

# Media Framing : An Evaluation of Australian and Indian Newspaper Coverage of The Haneef Issue



Ms T A Anu\*  
Dr Neeta Inamdar\*\*

© Institute of Management Studies, Noida  
Online access at [www.publishingindia.com](http://www.publishingindia.com)

## Abstract

Understanding mass communications through the concept of framing has become increasingly common, whether in the fields of social psychology, public opinion, or media studies. Since the 1970s, framing as a theoretical and research approach has proven useful in understanding what factors influence media coverage, the existence of ideological forces behind news reporting, what principles dominate public debate, the problems involved in the effects of media coverage and the demonstrations about how media emphasises on certain concepts or issues affecting public opinion and perception of the socio-political environment and ultimately, what elements prevail that impact public policy. Framing defines how an element of rhetoric is packaged so as to allow certain interpretations and rule out others. With this it causes message recipients to generate cognitions in line with the corresponding news frame.

The following paper deals with the concept of media framing in connection with the Haneef issue of 2007 which rocked the diplomatic relations between India and Australia. Media played a pivotal role determining all the actions and reactions involved in the issue. Dr Mohammed Haneef, a 27 year old physician was arrested on July 2, 2007 at the Brisbane Airport, Australia on suspicion of terror-related activities. He is the second cousin of Kafeel Ahmed and Sabeel Ahmed the operatives in the 2007 Glasgow International Airport terror attack. Haneef's ensuing detention became the longest without charge in recent Australian history, which caused great controversy in Australia and India. Public outcry over the incident was further increased when the Australian Government denied Haneef the presumption of innocence, along with the Australian federal government's actions in his case. Haneef was released when the Director of Public Prosecutions withdrew its charge on July 27, 2007, whereby his passport was returned and he departed Australia voluntarily on July 29, 2007.

There was a considerable difference in the coverage of this issue in Indian and Australian media. In this study, two newspapers from both the countries were studied to

find out the differences in both the quantum and the content of the coverage. Two newspapers from Australia, The Australian and The Age and two newspapers from India The Times of India and Deccan Herald were considered for the content analysis that was both qualitative and quantitative. The articles of the four online services were retrieved from the archives of each news service, using the same key word "Dr Mohammed Haneef". These key terms ensured that the major focus of the story would be Dr Mohammed Haneef. Only news articles were selected for the analysis. Editorials, opinion pieces, etc. were excluded. The categories of this content analysis were designed to capture both objective characteristics of the articles like date of publication and page number and more subjective characteristics like presence of positive, negative and neutral frames. Interestingly, considerable difference in the coverage of newspapers was observed leading to an interesting discussion on media framing.

\*Ex-student of Manipal Institute of Communication, press corner, Manipal, India

\*\*Assistant Professor, Manipal Institute of Communication, Press Corner, Manipal, India

## 1. Introduction

In today's world of globalisation, advanced communication technologies have empowered the media to obtain information on events taking place in any remote part of the world and instantly provide it as news feed to the local viewers. Lippmann (1922) observed more than seventy-five years ago; people get their information about the world outside their community through the mass media. The media also determines what issues are discussed by the populace, by putting certain news stories into the limelight.

Now, as we look closer into media, especially news media it shows how it "frames" news with a purpose. News is a rhetorical artifact. It is the message about an event and not the actual event. It is separated into two categories, hard news (such as politics, foreign affairs, and other serious issues), and soft news ('entertainment' news, like celebrity gossip, and scandals). Sometimes, a hard news story will replace a softer one for dominance. However, the news media provide more than "just the facts" in covering public affairs. They also provide frames, storytelling devices that suggest ways to understand the news.

The present paper deals with the media framing in case of the arrest of Dr Mohammed Haneef. He was arrested on July 2, 2007 at the Brisbane Airport, Brisbane, Australia on suspicion of terror-related activities. He is the second cousin of Kafel Ahmed and Sabeel Ahmed the operatives in the 2007 Glasgow International Airport attack. Haneef's ensuing detention became the longest without charge in recent Australian history, which caused great controversy in Australia and India. Public outcry over the incident was further increased when the Australian Government denied Haneef the presumption of innocence, along with the Australian federal government's actions in his case. Haneef was released when the Director of Public Prosecutions withdrew its charge on July 27, 2007, whereby his passport was returned and he departed Australia voluntarily on July 29, 2007.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

This research is a study to find out whether news is framed in newspapers, if so, how? In doing so it interrogates and extends the conceptualization of media framing. Here it also shows the way in which media messages are constructed to suit various interests of newspapers. Here are a few definitions which will give us a better understanding of the term media framing.

According to Goffman (1974), "frames help audiences by classifying into locating, perceiving, identifying and labelling a seemingly infinite number of concrete occurrences defined in its limits".

Similarly, Morley (1976) said that it is important to examine the "basic conceptual and ideological frameworks through which events are presented and as a result of which they come to be given one dominant or primary meaning rather than another".

Gitlin (1980) argued that frames are "persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation, of selection, emphasis and exclusion, by which symbol-handlers routinely

organize discourse". He explained that frames enable journalists when they are dealing with information to "recognize it as information and to assign it to cognitive categories". This analysis gives frames and journalists a power to bring information into a meaningful structure, making it more than simple inclusion or exclusion of information; thus frames are "active, information generating, as well as screening devices". According to him, media frames assist journalists in quickly identifying and classifying information "to package it for efficient relay to their audiences".

The concept of framing refers to "subtle alterations in the statement or presentation of problems" states Iyengar (1991).

Frames in the media emerge as the presence or absence of keywords, common phrases, images, sources of information and the connections among them, as well as sentences that cluster to reinforce certain themes. Frames underscore the importance of select pieces of information through the inclusion of certain text elements and by their placement or repetition (Entman 1993).

Ghanem (1997) explains that media frames are what is "included in the story, the size and placement of details and affective tone" of the presentation, as determined by the journalist.

A typical characteristic of framing is the linkage between, on the one hand, the journalistic approach of shaping the news within a frame of reference and according to a latent structure of meaning and, on the other hand, the stimulation of the public to adopt these frames and to view reality from the same perspective as the journalists do (McQuail, 2000).

According to Berenger (2004), "frames make messages memorable and understandable"

## 3. Operational Definition

Media framing is the decision of what to include within the view, or frame of a story and what to leave out, taken by media persons. With this it causes message recipients to generate cognitions in line with the corresponding news frame.

In the present study a comparative study of two Australian and two Indian newspapers was done to analyse the differences in the coverage of the Haneef issue. The Australian and The Age from Australia and The Times of India and The Deccan Herald from India were the papers analyzed.

## 4. Objectives of the Study

- To understand the concept of media framing
- To assess whether media framing exists in newspapers
- To compare whether two different countries frame the same news in different ways
- To what extent is an issue given importance in both countries, i.e. how a frame is successfully made and retained

## 5. Limitations of the Study

- The study is strictly issue centric, thereby only referring to articles that are analysed about the Haneef issue
- The study does not look into editorials
- This study cannot serve as the sole basis for claims about media framing
- The findings are limited to the framework of the categories and the definitions used in this study

## 6. Literature Review

### 6.1 Framing, News Frames And Framing Effects

Framing has recently enjoyed a renaissance of investigation in the social psychological literature. It is only one of thousands of phenomena we can examine within the social influence canon. To begin with we will see what a frame is.

A frame is a psychological device that offers a perspective and manipulates salience in order to influence subsequent judgment. ([www.workingpsychology.com](http://www.workingpsychology.com))

This definition consists of three separate components :

1. A frame "offers a perspective." It manages the viewer's alignment in relation to the issue. For Example, by labeling ground beef as "75% lean" rather than "25% fat, researchers Levin & Gaeth (1988) were able to impel people to consider meat in terms of its positive healthful qualities.
2. A frame "manipulates salience." That is, it directs the viewer to consider certain features and ignore others. For example, referring to someone as "blue collar" or "intellectual" or "an athlete" emphasizes one particular feature of that person. Perception may become organized around the label.
3. A frame influences "subsequent judgment." The frame precedes a persuasive attempt, and implies a certain organization for the information that follows.

### 6.2 Frame alignment

Snow and Benford (1988) say that when individual frames become linked in congruency and complementarity, 'frame alignment' occurs, producing 'frame resonance', which is, the key to the process of a group transitioning from one frame to another (although not all framing efforts are successful). This makes frame alignment an important element.

There are four types of frame alignment, which include frame bridging, frame amplification, frame extension and frame transformation.

1. Frame bridging is the "linkage of two or more ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem" (Snow et al., 1986). It involves the linkage of a movement to "unmobilized sentiment pools or public opinion preference clusters" of people who share similar views or grievances but who lack an organizational base.
2. Frame amplification refers to "the clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame that bears on a particular issue, problem, or set of events" (Snow et al., 1986). This interpretive frame usually involves the

invigorating of values or beliefs.

3. Frame extensions are a movement's effort to incorporate participants by extending the boundaries of the proposed frame to include or encompass the views, interests, or sentiments of targeted groups.
4. Frame transformation is a process required when the proposed frames "may not resonate with, and on occasion may even appear antithetical to, conventional lifestyles or rituals and extant interpretive frames" (Snow et al., 1986).

When this happens, new values, new meanings and understandings are required in order to secure participants and support. Goffman (1974) calls this "keying" where "activities, events, and biographies that is already meaningful from the standpoint of some primary framework, in terms of another framework" (Snow et al., 1986) such that they are seen differently. There are two types of frame transformation :

1. Domain-specific transformations such as the attempt to alter the status of groups of people.
2. Global interpretive frame transformation where the scope of change is quite radical as in a change of world views, total conversions of thought, or uprooting of all that is familiar (e.g. moving from communism to market capitalism; religious conversion, etc.).

In media studies, sociology and psychology, framing is an unavoidable process of selective control over the individual's perception of the meanings attributed to words or phrases. Framing defines how an element of rhetoric is packaged so as to allow certain interpretations and rule out others.

Understanding mass communications through the concept of framing has become increasingly common, whether in the fields of social psychology, public opinion, or media studies. Media frames can be created by the mass media or by specific political or social movements or organizations. Since the 1970s, framing as a theoretical and research approach has proven useful in understanding what factors influence media coverage, the existence of ideological forces behind news reporting, what principles dominate public debate, the problems involved in the effects of media coverage and the demonstrations about how media emphasises on certain concepts or issues affecting public opinion and perception of the socio-political environment and ultimately, what elements prevail that impact public policy. Framing also helps us to understand how salient issues are presented. These findings are invaluable to our understanding of the notions of media effects, media objectivity and journalistic independence.

Scholarly attention to this concept has grown rapidly, not only in the field of political communication, but in various other social science subfields as well (e.g. Entman, 1993). No consensus has been reached about how framing should be defined and operationalized in a media setting. Current conceptualizations of framing vary in complexity. Most of these conceptualizations, however, are at least partly in line with the classical definition of the framing concept offered by Erving Goffman.

News is a believable media message that people attend to in order to gather information. News-media effects are not limited to merely establishing the salience of certain topics. On

the contrary, news-framing research claims that how news is presented affects what people think about issues, people, and events (Iyengar 1991; Price and Tewksbury 1997). Media-framing theories are typically "flat" in the sense that they assume journalists are autonomous 'framers' of stories, meaning that journalists create frames at their own will.

Research has shown that audiences accept news coverage less critically than any other type of mass media message. Luhmann (2000) claimed that when information is offered "in the mode of news and reporting, people assume and believe that it is relevant, that it is true". Harris (1994) also argued that "if there is one area of media that people are most likely to uncritically accept as reflecting reality rather than creating it, that area is the news". Journalists are not limited to merely establishing the salience of certain topics, but a journalist's active role in framing a story may influence how people think about issues. Different news frames activate different cognitive reactions. Framing in the news media suggests that news texts are "a system of organized signifying elements that both indicate the advocacy of certain ideas and provide devices to encourage certain kinds of audience processing of texts".

Framing in news discourse includes four structural elements: syntactical, script, thematic, and rhetorical. Syntactical structure means that news frames can be identified by the words a journalist chose. The script is identified in how the journalist used the words. Thematic and rhetorical elements include the overall tone or theme determined by the author and the inclusion of rhetorical devices or storytelling schemes as part of the journalist's construction of a frame (Pan and Kosicki 1993). As Pan and Kosicki explain, the language comprising frames "holds great power in setting the context for debate, defining issues under consideration, summoning a variety of mental representations, and providing the basic tools to discuss the issues at hand".

De Vreese (2005) argues that there is little consensus about how to identify frames in the news. According to him, roughly two strategies can be applied. The first is inductive in nature: no predefined frames are used and frames emerge during the course of analysis (e.g. Gamson, 1992). The second is deductive in nature and texts are analysed using predefined and operationalized frames. Furthermore, De Vreese also makes a distinction between generic and issue-specific frames. The former are more general in nature and can be applied to different issues in different contexts (e.g. Valkenburg et al., 1999), the latter are tailored to the specific issue and context under study (e.g. Shah et al., 2002).

Price and Tewksbury (1997) explained that news frames have effects because of two separate, psychological processes. First, during message reception, salient message elements activate certain thoughts and ideas. Then, because these thoughts and ideas have been recently brought to mind, they are more accessible when people have to make subsequent judgments. News framing activates 'some ideas, feelings and values rather than others' and 'can encourage particular trains of thought and lead audiences to arrive at more or less predictable conclusions'.

But sometimes frames are constructed by reporters and have

the power to bring information into a meaningful structure. Industry and activists alike submit story ideas to the media, but on the basis of the guard-dog perspective, journalists continue only to reinforce the status quo position. Protest events and stories considered threatening to the status quo are typically framed 'episodically,' meaning that they are portrayed as extreme local examples and are not explained in terms of deeper social or global problems. Journalists are responsible for constructing news stories relative to their role in the social system; they rely on news values, professional norms (such as objectivity, balance, and fairness), and information from the leaders within the social structure.

The news arena is particularly vulnerable to the occurrence of events (Kepplinger and Habermeier, 1995). News values determine why some but not other events make it into the news. Events have to pass the news threshold, which consists of news values attributed to the real world. Galtung and Ruge (1965) note that what happens in the real world gets attributed some news factors that determine the chance that events make it into the news. Again, making it into the news is something different from significantly shifting the framing of an issue for a period of time. To accomplish this, the event must dominate the news for a longer period in time or change the political power base in society permanently and be incongruent with the way the issue has been framed before the event or result in political actors propagating other frames gaining dominance in society. Thus, news framing is typically driven by journalistic values and norms as well as the economics of the news business (Bennett 2006; Gans 1979; Graber 1993; Price and Tewksbury 1997).

## 7. Interrelationship Between Media Framing And Agenda Setting

According to McCombs and Ghanem in their study *'The Convergence of Agenda Setting and Framing'* the continuing explication of agenda setting theory over recent decades is that these two research traditions now share common ground.

Early twentieth century Walter Lippmann noted that much of the behaviour underlying public opinion is a response to mental images of events, an imagined pseudo-environment which is treated as if it were the real environment. Those mental images are one of the key sites where agenda setting and framing converge. One result of Lippmann's quest in public opinion to link the world outside to the pictures in our heads via the news media has been brought to rich quantitative, empirical fruition in the closing decades of twentieth century by agenda setting research.

Specifically, agenda setting is a theory about the transfer of salience from the elements in the mass media's pictures of the world to the elements of the pictures in our heads. In the empirical elaboration of Lippmann's perspective, the core idea is that elements prominent in the media picture become prominent in the audience's picture. In the words of the agenda setting metaphor, this is a causal assertion that elements emphasized on the media agenda come to be regarded as important on the public agenda.

Within the agenda setting framework there is a vast wealth of research on public agenda setting and considerably less attention to media agenda setting and the variety of influences shaping the media agenda. For agenda setting theory the convergence with framing research will mean greater unity in our knowledge of media and public agenda setting. For framing theory there will be the context of an established theoretical framework linking a variety of communication settings. Overall, consideration of framing within the context of agenda setting will enrich the contributions of both avenues of research to our knowledge of how specific aspects of communication content are linked to numerous cognitive and behavioural outcomes.

## 8. Role of Media Framing in Sterotyping Cultural Portrayal

This next issue with relation to media framing is whether the news media, deliberately or not, promote the notion of the clash of civilizations through the ways in which they frame conflicts. Scholars have routinely used the framing theory to demonstrate how the media portray the world in terms of symbolic selections and constructs. Frames define problems by determining what a causal agent is doing with what costs and benefits, usually measured in terms of common cultural values; diagnose causes by identifying the forces creating the problem; make moral judgments by evaluate causal agents and their effects; and suggest remedies by offering and justify treatments for the problems and predicting their likely effects. (Entman, 1993)

The significance of public salience caused by media coverage has numerous implications for the media and the public. Scholars agree that framing constitutes a form of bias—a process of selection and exclusion. Frames of cultural portrayals, produced and promoted by the modern media industry in the form of cultural products intended for mass consumption, are partially responsible for audience perceptions of cultural entities, and subsequently, perhaps for artificial constructs of cultural belonging. Frames incorporate both the structural and the ideological biases embedded in the news-making process. Accordingly, frames encourage certain understandings of reality and undermine alternative interpretations of facts. Such media frames portraying people or societies as distinct cultural groups or civilizations, thereby provide them with current mediated notions of cultural identity.

9/11 happened in New York but found its way to portray the west as victims and Muslims as villains. These happenings form a clear example of Wolfsfeld's (1997) argument that events determine media coverage to a great extent. However, journalists give the events meaning by transforming them into words and images. In other words, journalists create a "window on the world" (Tuchman, 1978). During this selection and presentation process, journalists decide what is important, making the complex reality understandable for their audiences. Moreover, through their coverage, media can influence public attitudes. Lippmann (1922) already made this connection between mass communications and public attitudes preferences when he stated, "The way in which the world is imagined determines at any particular moment what

men will do." This was what was seen following the attacks on the World Trade Centre in New York, whereby there has been an accelerating trend toward a global polarization of society into Western cultures on one hand and Islam on the other, epitomized in the 'War on Terror' against the 'Axis of Evil'. After 9/11, journalists enthusiastically embraced the new framework of the War on Terror to interpret the 'friends' and 'enemies' of a state, easily expanding the notion of 'enemy' to include all Muslims both in the Middle East and around the world.

One important issue arising from these events is the role and effects of mass media coverage of terrorism. Journalism often attracts controversy, not least where news coverage becomes part of the contest to define the social meaning of events. Reporting terrorism - whether the destruction of 9/11, suicide bombers in the second Intifada, or violence in Chechnya - raises significant questions about how far news coverage can meet journalistic standards of 'balance', 'truth' and 'objectivity' in cases of extreme political conflict.

Debate has centred around two questions. First, does media coverage err by supporting terrorists, lending them legitimacy and credibility, as well as unintentionally encouraging further incidents through a 'contagion' effect? (Cross-country transmission of shocks) Alternatively, do journalistic conventions slip up instead on the side of governments, due to over-reliance upon the framework of interpretation offered by public officials, security experts and military commentators, with news functioning ultimately to reinforce support for political leaders and the security policies they implement?

All these aspects put together is the basis for this research to see whether the arrest of Dr Mohammed Haneef was framed by media in Australia and India according to the identity that Muslims have in both countries. Were the articles positive, negative or neutral about the arrest and investigations? Did it try to frame the articles to re instil the negativity about Muslims or was it balanced?

## 9. Methodology

Since media framing is a part of media effects studies, the use of content analysis WAS considered as apt for this study.

This study analysed all news stories related to Haneef issue of four news organisations: two Indian and two Australian newspapers. All the newspapers were analysed from the online edition of the papers. The data analyzed were the population, not a sample, of articles of these four news media published from the day all four newspapers covered Dr Haneef's arrest and detention till post release.

The two Indian newspapers were Times of India and Deccan Herald. The Times of India (TOI) is a leading English-language broadsheet daily newspaper in India. It is owned and managed by Bennett, Coleman & Co. Ltd. The newspaper has the widest circulation among all English-language broadsheets in the world, with 2.6 million daily paid copies. The Deccan Herald is one of the largest English-language daily newspapers in the Indian state of Karnataka. It is published by the Printers (Mysore) Private Limited. According to the Indian Readership

Survey (Round One) 2007, the Deccan Herald has a readership of 498,000.

The two Australian papers were The Age and The Australian. The Age is a broadsheet daily newspaper, which has been published in Melbourne, Australia. The Age is owned by Fairfax Media. According to The Age, the paper currently has a Monday to Friday readership average of 658,000, reaching an average of 1,049,000 on Saturdays. The Sunday Age attracts an average of 666,000 readers. The Australian is a national daily broadsheet newspaper published by Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation. It has its headquarters in Sydney, but with bureaus around Australia. Its circulation is still quite small, with a weekday circulation of approximately 130,000 and a Saturday circulation of approximately 195,000.

The selection of news stories was achieved using online databases that archive articles from the national media. The University of Queensland database was used to retrieve articles from the Australian newspapers whereas databases from the official websites were used for Indian newspapers. The articles of the four online services were retrieved from the archives of each news service, using the same key word "Dr Mohammed Haneef". These key terms ensured that the major focus of the story would be the Dr Mohammed Haneef. Only news articles were selected for the analysis. Editorials, opinion pieces, etc. were excluded.

After careful revision of all definitions, four coders were trained independently to code each paper. Ten percent of the Indian newspaper (Times of India) articles were randomly selected to measure intercoder reliability. Intercoder reliability was calculated using simple agreement (Holsti's formula) and established at 0.88 for the categories. The categories of this content analysis were designed to capture both objective characteristics of the articles like date of publication and page number and more subjective characteristics like presence of positive, negative and neutral frames. All coders were presented with specific examples of each frame.

## 10. Independent and Dependent Variable

In this study nationality of the newspapers that is the geographical area of the operation of the four newspapers was the independent variable divided as Indian and Australian. Media framing was the dependent variable.

## 11. Statistical Analysis

To establish a quantification system in the content analysis of this study, nominal level is used. At the nominal level, researcher simply counts the frequency of occurrence of the units in each category and converts it to percentages.

## 12. Findings of the Study

- In terms of number of articles in each newspaper, Indian newspapers analysed had more articles than Australian newspapers analysed. The Indian newspapers analysed covered 81.48 per cent in comparison to the Australian newspapers analysed which covered 18.52 per cent.
- In terms of front page articles, Australian newspapers

analysed gave more coverage in the front page. The Australian newspapers analysed gave 53 per cent front page coverage while Indian newspapers gave 22 per cent front page coverage.

- Tone of neutral articles was more in Indian newspapers analysed than the Australian newspapers analysed. Indian newspapers had 54.86 per cent neutral articles while Australian newspapers had 43.34 per cent neutral articles.
- Tone of positive articles was more in Australian newspapers analysed than Indian newspapers analysed. Australian newspapers had 40 per cent positive articles while Indian newspapers had 32.53 per cent positive articles.
- Tone of negative articles was more in Australian newspapers analysed than Indian newspapers analysed. Australian newspapers had 16 per cent negative articles whereas Indian newspapers had 11.82 per cent negative articles.
- Tone of negative articles also differed between the two Australian newspapers, The Age and The Australian. The Age had 13.33 per cent negative articles whereas The Australian had 20 per cent negative articles.
- Tone of neutral articles also differed between the two Australian newspapers, The Age and The Australian. The Age had 46.67 per cent neutral articles whereas The Australian had 40 per cent neutral articles.
- Tone of positive articles was same between the two Australian newspapers, The Age and The Australian. Both had 40 per cent positive articles.
- Tone of negative articles also differed between the two Indian newspapers, The Times of India and Deccan Herald. The Times of India had 8.96 per cent negative articles whereas Deccan Herald had 16.28 per cent negative articles.
- Tone of neutral articles also differed between the two Indian newspapers, The Times of India and Deccan Herald. The Times of India had 49.25 per cent neutral articles whereas Deccan Herald had 60.47 per cent neutral articles.
- Tone of positive articles also differed between the two Indian newspapers, The Times of India and Deccan Herald. The Times of India had 41.79 per cent positive articles whereas Deccan Herald had 23.26 per cent positive articles.

## 13. Discussion

This study was about the Haneef issue, it is related to human interest news discourse. According to the results found in this study, the issue was not given much importance in Australia in comparison to India even though the arrest took place there. However, Ghanem (1997) found that certain framing mechanisms used in the design of a daily newspaper, such as page placement, influenced the degree of concern expressed by Texans about crime. McCombs and Mauro (1977) found that page placement, story format and other framing mechanisms available to newspaper editors also influenced the level of readership for a specific news story among the audience. Thus in those lines in terms of placement, the Australian newspapers printed over 53 per cent of the Haneef articles on the front page while the Indian newspapers printed 22 per cent on its front

page. If the front page denotes importance, then we can say that the Australian newspapers considered the issue more of a newsworthy issue than Indian newspapers. This could well be the reason for the public outrage in Australia that influenced Haneef's ultimate release. Studies have proved that national interests influence news discourse, and in turn the discourse within a nation's media influences opinion in a society (Morgenthau, 1957). Since the public opinion was in favour of him it gives a positive media effect to the issue. But, however this may not be the direct reason to his release because causal relationship between media message and a specific behaviour cannot be assumed to be the direct effect of the media message.

International news coverage is often influenced by the needs, cultural values and political orientation of a country (Chaudhary, 2001). In the case of India the reason for such high coverage was mainly because Dr Mohammed Haneef was an Indian who was caught in Australia as a terror suspect. Studies have established that mass media coverage and analysis of subject are largely approached from the perspective, interest and position of that country (Chrisco, 1994; Rusciano, 1992).

Next the study looked at why in the same country two newspapers tone of negative, positive and neutral coverage differed? This result was seen both in Australian and Indian newspaper. The only reason for this was the ideological difference. Ideology provides the framework through which events are represented. This representation is not necessarily a conscious process on the part of journalists but rather an assumption about the social world in which news must be embedded. Hall (1982) defines ideology as "the mental frameworks in the form of languages, the concepts, categories, imagery of thought, and the systems of representation which different classes and social groups deploy in order to make sense of, define, figure out, and render lucid way society works". From a critical perspective, some see the news as favoring those in power and reflecting the needs of certain groups over others (Molotch and Lester, 1974). This justifies the negative coverage of Dr Mohammed Haneef in The Australian than The Age because The Australian is known to be nicknamed as the 'Government Gazette'.

In terms of frames used the majority of articles in both countries newspapers were neutral and thus followed the rules of objectivity. Although only a few articles were negative about Dr Mohammed Haneef, we do note a difference between the amounts of negativity provided by each newspaper. The Times of India was negative about Haneef in 8.96 per cent of its articles, Deccan Herald 16.28 per cent, The Australian 20 per cent while The Age was 13.33 per cent. Even though the number of articles for both countries that was positive towards Haneef was more than those negative about him, the positivity was more evident in the Australian papers with 40 per cent of articles framing him positively while only 34.55 per cent of the Indian newspapers framed him positively.

This content analysis is a preliminary study for how media framing is done very subtly and how media framing can also be used in a positive way. From an ordinary person's point of view it looked like India was very sympathetic and supportive of Haneef. But this study shows how even though in terms of coverage the Australian newspapers were far behind Indian

newspapers but the Australian newspapers still could be a positive reason for Haneef's release.

#### 14. Reference

1. Bennett, W.L. (2006), *News: The Politics of Illusion*. 7th Edition. New York: Longman.
2. Berenger, R. D. (2004), *Gulf war fallout: A theoretical approach to understand and improve media coverage of the Middle East*, *Global media journal*.
3. Chaudhary, A. (2001), *International News Selection: A Comparative Analysis of Negative News in the Washington Post and the Daily Times of Nigeria*, *The Howard Journal of Communication*.
4. Chrisco, C. (1994), *Pre-War and War Reactions to the Persian Gulf: A Study of Editorial in the Conflict Zone*, PhD Dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi.
5. De Vreese, C.H. (2005), *News Framing: Theory and Typology*, *Document Design*.
6. Entman, R. (1991), *Framing U.S. coverage of international news: Contrasts in narratives of the KAL and Iran air incidents*, *Journal of Communication*.
7. Entman, R. (1993), *Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm*, *Journal of Communication*.
8. Galtung, J., and M. Holmboe Ruge (1965), "The Structure of Foreign News: The Presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus in Four Norwegian Newspapers", *Journal of Peace Research*.
9. Gamson, W. (1989), *News as framing*, *American Behavioral Scientist*.
10. Gamson, W. A. & Modigliani, A. (1989), *Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach*, *American Journal of Sociology*.
11. Gamson, W.A. (1992), *Talking Politics*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
12. Gans, H.J. (1979), *Deciding What's News*, New York: Vintage.
13. Ghanem, S. (1997), *Filling in the tapestry: The second level of agenda setting*. In *Communicating and democracy: Exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda setting theory*, edited by M. McCombs, D. L. Shaw, and D. Weaver, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
14. Gitlin, T. (1980), *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left*. Berkley, C.A.: University of California Press.
15. Goffman, E. (1974), *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*, New York: Longman.
16. Graber, Doris A. (1988), *Processing the News: How People Tame the Information Tide*, New York: Longman.
17. Graber, D.A. (1993), *Mass Media and American Politics*, Washington, D.C.: CQ.
18. Harris, R. J. (1994), *A cognitive psychology of mass communication*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
19. Iyengar, S. (1991), *Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
20. Kepplinger, H. M. and J. Habermeier (1995), 'The Impact of Key Events on the Presentation of Reality', *European Journal of Communication*.
21. Lippmann, W. (1922), *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
22. Luhmann, N. (2000), *The reality of mass media* (K. Cross, Trans.), Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
23. Molotch, H. and Lester, M. (1974), *News as purposive behavior: On the strategic use of routine events, accidents and scandals*, *American Sociological Review*.

24. Morgenthau, H. (1957), *Politics among Nations*, New York: Knopf Press.
25. Morley, D. (1976), *Industrial conflict and the mass media*, *Sociological Review*.
26. Pan, Z. and Kosicki, G. M (1993), *Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse*, *Political Communication*.
27. Price, V., and D. Tewksbury. (1997), *News values and public opinion: A theoretical account of media priming and framing*. In *Progress in communication sciences*, edited by G. Barnett and F. J. Boster, Greenwich, CT: Albex.
28. Reese, S. (2001), *Framing public life: A bridging model of media research. The convergence of agenda setting and framing*. In S. Reese, O. Gandy & A. Grant (Eds.). *Framing in the new media landscape*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
29. Rusicano, F. (1993), 'Media Perspectives on World Opinion during the Kuwaiti Crisis', in *The Media and the Persian Gulf War*, Westport, CT: Praeger.
30. Shah, D.V., M.D. Watts, D. Domke and D.P. Fan (2002), 'News Framing and Cueing of Issue Regimes: Explaining Clinton's Public Approval in Spite of Scandal', *Public Opinion Quarterly*.
31. Snow, D.A., E.B. Rochford, S.K. Worden, and R.D. Benford. (1986), "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation", *American Sociological Review*.
32. Snow, D. & Benford, R. (1988), *Ideology, frame resonance, and participation mobilization*, *International Social Movement Research*.
33. Valkenburg, P.M., H.A. Semetko, and C. H. de Vreese. (1999), "The Effects of News Frames on Readers Thoughts and Recall", *Communication Research*.
34. What is a frame? [internet] Available from <http://www.workingpsychology.com/whatfram.html> [cited on 10 October 2007]