

2004

Social protests, asocial media: patterns of press coverage of social protests and the influence of the internet of such coverage

Sonora Jha Nambiar

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations



Part of the [Mass Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nambiar, Sonora Jha, "Social protests, asocial media: patterns of press coverage of social protests and the influence of the internet of such coverage" (2004). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 711.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/711

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

SOCIAL PROTESTS, ASOCIAL MEDIA: PATTERNS OF PRESS COVERAGE OF
SOCIAL PROTESTS AND THE INFLUENCE OF THE INTERNET ON SUCH
COVERAGE

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

In

The Manship School of Mass Communication

By

Sonora Jha Nambiar
B.Com, Bombay University, India, 1988
Postgraduate Diploma, Social
Communication Media
Sophia Polytechnic, Mumbai, India, 1989
May, 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the phenomenal contribution of faculty, family and friends either directly toward this dissertation or to the circumstances that made it possible. I owe a mighty acknowledgement to the will and wisdom of Dr. Ralph Izard, my advisor. I thank him for being so solid in his work and for investing so much faith and time in me. I thank Dr. Renita Coleman for those several sessions of theory bashing and number crunching that I enjoyed as much as I did the free lunches that followed them. Dr. Coleman got me animated about the story behind the numbers on my computer screen, and to her I owe this new skill and spirit. I thank Dr. Wayne Parent whose paper examining the Internet and democracy guided me to my own topic; it was he who also made the invaluable suggestion that I temper my excitement over the Internet's ability to change the world.

I especially thank Dr. Jack Hamilton for setting up this new, unique doctoral program in Media and Politics at The Manship School of Mass Communication, for making it possible for me to be part of its first batch of graduate students and for his touching generosity, both professional and personal, through these years. I must thank some of the other members of the brilliant faculty here at LSU, who escaped the terrible fate of being on my committee, but did not escape my intrusions on their time. Among them are Dr. David Perlmutter, Dr. Tim Cook and Dr. Jim Garand, courses and conversations with whom helped my work along.

I thank Altaf Abid, Shilpi Dubey and Nasser H. in Mumbai, India, for their intelligent, insightful and super-efficient research assistance that helped me finish up much sooner than I could have imagined. I particularly want to thank all those people

who did not even know they were making this dissertation possible – those many members of the LSU staff who helped with crucial things like paperwork and printer settings; Florence Mbuba, who helped me keep a clean home so I could work with an uncluttered mind; the domestic workers and others in my family’s employ during the summer in Mumbai, India, who brought me food and peace – Brenda, Ameena, Kamal, Kashiram, Chaudhary-ji and several others.

I cannot thank my family enough for twisting me up so I must always endeavor; I thank them for then rejoicing in these endeavors. I thank my friends without embarrassing them – K.T.Sandip, Cleo Allen, Hope Childers and, especially, Hitesh Sood.

Finally, I thank my son Sahir for keeping me inspired and for never letting me take myself too seriously.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract.....	v
Chapter	
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Literature Review.....	9
3. Methods.....	30
4. Words and Writings: Results of Qualitative Depth Interviews and Content Analyses of Protest Coverage.	46
5. Discussions and Implications.....	60
6. Shifting or Steadfast? The Myths and Realities of Movement - Media Relations in the Age of the Internet.....	76
References.....	88
Appendix	
A Letter to Journalists Who Covered the Anti-Globalization Protests.....	95
B Code Guide for Qualitative In-Depth Interviews With 14 Journalists Who Covered the Anti-Globalization Protests in Seattle, Wash., Washington, D.C. and Quebec City, Canada	97
C Codebook for Newspaper and Magazine Coverage of Anti-WTO and Anti- Vietnam War Protests.....	102
D Instructions for Coders.....	103
E ANOVA Tests of Differences Between Anti-WTO Protest Coverage and Anti- Vietnam War Protest Coverage	107
F Comparisons of Frequencies of Protest Coverage and Frames	108
G Comparisons of Frequencies of Protest Coverage and Valence.....	109
Vita.....	110

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines media coverage of two social protests set more than three decades apart – “The March on the Pentagon” in October 1967, part of the anti-Vietnam war movement and “The Battle for Seattle” in November-December 1999, part of the movement for democratic globalization. Through two separate studies – a content analysis of print media coverage and qualitative in-depth interviews with journalists – this dissertation looks for patterns of sourcing and framing between the coverage of these two protests. It also examines any possible influence on these patterns caused by journalists’ access to diverse sources and research through the Internet.

This examination is prompted by the current celebration as well as debate over the capacity of the Internet, as a tool of political organization, to empower social movement protests, boost political participation, enhance media coverage and develop the public sphere. This research uses the lenses of sourcing and framing to examine journalists’ reliance on official and authoritative sources in government and trade, the circumstances under which they cite sources of dissent, their preferences and practices in their use of the Internet, their use of the episodic versus thematic frame and the valence in their stories.

The dissertation found that journalists who covered the anti-globalization protests used more official and authoritative sources in government and trade than did their predecessors who covered the anti-Vietnam war protests 30 years ago. No significant difference was found, however, in journalists’ sourcing from among protesters or the frames and valence in the coverage of both protests. Moreover, the coverage did not show any discernible impact of the Internet in either increasing the diversity of journalists’ sources or causing a shift from episodic to thematic frames; journalists exhibited

skepticism over protest Web sites and showed a preference for official and authoritative sources even over the Internet.

This dissertation, therefore, points to the endurance of age-old news values and norms despite journalists' enhanced access through new tools and technologies. It also calls for a continued examination of the Internet's ability to cause any shift in social movement-media relations, given the impact of these relations on participation and public opinion.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Social protest as a form of political participation has a colorful and controversial history. Press coverage of social protest, seen as necessary for projecting alternative voices into the larger public sphere, has an equally colorful, if not controversial, history in this country. This is currently playing out in the criticisms against the U.S. media's coverage of mass street protests in March 2003 against the war in Iraq. In a peculiar turn of events, alongside these anti-war protests across the nation, there were those who picketed outside media organizations, protesting inadequate coverage of the peace movement (Hinojosa et al, 2003). The word on the street is that the relationship between the mass media and social movements is uneasy.

Why is it interesting to look at how the media cover social protest, and why do it now? First, it can never be overstated that the health of a democracy requires that its citizens be both informed and involved, and a serious form of this involvement might mean every so often these citizens would gather to participate through social protest. Second, this form of participation is particularly relevant and, at least in principle, celebrated in the United States where the "right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances," is built into the First Amendment.

Third, in modern times, such activity depends on media attention to the protest. First Amendment scholar Barron (1973) has, in fact, termed this a *duty* of the media, stressing on a democratic citizenry's right of access to the media as a First Amendment issue as well as a necessary feature of a participatory democracy. Although the concept of "duty" may be contested by media practitioners, the notion of "responsibility," as laid out by the Hutchins Commission in 1947, has been consistently put forth as a normative ideal for a free press in a

democracy. Fourth, much excitement has been generated over the role the Internet has been playing in protest organization and its ability to engage the mainstream media, beginning with the anti-globalization protests in several U.S. cities in 1999-2000.

But, first, let us look at some of the dynamics involved here. Social movement organizations consider social protest to be a major political resource. They also consider news coverage to be a strong political resource. Where do the two intersect? Do journalists cover one social protest the same way they cover another? Do they use similar sources for newsgathering and similar frames for reporting news of social protest, or does coverage differ from protest to protest? Do certain strategies of political organization by social movement organizations facilitate such coverage for journalists and, in turn, improve the access that protest groups have to journalists?

For instance, has the recent success in mounting social protest over the Internet and the organization of groups on the Internet also meant a change in movement-media relations? Have sourcing strategies and framing of social protest changed as journalists access contacts and debates/arguments/research over the Internet? Or is the Internet merely a tool for political organization by activists who then orchestrate the kind of protest (the scale and the showdowns) that would draw media coverage?

Answering these questions has probably never been as important as it is today – a mass-mediated America is becoming increasingly reliant on mainstream media for the big picture as Internet use taps into a fragmented image. According to the 2003 statistics from the Pew Internet and American Life Project, America has an impressive 116 million adult Internet users, yes. But are these the Americans who are prompting the celebration over the arrival of the electronic civil society?

Imagine this situation: a young white male corporate executive in New York, who reads two newspapers a day (in print or online), watches the nightly news as well as surfs the six Web sites he “bookmarked” as being important to his professional and private life, is commuting to work with a newspaper in hand. He is intrigued by an image that catches his eye -- men in black masks smashing windows at Niketown, Seattle, Wash.

Now, given the superspecialization and fragmentization of society and the arguments of scholars like Cass Sunstein (2002) that we are increasingly seeking customization of our communications universe, self-selecting the news and opinions we want to log on to, it might be unlikely that this busy New Yorker belongs to an e-group run by The Ruckus Society (one of the protest organizations that spearheaded the anti-globalization protests). It is even less likely that he has bookmarked this website. It is unlikely that he is aware that this listserve and a hundred Web sites linked to the organization that runs it have got together the masses of people who protested against globalization in those streets of Seattle. It is unlikely that he will be an audience to the video footage shot by independent photojournalists for the Independent Media Center set up by groups seeking an alternative to mainstream media. It is also unlikely that he knows of the electronic sit-ins where he can vote to save the sea turtles. Here is what *is* likely: He just might want to read the story accompanying that picture he is looking at.

Now, let’s look at how things have shaped up for the journalist who wrote that story. Her predecessor a generation ago covered the early Vietnam antiwar protests with mounting frustration over the incoherence and disorganization of those flower children. That journalist knew that the dissent was a big story but found it easier to quote government and defense officials who were becoming gradually opposed to the war (or those opposed merely to President Lyndon Johnson). From the protesters, the easiest quotes came from celebrity protest officials

such as pediatrician Benjamin Spock, author Norman Mailer and singer Joan Baez. Also, colorful slogans became a part of U.S. history: “Hell no, we won’t go”; “Hey, hey, LBJ, how many kids did you kill today?” The journalist did “get” both sides of the story. The coverage at first reflected the consensus and then some of the more elite or colorful dissensus.

The slogans are still there, although modified for the new movement – “Hey, hey, ho ho, WTO has got to go!” But there’s much more to the picture. Today’s journalist has access to Web sites that have academic research papers from across the globe explaining exactly why we must save those sea turtles or how the sweatshop issue is linked to democratic globalization, or why, finally, there must be a multiplicity of voices involved in WTO decision-making. Media modules and quick links to instantly downloadable press kits in PDF format are readily available. In addition, anti-globalization spokespersons, although disdainful of mainstream “corporate-controlled” media, are willing to break down complex, multi-layered arguments into sound bytes.

Can we expect, then, that this enhanced access to the message, access provided by the movement itself, might lead to coverage on the movement’s own terms? That is, that media coverage would be a reflection of the debate, the arguments, the alternative voices opposed to unfettered globalization? Can we expect that the New Yorker reading that story while waiting for his Starbucks café latte to cool, will feel a little less bemused because (1) the Internet is enhancing democracy, (2) because this cyberdemocracy has led to crossborder networking (3) because such networking has brought people from across the globe onto the streets of Seattle (4) because the sheer numbers of protesters has forced newspapers to get out there and cover a movement when they had little idea it was even brewing? Will that New Yorker, more than anything else, benefit from the fact that the reporter who is bringing him the coverage now has

access to many more sources and can comprehend many more “frames” than her predecessor had while covering America’s last big movement?

Why is it even important that he (1) gets this message about a social movement *from his media* and (2) gets this message at all? Gitlin (1980), whose research on the media framing of America’s last big movement, the protests against the Vietnam war in the 1960s, believes that the processed image (manufactured by the rules of journalistic notions of events as newsworthy) then tends to *become* ‘the movement’ for wider public and institutions who have few alternative sources of information, or none at all, about it; that image has its impact on public policy, and when the movement is being opposed, what is being opposed is in large part a set of mass-mediated images. Today, when our society is far more mass-mediated than it was in the 1960s, with fewer *choices* from within the mainstream media (Bagdikian, 2000; Nichols & McChesney, 2002), public opinion on everything from presidential candidates to the politics of dissent hinges on that mass-mediated image.

This brings us to the second part, about why the audience should get the message at all. The answer is particularly relevant for a country that prides itself on the freedom its citizens enjoy, freedom that has been put into place by movements for social change, such as the civil rights movement, the women’s movement and the anti-war movement. All of these called for a major shift from the consensus and complacency that existed in American society before some people decided to voice their dissent. At a practical level, a society that suppresses (or ignores) dissent allows itself to lose accurate information and competing arguments, which are the basis for rational and effective decision-making (Sunstein, 2003). From the point of view of democratic theory, scholars believe that a democratic society such as America cannot expect its citizens to completely perform their

political obligations without encouraging a more participatory democracy than that provided by the electoral system (Pateman, 1979). Such participation occasionally must take the form of social protest.

The history of liberal democracies, in fact, is peppered with such protest and, far from subverting or sabotaging democracy, protest has been instrumental in forcing the introduction of most of the freedoms that are now taken for granted in these democracies (Martin, 1994). Constitutions laying down the rights and restrictions that form today's status quo, too, were borne not of institutionalized deliberation but in the aftermath of social revolution or turmoil (Carter, 1973; Martin, 1994).

Michael Lipsky (1968) refers to social protest as a political resource for social movements. Social scientists have established that news, too, is a political resource for these movements ((Tuchman, 1978; Gitlin, 1980; Gamson & Modigliani, 1989, Gamson, 1992; Croteau, Hoynes, & Carragee, 1996; McLeod & Detenber, 1999). For news audiences, the mass-mediated message is increasingly the only fount of the development of public opinion and culture.

For movements such as the one for democratic globalization (or, the anti-globalization movement), while the Internet provides a tool for political organization of those who are "accessible" i.e., knowledgeable, interested, sympathetic Web surfers or those who devise their personalized information networks over digital media, the mass media is still expected to provoke popular debate. How the mass media respond to these debates themselves, and how they access the contexts and arguments behind the movement over the Internet become questions fundamental to a democracy dependent on media for generation of public opinion.

These are some of the questions this dissertation has tried to answer. These questions are honed into specific research questions in Chapter Two. It is important to note here, however, that this research is focused on these two key areas: (1) patterns of sourcing and framing in the coverage of social protest, and (2) the role of the Internet in either changing or not changing these. More explanation will be provided in the literature review of why this researcher considers these two modes of analysis the most useful in answering the questions raised.

A quick mention here of the methods used to arrive at answers – or, to sound a little less ambitious – indications. A content analysis was performed of coverage given to two social movement protests set three decades apart in time, and these were compared to get at the question of whether journalists used similar sources and frames to cover these different protests. The two protests selected were (1) The March on the Pentagon in October 1967 (one of the first of the anti-Vietnam war protests) and (2) The anti-WTO protests in Seattle in November-December 1999. Before the analysis of the content, qualitative in-depth interviews were done with journalists from different media who covered the anti-WTO protests in Seattle. This provided some ideas and perspectives on how much they used the Internet for sourcing and research for their coverage.

These two methods of research, this researcher believes, presented a clearer picture of coverage of social protest over time and any change that might have taken place because of the entry of a tool (the Internet) of political organization on the one hand (for activists and social movement organizations) and access on the other (for journalists).

It must also be stated here that this researcher did not expect to get a clear and dazzling picture at the end of this research. However, given that this is an emerging area of inquiry with

significant pertinence for the role of the press in a democracy as well as the role of the Internet in a democracy, this dissertation does make a contribution. A number of related research questions and hypotheses have emerged from this research, which ought to provide this researcher and others with an exciting and vital research agenda for the future.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Scholarship in mass communication has necessarily turned a consistent and unblinking spotlight on the behavior of journalists, forming what is almost a whole new discipline termed “the sociology of news.” This forms the backdrop against which this dissertation examines the current resources and responses of journalists. Other areas of scholarship are equally important to this dissertation.

First, within this scholarship on the sociology of news, researchers also have focused specifically on (1) sourcing and attribution by journalists and (2) how journalists cover social movements. Such movements and the particular strategy of social protest and civil disobedience that they generate have raised vital questions about the health of democracy and the media.

Second, with the arrival of the Internet and the almost immediate recognition of it as a tool for political organization, scholars have, over the past decade or so, followed its role in social movements. This work has been interdisciplinary. It is fresh and inconclusive, which is what has prompted the particular focus of this dissertation on examining intersections between journalists’ use of the Internet and social movement’s use of the same.

Finally, the theory that guides this dissertation – framing theory – provides perspectives not merely on the slant that journalists give a story, but also the slant that journalists give a story on social protest. Naturally, all these key bodies of literature inform this dissertation, and have helped develop this dissertation’s research questions.

The Sociology of Sourcing

Academic research into the sociology of news production concludes, for one, that journalists “construct” the news (Molotch & Lester, 1974; Tuchman, 1978). The processes they follow for such manufacture of news brings into use several resources, or, tools. A major part of the analysis in this dissertation is on sourcing and attribution by journalists, which necessarily raises questions on whether and how journalists give voice and viewpoints that do or do not reflect the dominant paradigm.

The literature on “sourcing” has looked at journalism practices from several ends and made several observations. For one, journalists tend to rely on sources -- official rather than unofficial ones – for their news. The hierarchy thus represented in news tends to reflect the hierarchy in government and society (Gans, 1979; Fishman, 1980; Sigal; Cohen, 1963). A variety of sources might be “accessible” but only a few are considered to be “suitable.” Nimmo (1978) suggests that contrary to the view of journalists gathering news like a child plucking pansies from the meadow, political news is created jointly by journalists who assemble and report events and the politicians, professionals and spokespersons who promote them. Sigal (1973) suggests that journalists adhere to routine channels of newsgathering and thereby leave much of the task of selection of news to their sources.

Gans (1979) notes that source considerations come into play at the start of the story selection, when the story itself is unfamiliar but the sources are familiar and can be evaluated. He lists six major source considerations: past suitability, productivity, reliability, trustworthiness, authoritativeness and articulateness.

About the different roles that reporters play, which in turn impacts their coverage, Gans (1979) suggests that beat reporters tend to have symbiotic relationships with their sources and contacts, while general assignment reporters have little prior knowledge of the story and the sources it involves, although they tend to approach beat reporters for a list of sources and opinions on their reliability. The other aspect of significance with regard to general reporters is that, as Sigelman (1973) suggests, they move quickly from story to story, and reporters covering emotionally charged stories are rotated often.

The other major area of research into journalistic practice is centered on the notion of “news values.” Hall (1973) says of news values that even though journalists speak of “the news” as if events select themselves, there is “a ‘deep structure’ whose function as a selective device is un-transparent even to those who professionally must know how to operate it.” Gans (1979) refers to these as enduring values, which are blind to possible structural faults within the system, which in turn reduces the likelihood of stories that question the legitimacy of the present economic order. These values tie in with the concept of “story suitability.”

Stories are deemed suitable, Gans (1979) says, through the nature of their relationship with rank in governmental and other hierarchies; impact on the nation and the national interest; impact on large numbers of people, and significance for the past and future. In making their judgments, journalists employ exclusionary considerations that take into account the power of the newsmaker. Less powerful newsmakers, Gans(1979) suggests, must resort to conflict or violence to depict disagreement. Therefore, more peaceful protests were ignored during the late 1960s, the days when protests were frequent and

charged, and then, during the 1970s, when protests began to fade, the staging of the occasional protest itself became an indicator of importance.

Journalists, steeped in the self-constructed ideology of objectivity (Gans, 1979; Tuchman, 1972; Schudson, 1978), resist a shift in their opinions for fear of losing credibility and they change their opinions only in the cases of highly visible and traumatic events. The Tet offensive during the Vietnam war is one such example. North Vietnamese forces launched a strong military offensive and won a major political and psychological victory against U.S. and South Vietnamese troops, shattering the myth propagated by the U.S. government that the war in Vietnam had already been won, and forcing journalists into crisis journalism (Braestrup, 1977; Gans, 1979; Hallin, 1986). When such visible events change journalists' opinions, the events themselves are made highly visible by journalists (Gans, 1979).

Durham(2002) further hacks through the often-challenged notion of objectivity and, in fact, terms newspaper articles themselves as “ideological acts” (p. 65). He describes newspapers as social sites representing an intersection of multiple meanings, both from within and beyond their walls and their control. A newspaper article, then, may be interpreted as an ideological act on the part of the writer. According to Durham (2002), “Comparing the patterns among these articles over time provides a way to gauge whether the individual newspapers changed their positions and, if so, how. More centrally, interpreting the conflicts represented along the way to such changes offers a way to understand the social process leading to social change (p.65).”

Such patterns in news content become even more important when the concept of media “consonance” is concerned (Reese, 1991, p. 313). Media tend to converge around

not only a few sources but also a few issues, thus limiting the diversity of debate in the media.

Sigal's (1973) study of *The New York Times* and *Washington Post* found that official news sources, in particular American and foreign government officials, made up three-fourths of all news sources. Furthermore, 60 per cent of news stories originated from routine, source-controlled channels.

Gans (1979) found in his study of *CBS* and *NBC*, *Newsweek* and *Time*, that in 1967, 71 per cent of television stories and 76 per cent of magazine columns were made up of "knowns" or prominent people, including incumbent presidents, presidential candidates, leading federal officials, state and local officials, and alleged and actual (well-known) violators of the laws and mores. The "unknowns" made up five per cent of the coverage and were divided into five categories: (1) protesters, rioters and strikers; (2) victims; (3) alleged and actual violators of laws and mores; (4) voters, survey respondents and other aggregates, and (5) participants in unusual activities.

Bennett's (1988) "indexing" hypothesis suggests that news coverage seems to index the discussions and debates prevalent among the politically elite. Mermin, (1979) however, suggests that there might be "conflict within the sphere of consensus" and that just because journalists use official and authoritative sources, it does not rule out the likelihood of coverage critical of these sources. Dickson (1992) studied the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* coverage of the Nicaraguan conflict between 1983 and 1987 and found that reporters used government officials as sources half the time but "contra" sources were not cited frequently. News reporters, then, did not represent the point of view opposed to U.S. policy, Dickson's study concluded.

Similarly, Daley and O'Neill (1991) examined the coverage of the Exxon Valdez oil spill in 1989 to find that reporters once again gave preference to official sources in the government and the oil industry.

Sources and Social Protest

This is a key area of inquiry for this study. In particular, a major focus is on examining whether the media give access to social movement protesters on their own terms, whether the terms are decided by the media (through their norms, practices and exigencies), or whether the two are equitably negotiated.

With regard to coverage of social protest in particular, scholars have found that when covering social protests, even “general reporters” rarely interview ordinary people on the site of their coverage, and organizations that are “resource-poor” have problems gaining coverage (Goldenberg, 1975; Piven & Cloward, 1979). Gans (1979) recounts how, at anti-war demonstrations and at a civil rights march, television reporters would seek out unusual participants but ignored the rank-and-file demonstrators.

Gans (1979) also points out that disorder news is affected by *whose* order is being upset. The Vietnam anti-war protests were covered because they were against presidents, and the 1978 coal strike became a magazine cover story only when it involved the president. Moreover, the media depict social disorder stories such as marches and demonstrations as they tend to be concerned with the “restoration of order” (Gans, 1973, p. 54).

While the creators of protest movements can (mis)behave in ways that demand the media spotlight, they have very little power over how intensely the spotlight will shine or what it will selectively illuminate (Gitlin, 1980). Small (1994), in his book on the media and the anti Vietnam war movement, says: “Oppositional mass movements have a difficult time obtaining

fair, much less favorable, coverage from establishment media, even in the freest of democracies. For a variety of economic, political and institutional reasons, journalists and their employers tend to denigrate those out of the mainstream....” (Small, 1994, p.2)

Small’s (1994), content analysis of newspapers, magazines and television coverage shows that journalists covering major antiwar protests and demonstrations concentrated on violent and radical – albeit colorful – behavior on the fringes of the activity, undercounted the crowds, and ignored political arguments the protesters’ leadership presented. Moreover, the “fairness doctrine” had journalists going out of their way to carry the views of counter-demonstrators and the establishment every time they covered the views of the protestors.

In fact, research over the past few decades has shown that the media treat non-mainstream points of view as unduly deviant and thereby restrict the diversity of political discourse (Hertog and McLeod, 1988). Examining a protest march by the anarchist movement in Minneapolis, these researchers found that journalists concentrated on the *appearance* of the protesters more than their message. Also, they focused on the criminality of actions meant as symbolic criticism (burning of dollar bills), used official sources more than protester sources and visually depicted the protest from behind police lines rather than from among the protesters.

Framing Theory and the Frames of Social Protest

One of the earliest conceptualizations of frame analysis was by Erving Goffman (1974), in which he saw framing to be a circular process through which audiences played as much of a role in determining frames as those who embedded frames into their texts – “Our understanding of the world precedes these stories determining which ones reporters will select and how the ones that are selected will be told.... What appears, then, to be a

threat to our way of making sense of the world, turns out to be an ingeniously selected defense of it. We press these stories to the wind; they keep the world from unsettling us” (Goffman, 1974, pp.14-15). For his analysis, Goffman(1974) used anecdotes cited from the press and biographical books in the popular genre; ostensibly, he saw substantial links in the way frames were employed in different narrative texts. What is most interesting in Goffman’s (1974) conceptualization of frames (he credited Gregory Bateson, anthropologist-psychologist for originating the metaphor in 1972) and the process of framing is that he did not seem to think of it as the oppressive, almost demonic activity it has come to be seen as today. For Goffman(1974), as his title suggests, frames organized our experience, and framing was not even an overt or entirely conscious process.

Once Goffman(1974) had provided the structure for frame analysis, mass media scholars found in it great significance for the study of media content. Naturally, the study of such content put the media in the role of the frame-giver and different elite groups in the role of frame sponsors. “Framing” theory, in fact, became mass communication scholars’ response to the proposition that communication lacked a disciplinary status because of deficient core knowledge – communication was now understood to offer insights into how frames become embedded in texts; communication could now synthesize the conceptualizations of framing that existed across the social sciences and the humanities, and, finally, offer a theory (Entman, 1993).

Reese (2001) has provided a good compilation of *definitions* of framing from mass communication scholars over the years:

- “Persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation, of selection, emphasis, and exclusion, by which symbol-handlers routinely organize discourse...” (Gitlin, 1980, p.7).

- A “central organizing idea ... for making sense of relevant events, suggesting what is at issue” (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989, p. 3)
- “The concept of framing refers to subtle alterations in the statement or presentation of...problems” (Iyengar, 1991, p. 11).
- “A frame is a central organizing idea of news content that supplies a context and suggests what the issue is through the use of selection, emphasis, exclusion, and elaboration” (Tankard, Hendrickson, Silberman, Bliss, and Ghanem, 1991, p. 11).
- “To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation (Entman, 1993, p.52).

According to Entman (1993), communicators make conscious or unconscious decisions in deciding what to say, guided by frames (often called schemata or schemas) that organize their belief systems. Reese (2001) also provides the questions we may ask when studying media content for frames: Whose principle was dominant in producing the observed coverage? How did the principles brought to bear by journalists interact with those promoted by their sources? These questions involve looking behind the scenes and making inferences from the symbolic patterns in news texts.

Gamson and Modigliani (1989) analyzed the discourse on nuclear power in television news coverage, news magazine accounts, editorial cartoons, and syndicated opinion columns from 1945 to 1989 and traced the impact on public opinion. To explicate their idea of a frame, these researchers described the concept of a media package, at the core of which is its “frame,” displayed “as a whole with a deft metaphor, catchphrase, or other symbolic device.” (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989, p.3)

Iyengar & Kinder (1991) explored the direct impact of “episodic” and “thematic” news formats, or “frames,” on viewers’ attributions of responsibility for political issues

and the indirect effects of these frames on public opinion in general. According to these scholars, news always takes either episodic or thematic frames; the episodic focuses on specific events or particular cases and the thematic places things in a context. This becomes particularly important given that journalists have been traditionally criticized for failing to provide the larger contexts behind protests and cover them in merely the “disorder” and “violence” frames.

Several aspects of frame analysis are relevant to this study. Scholars have found that the media have the ability to “define situations” and label groups and individuals as “deviant” (Gans, 1979), supply context and suggest issue through selection, emphasis, exclusion, and elaboration (Tankard et al, 1991; Gitlin, 1980). Particularly relevant to this dissertation is model of “valence.” This notion of media effects on mass opinion suggests that the valence of news coverage exerts an influence over the course of public opinion (Fan 1988; Zaller 1992)

What does the theoretical framework point to in the context of media coverage of social movements and social protest? In other words, *how do the media frame protest?* Studies have shown that news coverage will marginalize challenging groups and that there will be a selection bias or description bias in the coverage of social protests (Ryan, Carragee & Meinhofer, 2001).

This dissertation is focused, in the most part, on the anti-WTO protests in Seattle between Nov. 29 and Dec. 2, 1999. In his study of media coverage of these protests, Rojecki (2002) points to *the need to develop a new theory of media, political elite and social movement relations*. He found that before the protest scene turned violent, coverage favored WTO officials and corporate executives and when the protests began, the focus was on the colorful nature of the

protests. However, while the front page was superficial and somewhat negative, the inside pages of newspapers carried more detailed coverage of the movement's goals and a "balanced debate on their desirability" (Rojecki, 2002, p. 161). He concluded that broadcast news was even-handed even before the protests. Most importantly, the range of views expressed in the news and op-ed commentaries was unprecedented. "Thus, to the extent that globalization will continue to erode national economic sovereignty, one might expect an almost permanent state of elite dissensus on the issue" (p. 166), Rojecki said.

Finally, Rojecki(2002) points out that the anti-globalization movement's Internet-reinforced tenacity and a widened media sympathy played an important role in what John Kenneth Galbraith has called 'countervailing power on unfettered markets' (Rojecki, 2002, p. 167).” According to Rojecki(2002), the media functioned, in this instance, as an important intermediary in linking the movement messages to an important segment of the politically engaged public. The result, says Rojecki(2002), is a reenergized pluralism although it remains to be seen whether the media will play this new role beyond extra-institutional politics.

Movements and the Internet

Recent research into the role of the Internet in the organization of social movement/contentious politics speaks of this medium as a necessary tool for key areas of organization: national and international activism, resource mobilization and interaction with the mainstream media. Basic structures, strategies and repertoires of social movements and activism are playing into the frames and freedom that the Internet is seen to provide. Recent success stories in social movement politics – the Zapatista revolt in Mexico, the MAI protests, the anti-WTO protests in Seattle – also are celebrated as success stories of online organization that facilitate an offline show of strength through

mass protests and demonstrations.

Getting organized on and through the Internet is coming to be understood as an indispensable task for contentious or social movement politics. “Any significant political movement in the near future arising in the industrial world will probably not only have a strong presence on the Internet, but that presence will be one factor among many explaining its rise to prominence” (Resnick, 1998). The Internet has been used with equal vigor by the right and left, and Internet skill has come to be considered a must for “progressive intellectuals if they are to participate effectively in the politics of the twenty-first century,” (Kellner, 1998).

Contention is being mounted with increasing ease today as international news services, television broadcasting, and electronic mail create commonalities among challengers across social groups and national states. (Meyer & Tarrow, 1998) An increase in education and the influence of universal access to the media are resulting in greater diffusion across spatial, social and demographic lines. (Meyer & Tarrow, 1998). For instance, students and activists alike have used the Internet effectively to relay information about issues and political activities (Meyer & Tarrow, 1998; Kellner, 1998; Hill & Hughes, 1998; Smith & Smythe, 1999; Smith 2000)

However, scholars feel that professionalization and institutionalization of social movements also result in a diminishing power to surprise, disrupt and mobilize and to provide a meaningful, non-coopted form of politics for those without access to more conventional means of influence. (Meyer & Tarrow, 1998)

This is where the Internet comes in. Mainstream media are seen as becoming less approachable because of an involvement with new emerging ideologies and exigencies.

As an alternative, the Internet is seen to make significant contributions to political normalization, democratic pluralism (Resnick, 1998), the development of a democratic media politics by the establishment of an alternative, progressive media (Kellner, 1998) and “the cyber-diffusion of contention” (Ayres, 1999) Political activity or activism is conducted both on and through the Internet. One kind of political activity is the simple and non-committal use of the World Wide Web such as that of Usenet threads and chat rooms, whose content, nevertheless, is dominated by conservative ideas from a vocal virtual minority even though Internet activists tend to be liberal. (Hill and Hughes, 1998) Another significant kind of activity is that which could originate on the Internet but lead up to -- and reflect -- an “observable event” (Tarrow, 1996.)

For instance, key areas of activities for social movement organizations include framing movement agendas, cultivating collective identities, and mobilizing collective actions (Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993; Smith 2001; Watkins, 2001). Organizing by networking and communications through the Internet is particularly crucial in the case of transnational advocacy networks. Such networks, in fact, have been described as “communicative structures for political exchange”(Keck & Sikkink, 1998, p.217) that conduct giant relays of information (Smith & Smythe, 1999).

Global computer networks for social change began in the earliest days of the Internet. The Association for Progressive Communications (APC), for example, linked more than 15,000 non-governmental organizations’ computers in 95 countries in 1990 (Frederick, 1992). Today, there are Web sites like www.idealists.org that not only link 23,000 non-profit organizations and volunteer groups in 156 countries but also seek to develop a “common frame of meaning” (Gerhads & Rucht 1992, pp 558-59). The

currency for such networks is information; their organization activity centers on campaigns and coordinating strategies to motivate action (Keck & Sikkink, 1998). These networks also aim to “link information and practice and to circulate struggles (Kellner, 1998). One major aspect of this shared information could be that of policy relevant research, shared by groups of similar political orientation (Rescind, 1998). Such networking can link labor, feminist, ecological, peace and other progressive groups, providing the basis for a new politics of alliance and solidarity to overcome the limitations of post-modern identity politics” (Kellner, 1998).

The creation of new identities, such as that professed by participants in the Seattle anti-WTO protests in 1999, is considered crucial for long-term mobilization and alliances across national boundaries after efforts have been made to define “who we are” (Smith 2001). Such a transnational collaborative outcome of networking through the Internet was, in fact, best seen in the Seattle case as a multitude of labor, environmental, consumer rights, human rights and religious groups demonstrated for the opening up of WTO decision-making (Gordon and Turner, 2000). In these events, national protest repertoires were adapted for use in global political arenas. This raised questions about processes across national boundaries and across class and cultural divides. It also points to the transcendence of social movements across local and national identities and interests to give a coherent opposition to state and corporate elites (Smith 2001).

Before Seattle, there was another success story of the power of the Internet in political organization. Activists managed to foil attempts at negotiating the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in the period between 1995 and 1998. Transnational cooperation

among activists set the agenda, and then, public spaces were thrown open for citizens to have discourse on the Internet, resulting in citizens contacting their elected representatives. This was one of the early examples of dialogue taking place in a global and civil society (Smith and Smythe, 1999). One indicator of the Internet being a tool not just for protests over e-mail to the government but also for anti-government protest is that people in less democratic countries use the Internet more than people in democratic countries to post anti-government messages (Hill & Hughes, 1998).

The most dramatic success story of an Internet uprising under an oppressive regime has been that of “the Zapatista effect” (Cleaver, Jr. 1998). The Internet provided an “electronic fabric of opposition” that moved protests from repressed, local ones in Chiapas, Mexico, to a complex weave of Web pages alerting social movement organizations and the international media to the plight of the Zapatistas. As a result, worldwide opposition developed to oppression in Mexican society.

The Internet, however, is not just a new “unmediated publication outlet” with little or no commercial bias but also “a ‘political space’ in which people and groups compete for political resources: supporters, money, political allies and prestige” (Hill & Hughes, 1998, pp135-136). These scholars did a case study of six interest groups to see their functions on the web. They found that the groups conducted a range of activities that included providing hypertext links to other leftist sites; advertising their local chapters; giving people political purposive reasons to join; information provision and member recruitment and lobbying. The most useful use of the Internet is still e-mail, which in itself can help raise money and organize political activity (Resnick, 1998). Another study found that newsletters, news items and organizational information were the chief kinds of

material disseminated by non-profit environmental organizations over the Internet (Zelwietro, 1998).

In the Seattle anti-WTO protests, Internet Web sites, listserves, and e-mail were used to bring together dispersed and diverse constituents. “These communication networks allow organizers to almost instantaneously transmit alternative media accounts and images of protests to contrast those of mainstream, corporate-owned media outlets” (Smith, 2001). The Seattle protests also ushered in the era of “electronic civil disobedience” as those activists who could not physically be present in Seattle organized electronic sit-ins at the WTO Web site to block others’ access to the site. “Mirror” sites were devised that mocked the WTO website but carried criticisms of the WTO; e-protests through email and fax-jamming disrupted routine flows of information to WTO targets (Smith, 2001).

Does the power of the Internet as a political and communication tool circumvent the relevance of the mainstream mass media? Research and practice suggest not, in spite of the repressive political economy even of the “free” media. A key element of “political opportunity structure” (Tarrow, 1996) is the use of the mass media. “Media norms and practices, and the broader political economy under which they operate affect the opportunities and constraints under which (social) movements operate” (Gamson & Meyer, 1996). Analyzing such opportunities and constraints in third-world development campaigns, for instance, Hernando Gonzales (1989) has commented on the work of critical researchers who argue that differential control of technology, content, and distribution channels among industrialized and third world countries have resulted in asymmetric and unequal flows of information. Debates have raged about the New World

Information and Communication Order and the redress of imbalances of communication flows. Norms have been provided, Gonzales(1989) points out, by Gramsci's "historical bloc"(a coalition formation along lines of shared interest by diverse groups) and Habermas's "public sphere" (which facilitates reciprocity or symmetry in communication.)

The problem that social movement groups or non-governmental organizations face in America occurs when they try to mobilize and confront capitalist democracy in America, which is strengthened and kept in place by American institutions (Costain & Mc Farland, 1998; Lichbach, 1998). One such institution is the mainstream, corporate-controlled media (Bagdikian 2000; Chomsky 1991; Chomsky 1997; Herman & Chomsky, 1988; Herman & McChesney 1997). Naturally, the Internet, like most other media innovations before it, has brought in its wake a flurry of examinations within democratic theory (Katz & Aspden, 1997).

The mainstream media, however, gain particular importance in the "network information politics" of transnational advocacy networks (Keck & Sikkink, 1998, p.228). Network activists cultivate credibility with the press and package their information in a timely and dramatic way to draw press attention (Keck and Sikkink, 1998). Novelty, polemic, confrontation and controversy are the frames that win media attention to social movement (Gamson & Meyer, 1996). Media strategies of interest groups have run an interesting course. In the 1920s, "boilerplates" (a plate containing a story of general interest that could be placed directly on a printing press without further typesetting) were sent out by social movement organizations. In the 1970s, there were position papers. The 2000s have Web links.

Activists persuade and mobilize the public by using the media directly as well as indirectly. Direct use is by advertising with image ads or advocacy ads. Indirect use is by cultivating the media, attracting media attention through written or videotaped press releases and, especially, protests and demonstrations, especially for organizations with their roots in social movements (Scholzman & Tierney, 1986).

Even groups that circumvent a focus on garnering mainstream media attention do sometimes provide hypertext links and information as press releases on their websites (Smith & Smythe, 1999). The Zapatista movement in Mexico used the Internet for everything from voting in plebiscites by participants from 47 countries to drawing in the mainstream media to create awareness and outrage worldwide (Cleaver, Jr., 1998). The architects of the Million Man March in Washington, D.C., sought media attention. For instance, organizers planned a year in advance, recruited celebrity spokespersons, conducted press conferences, and scheduled the event for maximum coverage.

Journalists, the Internet and Social Protest

Why is it important to study all this within the context of journalists using the Internet? Recent cases of social movement organizations mounting their protests and issues on the Internet have shown that these groups provide hypertext links and information as press releases on their Web sites. These sites also present complex debates, research papers, rationales and contact details, all of which may be expected to make the movement, its contexts and its participants more accessible to journalists than ever before.

If the Internet does provide a new public sphere for political participation, why are the mainstream media still important? Some scholars are finding that with the

cacophony of sources of information, the public increasingly relies on some central sources to reduce complexity, help users make judgments about what is important, and build shared beliefs (Schultz, 2000). If this is the case, there will be greater reliance on mainstream media, which in turn makes the role of these media more important than ever before.

Another reason this context to the study becomes important is the more obvious, but less often stated, larger question of the role of the Internet in enhancing democracy. News practices have been studied for several years with growing specialization and through the lens of varied theories. However, very little work has been done on the impact that the entry of a new medium/tool has on journalists' practices, and, through these, their coverage. Such work is particularly necessary since the Internet is seen to not only to enhance the public sphere but also substantially alter journalists' own routines.

When journalists begin to employ a tool such as the Internet, which they see as increasing their speed and efficiency, two premium attributes in the production of daily news, we would be right to expect some impact on their coverage. As a result, considerable interest has been generated in recent years into information-seeking by the media through the Internet. As more and more journalists begin to use the Internet to access information for their professional use, attitudes toward such use within the media have seen a gradual shift.

One of the biggest surveys of journalists' Internet use in the United States (Middleberg and Ross, 2000), conducted annually since 1994, has chronicled the rapid increase in Internet use by journalists and the gradual shifts in attitude toward such use. Based on 4,000 responses to 40,000 survey forms mailed, the latest survey finds that journalists' use of the Internet is at an all-time high in every category. Reporters' and

editors' use of the Internet to research stories, find new sources, receive press releases and information, update breaking news, interview sources and engage in dialogue with readers has reached record-levels. According to the survey, 98 per cent of the journalists who responded said that they're online at least once a day to check e-mail and spend 15 hours a week reading and sending e-mail.

Another study of Internet use in the British media (Nicholas et al, 2000) found use to be light, mostly among a handful of journalists with access to the Internet, and mostly of a fact-checking nature with a preference for official sites. This study, however, was conducted between 1997 and 1998 and given the swift advance of Internet use worldwide, a substantial increase and change are likely to have resulted since.

Research into Internet usage must now progress into how such use plays out in the final product of the journalist -- the media story -- and the decisions that surround it. Eric Fredin (2001) has pointed to one direct, observable output -- the expanded use of hypermedia links within news stories accessed through the Web, which allows readers to make several "digressions" and access different frames of understanding.

As evident from the literature, research into the relationship between movements and the media, and the role of the Internet in this relationship, stands at a juncture that is both exciting and undecided. Drawing on this the literature and theory presented above, the following research questions have been developed:

Research Questions

Research Question 1: What were journalists' news coverage decisions, especially sourcing decisions, for covering the anti-WTO protests in Seattle, Wash., in November-December 1999, and Washington D.C. and Quebec City, Canada, the following year?

Research Question 2: What do journalists perceive to be the impact of the Internet on their coverage of the anti-WTO protests?

Research Question 3: Was there a significant difference in sourcing and attribution between press coverage of the anti-Vietnam war protests (March on the Pentagon) in Washington D.C. in October 1967 and the anti-WTO protests in Seattle in November-December 1999?

Research Question 4: Was there a significant difference in “framing” between press coverage of the anti-Vietnam war protests (March on the Pentagon) in Washington D.C. in October 1967 and the anti-WTO protests in Seattle in November-December 1999?

Research Question 5: Does the Internet appear to have made an impact on the sourcing and attribution in press coverage of the anti-WTO protests?

Research Question 6: Does the Internet appear to have made an impact on the “framing” in the press coverage of the anti-WTO protests?

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

This dissertation seeks to analyze, by interviewing journalists and by examining sourcing and framing patterns in media content, whether the media have a pattern of coverage of social protest that operates within a sphere of elite consensus, and whether access to the Internet has had any impact on these patterns.

The research here is located chiefly in the context of a relatively recent showdown between a social movement and the media -- the anti-globalization protests that unfolded in Seattle, Wash., in November-December 1999. These protests were followed by more protests in Washington, D.C., and Quebec City, Canada, the following year, ushering in what is today called the movement for democratic globalization.

The Seattle protests, referred to here as the anti-WTO protests, is a particularly good case for such empirical examination. Internet Web sites, listserves, and e-mail were used to bring together dispersed and diverse constituents in unprecedented numbers, which played into some significant media “frames” and garnered extensive media coverage. As shown in the literature review in the preceding chapter, a fair number of studies have been done into these protests within the disciplines of sociology, political science and mass media. These studies have looked at the activism, what the new electronic form of protest means for e-democracy, and what this means for globalization or the anti-globalization movement itself.

Little research has been done, however, into how the media themselves receive these movements mounted over the Internet. There has been some research, largely through surveys, into the use of the Internet by journalists. Very little qualitative research has been done, however, into the question of whether online information-seeking by

journalists is perceived by them to have any impact on the coverage journalists give to the subjects of their search.

This sort of inquiry cannot be answered by a content analysis alone. Denzin & Lincoln (2000) suggest that “aside from the methodological problems associated with any quantitative technique, (sampling, generalization, validity, especially external validity, and reliability), content analysis has been unable to capture the *context* within which a written text has meaning. Context has been varyingly defined, in terms of an ongoing narrative, (‘plot’), the immediate semantic environment, the literary tropes operating, and connections between the text and experience of knowledge.” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 248)

This dissertation, therefore, first uses qualitative in-depth interviews for exploratory research into, indeed, the context under which the coverage of the anti-globalization protests played out. As one of the first efforts to investigate journalists’ own perspectives to how they respond to a news story armed with greater access – through the Internet -- to multiple channels of sourcing, information and research, this study also seeks to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of whether journalistic routines and news values/judgments change with such enhanced access. Next, this study analyzes media content for patterns of sourcing, attribution and framing.

A similar model combining in-depth interviews and content analysis has been used successfully before. Hansen, Ward, Conners, and Neuzil (1994) used content analysis in conjunction with in-depth interviews to explore how reporters were using electronic information technologies to write stories. They analyzed published stories for types of sources, use of documents, checking of source accuracy, and contextual elements. They

found that, despite increased use of electronic newsgathering, "reporters rely on the same types of sources representing the same institutional and social power structures as in classic newsmaking studies" (Hansen, Ward, Conners, and Neuzil, 1994, p. 561).

To reap the benefits of such triangulation, this dissertation is organized into two separate and distinctive studies, the results of which will provide a more coherent and complete answer to the research questions asked in the previous chapter. Study I, titled "Qualitative Depth Interviews with Journalists Who Covered the Anti-WTO Protests," seeks a qualitative measure based on perspectives of journalists who covered these recent protests in Seattle, Wash., Washington, D.C., and Quebec City, Canada. Study II, titled "Content Analysis of Sourcing and Framing in Anti-WTO and Anti-Vietnam War Protests," provides a quantitative measure of patterns of sourcing and framing in the coverage of these two protests.

Researchers believe that several design elements may be brought together in the same study (Riffe et al). Examining two prestige papers' international news coverage sampled from each year across a decade of Third World complaints about international news flow incorporates both a longitudinal and a comparative design, permitting the researcher to answer questions about between-paper differences, and trends in coverage over time (Riffe & Shaw, 1982). One study (Yu & Riffe, 1989) examined how the same newsmagazines covered world leaders during times of changing U.S. policy toward those leaders' countries. For this study, they combined both comparative and longitudinal design elements to permit testing whether "press nationalism" (the press rallying around official policy) is mitigated by the magazines' own political leanings.

For *Study II*, titled Content Analysis Comparing Protest Coverage for Patterns of Sourcing and Framing, this researcher had built a design that compares the coverage of two separate movements. This longitudinal design compares not one publication's coverage with another's, but the totality of coverage given to one movement by a set of publications with that given to another by the same set of publications. For this, a comparative analysis is made of the anti – WTO (World Trade Organization) protests in Seattle, Wash., with pre-Internet protest coverage, that given to the anti- Vietnam war protests.

Following are the detailed methodological discussions for both studies.

STUDY I : “Qualitative Depth Interviews with Journalists Who Covered the Anti-WTO Protests”

Telephone interviews lasting between 45 minutes to 1.5 hours were conducted from January-March 2002. A pool of 25 journalists was selected after a search on Lexis-Nexis for journalists from different media who had covered or organized coverage of the anti-globalization protests in Seattle, Wash., Washington, D.C., and Quebec City. This method of non-probability purposive sampling (Singleton and Straits, 1999) reflected the kind of variation in media, beats, geographical location and seniority that is called for in this kind of exploratory study. The letter sent to these journalists, requesting the interview, is presented in **Appendix A**.

A total of 14 journalists agreed to be interviewed, and, although redundancy in the interview material was achieved by the 10th interview, all 14 were completed and analyzed. The following is the description of the journalists interviewed. Care has been taken to preserve confidentiality, which was assured to encourage them to agree to the interviews:

1. Assignment Editor, national television news network
2. Correspondent, national television news network
3. Environmental Correspondent, Seattle television station
4. Correspondent, Seattle daily
5. Correspondent, Washington, D.C.-based daily
6. Business Correspondent, Washington, D.C.-based daily
7. Business Correspondent, Boston daily
8. Editorial director, national television news network-affiliated online news Web site
9. Correspondent, national television network-affiliated online news Web site
10. Correspondent, national radio network
11. Correspondent, Canadian (Quebec City) daily
12. Political correspondent, Seattle daily
13. Economics writer, Washington, D.C.-based daily
14. Business correspondent, Washington, D.C.-based daily.

This study used in-depth, personal respondent interviews conducted and audio-taped on the telephone (except one interview conducted via e-mail) to gain individual perceptions and experiences about the coverage of social movement protests and the role of the Internet in shaping this coverage. While content and textual analyses may be the methodologies to inquire into the nature of coverage, this study's focus was on journalists' perceptions, decisions, practices and residual impact, if any, on the coverage of anti-globalization protests and issues. The qualitative interviewing method was best suited to approaching these. Furthermore, no other qualitative interviewing format – ethnographic, informant, respondent, narrative, and focus group (Lindlof, 1995) – was

considered suitable for inquiring into the more sensitive areas of journalists' views on matters such as objectivity and organizational norms and attitudes. A focus group – as opposed to the privacy accorded by the one-on-one conversational format of the in-depth telephone interviews -- might have distorted the data collection process, as journalists would have been less willing to discuss professional practices and organizational decisions in the presence of other journalists, particularly competitors.

In keeping with the recommendations of Lofland & Lofland (1995) to structure the interview guide to facilitate “guided conversations,” the interviewees were asked for open-ended responses to a series of directed questions (see **Appendix B**). According to Lindlof (1995), the respondent interview has a standardized protocol and high content comparability, and all interviewees are asked roughly the same questions in nearly the same order, which helps minimize interviewer effects and assure greater efficiency of information gathering. The interviews were audio-taped for later analysis, allowing a freer, conversational flow to the interviews. Participants were assured confidentiality, and this was maintained by avoiding any mention of the respondents' names in the audio-taped interviews or transcriptions. In presenting the results in Chapter Four of this dissertation, care has once again been taken to identify respondents by the nature of their media and their function in the organization, both of which are general enough to preclude any identification.

The questions were roughly divided into three sets –

- (1) On the journalists' Internet use, particularly for facilitating the coverage of social issues and protests (Questions 1 through 11 in **Appendix B**).
- (2) On social movement protests in general (Questions 14, 47 and 48 in **Appendix B**).

(3) On their journalistic routines (particularly sourcing and news judgments) and any perceived impact on these routines following the anti-WTO protests and the availability of an Internet interface for their coverage (Questions 12 through 46 and Questions 49 through 58 in **Appendix B**).

Social science researchers value the evolving nature of qualitative research, which enriches the data-gathering by allowing for the addition and revision of questions as the interviews proceed (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). Such an evolution enhanced the content and data-gathering techniques of the interviews in this study.

In the first wave of analysis of the interviews, a system of *memos*, was used, which involved putting down in indented italics impressions on things said in the interviews. These served, in the case of the first few interviews, to develop further questions, reword them, or drop them altogether. These memos included, in particular, observations not found in the interviewee's manifest statements, things that were implied. These memos helped in developing codes.

In the second wave of analysis, a coding scheme was developed and the codes were put down and put down in parentheses in the margins of the transcribed interviews. Different waves of coding categories were developed, whittling and collapsing them down after every couple of interviews.

From a qualitative perspective, the analysis of the interview data had a rich, creative and evolving context. It is in the nature of qualitative studies that the design, data collection and analysis stages are not rigidly separated (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). The data were continually compared to previous data as they were being recorded and

transcribed. This allowed for a useful and meaningful development of concepts and interpretation over the three months of the interview process.

Analysis of the interview data involved discovery, coding and exclusion of irrelevant data. After every two interviews were completed, the data were examined for emerging themes, patterns, repetition, commonalities or novelty in responses. Coding was done by constructing typologies or classification systems whereby the data could be separated into one of several defined categories. Nine broad data classification systems or typologies emerged for the analysis:

- The usefulness of the Internet
- The usefulness of Internet elements like listservs, bulletin boards and Web sites for coverage of anti-globalization protests
- News values, judgments and processes employed during the protest coverage
- Perceptions of the nature of protests and protesters
- Perceptions of their readers'/audiences' attitude to social movement protests/civil disobedience
- Perceptions of themselves as journalists and of objectivity as a norm
- Perceptions of "independent/alternative media" used by protesters
- Perceptions of their own medium/organization with regard to such coverage
- Possibilities of raised/sustained interest and engagement in coverage of globalization/anti-globalization events and issues.

The results and analysis of these interviews are discussed in Chapter Four. As mentioned earlier, this process of interviewing journalists also contributed, along with the literature review, to developing codes for the content analysis, i.e., Study II.

STUDY II: Content Analysis Comparing Protest Coverage for Patterns of Sourcing and Framing

The anti-Vietnam war protests, in particular “The March on the Pentagon” on Oct. 21-22, 1967, in Washington, D.C., provide a good comparison for study with the anti-WTO protests labeled “The Battle for Seattle,” held between Nov. 30 and Dec. 3, 1999, in Seattle, Wash. In both cases, these protests came relatively early in the movement; used similar protests repertoires such as celebrity speakers, banners, slogans, costumes; indulged in some violence; attracted police force, and were relatively sudden, which gave the media little time to plan their sourcing, attribution, or frames for their coverage.

The Sample

The newspapers were chosen to represent national as well as local coverage, newspaper as well as magazine coverage. This would be essential to tap into source use by local as well as national journalists, and episodic as well as “thematic” frames, the latter being more likely to appear in magazine coverage.

Newspapers: Three weeks’ coverage was picked from each newspaper. The universe of coverage was examined, i.e., the entire newspaper was scanned for relevant coverage. The newspapers were datelined Oct. 15 through Nov. 4, 1967, for the anti-Vietnam war protests and from Nov. 23 through Dec. 13, 1999, for the anti-WTO protests. This comprises coverage from the week before the protests, the week during the protests and the week after the protest.

- The March on the Pentagon: The national newspaper being studied in this case is *The New York Times*, since it was considered the newspaper of record even in the

1960s. The local newspaper is *The Washington Post*, which in this case will be considered the local newspaper for Washington, D.C. The sample for the anti-war protests was collected from the microfiche department at the Middleton Library, LSU. The unit of analysis was every news report, editorial, feature, column, and article featured in weekend magazine supplements that made any mention of the anti-war movement, the war itself, and the protests. Letters to the editor were not coded. Those stories that were merely defense reports on the progress of the war also were not coded. Those stories that mentioned dissent, or the pros and cons of the war, including the entire protest coverage and the debate on the war in political, social, cultural and economic spheres were coded. This included, for instance, a profile of singer Joan Baez as an anti-war activist and, later, a protester who courted arrest.

- The Seattle Protests: The national newspaper studied in this case is *The New York Times*. The local newspaper is *The Seattle Times*. For both of these, the sample was collected from the Lexis Nexis Academic database. For *The Seattle Times*, I entered the search terms “protests,” “protesters,” “globalization” and “WTO.” For *The New York Times*, to eliminate those stories that did not refer to the protests in Seattle, I entered the terms “Seattle and protests,” “Seattle and protesters,” “globalization” and “WTO.” Care was taken to eliminate any repetition of stories in these multiple searches. Again, letters to the editor were eliminated. There was no equivalent to “reports on the progress of the war ” in the case of the anti-WTO protests, so, the unit of analysis was all stories – news reports, editorials, features, columns, and articles in weekend magazine supplements -- relating to

globalization, its spread, its pros and cons, and the protests, protesters, dissent and support.

Magazines: The sample for both protests included three issues each of *Time* and *Newsweek*. To equate time period of the magazine coverage with that for the newspaper coverage, the magazine issues that were picked were also of the week before, during and after the protests. Only one issue of *Time* magazine carried coverage of The March on the Pentagon – the issue dated Oct. 27, 1967. In contrast, three issues of *Newsweek* carried coverage of The March on the Pentagon, the issues dated Oct. 23, Oct. 30 and Nov. 6.

In the case of the coverage of the anti-WTO protests, *Newsweek* covered the protests only in one issue, the issue dated Dec. 13. This time, *Time* magazine covered the protests over all three issues, the ones dated Nov. 29, Dec. 6 and Dec. 13.

The same unit of analysis discussed above was used for the magazines. The sample produced a total of 444 stories.

Operational Definitions

In this study, the same coding was used for both the anti-Vietnam war protests and the anti-WTO protests, although slight variations existed in the categories given to the coders in the code guide (see **Appendix C**). The codes themselves were devised by drawing heavily on the literature on sourcing and attribution, particularly the categories of official and authoritative sources. A source was defined as a person or organization giving information to news reporters. Sources were identified as such when news reporters either quoted them directly or paraphrased comments and information from a person or organization, with or without attribution.

“Attribution” refers to the means by which reporters publicly credit a source for information. They do this by bringing in a person or organization’s names in a sentence with verbs such as “said,” “stated,” “revealed,” “pointed out,” “claimed,” and so forth. Journalists also use attribution by using verbs that denote a source state of mind, such as “thinks,” “believes,” “feels,” “wants,” “fears,” and so forth.

Since this study was not limited to news reports alone, and, since direct quotes and paraphrased comments and information are used chiefly in news reports and very little in editorials and human-interest stories, the operational definition was widened. It included instances when someone’s viewpoint, interests, or stand were cited directly or indirectly. For instance, a writer’s observation in a news analysis in a news magazine that “Police have little to fear...nor are they worried,” was taken to represent the stand of the police, and was coded as a source.

A detailed codebook was developed to assess various dimensions of the coverage with respect to its sources and frames. The variables to analyze *sourcing patterns* were – “Official (Govt. and Trade) Sources,” “Authoritative (Govt. and Trade) Sources,” “Official (Protester) Sources,” “Authoritative (Protester) Sources,” “Unknown Protesters.” The variables to analyze *framing patterns* were “Frame” and “Valence.” In addition, a variable titled “*Type of Story*” separated news stories from editorials.

The single significant difference between the codebook for the anti-WTO protests and the anti-Vietnam war protests was that in the case of the former, it was important to tap into the Internet effect, i.e., to get at answers to RQ 5 and 6 laid out in Chapter Two. For this, two columns were used for each variable in the codebook for the anti-WTO protests – one for coding those stories where sources did not appear to be from the

Internet, and the other for those that did. Coders were asked to code in the second category when the story mentioned quoted someone directly or indirectly from a Web-site or quoted an Internet posting. For instance, a story titled “*Nerve Gas at WTO?*” in *The Seattle Times* of Dec. 11, 1999, mentioned that protest organizations were asking protesters to post reports over the Internet about whether they had been targets of nerve gas allegedly used by the police during the protests. This was coded under “*Official (Protester) Sources – Internet.*”

The “*Official (Govt. and Trade) Sources*” variable was coded for sources such as U.S. President, U.S. Administration, City Officials (eg., mayor’s office) and City administration (police and fire fighters), all of which were common categories for sources in the anti-WTO as well as the anti-Vietnam war protests. In addition, in the case of the anti-WTO protest, coders included WTO officials/spokespersons in this variable. In the case of the anti-Vietnam war protests, coders included South Vietnamese government officials and governments of other countries.

The “*Authoritative (Govt. and Trade) Sources*” variable included – for the anti-WTO protests – U.S. corporations, U.S. trade representatives, former WTO/IMF officials and visiting WTO delegates. In the case of the anti-Vietnam war protests, this variable included defense spokespersons in the field and former defense officials. The sources common to these protests coded under this variable were academics and journalists speaking on behalf of the WTO/war, owners and officials of damaged public property, journalists and officials of trade/defense media and other supporters/commentators speaking in official capacity.

Research has shown that journalists will much more readily quote and cite cases of protest organization officials, celebrity and other “official” sources than ordinary street protesters (Gans, 1979, Gitlin, 1980, Small, 1994). To arrive at a closer understanding of how “protesters” are thus broken down into categories, this study divided them into the three variables described below.

“*Official (Protester) Sources*” included protest organization officials, “celebrity” or well-known protesters, officials of alternative/independent media, academics and journalists speaking on behalf of the protesters and other supporters/ commentators speaking in an official capacity. For instance, The *Washington Post*’s coverage on Sunday, October 22, had one story with the headline “(Norman) Mailer, March Organizer, Are Arrested at Pentagon.” The lead paragraph of the story provides a classic example of the order of importance (or news values) that journalists ascribe to classes of protesters : “Author Norman Mailer, Women Strike for Peace’s Dagmar Wilson, march organizer David Delinger and three members of the American Nazi Party were among the 179 persons arrested yesterday during the antiwar demonstration.”

In the case of the anti-Vietnam war protests, North Vietnamese and NLF (National Liberation Front) officials speaking out against the war, and government officials speaking out against the war, or, often, against President Lyndon Johnson’s war policies, also were coded under the “Official (Protester) Sources” variable.

“*Authoritative (Protester) Sources*” included those protesters whom reporters credited with a quote-worthy status (articulate or “knowledgeable”) protesters, those protesters who were quoted because they engaged in acts of violence, protesters in

costumes, protest hand-outs, banners and slogans, academics as protest participants, and, finally, “protesters,” or “doves” as a general, all-inclusive term.

There was one more variable, “*Unknown Protester*,” that was coded separately to tap into journalists’ use/disuse of the rank-and-file protester who is neither an official or organization member nor speaking from a position of authority.

The “*Frame*” variable coded stories as having either “Episodic,” “Thematic,” or “Mixed” frames (coded “1” “2” and “3” respectively), and coders were asked to judge these on the basis of whether a story was largely one or the other of these. Episodic frames were defined as coverage of merely the disorder on the streets, the number of protesters, the color and chaos, and “celebrity” speakers, etc., while stories with thematic frames were identified those that had a discussion of issues, contexts, debates, background and analysis of either one or both sides of the argument. The “Mixed” frame was one that discussed the protests as an episode, but also placed the protests in the context of the issues.

The “*Valence*” of the coverage was identified as being either in favor of the protesters or their targets or neutral. Earlier research has shown that journalists’ frames indicate the extent to which protests are legitimate. Their coverage expresses support, acceptance, indifference and/or opposition (Domke, 1996). Coders were asked to identify even the subtler means that journalists use to provide a negative valence toward any group or issue. Some of these means were -- quotation marks interjecting commentary (such as “peace march”) and stance adverbs that connote legitimacy or lack of it (such as allegedly, supposedly, ostensibly). Stories were coded as “Valence supportive of

protesters,” “Valence supportive of protest target (WTO/Govt. & Pentagon) or “Valence is neutral” (coded “1,” “2” and “3” respectively).

Two independent coders were trained and coded 10% of the stories to calculate the reliability coefficients. Once these were established, the remaining stories were divided equally between the two coders and this researcher. Reliability coefficients using Scott’s Pi for individual variables were: Type of Story .92; Official (Govt. and Trade) Sources .87; Authoritative (Govt. and Trade) Sources .83; Official (Protester) Sources .82; Authoritative (Protester) Sources .85 ; Unknown Protester .81; Frame .94; Valence .88.

Study I and Study II together provided a fairly clear picture of the approach that journalists take to social protests, which then impacts their decisions on not only whom to approach for a quote, but, with the entry of Internet-facilitated social protests, *whom to be approached by*. Also, we learn whether journalists are doing more thematic or episodic coverage, and whether they are putting a spin on it/giving a certain valence to it, either in favor of protesters, or their targets. The results of these two studies are presented in detail in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

WORDS AND WRITINGS: RESULTS OF QUALITATIVE DEPTH INTERVIEWS AND CONTENT ANALYSES OF PROTEST COVERAGE

Neatness counts when it comes to dealing with the news media.... Journalists are professional cynics, and if you're sloppy, they will notice it, and it will color their coverage. So go the extra mile; proofread the press release again; make the extra phone call. Never cut corners.... -- A posting on activist Web site www.ruckus.org.

Journalists' own perceptions of the context, circumstances and choices that determine their coverage provides a framework as well as a vivid measure of the concepts being studied. In this case, Study I, "Qualitative Depth Interviews with Journalists Who Covered the Anti-WTO Protests," did just that. It provided an exploratory understanding of the coverage of the anti-WTO protests in journalists' own words, and it also provided pointers for developing codes for the content analysis. Because journalists' perceptions delivered through qualitative depth interviews cannot entirely speak to the final outcome, i.e., the coverage, we have a quantitative technique to measure that coverage – content analysis. In this research, it is Study II, "Content Analysis Comparing Protest Coverage for Patterns of Sourcing and Framing" that revealed the numbers that allowed for comparisons over several measures between two separate protests forming parts of two distinct movements set three decades apart.

The results of the qualitative interviews are presented below, with brief analyses. The detailed discussion of these results, however, is presented in Chapter Five.

Results

STUDY 1: Qualitative Depth Interviews with Journalists Who Covered the Anti-WTO Protests:

This study was designed to inquire into a relatively new and emerging area that contributes to the sociology of news – the role of the Internet on journalists’ coverage decisions. We know, through recent scholarly research, that journalists are beginning to use the Internet, but little work has been done into whether and how this changes anything about their coverage. In that respect, this study contributes to the theory of the sociology of news production. It also presents a recent look at journalists’ responses to new social movements. Very few in the current generation of journalists have been called upon to cover protests of a social movement of any significance. This study asked 14 journalists from different media about their Internet use in general and their use of it as a tool to cover the anti-WTO protests in particular. It also asked journalists about their perceptions of this social movement and their trust or mistrust of the various characters involved with either side of the protests.

As discussed earlier, a content analysis alone cannot provide an understanding of, say, why one source was preferable to another, or what ideological underpinnings determine the “frame” that a journalist gives his or her story. This study sought answers to these very questions, in journalists’ own words, offering them confidentiality as a means to encourage candid responses and insights.

In the presentation of the results below, remarks noted in italics are verbatim comments transcribed from the tapes of the telephone interviews (and one e-mail interview). Preceding each set of remarks is the analysis that summarizes those remarks.

Analysis: Research Question 1 asked about journalists' news coverage decisions, especially sourcing decisions, for covering the anti-WTO protests in Seattle, Wash., in November-December 1999, and Washington, D.C., and Quebec City, Canada, the following year. The most significant finding of this study was that most of the journalists who covered these protests largely relied on their traditional news judgments, news values, and sourcing strategies to decide whether and how to cover these protests.

Quotes:

- An editor used to tell me that quantity has a quality all its own. If a demonstration is big enough, regardless of the cause, you must take notice. If a million people show up in D.C., regardless of the reason -- to celebrate the Fourth of July or to protest the war in Vietnam -- you're going to take notice and you should take notice. But there's no policy book that would tell us what to cover or not. - Assignment Editor, national television news network
- Our goal was not to cover too many things but summarize for readers ... give the bigger picture: "Seattle was shut down today for the third straight day." - Correspondent, Washington-based daily
- We don't cover all protests...people chaining themselves to trees... the first time that happened, we did; the 10th time, we didn't. Those are the news judgments we gotta make on any given day. - Environmental correspondent, Seattle television station
- Our coverage was the 'breaking news' type...what's going on with the protesters, what's the damage, who's been hurt, what are people saying, how the summit itself has been affected. - Editorial director, national television news network-affiliated online news Web site
- To give you an idea of how things change... it was a striking change for me ...in terms of going from being what my original job was supposed to be, to a sort of crisis management.... We were interviewing on Tuesday morning, Hose Bovee...a French farmer activist...we walked outside having done the interview and there were groups of protesters in the streets and there were riot cops...the world had changed. In the one hour that we had been inside...at that point we went down the street, took a few pictures and before we knew it the tear gas was flying. The interview with Bovee never made the air. - Environmental correspondent, Seattle television station

- I am sure if WTO was not coming to Seattle, I would not have got interested in the story. - Political correspondent, Seattle daily
- (We covered the story) clearly because it (the number of people) shows the support that an organization has.... But things don't occur in a vacuum...every story is weighed against every other story... to decide its importance. - Assignment Editor, national television news network
- All our energy was taken covering the protest...there was little discussion of what they were protesting about . . . we missed a story... there was a huge labor march of 50,000 people...barely got a mention in our paper because we were so busy focusing on what was happening downtown with people breaking windows, throwing things.... - Political correspondent, Seattle daily
- This was a real big step for the city of Seattle... the first time the city had hosted a meeting of this magnitude...Clinton was coming...we expected Fidel Castro...lots of presidents...and protests. - Environmental correspondent, Seattle TV station
- The minute your downtown becomes a war zone, that stuff (environmental stories) gets forced off the front burner. - Environmental correspondent, Seattle TV station
- This turned into a riot in the streets of an American city and we had to cover it as a riot...no matter what the underlying issues were. - Correspondent, national daily

Analysis: Also related to Research Question 1, which asked about journalists' coverage decisions over the anti-WTO protests, this study found that by and large, journalists admitted that there was little sustained coverage of the issue debates once the protests had passed. However, the recurrence of protests attracted enhanced coverage under a new "post-Seattle" pattern of newsgathering. For a variety of reasons ranging from flagging interest to organizational and beat changes, journalists felt that there has been no significant impact on their subsequent coverage, although some of those journalists who covered these issues even before the protests continue to do so.

Quotes:

- Almost never (cover the issues). We don't have as big a staff as we may appear to have. - Correspondent, Washington, D.C.-based daily

- The protests raised everyone's awareness of some of the important issues... but as soon as the breaking news story was over we had less time and resources to spend on an analysis of global trade issues. - Editorial director, national television news network-affiliated online news Web site
- In the nature of my job here, we are such generalists... move from subject to subject so often, I knew I wasn't going to come back to the subject. - Correspondent, Washington, D.C.-based daily
- I am working on a story right now that is a globalization issue but it isn't framed in the context of WT, though it did get onto my radar screen during the WTO. - Environmental correspondent, Seattle television station
- We used to cover the politics of trade much more actively than we do now...we got a sense that readers weren't interested in that anymore. We did not send anyone to the subsequent anti-globalization rallies. - Correspondent, Washington, D.C.-based daily

Analysis: Further related to Research Question 1 was the finding that despite the reduced interest and apparent indifference toward such coverage unless accorded a news peg, journalists, when asked to reflect on their coverage and comment on what they would have liked to change, almost all of the journalists invariably spoke of a desire for doing in-depth, contextualized coverage to issues raised in the globalization debate.

- I would take five complaints, and then go and see how they square with facts and do a kind of fact-check-reality- check kind of piece. - Correspondent, Washington, D.C.-based daily

Analysis: Research Question 2 asked what journalists perceive to be the impact of the Internet on their coverage of the anti-WTO protests. Regarding the use of the Internet, every journalist interviewed spoke enthusiastically about it in general, but a number of them was skeptical about Web sites maintained by social movement activists.

Quotes:

- Right now, sometimes we first go to the Internet . . . every organization seems to have one. - Assignment Editor, national television news network

- (What's most important is) speed and the ability to find what you're looking for in ways that ordinary research methods do not allow . . . (now we can) key in search terms and track a person down. - Editorial director, national television news network-affiliated online news Web site
- I would suspect that one of the first things reporters do when they have to figure out a subject that's new to them. . . you presume there's a Web site. . . usually you're right...for any cause or any issue....Twenty years ago, we would still have got the information but it would have taken so much longer. - Correspondent, Washington, D.C.-based daily
- Just the whole experience with the anti-WTO protests made me use the Internet much more. - Correspondent, Seattle daily
- My observation is that the whole online world was a very important outlet for (a) the alternative media and (b) the protest community to talk to one another...I think there was a huge amount of organizing done online...there was a lot of published accounts . . . some of them frankly I thought erroneous but who cares?. . .(laughing) I didn't have much time to digest all that. - Environmental correspondent, Seattle television station
- At various points we wrote that one of the reasons it was possible for indigenous people of Latin America, for example, to make contact with steel workers from Pennsylvania...was because some of them had been very aggressive in using the Internet to link people. - Business correspondent, national daily
- They had some bulletin boards to just see the amount of traffic and you can see the kind of sophistication that goes into the Web site and that led us to believe that it (the protest) was going to be of a large size. Now I have Internet sites bookmarked... we used to use them for both logistics and position statements. Of course, we also used the pro-globalization Web sites. - Assignment editor, national television news network
- It was useful to get basic information about groups' positions and contact information. But I don't recall what the sites looked like, whether I quoted them or provided links to them in my stories. - Correspondent, national television network-affiliated online news Web site
- There was a sense of gee-whizness about protesters using the Internet ...it won't be as much of a story at this point as it was then... - Editorial Director, Online news
- We were not interested in referring people to polemicists on either side. - Correspondent, national TV

- I tend to go to use the Internet to get information from groups or sources that I would go to get info from anyway. It's wonderful for getting trade stats from the government. . . for getting research papers from think tanks like the Economics Policy Institute...I know their Web site; I know the people there.... I don't go generally doodling around just coz some jerk's set up a Web site somewhere...a digital soapbox... and somebody's spouting off on it. - Correspondent, national television news network

Analysis: Research Question 5 asked whether the Internet appears to have made an impact on the sourcing and attribution in press coverage of the anti-WTO protests. This study found that sources and sourcing patterns changed for the duration of the protests for most reporters. Even business correspondents who traditionally had contacted, in one journalist's words, "high-ranking WTO officials, U.S. trade representative's office, corporate lobbyists, CEOs who are very active on trade, law firms that have big trade practices in Washington,..." made quick contacts during the protest coverage with anti-globalization activists. A number of these contacts were made by going online to anti-globalization Web sites, trade unionists and academics.

What is significant, however, is that journalists now have the latter variety on their "source files" but do not activate these sources unless another protest is planned or the issue "flares up" in some way. They do, however, continue to communicate with the former category of sources. Further, the new sources used fell largely in the category described in the literature, in the sense that preference was given to official spokespersons from amongst the movement activists, prominent (celebrity) activists and to the articulate. Even those journalists who spoke to common protesters on the streets did so only for on-the-spot coverage and no longer maintain contact with them.

Quotes:

- I talked to the farm bureau about genetic engineering, I talked to local farmers about their perspectives, I talked to timber companies about their concerns over globalization ...all those groups were there and I had a big packet full of phone numbers...all that stuff was very structured and organized until all hell broke loose. - Environmental correspondent, Seattle television station
- Because it was already erupting when I got there...I called the local authorities... the mayor's office, the police chief's office...for one...and then I think there was an assortment of protest leaders. - Correspondent, Washington, D.C.-based daily
- I couldn't get into the convention... so I walked around and interviewed whoever I could run into...mostly (WTO) delegates...this forlorn group of Pakistanis...I talked to delegates. I also did (earlier) a profile of one anti-WTO organizer...she was in a debate I covered and she was the most articulate... so I called her up. - Business correspondent, Seattle daily:

Analysis: Research Question 6 asked whether the Internet appears to have made an impact on the “framing” of the press coverage of the anti-globalization protests in Seattle in November-December 1999. Consonant with the literature on journalists' coverage decisions being based on their perceptions of story importance and suitability, it was found that journalists who covered the protests organized their coverage in conventional ways. What is interesting is that most of the times, the Web interface was also re-framed by them to fit into their traditional perceptions.

Quote:

- You know... there was a story that ...(chuckling)...actually resulted from reading one of the message boards...someone wrote a question to the organizers...I think the exact question was, “What's the deal with those big-assed puppets?” So...it was kind of... seemed interesting to us because we had the same question, so we went and interviewed a fascinating guy who made big-assed puppets...so that's a story that was a direct result of the bulletin board of the www.a16.org Web site. - Assignment Editor, national television news network

Analysis: Further results from this study demonstrated that journalists often related accounts of their coverage and, in that context, engaged in talk about their self-perception as journalists and

about their own objectivity. The latter often was in the context of the claims of the Independent Media employed by the activists. An interesting finding is that very few of the journalists really considered the objectivity norm to be relevant any more. Most of them spoke about it with humor.

Quotes:

- We're not supposed to answer questions like that (the questions asked for this study) . . . it presupposes that we have opinions, and you and others may come to the conclusion that therefore they cloud our objectivity. In order to keep up the fiction that we are totally objective...I will tell you that I have no ideas or opinions. But...at the time, I was viewed by the anti-globalizers as sympathetic to their cause... but they realized later that that was only half true. - Economics writer, Washington, D.C.-based daily
- My attitude toward the protests was just this -- objective analysis. - Correspondent, national television network-affiliated online news Web site
- If I know something is not right, I don't write about it and then go get the other side...I just don't write about it. - Correspondent, national television news network
- At one point during the demonstrations, I thought to myself, " What's going on in this city...you can have property destruction going on and a group of guys in MASKS... and they were not stopped...that made me angry...the protestors knew I wasn't friendly. - Correspondent, Seattle daily
- I did a story on how the protestors were covering themselves...we asked them what was wrong with the way we were covering it...(chuckling)...how are you different...we are alternative too – it was a light-hearted piece. We would get such answers as "well we don't think that the big multinational corporate media would give the same hearing"...and I would say, "big multinational corporate media...gee, that would be us!" - Correspondent, national television news network

Analysis: Journalists also had clearly stated notions of the attitudes of their readers/ the American public toward social movement protests/civil disobedience and toward the coverage these audiences wanted.

Quotes:

- My guess is that if the cause is seen as just, that most Americans are favorably inclined to protests like those against apartheid...but not towards people with

giant foam-rubber hats...that's all you need to know about such protesters. -
Correspondent, national television news network

- If you're presenting (news) for readers in intelligent ways...they really have a way of sorting out the lunacy from what's real in their own lives...they're no more trustful of big corporations than the people in the street, but they also don't trust people who dress as turtles and strawberries...and smash up shops.... They want reasonable checks on corporate behavior, too, but they also want the economy to function freely and they largely believe in capitalism -
Correspondent, Washington, D.C.-based daily

STUDY II: Content Analysis Comparing Protest Coverage for Patterns of Sourcing and Framing:

Qualitative in-depth interviews with journalists were not considered entirely adequate to inform this dissertation about whether journalists merely follow a pattern of sourcing and framing from protest to protest or whether there is a difference (even an improvement), and, if so, whether this is due in part to the mounting of today's protests over the Internet. Therefore, this dissertation used a quantitative measure, content analyses, to triangulate and facilitate a more rigorous and wholesome understanding. This content analysis study was designed not merely to analyze the content of media coverage of the anti-WTO protests, but to compare it to the coverage of America's last big social movement, the anti-Vietnam war movement. The design attempted to get at a comparison of the sourcing and framing in coverage over three weeks' each of *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Time* and *Newsweek* for the anti-Vietnam war protests and *The Seattle Times*, *The New York Times*, *Time* and *Newsweek* for the anti-WTO protests. Codes for variables measuring the sourcing and framing were common to coverage of both protests. Additionally, in the case of the anti-WTO protests, stories were coded separately for Internet and non-Internet source use.

Of the 444 stories analyzed, 212 were WTO coverage and 232 were anti-Vietnam war coverage. A total of 330 of these were news stories and 114 were editorials. In the WTO coverage, *The Seattle Times*, which was the local newspaper examined for this coverage, did a total of 152 stories while *The New York Times*, the national newspaper, did 47. *Time* magazine did five stories over the three weeks' issues examined, while *Newsweek* did eight stories in this same period.

In the case of the anti-Vietnam war coverage, the local newspaper, *Washington Post*, did 106 stories, while the national newspaper, *The New York Times*, did 109. This time around, *Time* did three stories and *Newsweek* did 14.

In the total coverage, i.e., the coverage of anti-WTO protests and anti-Vietnam war protests put together, of the total number of 3,752 sources used, 39 % were Official (Govt. & Trade) sources, 15 % were Authoritative (Govt. & Trade) sources (i.e., sources that did not hold a public office but had authoritative knowledge or commentary to offer), 25% were Official (Protester) sources, 17% were Authoritative (Protester) sources and 4% were Unknown (Protester) sources.

Analysis of Variance was used to see whether there were any significant differences between the anti-WTO coverage and anti-Vietnam war coverage on the “sourcing” and “framing” elements. The five dependent variables (DVs) measuring sourcing patterns, Official (Govt. & Trade) sources, Authoritative (Govt. & Trade) sources, Official (Protester) sources, Authoritative (Protester) sources and Unknown Protester, were studied with a univariate analysis. The two variables measuring framing patterns, “Frame of the Story,” and “Valence of the story,” were subjected to a chi square test.

Research Question 3 asked whether there was a significant difference in sourcing and attribution between press coverage of the anti-Vietnam war protests (March on the Pentagon) in Washington, D.C., in October 1967 and the anti-globalization protests in Seattle, Wash., in November-December 1999. Highly significant effects were obtained for two of the five “sourcing” variables, as shown in **Appendix E**.

In this sample, as shown by the first variable listed in **Appendix E**, anti-WTO protest coverage used significantly more official (Govt. & Trade) sources than the anti-Vietnam war protest coverage. Anti-WTO protest coverage used an average of .71 (sd = .70) sources of this kind per story while anti-Vietnam war protest coverage used an average of .51 (sd = .42, $F = 10.85$, $df = 1, 356$, $p = .001$).

As shown by the second variable in the same table, the anti-WTO protest coverage also used significantly more authoritative (Govt. & Trade sources) than the anti-Vietnam war protest coverage. The anti-WTO protest coverage in this sample used an average of .44 (sd = .37) sources of this kind per story while anti-Vietnam war protest coverage used an average of .26 (sd = .19, $F = 20.69$, $df = 1, 191$, $p = .001$).

No significant difference was found, however, in the use of official (protester) sources between the anti-WTO protest coverage and the anti-Vietnam war protest coverage, as shown by the third variable in **Appendix E**. Anti-WTO protest coverage used an average of .45 (sd = .42) sources of this kind per story while anti-Vietnam war protest coverage used an average of .54 (sd = .46, $F = 2.77$, $df = 1, 056$, $p = .09$).

Similarly, no significant difference was found in the use of authoritative (protester) sources between the anti-WTO protest coverage and the anti-Vietnam war protest coverage, as shown by the fourth variable in **Appendix E**. Anti-WTO protest coverage used an average of .65

(sd = .53) sources of this kind per story while anti-Vietnam war protest coverage used an average of .81 (sd = .96, $F = 2.23$, $df = 1, 135$, $p = .13$).

As shown by the final variable in the same table, no significant difference was found in the use of “unknown protester” sources between the anti-WTO protest coverage and the anti-Vietnam war protest coverage. Anti-WTO protest coverage used an average of 1.98 (sd = 1.54) sources of this kind per story while anti-Vietnam war protest coverage used an average of 1.76 (sd = .99, $F = 0.36$, $df = 1, 074$, $p = .54$).

Research Question 4 asked if a significant difference existed in “framing” between press coverage of the anti-Vietnam war protests (March on the Pentagon) in Washington, D.C., in October 1967 and the anti-globalization protests in Seattle in November-December 1999.

The two variables that measured the framing patterns in the coverage, “Frame of the story” and “Valence of the Story” showed no significant difference between the coverage given to the two protests. In the case of the “Frames of the story,” (**Appendix F**) the anti-WTO protest coverage had 63 stories with a thematic frame, 103 with an episodic frame and 46 stories in which the frame was mixed. The anti-Vietnam war coverage had 56 stories with a thematic frame, 138 stories with an episodic frame, and 38 stories with a mixed frame.

In the case of the “Valence of the story,” (**Appendix G**) the anti-WTO protest coverage had 42 stories with valence supportive of protesters, 57 stories with valence supportive of government/trade (the target of the protesters), and 103 stories in which the valence was neutral. The anti-Vietnam war coverage had 65 stories in which the valence was supportive of protesters, 58 in which the valence was supportive of the target and 109 in which the valence was neutral.

Research Question 5 and Research Question 6 inquired into the Internet element in the sourcing and framing of this coverage. With respect to the variables measuring the influence of

the Internet, i.e., those variables that measured how much sourcing and of what kind was *discernibly* done over the Internet, these results were most disappointing. The “N” coded for the Internet factor was very small and therefore not viable for statistical analysis. For a sample of the size picked for this study, the lack of an Internet focus is in itself quite revealing about the influence of the Internet in reporting practices. The cases where the Internet was, in fact, cited, are discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter Five also will present a detailed discussion of what the results of these two studies represent in combination, and the implications of these findings for understanding of media and movement relationships, and whether new technologies like the Internet challenge basic news values and norms at all.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

- The march had been billed as a ‘confrontation with the warmakers,’ but before the week was out the nation had once again confronted the derangement of the American scene in the ‘60s. - Newsweek, Oct. 30, 1967
- One thing that seems to be lacking today is a mission statement, a credo, that gives the movement, such as it is, some focus.- Michael Elliott, “The New Radicals,” Newsweek, Dec. 13, 1999

The qualitative examination through “Study I: Qualitative Depth Interviews with Journalists Who Covered the Anti-WTO Protests,” offers a theoretical framework for understanding why journalists preferred certain sources to others and displayed certain frames as opposed to others. It also provides insights into their use of the Internet and its impact on their sourcing decisions and framing outcomes. Given that research into the Internet itself is relatively new, and that research into the press and the Internet is an even smaller portion of this emerging area of inquiry, this study identifies itself as exploratory. It contributes in a substantial way to interdisciplinary research on how the Internet is being received and employed by diverse groups in general, and its influence on journalistic norms and principles in particular.

The quantitative examination through “Study II: Content Analysis Comparing Protest Coverage for Patterns of Sourcing and Framing” provides, quite simply, the numbers. More importantly, it provides a comparison of numbers, permitting a study of commonalities and differences in sourcing and framing of two separate social protests. It also measures, to some extent, the manifestation in actual content of any sourcing done over the Internet.

This dissertation makes two primary contributions to the disciplines of mass communication, political science, sociology, and the study of new media. And, while doing so, it contributes to theory as well as practice. First, the two distinct studies in this dissertation together demonstrate the steadfastness of journalistic norms. They also point to journalists' reception of new tools such as the Internet as mere facilitators of these very norms, given the Internet's qualities of speed and efficiency. Following are the discussions that expand on these two principal findings.

Clearly the most significant finding of this dissertation is that journalists today seem to be citing official and authoritative sources more than journalists did in the 1960s, at least as far as protest coverage is concerned. This is evident chiefly from the results of the content analysis, which shows a significant increase in sourcing and attribution from official and authoritative sources in government and trade in the anti-WTO protest coverage as compared to the anti-Vietnam war coverage. This finding is supported by the findings from the qualitative depth interviews, in which journalists seemed largely reluctant to cite protest sources, on or off the Internet ("...I called the local authorities... the mayor's office, the police chief's office...for one...and then I think there was an assortment of protest leaders."; "I tend to go to use the Internet to get information from groups or sources that I would go to get info from anyway. It's wonderful for getting trade stats from the government. . . .")

When broken down to the actual categories of sources coded in the content analysis (**Appendices "C" and "D"**) under the variables "Official (Govt. & Trade) Sources" and "Authoritative (Govt. & Trade) Sources," this means that journalists in the

anti-WTO protests cited the following sources more than journalists covering the anti-Vietnam war protests did:

- U.S. president
- U.S. administration
- U.S. trade representatives (in the case of the anti-Vietnam war protest, of course, there were no “trade representatives” and the corresponding category for this was “South Vietnam government and governments of other countries supportive of the war.”)
- City politicians (eg., mayor and city council officials).
- City administration (eg., police and fire department officials).
- U.S. corporations and WTO officials/spokespersons (for the anti-Vietnam war protest coverage, the corresponding category for this was “Defense officials/spokespersons).
- Journalists/officials of trade or defense media.
- Former WTO/World Bank/IMF spokespersons (the corresponding category for the anti-Vietnam war protest coverage was “former defense officials and commentators.”)
- Visiting WTO delegates (the corresponding category for this for the anti-Vietnam war protest coverage was “defense officials in the field”).
- Academics and journalists
- Other supporters speaking in official capacity
- Owners and officials of damaged property.

The implications of these findings acquire even more significance for understanding present-day journalism's treatment of social movements and social protest for two reasons. First, it can be argued that from what we know about the Vietnam war and its key players, sources like the U.S. president and the U.S. administration, in particular, were unquestionably more indispensable to that coverage than they would be to coverage of the anti-WTO protest. Therefore, journalists could be expected to approach those sources substantially more often for coverage of a war than that of free-trade issues. That the exact opposite seems to be the case, as revealed by this study, brings into focus even more sharply the fact that journalists today are, what John Nichols and Robert W. McChesney (2002) refer to as "stenographers to power."

Second, it is important to note one fact about the particular anti-Vietnam war protest sampled in this study – The March on the Pentagon. It took place in October 1967, which is noted by political scientists and media scholars to be *before public opinion turned against the war*. This should be viewed in the context of the analyses of the mass media's role in Vietnam war era. While it was earlier believed that the mass media were pivotal in turning public opinion against the war, mass media scholars later proved that the media at first ignored opposition to the war and later merely followed it when it became too large to ignore (Braestrup, 1977; Gitlin, 1984; Hallin, 1986; Small, 1994). In his revealing study titled "*The Uncensored War*", Daniel Hallin(1986) found that the war was, especially on television, largely sanitized as a result of media reliance and compliance with government and military sources and network television's policies against airing footage that might offend soldiers' families. Hallin's (1986) study found that, with few exceptions, network coverage prior to 1968 was "strongly supportive" of

the war. It wasn't until November 1969, more than a year and a half after the My Lai slaughter, evidence of which had, in fact, been presented to and ignored by the mainstream press, that the story was finally published by the small, alternative *Dispatch News Service's* investigative reporter Seymour Hersh. Braestrup's (1977) study also shows that the press did not bring in debate and doubt until after the U.S. government's claim of success in the war came under sharp question after the losses suffered in the Tet offensive of 1968.

Looking at these analyses, the implications of the findings in this dissertation become even starker. This content analysis is of a protest in 1967, when the U.S. mainstream media already were unduly dependent on establishment sources. The fact that they are even more so today, as shown by this content analysis, is potent proof of the media's apparent complicity with consensus and disregard for dissent. Moreover, the significantly greater dependence on official and authoritative sources from within the establishment (an average of .71 official sources and .44 authoritative sources per story in the anti-WTO protest coverage as compared to .51 official and .44 authoritative sources per story in the anti-Vietnam war coverage) is not matched by a corresponding increase in sourcing and attribution of official and authoritative sources from the other side of the confrontational issue. The content analysis found no significant difference in sourcing and attribution of protester sources used in the coverage of the anti-WTO protests and the anti-Vietnam war protests.

Similarly, journalists today are no more willing to quote "unknown protesters," i.e., street protesters who are not protest leaders or officials of protest organizations and are not sought out for their "quoteworthiness" (an average of 1.98 per story in the anti-

WTO protests and an average of 1.76 in the anti-Vietnam war coverage). This is consonant with the literature, which recounts how, at anti-war demonstrations and at a civil rights march, television reporters would seek out unusual participants but ignored the rank-and-file demonstrators (Gans, 1972; Gitlin, 1980; Hallin, 1994)

With regard to the framing of the anti-WTO protests, measured in the content analysis by the codes for (1) episodic, thematic or mixed frames and (2) valence “supportive of protester,” “supportive of target” and “neutral,” the fact that these journalists are not doing anything significantly different from what their predecessors did in the anti-Vietnam war protests points to what this dissertation sought to find out – there does seem to be a pattern of protest coverage.

This lack of a change is in itself quite revealing. Journalists have traditionally been criticized for not providing adequate context and background to their coverage, that is, they do not have adequate thematic frames. Small (1994) criticized the media’s coverage of the anti-Vietnam war protests saying that it used its own frames and filters to the detriment of the movement message and rarely exposed casual readers and viewers to the rationales behind the movement’s arguments. Iyengar and Kinder (1991) have established that when audiences don’t have access to thematic understanding of issue debates, they find it hard to attribute responsibility for political issues to the groups concerned and this, in turn, has an impact on public opinion. It must be argued that this becomes especially relevant in the context of a social movement like the anti-globalization movement, which is relatively new and in which the issues are more dispersed and, therefore, more challenging for a reader/audience member to immediately recognize. Such a movement would, then, *require* more thematic coverage. To have it

played out in the mainstream media as episodic news of “disorder” and “deviance,” increasing the media’s reliance on sources such as the police, fire officials, owners of damaged property and other such “official” sources, points to a pattern of protest coverage even more disappointing from the point of view of informing public opinion.

The qualitative analysis emerging from the in-depth interviews of journalists covering the anti-WTO protests provides some more interesting indications. For one, journalists seemed to have *approached* the protests with a notion (or “frame”) of what street protests and social movements are all about. They appear to have looked out for strategies, signals and news pegs that fit their perception of both the conduct and legitimacy of protests. Take these statements, for instance: “If a demonstration is big enough, regardless of the cause, you must take notice. If a million people show up in D.C., regardless of the reason -- to celebrate the Fourth of July or to protest the war in Vietnam -- you’re going to take notice and you should take notice”; “My guess is that if the cause is seen as just, that most Americans are favorably inclined to protests like those against apartheid...but not towards people with giant foam-rubber hats...that’s all you need to know about such protesters.” At other points in a number of the interviews, journalists mentioned the protests during the Vietnam era.

In a sense, then, journalists seem to have approached the story with *the pictures inside their heads*. Walter Lippmann’s (1932) classic phrase acquires new meaning in this context. If reporters in the 1960s expressed disdain for “the hippies,” (stories from the sample in the content analysis in this dissertation consistently drew attention to the “hippie movement,” almost entirely critical) reporters at the turn of the century took objection to “turtle costumes.” It would be interesting, even pertinent, then, to do a

comparison of both textual and visual content of coverage of the two protests to see if reality on the streets of Seattle was captured and cast in the image of the somewhat notorious, somewhat iconized images of the protests from the 1960s.

It becomes easier to understand journalists' candid dismissal of the anti-globalization movement as expressed in the in-depth interviews when one considers that journalists seem to be more willing than ever to state that they have discarded the objectivity norm. As discussed in the analysis in the preceding chapter, most of the journalists interviewed actually distanced themselves from notions of objectivity. Consider, then, the classic literature that states that journalists, steeped in the self-constructed ideology of objectivity (Gans, 1970; Tuchman, 1972; Schudson, 1978), resist a shift in their opinions for fear of losing credibility and change their opinions only in the case of some highly visible and traumatic events. In this case, however, journalists seem to be resisting a shift in their opinion *despite abandoning the traditional armor of objectivity*. This brings us even closer to Durham's (2002) interpretation of journalists as unquestionably ideological.

Given the implications of these findings, this dissertation builds on the theory of framing by the media, contributing to it an understanding of journalists' frames of coverage of past, similar events playing out in their coverage of current events. This researcher would like to suggest that there is, then, a "media mood," which flows from the concept of framing. This mood is a combination of factors like journalists' perceptions of the story they are covering, their perception of their own role in its coverage (in this case, it appeared to have been ambivalent, as opposed to objective) and their perception of what their reader/audience wants.

“Media mood” is conceptualized as being shaped by journalists’ own “schemas” (Graber, 1984; Mandler, 1984; Fiske & Taylor, 1991) and cultivation (Gerbner, 1969; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan & Signorielli, 1991). This is a view of journalists as social actors who respond not just to their professional norms and conventions but also to the schemas they share with others, as members of the public and as audience/consumers of the mass media. In the case of the coverage of anti-WTO protests, then, how much were journalists drawing upon not just their understanding of journalistic norms but also of the frames of protest received as a whole generation growing up in the imagery and iconization of the anti-Vietnam war protests? It becomes even more important, then, to examine the nature of the relationship between social movement agendas and media *perceptions* and *expectations*, collectively forming their “mood,” a concept that becomes more pertinent given the decline of clear norms such as objectivity in the media on the one hand and the complex, cumbersome nature of movement issues and its actors, on the other.

To examine the role of actors on the media mood during the anti-WTO protests, we would consider, for instance, the journalistic frames at that time toward president Bill Clinton that then colored journalists’ reception of his response to the anti-WTO protests. Similarly, what current cultural understandings of “political correctness” and “humor,” to name just two of several cultural indicators, guided journalists’ reception of the protester in the turtle costume? An analysis of these would provide greater context to variables such as the high number of sourcing and attribution from the president and the U.S. administration and the unsupportive “valence” in stories about protests tactics, as found by the content analysis in this dissertation.

One key area that needs to be explored is the increasingly complex question of how journalists seem to form impressions of what their readers/audience/the American public wants. None of the journalists interviewed drew upon any real social contact or correspondence with these people to back up what the journalists believed to be their needs and wants.

This dissertation also contributes to what Rojecki's (2002) analysis of the anti-WTO protests called for – the development of a new theory of media, political elite and social movement relations. Rojecki's(2002) study, in particular, provides important comparisons to the studies in this dissertation, particularly the content analysis.

Rojecki (2002) did a discourse analysis of (1) news reports in *USA Today* and the evening news broadcasts on CBS and (2) op-ed commentaries in three newspapers – *The New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times* and *Washington Post*. He found that after starting out as supportive of the WTO, the coverage was more balanced after the protests turned violent. This dissertation's findings are contrary to Rojecki's(2002) analysis and are, in fact, nowhere as optimistic as his suggestion that there is "a widened media sympathy" (Rojecki, 2002, p. 167).

These differences in findings could be because of several reasons. The first is a methodological issue – a content analysis is set up differently from a discourse analysis. Also, the sample of publications picked for the analyses were different. Moreover, this dissertation's focus was on sourcing and framing as modes of analyzing press coverage and to the extent that scholars have found these to be significant indicators of selection and description biases in the media, these modes of analysis are key to understanding

media coverage of social protest. A discourse analysis, of course, allows for more subjective analyses of text, which Rojecki(2002) has utilized for his study.

The most significant value of the difference between Rojecki's (2002) analysis and that of this researcher, however, is that it was crucial to this study to establish a *context* through *comparison* between a protest in the 1960s and one at the turn of the century. Establishing the existence or non-existence of a pattern, as this dissertation does, answers one simple and significant question – *has anything changed?*

This brings the discussion to the other key focus of this dissertation, the role of the Internet. While the findings above are consistent with the literature on the coverage of social protest (Gans, 1979; Goldenberg, 1975; Piven & Cloward, 1979), contributing to it some contemporary perspectives, the media become even more worthy of censure, given the fact that with the anti-WTO protests, it was far less difficult or undesirable for journalists to approach protester sources. They had unprecedented access to these people, opinions and perspectives over the Internet.

A larger part of the Internet element of this study has come from the qualitative depth interviews rather than the content analysis. This is possibly because the time lapse seems to have given journalists a chance to synthesize their understanding of the role of the Internet in their coverage of the protests. Considering the largely skeptical view that journalists had of protest Web sites, however, it is more likely that Internet sources are not cited in the press stories because journalists either did not care to read contextual material (research papers/position papers, statistics) from the Web sites, or, if they did read these, they did not care to quote them.

Since the number of times the Internet element showed up in the coding for the content analysis can quite literally be counted on one's fingertips, following are discussions of each of these. There were instances when the matter of the organization of the protests over the Internet was itself a story. There were two such stories in *The New York Times*, both on Dec. 5, 1999. One of these was titled "*The Nation: New World Disorder; Free Trade Talks on Free Speech*," mentioning a Seattle historian whose Web site, (www.historylink.org) "served as a digital diary of the disturbances." The other story was titled "*Word for Word Protest Studies: Skywriting, Collective Disappearance and Other Ways to Up the Revolution*" mentioning the existence of Web sites called www.ruckus.org and www.nonviolence.org. Similar stories on the role of the Internet in mounting the protests were found in the magazines studied in this same – *Time* and *Newsweek*. There was one quote from "an online activist" in a story titled "*How Organized Anarchists Led Seattle into Chaos*" in *Time*, dated Dec. 13, 1999. In the issue of *Newsweek* the same week, three separate mentions were made of how the protests were mounted over the Internet.

Of greater relevance to this dissertation, however, is the use of the Internet for actual sourcing and attribution, particularly of protest Web sites. An instance in which journalists actually cited a protest Web site is in two stories on the same topic. One of these, titled "*Nerve Gas at WTO?*" in *The Seattle Times* dated Dec. 11, 1999, reports on claims by protesters that the police fired nerve gas during the protests, and mentions that protest organizations have asked for reports to be posted over the Internet from protesters who can shed light on the use of nerve gas. The other story, titled "*Civil Rights Groups Call for Investigation*," in *The New York Times* dated Dec 6, 1999, mentions that the Web

site of the American Civil Liberties Union has invited complaints of wrongful police conduct. It is interesting to note here that both these stories, in different newspapers, have an episodic frame, and the Internet source was used not for discussing issues of global trade but issues of disorder and clashes with the police. The chance exists, of course, that these are not, in fact, Internet sources, but could be reported from press releases sent to these newspapers.

Indications are that some journalists did, in fact, use the Internet in their coverage of these protests, but seemed to have steered clear *particularly* of protest Web sites, preferring, for instance, to cite an e-mail from a “citizen” criticizing the protests in a story in *The Seattle Times* on Dec. 13, 1999, titled “*Bubble Was Bound to Burst for City That Put on Airs.*” In another instance, in a story in *The Seattle Times* on Nov. 28, 1999, titled “*If You Are More Worried About Traffic Than Free Trade...*” the reporter cited city email alerts by the Seattle city administration. Similarly, the very next day, on Nov. 29, the same newspaper again cited a Web site for readers to get updates of traffics and maps in a story titled “*WTO Week Off to a Rocky Start – Trade Center Locked Down.*” And, on Dec. 10, the same newspaper even cited a commercial Web site – eBay. In a story titled “*WTO Tear-Gas Mementos Already and Online Memory,*” the reporter discussed the rocks, tear-gas canisters and police batons being auctioned as memorabilia on eBay.

All this is consistent with the literature, particularly the 1994 study on journalists’ Internet use (Hansen et al, 1997), which found that “the forms of information retrieval may be different, but the same organizational power structures, sources, and news frames are still evident” (Hansen et al, 1997, p. 566). In the context of the celebration over the

networking power of Internet-mounted social protests, however, this becomes even more revealing.

We cannot conclude, however, that all journalists all the time are dismissive or resistant to either accessing protest sources over the Internet or directing their readers/audiences to information and debates available on Web sites. While some of the journalists interviewed in this dissertation were online journalists or filed online reports for their news organizations, the content analysis here did not sample online media. This was because the purpose of the content analysis was to compare the anti-WTO protests with the anti-Vietnam war protests and arrive at the kind of findings only a comparison would facilitate. The anti-Vietnam war protests, of course, were not covered online.

This dissertation, therefore, calls for a study of online coverage using the same modes of analysis, i.e., sourcing and framing. Such an examination of online coverage of the anti-WTO protests is likely to provide a clearer picture of journalists' use of the Internet and their distribution of Web site information and hypermedia links within their stories. As discussed in the literature review of this dissertation, the first few studies into the use and usefulness of such hypermedia linking by online reporters are now coming out. Eric Fredin (2001) has pointed to the expanded use of hypermedia links within news stories accessed through the Web, which allows readers to make several "digressions" and access different frames of understanding.

This dissertation also points to the need for another study comparing coverage given to two separate protests. It wasn't until the research for this dissertation was well under way that the United States went to war with Iraq, leading to more anti-war protests, again, largely facilitated by the Internet. The coverage of the anti-war protests of 2003 would

have provided a more direct and sharp comparison for this dissertation than the anti-WTO protests. Research is needed, therefore, comparing anti-war protest coverage of the 1960s with the coverage given to the protests in February 2003, against the war in Iraq. Together with the findings of this dissertation, such a study would provide keener perspectives on both, the coverage of social protests across decades. It will also reveal whether, in the three years between the anti-WTO protests in November -December 1999 and the anti-Vietnam war protests in February 2003, journalists are using the Internet more, or, differently. Interestingly, the anti-war protests in 2003 have grown out of the anti-globalization protests with some of the same groups and, indeed, Web sites, spearheading it.

Such a study of more recent protest coverage may also bring into clearer focus contemporary Internet use by journalists, given that Internet use is by different groups is new and fast evolving. Much is likely to have changed between 1999 and 2003 with regard to journalists' reception of information from alternative voices over the Internet. This brings the discussion to another possible factor that must be kept in mind while looking at the results of the interviews in this dissertation. The interviews were conducted two and a half years after the event of the anti-WTO protests. Despite this interviewer urging them to focus their answers on their use of the Internet in the coverage in November-December 1999, journalists might well have responded with a notion of their current efficiency with, dependence on and feelings of credibility toward the Internet and Web sites. Also, there is the possibility of respondent bias, that is, journalists may have played up, in their response to this interviewer's questions, their reportage of their use of protest Web sites, because they knew it was the subject of this study. The above two

factors point to the likelihood that Internet use may have, then, been even lower than that shown in the findings.

To summarize the above discussions, this dissertation's findings on how journalists use the Internet, and its disuse for certain types of coverage points even more strongly to what scholars have called a selection bias ((Ryan, Carragee & Meinhofer, 2001). It also alerts us to the need to study patterns of "gatekeeping" in journalists' use of the Internet. In the bigger picture, it contributes to the understanding of the democratizing impact of the Internet, tempering the excitement to a large extent with the finding that not all audiences are in the loop, or, to borrow an Internet phrase, "logged on." The implications of the coursing and framing patterns between two protests, and the failure of the Internet to impact these, suggests that it is not that it is too *early* to determine the impact that the Internet has in giving social movements access to the mainstream media. It might be plain *erroneous*.

While social movements have much cause to celebrate the power of the Internet for what it does for political organization and networking with their other constituents, they cannot assume that the press is included in that network. And, since news has been considered a significant political resource over the last few decades (Tuchman, 1978; Gitlin, 1980; Gamson & Modigliani, 1989, Gamson, 1992; Croteau, Hoynes, & Carragee, 1996; McLeod & Detenber, 1999) and is even more so in today's mass-mediated America, this paints a dim picture of not just where movement-media relations stand today, but also the role of the Internet in enhancing media coverage, and, indeed, empowering democracy.

CHAPTER SIX

SHIFTING OR STEADFAST? THE MYTHS AND REALITIES OF MOVEMENT-MEDIA RELATIONS IN THE AGE OF THE INTERNET

“It’s too soon to gauge the significance of the battle of Seattle: will future historians view it as the coming-out party for a truly international populist movement or a mere spasm of outrage by misfits in the new global economy? But one thing is certain. Once more, ordinary citizens have asserted what the historian C. Vann Woodward decades ago called their ability “to shock the seats of power and privilege and furnish the periodic therapy that seems necessary to the health of our democracy.” – Michael Kazin (History Professor, Georgetown University, and co-author of “America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s,”) *The New York Times*, Dec. 5, 1999.

Is it still too soon to gauge the significance of the battle of Seattle? More important, *for whom* was this “battle” significant? Four years after the anti-WTO protests and four decades after the protest era of the 1960s, what are the implications of a study such as this one?

This dissertation found that journalists covering social protest today, as compared to journalists in the 1960s, are citing more sources that represent an elite consensus. They have not correspondingly increased the sources from among those who dissent. Social movements are using the Internet for political organization, and journalists are going to the Internet, but, apparently, they prefer to go online to the same sources to which they would have gone had there been no Internet. They also are framing their stories along the same patterns as the frames used in the era of the Vietnam war protests. The implications of this dissertation, therefore, are significant for the three key players studied in this dissertation: social movements, the media and the Internet.

Implications for Social Movements

For a dissertation centered on social movements, this one decidedly lacks an argument for or against the movement itself. The aim of this study has not been to support, or even study, the movement for democratic globalization/the anti-globalization movement. The aim has been to examine aspects of media coverage of this social movement, and, because the mode of analysis was comparison, the examination was extended to the anti-Vietnam war movement. However, in this very selection and emphasis lies a conviction that social movements are not just important but *crucial* to the health of a democracy.

The particular case of the movement for democratic globalization, moreover, has an influence on not only the world economic order, but also the new world order, especially negotiations over two very important factors: money and wars. It comes as no surprise, then, that a number of the protesters who took to the streets to protest against this country going to war against Iraq in 2003 were the same people who have protested against globalization since the anti-WTO protests in Seattle in 1999. The Vietnam-era protests grew out of the civil rights movement in the 1960s; today's anti-war protests have grown out of the anti-globalization movement (Neuman, 2003). The same Web sites, e-groups and listserves that pulled together huge crowds for the protests in Seattle in 1999 once again used these channels to bring people to the streets in February-March 2003.

When we relate the above facts to the findings of the two studies in this dissertation, it becomes even more pertinent to now study the patterns between the anti-war protests of the 1960s and the anti-war protests that began in 2003. The content analysis in this dissertation pointed to greater reliance on official and authoritative sources by today's

mainstream media covering protests than the media in the 1960s. A similar pattern, if it emerges, between the coverage given to two anti-war movements, would be reason to call for a serious overhaul of journalists' understanding of the frames – and the very necessity – of social movements. Such a study might even contribute to the concept of media mood forwarded in this dissertation, particularly if there are certain codes that depict a transfer of a “critical” mood toward the anti-globalization onto the new anti-war movement that grew out of it. That is, did journalists' attitudes toward the anti-globalization protests make them dismissive or disdainful of the new anti-war protests?

It would also be important to study the above with precisely the same modes of analysis used in this dissertation – i.e., sourcing and framing. Todd Gitlin, in his classic study of movement-media relations, has suggested that “the more closely the concerns and values of social movements coincide with the concerns and values of elites in politics and in media, the more likely they are to be incorporated in the prevailing news frames” (p. 284). What does this mean for a social movement such as the one for democratic globalization (or, the anti-globalization movement), whose issues, unlike war, civil rights and feminism, are so complex and multi-layered that they are unlikely to coincide with the concerns and values of most elites in politics and in media, or, at least, not *recognized* as coinciding with their concerns and values? Moreover, what does it mean when these issues are in direct *opposition* to the concerns and values of most elites in politics and media?

When we consider politics, a United States reeling from 9/11 is exhorted by its president to bounce back by “buying” more. When we consider media, conglomerates are consistently bearing down on the Federal Communications Commission to implement

rule changes that will permit big media companies to extend dramatically their control over communications in the United States, and, thereby, abroad. Even as it becomes more and more evident that the conflicts of the future will be over economics rather than political ideology, it also becomes evident that we are unlikely, at least in America, to find these complex conflicts articulated in an increasingly profit-driven, “dumbed down,” politics and media.

It is also becoming likely that despite much to protest about, we can no longer have a sixties-style protest “era;” what we can have are protest “eruptions.” Episodic coverage is partially responsible for this, with its stress on the restoration of order and its tendency to move on to the newer, more exciting story, resulting in today’s fragmented images, reduced stamina for debate or deliberation and, finally, the public’s increasing dissociation from public life, civic engagement and democratic structures (Iyengar & Kinder, 1991; Putnam, 2000). The anti-war protests of the 1960s did play a role in bringing the United States out of Vietnam; the anti-war protests of 2003, even though they were mounted before the nation went to war, could boast of no such impact. The results of the content analysis in this dissertation – which found that media rely more today on official and authoritative sources than they did for the anti-Vietnam war protests – indicate that the concerns and values of elites in politics and media are even more important today for an issue to find its way into media coverage. Now, considering the fact that the key accusations against globalization – that free trade is unfair and that globalization promotes war (Staple, 2003) – are not arguments popular with those elites in politics and media that journalists covering protest are citing (i.e., official and authoritative sources in government and trade), it is not surprising that the 2003 protests

against the war in Iraq did not make it to the concerns and values of elites in politics and media.

Implications for the Media

Why do we involve the media in this? Aside from the obvious answer that there is a proven relationship between media and public opinion, there is the sharper indication that culture, context and the conduct of virtually every aspect of life in America is mass-mediated. Mass media are, increasingly, the sole public sphere in the nation, and, as multinational media conglomerates permeate global societies and culture, these mass media may likely be the global public sphere. A logical explication of this process has been provided by Herman and McChesney (1998) : global media corporations use the free market strategies to promote a worldwide culture of consumerism by distributing unidimensional, noncontroversial programming based on entertainment and infotainment. Advertisers support and guide this as they expand their markets and gain the support of those elite classes globally that benefit from such capitalist nourishment. The commercial media companies own more and more broadcast network systems and drive out smaller systems that may present alternative, less entertainment-driven, local, non-capitalist value systems.

As these public broadcasting systems flounder, the authors point out that citizens who are immersed in commercial media gradually embrace the values of selfish individualism and materialism and tend to disengage from their local communities. Institutions such as families, political parties, religious institutions, civic groups and, yes, social movements, lose those increasingly captivated by the enthralling media image.

Add to this Stuart Hall's simple observation that the media have the ability to *define* situations, and you have a nation-and-beyond of people whose very definitions come from mass media. As long as public opinion will be a pillar of democracy, the way it is formed by the mass media will be the very foundation of that pillar.

The qualitative in-depth interviews in this dissertation showed that most journalists, with or without the Internet, remain reluctant to extend social movements the concessions of credibility they reserve for official and authoritative sources in government and trade. Moreover, having access to a multiplicity of coherent voices over the Internet does not necessarily inspire journalists to include these in their stories, provide context or clarification.

A few cases in the study, however, indicate that journalists at times made an attempt at a well-rounded coverage. A business reporter at a Boston daily stated that he was interested in the issue of sweatshops and during the globalization debate, was able to tie in this interest. He said that while the sweatshop issue had been interesting to readers for some time "because of celebrities having been embarrassed in the issue," the "bane" of daily news-reporting was that it did not allow him to sustain his interest in covering these issues – he has moved beats and is now a metro editor. A correspondent at a Canadian daily, too, spoke of organizational factors having at first enhanced her newspaper's coverage of the anti-WTO protests in Quebec City ("Our boss was young and committed.") This same reporter stated that later, organizational factors – a change in the newsroom's leadership – led to watered down coverage of globalization issues.

Something appears to be inherent in the mainstream media's norms and structure, then, that precludes a sustained inclusion of diverse voices. When these voices are raised

in slogans in violent, riotous street protests, they get heard; when they are laid out in cogent arguments over the Internet, they are largely ignored. This is what leads to what Gitlin has called the mass media's making and unmaking of the New Left. In Gitlin's study, the media inflated the importance of revolutionary rhetoric and activist-celebrities, destabilizing the leadership and cohesion of the movement. Will a similar concentration on episodic frames of disorder and the echoing of those voices that are either "powerful" (officials and authorities in government and trade) or "loud" (violent, quoteworthy, well-known protesters) now lead to the making and unmaking of an Internet-bred, Newer Left?

Why, then, does our press ignore the thousands that march in the streets even as it is the very size and scale -- the numbers game -- that actually makes the headlines? Are news values and norms so severely at odds with the substance of social movements? And, if we are to agree that social movements are a necessary part of any healthy democracy, are we to conclude that news values and norms are at odds with democracy? It might be early yet, to make such a statement.

For one, journalists may well be in the process, today, of barely coming to terms with the complex nature of the new social movements. The issues of globalization are different from issues that sparked off the civil rights and anti-Vietnam war protests in that they do not have key actors and the "either-or" solutions that play into fundamental news values. The war had presidents on the one hand and hippies on the other. Also, as any student in a basic journalism course is told, war appeals to one of the most fundamental of news values -- conflict. The movement for democratic globalization, on the other hand,

does not have any significant celebrities and no consequences seen as posing an immediate threat to American lives.

Further, media coverage of the anti-globalization movement seems, thus far, to be in line with Gitlin's model of media interest and coverage studied in the coverage of the Vietnam protests. According to him, the media have a cycle of reporting about social movements – they first ignore, then discover, then denigrate, polarize and bifurcate...until they finally settle on elevating a moderate alternative. This cycle has been described and studied in the context of the lesbian and gay movement between 1969-1978 to find that media coverage of this movement moved along a similar path (Cook & Hartnett, 2001). In the interviews for this dissertation, journalists spoke of their own relative ignorance before the protests, surprise and discovery during the protests and a critical appreciation after the protests. The coverage and “mood” now seem to be in the “bifurcation” stage where journalists describe the existence of two groups – the radical anarchists and those who will now, they say, be included by the elite in all subsequent institutional dialogue on globalization. Once again, a sustained research agenda following the coverage of this movement, as well as others that grow out of it, such as the new anti-war movement, will establish whether journalists are, in fact, moving further away from giving voice to alternative opinions.

Bennett (2003), referring to globalization as the biggest story in the world today, warns that if mass media journalists do not abandon their standard press-government routines and business-driven news formulas and, instead, develop a technical code for serious news told from the personal political standpoint of citizens, the initiative for defining the future of political information will shift to the Internet. However, how likely

are journalists to abandon their current routines and formulas, and, as this dissertation has once again indicated, their increasing dependence on official and authoritative sources? What might motivate them to do so? If news values are, indeed, enduring, and since these values are the ones that guide these routines and formulas, a complete re-examination of the outcome of these news values – an uninformed public opinion from a disengaged public – and a re-education in its dangers, will make at least some strides. In the particular case of social movement protests, it will be difficult to break the cycle of coverage discussed by Gitlin (1980) unless the media are cognizant of and conscientious about the belief in their profession, in fact, being a higher calling. On a philosophical level, it will need a suspension of cynicism. On a practical level, it will dictate day-to-day practice such as with the use of the Internet. For instance, journalists may realize that rather than ignore activist Web sites because of doubts over their credibility, they might need to make that extra phone-call or fact-check that, in fact, *inquires* into the credibility, which, if established, brings in one more source, one more alternative viewpoint and one more number on an active rolodex.

Implications for the Internet

At the time of writing this concluding chapter, this researcher's e-mail Inbox contains three different e-mails that provide different glimpses into where the Internet seems to be headed as a tool for democracy.

1. MoveOn.Org, a Web site active against issues ranging from globalization to the war, sent out this email on Sept. 8, 2003: "In the next week, the final vote on rolling back the FCC rule change will come to the Senate floor. We can beat this thing, but we'll need every last person to do so. Please sign the "Stop the FCC" petition right now, and ask

your friends and family to sign as well. You can sign now at:

<http://www.moveon.org/stopthefcc/>. Together, we can make sure that America's media is diverse, competitive, and balanced.” This e-mail is particularly informative for its peculiar success in not just circumventing the mainstream media by urging direct action from its over 1.4 million members but also for its recognition of the fact that America’s media needs to stay diverse, competitive and balanced. The success of this organization is as revealing as is the interconnectedness of its causes – membership in MoveOn.org is said to have skyrocketed during the Iraq war, helping the group to raise \$1.3 million for an antiwar advertising campaign built around the theme "Inspections work/War won't." And, before the war, the organization collected more than 1 million signatures on an anti-war petition and coordinated a one-day "Virtual March on Washington" that jammed congressional phone lines. It didn’t stop the war, but the protests were heard. And, today, it lands informative modules through action-oriented e-mails on FCC decisions, Schwarzenegger’s candidacy and, yes, globalization.

2. CyberJournalist.Net, a Web site for online journalists run by “mainstream” journalist Jonathan Dube, senior news producer for MSNBC.com, whose coverage of the anti-WTO protests in Seattle, in fact, won him the first ever Online Journalism Award for Breaking News, posted this on Sept. 26, 2003: “In a column for the Online Journalism Review, Mark Glaser looks at the now hotter-than-ever debate over whether news sites should edit blog entries and passes on some tips from journalist bloggers:

- Find a trustworthy blogger
- Get everyone in the organization on the same page
- Don't be afraid of outside links”

This e-mail, too, is informative for two reasons. One, it indicates active discussion and debate among at least online journalists over issues such as the use of hyperlinks.

However, on reading further, one finds considerable wariness of those who fall outside the category of “the usual sources,” and that the tip, “don’t be afraid of outside links” is really a discussion not of diversifying sources but of the experience of readers straying away from the main Web site to other links. So, while on the one hand journalists seem to be using the Internet more, and discussing such use, it is still to be seen, through further scholarly research, whether this will result in a shift in media norms and news values.

3. The Pew Charitable Trust’s Internet and Public Life project posted, on Sept. 29, 2003, a list titled “The 25 Who Are Changing the World of Internet and Politics: Institute for Politics, Democracy & the Internet in top 25 sites.” This list includes Web sites as diverse as a news site run by a journalist exploding myths about the African American community, a Latvian Web site bringing policy debates to people, and, yes, the Internet operations of the White House.

These instances only enhance the discussions in this dissertation that the Internet is certainly a tool for enhancing democracy. Yet, these successes do not cloud but, in fact, only compound the chief argument raised through the studies of this dissertation, which is, will the mainstream media now log on to the sources and frames thrown open to them on the World Wide Web?

Once again, the discussions in this dissertation call for a multi-pronged research plan on this key issue. In particular, studies on the political communication strategies of social movements, particularly during social protests, will construct, along with this dissertation, not just a theory for scholars from different disciplines who consider social protest important, but

also a media navigation map for those who, propelled by their convictions or by a well-worded e-mail, take to the streets in protest.

REFERENCES

- Ayres, J. M. (1999). *From the Streets to the Internet: The Cyber-Diffusion of Contention*. 566 pp.132-143.
- Bagdikian, B. H. (2000)*The Media Monopoly*, Beacon Press Books, Boston, Massachussets.
- Barron, J. A. (1973). *Freedom of the press for whom?* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Bennett, L. (1988). *News: The Politics of Illusion*, Longman Books.
- Bennett, L. (2003) *The Twilight of Mass Media. News: Market Deregulation, Digital Convergence, and the Future of Public Information*. Talk given to at the 2003 Breaux Symposium, "Freeing the Presses," Reilly Center for Media and Public Affairs, Louisiana State University.
- Braestrup, P. (1977) *Big Story: How the American Press and Television Reported and Interpreted the Crisis of Tet 1968 in Vietnam and Washington*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Carter, A. (1973). *Direct Action and Liberal Democracy*. London: Routledge and Kegal Paul
- Chomsky, N. (1997). A Talk given to the Harvard University Trade Union Program, Cambridge, Massachussets; recorded by Alternative Radio.
- Chomsky, N. (1991). *Deterring Democracy*. Verso. London and New York.
- Cohen, S. & Young, J. (eds.) (1981). *The Manufacturing of News: Social Problems, Deviance and the Mass Media*. London:Constable.
- Cleaver Jr., H. M. (1998). The Zapatista Effect: The Internet and the Rise of an Alternative Political Fabric. (Mexican Zapatista National Liberation Army) *Journal of International Affairs*. V51 i2 p621(1)
- Costain, A. N. & McFarland A.S. (1998). *Social Movements and American Political Institutions*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dickson, S. H. (1991). Press and U.S. Policy Toward Nicaragua, 1983-1987: A Study of the New York Times and Washington Post, *Journalism Quarterly*, 69:562-71.

- Durham, F. (2002). Anti-Communism, Race, and Structuration: Newspaper Coverage of the Labor and Desegregation Movements in the South, 1932-40 and 1953-61. *Journalism & Communication Monographs*, 4 (2).
- Entman, R. (1993). Framing U.S. Coverage of International News: Contrast in narratives of the Korean and Iranian Airline incidents. *Journal of Communication*, 51(4), pp. 6-27.
- Entman, R. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), pp. 51-58.
- Epstein, E J. (1973). *News from Nowhere: Television and the News*. New York: Random House.
- Fan, D.P. (1988). *Predictions of Public Opinion from the Mass Media*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Fishman, M. (1980). *Manufacturing the News*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Fiske, S.T. & Taylor, S.E. (1991). *Social Cognition*, McGraw Hill Inc.
- Fredin, E. S. (2001) Frame Breaking and Creativity: A Frame Database for Hypermedia News. In *Framing Public Life: Perspectives On The Media and Our Understanding of the Social World*. Eds. Stephen D. Reese, Oscar H. Gandy Jr. and August E. Grant. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Mahwah, New Jersey.
- Gamson, W. A. & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media Discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(1), pp. 1-37.
- Gamson, W. A. & Wolfsfeld, G. (1993). *Movements and Media as Interacting Systems*. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, p114(12)
- Gamson, W. A. & Meyer, D.S.. (1996). "Framing Political Opportunity." In Comparative Perspectives On Social Movements. Eds Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald. Cambridge University Press.
- Gans, H. (1970) *Deciding What's News*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gerbner, G. 1969. "Toward 'Cultural Indicators': The Analysis of Mass Mediated Message Systems." In G. Gerbner, O.R. Holsti, K. Krippendorff, W.J. Paisley, & P.J. Stone (eds.), *The Analysis of Communication Content: Developments in Scientific Theories and Computer Techniques*. New York: John Wiley, 1969, pp. 123-132.

- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M. and Signorielli, N. *Growing Up with Television: The Cultivation Perspective*. In J. Bryant and D. Zillman (eds.), *Media effects*, p. 17-41. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gerhards, J. & Dieter R. (1992). Mesomobilization: Organizing and Framing in two Protest Campaigns in West Germany. *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (3): 555-95.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Goldenberg, E. (1975). *Making the Papers*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Gordon, M. E. & Turner, L. (2000). *Making Transnational Collaboration Work*. In Transnational Cooperation Among Labor Unions Ithaca, NY. Cornell University Press)
- Graber, D.A. 1984. *Processing the News: How People Tame the Information Tide*, Longman.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers
- Habermas, J. (1991). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a category of Bourgeois Society*. Trans. Thomas Burger with Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hall, S. (1980): 'Encoding/decoding'. In Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (Ed.): *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79* London: Hutchinson, pp. 128-38
- Hallin, D. (1986). *The Uncensored War: The Media and Vietnam*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Herman, E.S. & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. Pantheon Books, New York.
- Herman, E. S. (1998), *The Propaganda Model Revisited*. Capitalism and the Information Age, Monthly Review Press, New York.
- Herman, E S. & McChesney, R.W.. (1997). *The Global Media. The New Missionaries of Corporate Capitalism*. Cassell, London and Washington.
- Hill, K. A. & Hughes, J.E. (1998). *Cyberpolitics*. Rowman & Littlefield.

- Hinojosa, M., Flock, J. & Cabell, B. (2003). Americans Demonstrate For, Against War, <http://www.cnn.com/2003/US/03/22/sprj.irq.protests/>
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D.H. (1991). *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues* (American Politics and Political Economy Series) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jamieson, K., Hall, Campbell & Kohrs, C. (1997). *The Interplay of Influence: News, Advertising, Politics and the Mass Media*. London: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Keck, M.E. & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Transnational Advocacy Networks in the Movement Society*. In *The Social Movement Society*. Eds. David S. Meyer and Sidney Tarrow. Rowman&Littlefield.
- Kellner,D. (1998). *Intellectuals, the New Public Sphere and Technopolitics*. In *The Politics of Cyberspace: A New Political Science Reader*. Eds Chris Toulouse and Timothy W. Luke. New York:Routledge.
- Krippendorf , K. (1980). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. Sage.
- Lichbach, M. I. (1998). *Where Have All the Foils Gone? Competing Theories of Contentious Politics and the Civil Rights Movement*. In eds.Ann N. Costain and Andrew McFarland. Social Movements and American Political Institutions. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Lindof, T.R.(1995) *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*, London:Sage.
- Lofland, J. and Lofland L.H. 1995. *Analyzing Social Settings:A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*, Wadsworth:California.
- Martin, B. (1994). Protest in a Liberal Democracy. *Philosophy and Social Action*, Vol. 20 (1-2) 13-24
- Mandler, J.M. *Stories, Scripts, and Scenes: Aspects of Schema Theory*. Hillsdale, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum
- McChesney, R.W. (1997). *Corporate Media and the Threat to Democracy*. New York, Seven Stories Press: Distributed to the trade by Publishers Group West.
- McChesney, R. W.; Wood, Meiksins, E. & Foster, J.B. (1998) *Capitalism and the Information Age: the Political Economy and the Global Communication Revolution*. Monthly Review Press, New York.
- McFarland, A.(1984). *Common Cause*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1984.

- McLeod, D. M. and Hertog, J. K.(1998) "Social control, social change and the mass media's role in the regulation of protest groups." Demers, D. and Viswanath, K., eds. *Mass media, social control, and social change: a macrosocial perspective*. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1998, pp. 305-330.
- Mermin, J. (1997). "*Television News and American Intervention in Somalia: The Myth of a Media-Driven Foreign Policy*." *Political Science Quarterly* 112:3,385-403.
- Middleberg, D. and Ross, S. *The Media in Cyberspace IV: a national survey*. 1998. <http://www.mediasource.com/study/Ch01.HTM>.
- Meyer D.S. & Tarrow, S. (1998). *A Movement Society: Contentious Politics for a New Century*. In *Social Movement Society*, eds David S. Meyer and Sidney Tarrow. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Molotch, H. & Lester, M. (1974) News as Purposive Behavior: On the Strategic Use of Routine Events, Accidents, and Scandals," *American Sociological Reviews*, 39: 101-12.
- Neuman, J. (2003). *History Works Against Protests Over Iraq War. No Peace Movement has Prevented a War, says WSU Historian*. Los Angeles Times,
- Nichols, J. & McChesney, R.W. (2002). *Our Media, Not Theirs: The Democratic Struggle Against Corporate Media*, New York: Seven Stories.
- Nicholas, David., Williams, P et al, (2000). *The Impact of the Internet on Information Seeking in the Media*, *Aslib Proceedings*, 52 (3), 98-114.
- Nimmo, D.(1978). *Political Communication and Public Opinion in America*. Goodyear: Santa Monica, CA.
- Pan, Z. & Kosicki, G.M., (1991) Framing Analysis: An Approach to News Discourse, *Political Communication*, 10, 55-75.
- Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Piven, F. F. & Cloward, R.A.. (1979) *Poor People's Movements: Why they succeed, how they fail*. New York: Vintage.
- Putnam, R.D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Reese, S. D. (2001) , Prologue—Framing Public Life: A Bridging Model for Media Research, in Stephen D. Reese, Oscar H. Gandy, Jr., August E. Grant, (eds.) *Framing Public Life*:

Perspective on Media and Our Understanding of the Social World, NJ, London:
Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Resnik, D. (1998). Politics on the Internet: The Normalization of Cyberspace. in *The Politics of Cyberspace: A New Political Science Reader*. Eds Chris Toulouse and Timothy W. Luke. New York: Routledge.
- Riffe, D., Lacy, S. & Fico, F. (1998). *Analyzing Media Messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Riffe, D., & Shaw, E. (1982). Conflict and consonance: Coverage of the third world in two U.S. papers. *Journalism Quarterly*, 59, 617-626.
- Rojecki, A. (2002). Modernism, State Sovereignty and Dissent: Media and the New Post-Cold War Movements. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, June 2002, Vol 19, No. 2, pp 152-171.
- Ryan, C., Carragee, K.M. and Meinhofer, W., (2001). Theory Into Practice: Framing, the News Media, and Collective Action. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 45, 175-182.
- Schiller H. (1989)- *Culture, Inc: The Corporate Takeover of Public Expression*. Oxford University Press.
- Scholzman K. L. & Tierney, J.T. (1986) *Organized Interests and American Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Schudson, M. (1978). *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schulz, M..S. (2000). *Collective Action Across Borders: Opportunity Structures, Network Capacities, and Communicative Praxis in the Age of Advanced Globalization*. Sociological Perspectives. Vol 41, No. 3, pp 587-616
- Schultz, T. (2000) *Mass Media and the Concept of Interactivity: an exploratory study of online forums and reader email*. Media, Culture & Society, Sage Publications (London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi), 22, 205-221.
- Sigal, L.V. (1973). *Reporters and Officials*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Sigelman, L. (1973). "Reporting the News: An organizational analysis." *American Journal of Sociology*, 79, pp. 132-51.
- Singleton, R.A. Jr., & Straits, B.T. (1999). *Approaches to Social Research*, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Small, M. (1994). *Covering Dissent: The Media and the Anti Vietnam War Movement*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Smith, J. (2001). *Globalizing Resistance; the Battle of Seattle and the Future of Social Movements*. *Mobilization*. 6(1) p1-20
- Smith, P. & Smythe, E. (1999). *Globalization, citizenship and technology: The MAI meets the Internet*. *Canadian Foreign Policy*. V.7.N.2 pp 83-105
- Staples, S. (2003). *How Globalization Promotes War*. The Polaris Institute. www.unitedforpeace.org.
- Sunstein, C. (2002). *Republic.Com*. Princeton University Press.
- Sunstein, C. (2003) *Why Societies Need Dissent*. Harvard University Press.
- Tankard, J., Hendrickson, L., Silberman, J., Bliss, K., and Ghanem, S. (1991) *Media frames: Approaches to conceptualization and measurement*. Paper presented to the AEJMC, Boston.
- Tarrow, S. (1994). *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarrow, S. (1996). Social Movements in Contentious Politics. *American Political Science Review*. V. 90 (4) pp. 874-883.
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: Free Press.
- Warkentin, C. & Mingst, K. (2000). International Institutions, the State, and Global Civil Society in the Age of the World Wide Web. *Global Governance*. 6 (2) pp. 237-258.
- Watkins, C. S. (2001). Framing Protest: News Media Frames of the Million Man March. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*. Vol. 18, No. 1, March 2001, pp.83-101.
- Weaver D.H. & Wilhoit, G.C. (1996). *The American Journalist in the 1990s: U.S. News People at the End of an Era*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey.
- Yu, Y. C. & Riffe, D. (1989). Chiang and Mao in U.S. news magazines. *Journalism Quarterly*, 66, 913-919.
- Zaller, J. (1992). *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zelwietro, J. (1998). *The Politicization of Environmental Organizations through the Internet*. *The Information Society*, 14:45-56.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO JOURNALISTS WHO COVERED THE ANTI-GLOBALIZATION PROTESTS

Dear -----,

I am Sonora Jha Nambiar, a journalist from India and Singapore. I am currently doing a Ph.D. in Mass Media and Politics at the Manship School of Mass Communication, Louisiana State University.

I am working on an academic paper and dissertation on an exciting new area of Mass Media research: journalists' use of the Internet as a journalistic tool. As part of my research, I am doing a case-study on how the Internet was used by the anti-globalization protestors in Seattle, Washington D.C. and Quebec City and on journalists' perception of how this played out in terms of the numbers and the "organization" of the demonstration. Also, did this change the way journalists access information on such protests or social movements? Or did all this have no impact on the relationship between the media and activists?

As one of the prominent correspondents covering/organizing coverage of these protests, your comments would be invaluable to this area of research. I would really appreciate it if you would grant me an interview at any time convenient to you. Ideally, the telephone interview will last around 45 minutes to one hour. The format is that of a free-flowing, in-depth interview with little or no "rote" - style questions. You are assured of confidentiality and will be free to ask me questions/seek clarifications

during the interview.

Do e-mail/call me on the contacts below. I look forward to hearing from you and to including your viewpoints in my research.

Regards,

Sonora Jha Nambiar,

Doctoral Student,

Manship School of Mass Communication,

Louisiana State University

Baton Rouge, LA 70809.

Tel: 225-9243148 (H); 225-252-6779 (W)

E-mail: snambil@lsu.edu; sonorajha@hotmail.com.

APPENDIX B

CODE GUIDE FOR QUALITATIVE IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS WITH 14 JOURNALISTS WHO COVERED THE ANTI-GLOBALIZATION PROTESTS IN SEATTLE, WASH., WASHINGTON, D.C., AND QUEBEC CITY, CANADA

1. What do you use the Internet for?
2. What are the ways in which it changes your work patterns?
3. What are the ways in which it changes your coverage?
4. Have you been drawn into an occasional or regular online interface with those who try to network with you?
5. Who are the players on the Web that you believe best satisfy your needs?
6. Do you believe that using the Internet improves your work?
7. Do you believe that journalists need to be educated and trained differently now that they have the Internet?
8. Have you started quoting Web sites in your stories?
9. Do you use the “Contacts” section of a Web site to get a name and telephone/fax-number/e-mail of a contact?
10. How did you first become aware of the availability of an interface with anti-WTO protesters online?
11. Is there a stigma attached to it (Internet use)? Are journalists who use the Internet considered “lazy”?
12. Describe in some detail what you recall of the anti-globalization protests you covered.
13. What was your initial reaction to the scale and form of the protests?

14. Had you covered social movement/cause-related protests before? Name/describe these.
15. In the days preceding the anti-WTO protests, had you or your organization received e-mails/ online press releases with the activists' viewpoint and their protest plans?
16. In the days during the protests, who were your chief sources?
17. Did your own work involve reporting or commentary or both?
18. Did you do/suggest doing a story on any offbeat aspect of the protests? If so, what was this?
19. Were there any regular despatches/ briefings coming in from the activists' end?
20. Did you know whom to contact for the activists' viewpoint?
21. When and how did you become aware of the availability of an online source of information/website?
22. Did you log on to any of these Web sites? If No, why not? If yes, what information did you look for on these Web sites?
23. Approximately how long would you say you spent browsing these Web sites or the links available on them?
24. Did you find any of these Web sites useful? Why/why not?
25. Did you quote any of the contents on the Web site?
26. Did you provide any links to the Web sites in your online stories or name these links in your print/broadcast stories?
27. Did you contact any person listed on the Web site?
28. Did you become aware of an independent media coverage of the protests?

29. How did you become aware of this?
30. What did you think of this?
31. Was there any interaction between you and the independent media practitioners?
32. Did you see their coverage at all?
33. After the protests, have you done any story connected to the globalization/anti-globalization issue?
34. Who have been your sources for these?
35. Do you now receive any information from the anti-globalization activists?
36. What is generally the content of these?
37. Do you receive these online/by mail?
38. Do you visit any of the anti-globalization Web-sites after the protests?

If you do visit the sites...

39. What is your perception of these sites now?
40. What is most useful to you about these sites?
41. Is this your main source of information about anti-globalization issues/events?
42. If not, what is?

If you do not visit the sites...

41. Why not?
42. Under what circumstances would you visit the Web sites?
43. What kind of information would you look for there?
44. Do you encourage receiving press releases/ press-kits online?
45. Do you feel used, by the staging of such events?

46. What do you think is the attitude of most Americans to social protest? (This question was developed after several interviewees themselves offered their views on their subject, indicating that this was an important element in journalists' decision-making for their coverage).
47. Did you get feedback to stories?
48. If there were something you could change about your coverage or add to it, what would it be?
49. Why couldn't you do it back then?
50. What was the general attitude of your organization's decision-makers toward the WTO?
51. What was your attitude?
52. What was the general attitude toward the protesters and the protests?
53. What was your attitude?
54. What is your general ideology?
55. Did your organization's attitude undergo any change?
56. Did your own attitude undergo any change?

Fact Sheet:

1. Interviewee's Name (or code number)
2. The number of the interview (if number rather than name)
3. Date
4. Place
5. Sex

6. Age
7. Education
8. Ethnicity
9. Place of residence
10. Place of birth
11. Occupation or other position at the time of protests
12. occupation and position now
13. Organization then and now

Memos:

Jottings to self after the interview:

APPENDIX C

CODEBOOK FOR NEWSPAPER AND MAGAZINE COVERAGE OF ANTI-WTO AND ANTI-VIETNAM WAR PROTESTS

Coder Name:

Publication Name:

Publication Date (dd/mm/yyyy) :

<u>Category</u>	<u>Non- Internet</u>	<u>Internet</u>	<u>Non- Internet</u>	<u>Internet</u>	<u>Non- Internet</u>	<u>Internet</u>
News						
Editorial						
Official (Govt. & Trade) Sources						
Authoritative (Govt. & Trade) Sources						
Official (Protester) Sources						
Authoritative (Protester) Sources						
Unknown Protester						
Episodic Frame						
Thematic Frame						
Mixed Frame						
Valence is Supportive of Protesters						
Valence is Supportive of Target						
Valence is Neutral						

Comments:

APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CODERS

Type of Story

- News – “Breaking news” or a follow-up of an event...this is generally quite easy to identify.
- Editorial – This is a commentary on the editorial pages or op-ed pages of a newspaper, or any page of a magazine. In addition, there are columns by columnist presenting their personal viewpoint.

The Following Are The Categories of “Sources” Cited in a Story

Official (Govt. & Trade) Sources

- WTO officials/ spokespersons – Any person who has been quoted as an official or official representative of the World Trade Organization.
- U.S. President – At the time of the Seattle protests, it was Bill Clinton. At the time of the anti-Vietnam war protests, it was Lyndon Johnson.
- U.S. Administration – These are national-level politicians or office-holders in the Clinton or Johnson administration . The story will give their designation, from which you can make out whether they are in this category.
- City (Seattle and Washington, DC) officials (eg. mayor, city council members) – These are people like the mayor, deputy mayor, councilmen and councilwomen. DON’T put the Sheriff here – the sheriff and his/ her officials will be in the next category.
- City (Seattle and Washington, DC) administration (police and fire officials) – This category is for all police officers, squads, fire fighters, fire dept. chief, etc. and for those Pentagon officials who were policing the anti-war protests at the Pentagon. Note : In the case of the anti-Vietnam war protests, South Vietnamese government officials, as well as governments of other countries, come under this category.

Authoritative (Govt. & Trade) Sources

- U.S. Corporations – This is in the case of the anti-WTO protests only – companies like Nike, Boeing, and Starbucks were targets for some protesters.

- U.S. Trade representatives – For anti-WTO protests only --Officials or spokespersons of trade associations like Economic Development Board.
- Journalists/officials of trade/ defense media -- eg., editor of the WTO newsletter in the case of the anti-WTO protests; defense media, in the case of the anti-Vietnam war protests.
- Former WTO/ IMF spokespersons/ Former defense officials – these are people whom journalists approach because they are knowledgeable about certain subjects; they are the “expert commentators.”
- Visiting WTO delegates – there were delegates from across the world; some of them were caught in the street violence and chaos. If their views are mentioned or quoted, code this category.
- Academics and journalists – these are university deans, professors, researchers, and journalists who have a point of view that is pro-trade (for anti-WTO protests) or pro-war (in the case of the anti-Vietnam war protests).
- Other supporters/ commentators speaking in official capacity – These are people like lawyers and other public officials, who do not belong to any of the above categories, who comment on the pro-WTO or pro-war side. Owners and officials of damaged public property will be coded under this category. In the case of the anti-WTO protests, it would be downtown Seattle merchants, officials of shops that were targeted; in the case of the anti-Vietnam war protests, this would be Pentagon security officials speaking exclusively on the damage (i.e., not on the war). Additionally, in the case of the anti-Vietnam war protests, you will code under this category defense spokespersons speaking from the field (the war zone), eg. General Westmoreland.

Official (Protester) sources

- Protest organization officials – In the case of the anti-WTO protests, there were a number of organizations like The Ruckus Society, A-16, Direct Action Network, etc. who participated in these protests and spoke about the cause after the protests. In the case of the anti-Vietnam war protests, there were groups like the Students for a Democratic Society.
- “Celebrity”/well known protesters – These are the well-known people. In case you don’t recognize a name but think that from the way they have been described in the story, they sound like they might be someone well known, do an Internet search. In the case of the anti-WTO protests, these would be people like Ralph Nader, and French radical farmer Hose Bove. In the case of the anti-war protests, it was people like Benjamin Spock, Norman Mailer, Joan Baez, David Delinger.

- Officials of alternative/independent media – During the anti-WTO protests, there were a number of independent filmmakers and reporters, and also a group called the Independent Media Center.
- Academics (analysts) and journalists – In this case, the journalists would be of the well-known media, and networks (even King TV in Seattle, and other commercial broadcast stations). Academics would be protesters as well as those who speak in favor of the protesters and their cause.
- Other supporters/ commentators speaking in official category – eg. lawyers who have been hired to represent the protesters who were arrested. Additionally, in the case of the anti-Vietnam war protests, there were elected government officials, eg. Michigan governor Ronald Reagan, who were speaking out against President Lyndon Johnson’s war policies. Such sources will be put into this category. Also, officials of the North Vietnamese government, and the National Liberation Front (NLF) in North Vietnam, will be coded here.

Authoritative (Protester) Sources

- Protesters attributed with otherwise “quote-worthy” status – Sometimes, journalists look out for protesters who seem articulate...in the story, they will briefly mention why they are quoting this person – eg., “the articulate Kim Coleman” or “the mesmerizing” or the “strident.” Check with me about this category if you aren’t sure.
- Protesters in costumes – research has shown that journalists tend to quote or cite examples of people in masks and costumes (there were a lot of such protesters in the anti-WTO protests).
- Protests banners, handouts – This is one source that journalists use a fair deal. They cite slogans and statements directly from material distributed during the protests. In the case of the Internet, they might get a slogan off a website.
- Academics as protest participants – A number of professors and university officials went to these protests, and, in the case of the anti-WTO protests, they came from all over the world. This category is to be coded if they were physically involved in the protests, as opposed to the similar category of academics as analysts, which is in the “Official (Protester) Sources” category.
- Violent protesters – If the journalist cites the fact that this person was committing an act of violence, or was arrested for violence.

Unknown protesters:

This is the rank, unknown protester, who is identified probably only by his/her name, is not stated to be an official/affiliated with a protest organization; not being approached for being articulate or unusual, and not described as committing a violent act.

Frames of the Story

This refers to the general tone or context in which the story has been written.

- Thematic – This means, the story discusses the themes behind the protest – that is, whether trade is good or bad, why it is being opposed, what issues are being raised, etc. If you think that the tone of the story is largely thematic, code this,
- Episodic – This is when the story covers just actual events and episodes, without discussing the issues and larger debates and contexts.
- Mixed – If you think the story is 50-50 of both the above, code this category.
- Valence supportive of protesters/targets/ neutral – The “Valence” is again the tone of the story. You will decide on the basis of whether a majority of the story seems to favor one or the other group, or whether the journalist seems neutral.

APPENDIX E

ANOVA TESTS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ANTI-WTO PROTEST COVERAGE AND ANTI-VIETNAM WAR PROTEST COVERAGE

Source of Variance	Mean WTO (SD)	Mean Vietnam (SD)	Df	Mean Square	F value	Eta Squared
Official (Govt. & Trade) Sources	.7109 (.7023)	.5106 (.4259)	1, 356	3.57	10.85***	.03
Authoritative (Govt. & Trade) Sources	.4441 (.3720)	.2626 (.1945)	1, 191	1.19	20.69***	.08
Official (Protester) Sources	.4593 (.4260)	.5471 (.4691)	1, 056	0.56	2.77	.009
Authoritative (Protester) Sources	.6549 (.5349)	.8173 (.9606)	1, 135	1.35	2.23	.011
Unknown Protesters	1.9821 (1.5432)	1.7619 (.9952)	1, 074	0.74	0.36	.005

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

APPENDIX F

COMPARISONS OF FREQUENCIES OF PROTEST COVERAGE AND FRAMES

Protest Coverage	Frame of the Story		
	Thematic	Episodic	Mixed
Vietnam Coverage	56	138	38
WTO Coverage	63	103	46

Chi square = 5.37

df = 2

p = .068

APPENDIX G

COMPARISONS OF FREQUENCIES OF PROTEST COVERAGE AND VALENCE

Protest Coverage	Valence of the Story		
	Protesters	Govt./Trade	Neutral
Vietnam Coverage	65	58	109
WTO Coverage	42	57	103
Chi square = 4.13 df = 2 p = .127			

VITA

Sonora Jha Nambiar is an assistant professor of journalism at Seattle University. She was a reporter for India's largest English-language daily, The Times of India. She went on to head a bureau for that newspaper, making her the youngest journalist in the country's English language press to be assigned such a job. She was also the first woman chief reporter in the city of Bangalore, India. She herself worked on a range of beats including crime, public affairs, politics, health and social justice issues.

For two years between these assignments, Sonora worked as Communications Manager for Actionaid India, a development funding agency, through which she traveled across rural India, writing for the national press on issues of rural poverty. She later worked as a freelance journalist in Singapore.

She graduated with a bachelor of commerce degree in business management in 1988 from Bombay University's Narsee Monjee College of Commerce and Economics. She earned a post-graduate diploma in Social Communications Media at Sophia Polytechnic in Mumbai, India. In May 2004 she will be the second recipient of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in media and politics from The Manship School of Mass Communication at Louisiana State University.