2004

The role of stereotyping in the construction of reality in a crisis

Youngkee Ju
San Jose State University

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

Recommended Citation

Ju, Youngkee, "The role of stereotyping in the construction of reality in a crisis" (2004). *Master's Theses*. 2595.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.6ez6-euye>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2595

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.

THE ROLE OF STEREOTYPING
IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF REALITY IN A CRISIS

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

Youngkee Ju

May 2004

UMI Number: 1420477

INFORMATION TO USERS

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 bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send 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.

UMI Microform 1420477

Copyright 2004 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2004

Youngkee Ju

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR
THE SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATIONS

Dr. Cecelja Baldwin

Dr. William Tillinghast

Dr. Mark Wu

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

The Role of Stereotyping in the Construction of Reality in a Crisis

by Youngkee Ju

This study analyzed the New York Times news coverage of 9-11 to see how the press stereotyped the three groups, Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs. It was hypothesized that the social psychological inclination in a crisis to maintain positive social identity through stereotyping in-group as well as out-group members would appear in media content. News frames, episodic cases, and quotes were quantitatively analyzed, and textual analysis was added. As a result, the images of coping Americans, longing Arab-Americans to be accepted as Americans, and hungry and angry Arabs were found. The three images supported the idea that the temporary mood for positive identity in a social crisis should influence news narratives. This study tried to expand the concept of framing applying it to people rather than issues or events. Also, it provided a methodological tool for the research of stereotyping.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank his committee for carefully and expertly guiding the researcher through the entire process. Especially, Dr. William Tillinghast and Dr. Cecelia Baldwin provided the essential insights as this research project progressed. The researcher is also grateful to Dr. Kevin Daly and Karen Switzer who contributed much encouragement and proofreading. Finally, this project would not have been possible without the love, support, and understanding of the author's family, Myoungsoon and Jaehyoung.

Table of Contents

Chapter1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	6
The Explication of Stereotyping.....	6
The Function of Stereotyping: Keeping a Positive Social Identity	9
Stereotyping and Framing.....	12
Self/Hetero-Stereotyping.....	14
Subtyping.....	15
Group Cohesiveness Expressed in Episodic Cases and Quotes.....	16
Hypotheses.....	18
Chapter 3: Method.....	22
Sampling: Selection of Newspaper and Coverage Periods.....	22
Coding Stories into Frames.....	22
-Framing Devices.....	22
-Two-Step Analysis.....	24
-The Rationale for the Seven Categories.....	26
-Operationalization.....	29
-The Unit of Analysis.....	36
Other Methods of Content Analysis.....	38
Textual Analysis.....	39
Chapter 4: Results.....	40
Overview.....	40
General Features.....	42
-The Shift of Frames.....	44

Americans, the Resilient.....	49
Arab-Americans, “We, Americans”.....	58
Arabs, the Hungry and Angry.....	63
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	72
References.....	78

List of Tables

Table 1. Operationalizing Frames.....	31
Table 1-1. The Examples of the Two-Step Analysis.....	33
Table 2. The Instruction for Numbering Episodic Cases and Quotes.....	39
Table 3. The Percentage of Frames Found in Articles on Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11.....	41
Table 4. The Frequency of Articles on Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods	43
Table 5. The Percentage of Frames Found in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods.....	45
Table 6. The Percentage of Frames Found in Articles on Americans in New York Times Coverage of September 11.....	50
Table 7. The Average of Episodic Cases and Quotes in Articles on Americans, Arab- Americans, and Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11.....	54
Table 8. The Percentage of Emotional Frames and the Average of Episodic Cases and Quotes in Articles on Americans in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods	55
Table 8-1. The Correlation between Episodic Cases and Quotes in Articles on Americans in New York Times Coverage of September 11.....	57
Table 9. The Percentage of Frames Found in Articles on Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11.....	63
Table 10. The Average of Episodic Cases and Quotes in Articles on Americans, Arab- Americans, and Arabs Framed with <i>Relations</i> in New York Times Coverage of September 11	67
Table 11. The Average of Episodic Cases and Quotes in Articles on Americans, Arab- Americans, and Arabs Framed with <i>Character</i> in New York Times Coverage of September 11.....	69

List of Figures

Figure 1. The Relations of Variables Examined.....	37
Figure 2. The Number of Articles on Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11	44
Figure 3. The Frequency of Frames Found in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods	46
Figure 4. The Frequency of Frames Found in Articles on Arab-Americans in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods.....	59
Figure 5. The Frequency of Frames Found in Articles on Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods	65

Chapter 1: Introduction

On September 11, 2001, the United States experienced a massive terrorist attack in which the heart of its financial district fell into chaos and thousands of people died. About a month later, the US bombed Afghanistan whose government was believed to provide a shelter for Osama bin Laden, the arguable director of the terror on September 11.

Reflecting the significance of the events, the attention of news media as well as the public was highly focused on the terrorist attack and subsequent bombing. On the morning of September 11, people viewing television could have repeatedly watched airplanes ramming into the World Trade Center. According to the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 9-11 news stories were attended to “very closely” by 72 to 78 percent of the American public (Rasinski, Berktoed, Smith, & Albertson, 2002).

Although the image of the two huge buildings crumbling down made the term “ground zero” popular, the impression of the crisis must have been built upon mass media as well as public mind. In other words, Carey’s (1989) definition of communication as “a symbolic process whereby reality is produced, maintained, repaired, and transformed” may have been exemplified in the event coverage by mass media (p. 23).

Then, a question arises: How is reality “produced,” or constructed, especially in a crisis like the September 11 attack? More specifically, how the people involved, directly or indirectly, with the crisis are represented in mass communication is the question that prompted this research.

Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 2001; Hogg & Abrams, 1988) explains that the stereotypes play an important role in a society under the condition of tension or conflict. The theory insists that the stereotypes become prominent in a way that people differentiate their group from others to maintain positive self-esteem. Following the idea of stereotyping in social identity theory, this study examines how the human groups' tendency to keep a positive social identity through stereotyping appears even in the news stories of a crisis.

This study divides people into three groups according to their general positions in 9-11 and the bombing of Afghanistan: Americans, the attacked; Arab-Americans living in the same country as the attacked but having the same ethnicity with the alleged attackers, and Arabs having the same ethnicity and living area as the attackers. Then, this study explores how the stereotypes, defined by Ashmore and Del Boca (1981) as "beliefs about a group of people," are established in the news stories of the three groups in a way that they serve to maintain a positive self-esteem and differentiate other groups in the crisis.

The method applied in this study is a content analysis of the news coverage of 9-11: a quantitative analysis of news frames, quotations, and episodic cases, the operationalization or definition of which appears in the Method section.

The concept of framing is newly applied to stereotyping research in the current study. According to Entman (1993), "to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and/or treatment recommendation for the item described." Framing seems not quite the same as

stereotyping in terms of the topics to which both have been applied: The former has usually been studied in relation to individual events or issues such as nuclear power (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989), Soviet's shooting down of KAL (Entman, 1991), and the downsizing of General Motors (Martine & Oshagen, 1997). The latter has mostly been examined in light of how a group of people such as African-Americans, women, and ethnic minorities are represented (Martindale, 1990; Kelly, Mills, & Thorson, 2000).

Framing serves, however, a common function to stereotyping in that a particular feature of a subject is stressed while other aspects are omitted in both stereotyping and framing. The similarity is well supported by Wicks and Drew (1991) who explain that framing and stereotyping as well as other concepts including prototypes and social scripts "refer to a categorization plan by which an individual summons a concrete image of the average category member." The selection and omission in framing and stereotyping might be major tools for drawing the "concrete image of the average category member," by which individuality or other aspects of events or people are disregarded. Considering the similarity, this study examines the dominant frames of each group to demonstrate the stereotyping in the crisis.

All articles are categorized into the frames of *Horror*, *Grief*, *Compassion*, *Coping*, *Relations*, *Character*, and *Surveillance*. Each frame is operationalized in the Method section. The frames of *Horror*, *Grief*, *Compassion*, and *Coping* focus on people's activities or appearances based on their emotional responses; the frames are from the basic emotions suggested by William James (Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1988). This study sets the emotional frames taking into account the fact that 9-11 and the subsequent

bombing of Afghanistan were traumatic events in which thousands of people died. It is expected that a quantitative analysis of those frames will show how the three groups are stereotyped in the newspaper with the salience of their particular emotional responses.

Relations focuses on each group member's favorable or hostile attitude toward or relations with in/out-group, their own group or other group, while the frame of *Character* attributes socio-economic, cultural, or other characters to the in/out group. It is appropriate to think that the news stories of *Relations* frame should appear during the crisis of a group conflict. *Character* is also set up as a category following social identity theory that explains people's tendency to differentiate others from themselves negatively or themselves from others positively. In other words, the two frames are based on the assumption that the recognition of relationships among in/out-group members and the differentiation of other groups are intensified in the crisis of a group conflict.

However, a quantitative analysis of *Relations* and *Character* frames per se cannot provide any image of a group unlike the emotional frames that suggest particular emotional images of groups just by their frequency of appearance. Therefore, the study conducts a textual analysis to support the quantitative method.

The first six categories mentioned above are all applied to the stories that are framed in light of the three groups' emotional response, relational attitude, and other characters. The underlying assumption is that news stories of people in a group conflict with mass casualties will mainly focus on their emotional and relational responses to the crisis, and characterize in/out- groups in a way that out-group members are differentiated from in-group members.

One can imagine, however, that the news coverage of a crisis might not be limited to describing ordinary people's responses to the crisis. Shoemaker (1996) explains that people, "hardwired for news," are innately characterized to monitor the world around them. Especially, in the traumatic event with mass casualties, people would seek to know why it had happened, what would happen, and what they have to do next. The stories of political and economic impacts, political leaders' activities, military operation, the suspects, etc. all involve Lasswell's (1948) surveillance function of news. In this study, *Surveillance* is the frame of those situation-oriented stories the focus of which goes beyond ordinary people (e.g., victims and their relatives, rescuers, protesters, observers, and citizens in general). Although *Surveillance* frame does not involve the representation of ordinary members of the three groups, it is set as a category in the current study because it is expected to be a common part of the crisis news coverage.

The New York Times coverage of 9-11 is examined. The Times is selected because it is regarded as one of the most prestigious newspapers in the US. Since the study examines stereotyping as a normal mental activity, stereotyping examined in a prestigious paper should contribute to the persuasiveness of the study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Much research on stereotyping has flooded into the field of mass communication studies since the 1970s (Pickering, 2001). Kelly, Mills, and Thorson (2000) reviewed 145 stereotyping studies, most of which focused on stereotypic coverage of ethnic minority, African Americans, or women in mass media. For example, Martindale (1990), in his *Coverage of Black Americans in Four Major Newspapers, 1950-1989*, operationalized “stereotypic coverage” as “portraying African-Americans in antisocial behavior or as athletes and entertainers,” and argued that the New York Times devoted 12 percent of its space to stereotypic coverage in the 1980s while it did just five percent in the 1950s.

Those studies, however, are from similar social pathological standpoints, searching for a fixed and negative picture of a group in media content. Also, self-stereotyping, which attributes a positive character to its own group, has rarely been examined.

Although the previous studies draw attention to the existence of the problematic social phenomenon, stereotyping, in mass media (Pickering, 2001), they do not explore the nature of the arguably problematic phenomena per se, which this study tries to do by relating it to the human nature of seeking a positive social identity. As the first step on the road that goes beyond the previous studies, it is necessary to examine the very concept of stereotyping.

The Explication of Stereotyping

The word *stereotype* was coined in 1789 by the French printer Didot to describe a printing process in which fixed casts were used to reproduce materials, and used a

century later by psychiatrists to denote a pathological condition of repetitive modes of behavior and expression (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1981).

The conceptual expansion, however, from indicating a printing process to describing a mental process was made by Lippmann (1922). He initiated a formal inquiry into “stereotype” and defined it as “pictures in our heads.” He thought that people construct in their heads simplified pictures of environments in order to cope with the complexity of the social environment.

Following Lippmann, social and experimental psychologists, sociologists, and communication researchers later in 1970s explored stereotyping. With those subsequent studies of stereotyping, however, the meaning of stereotyping has not been agreed upon unanimously because different theoretical approaches have been applied to stereotyping studies (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1981).

Ashmore and Del Boca (1981) classified the various concepts of stereotype into two categories: One defined as bad and another defined as neutral, neither bad nor good. Then, they synthesized the two, saying that stereotypes are “a set of beliefs about the personal attributes of a group of people.”

In the former concept, stereotypes were defined as over-generalized, fixed, and incorrect beliefs or impressions based on insufficient evidence. One example of the often-quoted definition in this position is that of Allport (1954) who defined stereotype as “an exaggerated belief associated with a category.” This classical view on stereotype regards it as bad because it distorts the ways in which social groups or individuals are

perceived, and obscures the more complex and finite particularities and subjectivities tangled up in the everyday lives of groups and individuals (Pickering, 2001).

The latter category of the concept of stereotyping regards it as an attribution of a generalized and simplified characteristic to a group by categorization. The researchers in this position focus on people's limited cognitive capacities. Although Lippmann had previously noted the limit of mental capacities, it was in 1970s and 1980s that the cognitive approach developed as one of the main directions in social psychological stereotyping studies. One of the researchers in the new trend, Tajfel (1969) redefined stereotyping as an explicitly normal cognitive process common to all individuals, saying "Stereotypes arise from a process of categorization. They introduce simplicity and order where there is complexity and nearly random variation." Ashmore and Del Boca (1981), too, recognized that "cognitive limitations make humans susceptible to systematic biases in processing information about people and events, and these biases contribute significantly to the formation and maintenance of the stereotypes regarding social groups." Fox (1992) went a step further by insisting that stereotyped thinking is fundamental in much of human thought, and that mostly our prejudiced thinking is defensive in form, serves to protect us from the unfamiliar, and enhances our chance of survival.

This definitional dilemma, between bad and not bad, was predestined at the beginning of stereotyping studies. Lippmann (1922) thought media stereotyping is one of the political obstacles standing in the way of effective political democracy. At the same

time, he considered it as a necessary mode of processing information, an “inescapable way of creating order out of the great blooming, buzzing confusion of reality.”

The definitional dilemma may arise from the different foci of the two positions. The classical view concerns more with societal outputs of the mental process while the other focuses on the mental process itself. In terms of this aspect, the previous media studies on stereotyping have taken the former position. They do not usually attempt to conceptualize stereotyping per se or explore, in psychological terms, the procedural aspects of stereotyping appearing in media content; they just operationalize the way to measure it. This trend in mass communication studies in 1970s is disparagingly described by Martin Barker, who states that the “search for stereotypes in the media has become a small industry in its own right.” (Pickering, 1995)

Even though the previous studies based on the former position have their own strength in making people recognize the problematic phenomena of stereotyping in mass media, the current study takes the latter position. This study examines how the human innate preference for their positive social identity leads to stereotyping in mass media in a social crisis caused by a group conflict by comparing the frames of different groups in news stories.

The Function of Stereotyping: Keeping a Positive Social Identity

Although this study takes a normal cognitive approach to stereotyping, that does not mean that simplification is the only function of stereotyping in human society in which the members’ interaction incessantly occurs. There have been three main theoretical orientations regarding the function of stereotyping (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1981).

First, the socio-cultural orientation is the most frequent research direction. In this perspective, stereotypes are drawn from the social role that stereotyped people play, and considered a “part of a society’s nonmaterial culture.” Individuals are socialized into a particular culture that includes a specific set of stereotypes, and the stereotypes play a role of supporting norms about how a group and its members are expected to behave and how they should be treated (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1981; Bierhoff, 1989).

While this socio-cultural approach focuses more on society, a motivational perspective places more importance on psychological aspects of individuals. Bierhoff (1989) divides this research orientation into two groups: psychoanalytic reductionism and social identity theory.

Psychoanalytic reductionists assume that human beings have a basic instinct of aggression. Out-group hostility substitutes for this aggressive instinct and stereotypic beliefs are projected on an out-group to justify the hostility against the group. In other words, stereotyping serves as the means of reducing the tension generated by the intra-psychic conflict originated from the basic human instinct of aggression (Bierhoff, 1989).

Another motivational perspective focuses on human desire to keep a positive social identity. Tajfel and Turner (2001) develop “social identity theory” in which they argue that stereotypes are shaped by group membership, by which individuals maintain a consensus on group values and inter-group relations, and are emotionally linked to one another. The group membership entails the desire for a positive social identity that leads to stereotyping.

Also, social identity theory is related to the theories about conflict in reality. The conflict theorists argue that stereotyping occurs due to inter-group competition for scarce resources. The competition elicits hostility toward the out-group and solidarity within the in-group (Biefhoff, 1989). Combining the two theories leads to the viewpoint that stereotyping serves, especially during the period of competition or conflict among groups, to maintain perceivers' positive social identity by accentuating in-group similarity and out-group difference.

Although each of the three viewpoints on stereotyping has its own strengths, the perspective of social identity theory combined with the conflict theory is preferable to the other two perspectives in explaining the conflict like 9-11 since the theory is related to inter-group relations in a real conflict situation.

Following the social identity theory, it can be assumed that the people in a crisis caused by a group conflict will seek their positive social identity. National Tragedy Study launched by National Opinion Research Center (NORC) on two days after the attack, September 13, supports the assumption. The study by NORC was conducted with a national survey, and found that the American people's national pride and confidence in institutions all have gained ground after the attack. For example, the number of Americans expressing confidence in their government increased from 13.5% in 2000 to 51.5% after the attack while the number of Americans expressing confidence in Congress jumped from 12.7% to 43.4% (Smith, Rasinski, & Toce, 2001).

Based on the assumption, then, this study sets up an overall hypothesis that bases all following hypotheses: the human tendency for preserving a positive social identity

activates in news coverage of 9-11 through stereotyping of the people involved, Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs.

Stereotyping and Framing

McCombs and Estrada (1997) explain that the agenda-setting effects of media are not only concerned with selecting the object of attention, but also determining the attributes ascribed to this object. This second dimension of the agenda-setting role leads to another key concept, framing, which Entman (1993) explains as:

To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and/or treatment recommendation for the item described. (p.52)

In other words, framing is to select a small number of attributes that will be assigned to an agenda.

The concept of framing is derived from the “primary framework” coined by Goffman (1974). He assumes that individuals cannot understand the complex world fully, and therefore classify and interpret their experiences to make sense of the world around them. The scheme of this classification and interpretation is the primary framework.

On the other hand, Gitlin (1980) emphasizes the persistency of framing defining it as “persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation of selection, emphasis, and exclusion, by which symbol-handlers routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or

visual.” Accordingly, he argues that an initial frame tends to determine how an issue will be presented in the future.

Considering these two definitions, it seems appropriate to say that framing and stereotyping share a few characters in that both are based on human cognitive limits, that a particular feature is emphasized while other aspects are disregarded, and that both tend to be persistent. In spite of the common features, however, no previous research seems to connect both concepts. Rather, there has been a tacit focus of communication studies: Framing analysis has usually been done on the coverage of such particular issues as nuclear power (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989), the shooting down of an airplane (Entman, 1991), downsizing of a car company (Martine & Oshagen, 1997), and the possible reduction in state funding of the subjects’ university (Price, Tewksbury, & Powers, 1997). On the other hand, stereotyping studies have mainly focused on groups of people such as ethnic minority, African Americans, and Women (Kelly, Mills, & Thorson, 2000), even though Lippmann (1922) thinks stereotypes in generic terms of “pictures in our head.”

The conceptual connection of stereotyping and framing, based on their common nature of selection, is needed under the two considerations. First, the connection will expand the scope of framing studies by examining how a group of people rather than a non-personal issue is framed. Next, it provides the studies on stereotyping with a methodological tool for analysis. That is, analyzing the frame of a particular group of people in news media will show how the group is stereotyped.

Self/Hetero-Stereotyping

Social identity theory argues that stereotyping occurs toward both in-group and out-group since people tend to positively differentiate in-group from out-group or negatively differentiate out-group from in-group. The former is self-stereotyping and the latter is hetero-stereotyping. Both concepts are helpful for the current study to examine the depiction of the three groups in news stories.

Hogg and Abrams (1988) explain that self-stereotyping occurs on “all and any dimensions... that is not only personality traits... but also behavior, attitudes, beliefs, norms of conduct, emotional reactions, and physical appearance” (p.74). Considering that self-stereotyping occurs on all and any dimensions, this study expects that analyzing how the NYT frames Americans’ various reactions to the crisis will reveal how Americans are stereotyped.

On the other hand, what the sociologist Goffman (1974) has written about “stigmatization” can be seen as the outcome of extremely negative hetero-stereotyping (Soeters & Twuyver, 1997). A motive for maintaining a positive self-esteem accentuates inter-group differentiation on heavily evaluative stereotypical dimensions, and hetero-stereotyping is done in the way to maximize in-group’s relative superiority (Hogg & Abrams, 1988).

In addition, it should be noted that Americans and Arabs, especially Afghans, are in similar situations of being attacked. Arabs must have escaped out of the bombing sites as Americans did from the WTC buildings, and the general reactions of both should be based on their basic instinct to survive regardless of their socio-cultural and political

difference. Considering the similarity of situations, it seems worthwhile to examine how both groups' reactions are differently framed, because the difference should provide a clue to understand the idea of self/hetero-stereotyping.

Subtyping

Although the term stereotype has long been regarded as a type of fixed belief, the recent research on stereotype has explored how group beliefs change in response to disconfirming information. For example, Haslam, Turner, Oakes, McGarty, and Hayes (1992) conducted an experiment with Australian university students (N=200) before and after the Persian Gulf War to explore whether social stereotyping of Americans varied along with social contextual change. They found that the stereotypes of Americans in the students' mind were significantly more negative after the war, and questioned the idea of stereotypes as fixed and resistant to change.

There are three models explaining the change: the bookkeeping model, conversion model, and subtyping model (Hewstone, Hopkins, & Routh, 1992). The bookkeeping model suggests a gradual modification of stereotypes by the additive influence of various disconfirming information. The conversion model proposes a radical change in response to dramatic disconfirming information but insists that there is no change in response to minor disconfirming information.

The subtyping model proposes a hierarchical structure within a group being created in response to disconfirming information. Subtyping occurs when perceivers respond to the members of a target group who disconfirm their stereotype by seeing them as exceptions to the rule and placing them in a separate subcategory apart from the members

who confirm the stereotype. They are not counted when thinking about what the group is like. It is a primary means for preventing the change of the original stereotype (Taylor, 1981; Park, Wolsko, & Judd, 2001; Richards & Hewstone, 2001).

Among the three models explaining the changes of stereotypes, subtyping model seems preferable to the other two in explaining the news stories of Arab-Americans in the crisis. For, this model recognizes the existence of Arab-Americans' image independent of Arabs' while other two models just focus on the change of original stereotypes which is Arabs' image. In the case of 9-11, Arab-Americans may not be treated in the same way as Arabs or Americans in news coverage considering the incongruence of their nationality and ethnicity. Based on the subtyping model, this study examines how Arab-Americans are differently depicted from Arabs.

Group Cohesiveness Expressed in Episodic Cases and Quotes

In addition to the people's tendency to maintain a positive social identity in a crisis of group conflict, another feature of group behavior should also be mentioned. Social cohesion model (Hogg, 1992) explains that the group cohesiveness, usually defined by social psychologists as an attraction among group members, increases as shared goals, attitude similarity, physical proximity, common fate, shared threat, etc. intensify (Hogg and Abrams, 1988). Based on the model, Americans may become more cohesive after the 9-11 attack because they have faced a common threat. The result of NORC survey mentioned above seemed to reflect the increase of group cohesiveness.

Shoemaker and Reeves (1996) suggest that various levels of factors affect media contents, and that ideology constitutes part of the hierarchical model of the influences.

The increased group cohesiveness in a society is a kind of social moods, and may influence media content as ideology does. Then, how can one investigate the increased group cohesiveness reflected in news stories? To answer the question, this study sets up two quantifiable measurements: episodic cases and quotes.

Regarding episodic cases, there is a noticeable feature common in the news stories of 9-11: Individual episodes of victims, survivors, rescuers, and other people involved in the crisis flood into news stories as emotional quotes do. From victims' hobby, habit, and life history to survivors' nightmare, many individual stories are conveyed. Those trivial stories rarely become news in normal situation unless people covered are important enough to get readers' attention. Accordingly, a question arises here: Why ordinary people's episodes become newsworthy and flood into the news coverage of 9-11? Based on social cohesion model that proposes the solidification of group membership (Hogg, 1992), both episodic cases and quotes might as well be recognized as the channels through which the readers of the news stories share, as in-group members, their emotions and relational attitude toward in/out-group in the crisis. The changed newsworthiness by which ordinary people's episodes are salient in news stories should reflect the increased group cohesiveness. In addition, this emotional and relational sharing is expected to be made in the way that in-group members' positive social identity is maintained as social identity theory explains.

On quotes, Peter (2000) says that the use of a quote is "a gate-keeping device that admits only those in positions of power and influences while shutting out the opinions and perspectives of those deemed by society to be powerless." Van Dijk (1991) says that

minorities are largely silent and are hardly quoted or quoted with suspicion or distance in newspaper reporting. Based on Peter and Van Dijk's idea of quotes, quotation patterns can be a powerful ideological tool to manipulate readers' perception and interpretation of people and events in the news. In 9-11 news coverage, however, many of ordinary people's quotes loaded with heavy emotional expressions flood into the news stories. Those quotes with more emotions than information per se may be considered, too, as a channel through which victims, their relatives, readers as well as journalists share their emotions, which should lead to group cohesiveness.

Hypotheses

Social identity theory and social cohesion model in social psychology explain about pattern of group behaviors by which people preserve their positive social identity through stereotyping of in/out-group. This study hypothesizes that this social psychological pattern will also appear in the news coverage of 9-11 and the subsequent bombing of Afghanistan. Considering that Shoemakers and Reeves (1996) have previously noted the effect of ideology on news coverage, the social psychological trend of preserving a positive identity may also be examined as an influence on media content.

Since the current study conducts a content analysis of an American newspaper quantifying frames, episodic cases, and quotes, all hypotheses are set in terms of these elements.

Regarding Americans, the emotional frames (i.e., *Horror*, *Grief*, *Compassion*, and *Coping*) should be salient in stories on the group for the following reason: Since 9-11 was a traumatic event in which thousands of people died, the emotional sharing among in-

group members, Americans, was expected. Accordingly, the increased emotional sharing at the societal level may affect the news coverage, and Americans will be framed with the more emotional frames than the other two groups. It is expected, therefore, that:

Hypothesis 1. The percentage of emotional frames in stories focusing on Americans will be greater than the percentage of emotional frames in stories on any other group.

Also, the emotional framing of Americans should be conducted in the positive way that:

Hypothesis 1-1. There will be more *Coping* frames than *Horror*, *Grief*, or *Compassion* frames in stories on Americans.

The reason why *Coping* is regarded as more positive than other emotions in the crisis is based on the following rationale: 9-11 was an attack by terrorists on America, and normalcy in general was destroyed throughout the American society. The emotional responses of horror, grief, and compassion all reflect the disruption of social normalcy. Although *Coping* also reflects this disruption, it involves a will to return to the very same normalcy. In this respect, *Coping* may be a different response from the other three emotional frames, making it more positive than the other three in the situation of disrupted normalcy.

On the other hand, Americans should be also represented in the positive ways in terms of episodic cases and quotes that:

Hypothesis 2. The frequency of episodic cases in stories focusing on Americans will be greater than that focusing on Arab-Americans or Arabs.

Hypothesis 2-1. The frequency of quotes in stories focusing on Americans will be greater than that focusing on Arab-Americans or Arabs.

When these two hypotheses are supported, however, one might raise a question that this numeral dominance in the two indices of stories on Americans over those on the other two groups may reflect just that most readers of the NYT are Americans. To put it another way, this numeral dominance may not reflect the crisis in which group cohesiveness have increased. To show the situational influence on episodic cases and quotes, the best way may be to compare news stories of before and after 9-11. However, the comparison may have another problem of selecting appropriate samples to be compared. To show the influence of group cohesiveness, therefore, this study compares the news stories of the three periods the duration of which reach a year since 9-11 happened:

Hypothesis 3. The average of episodic cases and quotes in stories on Americans will differ during the three periods of coverage.

The variance can explain the situational influence, in social psychological terms, on journalistic activities of quotation and newsgathering of human episodes.

Also, the frequency of episodic cases and quotes per se will vary positively with each other if both reflect the situational variance of group cohesiveness:

Hypothesis 3-1. The number of episodic cases for Americans will vary positively with the number of quotes.

In the case of 9-11 and the bombing of Afghanistan, Arabs are the out-group to the New York Times and social identity theory anticipates negative differentiation of the out-group more than emotional or relational sharing with the out-group members. Accordingly, a hypothesis is set up:

Hypothesis 4. There will be more *Character* frames than any other frame in stories focusing on Arabs.

Hypothesis 4-1. The stories focusing on Arabs will contain fewer episodic cases and quotes than stories focusing on either of the other two groups.

This *Character* frame may strengthen the differentiation of Arabs from Americans, and lead to hetero-stereotyping in public mind as well as in media discourse.

Regarding the stories of Arab-Americans, this study expects that they are treated as a subcategory apart from Arabs in the way that:

Hypothesis 5. The frequency of emotional frames in stories focusing on Arab-Americans will be greater than that of stories focusing on Arabs.

Hypothesis 5-1. The frequency of emotional frames in stories focusing on Arab-Americans will be less than that of stories focusing on Americans.

This hypothesis is set up because the emotional frames in this study are an indication of emotional sharing among group members. The more emotional frames appear in Arab-Americans' stories, this study expects, the more they are treated as in-group members rather than out-group. Also, their episodic cases and quotes are expected to be more than those of Arabs but less than those of Americans:

Hypothesis 6. There will be more episodic cases and quotes in stories focusing on Arab-Americans than those focusing on Arabs.

Hypothesis 6-1. There will be less episodic cases and quotes in stories focusing on Arab-Americans than those focusing on Americans.

Chapter 3: Method

Sampling: Selection of Newspaper and Coverage Periods

The New York Times coverage of 9-11 is examined. The Times is selected because it is regarded as one of the most prestigious press in the US. Since this study examines stereotyping as a normal mental activity, stereotyping found in a prestigious paper, which might stereotype people less than other average newspapers do, provides a stronger basis of understanding stereotyping.

The newspaper is analyzed for three seven-day periods during the crisis: immediately after the attack (September, 12-18, 2001), during the bombing of Afghanistan (October, 8-14, 2001), and around the anniversary of the attack (September 6-12, 2002). All articles concerning 9-11 in A sections and other special sections such as “Before and After,” “After the Attacks,” “Nation Challenged,” and “Threat and Responses” are examined. Editorials, reporter’s notebooks published not as a normal article but as a special provision, excerpts from government officials’ addresses, sermons, obituaries, and captions for pictures are excluded. This results in a total of 806 articles.

Coding Stories into Frames

Framing Devices

In this study, news frames are analyzed quantitatively. Entman (1993) explains that frames “are manifested by the presence or absence of certain keywords, stock phrases, stereotyped images, sources of information, and sentences that provide thematically reinforcing clusters of facts or judgments” (p.52). They can be “detected by probing for particular words and visual images” that convey thematically consonant meanings since

all the framed narratives consist of words and pictures (Entman, 1991, p.7). Accordingly, to discern and describe the framing devices that consist of particular words and visual images has been one of the main goals of framing research (D'Angelo, 2000).

A tricky part in framing analyses, however, is associated with the fact that a framing device is a multi-dimensional entity that one cannot thoroughly examine its full scope just in terms of lexical features of a text, and that there seems not unanimously agreed upon theoretical dimensions around which framing devices operate. For example, Gamson and Modigliani (1989) suggest five framing devices that may constitute a particular frame: metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions, and visual images. Pan and Kosicki (1993), however, take a different approach to framing devices and explain that the five devices except visual images are just one dimension of narratives that establish a frame. There are four broader dimensions of potential framing devices in news stories (i.e., syntactic, script, thematic, and rhetorical structures), and Gamson and Modigliani's (1989) framing devices, they think, just belong to rhetorical structures that result from the stylistic choices made by journalists.

On the other hand, syntactical structures refer to the stable patterns of the arrangement of words or phrases into sentences. These structures in most news stories are characterized by the inverted pyramid structure, a sequential organization of structural elements such as headline, lead, episodes, background and closure. (Pan & Kosicki, 1993)

Thematic structures are concerned with the "hypothesis-testing" aspect of news stories: Such propositions about political campaign and nuclear power as "The No Bull

Campaign” (Pan & Kosicki, 1993), “progress, energy independence, public accountability,” and “devil’s bargain” (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989) are substantiated with empirical facts in the news stories with thematic structures.

Finally, script structures are the internalized scheme of the sequence of activities and components of an event. Pan and Kosicki (1993) explain that news discourses are stories because they are “arbitrarily chunked concretes in a continuous flow of history” (p.60). A script refers to the stable pattern of the newsworthy stories, and the generic version of script structure in news stories consists of the five Ws and one H: who, what, when, where, why, and how. The script structure in news stories “conveys the impression that a news story is a relatively independent unit, because it appears to contain complete information of an event with a beginning, a climax, and an end” (p.60).

When taking into account Entman’s (1993) conceptualization of framing as selecting “some aspects of a perceived reality,” Pan and Kosicki’s (1993) four dimensions of framing devices provide a more concrete perspective on the process of selection by which reality is framed. For example, to select some facts to put in a headline, to select some information as the How or What or other Ws in a story while disregarding others, to select a causal statement as a theme in a news story, and to select rhetoric styles of news narratives may occur during the selection.

Two-Step Analysis

This study utilizes Pan and Kosicki’s (1993) idea that script structures of news stories consist of five W and one H to analyze the frame of 9-11 news. Although they analyze the script structure of a news story sentence to sentence, this study will examine

the script structure of a news story. As they explain, the five Ws and one H “do not have to be present in every single story” (p.60). Also, the Ws and H covered in a story are not all headlined or treated with the same degree of salience. The emphasis on different Ws or H should lead to different framing, and thereby the determination of the main Ws or H in a story may become the first step of a framing analysis.

Based on this rationale, this study will examine the 9-11 news in terms of 5Ws and 1H to determine the main elements that connect the various episodes, events, and thematic facts in a story. To decide the main elements, the headline, sub-title, and the theme of each story that is usually reflected in the headline and sub-title are examined. For example, the story headlined “The Lives They Lost: Passengers and Crew of the Hijacked Jets,” and which has the sub-title of “THE FLIGHTS” is full of the previous episodes of passengers that happened during their living (September 15, 2001, A5). In the story, the victims in the flights, the element of *Who*, becomes the connecting element among various episodes considering the headline and sub-title of the story.

After deciding the main Ws or H of a story, the story is coded into one of the seven frames according to the attributes assigned to the main Ws or H. To put it another way, the next step of the framing analysis is to determine attributes ascribed to the Ws or H in a story and thereby categorize the story into one of the seven frames. This second step is the critical stage of the coding procedure, and done by reviewing episodes and thematic facts about the three groups in each story. In the case of the story mentioned above, there are various but consistent humanistic episodes such as the death of a young doctor who was falling in love and married with a woman, the birth of a child whose father died, and

the death of the family returning from vacation. All the episodes serve to represent the victims as the main characters in a tragedy, and thereby the story is coded into the frame of *Grief*.

Because the analysis of a frame has been a long descriptive task based on a qualitative textual analysis (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989; Martin & Oshagan, 1997), the descriptive exemplification of the two-step analysis with another story seems appropriate. The story headlined “As Others Flee, Scores of Firefighters Dash Into Towers to Help; Many Do Not Return” with the sub-title “THE RESPONSE” consists of firefighters’ rescue activities on the spot (September 12, 2001, A2). The firefighters (*Who*) and rescue (*What*) are the elements that organize the story, and their courageous sacrifice conveyed through other rescuers or onlookers’ quotes becomes the main attribute of the story. These episodes of courageous sacrifice characterize the elements of *Who* and *What*, and the story then is coded into the frame of *Coping*. Operationalization of each frame follows later.

The Rationale for the Seven Categories

All articles are categorized into the seven frames of *Horror*, *Grief*, *Compassion*, *Coping*, *Relations*, *Characters*, and *Surveillance*.

The frames of *Horror*, *Grief*, *Compassion*, and *Coping* are concerned with the emotions that should be salient in people’s response to the traumatic crises. The four emotional frames are from the basic emotions explained by William James, one of the forerunners in psychology: fear, grief, love, and rage (Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1988). Taking into account the nature of 9-11 in which people were scared by mass killing

attacks, and showed their sympathy with victims and will to cope with the hardships, this study changes William James' "fear," "love," and "rage" into *Horror*, *Compassion* and *Coping*.

Regarding *Relations* as well as the four emotional frames, this study assumes that all of them should be the main organizing ideas, whether they are media frames or public frames, by which people make sense of the world of the crisis. The rationale for this assumption is based on social identity theory and social cohesion model: If group membership is intensified in a group conflict as social cohesion model explains, people's emotional and relational sharing, the major components of group membership, should also increase. Then it seems appropriate to say that the increased emotional and relational sharing among group members will lead them to make sense of the world of the crisis in terms of emotions and relationships.

Of course, the emotional sharing and common recognition of in/out-group relationships among group members are not all that constitute group membership and bring about stereotyping: It may consist of other mental entities, too, including shared norms, ideologies, values, and so on. However, this study assumes that the two components, shared emotions and relationships are activated as the major parts of group membership in the crises since both 9-11 and the bombing of Afghanistan are emotion-arousing group conflicts that bring about many casualties. Therefore, the current study will examine how the news stories that frame people in a crisis in terms of their emotion and recognition of relationships construct the images of in/out groups.

The frame of *Character* is based on the idea of differentiation of social identity theory. The theory explains that people tend to positively differentiate in-group from out-group or negatively differentiate out-group from in-group. This study presumes that the differentiation should appear in media discourse, too, and is made via *Character* frame of news stories.

The concept of *Surveillance* frame is from Lasswell's (1948) two functions of news media, surveillance and correlation. In a crisis as well as a normal situation, news media inherently try to satisfy people's needs of information by attempting to cover as many newsworthy events as possible. The frame can be also understood in terms of audience or people in general. Shoemaker (1996) explains that people, "hardwired for news," are innately characterized to monitor the world around them for survival. Especially in the traumatic event with mass casualties, people may need the information regarding why it happened, what will happen next, and what they have to do to cope with the crisis.

Surveillance is the frame of the stories that have specific topics of the crises with which ordinary people's response is not directly concerned. For example, the story on the transportation in New York on the day of the terror has the frame. Although any specific image of ordinary members of the three groups were not conveyed in the frame, it is set as a category because it may be the main part of the crisis news coverage, and the category helps the current study to get the exhaustiveness of its variables.

In summary, people in the crises are assumed to share their emotions and relational attitudes among in-group members, differentiate out-group members, and look for information necessary to manage the crises. These social psychological patterns of group

behavior accordingly become the media frame of people involved, and the stereotyping of in/out-groups is proceeded through the frames.

Operationalization

After explaining the reason of using the seven frames in this study, operationalizing the frames is in order. Since this study examines the script structure of stories to identify each frame, the operationalization of each frame may as well be conducted in terms of 5Ws and 1H. However, utilizing all of the six factors as index for operationalization should bring about the problem of over-complexity because seven categories are used in this study. Therefore, this study utilizes only the *Who* as well as the salient attributes assigned to it as indices for coding. The other elements caught in the two-step analysis also serve the current study to code because they clarify what a news story is about.

First of all, the *Who* of the six frames other than *Surveillance* is the ordinary people, and it becomes the main element of a story. Ordinary people refer to all Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs who do not work for each government and are not the suspects of 9-11. The story of the President Bush's activities or the investigation of the suspects, for example, is coded into *Surveillance* rather than one of the six frames.

Horror is the frame of the story in which such aversive reactions as escaping from the crumbling site and being scared by the attack or its memory are salient. In the story of this frame, people in the site of attack (e.g., the witness, survivors, and rescuers), those who experience the attack indirectly (e.g., victims' relatives, other acquaintances, and the people with the same nationalities as victims), and those who worry about a possible attack (e.g., Afghans, Muslims in the area other than Arabs) become the *Who*. The

attribute ascribed to the *Who* is the *aversive reaction* to the crisis that happened or other possible dangers. By aversive reaction, this study means escaping, worrying, being nervous and careful. For example, the stories about the parents who rush to schools for picking up their children, rescuers struggling against the memory of the traumatic happenings, and the workers whose offices are around Manhattan and who still are nervous to work are coded into *Horror* frame. Since framing analysis has usually been a descriptive discourse based on textual analysis, operationalizing each frame might as well be clarified with the examples of the two-step analysis of real news stories (Table 1).

The *Who* of *Grief* is the people who experience the attack indirectly (e.g., victims' relatives or other acquaintances, and the people with the same nationalities as victims), survivors, rescuers, and the victims. The attribute to the main elements is the *mental pain* caused by missing the victims whether they are relatives, friends, or just those with the same nationality. The typical story of the frame is about the bereaved people who lost their loved ones or someone in intimate relationships. Therefore, the story of handbills posted all over the city by victims' families or friends to find their husband, wife, etc. and that of families who are searching for their missing around hospitals are coded into *Grief*. Also, the story of rescuers who dug the spot of collapsed building to seek survivors and felt despair with increasing dead bodies, and the story about the episodes of passengers who died in the crashed flights are coded into the frame. In the case of passengers' episodic story, the memories of the victims represented in the episodes were distinctively contrastive to their reality of dying, and make the victims the main character of the

tragedy. As a result, grieved Americans are framed with the script of the story rather than the stylistic choice by journalists.

Compassion has the different element of the *Who*: the strangers to the victims become the *Who* and their *help of or sharing with the damaged* is the attribute ascribed to the frame. The stories about donators and institutions for charity are the examples. Also, the story of the solace from strangers is coded into the frame (Table 1).

Coping has the same *Who* as *Grief* and the attribute of the frame is *willingness to overcome the crises*. The news about the sellout of American flags, or people's displaying of their patriotism is a typical story. The story of victims' courageous activities is also coded into this frame. Also, the interview with the corporate leader who lost his office and employees but showed a strong "fighting spirit" to make his corporate come back is the example of the frame. Although *Coping* is not regarded an emotion in an exactly psychological term, it is also considered as an emotion in the current study since it is also a mental response to a crisis.

Table 1. Operationalizing Frames

Frame	Operationalization	
	Who	Attributes
<i>Horror</i>	People in the site of attack (e.g., the witness, survivors, and rescuers), those who experience the attack indirectly (e.g., victims' relatives, other acquaintances, and the people with the same nationalities as victims), and those who worry about a possible attack (e.g., Afghans, Muslims in the area other than Arabs, and nervous workers in Manhattan)	<i>Aversive reactions</i> like escaping, worrying, being nervous and careful

<i>Grief</i>	People who experience the attack indirectly (e.g., victims' relatives, other acquaintances, and the people with the same nationalities as victims), survivors, rescuers, and the victims	<i>Mental Pains</i> from missing the victims
<i>Compassion</i>	People who are the strangers to the victims	<i>Help of or sharing with the damaged</i>
<i>Cope</i>	People who experience the attack indirectly (e.g., victims' relatives, other acquaintances, and the people with the same nationalities as victims), survivors, rescuers, and the victims	<i>Willingness to overcome the crises</i>
<i>Relations</i>	People who show their support for or opposition to the terror and the bombing of Afghanistan, people who have or newly establish a relationship with those having a direct experience of the crises (e.g., the relatives of victims who form a network with other victims' family, and the residents of the community who have had close relationships with a US air base)	<i>Relational attitude toward in/out-group</i> (e.g., protesting and other expressions of un/favorable opinion on the two events, keeping in touch with those in the same situation)
<i>Character</i>	Any sub-group of Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs (e.g., the crowd in churches, moviegoers, consumers, small-business owners, emergency escape planners, refugees, the dead by bombing in Afghanistan etc.)	<i>Socio-economic, cultural, or other non-emotional and non-relational features</i>
<i>Surveillance</i>	Such non-ordinary people as political leaders, government officials, military, intelligence agency, and the suspects *Topic: Non-personal issues like governmental response, the impact of the crises on infrastructure (e.g., transportation, telecommunication) or economy, security, and so on.	No specific attribute ascribed to ordinary people.

Table 1-1. *The Examples of the Two-Step Analysis*

Date	Page	Article	Who	Salient Attributes	Frames
09/12/01	A1	Creeping horror	Who (the witness), Where (crumbling site)	Escaping people in horrifying scenes	<i>Horror</i>
09/12/01	A9	Hospitals	Who (waiting doctors) Where (hospitals)	No patient in spite of medical readiness	<i>Grief</i>
09/14/01	A8	The memorials	Who (people who don't know the victims) What (expression of condolence)	Solace from strangers	<i>Compassion</i>
09/12/01	A2	Firefighters	Who (firefighters) What (rescue)	"Dash into towers"- courageous activities	<i>Coping</i>
09/12/01	A12	Relations	Who (Arab-Americans, Jews)	Blaming the terror	<i>Relations</i>
10/08/01	B8	Refugees	Who (Afghan refugees in Iran)	Unwelcome refugees	<i>Character</i>

As mentioned before, *Relations* is based on the social psychological viewpoint: the common recognition of inter-group relationship constitutes part of group membership and the membership gets stronger when a group faces a common threat. The intensified group membership may lead people to attend to in/our-group relationship, and accordingly this attention should become one of organizing idea by which people make sense of the world of group conflict.

The *Who* of *Relations* frame is the person who supports for or opposes to the terror and the bombing of Afghanistan. Also, those who have or newly establish a relationship with people having directly experienced the crises become the subjects of the frame. For example, the victims' relatives who form a network among other victims' families, and the residents of a community who have had close relationships with a US air base that locates in their community become the ordinary people of *Relations* frame.

The attribute is people's *relational attitude toward in/out-group*. By relational attitude, this study means all types of activities or relationships favorable or unfavorable to the people involved in the crises (e.g., protesting and other expression of un/favorable opinion on the two events, keeping in touch with those in the same situation). The stories of Americans' protest against the bombing of Afghanistan, Arab's demonstration against the US, and Arab-Americans' attitude toward the US attack against Afghanistan are the examples. Also, the story about the solidified relationships among the relatives of victims is coded into the frame since it represents the relational attitude among in-group members.

In addition, the difference between emotional frames and *Relations* should be noted since relational attitudes might be based on emotions as one can see in the story of angry Arabs' demonstration against the US. By relational attitudes, this study indicates the attitudes that make it possible to predict the stable relationships among groups or their members. Arabs' anger in the story of their demonstration, for example, implies their persistent attitude toward the out-group, the US, while the story of donators does not give a hint on the long-term relationships between donators and victims or their relatives. Therefore, the latter is coded into *Compassion*, an emotional frame, while the story of

angry Arabs is coded into *Relations*. The story of the networks among victims' relatives is also coded into the frame: although their relationship is based on their emotional sympathy with each other, a long-lasting relationship is implied in the story.

In the case of *Character*, any sub-group of Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs (e.g., the crowd in churches, moviegoers, consumers, small-business owners, emergency escape planners, refugees, the dead by bombing of Afghanistan etc.) becomes the *Who*. The attribute assigned to the frame is *socio-economic, cultural, or other non-emotional and non-relational features* of a group. A unique feature in the story of this frame is that people are represented collectively with statistics, comparison with other group, and thematic explanation interpolating collective nouns. In the story of Afghan refugees to Iran, the refugees, the *Who*, are characterized as unwelcome people increasing in Iran (Table 1). Also, the stories of Arabs' negative socio-economic situation, American consumers' returning to market, the increase of American moviegoers, and the miserable economic status of Arabian casualties by the US bombing are the examples.

Regarding *Surveillance*, the *Who* of the frame are such non-ordinary people as the US President, other government officials, political and religious leaders in Arabs, and the suspects including Osama bin Laden. However, the story of ordinary people is also coded into the frame when its topic involves such non-personal issues like governmental response, the impact of the crises on infrastructure (e.g., transportation, telecommunication) or economy, security, and so on. For example, the story headlined "With City Transit Shut Down, New Yorkers Take to Eerily Empty Streets" with the subtitle "TRANSPORTATION" (September 12, 2001, A8) is coded into *Surveillance* even

though it describes the difficulty of ordinary people to get back home. The topic of a story is signaled in each sub-title that the New York Times provides for each new story. For the purpose of clarification, the examples of the sub-titles of *Surveillance* frame may as well be provided. In the case of the stories on September 12, the sub-titles of *Surveillance* stories are as follows: THE BUILDINGS, THE MEASUREMENT, THE PRESIDENT, THE VIEW FROM THE PACIFIC, ATTACK ON MILITARY, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, DISASTER PLANNING, THE GOVERNMENT, TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATIONS, THE ELECTIONS, THE NEED, THE OPERATION, THE PSYCHOLOGY, THE PLANES, PENNSYLVANIA CRASH, SECURITY, TERRORIST VIGIL, THE BACKGROUND, THE AIRLINES, CONGRESS, IN THE CAPITAL, INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES, THE MILITARY, THE AFGHANS, THE MILITANT, THE THREAT, THE MEDIA, THE WARNINGS.

The Unit of Analysis

The framing studies vary in their unit of analysis: some studies examine a clause (Rhee, 1997) or a sentence (Pan & Kosicki, 1993) while others take an article as well as a cartoon and a column as the unit of analysis (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989; Martin & Oshagan, 1997). The previous framing studies that examined a clause or sentence, however, have the purpose of identifying a specific frame in a story or a series of stories. This study takes an article as the unit of analysis because one of the purposes of this study is to see which frame is more salient than other frames examining the script structure of news stories. In that case, the concept of frames may as well be applied to an article rather than a sentence or phrase.

In general, the frequency of each frame, episodic cases, and quotes of each group are analyzed. Although the unit of analysis is each article, an article can be coded into more than one frame if it has two or more frames. As a result, 861 frames for 806 articles are analyzed. (Figure. 1)

Figure 1. The Relations of Variables Examined

Other Methods of Content Analysis

On the other hand, all articles about people that have the frames of *Horror*, *Grief*, *Compassion*, *Coping*, *Relations*, and *Character* are examined in terms of the amount of episodic cases and quotes. By episodic cases, this study indicates the description of all personal life stories, individuals' activities and appearances in everyday lives or in the situations related to the events. For example, parts of an article saying "Also killed was one of the department's Roman Catholic chaplains, Michael F. Judge, who had rushed to the scene to comfort victims" (September 12, A2) and "Seth Bower was on Broadway when the force of the collapse knocked him over onto other people. Bodies fell on top of him..." (September 12, A7) become a case. To be a case, an individual's name should appear in the description. If two or more people make a situation, it is calculated as one case. Anonymous people's actions are not categorized as cases unless they come along with a quote because there are so many descriptions of the activities of anonymous people on the street whether in the US or the Middle East. Regarding quotes, two or more quotes made by a person are calculated as one. Also, if a quote delivers the speaker's or others' episodic cases, a quote and a case are calculated together (Table 2).

Two coders read news stories: the researcher reads all and the other reads stories for two days that amounts 10% of total. The inter-coder reliability was .80 for frames (Scott's Pi); Cronbach Alpha for episodic cases was .90 and that for quotes was .94.

Regarding statistics, Chi-Square is used to test the statistical significance of different frames among the three groups, and One Way ANOVA is utilized to examine the

statistical significance of difference in the amount of episodic cases and quotes among the three groups.

Textual Analysis

Although the quantitative analysis of frames, episodic cases, and quotes is expected to provide a general picture of images of the three groups, the quantification needs to be complemented with a qualitative method. A quantitative approach may cause the problem of oversimplification, omitting the implicit meaning of media contents as Reese (2001) mentioned. Especially in this study, the quantification of such frames as *Relations* and *Character* does not provide any image of people. Therefore, a textual analysis is accompanied to check the findings of the quantitative framing analysis.

Table 2. The Instruction for Numbering Episodic Cases and Quotes

Episodic cases	Quotes
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To be a case, an individual's name should appear in the description. Anonymous actions are not regarded as cases but anonymous quotes are taken as quotes. 2. The same action by a group is taken just as one case but different actions of each person or a group of people in different situations are regarded as separate cases. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More than two quotes of a person are regarded as a quote. 2. A quote in which people's episode is conveyed is regarded as both a case and a quote, but when a quote conveys just the speaker's opinion, it is coded as just a quote. <p>The quotes of Government officials and political leaders are not calculated as a quote because they are associated with <i>Surveillance</i> frame, but the quotes of local government officials like police officers in the article of non-<i>Surveillance</i> frame, are coded as a quote. Outsiders' comments about the target group are excluded. (e.g., U.N. officials' quotes on Arabs)</p>

Chapter 4: Results

Overview

A total of 806 articles with 861 frames were analyzed. The frames showed up as follows: *Surveillance* (66.8%), *Coping* (7.1%), *Relations* (7.0%), *Grief* (6.0%), *Character* (5.9%), *Horror* (5.5%), and *Compassion* (1.7%).

When thinking about the stories of people, excluding *Surveillance*, frames showed up as follows: *Coping* (21.3%), *Relations* (21.0%), *Grief* (18.2 %), *Character* (17.8%), *Horror* (16.4%), and *Compassion* (5.2%). In terms of each group, all hypotheses regarding Americans were supported: they were emotionally framed more than other two groups, and of the emotional frames, *Coping* Americans were the most salient.

In addition, the frequency of episodic cases and quotes in stories focusing on Americans was greater than that focusing on Arab-Americans or Arabs. This numeral dominance of stories on Americans over those on the other two groups seemed to reflect the situation in which American group cohesiveness intensified. Also, the situational impact of the increased group cohesiveness and need for a positive social identity on the numeral dominance was supported. That is, the average of episodic cases and quotes in stories on Americans changed with a statistical significance during the three periods of coverage, and the number of episodic cases for Americans varied positively with the number of quotes.

Regarding Arab-Americans, they were less frequently framed with emotions than Americans while more than Arabs. The hypotheses on episodic cases and quotes were also supported. These findings signified that Arab-Americans were not so much treated as an out-group as Arabs were.

Accordingly, the stories focusing on Arabs contain the fewest episodic cases and quotes of all groups. In light of frames, however, the hypothesis that Character frames would be predominant in stories on Arabs was rejected. The frame of *Relations* (51.7%) appeared more than *Character* (44.8%) (Table 3). The finding implied that the group members' attention to in/out-group relationships might change first while the differentiation of the out-group may come later.

As a result, all hypotheses except the one that Arabs would be framed with *Character* were supported. These findings confirmed the overall hypothesis that the human tendency for preserving a positive social identity activates in news coverage of 9-11 through stereotyping.

Table 3. The Percentage of Frames Found in Articles on Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11

Focus of Article		Americans	Arab-Americans	Arabs	Total
(Number of Articles)		(208)	(20)	(58)	(286)
Frames	Emotions	79.8	35.0	3.4	61.2
	Horror	19.2	35.0		16.4
	Grief	24.0		3.4	18.2
	Compassion	7.2			5.2
	Coping	29.3			21.3
	Relations	9.1	55.0	51.7	21.0
	Character	11.1	10.0	44.8	17.8

χ^2 (4, n=286) = 126.449, $P < .001$. Chi-Square was computed on the basis of the three frames, Emotions, Relations, and Character.

General Features

As mentioned before, Surveillance frames appeared the most frequently of all frames. Considering that the stories with *Surveillance* focus more on specific issues concerning the development of the crises, the predominance of the frame in the 9-11 news stories is expected. If the research topic is on how the event of 9-11, rather than the people in the event, is framed in news media, *Surveillance* frame also needs to be analyzed with its sub-categories. Since the current study, however, tries to examine the frame of ordinary people in the crises, the analytic discourse from now on is made only about the first six frames excluding *Surveillance* stories.

When thinking about the stories of people, excluding *Surveillance*, frames showed up as follows: *Coping* (21.3%), *Relations* (21.0%), *Grief* (18.2 %), *Character* (17.8%), *Horror* (16.4%), and *Compassion* (5.2%). The emotional frames are the most salient (61.2%), and *Coping*, one of the emotional frames, was the most frequent of all the six frames (Table 3).

In terms of the groups described, the stories about Americans dominated the whole coverage: 72.7% of all articles about people dealt with Americans while 20.3% was for Arabs. The stories about Arab-Americans amounted to just 7.0%, most of which were concerned with the anti-Arab moods in the US. (Table 4, Figure 2)

This composition was constant immediately after the attack and around the anniversary but changed when the US retaliated against Afghanistan. The portion of Arab stories increased from 12.8% to 33.3% during the period, and reduced again to 17.1% around the anniversary (Table 4). The increased news coverage of Arabs seemed

to be associated with the role of news media in the situation in which a new event of bombing broke out in Afghanistan.

In general, Americans are emotionally framed (79.8%) while Arab-Americans and Arabs are framed in terms of their relational attitudes (55.0, 51.7%) (Table 3).

Table 4. *The Frequency of Articles on Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods*

Period of Coverage	After the Attack	After the Bombing	Around Anniversary	Total
(Number of Articles)	(117)	(87)	(82)	(286)
Americans	78.6%	59.8%	78.0%	72.7%
Arab-Americans	8.5	6.9	4.9	7.0
Arabs	12.8	33.3	17.1	20.3

$\chi^2 (4, n=286) = 14.754, P < .01$.

Figure 2. The Number of Articles on Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11

The Shift of Frames

Considering the time dimension, this study found that each frame evolved in terms of its frequency as the phase of the crisis developed. In general, the portion of emotional frames shifted from 76.9% immediately after the attack through 41.4% to 59.8% (Table 5). It is expected that the frame of *Horror* should decrease as time goes on. Among the total stories of *Horror* frame, majority (59.6%) appeared in the first period and 34.0% of them showed up during the bombing period. When considering the portion of *Horror*

frame among the whole frames within each period, it still decreased from 23.9% to 18.4%, and finally to 3.7% (Table 5, Figure 3).

Table 5. *The Percentage of Frames Found in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods*

Period of Coverage (Number of Articles)		After the Attack (117)	After the Bombing (87)	Around Anniversary (82)	Total (286)
Frames	Horror	23.9%	18.4%	3.7%	16.4%
	Grief	19.7	6.9	28.0	18.2
	Compassion	8.5	2.3	3.7	5.2
	Coping	24.8	13.8	24.4	21.3
	Sub-Total	76.9	41.4	59.8	61.2
	Relations	13.7	39.1	12.2	21.0
	Character	9.4	19.5	28.0	17.8

$\chi^2 (10, n=286) = 59.756, P < .001.$

Figure 3. The Frequency of Frames Found in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods

In the case of *Grief*, it decreased after the US bombing of Afghanistan and increased again around the anniversary (19.7, 6.9, and 28.0%). *Coping* was also decreased during the bombing period (24.8, 13.8, and 24.4%). On the other hand, the *Relations* frame increased after bombing of Afghanistan (13.7, 39.1, and 12.2%). Most *Relations* stories during the period are about Arabs' response to the attack.

Generally speaking, the six frames showed four types of shift in its frequency: the gradual decrease (*Horror*), gradual increase (*Character*), decrease during the bombing of Afghanistan, which is a reaction period (*Grief*, *Compassion*, and *Coping*), and the increase during the reaction time (*Relations*). The gradual change of *Horror* and *Character* seems to be compatible with a general expectation that people's emotional

reaction to the crises should fade out as time goes while non-emotional characterization may increase. The big increase of *Relations* frame is also expected since people should attend to an out-group's response after acting upon the group. They should be concerned about the target group's relational attitude toward them rather than about the out-group's emotional change. In the real news stories, most *Relations* stories are about Afghans' general attitude toward the US and the bombing. Of course, *Relations* frame appeared in the American stories, too: "Sept. 11 Terrorist attack Narrows the Racial Divide in the US" (October 10, B1); "Left behind now in the wake of the World Trade Center attack are networks of survivors, loose-knit clans of wives, partners and children woven together by the office friendships of men now dead..." (October 10, A16); a story about the close relationships between a US air base and the residents of the community it locates (October 11, B12); the friendship between a rescuer and a survivor (September 11, 2002, E16), and so on.

Although the three patterns mentioned above are quite expected as explained, a question is raised regarding the shift of *Grief, Compassion, and Coping*: Why did they re-increase around the anniversary while *Horror* gradually decreased? The increase of the three emotional frames might be concerned with the fact that an anniversary is a ritual deeply rooted in people's schema across diverse cultures. In other words, the schema of the ritual elicited the emotions of people again, and thereby led media to reframe people and events with those emotions. In the case of *Horror*, however, it is generally considered to involve the less positive image of people than coping and other emotions, and might not come along with other emotional frames around the anniversary.

In summary, the emotional frames except *Horror* increased again in the anniversary news coverage of 9-11, and seemed to serve the news stories to be a forum of emotional sharing of in-group members.

Americans, the Resilient

As mentioned above, the stories of Americans were predominant during the whole period while the portion slightly decreased during the bombing of Afghanistan (Table 4). The decrease was caused by the increase of stories on Arabs, who had been newly attacked.

In terms of frames, Americans were represented the most frequently with emotional frames. Especially among the emotional frames, coping Americans were the most frequent (29.3%) of all frames, and grieved (24.0%), and horrified (19.2%) Americans followed. *Compassion* (7.2%), however, was found the least (Table 6). When considering the proportion of emotional frames in all the six frames, the percentage of emotional frames in stories on Americans reached up to 79.8% while that in stories on Arab-Americans and Arabs was just 35.0 and 3.4% (Table 3).

As a result, the first hypothesis that the percentage of emotional frames in stories on Americans would be greater than that of stories on any other group was supported (Table 3). Also, the next hypothesis that *Coping* frames in stories on Americans would be greater than any of the other emotional frames was supported: If all the six frames have the same odd of appearing in news stories in a normal situation, the observed difference of frames showed a statistical significance (Table 6).

Considering that the frame of *Coping* involves people's willingness to overcome the crisis, the finding that *Coping* Americans were predominant in the NYT coverage of Americans seems to substantiate the expectation of the current study that the group

inclination to maintain a positive social identity explained in social identity theory should occur in media framing.

Table 6. *The Percentage of Frames Found in Articles on Americans in New York Times Coverage of September 11*

Frames	Articles on Americans (208)
Horror	19.2%
Grief	24.0
Compassion	7.2
Coping	29.3
Relations	9.1
Character	11.1

$\chi^2 (5, n=208) = 49.769, P < .001$, Chi-Square was computed under the assumption that each frame has no different probability of appearing in news stories in a normal situation.

The image of coping Americans becomes more vivid with a textual analysis of quotes into which people's resolution to carry on their normal life flooded. The voice of a New Yorker saying, "we have to go ahead and live our lives, if it's going to happen, it's going to happen" is optimistic and pragmatic in spite of the hardship (September 16, 2001, A8). An unemployed teacher showed his resolution not to be scared, saying, "When they see us in the streets, wearing the flag, they know that we are not afraid of them, and that we will defeat them" (September 17, 2001, A1). Many people in different areas spoke up their voice: A truck driver says, "They hit the Pentagon. But they missed

America” (September 17, A1); a corporate leader, “it makes me sick to my stomach to think that a bunch of terrorists could bring us to our knees for a day, no less a week. I would have liked to have been able to raise the flag right away... You’re damn right the firm is going to come back” (September 16, 2001, A10); a navy admiral, “My aunt works at the World Trade Center, but she was away... So we were some of the lucky ones. I’ve been waiting for this for a long time. The faster we bomb, the sooner we can go home” (October 8, 2001, A1).

A year later, the coping voice was still vivid. A man who had been in prison for 10 years and felt lonely when nobody asked him about 9-11, which meant his neighbors’ denial for emotional sharing with him about the tragedy, had a lead on a carpentry job. He said, “I’m trying to fit back into society. I’m convinced I’m not going to mess up. My desires have changed. I want to make it in New York, above all New York.” The old people also spoke up. A 75-year old man playing pool alone in a senior center in New York said, “You can’t be scared... there’s no place to run. You have to hand it back to them” (September 11, 2002, B8).

The resilience of Americans are not only voiced out through their quotes, but also described in their episodic cases. Among these cases, those that represented Americans’ will to carry on their normal life seemed to appear the most. For example, the chairman of a law firm didn’t stop doing his business in spite of losing his office in World Trade Center. He opened his house as a substitute office, with “the book-lined living room becoming a command center and his elegant dining room a cafeteria for senior partners” (September 14, 2001, A6). In another case, a combat paratrooper whose unit might soon

be shipping out to danger stepped up to the first tee at a golf course, radiating a sense of relaxation amid the unnerving war reports from Afghanistan. The NYT did not miss his confident voice, “we live on preparedness” (October 9, 2001, B5). Although there were some people who keep away from shopping at a big mall, a mother, determined not to let the conflict change her lives, willingly participated in a party at the mall with her three children, saying, “I’m not afraid” (October 11, 2001, B12).

On the other hand, many around the country were eager to do something for helping or showing their resistance in the crisis. “Volunteers with authentic skills continued to plead for a chance to help in the search and cleanup...” (September, 15, 2001, A5). Also, the NYT covered the attitudinal change of people “up at 30,000 feet.” The story titled “Air Passengers, Jolted by Attacks, Vow to Resist Hijackers” conveyed a case in which “passengers gang-tackled a mentally disturbed man who had knocked open the cockpit door and was screaming about his fears that the plane was about to crash into the Sears Tower” (October 11, 2001, B10). In the story, the citizens’ courageous voices also followed, “It would be a bad idea for someone to try to hijack a plane while I’m on it. I’ll tell you that. I think the American citizenry as a whole, especially males, are pretty pumped about this now.”

Many examples of the episodic cases of coping appeared even in the coverage of anniversary. A man of 220 pounds who worked four blocks from World Trade Center began to run four days after 9-11 to change himself “to deal with the change in the world,” and a year later he became 63 pounds slimmer than he had been. A 86-year old woman who had denied to encase herself in a new solitude went to movie at a senior

center in New York, saying “I’m not afraid...I go once every two weeks to Manhattan, for theater. I go at night. I go alone. I hop a bus. I don’t want to live in fear and I don’t” (September 11, 2002, B8).

Although the quotes and episodic cases mentioned above should be understood properly in their own contexts, they shared a similar function in representing Americans as being resilient to the crisis. Therefore, the property of resilience was attributed to Americans in the crisis that had never happened since the Pearl Harbor.

The positive identity of Americans found by the qualitative examination of episodic cases and quotes was also substantiated by the quantitative analysis of both. First, the average number of episodic cases in news stories on Americans was 5.7 while that on Arab-Americans and Arabs was 4.1 and 2.1. Regarding quotes, the average number in news stories on Americans was 7.4 while that on Arab-Americans and Arabs was 5.1 and 4.1. The difference in the number of episodic cases and quotes among each group was statistically significant (Table 7). Therefore, the two hypotheses, H2 and H2-1, that the frequency of episodic cases and quotes in stories on Americans would be greater than those focusing on the other groups were supported.

These findings per se, however, were insufficient to substantiate the social psychological perspective anticipating that the intensification of group membership through emotional sharing in a crisis may influence news narratives. For, a greater frequency of episodic cases and quotes in stories on Americans was expected in an American newspaper covering rather normal news as well as 9-11.

Table 7. *The Average of Episodic Cases and Quotes in Articles on Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11*

Focus of Article (Number of Articles)	Americans (208)	Arab-Americans (20)	Arabs (58)
Episodic Cases	5.7	4.1	2.1
Quotes	7.4	5.1	4.1

$F(2,283) = 17.166, P < .001$; $F(2,283) = 12.855, P < .001$.

At this point, to examine the variation over time of both measures in stories on Americans may be a complement to identify the influence of the crisis situation on media content. In this respect, the average number of Americans' episodic cases during the three periods changed from 6.4, to 4.2, and finally to 5.9, and that of their quotes shifted from 8.0 to 6.1, and finally to 7.5. As a result, the hypothesis, H3, stating that the number of episodic cases and quotes would vary significantly along the three periods was supported (Table 8). The statistical significance of the difference implied that situational factors of the crisis influenced journalistic activities of quotation and newsgathering.

Table 8. *The Percentage of Emotional Frames and the Average of Episodic Cases and Quotes in Articles on Americans in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods*

Period of Coverage (The Percentage of Emotional Frames)	After the Attack (92.4%)	After the Bombing (67.3%)	Around the Anniversary (87.5%)
Episodic Cases	6.4	4.2	5.9
Quotes	8.0	6.1	7.5

$F(2,205) = 3.821, P < .05$; $F(2,205) = 2.563, P < .01$.

Then, what are the situational factors? Another national survey by NORC conducted three to five month after the first survey suggest a hint: it showed that the number of Americans expressing their confidence in federal government decreased from 52.7% to 46.1% while the number of Americans confident in Congress reduced from 44.4% to 31.3%. Also, the altruistic activities of Americans who “gave money, clothing, or other items to charity” and “donated blood or tried to donate blood” reduced 51.4 and 24.3% to 39.3 and 14.1% (Rasinski, Berkold, Smith & Albertson, 2002). Generally speaking, group cohesiveness, attraction among group members, may have been returning to pre-September 11 level.

This social trend was consistent with the shift of emotional frames in news stories on Americans. The emotional frames dominated news stories on Americans immediately after the attack (92.4%), dropped during the bombing of Afghanistan (67.3%), and

increased again around the anniversary (87.5%) (Table 8). The increase of emotional frames, with the exception of *Horror*, around the anniversary might reflect the fact that an anniversary is a ritual deeply rooted in people's schema across diverse cultures. The schema of the ritual might elicit the emotions of people again, and thereby lead media to reframe people and events with those emotions even though 9-11 had occurred one year ago.

As a result, the textual features of news narratives such as episodic cases, quotes, and emotional frames varied along with social situation and general mood in society. Because the change in-group cohesiveness is a social phenomenon that has already been explained by social psychologists, similar pattern in media discourse might as well be regarded as a representation of the social trend.

Another finding on the correlation between the number of episodic cases and quotes also supported this explanation. That is, the hypothesis expecting that the number of episodic cases for Americans would vary positively with that of quotes was supported (Pearson $r = .856$, $P < .001$) (Table 8-1). The strong correlation between both seemed to support the expectation that both reflect and serve for people's emotional sharing and group cohesiveness.

As a result, the salience of *Coping* Americans and the confirmation of the four hypotheses about episodic case and quotes supported the expectation of this study that social identity theory and social cohesion model can be applied to media content, too. This finding implies that there is another factor not explained by Shoemaker and Reese's (1996) hierarchical model of influences on media content. That is, the social

psychological inclination may be an influence, in a societal level, that affects media content in a social crisis.

Table 8-1. *The Correlation between Episodic Cases and Quotes in Articles on Americans in New York Times Coverage of September 11*

	Episodic Cases	Quotes
Average Number	5.7	7.4
Correlation	1.000	.856
Significance (Two-Tailed)		.000

Arab-Americans, “We, Americans”

The stories of Arab-Americans were much less frequent (7.0%) than other two groups (Table 4). It is, however, worthwhile to explore the coverage of the group because the group has both possibilities of being treated more as in-group, Americans or more as out-group, Arabs. In general, Arab-Americans were framed with *Relations* (55.0%), *Horror* (35.0%), and *Character* (10.0%).

When the frames are examined in light of time dimension, *Horror* was dominant in the first period while *Relations* was so during the bombing of Afghanistan. In the first period, the salience of *Horror* was associated with the increase of domestic anti-Arab terror, and in the second period, Arab-Americans were framed mostly with their attitude toward the event of bombing (Figure 4).

The composition is noticeable when it is compared with that of Americans in terms of situations both groups have faced. The reason that Arab-Americans became media agenda in 9-11 was not only from their ethnicity of Arabs but also from the increasing assaults against them in the US. In this respect, they were in similar situation to Americans who had already been attacked and worried about another possible attack. In the case of Americans, the frame mostly applied was *Coping*, followed by *Grief* and *Horror*; *Relations* frame amounted to just 9.1% and ranked the fifth (Table 6). For Arab-Americans, however, *Relations* was the major frame. Therefore, it can be said that *Coping* frame in the stories of Americans was substituted with *Relations* in those of Arab-Americans.

Figure 4. The Frequency of Frames Found in Articles on Arab-Americans in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods

There was another difference between the two groups. Arab-Americans' nervousness about being harmed by raged Americans was not so much strongly depicted as Americans' horror in terms of the frequency of the episodic cases and quotes. Although the frame applied to both groups was the same, the average number of the episodic cases and quotes in the stories of Americans was bigger (7.0 and 8.9 respectively) than that of Arab-Americans (5.0 and 5.9). Although the difference in the amount of both is not statistically significant due to the small amount of Arab-American stories, it may well be noted that the direction of the numeral dominance fits to the general pattern of news. To put it another way, the numeral dominance of Americans

over Arab-Americans in their episodic cases and quotes seems compatible with the salience of American emotional frames.

Overall, Arab-Americans are negatively differentiated from Americans in terms of their frames and the amount of episodic cases and quotes. Therefore, social psychological theory that people tend to differentiate in-group positively from out-group or differentiate out-group negatively seems to be substantiated in the NYT coverage of both groups.

Although Arab-Americans were not treated similarly to Americans as in-group members, it does not give a clear answer to the question: Were they dealt with similarly to Arabs? Rather, the answer is negative when considering the fact that the portion of the emotional frame among the stories of Arab-Americans amounted to 35.0% of the total while that of Arabs was just 3.4% (Table 3). Also, the episodic cases and quotes of the group were more than those of Arabs while the number of stories is less than Arabs. Especially, the number of their episodic cases almost doubles that of Arabs' (Table 7). This implies that the group was represented differently from Arabs, the "others," in a way that their emotional voices and episodes were conveyed more vividly than Arabs'.

As the result of the difference of Arab-American stories in their frames and the two quantitative indices from the other two groups' stories, the four hypotheses regarding Arab-Americans were confirmed. That is, they were emotionally framed less often than Americans but more often than Arabs (Table 3), and the number of episodic cases and quotes for them was greater than that for Arabs but smaller than that for Americans (Table 7). This finding seems to substantiate subtyping model the idea of which is

concerned with a group that disconfirms the stereotypes of the original group. As the model argues that the disconfirming group is sub-categorized as a different group from the paradigmatic group, Arab-Americans were treated differently from Arabs in terms of the frames and both quantitative indices.

The finding that they are represented differently from Arabs in the two terms, however, does not provide any image of Arab-Americans. Accordingly, the question of how they are sub-categorized is examined by a textual analysis of their episodic cases and quotes.

Most of all, the feature of their relational attitude depicted in the news coverage seems a key to the question since *Relations* was the major frame of Arab-Americans' stories. In the quotes and episodic cases of the *Relations* frame, their "being American" is salient; to say "we love America this is our world. This is where we live..." is typical (September 16, 2001, A18). Even an Arab-American professor who had taken a pro-Taliban position expressed his willingness to convert saying, "if it's proven that bin Laden is behind the events, I'll review my position" (September 18, 2001, B5). Of course, some clerics interviewed were cautious saying frankly, "we wish there had been a diplomatic resolution to the crisis..." However, most Arab-Americans in the stories openly spoke out their following the American leadership in "getting the perpetrators of this crime to justice" (October 8, 2001, B8). Further more, an active Lebanese immigrant who wanted to work as a translator for the US intelligence agency even said, "I make a lot of money now than I would with the FBI, but I am ready to move my family, to sell my businesses, to do whatever it takes" (October 12, 2001, B12).

It is also noticeable that Arab-Americans' response to the bombing of Afghanistan was conveyed in the top story of the first page of the special section named "Nation Challenged" on October 8, immediately after the US bombing of Afghanistan. The journalistic decision of treating the Arab-American response as a top story in the special section symbolizes the role of *Relations* frame in the news coverage of the crisis caused by a group-conflict. The story described the response of Arab-Americans' communities to the bombing:

From the Arab world's local Main Street, in Brooklyn, to Afghan mosques in Queens, to the halls of academe, many Muslims yesterday expressed sometimes tentative, sometimes anguished support for the attacks on Afghanistan...Unlike many Muslims abroad, who declared the bombing and missile raids an outrage against Islam, a number of Muslim New Yorkers said -publicly, at least- that the strikes were necessary... "But we think the attack is not on regular citizens, and so all and all it is a positive thing, a new beginning for our people."... "I'm happy because it will save the future of Afghanistan,"... Several of those at the mosque said that they believed the United States would be steadfast in attempts to avoid hitting civilians.

(October 8, 2001, B1)

As a result, it might be said that Arab-Americans who had had other stereotype that linked to the image of terror got a new subtype of nation-loving Americans who wanted to be assimilated into the American culture or at least stood behind American national policies.

Arabs, the Hungry and Angry

The stories of Arabs amounted to 20% of the total articles about people. But the ratio of the Arab stories went up to 33% from 13~17% during the US bombing of Afghanistan (Table 4).

In terms of framing, *Relations* (51.7%) was the most salient, followed by *Character* (44.8%) and *Grief* (3.4%) (Table 4). When expecting that the three frames should have the same probability of appearing in news stories in a normal situation, the difference of frequencies among the three frames was statistically significant (Table 9). As a result, the hypothesis that there would be more *Character* frames than any other frame in stories on Arabs was rejected.

Table 9. *The Percentage of Frames Found in Articles on Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11*

Frames	Articles on Arabs (58)
Grief	3.4%
Relations	51.7
Character	44.8

χ^2 (2, n =58) =23.724, $P < .001$, Chi-Square was computed under the assumption that each of the three frames has no different probability of appearing in news stories in a normal situation.

In the case of the episodic cases and quotes, however, the average amount of both in the stories of Arabs is 2.1 and 4.1 respectively. Therefore, the finding supported the hypothesis that there would be the least amounts of episodic cases and quotes in Arab stories (Table 7).

Although the finding that *Relations* was used more than *Character* in framing Arabs does not agree with the original expectation of this study, the finding may still be compatible with the social psychological pattern suggested by social identity theory and social cohesion model. First of all, the dominance of *Relations* in their stories was similar to that in the coverage of Arab-Americans. The dominance of *Relations* in both groups may as well be interpreted as reflecting the increased attention of Americans to in/out-group relations. This attention is expected to intensify based on the explanation of both social identity theory and social cohesion model. That is, group membership intensifies in a crisis and thereby, the group members' attention to in/out-group relationships is expected to increase since the attention is necessary for their common recognition of the relationships, which is one of the main elements of group membership together with the members' emotional sharing.

When the frames are examined in terms of time dimension, this interpretation becomes more cogent. The frame of *Relations* was dominant after the attack and during the bombing periods; mostly, they were framed in terms of their attitude toward 9-11 and the bombing of Afghanistan. However, around the anniversary when people's alertness for the crisis should relatively reduce, *Character* became the most frequent frame (Figure 5).

Figure 5. The Frequency of Frames Found in Articles on Arabs in New York Times Coverage of September 11 Published during Three Periods

The more close examination of the framing shift seems to provide a deeper viewpoint: *Relations* appeared two times more than *Character* immediately after the attack when the level of Americans' being threatened might be the highest, their group membership intensify, and thereby when their attention to in/out group relationships gets strengthened. Then, during the bombing period when the reaction of Americans started, the difference of the frequency of both frames decreased and both appeared almost the same. Finally, around the anniversary when the American feeling of horror caused by the

attack almost calmed down, *Character* frame doubled *Relations* (Figure 5). This pattern of the frame shift substantiates the idea that the attention to group relationships may intensify in the midst of a crisis, bring about common recognition of group relations, and intensify group membership.

Therefore, the finding that *Relations* was dominant over *Character* still substantiates the social psychological pattern on which the study is based. Furthermore, the finding that *Character* was the second most frequent frame in the stories of Arabs implies that the differentiation of out-group has appeared at any rate in representing Arabs. On the contrary, *Horror*, an emotional frame, was the second in the news of Arab-Americans and thereby their emotional response was shared among American readers.

Then, what kind of pictures was drawn with the frames of *Relations* in the stories of Arabs? *Relations* frame had appeared since the first day of the news coverage of 9-11. On September 12, the NYT conveyed the general response of Arabs with just a sentence saying “But the attack clearly had support on the streets. Palestinians in refugee camps in Lebanon fired guns in the air in celebration.” The rest of the story was full of Arab government officials’ comments criticizing the terrorist attack, and came along with a picture in which Palestinians were waving flags with smiling. This is an extreme example of the negative relational framing of ordinary Arabs and their leaders who seemed to oppose politically to the terror.

In *Relations*, they were usually framed in terms of their attitude toward Americans’ being attacked and the US bombing of Afghanistan. They were mostly depicted as being angry at the US President and his policy including the supporting of Israel. Even though

they were rarely represented as being in favor of the terrorist attack, they were generally described in more relational terms than emotional ones. To put it another way, their relational belief that terrorism would not disappear until the US “pro-Israel policy” changes was more salient than their sympathy to American victims.

Also, most *Relations* stories conveyed the negative response of angry Arabs to the US bombing, even though the positive attitudes toward the US bombing of Taliban military facilities had appeared immediately after the bombing.

In this frame, Arabs, the angry people, were given the least space for their voice and episodic cases as they were in all other frames. It is comparable to *Relations* frame of American stories that focused on the in-group relationships between the rescuers and survivors, or among the relatives of the victims. While the average amounts of the episodic cases and quotes in American *Relations* stories were 5.3 and 7.9, those in Arab stories were just 1.7 and 4.0 (Table 10). The difference in the average amount of episodic cases and quotes among the stories of this frame was statistically significant as it was among the stories of all frames.

Table 10. *The Average of Episodic Cases and Quotes in Articles on Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs Framed with Relations in New York Times Coverage of September 11*

Focus of Article (Number of Articles)	Americans (19)	Arab-Americans (11)	Arabs (30)
Episodic Cases	5.3	3.6	1.7
Quotes	7.9	4.9	4.0

$F(2,57)=7.603, P=.001; F(2,57)=6.676, P=.002.$

Then, what kind of image was conveyed in *Character* frame of Arab stories? As one can infer from the least amount of Arabs' episodic cases and quotes of the three groups, they were represented mostly at the group level unlike Americans depicted at the individual level. The group-level attribution was made in light of their socio-economic underdevelopment, and political unstableness:

The United Nations said also it feared another major population displacement in drought and conflict- ravaged Afghanistan, saying there were almost six million vulnerable people, around 25 percent of the population. Blighted by conflict, Afghanistan has been embroiled in various wars for 23 years.
(September 16, 2001, A5)

In terms of culture, too, Arabs were framed as being lost their power to maintain their own culture, and occupied by American popular culture in the story titled "Hating American Values But Yearning For Levi's And Marlboros":

America, in a world mostly impoverished and frustrated, is a synonym for an earthly paradise... Americans, with the richness of intermingling cultures, can find it difficult to grasp how vulnerable other societies can feel as their own cultures begin to erode. This anxiety has found a ready focus in American rock music, and in Hollywood movies.
(September 16, 2001, A17)

Also, the religious and ideological solidarity of Arabs were not framed in positive terms. Their mental uniqueness was explained in light of its monolithic process of socialization and its socio-economic origin of poverty:

A thousand years ago, in the days of the camel caravans, storytellers gathered here in the tea shops and brought the outside world and all its thoughts and ideas to the bazaar...travelers from distant lands and differing religious told stories about moguls, magic wit and wisdom. Now...Blaring car horns drown out all other sound, just as the teachers and students in the Islamic seminaries that surround this bazaar have drowned out all conflicting ideas, all unacceptable thoughts. What the students hear...is a drumbeat of American injustice, cruelty and closed-mindedness.
(October 14, 2001, A1)

Predictably, the disappointed and disenfranchised youth of both Egypt and Saudi Arabia, where Islam is a way of life, turns to religion for comfort. They blame outsiders – in the Middle East, that is the seemingly all-powerful United States- who seem to have everything. (October 14, 2001, B1)

This characterization was more sophisticated a year later exploring the socio-political context in which extremists organizations maintained their power:

More than in previous bouts of anti-Americanism in the region, the anger permeates all strata of society, especially among the educated, and is tinged, people acknowledge, with disillusionment at their own long-entrenched American-backed regimes...”People in the Arab world are much more educated than before and they resent their regimes.” This resentment would strengthen the hand of such extremist organizations as Hezbollah and Hams, he said. (September 11, 2002, A23)

In terms of the number of episodic cases and quotes, Arabs were characterized with the less episodic cases and quotes than Americans as they were in the stories with other frames (Table 11). Although the stories of Arabs had slightly more quotes than those of Arab-Americans, the stories of Arab-Americans were so few that no statistical significance in the difference of both cases and quotes was found.

Table 11. *The Average of Episodic Cases and Quotes in Articles on Americans, Arab-Americans, and Arabs Framed with Character in New York Times Coverage of September 11*

Number of Articles		Americans (23)	Arab-Americans (2)	Arabs (26)
Average	Episodic Cases	4.9	3.5	2.3
Amount	Quotes	7.0	3.0	3.9

$F(2,48)=4.596$ $P=.015$; $F(2,48)=3.713$, $P=.032$.

In addition, it seems significant that a few stories that have an emotional frame, *Grief*, appeared a year later of the tragedy and after Taliban leaders were ousted:

Afghans are passing through their own harrowing remembrance, of an attack that was overshadowed for the rest of the world by what happened two days later in the United States. Only four men died on Sept. 9... but there has been little healing of the wounds the killers inflicted on the hearts and the hopes of millions of his countrymen. (September 9, 2002, A21)

The story was about a national leader in Afghanistan who died by terrorists two days before 9-11, and described a national mood of sorrow. The late appearance of *Grief* did not provide a statistical meaning in any way. However, the fact that both of the two stories framing Arabs emotionally appeared in the last period is noticeable. For, the NYT's focusing on Arabs emotion of grief occurred after Taliban leaders lose their power and Afghanistan became no longer an official enemy of the US. The emotional framing of the out-group after the change of the group's identity seemed to be compatible with other two findings about the emotional frames: that *Coping* was dominant in the stories of Americans, and that *Horror* ranked the second place in news of Arab-Americans while *Character* did in the stories of Arabs. All of them suggest that the emotional frames let the news stories be a forum in which the emotional sharing by readers with the people in the stories occurs. This also may happen in a way that in-group's positive identity is maintained and out-groups' emotion is excluded.

In summary, Arabs' images formed through their *Relations* and *Character* frames were their being angry at the US and hungry for political stability, the American popular culture as well as economic affluence. In terms of the quantitative analysis, they were

differentiated not only from Americans but also from Arab-Americans with negative *Character* of socio-economic under-development, anti-US *Relations*, and the fewest episodic cases and quotes.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The study is based on the three theoretical constructs: a normal cognitive approach to stereotyping, social identity theory, and social cohesion model. The normal cognitive approach to stereotyping provides this study with a basic assumption that stereotyping is a normal mental process by which people cope with the information flooded reality, and social identity theory and social cohesion model are the theoretical framework on which the hypotheses are set up.

The quantitative and qualitative analysis of the NYT in terms of the seven frames, episodic cases and quotes uncovered the different images of the three groups involved in the crises: Americans were dominantly represented with their emotional responses, and *Coping* Americans were the most salient of all. On the other hand, Arab-Americans and Arabs were mainly framed in terms of their relational attitude toward the two events, the terrorist attack on World Trade Center and the bombing of Afghanistan. The images drawn out from *Relations* frame, however, were different from each other. In the case of Arab-Americans, their *Relations* frame represented them as a group that wanted to belong to America, while Arabs were pictured as angry people at the US. One might appropriately say that the difference reflected *existing* reality rather than *constructed* one. The differentiation, however, seemed to reflect constructed reality, based on journalistic selection, more than existing one when considering the second frames of both groups, *Horror* and *Character*: While *Horror* frame of Arab-Americans made their vulnerability and instability more salient, *Character* of Arabs made their economic, cultural lack and socio-political instability distinct.

These images of the three groups all may serve Americans to maintain their own positive social identity suggested by social identity theory. First of all, Americans were self-stereotyped as being resiliently coping people. Also, the negative differentiation of the Arab-Americans and Arabs from Americans was found in two respects: Although Americans and Arab-Americans were both in the threat of another terror or counter-terror, Americans were framed dominantly with *Coping* while Arab-Americans were with *Horror*, their second frame. In the case of Arabs, they are characterized with their negative societal features.

At this point, a consideration in terms of stereotyping studies should be noted. That is, these images may be situation-specific ones based on reality and not perpetuating. The previous studies that have looked for a fixed, generally agreed-upon image of a particular group in media contents might not agree that the images of the three groups in this study are stereotypes because of the case-specific nature of the images and the uncertainty of their persistence. What the current study tries to do is, however, to see how stereotyping operates in the level of society, rather than individuals, through mass media by examining the numeral shift of frames about people and the episodic cases and quotes. Some images may be persistent while the others not. This study shows how the images, regardless of their persistency, are formed while the previous studies usually have attempted to identify the persistent images in mass media. The difference may bring about the different social significance of the studies: This study provides a deeper perspective on the source of the images that may fill our mind while the previous studies identify a social pathological problem.

Methodologically, this study attempts to develop a new approach to framing analysis in two terms. First, it applies the concept of frames to people rather than issues or events that the previous framing studies have dealt with. There has been no clear-cut definition of frames, which limits the topic of framing studies to non-personal issues or events. Rather, it seems a tacit habituation of framing researchers to focus on the news coverage of issues or events. The expansion of the scope of frames may help accumulate the knowledge on the conceptual aspect of media framing.

The application of framing to people, also, provides a methodological tool for stereotyping studies that is also one of the main topics in communication research. The previous studies on stereotyping have had no generally agreed-upon way of defining various stereotypes, and thereby operationalized specific stereotypes in specific terms within the unique context of the topic investigated. Although the concept of media frame and framing devices are not quite clearly delineated yet, utilizing framing devices as an analytical tool for stereotyping studies seems attractive to do because it should stimulate the methodological sharing across the studies of different stereotypes.

Next, many previous framing studies took qualitative approaches by which they conducted descriptive analyses of what constitutes frames, while some others utilized case-specific indexes of frames, both of which could not be generally applied to other framing studies. As a result, the findings of the framing analysis were appropriately pertained to only the situation or event covered in the examined media text. For example, the frames of “difficult but necessary business decision” (Martine & Oshagen, 1997), “moral bankruptcy” (Entman, 1991), and “devil’s bargain” (Gamson & Modigliani,

1989) were found in the news stories of a car company's downsizing, the Soviet's shooting down a Korean airplane, and nuclear power respectively. Unlike the unique frames, more generic ones such as episodic/thematic frame (Iyengar, 1991), issue/strategy frame (Cappella, Rhee, & Jamieson, 1996; Rhee, 1997) may be utilized in the analysis of various media discourses that deal with different topics. Developing the generic frames should be a way for framing studies to overcome the problem of "scattered conceptualization" insisted by Entman (1993), and establish a coherent research paradigm. In this respect, this study adds another set of generic frames that may be utilized mostly in the news coverage of war or other events caused by group conflicts.

One thing should be added regarding the character of frames examined in this study: Although the previous generic frames, issues/strategic or episodic/thematic frames, were not suggested with their psychological motive, the current study provides the social psychological origin of the emotional, relational, and character frames. This explanation of the motive of frames leads communication studies to a more comprehensive understanding of the nature of mass communication.

Another significance of this study should be noted. Shoemaker and Reese (1996) have suggested the hierarchical model of influences on media contents and ideology is listed in the highest level of the influences. Their model is contributive to the understanding of the origin of media contents, and this influence-oriented approach to media contents may as well be one of main topics in mass communication studies. In this respect, the current study may add another influence that has already recognized in social psychology: this study shows how the social psychological inclination for positive

identities can be excavated in media discourse. This addition of the social psychological influence is significant for the research of communication that may as well be regarded social psychological phenomena. To put another way, the link between communication research and social psychology is necessary and this study tries to do the very thing.

The limit of this study should be also noted since it should provide some ideas on further issues to work on. First, the main research topic of this study is how reality is constructed. Entman (1993) says that framing had better be examined in comparison to other framing conducted on the similar events or issues. To see how an event is differently framed is an appropriate way to understand the role of framing in perceiving the event. Likewise, the post-modernistic idea of the *construction of reality* could be understood more clearly by comparison. This study, of course, conducts a comparison: since all the three groups are in the threat of terrorism, counter-terror, or bombing, the comparison of the depiction of the three groups provides an idea on how the groups of people in similar types of threats are differently represented in mass media.

However, the comparison is limited because this study examines just one medium. If one asks, “Is there any way of depicting Arab-Americans who are in the threat of counter-terror and Arabs who really are in poor socio-economic status other than the way that the NYT did?” this study cannot provide any empirical answer. In this respect, another way of comparison, which is more traditional and common, may be to examine the coverage of different media of the same group. A comparative and quantitative analysis of two different media may provide clearer perspective on the construction of reality.

In addition, a consideration should follow the finding about the dominant episodic cases and quotes in the news of Americans. That is, one of the reasons of the numeral difference of episodic cases and quotes between Arab-Americans and Arabs might be from the different journalistic conditions with different languages and cultures: American journalists might have felt more difficult to report Arabs than Arab-Americans, who might have been trickier to cover than Americans. This difficulty could be one of the reasons that episodic cases and quotes appear less in the stories of Arabs, and this study finds no way to sort out the journalistic difficulties from the original influence caused by the different group membership.

In a conclusion, this study examined how the reality of a crisis was constructed through a content analysis of a newspaper. Regarding the stereotyping examined in this study, Hinton (2000) argues that it is inevitable strategy for the construction of reality saying, “We cannot eradicate stereotypical thinking as it is fundamental to us, but we can change the contents of specific stereotypes to a more positive view.” The better stereotype of stereotyping per se is suggested in this study.

Reference

- Allport, Gordon W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ashmore, Richard D., & Del Boca, Frances K. (1981). Conceptual approaches to stereotypes and stereotyping. In David L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (pp.1-35). Hillsdale,NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bierhoff, Hans Werner (1989). *Person perception and attribution*. Berlin & London: Springer-Verlag.
- Cappella, Joseph N.; Rhee, June Woong; & Jamieson, Kathleen Hall (1996). *Cynical reactions to strategic and issue-based news: Experimental tests and social cognitive explanations*. Paper presented at the meeting of International Society of Political Psychology, Vancouver, BC.
- Carey, James W. (1989). *Communication as culture: Essays on media and society*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- D'Angelo, Paul (2002). News framing as a multi-paradigmatic research program: A response to Entman. *Journal of Communication*, 52, 870-888.
- Dijk, Teun Adrianus Van (1991). *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Entman, Robert M. (1991). Framing the US coverage of international news:Contrasts in Narratives of the KAL and Iran Air incidents. *Journal of Communication*, 41(4), 6-27.
- Entman, Robert M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-56.
- Fox, Robyn (1992). Prejudice and the unfinished mind: A new look at an old failing, *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 137-152.
- Gamson, William A., & Mogdiliani, Andre (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(1), 1-37.
- Gitlin, Todd (1980). *The whole world is watching: mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left*. Berkely: University of California Press.

- Goffman, Erving (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haslam, S. Alexander; Turner, John C.; Oakes, Penelope J.; McGarty, Craig; & Hayes, Brett K. (1992). Context-dependent variation in social stereotyping 1: the effects of intergroup relations as mediated by social change and frame of reference. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 3-20.
- Hewstone, Miles; Hopkins, Nicholas; & Routh, David A. (1992). Cognitive models of stereotype change: (1) generalization and subtyping in young people's views of the police. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 219-234.
- Hinton, Perry Roy (2000). *Stereotypes, cognition and culture*. Philadelphia : Psychology Press.
- Hogg, Michael A. (1992). *The social psychology of group cohesiveness: From attraction to social identity*. New York: New York University Press.
- Hogg, Michael A., & Abrams, Dominic (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. London & New York: Loutledge.
- Iyengar, Shanto (1991) *Is anyone responsible?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kelley, Ronald; Mills, Dean; & Thorson, Esther (2000). *Guide to research on race and news*. Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri, School of Journalism.
- Lasswell, Harold D. (1948). The structure and function of communication in society. In Lyman Bryson (Ed.), *The communication of ideas* (pp.84-99). New York: The Institute for Religious and Social Studies.
- Lippman, Walter (1922). *Public opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.
- Martin, Christopher R., & Oshagan, Hayg (1997). Defining the Workforce. *Communication Research*, 24, 669-697.
- Martindale, Carolyn (1990). Coverage of black Americans in four major newspapers, 1950-1989. *National Review of Journalism*, 96-112.
- McCombs, Maxwell E., & Estrada, George (1997). The news media and the pictures in our heads. In Shanto Iyengar & Richard Reeves (Eds), *Do the media govern?* (pp.237-247). Thousand Oaks & London: Sage Publications.
- Ortony, Andrew; Clore, Gerald L.; & Collins, Allan (1988). *The Cognitive Structure*

- of Emotions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pan, Zhongdang, & Kosicki, Gerald M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10(1), 55-76.
- Park, Bernadette; Wolsko, Christopher; & Judd, Charles M. (2001). Measurement of subtyping in stereotype change. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 325-332.
- Peter, Teo (2000). Racism in the news: a Critical Discourse Analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers. *Discourse & Society*, 11, 7- 49.
- Pickering, Michael (2001). *Stereotyping: the politics of representation*. New York: Palgrave.
- Pickering, Michael (1995). The politics and psychology of stereotyping. *Culture & Society*, 17, 691-700.
- Price, Vincent; Tewksbury, David; & Powers, Elizabeth (1997). Switching trains of thought: The impact of news frames on readers' cognitive responses. *Communication Research*, 24, 481-506.
- Rasinski, Kenneth A.; Berk told, Jennifer; Smith, Tom W.; & Albertson, Bethany L. (2002). *America Recovers: A follow-up to a national study of public response to the September 11th terrorist attacks*. National Organization for Research at the University of Chicago.
- Reese, Stephen D. (2001). Prologue-framing public life: A bridge model for media research. In Stephen D. Reese; Oscar H. Gandy, Jr.; & August E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 7-32). Mahwah, NJ & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rhee, June Woong (1997). Strategy and issue frames in election campaign coverage: A social cognitive account of framing effects. *Journal of Communication*, 47(3), 26-48.
- Richards, Zoe, & Hewstone, Miles (2001). Subtyping and subgrouping: processes for the prevention and promotion of stereotype change. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 52-73.
- Scheufele, Dietram A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication*, 49, 102-122.
- Shoemaker, Pamela J. (1996). Hardwired for news: Using biological and cultural evolution to explain the surveillance function. *Journal of Communication*, 46(3), 32-

- Shoemaker, Pamela J., & Reese, Stephen D. (1996). *Mediating the message: Theories of influences on mass media content*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Soeters, Joseph L., & Twuyver, Mireille van (1997). National and ethnic stereotyping in organizations. In C. C. Barfoot (Ed.), *Beyond Pug's tour: National and ethnic stereotyping in theory and literary practice* (pp.495-510). Amsterdam & Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Smith, Tom W.; Rasinski, Kenneth A.; & Toce, Marianna (2001). *America Rebounds: A national study of public response to the September 11th Terrorist Attacks*. National Organization for Research at the University of Chicago.
- Tajfel, Henri (1969). Cognitive aspects of prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25, 79-97.
- Tajfel, Henri, & Turner, John (2001). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In Michael A. Hogg & Dominic Abrams (Eds.), *Intergroup relations: Essential readings* (pp.94-109). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Taylor, Shelley E. (1981). A categorization approach to stereotypes. In David L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behaviour* (pp.83-114). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wicks, Robert H., & Drew, Dan G. (1991). Learning from News: Effects of message consistency and medium on recall and inference making. *Journalism Quarterly*, 68, 155-171.