

# **How Pakistani and the US Elite Print Media Painted Issue of Drone Attacks: Framing Analysis of the News International and the New York Times**

Atiya Dar and Dr. Shahzad Ali

## **Abstract:**

*The study examined the editorial treatment of drone attacks in mainstream newspapers of Pakistan and the United States in the mirror of framing theory. The overall findings based on framing analysis of 190 editorials, 120 and 70 leading articles appeared in the News International and the New York Times respectively published in the period of five years i.e. January, 2008 to December 2013. It was census study as the entire population was taken as sample. In order to analyze the phenomena of drone attack, the research techniques of semantic and content analyses were employed. It was explored that both the selected newspapers, specially the New York Times framed the drone attacks by considering foreign policy and national interest of their respective countries. The News International presented the issue in critical tone by supporting popular public sentiments against drone attacks and its implication in the context of collateral damages and sovereignty of Pakistan. The selected Pakistani newspaper projected the coverage of drone attack by attributing unfavourable frames whereas American newspaper used favourable tone while discussing the justification of use of drone attacks in its leading articles. In light of chi square inferential analysis five categories out of twelve were found statistically significant.*

**Keywords:** *Framing theory, Drone attacks, Pakistani mainstream newspaper, foreign policy, the News International, the New York Times, National Interest.*

## **Introduction**

The incident of 9/11 in America has changed the entire framework of global political system. The world trade centre was considered as symbol of the corporate and capitalist system. Western world in particular and the rest of the US allies condemned the attack and within three hours of the tragic incident Bush administration declared that Al-Qaeda as sole responsible and OBL as mastermind behind this act. On 7<sup>th</sup> October 2001 the US and NATO forces attacked on Afghanistan and the US war on terror took a new momentum. Later on in order to hunt the fugitives of Al-Qaeda and Taliban, the lethal usages of drone attacks was started and area of gravity was tribal areas adjacent to Afghan border. Pakistani media, Parliament and academics has arose a great debate whether these drone attacks are commended with the permission of Pakistan government or otherwise. Initially Pakistan state officials denied about its approval later on declared that these drones attacked by Pakistan itself and then this assumption revealed wrong. As far as legal issue of drone attacks was concerned it could not be carried out without the prior permission of Islamabad. Hence different inter clashing perceptions prevailed in the opinion of Pakistan state and society (Minhas&Qadir, 2014).

## **Coalition of Pakistan with US in war on terror**

Pakistan is one of the key allies of war on terror and playing the role of front-line state. After 9/11 attacks Bush government asked the Musharraf to decide about their strategy of coalition. Pakistan had no other option except to join hands in the global alliance against war on terror. Zia's alliance in Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and Musharraf's coalition as front-line ally in war on terror exerted profound impact on Pakistan. Being a key ally Pakistan has provided logistical, transit and basing support to the coalition forces in war against terror. Despite the fact Pakistan neutralizing Al-Qaeda and its adherents but CIA drone programmes in Pakistan cause innocent civilian casualties and also violate the sovereignty of the state which create anti-American sentiments among Pakistan's public. Pakistan's state officials condemned drone attacks symbolically but take no steps to end this just because of economic constraints. Parliament of Pakistan passed a joint resolution against drone attacks and it is also clear that according to the resolutions of Parliament drone attacks are unfavourable and illegal because these are against the sovereignty of Pakistan (Sohrab&Choudhary, 2012).

The first U.S drone attack was crop up in Pakistan's Federally Administrated Tribal Area (FATA) approximately eleven years ago in 2004. Officially U.S refused to uphold the fact that CIA is running the program although Pakistan also revoked concurrence to it. The secrecy of this issue testifies efforts to appraise the legality of drone program as well as its impact on population of FATA (Asia report, 2013). America justifies the drone program with the argument of self defence, and under consideration the aim to wipe out the terrorists who are concealed in the heavens of Pakistan. It dreadfully disheartening that Pakistan is a strong ally of America in war of terror but still Pakistan is facing large amount of destruction in her territory in the form of drone strikes. These attacks are responsible for the casualties of poor civilians. On the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of president that was 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2008 from the Obama administration two drone strikes were killed twenty people at a moment. According to the New American Foundation in first nine and half months of Obama presidency increased the number of drone strikes that were comparatively more than the last three years of Bush government (Mayer, 2010). New American Foundation, 2013 is evident for the statistical variation among Obama and Bush administration regarding drone attacks policy.

During the past decade hundreds of drone strikes has launched on Pakistan by the United States government as in the context of war on terror that also has rooted ever since the incidents of 9/11. Common recurrence of these attacks to target the northwest of Pakistan is the zone of Taliban (Mohanty, 2013). Drones attacks considered as the potential weapons by the U.S with a counter rejoinder to war on terror but in Pakistan a strong negativism to be found regarding drones. Critiques of drone attack policy claimed that these attacks are responsible to target and kill innocent civilians. Hence it is illusive by (Fair, Kaltenthaler, & Miller, 2012) that an important debate rise up not only among the United States and Pakistani media but also involves the global media about the framing of drone attacks. Drone strikes have become one of the most salient issues among Pakistan's general public just because of its anti-Pakistan dreadful consequences and the large amount of media coverage given to it. This debate about the framing of drone strikes can be seen into different framing perspectives. An immense coverage has been given to the killings of major Al Qaeda, Pakistani and Afghani Taliban by Pakistani print and electronic media but on the other hand Pakistan's media outlets also putting much emphasis on the collateral damage and subsequent outrage of drone strikes. According to the Pew Global

Attitudes Project Survey (2010) canvass that drones strikes are passably unpopular among Pakistan's citizens and commonly they tend to be viewed negatively rather than they are framed positively.

### **Statement of the problem**

The study has been designed to analyze the way elite newspapers of Pakistan and the United States i.e. the News International and the New York Times represented the issue of drone attack in the mirror of their national interest.

### **Objectives of the study**

- To investigate the framing techniques used by the elite newspapers of Pakistan and USA by considering the national interest of their respective country as prime yardstick to set the tone of editorial about the drone issue
- To explore about the nature of frames employed by the News International and the New York Times in the light of semantic analysis
- To investigate the editorial treatment of official & opposition parties stance of both the countries in the mirror of framing analysis.
- To dig out any difference of framing techniques used by both the selected newspapers on the said issue.

### **Review of Literature**

Scheufele (1999) observed that in present day's media effects considered and categorized as 'social constructionist' approach (p. 103). Supporting to the same idea (McQuail, 1994) noted that mass media constructs the social reality by "framing images of reality in predicable and patterned way" (p. 331). According to (Gamson & Modigliani, 1987) media discourse is part of a process by which individuals construct meaning and public opinion while journalists play a vital role to develop meanings in the public discourse. A wide range of literature exists here to portray the role of media in the domain of 'framing'. Existing research work on media framing covered an extensive range of topics that exhibits different conceptual approaches (e.g. Ali, Jan, & Saleem, 2013; Saleem, N., 2011; Yusof, Hassan, F., Hassan, S., & Osman 2013) suggested that media is considered to be an objective and reliable source that is expected to portray a fair picture of issues happening around the world both at local and international level. They also filter, shape and then frame the issues according to their own agenda (Yusof et al., 2013). It also argued that giving a little attention, American media specifically portrayed the image of developing countries in his content pessimistically (Ali et al., 2013). Media framing serves to explain that U.S media gave coverage to the foreign countries according to the interest of their own country (Saleem, N., 2011). Apart from U.S media (Steuter & Wills, 2009) examines that Canadian news media constructed and frame the image of Iraq and Afghanistan as an enemy with certain agenda of framing. Several studies found the literature on media framing of war on terror. On the other hand it is posited that Pakistani media specify to print media frame the war on terrorism and drone attacks issue in an unfavourable way and they support the national interest of Pakistan (Ahmad, Mahsud, & Isshtiaq, 2011). Another perspective of framing highlighted by (Rehman, 2013) that due to the drone attacks policy media is contributing and mediating anti-American

sentiments more rapidly in the region than ever before. Additionally in the realm of media framing the concept of peace framing depicted that Pakistani print media cover the ‘war on terror’ in peace frame. As a matter of fact media also support the political jurisdiction of its own country and proceeding of interlocution to reach on peaceful agreement (Raza, Jan, Sultan, & Aziz, 2012). Apart from the framing agenda of media outlets regarding several issues it’s important to stride forward to feign the legality and efficacy of drones. The study of Orr (2011) has explored the status of American drone strikes in Pakistan under international law states a groundwork regarding the effectiveness of drones that secure the countries from terrorism risks. It endorse the legality of these attacks under the international law to plummeting the illustration in which nation states compelled to opt among their own security requirements; and observed to concealed by international norms. In this era countries contend themselves and definitely they will continue it to wipe out terrorists . Whereas the study of Khan argued the previous study of Orr and exposed the statistics that rendered the coverage of non-militant deaths from various media outlets to forecast the accurate non-combatant casualty rate as 32%. It is approximately a third of demises culminating from drone attacks. Whilst on the inferior edge of the spectrum this number is still a horrific happening (Khan, 2011). Jaeger & Siddique (2011) concluded in their research report about the effectiveness of drone attacks in Afghanistan and Pakistan; these attacks are significant against Taliban violence in Pakistan while having minimal or no effect across the border of Afghanistan. Different researches identified the effectiveness and legality of drone attacks so Jr (2012)also argued that drone war imposed by America on Pakistan is not unlawful according to the international humanitarian law. Whereas any deliberate decision must be taken within the define premises of law with the sensitivity of ground realities. Several reports, reviews and researches frame the U.S policy regarding war on terror and drone strikes in more critical, pessimistic and cynical way. Ayoub&Ahmed (2013) analyse two newspapers The Nation and Dawn to examine the portrayal of Pakistan –USA relationship with reference to drone strikes on Waziristan. Results revealed that due to the double standard and diplomatic policy of America, Pakistani press have exposed the Pak-US bilateral relationship in a negative way with reference to drone strikes. So as far as the international media is concerned it has its own agenda regarding framing of Islam and Islamic states. However (Yusof, H. S., Hassan. F, Hassan. S, & Osman, N. M, 2013) conducted the research about framing of international media on Islam and terrorism. Findings concluded that international media outlets labelling the Islam with terrorism even after the death of Osama Bin Laden. Islam as a religion associated with terrorism and also framed negatively in a biased way. Another perspective of media framing explained by (Rowling, M. C., Sheets. P, & Jones, M. T, 2013) regarding frame contestation in news about national identity, cultural resonance and U.S drone policy. They conducted an experiment on the adults of U.S and to expose them a news story about drone strikes killing 23 Afghan civilians. Outcomes showed respondents found significantly critical and military more broadly about that incident with frame contestation. Although the study of Paracha regarding framing of drone attacks in Pakistani elite press contains content analysis of two Pakistani newspapers to analyse their framing tendency about drone strikes. Pakistan is at stake after 9/11 issue and is continuously trying to clarify its position to the world while the people of Pakistan doesn’t have any association with 9/11 terrorist attacks. Results of the study concluded that despite the fact that Pakistan is the American ally in war on terror but still Pakistan’s elite press more or less frame this issue in an unfavourable way (Paracha, 2012). Saleem (2014) also found that Pakistani press was critical

towards the U.S drone attacks policy in Pakistan but tone of newspapers varied as per the policy of organization. While Dawn supported the policy of America to offer USAID to Pakistan on the other hand The News is inauspicious to it. She argued that the relation of media and foreign policy related to issue specific. However, it also not necessary that framing was influenced by the objectives of country's foreign policy objectives. Whereas, Siraj (2006) stated that foreign policy influence the way media frame the content. He explored the image of Pakistan in the US media exploring news framing. The study analysed the news stories of The Washington Post and The New York Times which concluded that US media frame the countries according to the national interest and foreign policy of its country. Within Pakistani press some other factors observed regarding the framing of counter terrorism activities. The detail analysis of The Nation and The News discovered that, at the time of U.S war in Afghanistan Pakistani press have soft corner towards Taliban but gradually opinion of press changed as per U.S counter terrorism policies. A year after the occurrence of 9/11 incident voices of public and media men has changed and turn into Pro U.S policy about war on terror (Jan, Ali, Siddiq&Noshina, 2013).

### **Research Questions**

- **RQ1:** How did the eliteslected newspapers of Pakistan and the U.S portray the drone attacks?
- **RQ2:** How did both the newspapers frame the civil military establishment& opposition parties' perspectives of Pakistan and the US?
- **RQ3:** To what extent the portrayal of The News on drone attacks was different in comparison of the New York Times.
- **RQ4:** what was nature of treatment of both the elite newspapers regarding stance of general public of Pakistan and the United States on the issue of drone attacks?

### **Hypotheses**

- It is more likely that the both the selectedelite newspapers i.e. the News International and The NewYork Times would portray the issue in accordance of national interest of their respective country.
- The ratio of negative frame about representation of drone attacks would likely to be greater in the News International as compared to the New York Times.
- Both the selected newspapers would positively frame the official stance of their respective governments on drone attacks in comparison of opposition parties' point of view.
- The militant and radical groups would be framed in negative manners by the News International and the New York Times.

### **Methodology**

This study has used content analysis technique to analyse framing of two dailies The News International from Pakistan and The New York Times from America about drone attack issue in Pakistan. A time period of five years from January 2008 to December 2013 has opted.

The rationale to select that time period was the constantly increased drone strikes in the post Musharraf(Pakistan's president) era. Media framing theory is baseline of this research. Editorials considered the most influential media content to influence public opinion. All editorials of selected newspapers about drone attacks were taken as a sample. A census method was used because only 70 editorials from The New York Times and 120 from The News International were appeared in both the newspapers during the specific time period of five years. That is why entire population was taken as sample.

### Unit of Analysis

Each paragraph of the leading articles regarding drone attacks was selected as unit of analysis in order to determine positive, neutral and negative valence of the frames attributed to the coverage.

### Data Analysis and Interpretation

The findings comprised the two sections, in the first section the descriptive results would be described in the form of tables and graphs. The second section highlighted comparative analysis of different frames and valence of these frames across neutral positive and negative categories of framing. Similarly, a comparative analysis is presented for the entire number of frames across the two different Newspapers namely The New International and The York Times. The obtained data was analysed by using statistical technique such as mean score. Chi-Square test was applied to determine if there existed any statistically significant difference of valence across the two dailies.

**Figure 1**

#### Valence of the frame on Pakistan's Governments stance on Drone

| Frame valence      | The News |      | The New York Times |      |
|--------------------|----------|------|--------------------|------|
|                    | N        | %    | N                  | %    |
| Negative           | 36       | 58.1 | 10                 | 33.3 |
| Neutral            | 21       | 33.9 | 12                 | 40.0 |
| Positive           | 5        | 8.1  | 8                  | 26.7 |
| Chi-Square p-value | .022     |      |                    |      |

The results show that the Pakistani newspaper used more negative frames (58 %) about official stance of Pakistani government on drone attacks in comparison of the US paper.

**Fig 2**

#### Valence of the frame on US government's stance on drone attacks

| Frame valence | The News |     | The New York Times |   |
|---------------|----------|-----|--------------------|---|
|               | N        | %   | N                  | % |
| Negative      | 4        | 6.0 | 0                  | 0 |

|                    |      |      |    |      |
|--------------------|------|------|----|------|
| Neutral            | 10   | 14.9 | 9  | 30.0 |
| Positive           | 53   | 79.1 | 21 | 70.0 |
| Chi-Square p-value | .110 |      |    |      |

The results of this self explanatory table highlights that the New York Times overwhelmingly supported the stance of Whitehouse on drone attacks. On the contrary the News International was less supportive of Islamabad on the issue.

**Fig 3**

**Framing valence on Stance of Pakistani Opposition Parties on Drone Attacks**

| Frame valence      | The News |      | The New York Times |       |
|--------------------|----------|------|--------------------|-------|
|                    | N        | %    | N                  | %     |
| Negative           | 36       | 76.6 | 18                 | 100.0 |
| Neutral            | 10       | 21.3 | 0                  | .0    |
| Positive           | 1        | 2.1  | 0                  | .0    |
| Chi-Square p-value | .079     |      |                    |       |

The results divulge that the selected American elite paper attributed completely negative frames by adopting critical approach at point of view of Pakistani opposition political parties. Likewise the ratio of negative frames in the News was also statistically significant.

**Fig 4**

**Framing valence of Stance of US Opposition Parties on Drone Attacks**

| Frame valence      | The News |      | The New York Times |      |
|--------------------|----------|------|--------------------|------|
|                    | N        | %    | N                  | %    |
| Negative           | 5        | 18.5 | 2                  | 6.7  |
| Neutral            | 10       | 37.0 | 9                  | 30.0 |
| Positive           | 12       | 44.4 | 19                 | 63.3 |
| Chi-Square p-value | .250     |      |                    |      |

Quite interesting findings were explored as both the newspapers employed lesser negative frames regarding the stance of the US opposition political parties. On the other hand the ratio of positive frames was calculated 44 and 63 percent respectively in Pakistani and American newspapers.

**Fig 5: Framing valence of Stance that Drone Attacks causes casualties among civilians**

| Frame valence      | The News |      | The New York Times |      |
|--------------------|----------|------|--------------------|------|
|                    | N        | %    | N                  | %    |
| Negative           | 36       | 73.5 | 0                  | .0   |
| Neutral            | 4        | 8.2  | 5                  | 16.7 |
| Positive           | 9        | 18.4 | 25                 | 83.3 |
| Chi-Square p-value | .000     |      |                    |      |

The News international was found more critical of collateral damages of civilian in result of drone attacks on militants as the ratio was calculated almost 74 percent in comparison of the New York Times which has not as such projected casualties of the civilian in its leading articles.

**Fig 6**

**Framing valence of Stance that drone attacks are a factor of terrorism in Pakistan**

| Frame valence      | The News |      | The New York Times |      |
|--------------------|----------|------|--------------------|------|
|                    | N        | %    | N                  | %    |
| Negative           | 36       | 78.3 | 6                  | 23.1 |
| Neutral            | 10       | 21.7 | 20                 | 76.9 |
| Positive           | 0        |      | 0                  | 0    |
| Chi-Square p-value | .000     |      |                    |      |

The selected elite newspaper of the US dominately adopted neutral stance in the context of drone attacks as one of boiling factors of terrorism in Pakistan as the neutral ratio was calculated almost 77 percent of the total coverage.

**Fig 7**

**Framing valence about Pakistani militants on Drone attacks**

| Frame valence      | The News |      | The New York Times |       |
|--------------------|----------|------|--------------------|-------|
|                    | N        | %    | N                  | %     |
| Negative           | 28       | 80.0 | 24                 | 100.0 |
| Neutral            | 4        | 11.4 | 0                  | .0    |
| Positive           | 3        | 8.6  | 0                  | .0    |
| Chi-Square p-value | .066     |      |                    |       |

It is significant to mention here in the light of findings as the table 7 shows that both the Pakistani and the US newspaper depicted no sympathy for the militants as the ratios of negative frames were 80 and hundred percent respectively in the News and the New York Times.

**Fig 8**

**Framing valence of the stance of Pakistan's intelligence agencies on Drone Attacks**

| Frame valence      | The News |      | The New York Times |       |
|--------------------|----------|------|--------------------|-------|
|                    | N        | %    | N                  | %     |
| Negative           | 18       | 51.4 | 0                  | .0    |
| Neutral            | 9        | 25.7 | 0                  | .0    |
| Positive           | 8        | 22.9 | 4                  | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square p-value | .007     |      |                    |       |

Quite interestingly the News represented Pakistani spy agencies in more critical manners in comparison of positive coverage as the results of this self explanatory table also communicated that the selected American newspaper framed the role of Pakistani intelligence agencies in completely positive tone.

**Fig 9**

**Framing valence of the Stance of US intelligence agencies on drone attacks**

| Frame valence      | The News |      | The New York Times |       |
|--------------------|----------|------|--------------------|-------|
|                    | N        | %    | N                  | %     |
| Negative           | 7        | 18.4 | 0                  | .0    |
| Neutral            | 3        | 7.9  | 0                  | .0    |
| Positive           | 28       | 73.7 | 30                 | 100.0 |
| Chi-Square p-value | .010     |      |                    |       |

Likewise, the New York Times absolutely appreciated the stance of the US intelligence agencies on drone attacks as the findings indicated the cumulative ratio of positive frame was cent per cent. While on the other hand the selected Pakistani newspaper also painted the US spy agencies in significantly with positive tone as more than two third coverage was in support of the stance.

**Fig 10**

**Framing valence of the Stance of the general public of Pakistan on Drone attacks**

| Frame valence      | The News |      | The New York Times |       |
|--------------------|----------|------|--------------------|-------|
|                    | N        | %    | N                  | %     |
| Negative           | 48       | 90.6 | 23                 | 100.0 |
| Neutral            | 3        | 5.7  | 0                  | .0    |
| Positive           | 2        | 3.8  | 0                  | .0    |
| Chi-Square p-value | .313     |      |                    |       |

The negative frame valence of the general public of Pakistan on the said issue was covered in overwhelming unfavorable manners as it is highlighted in the above table that the ratio of neutral or positive frame valence was not found statistically significant.

**Fig 11**

**Framing valence of the Stance of the general public of US on Drone attacks**

| Frame valence      | The News |      | The New York Times |      |
|--------------------|----------|------|--------------------|------|
|                    | N        | %    | N                  | %    |
| Negative           | 11       | 47.8 | 15                 | 65.2 |
| Neutral            | 11       | 47.8 | 8                  | 34.2 |
| Positive           | 1        | 4.3  | 0                  | .0   |
| Chi-Square p-value | .352     |      |                    |      |

On contrary stance of American general public on drone attack was presented more with negative frame valence in the New York Times in comparison of the News. Quite interestingly the selected Pakistani newspaper portrayed the stance with neutral tone as the ratio of by and large half of the coverage in Pakistani newspaper was appeared with negative frame.

**Fig 12**

**Framing valence of the Stance that Drone attacks causes militant casualties**

| Frame valence      | The News |      | The New York Times |      |
|--------------------|----------|------|--------------------|------|
|                    | N        | %    | N                  | %    |
| Negative           | 7        | 13.5 | 0                  | .0   |
| Neutral            | 16       | 30.8 | 10                 | 33.3 |
| Positive           | 29       | 55.8 | 20                 | 66.7 |
| Chi-Square p-value | .108     |      |                    |      |

It is worth mentioning as the mainstream American media is acknowledged as custodian of the national interest; not a single story was published in the New York Times which has given impression of empathy or soft corner for militant casualties in result of drone attacks. Similarly the overall tone of the selected Pakistani newspaper was explored on the similar pattern because as findings indicated the ratio of critical coverage on the said aspect was not calculated statistically significant.

**Mean value for framing valence of different items**

| The News International | The New York Times |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| <b>0.756167</b>        | <b>1.067875</b>    |

As to the inferential analysis the researcher computed aggregate mean for entire number of items across the two newspapers. Lower the score, more negative the framing on an average after the computing the aggregate mean the researcher found that The News International aggregate mean amounts to 0.756167 whereas The New York Times mean amounts to 1.067875 at face value one general conclusion we can draw is that The New York Times portray drones attacks more positively as compare to The News International. However as mean values are very sensitive to extreme values therefore it is more suitable to go into the depth of each measure of association between the newspaper and framing issue. Hence the table below describe the chi square value. The total number of editorials from both dailies also depicts the salience of the drone attacks issue in Pakistan. A total number of 70 editorials found but on the other hand only 40 out of 70 were relevant to this study from The New York Times. Irrelevant editorials that incorporate drone attacks issue with the bunch of other countries exempting than Pakistan were removed. Primarily from The News International 120 editorials bring into being for this study and all of them directly or indirectly associated with drones attacks issue in Pakistan. So there exists a significant difference among two dailies that revealed the preferred agenda of both countries. It also proves that Pakistan as a victim to these drones gave more coverage to the issue whereas U.S gave less coverage to the same matter.

| <b>Inferential analysis</b>                                       |                         |  |
|---|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Name of items</b>  | <b>Chi-square value</b> | <b>Statically significant or insignificant</b> |
| Pakistan's government stance on drone attacks                     | .022                    | Statically significant                         |
| frame on US government's stance on drone attacks                  | .110                    | Statically insignificant                       |
| Stance of Pakistani Opposition Parties on Drone Attacks           | .079                    | Statically insignificant                       |
| Stance of US Opposition Parties on Drone Attacks                  | .250                    | Statically insignificant                       |
| Drone Attacks causes casualties among civilians                   | .000                    | Statically significant                         |
| Stance that drone attacks are the factor of terrorism in Pakistan | .000                    | Statically significant                         |
| Stance of Pakistani military on Drone attacks                     | .066                    | Statically insignificant                       |
| stance of Pakistan's intelligence on Drone Attacks                | .007                    | Statically significant                         |
| Stance of US intelligence agencies on drone attacks               | .010                    | Statically significant                         |
| Stance of the general public of Pakistan on Drone attacks         | .313                    | Statically insignificant                       |
| Stance of the general public of US on Drone attacks               | .352                    | Statically insignificant                       |
| Stance that Drone attacks causes casualties among Militants       | .108                    | Statically insignificant                       |

Above mentioned table describes the statistically significance of various items in order to judge the results of the study. With the help of chi-square value which is known as P-value depicts the statistically significance or insignificance regarding the framing of drone attacks. After computing the descriptive analysis and applying chi-square

test on different items across newspaper's editorial categories found that five out of 12 items bare statistically significant difference of framing. However, seven items did not produce statistically significant difference across two newspapers. This fact proves that there exist some sort of differences and similarities on framing of drone attacks. Two out of five significant items not be genuinely so significant because of cells within the contingency table without any values. Since chi-square is very sensitive to low frequency count we can't accept chi-square results at their face value. This is the case of two items on the stance of intelligence on drone attacks. For the rest the remaining items which were found to be significant have some ethical or moral connotation so general conclusion we can make from the analysis is that two newspapers tend to differ in their framing drone related issues with high moral content. For instance this is the case items on the issue of civilian deaths as well as drone attacks as the factor of terrorism as it is implicit in these two items they raise moral questions about drone attacks. The two newspapers are made for the consumption of audiences with different moral values in fact American value of practicality and rationalization tend to under estimate drone attacks as cause of civilian death and as a factor behind terrorism. Similarly, American press underestimates the level of this content among Pakistani government.

## **Results**

On the basis of in-depth analysis, it can be said in simplified manners supported by the substantive evidence of different frames found in the published editorials that drone attacks issue have been a significant cause of creating strain among two countries i.e. Pakistan and the US. Inter-state relations apparently moving toward deterioration with each passing day as civil society, media, intelligentsia and overall public opinion in Pakistan adopted critical stance of American drone policy. Ultimately blowing flow of public opinion compelled the ruling elite in Pakistan to issue official statements of displeasure and condemnation against drone policy through mainstream national and international media. In addition to this collateral damages in shape of killing of innocent civilian further aggravated the situation. Anti-American sentiment prevailed throughout the country. Due to bizarre situation and due to trust deficit in the minds of man in street of Pakistan, they were not willing to believe or accept the official stance of the US state department and Pentagon regarding collateral damages. Drone program of America adversely effecting peace and stability process in Pakistan. It created certain apprehension regarding implications of this policy. As it was demanded by the public to revisit Pakistan policy for her role as a front line state in war on terror. On the other hand the US concerned civil and military leadership were categorically asking to Islamabad to do more. This present study presented framing analysis about the treatment of drone issues in different dimension as discussed earlier of 190 leading articles appeared in both the selected newspapers during the specific time period of five years. In this context, the tilt of the published editorial on the said issue was measured to likelihood of positive, negative and neutral stance in the mirror of foreign policy of the respective states. It can be said precisely that apart from other external and internal factors which significantly influence as identified by Shoemaker and Reese in their classical research on influence on media contents, the policy of country is acknowledged as pivotal factor for shaping media framing with special reference to international issues.

As far as treatment of Pakistani selected newspaper was concerned it frames the issue of drone attack relatively opposite manners in comparison of the US newspaper i.e. the New York Times. The US newspaper supported the policy of drone attacks in accordance of the official stance of

White House. On the contrary as it has been proven in light of findings of the study that Pakistani newspaper i.e. the News international painted this issue in more unfavourable manner apparently opposite to Pakistan role in war against terrorism. Yet the American selected newspaper emerged as custodian of national interest. So, the editorial framing of the New York Times was found highly in the favour of drone strikes that indicates pro nationalist stance and toeing with the policies of their respective government. On the other hand Pakistani elite press frame this issue in more negative way and often criticize the government's ailing policies about drone strikes. The reason behind the tilt of the News International against the government policy on issue of drone attacks was influenced due to public sentiments and critical stance of mainstream opposition political parties and particularly the hostile stance of right wing religious political parties. Pakistani selected newspaper preferred to be on the side of popular voices instead of the ruling elite class, losing her grip on certain issue due to bad governance and ailing socioeconomic conditions of the country. In light of the statistical analysis it is proved that the first hypothesis was partially supported as the New York Times painted the issue of drone attacks by following the policy and safeguarding national interest of the United States. Furthermore, the statistical testing of the second hypothesis based on the cumulative results of the study strongly supported the second hypothesis as the News International framed drone attacks more negatively as compared to the New York Times.

## **Discussion:**

This study presented framing analysis of 190 leading articles on the issue of drone attacks appeared in the New York Times and the News International during the selected time period of five years. On the whole, the mainstream American newspaper projected the issue of drone attack in accordance of the US policy as this argument has been supported in the light of several other researches that the influence of White House policy was one of the significant factor, used as a yardstick by the mainstream newspapers for coverage of international issues. The national interest has not been jeopardized by the US print and electronic media. Precisely speaking the media in the United States observed nationalist approach by following the government policy with regard to foreign coverage (Dorman&Farhang, 1987; Yu&Riffe, 1988; Kim, 2000; McChensey, 2002; Yang, 2003). Hence, our study has significantly supported the above mentioned argument. On the contrary the selected Pakistani newspaper partially supported the government stance on the issue as the tone of editorial was relatively more critical in comparison of the US newspaper which stood by her government while cultivating positive image of Washington policy on the said issue. It can also be argued in this manner in the case of media framing, the editorial gatekeepers of print or electronic media organization decide to frame an issue offensively or defensively for their rivals (Hanggli&Kriesi, 2010). The News International used media frames offensively concerned to drone policy of America but on the other hand, the New York Times employ the defensive approach to construct their own social reality. First of all this study distinguished two opposite framing stance of both countries and revealed the bottom line story. These framing agendas of both countries can be able to cultivate or construct their own social reality to their public and rest of the world. According to (Glagier&Boydston, 2012) often press and government exhibited similar framing behaviour over the time. The New York Times framed as discussed earlier the drone attacks issue positively in a favourable manner as their government defending this strategy. It has been substantively proved in the mirror of several researches as also elaborated in the results that mainstream media of the US supported the civil or political leadership policy and implementation by Pentagon in different ventures

namely Vietnam war, cold war era, Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, First and second Gulf war, Middle east crisis , war on terror or the foreign policy in the wake of Arab spring with special reference to political upheaval in Egypt, Tunis, Libya or recent Syrian conflict. The US media stood by in support of the armed forces whatsoever measures adopted by them for achieving the ultimate goals set by the political leadership in different conflicts. The same treatment was explored in our study as the issue of drone attack was framed in favourable tone. It can be concluded precisely that the major priority of mainstream media in any part of the world by and large the US in particular and Pakistan in general to safeguard the national interest. In the context of editorial treatment of drone attack, it can be sum up that the New York Times defended its government drone policy by employing the positive frame valences. Hence the U.S elite press is the supporter for the continuation of drones' policy against the militants. American drone strategy is a highly criticizing phenomenon in Pakistani elite press. It also contributing to cultivate the negative sentiments among public about the U.S drone strategy with the use negative frame valence. That is why the selected Pakistani newspaper criticized the both governments by giving representation to popular public sentiments.

### **About the Authors**

---

Atiya Dar is Research Scholar in Department of Communication Studies, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan.

Dr. Shahzad Ali is Associate Professor in Department of Communication Studies Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan.

### **References**

- Ahmad, I. M., Mahsud, N. W., & Ishtiaq, T. (2011). Pakistani Press and War against Terrorism in Democratic Era. *Berkeley Journal of Social Science*, 1 (5), 1 - 23.
- Ali, Z., Jan, M., & Saleem, N. (2013). Portrayal of Pakistan by US. Leading news magazines. *Science international Lahore*, 25(4), 965-970.
- Ayoub, U., & Ahmed, T. (2013). Portrayal of Pakistan-US relationship with reference to drone strikes on Waziristan in the editorials of dawn and nation: a comparative study. *Academic Research International*, 4 (6), 56-64.
- Boydston, A. E., & Glazier, R. A. (2012). The president, the press, and the war: a tale of two framing agendas. *Journal political communication*, 29 (4), 428- 446.
- De Vreese, C. H. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information design journal*, 13 (1), 51- 62.
- Dorman, W. A., & Farhang, M. (1987). *The U.S. press and Iran: Foreign policy and the journalism of difference*. Berkeley: University of the California press.
- Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1987). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American journal of sociology*, 95 ( 1), 1 -37.
- Gorp, B. V. (2007). The constructionist approach to framing: Bringing culture back in. *Journal of communication*, 57 (1), 60- 78.
- Jan, M., Ali, Z., Siddiq, M., & Noshina. (2013). Counter terrorism activities in Pakistan: comparative study of the editorials of elite newspapers. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 29(2), 67-77.
- Jaeger, D. A., & Siddique, Z. (2011, December). *Are Drone Strikes Effective in Afghanistan and Pakistan? On the Dynamics of Violence between the United States and the Taliban*. Discussion paper presented at the Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit Institute for the Study of Labour, Germany.
- Iyengar, S. (1994). *Is anyone responsible?: How television frames political issues*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jr, B. P. R. (2012). A qualified defence of American drone attacks in northwest Pakistan under International humanitarian law. *Boston university international law journal*, 30:409-447.
- Kaltenthaler, K., Miller, W., & Fair, C. (2012, April). *The Drone War: Pakistani Public Attitudes toward American Drone Strikes in Pakistan*. Paper prepared for presentation at the Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association Meetings, Chicago, IL.
- Khan, A. M., & Safder, A. (2010). Image of U.S. in Pakistani elite newspaper editorials after 9/11 Incident: A Comparative Study of The Dawn and Nawa-i-Waqt with special regard to media conformity theory. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 30(2), 325- 339.
- Khan, R. (2011). Drone Strikes in Pakistan: Mitigating Bloodshed or Amplifying it. *Stanford journal of international relations*, 13 (1), 16-17.
- Kim, S. T. (2000). Making a difference: U.S. press coverage of the Kwangju & Tiananmen pro-democracy movements. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77(1). 22-36.

- Kriesi, H., & Hanggli, R. (2010). Political framing strategies and their impact on media framing in Swiss direct- democratic campaign. *Journal of political communication*, 27 (2), 142-157.
- Kwansah-Aidoo, K. (2005). Prospects for agenda setting research in the 21st century. In K. Kwansah-Aidoo (Ed.), *Topical issues in communications and media research*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- McChesney, R. W. (2002). The news media and world war III. In M. Bromley, H. Tumber, B. Zeiler. (Eds.). *Theory practice & criticism. Journalism*, 3(1). (pp. 14-21). London: Sage.
- McQuail, D. (1994). *Mass communication theory: An introduction* (2nd Ed.). USA, Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.
- Minhas, Z., & Qadir, A. (2014). The US War on Terror and the Drone Attacks in FATA, Pakistan. *Pakistan Annual Research Journal*, Vol, 50, 15-28.
- Mohanty, N. (2013). *America, Pakistan and the India factor*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- New American Foundation. (2010). *Counterterrorism Strategy Initiative Policy Paper; The Year of the Drone; An Analysis of U.S. Drone Strikes in Pakistan, 2004-2010*. U.S: Bergen, P., & Tiedemann, K.
- New America Foundation. (2013). *Drone Wars: The Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killing*. U.S: Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights.
- Orr, A. (2012). Unmanned, Unprecedented, and Unresolved: The Status of American Drone Strikes in Pakistan under International Law. *Cornell International Law Journal*, 44: 730 - 752.
- Ottosen, R. (2014). Underreporting the legal aspects of drone strikes in international conflicts: A case study of how Aftenposten and The New York Times cover drone strike. *Conflict & Communication Online*, 13(2), 1-12.
- Paracha, A. S, Imran, F, & Khan, A. M. (2012). Framing of Drone Attacks in Pakistani Elite Press: A Comparative Study of Dawn and the Nation. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3 (1), 471- 480.
- Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: an approach to discourse. *Political Communication*, 10, 55- 75.
- Raza, R. M., Jan, M., Sultan, K., & Aziz, F. S. (2012). Portrayal of war on terrorism in Pakistani print media exploring peace framing in daily nation and business recorder. *Asian journal of social sciences & humanities*, 1 (4), 97-108.
- Raza, H. S., & Awan, M. S. (2013). Discourse Analysis of Coverage Regarding Drone Attacks: A study of Pakistani Print Media. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 33(2), 379-388.
- Rehman, A. (2013). *Impact of drone attacks in Pakistan and the war on terror* (Unpublished Master's dissertation). Malmö University, Sweden.

- Rowling, M. C., Sheets, P., & Jones, M. T. (2013). Frame Contestation in the News: National Identity, Cultural Resonance, and U.S. Drone Policy. *International Journal of Communication*, 7 (1), 2231-2253.
- Saleem, N. (2011). U.S Media Framing of Foreign Countries Image: An Analytical Perspective. *Canadian Journal of Media Studies*, 2(1), 130-162.
- Saleem, N. (2014). US Foreign Policy towards South Asia (2011-2012): Framing of Pakistani Press. *A Research Journal of South Asian Studies*, 29(2), 423-433.
- Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of communication*, 49 (1), 103- 122.
- Siraj, A. S. (2006). *Image of Pakistan in the US Media: Exploring News Framing*. University of Southern Illinois Carbondale, USA. Unpublished manuscript.
- Sohrab, W., & Choudhary, A. I. (2012). Pak- US Relations in 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Challenges and Opportunities for Pakistan. *Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences*, 2 (3), 1-16.
- Steuter, E., & Wills, D. (2009). Discourses of Dehumanization: Enemy Construction and Canadian Media Complicity in the Framing of the War on Terror. *Global Media Journal Canadian edition*, 2 (2), 7- 24.
- Yang, J. (2003). Framing the NATO air strikes on Kosovo across countries comparison of Chinese and U.S. newspaper coverage. *Gazette*, 65(3), 231-249
- Yusof, H. S, Hassan, F, Hassan, S. M, & Osman, N. M. (2013). The Framing of International Media on Islam and Terrorism. *European Scientific Journal*, 9 (8), 104- 121.