1994

A study of the news coverage of the international whaling ban in the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times

Gunnar E. Kvaran
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Kvaran, Gunnar E., "A study of the news coverage of the international whaling ban in the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times" (1994). *Master's Theses*. 767.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.f67x-cnb8>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/767

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 1358191

**A study of the news coverage of the international whaling ban
in "The New York Times" and the "Los Angeles Times"**

Kvaran, Gunnar E., M.S.

San Jose State University, 1994

U·M·I

300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**A Study of the News Coverage of the International Whaling
Ban in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times.**

A Thesis

Presented to

**The Faculty of the School of
Journalism and Mass Communications
San Jose State University**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science**

by

Gunnar E. Kvaran

May, 1994

© 1994

Gunnar E. Kvaran

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM
AND MASS COMMUNICATIONS

Dr. Diana Stover

Dr. Dennis L. Wilcox

Dr. Stanley Baran

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE NEWS COVERAGE OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING BAN IN THE NEW YORK TIMES AND THE LOS ANGELES TIMES.

by Gunnar E. Kvaran

This research was conducted to determine how two U.S. newspapers, The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times, covered the dispute concerning the international whaling ban that was imposed by the International Whaling Committee in 1986.

Two time periods were included in the study, 1981-1985 and 1986-1993. The purpose was to determine whether new information about the condition of the whaling stocks in the North Atlantic affected the perception and presentation in the two newspapers.

All articles and editorials that the newspapers carried about the whaling dispute during the research periods were studied and coded for tone, use of sources, background vs. event orientation, placement, and size.

The study revealed that the two newspapers provided balanced news coverage although they tended to rely more on sources unfavorable to whaling, such as Greenpeace and other environmentalist organizations, than on sources from whaling nations such as Japan, Norway, and Iceland. There was not a significant change in tone of the coverage between the two research periods as new information about the condition of the whaling stocks emerged.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to offer my sincerest thanks to Dr. Diana Stover for her guidance and support during my work on this thesis. Other members of my committee are acknowledged for their ongoing review and recommendations: Dr. Dennis L. Wilcox, and Dr. Stanley Baran. Finally, thanks go to Dr. William Tillinghast for his statistical advice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	6
Research Questions.....	7
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
Environmental Issues Gain Media Attention.....	9
Agenda-Setting and the Media.....	10
Issue Thresholds.....	12
Issue-Attention Cycle.....	13
Newsworthiness and Protesters.....	15
Relationship between Protesters and the Press.....	16
Environmental Reporting.....	18
Criticism of Environmental Reporting.....	20
Activist Groups and Campaigns.....	21
Cause Groups vs. Sectional Groups.....	21
Single Issue Groups.....	22
Insider vs. Outsider Groups.....	22
Methods of Activist Groups.....	23
Relationship between Activist Groups.....	27
The Group's Effectiveness.....	28
Summary.....	30

CHAPTER 3: METHOD.....	32
Newspapers.....	32
Sampling.....	33
Content Analysis.....	33
Selection of Items for Coding.....	35
Unit of Analysis and Operationalization of Variables.....	35
Tone.....	36
Humanizing the Whales.....	37
Event-vs. Background/Issue-Oriented Stories.....	37
Sources as Knowns and Unknowns.....	37
Knowns.....	38
Unknowns.....	39
Placement and Size.....	40
Intercoder Reliability.....	40
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	42
The Humanization of Whales.....	42
The Selected Stories.....	46
Tone of the News Coverage.....	48
Tone of the Editorials.....	52
Event vs. Issue/Background Orientation.....	54
Sources.....	57
Access and Origin.....	57
Knowns and Unknowns.....	60

Placement and Size.....	62
Research Questions.....	62
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION.....	65
Summary.....	65
Discussion.....	66
Keeping the Issue on the Governments Agenda.....	66
The News Stories.....	68
Sources in the News.....	70
Sources as Knowns or Unknowns.....	72
U.S. Policy and Practice.....	72
Limitations of the Study.....	74
Implication of the Study.....	75
Direction for Future Research.....	76
REFERENCES.....	77
APPENDICES.....	82
A. Classification of Articles on Whales and Whaling.....	83
B. Coding Form.....	88

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Articles Published in the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times on Whales and Whaling from 1981-1985 and 1986-1993.....	44
2. Articles Within the Four Categories Related to the Whaling Dispute, Published in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times from 1981-1985 and 1986-1993.....	47
3. A Comparison of the Tone of the Whaling Dispute in News Stories in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times from 1981-1985 and 1986-1993 by Number of Stories and by Number of Paragraphs.....	50
4. A Comparison of the Tone of the Whaling Dispute in News Stories during 1981-1993 in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times by Number of Paragraphs.....	51
5. A Comparison of the Tone of the Whaling Dispute in Editorials in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times from 1981-1985 and 1986-1993 by Number of Stories.....	53
6. A Comparison of the Event vs. Issue/Background Orientation of the Whaling Dispute in News Stories in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times from 1981-1985 and 1986-1993 by Number of Stories and by Number of Paragraphs.....	55
7. News Paragraphs about the Whaling Dispute in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times as Event vs. Issue/Background Oriented between the Two Research Periods.....	56
8. Origin of News Sources and Number and Tone of Citations in News Articles about the Whaling dispute in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times from 1981-1985 (A) and 1986-1993 (B)	59
9. Sources as Knowns and Unknowns in News Stories about the Whaling dispute in the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times from 1981-1985 and 1986-1993.....	61

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The main reason the International Whaling Commission (IWC) introduced a temporary moratorium (a zero quota) on commercial whaling in 1982 was the perceived inadequacy of the scientific database on the harvesting of whale populations without exposing them to undue risk.

The IWC whaling ban, which began in 1986, was supposed to last five years. After this period, in 1990, the Commission was expected to review its decision based on a scientific assessment of the whaling stocks. For nine years, from 1982-1990, the reassessment of the whaling stocks was the main subject of the IWC Scientific Committee. Iceland and Norway, among several other nations, made a substantial contribution to whale research during this period.

Iceland regarded its scientific whaling program of 1986-1989, which included a limited catch of whales, as a genuine contribution to whale research and to the comprehensive assessment of whale stocks to which the International Whaling Commission pledged itself. The Icelandic research program was expected to be among the basis for the Commission's review on the temporary moratorium on commercial whaling.

One of the findings of the Icelandic research program was that, despite decades of exploitation, the stocks of fin whales and minke whales in the North Atlantic, particularly in the Icelandic and adjacent waters, were still at high levels. It also demonstrated the recovery of two other species of

whales--blue and humpback whales--in the North Atlantic after more than 30 years of protection from commercial exploitation.

In light of these and other findings, the Scientific Committee estimated that about 100,000 minke whales were in the three North Atlantic stock areas, stretching from West Greenland in the west, to the Barents Sea in the east. The Scientific Committee recommended a reclassification of the Central Atlantic minke whale stock appropriate for a limited harvest. The IWC rejected this recommendation when Iceland requested a limited catch quota of the minke whale based on these same findings. The General Assembly of the International Whaling Commission refused at its annual meetings in 1990 and 1991 even to discuss the Icelandic proposal. A majority of the International Whaling Commission determined that it was necessary to develop a new Revised Management Procedure to govern the future harvest of the whaling stocks before any new catch quotas could be issued. The whaling nations' representatives considered this move as a tactic for the IWC to prevent any whaling at all and, in protest, Iceland withdrew its membership from the International Whaling Commission.

The Icelandic government stated that the IWC had replaced a policy of rational management of whales as renewable resources by a demand for complete protection of whale stocks. This policy lacked a legitimate basis in scientific evidence or conservation principles, according to the Icelandic government.

In 1992 the Norwegian government, as a result of pressure from minke whale hunters, allowed a limited catch of minke whales. As expected,

this provoked Greenpeace and other environmental organizations into action. A Greenpeace vessel loaded with activists and news reporters tried to disturb the Norwegian minke whale hunting in 1992 but without much success.

In 1992, the IWC's Scientific Committee finally managed to design a Revised Management Procedure that was acceptable to the majority of the IWC. However, in 1993, facing a proposal to allow a limited catch of minke whales based on the revised procedure, the IWC General Assembly still refused to allow any whaling. An official representative for the U.S. delegation stated that a decision to allow the future catch of whales was not only a scientific issue but also a decision that should consider other matters as well. This resulted in the resignation of the British chairman of the Scientific Committee and appeared to confirm what the whaling nations had feared-- that the whaling issue no longer was a question of whether the whaling stocks could sustain some harvesting. It was an emotional issue, not merely a scientific one.

In mid-1994 Norway was still facing possible sanctions because of the government's decision to resume minke whaling. Under the Pelly Amendment, the U.S. Commerce Department is required to notify the President when a foreign country conducts fishing operations in a way that reduces the effectiveness of international fishery conservation programs.

After receiving certification from the Secretary of Commerce regarding alleged violations, the President has 60 days to respond and decide whether to enforce sanctions on the country.

The Commerce Department paved the way for trade sanctions on

Norwegian goods when it certified in August 1993 that the Norwegian minke whaling program was a violation of the IWC whaling moratorium. President Clinton had until October 4, 1993 to decide whether to impose sanctions on Norway. On that day, the president announced that he had decided to delay imposing sanctions against Norway although he considered the Norwegian minke whaling a violation of the international ban on whaling, a violation that warranted sanctions under American law.

The Norwegian government argued that Norway is exempted from the IWC moratorium since it made an objection to the whaling ban in the early 1980s. When the IWC voted for the temporary ban on whaling in 1982, member nations could lodge an objection to the ban and thus, according to IWC law, would not be bound by the decision. Norway officially objected to the ban, but Iceland did not.

In 1982, when the IWC voted for a temporary ban on commercial whaling, it was considered a victory for the environmentalist movement, which for many years had campaigned for a ban on all whaling. For whaling nations like Iceland and Norway that contended that their whaling activities were not a threat to the whaling stocks they were harvesting, this was a difficult and controversial decision.

The decision involved the rights of coastal states to utilize the living resources of the sea in a rational manner and to defend the interest of an established whaling industry. Public opinion polls conducted in Iceland in 1988 and 1989 at the height of the controversy concerning the Icelandic scientific whaling program indicated that 73-84% of the Icelandic population wanted to

continue the whaling program, but only 16-27% wanted to stop further whaling (Ívarsson, 1990).

For more than two decades the environmental organization, Greenpeace, has been the driving force behind the successful campaign to stop all whaling. Through sophisticated public relations campaigns, the organization and other environmental organizations have managed to shape public opinion toward whaling in the United States and in Europe. Whales and whaling have become a symbol of man's failure to take the necessary measures to conserve the environment, to stop the overharvesting of natural resources, and to avoid the release of harmful wastes into the environment.

Because of these environmental concerns, it has been difficult for whaling nations such as Iceland and Norway to get their message through-- that the limited whaling these nations were doing in their own waters did not threaten the species they were harvesting. The success of the anti-whaling arguments is evident in Norway's difficulties when resuming limited minke whaling in 1992 despite scientific data showing the stock in a healthy condition. Environmental organizations such as Greenpeace started campaigning against Norway and a threat of U.S. sanctions against Norwegian products was invoked.

Iceland's leading whale expert, Sigurjónsson, noted:

The pledge to stop whaling in Iceland for the unforeseeable future means, in reality, that one of the few nations that happened to utilize this resource successfully will be punished by those who did not. It

would be equivalent to banning the hunting of caribou in the Canadian Arctic because stocks elsewhere had become endangered. (1989, p. 32)

The Icelandic Ministry of Fisheries has argued that nations within the IWC that oppose whaling include many of the world's largest industrialized nations, which bear much of the responsibility for the serious state of the global environment today. These nations' intense concern about harvesting the ocean--but not about polluting it--has, according to the Icelandic Ministry of Fisheries, prompted questions as to whether they are using their opposition to whaling as a kind of green alibi designed to show that they are actually concerned with environmental issues despite their poor records in other respects.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine how two U.S. newspapers, one on the East Coast (The New York Times) and the other on the West Coast (Los Angeles Times) covered the whaling dispute, during two periods: 1981-1985 and 1986-1993. The research periods include one year before the decision on the moratorium was initiated and continues through the year 1993 when the Norwegians had resumed minke whaling.

Furthermore, the researcher wanted to investigate whether information about the scientific assessment of the whaling stocks, undertaken by the IWC Scientific Committee during 1982-1990, changed the two newspapers' perceptions and presentation of the whaling dispute. In other words, did the

scientific results indicating that the stocks of minke whales and fin whales in the North Atlantic could sustain a limited harvest result in more favorable coverage when the Norwegian government decided to resume minke whaling in 1992?

Research Questions

The questions to be answered in this study are:

1. Did the two U.S. newspapers provide balanced news coverage of the whaling dispute during the two research periods--1981-1985 and 1986-1993?
2. Was there a difference between these two newspapers in the news coverage of the whaling dispute during these two periods, as well as in editorial opinions expressed toward the dispute?
3. Was there a difference in the tone of the news coverage between the two research periods--1981-1985 and 1986-1993--as new information about the condition of the whaling stocks in the North Atlantic emerged?
4. Did the tone of the editorials in the two newspapers toward the whaling dispute change between the two research periods as new information about the conditions of the whaling stocks emerged?
5. Did the news coverage of the whaling dispute focus on the issues and the underlying content of the newsworthy situation or was it more event oriented. Did this pattern change between the two research periods?
6. Did sources unfavorable to whaling have better access to the two newspapers than did sources that supported whaling? Was there a

change in this pattern between the two research periods?

7. Did the two newspapers mostly cite familiar or well known sources that represent well known positions (Knowns), or did they rely on ordinary people (Unknowns) as news sources?

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

As there was limited literature available on how the U.S. media have covered the whaling dispute, this literature review focuses mainly on the issues of environmental reporting, interest groups, and the agenda setting process.

Environmental Issues Gain Media Attention

As the public has become more aware of the serious threats of industrialization to the environment, various citizen groups have been established to impose pressure on governments and force them to take action to preserve the environment. Animal lobbyists, whether they fought against animal cruelty or to preserve endangered species, gained much attention in the 1970s and the 1980s. To force governments or other management institutions to respond to their demands, these groups first had to gain the attention of the mass media to build up public support for their cause.

According to Walker (1988), it was not until Earth Day in 1970 that the media began to put an emphasis on stories related to environmental issues, since the environment appeared to lack the status as a significant news story. This changed after the media's attention on Earth Day in 1970 which was an event organized specifically to capture the media's attention. Broadcast networks and wire services began a more vigilant watch, and many daily newspapers appointed one or more environmental news specialists (Rubin & Sachs, 1973).

According to Walker (1988), three years after that Earth Day, more than 5,000 environmental organizations were active in the United States. Older conservation groups originally dedicated to wildlife preservation had also expanded their scope to include emerging environmental concerns.

A major environmental organization that has roots in the early 1970s is Greenpeace, which started in 1971 as a local action group in Vancouver, Canada (Walker, 1992). Saving the whales soon became a central issue in Greenpeace's work, and the whale became a symbol for the conservation of the environment.

It is extremely difficult to determine a cause and effect relationship. Was the public's demand for more news on environmental issues the result of previous news stories? Did the public think the environment was an important issue because the media said it was important, or was the media just following the public? Since McCombs and Shaw came up with the agenda-setting theory, this function of the media has been studied by many social scientists.

Agenda-Setting and the Media

McCombs and Shaw (1977) catalogued the effects of exposure to communication as generally going from awareness-to-information-to-attitudes-to-behavior. They noted that in the late 1970s scholars interested in mass communication began to concentrate on the earlier points in the communication process--awareness and information.

The mass media's ability to affect cognitive change among individuals,

to structure their thinking, was labelled by McCombs and Shaw as the agenda-setting function of mass communication. McCombs and Shaw noted that this was one of the most important effects of mass communication: “The mass media may not be successful in telling us what to think, but they are stunningly successful in telling us what to think about” (p. 5).

Researchers such as Greene (1988) noted that McCombs and Shaw’s seminal work on agenda-setting helped shift the emphasis away from the earlier “minimal effects theory” to one that posited a stronger role for media in shaping the public’s point of view.

McCombs and Shaw (1977) stated that agenda-setting not only asserted a positive relationship between what various communication media emphasize and what voters come to regard as important, but that it also considers this influence as an inevitable byproduct of the normal flow of news. They suggested that, not only could the press influence the nature of the political arena in which a campaign is conducted, but occasionally could also define an agenda which accrues to the benefit of one party. Atkin (1981) argued that campaigns primarily aim at creating awareness, to increase knowledge, change beliefs, raise salience, or affect attitudes or behaviors.

Shaw and Martin (1992) noted that the media spotlight public events and issues long enough for collective identification and social discourse:

That is one major function of mass media agenda-setting--presenting and reflecting a slowly evolving array of public issues, so that societies, like glaciers, can inch along. If we can agree on the issues, can we compromise on solutions? (p. 920)

The Greenpeace campaign to save the whales in the early 1970s is an example of how an environmental organization was able to contribute to the agenda-setting by drawing media attention to this issue. Later, in 1985 and 1988, Greenpeace and other environmental organizations also used litigation to set the agenda by suing the U.S government for not putting restrictions on nations that kept on whaling. These lawsuits received much media attention.

Cook et al. (1983) used an experimental design built around a single media event to explore the impact of the media on the public, policy makers, interest group leaders, and public policy. The results suggested that the media influenced views about issue importance among the public and government policy makers, but did not affect interest group elites. The interest group elite was already knowledgeable and committed to the issue. Therefore, media exposure did not make much difference to this group.

Issue Thresholds

Lang and Lang (1981) have questioned the direct relationship between media exposure and what the public regards as important issues. They suggested that what people think may not be as easily separated from what they think about as the various formulations of agenda-setting have implied. Furthermore, they suggested that some observed correlations between salience and media content may be nothing more than an artifact of the subject categories under which specific news items are classified. Lang and Lang also argued that three categories of issues have vastly different thresholds of sensitivity, and the nature of the influence exerted by the media

varies accordingly.

First, they noted that some issues arise out of conditions that directly affect nearly everyone in the same way--issues such as inflation, high taxes, and gasoline shortages. Therefore, these issues exhibit a strong propensity to show up as personal concerns.

Second, according to Lang and Lang, different types of issues are related to situations whose effects are selectively experienced, such as urban congestion or draft calls.

Finally, the authors suggested that there are conditions and developments whose effects are generally remote from just about everyone, such as the plight of refugees from Vietnam or wrongdoing high up in the government. The whaling issue would fall within the third category. Among the public in the United States, relatively few people have actually been close to a whale or seen one, but most have seen pictures of whales and learned that whales are endangered species.

Issue-Attention Cycle

American public attention rarely remains sharply focused upon any one issue for a very long time (Downs 1972). Instead, a systematic issue-attention cycle appears to influence public attitudes and behavior concerning most key problems. Downs argued that each of these problems suddenly leaps into prominence, remains there for a short time and then, although still largely unresolved, gradually fades from the center of public attention. Downs' issue-attention cycle has five stages, which may vary in duration

but that usually occurs in the following sequence:

1. The Pre-Problem Stage. This exists when some highly undesirable social condition exists, but has not yet captured much public attention.
2. Alarmed Discovery and Euphoric Enthusiasm. Because of some dramatic series of events, or for other reasons, the public suddenly becomes aware of and alarmed about the evils of a particular problem. Environmental issues seemed to gain this attention during Earth Day in 1970.
3. Realizing the Cost of Significant Progress. The third stage, according to Downs, consists of a gradually spreading realization that the cost of solving the problem is very high and would require major sacrifices by large groups in the population.
4. Gradual Decline of Intense Public Interest. As more and more people realize how difficult and how costly a solution to the problem would be, public interest gradually declines.
5. The Post-Problem Stage. In this final stage an issue that has been replaced at the center of public concern moves into a prolonged limbo--“a twilight realm of lesser attention or spasmodic recurrences of interest” (p. 40).

When Downs wrote his article in 1972, he suggested that the public concern about environmental problems was about midway through the issue-attention cycle. He predicted that much of the enthusiasm about prompt, dramatic improvement in the environment was fading. This may be the case. Although the environment is still a big issue in the public mind, the enthusiasm about improving the environment and the intensity that

characterized the debate in the 1970s appears to have declined.

Downs also noted that when the media realized that their emphasis on these problems was threatening to many people, and boring to even more, they would shift their focus to other issues.

Downs' conceptual framework appears to apply to the U.S. media coverage of the whaling dispute. Although environmentalist organizations managed to drum up support for the demand to impose an international ban on commercial whaling, they have not been as successful in other aspects of environmental conservation.

The environmentalists' apparent success with the whaling issue, according to Downs, can therefore be linked to the fact that the demand to stop whaling did not threaten the interests of U.S. citizens and the whaling issue had a sentimental value that prevented it from becoming tedious.

Newsworthiness and Protesters

There are many reasons why activist groups such as Greenpeace, which uses protests to gain media attention, have been successful. McDonald (1978) suggested that something is not newsworthy until it becomes an event, until something happens. As Wolfsfeld (1984) argued, protests very often combine many major criteria considered necessary for belonging to that special class of events known as news.

This point was demonstrated in Gans' (1980) study of news and newsworthiness where protesters, rioters, and strikers constituted 40% of ordinary people in the news. When looking at activities in the news, Gans found

protests, violent and nonviolent, to be the fourth most likely activities to appear in the news, following governmental news.

The environmentalists often use protests to gain media attention. According to Boorstin's (1973) definition, this would meet the criteria of what he characterizes as the pseudo-event. It is not spontaneous because someone has planned, planted, or incited it for the immediate purpose of being reported. The success of the event is measured by how widely it was reported.

Relationship between Protesters and the Press

When trying to get their message through, it is critical for demonstrators to have a good relationship with the press. Wolfsfeld (1984) suggested that a mutually dependent relationship exists between the press and the protesters.

Wolfsfeld noted that demonstrators depend upon the press to get their message across, and the press depends upon demonstrators for information: "Whereas protest leaders are primarily interested in persuasion, the press is more interested in sensation" (p. 551).

Wolfsfeld describes the basic relationship between the antagonists (e.g., protest group(s) and the political authorities) and the mass media as a competitive symbiosis in which each side is dependent on the other for needed services but each tries to obtain those services on its own terms. He described the exchange process that takes place between protest leaders and reporters in terms of three stages:

During the bidding stage, the reporters dominated the exchange as the

various groups attempted to attract media coverage by staging media events. The bartering stage was characterized by an increased bargaining power of each of the groups due to their initial successes in achieving publicity. . . . The timing and the nature of the final, closing stage depended on the particular set of events surrounding the fate of the various group demands. (p. 552)

Later in his transactional analysis of three different conflicts in Israel, Wolfsfeld developed seven media strategy rules for protest groups:

Rule Number 1: The centrality of the news media to any conflicts hinges on the extent to which either or both of the sides is dependent on the services of the media for mobilizing third parties into the conflict . . .

Rule Number 2: The lower the level of the antagonist's (social, political, and media) status, organization, and resources, the greater the level of media influence on the antagonist . . .

Rule Number 3: The higher the antagonist's level of (social, political, and media) status, organizations, resources, and/or newsworthy behavior, the greater the level of antagonist influence on the media . . .

Rule Number 4: The higher the level of the news medium's social and political status, organization and resources, and/or distributional

capacity, the greater the level of media influence on the antagonists . . .

Rule Number 5: Influence on the news media depends on the antagonists' level of relative newsworthiness at the time of the transaction . . .

Rule Number 6: The nature of the antagonist's influence on the news media depends on the antagonist's level of event and information control at the time of the transaction . . .

Rule Number 7: The nature of the media influence on the antagonists depends on the antagonists' political goals at the time of the transaction. (pp. 292-295)

Wolfsfeld's rules for strategy appears to apply to the coverage of the whaling dispute, especially in the earlier stages when the protests against whaling had not resulted in the international ban on commercial whaling. Later the protest groups relied more on lobbying.

Environmental Reporting

Reporters assigned to environmental stories face problems similar to reporters covering other science news. Environmental issues are complicated and demand extensive background knowledge on the reporter's part. Because of the complexity, it can be hard for the reporter to get sufficient and accurate

information. This leaves the writer dependent on news sources such as government officials, scientists, or environmental activists, who often are directly involved in the success of the project on which the reporter is working.

Rubin and Sachs (1973) suggested that the reliance on these sources turns the reporter into a slave to the pseudo-event: "He [the reporter] is forced to wait for scientists, government officials, academicians, and activist citizens to do the investigation for him and pass on their conclusions at a press conference" (p. 109).

In the coverage of the whaling dispute, reporters had to rely heavily on government officials and scientists within the International Whaling Commission for information about the development of the issue.

Lack of expertise and reliance on few sources are not the only constraints that affect the quality of environmental reporting. There are other constraints such as advertiser pressure; management policy; distrust of conservationist sources; dependence on hard news; and time, space, and money pressures.

Walker (1988), noted that residents who are sources and who are committed to their communities have a tendency to minimize or overlook certain environmental problems, especially if they are linked with the economic well being of their area. This tendency may have affected public opinion and the local news coverage in countries that have been trying to resume whaling.

Salomone, Greenberg, Sandman, and Sachsman (1990) emphasized that covering topics involving environmental risks require that journalists rely

on sources other than scientists for information, sources such as industry and officials, government regulators, and environmental advocates.

Glynn and Tims' (1982) study on sensationalism in science issues indicates that a major problem with science articles is not in the collection of facts for the article but in the presentation of an issue. They noted that the main conceptual point of the stories may not be presented correctly or thoroughly: "Although actual sensational coverage was not very high, peripheral issues did seem treated with undue emphasis" (p. 130). Griswold and Packer (1991) suggested in their study on AIDS reporting that the ability of the media to communicate medical-scientific information is constrained by the interaction of two different sets of publication norms and conventions developed by journalists and scientists. Among the conventions of news work they mention are simplification and popularization. Because of the need to attract a mass audience, media portrayals tend to be popularized and simplified treatments, even of very complex issues.

Rubin and Sachs (1973) noted that lack of knowledge about environmental issues within the news organizations makes the environmental reporter's position as a gatekeeper relatively strong. Rubin and Sachs suggested that an enthusiastic reporter can overcome newsroom inertia and help guarantee that certain stories are given priority by editors.

Criticism of Environmental Reporting

The media's lack of expertise in the field of environmental reporting and other limitations have often produced severe criticism. Salomone, Greenberg,

Sandman & Sachsman (1990), noted that industry and government officials, leading scientists, and representatives of environmental advocacy groups have criticized the media for exaggerating and sensationalizing some risks, omitting important information, distorting data, and, in general, leading the public to ignore important hazards and worry about minor ones.

In a 1992 article in Forbes, Sowell argued that the news media's liberal bias has resulted in a one-sided view of what is news. Sowell noted that nowhere is this more prevalent than in media discussion of environmental issues:

It is impossible to watch a nature program on television--public or commercial--without getting the Sierra Club's political vision of the world, without even a hint that there are other viewpoints, much less facts that flatly contradict various claims. (p. 99)

Activist Groups and Campaigns

Cause Groups vs. Sectional Groups

In the study of pressure or activist groups, many different distinctions have been made. Garner (1991) who studied the animal lobby in Britain, suggested the most traditional distinction is between promotional or cause groups and sectional groups. While the former seek to promote a particular idea or cause, and membership is open to all those who hold the same view, the latter exists to defend the interest of their membership that consists of a group of people with something in common. Thus membership of sectional groups is restricted and they are not only concerned with putting pressure on

public authorities, but also tend to provide various services to their members. Under this definition, Greenpeace would be a typical cause group.

Single Issue Groups

Another distinction concerns the areas with which the various groups are involved. Some groups focus on a single issue while others have wider interests.

Oberstar (1983) argued that social forces that today are putting pressure on political parties are increasingly organizing into groups with a single-issue focus. In contrast to other traditional interest groups, they do not take organizational stands on other issues and compromise is rejected. By limiting themselves to just one issue, a group is assured of unity on group goals. Oberstar (1983) wrote: "Today's groups appear to present a special danger, however, emerging as they have at a time when political parties appear weak, and technological advances have given them special tools of mass persuasion. Politicians appear frustrated and wary of them" (p. 616).

Insider vs. Outsider Groups

The third distinction is between insider and outsider groups. Insider groups, according to Garner (1991), have access to governments on a regular basis while outsider groups have to rely on contacts with backbenchers and changing public opinion. Garner argued that acquiring access to the central government is the most effective way for the animal lobby to make progress. Here, respectability and flexibility are crucial because governments are less

likely to listen to groups who are not prepared to meet them half way.

But, this does not mean that the outsider groups are without effect as Garner noted: "Arguably the most successful recent campaigns are those that have targeted the consumer. The decline in the fur trade and the growing sales figures for cosmetics that have not been tested on animals are an impressive testimony to this" (p. 287).

Finally, Garner noted that the use of different methods is the fourth distinction that can be used to characterize the many activist groups. The fundamental distinction in this aspect is between the militant groups and those that utilize traditional campaigning methods. Garner argued that the media concentration on the militants tends to disguise the fact that the vast majority of the groups working in the field of animal lobbying engage in traditional pressure group activity.

But how does this distinction between insider vs. outsider groups relate to the whaling dispute? As the whaling dispute evolved and Greenpeace gained prominence, the organization developed from being an outsider group to being an insider group. Instead of direct action, the organization increasingly relied on lobbying and litigation because the most effective way to put an end to whaling was if the U.S government threatened to enforce sanctions against the whaling nations.

Methods of Activist Groups

Action groups have used a variety of methods to get their messages through. Almost everything has been tried, from lobbying and letter-writing

campaigns to boycotts and direct actions against organizations as well as individuals.

Atkin (1981) noted that the conventional approach to designing communication strategies involves dissecting the communication process into source, message, channel, and receiver variables to determine the role of each factor. In the typical campaign situation, the strategist has control over the first three elements. However, the optimum manipulation of source, message, and channel components largely depends on a thorough understanding of the receivers in the target audience.

Wilcox, Ault, and Agee (1992) mentioned four principle ways in which environmental organizations work to achieve their goals. These same methods have been adapted by the various action groups as well as other more militant methods.

1. Lobbying. Lobbying concentrates on passage of laws that advance environmental causes or, conversely, on defeat of measures viewed as detrimental to the environment.

2. Litigation. Organizations file suits seeking court rulings favorable to their projects or make an attempt to block unfavorable projects.

3. Mass Demonstrations. Mass demonstrations are designed to prove public support for a cause “and in some cases to harass the operators of projects to which the groups object” (p. 459).

4. Boycotts. The underlying principle of the boycott is to use economic pressure to achieve a goal.

These four methods have all been used by conservationists to force nations to stop whaling. Lobbying was used to persuade the U.S. government to enforce sanctions against nations that allegedly did not comply with the international moratorium on whaling. When the U.S. government was reluctant to enforce sanctions against whaling nations, Greenpeace filed lawsuits to force the government to take action. There were demonstrations against the whaling nations and also threats of consumer boycotts.

According to Garner (1991), the most successful avenue for the animal lobby in Britain has been to target the consumer. In the United States, the primary tool to change television programming used by advocacy groups has been to boycott the products of sponsoring advertisers.

Many groups who initially approach advertisers through letter-writing campaigns or phone calls will, according to Hill and Beaver (1991), threaten product boycotts if their requests are ignored and if advertisers continue sponsorship of TV programs to which the groups object. Hill and Beaver, who studied the relationships among advocacy groups, the media, national advertisers, and advertising agencies, also suggested that activities directed toward the media are more diverse than those directed toward advertisers. When dealing with the media, advocacy groups resort to phone calls and letter-writing campaigns, but many groups also target legislators and government agencies in an attempt to gain legal recourse.

A recent example of how environmentalist groups put pressure on the U.S. government is a one-page paid advertisement the Animal Welfare Institute placed in The New York Times ("Save the Whales," 1993). In this ad

the reader was encouraged to contact the vice president of the United States and urge him to recommend to the president that an embargo be imposed upon Norwegian products until Norway stopped whaling. Furthermore, the reader was encouraged to boycott all Norwegian products and to ask his travel agent to stop booking trips to Norway.

Garner (1991) suggested that there is a disturbing trend toward targeting individual scientists involved in animal experimentation: "It seems only a matter of time before someone is killed in the name of animal liberation" (p. 288).

Oberstar (1983) argued that effective lobbying generally requires the capability of being a threat to an official's chances of re-election. The most common pattern of electoral activity of such groups has been an attempt to persuade the public and public officials of the group's position. Oberstar suggested that by using highly emotional arguments, these groups often rely on references to higher authority, or threats to widely held values, to gain support: "To some contemporary single-issue groups abortion is in opposition to God's will, the women's movement will destroy the American family, and gun control is exactly what the Russians would like to see in the United States" (p. 617).

Although the effectiveness of the boycott tactic can be questioned, many agree that the mere threat of a boycott often is persuasive.

According to Garner (1991), there has been considerable debate over strategy within the animal lobby movement in Britain. Those firmly against militant actions have noted that it discredits the entire animal lobby and

makes it much more difficult to alter public opinion and to gain access to government. The militants, however, argue that at least direct action in the form of breaking into laboratories have produced results while little has been achieved by traditional lobbying.

The anti-whaling movement has almost solely relied on non-militant methods in their protests. Nevertheless, there is one incident where the militant environmental group, Sea Shepherd, attacked and caused extensive damage by sinking two whaling vessels and vandalizing a whaling station in Iceland. This group was formed by a former Greenpeace member, Paul Watson, who contended that the methods used by Greenpeace were not effective enough.

Relationships between Activist Groups

Hill and Beaver (1991) noted that activist groups are involved in three central relationships. The first relationship is activist group to activist group. Such groups often work together to increase the size of their memberships.

A second relationship is between activist groups and advertisers. About two-thirds of Hill and Beaver's respondents stated that their organization had taken a traditionally antagonistic view, demanding that advertisers refuse sponsorship of programs deemed objectionable by their groups.

A third relationship is between activist groups and the media. Almost all activist groups' executives who were interviewed in Hill and Beaver's study expressed a strong desire to interact regularly with the media and hold the media directly liable for problems with broadcasts.

In the whaling dispute at least two of these relationships have occurred. Environmental groups have worked together and they have also at times worked closely with the news media by providing footage and transportation during protests in remote areas.

The Group's Effectiveness

Regarding perceptions of success, environmental groups opposing whaling evaluate their success by looking at the prolonged moratorium on whaling. As long as they can prevent all commercial whaling, they have been successful. However, they have not succeeded in their latest efforts to put pressure on the Norwegian government to have it stop further minke whaling.

A concrete example of how environmentalist organizations evaluate success is the recent decision by General Motors not to purchase products from a Norwegian firm that produces whaling harpoon grenades. In a letter to the Humane Society of the United States, a GM vice president stated that the company did not plan to purchase products from this company as long as Norway continued to whale commercially. This decision was interpreted by the vice president of the Humane Society of the United States as a tremendous victory for the American consumer.

Advocacy groups who are opposing certain TV programs evaluate accomplishments by their ability to remove controversial programs from the airwaves. Hill and Beaver (1991) suggested that almost all the network representatives who were interviewed in connection with their study felt that their organizations were indirectly affected by the actions of advocacy groups.

More than half the national advertisers who responded felt that threatened boycotts by these groups had an impact upon them. Nevertheless, few agencies had developed strategies to manage advocacy groups or policies regarding program standards.

Most media executives interviewed in Hill and Beaver's (1991) study believed advocacy groups often boast large memberships that later turn out to be fabricated. Further, many people who are members of these groups complain blindly, using pre-printed postcards or letters without watching the targeted program or series. Nevertheless, the networks do not have any formal policies regarding interaction with advocacy groups, and most handle advertisers concerns on a case-by-case basis (Hill & Beaver, 1991).

While action groups who target television stations use the ability to remove controversial programs from the airwaves to evaluate their success, animal lobby groups use their impact on sales. Garner (1991) stated that activists in Britain have helped to decimate the fur trade in the country by making it socially unacceptable to wear fur. Official figures show that the total income from fur sales has declined by two-thirds since 1984.

The growing public concern about animal cruelty can also be seen in the success of companies who market cruelty-free cosmetics. As an example, Garner noted that the firm, Beauty Without Cruelty, that started out in the early 1960s as a mail order company now has an annual turnover of 3 million pounds sterling.

In the United States, sportsmen who have been subject to pressure by animal rights organizations, are now starting to respond. In 1992, Outdoor

Life magazine (Shedd, 1992) published a list of 16 pro hunting organizations that are defending hunters' rights against the animal rightists. Organizations like Wildlife Legislation Fund of America, Safari Club International, National Shooting Sports Foundation, and the Izaak Walton League of America are all pro hunting organizations, promoting the sport hunters' cause against the attacks of the animal rights movement. In 1991 the United Conservation Alliance (UCA) was formed as a coordinating group for those fighting the animal rights movement.

Summary

The literature has provided an overview of how environmental issues have gained public attention in the United States since the early 1970s. Media theories such as agenda-setting have contributed to the understanding of the media's role in this process. It has become clear that one of the main reasons why environmentalist organizations like Greenpeace have been successful in shaping public opinion is the nature of news; a thing is not newsworthy until something happens and it becomes an event. Protests combine the major criteria considered necessary in news. The mutually dependent relationship between protesters and the press is also of importance. The protesters provide the press with a news story by staging an event and the press provides the protesters with access to the public. This relationship tends to make the news media dependent on conservationists for environmental information.

Conservationists, like other pressure groups, use a variety of methods

to reach their goals. The choice of what methods to use reflects the nature of the organization as well as the issue at stake and the circumstances of each particular case.

After more than two decades of campaigning, environmental organizations have gained expertise in dealing with the press. Their sophisticated approach shows results. Extensive lobbying and threats of boycotts have also proved to be successful.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This study examined two newspapers' coverage of the international whaling ban during two periods: 1981-1985 and 1986-1993 to determine whether their coverage of the issue changed during the time periods. Specifically, the study focused on whether the tone of the reporting became more favorable toward whaling in the North Atlantic as new information about the condition of the whaling stocks in this region became available. The study examined the use of sources in an attempt to determine to what extent, if any, the two newspapers' coverage of the dispute was colored by the sources they relied on for their reports. In other words, did the sources set the agenda?

Murdock (1970) noted that the news media often ignore the underlying content of a situation by focusing attention on the immediate form of contemporary events. To determine if the two newspapers' coverage of the whaling dispute reflected this phenomenon, the study examined whether the stories were event oriented or issue/background oriented.

Content analysis was chosen as a research method for the study to determine the tone of the coverage as well as the use of sources.

Newspapers

The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times were selected for the content analysis because they are widely read, major metropolitan

newspapers on opposite coasts of the United States. It was considered of interest to study one newspaper on the East Coast and the other on the West Coast to determine if there were differences that might be related to geographical location. Both of these newspapers are on Merrill's (1990) list of the world's top 20 elite newspapers. Merrill (1990) defines elite newspapers as well informed, articulate papers that thoughtful people the world over take seriously.

Sampling

The two newspapers' coverage of whales and whaling during the two periods 1981-1985 and 1986-1993 was examined. To locate these articles, the researcher used the respective newspaper indexes.

Although the conservation movement began its campaign to save the whales in the 1970s, it was not until 1982 that this resulted in the International Whaling Commission's five-year moratorium on all commercial whaling that was to become effective in 1986. By beginning the study period in 1981, one year prior to the IWC's decision, and by studying through the year 1993 when the Norwegian government resumed limited minke whaling, this study included the most active period of the whaling debate.

Content Analysis

The content analysis was carried out in two steps. The first step included classification of all articles about whales and whaling published in the two newspapers during the 12-year period, 1981-1993. The classification was

based on a brief description of the content of each item in the respective newspaper indexes. The following three categories resulted: News stories (A), editorials (B), and letters to the editor (C). The largest category, news stories, was then divided into eight subcategories according to content. The categories and subcategories are as follows:

A. News stories.

1. Activists. News stories about activists' activities, protests, etc.
2. International Whaling Commission (IWC). Stories about IWC and the whaling ban.
3. Whales beached or stranded; whales in captivity in rivers or in ice.
4. Whale studies.
5. Whales in amusement parks.
6. Whales and whaling, including stories that did not fit into other categories.
7. Whaling industry and whaling nations.
8. Whale watching.

B. Editorials.

C. Letters to the editor.

The classification of the articles provided an overview of what kind of stories on whales and whaling the two respective newspapers carried during the research period. As a second step of the content analysis, editorials and three of the eight news subcategories were selected for closer study. These items were chosen because they included content that was likely to deal

specifically with the dispute concerning the international whaling ban.

Selection of Items for Coding

As a second step of the content analysis, the following two categories of content and three subcategories of news were chosen for further study:

A. News stories.

1. Activists. News stories about activists' activities, protests, etc.
2. International Whaling Commission (IWC). Stories about IWC and the whaling ban.
3. Whaling industry and whaling nations.

B. Editorials.

A coding sheet was designed for use with every article evaluated. Every sentence in the articles was coded in five ways: tone, use of sources, placement on the page, size (number of columns), humanization of whales, and whether the items were event or background/issue oriented.

Unit of Analysis and Operationalization of Variables

The unit of analysis for all news stories was the paragraph. The paragraph was chosen instead of the entire story because most of the news articles contained favorable as well as neutral and unfavorable statements. By breaking the stories down into paragraphs, it was possible to account for the variations in tone of an entire article and between different sources. The paragraph was also used as the unit of analysis when deciding whether the stories were issue or event oriented. However, the study also

presents an alternative classification based on the entire article as the unit of analysis.

The unit of analysis for all editorials was the entire article. Since editorials usually argue for or against a particular position or issue, it was not appropriate to use the paragraph as the unit of analysis.

Tone

The tone coding subcategory was operationalized as follows:

1. Unfavorable: Unfavorable descriptions included portrayals of a point of view that opposed whaling or that did not support the whaling nations' point of view. Negative descriptions of whaling and using quotation marks around terms such as "scientific whaling" were coded as unfavorable.
2. Neutral: Descriptions or statements that could not be clearly defined as either favorable or unfavorable in tone were coded as neutral.
3. Favorable: Paragraphs that included favorable assessments of whaling and showed the whaling activities of the whaling nations in a positive light were coded as favorable.

If a paragraph contained equal numbers of favorable and unfavorable assessments, it was classified as neutral. If a news story contained an equal number of favorable and unfavorable paragraphs it was classified as neutral. However, before a final decision was made on how to classify an article with equal numbers of favorable and unfavorable assessments, a consideration was given to the overall impact of the entire article, including the tone of the heading. In a few cases this resulted in a different classification.

Humanizing the Whales

If whales were described as having human characteristics such as being intellectual, able to sing, or given a name, the article was coded by the researcher as humanization.

Event vs. Background/Issue-Oriented Stories

These two categories were developed by Harney (1991) who based them on Murdock's (1970) and Gitlin's (1980) observations that news is event oriented and often neglects the underlying content of a newsworthy situation. Coding paragraphs as either event oriented or background/issue oriented was determined by the following definitions:

1. Event-Oriented News: Any description pertaining solely to the event itself, not the underlying issue at hand, was coded as event-oriented news.
2. Background/Issue-Oriented News: Information other than the actual news of the event such as discussion of the issues behind the event and references to the previous history of the whaling dispute were coded as background/issue-oriented news.

Sources as Knowns and Unknowns

Gans' (1980) method of classifying actors in the news was adapted for use in this study. Instead of measuring the amount of space certain actors were given in news magazine columns as Gans did, this study counted how often different sources appeared in the news.

As in Gans' study, those who are classified as Knowns are a combination of people. Some are assumed by journalists to be familiar and well known names among the audience; others are not necessarily known by name but occupy well-known positions.

Knowns

In this study seven different types of people were classified as Knowns, according to the level of influence and assumed power. The categories are as follows:

1. Presidents: Since 1981 at least two U.S. presidents have been involved in the whaling dispute. In July 1981 Ronald Reagan wrote a letter to the International Whaling Commission making a personal plea for an indefinite moratorium on commercial whaling. The President of the United States was the highest ranking representative involved in the dispute, and the only head of state according to the two newspapers in this study.

2. Government and Cabinet Members: Sources representing governments, or cabinet members. Included in this group were sources cited as government spokesmen or sources referred to as the Reagan administration.

3. Federal and State Officials: This group includes department officials, members of parliaments, embassy officials, members at the International Whaling Committee, and other heads of federal agencies. Also included in this category are the U.S. courts, both federal and state, that dealt with aspects of the whaling dispute.

4. **Elite Environmentalists:** When environmentalists were referred to as members of a specific group, such as Greenpeace or Sea Shepherd, they were considered elite environmentalists and coded as Knowns. Also, if a source were referred to as a spokesperson for a specific group of conservationists, it was considered a Known.

5. **Whaling Industry Officials and Representatives:** Sources representing the whaling industry, other than single whalers, were coded as Knowns

6. **Scientists:** When not referred to as members of the International Whaling Committee, scientists were classified as a special group of Knowns.

7. **Media and Journalists:** When other media were quoted as sources, they were classified as Knowns. For example, when the Sea Shepherd group sank two whaling vessels in the Reykjavík harbor, the Icelandic Radio was cited as a source for news in the two U.S. newspapers.

Unknowns

Unknowns were divided into following three categories:

1. **Low-level Public Officials:** Officials who do not participate in policy making and do not occupy well known or powerful positions. For example, unidentified police officers and museum employees who were not called by name were considered Unknowns.

2. **Other Environmentalists:** When a story or editorial cited environmentalists or conservationists without specifying what group they belonged to, they were coded as Unknowns.

3. Ordinary People: People who only represent themselves. Some examples include former whalers, wife of a whaler, bank employee, and restaurant customers who were all classified as ordinary people. Public surveys were also considered to represent ordinary people and classified as such in this study.

Placement and Size

To determine how newsworthy the stories about the whaling dispute were considered by the two newspapers, the researcher looked at placement of the news stories in the papers and their size. The size refers to how many columns on the page a story covered. The larger the space a story obtained, the higher the story was rated. The placement refers to where on the page the story was placed--whether it was the lead story on the front page, whether it was placed above the fold, or whether it was placed below the fold.

Intercoder Reliability

To test the reliability of the coding, a pretest was conducted with the researcher and one coder. An Icelandic student in the master's program in the Department of Occupational Therapy at San Jose State University served as a second coder. To determine percentage of agreement, both coded the same 25 articles for tone and for event- vs. background/issue-oriented news. Articles used in this reliability test were from 1981 and represented 14% of the total content analyzed; there were 13 articles from The New York Times and 12 articles from the Los Angeles Times. Holsti's formula, discussed in Budd,

Thorp, and Donohew (1971), was used to determine reliability:

$$R = \frac{2(C_{1,2})}{C_1 + C_2}$$

$C_{1,2}$ is the number of category assignments both coders agree on, and

$C_1 + C_2$ is the total of category assignments made by both coders (p. 68).

The intercoder reliability for both tone and event vs. background/issue orientation was .92.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This study examined the newspaper coverage of the international whaling dispute during the two research periods of 1981-1985 and 1986-1993. The tone and occurrence of event oriented vs. background issue-oriented news in articles reported by The New York Times and Los Angeles Times were analyzed and compared between the two time periods.

In all, 2,064 paragraphs from 185 articles were coded for tone, orientation, and use of sources. Of the total, 149 were news articles and 36 were editorials.

The Humanization of Whales.

A classification of all 545 articles on whales and whaling carried in the two newspapers during the 13-year period, 1981-1993, showed that the single most frequent category of stories dealt with whales in danger, either beached or captive in a river or in ice. Most often these stories pictured helpless whales and human efforts to rescue them.

Table 1 shows that during both research periods, 1981-1985 and 1986-1993, a total of 29% of the stories fell within the human interest category of beached whales or whales that were captive in a river or in ice. At the same time, 22% of the stories during the first research period and 16% of the stories

during the second research period addressed hard news categories concerning the whaling ban or the International Whaling Commission. In other words, the two newspapers were more interested in writing stories about relatively few whales in captivity and danger than stories about whether to allow future whaling.

Table 1

Articles Published in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times on
Whales and Whaling: 1981-1985 and 1986-1993

	<u>1981-1985</u> (<u>n=252</u>)	<u>1986-1993</u> (<u>n=293</u>)
<u>News stories</u>		
Activists	6%	7%
IWC/Whaling ban	22	16
Whales beached in river or ice	29	29
Whale studies	9	15
Whales in amusement parks	7	7
Whales other	9	9
Whaling nations/whaling industry	2	2
Whale watching	5	11
<u>Other content</u>		
Letters to the editors	2	—
Editorials	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>
	100%	100%

A further analysis of the human interest category shows that a large proportion of stories about whales in captivity during 1981-1993 can be traced back to two separate incidents. (See Appendix A-1.)

In 1985 a humpback whale trapped in the Sacramento River captured considerable media attention. During a four-week period, from October 16 - November 12, the two newspapers carried 38 stories about Humphrey the Humpback Whale in the Sacramento River. (See Appendix A-2 and Appendix A-3.)

In October 1988, exactly three years later, three Californian grey whales trapped in ice in the Antarctic Ocean, were subject to extensive media coverage for five weeks. Finally, a Soviet icebreaker was called in to rescue the whales. Together the two newspapers carried 38 stories about the Californian grey whales during these five weeks. This same year, 1988, the controversy concerning the Icelandic and Japanese scientific whaling programs was at its peak. However, that resulted in only eight news stories and two editorials in The New York Times. The Los Angeles Times did not write about the controversy at all during that year.

The New York Times ended its news coverage of the California grey whales in 1988, asking experts to explain why three grey whales, captive in ice in a remote place far away in the Antarctic Ocean, could generate such concern among people who scarcely reacted to the Japanese plans to kill 300 minke whales in the same year. A possible explanation might be that there was a satellite uplink station close to the place where the whales were trapped in the ice.

Incidents like these, when the public is able--through the news media--to observe rescue operations to save whales, are well suited to raise concerns about whales in general and to contribute to the agenda-setting process on whale conservation.

The Selected Stories

Of the 545 stories the two newspapers carried on the issues of whales and whaling during the two research periods, 185 stories, including 2,064 paragraphs, were selected for closer study, according to guidelines outlined above. Table 2 shows that, of these stories, 98 were from the first research period, 1981-1985, and 87 from the second period, 1986-1993.

During the 1981-1985 period, 76% of the coded stories were news articles and 24% were editorials. During the 1986-1993 period, 85% of the coded stories were news stories and the remaining 15% were editorials.

As shown in Table 2, a majority of the news stories included in the study dealt with the International Whaling Commission (IWC) or the international whaling ban. This category of stories counted for 57% of the stories during the first research period, 1981-1985, and for 55% of the stories during the second research period, 1986-1993.

Stories about activists accounted for 14% of the news stories during the first period and 22% during the second research period.

Relatively few stories dealt with whaling nations or the whaling industry which accounted for only 5% in the first period and 8% in the second period.

Table 2

Articles Within the Four Categories Related to the Whaling Dispute, Published in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times from 1981-1985 and 1986-1993

	<u>1981-1985</u> (<u>n=98</u>)	<u>1986-1993</u> (<u>n=87</u>)
<u>News stories</u>		
Activists	14%	22%
IWC/Whaling ban	57%	55%
Whaling nations/whaling industry	5%	8%
<u>Other content</u>		
Editorials	<u>24%</u>	<u>15%</u>
	100%	100%

Tone of News Coverage

The total number of news paragraphs coded during the two research periods, 1981-1985 and 1986-1993, was 1,805 paragraphs in 149 news stories.

Table 3 shows that both newspapers presented the majority of news paragraphs as neutral, and paragraphs unfavorable to whaling came in second place while paragraphs favorable to whaling were not used very often in both newspapers. The same pattern evolved when the unit of analysis was the news story.

As shown on Table 3, the Los Angeles Times, which was more unfavorable toward whaling during the first research period, with 38% of its stories unfavorable toward whaling and 58% neutral, became almost identical with The New York Times during the second period, with 79% of its stories neutral and 21% unfavorable.

The number of unfavorable assessments in both newspapers decreased from the first research period to the second. This was even more noticeable when the combined number of news stories in both newspapers was compared between the two research periods. During the first research period, 67% of the combined news stories were neutral, 29% were unfavorable and 4% were favorable to whaling. During the second period, 76% of the news stories were neutral, the number of unfavorable stories had dropped to 20%, and favorable stories remained 4%. Although the tendency is noticeable, the difference between research periods is not statistically significant ($X^2 (2, N = 149) = 1.68, p < .50$).

However, as shown on Table 4, there was a statistically significant difference between the two newspapers in the news coverage when the unit of analysis was the paragraph. As shown on Table 4, The New York Times was more unfavorable and less neutral toward whaling than the Los Angeles Times. In all, 61% of news paragraphs in The New York Times were neutral and 27% were unfavorable, while 65% of news paragraphs in the Los Angeles Times were neutral and 22% were unfavorable toward whaling.

When the unit of analysis was the news story, the difference between the news coverage in the two newspapers was not statistically significant. The New York Times ran 99 stories related to the whaling dispute during the 12 year period, or twice as many stories as the Los Angeles Times, which ran 50 news stories addressing the whaling dispute.

Table 3

A Comparison of the Tone of the Whaling Dispute in News Stories in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times from 1981-1985 and 1986-1993 by Number of Stories and by Number of Paragraphs

	<u>1981 - 1985</u>		<u>1986 - 1993</u>	
	N.Y.T.	L.A.T.	N.Y.T.	L.A.T.
<hr/>				
<u>Stories</u>				
	(<u>n</u> =49)	(<u>n</u> =26)	(<u>n</u> =50)	(<u>n</u> =24)
Favorable	4%	4%	6%	0%
Neutral	71	58	74	79
Unfavorable	<u>25</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>21</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%
<hr/>				
<u>Paragraphs</u>				
	(<u>n</u> =395)	(<u>n</u> =380)	(<u>n</u> =616)	(<u>n</u> =414)
Favorable	9%	15%	14%	12%
Neutral	67	56	58	73
Unfavorable	<u>24</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>15</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%
<hr/>				

Table 4

A Comparison of the Tone of the Whaling Dispute in News Stories during
1981-1993 in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times by Number of
Paragraphs

	1981-1993 N.Y.T.	1981-1993 L.A.T.
<u>Paragraphs</u>		
	(<u>n</u> =1011)	(<u>n</u> =794)
Favorable	12%	13%
Neutral	61	65
Unfavorable	27	22
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%

$X^2(2, N = 1,805) = 6.742, p < .05$

Tone of Editorials

During the two research periods, 1981-1985 and 1986-1993, the two newspapers ran a total of 36 editorials. As seen in Table 5, there was a noticeable difference between the two newspapers' editorials. During the first research period, The New York Times was more unfavorable toward whaling and less neutral, as compared with the Los Angeles Times.

This pattern changed during the second research period as the editorial writers at The New York Times appeared to gain interest in the whaling dispute and became more neutral. At the same time, editors at the Los Angeles Times appeared to lose interest in the whaling dispute during the second research period.

Since there was only a small number of editorials in the study, the differences were not statistically tested.

Table 5

A Comparison of the Tone of the Whaling Dispute in Editorials in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times from 1981-1985 and 1986-1993 by Number of Stories

	<u>1981 - 1985</u>		<u>1986 - 1993</u>	
	N.Y.T.	L.A.T.	N.Y.T.	L.A.T.
<u>Editorials</u>				
	(n=5)	(n=18)	(n=11)	(n=2)
Favorable	0%	6%	0%	0%
Neutral	20	44	36	50
Unfavorable	<u>80</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>50</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Event vs. Issue/Background Orientation

Table 6 shows that the news about the whaling dispute, measured by number of paragraphs, contained a greater numbers of background or issue oriented paragraphs than event-oriented paragraphs during both research periods.

This indicates that the two newspapers put more emphasis on the issue of whaling than on newsworthy events. Relatively few news stories were based on demonstrations against whaling or other dramatic events. Therefore, the newspapers could focus on the underlying issue and how it developed.

As shown on Table 7, when the two research periods were compared, the two newspapers became even more background and issue oriented in their news paragraphs and less event oriented as the whaling dispute evolved. This difference was statistically significant.

Table 6

A Comparison of the Event vs. Issue/Background Orientation of the Whaling Dispute in News Stories in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times from 1981-1985 and 1986-1993 by Number of Stories and by Number of Paragraphs

	<u>1981 - 1985</u>		<u>1986 - 1993</u>	
	N.Y.T.	L.A.T.	N.Y.T.	L.A.T.
<u>News stories</u>				
	(n=49)	(n=26)	(n=50)	(n=24)
Event	49%	62%	42%	42%
Backgr./Issue	<u>51</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>58</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%
<u>News paragraphs</u>				
	(n=395)	(n=380)	(n=616)	(n=414)
Event	37%	47%	32%	32%
Backgr./Issue	<u>63</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>68</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 7

News Paragraphs about the Whaling Dispute in The New York Times and the
Los Angeles Times as Event vs. Issue/Background Oriented between the Two
Research Periods

	<u>1981 - 1985</u>	<u>1986 - 1993</u>
<u>News paragraphs</u>		
	(<u>n</u> =654)	(<u>n</u> =1151)
Event	42%	32%
Backgr./Issue	58	68
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

$X^2(1, N = 1,805) = 20.0, p < .001$

Sources

Access and Origin

Of the 1,805 news paragraphs included in this research, 52% of the paragraphs cited a source, 48% of the paragraphs were contributed by the two newspapers' reporters or editors and could not be related to any specific source.

Of the 934 news paragraphs that cited a source, 47% were neutral and did not contain any opinion or judgment about whaling. The remaining 53% contained either favorable or unfavorable assessments.

Table 8 shows that, of the 491 news paragraphs that contained judgments about whaling, 60% of the paragraphs were unfavorable toward whaling while 40% of the paragraphs were classified as favorable toward whaling. Although these figures show that there was a tendency to use sources that were unfavorable toward whaling more often than those that supported whaling, the difference was not statistically significant ($\chi^2(1, N = 491) = 2.155, p < .20$).

Table 8 also provides an overview of what sources were most often cited in the news articles. According to this overview, the whaling dispute had three key players: the Japanese, the Americans, and the environmentalists. Two of these key players were against whaling but one supported whaling.

Also noteworthy is the extensive reliance on environmentalists as sources. While sources from the five whaling nations combined were cited in 359 paragraphs during the 12-year period, environmentalists were cited in 313 paragraphs.

Table 8 shows that Norwegian and Icelandic sources appeared to gain media attention during the second research period as compared with the first period while the third whaling nation, Japan, appeared to enjoy a steady access to the media during both periods. As to Iceland, the explanation is primarily because of the Sea Shepherd's attacks on the Icelandic whaling industry in 1986. The Norwegian decision to resume minke whaling in 1992 also drew some media attention.

According to the Los Angeles Times on July 6, 1993, the Norwegian government launched an \$800,000 international public relations campaign when it announced its decision to resume whaling. That might be one of the reasons why Norwegian sources favorable to whaling were cited more often in the newspapers.

Table 8

Origin of News Sources and Number and Tone of Citations in News Articles
about the Whaling Dispute in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times
from 1981-1985 (A) and 1986 -1993 (B)

Sources	Favorable		Neutral		Unfavorable	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)
	(<u>n</u> =83)	(<u>n</u> =112)	(<u>n</u> =180)	(<u>n</u> =263)	(<u>n</u> =146)	(<u>n</u> =150)
Whaling nations						
Faeroy Islands	—	4	—	4	—	3
Iceland	4	18	8	54	—	—
Norway	3	18	—	11	—	—
Japan	65	61	62	34	2	4
Soviet Union	—	1	2	1	—	—
United States	3	3	44	39	36	28
Other nations	—	—	1	3	—	12
Environmentalists	4	1	53	74	102	79
International Whaling Commission	4	2	5	15	5	13
Scientists	—	4	2	20	1	11
News media	—	—	3	8	—	—

Note. (A) refers to the first research period 1981-1985 and (B) refers to the second research period 1986-1993.

Knowns and Unknowns

Both newspapers relied mostly on sources that were well known or occupied well known positions.

Federal officials were by far the most often cited sources in the news followed by elite environmentalists and government members or government representatives. The single most often cited environmentalist actor was Greenpeace, but the U.S. Secretary of Commerce was the single most often cited government spokesperson.

Table 9 shows that while Knowns were cited 85% of the time, Unknowns were cited only 15% of the time. There was neither a statistically significant difference in use of sources between research periods ($X^2(1, N = 463) = 0.23, p < .70$) nor between the two newspapers ($X^2(1, N = 463) = 0.54, p < .50$).

Table 9

Sources as Knowns and Unknowns in News Stories About the Whaling
Dispute in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times from 1981-1993
and 1986-1993

	<u>1981 - 1985</u>		<u>1986 - 1993</u>	
	N.Y.T.	L.A.T.	N.Y.T.	L.A.T.
	(n=112)	(n=78)	(n=177)	(n=96)
<u>Sources</u>				
Knowns	82%	88%	89%	81%
Unknowns	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>19</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Placement and Size

The whaling dispute was not an issue the two newspapers emphasized or rated as highly important. Rarely did those stories make it to the front pages and only once, on July 24, 1982, did the whaling dispute become a front page story with a six-column head. That was when the Los Angeles Times reported on the International Whaling Commission's approval of a worldwide ban on whaling.

Most often stories about the whaling dispute were one- or two-column stories without pictures. In the 1981-1985 research period, 68% of the stories were one-and two-column stories and 19% were three-columns. During the 1986-1993 research period, 50% of the stories were one-or two- columns and 25% covered three-columns.

During the first research period, 69% of the stories appeared above the fold but 31% were below the fold. This pattern was almost identical during the second period, when 70% were placed above the fold and 30% below.

Research Questions

As an answer to the first research question, the findings of the study indicate that the two U.S. newspapers provided balanced coverage of the whaling dispute in their news stories since most of the paragraphs during the research period from 1981 through 1993 were neutral. However, a study of the use of sources indicates that both papers tended to rely more extensively on sources that were unfavorable to whaling than sources favorable to whaling.

The second research question was concerned with whether there was a

difference in coverage between the two newspapers on the whaling dispute during the entire research period from 1981 through 1993. Table 4 shows that there was a statistically significant difference in news coverage between the two papers when the unit of analysis was the news paragraph. The New York Times was more unfavorable and less neutral toward whaling than the Los Angeles Times. However, this difference was not significant when the unit of analysis was the news story.

In editorials there was also a difference in tone between the two newspapers. As shown on Table 6, The New York Times editorials were more unfavorable but less neutral and less favorable toward whaling than the Los Angeles Times editorials. However, because of the limited number of editorials, this difference was not statistically tested.

The third research question was concerned with whether there was a significant difference in the tone of the news coverage between the two research periods. As shown on Table 3, the news coverage became more neutral and less unfavorable in the second research period compared to the first research period. This tendency, nevertheless, was not statistically significant.

The fourth research question asked if the tone of the editorials in the two newspapers toward the whaling dispute changed between the two research periods. Although Table 5 indicates that The New York Times editorials became more neutral toward whaling during the second period, as compared with the editorials the newspaper ran in the first research period, this difference was not statistically tested, because of the limited number of

editorials.

The fifth research question was concerned with whether the news coverage of the whaling dispute during both research periods, 1981-1985 and 1986-1993, contained a higher number of background/issue oriented assessments than event-oriented assessments. Table 6 indicates that there was a noticeably higher number of background/issue oriented assessments than event-oriented assessments and that the news coverage became more background/issue oriented and less event-oriented in the second research period. Table 7 shows that there was a significant difference between the two research periods.

The sixth question asked whether sources unfavorable toward whaling had better access to the two newspapers than sources that supported whaling, and if this pattern changed between the two research periods. Although Table 8 shows that during both research periods the two newspapers carried a considerably higher number of assessments that were unfavorable to whaling than assessments that were favorable, the difference was not statistically significant.

The seventh research question was concerned with whether the two newspapers cited mostly familiar or well known sources (Knowns) rather than ordinary people (Unknowns). Table 9 shows that both newspapers relied mostly on sources that were well known or occupied well known positions. Knowns were cited 85% of the time and Unknowns were cited only 15% of the time.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Summary

This study was designed to determine how two U.S newspapers covered the whaling dispute during two time periods, 1981-1985 and 1986-1993. The intention was to investigate whether the tone of the coverage changed between the two periods when new information about the condition of the whaling stocks in the North Atlantic emerged as a result of the scientific assessment of the whaling stocks undertaken by the International Whaling Commission.

The findings of the research indicate that, although a majority of the coverage was background/issue oriented, the whaling dispute was not rated as a highly newsworthy issue by the two newspapers. The research shows that the two newspapers provided balanced coverage of the whaling dispute when all news paragraphs were studied. The number of unfavorable assessments in the news declined during the second research period, as compared with the first time period, as the number of neutral assessments increased. However, when the research was narrowed to focus on those news paragraphs and news stories that conveyed opinions and views toward whaling, unfavorable news stories and news paragraphs far outnumbered favorable assessments.

Discussion

The agenda-setting function of the mass media, as described by McCombs and Shaw (1977), argues that the mass media may not tell its users what to think, but what to think about.

This study that was confined to two U.S. newspapers was not extensive enough to provide data on the agenda-setting function of the U.S. mass media concerning the whaling dispute. To do so, it would have been necessary to include a study of other newspapers and other media such as television, radio, and news magazines and to compare the overall coverage to changes in public opinion during the two time periods.

However, the findings indicate that the two newspapers did not play much of an agenda-setting role on the whaling issue during the 13-year period between 1981-1993. The coverage of the whaling dispute was not extensive, and the placement and size of the stories in the newspapers indicated that the whaling dispute was not an issue the two newspapers rated as highly important or newsworthy.

However, this does not mean that agenda-setting was not a factor in the coverage of the whaling dispute.

Keeping the Issue on the Government's Agenda

Although the environmental movement seldom used direct action to put the whaling issue on the public agenda during the research period from 1981-1993, it should not be concluded that the movement had not been successful in helping to set the agenda. Instead of focusing mainly on the public agenda by

means of direct action, the environmentalists made efforts to keep it on the government's agenda through litigation and lobbying.

The most effective way of keeping the whaling dispute on the government's agenda was Greenpeace's decision to sue the United States government to force it to impose sanctions on the whaling nations. This was first done in 1985 against Japan and the Soviet Union and later in 1988 against Iceland. In 1984 the U.S. and the Japanese governments reached an agreement which was supposed to end the whaling controversy. The U.S. government, which was reluctant to put sanctions on Japan, agreed to allow that nation to continue its sperm whaling for three more years without penalties. The U.S. government stated that this was a necessary step to get Japan to end its sperm whaling. However, the environmentalists argued that, because of the international whaling ban, the U.S. government was required by law to put restrictions on Japan because of its whaling activities.

Had it not been for the lawsuit in 1985, the whaling dispute would most likely have been put on hold for the next three years because the main controversy was connected to the Japanese whaling activities. Not only did the lawsuit result in coverage in the news media, but this also was a threat that caused serious concern among other whaling nations that had an interest in keeping their non-restricted status in the U.S. market. Furthermore, it kept the U.S. government from changing its position on whaling.

Later, in 1988, when the U.S. and Icelandic governments reached an agreement on the Icelandic scientific whaling program, Greenpeace sued the U.S. government again to force it to put sanctions on Iceland. That case was

never ruled on because the Icelandic scientific whaling program ended in 1989 before the court ruling was announced. To avoid U.S. sanctions, the Icelandic government agreed to reduce the number of whales included in its scientific whaling program, but it also threatened to take up discussion about the future of the U.S. Navy base in Iceland (Ivarson, 1990).

The News Stories

The main results of the study show that the majority of the two newspapers' news coverage of the whaling dispute was neutral during both research periods. Although the number of assessments that were unfavorable toward whaling outnumbered favorable assessments by far in both research periods, the number of unfavorable assessments in both newspapers decreased from the first research period to the second.

There is no single explanation as to why the news coverage became slightly more favorable toward whaling during the second research period. However, before the international ban on commercial whaling was imposed in 1986, the focus of the news coverage was the coming moratorium, and how to force whaling nations like Japan, Norway, and the Soviet Union, that had reserved their right to continue whaling, to obey to the ban. This included several news articles describing how the U.S. government was putting pressure on Japan to end its whaling.

After the international ban on commercial whaling was imposed in 1986, the number of news articles written each year about the International Whaling Commission and the whaling ban declined to only one article in 1990

and one article in 1991 (See Appendix A-1).

It was not until the Norwegians announced their decision to resume minke whaling in 1992 that the two newspapers again appeared to gain some interest in the whaling ban, and the number of articles increased modestly. But at that time the Norwegians were the focus of the stories that resulted in a more favorable coverage of whaling.

One possible explanation as to why the coverage of the whaling dispute has declined in the two U.S. newspapers in recent years, despite the fact that Norway has resumed minke whaling, might be that small whales like minke whales are not considered by the media to be as interesting as the larger ones.

Another possible explanation is that environmental organizations are not as concerned about the minke whales. Keeping in mind that the International Whaling Commission's Scientific Committee has recommended reclassification of the minke whale stock in the North Atlantic as sustainable for limited harvest, it may be more urgent for the movement to focus on other issues.

It is noteworthy that Greenpeace and other leading conservationist organizations have been reluctant to accept the scientific data provided by the IWC's Scientific Committee. They have not yet officially recognized that minke whales should be distinguished from other whales. This reluctance appears to affect the media's perception of the issue and, as a result, the public has not achieved the knowledge necessary to differentiate between the whale stocks in general and different types of whales. This corresponds with findings by Glynn and Tims (1982), that indicated that the major problem in

scientific issues is not with the collection of facts but with the presentation of an issue where peripheral issues appear to be treated with undue emphasis.

Sources in the News

Wolfsfeld (1994) argued that the higher the antagonist's level of (social, political, and media) status, organizations, resources and/or newsworthy behavior, the greater the level of antagonist influence on the media.

This study appears to correspond with Wolfsfeld's findings. Although the environmentalist organizations did not use staged events to get the media's attention during the two research periods, environmentalists were, nevertheless, the most often cited source in both newspapers. Among environmentalist sources, the Greenpeace organization or members of Greenpeace were by far the most often cited.

Since the 1970s, Greenpeace has developed from being an outsider group that had to rely on pseudo-events to change public opinion into being an insider group with access to government officials on a regular basis and which spends most of its efforts on lobbying. Bill Walker (1992), a Greenpeace media coordinator in San Francisco, noted that only about one-tenth of Greenpeace's activity today consists of direct actions. Most of the organization's work involves lobbying and providing information about environmental issues. The organization runs a media department that has one of the world's largest archives of video and still images on environmental subjects. This material is made accessible to journalists who know that if they are on deadline and need a picture to cover an environmental story, they can contact Greenpeace.

Walker said that news organizations also realize that, when they have an agenda, they can call the Greenpeace media department to get its version of the story.

Greenpeace's development from being an outsider group to becoming an insider group parallels Garner's (1991) findings that access to the central government is the most effective way for the animal lobby to make progress. If the goal is to change governmental policy or to avoid a change in governmental policy, an insider group does not always have to work on public opinion to put pressure on the government. Often it is more effective to bypass the public and lobby government representatives directly.

The second most often cited source in news about the whaling dispute were the Japanese, while U.S. sources were in third place. The extensive reliance on these three categories is noteworthy.

Although it can be argued that the Japanese were a key player in the whaling dispute because they provided the only market for whale meat and killed large numbers of whales, the amount of attention they got is in striking contrast to the attention Norway received when it resumed minke whaling in 1992. It should be noted here that the U.S. relationship with Japan and the Japanese trade surplus with the United States has been a controversial issue in the United States. This environment may have contributed to the extensive coverage of the Japanese whaling activities in the two U.S. newspapers. During this time, the Japanese Government and other interest groups gained experience in lobbying and in public relations in the United States that benefited them during the whaling dispute.

The Norwegians, which were hardly cited during the first research period, gained only modest coverage when resuming minke whaling in the second research period.

Sources as Knowns or Unknowns

Because of the nature of this multinational conflict, the major actors were national leaders and environmentalist--those who represented the various participants in the conflict. However, since the whaling ban primarily affected people in local communities in Japan, Norway, and Iceland where whaling had been a part of the culture and an economic source of revenue for decades, one would have expected the news coverage to reflect the views of these people to some degree. That was not the case; ordinary people were hardly cited. This is similar to the pattern described by Gans (1980), where Knowns took up between 70 and 85% of all domestic news, but Unknowns occupied only about a fifth of the time or space.

U.S. Policy and Practice

During the research period 1981-1993, the U.S. government policy has been to oppose all whaling whether it was for commercial or scientific purposes. However, the U.S. government has not been ready to put its relationship with the whaling nations at risk by using extensive force to stop their whaling activities. It can be argued that, at times, the U.S. government values business and political relationships with other nations above environmental concerns.

According to U.S. law, the President can enforce sanctions against countries that conduct their fishing operations in a way that reduces the effectiveness of international fishery conservation programs. Although the U.S. government repeatedly threatened to use this power against the whaling nations, it was reluctant to do so. It even appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court in 1986 when lower courts had ruled that the government was obliged to put sanctions on Japan because of the Japanese sperm whaling.

When the U.S. government finally used sanctions against Japan because of its minke whaling program in 1988, it was in the form of cutting the already small Japanese fish quotas in U.S. waters. An alternative sanction to ban all imports of Japanese fish products to the U.S. market was not imposed. A possible explanation as to why this was not done is because that might have evoked a similar response from Japan which at that time was buying twice as many fish products from the United States as the United States was importing from Japan (Ivarsson, 1990).

After Norway resumed its minke whaling, President Clinton announced in October 1993 that he had decided to delay imposing sanctions against Norway although he considered the Norwegian minke whaling a violation of the international ban on whaling. It is noteworthy that the President had to announce his decision just at the time Norway was being given credit for getting the Palestinians and the Israelis to sign a peace treaty.

If the U.S President ever had the intention to put sanctions on Norway because of its whaling activities, these circumstances made such a move very difficult.

The preceding examples of the U.S. policy demonstrate that, although the two U.S. newspapers have described the U.S. government as actively opposing whaling, a closer study of what actually happened indicates that the concern for whales often was put aside because of other interests that were considered more important by the government.

Limitations of the Study

This study focused on news and editorials in the two newspapers; advertisements were excluded. It is known that, during the research periods, advertisements were used to influence public opinion. An example is the previously mentioned advertisement ("Save the Whales," 1993) published in The New York Times and paid for by the Animal Welfare Institute. In this advertisement the President of the United States was encouraged to impose sanctions on Norway because of its whaling and the readers were urged to boycott Norwegian products.

It might have strengthened the study to include the two newspapers' advertisements but that would have been virtually impossible since advertisements are not listed in the available indexes.

This study would also have benefited from a content analysis of television news broadcasts on the whaling dispute, but the limited access to old television newscasts made studying them difficult. Thus, for practical purposes, the study was limited to a content analysis of newspaper coverage of the whaling dispute.

Implications of the Study

Among the first observations made by this researcher when he came from Iceland to the United States in 1992 as a graduate student was that there was a striking difference in attitudes toward whales and whaling among Icelanders and Americans.

In Iceland, an island in the North Atlantic between Greenland and Norway where the 260,000 inhabitants are overwhelmingly dependent on harvesting the surrounding seas, the whaling stocks are considered a resource that should be brought under sustainable utilization, in consultation with marine scientists.

In the United States, whales have become a symbol for the need for environmental protection. A common notion among Americans the researcher spoke to was that all whales should be protected from human impact. Some argued that whales were an endangered species and others contended that whales were intelligent and highly developed and were thus entitled to the right to live without being hunted.

Why is the opinion of Icelanders and U.S. citizens on this issue so different? The implications of the study are that the main reasons are proximity and dependence on whaling. While whaling has been a part of the fishing industry in Iceland for many decades, the United States ended its whaling activities a long time ago.

In Iceland, pollution on land or in the sea is not at present a direct threat to animal life. Resources of the sea are practically the only ones available to support life, and most of the stocks of whales are fairly abundant.

As a result, many Icelanders feel strongly about the whaling ban that was forced upon them. They also fear that giving in to the environmentalist pressure in the whaling dispute would pave the way for the environmental movement to focus next on other stocks of fish that are even more vital for the Icelandic economy. In the United States, whales are a symbol for the environment which is under immediate threat by human activity.

Lang and Lang (1981) argued that three categories of issues had different thresholds of sensitivity and that the influence exerted by the media varied accordingly. The whaling issue clearly does not fall into the same category of issue thresholds in the United States where whaling is generally remote from just about everyone as it does in Iceland where whaling affects nearly everyone in some way.

Directions for Future Research

The whaling nations have criticized the United States for using its opposition to whaling as a green alibi designed to show that it is actually concerned with environmental issues despite its poor record. In this light, it would be of interest to study how these two U.S. newspapers have covered other environmental disputes that were closer to U.S. interests and had a greater effect on U.S. citizens than did the whaling dispute.

In addition, for comparison purposes, it would be of interest to do a similar study on how Icelandic and Norwegian newspapers covered the whaling dispute.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Atkin, Charles K. (1981). Mass media information campaign effectiveness. In Ronald E. Rice and William J. Paisley (Eds.), Public communication campaigns (pp. 265-279). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Budd, Richard W.; Thorp, Robert K.; and Donohew, Lewis (1967). Content analysis of communications. New York: Macmillan.
- Boorstin, Daniel J. (1973). The Image: A guide to pseudo-events in America. New York: Atheneum.
- Cook, Fay L.; Tyler, Tom R.; Goetz, Edward G.; Gordon, Margaret T.; Proress, David; Leff, Donna R.; & Molotch, Harvey L. (1983). Media and agenda setting: Effects on the public, interest group leaders, policy makers, and policy. Public Opinion Quarterly, 47, 16-35.
- Downs, Anthony (1972). Up and down with ecology: The issue attention cycle. Public Interest, 32, 38-50.
- Gans, Herbert J. (1980). Deciding what's news: A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, Newsweek and Time. New York: Random House.
- Glynn, Carroll J. & Tims, Albert R. (1982). Sensationalism in science issues: A case study. Journalism Quarterly, 59, 126-131.
- Garner, Robert (1991). The animal lobby. Political Quarterly, 62, 285-291.
- Gitlin, Todd (1980). The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making & unmaking of the new left. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Greene, Stephen L.W. (1988). An agenda-setting experiment to test the relative importance of interest and obtrusiveness. Unpublished master's thesis, San Jose State University, Department of Journalism and Mass Communications, San Jose, CA.
- Griswold, William F. & Packer, Cathy (1991). The interplay of journalistic and scientific conventions in mass communication about aids. Mass Comm Review, 18(3), 9-20.
- Harney, Patricia L. (1991). Newspaper coverage of anti-nuclear protests: 1979 vs. 1986. Unpublished master's thesis, San Jose State University, Department of Journalism and Mass Communications, San Jose, CA.
- Hill, Ronald P. & Beaver, Andrea L. (1991). Advocacy groups and television advertisers, Journal of Advertising, 20(1), 18-27.
- Ívarsson, Jóhann V. (1990). Hvalamálið [The whaling issue]. Unpublished BA thesis, University of Iceland, Department of Social Studies, Reykjavík, Iceland.
- Lang, Gladys Engel and Lang, Kurt (1981). Watergate: An exploration of the agenda-building process, Mass Communication Review Yearbook, 2, (pp. 447-468). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- McCombs, Maxwell E. & Shaw, Donald L. (1977). The agenda-setting function of the Press. In Donald L. Shaw and Maxwell E. McCombs, The emergence of american political issues: The agenda-setting function of the press (pp. 1-17). St. Paul: West.

- McDonald, Donald (1978). Is objectivity possible? In Everette E. Dennis, Arnold H. Ismach, & Donald M. Gillmor (Eds.), Enduring issues in mass communication (pp. 146-160). St. Paul: West.
- Merrill, John C. (1990). Global elite: A newspaper community of reason. Gannett Center Journal, 4, 93-101.
- Murdock, Graham (1970). Political deviance: The press presentation of a militant mass demonstration. In Stanley Cohen and Jock Young (Eds.), The manufacture of news: Social problems, deviance, and the mass media (pp. 206-225). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Oberstar, Gloria T. (1983). Strategies of single-issue interest groups, Policy Study Journal, 11(4), 616-625.
- Rubin, David M. & Sachs, David P. (1973). Mass media and the environment: Water resources, land use and atomic energy in California. New York: Praeger.
- Salomone, Kandice L.; Greenberg, Michael R.; Sandman, Peter M.; & Sachsman, David B. (1990). A question of quality: How journalists and news sources evaluate coverage of environmental risk, Journal of Communication, 40, 117-130.
- Save the Whales. (1993, September). The New York Times, p. 16.
- Shaw, Donald L. & Martin, Shannon E. (1992). The function of mass media agenda setting, Journalism Quarterly, 69, 902-920.
- Shedd, Warner (1992). Know your friends. Outdoor Life, 189, pp. 60-62.
- Sigurjónsson, Jóhann (1989, Spring). To icelanders whales were a godsend. Oceanus Magazine, 32, 29-33.

- Sowell, Thomas (1992, July). What's news: Liberal bias of the news media. Forbes, pp. 98-99.
- Walker, Bill (1992, December 1). [Tape-recorded personal interview conducted with Walker, Greenpeace media coordinator, in his office at Greenpeace headquarters in San Francisco, CA].
- Walker, Gloria J. (1988). Media agenda setting and public opinion: A chronicle of environmental issues from 1963 to 1980. Unpublished master's thesis, San Jose State University, Department of Journalism and Mass Communications, San Jose, CA.
- Wilcox, Dennis L.; Ault, Phillip H.; & Agee, Warren K. (1992). Public relations: Strategies and tactics (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Wolfsfeld, Gadi (1984). Symbiosis of press and protest: An exchange analysis. Journalism Quarterly, 61, 550-555, 742.
- Wolfsfeld, Gadi (1994). Media, protest, and political violence: A transactional analysis. In Doris A. Graber (Ed.), Media power in politics (pp. 281-295). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CLASSIFICATION OF ARTICLES ON WHALES AND WHALING

- A-1. Articles Published in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times on Whales and Whaling, 1981-1993.
- A-2. Articles Published in The New York Times on Whales and Whaling, 1981-1993.
- A-3. Classification of Articles Published in the Los Angeles Times on Whales and Whaling, 1981-1993 .
- A-4. Classification of Articles within the Four Categories related to the Whaling Dispute Published in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times, 1981-1993.

Appendix A-1

Articles Published in The New York Times and the Los Angeles Times
on Whales and Whaling 1981-1993.

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Activists	3	3	7	1		10	2	2	1			2	2
Editorials	8	4	5	3	3	4	5	4					
Letters to ed.	4	1							1				
IWC/whal. ban	15	13	4	11	13	11	9	8	3	1	1	7	8
Whales beaching in river or ice	16	9	5	3	40	15	9	43		6	5	1	5
Whale studies	4	3	5	5	5	6	6	8	1	4	5	7	7
Whales amuse.prk.		6	3	3	5	2	5	5	3	1	1		4
Whales other	4	8	2	7	2	5	3	3	7		4	2	1
Whaling Nations and industry		3	2			1	1		2		2		1
Whale watching	1	2	6	4	1	2	9	2	5	6	4	2	1
	55	52	39	37	69	56	49	75	23	18	22	22	28

Appendix A-2.

Articles Published in The New York Times on Whales and Whaling,1981-1993.

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Activists	3	2	5	1		5	1	1	1			2	1
Editorials	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	3					
Letters to ed.	1	1											
IWC/whal. ban	9	8	2	7	9	6	7	8	1	1	1	7	4
Whales beaching in river or ice	10	7	5	3	17	8	6	22		3	5	1	3
Whale studies	3	1	2	4	2	2	5	4		4	4	4	6
Whales amuse.prk.				1	3	1	2	3	1		1		2
Whales other	3	4	2	3	1	4		2	4		3	1	1
Whaling Nations and industry		2	1			1	1		1		1		1
Whale watching	1	1	2	3	1	1	5		3	2	1	2	1
	31	27	20	23	34	32	31	43	11	10	16	17	19

Appendix A-3.

Classification of Articles Published in the Los Angeles Times on Whales
and Whaling, 1981-1993.

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Activists		1	2			5	1	1					1
Editorials	7	3	4	2	2		1	1					
Letters to ed.	3								1				
IWC/whal. ban	6	5	2	4	4	5	2		2			1	3
Whales beaching in river or ice	6	2			23	7	3	21		3			2
Whale studies	1	2	3	1	3	4	1	4	1		1	3	1
Whales amuse.prk.		6	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	1			2
Whales other	1	4		4	1	1	3	1	3		1	1	
Whaling Nations and industry		1	1						1		1		
Whale watching		1	4	1		1	4	2	2	4	3		
	24	25	19	14	35	24	18	32	12	8	6	5	9

Appendix A-4.

Classification of Articles Within the Four Categories Related to the
Whaling Dispute Published in The New York Times and the Los Angeles
Times, 1981-1993.

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Activists	3	3	7	1		10	2	2	1			2	2
Editorials	8	4	5	3	3	4	5	4					
IWC/whal. ban	15	13	4	11	13	11	9	8	3	1	1	8	7
Whaling Nations and industry		3	2			1	1		2		2		1
	26	23	18	15	16	26	17	14	6	1	3	10	10

APPENDIX B
CODING FORM

Coding Form

Newspaper: LAT / NYT	Date:	Coded by:
Width: [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6]	Picture: Y / N	Length:
Location: L / A / B	Head: F / N / U	Page:
News []	Features []	Editorials []
		Letters []

Source of Information	Number of Paragraphs by Source				
	Fav.	Neut.	Unf.	Ev.O.	Bg.O.

Whal. ban mentioned: Y / N Whales Humanized: Y / N Whales have name: Y / N	Number of paragraphs: <table border="1"> <tr> <th colspan="3">Overall Score of Article</th></tr> <tr> <td>Fav.</td><td>Neut.</td><td>Unf.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Evnt. Or.</td><td colspan="2">Bckgr./Iss. Or.</td></tr> </table>	Overall Score of Article			Fav.	Neut.	Unf.	Evnt. Or.	Bckgr./Iss. Or.	
Overall Score of Article										
Fav.	Neut.	Unf.								
Evnt. Or.	Bckgr./Iss. Or.									