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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This cross-national research examines if in the times of globalization and ubiquity of technologies the media’s perception of international news is still shaped by cultural differences. Previous research did not produce an unequivocal answer if the media chose a less domestic approach to the coverage of the international events. By contrast, past investigations showed that media’s coverage across countries is more likely to diverge, especially when it comes to politically salient and controversial events. This happens because media tend to lean to official geopolitical position of countries in which they operate while covering political issues. The ubiquity of technologies and information they provide has the potential to alter media’s practices by providing journalists access to a variety of points of view. Constant research will be beneficial to monitor if these changes are taking place. In order to do this, this research explores how the tone of coverage, sourcing and framing patterns vary between the media outlets while addressing a politically controversial issue.

A basis for this analysis is provided by the Ukraine’s uprisings against the governing elite, which moved across Kiev and other Ukrainian cities at the end of 2013. Known as “Euromaidan” (European Square, known also as Independence Square), these events have received wide media attention across the globe and have been largely compared to the Arab Spring revolutions of 2011. A spontaneous massive demonstration that began on November 21, 2013, in downtown Kiev was the largest campaign of civil resistance since the time of Orange Revolution of 2004. Then, thousands of people protested against the fraud on presidential elections that brought victory to Viktor Yanukovych instead of the opposition leader Viktor Yushchenko. This time, the conflict unfolded when the incumbent president Viktor Yanukovych decided to pull back from signing the pact with the European Union and favored instead his long-term ally Russia. That
geopolitical choice upset pro-European Ukrainians who took to the streets the same day the Yanukovich’s government decided to freeze negotiations with the EU. It also came as a disappointment for European officials who blamed Yanukovich for lack of leadership and accused Russia for strong arming Ukraine. In its turn, Russia made the West accountable for escalation of the protests that turned violent very soon.

Although the initial protests urged Yanukovich and his cabinet to pursue partnership with the EU, further consolidation of anti-government movement had other rationale behind it. Kiev International Institute of Sociology (KIIS) researched protesters’ reasoning for joining the anti-government group shortly after its formation on Independent Square. Three surveys, which they carried out between December 2012 and early February 2013, showed that protesters demanded the government stop violence and political repressions as well as urged Yanukovich to resign. According to the earliest poll (several answers were accepted to state as a reason for joining Euromaidan), the majority, about 70 percent, condemned violence that police used against peaceful protesters with the consent of authorities on November 30, 2013. About 53 percent of protesters were against Yanukovich’s decision not to sign the agreements with Europe; 50 percent wanted to change their lives for better, economically and politically; 39 percent called for Yanukovich’s resignation; only five percent sympathized with the opposition and decided to respond to their summon (Maidan-December and Maidan-February: What has changed? 2013).

The Euromaidan movement received wider public awareness after the police brutally dispersed peaceful protesters in downtown Kiev on November 30, 2013. It was the first violent standoff between protesters and police that contributed to radicalization of the protests. Basically, after the first month of Euromaidan standoff, the number of protesters who began to approve radical tactics increased, according to the same KIIS report. Thus, research claimed that
more protesters supported formation of independent armed forces in camps (50 percent against 31 percent in November) as well as seizure of official buildings (19 percent against 41 percent earlier).

The demographics of protesters were rather homogenous and stable throughout the early stage of demonstrations. According to KIIS, this grassroots movement (70 percent of people did not belong to any alliances) was comprised predominantly from middle-aged (30 to 54–year-old men made up 56 percent of all protesters) educated (up to 62 percent of protesters hold a university degree) and skilled professionals or business owners (up to 27 and 17 percent respectively). The majority of them came to protest from regions (up to 88 percent). Particularly, up to 55 percent of activists came from the Western part of Ukraine, which ideologically leaned to Europe, and 21 percent from pro-Russian East and South of Ukraine.

The appraisal of the political crisis in Ukraine varied in different countries. Russian Public Opinion Research Center stated that by December 2013 only 30 percent of Russians knew about the political developments in the neighboring country (as cited in Goryashko, 2013). The majority of them regarded demands for Euro-integration as the main goal of protesters, considering it a wrong political choice. By the beginning of February, a number of violent attacks confirmed the negative attitude of Russians towards the Ukrainian protesters. The polls showed that only five percent of Russians condemned security forces Berkut for slaughtering people and violating their rights and one percent admitted that they sympathized with protesters (as cited in Korchenkova, 2013). Surprisingly, the Berkman Center for Internet & Society studied the reaction of blogosphere to Ukrainian protests and found that Russian blogosphere was dominantly positive to protesters, while those who blogged about activists in the U.S. and Great Britain did not approve their tactics (Etling, 2014).
The geographic focus of this study includes Russia, the United States, and Great Britain. This study aims at extending the existing body of cross-national research by insights into the way quality media from the opposing political camps cover a third-party political controversy.

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Global Coverage. National Interests

Global communication has been facilitated by technology; however, globalization of news media has not lessened a national approach to the coverage of foreign events. In fact, Gurevitch et al. (1991) argue that “the Global Newsroom is still confronted by a Tower of Babel,” implying that journalists report the same news in different ways in accordance with political and social values of their audience. This “domestication” argument - presenting news that is appealing to a local audience’s framework - has been supported by numerous studies (Dimitrova & Strömbäck, 2011; Brewer, 2006; Golan & Wu, 2003; Entamn, 1991; Gurevitch et al; 1991, Gans, 1979, Gerbner & Marvanyi, 1977; Galtung & Ruge, 1965).

Examining foreign coverage by the U.S. media, Gans (1979) has found that the U.S. media interpreted international news with in the context of American values and interests. By bringing the reporting of an international problem to a local audience, domestic media fulfill the “need for orientation” function for this audience (Weaver, 1977; McCombs & Shaw, 1972). However, this phenomenon has wreaked havoc with reporters’ practices, which imply commonality of news values and judgments across all professional news media. Another problem is that media’s domestication practices are often in tune with an official political stance of that country’s government. When the media narrative and national interest intertwine, descriptive and selective
bias increases. This connection has been observed in the studies of the coverage of post-Soviet countries (Katchanovsky, 2012; Zhang & Fakhmi, 2009; Khineyko, 2005).

For example, Khineyko (2005) analyzed the coverage by six Russian print media with different political affiliations of the election fraud in Ukraine in 2004, which led to political demonstrations known as the Orange Revolution. He found that these media outlets varied in their attitude to protesters, but concurred in their critique of the Western involvement in the Ukrainian events. Basically, media’s stance was in tune with the official Russian government position that did not support Western interest and activism in impacting internal politics of the countries that were within the Russian geopolitical orbit. Another study of the coverage of post-communist countries by the U.S. media outlets suggests that the U.S. media are still being guided by historical biases (Katchanovsky, 2012). A variety of analyzed issues showed that the U.S. media covered more positively the U.S. allies rather than other countries. For example, the media stance on Ukraine became more positive only after the Orange Revolution in 2004 when Ukraine adopted pro-Western policies.

Research on the coverage of political developments in the Middle East provides a global basis to the argument that media and national interests converge during political controversies and crises (Alasuutari et al., 2013; Handley & Ismail, 2010; Dimitrova et al., 2005; Reese & Buckalew, 1995; Kaid et al., 1993; Frey, 1963). Dimitrova et al. (2005) and Kaid et al. (1993) tapped into the Gulf Wars coverage by the global media. They found that media outlets of the allied coalition shared a common positive attitude to the military efforts in Iraq. Basically, each country’s media outlets provided the official viewpoint of that country. Handley and Ismail (2010) studied representation of the Gaza conflict by the U.S. and Israeli print media. They found that these media outlets abandoned professional style and adopted the national outlook on
the story by regarding the conflict as “ours.” On the other hand, media coverage was more balanced when reporting on events that did not represent any sort of threat to their national interests and security. According to the study, both the U.S. and Israeli media were impartial observers during the coverage of the internal conflicts between two Palestinian parties - Hamas and Fatah. When the conflict erupted between Palestine and Israel, the Israeli media’s narrative became more biased: it legitimized Israeli violence, criminalized Palestinian violence, and heavily relied on official sources. The U.S. media continued employing a more professional, balanced narrative.

Media outlets tend to represent a national position on foreign events by using official elites as sources (Alsaautari et al., 2013; Clausen, 2004; Reese & Buckalew, 1995; Kaid et al., 1993). Examining the coverage of the 1995 United Nations Conference in Beijing by Japanese and Danish TV outlets, Clausen (2004) found that actors featured in the news stories “largely reflected the regional and national affiliations of Denmark and Japan,” although, a difference was noted between the public and commercial broadcasters. While public outlets provided a pro-government outlook with abundance of elite sources, commercial broadcasters tended to voice a variety of sources by bringing into their coverage views of ordinary citizens and anti-government voices. Zhang and Fahmy (2009) studied sourcing patterns in the coverage of the colored revolutions in post-Soviet countries (Ukraine, Belarus, and Uzbekistan) by the American (the New York Times) and Russian (the Moscow Times) print media. Their research showed that Russian government sources dominated the Moscow Times coverage, while the New York Times’ coverage was shaped by U.S. officials.

Generic and Issue-specific Media Frames

Communications research has shown that media outlets within a particular country built an
agenda for public officials and policymakers (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Framing theory suggests that the media also tell their audiences “how to think about” an issue (Wu & Coleman, 2009; Scheufele, 2000; McCombs et al., 1998). Frames are conceptualized as “central organizing ideas” (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989) or “principles of selection, emphasis, and presentation” (Gitlin, 1980) that reporters enable to guide their audience throughout a news story. A more specific definition by Entman (1993, 1991) suggests that framing is about emphasizing some aspects of reality through verbal and visual narrative patterns that encourage an audience to develop a “particular understanding” of events. DeVreese (2005) dichotomizes media frames into issue-specific and generic frames. Issue-specific frames can be carried out specifically to a particular event or issue, while generic frames can be generalized across different issues and cultural contexts.

Applying these concepts to the international coverage of controversial political events, such as wars or violent confrontation, the media often construct framing suitable for domestic audiences such as the U.S. media’s “war on terror” label – a specific frame used as a lens through which to interpret military interventions in the Middle East, as well as to link these interventions to coverage on terrorist attacks. A countervailing “Wild West” frame emerges from media outlets within countries that do not support U.S. activity as peacemaker and mediator in the military conflicts in the East, with the linkage to terrorist attacks less visible or absent. Two framing concepts “cold war” and “western meddling” evaluate media stories on Western involvement in post-communist countries. They put a negative slant on these countries as well as on the U.S. and Europe’s involvement into the affairs of their post-Soviet opponents.

Matthes (2009) claims that the majority of studies on framing are descriptive, while research on generic framing, which allow a higher level of abstraction, is less common but
essential. Only a limited number of studies address generic frames in cross-national coverage. Among these, conflict, human interest frames (deVreese, 2004; Valkenburg et al., 1999; Galtung and Ruge, 1965) “responsibility” frames (Iyengar, 1990), and economic consequences and morality frames (Neuman et al. 1992) most commonly occur in the news coverage. Dimitrova et al. (2005) extends this list with diagnostic frame, which focuses on the reasons behind an event occurring, and media self-referential frame, which centers on reporters’ self-reflection. Iyengar (1990) also distinguishes between episodic and thematic frames. According to Iyengar, episodic frame depicts pure facts about an event without a broad context. Thematic frame provides the necessary political or socio-economic context to an event and enhances its chances of becoming an important problem on the public agenda.

Conflict Frame

The dominance of conflict and human interest frames is notable in coverage of political issues because their presence increases the value of news stories. Numerous studies on coverage of the politics of dissent have documented that journalists dramatize their narratives and represent situations as fight and controversy (Dimitrova & Strömbäck, 2011; Brasted, 2005; de Vreese, 2004; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; Valkenburg et al., 1999; Price et al., 1997; Reese & Buckalew, 1995). The situation becomes more newsworthy when “reporters notice trouble like stone throwing and other physical or verbal violence against the police” (Gans, 1979); however, when following this logic the media capture only a sporadic set of events without providing a broader context to them. Categorized as a sub-type of episodic frame, as opposed to thematic frame, conflict frame falls short of illustrating the general causes and outcomes of an issue. For example, Brasted (2005) examined the coverage of the student movement during the Chicago Democratic Convention in 1968 by the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune and found that
both media outlets focused on the conflict between the protesters and police without providing the backdrop and possible root causes for their confrontation.

Studies of international news coverage have also noted that a great variety of issues - from military actions and global threats (Dai & Hyun, 2010; Handley & Ismail, 2010; Ruigrok & van Atteveldt, 2007; Dimitrova et al., 2005), to more peaceful political events like the European integration (de Vreese et al., 2001; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000) - have been reported predominantly as a conflict. Examining the U.S., South Korean, and Chinese coverage of the nuclear test by North Korea in 2006, Dai and Hyun (2010) found that the news agencies of all three countries connected “global threat” to a conflict framework. The U.S. and South Korea put North Korea against the rest of the world as a “terrorist state or actor,” “the last Cold war frontier,” engaging in the “war on terror,” and embracing a “Cold war” perspective; China interpreted the event as a personal conflict with a “negative impact” on their friendships with the North Korea. Among other examples is a study of DeVreese et al. (2001), who found that European media frame even general national political and economic news in terms of a controversy. In Semetko and Valkenburg’s (2000) similar research, conflict frame was the second most common type of frames used in European elite news outlets after responsibility frame.

Conflict is intrinsic to professional journalism as a criterion of newsworthiness. Journalistic ethics require journalists to present different points of view in their news reports, even contradictory, to get impartial news coverage. On the other hand, media have been criticized for their misuse of the conflict frame in favor of sensationalism. There is evidence that the de-legitimization of protesters is concentrated in the usage of conflict frame, which is usually accompanied by negative treatment of protesters and “status quo” quotes (Boyle et al. 2012; de
The conflict frame implies the selection and emphasis of news and opinions that “can move the reader to feel some emotion” (Desmond, R.W., as cited in Östgaard, 1965). When applied to international reporting, this approach generally produces more sporadic and inconsistent coverage of moments of crisis. Frey (1963) criticizes this approach as an oversimplified domestic interpretation of international events that “artificially” creates “images of nothing but ceaseless crisis” in the covered countries.

**Research Questions**

RQ 1: How do media vary in their framing and sourcing patterns?

RQ2: How do media vary in their choice of labels and tone of coverage of the Euromaidan events?

RQ3: How do media vary in their choice of topics?

RQ4: What types of sources (official, alternative, or institutional) are prominent within the conflict, responsibility, outcome, and human-interest frames?

**CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY**

**Method and Data**

This cross-national study analyzes framing and sourcing patterns of news stories dealing with issues of civil unrest in Ukraine in 2013-2014. The study analyzes coverage from the *New York Times* (USA), the *Daily Telegraph* (the Great Britain), and the *Kommersant* (Russia). These newspapers are nationally recognized quality news media with an emphasis on international news and considerable print and digital circulation (Moore, 2010; Koikkailainen, 2007; Shoemaker & Reese, 1996). One more reason for considering *Kommersant* for the Russian
sample is because it shares Western reporting practices in terms of the use of first-hand sources (Koikkalainen, 2007). The timeline of research starts with the spontaneous demonstrations that began at Maidan Square, Kiev, on the night of November 21, 2013. The analysis ends on Jan. 29, 2014, when the government status quo was challenged with the resignation of the Ukrainian Prime Minister Mykola Azarov. This time period is chosen because major events occurred (i.e. Yanukovich’s rollback of trade agreements with the EU and several violent standoffs between the riot police and protesters) that escalated political conflict between third-party countries. A news story is the primary unit of analysis. The story on the 2014 Ukrainian crisis is defined as a newspaper story that deals specifically with anti-government protests across Ukraine, their participants, and diplomatic relations between the involved third parties - primarily Russia, the U.S., and European countries - within the examined period of time.

The sample for English-language newspapers is obtained through the Lexis Nexis Academic database. Russian-language sample is pulled from the digital archive of the newspaper Kommersant. Only stories that appeared in the print version of newspapers are included in the sample. A total of 456 stories have been pulled from the databases, using the key word “Ukraine.” Headlines, date of publishing, and text of news stories were screened for relevance. After that, stories irrelevant to this study were excluded. Editorials, op-eds, and columns are included to provide a counterbalance to hard news (Boykoff, 2006) and to also counterbalance the Russian sample. Some studies suggest the presence of an interpretive tradition of Russian media, as reporters put forth their political agenda even while conveying fact-based stories (Koikkalainen, 2007; Wu et al., 1996). Overall 163 stories have been selected for analysis by two coders (Russian speakers with advanced proficiency in English).
Coding Categories and Procedure

Every story was read in full length to identify the media frames and sources and to measure general support or disapproval of major parties of the conflict. Four predefined frames - conflict, human interest, outcome, and responsibility - were applied on the basis of previous research (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000). The goal was to measure visibility of frames. Screening questions adopted in previous research have been used to identify the dominant frame (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000). The conflict frame emphasized disagreement between the opposing actors (e.g. Russian government vs. EU’s officials, protesters vs. riot police). The outcome frame focused on real or potential consequences of events and political decisions. Responsibility frame attributed responsibility for events on governments or individuals. The human interest frame profiled participants of events, creating feelings of outrage or empathy.

The variables “conflicting parties” and “attribution of responsibility” have been coded only for stories that contained conflict or the responsibility frame. During the pretests stage, coders found seven possible choices that emphasized the conflicting parties: incumbent government and Western/pro-Western leaders, incumbent government and political opposition, incumbent government and Russia, Russia and EU/U.S., riot police and protesters, opposition and pro-government protesters, internal conflict within opposition. In terms of accountability for the crisis, the following options have been suggested: Yanukovich, incumbent government, EU’s leaders, Putin, Russian government, opposition. The incumbent government referred to the government of Viktor F. Yanukovich.

The variable topic examined the spectrum of relevant issues for each of the media outlets. This is a common variable to examine domestication practices in the news coverage (see Table 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Title</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official commentary</td>
<td>Stories whose main focus is official international reaction and demonstration of support or disapproval of geopolitical choice of the incumbent government, actions and opinions of allies or opponents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest demonstrations</td>
<td>Stories that describe violent and nonviolent demonstrations, discuss strategies and preparation that opponents undertake in their struggle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Reports on budget crisis in Ukraine and financial support, analysis of outcomes of EU integration or customs union with Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal politics</td>
<td>Reports with the focus on local politics such as political disintegration in the incumbent government and opposition, tension between the Yanukovich’s government and opposition, including negotiations to mitigate the crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human interest</td>
<td>Stories on personal events, political actors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To measure the story’s support/disapproval of opposition, coders looked for phrases that supported protesters, criticized them, or were neutral to them. Coders used labels predefined during the pretest stage to describe the conflicting parties and their actions. Positive labels described the anti-government protest as an act of courage and emphasized protesters as fighters against the repressive and corrupted regime. Another set of positive labels described demonstrators, referring to them as victims who were forced to resort to violence for their own self-defense. Statements that described protesters as peaceful pro-Europeans who wanted break free from Russia and its pressure also emphasized a positive valence of the opposition. Statements that described protesters as hardliners or ridiculed them were referred to negative coverage. The most prominent labels for opposition were: *fighters against corrupted regime; pro-Europeans who want to break free from Russia; victims; hardliners; power grabbers; and other.*

The negative valence of Yanukovich and his government was captured in statements that emphasized his presidency as parasitic and based on an oligarch-dominated economy; highlighted his lack of leadership in the world political arena and criticized his authoritarian and
brutal approach to domestic affairs. Positive labels towards Yanukovich’s government victimized it and presented it as the subject of the EU or Russia’s strong-arm diplomacy, or the subject of the opposition’s pressure. They also emphasized non-destructive decisions, directed at maintaining of status quo, like the protection of traditional cultural and economic ties with the incumbent government’s allies.

The most prominent labels that emphasized authorities and the incumbent government were: *victims; suppressors; protectors of traditional ties (economic and cultural); weak leaders; “gang from Donetsk;” and other.* If a news story victimized one of the parties, then an additional variable was coded to describe who was responsible for victimization. This variable offered the following choices: *1 Russia/Kremlin/Putin; 2 EU/U.S.; 3 both (1&2); 4 political opposition; 5 radical protesters; 6 both (4 &5); 7 official authorities (e.g. riot police); 8 other.*

The sourcing patterns were organized into seven categories: “official government sources,” “elite opposition,” “foreign officials,” “institutional sources,” “ordinary citizens,” “anonymous sources,” and “other sources.” Elite sources included Ukrainian, foreign government, and opposition officials, and their well-known supporters. The institutional sources category applied to speakers that have been featured as experts, political analysts, consultants, or academics. For the purpose of the analysis, all sources were grouped into categories that reflect their affiliation to a country or union of countries (Ukraine, Russia, USA, Europe, other countries) or expose their status (elite, institutional, and alternative sources). Only direct quotations were considered for the analysis. *Spokesperson variable* was included in the analysis to capture actors’ prominence in the coverage of the Ukrainian protests. The *spokesperson variable* was included in the analysis to capture actors’ prominence in the coverage of the Ukrainian protests.

Research question four linked media’s sourcing decisions with their choice of frames. It
examined type of sources (official, alternative, or institutional) that media used more prominently within each of the described generic frames (i.e. conflict, responsibility, outcome, and human-interest frames). Holsti’s reliability coefficients for the key variables were .92 for frames, .85 for media slant, .86 for topic, and .93 for sources.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Framing Patterns

The first research question focuses on the framing patterns across the examined news outlets. This study includes four predefined frames used in previous studies: the conflict, human interest, responsibility, and outcome frames. Chi-square comparisons show that human interest and responsibility frames are significantly different, and the outcome frame approaches the margin of significance.¹ The media do not vary in their use of the conflict frame, which dominates the coverage of all three international media - with the most visible role in Britain (see Table 2).

Table 2: Presence of frames; slant across the U.S., UK, and Russian media (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame/Slant</th>
<th>All international media (N=163)</th>
<th>U.S. (N=68)</th>
<th>UK (N=36)</th>
<th>Russia (N=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human interest*</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility*</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-opposition**</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-opposition**</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral**</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There is insignificant (.6) number of stories with the frames not included in the analysis. Emphasis is indicated only for the stories that prominently discuss opposition, their activities and demands. There are stories without the slant in all international media (.24).

* Chi-square test is significant at p < .05

** For the slant of the media coverage p < .001

¹ $X^2 = 5.77$, df = 2, p = .056
Although the media converged in their use of the conflict frame, they highlighted different aspects of the Ukrainian controversy. The internal conflict between the incumbent government and the political opposition prevailed within the English-language sample (25 percent of the U.S. stories and 39 percent of the UK stories). The standoff between protesters and riot police was the second major angle of the conflict for the Daily Telegraph (19.44 percent) and the New York Times (12.5 percent). The Russian media highlight their national voice by emphasizing confrontation between Russian and Western interests first (22 percent), compared to the UK (13.9 percent) and the U.S. (10.29 percent). A tug of war between the opposition and incumbent president accounted for 18.6 percent of the Russian sample, while 15.3 percent focused on clashes between the demonstrators and police (see Table 3). There were a number of stories that focused on rivalry development inside the opposition camp and clashes between opposition protesters with pro-government supporters.

Table 3: The conflicting parties within the conflict frame across the international media (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflicting parties</th>
<th>All international media (N=163)</th>
<th>U.S. (N=68)</th>
<th>UK (N=36)</th>
<th>Russia (N=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent government and political opposition</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia and EU/U.S.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riot police and protesters</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent government and Western/pro-Western leaders</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent government and Russia</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal conflict within opposition</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition and pro-government protesters</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 23.9 percent of stories did not emphasize the conflicting parties for all international media; 13.9 percent of
stories did not discuss the rival parties in the Daily Telegraph, 22 percent for the Kommersant, and 30.9 percent for the New York Times.

Other common frames included responsibility and outcome emphases. Both of them constituted 43 percent of the whole sample and did not surpass the conflict frame. Within the thematic frames, a striking difference emerged between the usage of the outcome and responsibility frames in the U.S. and Russian samples. The responsibility frame was more important in the U.S. coverage and the Russia media were more concerned with the outcome aspect of the political crisis. A possible explanation of these differences may be linked to the ways journalists perceive their professional and political roles in these two different cultures. It is in the tradition of U.S. journalism to check government activity and to attribute responsibility. In Russia, with its history of government censorship and a weaker tradition of civic society, the media do not prioritize investigation of government claims and are also not as likely to seek those responsible for social problems. Instead, Russian media outlets fulfill their interpretative roles, by defining the possible outcomes of the Ukrainian political crisis and suggesting the ways, which may affect Russian political and economical interests.

Within the responsibility frame, international media tended to hold the incumbent Ukrainian government accountable for the Ukrainian crisis and suggested individual responsibility for the turmoil. In this sample, Yanukovich’s leadership was questioned as his personal responsibility for the Ukrainian crisis were prominently discussed by all three media with the New York Times leading the debate (see Table 4). In case of the Daily Telegraph, the British newspaper did not show other preferences concerning responsibility other than Yanukovich and his cabinet. On the other hand, the New York Times and the Russian Kommersant critically assessed EU’s leaders and Russian government’s roles in the political crisis. In their evaluations of the EU and the Kremlin, the Russian media had more critical stance
on the EU’s leaders responsibility, while the *New York Times*’ coverage suggested Russian government’s accountability and provided a strong sense of the president Putin’s individual liability. Although us-versus-them treatment of major parties’ accountability was prominent, the U.S. and Russian newspapers indicated the degree to which they considered political institutions from the corresponding political camps were responsible for the events. As shown in the table 4, the U.S. and Russian newspapers attributed responsibility for the escalation and resolution of the Ukrainian crisis on EU and Russian’s officials respectively, but their evaluations had a view of strategic errors rather than guilt. For example, the *New York Times* reproached European leaders for wrong messaging and asserting “civilizational choice” between Russia and Europe” ignoring historical and cultural ties with Russia.\(^2\) The story emphasized the strategic error of EU’s negotiators who “turned Union association into loyalty test” instead of deepening relationships with both Russia and Ukraine “who consider themselves European nations.”

Another news story in the *New York Times* reflected on EU’s responsibility to seek for peaceful resolution of the conflict, pressing the incumbent president Yanukovich and the opposition to negotiate in order to mitigate the crisis.\(^3\) Only a small number of Russian stories reflected on the conflict in terms of the Kremlin’s responsibility. Most of them referred to this problem in terms of enormous EU as well as Russian pressure that Mr. Yanukovich had to tolerate. Opposition and activists were another group whose activity was negatively assessed in a small amount of Russian news stories. In this case, Ukrainian activists performance portrayed as destructive and driven by nationalism.

---


Table 4: The parties accountable for the escalation of the Ukrainian crisis according to the U.S., UK, and Russian media (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountable parties</th>
<th>All international media (N=163)</th>
<th>U.S. (N=68)</th>
<th>UK (N=36)</th>
<th>Russia (N=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yanukovich</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent government</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU’s leaders</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian government</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putin</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There were 75.5 percent of stories that did not hold any party accountable for the beginning and escalation of the Ukrainian crisis (64.7 percent for the New York Times, 80.6 for the Daily Telegraph, and 84.7 for the Kommersant).

The human interest frame emerged as a less important frame. Only the U.S. media exposed interest in the human participants in their coverage of the Ukrainian protests.

**Topic**

The most frequently used theme in stories about the Ukrainian unrests was “official commentary.” Stories that prominently discussed the local conflict from the standpoint of the international geopolitics were the major topic of 26 percent of all media stories (see Table 5). Stories that described preparations and strategies that opposition and riot police undertook in their standoffs were the second most common topic (25.9 percent). The account of budget crisis in Ukraine as well as discussion of possible outcomes of economic alliances with the EU or Russia was also frequently featured in all international newspapers (20.1 percent). The development in the internal politics and negotiations between the incumbent government and the political opposition as well as human interest stories were also frequently featured in all media.

Although commonalities were observed throughout the samples, the chi-square suggested the difference in the way stories were told by each media.\(^4\) Statistically significant difference was stressed in the “official commentary” topic and its subthemes. The official international reaction

\(^4\) \(X^2 = 39.17, df = 16, p = .001\)
on Yanukovich’s geopolitical choice and his intensifying battle with the opposition received the
greatest prominence in the Russian newspaper. The Kommersant spent substantial time providing
geopolitical stance on the Ukrainian political crisis. In spite of the domestication theory premise
that local media tend to favor local actors and national themes, the attention to foreign and local
reaction is distributed evenly. The high percentage of the mixed reaction was also a factor of
more balanced reporting as it represented the stories in which reaction of international actors
were so intertwined that it was hard to distinguish a dominant player. The least balanced
representation of international reaction was in the UK newspaper. Most of the time the Daily
Telegraph emphasized reaction of the European and U.S. politicians. The New York Times
showed the least interest in discussion of Russian point of view on the Ukrainian crisis. Another
apparent difference emerged in the approach to “protest demonstration” topic. Stories on anti-
government demonstrations were important to the English sample and were not of major concern
for the Russian newspaper. The Daily Telegraph especially took interest in telling stories from
the standpoint of street battles between the protesters and riot police. The Russian sample was far
more concerned with the economical situation in Ukraine and developments in its internal
political life.

It was reasonable to expect that the Kommersant would assess the crisis through the stories
that discussed political and economical risks of its closest political and economical ally. The New
York Times and the Daily Telegraph did not focus on political turmoil inside the Yanukovich’s
government and political opposition, as well as did not discuss in depth their attempts to mitigate
the crisis. As to other categories, the New York Times substantially stressed its interest in
individuals showing the Ukrainian turmoil from the standpoint of ordinary citizens or political
personalities. The Daily Telegraph did not focus on personal stories as an important theme; the
*Kommersant* had an interest in it but the percentage of the human interest theme was relatively low in the sample.

**Table 5: Issue coverage across the international media (in percentages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>All international media (N=163)</th>
<th>U.S. (N=68)</th>
<th>UK (N=36)</th>
<th>Russia (N=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official commentary</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU/U.S. reaction</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied international reaction</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian reaction</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest demonstrations</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal politics and debates</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human interest</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Story Tone**

Research question 2 asked if the media varied in their choice of labels and tone of coverage of the Euromaidan events. A chi-square test was performed to describe the media’s representation of the opposition and their activities. Chi-square comparisons showed that media outlets diverged considerably in their judgment of the opposition and their methods of political action. The U.S. offered the most positive outlook on the opposition’s attempts to oust Yanukovich and his government, followed by Britain (see Table 2). Both media had a non-critical tilt to the protesters, as opposed to their Russian counterpart, which called into question the acceptability of the protesters and their claims much more often. On the other hand, both the pro-opposition and neutral slant coverage of the Russian media, when grouped together (37.2 percent), surpassed its anti-opposition emphasis, which provided a counterbalance to the negative Russian coverage. After similar calculations, the pro-opposition tone of the British and U.S. coverage still prevailed.

The U.S. and British positive coverage was also emphasized through the labels they used to
describe demonstrators (see Table 6). The U.S. and British newspapers were more likely to refer to protesters as fighters for the European values (30.9 percent and 30.6, respectively) or victims of the riot police (20.6 percent and 13.9, respectively). For the Russian media these labels were less prominent (10.2 percent each). More frequently Russian coverage emphasized the destructiveness of the protesters’ activity and questioned their legitimacy.

Table 6: Presence of labels that emphasized opposition (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>All international media</th>
<th>U.S. (N=59)</th>
<th>UK (N=36)</th>
<th>Russia (N=68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Europeans</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighters against corrupted regime</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardliners</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power grabbers</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Overall 31.3 percent of stories came without a definite label. For the UK sample it was 41.7 percent; for the U.S. sample it was 25 percent; for the Russian sample it was 32.2 percent.

As to the Ukrainian incumbent government and authorities, most of the time they appear in the coverage as suppressors who “order a bloody crackdown” (see Table 7). About 36 percent in the British sample, 30.9 percent in the U.S. sample, and 18.6 in the Russian sample highlighted this angle. Much of the Russian coverage is about emphasizing the difficult position of Yanukovich and his government, who were caught between the competing demands of the EU and Kremlin (32.2 percent). It is interesting to note, that the UK and U.S. also attached this label to the Ukrainian officials (16.7 percent and 11.8) but attributed responsibility for that to the Kremlin and its pressure.
### Table 7: Presence of labels that emphasized the incumbent government (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>All international media (N=163)</th>
<th>U.S. (N=68)</th>
<th>UK (N=35)</th>
<th>Russia (N=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suppressors</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang from Donetsk</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak leaders</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protectors of traditional ties</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Overall 20.2 percent of stories came without a definite label. For the UK sample it was 27.8 percent; for the U.S. sample it was 20.6 percent; for the Russian sample it was 15.3 percent.

### Sourcing Patterns

The last goal of this study concerns summarizing the variance of sources and frequency with which they are cited in the international media. Overall, 1,110 citations are examined. A total of 160 named sources (excluding ordinary protesters) are cited. All three media reveal a similar sourcing pattern. In contrast to the domestication theory, foreign sources dominate the coverage of the Ukrainian crisis. International sources account for the most citations and the representatives of the Ukrainian political elite, experts, and ordinary protesters make up the largest part (Table 8). Although the findings show that media share a common globalized approach to their choice of sources, it is also true that they try to put a domestic spin on the Euromaidan events. After the Ukrainian sources, all media outlets in all three countries cited more frequently their domestic political elite and experts. In fact, all domestic citations reflect the countries’ general political leanings, as the frequency of citations of institutional sources is rather small for all the media outlets.
There was a significant difference in the frequency of citations of Russian sources. The Russian media tended to focus on domestic sources far more frequently, as compared to their European or U.S. counterparts. No significant difference has been found in the use of sources grouped by their status (Table 9). From this perspective, the coverage is characterized by the heavy dominance of elite sources, followed by the civil voice in the case of the U.S. and Britain. The U.S. and British media tended to feature experts in their stories the least. By contrast, the Russian media tended to allocate more attention on experts’ interpretation of events, rather than the view of ordinary protesters.

Similar results were obtained from the analysis of frames and their proponents. The RQ4 explored the type of sources that media tended to feature within each frame. In this sample, news stories that were framed as a conflict had the strongest presence of government officials and elite opposition voices (see Table 10). The frequency of citation of elite sources within the conflict frame accounted for more than a half of the total international sample. Within the international media, the Russian Kommersant tended to put more official emphasis on news
stories (29.2 percent) and paid less attention to the voice of ordinary citizens (2.7) while describing the conflict. The outcome and responsibility frames provided the official outlook as well (6.9 and 3.2 percent for all international media), while voices of ordinary citizens were almost muted. The human interest frame was the only frame, which was characterized by the prominence of citizen voices (3.6 percent). However, only the New York Times approached alternative sources as important within human interest frame. The experts’ judgments came across as important in the outcome (3.2 percent) frame and had weaker representation within the responsibility frame (1 percent). The experts’ opinion was more important in the elaboration of conflict and outcome frames for the Kommersant and New York Times rather than the Daily Telegraph, in which institutional sources were muted almost within all the researched frames.

**Table 10: Frequency of citations within news frames (N = 1110)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Elite</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All international media</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>59.6 (662)</td>
<td>20.7 (230)</td>
<td>9.7 (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>6.9 (77)</td>
<td>3 (33)</td>
<td>1.9 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>3.2 (36)</td>
<td>1.6 (18)</td>
<td>.09 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Interest</td>
<td>2.2 (24)</td>
<td>2.2 (24)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: numbers in parentheses are frequency of citation*
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

This cross-national study explores how media from the U.S., Britain, and Russia varied in their choice of frames, tone of coverage, and use of sources while covering the Ukrainian political unrest. The findings show that the media are consistent in their choice of the conflict frame and reliance on foreign sources as well as the elite point of view. The cultural differences emerge when the media begin to assess protesters and their strategies.

Predominance of the conflict frame in the coverage of all three newspapers suggests that the media follow the common journalistic practice to represent political unrest in the contextual realm of a conflict. These findings also support the assumption that the conflict frame is an intrinsic and legitimate part of qualitative journalism - in spite of criticism that it is more shallow and non-informative as compared to analytical type of frames (e.g. outcome frame). Although the conflict frame has been the point of intersection and commonality for all the media outlets studied, the basis for the conflict varied between the countries. While the U.S. and Britain media focused on the internal confrontation between the Ukrainian actors for the most of the coverage, Russia brought the conflict to a more personal level labeling it as Russian-Western thuggery. A possible explanation may be rooted in the conceptualization of the conflict as “ours” or “theirs” by the media. The Kommersant addresses the conflict with respect to the foreign policy objectives of Russia, referring to the Ukrainian crisis as “ours,” rather than more impartial “theirs.” These findings are in line with the broader domestication concept that suggests that media outlets are affected by the political institutions of their countries, and the media reveal the same values when it comes to the coverage of national interests.

It is interesting to note, that the human interest frame – another episodic frame – was rather rare. Overall, only the U.S. media tried to personify the unrests on Maidan Square,
conveying emotional passages like the father’s last farewell to his son who was shot dead during the demonstrations in Kiev. These findings are in accordance with the previous research that posits that the U.S. media more often put a human face on a story (Dimitrova et al., 2005). By contrast, in the European media, a human focus in news stories is more common for TV outlets and tabloids (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000).

Numerous articles in the English sample emphasized peaceful and polite demeanor and high socio-educational status (e.g. students, small business owners, game developers, priests) of those who came to Maidan as qualities intrinsic to the European mindset. For instance, news stories in the *New York Times* described the first weeks of encampment at Maidan as gathering of families of patriots, who stood for their brighter economic and political future with Europe in the freezing cold:

The teeming crowds on Sunday included parents with children on their shoulders,

students wearing face paint in the blue and yellow of the national flag, and volunteers

handed out steaming cups of tea and other refreshments.5

Another story in the *New York Times* delineated protesters pacifism by their readiness to communicate and share food with their opponents:

Organizers of the antigovernment protest sent activists to the pro-government crowd to hand out friendly fliers. One said, referring to a common name for the main square,

"Maidan is love." They invited the pro-government protesters for tea and dinner, if they wanted. By late Sunday, no large fights had broken out.6

The *Daily Telegraph* wrote:

Some of the troops chatted with protesters who offered them sandwiches and milk and biscuits and formed a cordon around them to prevent attacks by ‘provocateurs.’

The similar scene conveyed by the New York Times:

Another tactic here was to smother the police with something like love, as expressed during the snowstorm. "We hug them, we bring them tea, we wipe off their helmets," said Valentina Zagurskaya, a pensioner, describing the way she interacted with the line of heavily armored young men outside the camp.7

Many stories showed that political ideals of protesters were based on “the dull bureaucracy of Brussels” which was equivalent to the “rule of law” and “government without corruption” for them.8 The underlying message of this stories suggested that protesters were people of new formation and their behavior contrasted to unfriendly mindset associated with the Soviet heritage:

The protesters express their “Europeanness” frequently, with excitement, and often touchingly: They emphasize politeness, friendliness and cleanliness. Why? Because this is “the European way.” Everything else is perceived as backward, inconsiderate and annoying – in short, it's “sovok,” or the dustbin, a euphemism for the disappointing post-Soviet state.9

English language media tended to bring this distinction to the forefront by highlighting the dissatisfaction of protesters with their shared history with Russia. In its story on dismantlement of Lenin’s statue in Kiev – the historical sign of the Kommunist Ukrainian past, the Daily Telegraph represented the event as a sacred ritual cheered by “hundreds of thousands” who

considered Russia their “enemy:”

A priest emerged from the throng with holy water and proceeded to bless the hammer as the mood among the protesters verged on the euphoric.  

Victimization of protesters was a common label for describing activists when demonstrations became violent. Berkut riot police was hold accountable for display of violence in the camps of protesters. For instance, the Daily Telegraph referred to the defense troops’ brutal tactics that aroused anger of opposition:

The crowds, who threatened to stage a permanent sit-in, were galvanized by police action against several hundred protesters at a smaller demonstration on Saturday. Around 30 people were arrested and dozens injured after riot police used stun grenades and batons against them. “They beat people, they spill blood,” said Nina Moskalik, 25. “This is why we have to come out.”

The New York Times pointed to the same reason for the opposition’s anger:

Public anger deepened over brutal tactics used by riot police officers against protesters in Independence Square early Saturday – a display of violence that roused a march and rally by hundreds of thousands of people in Kiev on Sunday, and thousands more in cities around the country.

Although the English language sample condemned street violence referring to it as an utter mayhem, some stories gave free rein to less peaceful tactics of opposition as the incumbent government passed legislation that criminalized peaceful methods. After the Yanukovich’s

---

10 Roland Oliphant, “Ukraine teeters on razor's edge between dictator and democracy,” The Daily Telegraph, December 9, 2013.
11 Roland Oliphant, “Ukrainians try to bulldoze their way into an EU deal,” The Daily Telegraph, December 2, 2013.
cabinet issued the law that outlawed most forms of legitimate protest, the *Daily Telegraph* featured readiness of the opposition leaders Vitaly Klitschko and Arseny Yatsenyuk to support activists in their street battles with the security police:

In a sign that politicians are now being dragged along by events, two of the opposition's most prominent leaders indicated that they may join the protesters. Vitaly Klitschko, the former world champion boxer and leader of the Udar party, told a crowd in Independence Square: “If I have to go [on to the streets] under bullets, I shall go there under bullets. Tomorrow if the president does not respond ... we will go on the offensive.” Arseny Yatsenyuk, of the Fatherland Our Ukraine party, told protesters: “Tomorrow we will go forward together.”

Only a small number of news stories negatively highlighted the display of violence among the demonstrators. As the political opposition turned powerless to stop the swell of bloodshed among the activists, more critical and disenchanted stance on riots appeared in the media. For instance, with the escalation of the conflict, the *Daily Telegraph* referred to protesters as an “angry crowd” and “mob”. The British newspaper emphasized that a “younger” and “angrier element of protesters,” who had “no qualms about violence,” began to take advantage in the ideological clash between West and East. “The government has no one but a mob to negotiate with, although this is a situation they have created themselves,” the *Daily Telegraph* wrote.

The *New York Times* described the episodes of radical opposition’s attack of police officers and put more pressure on opposition leaders for their inability to urge political changes peacefully:

---

By midnight, the streets were a scene of utter mayhem. Those fighting the police struck them with lengths of pipes and sticks, and hurled cobblestones the size of soccer balls into their midst. They sent fireworks whistling and sparking into their ranks, and threw what appeared to be firebombs, blossoming into flames when they struck. The police stumbled backward, patting at their clothes as fire burned their metal shields.¹⁵

Unlike the English media’s sample, which represented Euromaidan uprising as an act of courage, Russian sample represented peaceful Euromaidan protests without featuring protesters’ patriotic devotion. Many stories on opposition highlighted the anti-Russian spirit of demonstrations driven by ultranationalist agenda, rather than readiness for the EU integration. The mention of red-and-black banners, which are associated with a controversial leader of Ukrainian nationalists Stepan Bandera, emerged in the description of Euromaidan events more often in Russian sample and are almost overlooked in the English sample. For example, in the stories on the dismantling of Lenin’s statue in Kiev, the Kommersant highlighted joy of people who regarded that act as symbolic moment that enabled to rewrite the history. The festive atmosphere was emphasized in the English sample as well. However, the Russian newspaper chilled the ubiquitous euphoria by introducing in its stories the dysfunctional element of the ultranationalism. In the following example, a person who climbed first on the Lenin’s pedestal became as important element of the story as the collapsed Lenin’s statue itself:

A ladder, evidently got ready ahead of time, is braced close to the empty pedestal; an exultant man with a red-and-black battle flag of UPA - the Ukrainian Insurgent Army - climbs upon it. Cars, which are passing by the boulevard of Taras Schevchenko, are ceaselessly beeping in support of the crowd. Someone is pulling the EU flag up to the

pedestal, but the unknown man who occupied Lenin’s place does not want to raise it on purpose. After lengthy negotiations, a lady from the crowd climbed to him. “Ukraine is Europe!” She shouts, while swinging the blue EU flag. “As long and tiring they tried to place the flag, as well they understand what EU means,” a fellow from a neighboring town says. There is a heavy traffic jam at the Schevchenko boulevard and the adjacent streets: the families go on pilgrimage to take a picture of the recumbent Lenin. “It is a special day” can be heard in the crowd. The nation triumphs and it seems that it is what they have been longing all the days of their indefinite protest at Maidan.16

Negative portrayal of demonstrators as ultra-nationalists began to appear in media with the radicalization of protests. In this regard, the negative slant intensified as the responsibility for the bloodshed shifted to hardliners. While the New York Times and Daily Telegraph hold radical protesters accountable for the massive deaths along with the riot police, the Russian media tended to emphasize protesters’ malicious behavior and victimize riot police. Hence, more news stories in Russian newspaper put a human emphasis on security police and a “hardliner” label on activists. For example, one news story wrote:

The opposition demonstration went beyond the limits of a peaceful protest after a group of several hundreds radically minded people moved towards the government buildings. They set fire to a police bus and clashed with the special security troops. According to several Ukrainian media outlets, demonstrators seized a Berkut police officer and dragged him at Maidan “to hold a people’s trial of him.”17

Another article provided a compassionate story on a Berkut police officer’s mother, who was looking for her son in a police cordon at Maidan, which contrasted with brutal and uncontrolled behavior of the opposition activists. Also, the labeling of activists as hardliners emerged in the stories that highlighted disintegration of the opposition and lack of control over the situation from the part of its moderate leaders. For example, the *Kommersant* wrote about tactics of the ultra nationalist opposition group known as *Right Sector* or *Pravy Sector*:

On the eve of the opposition assembly at Maidan, the Right Sector gave a speech to the Ukrainian nation, making them understand that its paths diverged from the moderate opposition. The manifesto called to “punish traitors with the all rigor of the revolutionary laws,” considered “hostile” actions of those activists who “wanted to curb the revolutionary energy of the nation and transform national war for independence into “hop” and “doing nothing” or began to negotiate with the inside occupants about so called “peace and order.” There is no chance to compromise with a gang.  

Another example accentuated the loss of control over the radical activists representing them as blatant nonconformists:

Then the Right Sector warriors blocked the entrance of the Culture House of Trade Unions and rejected to let in even the opposition delegates, announcing them in a rude manner:

“Your places are at the barricades, not in the warm cabinets.”

Russian stories were not immune to the “protest paradigm,” communicating to public the deviance of protesters and framing peaceful protests as a carnival. For example, this is how the *Kommersant*’s journalist described a night in the Euromaidan encampment before the Berkut riot

---

19 Ibid.
In the evening, a couple of hours before the crackdown, I took a tour around the impromptu encampment at Maidan Nezalezhnosti and did not notice any signs of the approaching revolution. There were students gathered around campfires, Cossacks dressed up in their national dress, exalted teenagers who resembled football fans, and austere mustached dudes with the red-and-black Bandera banners, which looked absurdly and provocatively against the backdrop of the European flags. Overall, all the action resembled a theatrical performance that tired actors were trying to finish playing.\(^{20}\)

Representation of protesters as victims emerged in the stories along with the critics of Yanukovich, opposition leaders’ reluctance to compromise, and unreasonably harsh Berkut’s enforcement on protesters. However, these stories did not exculpate activists for the violent clashes with police officers. Still some stories conveyed a sympathetic feeling to protesters, especially stories that put a human face on demonstrators and described their fears and concerns. For example, one story described protesters’ concern with a potential violent crackdown on them as a bunch of ambulances – a covert sign of riot police violence - had suddenly appeared close to the Maidan encampments earlier that day. Another story described a lady who appealed to riot officers trying to mitigate their hostility by telling them: “We’re like you! You have parents, haven’t you? We are protecting your rights as well.”\(^{21}\)

The most common description for the incumbent authorities was the label “suppressors” and “the gang from Donetsk.” In the realms of violent standoffs between the opposition and riot


police, the representation of the Yanukovich’s presidency as dictatorship and suppression was quite common. Especially visible this label was in the New York Times and the Daily Telegraph. More stories condemned the excessive brutality against protesters as their tension with police intensified. For example, the New York Times described the brutal crackdown on activists:

“At least three dozen people were beaten,” said Roman Sharan, 21, a veterinary student who was in the crowd and had a deep red welt on his knee from being hit with a truncheon. Mr. Sharan said the violence had been unprovoked, with the police warning protesters to leave, then viciously beating them. He said he was knocked to the ground and kicked in the head before being thrown into a detention vehicle with others.  

Besides commonplace description of law enforcement officers’ brutality, historical parallels helped to convey an image of despotic power of the Yanukovich’s presidency. For example the Daily Telegraph cited Vitaly Klitchko, one of the oppositional leaders, who compared Yanukovich with some unsavory dictators:

"I call on President Yanukovych: find it in yourself not to repeat the fate of [Nicolae] Ceausescu and [Muammar] Gaddafi,” said the boxer turned-politician, referring to the slain Romanian and Libyan dictators.  

The label “the gang from Donetsk” described the incumbent president Yanukovich and his milieu as an isolated economic environment based on “crony capitalism and political favoritism” interested only in accumulating wealth for itself. Personal responsibility for the turmoil was attached to president Yanukovich for his inability to face the challenges posed by the Kremlin and provide the civil resolution for the crisis. The English sample reiterated leadership vacuum

23 Foreign staff, “Violence flares as 200,000 take to streets in Kiev,” The Daily Telegraph, January 20, 2014.  
in Ukraine, emphasizing Yanukovich’s lack of control over the response to opposition and international political leaders rather than abuse of power and flinching. A story in the *New York Times* gave an account of the president’s ignorant political decisions while a wave of violent clashes convulsed the country:

On the day after a protest by hundreds of thousands of people in Kiev, the capital, and by thousands more in other cities, Mr. Yanukovich struck a casual pose, sitting in an armchair for an interview with four television stations. He seemed to brush aside the unrest in the country, saying he would leave as scheduled for a state visit to China on Tuesday and taking the opportunity to note that the government intended to increase financing for road repair next year.25

Some articles in the *Daily Telegraph* as well as *Kommersant* underlined Yanukovich’s political chicanery that infuriated the opposition. The *Daily Telegraph* wrote:

Mr. Yanukovych has realised the gravity of the situation and has been tossing out concessions like confetti. His hasty offers include "amending" the hated security laws, sacking unpopular ministers, giving powerful jobs to his opponents, and granting an amnesty for anyone imprisoned during the unrest. In fact, he is willing to give the demonstrators just about anything - except what they most want, namely his departure and the junking of the anti-protest laws.26

For the *Kommersant* the poor leadership label was to a larger extent complimented with characteristics of a blatant manipulator. Several stories in the Russian sample emphasized that the incumbent president Yanukovich compromised on different issues with the opposition, but

---


26 David Blair, “Behind the frozen barricades, morale is high; No compromise deal between the president and the opposition will stop the demonstrators,” *The Daily Telegraph*, January 27, 2014.
“ignored in an emphatic manner” the core opposition’s requirements such as resignation of the incumbent government or his reelection.  

For the English newspapers, especially for the *Daily Telegraph*, victimization of the incumbent Ukrainian government was one more chance to demonstrate the contention that existed between the Western countries and Russia. The anger of a number of news stories was directed at Russia for trying to convert Ukraine into the “Soviet era colony” by using its “hardball tactics” or “every bit of economic muscle -- including trade threats and its stranglehold on energy supplies.” From this perspective, the incumbent Ukrainian government was granted indulgence for succumbing to trade pressure of its powerful neighbor. One story wrote, “Moscow cajoled, threatened and bribed Ukraine into submission.” Another story stated that the “Ukraine's prime minister, Mykola Azarov, told Ukraine's parliament that the country has been forced to cancel its trade and pre-accession deal with the EU because Russian sanctions are strangling the economy, ‘pushing Ukraine to the brink of a huge social crisis.’”

In the Russian sample, victimization of the authorities had a twofold purpose. One type of stories emphasized harm that authorities endured from hardliners. The Russian *Kommersant* was more likely to put a human face on riot officers or feature the seizure of governmental buildings by protesters as an unlawful violent action rather than their civic right. For example,

---

27 Yusin, M. “Viktor Yanukovich otstupaet ogorodami. Prezident Ukrainy obeshaet oppositii assotsiatsiyu s EC, kak to'l'ko budut ulajeny agrarnye raznoglasia.” [President Yanukovich promises opposition to ally with EU after all agrarian issues have been arranged], *Kommersant*, December 11, 2013.
30 Alex Spillius, “Ukraine’s unfair trade; The rejection of a deal with the EU amid pressure from Russia cuts to the quick of the national dilemma,” *The Daily Telegraph*, December 3, 2013.
31 Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, “Ukraine had no option - drop EU for Russia or be crushed; Blow to European power as Kremlin sanctions trump historic trade deal,” *The Daily Telegraph*, November 23, 2013.
an article in the *Kommersant* emphasized injuries that local officials received during the occupation of administrative buildings, but it did not provide any details on protesters rather than stressing their violence:

The head of a local City Council in Chernovtsy Mikhail Gainicher was injured during the seizure. He was hit in his head presumably with a stone or with a blade of a shovel. A policeman was seriously injured with the metallic pipe during the attack. Police arrested more than a hundred people and initiated proceeding against several dozens of protesters.\(^{32}\)

Another type of stories emphasized the tug of war between Russia and Western countries. Yanukovich was described as caught in the middle between the demands of the Kremlin, EU, and opposition. As a result of this, he had to tolerate substantial pressure. For example, *Kommersant* wrote:

The situation reaches a deadlock for Yanukovich, while the tension between the West and opposition becomes more hostile. His problem even worsens because Viktor Yanukovich lost hope to make any agreements with the West and failed to handle the escalated protests; at the same time he slightly can count on significant preferences from Moscow.\(^{33}\)

Only a few news stories stressed that incumbent government leaned to its Russian ally because of paternal concern about the nation. Their characteristics as protectors of traditional ties stemmed from commonalities of cultural and religious values of Ukraine and Russia as well as

---


\(^{33}\) Strokan, S. “Ukraina ne prodaetsya. EC zakryvaet pered ney dveri na Zapad, a oppozitsiya perekryvaet put na vostok.” [Ukraine is not for sale. EU closes its doors to the West, while opposition blocks the way to the East]. *Kommersant*, December 12, 2013.
fear of “a very liberal moral agenda,”\textsuperscript{34} including nontraditional families, which Europe might impose on society. Embarking on the tradition-preservation logic, the \textit{New York Times} made a point, “Since the majority of Ukrainians traditionally regard Russia as their closest and friendliest neighbor, is it any wonder that they balked at such a choice.”\textsuperscript{35}

The dominance of citation of limited top-ranked international sources is another point of convergence that the media revealed. These findings do not support the expectations of the domestication theory, which postulates that national media outlets are more likely to rely on their domestic sources for interpretation of international events. Instead, the uniformity of the media’s approach to foreign sources assumes that journalists share the same reporting routines. It is likely that the important factor for globalization of journalists’ norms was the accessibility of top-ranked international speakers for the reporters. All of them were accessible directly, through their press relationships, or through their social media profiles. For example, the U.S. and Russian media kept up with the Twitter account of the EU Commission’s official Stefan Fule, publishing his messages on the same day. All media addressed only a limited number of key speakers. The majority of foreign citations for each media came from the Ukrainian sources with the most frequently cited leaders of the mainstream opposition (Arseniy Yatsenyuk, Vitali Klitschko, and Yulia Tymoshenko) and of the incumbent government (Viktor Yanukovich and Mykola Azarov). The European sources were mainly represented by the EU’s Commission’s cabinet (Catherine Ashton, Jose Manuel Barroso, Carl Bildt, and Stefan Fule). Russian politicians included President Putin of Russia and the Minister of the External Affairs Sergey Lavrov. The U.S. most prominent sources influencing the coverage were representatives of the Department of State (Victoria Nuland and Jen Psaki), and Senator McCain.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid.
It is also significant how other country-specific sources were distributed between the media. For example, Russian and the UK media mirrored each other featuring European and Russian politicians and paying less attention to the U.S. sources. Within the U.S. media, the visibility of the foreign sources was less skewed. The citations of Russian speakers were the least visible of all. The domestication theory posits that media will cite more willingly views from national affiliations within their countries rather than views of other actors. Although this is true in the case of the U.S. media who quoted their European allies frequently, this assumption cannot fully explain the choice of sources made by the UK and Russian media. A competitive explanation may be found in the way the media conceptualized the Ukrainian conflict, which emerged as a battle for Ukraine between the European countries and Russia. All media prominently discussed the EU-Russian rivalry. So it is possible to expect that journalists used the reactions of politicians and experts from the opposing camps as a basis for criticism and a chance to make stories more newsworthy by enhancing the conflicting nature of the event. Although the tendency to bring more international sources into the coverage of these stories is visible across all the media, the gap between the frequency of national and foreign citations varies by the outlet, with the lowest one in the Russian sample. This suggests that the Russian media, who intensively turned to their local political and social elite, were by far the most driven to provide the local angle to the news.

Although the normative approach of journalism prescribes media to represent multiple voices, including those of ordinary citizens, all the media dominantly presented the elite point of view. Such favoring of elite sources implies that the media define status as a measure of newsworthiness, especially when national interests are at stake. The analysis of proponents of media frames suggests that media are still the ones who decide who gets the voice and whose
interpretation gets reported in it (Jha, 2007). The dominance of the conflict frame with the prevalence of messages from elite sources may imply that all international media enjoy a similar newsgathering routine. Mainly, they predominantly stress the conflict nature of protests and tend to scrutinize protesters themselves, rather than messages and goals they want to voice (Price et al., 1997). In this regard, attractiveness of elite sources in the news framing is related to their potential to increase drama and conflict of news reports. These findings support the existing research that regards the conflict frame as a shortcoming and result of a biased media’s coverage of protest events (Andrews and Caren, 2010; Brasted, 2005), rather than intrinsic to professional journalism frame that helps reporters to maintain unbiased coverage of events by bringing together diverse voices (Cottle, 2008).

The cross-cultural differences among the news outlets emerged in the tone of the coverage. The media diverged from each other in their pro-oppositional or anti-oppositional slant. The media of the countries supportive of steering Ukraine toward the West were more positive to the opposition, in contrast to those that opposed closer ties between Ukraine and the EU. Indeed, the British and U.S. media revealed a pro-opposition pattern of their coverage, reinforcing the image of protesters as peaceful pro-European demonstrators who fight for European values and against the Kremlin’s control. The representation of protesters as victims of brutality at the hands of security forces became a recurring characteristic of their coverage. By contrast, the Russian media more negatively judged the advocates of political changes in Ukraine, emphasizing the destructiveness of their actions.

These differences in each country’s media outlooks on protesters resonate with the general assumption of the domestication theory—that a country’s media coverage of international political events reflects the political environment in which these media operate. In
general, positive appraisal of the protesters by the U.S. and British newspapers intertwine with the official line of their government that encouraged the protesters to insist on Western integration. On the other hand, the Russian government, which regards Ukraine as a long-term close political and economical ally, resisted the deal between Kiev and the European Union. To a larger extent, the Russian newspaper reflected this outlook.

CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION

In summary, the international media haven’t completely homogenized their initial coverage of the Ukrainian political crisis of 2014. They had common global patterns in the choice of frames and sources, but revealed a domestic approach in the way they assessed the protesters and their role in challenging of the status quo.

Study Limitations

The study has several limitations. Although this research chooses to analyze the flagship media with the agenda-setting potential, additional media outlets and their better diversity will make the sample more representative. Broadcasting outlets will be especially relevant to the analysis. Future research should also take into consideration online reporting, since more news outlets operate as multimedia organizations. Another avenue for improvement is to investigate the web-native media projects’ input into the coverage of anti-government movements and political crisis. It will be beneficial to see if the new media’s portrayals of political conflicts follow the patterns of traditional media or how far they deviate from the commonplace professional norms.

Another suggestion is to extend the period of analysis in order to trace the developments of anti-government confrontation. This study has no potential to map up the historical progress
as it had a distinct short-term period defined by two major events – the spontaneous
demonstration in Kiev and the resignation of the top-rank official. Further studies should
consider a longitudinal coverage, including aftermath of the confrontation, in order to examine
how framing and sourcing patterns change over time.

Third, this cross-national study reviews coverage of international media of three
countries, although the exposure of the political conflict was much wider. The results will be
more able to generalize if they include the study of media in other countries, rather than the
United States, Britain, and Russia, including countries which media were less involved in the
framing of the Ukrainian political crisis. Besides, the conception of media’s role in society and
their reporting traditions considerably vary even within the European journalistic continuum. For
example, differences in conception of media roles between German and British journalists
impacts their framing choices (DeVreese et al., 2001, Köcher, 1986). German journalists
underline their interpretative nature by choosing frames that allow them to sound more
opinionated (e.g. consequence frame). At the same time, their British counterparts are more
concerned to communicate news without general context and stick to episodic frames. In this
regard, investigation of broader spectrum of countries would allow getting a more complete
picture of framing and sourcing strategies while covering political protests. Although the
Ukrainian media were excluded from this research for purpose, further studies may extend their
sample with local news coverage in order to get a more representative sample.

This research explores a single case of political confrontation that does not transcend a
certain space and time limit. A further research should more carefully compare episodes of
political tensions in different countries and time dimensions.

A comprehensible set of four frames has been identified and chosen for this research.
More scrutinize and careful investigation will reveal other possible frames and increase representativeness of results. In sum, future studies may add to our understanding of news coverage patterns of political crisis in the globalized environment by overcoming certain limitations. A more representative study should provide a qualitative and quantitative analysis of a larger sample extended by including into comparison more diverse media outlets, countries, extending time periods and number of cases.

Implications for Future Research

The findings outlined in this study suggest implications for further research that fall into two areas. First, future research should explore the relationships between framing strategies and media’s conception of their role in society and how these relationships are shaped by culture and globalization. Second, it should further investigate the relationships between the media practices and external factors that contribute to a particular media framing and sourcing decisions.

1. Media Culture and Media Strategies

In this study, commonalities were found in the attachment of media to a certain type of frames and sources. Media diverged in news coverage patterns when it suggested a more interpretative perspective and referred to labeling of rivalry political groups, or putting positive or negative emphasis on them. These findings suggest that media perception about their role and culture, in which they operate, are related and impact journalists’ professional decisions and might be of major importance, rather than tradition of quality news reporting. Although the impact of cultural environment, in which media operate, is feasible, it is less clear what triggers journalists to put forth cultural patterns while covering news. For example, a number of cross-national studies revealed the importance of conflict frame for journalistic reporting (Price & Tewksbury, 1997; Shoemaker and Reese, 1986). Cross-national consistency with which this
pattern is applied suggests convergence of media practices at least in Western democracies (DeVreese et al., 2001).

At the same time international media may assign different importance to economic consequences frame even if the topic of their coverage is economy, precisely the launch of euro currency in EU in 1999 (DeVreese, 2001). This research showed that the human interest frame was more prominent only in certain international media, although the study explored the power struggle with human lives drawn into it. Difference in reporters’ decision-making approach is linked to their self-perception, which is archetypal and embedded in their culture. For example, DeVreese (2001) pointed out that news coverage patterns could diverge even within European journalistic traditions. While German journalists approached news as “missionaries,” who interpret news for their audience, British journalists regarded themselves as “bloodhounds,” who transmit facts only. In this regard, further research on role of culture in media’s practices is beneficial.

As journalists’ role conception varies in the international media continuum, further research should explore the extent to which media comply with professional norms and when their cultural roles begin to emerge.

2. Media Framing and External Factors

The next avenue for research is to design a study to explore external factors that impact media’s framing and sourcing decisions, rather than examining media as an autonomous news producer and interpreter. External sources such as political institutions, actors and public influential organizations that can affect public opinion contribute to news production. Up to date more attention has been paid to the ways media shaped narrative of their news sources and fit it into the existing set of frames. The goal of future research is to explore the way public and
political actors transform media framing.

The existing scholarship distinguishes two types of frames: advocacy frames and media frames. Media frames are those produced by news outlets. Advocacy frames are frames proposed by proponents of a political debate. Public and political actors want media to access them for their opinions. They also frame their messages in a way to get their point across in advantageous way. In order to do this, they are looking to promote one strong core frame to make their communication effective (Hannegli and Kriesi, 2012; Aalberg et al., 2011; Gerth, 2011; Shoemaker and Reese, 1996). These core frames may come into the form of strategic or contest frame with the focus on motives and strategies of political actors and approval or disapproval from different interest groups (Aalberg, 2011). Usually this type of frame produces the strongest effect on opponents and is easily picked up by media and promoted by it (Hannegli and Kriesi, 2012). The counterbalance to this frame is a substantial frame that emphasizes issues, problems, solutions, and implications of different political actions (Aalberg, 2011). This type of frame is usually associated with the thematic media frames.

Exploring media’s limited role in framing process, future research should tap into interplay between advocacy and media frames to provide broader understanding of the role that advocacy frames play in the construction of media frames.

3. New Media Framing

The third challenge for future research is to explore how technologies impact news coverage of political crisis and if “new” portrayals of political conflicts correspond to professional framing and sourcing patterns, and what challenges it involves. New technologies provide potential for a broader democratic discourse as more voices are brought to public arena. In other words, conversation in the media unfolds in multiple directions, especially when it
comes to political or civil rights discourse. In this regard, it is reasonable to expect that constraints that dominated mainstream media (e.g. gatekeeping and agenda-setting effects) lessen, as well as news values and newsgathering routines might be going through changes. In fact, digital technologies provide tremendous possibilities to improve newsgathering routines in terms of speed and quality of news research, as well as sources accessibility. At the same time, many changes are still necessary to explore. One of them is whether media’s newsgathering routine changes their selection and description bias in the coverage of political conflicts.

For example, geographical proximity of a traditional news organization to a location of news increases media attention to an event because it ensured reporters closer interactions with authorities. It is also one of the newsgathering factors that challenge reporters’ objectivity while covering political news (Andrews and Caren, 2010; Oliver and Myers, 1999). Studies have concluded that reporters who are closer to a location of a disruptive political event immerse deeper into it and are easier politically influenced. Brasted (2005) studied news coverage of the student movement protests during Chicago Democratic Convention in 1968 by the New York Times and Chicago Tribune. He found that media showed different degree of description bias. The Chicago Tribune was more biased, framing police as “order keepers” or “victims” and protesters as “invaders” who disrupted social order and acted violently toward police. Although the New York Times was not immune to status quo framing and sourcing patterns, the New York Times’s reporters had more “objective distance” (Brasted, 2005) rather than their Chicago colleagues who were affected by the proximity factor.

Applicably to professional media, the geographical proximity factor was one of the factors that produced patterns of coverage that supported status quo and disparaged those who challenged it. Known as “protest paradigm” (McLeod and Hertog 1999; Chan and Lee 1984;
Shoemaker 1984; Gitlin 1980), the set of framing patterns that acted as a negative reinforcement against anti-government groups and their actions rather than engagement (Boyle, 2009).

With the ubiquity of technologies it is easier to establish routine interactions with sources and include in the coverage voices that were muted before. But does it really change the way reporters treat news that involve conflict? Especially this question is relevant in regard to so-called new media that have a powerful civic engagement potential and can facilitate different protest forms of participation overcoming geographical boundaries. The emerging model of new media does not have completely settled boundaries. Usually this very elusive term implies different forms of communication that involves the computer-based or mobile-based Internet. In the broadest interpretation, it includes social network platforms, crowdsourcing resources, podcasts, different types of blogs (vlogs, hyperlocal, microblogs as Twitter, personal blogs or “A-list” blogs with a high readership [Trammel et al., 2005]) and other kind of the Internet accessible resources that contain interactive text, images, graphics, and video. This “audience-driven” form of journalism (Miel and Faris, 2008) dwells on newsgathering practices that suppose production of diverse content not stifled with commitments to professional code. Some characteristics of new media newsgathering practices suppose that media dwell on content contributions of nonprofessionals and practice less control over the content and encourage open communication. The Arab Spring reporting, which amateurs with video-enabled cellphones did, is the most recent and already classical example of citizen journalism. As traditional media were catching up, citizen vlogs and microblogs transcended geographical boundaries and provided pristine account of anti-government protests.

The challenge for future research is to explore to what extent new media practices diminish description biases and marginalization of protesters in different countries. Another goal
is to understand how citizen journalists enact their cultural conceptions about journalism. It will also be beneficial to design a research to explore how citizen journalists from different countries embrace technologies and what news outcomes they have in terms of framing and sourcing patterns.

4. Media Coverage of Globalized Protests

The fourth avenue for future research suggests designing a comprehensive cross-national study that explores how protesters’ tactics affect media coverage. Protest groups are an intrinsic part of a democratic society as they ensure critical feedback to political and public organizations. The quality of news coverage of political protests is a determinant of the openness and vitality of a democratic discourse in society. Some studies were carried to explore a wide range of U.S. protests – from labor to war movements (Boyle et al., 2012; Boyle et al., 2004; McLeod and Hertog 1999). They suggested that protest groups’ tactics affect whether protesters would receive supportive or negative news coverage. They pointed out that protest organizations that represented a greater challenge to status quo received less favorable media coverage. It means that radical goals and extreme tactics will convey a negative perspective on protesters to a broader public audience. For example, war protests, that are more radical in their goals and tactics rather than labor movements, got more critical media coverage with less frequent use of protesters as sources (Boyle et al., 2004). At the same time, this research showed that appraisal or marginalization of tactics, even extreme ones, varies from country to country. A broader sample of international media is required to explore if the tactics approval/disapproval by media vary from country to country and if it correlates to the overall openness of political system in those countries.

Another aspect that challenges traditional approach to media framing of protest movements
is the emergence of globalized movements that get wide public approval. Protests that are moving away from its left-leaning nature to mainstream challenge media’s approach to rely on “protest paradigm” toolbox while covering protest groups (Cottle, 2008). Technologies add even more complexity to it by providing opportunities for them to globalize, making them less aligned to certain political groups or countries. The Occupy Movement and the Anonymous groups are the most recent examples of a new type of loose international movements. Future studies should explore how international media approach this new type of protest movements and how they deal with groups’ globalized presence.
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