THE U.S. NEWSMAGAZINES COVERAGE OF THE "ASIAN ECONOMIC TIGERS," 1990-2000: A CONTENT ANALYSIS

A thesis presented to

the faculty of

the College of Communication of Ohio University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Science

Ariadne P. Budianto

August 2004

This thesis entitled

THE U.S. NEWSMAGAZINES COVERAGE OF THE "ASIAN ECONOMIC TIGERS," 1990-2000: A CONTENT ANALYSIS

BY

ARIADNE P. BUDIANTO

has been approved for

the E.W. Scripps School of Journalism

and the College of Communication by

Daniel Riffe

Professor of Journalism

Kathy Krendl

Dean, College of Communication

ABSTRACT

BUDIANTO, ARIADNE PRIMASARI. M.S. August 2004. E.W. Scripps School of Journalism

The U.S. Newsmagazines Coverage of the "Asian Economic Tigers," 1990-2000: A Content Analysis (125 pp.)

Director of Thesis: Daniel Riffe

In the early 1990s, several nations emerged as the new Asia's economic powerhouses: Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan and Thailand. These nations, known as the "Asian economic tigers," have always played an important role in serving the United States' interests in the East Asia region.

Previous studies have shown that the way the United States sees other countries is most often reflected in its media. This study is a content analysis of how four leading American news magazines—*Business Week, Newsweek, Time* and *U.S. News & World Report*—portrayed these Asian "tigers," from 1990 to 2000. Although there are many studies conducted to examine the other Asian economic giants (China and Japan), only limited attention has been given to examine American media coverage these new "tigers." This research is designed to find out how these

magazines cover these nations by examining: the number of stories written, the trends and patterns of coverage over time, the topics prevalent in this period, and the sources within the stories.

The results show that although the magazines have different preferences in covering each “tiger,” they were similar in determining what events are considered “important.” They agree that events related to “economy and business” are the “most important.” This research also found that overall the magazines employ sources from the “tiger” nations more than to sources from the United States or international institutions. A new power structure that defines information in American media is set by a new form of elite: the economic elites.

Approved:

Daniel Riffe

Professor of Journalism

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The period of the Cold War ended with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991. Studies of United States media coverage of foreign news during the Cold War have shown that most media coverage of the international events illustrated the superpower rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union.[1] This "Cold War frame" dominated the international news flow, more specifically in foreign news, where the journalists took cues from the official policy of their home government when reporting on international events.[2]

Hallin noted that the Cold War ideology was produced through a primarily "unconscious" process employed by journalists. While not so much to make a political point, journalists tend to package a presentation of news in terms they assume the audience will find interesting and easy to understand.[3] Before the Cold War ended, media tended to focus on issues and events made significant by the struggle of East-West bipolar perspective, which was indeed perceived as the most interesting part of international events. In the case of United States media, even countries as small as Nicaragua or Cuba got more coverage because of their perceived association with the Soviet Union.[4] Huang and McAdams pointed out that the Cold War newsframe once "organized virtually all foreign affairs coverage into a coherent ideological picture supportive of American world hegemony." [5]

However, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, people's attention to East-West tension decreased considerably. The demise of the Cold War offered challenges as media and institutions fumbled for new directions and mandates. The United States public and its press shared a renewed awareness of the extent to which "side events" such as environmental degradation, economic dysfunction or anti-Western enmity got closer to center stage.[6]

Giffard noted that soon after the breakdown of the Cold War, the media focused more on specific "trouble spots," such as areas plagued by political or armed conflict, famine, flood, or other natural disasters.[7] He concluded that extensive attention given by the United Nations to aid the world had helped construct global concern through conferences on global issues such as population, social development, environmental problems, and human rights, which eventually made their way onto the international agenda, therefore dominating the international news flow in the 1990s. Moreover, Dennis concluded that as the Cold War ended, the media focus shifted to issue-based stories, and there was a surge of interest in economic competition.[8]

Shoemaker and Reese noted that, in general, countries were particularly concerned with how they were covered and, consequently perceived by others in the world community.[9] The United States was seen as a major news source supplementing the international news flow rather than receiver, because of its "Big Power" status.[10] In a study investigating the influence of systemic determinants of news coverage in 38 countries, Wu concluded that the United States influence in international news flow was also magnified by the fact that the U.S. was a dominant subject in almost every

country's news hole, with almost one in every five international news stories dealing with the U.S.[11] Accordingly, Perry also asserted that United States media portrayals can have great influence on Americans, in which "negative attitudes about foreign countries resulted partly from a lack of information," whereas "the quantity of news available about foreign countries often may be at least as important as its content."[12]

Based on a study of coverage by international news agencies, Giffard observed the emergence as newsmakers by Asian and Pacific Rim nations—China, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines—in the post-Cold War's international news flow.[13] His qualitative analysis of the agencies' reports showed that those developed countries were often defined in terms of their support for, or opposition to, Western policies and values. Nevertheless, those nations were most often depicted as despoilers of rain forests, exploiters of child labor, or as undeserving supplicants for debt relief.

Studies of the relationship between a nation's policy and the media coverage have noted that foreign news depicted by the media would reflect the nation's foreign policy.[14] Thus for the countries that have significant new meaning for the United States in the post-Cold War era, it was important to acknowledge how they were depicted by the U.S. media. This study was designed to examine the American news magazines coverage of specific East and Southeast Asian countries and regions (which many used to be defined as "less-developed" or "Third World" nations) right after the end of Cold-War era, specifically within the 11-year period of 1990-2000. The countries and region examined in this study were Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia,

the Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan and Thailand, which were known as the "Asian economic tigers" due to their astonishing economic boom in 1990s. While the reasoning for choosing those particular countries/region will be elaborated on subsequently in the next chapter, this study essentially focused on identifying three crucial variables that shaped news: *what* were the topics considered as important for public attention, *where* the news story came from, and *who* voiced them. The result would substantiate, complement or repudiate previous studies' assertion about the United States media coverage of foreign news after the Cold War: that they focused more on covering those issue-based stories such as "trouble spots," social movements, or economic competition, as previously mentioned.

Background

The Asian Economic Tigers

Starting in the mid-1960s and through the 1970s, four East Asian countries—Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong became industrialized and grew rapidly as "*newly industrialized countries* (NIC) and *newly industrialized economies* (NIE)." The flourishing economy achieved by these countries had made them renowned as the "Four Tigers of the Asian Economy."[15]

Consecutively in the 1980s, Malaysia, Thailand and Indonesia emerged as fast-growing industrial powers. A distinguishing feature that marked these countries significance in the world's economy was the combination of rapid growth with increasing income equality. As a result, in the beginning of the 1990s they had also become *new tigers*.[16] Lukauskas observed that since the early 1990s, South Korea,

Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines exhibited a rapid expansion of per capita income. Except for the Philippines—which was the least developed of them—the East Asian economies even surpassed the United States average rate in growth of per capita income between 1960 and 1995. They also outperformed the industrialized world in general, diverging from the experience of most other developing countries.[17]

East Asian and Southeast Asian countries were growing rapidly before the 1997 financial crisis hit the region. In fact, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia and South Korea, the hardest hit countries, were among the fastest growing countries worldwide since the mid-1980, and all of them were growing fast until the eve of the crisis in 1996.[18] Garran noted the weak United States *dollar* and the consequences resulting from it in late 1970s, plus the strong Japanese *yen*, were substantial forces behind the prosperity of East and Southeast Asia in the late 1980s and early 1990s.[19] However, the flourishing economy soon plummeted following the devaluation of Thailand's currency (*baht*) in 1997, which sent the region into a long and deep economic crisis. Even for some countries, this turning point was followed by multidimensional crises, often due to changes in the government or political constellation.

The Nations in Focus

Van Ginneken noted that the American major media outlets maintain the most extensive network in the world.[20] However, in the post-Cold War era, from the mid-90s onward, there has been "a noticeable shift, particularly to East Asia, now identified as a major current and future growth, and therefore an important producer and consumer of news."[21]

As previously noted, in 1990s several East Asian nations emerged as “the Asian economic tigers.” Below is a brief look at the post-Cold War relationships between the U.S. and each country or region examined in this study, in alphabetical order:

Hong Kong

The former British colony played a very important role as trade and finance gateway of China, the “world’s most populous country and an increasingly powerful political and economic force.”[22] Originally a colony of England but ceded to China in 1842, Hong Kong gradually gained its status as an “economic tiger” with the help of the establishment of the Republic of China (PRC) in October 1949.[23] As the new communist state was established, a sea of refugee from the mainland overflowed this 1,000- square kilometer territory, increasing its population from 600,000 to 2.4 million.[24] Although Hong Kong’s economy tumbled in the 1950s due to the United Nations’ trade embargo on China, the mainland refugee entrepreneurs created light manufacturing industries, which were aimed mainly at the United States’ market. The territory’s economy began to thrive, and by 1990 its income per person was the third highest in Asia after Japan and Singapore.[25]

Based on the Sino-British Joint Agreement signed by both governments in 1984, Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China on July 1, 1997. According to this agreement, China had promised to treat Hong Kong under its "one country, two systems" formula, which meant China's socialist economic system

will not be practiced in Hong Kong and that Hong Kong will enjoy a high degree of autonomy in all matters except foreign and defense affairs for the next 50 years.[26]

With this formula regulating Hong Kong, combined with its policy of status quo toward China, the United States considered the region one of the key players in the Asian economy, with a combination of marketing opportunity, technology, and transparent bureaucracy within a strong market-oriented society. The U.S. interests in Hong Kong were going stronger at the end of the 1990s, as remarked on by Consul General Richard A. Boucher in March 1998:[27]

> Our commercial relationship, our excellent law enforcement cooperation with the Hong Kong authorities, our cordial and efficient relationship with the Chinese entities stationed in Hong Kong, serve United States interests and provide a base for the future. Across the board, our primary interest is that people in Hong Kong decide these issues for themselves, without interference and in keeping with the traditions, which have made Hong Kong successful. The first issue is the elections and the question of how democracy evolves in subsequent elections in the year 2000, 2002, 2004, 2005, 2007, and beyond. Second is a law to be passed on sedition and secession that we hope will not impinge on freedom of expression. Third are the court cases, in which Hong Kong's common law courts will have to decide how to interpret the new system. Fourth are some of the panoramic issues: how does China change and what role does Hong Kong have in that process?

Whatever the overall effects of Hong Kong being part of China for United States foreign interests, Hong Kong served primarily as East Asia's center of economic significance. However, in September 1998 the effect of the Asian financial crisis forced the Hong Kong government to intervene directly in its financial market to support its currency by buying up shares in every "blue chip" Hong Kong company,

demonstrating an act of defiance toward the expectation of American government, especially the United States Treasury Department.

Indonesia

From its struggle to gain independence from the Dutch in 1945 to emerging as a "new economic tiger" in the 1990s, the Indonesian economy developed rapidly during the Suharto authoritarian regime (1965-1998). Nuechterlein observed that in the 1990s Indonesia became one among several countries likely to be key players in the international relations of East Asia based on its population base, resources, military capability, and internal political cohesion to act with some independence in relations with other states.[28] Despite abundant natural resources, a huge population and an effective army, Indonesia had not yet achieved a level of economic advancement exhibited by its neighboring countries—Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand—or by South Korea and Taiwan, mostly due to geographical problems (great distances between its many islands and overpopulation of Java, the island bearing the central economic and government activities), authoritarian government, massive corruption and warring ethnic groups.[29]

Garran noted that the 1997 Asian financial crisis was the most profound political and economic event since Suharto seized power from communist-friendly Sukarno in 1966. Thirty years later, in 1996, Indonesia had a per capita gross national product that was higher than that of China and India—with the levels of infant mortality, life expectancy and education somewhat better than India's, although lower than China's.[30] However, this achievement ended when the wave of financial crisis hit

the country in 1997. Within the last months of that year, the U.S. government announced a major new policy on Indonesia: that it would commit $3 billion to an international effort to rescue the Indonesian economy that was badly hurt by the financial crisis.

In addition to the political turmoil coloring the late 1990s, Indonesia also experienced a multi-dimensional glut of crises. The impact of the economic crisis was exacerbated by environmental disasters: forest fires in 1997 raised health concern which led to escalating tension with Singapore, tourism losses exceeding $4 billion, and the El-Nino/La Nina weather patterns in 1998 that hurt agricultural production.[31]

Despite mounting criticism in the United States Congress about resuming aid for Indonesia due to its resistance to allowing independence to East Timor prior to 1997, then U.S. Secretary of State Robert Rubin announced that the aid was "critical to the national security and economic interests of the United States." The basic reason is that Indonesia "not only serves a key market for U.S. exporters, but also is crucial to our efforts to promote growth, peace and prosperity throughout the world."[32] This could be read as a fear that market instability could lead to a violent leadership transition, as happened in 1965 when Sukarno was overthrown. It eventually happened in spring 1998, when the economic crash led a lynch mob to demand the resignation of Suharto.

Among the most prominent interests the U.S. had in Indonesia were security and defense interests, inasmuch as the country held an essential role as a strategic link between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. Wood wrote that, "the Indonesian

archipelago, stretching 3,000 miles from mainland Southeast Asia to the Southwest Pacific, formed a natural bridge or barrier—depending on one's ability to transit it successfully—from East Asia from the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf."[33] In an ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) plenary in Manila in 1998, former U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright stated that the United States has "long relied on Indonesia to be a force of stability in Southeast Asia and for moderation in world affairs."[34] However, escalating concern about East Timor inevitably led to the end of the long-standing form of military cooperation between the two countries.[35] East Timor became independent in 1999 through a controversial referendum aided by the United Nations.

Malaysia

United States-Malaysia relations seemed to be uniquely concentrated around the long-running Prime Minister of Malaysia, Mahathir Mohammad. In the 1990s, Malaysia was among several countries which persisted in countering the fixation of the market to determine a society's welfare and/or the nation's position in global system—in direct opposition to the Western, more explicitly American—values. Close associates of Mahathir observed that this deep distrust of Western intentions and security stemmed from the trauma of colonial domination in the region, while he adamantly believed that "the West does not wish to see the East to become so advanced and strong as to pose a threat to the West."[36] His anti-Western rhetoric often combined "zeal and conviction with shrewd political tactics but lacking diplomatic tactfulness." [37] However, it often conflicted with Singapore's close ties with Western

power, causing tension between the two countries, and their neighboring countries as well.[38]

In defiance of the free market ideology adhered to by most Western nations, particularly the United States, the Malaysian government imposed strict capital controls.[39] Mahathir argued that although the Western nations had let go of their colonies, they would strive to protect themselves through various means. He declared in an ASEAN meeting in October 1991, "It is ironical that while we adopted the liberal economic policies based on free trade and open markets recommended by the West, they are now forming trade blocs which would effectively restrict our products into their markets."[40] Hence since late 1990, Mahathir proposed the controversial East Asian Economic Grouping (EAEG) comprising all East Asian economies but excluding the United States and Australia, using strong wording during its launch.[41]

Malaysia's rocky relationship with the United States was colored not only by diplomatic engagements but also friction, most notably since the 1980s. In 1984, Mahathir's visit to Washington led the Reagan administration to establish closer military ties. By contrast, on another visit paid in 1989 Mahathir was only granted a brief meeting by President George Herbert Walker Bush outside Washington, which led the prime minister to call the United States "racists" in a United Nations convention.[42] When Malaysia began turning back Vietnamese boat people in 1991 the United States Congress responded by suspending a military training program for Malaysia.[43]

Although the authoritative Mahathir was and still is the country's number one advocate for the campaign against international "speculators," through the first half of 1997 the Malaysian economy accumulated an amazing record of economic growth with budget surpluses and consistently low inflation.[44] However, Low argued the imposition of capital controls by Mahathir had a neglected political and foreign policy dimension, in which he used a rigid nationalist foreign policy to consolidate political bases of support.[45] Other experts concluded that Mahathir's aggressive style was induced by his desire to be "somebody in the world."[46]

Malaysia was the only one among the four countries worst hit by the Asian financial crisis—the others were South Korea, Indonesia and Thailand—that did not undergo a change of government. The crisis, if it had any effect on its political constellation, seemed to lead to an increasing concentration of authority for Mahathir.[47] In September 1998, Mahathir expelled his U.S.-backed, International Monetary Fund (IMF)-friendly deputy, Anwar Ibrahim, from the cabinet and had him arrested on shocking allegations of homosexual sodomy, a crime in Malaysia, while at the same time enforcing even more rigid capital controls on the country.[48] The removal of Anwar left Mahathir not only serving as prime minister, but home minister and finance minister as well.[49] Yet if the economic crisis did not lead to a change of government, it had a significant influence on political activities, especially after the dismissal of Anwar. Although the opposing political force was strongly motivated by Anwar's case and called for political reform, it also sought to highlight the

government's economic failures, ongoing problems of business-government relations and corruption, and social inequality.[50]

The Philippines

United States relationship with the Philippines goes back to the late 19th century when the Spanish-American War of 1899-1902 ended the Spanish-colony republic, and replaced it with the American occupation until 1946, when it finally declared its independence.[51] Before that, the promise of independence was undermined by the threat of world war breakout, which again prompted the United States to mold the Philippines domestic politics to meet America's economic and strategic interests.[52] Bresnan noted the acquisition of the Philippines as a part of strategic plan to secure American interests, as the country would serve as a "stepping-stone" to China.[53]

With a constitution modeled on that of the United States, the Philippines had one of the longest records of democratic governance in Asia, although the Marcos regime (1972-1986) broke with this by declaring martial law to secure his authoritarian leadership.[54] Marcos defended his policy by declaring that it would serve American economic and strategic interests by securing them from the nationalists' opposition.[55] The growing media outcry on human rights violations and poverty throughout the Philippines led Marcos to denounce the media attention—particularly from the West—to those issues, with claims that such "allegations" were unverifiable.[56]

However, the assassination of opposition leader Benigno Aquino in August 1983 created widespread alarm, including within the United States government—which had had extended economic and military ties with the regime—resulting in the U.S. and Aquino allies mobilizing against Marcos. Nevertheless, many regarded the American response toward Aquino's assassination as merely a "tepid" protest, which was expressed by President Reagan's decision to cancel all his visits to Southeast Asia instead of canceling only the Philippines trip. President Bush emphasized a softer tone, as he publicly announced in 1993 that the United States "would not cut away from a person who, imperfect as he may be on human rights, has worked with us."[57]

There finally came a strong front of opposition comprised of the Catholic Church, business groups and discontented military leaders united under the "People Power" movement aimed to overthrow Marcos. The movement successfully did so, and in 1986 Aquino's widow, Corazon, became president.[58] Her terms highlighted the transition of the most important interests the United States had in the Philippines: defense and security, established since 1916 through the Jones Act, which allowed American military forces to remain in the Philippines until 1936 while giving way for the Philippines' independence. The bases include a naval station at Subic Bay (in Olongapo) and an army/air forces fort at Clark Field near Manila.[59] Based on an agreement signed by Marcos in 1983, the United States was given the right to prolong its military bases until 1991. But due to political pressures preceding the 1992 election, Aquino refused to renew the bases agreement, resulting in a gradual withdrawal of the United States forces from the country that many regarded as the end

of "American neo-colonization."[60] Even so, the United States expressed its interest in continuing an appropriate military-to-military relationship with the Armed Forces of the Philippines in accordance with Mutual Defense Treaty obligations.[61] However, the U.S. military retreat from the Philippines initiated a significant change in its economy, once heavily dependent on the existence of the bases, into more trade-oriented activities (i.e. exports).[62]

The economic dynamism exhibited since the restoration of political stability in 1992 was reflected in the growth of the Gross National Product (GNP), the expansion of exports, the increase of foreign exchange reserves and the low rate of inflation in the Philippines.[63] However, the economy did not prove to be as vital as its neighboring countries. Bresnan concluded that recurring national political instability and careless economic policies in the Philippines stalled growth for at least a decade until the early 1990s.[64] Haggard argued that although the country experienced a substantial debt crisis in 1983-84, the transition to Aquino's governance in 1986, along with gradual reduction of external debt and a return into the international capital market, made the Philippines' economy gradually stabilize in the early 1990s. Consequently it began to take off when the government relaxed the monetary and fiscal policy.[65] Aquino did her share in reversing the crony-abused economy by selectively introducing market forces to areas once dominated by monopolistic practices, protection and subsidiaries. But the economy boomed during the administration of Fidel Ramos (1992-98), who advocated more substantial structural reforms for the Philippines, and emphasized explicitly the importance of reforming business-government relations.[66] It was due to

this late economic boom that the Philippines was barely affected by the 1997 financial crisis.

Singapore

Like Hong Kong, Singapore (founded in 1819 as a trading post) was part of British imperialism in the Asia-Pacific region. Due to its strategic location and convenient landing space for large fleets, the British initially established this small region as an entry-port for trade with the Malaysian peninsula region and what would later became Indonesia. Laborers were imported from the South China area, and Singapore became a predominantly Chinese community in the area inhibited mainly by Malays.[67]

Singapore is an authoritarian, one-party state (sometimes called "hegemonic party") system, once led by the long-running moderate socialist Lee Kuan Yew. Singapore's tumultuous relationship with its neighbor Malaysia began when it merged with Malaysia in 1963 to form a federation to combat the influence of communism. But it ceased in 1965 when then Malaysian leader Tunku Abdul Rahman rejected the idea of the common market, and insisted on including parts of British Borneo to avoid having a Chinese majority in Malaysia.[68] Prior to the separation in 1964, there had been bloody race riots between the Malays and Chinese in Singapore, forcing Singapore to be expelled from the federation and to form an independent, multiracial state.[69] Immediately Yew's government launched ambitious programs of housing and road building—financed by compulsory savings—that helped initiate the cooperation of labor in the development of industry. Rather than continuing its role as an entry-

port, Singapore laid its new economic foundations on oil refineries and ship manufacturers.[70]

Yew's style of socioeconomic and political management was rooted in the notion that individual achievements, put in a context of family, would contribute to economic growth, since extended family contained "cultural backdrop: the belief in thrift, hard work, filial piety and loyalty, and more significantly the respect for scholarship and learning."[71] Experts believed the impressive success of Singapore's economy derived from its government-centered policies, as described by L.Y.C. Lim:[72]

> (It) is more the result of the Long Arm of state intervention than it is of the Invisible Hand of the free-market. While Singapore is a success story of capitalist development, this is not the same as a success story of a free market development. (The Singapore state) is in fact a heavy interventionist. It owns, control and/or regulates land, labor, capital resources, and their allocation. It sets or influences many of the prices on which private investors base their business calculations and investment decisions.

The relationship between Singapore and the United States began with American efforts to contain communism in the 1960s. Yew used the opportunity to make the U.S. its ally by strongly denouncing communism. He built the bond by discreetly supporting American troops during the Vietnam War and welcoming U.S. ships into the country, resulting in the growth of the textile industry and electronic plants, which proved to be a very convenient way out of the 1970s oil crisis.[73]

In defense, Singapore had worked out a naval access agreement for a short period of time, followed by an air agreement, which were considered more significant for the future relationship between the two countries.[74] Other experts noted these

arrangements were “the most notable arrangements post-Subic,” with Sembawang Wharf serving as a berth for the United States Navy. The wharf provided ample storage and office space for the U.S. Navy to set up the Navy Regional Contracting Center and to relocate the Seventh Fleet’s logistic support forces. In sum, the United States foresaw using Singapore as regional center for coordinating repair, deployment, etc., throughout the Southwest Pacific.[75]

In 1994, Singapore’s rigid governance produced anxiety when the Singaporean government detained and sentenced an American juvenile (Michael Fay) to caning punishment for vandalism.[76] Although it did not affect the relationship between the two countries, it did cause public controversy since many American publications (e.g. *Newsweek*, *Time*, and the *New York Times*) provided quite extensive coverage of the case. Many aggravated Americans believed the Singaporean government exaggerated a trivial issue, forsaking humanity for a juvenile misdemeanor, while the Singaporean government defensively argued that the nation’s law must prevail in any situation.

South Korea

A new episode in Korean history in the post-Cold War international system began in the early 1990s, and dealt mostly with the tension between North and South Korea. United States interests in South Korea, the democratic nation of Korea, were highlighted by the economic, ideological and political relationships between the two countries. The American policy toward South Korea reflected and demonstrated concerns over local business conglomerations, the threat of communism and escalating military competition between the two Koreas.

In the 1990s, South Korea strongly resisted American demands to liquidate the "chaebols," or Korean conglomerates.[77] Nuechterlein observed that in 1991, there was perceived anxiety as a result of the new American policy on the Korean peninsula. Moreover, President Bush announced that the United States would withdraw unconditionally all of its nuclear weapons from South Korea, which left North Korea with absolutely no argument for pursuing a nuclear program. In 1992, during the first official meeting of United States-North Korea at the United Nations, the United States declared that it would press strict sanctions against North Korea if it did not permit international inspections of its nuclear facilities. Those inspections were needed to ensure that the nuclear capability was intended for peaceful purposes only.[78]

Meanwhile, South Korea consistently leaned more toward the United States than to its counterpart. However, its relationship with the United States became strained in 1993 when South Korea elected its first civilian president in 32 years, Kim Young Sam, who was more inclined to build bridges with the North than any of his predecessors.[79] This evolution obviously alarmed the United States, which unceasingly tried to preserve its security interests across the Pacific.

Subsequently in 1994, South Korea along with the United States and Japan attempted to align with North Korea through an "Agreed Framework." It basically proposed that the three countries would envision the construction of two reactors in North Korea in return for inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the eventual dismantling and removal of North Korea's nuclear facilities and associated materials.[80] However, the launch of North Korea's three-stage ballistic

missile over Japan and into the Pacific Ocean sent the United States government to review its policy toward North Korea. Before long, the United States conferred closely with South Korea and Japan to propose a new approach toward North Korea.

The United States seemed to be more agitated on this issue than Korea itself. The U.S. sent more troops to South Korea, and to reinforce the importance of preserving the security of the Korean peninsula, United States Secretary of State Madeleine Albright stated in August 1998 that the U.S. has"37,000 troops in Korea standing guard at one of the most dangerous frontiers in the world; any threat to Korea's economic stability would be a threat to the stability of the Korean peninsula as a whole."[81]

Intense negotiations nearly failed by mid-1999, but in September 1999, a tentative agreement was announced in which North Korea agreed to suspend the missile tests during negotiations while the United States agreed to reduce some sanctions against North Korea.[82] A few weeks later South Korea sent some of its prominent businessmen to North Korea for a congenial visit, during which the South Korean government expressed its optimism that North Korea might be shifting toward accommodating the other three countries' interests.[83]

Observing the tension between the two Koreas, Gershman suggested the U.S. preserve the positive attitude expressed by former Secretary of Defense William Perry about fulfilling the promise of the "Agreed Framework" and follow the attitude of former South Korean President Kim Dae Jung on his policy toward North Korea.[84] However, beyond its baseline commitment under the Framework, the United States

was advised to also support overall efforts in maintaining peace on the peninsula by increasing economic cooperation and by supporting confidence building measures (such as Northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue and the North Pacific Arms Control Workshop), make commitments to reduce the cost of the reunification transition, champion demilitarization—including troop withdrawal—along with providing adequate financial assistance and comprehensive dismantling all the United States bases in Korea.[85]

Taiwan

Prior to 1949, before separating itself from the mainland China, Taiwan *was* China. As outlined in the three *communiqués* throughout the period of 1972-1982 on the United States diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China, the United States acknowledged a "one China" status that consisted of the mainland and Taiwan as its province.[86] As Taiwan left the United Nations in 1974, the United States froze its relation with Taiwan.

However later, the United States relation with China proved to be deteriorating after the Tiananmen Square crackdown in 1989. As noted by Lasater, the incident "poisoned U.S.-China relations in the eyes of many Americans (which was) reflected strongly in the mass media, among American intellectuals, and in the Congress," despite previous efforts by President Bush to maintain constructive relationships between the two.[87] After the crackdown, the Bush administration imposed sanctions against China which included suspending high-level military exchanges, postponing all official exchanges (above the level of assistant secretary) and sending out

recommendations to international financial institutions to defer further lending to Beijing.[88] Meanwhile, Taiwan absolutely benefited from this tension. Lasater noted that in July 1991 the Bush administration agreed to support Taiwan's accession to the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) partly to win congressional support for the unconditional renewal of Most Favorable Nation (MFN) trading status for China.[89]

In 1993, the Clinton administration drew a linkage between China's MFN status renewal with its progress on human rights issues—a policy that many regarded as mishandled—which lasted for less than a year, followed by the "de-linking" in 1994. Lasater noted that China's MFN status renewal that year marked "the end of a period in which the Tiananmen incident dominated Washington's relations with Beijing," and "reinforced the post-Cold War trend of economics being one of the most important factors in normal international relations."[90]

Lasater also noted that in the same year, the United States administration upgraded its relations with Taiwan by agreeing to a sub-cabinet-level economic dialogue with Taiwan and permitting high-level U.S. officials to visit Taiwan. Similarly, senior-level Taiwanese officials were permitted to meet with U.S. officials—although not under official settings—while high-level economic and trade officials from Taiwan could meet with the United States economic, commercial and technical agencies in official settings.[91]

In early 1996 the United States relations with China deteriorated to an alarming degree as a result of China's decision to conduct military exercises in the

Taiwan Strait, which many regard as "purposively trying to intimidate" Taiwanese voters prior to their first presidential election.[92] Nuechterlein concluded that this aggressive action was induced by Taiwan's former President Lee Teng Hui's remark in March 1996 that Taiwan had earned the recognition of being an important player in international relations and was not simply regarded as a "renegade" province of China.[93] In response, the United States government confirmed its position of defending Taiwan against the excessive force of China by sending aircraft carriers to the Strait.

During President Clinton's visit to China in 1998, he reaffirmed the long-standing "one China" policy to Jiang Zemin while at the same time emphasizing the importance of human rights issues for Americans.[94] This new "coziness" between the United States and China alarmed Taiwan, South Korea, Japan and India. Meanwhile, Taiwan's desire to seek international recognition for its separate status flared up in 1999 when President Lee Teng Hui declared once again that Taiwan-China relations could only progress if China recognized Taiwan as an equivalent party in negotiations.[95]

Gershman proposed that the best way for the United States to position itself with regard to Taiwan and mainland China was to maintain the status quo, and that the United States should back away from its emerging "containment of China" strategy by halting efforts to build a missile defense system and support the status quo in the Taiwan Strait. If the United States was to support negotiation between Taiwan and mainland China, it had to provide no military support for Taiwan's independence,

and oppose an invasion by China.[96] In a more recent discussion regarding the issue of Taiwan's independence, President George H. W. Bush restated that America would keep its "one-China" policy that had been established since the 1970s.[97]

Thailand

Thailand's close relationship with the United States deteriorated in the 1980s, when Thailand's objection to declining levels of aid from the United States was matched by the U.S. protesting over a Thai policy of using its military to block the entrance of Vietnamese refugees. Niksch noted that Thailand's foreign ministry seemed irritated over demands by the United States Congress that Thailand should end its aid to Khmer Rouge movements in Kampuchea. This anxiety was exacerbated when the *Washington Post* published an article in 1988 criticizing and alleging the Thailand military embezzled about $3.5 million of United States aid designated to fund the non-communist Khmer resistance forces.[98] Civilian Prime Minister Chatichai Choonavan responded that Thailand would reduce its future need for United States military aid.

Trade relations also eroded when the United States pushed the Thailand government to create special legislation that would protect United States merchandise, particularly computer software and pharmaceutical products. When Thailand refused to comply, President Ronald Reagan's administration threatened to end the General System of Preferences (GSP). The trade relations worsened to the extent that the George H.W. Bush administration reviewed the trade policy with Thailand.

However, the strong United States backing for the ASEAN's resistance to Vietnam's invasion of Kampuchea in 1978, and the continued U.S. military assistance program to Thai armed forces, reassured Thailand about the United States commitment toward the country.[99] Moreover, the United States continued its economic and military assistance to Thailand and provided political support in the United Nations for ASEAN's position on Kampuchea.

During his visit to Thailand in 1996, President Clinton pointed out that Thailand was among several nations that have had close political, economic and security ties with the United States since the early 19th century: "(It) goes back to 1833, when America signed a treaty of amity and commerce with the Kingdom of Siam. Those early bonds of friendship have endured the test of time, anchored by our security alliance, strengthened through our comradeship in Korea and Vietnam, and kept sharp and ready through Cobra Gold—the largest exercise involving United States forces anywhere in Asia."[100]

With the United States serving as a main market for Thailand's products, Clinton stated that in 1995 alone the economic relations between the two countries reached up to $18 billion through two-way trading. He also highlighted expanding relations between the two countries on issues apart from trade and security: environment preservation, health, gender-related issues, drug-trafficking and social welfare.[101]

In terms of the economic boom achieved by Thailand in 1990s, King noted that since 1950s Thailand's leaders had focused on developing Thai industries and

subsequently gained a good record of overall success.[102] Niksch also noted that in 1987 Thailand became a principal target in East Asia for Japanese and Taiwanese investments, which grew beyond only textiles, food processing and computer circuit industries.[103] Its economy grew rapidly—except during the aftermath of the 1970s oil crisis followed by the early 1980s recession—to become a sustainable economic powerhouse during Choonavan's administration in 1996, making it renowned as one of the new "economic tigers."[104] However, this thriving period ended soon afterward when Thailand's government devaluated the *baht* (Thai currency) on July 2, 1997, resulting in the catastrophic Asian financial crisis.[105]

America Re-assessing Its Role in East and Southeast Asia Post-The Cold War

Experts noted that the United States began to establish its role in containing the spread of communism in East Asia as early as in the 1950s when President Truman decided to confront the growing Soviet and Chinese military threat in this region with a major buildup of American power in the Pacific.[106] He decided that the United States must produce a series of bilateral and multilateral pacts with several East Asian states seeking protection from Communist pressures: Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines and Thailand. However, since Deng Xiaoping's administration in late 1970s requested Western help in modernizing the economy of China, the balance of power in East Asia gradually shifted and became more favorable to the United States and Japan.[107]

However, the end of the Cold War brought new perspectives to the way the United States government sees the world. The contending East-West perspective did not define the idea of global concern any more, and thus the phrase "new world order," which was coined by the United Nations in the 1970s, was redefined. Cyr noted that this phrase, made legendary by President George H.W. Bush, had proven to be the "enduring rhetorical legacy of (his) presidency since the collapse of the Berlin Wall."[108]

With the adopting of foreign policy according to the "new world order," scholars expressed criticism that the American republic might try to serve as "the world leader" in order to impose this "new world order" upon the international system. Such behavior, which was described as an "interventionism policy," highlighted the United States role in the post-Cold War's international system.[109] From the end of the World War II down to the late 1980s, the United States opted for this "interventionist" (sometimes called "universalist") approach to assess global problems. This role was characterized by two main propositions: first, that the United States has inescapable global commitments and responsibilities as the world's only remaining superpower; and second, that the United States must limit the commitments it assumed abroad and must exercise care in assuming them.[110] To illustrate the latter suggestion, many observers[111] noted that the existence of United States military bases throughout Asia contributed to the political tensions within the region. Many time it led to serious controversies and misunderstanding between the United States and Asian

governments. A good example is the deterioration of the United States relationship with the Philippines.[112]

Nevertheless, with around 2/3 of the world's population and some of the world's fastest growing economies, the Asian region became more important, politically and economically. According to a study by Cronin and Metzgar of the Institute for National Strategic Studies in 1996, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) contributed to United States political, economic and especially security interests in the Asia-Pacific region.[113] This study identified three American basic interests in East Asia: to maintain open access to markets; to preserve open sea lanes of communications; and to ensure that no one power, or group of powers, dominated the region.

Moreover, as stated in a report by the Asia Foundation, United States economic interests were directed to gain and to protect access to free markets, and to help strengthen legal and administrative structures and practices that support free trade. Meanwhile, United States vital security interests in the East Asia region require a stable balance in the region to reduce the risk of conflict and to avoid domination of powers that might be hostile to the United States. To reshape United States foreign policy toward post-Cold War Asia, the Asia Foundation produced some suggestions: providing attention to long-term trends, such as the rise of Chinese military and economic power as a potential contender to United States superiority; or looking out for the possibility of internal instability in regional and sub-regional powers (i.e. in China or Indonesia). However, on a daily basis, the United States interests were

manifested in managing the constant flash points—the Taiwan Straits and Korean peninsula.[114]

Rohwer observed that following Japan's economic success after the 1960s, four countries had trailed in its footsteps in recharging their economic prosperity. South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore emerged from poverty with their economies doubling every eight years from 1960 to 1985. Similarly, this step was followed by four other countries—Malaysia, Thailand, China and Indonesia—which began "hauling themselves out of the dumps" after the 1970s. These eight economies were among the world's 13 most successful at raising real incomes from 1965 through 1990—making them lucrative spots for United States markets and investments.[115] Furthermore, Lim noted that during the early 1990s, several East Asian countries had enjoyed immense economic growth, mostly due to a conventional macro economic policy—which combined both "openness" to trade and foreign investment and conservatism in fiscal and monetary policy.[116] Geographical proximity has facilitated capital flow in this region; a surge of investment—flowing first from Japan and later from Hong Kong, South Korea, Singapore and Taiwan, China—has contributed significantly to the dynamism of Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand, due to liberal treatment of foreign investments.[117] Combined with the United States effort in reassessing its role in the "new world order," these nations served as potential suppliers for American markets.

At the same time, East and Southeast Asia served not only the economic interest of the United States but also the security interest. After the Cold War, to

protect itself from the threat of emerging dominating power in the region that might be hazardous to its interests, the United States government opted to maintain a policy of relative status quo in East Asia by continuing its military posting around the region, but pledging to reduce the number gradually.[118] The Republic of Philippines—a former U.S. colony—while considered as a "late-bloomer" for economic investment,[119] served as a major United States' military base in the Southeast Asia region. Bresnan concluded that the United States should pay more attention to this region due to its extensive economic, political and strategic interests.[120]

Moreover, Nuechterlein concluded that United States interests in East and Southeast Asia during the four-year period of late 1990s (1996-1999) reinforced the notion that the post-Cold War international environment would be filled with serious economic challenges and threats to regional peace.[121] Probably the most notable economic cooperation that linked the United States with the region toward the end of the Cold War would be the signing of the "ASEAN-U.S Initiatives" in late 1990, which established a committee aimed at monitoring and reviewing issues related to trade and investments.[122]

Gershman observed that President William Clinton's administration, recognizing the opportunity to advance United States corporate interests, responded to the economic crisis with a "mad rush" to penetrate open sectors of East and Southeast Asian economies previously sheltered from foreign involvement. Whether as part of the IMF-assisted financial aid programs or through bilateral pressure by the United States government, the United States approach to East and Southeast Asia was in

accord with its use of trade warfare as a key element of its "neo-mercantilism" strategy within the region. Even in 1998 the Department of Commerce through U.S. Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky, admitted that it was "controlled" by strategic traders who view Asia from a geo-economic perspective, thus making the Clinton administration vigorously in opening doors to United States trade and investment.[123]

Nevertheless, security issues in the region continue to be a significant post-Cold War interest for the United States. To protect its global security interests, the preservation of United States military presence would be critical, although there had been a debate over the extent of its implementation. With the end of the United States base relationship with the Philippines, ASEAN states and the United States have been searching out means and ways for a continuing presence that would be very different from the "relatively large war-fighting capability" once centered at Clark air base and Subic naval base near Manila.[124] Others, however, believed that the long-term effect of United States military presence in East and Southeast Asia would protect not only United States interests, but also strengthen regional stability by reducing potential tension.[125]

In summary, the United States foresaw these East and Southeast regions as fundamentally different from the regions that were merely served as the Cold War battleground. Scholars noted the increased United States' roles in the regions in mid- and toward the end of-1990s was dominated by political-economic activities, especially in response to the growing effect of the 1997 Asian financial crisis. The

American pleas for democracy, good governance and human rights found general acceptance in Asia, while the United States market remained crucial to Asia's full economic recovery and future growth.[126]

The Relationship between United States Interests and American Media

Linking United States' interests in East and Southeast Asia with United States' media coverage would echo previous studies on the relationship between the press and policy makers. Chang noted that press-policy maker's relations are important since "the press is the principal instrument in making a well-informed public," and served as leading source of information and ideas.[127] Moreover, scholars have noted that media coverage can be expected to influence,[128] or reflect[129] public opinion.

In reviewing the linkage between foreign policy and the media, the Asia Foundation observed that, "in accordance to the growing democratization in the Asia-Pacific region, foreign policy (and policy-making process) became more specifically directed to issues such as human rights, environmental, and gender-related problems," which was "generated by the proliferation of new institutional actors and interest groups," including the media. Moreover, Chang emphasized that the press holds an important role in shaping—if not directing—a nation's policy-making process and is "the principal instrument in making a well-informed public," which is "considered an essential component in democracy."[130]

Previous research noted the linkage between a nation's policy interests and the coverage given by its press to regions that served that nation's interests.[131] Moreover,

by comparing media coverage with United States foreign policy toward a certain country, Paletz and Entman asserted that United States government response, based on its national interests, might influence the way United States media report the news.[132] Lee and Yang also emphasized that foreign policy concerns play an important role in conveying media accounts of international events.[133]

Shoemaker, Danielian and Brendlinger identified characteristics which may influence how newsworthy American journalists rate an international event: economic significance (business-dominated links between the United States and the event country), political significance (government dominated links between the United States and the event country), cultural significance (linkages between the United States and the event country which were a function of similarities among the people of the two countries), and normative and social change in international events, as well as whether the United States was directly involved as a participant in the event. These characteristics were used to predict how prominently an event would be covered in American media.[134]

Studies have shown that magazines play a crucial role as widely read and notable sources for international news.[135] Magazines tend to give more elaborate in-depth analysis of events, as noted by Griffin and Lee, "because newsmagazines hit the stands more than a week after the events they report on, they serve as a kind of news digest—compressing, recapitulating, elaborating upon, and even critiquing the television and newspaper reports of a previous week."[136]

Furthermore, Riffe, Lacy and Drager found a large amount of attention had been given by scholars to examine prominent newsmagazines, namely *Time*, *Newsweek* and *U.S. News & World Report*. They noted that the "popularity" of those newsmagazines for research might be due to their large readership, or their assumed influence among elites.[137] The exclusive nature of newsmagazines matched the exclusiveness of their readers, as asserted by Jamieson and Campbell: since magazines tend to target their audience, magazine readers get specially tailored information resulting in high-involvement media use. Therefore, their readers were generally well educated and more affluent than non-magazine readers.[138]

Similarly, Mayo and Pasadeos noted that specifically in the case of business magazines, United States corporate executives and government officials read them regularly.[139] When the policy makers want their message to resonate throughout the country, they prefer to go to newsmagazines rather than newspapers.[140] *Business Week*, one of the largest-circulated general business magazines in the world, ranked within the top five magazines read by economic leaders and within the top ten magazines read by political leaders.[141]

Linking the United States policy post-Cold War in East and Southeast Asia regions with the way United States media portray them would give a description of how Americans view those regions in the "new-world order" paradigm, the new perspective of how the United States government saw the world after the end of the Cold War. The United States government attempted to update its foreign policy simultaneously to accommodate its growing interests in the East and Southeast Asia

region since the end of the Cold War, as the broader political, economic and social trends in these regions favored United States' interests.[142] Since the United States policy makers have expressed a renewed interest in strengthening Trans-Pacific diplomacy after the Cold War,[143] it would be very interesting to see if this new policy toward Asia is reflected in the United States media, especially in the magazines. If yes, how do they cover it? What are the topics covered? Who gets to speak for it?

Purpose

This research attempted to answer those questions by examining the coverage of four United States newsmagazines, namely *Business Week, Newsweek, Time* and *U.S. News & World Report,* of the "Asian economic tigers" during an 11-year period after the Cold War, 1990-2000. Research and experts have concluded that these eight "tiger nations" (Hong Kong [since 1997 is known as the "Special Administrative Region" of China], Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan and Thailand, which achieved spectacular economic growth in the 1990s) respectively served three American basic interests: economic, political and security.[144]

Meanwhile, the 11-year period of 1990 to 2000 was used to ensure a sufficient amount of time to review changes that might occur in the coverage over time. The study initially started in the early 2001—therefore the articles examined in this study were obtained up until the December 2000 publications. The year 1990 was chosen as the beginning of the period of study as it marked the first year of the end of the Cold War, the first anniversary of the "world new order."

Furthermore, while considerable research has been dedicated to examining the coverage of or on two East Asian giants, Japan and China, there was no research conducted in examining the content of United States newsmagazines' coverage of these "tigers," nations that had significant importance to the United States. The purpose of this study was to address that void.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

[1] E.g., J.A. Lent, "Foreign news in American media," *Journal of Communication* (Winter, 1977): 46; O.V. Malinkina and D.M. McLeod, "From Afghanistan to Chechnya: News coverage by *Izvestia* and *the New York Times*," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 77/1 (Spring 2000): 37.
[2] E. Herman and N. Chomsky, *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media* (NY: Pantheon Books, 1988).
[3] D.C. Hallin, "Hegemony: The American news media from Vietnam to El Savador, a study of ideological change and its limits," in *Political communication research*, ed. D.L. Paletz (Norwood, NJ: Ablex), 17.
[4] R.K. Jayakar and K.P. Jayakar, "Hegemonic frames and international news reporting: A comparative study of the New York Times coverage of the 1996 Indian and Israeli elections," in *The global dynamics of news: Studies in international news coverage and news agenda*, Eds. A. Malek & A.P. Kavoori (Stamford, CT: Ablex, 2000), 125.
[5] L.N. Huang and K.C. McAdams, "Ideological Manipulation via newspaper accounts of political conflict: A cross-national news analysis of the 1991 Moscow coup," in *The global dynamics of news: Studies in international news coverage and news agenda*, Eds. A. Malek and A.P. Kavoori (Stamford, CT: Ablex, 2000), 59.
[6] J.F. Hoge, Jr., "The end of predictability," in *Global news after the The Cold War: Media Studies Journal* 7/4 (1993): 1-2.
[7] C.A. Giffard, "International agencies and global issues: The decline of the The Cold War news-frame," in *The global dynamics of news: Studies in international news coverage and news agenda*, Eds. A. Malek and A.P. Kavoori (Stamford, CT: Ablex, 2000), 390.
[8] E.E. Dennis, "Life without the 'evil empire': New ways to make sense of the world," in *Media and foreign policy in the post-The Cold War world* (NY: Freedom Forum Media Studies Center, 1993), 5-12, quoted in R.K. Jayakar and K.P. Jayakar, "Hegemonic frames and international news reporting: A comparative study of the New York Times coverage of the 1996 Indian and Israeli elections," in *The global dynamics of news: Studies in international news coverage and news agenda*, Eds. A. Malek and A.P. Kavoori (Stamford, CT: Ablex, 2000), 125.
[9] P.J. Shoemaker and S.D. Reese, *Mediating the message: Theories of influences on mass media content* (White Plains, NY: Longman, 1996), 50.
[10] J.A. Lent (1977): 46-7.
[11] H.D. Wu, "Systemic determinants of international news coverage: A comparison of 38 countries," *Journal of Communication* (Spring 2000): 121.
[12] D. Perry, "News reading: Knowledge about and attitudes toward foreign countries," *Journalism Quarterly* 67/2 (1990): 357-58, as cited in A. Cooper-Chen, "Praising, Bashing, Passing: Newsmagazine coverage of Japan, 1965-1994," paper presented to the International Communication Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication annual convention, New Orleans, August 1999, available online through http://list.msu.edu
[13] See C.A. Giffard (2000): 406.
[14] For example, see T. Chang, *The press and China policy: The illusion of Sino-American relations 1950-1984* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1993), 17. He noted that as the most frequently cited sources in news stories, policy makers were usually able to define issues and frame debates. See also W.L. Bennett, "Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States," *Journal of Communication* 40 (1990), 103-25, in which he firmly argued that the media generally accept the definitions and frames set by the policy makers, although other researchers had claimed that there were times when policy makers lost their "privileged voice in the news."
[15] R. Solomon, *The transformation of the world economy* (NY: St. Martin's Press, 1999).
[16] R. Garran, *Tigers tamed: The end of the Asian miracle* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 1998), 48.
[17] A.J. Lukauskas, *The political economy of the East Asian crisis and its aftermath: Tigers in distress* (Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Pub., 2001), 30-4.

[18] A.J. Lukauskas, *The political economy of the East Asian crisis and its aftermath: Tigers in distress* (Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Pub., 2001), 34.
[19] See R. Garran (1998):96-7. He explained that most countries in the rich West moved to floating currencies during the 1970s and early 1980s, but most developing countries opted a pegged exchange rate to the U.S. dollar. As long as the U.S. was the main source of capital and main market for a country's products, this would be a beneficial arrangement. However, the emergence of Japan during the 1980s as an investor and market for East Asian products weakened the notion above. The dollar began to sink against the yen, and by mid-1995 the dollar lost two-thirds of its value. While Japan was attracted into investing largely in East Asia, the countries managed to make their prices (in mass production) increasingly competitive against Japan.
[20] J.V. Ginneken, *Understanding global news: a critical introduction* (London: Sage, 1998): 130.
[21] Ibid. p.131.
[22] R. Garran (1998): 111.
[23] Ibid. p.61.
[24] These figures were cited from James C.F. Wang, *Comparative Asian politics: power, policy and change* (Englewood Cliffs, CA: Prentice Hall, 1994).
[25] As cited in R. Garran (1998): 61.
[26] Central Intelligence Agency, *CIA World Fact Book Online*, http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/hk.html
[27] Remarks by Consul General R. A. Boucher to the Asia Society Washington Center, *Advancing U.S. interests in Hong Kong and Asia: Beyond transition and crisis*, March 24, 1998. Available online at http://www.asiasociety.org/speeches/boucher.html
[28] D.I. Nuechterlein, *America recommitted: A superpower assesses its role in a turbulent world* (Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 2000), 150.
[29] Ibid. p.155.
[30] According to World Bank, "Selected World Development Indicators," in *From plan to market: World development report 1996* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1996), 200-1: table 5. Cited from J. Bresnan, "Indonesia, " in *The pivotal states: A new framework for U.S. policy in the developing world*, eds. R. Chase, E. Hill & P. Kennedy (NY: W.W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1999), 17.
[31] J. Gershman, "Still the Pacific century? U.S. Policy in Asia and the Pacific," in *Global focus: U.S. foreign policy at the turn of the millennium*, eds. M. Honey & T. Barry (NY: St. Martin's Press, 2000), 284-85.
[32] J. Bresnan, "Indonesia, " in *The pivotal states: A new framework for U.S. policy in the developing world*, eds. R. Chase, E. Hill & P. Kennedy (NY: W.W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1999), 15-39.
[33] P. Wood, "The United States and Southeast Asia towards a new era," in *Asian security to the year 2000*, ed. W.J. Taylor (Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2000), 96.
[34] M. K. Albright, "U.S. commitment to security and prosperity in Asia, "*U.S. Department of State Dispatch* 9/7 (August 1998).
[35] Ibid. pp. 15-16.
[36] M. Vatikiotis, "Making of a maverick: Anti-Western values shaped by career, education," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 20 August 1992, 18-19.
[37] Ibid. p.16.
[38] See M. Vatikiotis, "Clash of style: High profile diplomacy upsets neighbors," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 20 August 1992, 19. Mahathir's diplomatic style resulted in awkward yet close relationships with Malaysia's neighboring countries, especially Singapore and Indonesia.
[39] R. Gilpin, *Global political economy: Understanding the international economic order* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 381.
[40] M. Vatikiotis, "Making of a maverick: Anti-Western values shaped by career, education," p.18.
[41] M. Vatikiotis, "The Mahathir paradox," p.17.
[42] M. Vatikiotis, "Making of a maverick: Anti-Western values shaped by career, education," p.19.
[43] M. Vatikiotis, "The Mahathir paradox," p.17.

[44] S. Haggard, *The political economy of the Asian financial crisis* (Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics, 2000), 59.
[45] L. Low, "The political economy of Malaysia's capital controls," in *The political economy of the Asian financial crisis*, ed. S. Haggard (Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics, 2000), 73.
[46] E.g. M. Vatikiotis, "The Mahathir paradox," and "Making of a maverick…" *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 20 August 1992, pp. 17-9. See also S. Haggard (2000), 58-61.
[47] S. Haggard, *The political economy of the Asian financial crisis* (Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics, 2000), 107.
[48] J. Rohwer, *Remade in America: How Asia will change because America boomed* (NY: Crown Business, 2001), 110.
[49] S. Haggard (2000): 107.
[50] Ibid. pp. 108-9. The opposition coalition known as *Barisan Alternatif* (Alternative Front) made gains in the 1999 election and was forcing important realignments in Malaysian politics. Meanwhile, Anwar was jailed without trial but continued to stress economic issues such as Mahathir's ambitious megaprojects (i.e. Kuala Lumpur light rail system or Bakun dam), lack of transparency in awarding privatization contracts and the bailout of connected companies.
[51] R.S. Velasco, "The Philippines," in *Democracy, governance and economic performance: East and Southeast Asia*, Eds. I. Marsh, J. Blondel & T. Inoguchi (NY: United Nations University Press, 1999). See also A. Blitz, *The contested state: American foreign policy and regime change in the Philippines* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2000) for exhaustive history and analysis on America's role in the Philippines.
[52] A. Blitz, *The contested state: American foreign policy and regime change in the Philippines* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2000), 82.
[53] J. Bresnan, *From dominoes to dynamos: The transformation of Southeast Asia* (NY: Council on Foreign Relations, 1994), 81.
[54] R.S. Velasco (1999): 170-71.
[55] The National Security Archives Collection, Confidential Cable #09089, 25 September 1972, as cited in A. Blitz, *The contested state: American foreign policy and regime change in the Philippines* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2000), 119.
[56] A. Blitz (2000): 141.
[57] Idem. pp.118, 160. The U.S. embassy in Manila threatened Marcos that Reagan would cancel his Filipino trip unless Marcos established political reforms and performed a comprehensive investigation of the assassination, but Marcos put back the pressure against the U.S. that such cancellation would undermine the security of the bases' agreement. After a long debate within the executive line, Reagan opted to cancel all his trips to Southeast Asia.
[58] A. Blitz (2000): 170-1.
[59] Idem. p.60.
[60] Idem. pp. 171-73. Blitz noted the nationalist Aquino initially opposed strongly to the bases agreement and even contemplated about opening to communism, according to a New York Times article, and this proved to have induced a disaster in her campaign for reelection. Aquino yielded to U.S. pressure and soon thereafter publicly proclaimed opposition to communism and supported the 1983 bases agreement. However, the Filipino leftists (who claimed to hold the support of 20% of all Filipinos) threatened to withdraw their support should Aquino complied with the U.S. pressures, resulting Aquino to reiterated her previous notion.
[61] C.R. Larson, "Geopolitical trends in the Pacific: Military strategies for stability," *Vital Speeches of the Day* 58/15 (15 May 1992), 459.
[62] R.S. Velasco (1999): 170.
[63] Ibid. p.171.
[64] J. Bresnan (1994): 19.
[65] S. Haggard (2000): 128.
[66] Idem. pp. 129-30.

[67] B. Harland, *Collision course: America and East Asia in the past and the future* (Pasir Panjang, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1996), 147.
[68] Idem. p.148.
[69] J. Tuck, "Singapore remains upbeat," *The New Leader* 81/12 (2-16 November 1998), 8.
[70] B. Harland (1996): 148.
[71] R. Garran (1998): 62.
[72] See comments by L.Y.C. Lim, "Chinese economic activity in Southeast Asia: An introductory review," in *The Chinese in Southeast Asia Volume 1: Ethnicity and economic activity*, Eds. L.Y.C. Lim & L.A.P. Gosling (Singapore: Maruzen Asia, 1983), as cited in Garran (1998): 63-4.
[73] B. Harland (1996), 149.
[74] J. Bresnan, *From dominoes to dynamos: The transformation of Southeast Asia* (NY: Council on Foreign Relations, 1994), 7.
[75] P. Wood (2000): 98.
[76] See articles on the caning of Michael Fay, e.g. "Justice in Six Lashes," *Newsweek* (11 April 1994); "The Whipping Boy" *Time* (2 May 1994).
[77] R. Gilpin (2001): 381.
[78] D.I. Nuechterlein (2000): 226.
[79] Ibid. p. 226.
[80] Ibid. p. 227.
[81] M. K. Albright (1998): 1-2.
[82] D.I. Nuechterlein (2000): 262.
[83] Ibid. p. 263.
[84] J. Gershman (2000): 307.
[85] Ibid. pp. 307-8.
[86] To view the complete release of the *Shanghai Communiqué* (1972), the *U.S.-PRC Diplomatic Relations Communiqué* (1979), the *U.S.-PRC Joint Communiqué* of August 1982, and the *Taiwan Relations Act* (1979), see the online version at http://www.nwc.navy.mil/apsg/communiques.htm
[87] M. Lasater, *U.S. interests in the new Taiwan* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993): 187.
[88] M. Lasater, *The changing of the guard: President Clinton and the security of Taiwan*. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995): 44.
[89] M. Lasater (1993): 90.
[90] M. Lasater (1995): 67.
[91] Ibid. p.146.
[92] D.I. Nuechterlein (2000): 254.
[93] Ibid. pp. 254-55.
[94] Ibid. pp. 254-57. In response, China reiterated its version of the Tiananmen Square incident that the action was necessary to defend its right to protect China's internal security and preserving national stability.
[95] Ibid. p.260.
[96] J. Gershman (2000): 308.
[97] D.I. Nuechterlein (2000): 260.
[98] L.A. Niksch, "Thailand in 1988: The economic surge," *Asian Survey* 29/2 (February 1989), 172-73.
[99] Ibid. p. 160.
[100] W. Clinton, "The U.S. and Thailand: Making a partnership work for the Asia-Pacific," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* 7/48 (25 November 1996).
[101] Ibid.
[102] D. King, "Thailand," in *Democracy, governance and economic performance: East and Southeast Asia*, eds. I. Marsh, J. Blondel and T. Inoguchi (NY: United Nations University Press, 1999), 205.
[103] L.A. Niksch (1989): 166.
[104] D. King (1999): 205.
[105] J. Rohwer (2001): 3.
[106] D.I. Nuechterlein (2000): 145-52.

[107] Ibid. p.149.
[108] A.I. Cyr, *After the The Cold War: American foreign policy, Europe and Asia* (NY: New York University Press, 1997), 62-93.
[109] C.V. Crabb, Jr., L.E. Sarieddine, and G.J. Antizzo, *Charting a new diplomatic course: Alternative approaches to America's post- Cold War foreign policy* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2001), 49.
[110] Ibid. pp. 25-6.
[111] For more thorough analysis, see C. Johnson and E.B. Kechin, "The Pentagon Ossified Strategy," *Foreign Affairs* 74 (July-August 1995): 103-14. Also see C. W. Maynes, "Relearning Intervention," Foreign Policy 98 (Spring 1995): 96-113, for further illustration on the U.S. foreign policy tendency post-The Cold War.
[112] This is a contemporary restatement of the then chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, J. William Fulbright's view on U.S. involvement in Asia. He identified some possible actions that lured this "interventionist" behavior such as meeting obligation arising out of America's military alliances; using armed force to counter nuclear proliferation; protecting states that are threatened with internal disorders and conflicts; and supporting democracy in foreign societies.
[113] P.M. Cronin and E.T. Metzgar, "ASEAN and Regional Security," *Strategic Forum Online* 85, 1998, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/forum85.html
[114] The Asia Foundation, *America's role in Asia: American view* (San Francisco, CA: The Asia Foundation, 2001), 10-11.
[115] J. Rohwer, *Asia rising: Why America will prosper as Asia's economy boom* (NY: Touchstone, 1995), 28.
[116] L.Y.C. Lim, "Whose Model Failed? Implications of the Asian Economic Crisis," *The Washington Quarterly* 21/3 (1998): 25.
[117] World Bank, *The East Asian miracle: The economic growth and public policy* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1993).
[118] See C.V. Crabb, Jr. et al.,give authors' names *Charting a new diplomatic course: Alternative approaches to America's Post-The Cold War foreign policy* (2001): 168. In February 1990, then Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney underscored the administration's decision to maintain this policy: although announcing a 10% reduction of U.S. forces in South Korea, Japan and the Philippines over 3 years period, he reaffirmed the U.S. government's determination to remain powerful in the Pacific and to play a major political role in East Asia.
[119] See R. Garran (1998): 114. The Philippines escaped the worst of the Asian financial crisis because it achieved 'beauty queen' status in early 1990s.
[120] J. Bresnan (1994): 3.
[121] See D. I. Nuechterlein (2000): 239.
[122] J. Bresnan (1994): 50.
[123] See J. Gershman (2000): 286. This is an abstraction of data from the Office of the United States Trade Representative, *1998 Trade Policy Agenda and 1997 Annual Report of the President of the U.S. on the Trade Agreements Program* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1998): 9. Available online at http://www.ustr.gov/reports/tpa/1998/contents.html. See also Testimony of Ambassador Charlene Barshefsky, U.S. Trade Representative before the House Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee, February 24, 1998, and Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, *USTR Strategic Plan, FY 1997-FY 2002* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 30, 1997): 51. Available online at http://www.ustr.gov/reports/gpra.pdf.
[124] J. Bresnan (1994): 87.
[125] A.I. Cyr (1997): 116.
[126] The Asia Foundation, *America's role in Asia: Asian view* (San Francisco, CA: The Asia Foundation, 2001), 9.
[127] T. Chang, *The press ad China policy: the illusion of Sino-American relations 1950-1984* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1993), 4, 110.

[128] See B. Page, R. Shapiro and G. Dempsey, "What moves public opinion?" in *Media power in politics*, ed. D. Graber (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1990). See also T. Chang (1993).
[129] M. Isaacs, "Two different worlds: The relationship between elite and mass opinion on American foreign policy," *Political Communication* 15 (1998): 342.
[130] T. Chang (1993): 4.
[131] E.g. T. Chang (1993), D. Riffe, "Linking international news to U.S. interests: A content analysis," *International Communication Bulletin* 31/3-4 (1996): 14-18; and M. Isaacs, "Two different worlds: The relationship between elite and mass opinion on American foreign policy," *Political Communication* 15 (1998): 323-345.
[132] D.L. Paletz and R.M. Entman, *Media Power Politics* (NY: The Free Press, 1981), as cited in S.T. Kim, "Making a difference: U.S. press coverage of the Kwangju and Tiananmen pro-democracy movements," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 77/1 (Spring 2000): 23.
[133] C.C. Lee and J.H. Yang, "Foreign news and national interests: Comparing U.S. and Japanese coverage of a Chinese student movement," *Gazette* 5/1 (1995): 1-8, as cited in S.T. Kim, "Making a difference…" (2000): 23.
[134] P.J. Shoemaker, L.H. Danielian and N. Brendlinger, "Deviant acts, risky business and U.S. interests: The newsworthiness of world events," *Journalism Quarterly* 68/4 (Winter 1991): 784-86.
[135] E.g. C. Mayo and Y. Pasadeos, "Changes in the international focus of U.S. business magazines," *Journalism Quarterly* 68/3 (Fall 1991): 509-14; L.J. Mullen, "An overview of political content analyses of magazines," *Electronic Journal of Communication/REC* 4/2-4 (1994); A. Cooper-Chen (1999).
[136] M. Griffin and J. Lee, "Picturing the Gulf War: Constructing an image of war in Time, Newsweek and U.S. News & World Report," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 72/4 (Winter 1995): 814.
[137] D. Riffe, S. Lacy and M.W. Drager, "Sample size in content analysis of weekly news magazines," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 73/3 (Fall 1996): 635.
[138] K.H. Jamieson and K.K. Campbell, *The interplay of influence: Mass media and their publics in news, advertising, politics* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1983): 15.
[139] Mayo & Pasadeos (1991): 510.
[140] M.B. Grossman and M.J. Kumar, *Portraying the president: the White House and the news media* (Baltimore, MD: Johns-Hopkins University Press, 1981): 32, as cited in L.J. Mullen (1994).
[141] C.H. Weiss, "What America's leaders read," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 68 (1974): 57-58, as cited in Mayo & Pasadeos (1991): 510.
[142] The Asia Foundation (2001): 12.
[143] J.S. Conklin, *Forging an East Asian foreign policy* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1995): 14-21.
[144] E.g. J.S. Conklin (1995): 13-17, P.M. Cronin & E.T. Metzgar (1998), The Asia Foundation, *America's role in Asia: American view* (2001).

Chapter 2

RELATED STUDIES

Studies on the relationship between a nation and its media have shown that most of the time media coverage mirrors the interests and policies of the nation where the media originated. As noted by Malinkina and McLeod, in reporting international news the media might select and highlight only particular aspects of reality, especially those aspects that favored its government's voices.[1]

Cohen once observed that most reporters in the foreign affairs field "understand their primary role and their chief responsibility to be the provider of factual information about foreign affairs, as it originates abroad and in Washington, to the American people."[2] One could say that the media are the apparatus of the powerful, inasmuch as the media are part of the policy-making process, although journalists might argue that they see themselves as detached when it comes to the enactment of a policy. Said asserted that foreign news is "framed" by a "consensus apparatus," which includes the elite media, corporations, defense and intelligence communities, and the executive branch, and is defined for the public in terms of strategic importance or United States policy.[3]

However, why would anyone expect the American media coverage not to reflect United States' policies or orientation? Taken out of the United States context and into a general East-West or First World-Third World situation, Riffe and Shaw brought a similar query: "Should one even expect Western accounts of Third World

events to reflect any but a Western orientation?"[4] Likewise, one might expect American media coverage to reflect its own foreign policy and not that of other nations, although this view might suggest that the coverage would be perceived as skewed, biased or stereotyped.

While research on media coverage of foreign policy issues usually centered on whether or not the coverage supported official United States policy, most researchers concluded that it did.[5] Gans also acknowledged that American media "tend to follow American foreign policy," with the emphasis that "the media drew closer to the State Department line on foreign news than to the White House line on domestic news." He asserted that foreign news in American media might adhere less strictly to objectivity than domestic news.[6]

Moreover, based on a study of the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* news coverage and United States government responses, together with the foreign policy decisions concerning the Kwangju movement in South Korea and the Tiananmen incident in China, Kim asserted that the United States government response, based on its national interests, might influence the way the American media report international news.[7] This research then enforced the notion suggested by Shoemaker, Danielian and Brendlinger in examining the coverage of world events by the *New York Times*, *ABC, CBS* and *NBC*. They found that the events which were deviant in certain ways from American national values and which occurred in nations of political and economical significance to the United States were more likely to be covered in the news.[8]

Scholars have emphasized the great influence of the news flow from Western nations, particularly the United States, to the Third World nations during the Cold War.[9] One must note that the term "Third World," once described only as the political force outside of the contending East-West sphere (the Non-Aligned Movement) or North the Group of 77, had became synonymous with poverty, hunger and disaster.[10] Critics documented the influence from Western nations as evidence of "cultural imperialism," an effort by Western governments and multinational corporations to maintain the Third World in a state of economic, political, and cultural dependency.[11] Laitin also noted that in the post-colonial world "many aspects of the imperial relationship remain and ever prosper… the economic, military and technological," but also "the more elusive but no less significant cultural ties".[12]

Moreover, critics noted Western media had developed a tendency to ignore less-developed countries in this "cultural and/or technical imperialism," and created a form of stereotyping by concentrating only on reporting disastrous events known as "coups and earthquakes."[13] Stevenson and Shaw compiled the most widespread criticisms about Western news agencies' coverage of the underdeveloped areas:[14]

1. World news is defined by the West and distorts or excludes authentic but non-Western values of the Third World,
2. This "cultural filter" excluded much of the world, especially the part not of immediate interest to the West,
3. That little information from the Third World that does get into the world news-system emphasizes fragile aspects of the Third World,
4. Distorted, negative treatment of the Third World in the Western media is transferred to the Third World itself because of the latter's dependence on Western news agencies,
5. There is a lack of "development news"—a term that covers both special information developing countries need and the kind of events occurring in Third World that needed to be reported internationally but seldom is.

Others scholars,[15] consequently supported ex-AP journalist Mort Rosenblum's notion that most Western media, particularly the United States media, concentrated too much on reporting "bad news" when covering the less-developed countries. They argued that "the violent, the bizarre, and the conflict-ridden" events largely characterized the coverage of those countries.

Accordingly, other scholars concluded that media accounts of foreign affairs were "colored by philosophic, moral and political perspectives" prevailing in the nation where the media is published, which dealt mostly with "crises, the bizarre or the outlandish."[16] In examining the *New York Times* and the *Chicago Tribune's* coverage of Third World countries, Riffe and Shaw found that "international conflict" was the most prevalent topic.[17] In sum, as noted by Chang, Shoemaker and Brendlinger, most of the empirical studies focusing on performance of the United States news media resulted in the impression that the American media "lead the way of Western news media in their negative accounts of world affairs."[18]

A study by Hopkins and Wallerstein found that the transnational information flow was a reflection and a constituent of the larger global system, which in turn was structured by the world's politics, economy and culture.[19] Although scholars and critics have long abandoned and rejected the concept of the "three worlds" since the demise of the Cold War,[20] this argument nonetheless reinforced the notion that the dominant power would echo a similar pattern in terms of the influence of its media on the international news flow. Especially in this "new-world order," a term coined to explain the international constellation after the Cold War, the United States emerged

as the sole "superpower" nation. Lent noted that the United States was seen as a major news source rather than receiver because of its "big power" status and because of its pervasive, worldwide network of news agencies.[21] Due to this "sole superpower" position, American media have the potency to be a dominating influence in international news flow.

"News" According to the United States Media, Post-Cold War

Studies have found that characteristics of a nation influenced the amount of coverage it would receive. Scholars said that Western media, particularly United States media, tend to demonstrate bias in covering international events.[22] Herman and Chomsky charged that in the United States, 5 filters narrowed the range of news to make it responsive to the needs of the government and major power groups: the concentrated ownership of the media, advertising as a major source of revenue, reliance on official sources for information, flak from government and business officials, and the anticommunist ideology. They also observed that American media often used a double standard in covering world events: condemning the Soviet "invasion" in Afghanistan and "interventions" in Czechoslovakia and Hungary, while justifying the United States intervention in Vietnam and Grenada for "humanitarian" reasons.[23]

Galtung and Ruge found that as a conceptual framework, economic, political, social and geographic characteristics of nations determine the amount of coverage one country receives in another country's news media.[24] In a study of *Atlas* (now *World*

Press Review), an American magazine containing materials from foreign publications, Dupree listed the variables that can be associated with or influence news coverage: foreign stock residing in the United States, GNP per capita, population, language translatability, literacy rate, newspaper availability, import-export volume, distance, GNP, population density per square kilometer and continent.[25] Kariel and Rosenvall also noted factors influencing international news flow: distance, cultural affinity, population, amount of trade between nations, and GNP, since they argued that news flow relates closely to the economic and political importance of nations as well as their level of technological developments.[26]

The sudden demise of the Cold War left the American public and the press to review the extent to which domestic problems had gone unobserved while attention was directed mainly to the bipolarity of the Cold War. Thomas Kunkel, dean of the University of Maryland journalism school, wrote, "Since the fall of the former Soviet Union, mainstream American media have more or less got out of the business of covering events beyond America's borders."[27] Hoge noted the decline in foreign news coverage by the United States television networks, newspapers, and newsmagazines, despite the expansion of foreign bureaus and the increase of the numbers of foreign correspondents.[28]

Cunningham observed the United States audience's interest in "soft news" in the 1990s, such as lifestyle, personal finance, human interest, infotainment, and celebrity stories. "Once the Gulf War and the recession in the early 90's were in the

rearview mirror, the country settled into a period of unprecedented affluence and mesmerizing technological wizardry," he added.[29]

According to Hess, some analysts and policymakers contend that American consumers want more international news and are only being denied it by "the ignorance of editors and the greed of the owners" of United States media outlets. He argued further that editors are more skeptical about the interest of their audiences than are advocates of greater attention to international news.[30] Gans noted that American news media "tend to follow American foreign policy, even if not slavishly."[31] He also acknowledged his concern that the depiction of foreign news in United States media might "adhere less strictly to objectivity than domestic news."[32]

Graber noted that the number of foreign news items and their length shrank when times seem to calm down, as occurred right after the Cold War ended. In order to be published, foreign news must have a more profound impact on the political, economic, or cultural concerns of the United States than domestic news.[33]

International News in American Newsmagazines

Although Yu and Riffe noted that, "newsmagazines are, after all, influential purveyors of national and international news," studies dedicated to examining magazines are few and far between.[34] Cooper-Chen observed that, "… almost no research dealt with newsweeklies' international coverage and role."[35] In her study she also quoted another finding from a study by Gerlach, that only six percent of *Journalism Quarterly* articles between 1964 and 1983 dealt with magazines.[36]

Moreover, Hachten observed that three major American newsmagazines showed declining interest in international news as the result of the end of the Cold War. By September 1996, *Time* had run five of that year's covers on international topics, compared to eleven in 1995. During the same period of 1996, *Newsweek* featured only four international covers, versus eleven in 1995. The *U.S. News & World Report* produced no international covers as of late 1996, while it ran six in 1995. As Steven Cohn from the Media Industry Newsletter (MIN) argued, "It appears that things from overseas don't sell here."[37]

Foreign events interrupt the American media staple of coverage of lifestyle, human interest, infotainment or personal finance, mainly when there are crises, such as the peacekeeping operation in Bosnia, floods in Europe, or genocide in Rwanda, but only briefly. Cunningham noted, "Newsweeklies foolish enough to carry a foreign cover were snubbed at newsstands. Even the Associated Press added celebrity and entertainment editors."[38] As quoted by Hoge, Mortimer Zuckerman, then the editor-in-chief for *U.S. News & World Report* concurred: "The poorest selling covers of the year are always those on international news." [39] In a more recent (unpublished) study, Sanam found that only 4 "Asian economic tigers" were featured on *Time*'s cover pages from 1982 to 2003, with South Korea getting the most attention (4 covers), while Hong Kong, Indonesia and Singapore each got one cover.[40]

Rosenblum affirmed that when weekly newsmagazines feature foreign events on their covers, they are reputed to sell 20% fewer copies than they do on average.[41] MIN also listed some of the American magazines worst selling covers in 1994:

Newsweek ("Bosnia's Anne Frank," February 28), *U.S. News & World Report* (Nelson Mandela, May 9), *Business Week* ("China: How Much Change?" on June 9).

Hoge noted that findings in Hall's Magazine Editorial Reports showed a steady decline in the United States newsweeklies' coverage of international events from 1985 to 1995. *Time* decreased its international news from 24% to 14%, while the numbers also went down from 22% to 12 % in *Newsweek*, and 20% to 14% in *U.S. News & World Report*. The editors argued that the diminution of coverage was simply because the issues were irrelevant to the American audience's interest, and "a bit less urgent," and thus always created a drop in sales.[42]

Newsmagazines often indicate the way an event is being portrayed for Americans' consumption. As Griffin and Lee asserted, "…the weekly news magazines provide a useful site for examining the way (the conflict) was pictured for the U.S. audiences."[43]

Who Gets to Speak in International News?

Scholars have attempted to identify the influential factors that drive the mass media to cover certain international events. Herman and Chomsky distinguished five news filters that affect foreign news: "the size, concentrated ownership, owner wealth, and profit orientation of the dominant mass-media firms; advertising as the primary income source of the mass media; the reliance of the media on information provided by the government, business and 'experts' funded and approved by these primary sources and agents of power; 'flak' as a means of disciplining the media; and

'anticommunism' as a national religion and control mechanism."[44] Van Ginneken observed that, "since authority, credibility, and availability are judged primarily in relations to Western situations, Western audiences, and Western editors, they also tend to favor Western official sources."[45]

The media reliance on official sources for information when covering foreign affairs stemmed partly from economic factors, partly on professional standards, and partly on shared interests. Economics dictate that they concentrate their resources where significant news often occurs, where important rumors and leaks abound, and where regular press conferences are held: in the White House, the Pentagon, and the State Department in Washington, D.C.[46] The media's aim for objectivity results in a standard demanding a premium on accuracy, and material from official sources "can be portrayed as presumptively accurate." This inherent credibility of government and corporate sources gives them the forefront over other potential sources: "Taking information from sources that may be presumed credible reduces investigative expense, whereas material from sources that are not *prima facie* credible, or that will elicit criticism and threats, requires careful checking and costly research."[47]

Lieberman noted that the right wing has come to dominate public policy, particularly in influencing the media. Its success stems largely from a variety of aggressive strategies used by well-financed think tanks and policy institutes to influence the media's coverage of political and economic issues. Backed by huge sums of money from a handful of ideologically grounded foundations, right wing think tanks operating in the States and in the national political arena have become

"extraordinary idea peddlers: they tried to market their 'products' everywhere, but mostly by using the power of media." Furthermore Lieberman argued that while groups on the other wing sometimes use the same techniques, the right has used the media more effectively, and increasingly reporters are relying on them.[48]

Many scholars agreed that the media served as the government's bullhorn. At the same time the media also lean more toward business in society. Hoge asserted that policy makers and business and professional elites are key players, since they have ample news and information sources.[49] Huntington observed that in a time of relative security Americans would "delegate the day-to-day oversight of foreign affairs to professionals."[50] Businessmen and people with a direct need to know have plenty of elite and niche sources of information, hence increasing the number of publications and news services devoted to international business and economics. It is understandable that most international coverage is angled toward politics and economics to serve the interests of the government and business community. Hadar noted in 1994 that there was a growing interest in geo-economic news after the Cold War.[51]

This cycle does not only involve the media, government, and business or professional elites, but also the audience. Moisy asserted that although it is rare, the public could also play a quite significant part in international news flow. In response to international events portrayed by the mass media, the public often reacts based on emotions aroused by the media, not so much based on the knowledge of the events themselves, for example, the Kent State massacre after the students' demonstration

against the Vietnam War. “These rare occasions have the potential of becoming the turning points in the life of the country. That is why the amount and quality of international news carried by mass media, or the lack thereof, remain relevant to the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States.”[52]

As previously noted, studies noted the emergence of eight Asian nations in the world economy during the 1990s. This phenomenon had influenced the way the United States government view them after the Cold War. The interest the United States has in these nations has influenced the way the media portrayed them. Emphasis on security interests and alliance cohesion provided the political glue that held the world economy together and facilitated compromises of important national differences over economic issues.[53]

Based on these notions, this study attempted to analyze the coverage of the eight Asian economic tigers in selected newsmagazines in order to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What was the number of stories on each nation published in individual magazines and what were the patterns of coverage shown over time?

RQ2: What were the dominant topics covered?

RQ3: Who got to speak in the news, what types of sources were cited by the magazines to represent an event?

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

[1] O.V. Malinkina and D.M. McLeod, "From Afghanistan to Chechnya: News coverage by Izvestia and the New York Times," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 77/1 (2000): 39.
[2] B. Cohen, *The press and foreign policy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963): 22-23.
[3] E.W. Said, *Covering Islam: How the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world* (NY: Pantheon, 1981), as cited in D. Riffe, "Linking international news to U.S. interests: A content analysis," *International Communications Bulletin* 31/3-4 (1996): 14.
[4] D. Riffe and E. Shaw, Conflict and consonance: Coverage of Third World in two U.S. papers. *Journalism Quarterly* 59 (1982): 617.
[5] E.g. J. Aronson, The press and the Cold War (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1970); R. Morris, "Henry Kissinger and the media: A separate peace," in *Readings in mass communication: Concepts and issues in the mass media*, Eds. M. Emery and T. Smythe (Dubuque, IA: W.M.C. Brown, 1974); D. Hallin, "The media, the war in Vietnam and political support: A critique of the thesis of an oppositional media," *Journal of Politics* 46 (1984): 2-24; S. Dickson, "Press and U.S. policy toward Nicaragua, 1983-1987: A study of the New York Times and Washington Post," *Journalism Quarterly* 69 (1992): 562-71.
[6] H.J. Gans, *Deciding what's news: A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, Newsweek and Time* (NY: Vintage/ Random House, 1980).
[7] S.T. Kim, "Making a difference: U.S. press coverage of the Kwangju and Tiananmen pro-democracy movements," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 77/1 (2000): 23.
[8] P.J. Shoemaker, L.H. Danielian and N. Brendlinger, "Deviant acts, risky business and U.S. interests: The newsworthiness of world events," *Journalism Quarterly* 68/4 (1991): 783-84.
[9] R.L. Stevenson and R.R. Cole, "Issues in foreign news," in *Foreign news and the new world information order*, Eds. R.L. Stevenson and D.L. Shaw (Ames, IA: The Iowa State University Press, 1984): 7.
[10] P. Harris, "Communication and global security: The challenge for the next millennium," in *Beyond cultural imperialism: Globalization, communication and the new international order*, Eds. P. Golding & P. Harris (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997): 152.
[11] E.g. A. Wells, *Picture–tube imperialism? The impact of U.S. television on Latin America* (NY; Orbis, 1972); H.I. Schiller, *The mind managers* (Boston, MA: Beacon, 1973); K. Nordenstreng and H.I. Schiller, *National sovereignty and international communication* (Noorwood, NJ: Ablex, 1979), cited in R.L. Stevenson and R.R. Cole (1984): 7.
[12] D. Laitin, "Language disassociation for Africa," in *The Antinomies of interdependence*, ed. J.G. Ruggie (NY: Columbia University Press, 1983): 317-68, quoted in A. Sreberny-Mohammadi, "The many cultural faces of imperialism," in *Beyond cultural imperialism: Globalization, communication and the new international order*, Eds. P. Golding & P. Harris (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997): 49-58.
[13] S.M. Mazharul-Haque, "Is U.S. coverage of news in Third World imbalanced?" *Journalism Quarterly* 60 (1983): 521-24. See also J.A. Lent, "Foreign news in American media," *Journal of Communication* 27 (1977): 46.
[14] R.L. Stevenson and R.R. Cole (1984): 7-9.
[15] E.g. J.T. McNelly and F. Izcaray, "International news exposure and images of nations," *Journalism Quarterly* 61 (1984): 546-553; K. Viswanath, "International news in U.S. Media: Perceptions of foreign students," *Journalism Quarterly* 65 (1988): 925-59; C.A. Giffard, "International agencies and global issues: The decline of the Cold War news frame," in *The Global dynamics of news: Studies in international news coverage and news agendas*, Eds. A. Malek and A.P. Kavoori (Stamford, CT: Ablex, 2000): 389-408.
[16] J.A. Lent (1977): 46. See also D. Riffe & E. Shaw, "Conflict and consonance: Coverage of Third World in two U.S. papers," *Journalism Quarterly* 59 (1982): 617-26.
[17] D. Riffe and E. Shaw, Conflict and consonance: Coverage of Third World in two U.S. papers. *Journalism Quarterly* 59 (1982): 621.
[18] P.J. Shoemaker, L.H. Danielian and N. Brendlinger (1991): 397-98.

[19] T.K. Hopkins and I. Wallerstein, *The age of transition: Trajectory of the world-system, 1945-2025*. (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed Books, 1996).
[20] P. Harris, "Communication and global security: The challenge for the next millennium," in *Beyond cultural imperialism: Globalization, communication and the new international order*, Eds. P. Golding & P. Harris (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997): 152-53.
[21] J.A. Lent (1977): 49.
[22] E.g. J. Galtung and M.H. Ruge, "The structure of foreign news," *Journal of Peace Research* 2 (1965): 64-91; H.J. Gans, *Deciding what's news: A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, Newsweek and Time* (NY: Vintage/ Random House, 1980).
[23] E.S. Herman and N. Chomsky, *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media* (NY: Pantheon, 1988).
[24] J. Galtung and M.H. Ruge (1965): 64-91.
[25] J.D. Dupree, "International communication: View from a window on the world," *Gazette* 17 (1971): 224-235, cited in H.D. Wu, "Systemic determinants of international news coverage: A comparison of 38 countries," *Journal of Communication* 50 (2000): 112. However, Wu noted that the results of this research were not conclusive.
[26] As quoted in L.J. Martin and R.E. Hiebert, "Factors influencing international news flow," *Current issues in international communication* (NY: Longman, 1990): 18-20.
[27] As quoted in B. Cunningham, "Global blinders," *Columbia Journalism Review* 40/4 (Nov/Dec 2001): 110.
[28] J.F. Hoge, Jr., "Foreign news: Who gives a damn?" *Columbia Journalism Review* 36/4 (Nov/Dec 1997): 49.
[29] B. Cunningham (2001): 110.
[30] S. Hess, International news and foreign correspondents (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1996): 87.
[31] H.J. Gans (1980), cited in J.V. Ginneken, *Understanding global news: a critical introduction* (London: Sage, 1998): 26.
[32] Ibid. p.28.
[33] D.A. Graber, *Mass Media and American Politics* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1997), 340-1.
[34] Y.C. Yu and D. Riffe, "Chiang and Mao in U.S. newsmagazines," *Journalism Quarterly* 66/4 (Winter 1989): 914.
[35] A. Cooper-Chen, "Praising, bashing, passing: Newsmagazine coverage of Japan, 1965-1999," *AEJMC Archives Online*, 8 September 2000, http://list.msu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9909B&L=aejmc&P=R14351
[36] A study by R. Gerlach, in A. Cooper-Chen, "Praising, bashing, passing: Newsmagazine coverage of Japan, 1965-1999," *AEJMC Archives Online*, 8 September 2000, http://list.msu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9909B&L=aejmc&P=R14351
[37] Quoted in P.D. Colford, "In magazine sales, the world is too big," *Newsday*, 9 March 1995, p. B2.
[38] B. Cunningham (2001): 111.
[39] J.F. Hoge, Jr. (1997): 49.
[40] C. Sanam, *World news coverage of international stories on Time's cover pages, 1982-2003*, unpublished master's thesis, Ohio University.
[41] M. Rosenblum, *Who stole the news? Why can't we keep up with what happens in the world and what we can do about it?* (New York: Wiley, 1993): 196, as quoted in S. Hess, *International news & foreign correspondents* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1996): 87.
[42] J.F. Hoge, Jr. (1997): 49.
[43] M. Griffin and J. Lee, "Picturing the Gulf War: Constructing an image of war in Time, Newsweek, and U.S. News & World Report," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 72/4 (Winter 1995): 814.
[44] E.S. Herman and N. Chomsky (1988): 2.
[45] J.V. Ginneken, *Understanding global news: a critical introduction* (London: Sage, 1998), 90-91.

[46] Ibid. pp. 18-19.
[47] Ibid. p.18.
[48] T. Lieberman, *Slanting the Story: the Forces that Shape the News* (New York, NY: The New Press, 2000): 4-5.
[49] As quoted in J.F. Hoge, Jr. (1997): 51.
[50] Ibid. p.51.
[51] L. Hadar, "Covering the New World Disorder," *Columbia Journalism Review* 33/2 (July 1994): 27.
[52] J.F. Hoge, Jr. (1997): 51-52.
[53] R. Gilpin, *Global political economy: Understanding the international economic order* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 5.

Chapter 3

METHOD

This study aims to analyze the coverage of the eight "Asian economic tigers" from 1990 to 2000 in four U.S. newsmagazines: *Business Week, Newsweek, Time*, and *U.S. News & World Report*, by using a content analysis method.

These magazines were chosen for this study because: 1) they cover international issues on a regular basis, 2) each has foreign correspondents stationed in the Asia-Pacific region, and 3) each has a large circulation (more than two million readership) figures.[1] Further description of these magazines can be found in the *Reader's Guide Abstracts* (see Appendix A). Cooper-Chen noted that with numerous overseas bureaus and international correspondents, *Newsweek, Time*, and *U.S. News & World Report* play a crucial role as the most widely read sources of international news.[2]

The search of articles was conducted using the electronic version of *Reader's Guide Abstracts*, which listed abstracts of articles from popular magazines.[3] The researcher separately typed in the eight countries/nations examined (Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, The Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, and Thailand) within each periodical title: *Business Week*, *Newsweek*, *Time*, and *U.S. News & World Report*. The researcher also limited the period of time for each search, starting in 1990, which marked the end of Cold War, and ending in 2000, to capture the long-term

trends in coverage. Since the study started in early 2001, the researcher obtained all article of the "tigers" published on these 4 newsmagazines until December 2000.

The search yielded a universe of 657 articles that covered the eight Asian "tigers" from 1990 to 2000. Using content analysis method, the researcher coded the universe, not a sample, to capture a more detailed trend in coverage. A coding sheet and instructions were developed for the purpose of this study (see Appendices B and C). The unit of analysis was the magazine article. Each was coded for the following variables: 1) *Case number,* 2) *article title,* 3) *name of magazine,* 4) *year,* 5) *date,* 6) *page number of article,* 7) *number of paragraphs in article,* 8) *"Focus":* the name of the country, and 9) *Topic:* the dominant theme of the story.

The categories for topic employed the modified set of the Deutschmann categories developed by Stempel,[4] combined with other categories developed by Riffe,[5] forming a total of 14 categories. The following are available for categories: 1) *politics/ government,* 2) *war/defense,* 3) *diplomacy/foreign affairs,* 4) *economy,* 5) *crime,* 6) *public moral problems,* 7) *public health/welfare,* 8) *education/classic arts,* 9) *science/ technology,* 10) *popular amusement,* 11) *accident/ disaster,* 12) *nationalism,* 13) *refugees/immigration,* and 14) *human interest/personalities.*

The last variable is "Source." Each article was coded for types of sources quoted or cited. Source can determine the way media portray an issue or an event, as maintained by Hall that, "media statements are grounded in objective and authoritative statements from sources accredited by virtue of their institutional power and position."[6] Coding for sources shows the relationship between media preference of the

sources when covering and discussing different topics and country of focus. The choice of sources in this study is a modification of source categories developed by Kim,[7] with additional identification of each category into three sub-categories based on origins (whether it is the U.S., country of focus, or International institutions). The categories for sources in this study are: 1) *government/military officials,* 2) *academicians/experts,* 3) *business/professionals,* 4) *participants/activists,* and 5) *others*: sources whose occupation and origin cannot be classified into any of the category above. This includes quotes like "Based on sources close to the case…" or "According to a source…"

The author coded all the 657 news items (the universe) in this study. To assess reliability, the author conducted a pretest with the help of two more trained coders. The other coders were a graduate student majoring in international affairs in a private university in New York, and a graduate from a private university in Washington, D.C., majoring in international journalism studies. All independently and simultaneously coded approximately 10% of the universe: 67 randomly selected news items. Item-by-item percentage agreements were calculated to detect disagreements.[8] The overall percentage agreement for all the coding categories combined was 97.63%.

Intercoder reliability for individual categories ranged from a low of 91.06% for "Government/Officials from Country of Focus" (a sub-category within "Source"), to a high of 100% for purely quantitative and non-interpretative categories, such as "Magazine Title", "Date" and "Country of Focus." When the sub-categories were collapsed by identity (such as "Government/Officials" or "Experts/Academicians"),

the percentage ranged from a low of 94.70% for “Government/Officials” and “Business/Professionals” to a high of 99.51% for “Other.”

All differences resulted by this pretest were discussed thereafter, eventually leading to a final agreement on the categorization. The data generated was analyzed using SPSS 11.0, a computer program that calculated frequency distributions and cross tabulations of categories. This program is also used to measure the trends in coverage, by running the frequencies under a simple non-parametric test (Spearman’s rho).

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

[1] See electronic paper by D. Abrahamson, *Newsmagazines: the Evolving Mirror*, 2001, http://abrahamson.medill.nwu.edu/WWW/NewsMagazines.txt. *Time* has, since the 1960s, had a paid circulation of approximately 4 million, *Newsweek* 3 million, and *U.S. News & World Report* 2 million.
[2] See A. Cooper-Chen (8 September 2000).
[3] This study employs the electronic version of *Readers Guide Abstracts*, at http://firstsearch.oclc.org.
[4] G.H. Stempel III, "Gatekeeping: The Mix of Topics and Selection of Stories," *Journalism Quarterly* 62/4 (Winter 1985): 791-6, 815.
[5] D. Riffe and A. Budianto, "The Shrinking World of Network News," *International Communications Bulletin*, 36/1-2 (2001): 12-35.
[6] S. Hall, et al., *Policing the Crisis* (London: Macmillan, 1978): 58-59, as cited in H.Tumber, "Sources, the media and the reporting of conflict" in *Media and conflict: Framing issues, making policy, shaping opinions*, Ed. Eytan Gilboa (Ardsley, NY: Transnational Publishers Inc., 2002): 136.
[7] S.T. Kim, "Making a difference: U.S. press coverage of the Kwangju and Tiananmen pro-democracy movements," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 77/1 (Spring 2000): 23.
[8] G.H. Stempel III, "Statistical designs for content analysis, " in *Research methods in mass communication*, Ed. G.H. Stempel III and B.H. Westley (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989): 137-49.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

The findings of this study showed how weekly American magazines covered the eight "Asian economic tigers": what events they regarded as "important" when discussing about these nations, how the patterns of coverage change over time, and who were the sources cited to represent their news stories. Although the magazines exhibited different preferences in coverage and employed a wide variety of sources, similarities were also found in some areas.

Overall, the study found that out of the total of 657 articles found in 1990 to 2000, the quantity of total coverage ranged from the lowest of 24 news items in 1993, to the highest of 96 news items in 1997. *Time* dedicated the least amount of coverage with 84 articles, while *Business Week* published 350 articles. This echoed the data from a preliminary study that counted the amount of articles written by these magazines on the "tigers" within 10 years prior to the current study, from 1980 to 1989, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Frequency of newsmagazines coverage of the "tigers," 1980-1989

	Business Week	***Newsweek***	***Time***	***US News***	**Total**
Hong Kong	45	10	12	8	75
Indonesia	3	4	3	2	12
Malaysia	2	1	0	1	4
Philippines	37	131	95	64	327
Singapore	6	1	0	1	8
South Korea	68	40	39	25	172
Taiwan	27	4	6	5	42
Thailand	3	3	6	2	14
Total	191	194	161	108	654

The country with the least coverage was Malaysia, with 25 articles (3.8% of total 657 news items). However, Hong Kong, which is not even a country, but serves as a vital business partner of the U.S., was in the limelight with 145 articles (22.1%). The second highest coverage was of South Korea with 129 articles (19.6%), followed by Taiwan with 128 news items (19.5%).

Most news stories found dealt with the economy or business, which added up to a total 255 articles (38.8% of total 657 items). Overall, news on politics or government ranked second with 177 items (26.9%), followed by stories on diplomacy and foreign affairs with 83 items (12.6%). The least amount of coverage was given to issues on nationalism, which was only covered 5 times (0.8%) throughout the years.

"Business/professional" was the most frequent category of sources used by all newsmagazines, accounting for 1,066 citations (38.03% from the total of 2,803 citations) in the 11-year period. "Government/ military" was the second most-quoted group, with 788 citations (28.11%), and "Expert/academician" came next with 516 citations (18.41%). The least-quoted group was "Other," with only 18 citations (0.64%). The numbers represented overall number of sources regardless of the origin, whether from the U.S., the country of focus, or an international institution (U.N.).

RQ1: The quantity and patterns of coverage over time

Findings on the number of articles on the eight tigers of Asian economy by year and magazine are summarized in Table 2. Of all the magazines studied, *Business Week* published the greatest amount of coverage during 1990 to 2000, with the total of

350 articles or 53.3% of the 657 articles. *Newsweek* was second with 125 articles or 19.0% of the population. *US News & World Report* published a total of 98 articles or 14.9% of the population, while *Time* published the smallest amount of coverage with a total of 84 articles or 12.8% of the population.

The amount of coverage by all magazines varied over time, ranging from the peak of 96 articles (14.61% of the population) in 1997, to 24 articles (3.65%) in 1993. The numbers fluctuated from 1990 to 1993, but there was an increase in coverage from 1994 to 1997. From that year on, the amount of coverage begun to shrink, not substantially different in 1998 but continually declining until 2000.

In the first year examined in this study, 1990, the magazines dedicated a total of 54 articles to the eight East Asian countries/region. *Business Week* published 22 articles (40.74% of the 54 articles in 1990) while *Newsweek* ran 17 articles (31.48%). *U.S. News & World Report* used 8 articles, and *Time* had 7 . The largest body of coverage by *Business Week* was in 1998, with 55 articles (15.71% of 350 articles). *Newsweek* gave its greatest coverage in 1997, with 23 articles (18.4% of 125 articles), while *Time* peaked at 14 articles (16.67% of 84 articles) in 1999. In 1992, *U.S News* ran its peak of 15 articles (15.3%) of the total of 98 articles.

In 2000, the last year of the period of study, *Business Week* offered 40 articles (60.6% of total 66 articles that year). But coverage by *U.S. News* plunged to 13 articles (19.70%), followed by *Time* with 9 articles (13.64%). *Newsweek* offered only 4 articles (6.06%) written on the “tigers.”

Table 2
Frequency of article on the "tigers" in each newsmagazine, 1990-2000

Year (n=657)	***Bus. Week*** %	(n=350)	***Newsweek*** %	(n=125)	***Time*** %	(n=84)	***U.S. News*** %	(n=98)
'90 (n=54)	6.29	(22)	4.86	(17)	8.33	(7)	8.16	(8)
'91 (n=31)	3.71	(13)	6.4	(8)	3.57	(3)	7.14	(7)
'92 (n=60)	7.71	(27)	7.2	(9)	10.71	(9)	15.31	(15)
'93 (n=24)	4.86	(17)	3.2	(2)	3.57	(3)	2.04	(2)
'94 (n=35)	5.14	(18)	7.2	(9)	4.76	(4)	4.08	(4)
'95 (n=51)	9.43	(33)	4	(5)	7.14	(6)	7.14	(7)
'96 (n=75)	10.29	(36)	16	(20)	9.52	(8)	11.22	(11)
'97 (n=96)	14.29	(50)	18.4	(23)	11.9	(10)	13.27	(13)
'98 (n=94)	15.71	(55)	15.2	(19)	13.10	(11)	9.18	(9)
'99 (n=71)	11.14	(39)	7.2	(9)	16.67	(14)	9.18	(9)
'00 (n=66)	11.43	(40)	3.2	(4)	10.71	(9)	13.27	(13)
rho.	**.827**		**.216**		**.694**		**.403**	
p value	**.01**				**.05**			

A non-parametric test for trend (Spearman's rho) was used to determine whether there is an increase or decrease trend in the overall coverage of the "tigers" over 11 years. The annual total frequency from each magazine is used to compute trend scores. As we see on Table 1, the positive values of rho (between zero and 1) indicate increasing trends in coverage over time: as the year progress, the coverage increase. However, two of the magazines are very close to 0, or showing non-significant trends in increasing coverage over time.

Two of the magazines studied, *Business Week* and *Time,* did, however, exhibit significant values of rho. This indicates that even though changes from year to year might not be monotonic, overall, there is an increase trend in covering the "tigers" for these two magazines.

Findings on the annual number of articles pertaining to each "tiger" are summarized in Table 3. Overall, Hong Kong, received the largest amount of coverage, ranging from a low of 2 articles in 2000 to a high of 51 articles (7.76%) in 1997. The country which received the least coverage overall was Malaysia with a mere 25 articles throughout the period (3.81% of population). The coverage ranged from a high of 13 articles in 1998, to a low of 1 article in 1990, 1991, 1992, and 2000, with nothing published in 1993, 1995 and 1996. The overall coverage peaked between 1996-1998, as events that were regarded as "important" by these magazines arose around this time, such as the widespread economic failure across Asia in 1997, Hong Kong's handover back to China in July 1997 and its increasing economic significance to the United States, or the East Timor struggle for independence from Indonesia in 1997 and the fall of Indonesia's President Suharto, one of the longest-run authority in the world, in 1998.

Table 3
Percentage of article dedicated to each "tiger" in all newsmagazines, 1990-2000

	Hongkong		*Indonesia*		*Malaysia*		*Philippines*		*Singapore*		*S. Korea*		*Taiwan*		*Thai land*	
Year	%	n **(n=145)**	%	n **(n=105)**	%	n **(n=25)**	%	n **(n=56)**	%	n **(n=35)**	%	n **(n=129)**	%	n **(n= 128)**	%	n **(n=34)**
90	7.59	**11**	1.90	**2**	4	**1**	23.21	**13**	2.86	**1**	15.50	**20**	3.91	**5**	2.94	**1**
91	6.21	**9**	0	**0**	4	**1**	16.07	**9**	0	**0**	3.10	**4**	6.25	**8**	0	**0**
92	9.66	**14**	0.96	**1**	4	**1**	26.78	**15**	0	**0**	6.98	**9**	9.38	**12**	23.53	**8**
93	4.14	**6**	0	**0**	0	**0**	1.79	**1**	8.57	**3**	7.75	**10**	2.34	**3**	2.94	**1**
94	4.14	**6**	4.76	**5**	8	**2**	5.36	**3**	22.86	**8**	3.10	**4**	4.68	**6**	2.94	**1**
95	8.28	**12**	0.95	**1**	0	**0**	3.57	**2**	28.56	**10**	8.54	**11**	10.94	**14**	2.94	**1**
96	9.65	**14**	11.43	**12**	0	**0**	7.14	**4**	11.43	**4**	4.65	**6**	25	**32**	8.83	**3**
97	35.16	**51**	4.76	**5**	8	**2**	0	**0**	11.43	**4**	15.50	**20**	6.25	**8**	17.65	**6**
98	9.65	**14**	33.33	**35**	52	**13**	1.79	**1**	2.86	**1**	15.50	**20**	3.91	**5**	14.71	**5**
99	4.14	**6**	32.38	**34**	16	**4**	0	**0**	2.86	**1**	6.98	**9**	10.16	**13**	11.76	**4**
00	1.38	**2**	9.52	**10**	4	**1**	14.29	**8**	8.57	**3**	12.40	**16**	17.18	**22**	11.76	**4**
	rho -.147		**rho -.769 p .01**		**rho .386**		**rho -.598**		**rho .300**		**rho .258**		**rho -.767 p .01**		**rho .518**	

Findings on the amount of coverage annually showed which nation gets the most attention each year. When computing the variables of frequency of coverage given to each nation by all newsmagazines annually, the Spearman's rho test indicates that only two, Indonesia and Taiwan, show significant trend in increasing coverage over time. Meanwhile, the rho values on other countries show that the increase of coverage over the 11-year period is not statistically significant. This means that the coverage for countries other than Indonesia and Taiwan was not affected by specific events happening in East Asia, such as the economic boom and its sudden collapse, or political upheavals over time.

We can see the amount of coverage each magazine gave to each nation in Table 4. *Business Week* provided the greatest coverage for Hong Kong with 79 articles (54.11% of total 146 stories). *Newsweek* ran 38 articles (26.03%) on Hong Kong, while *US News* dedicated 15 stories (10.27%) and *Time* only 13 news items (8.90%).

Indonesia was also most covered by *Business Week* with 50 stories (47.62% of total 105 news items). Both *Newsweek* and *Time* gave the same coverage of Indonesia, with 19 stories each (18.1%), and *US News* gave the least amount to Indonesia with 17 articles (16.19%) published during the period of study.

The numbers differ greatly on Malaysia, with the total coverage of 25 articles, ranging from a high of 17 stories (68%) by *Business Week*, to a low of 2 articles (8%) by *Newsweek*. This was the lowest overall coverage by all magazines during the 11-year period.

The third most covered nation overall was Taiwan, with a total of 128 articles, the majority in *Business Week* with 67 stories (52.34%). As with South Korea, the coverage other magazines have given this country also differs, from a high of 27 stories (21.1%) in *US News* to the low of 16 articles (12.5%) in *Time*. Thailand was the second least covered country with a total of 34 articles, ranging from a low of 4 articles (11.76%) in both *Newsweek* and *Time*, to a high of 19 stories (55.88%) in *Business Week.*

Table 4
Frequency of overall coverage on each "tiger" by magazine, 1990-2000

Magazines	*Business Week*		*Newsweek*		*Time*		*US News*		**Total**	
Nations	%	n=350	%	n=125	%	n=84	%	n=98	%	n=657
Hong Kong	22.57	79	30.4	38	15.47	13	15.30	15	22.22	146
Indonesia	14.29	50	15.2	19	22.61	19	17.34	17	15.98	105
Malaysia	4.86	17	1.6	2	3.57	3	3.06	3	3.81	25
Philippines	2.86	10	14.4	18	15.47	13	15.30	15	8.52	56
Singapore	4	14	8	10	9.52	8	3.06	3	5.33	35
S. Korea	26.86	94	12.8	16	9.52	8	11.22	11	19.63	129
Taiwan	19.14	67	14.4	18	19.04	16	27.55	27	19.48	128
Thailand	5.43	19	3.2	4	4.76	4	7.14	7	5.18	34

Spearman's rho correlation test results:

- *Business Week-Newsweek*: correlation coefficient .333
- *Business Week-Time*: correlation coefficient .238
- *Business Week-U.S. News*: correlation coefficient .452
- *Newsweek-Time*: correlation coefficient .857, significant at the .01 level
- *Newsweek-U.S. News*: correlation coefficient .810, significant at the .05 level
- *Time-U.S. News*: correlation coefficient .905, significant at the .01 level

A Spearman's rho correlation test was performed in order to show trends in coverage by each magazine, in order to find out how one magazine's coverage differed from the other. The frequencies were ranked, from the country most covered, to the least. The ranks were computed, and the results show that there is a significant

correlation of pattern of coverage between *Newsweek* and *Time, Newsweek* and *U.S. News,* and also between *Time* and *U.S. News*. However, *Business Week* does not show a significant similarity of coverage compared to the other three magazines.

RQ2: Prevalent topics in each magazine, 1990-2000

The most prevalent topic for all magazines and for the whole time period was "Economy and business," numbering 255 news items (38.81% of total population), while "Nationalism" was the most infrequently covered topic at only 5 articles (0.76%) written. The amount of coverage given to each topic per year is summarized in Table 5, and Table 6 shows the amount of each topic covered by each magazine.

Overall, coverage was dominated by "Economy/business" news in 1997, with 47 news items (7.15% of population, or 18.43% of 255 total articles on this particular topic). For "Politics/government," the greatest coverage was in 1992 and 1998, with 26 news items each (14.70% of total 177 articles on this topic). The least coverage of "Politics and government" was in 1991, with only 5 articles (2.82%). *Business Week* offered the greatest coverage of the topic with 80 articles (45.2% of 177 news items) while *Newsweek* ran the least with 30 articles (16.95%).

"War/defense" received the highest coverage in 1999, with 10 articles (41.67% of total 28 news items on this topic), while its least (1 article), was in 1992 and 1998. No coverage was given to this topic in 1993, 1994 and 1997. *US News & World Report* gave the topic the most coverage with 10 articles (35.71% of total 28 news items), while *Time* gave it the least with 4 articles (14.29%).

Table 5
Percentage of topics covered by all newsmagazines annually, 1990-2000

Year	'90	'91	'92	'93	'94	'95	'96	'97	'98	'99	'00
Topic (n=657)	N=54 %	n=31 %	n=60 %	N=24 %	n=35 %	n=51 %	n=75 %	n=96 %	N=94 %	n=71 %	n=66 %
Econ./ Busines n=255	33.33	35.48	30	50	31.42	45.09	26.66	48.95	48.93	32.39	34.84
Politics/ Gov't. n=177	35.18	16.12	43.33	29.16	8.57	21.56	30.66	23.95	27.65	21.12	28.78
Dipl./ For.Aff n=83	14.81	16.12	10	4.16	17.14	15.68	21.33	9.37	8.51	14.08	9.09
War/ Defense n=28	5.55	6.45	1.66	0	0	3.92	6.66	0	1.06	14.08	6.06
Human interest n=21	3.70	3.22	1.66	0	5.71	3.92	5.33	4.16	1.06	4.22	1.51
Sci/ Tech n=20	0	0	3.33	8.33	5.71	1.96	4	3.12	1.06	2.81	6.06
Pub. Health n=15	1.85	3.22	5	4.16	0	0	0	3.12	5.31	1.40	0
Pub. Moral n=11	0	3.22	0	4.16	11.42	0	0	0	3.19	0	3.03
Edu./ Arts n=10	0	6.45	1.66	0	0	0	1.33	2.08	1.06	1.40	3.03
Accids./ Disast. n=9	1.85	9.67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.22	3.03
Pop.A muse. n=8	0	0	0	0	0	3.92	1.33	1.04	1.06	1.40	3.03
Crime n=8	1.85	0	0	0	11.42	3.92	0	0	0	1.40	0
Refug./ Emigr. n=7	0	0	3.33	0	0	0	1.33	2.08	1.06	1.40	0
Natio- nalism n=5	1.85	0	0	0	0	0	1.33	2.08	0	0	1.51

"Diplomacy/foreign affairs" had the highest coverage in 1996 with 16 articles (19.28% of total 83 items on this topic) and the lowest, of 1 article, was in 1993. Other than these two extremes, "Diplomacy/foreign affairs" enjoyed a fairly steady

coverage. *Business Week* gave the most coverage for this topic, with 28 articles (33.73% of total 83 items), while *Time* gave the least the lowest with 11 articles (13.25%).

The coverage of "Economy/business"-related events, which enjoyed the most attention in 1997, decreased slightly the year after with a total of 46 articles (18.40% of total 255 articles for this topic). In 1990, this topic was the second highest covered by all magazines after "Politics and government." Afterward, the coverage on "Economy/ business" increased steadily, ranging from the low of 11 to 23 articles, before it hit the peak in 1997 and 1998. Then the coverage steadied at 23 news items in both 1999 and 2000. Obviously *Business Week* would dominate this topic, with 207 articles (81.2 percent of total 255 articles), while *Time* gave the least coverage with only 12 articles (4.71 percent).

"Crime" received minimal coverage throughout the 11-year period of study. "Public moral problems" also receive little attention, with a total of 11 articles written from 1990 to 2000.

The newsmagazines dedicated a total of 15 articles on "Public health and welfare." 'Education and classic arts" received only 10 articles throughout the entire period of study. *Business Week* featured the most stories on "Science and technology," with 10 (50%) out of a total of 20 articles, while *US News* gave the least coverage to this topic with only 2 stories (10%).

The author ran the Spearman's rho tests in order to determine the pattern of coverage by each magazine in reporting each topic. The frequencies topics were

ranked from the most covered to the least, and the test was computed to compare one magazine to the other. The results indicate that all magazines show a significantly similar (highly correlated) pattern in covering the topics.

Table 6
Frequency of topic in each newsmagazine, 1990-2000

Topic	Magazine title				
	Bus. Week	*Newsweek*	*Time*	*US News*	Total
Economy/business	207	18	12	18	255
Politics/gov't	80	30	33	34	177
Dipl./for. Affairs	28	26	11	18	83
War/defense	7	7	4	10	28
Human interest/ Personality	6	10	2	3	21
Science/Tech.	10	4	4	2	20
Publ. health/ Welfare.	3	5	3	4	15
Pub. moral Problems	1	6	2	2	11
Edu./Classic arts	4	2	1	3	10
Accidents/ Disasters	0	4	3	2	9
Pop. Amusement	1	2	4	1	8
Crime	1	5	1	1	8
Refugees/ Emigration	2	3	2	0	7
Nationalism	0	3	2	0	5

Spearman's rho correlation test results:

- *Business Week-Newsweek*: correlation coefficient .701, significant at the .01 level
- *Business Week-Time*: correlation coefficient .807, significant at the .01 level
- *Business Week-U.S. News*: correlation coefficient .807, significant at the .01 level
- *Newsweek-Time*: correlation coefficient .560, significant at the .05 level
- *Newsweek-U.S. News*: correlation coefficient .780, significant at the .01 level
- *Time-U.S. News*: correlation coefficient .618, significant at the .05 level

Meanwhile, the data on the amount of coverage each topic received in each country are summarized in Table 7. As noted above, stories on "Economy and business" get the most attention from the newsmagazines examined with the total of

255 articles published between 1990 and 2000. South Korea accounted for 89 stories (34.9%), followed by Hong Kong with 63 items (24.71%), Taiwan with 30 (11.76%), Indonesia with 29 (11.37%),and 15 stories (5.88%) for Singapore.

Table 7
Percentage of topics for each "tiger" by all newsmagazines, 1990-2000

	Country of focus								
Topics	*Hong Kong* %	*Indonesia* %	*Malaysia* %	*Philippines* %	*Singapore* %	*South Korea* %	*Taiwan* %	*Thailand* %	**Total** N=657
Economy/ Business	43.44	27.61	40	8.92	42.85	68.99	23.43	41.17	255
Politics/ Gov't	25.51	37.14	32	44.64	11.42	23.25	20.31	23.52	177
Diplomacy/ for. Affairs	11.03	7.61	8	7.14	2.85	3.87	36.71	0	83
War/ Defense	0	12.38	0	7.14	0	0.77	6.25	5.88	28
Human int./ Personality	6.20	3.80	0	5.35	8.57	0.77	0.78	0	21
Science/ Technology	0.68	1.90	8	7.14	5.71	0	7.03	0	20
Pub. health/ Welfare.	2.75	1.90	4	1.78	2.85	0.77	0.78	11.76	15
Publ. Moral Problems	0.68	2.85	4	5.35	8.57	0	0	0	11
Education/ Classic arts	2.06	0.95	0	1.78	0	1.55	2.34	0	10
Accidents/ Disasters	0	0	0	8.92	2.85	0	2.34	0	9
Popular Amusement	2.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	11.76	8
Crime	0	0	4	0	14.28	0	0	5.88	8
Refugees/ Emigration	3.44	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
National-ism	1.37	1.90	0	1.78	0	0	0	0	5

"Nationalism" receives the lowest amount of coverage by all magazines during the 11-year period, with only 5 articles, 3 dealing with: Hong Kong, Indonesia and the Philippines. For the last category of topics, "Human interest and personality," the

research yielded a total of 21 stories, ranging from a high of 9 articles (42.86%) for Hong Kong, to a low of 1 article for South Korea and Taiwan.

RQ3: Who Gets to Speak in American Media?

Overall, the most common sources cited by all magazines comes from the "Business and professionals" category, which accounted for1,066 sources (38.03 %) out of a total of 2,803 sources cited by all magazines from 1990 to 2000. Overall, the four newsmagazines relied more on sources from "Focus" nations than sources from other origins, with the total of 1,710 citations (61.01 percent). Findings on the amount of sources used within the 657 articles in this 11-year period of study are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8
Frequency of sources by identity and origins (n=2,803)

Identity	**Origins**			**Total (%)**
	Focus	*International*	*U.S.*	
Business/professional	679	235	152	**1,066** (38.03%)
Government/military	439	172	177	**788** (28.11%)
Expert/academician	263	144	109	**516** (18.41%)
Activist/participant	319	54	42	**415** (14.81%)
Other	10	5	3	**18** (0.64%)
Total (%)	**1710 (61.01%)**	**610 (21.76%)**	**483 (17.23%)**	**2,803 (100%)**

Within the "Government/military" category, the majority of sources cited on all magazines came from the "Focus" nation, with 439 persons cited (55.7% of total 788 sources). Sources from the "U.S" were the second most-cited group in this category with 177 persons (22.46%) cited, followed closely by sources from the "International" community with 172 persons (21.83%).

For the “Expert/academician” category, sources from “Focus” nations command the most attention with 263 people (50.97% of total 516 sources) cited. Unlike the previous category, sources from the “U.S.” were the least covered with only 109 persons (21.12%) cited. The second most-cited group was sources from “International” community with the total of 144 citations (27.91%).

The most-cited category, “Business /professionals” showed more similarity with “Expert/academician,” with sources come mostly from “Focus” nations. The second most-cited group within this category is also “International” sources with 235 persons (22.05%) cited, followed by 152 (14.26%) of “U.S.” sources.

Out of the total 415 citations within the “Activist/participant” category, sources from the “Focus” country also caught the most attention with 319 people (76.87%) cited. Then the number of citations plunged to 54 citations (13.01%) for sources from “International” community, followed by “U.S.” sources with 42 citations (10.12%).

Based on the findings above, sources who get to “speak” the most in all magazines studied, within all source-category, come from the “Focus” nations. The only category that has sources from “U.S.” as the second most-cited group is “Government/military.” Each of the other four categories has “International” sources surpassing the number of “U.S.” sources.

Looking at all the categories for sources, the research found that each magazine tended to concentrate more on finding sources from the “Focus” nations than from the “U.S.” or “International” community. There was one exception, with *Newsweek* featuring more “U.S.” sources in the category of “Expert/academician.”

Findings on how many sources were cited by each of the four magazines are summarized in Table 9. *Business Week* featured "Focus" sources more in all source-categories, in the overall coverage from 1990 to 2000. "International" sources were the second most-cited group while "U.S." sources were the least cited. *US News & World Report* showed similar use, featuring "Focus" sources, then sources from the "International" group, and lastly, the "U.S" sources. This inclination applies to all source-categories, except for "Other," in which only one "International" source is cited throughout the 11-year period.

Table 9
The division of sources in Asian "tigers" stories by each magazine (n=2,803)

		Magazine				
Source	Origin	*Bus. Week*	*Newsweek*	*Time*	*US News*	**Total**
Govern-ment/ Military	US	46	69	47	26	177 (6.31%)
	Focus	219	91	50	79	439 (15.66%)
	Int'l	70	46	27	29	172 (6.14%)
Expert/ Academi-cian	US	50	41	4	10	109 (3.89%)
	Focus	159	30	37	37	263 (9.38%)
	Int'l	83	29	14	18	144 (5.14%)
Business/ Professi-onals	US	105	26	14	7	152 (5.42%)
	Focus	512	75	42	50	679 (24.22%)
	Int'l	165	32	25	13	235 (8.38%)
Partici-pant/ Activist	US	9	17	12	4	42 (1.50%)
	Focus	107	74	57	81	319 (11.38%)
	Int'l	17	20	12	5	54 (1.93%)
Other	US	1	2	0	0	3 (0.11%)
	Focus	5	4	1	0	10 (0.36%)
	Int'l	3	1	0	1	5 (0.18%)
Total		1,551 (55.33%	557 (19.87%)	342 (12.20%)	360 (12.84%)	**2,803 (100%)**

Meanwhile, *Newsweek* demonstrated a different trend. Throughout the period studied, within the category of "Expert/academician," it used more "U.S." sources (41 citations) than sources from "Focus" nations (30 citations) and "International" sources

(29 citation). Aside from this distinction, *Newsweek* still followed the pattern of featuring "Focus" sources the most for "Government/military," "Business/professional," "Participant/activist," and "Other." The second most-cited group is "International" sources in all but for "Government/military" category, in which sources from the "U.S." was the second most-cited group.

Time, the magazine that gave the least coverage, also provided the least amount of sources with the total of 342 citations. It also gave more attention to sources from "Focus" nations in any source-category, and the second most-cited group is also "International" sources. There were two exceptions: first, for "Participant/activist" category, the number of sources from "U.S." was the same as that of "International" sources, each with 12 citations. Secondly, only one source was cited for "Other" throughout the period of study, which comes from a "Focus" nation.

Table 10 presents the overall frequency of sources by each topic.

Table 10
Frequency of sources for each topic in all newsmagazines coverage of the "tigers," 1990-2000 (n=2,803)

	Sources by origin & identity														
Topics	US Gov/military	Focus Gov/military	Int'l Gov/military	US Exp/academic	Focus Exp/academic	Int'l Exp/academic	US Bus/proffes'l.	Focus Bus/proffes'l/	Int'l Bus/proffes'l.	US Part/activist	Focus Part/activist	Int'l Part/activist	US Other	FocusOther	Int'l Other
Eco./bus. (n=255)	28	136	41	31	82	43	98	438	184	1	59	5	1	0	2
Pol./gov't. (n=177)	32	197	41	20	107	47	15	124	9	8	140	5	0	3	3
Dipl./for.aff. (n=83)	76	44	45	29	26	32	7	13	11	6	18	6	1	2	0
War/defense (n=28)	23	20	18	5	3	6	7	6	2	2	20	13	0	0	0
Hum. inter. (n=21)	1	1	3	2	0	3	5	21	5	8	9	5	0	0	0
Sci./Techno. (n=20)	1	5	3	6	13	5	4	24	5	2	6	1	0	3	0
Pub. Health (n=15)	1	6	6	6	5	4	1	8	1	4	14	3	0	0	0
Publ. Moral (n=11)	4	10	3	1	7	0	1	6	3	4	16	1	1	0	0
Edu./arts (n=10)	0	1	1	4	12	1	1	3	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Acc./dissast. (n=9)	1	4	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	6	2	0	0	0
Pop. amuse. (n=8)	0	2	0	0	0	0	11	9	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
Crime (n=8)	10	8	2	4	3	0	2	9	4	3	4	1	0	1	0
Refugee (n=7)	0	3	4	1	2	0	0	12	3	0	13	5	0	1	0
Nationalism (n=5)	0	2	4	0	2	2	0	4	1	2	9	7	0	0	0

The data show that by cross tabulating all the source categories with the 14 categories of topics in all magazines, sources from “Focus Government/military” are the most cited for stories on “Politics/government.” The second most cited group for this topic was “Focus Participant/activist,” followed by “Focus Business/professional.” The least cited groups are “Focus Other” and “International Other,” while “US Other” was not cited at all.

For stories on “War/defense,” sources from “US Government/military” were featured the most, followed by “Focus Government/military” and “International Government/ military” sources. Sources from “International Business/professional” and “US Participant/activist” received the fewest citations, while no source from “Other” was identified in any “War/defense” story.

The highest number of sources for stories on “Diplomacy/foreign affairs” again came comes from “US Government/military,” followed by “International Government/ military,” then sources from “Focus Government/military.”. “Economy/business” is the most covered topic in this study, resulting in aggregating the highest number of sources cited. For this topic, all magazines favored using sources from the “Focus Business/professional” group more than any other group. Sources from “International Business/professional” were the second most-cited group, followed by sources from “Focus Government/military.”

Summary

This study found that during the 11-year period after the end of Cold War, all four U.S. weekly magazines gave different treatment in covering the eight Asian nations. However, they were highly similar in the topics they emphasized. Overall, *Business Week*

gave the largest amount of coverage, followed by *Newsweek* and *U.S. News & World Report*, while *Time* gave the least. The numbers fluctuate up and down from 1990 to 1994, however, they continue to increase steadily in 1995, reaching to peak in 1997 then begin to decline toward the end of 2000.

Hong Kong dominates the attention in all magazines from 1990 to 2000, with South Korea second and Taiwan third. The fourth most covered nation is Indonesia and Malaysia is the least covered nation.

There was an overarching association between all newsmagazines, that even though each publication claimed to be different than the other—that they were tailored specifically, they showed similarities in determining what topics were regarded as "important." Overall, the most prevalent topic in this study is "Economy/business" with the coverage for this topic peaking in 1997. In 1998 the number began to decline. This was the topic most covered by *Business Week*, with most of the stories coming from South Korea, Hong Kong and Indonesia. The second most covered topic was "Politics/government," with most of the stories in this category coming from Indonesia, Hong Kong and South Korea. "Diplomacy/foreign affairs" is the third most prevalent topic, Taiwan leading the other countries in generating stories on this topic, followed by Hong Kong and Indonesia.

However, in terms of coverage dedicated for each "tigers" over time, the magazines showed a slight difference. Only *Business Week* and *Time* showed an increase trend in covering these nations over time, while the two other newsmagazines did not. While there was a significant correlation of pattern of coverage between *Newsweek* and

Time, *Newsweek* and *U.S. News*, and also between *Time* and *U.S. News*, *Business Week* did not show a significant similarity of coverage compared to the other three magazines.

In most cases, when covering events on the eight Asian nations, all magazines look for sources from the "Focus" nations before "International" sources or "US" sources. There were only few exceptions to this phenomenon. The popularity of topics somewhat reflects the prominence of sources in this study. In general, sources from "Business/professional" are the most quoted by all magazines, followed by "Government/military" sources, and those who belong into the "Expert/academician" category.

In summary, *Business Week* gave the most coverage on the eight Asian nations, while *Time* presented the least, with the greatest coverage in 1997 and 1998, with "Economy/Business," "Politics/ Government" and "Diplomacy/Foreign affairs" the most prevailing topics. Most of the magazines choose to employ sources from "Focus" nations more than the two other origins, and the highest number of source come from "Focus Business/professional." "Focus participant/activist." In all weekly U.S. newsmagazines examined, "Focus" sources spoke more than any other sources about events happening in their own backyard, and the economy was the predominant subject the magazines preferred to explore.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study showed that in 1990s, all four newsmagazines focused on events related to the economy and politics. After all, as said by one analyst, "… the nineties marked the biggest peacetime expansion of the U.S. economy or the huge growth in the spread of a truly integrated global economy," and the term "globalization" that marked the 1990s was defined primarily as an economic rule set.[1] Perhaps the most interesting thing was that the results were similar to the conclusion proposed by Shoemaker, Danielian and Brendlinger in their 1991 research on the definition of newsworthiness of world events by U.S. journalists.[2] This study also indicated that economic and political significance, normative and social change deviance of international events, and also the U.S. direct involvement in an event are key ingredients for a nation to be covered by the four major American magazines.

All the eight Asian nations had significant relationships with the United States, whether in terms of the economy or diplomatic relationsstemming from the Cold War era. However, there had been a considerable change of coverage since the Cold War ends. Although prevalent topics such as "politics" and "diplomacy" still served as the media's main interest when covering news from abroad, "economy" was the most covered topic right from the beginning of the study. Even so, "politics" followed closely, and stories on "diplomacy" are the third most-covered by all magazines. This mirrors closely what the Clinton Administration emphasized during the 1990s, a

foreign economic policy, that some regard as "spinning off one alphabet soup after another (NAFTA, APEC, etc.)," with the Pacific Rim region potentially serving the sole superpower country as its "new source of power."[3] In the 1990s East and Southeast Asian countries tallied up for nearly two-thirds of global capital investment, and for half of the growth in world output, even though they constitute only 20 percent of the world's GDP.[4]

With "economy" the main concern, it is not surprising that *Business Week* dominates the news within the study period. The coverage increases significantly from 1993 to 1998, then decreases in 1999 and 2000, with the "miracle economies" being the stars: South Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan. Business Week quotes sources from local business professionals, local government and military, and International business professionals. It employs the fewest American sources in any category. With bureaus in Hong Kong, South Korea and Singapore, it is unproblematic for *Business Week* to look for sources abroad with direct involvement to the subject.

Contrary to *Business Week, Newsweek* shows a decline in coverage from 1994 to 1995, although the amount quadruples the next year and continues to increase consecutively until it declines in 1999. *Newsweek* shows more interest in reporting events related to politics and foreign affairs rather than those related to the economy. *Time* tends to mirror *Newsweek* in its coverage, although it covers more economic-related events than those related to diplomacy. *U.S. News* also gives the most attention to events related to politics and government while giving the same amount of attention to events related to the economy and foreign affairs. The most interesting part is the

fourth most-covered topic on *U.S. News*' coverage is war/defense issues, the main discussion topic in American mass media at that time. The "Cold War Frame," as noted by Entman, serves to anchor the American government's control over the news coverage on foreign policy.[5] Zaller and Chiu highlight the correlation between reporters and policymakers, as "reporters tend to elaborate on the information that they thought would foretell future events," such as how the government would use this information for the process of decision-making.[6] In return, foreign policy sets the agenda for U.S. media coverage by strongly influencing what people think about. Therefore, countries perceived as important for U.S. interests get more coverage in American media.

Truly, media coverage in the Cold War era exhibits a similar outlook. According to the findings from a preliminary study, at the height of the Cold War, prior to the 1990s, the four newsmagazines show a different attitude in covering the eight nations. Even though the total amount of coverage dedicated by all magazines during the period of 1980-1989, was not that much different from the coverage during the period of study—654 articles as compared to 657 articles. Although the U.S. policymakers have expressed more interest in strengthening Trans-Pacific diplomacy after the Cold War,[7] the amount of attention given by the four newsmagazines to these tigers did not differ significantly. The highest attention given by the magazines during 1980-1989 was to the Philippines. This amount reflected the American attention to the Philippines during the Cold War, which as noted by Bresnan "serves as a stepping stone to China" during that period of time.[8] The coverage also highlighted the

economic and strategic relationship between the two countries, which was established since 1916 through Jones Act, which allowed American military forces to remain in the Philippines until 1936 while giving way for its independence. This agreement was renewed in 1983, which gives the U.S. forces an extended time to occupy the army/air force forts in Subic Bay and Clark Field, Manila. All magazines give an ample amount of attention to this security cooperation.

South Korea claims the second most-covered country between 1980-1989, with emphasis on the military cooperation with the U.S., and not so much on the events related to the economy, as shown in the coverage between 1990-2000. The third most-covered nation, Hong Kong, might be the only focus nation which coverage is emphasizing on economic-related events, although the overall coverage is also heavy on foreign affairs and politics-related stories.

In summary, although the amount of coverage given to these tiger nations 10 years prior to the period of study is almost the same, the emphasis on the topics is slightly different. While the period of 1980-1989 gives more attention to issues of war-related events and military operations/cooperation, the period of 1990-2000 concentrates heavily on economic and politics/government stories. Due to the heavy political and economic interests of the U.S. government in some parts of the Pacific Rim, Hong Kong, South Korea, Taiwan and Indonesia gets the most coverage. Especially in regard to Hong Kong's return to China as its Special Administrative Region (SAR), South Korea and Taiwan's emerging role as the center of East Asian economy, and Indonesian political turmoil. There are special cases for certain topics,

such as heavy coverage on crime stories for Singapore as the result of the Michael Fay's flogging case, or more science and technology news dedicated for Taiwan as the center of technology research in Asia, or more stories on human interests/personality coming from Hong Kong as the largest entertainment industry in the region.

Media coverage is influenced by what the government believes as important, but on the other hand, the decision-making process is also influenced by the information conveyed by the media. However, the press often argued that although media is the main purveyor of information, "it is not the media's job to articulate national interest," and certainly not their job either to establish foreign policy concepts.[9] Nevertheless, media and foreign policy co-exist here to influence each other.

The findings in this study show that all four newsmagazines generally employ more sources from outside the U.S. government. The big three groups of sources are local professionals or business people, local government or military person, then local experts or academicians. Only *Time* includes the U.S. government or military sources, and only *Business Week* incorporates sources from International business professionals, within its' big three groups of sources cited the most. The rest employ only local sources in their top three groups of sources throughout the period of study.

Five areas of topic that get the most coverage are: 1) *economy and business,* 2) *politics and government,* 3) *diplomacy and foreign affairs,* 4) *war and defense,* and 5) *human interests and personality*. For *economy and business,* "local business and professionals" get cited the most. All magazines prefer sources from "local

government/military" personnel to speak on stories about *politics and government*. However, "U.S. government/military" personnel gets to speak more than other groups on stories related to *diplomacy and foreign policy,* as well as stories related to "*war and defense*. And for articles on *human interests and personalities,* all magazines mostly prefer to use "local business" sources.

According to findings on patterns of sources, it can be concluded that although U.S. media and the government influence each other, it does not indicate that U.S. government gets to speak more on the media. Only on certain topics, such as *diplomacy/foreign affairs* and *war/defense* can the "U.S. government/military" act as the main source of information. The main sources for all topics are still "local" sources, and the amount of "international" sources employed exceeds the amount of U.S. sources cited in all 657 articles.

In summary, all four newsmagazines decided to shift the focus of coverage more toward economic and political issues in the 1990s, with different emphasis on each country. The areas that serve the economic, strategic and political interests of the U.S., such as Hong Kong, South Korea, Taiwan, and Indonesia certainly get more coverage, although all the other four countries are also considered as the "tigers of Asian economy" during that period. Different patterns in reporting international events that were considered "important enough" for American audience indicated that the magazines have their own agendas. However, they do share some similarities. One most striking is that all made an effort to reach local sources as their main informer (with the exception of a few topics) that reflects how much they want to be as 'distant'

as possible from the U.S. government when shaping the news. Although the media does not talk about "war" or "ideology" anymore, the world still relies on the same "power structure" in defining information. As most part of the world inclines toward capitalism in this post-Cold War era, the new "power structure" is defined by the economic elites—CEOs, business professionals, etc. A new set of elites, but yet the same structure.

The amount of foreign bureaus and stringers may be reduced. The foreign news outlet may shrink. But this study shows that the U.S. media does not rely much on its government to tell them what is important when covering events related to East Asia, post-Cold War.

Conclusions

As stated previously, scholars noted the dismantling of the Cold War could mean that the areas previously neglected or regarded as "of no great concern" by the U.S. media can take up more space. For *Business Week, Newsweek, Time* and *U.S. News & World Report*, the new "feud" to deal with is the international economic constellation. The first U.S. presidential election after the end of Cold War, in 1992, concentrated primarily upon domestic economic issues. Economy is the focus of attention in the 1990s. The eight "tigers of Asian economy," which were covered due to its strategic importance during the Cold War, were seen in a different manner here.

However, the magazines did not take a drastic turn in their reports, although many suggested that the U.S. media should look beyond politics in order to fight for

the attention of American audience. Instead of reporting more stories on human interests or the environment, for instance, they still cover heavily stories on politics and diplomacy, and even on events related to war and defense. And it seems that the four magazines made more effort to segregate themselves from the heavy influence of U.S. policy makers by employing mostly sources from focus nations rather than the U.S. in most of the topics covered. It is possible that the American media now wants to strengthen their role as a "watchdog," and not so much as a "consensus apparatus," that carried the established frames of the warring ideologies of the Cold War, anymore.

In this world of advanced communications technology, media outlets are able to cut back the amount of correspondents and bureaus around the world. Especially those who work on second-to-second basis such as television, although in the end this leads to a somewhat "homogenization of news." Weekly newsmagazines offer views that are more in-depth and analytical that gives the audience more comprehensive perspective on world issues, although absorbing it involves a higher degree of effort than that of the bite-sized information of audio-visual nature.

This, added by the waning public interest in foreign news after the Cold War ended, has left the magazines competing for more audience attention. As a result, some magazines dedicated a special feature on certain countries, which include not only reporting the events but also on its historical or cultural backgrounds. This new pattern of coverage shifts the foreign news agenda away from concentrating heavily around war and defense issues. The new coverage is trying to draw the parallel

between international and domestic issues, issues that are compelling to the American hearts. Here we see more of the media mixing issues on politics with human rights, or diplomacy/foreign affairs with domestic economy.

This study found that the amount of coverage of the "tigers of Asian economy" by the four newsmagazines increased only slightly, compared to the coverage 10 years prior to the period of study. This means that for 21 years the magazines are giving steady amount coverage for this region, although the focus of coverage may differ slightly. As the U.S. interests in the world economy grew higher in the 1990s, more articles are dedicated in discussing economic and political issues rather than issues of war, military and defense.

Limitations to the Study and Suggestions for Future Research

The objective of this study is to give an overview of how major U.S. newsmagazines covered the "tigers" of Asian economy from 1990 to 2000: how much did they cover, what were the prevailing topics, and who got to speak the most in representing the coverage. This study uses a traditional content analysis, therefore the most prominent shortcoming is that it tells "what" but does not explain "why." An examination of manifest content is an excellent way of determining the patterns of coverage and changes over time, but it can only give a general assumption on why these newsmagazines consider some issues to be more important than others, and why they chose to cite certain sources over others.

A further examination of certain variables in this study will show more comprehensive look at the patterns of coverage over time. For example, running a

correlation test of “sources” against the other variables. Perhaps the most important factor to consider when completing a similar study is to find out who are those sources rather than just identifying them by “identity” and “origins.” In this case, further examination should be conducted in order to find out who are these “economic” sources that set out the new world power structure.

Future research needs to investigate the reasons behind covering certain world events over others and whether or not policy making and news coverage are influencing each other. Such analysis can be obtained by qualitative method, such as interviewing foreign news editors and some government personnel related to foreign policy making. For more in-depth results that would further explain U.S. media versus foreign media coverage of foreign news, the research should also include qualitative and quantitative of world news as seen by both U.S. and foreign media.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

[1] T.P.M. Barnett, *The Pentagon's new map: War and peace in the twenty-first century* (New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 2004): 24, 26.
[2] P.J. Shoemaker, L.H. Danielian & N. Brendlinger, "Deviant acts, risky business and U.S. interests: The newsworthiness of world events," *Journalism Quarterly* 68/4 (1991): 783-84.
[3] B. Cumings, *Parallax visions: Making sense of American-East Asian relations* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002): 178-79.
[4] Ibid. p.180.
[5] R. Entman, "Declarations of independence: The growth of media power after the Cold War," in *Decision Making in a Glass House: Mass Media, Public Opinion, and American and European Foreign Policy in the 21st Century*, Eds. B. Nacos, R. Shapiro & P. Isernia (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), 13-14.
[6] J. Zaller & D. Chiu, "Government's little helper: U.S. press coverage of foreign policy crises, 1946-1999, in *Decision Making in a Glass House: Mass Media, Public Opinion, and American and European Foreign Policy in the 21st Century*, eds. B. Nacos, R. Shapiro & P. Isernia (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), 82.
[7] See Chapter 1, pp. 28-31.
[8] J. Bresnan, *The pivotal states: A new framework for U.S. policy in the developing world*, Eds. R. Chase, E. Hill & P. Kennedy (NY: W.W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1999), 81.
[9] The Freedom Forum Media Studies Center, *The media and foreign policy in the post-Cold War world* (NYC, NY: The Freedom Forum Media Studies Center at Columbia University, 1993), 14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abrahamson, D. *Newsmagazines: the Evolving Mirror*. 2001 <http://abrahamson.medill.nwu.edu/WWW/NewsMagazines.txt>
2. Albright, M.K. "U.S. commitment to security and prosperity in Asia, "*U.S. Department of State Dispatch.* 9/7. August (1998).
3. Aronson, J. *The press and the Cold War*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1970.
4. Barnett, T.P. *The Pentagon's new map: War and peace in the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 2004.
5. Bennett, W.L. "Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States," *Journal of Communication.* 40 (1990).
6. Blitz, A. *The contested state: American foreign policy and regime change in the Philippines*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2000.
7. Bresnan, J. "Indonesia, " *The pivotal states: A new framework for U.S. policy in the developing world.* Eds. R. Chase, E. Hill & P. Kennedy. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1999.
8. Bresnan, J. *From dominoes to dynamos: The transformation of Southeast Asia*. NY: Council on Foreign Relations, 1994.
9. Central Intelligence Agency. *CIA World Fact Book Online.* 2001 <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/hk.html>
10. Chang, T. *The press ad China policy: the illusion of Sino-American relations 1950-1984*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1993.

11. Chase, R., E. Hill & P. Kennedy, eds. *The pivotal states: A new framework for U.S. policy in the developing world.* New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1999.

12. Clinton, W.J. "The U.S. and Thailand: Making a partnership work for the Asia-Pacific." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch.* 7. 48 (25 November 1996).

13. Cohen, B. *The press and foreign policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963.

14. Colford, P.D. "In magazine sales, the world is too big," *Newsday*. 9 March 1995: B2.

15. Conklin, J.S. *Forging an East Asian foreign policy*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1995.

16. Cooper-Chen, A. "Praising, Bashing, Passing: Newsmagazine coverage of Japan, 1965-1994." Paper presented to the International Communication Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication annual convention, New Orleans, August 1999 <http://list.msu.edu>

17. Crabb, C.V. Jr., L.E. Sarieddine, and G.J. Antizzo. *Charting a new diplomatic course: Alternative approaches to America's post- Cold War foreign policy*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2001.

18. Cronin, P.M. and E.T. Metzgar. "ASEAN and Regional Security," *Strategic Forum Online* 85, 1998 <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/forum85.html>

19. Cumings, B. *Parallax visions: Making sense of American-East Asian relations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.

20. Cunningham, B. “Global blinders.” *Columbia Journalism Review*. 40. 4 (Nov/Dec 2001): 100.

21. Cyr, A.I. *After the The Cold War: American foreign policy, Europe and Asia*. New York, NY: New York University Press, 1997.

22. Dennis, E.E. “Life without the ‘evil empire’: New ways to make sense of the world.” *Media and foreign policy in the post-The Cold War world*. New York, NY: Freedom Forum Media Studies Center, 1993.

23. Dickson, S. “Press and U.S. policy toward Nicaragua, 1983-1987: A study of the New York Times and Washington Post,” *Journalism Quarterly* 69 (1992): 562-71.

24. Dupree, J.D. “International communication: View from a window on the world,” *Gazette* 17 (1971): 224-235.

25. Entman, R. “Declarations of independence: The growth of media power after the Cold War.” *Decision Making in a Glass House: Mass Media, Public Opinion, and American and European Foreign Policy in the 21st Century*. Eds. B. Nacos, R. Shapiro & P. Isernia. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.

26. Galtung, J. and M.H. Ruge, “The structure of foreign news,” *Journal of Peace Research* 2 (1965): 64-91.

27. Gans, H.J. *Deciding what’s news: A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, Newsweek and Time*. New York, NY: Vintage/ Random House, 1980.

28. Garran, R. *Tigers tamed: The end of the Asian miracle*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 1998.

29. Gershman, J. “Still the Pacific century? U.S. Policy in Asia and the Pacific.” *Global focus: U.S. foreign policy at the turn of the millennium*. Eds. M. Honey & T. Barry. New York, NY: St. Martin’s Press, 2000.

30. Giffard, C.A. “International agencies and global issues: The decline of the Cold War news-frame.” *The global dynamics of news: Studies in international news coverage and news agenda*. Eds. A. Malek and A.P. Kavoori. Stamford, CT: Ablex, 2000.

31. Gilpin, R. *Global political economy: Understanding the international economic order*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.

32. Ginneken, J.V. *Understanding global news: A critical introduction*. London: Sage, 1998.

33. Graber, D.A. *Mass Media and American Politics*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1997.

34. Griffin, M. and J. Lee. “Picturing the Gulf War: Constructing an image of war in *Time, Newsweek* and *U.S. News & World Report*.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly.* 72. 4 (Winter 1995).

35. Grossman, M.B. and M.J. Kumar. *Portraying the president: the White House and the news media*. Baltimore, MD: Johns-Hopkins University Press, 1981.

36. Hadar, L. “Covering the New World Disorder.” *Columbia Journalism Review*. 33. 2 (July 1994).

37. Haggard, S. *The political economy of the Asian financial crisis*. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics, 2000.

38. Hallin, D.C. “Hegemony: The American news media from Vietnam to El Savador, a study of ideological change and its limits.” *Political communication research*. Ed. D.L. Paletz. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1987.

39. Hallin, D.C. “The media, the war in Vietnam and political support: A critique of the thesis of an oppositional media.” *Journal of Politics.* 46 (1984).

40. Harland, B. *Collision course: America and East Asia in the past and the future*. Pasir Panjang, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1996.

41. Harris, P. “Communication and global security: The challenge for the next millennium.” *Beyond cultural imperialism: Globalization, communication and the new international order*. Eds. P. Golding & P. Harris. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997.

42. Herman, E. and N. Chomsky. *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1988.

43. Hess, S. *International news and foreign correspondents*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1996.

44. Hoge, J.F., “Foreign news: Who gives a damn?” *Columbia Journalism Review*. 36. 4 (Nov/Dec 1997).

45. Hoge, J.F., “The end of predictability,” *Global news after the Cold War: Media Studies Journal*. 7. 4 (1993).

46. Hopkins, T.K. and I. Wallerstein. *The age of transition: Trajectory of the world-system, 1945-2025*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed Books, 1996.

47. Huang, L.N. and K.C. McAdams. “Ideological Manipulation via newspaper accounts of political conflict: A cross-national news analysis of the 1991 Moscow coup.” *The global dynamics of news: Studies in international news coverage and news agenda*. Eds. A. Malek and A.P. Kavoori. Stamford, CT: Ablex, 2000.

48. Isaacs, M. “Two different worlds: The relationship between elite and mass opinion on American foreign policy.” *Political Communication.* 15 (1998).

49. Jamieson, K.H. and K.K. Campbell. *The interplay of influence: Mass media and their publics in news, advertising, politics*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1983.

50. Jayakar, R.K. and K.P. Jayakar. “Hegemonic frames and international news reporting: A comparative study of the *New York Times* coverage of the 1996 Indian and Israeli elections.” *The global dynamics of news: Studies in international news coverage and news agenda.* Eds. A. Malek & A.P. Kavoori. Stamford, CT: Ablex, 2000.

51. Johnson, C. and E.B. Kechin. “The Pentagon Ossified Strategy.” *Foreign Affairs.* 74 (July-August 1995).

52. Kim, S.T. “Making a difference: U.S. press coverage of the Kwangju and Tiananmen pro-democracy movements.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly.* 77. 1 (Spring 2000).

53. King, D. “Thailand.” *Democracy, governance and economic performance: East and Southeast Asia.* Eds. I. Marsh, J. Blondel and T. Inoguchi. New York, NY: United Nations University Press, 1999.

54. Laitin, D. “Language disassociation for Africa.” *The Antinomies of interdependence*. Ed. J.G. Ruggie. NY: Columbia University Press, 1983.

55. Lasater, M. *The changing of the guard: President Clinton and the security of Taiwan*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995.

56. Lasater, M. *U.S. interests in the new Taiwan.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993.

57. Lee, C.C. and J.H. Yang. “Foreign news and national interests: Comparing U.S. and Japanese coverage of a Chinese student movement.” *Gazette.* 5. 1 (1995).

58. Lent, J.A. “Foreign news in American media.” *Journal of Communication*. 27. Winter (1977): 46-51.

59. Lieberman, T. *Slanting the Story: the Forces that Shape the News*. New York, NY: The New Press, 2000.

60. Lim, L.Y.C. “Whose Model Failed? Implications of the Asian Economic Crisis.” *The Washington Quarterly.* 21. 3 (1998).

61. Lim, L.Y.C. and L.A.P. Gosling, eds. *The Chinese in Southeast Asia Volume 1: Ethnicity and economic activity*. Singapore: Maruzen Asia, 1983.

62. Low, L. “The political economy of Malaysia’s capital controls.” *The political economy of the Asian financial crisis*. Ed. S. Haggard. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics, 2000.

63. Lukauskas, A.J. *The political economy of the East Asian crisis and its aftermath: Tigers in distress*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2001.

64. Malek, A. and A.P. Kavoori, eds. *The global dynamics of news: Studies in international news coverage and news agenda*. Stamford, CT: Ablex, 2000.

65. Malinkina, O.V. and D.M. McLeod, “From Afghanistan to Chechnya: News coverage by *Izvestia* and *the New York Times*.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly.* 77. 1. Spring (2000).

66. Martin, L.J. and R.E. Hiebert, “Factors influencing international news flow,” *Current issues in international communication*. New York, NY: Longman, 1990.

67. Maynes, C.W. “Relearning Intervention.” *Foreign Policy.* 98 (Spring 1995).

68. Mayo, C. and Y. Pasadeos. “Changes in the international focus of U.S. business magazines.” *Journalism Quarterly.* 68. 3 (Fall 1991).

69. Mazharul-Haque, S.M. “Is U.S. coverage of news in Third World imbalanced?” *Journalism Quarterly.* 60 (1983).

70. McNelly, J.T. and F. Izcaray. “International news exposure and images of nations.” *Journalism Quarterly.* 61 (1984).

71. Morris, R. “Henry Kissinger and the media: A separate peace.” *Readings in mass communication: Concepts and issues in the mass media,* Eds. M. Emery and T. Smythe. Dubuque, IA: W.M.C. Brown, 1974.

72. Mullen, L.J. “An overview of political content analyses of magazines.” *Electronic Journal of Communication/REC.* 4. 2-4 (1994).

73. Nacos, B., R. Shapiro & P. Isernia. *Decision Making in a Glass House: Mass Media, Public Opinion, and American and European Foreign Policy in the 21st Century*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.

74. Niksch, L.A. “Thailand in 1988: The economic surge.” *Asian Survey.* 29. 2 (February 1989).

75. Nordenstreng, K., and H.I. Schiller. *National sovereignty and international communication*. Noorwood, NJ: Ablex, 1979.

76. Nuechterlein, D.I. *America recommitted: A superpower assesses its role in a turbulent world*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 2000.

77. Office of the United States Trade Representative. *1998 Trade Policy Agenda and 1997 Annual Report of the President of the U.S. on the Trade Agreements Program*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1998 <http://www.ustr.gov/reports/tpa/1998/contents.html>

78. Office of the United States Trade Representative. *USTR Strategic Plan, FY 1997-FY 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 30, 1997 <http://www.ustr.gov/reports/gpra.pdf>

79. Page, B., R. Shapiro and G. Dempsey. “What moves public opinion?” *Media power in politics*. Ed. D. Graber. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1990.

80. Paletz, D.L. and R.M. Entman. *Media Power Politics*. NY: The Free Press, 1981.

81. Perry, D. “News reading: Knowledge about and attitudes toward foreign countries.” *Journalism Quarterly*. 67. 2 (1990).

82. *Readers Guide Abstracts Online,* 2003 <http://firstsearch.oclc.org>

83. Riffe, D. “Linking international news to U.S. interests: A content analysis.” *International Communication Bulletin.* 31. 3-4 (1996).

84. Riffe, D. and A. Budianto. “The Shrinking World of Network News.” *International Communications Bulletin*. 36. 1-2 (2001).

85. Riffe, D. and E. Shaw. “Conflict and consonance: Coverage of Third World in two U.S. papers.” *Journalism Quarterly.* 59 (1982).

86. Riffe, D., S. Lacy and M.W. Drager. “Sample size in content analysis of weekly news magazines.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*. 73. 3 (Fall 1996).

87. Rohwer, J. *Asia rising: Why America will prosper as Asia’s economies boom.* New York, NY: Touchstone, 1995.

88. Rohwer, J. *Remade in America: How Asia will change because America boomed*. New York, NY: Crown Business, 2001.

89. Rosenblum, M. *Who stole the news? Why can't we keep up with what happens in the world and what we can do about it?* New York, NY: Wiley, 1993.

90. Said, E.W. *Covering Islam: How the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world*. New York, NY: Pantheon, 1981.

91. Sanam, C. *World news coverage of international stories on Time's cover pages, 1982-2003*. Master's thesis. Ohio University, 2004.

92. Schiller, H.I. *The mind managers*. Boston, MA: Beacon, 1973.

93. Shoemaker, P.J. and S.D. Reese. *Mediating the message: Theories of influences on mass media content*. White Plains, NY: Longman, 1996.

94. Shoemaker, P.J., L.H. Danielian and N. Brendlinger. "Deviant acts, risky business and U.S. interests: The newsworthiness of world events." *Journalism Quarterly*. 68. 4 (Winter 1991).

95. Solomon, R. *The transformation of the world economy*. NY: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

96. Sreberny-Mohammadi, A. "The many cultural faces of imperialism." *Beyond cultural imperialism: Globalization, communication and the new international order*. Eds. P. Golding & P. Harris. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997.

97. Stempel III, G.H. "Gatekeeping: The Mix of Topics and Selection of Stories." *Journalism Quarterly*. 62. 4 (Winter 1985).

98. Stempel III, G.H. "Statistical designs for content analysis." *Research methods in mass communication*. Eds. G.H. Stempel III and B.H. Westley. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989.

99. Stevenson, R.L., and R.R. Cole. “Issues in foreign news.” *Foreign news and the new world information order*. Eds. R.L. Stevenson and D.L. Shaw. Ames, IA: The Iowa State University Press, 1984.

100. The Asia Foundation. *America’s role in Asia: American view*. San Francisco, CA: The Asia Foundation, 2001.

101. The Asia Society, *Advancing U.S. interests in Hong Kong and Asia: Beyond transition and crisis*, March 24, 1998 <http://www.asiasociety.org/speeches/boucher.html>

102. The Freedom Forum Media Studies Center. *The media and foreign policy in the post-Cold War world*. New York, NY: The Freedom Forum Media Studies Center at Columbia University, 1993.

103. The Naval War College. *Shanghai Communiqué* (1972), *U.S.-PRC Diplomatic Relations Communiqué* (1979), *U.S.-PRC Joint Communiqué* of August 1982, *Taiwan Relations Act* (1979), 2003 <http://www.nwc.navy.mil/apsg/communiques.htm>

104. The World Bank. “Selected World Development Indicators.” *From plan to market: World development report, 1996*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1996.

105. The World Bank. *The East Asian miracle: The economic growth and public policy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1993.

106. Tuck, J. “Singapore remains upbeat.” *The New Leader*. 81. 12 (2-16 November 1998).

107. Tumber, H. “Sources, the media and the reporting of conflict.” *Media and conflict: Framing issues, making policy, shaping opinions*. Ed. Eytan Gilboa. Ardsley, NY: Transnational Publishers Inc., 2002.

108. Vatikiotis, M. “Clash of style: High profile diplomacy upsets neighbors.” *Far Eastern Economic Review*. 20 August 1992: 19.

109. Vatikiotis, M. “Making of a maverick: Anti-Western values shaped by career, education.” *Far Eastern Economic Review*. 20 August 1992: 18-19.

110. Vatikiotis, M. “The Mahathir paradox.” *Far Eastern Economic Review*. 20 August 1992: 17.

111. Velasco, R.S. “The Philippines.” *Democracy, governance and economic performance: East and Southeast Asia*. Eds. I. Marsh, J. Blondel & T. Inoguchi. New York, NY: United Nations University Press, 1999.

112. Viswanath, K. “International news in U.S. Media: Perceptions of foreign students.” *Journalism Quarterly*. 65 (1988).

113. Wang, J.C.F. *Comparative Asian politics: power, policy and change.* Englewood Cliffs, CA: Prentice Hall, 1994.

114. Weiss, C.H. “What America’s leaders read.” *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 68 (1974).

115. Wells, A. *Picture–tube imperialism? The impact of U.S. television on Latin America.* New York, NY: Orbis, 1972.

116. Wood, P. “The United States and Southeast Asia towards a new era.” *Asian security to the year 2000*. Ed. W.J. Taylor. Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2000.

117. Wu, H.D. “Systemic determinants of international news coverage: A comparison of 38 countries.” *Journal of Communication.* (Spring 2000).

118. Yu, Y.C. and D. Riffe. “Chiang and Mao in U.S. newsmagazines.” *Journalism Quarterly*. 66. 4 (Winter 1989).

119. Zaller, J. and D. Chiu. “Government’s little helper: U.S. press coverage of foreign policy crises, 1946-1999.” *Decision Making in a Glass House: Mass Media, Public Opinion, and American and European Foreign Policy in the 21st Century*. Eds. B. Nacos, R. Shapiro & P. Isernia. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.

APPENDIX A

Description and Circulation of Magazines Studied

1. ***Business Week*** is a weekly magazine containing analysis, commentary and news of global and local perspective on current business issues and events, economic trend projections, and technology coverage related to all business in addition to financial, career, and small-business news and resources. It was established in 1929 and currently has the circulation of 987,369.
2. ***Newsweek*** is edited to report the week's developments on the news front of the world and the nation through news, commentary and analysis. This weekly magazine divides its news division into national affairs, international, business, lifestyle, society and the arts. Opinion columns deal with views on national and international trend s in politics, the economy, etc. It was established in 1933 and currently has the circulation of 3,125,151.
3. ***Time*** is a weekly newsmagazine provides reporting and analysis of domestic and international affairs, business, science, society and the arts. It regularly offers select editorial focusing on topics such as economy, travel and family life. It was established in 1923 and currently has the total circulation of 4,109,962.
4. ***U.S. News & World Report*** is a weekly national newsmagazine emphasizing investigative journalism and reporting. It offers analysis of national and international affairs, as well as weekly coverage of politics, business, health, science, technology and cultural trends. It also publishes annual rankings of U.S colleges, graduate schools and hospitals. It was established in 1933 and currently has the total circulation of 2,032,286.

Source: *Standard Rate and Data Service, Consumer Magazine Advertising Source,* vol. 85/5, May 2003.

APPENDIX B

Coding Sheet

Serial #_____

---

1. Article Title _____

2. Magazine **1** = B. Week **2** = Newsweek **3** = Time **4** = U.S. News ___ 1

3. Year (YY) ___ ___ 2-3

4. Date (DD/MM) ___ ___ ___ ___ 4-7

5. Page Number of Article ___ ___ ___ 8-10

6. Paragraphs in Article ___ ___11-12

6. Focus
1 = Hong Kong **5** = Singapore ___ 13
2 = Indonesia **6** = South Korea
3 = Malaysia **7** = Taiwan
4 = Philippines **8** = Thailand

7. Topic
1 = Politics/Government **9** = Science/Technology ___ ___14-15
2 = War/Defense **10** = Popular Amusement
3 = Diplomacy/Foreign **11** = Accidents/Disasters
4 = Economy/Business **12** = Nationalism
5 = Crime **13** = Refugees/Emigration
6 = Public Moral Problems **14** = Human Interest/Personalities
7 = Public Health/Welfare
8 = Education/Classic Art

9. Sources:

9.1. Government/Military Officials

9.1.1. U.S. ___ 16

9.1.2. Country of Focus ___ 17

9.1.3. International Person/Organization ___ 18

9.2. Academicians/Experts

9.2.1. U.S. ___ 19

9.2.2. Country of Focus ___ 20

9.2.3. International Person/Organization ___ 21

9.3. Business/Professionals

9.3.1. U.S. ___ 22

9.3.2. Country of Focus ___ 23

9.3.3. International Person/Organization ___ 24

9.4. Participants/Activists

9.4.1. U.S. ___ 25

9.4.2. Country of Focus ___ 26

9.4.3. International Person/Organization ___ 27

9.5. Others _____

9.5.1. U.S. ___ 28

9.5.2. Country of Focus ___ 29

9.5.3. International Person/Organization ___ 30

APPENDIX C

Coding Instructions

General Instructions:

In this study, we are interested in the amount, geographic focus, topics of article, and the linkage of U.S. affairs on these articles about the "Tigers of Asia" countries in U.S. newsmagazines. We will be examining each article from those magazines on sampled items.

You will be working from the copies of articles from the sample. A code sheet will accommodate one article. You will be looking at the *title of the article, title of the magazine, date of publication, page number of article, amount of paragraphs in article, focus* (the MAIN country—other than the U.S.—being covered in an article), *topic, type of article,* and *sources.*

Please go through the article in order to determine the *main focus,* and the amount of all *sources* cited; then specify each identity and origin. If an article has more than one main focus, please mark for further consideration.

SPECIFIC CODING INSTRUCTION

Variable Name	**Instructions/Options**
Article Title	Title of the article.
Magazine	*Time, U.S. News & World Report, Newsweek* or *Business Week*
Year	Use abbreviated numbering: 9 2.

Date	Use an abbreviated numbering for Date and Month, e.g. 0 2 1 2 (December 2).
Page Number of Article	Page number in which the article is located: e.g. 1 0 1 or 0 7 4.
Paragraphs of Article	Amount of paragraph in an article: e.g. 0 1 or 2 4.
Focus	Main country being the focus of an article. Keep in mind that this is a study of the "Asian Tigers", so a story *could not fall under any nation other* than those eight. You may know the focus instantly from the *title* or *subject heading* of that article. If the title does not mention a country, please peruse further. The story reported on Taiwan about Hong Kong's annexation to China does not mean that the focus is Taiwan, but that of Hong Kong. If there are two or more countries portrayed in an article, select the one *dominating to the topic*, or that of elaborated with more paragraphs. For example:

> "When a South Korean businessman expressed interest last April in being photographed with Clinton, the Democratic National Committee was only too happy to sell him a $50,000 ticket to a presidential fund raiser… Mochtar Riady, an Indonesian tycoon who heads Lippo Group… Lippo's connection to Clinton goes back a long way… the Riadys discovered that the back-scratching political culture that prevails in Indonesia meshed perfectly with the cozy world of Arkansas." (*Time*, Oct. 28, 1996)

Thus, the focus of this story is *Indonesia* instead of *South Korea*.

Topic (See Appendix)

Sources Determine both the *identity* (based on occupation/rank) and the *origin* (countries) of each source, and count the

amount of each category of source based on the identity and origin. Put the n*umber of sources quoted* (directly/indirectly) within an article. For example:

10.2. Academicians/Think tanks

U.S.	1	18
Country of Focus	0	19
International Person/Organization	3	20

1. ***Government/Officials***: government personnel, public officers, law-makers, people who worked at the governmental institutions, *including* military personnel. Also *include* members of International organizations (i.e. WHO, NATO).

2. ***Academicians/experts***: scholars (students/professors/teachers who speak on behalf of their educational affiliations, *excluding* participants to a demonstrations); experts affiliated with (educational) institutions; (non-government) members of think tank organizations. *Excluding* business experts, unless they speak on behalf of an (think tank) organization. *Including* professionals who speak

in the capacity of an expert (i.e. journalists specializing in a country/world region, scientists/specialist doctors).

3. ***Business/Professionals***: practitioners (i.e.: CEO, investment broker, a company's manager, small-scale entrepreneurs). Including professionals working in the area of public service, such as lawyers, medical doctors, local clerks.

4. ***Participants/Activists***: participants to an event (i.e. to a conference, test/experiments, war, civil movements); students/people engaged in demonstrations; survivors; activists of any kind of non-governmental organizations (i.e. labor union, tree-huggers); participants to civil rights movements.

5. ***Others***: sources whose origins/occupation could not be identified within the categories above.

Note:

1. **U.S.**: persons/groups identified as American who represent U.S. company or institutions,

unless if stationed outside the U.S. (e.g. John Doe of Merril-Lynch Hong Kong does not belong in "U.S." category)

2. **Country of Focus**: same rule as above. Only if the organization/company represented by the source does not give country attribution, then it is considered as "International" instead of "Country of Focus".
3. **International Person/Organization**: goes for people/institution from countries other than the U.S. and the country of focus. Use for specific group/person mentioned without country attribution (e.g. "Experts said…").

APPENDIX: TOPICS

1. *Politics/Government*: in general—internal and external—all political aspects including government; political solution to a conflict; legal approach toward an issue (i.e. constitutionality issues, bills, court rulings); election and campaign issues; non-violent political crimes (fraud, bribery, corruption, etc.); government/state attempts to regulate mass media, such as censorship; government violation of human rights (including banning speech or right to assembly); coups

or civil disobedience/disloyalty. Contrast from #5 (crime) and #14 (the act of emigrating).

2. *War/Defense*: military spending; weaponry; inter-nation agreement on use of bases; inter-nation conflict; international intelligence-gathering activities; internal conflicts involving weaponry; terrorism. Contrast from #1, 5 and 14.
3. *Diplomacy/Foreign Affairs*: both foreign and domestic items dealing with diplomacy and foreign relations; including United Nation's and other International organizations' policies; travels and statements of policy by government personnel; a nation's attitude toward foreign affairs.
4. *Economic*: both internal and external; changes in economic trading; export-import; devaluation; inflation; currency or monetary structures; economic conflict (e.g. embargoes); labor strikes; economic policies.
5. *Crime*: regular acts of wrongdoing (i.e.: murder, theft, arson, sexual crimes—excludes political persona, robbery, hijacking, etc.); *exclude* political or war crimes (i.e. hijacking an embassy or terrorism), resolution of crimes via court cases; drug-related developments; man-made disasters.
6. *Public Moral Problems*: human relations and moral problems (including alcohol, divorce, sex); race relations; gender issues; civil court proceedings.
7. *Public Health/Welfare*: health (including insurance); concerns on threats to health; public welfare; social and safety measures; welfare of children and marriage. Contrast to #10 (breakthrough in medicine), or #12 (the *real* plague).

8. *Education/Classic Arts*: policies and matters of education; mass media intended for (civil) education; reports on media events/activities; classic arts; religion; philanthropy; history; artifacts and archaeology.
9. *Science/Technology*: (both in hard and soft news) developments; controversy; innovations, including information technology; discoveries; rain forests/endangered species/nature preservations; agricultural breakthroughs, crops; government/state policies on technology or applied science; including breakthrough in medicine. Contrast from #7.
10. *Popular Amusements*: entertainment and amusements; sports; mass media (TV, radio, print media and Internet) coverage related to entertainment and sports.
11. *Accidents/Disasters*: natural disasters, such as flood, volcanoes, massive drought, famine and quakes; epidemic diseases (contrast from #7); plagues; forest fires; environmental disasters that are man-made, such as chemical spills, poison-gas clouds, oil spills, nuclear plant leaks; includes large-scale accidents like plane crashes, train wrecks, boat sinking.
12. *Nationalism*: demonstrations of nationalism; pro-nationalist policies; patriotism; heroes/veterans honored; commemoration, including national holidays.
13. *Refugees/Emigration*: the plight or movement of those fleeing as the result of national/borderline conflicts; defections; refugee camps.
14. *Human Interests/Personalities*: timeless human interests' stories; show-biz personalities; political persons and the families in travels unrelated to

policy/business; private lives of prominent people; tourisms; a city's points of interests.