to help

with the economy and military assistance (Sharp, 2011). This foreign aid "has long been framed

as an investment in regional stability, built primarily on long-running military cooperation and

sustaining the March 1979 Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty" (p. 2). Since the United States views

Egypt as necessary to stability in the Arab world, the Obama administration faced the dilemma

of supporting or opposing Egypt's popular protest.

The fact that the United States did not hold with one firm stance toward the protests in

Egypt is obvious.

Between February 5 and February 8, many observers suggested that the

Administration had somewhat softened its insistence that a transition occur

immediately. Analysts attributed the subtle shift to a combination of Mubarak's

intransigence, the U.S. military's concern that the United States was isolating a

key Arab military partner, and fears that the Muslim Brotherhood could dominate

future parliamentary or presidential elections that by law would need to be held

sooner rather than later (Sharp, 2011, p. 12).

Martin Asser, a reporter for *BBC News,* said:

Mr. Mubarak's most influential Western ally, the U.S., has been caught in a

serious bind. Should it live up to its professed desires for democracy or support

the Egyptian president for fear of loss of influence and what might follow his

overthrow (Asser, 2011, p. 5).

The conflict in Egypt caused a potentially serious dilemma for the United States as to the

appropriate official stance. Because of this dilemma, U.S. journalists had two stories to cover

during the two-week period, the Egyptian protests and the struggle over an appropriate response

from U.S. officials.

Framing

Events may dictate what is reported by the media (Wolfsfeld, 1997), but the theory of framing says the media give specific meaning to events by doing two things: One, being the first to report or bring news coverage to the event and two, piecing story elements together in a unique way (Becker, 1995; Kitzinger, 2000). According to Riker (1986), framing was the way journalists and government officials influenced each other and the public politically. Entman (1993, p. 52) said framing required both "selection" and "salience." Entman (2003) further defined this particular theory when he said, "Framing entails selecting and highlighting some facets of events or issues, and making connections among them so as to promote a particular interpretation, evaluation, and/or solution" (p. 417).

Framing incorporates both the language and organization used in a story. However, framing goes further to examine how these two elements combine to give meaning to reported events (Entman, 1993; Edelman, 1993; Gamson & Modigliani, 1989; Gamson, 1992; Gans, 1979; Gitlin, 1980; Goffman, 1974; Iyengar, 1991; Kahneman & Tversky, 1984; McCombs & Ghanem, 2001; McLeod & Hertog, 1992; Pan & Kosicki, 1993; Scheufele, 1999; Tuchman, 1978; Zaller, 1992).

Entman (2004) distinguished two classes of framing: substantive and procedural. While procedural frames have more to do with how credible political actors are, substantive frames have a different role (pp. 5 – 6). "Substantive news frames perform at least two of the following basic functions in covering events, issues, and political actors: defining effects or conditions as problematic, identifying causes, conveying a moral judgment of those involved in the framed matter, [and] endorsing remedies or improvements to the problematic situation" (Entman, 2003, p. 417). Of the four functions, Entman said one of the most important was the problem definition because it leads to the rest of the frame. Once the problem has been defined it is easy to move to

the next step and identify causes of the problem, or the factors that contributed to the problem. "Conveying a moral judgment of those involved in the framed matter" is where framing defines how audiences should regard each player involved in the problem or the problem itself (Entman, 2003, p. 417). For instance, when the Bush administration used words such as "evil" to portray the tragedy of September 11, 2001 (p. 417). "Endorsing remedies or improvements to the problematic situation" are also very important because the remedies will either support or oppose government action since the government will be looking for a solution to the problem (pp. 417 – 418).

A different aspect of framing that journalists and politicians often use is emotional proximity. Robinson (2002) posed that when news coverage provides an emotionally close perspective on events, members of the audience tend to identify with participants in the story. To make a story emotionally close, journalists appeal to the audience's sympathy with techniques like graphically displaying suffering, putting names with faces, and detailing events. A story told this way might cause the audience to empathize with those involved in the situation.

However, the opposite can also be true. When the media emotionally distance the audience from specific events, the audience may become more critical of a particular situation than they might otherwise be. Journalists might keep an audience emotionally distant with techniques like using statistics to describe victims, leaving victims nameless, and concentrating on the overall effect of the disaster rather than a victim's personal struggle with a disaster.

Media Content

There are several different factors that affect what goes into a news story. News values are one way to predict if an event will rate the media's attention. According to Lee (2009) the amount of news that can be covered by the media is limited and this is one reason why news

values are so important to journalists. Lee (2009) also said, "In sum, news values of an event predict media coverage of the event, and the media coverage predicts audience attention to the event" (p. 175). Malinkina and McLeod (2000) also identified factors that influence media content. They pointed to "extra-media forces such as sources of information and revenue, government, various powerful social institutions, the utilization of technology, and the economic environment" as having an important effect on what makes the media's agenda (p. 38).

Looking at foreign news in the U.S. media, it is important to note that, according to Riffe and Shaw (1982), Western media usually cover developing countries when there is some type of crisis or conflict to report. Scholars have also said that the U.S. media often frame news of developing countries negatively for consumers by either not reporting the event fully or ignoring what happens overseas.

When U.S. media coverage frames international news in developing countries negatively, this allows a strong government the chance to use the media as another arm of power and further that government's agenda (Anash, 1984; Shoemaker, Danielian, & Brendlinger, 1991). Entman (2004) added that the media follow the government's agenda, thereby supporting that government's objectives. Herman and Chomsky (1988) concurred by stating that the media are a tool governments can use to garner support for plans and to gain influence in several ways. One of these is by being the official source of information. Media provide the government with a way to communicate official information to the public. Because of this, media content in the United States will often back the official foreign policies of the American government (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). This can be especially true when it comes to foreign policy where the U.S. government controls the information causing the media to defer to what the executive branch wants (Meuller, 1973).

Gatekeeping

Gatekeeping has traditionally been defined as "the process by which countless messages are reduced to the few we are offered in our daily newspapers and television news programs" (Shoemaker, 1996, p.79). This theory speaks to the role the journalist plays when putting together the actual news story. While reported events are usually subject to traditional news values, it is simply not possible for a journalist to include every fact and iota of information in a few printed paragraphs or seconds of broadcast. Thus, the journalist becomes the gatekeeper to the information the audience receives. While the traditional sense of gatekeeping is still viable, over time, this theory has come to play a bigger role in state-press relations research. Bennett (2007) furthers defines gatekeeping in the media by saying "…the press plays the crucial role of gatekeeper in the media-based American political system, opening the news gate to admit certain voices and ideas into public view and closing it to others" (p. 11).

Although gatekeeping is an accepted role for a journalist, it often leads to problems because "economic demands, formal convention, or, more conspiratorially, a commitment to preserving the ideological status quo," certain voices are often cut out of the average news agenda (McKain, 2005, p. 416). Often, the perspectives that are underrepresented are those that are not approved by government sources, leading to what is known as indexing.

Indexing

Indexing theory said the media tend to deemphasize non-elite voices since news organizations depend on elite and government voices for information (Bennett, 1990; Mermin, 1999; Robinson, 2002). Bennett, Lawrence, and Livingston (2007) defined the role mainstream media play with politics as this "…the mainstream news generally stays within the sphere of

official consensus and conflict displayed in the public statements of the key government officials who manage the policy areas and decision-making processes that make the news" (p. 49).

Scholars also said that despite having abundant sources for information, mainstream media would often only cite the sources that are powerful in the U.S. government (Bennett, 1990; Bennett, Lawrence, & Livingston, 2007; Lawrence 2000; Mermin 1999). This "indexing" also means that while the president's political stance receives the majority of coverage, opposing perspectives can only receive coverage if they come from elites who could possibly deter the president's political action (Bennett, 1990; Entman & Rojecki, 1993). If the mainstream media do use unofficial sources or non-elite voices, it is usually because they have approval from elite voices or they can be discounted as unacceptable political opinions (Entman & Rojecki, 1993; Gitlin, 1980; Hallin, 1994; McLeod & Hertog, 1992; Shoemaker 1991).

When the consensus of these elite government voices shifts their views on a political policy as it undergoes the legislative process, these periods tend to become "punctuation points in news coverage as political forces line up for or against particular initiatives" (p. 49). By doing this, journalists only report on "institutional conflict" and how different policy-makers can sway or influence government initiatives. This, then, often leads to outside voices and viewpoints being ignored (Bennett et al., 2007, p. 49). Bennett et al. (2007) also point out that:

> Once the Washington story becomes set, other sides of the story become more
> easily excluded by the mainstream press, even when there are reputable sources
> outside government that could introduce and support them. And so the
> Washington consensus reigns, with the press acting alternatively as filter,
> amplifier, echo chamber, and adjustment mechanism (p. 53).

Researchers have also said that journalists rely more on outside sources when more professional distance is maintained between the news organization and government politics or government funding. This means that when the news organization doesn't allow government politics or funding to influence what they report on or how they report on a story, journalists will be more likely to include many different perspectives on an event, rather than the one promoted by the government. Journalists are also more likely to present diverse perspectives on an issue when elite voices are engaged in conflict (Altheide, 1984; Bennett & Lawrence, 1995; Olien, Donohue, & Tichenor, 1984; Wolfsfeld, 2001).

While it is clear that indexing theory applies to U.S. news coverage of domestic events, it seems to apply to U.S. news coverage of international events as well. Livingston and Bennett's (2003) study found that a consistent factor in news coverage of international events is the official voice above all else, no matter if the news coverage is event-driven or not. "When an unpredicted, nonscripted, spontaneous event is covered in the news, the one predictable component of coverage is the presence of official sources" (p. 376).

However, there is a large distinction to be made between U.S. official sources and foreign official sources in the U.S. mainstream media. According to scholars, foreign official sources are largely left out unless they are perceived as hostile to the United States (Hayes & Guardino, 2011). Entman (2004) said that foreign sources are voices that Americans largely perceive as untrustworthy and that "the political culture encourages Americans to disregard foreign criticism of the United States" (p. 55).

An example of foreign official sources in the U.S. mainstream media can be found in the U.S.-Libya conflict where journalists relied heavily on foreign voices when presenting perspectives that opposed mainstream public opinion (Althaus, Edy, Entman, & Phalen, 1996;

Entman, 2004). Similarly, Entman (2004) showed that during the Grenada and Panama invasions, journalists again relied on foreign voices for the oppositional perspective to the one found in U.S. official sources.

Cascading Activation Model

Entman's (2003) cascading activation model takes the concept of indexing voices in the mainstream media one step further by clarifying how information from elites spreads downward to the media. Lodge and Stroh (1993) first presented the concept of "spreading activation" when describing how feelings and thoughts enter the mind.

Entman's (2003) model builds upon that concept so that the cascading activation model is a way to "…explain how thoroughly the thoughts and feelings that support a frame extend down from the White House through the rest of the system – and who thus winds the framing contest and gains the upper hand politically" (Entman, 2003, p. 419).

The cascading activation model is highly divided among levels with the highest being the "Administration: White House, State, Defense" and the lowest level being the "Public: Polls, Other indicators" (Entman, 2003, p. 419).

The model includes three intermediate levels which are in order: other elites – congress members and staffers, ex-officials, experts; media - journalists, news organizations; news frames – framing words, framing images (p. 419). While ideas and thoughts flow within each level, they also trickle down from the top level to the bottom over time. During this process, feedback from each level, with the exclusion of the highest, simultaneously raises two levels above. According to Entman (2003) the model is like a waterfall in the fact that while ideas and thoughts can easily trickle down the model, it might be hard for ideas or thoughts to travel up the model. Also, the closer to the top each level is the more power and influence it can exert over the others.

The cascading activation model accounts for the fact that most political news comes from government officials and that it is difficult for journalists to ignore such viable news sources, especially since politicians are an active part of government (Bennett, 2007). Bennett said: "By any accounting, the confusion is inescapable: Even the best journalism in the land is extremely dependent on the political messages of a small spectrum of official news sources" (p. 114). Because of official news sources, it is easy to see how journalism will often reflect the frames politicians' use when communicating, and essentially, making news.

Journalists and Sources

Politicians spend time with journalists framing events and official messages and journalists take it further by framing the official comments as news. Bennett (2007) said an effective government will have the skill to "make and control the news" and that a crucial part of communicating "is the struggle over influencing, or *spinning*, journalists and news organizations to report versions of events that favor particular political sides" (p. 2).

Bennett also points out that although there seems to be an adversarial relationship between politicians and reporters, oftentimes reporters have no choice but to rely on politicians despite the fact that they might spin the news. "Like it or not, reporters must depend on the sources they cover," Bennett said (p. 165).

For reporters, this might translate into a different situation. Rewards might be given to those who report what politicians' desire, such as access to news or highly placed sources. Bennett also said that another recent development in the field of journalism "is an increasing consolidation of information channels on which media organizations rely for their daily supply of news" (p. 171).

Another reason journalists might feel pressured to use politicians as sources could be dwindling budgets. News associations that are forced to make budget cuts often reduce staff and pare down foreign news bureaus since international news doesn't sell as easily (Carroll, 2006; Bennett, 2007). Staff reductions seriously limit the journalist's ability to get information firsthand or from inside sources about global incidents. However, when sources from the scene of a conflict are not readily available, reporters might rely on elite voices that have influence.

Access to news sources, limited news channels, and financial means are three things that impact journalists on a daily basis. These three factors can influence the newsgathering process, the news agenda, and the voices carried by the media.

Another factor that influences the relationship between reporters and politicians is emotional proximity. Through emotional proximity, politicians can be influenced to become more active or vice versa due to the pressure they feel from audiences either empathizing or criticizing specific situations. Robinson (2002) said that how the media frame a particular issue or event can either urge or deter government officials to act. Therefore, the effect of emotional proximity allows the media to influence policymaking depending upon the situation and the media's treatment of that situation. This, then, becomes a situation where politicians influence the frames journalists' use, and the mainstream media's news frames influence politicians.

Evans (2010) compared two conflicts in the Middle East, both centered upon Palestinian refugee camps. In one conflict, Israeli soldiers surrounded a refugee camp in order to oust armed militants. In the other, Lebanese soldiers surrounded a Palestinian refugee camp in order to arrest Palestinian militiamen. Media coverage was present in both cases. However, depth of media coverage for the conflict in which Israeli soldiers were involved was much greater than coverage for the conflict in which the Lebanese soldiers were involved. In fact, Evans concluded that

frames of emotional proximity were used in the media coverage of the Israeli soldiers. For the

conflict involving the Lebanese soldiers, the opposite was true. Frames employed by the media

in that case were emotionally distant.

Policy Certainty

In order to fully understand the type of framing U.S. media coverage used to portray the

crisis in Egypt, it is crucial to understand the relationship between "policy certainty," as

described by Robinson (2002) and the mainstream media. Robinson said that a policy can be

classified as either certain or uncertain. The more government officials feel their policy is certain,

the less likely the media will have an effect upon that policy and whether or not it will change.

However, if government officials convey policy uncertainty to the media about any specific issue,

the media have a greater chance of influencing that policy.

Robinson also said that because of this, the media should have the greatest influence on

policy when it is uncertain. Perhaps the best way to gauge whether or not policy is certain is to

analyze the changes made to a particular policy over the course of time, especially when the

mainstream media perceive that policy to be a salient issue. Since it has been established that the

media did perceive the crisis in Egypt as salient, examining the changes in the way sources in the

Obama administration framed the situation should give a clarity as to whether the foreign policy

held by the president was certain from the beginning or not.

There are many factors that influence how journalists report on foreign media events.

These are things such as the availability of sources, the frames used, and the relationship

between official sources and reporters. So far, much of research has focused on events where the

United States played a key role. However, with the 2011 Egyptian protests, the United States was

merely an observer even though U.S. mainstream media dedicated the majority of the media

agenda during the two-weeks leading to the fall of the Mubarak regime to events in Egypt. Using Entman's theoretical framework, this study looked at the protests in Egypt, while focusing on the definition of the problem and the remedy endorsed by the United States. This study also looked at how both sources and newspapers framed the conflict and how those frames changed during two-weeks of news coverage.

The above theoretical framework leads to these research questions:

RQ 1: Who are the sources used by the U.S. media when covering the 2011 conflict in Egypt?

RQ 1a: Where did news coverage originate (dateline)?

RQ 1b: What was the emotional proximity of the news coverage?

RQ 2: How do these sources frame the conflict in Egypt (positive, negative, or neutral)?

RQ 3: Do the frames of U.S. sources shift during the two-week period?

RQ 4: Do U.S. and other sources change their endorsed remedy during the two-week period?

Method

This study used a quantitative textual analysis to examine the sources used by the U.S. mainstream media. The method for this study was modeled after Dimitrova and Stromback's (2005) framing article and Evan's (2010) study. The data for this study were collected over a two-week period, from January 31 through February 13, 2011. According to reports from *Project for Excellence in Journalism,* these dates coincide with the two weeks where news coverage over the conflict in Egypt accounted for a large portion of the news agenda (Jurkowitz, 2011a, b).

Articles from *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* were analyzed because these two papers are leading national newspapers and also agenda-setters for other media in the United States (Carroll, 2006). Not only this, but *The New York Times* also has substantial influence on decision-making elites when it comes to international events (Block-Elkon, 2007).

Newspaper articles for this study came from the database *LexisNexis Academic Source List*. Using the keywords "Egypt" and "protest" during the two-week time frame, 160 articles were retrieved from *The New York Times* and 141 articles were retrieved from *The Washington Post*. Articles that were opinion, editorials, or letters were discarded leaving a total of 153 articles: *The New York Times* (N=75), *The Washington Post* (N=78). The articles examined were either hard news stories or feature stories.

Entman (2004) said framing takes place in three different areas: political events, issues, and actors. He further defined substantive framing as the effects of a problem or condition, identifying its causes, endorsing a remedy, and conveying a moral judgment. Based on this, the protest in Egypt was identified as the event, political reform in Egypt was identified as the issue, and Hosni Mubarak was identified as the political actor.

Reviewing newspaper articles showed two different problem to be explored. For the protesters, the problem was Hosni Mubarak's autocratic regime. For U.S. official sources, the problem was a need for a political change. This study evaluated how the effects these problems had on both the United States and Egypt were framed (positive, negative, or neutral). This study also examined the moral judgments conveyed by assessing how both Hosni Mubarak and the protests were framed (positive, negative, or neutral). Lastly, this study looked at the remedies endorsed (political change, general political change, Mubarak's resignation, etc.).

Following this model and the method used in Evan's (2010) research, frames were distinguished through the analysis of sources' comments. The sources were categorized according to job description. Sources were placed in one of these broad categories:

- Author
- Official source

- Nonofficial source

Sources were differentiated between paragraphs by:

- Quote

- Paraphrase with the word "said"

- No attribution

Sources' comments were then analyzed based on how they characterized the event, how they characterized the actors, and how they identified the issue. By analyzing the sources, it was possible to determine whether the U.S. media did, in fact, index reported viewpoints, resulting in the majority of sources used being either elite or government voices, or whether differing viewpoints were reported.

A coding sheet (See Appendix B) was created, based on Barnett's (2006) framing study and Entman's (2004) substantive framing. This allowed for exploration of three different types of variables: inventory variables, content variables, and tone variables. Inventory variables tracked the date, author, newspaper, etc., content variables measured the sources and the type of story and tone variables measured how something was framed (positive, negative, or neutral). These three sets of variables allowed sources to be categorized and frames to be tracked over the two-week period.

This study utilized each paragraph as the unit of analysis because this way sources could be catalogued. Also, paragraphs were determined to be a better unit of analysis since an article might contain both positive and negative paragraphs, balancing into a neutral article. A total of 3,527 paragraphs were analyzed, to determine if the paragraph was positive, negative, or neutral.

To analyze the paragraphs, a pre-tested coding sheet was used to assess intercoder reliability. An independent coder, a graduate student, coded 10 percent of the articles to

determine intercoder reliability. Each paragraph was carefully assessed to see if first, the source made mention of the players in the conflict, a remedy for the conflict, and the effects of the conflict. Secondly, the paragraph was analyzed to see how the source categorized each of the aforementioned variables (positive, negative or neutral).

For example, when assessing a paragraph that mentioned the protests in Egypt positively, themes might include the good protestors were doing for the country, the patriotism of the protestors, and how the protestors are the only ones doing something to bring democracy to the country. Themes that reflected the protest negatively in a paragraph spoke of how the protests have resulted in violence or the unavailability of government buildings or Tahrir Square due to the amount of people protesting.

When categorizing a paragraph that described Mubarak, his regime, or his security forces, positive themes might include his long-term stability, his association with the United States, and Egypt's peace treaty with Israel. Negative themes about the former president, his regime, or his security forces would include labeling the former president as corrupt, a thug, a criminal, or citing examples of police violence so he could remain in control of the protests.

Examples of remedies endorsed would be demands for Mubarak's resignation, a desire for an orderly transition to a more democratic society to begin, or for the protestors to back down and allow President Mubarak to finish his term until elections could take place in September 2011.

When assessing paragraphs for positive effects on Egypt, themes typically mention how the protests are bringing the Egypt into a more fair and democratic government. Negative effects on Egypt are usually categorized as the conflict being bad for Egypt's economy, the lack of tourism, and the shortage of food and gas for the common Egyptian.

A paragraph that mentions the effects of the conflict on the United States being positive usually speaks about freedom for the people and another democratic government being good for the United States. Negative themes about the effects of this conflict on the United States usually reflect the lack of a stalwart ally in Egypt, the instability of the Middle East without Mubarak as an American ally, the distancing of Egyptians from the United States, and the possibility of Egypt's peace with Israel unraveling.

Examples of emotional language in a paragraph would be when the source would talk about the pro-Mubarak protestors as "itching for a fight" or protestors being brave and determined in the face of Egypt's authoritarian government.

Intercoder reliability with the independent coder was 1.000 for all variables except for emotional proximity and remedies endorsed. For emotional proximity, intercoder reliability was .95. For remedies endorsed, intercoder reliability was .96. To see examples of paragraphs coded for each variable, please see Appendix C.

Results

For this study a total of 3,527 paragraphs was analyzed from 153 articles, 75 from *The New York Times* and 78 from *The Washington Post*. The paragraphs analyzed included hard news and feature articles and came from a two-week period, January 31 through February 13, 2011. A majority of the news copy was from news stories, about 61 percent, and 58 percent of all paragraphs had a contributing author.

RQ1

Descriptive statistics were used to examine RQ1, which asks about sources U.S. media used in their coverage of the conflict in Egypt. The results show that U.S. media used U.S. officials 57.6 percent of the time and Egyptian officials 16.7 percent. Of the

U.S. officials, the Obama administration was used most often at about 49 percent. Non-official sources were cited 34 percent of the time, with Egyptian protestors acting as sources 8.5 percent (See Appendix A: Table 1).

RQ 1a

RQ 1a asks where the news coverage of the 2011 Egyptian conflict originated (dateline). Cross tabulation was used to determine which datelines each newspaper used the most. *The New York Times* had three main datelines with the highest number of stories. Stories originated 46.9 percent from Cairo, 21.1 percent from Washington, D.C., and 17.0 percent from New York City. For *The Washington Post*, the three datelines stories originated from the most were Cairo with 50.2 percent, Washington, D.C. with 38.1 percent, and Baghdad with 5.1 percent (See Appendix A: Table 2). The Chi-Square test determined that this data were statistically significant (p < .001).

RQ 1b

RQ 1b asks what the emotional proximity was for each newspaper. Cross tabulation was used to determine which newspaper had emotional proximity. From *The New York Times*, 39.0 percent of paragraphs had emotional proximity and 61.0 percent did not. From *The Washington Post*, 20.8 percent of paragraphs had emotional proximity and 79.2 percent did not. The Chi-Square test showed that the data were statistically significant (p < .001).

RQ2

RQ2 asks how sources framed the conflict in Egypt (positive, negative, or neutral). A cross tabulation was used to perform the statistical analysis. Results demonstrate that *The New York Times* stories were overall more positive about the conflict in Egypt than

The Washington Post. About 55 percent of *The New York Times* paragraphs were neutral compared with 51.3 percent of *The Washington Post* paragraphs. Paragraphs from *The New York Times* were positive about 36 percent of the time, while paragraphs from *The Washington Post* were positive only about 32 percent of the time. Overall, both newspapers reported few negative frames, with only 9.2 percent of negative paragraphs from *The New York Times* and 16.8 percent of negative paragraphs from *The Washington Post* (See Appendix A: Table 3). How these two papers presented the stories were significantly different ($X^2 = 17.213$, p < .001).

RQ3

RQ3 asks if the frames used by sources in the Obama administration shift over time. A cross tabulation was used to perform the statistical analysis. The first three days of the reported coverage showed sources as being more positive and neutral. However, by day four (Febrary 3, 2011) sources were more neutral at 43.8 percent with positive frames only being used 26 percent of the time. This trend hit a high point on day seven (February 6, 2011) with neutral frames being used 69 percent of the time but continued until the last two days of media coverage. On day 13 (February 12, 2011), positive frames were used 50.3 percent of the time and neutral frames only 45.6 percent. However, this cross tabulation was not significant when run through the Chi-Square tests. There were very few negative frames used overall in comparison with neutral and positive frames. However, negative frames started day one (January 31, 2011) at 21.8 percent and hit a high on day four (February 3, 2011) at 30.2 percent. Negative frames then declined rapidly until rising briefly on day 11 (February 10, 2011) to 15.7 percent before declining again.

Another point of interest is that U.S. official sources made up 33.8 percent of news sources. Cross tabulation was used to break down who the U.S. official sources were over time. The statistics showed that, generally, U.S. official sources were either from the Obama administration or the Secretary of State's office. The first seven days of the conflict, journalists heavily cited sources from the Obama administration. On day eight, the trend switched so that sources from the Secretary of State's office were more heavily cited. This carried on until day 12. Then, the last two days sources in the Obama administration were cited more heavily. When checking the frequency of U.S. official sources against everyone else, the U.S. official sources tended to be more neutral overall and there was a significant difference ($p < .01$).

RQ4

RQ 4 asks if U.S. and other sources changed their endorsed remedy over time. Descriptive statistics were used to compare remedies endorsed by the U.S. official sources and everyone else. The three remedies that received the highest endorsement were "political change," "general political reform," and "political change where Mubarak stays president." "Political change" and "general political reform" were the two most endorsed remedies at 34.7 percent. The "political change" remedy called for a more democratic government and the "general political reform" was simply a call to action requesting that something be done in Egypt's government to pacify protesters. "Political change where Mubarak stays president" was another endorsed remedy at 26.5 percent. Cross tabulation was used to determine how U.S. official sources changed over time. Overtime, U.S. official sources alternated between endorsing Political Change and

Political Change with Mubarak. However, there was no overall significant shift in how the groups (U.S. official sources and others) endorsed remedies over time (p < .001).

Discussion

RQ1 asked who the sources were that were cited by U.S. mainstream media. Statistics show U.S. official sources were quoted nearly 58 percent of the time and Egyptian protestors were only used 8.5 percent of the time. These results point out a clear underrepresentation of non-official sources. What's more, the numbers show that U.S. mainstream media rely heavily upon U.S. official sources for information. This means U.S. audiences are being presented with the U.S. official perspective more than any other perspective. It also means that the U.S. official agenda is most presented by U.S. mainstream media to audiences. With a predominantly heavy U.S. official viewpoint, audiences are more likely to dismiss voices that disagree with U.S. official sources.

RQ 1a asks where stories originated (datelines). For *The New York Times*, the most stories came from Cairo, 46.9 percent, and Washington, D.C., 21.1 percent. This shows nearly half of the stories were by journalists who were seeing the protest with their own eyes, which is good for the audience because they have a more direct link to the media event.

This also means that the perspective journalists were writing from was different than if the majority of stories had come from the United States or another country in the Middle East. The fact that Washington, D.C. had the next highest percentage of stories means that for this newspaper, the official voice was important to have represented.

For *The Washington Post*, the majority of stories came from Cairo as well, about 50 percent. This might be expected because *The Washington Post* has an international

office there. Washington, D.C. was the next most popular dateline with about 38 percent of stories. For *The Washington Post*, U.S. official voices were also important to its stories.

For both newspapers the fact that such a high percentage of stories came from Washington, D.C. means that for a grassroots movement, U.S. audiences are getting the U.S. official perspective.

RQ 1b asks about the emotional proximity reported by U.S. mainstream media. *The New York Times* had more paragraphs with emotional proximity, at 39 percent, than *The Washington Post* did, at 20.8 percent. This means that reporters at *The New York Times* had a writing style where they used more emotional language in their stories than reporters from *The Washington Post.* Because of this, audiences are getting two different perspectives on one media event. For *The New York Times*, audiences might feel that more of the newspaper's opinion about the protests is present in its stories than readers of *The Washington Post* feel.

RQ2 addressed how sources framed the conflict in Egypt. It is important to point out that although both *The New York Time* and *The Washington Post* are considered mainstream media and both newspapers relied heavily on U.S. official sources, these two newspapers framed the conflict in very different ways. *The Washington Post* was more negative in framing the Egyptian conflict than *The New York Times* and had less positive and neutral frames overall. This means that the audience in Washington, D.C. was getting news with more negative framing when compared with the audience in New York City. The difference between the framing both newspapers might be because *The New York Times* had a writing style where they tended to agree with the Egyptian protesters and *The Washington Post* had a writing style where they tended to agree with U.S. official

sources. This might mean that between the two geographic locations of these two newspapers, audiences are getting different sides of the same story. For *The Washington Post*, the side of the media event that seems to be presented most often is the U.S. official side, where as for *The New York Times*, readers get a little less of the government perspective.

RQ3 asks how the frames used by sources in the Obama administration shifted over time. The first three days of the two-week period, sources in the Obama administration were both positive and neutral when framing the Egyptian conflict. By day four (February 3), sources were more neutral, but negative framing had risen as well. This could be because on day four Mubarak supporters took to the streets around Tahrir Square and used violence against the protestors. The level of violence that was seen all around, against both journalists and anti-Mubarak protestors, may have been higher than anticipated by the U.S. government, which could account for the rise in negative framing. The neutral framing that had risen could be because U.S. official sources didn't want to push Hosni Mubarak out of office openly, even though they were putting pressure on him to make a transition of some type at this time.

There were many factors that played in the Egyptian protests and Mubarak's eventual resignation. For the U.S. government, this seems to have been a time of uncertainty as to the relationship between the United States and Egypt. For readers, the frames that were presented seemed to show the uncertainty of how the United States wanted to deal with Mubarak while at the same time presenting the grassroots movement and the Egyptian people's desire for democracy.

On day seven (February 6), sources hit a neutral high which lasted until day 13 (February 12) when sources in the Obama administration became more positive about the conflict in Egypt. This might be because on that day, the protestors were celebrating the resignation of Mubarak from office. For the United States, this meant that the uncertainty of how to deal with Mubarak had passed and now U.S. officials only needed to dedicate time to the successful protesters.

The last day of news coverage (February 13) showed sources almost split evenly between neutral and positive comments. For the U.S. government, this would have been a day where the government would have been trying to balance the impact of saying farewell to a key ally in the Middle East and supporting Egyptians' successful protest for democracy. There were almost no negative frames used by this time and that might mean that sources were more focused on what Mubarak's resignation meant for the Egyptian people, rather than what it meant for U.S. foreign policy.

RQ 4 asked if the United States and other sources changed their endorsed remedy overtime. T-tests determined that there was no overall significant shift in how U.S. official sources and other endorsed remedies. However, when isolating U.S. official sources and evaluating how the endorsed remedy changed overtime, the high points were among "political change," "general political reform," and "political change where Mubarak stays." The main observation here is that U.S. official sources were not unified on any endorsed remedy. This shows that the Egyptian foreign policy was by no means stable.

Conclusions and Limitations

The 2011 conflict in Egypt gained the majority of mainstream media coverage during a two-week period, beginning with the anti-Mubarak protests in Egypt and culminating in the resignation of the Egyptian president, Hosni Mubarak on February 11, 2011 (Sharp, 2011). The fact that the Egyptian protests were the salient issue for these two weeks shows that either the news value of conflict or the U.S. media heightened the value of the Egyptian protest for U.S. mainstream media. This study also lends support for Entman's (2004) conclusion that the media follow the government's agenda in order to support the government's objectives. The answer to RQ1 showed clearly that U.S. official sources were overrepresented, which means that the U.S. government agenda was also overrepresented.

Herman and Chomsky (1988) stated that U.S. media content often backs U.S. official foreign policy. This study certainly lends support for that statement because, even though U.S. foreign policy was not completely stable, the media used both foreign official sources and foreign nonofficial sources sparingly. The underrepresentation of foreign official sources and foreign nonofficial sources kept voices that might have expressed contrary opinions about U.S. foreign policy from gaining any real media coverage. The underrepresentation of nonofficial sources gave support to Bennett's (2007) conclusion that when it comes to political news, journalists are gatekeepers and tend to limit voices that do not support the U.S. government's party line. Thus, one conclusion of this study is that U.S. mainstream media do indeed index sources and depend heavily upon government voices for information.

However, there could be other explanations for this overrepresentation of U.S. official sources such as newsgathering deadlines and trouble identifying protest

motivators. Also, the overrepresentation of U.S. official sources might be because U.S. audiences might be more interested in hearing from U.S. sources rather than Egyptian sources because U.S. sources can relate to readers more easily. Another possible reason for the overrepresentation of U.S. official sources could be that journalists find it better to go for the sources they already have relationships with or that are close by as they go through their newsgathering routine. Articles might also have a greater appeal to U.S. audiences because they are centered upon the U.S. government's reaction to the conflict in Egypt rather than what Egyptians feel about the conflict. This is something that further study could possibly determine.

The overrepresentation of U.S. official sources also shows clearly how Entman's (2003) cascading activation model works with the White House at the top of the model and the public at the bottom. Journalists did not use Egyptian protestors as sources, which would have been at the bottom of the model, the way they used U.S. official sources, which would have been at the top of the model. Hayes and Guardino (2011) also concluded that foreign sources are usually ignored or left out of the U.S. mainstream media unless they are perceived as hostile to the U.S. government or its agenda. This conclusion holds up in this study as well.

Another reason as to why U.S. official sources might have been overrepresented could be because of access to sources. Both *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* had journalists on the ground in Egypt and *The Washington Post* has a foreign office in Cairo, Egypt. Perhaps nonofficial sources were so underrepresented was because of the threat of violence that journalists faced in Egypt. This would have limited where reporters could go and who they could approach for a story.

During the two-week period, there was a lot of talk from both reporters and U.S. officials about how social media impacted the popular uprising in Egypt and fueled the protests. Although this study did not address the role social media played directly, further study might find it valuable to measure the role Facebook and Twitter played in the protests.

Although U.S. official sources were clearly used more than any other source, datelines show that the majority of stories for both newspapers came from Cairo, Egypt. Since Cairo was clearly where most of the protests were taking place, it makes sense that both newspapers were making use of reporters who were in the middle of the action. However, even with most of the stories coming from reporters in Cairo, these same reporters evidently felt it important to use U.S. official sources a majority of the time. This could be because the anti-Mubarak protests refused to set any one person up as a leader, although there were a few key individuals who were adopted with time as major players in the conflict. This lack of a figurehead for the protests would have made it hard for any reporter to connect with those who motivated the protests.

Although the amount of emotional proximity used by both newspapers was not overwhelming, it was still more than expected. This could be because journalists for both newspapers were writing a lot of stories from Egypt. However, in order to determine what factors caused the emotional proximity, this study would have had to look at individual reporters and their backgrounds. That is something perhaps further research could determine. What was clear was that when telling the story of the conflict in Egypt, journalists from *The New York Times* used emotional language to portray what was

happening more than journalists from *The Washington Post*. This higher level of emotional proximity closely relates to how both newspapers framed the conflict in Egypt.

Examining how sources framed the conflict in Egypt showed that *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* handled the conflict differently. The fact that *The Washington Post* used more negative frames than *The New York Times* could be because of the two geographic locations of these newspapers and their very different audiences. *The Washington Post* is based out of the political capital of the United States and, therefore, caters to an audience of politicians and government workers. The location of this paper could be why more negative frames were employed because while the government didn't set a hard line with the conflict in Egypt, the protests in the Middle East did divest the United States of a longtime ally. The newspaper might have seen this as a bad thing for the U.S. government, especially since it resulted in a lot of uncertainty about the relationship between the United States and Egypt.

The New York Times, however, is based in the commercial capital of the United States. The audience for this paper might feel a little more distance from politics than readers of *The Washington Post*. This might account for the more positive and neutral framing *The New York Times* had overall. Further study might be able to determine whether the differences in framing between the two mainstream newspapers is more because of writing style or because of the audiences these two newspapers serve.

When examining how the frames employed by U.S. official sources shifted over time, the trend went from positive and neutral frames at the beginning of the two-week period, to more neutral frames until after Mubarak resigned when frames were more positive and neutral. It seems that U.S. official sources were unsure how to treat the

situation in Egypt and the media reflected that impression. On one hand, there was the fact that Mubarak had been a longtime ally of the United States but on the other hand Egyptians were adamant about a change in the regime and bringing about a more democratic government. This put the United States in a predicament because of factors such as the peace treaty Egypt has with Israel and the involvement of the political group, the Muslim Brotherhood, in the protests. The United States didn't want to alienate Egyptians when there was a very real possibility of a completely new government taking charge in the country. If the Egypt's potential government took a hostile tone with the United States it could make things very hard for American soldiers in the Middle East. Not only that, but the United States has long been an ally to Israel and if Egypt suddenly decided upon hostile relations with the United States, the treaty Egypt has with Israel could crumble. The United States has a longtime dependence upon Mubarak as a stabilizing force in the Middle East and someone who upholds U.S. foreign policy. Government leaders didn't want to upset the tenuous stability of the Middle East simply because Egyptians wanted a new leader. Because of this, U.S. official sources probably tried to seem more neutral in the way they framed the conflict and for this, used the reason that the U.S. government shouldn't tell Egyptians what to do in their own country.

Examining the remedies that the U.S. government endorsed over time showed that throughout the two-week period of news coverage, U.S. foreign policy was very uncertain. Robinson (2002) said that the media should have a greater influence on U.S. foreign policy when that policy is uncertain. However, U.S. official sources went back and forth between "political reform," "general political reform," and "political reform where Mubarak stays" over the course of the two-week period. This shows the

uncertainty of the U.S. foreign policy with the situation in Egypt and this uncertainty was represented widely in U.S. mainstream media.

When the framing switched from predominantly neutral frames to positive frames after Mubarak resigned, it seemed like the U.S. government wanted to curry favor with Egyptian people in the aftermath of the conflict. This way, the new Egyptian government would be more likely to look on the U.S. government favorably instead of as an impediment to democracy.

The overall frame for the 2011 Egyptian conflict reported by U.S. mainstream media seemed to be stasis. The U.S. mainstream media seemed to feel that it was better to watch the protests unfold and wait to see how this would impact the United States. This frame dominated U.S. official sources and, by extension, U.S. mainstream media reports. This study reinforced the fact that there is always a U.S. official voice present in the media, no matter if the United States is involved directly in the conflict or not, and, in the limited two-week period, U.S. mainstream media followed the framing set by U.S. official sources.

For journalists, this study points to a clear need for more viewpoints to be represented, especially those sources who are nonofficial because then those sources would be less likely to characterize an event the way the U.S. government would. A variety in sources would also mean that audiences would get a more complete picture on what is happening. This study also seems to point out the fact that U.S mainstream media cover foreign conflict from a distance, regardless of the fact that journalists now have more access to technology than before. Even though there were reporters in Egypt when the protests started, still, they did not always report the story from the perspective of

those involved. Sometimes those foreign-based reporters seemed to include a more U.S. official sources than foreign official sources or foreign sources.

Although this study is limited to one foreign incident, it shows that in the 2011 Egyptian conflict, U.S. mainstream media rely on U.S. official sources to tell the story about what is happening internationally. The findings in this study also show that international news coverage in this instance is narrow, limited, and centers on how an event affects U.S. audiences rather than how the event affects local audiences. Reasons for this could have been because it was an international incident and sources were difficult to locate or because access to the story from ground zero was dangerous for reporters.

The limitations of this study were that the specific language of the journalists could not be examined. Perhaps in further study, whether or not journalists and politicians employ emotional language when dealing with a conflict outside the realm of U.S. official influence might be enlightening. It might also be good for further study to gauge how foreign sources portray the U.S. and American influence. However, that was beyond the scope of this study at this time. Other limitations might be the fact that the study only looked at two U.S. mainstream newspapers and the time period was only for two-weeks. Further study suggests that analyzing international papers who were involved deeply in the Egyptian conflict, such as *Al Jazeera* or *Al Ahram*, might prove beneficial.

References

Adams, L. (2011). Report Reveals Details of U.S.-Egypt Relationship. *The National Law Review*. Retrieved March, 14, 2011, from http://www.natlawreview.com.

Althaus, S., Edy, J., Entman, R., & Phalen, P. (1996). Revisiting the Indexing Hypothesis: Officials, Media, and the Libya Crisis. *Political Communication*, *13*(4), 407-21.

Altheide, D. (1984). Hegemony: A failure of perspective. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *48*, 476-90.

Asser, M. (2011, Feb. 11). Q&A: Egyptian protests against Hosni Mubarak [Electronic version]. *BBC News*.

Avraham, E., Wolfsfeld, G., & Aburaiya, I. (2000). Dynamics in the news coverage of minorities: The case of the Arab citizens of Israel. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, *24*, 117-133.

Baumgartner, F.R., & Jones, B.D. (1993). Agendas and instability in American politics. *Choice*, *31*, 218.

Barnett, B. (2006). Health as Women's Work: A Pilot Study on How Women's Magazines Frame Medical News and Femininity. *Women and Language*, *29*(2), 1-12.

Becker, K. (1995). Media and the ritual process. *Media, Culture & Society*, *17*, 629.

Bennett, W.L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, *40*(2), 103-127.

Bennett, W.L. (2007). *News: The politics of illusion*. New York: Pearson-Longman.

Bennett, W.L., & Lawrence, R.G. (1995). News icons and the mainstreaming of social change. *Journal of Communication*, *45*, 20.

Bennett, W.L., Lawrence, R., & Livingston, S. (2007). *When the Press Fails: Political Power and the News Media from Iraq to Katrina*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bilefsky, D. (2011, February 12). Amid jubilation in Little Egypt, a dissonant voice. *The New York Times*, p. 18.

Bloch-Elkon, Y. (2007). Studying the Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy in International Crises: The United States and the Bosnian Crisis. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, *12*(4). 20-51.

Boyle, M.P., McCluskey, M.R., Devanathan, N., Stein, S.E., & McLeod, D. (2004). The Influence of the Level of Deviance and Protest Type on Coverage of Social Protest in Wisconsin from 1960 to 1999. *Mass Communication and Society*, *7*(1), 43-60.

Carroll, J. (2006). *Foreign News Coverage: The U.S. Media's Undervalued Asset*. Cambridge, MA: Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, Harvard University.

Cooper, H., Landler, M., & Mazzetti, M. (2011, February 3). Sudden split recasts foreign policy. *The New York Times*, p. 1.

Dimitrova, D., & Stromback, J. (2006). Mission Accomplished? Framing of the Iraq War in the Elite Newspapers in Sweden and the United States. *Gazette*, *67*(5), 399-417.

Donnelly, T. (2000). *Rebuilding America's defenses: Strategy, forces and resources for a new century*. Washington, DC: Project for the New American Century.

Edelman, M.J. (1993). Contestable categories and public opinion. *Political Communication*, *10*(3), 231-242.

Egypt rejects US advice on reforms [Electronic version]. (2011, February 9). *Al Jazeera*.

Englund, W. (2011, February 1). In Cairo's gas and bread lines, divergent outlooks, *The Washington Post*, p. A08.

Englund, W. (2011, February 7). Egypt's military feints, jabs with protesters. *The Washington Post*, p. A08.

Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: Towards clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, *43*, 51-58.

Entman, R.M. (2003). Cascading Activation: Contesting the White House's Frame After 9/11. *Political Communication*, *20*, 415-432.

Entman, R.M. (2004). *Projections of Power – Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Entman, R.M., & Rojecki, A. (1993). Freezing out the public: Elite and media framing of the U.S. anti-nuclear movement. *Political Communication*, *10*(2), 151-167.

Evans, M. (2010). Framing international conflicts: Media coverage of fighting in the Middle East. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, *6*(2), 209-233.

Even, S. (2011, Jan. 31). The Uprising in Egypt: An Initial Assessment. *The Institute for National Security Studies*, *240*.

Fadel, L., & Schneider, H. (2011, February 6). As the crisis drags on, Egyptians suffer. *The Washington Post*, p. A14.

Fahim, K., & Cambanis, T. (2011, February 11). In a teeming Tahrir Square, hopes mount, and they are dashed. *The New York Times*, p. 11.

First, A. (2002). The fluid nature of representation: Transformation in the representation of Arabs in Israeli television news. *Howard Journal of Communication*, *13*, 173-190.

Galtung, J. & Ruge, M. (1965). The structure of foreign news: The presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus crises in four Norwegian newspapers. *Journal of Peace Research*, *2*(1), 64-91.

Gamson, W.A. (1992). *Talking politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gamson, W.A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media Images and the Social Construction of Reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *18*, 373-93.

Gamson, W.A., & Lasch, K.E. (1983). The political culture of social welfare policy. In S.E. Spiro & E. Yuchtman-Yaar (Eds.), *Evaluating the welfare state: Social and political perspectives*, 397-415. New York: Academic Press.

Gamson, W.A., & Modiglani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *95*(1), 1-37.

Gamson, W.A., & Wolfsfeld, G. (1993). Movements and Media as Interacting Systems. *American Society of Political and Social Science Annals*, *528*, 114-25.

Gans, H.J. (1979). *Deciding what's news: A study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek and Time*. New York: Pantheon.

Gilpin, R., Kandeel, A.A., & Sullivan, P. (2011, March 4). Diffusing Egypt's Demographic Time Bomb. *Peacebrief*, *81*.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York: Free Press.

Hallin, D. (1994). *We Keep America on Top of the World: Telvision Journalism and the Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.

Hammond, J.L. (2004). The MST and the Media: Competing Images of the Brazilian Landless Farmworkers' Movement. *Latin American Politics and Society*, *46*(4), 61-90.

Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

John, S.L., Domke, D.A., Coe, K.M., & Graham, E.S. (2007). Going Public, Crisis after Crisis: The Bush Administration and the Press from September 11 to Saddam. *Rhetoric & Public*

Affairs, *10*(2), 195-220.

Jurkowitz, M. (2011, Feb. 6). Events in Egypt Trigger Record Coverage, *Project for Excellence in Journalism*.

Jurkowitz, M. (2011, Feb. 13). The Fall of Mubarak and the Media. *Project for Excellence in Journalism*.

Kahneman, D. & Tversky, A. (1984). Choice, values, and frames. *American Psychologist*, *39*, 341-350.

Kingdon, J.W. (1984). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). New York: Harper-Collins.

Kirkpatrick, D. D., & Sanger, D. (2011, February 7). After first talks, Egypt opposition vows new protest. *The New York Times*, p. 1.

Kitzinger, J. (2000). Media templates: Patterns of association and the (re)construction of meaning over time. *Media, Culture & Society*, *22*(1), 61.

Landler, M., & Cooper, H. (2011, February 9). Mideast allies favor stability over immediate change in Egypt, diplomats tell U.S. *The New York Times*, p. 12.

Lander, M., Cooper, H., & Kirkpatrick, D. D. (2011, February 2). A diplomatic scramble as an ally is pushed to the exit. *The New York Times*, p. 1.

Lawrence, R. (2000). *The Politics of Force: Media and the Construction of Police Brutality*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Lee, J. (2009). News values, media coverage, and audience attention: An analysis of direct and mediated causal relationships. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *86*(1), 175-90.

Levin, D. (2003). Structure of news coverage of a peace process: A test of the indexing and zero-sum hypothesis. *Press/Politics*, *8*, 27-53.

Livingston, S., & Bennett, W.L. (2003). Gatekeeping, Indexing, and Live-Event News: Is Technology Altering the Construction of News? *Political Communication*, *20*, 363-380.

Lodge, M., & Stroh, P. (1993). Inside the mental voting booth: An impression driven process model of candidate evaluation. In S. Iyengar & W. McGuire (Eds.), *Explorations in political psychology*, (pp. 225-263). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mandelzis, L. (2003). The changing image of the enemy in the news discourse of Israeli newspapers, 1993-1994. *Conflict & Communication Online*, *2*.

Marchi, R.M. (2005). Reframing the Runway: A Case Study of the Impact of Community Organizing on News and Politics. *Journalism*, *6*(4), 465-85.

McAdam, D. (1997). Tactical innovation and the pace of insurgency, In D. McAdam & D. Snow (Eds.), *Social movements* (pp.340-56). Los Angeles: Roxbury.

McCarthy, J.D., Smith, J., & Zald, M.N. (1996). Accessing Public, Media, Electoral, and Governmental Agendas. In D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy, & M.N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framings*, pp. 291-311. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCombs, M., & Ghanem, S. (2001). The convergence of agenda setting and framing. In S. Reese, O. Gandy, Jr., & G. August (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 67-82). Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

McFarlane, T., & Hay, I. (2003). The Battle for Seattle: Protest and Popular Geopolitics in the Australian Newspaper. *Political Geography*, *22*(2), 211-32.

McKain, A. (2005). Not Necessarily Not the News: Gatekeeping, Remediation, and *The Daily*

Show. *The Journal of American Culture*, *28*(4). 415-30.

McLeod, D.M, & Hertog, J.K. (1992). The manufacture of public opinion by reporters: Informal cues for public perceptions of protest groups. *Discourse and Society*, *3*, 259.

McLeod, D.M., & Hertog, J.K. (1999). Social Control, Social Change, and the Mass Media's Role in the Regulation of Protest Groups. In D.P. Demers & K. Viswanath (Eds.), *Mass Media, Social Control, and Social change* (pp. 305-30). Ames: Iowa State University.

Mermin, J. (1999). *Debating war and peace: Media coverage of U.S. intervention in the post-Vietnam era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Meuller, J. E. (1973). *War, Presidents and Public Opinion*. New York: Wiley.

Miller, M. M., & Reichert, B.P. (2001). The spiral of opportunity and frame resonance: Mapping the issue cycle in news and public discourse. In S.D. Reese, O.H. Gandy, & A.E. Grand (Eds.) *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social life*. (pp. 107-121). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Newhagen, J., & Nass, C. (1989). Differential Criteria for Evaluating Credibility of Newspapers and TV News. *Journalism Quarterly*, *66*(2), 277-84.

Olien, C.N., Donohue, G.A., & Tichenor, P.J. (1984). *Media and stages of social conflict* [Journalism Monographs]. Columbia, SC: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G.M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, *10*(1), 55-75.

Pollock, P.H., III. (May, 1994). Issues, values and critical moments: Did "Magic" Johnson transform public opinion on AIDS? *American Journal of Political Science*, *38*, 426-46.

Preston, A. (1996). Television News and the Bosnian Conflict, Distance, Proximity, Impact. In J. Gow, R. Paterson and A. Preston (Eds.), *Bosnia by Television*, London: British Film Institute: 112-116.

Riker, W. (1986). *The art of political manipulation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Robinson, P. (2002). *The CNN effect: The myth of news, foreign policy and intervention*. London: Routledge.

Robinson, P., Brown, R., Goddard, P., & Parry, K. (2005). War and Media. *Media Culture and Society*, *27*(6), 951-959.

Rohlinger, D.A. (2002). Framing the Abortion Debate: Organizational Resources, Media Strategy, and Movement-Countermovement Dynamics. *Sociological Quarterly*, *43*(4), 479-507.

Ross, S.D, & Bantimaroudis, P. (2006). Frame shifts and catastrophic events: The attacks of September 11, 2001, and *New York Times's* portrayals of Arafat and Sharon. *Mass Communication & Society*, *9*(1), 85-101.

Rubin, B. (2011, Jan.). Egypt: What the U.S. Should Do. *E-Notes*, Foreign Policy Research Institute, Retrieved online from: www.fpri.org

Ryan, C. (2004). It Takes a Movement to Raise an Issue: Meida Lessons from the 1997 UPS Strike. *Critical Sociology*, *30*(2), 483-511.

Scheufele, D. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication*, *49*(1), 103-122.

Schneider, H. (2011, February 12). In show of confidence, Egypt's economy exhales; equity markets rise. *The Washington Post*, p. A10.

Scholzman, K.L., & Tierney, J.T. (1986). *Organized Interests and American Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.

Shadid, A. (2011, February 4). Egypt officials widen crackdown; U.S. in talks for Mubarak to quit. *The New York Times*, p. 1.

Shadid, A. (2011, February 7). At night in Tahrir Square, Cairo protest gives way to poetry and performance. *The New York Times*, p. 9.

Sharp, J.M. (2011). *Egypt: The January 25 Revolution and Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy*. Congressional Research Service. www.crs.gov

Shoemaker, P. (1991). Introduction: Theorizing about Gatekeeping. *Communiction Concepts 3: Gatekeeping*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Slackman, M. (2011, February, 12). A brittle leader, appearing strong. *The New York Times*, p. 1.

Smith, J., McCarthy, J.D., McPhail, C., & Augustyn, B. (2001). From Protest to Agenda Building: Description Bias in Media Coverage of Protest Events in Washington D.C., *Social Forces*, *79*(4), 1397-1423.

Snow, D.A., & Benford, R.D. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participation mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, *1*, 197-216.

Snow, D.A., & Benford, R.D. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In A.D. Morris & C.M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 133-55). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Snow, D.A., Rochford, Jr., E.B., Worden, S.K., & Benford, R.D. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review*, *51*, 464-81.

Timeline: Egypt's revolution [Electronic version]. (2011, Feb. 14). *Al Jazeera*.

Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news: A study in the construction of reality.* New York: Free Press.

Underwood, D. (2001). Reporting and the Push for Market-Oriented Journalism: Media Organizations as Businesses. In W. L. Bennett & R. M. Entman (Eds.), *Mediated Politics: Communication in the Future of Democracy.* (pp. 99-116). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vraneski, A., & Ritcher, R. (2002). *Frames, framing and reframing in, and through, the mass media: Reflection of four protracted environmental disputes in the Israeli press*. ICAR paper.

Witte, G. (2011, February 5). Tahrir becomes central battlefield of a revolution. *The Washington Post*, p. A06.

Wolfsfeld, G. (1997). *Media and political conflict: News from the Middle East*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wolfsfeld, G. (2001). Political waves and democratic discourse: Terrorism waves during the Oslo peace process. In W.L. Bennett & R.M. Entman (Eds.), *Mediated Politics: Communication in the future of democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zacharia, J. (2011, February 2). Israel worries about peace and regional tumult. *The Washington Post*, p. A10.

Zaller, J.R. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A: Tables

Table 1: *Comparing Sources*

U.S. officials	57.6%
Egyptian officials	16.7%
Foreign officials	15.8%
Egyptian protesters	8.5%
U.S. experts	5.8%
Egyptian citizens	4.7%
U.S. government	3.9%
Egyptian protest leaders	3.8%
Egyptian military personnel	3.3%
Egyptian political groups	2.0%

Table 2: *Story Datelines by Newspaper*

Dateline	*The New York Times*	*The Washington Post*
Egypt		
Alexandria	3.1%	2.6%
Cairo	46.9%	50.2%
Greater Middle East		
Algeirs	1.3%	0.0%
Baghdad	1.5%	5.1%
Beirut	1.1%	0.0%
Gaza	1.3%	0.0%
Jerusalem	0.8%	1.9%
Sana, Yemen	0.7%	0.0%
Tehran	0.9%	2.1%
Europe		
Berlin	0.6%	0.0%
Brussels	0.8%	0.0%
Munich	2.0%	0.0%
Paris	1.0%	0.0%
United States		
New York City	17.0%	0.0%
Washington, D.C.	21.1%	38.1%

Table 3: *How Newspapers Framed the 2011 Egyptian Conflict*

Newspaper	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Total
The New York Times	35.9%	9.2%	54.8%	100.0%
The Washington Post	31.9%	16.8%	51.3%	100.0%
Total	34.4%	12.1%	53.5%	100.0%
Pearson-Chi Square	$X2 = 17.213$	$df = 3$	$p < .001$	

Appendix B: Codebook

Inventory Variables

    A.   Article Number (   )

    B.   Newspaper: 1 - The New York Times

                            2 - The Washington Post

    C.   Date:

1 – Jan. 31, 2011	8 – Feb. 7, 2011
2 – Feb. 1, 2011	9 – Feb. 8, 2011
3 – Feb. 2, 2011	10 – Feb. 9, 2011
4 – Feb. 3, 2011	11 – Feb. 10, 2011
5 – Feb. 4, 2011	12 – Feb. 11, 2011
6 – Feb. 5, 2011	13 – Feb. 12, 2011
7 – Feb. 6, 2011	14 – Feb. 13, 2011

    D.   Word Count in rough numbers (   )

    E.   Lead Author:

1 – Liz Sly	9 – Nicholas Kulish
2 – Karen DeYoung	10 – Brian Knowlton
3 – Griff Witte	11 - Anthony Shadid
4 – Leila Fadel	12 – David D. Kirkpatrick
5 – Paul Kane	13 – Judy Dempsey
6 – Steven Mufson	14 – Will Englund
7 – Mark Landler	15 – Associated Press
8 – Dan Bilefsky	16 – Janine Zacharia

17 – Joby Warrick, 18 – Dan Eggan, 19 – Colum Lynch, 20 – Cecilia Kang, 21 – Anne E. Kornblut, 22 – Craig Whitlock, 23 – Michelle Boorstein, 24 – Greg Miller, 25 – Paul Farhi, 26 – Ernesto Londono, 27 – LA Times, 28 – Thomas Erdboink, 29 – Walter Pincus, 30 – Scott Wilson, 31 – Amy Gardner, 32 – Howard Schneider, 33 – Dan Balz, 34 – Caryle Murphy, 35 – Tim Bahrampour, 36 – Mary Beth Sheridan, 37 – Reuters, 38 – Kareem Fahim, 39 – Fares Akram, 40 – Helene Cooper, 41 – Souad Mekhennet, 42 – Christine Hauser, 43 – J. David Goodman, 44 – Raui Somaiya, 45 – John Leland, 46 – Laura Kasinof, 47 – Jeremy W. Peters, 48 – Scott Shane, 49 – Mark Mazzetti, 50 – Stephen Castle, 51 – David E. Sanger, 52 – Jennifer Preston, 53 – Elizabeth Bumiller, 54 – Jeff Sommer, 55 – Steve Erlanger, 56 – Alessandra Stanley, 57 – William Yong, 58 – Jeff Zeleny, 59 – Michael Slackman, 60 – Thom Shanker, 61 –

Nada Bakri, 62 – Ethan Bromner, 63 – Ben Zimmer, 64 – Neil MacFerguhar, 65 – Adam Nassiter, 66 - -Peter Baker

F. Was there a contributing author?
    1. Yes
    2. No
G. Where is the story coming from?
    1. New York
    2. Washington D.C.
    3. Alexandria
    4. Cairo
    5. Tunisia
    6. Baghdad
    7. Berlin
    8. Jerusalem
    9. Tehran
    10. Gaza
    11. Sana, Yemen
    12. Brussells
    13. Munich
    14. Paris
    15. Beirut
    16. Algeirs
H. Type of story:
    1. News Story
        a. Presents events/facts about events taking place, action-oriented
    2. Feature Story
        a. Presents in-depth reporting about individual/organization
    3. Other
        a. That which doesn't fall into any of the above categories

Content Variables

I.   Paragraph Number (   )

Each time the paragraph number changes, please repeat the following questions for each new paragraph you code.

J.   Is the source an official source? (Meaning is the source employed by a government agency or speaking on behalf of a government agency?)

1.   Yes

2.   No

K. If the source is official – what title does the source carry?

1. Egyptian Official

a. Individual employed by the Egyptian Government

2. U.S. Official

a. Individual employed by the U.S. Government

3. Foreign Official

a. Individual employed by a government that is neither the U.S. nor Egypt

4. Egyptian Government

a. Government as a whole organization or a high placed official source that remains anonymous

5. U.S. Government

a. Government as a whole organization or a high placed official source that remains anonymous

6. Foreign Government

a. Government as a whole organization that is neither the U.S. nor Egypt, or a high placed official source that remains anonymous

7.   U.S. Military Person

a. Individual employed by a branch of the U.S. military

8. Egyptian Military Person

a. Individual employed by a branch of the Egyptian military

9. Foreign Military Person

a. Individual employed by a branch of the military in a country that is neither the U.S. nor Egypt

10. U.S. Military

a. A person speaking on behalf of the U.S. military

11. Egyptian Military

a. A person speaking on behalf of the Egyptian military

12. Foreign Military

a. A person speaking on behalf of a military that is neither from the U.S. nor Egypt

13. U.S. Law Enforcement Person

a. Individual employed by a U.S. law enforcement agency

14. Egyptian Law Enforcement Person

a. Individual employed by a Egyptian law enforcement agency

15. Foreign Law Enforcement Person

a. Individual employed by a law enforcement agency in a country that is neither the U.S. nor Egypt

16. U.S. Law Enforcement Agency

a. A person speaking on behalf of a U.S. Law Enforcement agency

17. Egyptian Law Enforcement Agency

a. A person speaking on behalf of an Egyptian Law Enforcement agency

18. Foreign Law Enforcement Agency

a. A person speaking on behalf of a law enforcement agency that is from neither the U.S. nor Egypt

19. Other

a. A person who does not fall into any other official category

L. If the source is a U.S. official, which category does the source fall into?

1. Obama Administration
2. Secretary of State office
3. Congress
4. Pentagon
5. Government Agency
6. State Government
7. Other

M. If the source is a non-official source, what title does the source carry?

1. Egyptian Citizen

    a. Person not directly involved with the protest but who is a citizen of Egypt

2. U.S. Citizen

    a. Person not directly involved with the protest but who is a citizen of the U.S.

3. Foreign Citizen

    a. Person not directly involved with the protest but who is neither a citizen of the U.S. nor Egypt

4. Egyptian Protestor

    a. Individual that is a citizen of Egypt and actively involved in the protest in Egypt

5. U.S. Protestor

    a. Individual that is a citizen of the U.S. and actively involved in the protest in Egypt but who does not belong to any particular organization or political group

6. Foreign Protestor

    a. Individual that is neither a citizen of the U.S. nor Egypt but who is actively involved in the protest in Eygpt

7. Egyptian Protest Leader

    a. Individual who speaks for a faction of citizens actively involved in the protest in Egypt but who does not belong to any particular organization or political group

8. U.S. Protest Leader

    a. Individual who speaks for a faction of citizens actively involved in the protest in Egypt but who does not belong to any particular organization or political group

9. Foreign Protest Leader

    a. Individual who speaks for a faction of citizens actively involved in the protest in Egypt but who does not belong to any particular organization or political group and who is not a citizen of the U.S. nor Egypt

10. Egyptian Political Group

    a. Individual who speaks on behalf of an Egyptian political group

11. U.S. Political Group

    a. Individual who speaks on behalf of a U.S. political group

12. Foreign Political Group

a. Individual who speaks on behalf of a foreign political group that is not made up of citizens of either the U.S. or Egypts

13. Person with Education credentials

a. Individual who is associated with some type of teaching facility

14. Retired U.S. Military Person

a. Individual who was once employed by the U.S. military, but is now retired

15. Retired Egyptian Military Person

a. Individual who was once employed by the Egyptian military, but is now retired

16. Retired Foreign Military Person

a. Individual who was once employed by a military organization that was from neither the U.S. nor Egypt, but is now retired

17. U.S. Expert

a. Individual who cannot be placed in any of the other categories but who can offer an expert opinion on article's subject matter and who is a U.S. citizen,

18. Egyptian Expert

a. Individual who cannot be placed in any of the other categories but who can offer an expert opinion on article's subject matter and who is an Egyptian citizen

19. Foreign Expert

a. Individual who cannot be placed in any of the other categories but who can offer an expert opinion on article's subject matter and who are neither citizens of the U.S. or Egypt

20. Egyptian Journalist

a. Individual who is a citizen of Egypt and whose profession is gathering and reporting news and employed by a news organization
a. Individual whose profession is gathering and reporting news and who is employed by a news organization

21. U.S. Journalist

a. Individual who is a citizen of the U.S. and whose profession is gathering and reporting news and who is employed by a news organization

22. Foreign Journalist

a. Individual who is neither a citizen of the U.S. nor Egypt and whose profession

is gathering and reporting the news and who is employed by a news organization

23. U.S. Media

a. Individual who speaks on behalf of a U.S. media organization

24. Egyptian Media

a. Individual who speaks on behalf of an Egyptian media organization

25. Foreign Media

a. Individual who speaks on behalf of a media organization that is neither from

the U.S. nor Egypt

26. Author of the story

a. The lead author who wrote the story

27. Other

a. Any individual or group who does not fall into one of the above categories

Tone Variables

N. Does the source describe the protest/conflict in Egypt?

1. Yes

2. No

O. If yes, how does the source describe the protest/conflict in Egypt?

1. Positive

a. When speaking of the protest/conflict, the source uses words such as "freedom,"

2. Negative

a. When speaking of the protest/conflict, the source uses words such as "unstable,"
"corrupt," or

3. Neutral

a. When speaking of the protest/conflict, the source does not attempt to label the
protest/conflict in any way

P. Does the source describe President Hosni Mubarak or his regime?

1. Yes

2. No

Q. If yes, how does the source describe President Hosni Mubarak or his regime?

1. Positive

  a. The source describes President Mubarak or his regime as "stability for the country," "fair,"

2. Negative

  a. The source describes President Mubarak or his regime as "corrupt," "criminal," or "unfair"

3. Neutral

  a. The source does not attempt to describe President Mubarak or his regime

R. Does the source endorse a remedy for the protest/conflict in Egypt?

 1. Yes

 2. No

S. If the source does endorse a remedy for the protest/conflict in Egypt, how is that remedy categorized?

 1. Political Change where the government changes and Mubarak is out

  a. A change should occur within the Egyptian government

 2. Military Change

  a. A change should occur within the Egyptian military

 3. Cultural Change

  a. A change should occur within the Egyptian culture

 4. Economic Change

  a. A change should occur within the Egyptian economy

 5. Religious Change

  a. A change should occur within one of Egypt's religions

 6. Educational Change

  a. A change should occur within Egypt's educational system

 7. Media as a Change

  a. A change should occur within Egypt's media

 8. General Political Reform

  a. A change should occur, but it is not yet determined what that change should be and the Mubarak Regime is not addressed

 9. Keep everything the same and get rid of the protestors

 10. Don't know what the change should be

11. Political change that allows Mubarak to stay until his term is finished in September, 2011

12. Mubarak has now resigned

13. Now that Mubarak is gone – work for a democratic government

14. Other

    a. A change should occur that does not fit one of the categories above

T. Does the source speak about the effects this conflict will have on Egypt?

  1. Yes

  2. No

U. If yes, how does the source characterize the effects this conflict will have on Egypt?

  1. Positive

  2. Negative

  3. Neutral

V. Does the source speak about the effects this conflict will have on the U.S.?

  1. Yes

  2. No

W. If yes, how does the source characterize the effects this conflict will have on the U.S.?

  1. Positive

  2. Negative

  3. Neutral

X. Does the source characterize the conflict in Egypt as emotionally close?

  a. Emotional Proximity as closeness – the language used leads the audience to empathize with the individuals/groups involved in the issue being reported. Example: charged words used like "victimized," "freedom," or "love."

  1. Yes

  2. No

Appendix C: Definitions

The Protest in Egypt

Positive Paragraph

An example of a positive paragraph would be:

The menace was a counterpoint to Tahrir Square, where the literati and well-off demonstrators mixed with the poorest of rough-and-tumble neighborhoods in scenes of camaraderie and determination that have made the square an emblem of the revolt. Protestors flashed V-for-victory signs at dawn, celebrating their success in holding the square and even pushing the barricades forward in clashes that dragged through the night (Shadid, 2011, February 4).

Negative Paragraph

An example of a negative paragraph would be:

There have been short-term costs: property damage and the virtual shutdown of the nation's vital tourist industry for more than two weeks (Schneider, 2011, February 12).

Neutral Paragraph

An example of a neutral paragraph would be:

For a short time Sunday morning, soldiers prohibited anyone from bringing food into Tahrir Square, the scene of nearly two weeks of anti-government protests, though people were still allowed to pass the checkpoints (Englund, 2011, February 7).

Framing Mubarak, the Regime, Government Officials, and Security Forces

Positive Paragraph

Here is an example of a positive paragraph:

"I am worried that Egypt will turn into Afghanistan, that girls won't be able to go to school and will be forced to wear burqas, that we will end up with a country run by extremists," Mr. [Hassan] Abouelenein said. "Mr. [Hosni] Mubarak was America's son, and we had good relations with America. We had good relations with Israel. Now what will happen?" (Bilefsky, 2011, February 12).

Negative Paragraph

Here is an example of a negative paragraph:

The New Market, in Mohandiseen, hasn't had any chickens for a week. The manager, who asked not to be identified, said he normally sells 50 to 100 a day. "People are angry. They're angry because things aren't coming," he [Hassan Hagazy] said. "[Hosni] Mubarak is responsible," (Englund, 2011, February 1).

Neutral Paragraph

Here is an example of a neutral paragraph:

Hosni Mubarak's legacy was supposed to be stability. During almost three decades in power, he rejected bold action in favor of caution. He took half-steps at economic liberalization, preserved the peace with Israel, gave his police force the power to arrest without charge and allowed only the veneer of democracy to take hold (Slackman, 2011, February 12).

Remedies Endorsed

Remedy: Political Reform

Here is an example of a paragraph endorsing the Political Reform remedy:

Everywhere there was humor, for which Egyptians are famous. "[Hosni] Mubarak, please leave" went one man's placard. "I've been married for 20 days, and I miss my wife." Someone else joked that Mr. [Hosni] Mubarak immolated himself in protest over his people (Shadid, 2011, February 7).

Remedy: General Political Reform

Here is a paragraph endorsing the General Political Reform remedy:

Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr. conveyed that message in a call to Mr. [Omar] Sulieman, the White House said, urging him to take specific steps toward democracy. The strong language from Mr. [Robert] Gibbs followed some criticism of the administration from Egyptian protestors and their foreign supporters that its public statements had been contradictory and equivocal (Landler, & Cooper, 2011, February 9).

Remedy: Political Reform with Mubarak in Office

Here is a paragraph endorsing the Political Reform with Mubarak in Office remedy:

Mr. [Hosni] Mubarak said in an interview with ABC that he was eager to step down but if he did, "Egypt would sink into chaos," (Shadid, 2011, February 4).

Framing the Effects of the Conflict on Egypt

Positive Paragraph

Here is an example of a positive paragraph:

"Revolution is like a love story," said Alaa Al Aswany, the Egyptian novelist whose writings about the hypocrisy of the Egyptian government and the need for free elections have helped inspire the pro-democracy movement. "When you are

in love, you become a much better person. And when you are in revolution, you become a much better person," (Witte, 2011, February 5).

Negative Paragraph

Here is an example of a negative paragraph:

"When some people in the West see what's happening in Egypt they see Europe 1989," said an Israeli official, who declined to be identified because he was not authorized to speak on the matter. He was referring to the revolutions in Easter Europe that preceded the fall of the Soviet Union. "We see it as Tehran 1979," (Zacharia, 2011, February 2).

Neutral Paragraph

Here is an example of a neutral paragraph:

"I'm really lost. I don't know what's wrong and what's right," said Nada Nassar, 25, who works in advertising and hasn't been paid since the crisis started. "I wanted [Hosni Mubarak] to leave, but now I don't know if things will be worse if he does," (Fadel, & Schneider, 2011, February 6).

Framing the Effects of the Conflict on the United States

Positive Paragraph

Here is an example of a positive paragraph:

But the young revolt's initiators said they were unfazed because they had never relied on Western support. "If the United States supports the revolution, it is good for the United States," said Islam Lofty, 32, a lawyer. "If they do not, it is an Egyptian issue," (Kirkpatrick, & Sanger, 2011, February 7).

Negative Paragraph

Here is an example of a negative paragraph:

"No one wanted the vacuum of power that would happen If [Hosni] Mubarak left

too soon," said a former senior official who was consulted by the White House

(Cooper, Landler, & Mazzetti, 2011, February 3).

Neutral Paragraph

Here is an example of a neutral paragraph:

"No one wanted it to seem as if we were pushing him out," one administrative

official said. "That would not serve American interests. It was important for

President Mubarak to make the decision," (Landler, Cooper, & Kirkpatrick, 2011,

February 2).

Emotional Proximity

Paragraph 1

Here is an example of a paragraph with emotional proximity:

Anger turned to festivity much later in the night, as thousands poured past the

concrete barriers to demonstrate – and set up camp – in front of the Stalinist state

television headquarters, an imposting tower on the Nile that looks like a fortress

even when not protected by tanks (Fahim, & Cambanis, 2011, February 11).