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Abstract

The purpose of this study is to analyze how South Korea newspapers framed the Iraq war through a content analysis according to the principles of war and peace journalism developed by Johan Galtung. This study examines the content analysis of 196 stories of the two newspapers that have different ideological characteristic, Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo, from January 20, 2003 to May 1, 2003.

Result of this study showed that there were difference between Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo. More specifically, the results of analysis suggest that Hankyoreh has a strong peace-journalism frame, on the other hand, Chosun-ilbo has a strong war-journalism frame. And Hankyoreh emphasized the role of South Korea in the world as a peace make while Chosun-ilbo focused on military affairs. Also, Hankyoreh did not support the war while the Chosun-ilbo was neutral of the protagonists. Finally, both Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo are neutral in supporting of the protagonists, the United States and the government of Saddam Hussein.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In his state of the union address on January 19, 2003, U.S. President George W. Bush announced that Saddam Hussein systematically violated a previous agreement about removal of all weapons of mass destruction. Bush also claimed Saddam Hussein aided and protected terrorists, including members of al-Qaeda, and could provide one of his hidden weapons to terrorists or help them develop their own.

Since the World Trade Center was attacked by terrorists on September 11, 2001, the United States has waged a war against terrorism, including Saddam Hussein’s government. On March 19, 2003, the United States declared war on Iraq. However, many countries, including France, Germany, and China did not approve of the United States- and United Kingdom-led alliance. Furthermore, the war did not receive United Nations endorsement.

Nowhere was anti-American feeling stronger than in Asia (Maslog, Lee, & Kim, 2006). According to Time magazine survey, the majority of Asians opposed the war. In contrast, their governments tried to find a way to reconcile the two sides, their own people and the United States, which has significant economic and military power (Beech, 2003).

In South Korea, protestors against the war who burned a U.S. flag and climbed a wall at the U.S. embassy were arrested by police. Newspaper surveys put the opposition to the U.S.-led strike on Iraq as high as 80 percent, reflecting a key change in public attitudes in a country that hosts 37,000 U.S. troops and has for six decades been one of the strongest U.S. allies in Asia.

The purpose of this study is to explain South Korean news coverage of the Iraq war and how two kinds of newspaper frames of the war developed according to two ideologies,
conservative and liberal ideologies. Although many scholars have studied the Iraq war in different ways, the research about the relationship between ideology and framing in the news media has not been done sufficiently.

According to Shoemaker and Reese (1996), “news is a socially created product, not a reflection of an objective reality.” In other words, “modern newsgathering is a ‘feedback loop’ because what is reported is created to be reported, but what is reported ultimately wields an influence over the course of events” (Maslog et al., 2006, p.20).

Majid and Ramaprasad (1995) said that news is influenced by political, economical, and ideological factors. So exploring the relationship between ideology and framing of news coverage is very important.

In recent years, scholars have suggested that reporting a conflict needs to be more peaceful rather than bellicose. The concept of peace and war journalism was proposed first by Johan Galtung in the 1970s and this was developed by Jake Lynch (McGoldrick & Lynch, 2000). According to Galtung (2002), “peace journalism is an advocacy, interpretative approach that highlights peace initiatives, tones down ethnic and religious differences, prevents further conflict, focuses on the structure of society, and promotes conflict resolution, reconstruction and reconciliation” (Maslog et al. 2006, p. 20). In contrast, war-journalism frame prefers to report and enhance the violence, and even the negotiations are described as verbal battles (Verhoeff, 2006). Galtung (2002) also said that “War journalism has sports journalism – and court journalism! – as models (ibid, p.260)”.

Based on Galtung’s war and peace journalism frames, this study will explore that how the Iraq war is portrayed in two South Korean newspapers, Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The mass media have a role of informing the public with objective facts. They include conflict and violence in their reporting. The mass media are useful sources of information for the public and for government. Therefore, the journalists who report the news have an important task to fulfill since important decisions often are based on information derived from the daily news (Verhoeff, 2006).

Wolfsfeld (2003) states:

Those who hope to understand the role the media play in conflicts must also consider the role they can play in attempts to reduce conflict. A peace process can be considered, after all, simply as another stage in a conflict. Although the change in context leads to a somewhat different set of rules, there are important overlaps between the two topics. It is also clear that by looking at both dimensions it allows researchers to develop a more dynamic and comprehensive theory (p. 139).

Lynch (1998) and Shinar (2003) said that the mass media should be active participants, catalysts, mediators, and messengers in order to promote peace regardless of (a) conservative objections to an alleged loss of objectivity linked with the promotion of peace, (b) theoretical and practical questions about which version of peace should be promoted, and (c) economic and political institutional constraints built into the media structure, including the notions of media “intransitivity, “speech without response,” and “non-communication,” in which the style and discourse do not allow for critical dialogue (Baudrillard, 2001).

Today, media roles have changed from observer to participant and catalyst and some people worry about the loss of define in reporting the news. However, Shinar (2004) explained that this transition is part of the ongoing erosion of a mythical objectivity and of the acceptance of subjective reality construction concepts. According to the peace-
journalism perspective, objectivity has been suppressed by the establishment world view such as, powerful countries and democratism in the past, but now that view is fragmenting, making objectivity is impossible in journalists’ presence. Iggers (1998) noted that journalistic objectivity is dying, but isn’t dead because journalists never give it up. He also described that “it remains one of the greatest obstacles to their playing a more responsible and constructive role in public life, although few journalists still defend the idea of objectivity” (p.91).

Gjelten (1998) said that “journalists have always had a difficult time deciding whether professional ethics require that we care about the people we cover or remain indifferent to the plight” (p.21). He suggested that most journalists want their reporting to make a difference in the world, but that role should be clear and not combined with the role of a help-worker (Verhoeff, 2006).

There are two ways of looking at a conflict, the high road and the low road, depending on whether the focus is on the conflict or on the derived other conflict that comes after the root conflict, and the question of who wins and who loses (Galtung, 2002). In reporting a conflict and violence, the first victim in a war is not truth but peace. The truth is the most important factor in reporting. Truth journalism alone is not peace journalism. And the truth does not come easily given the tendency to take sides once the “who wins” perspective has been adopted (Galtung, 2002).

Galtung’s (1986, 1998) classification of war and peace journalism is composed of four orientations. The four orientations for war journalism are war/violence, propaganda, elites, and victory. For peace journalism, they are peace/conflict, fact, people, and solution. This characterization of war journalism and peace journalism was adapted from Jake Lynch (1998).
War journalism makes the number of parties two, so one is a friend and the other side is automatically an enemy. During the Gulf War, Galtung explained that “many people, perhaps most people in the world, belonged to a third camp against both the war that started 2 August 1990 and the war that started 17 January 1991” (Lynch, 1998). War journalism draws multiple situations polarities. For example, during the Iraq war, news that could prove Saddam Hussein’s viciousness and the existence of his weapons of mass destruction are offered by official information sources to demonize the enemy, namely the Iraqi government. Also, war journalism tries to make clear winners and losers. It ignores or conceals peace initiatives from the other side or third parties, particularly any option for a non-violent outcome which does not give total victory to “our” side (Lynch, 1998). Here, the focus is on elites as peacemakers, with the emphasis on victory in a zero-sum game and every move assessed in terms of who is having to give ground and being forced to make concessions. It seeks evidence of peace breaking out in the form of treaties and institutions (Lynch, 1998).

In contrast, peace journalism tries to depolarize by showing the black and white of all sides, and to de-escalate by highlighting peace and conflict resolution as much as violence. In this view, peace journalism stands for truth as opposed to propaganda and lies, “truthful journalism” being one aspect in peace journalism (Galtung, p.4).

Mavroudis (2005), who studies the theory of peace journalism in Israel and Palestine, showed that the magazines and newspapers were rarely interested in articles written with a peace journalism approach.

War and peace journalism concept is related to framing theory. Entman (1993) referred to framing as "a scattered conceptualization" (p.51), with previous studies lacking clear conceptual definitions and relying on context-specific, rather than generally applicable
operationalizations. Brosius and Eps (1995) went even further, positing news framing refers to the process of organizing a news story, thematically, stylistically, and factually to convey a specific story line (Maslog et al., 2006).

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, casual interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described” (p.52). Entman (2001) reported that the mental representations that result from contact with a news frame can be conceived as an “event-specific schema,” an understanding of the reported happening that guides individuals’ interpretation of initial information and their processing of all succeeding information about it (p.7). There is a reciprocal relationship between frames in the text and these event schemata or frames in the audience’s thinking.

Goffman (1974) said “definitions of a situation are built up in accordance with principals of organization which govern events and our subjective involvement in them. Frame is the word I used to refer to such of these basic elements as I am able to identify” (p.10). Todd Gitlin has summarized these frame elements most eloquently in his widely quoted elaboration of the frame concept. He described that “frames are principles of selection, emphasis and presentation composed of little tacit theories about what exists, what happens, and what matters” (1980, p.6). Also he said that frames organize the world both for journalists who report it and, in some important degree, for consumers. Similarly, Entman (1991) differentiated individual frames as “information-processing schemata” of individuals and media frames as "attributes of the news itself" (p.7). Gamson and Modigliani (1987) conceptually defined a media frame as "a central organizing idea or story line that provides
meaning to an unfolding strip of events. . . The frame suggests what the controversy is about, the essence of the issue” (p.143). Media frames also serve as working routines for journalists that allow the journalists to quickly identify and classify information and "to package it for efficient relay to their audiences" (Gitlin, 1980, p.7). This concept of media framing can include the intent of the sender, but the motives can also be unconscious ones (Gamson, 1989).

Gamson (1992) identified four frames used in the news framing of the Arab-Israeli conflict: (a) strategic interests, (b) feuding neighbors, (c) Arab intransigence, (d) and Israeli expansionism. By charting the development of the four frames over nine periods, Gamson found “feuding neighbors” to be the most consistent frame.

Hackett (1994) analyzed U.S. newspaper articles published during the first two weeks of the Gulf War. He found three interpretative news frames dominated press coverage of antiwar protests: enemy within, marginal oddity, and legitimate controversy. The differential treatment of different voices within the peace movement showed that some perspectives tended to be relatively privileged over others and this pattern of press discourse is related very broadly to America’s master narrative of war, a narrative which had been threatened by the Vietnam experience. Iyengar (1993) studied three types of media effects that operated on public opinion during the Gulf war and found that network news coverage was preoccupied with military affairs and highly event oriented.

The concept of news as a manufactured product subject to influence by a host of social, economic, political, and ideological factors is evident. According to Becker (1984), ideology “governs the way we perceive our world and ourselves; it controls what we see as ‘natural’ or ‘obvious’ ” (p.69). Although previous studies of framing in the news have sought
to identify prevailing sources of influence on news frames, few studies to date have explicitly explored the link between framing and ideology. According to Snow and Benford (2000), ideology is a cultural resource for framing activity and framing is a more readily empirically observable activity in contrast to ideology. They said that “the framing process involves, among other things, the articulation and accenting or amplification of elements of events, experiences, and existing beliefs and values, most of which are associated with existing ideologies” (p.11). Namely, the connection between news frames and ideology has remained largely unexplored in the literature. Close examination of the concepts of news frame and ideology reveals a clear connection between the two. Both frames and ideologies provide the people in a given society with a framework within which to interpret events, define problems, diagnose causes, and seek remedies.

According to ideological influences on media content in the hierarchical model by Shoemaker and Reese (1996), ideological level subsumes all the other levels—extramedia level, organization level, media routines level and individual level. At the ideological level, media and political elites intervene against normal journalistic routines and professionalism (p.224).

There are three types of ideology that may be expected to exert primary influence on the framing of news: (1) dominant ideology, (2) elite ideology, and (3) journalistic ideology (Majid, 2000). In particular, journalistic ideology, or occupational ideology, may be considered to function as a major source of influence on framing of the news. According to Majid and Ramaprasad (1998), examples of journalistic ideology within the United States include “emphasis on events, not issues; emphasis on the unusual and deviant; and focus on elite sources and actors example.” In many ways, the journalistic ideology tends to reinforce
the dominant or elite ideologies, not only by being subject to manipulation by elites, but also through keeping out access by, and trivialization of, other less powerful groups in society.

In this study, war and peace journalism are compared in the news coverage of the Iraq war. Also two different ideologies, liberal and conservative, will be suggested. Liberal ideology refers to views and ideas shared by people regarding many traditional beliefs as dispensable, invalidated by modern thought, or liable to change. Within South Korea society, anti-American and anti-government may be considered as examples of liberal ideology because American line and government supports has been a conservative vested interests. In contrast, conservative ideology implies adversness to change or innovation and holding traditional values. Examples of conservative ideology within South Korea include support of the governing party or vested interests and a pro-American line. According to Han (2000), a newspaper with a liberal ideology is more aggressive than a newspaper with a conservative ideology in reporting the conflict and violence associated the United States. Based on this, I assume that the dominant frame would be different if the ideology of newspapers is different.

This study examined the extent to which the news coverage of the Iraq war by two newspapers from South Korea is framed according to the principles of war/peace journalism suggested by Galtung.

Considering this literature review, the study explores the following questions related to the news coverage framing in South Korea:

(1) What is the dominant frame in the coverage of the Iraq war by South Korean newspapers?

(2) What is the most emphasized part related to national interest about the Iraq war in the newspapers?
(3) What are the most salient factors supporting the frames?

(4) How much do news reports support the Iraq war?

(5) How much does coverage support the protagonists, American vs. Iraq, in the Iraq war?
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The Research Design

This study is based on analysis of newspaper content to answer the research questions. Holsti (1969) offers a broad definition of content analysis as “any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristic of units of analysis such as records, newspaper reports and TV program transcripts” (p.14). According to Wimmer and Dominick (2006), content analysis is often used in the traditional descriptive manner to identify what exists (p.152). It is useful for examining trends and patterns in documents. Kerlinger (2000) looks at content analysis in a very similar way, describing it as the “method of studying and analyzing communication in a systematic, objective, and quantitative manner for the purpose of measuring variables” (Wimmer et al., 2006, p.150). Content analysis is systematic, and it means that the analyzed content is selected according to “explicit and consistently applied rules” (Wimmer et al., 2006, p.151). At the same time, sample selection and evaluation process must be systematic.

The objective measurement of variables ensures that the study can be replicated by other researchers. In order to do so, the operational definition and rules for the classification of variables have to be explicit and comprehensive so that other researchers could have the same conclusion. “Researchers conducting a content analysis follow carefully specified rules to categorize content” (Perry, 1996, p.67). To meet the requirement of objectivity and reliability, a clear set of criteria and procedures that fully explain the sampling and categorization methods should be established.
To explore an accurate representation of a body of messages, the study has to be quantitative. Quantification helps researchers to summarize the results and make a concise report. Also, comparisons of the numerical data from one time period to another can help researchers to have additional statistical tools and simplify the evaluation procedure (Wimmer and Dominick, 2006).

**Selection of news source**

To collect data, a sample of the newspapers was taken. The second step involved selecting the dates to be studied from among the population of newspapers chosen. This study examined national newspaper coverage of the Iraq war over a five-month period, from January 20, 2003 to May 1, 2003. In the first stage, two national newspapers, Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo, because of their circulations and reputations, were selected from the sampling universe of all South Korean newspapers. The selection of the most widely circulated newspapers means that the information is reaching the maximum number of audience member. The top seven national newspapers were selected, however due to contrary ideological character, the first and the seventh newspapers, Chosun-ilbo and Hankyoreh were chosen. The two national newspapers are published in Seoul, the capital city. Table 1 outlines the characteristics of the two newspapers under study and specifies their service area.
Table 1. Characteristics of the newspapers under study and their service areas. (Source: Newspaper Websites, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hankyoreh</th>
<th>Chosun-ilbo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of First Publication</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>2,380,000</td>
<td>326,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service area</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Tae-Gi Jung</td>
<td>Sang-Hun Bang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most important reason to choose these two newspapers is their different ideological character. This difference appears in their history. Chosun-ilbo has been considered as the most influential newspaper for a long time while Hankyoreh began publishing just twenty years ago. And Chosun-ilbo has been owned by one single family while Hankyoreh was published by favor of publics to freedom of the press and was launched by citizen’s fund-raising. After the launch, Hankyoreh has been evaluated as the most fair and accurate newspaper by journalists and publics according to survey (The
Hankyoreh, 2007). This difference in history and ownership is a very important factor to determine the ideological characteristic. According to hierarchical model (1996), organizational characteristics influences gatekeeping of newspaper and it also may influences on deciding ideological characteristics.

Moreover, these two newspapers have been compared by researchers in many previous studies. Chosun-ilbo represents conservative ideology and Hankyoreh liberal ideology. For example, Jung (2001) explained that Chosun-ilbo and Hankyoreh produced extremely polarized ideological voice about media reform. Also many other studies show very different point of view about social science issues between Chosun-ilbo and Hankyoreh.

According to Moon (2006), Chosun-ilbo shows a pro-American line and it tries to transmit this view to its readers. In contrast, Hankyoreh is more liberal and independent in national and international affairs. Lim (1998) said that Hankyoreh is consistently liberal and independent, which the other newspapers can’t be so easily. Therefore, it maintains very solicitous class of readers.

These differences in historical and ownership and previous researches approve that Chosun-ilbo and Hankyoreh is the most appropriate to compare news coverage frame in different ideological characteristic.

This study counted all articles related to Iraq war published in the selected. The unit of analysis is the complete individual story, a definition that included hard news (news for informing the fact or process of the war to readers, generally urgent and serious), soft news (news for focusing on human interests like interviewing the citizen and foot soldiers), and editorials from the two papers. They were collected using the KINDS.com database over a five month period, from January 20, 2003, to May 1, 2003. KINDS.com is similar database
system with LexisNexis which was founded by Korean Press Foundation. All articles that carry the phrase “Iraq war” were compiled to form the sample. This key word ensured that the story focus on the war mainly. The war began on March 19, 2003, when the United States attacked Iraq. U.S. attacked targeting Saddam Hussein and other Iraqi leaders in Baghdad. On March 21, the major phase of the war began with heavy aerial attacks on Iraqi cities. On May 1, 2003, Bush announced an end to all major combat activities.

To study the war and peace framing of the newspapers, all newspapers article released before and after war were collected. One hundred and seventeen articles from Chosun-ilbo and seventy six articles from Hankyoreh were collected.

**Operationalization of variables**

Five research questions were posed.

(1) What is the dominant frame, war/ peace journalism, in each newspaper in the five-month period of newspaper coverage of the Iraq war?

(2) What is the national interest referred to in each newspaper about the Iraq war?

(3) What are the salient factors in each newspaper supporting the frames?

(4) What is the level of news reports supporting the war?

(5) What is the level of coverage supporting the protagonists, U.S side or Iraq side?

To answer all research questions, 193 newspaper contents released over the five-month period were determined. The coding categories for RQ 1 and 3 were adapted from Galtung’s (1986, 1998) classification of peace/ war journalism. Each story was coded based on five indicators of war journalism and five indicators of peace journalism to find out which frame dominated narrative, such as zero-sum orientation/win-win orientation, two party
orientation/multi party orientation, reactive/ proactive, elite peace makers/people peace
makers, and focus on here-and-now/focus on causes and consequences of the war. For
example, zero-sum orientated narrative means that the winner and loser is obviously
distinguished and there is just one goal, to win the war. These stories conceal peace
initiatives and focus on treaty and institutions that controll society. Peace is considered as
sum of victory and cease-fire. In contrast to zero-sum orientation, win-win orientation is a
focus on a solution and persuasion to overcome the war and violence and explore conflict
resolution. The story looks at peace as a sum of nonviolence and creativity, and it focuses on
structure and culture and looks for resolution and reconciliation by highlighting peace
initiatives. If each individual story focuses on confining “us-them” journalism and voice for
“us,” it is intended to have a two-party orientation and the actors and sources of war are just
two parties. However, if the story focuses on empathy and understanding for all parties, it
means peace journalism. In the multi-party-oriented narrative, all parties are actors in solving
violence and conflict, and they are given a voice.

Articles were considered reactive when reporters are waiting for potential violence
before reporting violence in contrast to proactive means that reporters try to warn about
potential violence before war occurs. Also, the stories were considered as elite peace makers
when the story tended to focus on the political and military officials as actors and sources of
information while ignoring the foot soldiers who fight and the civilians who suffer the
consequences of war. Reporting only on the here and now was considered as reporting only
what is happening in the battlefield, the military clashes, and the casualties, with very little
backgrounding in contrast to reporting on causes and consequences of the war was
considered as reporting how is happening and what is the complex effect of war, with fully
backgrounding including history and culture in open space and open time. In this way, these indicators were measured.

In the first research question, the dominant frame was operationally defined as the war and peace framing according to total number of articles in each frame published over the five-month period. The newspaper coverage was analyzed to determine the framing: war journalism and peace journalism. Descriptive statistics was used to answer RQ 1.

The second research question asks which part of the national interest is often emphasized related to the Iraq war in each newspaper. These parts are (1) economy, (2) military, (3) culture/society, (4) national security, and (5) world peace. For example, human activity related with the production, distribution, exchange, and consumption of goods and services, such as the change of stock market or increase of oil price is economy. And if the article is writing about soldiers, soldiering, and armed force, it means interest in military affairs. Especially, agenda of dispatch of troops is major military affairs. Demonstrations for the peace is example of interest in culture and society. People worried about bad influence on social structure and culture from the violence. And national security is also important interest because protecting the place and people from terror intimidation and direct damage. At last, world peace interest means that reporter focus on role of South Korea government and people as principal body of peace maker. An initial examination of a sample of the news articles was conducted to confirm the presence of five variables. This question also was measured by content analysis. To answer this research question, descriptive statistics were used.

The third question asks what is the salient indicator among five indicators in each frame. Each indicator was checked in each frame and descriptive statistics also were used.
The fourth question asks what the level of support is shown in the news reports for the Iraq war. The Likert scale was used. On a scale of 1 to 5, the response items range from 1 to 5, where 1 means “very pro-war” and 5 means “very anti-war.” Therefore, to answer this question, a descriptive statistics on means was conducted.

The fifth question asks to what extent does the coverage indicate support for the protagonists in the war. Also, the Likert scale was used for answering the fourth question. On a scale of 1 to 5, the response items range from 1 to 5, where 1 means “very U.S. side” and 5 means “very Iraq side.” A descriptive statistics on means was used.

**Inter-coder reliability**

The contents were coded by two coders, graduate students from the Greenlee School of Journalism and Communication who are fluent in both Korean and English languages. The initial training required revision of some of the variables and adding more categories to other variables. Both were trained independently by practicing coding 40 samples of articles, which were included in the final analysis. To randomly select the articles to test inter-coder reliability, every third article was chosen to make up a total of 40 articles, which is about 20 percentages of all contents. Inter-coder reliability was established at 89% across all categories, using percent agreement to samples (Appendix A).
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Of the 76 stories analyzed from Hankyoreh, the majority were editorials (31, 40.8%), followed by soft news (23, 30.3%), and hard news (22, 28.9%). In Chosun-ilbo, hard news (67, 57.3%) were majority, followed by soft news (41, 35%) and editorials (9, 7.7%) were followed.

Answering the Research Questions

This study set out to determine (1) the dominant frame in each newspaper in the five month-period of newspaper coverage of the Iraq war; (2) the national interest referred in each newspaper about the Iraq war; (3) the salient factors in each newspaper supporting the frames; (4) the level of news reports supporting the war; and (5) the level of coverage supporting the protagonists.

RQ1: What is the dominant frame, war journalism or peace journalism, in the coverage of the Iraq war by two newspapers which show different ideology from the South Korea?

To examine the dominant frame of newspapers, the total number of articles in each paper was measured. Of the 193 stories, a slightly higher number of stories was framed as peace journalism, 105, compared to 88 war journalism, according to Table 2. While the news coverage on the Iraq war as a whole was slightly peace journalism oriented, there were marked variations in two newspapers.

The two newspapers differed significantly in terms of their frame (Chi-square = 44.900, p= .000, df= 1). It means that the two newspapers have significant difference in their distribution of war journalism and peace journalism-frames.
Table 2. Comparisons of Frame Presentations between Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hankyoreh</th>
<th>Chosun-ilbo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>War Journalism</td>
<td>12 (15.8%)</td>
<td>76 (65.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Journalism</td>
<td>64 (84.2%)</td>
<td>41 (35.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square (1, N= 193) = 44.900, p < 0.0001

There were marked variations between two newspapers. Hankyoreh exhibited a strong peace-journalism frame, in contrast to Chosun-ilbo, which had a strong war-journalism frame.

**RQ 2: What is the most referred national interest related to the Iraq war in between Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo?**

The five variables were determined as main topics that appeared in newspapers about South Korea’s national interest related to the Iraq war. Counting the number of national interest references in each newspaper published over the study period showed differences. Of the 76 stories, 44 (57.9%) made references to South Korea national interest in Hankyoreh, in contrast to only 34 articles (29.1%) in Chosun-ilbo (Table 3).
Table 3. Total number of articles referred national interest in the two newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hankyoreh</td>
<td>44 (57.9%)</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosun-ilbo</td>
<td>34 (29.1%)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scoring used to calculate and analyze the means of interest

An independent samples t-test on means also shows that there is significant difference between Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo (t value = 3.473, df = 191, p < .001).

Table 4. Distribution of national interests between two newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Hankyoreh</th>
<th>Chosun-ilbo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>4 (9.1%)</td>
<td>6 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>12 (27.3%)</td>
<td>13 (38.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture / Society</td>
<td>7 (15.9%)</td>
<td>5 (14.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security</td>
<td>8 (18.2%)</td>
<td>4 (11.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World peace</td>
<td>13 (17.6%)</td>
<td>6 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 showed that the two most emphasized national interest issues in Hankyoreh were world peace (13, 17.6%) and a military (12, 27.3%). It means that Hankyoreh showed interest in the national position of South Korea in the world. Hankyoreh reported mainly about the role of South Korea as a main body of peace maker. In contrast, Chosun-ilbo reported about military affairs (13, 38.2%) and world peace was reported widely. A significant difference between Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo was found in the presentation of the world peace (chi-square = 7.447, df = 1, p < .01).

**RQ 3: What are the salient factors quoted the most in the newspapers’ coverage of the Iraq war?**

The total number of 193 articles was used to answer this research question. Cause and consequences of the war were found to be the most quoted indicators, followed by elite peace maker and proactive indicator (Figure 1). The least quoted indicators were multi-party orientation and win-win orientation.
Figure 1. Indicators most frequently quoted across two newspapers
A comparison between Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo regarding their most commonly quoted sources showed that Chosun-ilbo quoted more indicators across all indicators than Hankyoreh (Table 5). A focus on cause and consequences of the war was found to be the most quoted indicators in Hankyoreh. The three most salient factors in Hankyoreh were found in the peace-journalism frame. The newspapers fully provided backgrounds, including
history and culture in open space and open time and focused aftermath and complex effect of the war. Moreover, by reporting foot soldiers and citizens as peace makers and sources of information, the story gave a voice to a range of people involved in the war. However, Chosun-ilbo is diametrically opposite to Hankyoreh. The three most salient indicators were the elite peace maker, a focus on here-and-now, and reactive perspective. These stories tended to focus on the political leaders and military officials as actors and sources of information with a here-and-now perspective which doesn’t explain the cause and long-term effects of the war in closed space and time. Moreover, the reporters seem to wait for another conflict and war before breaking it.

Table 6. The level of support for the war between two newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Very pro-war</th>
<th>Pro-war</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Anti-war</th>
<th>Very anti-war</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hankyoreh</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>14 (18.4%)</td>
<td>10 (13.2%)</td>
<td>51 (67.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosun-ilbo</td>
<td>7 (6.0%)</td>
<td>13 (11.1%)</td>
<td>80 (68.4%)</td>
<td>5 (4.3%)</td>
<td>12 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (4.1%)</td>
<td>13 (6.7%)</td>
<td>94 (48.7)</td>
<td>15 (7.8%)</td>
<td>63 (32.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square (4, N= 193) = 84.765, p < 0.0001
RQ 4. How much is the level of support for the war between two newspapers?

Based on a five-point Likert scale, the majority (48.7%) of the 193 were neutral on the Iraq war (Table 6). Only eight articles (4.1%) were strongly pro-war and general level of support for the war was inclined to anti-war.

Table 7. The comparison of level of support for the war between Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hankyoreh</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosun-ilbo</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scoring used to count the level of support: 1 = very pro-war, 5 = very anti-war

However, there was a difference in coverage between the news media from Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo (Table 7). Hankyoreh showed a significantly lower support for the war than those from Chosun-ilbo (t = 10.856, p = 0.000, df = 191).

In terms of the relationship between support for the war and framing, a higher proportion of war journalism stories was neutral compared to the peace journalism stories while a higher proportion of peace journalism stories was very anti-war compared to the war journalism stories. It is also statistically significant, $X^2 (4, N= 193) = 90.057, p < 0.0001$. Also peace-journalism framing showed a significantly higher support for the peace (mean = 4.26) than those war-journalism framing (mean = 2.77), t = -11.9333, p < .0001, df = 191.
To avoid the low frequency counts in some of the cells, very pro-war stories and pro-war stories were combined to one and very anti-war stories and anti-war stories were combined also to one, it was found to be significantly different among the two newspapers, chi-square (2, N = 193) = 83.406, p < .0001 (Table 8).

Table 8. The level of support for the war between two newspapers in 3 Likert-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Pro-war</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Anti-war</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hankyoreh</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>14 (18.4%)</td>
<td>61 (80.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosun-ilbo</td>
<td>20 (17.1%)</td>
<td>80 (68.4%)</td>
<td>17 (14.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21 (10.9%)</td>
<td>94 (48.7%)</td>
<td>78 (40.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square (2, 193) = 83.406, p < .0001

RQ 5. How much is the level of support for the protagonists, American vs. Iraq, in the Iraq war?

Based on a five-point Likert scale, the majority (76.2%) of the 193 were neutral on which side in the war to support (Table 9). Only three articles (1.6%) were strongly support for the Iraq side.

However, comparing the news coverage, the data showed that the newspapers from Hankyoreh were significantly neutral (mean = 3.14) while Chosun-ilbo were more supportive of the Americans (mean = 2.70). The t-test was significant, t = 4.778, p < 0.0001, df = 191.
Table 9. The level of support for the protagonists between two newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Strong U.S. side</th>
<th>U.S. side</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Iraq side</th>
<th>Strong Iraq side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hankyoreh</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>63 (82.2%)</td>
<td>8 (10.5%)</td>
<td>3 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosun-ilbo</td>
<td>10 (8.5%)</td>
<td>19 (16.2%)</td>
<td>84 (71.8%)</td>
<td>4 (3.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (5.7%)</td>
<td>20 (10.4%)</td>
<td>147 (76.2%)</td>
<td>12 (6.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square (4, N= 193) = 23.236, p < 0.0001

To avoid the low frequency counts in some of the cells, strong U.S. side stories and U.S. side stories were combined to one and Strong Iraq side stories and Iraq side stories were combined also to one, it was found to be significantly different among the two newspapers, chi-square (2, N = 193) = 22.069, p <.0001 (Table 10).

Table 10. The level of support for the protagonists between two newspapers in 3 Likert-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>U.S. side</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Iraq side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hankyoreh</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td>63 (82.9%)</td>
<td>11 (14.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosun-ilbo</td>
<td>29 (24.8%)</td>
<td>84 (71.8%)</td>
<td>4 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31 (16.1%)</td>
<td>147 (76.2%)</td>
<td>15 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. The relationship between level of support for the protagonists and framing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framing</th>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong U.S. side</td>
<td>U.S. side</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Iraq side</td>
<td>Strong Iraq side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Journalism</td>
<td>11 (12.5%)</td>
<td>18 (20.5%)</td>
<td>58 (65.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Journalism</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.9%)</td>
<td>89 (84.8%)</td>
<td>11 (10.5%)</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (5.7%)</td>
<td>20 (10.4%)</td>
<td>147 (76.2%)</td>
<td>12 (6.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square (4, N= 193) = 40.487, p < 0.0001

There is a significant relationship between support for the protagonists and framing. The war journalism stories and peace journalism articles are also neural in supporting the protagonists (Table 11).
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to show the frames of newspaper coverage in two
South Korean newspapers of the Iraq war over a five-month period, from January 2003 to
May 2003. Comparing newspaper coverage of the Iraq war framing in South Korea by
operationalizing Gultung’s classification (1998), I expected that Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo
would show different new coverage framing because of their different ideological
characteristics.

Overall, although the two newspapers that have different ideologies differed
significantly in their distribution of war and peace journalism, more stories proved to be
slightly more peace-journalism framing. Also, the two newspapers showed a significant
difference in every aspect, including the dominant frame, a matter of national interest, the
salient factors support for the war and for the protagonists. In attempting to understand how a
war is covered and framed by the news media from other countries that are not involved in
the conflict, this study found that ideology is an important factor shaping the framing of news
coverage of the Iraq war.

During the war, the United States urged South Korea to send troops to Iraq. The
United States has been one of South Korea’s strongest allies and actually very huge power
not only to South Korea but also in the world. For a long time, the most powerful vested
interests in South Korea has strongly supported the United States. They still continue to
support the United States while the young generation and intellectuals blame the manner of
the government that depends on the United States too much. Chosun-ilbo is the
representative newspaper that supports American interests and Hankyoreh resists the
government and the United States.

Based on the content of the two newspapers, it is clear that ideology of newspaper
was an important factor in the news framing of the war. As shown in the results, Chosun-ilbo
had a stronger war-journalism framing than Hankyoreh. It is almost 3.45 times than
Hankyoreh.

The ideological characteristic is also revealed in most frequently emphasized national
interest. The total number of articles of Hankyoreh about South Korea’s national interest
related to the Iraq war is almost two times that of Chosun-ilbo. This might suggest that
Hankyoreh tended to associate the conflict with its own country. Despite Chosun-ilbo
reported more stories about the Iraq war than Hankyoreh, however, Hankyoreh showed more
references to the national interest. Perhaps the conservative Chosun-ilbo focused on reporting
the war’s progress rather than linking it with the national interests. Nevertheless, the two
newspapers tended to focus on military stories because the agenda of the dispatch of troops
was the most controversial and most directly affected in South Korea during the Iraq war. A
difference, however, was observed in world peace story. Hankyoreh mainly focused on world
peace story such as emphasizing a role and expected behavior of South Korean governement
as the principal body in looking at the war. This may reflect that liberal ideology highlights
the critical and dynamic perspective, not just following voice of the strong.

Since the two newspapers showed different frames, distribution of salient factors
quoted in the coverage was significantly different. Hankyoreh used the peace-journalism
frame. It was supported by proactivity, people as peace makers, and a focus on the cause and
consequences of the war. Chosun-ilbo tended to use the war-journalism frame. It was
supported by an elite orientation, a focus on the here-and-now, and a reactive perspective. Interestingly, the top three quoted indicators was found in just one frame and indicators in each frame are more than 70 percent of the total number of indicators. However, according to Galtung’s peace-journalism framing (1986), “peace journalism is a self-conscious concept, and the framing of the Iraq war may be more reflective of a cautious attitude in reporting a controversial military engagement initiated by a superpower in a distant land than any genuine desire to promote peace and find solutions to the situation in Iraq” (Maslog et al., 2006, p. 21). As shown in the results, Hankyoreh suggested more emotive and ideal solution while Chosun-ilbo just reported the fact obtained from leader of military or government.

The effect of ideology shaping the media coverage framing was also salient in the patterns of support for the war and for the protagonists in the war. Hankyoreh newspaper is less supportive of the war than Chosun-ilbo. Hankyoreh is very antagonistic to the war at the same time it didn’t support the Iraq side while Chosun-ilbo-produced stories were neutral for the war and for the protagonists in the war. This may support the literature mentioned above that a country’s news media are less likely to remain neutral in reporting conflict in which its government is involved directly (Iggers, 1998). This might be a possible explanation that South Korean’s indirect involvement in the Iraq war makes reporters to adopt a more neutral role.

This study has several limitations. First, the stories were downloaded from an online archives. Although the contents were collected from a neutral website to guarantee the objectivity, the online version of the newspaper may be different from the paper version. Also, this study is limited by its sample of only Korean-language newspapers. Future study should further explore the difference between English-language newspapers for mainly
foreigners in South Korea and Korean-language newspapers for South Korean. Also of interest is comparing how the newspapers which have different ideology from the other countries not involved in the war framed the Iraq war.

My coding instruction also has limitations. The indicators adopted from Galtung’s classification of war-journalism and peace-journalism frame were major standards in determining the dominant frame. The dominant frame was decided by just two, the war or peace-journalism frame. However, the sentences that don’t show any factors in an article were excluded in judging the dominant frames because this study tried to show the difference between two newspapers in just war and peace frames.

In sum, ideology is a very important factor shaping the framing of news coverage. The liberal ideology newspaper in this study produced more peace-journalism framing compared to the conservative ideology newspaper. This may suggest that liberal ideology newspaper stands against the war itself and vested interests basically while conservative ideology newspaper relies on power or world affairs. Also, an ideologically liberal newspaper focused on world peace by finding a solution to settle the problem actively, while an ideologically conservative newspaper mainly emphasized military affairs, especially the dispatch of the troops. However, although Hankyoreh and Chosun-ilbo showed different news coverage framing, both of newspapers didn’t support any side because South Korea was not directly involved in the war and objectivity in reporting is also important to both papers.

The most important contribution of this study is the operationalization of ten salient factors. Galtung’s classification of war journalism and peace journalism frames is too conceptual to apply to study. So I operationalized the variables and this maybe helpful in
conflict and violence researches that use Galtung’s classification. And I believe that the results from this study will be helpful in understanding the differences in news coverage of the Iraq war according to the ideology of newspaper. This study also will be helpful for future studies in mass communication, political science, and international studies examining the effects of ideology in framing international conflict and violence on public opinion.
## APPENDIX A

**Intercoder-reliability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percent agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture / Society</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World peace</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-sum orientation</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two party orientation</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite peace maker</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here and now</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win-win orientation</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-party orientation</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People peace maker</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause and consequences of the war</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant frame</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of support for the war</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of support for the protagonists</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
CODING INSTRUCTIONS

Please use one code sheet for each article.

PUBLICATION

Please write down the title of the newspaper. Write down the alphabet (C or H) of two kinds of newspaper. C is the Chosun-ilbo and H is the Hankyoreh.

DATE

Please write down the date on which the news item appeared. Use this format

Month/Day/Year-e.g., 03/15/2003

NATIONAL INTEREST

Please check emphasized parts related to national interest about the war in the article. It can not be appeared in every article.

- Economy ________ The article write about human activity related with the production, distribution, exchange, and consumption of goods and services which can be derived from the effect of the Iraq war.

Examples:

- A predictable changes of the stock market
- An increase in oil price
- Economic losses by taking down Korean companies in the Middle East area
- Electronic energy saving policy to prepare an increasing oil price
- A deepening recession by the war

- Military _________ The article writes about soldiers, soldiering, and armed force as a whole.
Examples:

- Dispatch of troops to Iraq
- Reporting the life of Korean soldiers in Iraq
- A requirement for soldiers from U.S.

**Culture/Society** The article expresses the worries about the bad influence and any change in human activity and structure in South Korea.

Examples:

- Interview with individuals or groups who worried about the bad effect of the war
- Demonstration against the war in South Korea

**National security** National security refers to all measures that are taken to protect a place and people.

Examples:

- Interview with security specialists for protecting South Korea
- A new policy for prevention of terror intimidation
- Protection South Korean in Iraq

**World peace** The report worries about the intimidation which can break the world peace.

Examples:

- The role of South Korean government to keep the world peace
- A conference and fund-raising campaign to help the victims
- Reporting about medical team working in conflict are
THE SALIENT INDICATORS

Please check all indicators represented in each article. Every indicator should be checked just once in article based on sentence.

War journalism

● Zero-sum orientation ______ There is winner and loser obviously and only goal is winning. Peace is a sum of victory and cease-fire.

Examples:

• When journalists report the terror by the Iraqi, there was no mentioning of U.S. army’s violence, the cruelty of the U.S. army.
• Winning is the most important thing and there is no compromise.
• Who started the war is important.

● Two party orientation ______ There is just “us-them” relationship and voice for “us”.

The actors and sources of war is just two parties.

Examples:

• The U.S. and the Iraq extremists are depicted as two monolithic camps without any reference to moderate groups. There is only rigid dichotomy.
• France and German are enemy of the United State and United Kingdom.
• The report refers the Iraq activists as terrorists and countries involved in the war as liberalists.
• The impervious narratives regarding “who we are,” “what are we doing here and why” and “why we are right and just and they are not”, is tightly kept.

● Reactive ______ The reporter is waiting for potential violence or war before reporting.

Examples:
• The reporter has interest in just terror itself and its cruelty. The terrorist deed and its harsh consequences are only shown without discussion.

• Relaying the horrors of terrorism intensifies conflict and totally eclipses the despair that provoked it in the first place.

• The report assumes that one terrorist incident will make another terror.

• **Elite peace maker** —— Political and military officials are actors and sources of information.

Examples:

• The Iraq military leaders announced that young people in Iraq are admiring Saddam Hussein.

• The military officials report how the war is going in the Iraq.

• The political leaders in the world have a conference and announced their opinion regarding the Iraq war.

• **Here and now** —— The article reports only what is happening in the battlefield.

Examples:

• Only the military clashes in the Iraq are shown in article.

• There is no historical root of the war.

• The destruction caused by war and statement about bombing, injury in conflict area are shown.

• The article doesn’t refer to solution and effort to settle the conflict.

**Peace journalism**

• **Win-win orientation** —— The article focuses on solution and persuasion to overcome the war by highlighting peace initiative.
Examples:

• The reporter suggested solutions which can end the war.

• When reporter transmits the political leaders’ announcement, he or she criticizes or supports it with their recommendation.

• The reporter suggested another ways to protect world peace and to solve the conflict between the United States and Iraq.

• **Multi-party orientation** ________ All parties are actors in solving violence and conflict and the are given voice.

Examples:

• The story conveys the other parties voices, not only Pentagon and Iraq government in the conflict.

• The third party such as, Asian or European countries, and international organizations are also principal bodies in solving the conflict.

• **Proactive** ________ The reporter tries to present and warn potential violence before war occurs.

Examples:

• The reporter has a interest in cause of terror incident.

• The reporter seeks reconciliation and presentation of future hostilities.

• **People peace maker** ________ Foot soldiers who fight the war and the civilians who suffer the consequences of war are actors and sources of information.

Examples:

• Foot soldiers who fight the war are main source of story.
• Civilians who suffer the consequences of wars and volunteers who service in Iraq give their voices.

• **Cause and consequences of the war** The article shows how the war is happening and which is the complex effect of the war.

Examples:

• The reporter shows the long-term effect of war in the world including conflict area.

• Destruction of cultural assets and social structure and trauma are also considered and reconstruction and reconciliation are focused in the story.

**FRAME THAT ARE PRESENT IN THIS ARTICLE**

Please write down the most dominant frame in the article. The dominant frame is determined by number of lines. If war journalism indicators appear in more number of lines in the article than peace journalism indicators, the dominant frame will be war journalism.

• War ______

• Peace ______

**THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR THE WAR**

Please check the level of support for the war shown in the article on a 5-point Likert scale. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 means “very pro-war” and 5 means “very anti-war”. For example, if the story totally supports the war emphasizing the benefit which can be acquired from the war such as oil, victory of democracy at the same time it considers Saddam Hussein government as axis of evil. In contrast, if the story consistently criticizes the war itself and has an interest the bad effect of the war, it means very anti-war. For example, the article shows strong expression like, “Arrogant U.S. army”, and “U.S. is the crucial criminal”. Also,
the article who support moderately pro-war and anti-war seldom abases the other side.

Neutral means there is neither clearly supportive of U.S. nor supporting the Iraq side.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very pro-war</th>
<th>Pro-war</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Anti-war</th>
<th>Very anti-war</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPPORT FOR THE PROTAGONISTS IN THE WAR**

Please check the level of support for the protagonists shown in the article on a 5-point Likert scale. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 means “strong U.S. side” and 5 means “strong Iraq side”. For example, if the story totally supports the U.S. side at the same time it abases Iraq as an enemy, it is determined as strong U.S. side. The story often uses demonizing language such as vicious, cruel, brutal, and terrorist in most sentences. In contrast, if the story supports Iraq side with criticizing attack from the U.S. army, it is determined as strong Iraq side. The Strongly pro-U.S. and Iraq and moderately pro-U.S. and Iraq side is determined by using severe words and expression in entire article. The article who support moderately pro-U.S. and Iraq doesn’t abase the other side but only support own side. Neutral means there is neither clearly supportive of U.S. nor supporting the Iraq side.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong U.S. side</th>
<th>U.S. side</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Iraq side</th>
<th>Strong Iraq side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
CODING SHEET

PUBLICATION: ________________________________

DATE : ____________________

NATIONAL INTEREST :

● Economy ________
● Military ________
● Culture/ Society ________
● National security ________
● World Peace ________

THE SALIENT INDICATORS

War journalism

● Zero-sum orientation _______ There is winner and loser obviously and only goal is winning. Peace is a sum of victory and cease-fire.

● Two party orientation _______ There is just “us-them” relationship and voice for “us”. The actors and sources of war is just two parties.

● Reactive _______ The reporter is waiting for potential violence or war before reporting.

● Elite peace maker _______ Political and military officials are actors and sources of information.

● Here and now _______ The article presents what is happening in the battlefield.

Peace journalism

● Win-win orientation _______ The article focuses on solution and persuasion to overcome the war by highlighting peace initiative.
• Multi-party orientation _______ All parties are actors in solving violence and conflict and are given voice.

• Proactive _______ The reporter tries to present and warn potential violence before war occurs.

• People peace maker _______ Foot soldiers who fight the war and the civilians who suffer the consequences of war are actors and sources of information.

• Cause and consequences of the war _______ The article shows that how is the happening and which is the complex effect of the war.

FRAME THAT ARE PRESENT IN THIS ARTICLE

• War _______

• Peace _______

THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR THE WAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very pro-war</th>
<th>Pro-war</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Anti-war</th>
<th>Very anti-war</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPPORT FOR THE PROTAGONISTS IN THE WAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong US side</th>
<th>US side</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Iraq side</th>
<th>Strong Iraq side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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