

2011

# NEWS FRAMING OF GOOGLE'S WITHDRAWAL FROM CHINA: A COMPARISON BETWEEN AMERICAN AND CHINESE NEWSPAPER

yezi hu  
yezi\_hu@hotmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: [http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs\\_rp](http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs_rp)

---

## Recommended Citation

hu, yezi, "NEWS FRAMING OF GOOGLE'S WITHDRAWAL FROM CHINA: A COMPARISON BETWEEN AMERICAN AND CHINESE NEWSPAPER" (2011). *Research Papers*. Paper 19.  
[http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs\\_rp/19](http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs_rp/19)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Papers by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact [opensiuc@lib.siu.edu](mailto:opensiuc@lib.siu.edu).

NEWS FRAMING OF GOOGLE'S WITHDRAWAL FROM CHINA: A  
COMPARISON BETWEEN AMERICAN AND CHINESE NEWSPAPER

by

Yezi Hu

B.A., Nanjing University, 2008

A Research Paper  
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Master of Science

Mass Communication and Media Arts  
in the Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
December 2010

Research Paper APPROVAL

NEWS FRAMING OF GOOGLE'S WITHDRAWAL FROM CHINA: A  
COMPARISON BETWEEN AMERICAN AND CHINESE NEWSPAPER

By

Yezi Hu

A Research Paper Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Science

in the field of media management and professional media

Approved by:

Wenjing Xie, Chair

Graduate School

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

November 5, 2010

AN ABSTRACT OF THE RESEARCH PAPER OF

Yezi Hu, for the Master of Science degree in Media Management and Professional Media, presented on November 5, 2010, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: NEWS FRAMING OF GOOGLE'S WITHDRAWAL FROM CHINA: A COMPARISON BETWEEN AMERICAN AND CHINESE NEWSPAPER

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Wenjing Xie

To compare how different Chinese newspapers and American newspapers frame the issue of Google's withdrawal from China, I choose China Daily and the New York Times as representatives, adopting an inductive framing analysis method in this research. I systematically choose twenty percent of articles covering the issue from their official website and analyze metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions in the articles. Moreover, I discuss how ideology, ownership, economic structures, and shareholders influence the framing process as crucial factors.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ABSTRACT .....	i
CHAPTERS	
CHAPTER 1 – Introduction .....	1
CHAPTER 2 – Literature Review .....	3
CHAPTER 3 – Method .....	12
CHAPTER 4 – Results .....	15
CHAPTER 5 – Discussion .....	24
CHAPTER 6 – Conclusion .....	28
REFERENCES .....	29
APPENDICIES	
Appendix A .....	33
Appendix B .....	35
Appendix C .....	37
Appendix D .....	39
VITA .....	40

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Born on January 26, 2006 and died on March 23, 2010, Google.cn had only survived for four years. Since a statement announced on Google's official blog that Google might pull out of China due to censorship on January 13, 2010, the decision of Google has got a great deal of attention all over the world. Meanwhile, different value judgments have been given to it. Some supporters of Google laud Google's brave fight for human rights and Internet freedom, while some others criticize Google for just making an excuse for its business failure in China. On the one hand, on January 21, 2010, Hillary Clinton gave speeches and said that companies such as Google should refuse to support "politically motivated censorship" ("Hillary Clinton Calls", 2010). On the other hand, Chinese government denied the accusation of hacking peoples' Gmail accounts, and it censured Google as the tool of American government. In the later three months, the issue also became a hot topic in the world. Newspapers in all over the world have been covering this issue for at least three months. India media concluded the issue as "Google drags US into fight" (Google drags US, 2010, March 24). Obviously, the debate between different institutions over Google's incident provides a struggle between politics and economics. Moreover, it is a play between Google, a transnational company, and China, a developing country, and it is a competition between the most powerful governments in the world. It is also a tension between liberal market and state control. It even can be considered as a challenge to current American-driven order of global communication.

Communication scholarships suggest that there are two effective ways for media to influence public opinions, setting public agenda and framing (Biswas, 2007). If agenda

setting can just decide what we think about (Cohen, 1963), as the “extension of agenda setting” (Scheufele 1999), framing may influence what we think.

How different do American newspapers and Chinese newspapers frame the incident of Google pulling out of China? In this paper, we choose two different newspapers, *the New York Times* and *China Daily*, to analyze their different framing works.

Moreover, what elements have influenced this framing process? From a political economy perspective, do ownership and social economic structures impact on the framing process? We will use this case to examine the relationship between ownership, economic structure and framing.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### Framing Theory of Media

Framing as a social theory was first proposed by Goffman in 1974. It refers to a process of building a cognitive structure to make sense of the world. In the last forty years, it has been broadly used in sociology, psychology and media studies (Goffman, 1974).

Tuchman (1978) points out “mass media actively set the frames of reference that readers or viewers use to interpret and discuss public events” (P. ix). Within the realm of communication, framing research mostly emphasizes on two issues. The first issue is the process of framing news. Another issue is the effects of framing, such as how framing media influence audience (Neuman, 1992). To study the different content between two newspapers, we will concentrate on the first aspect that is how these frames were produced.

Although journalists try to increase credibility and objectivity of their coverage, they cannot escape from being criticized over unfairness. The concept of “Objectivity” itself is suspected as a “negative ideology” (Kerr & Moy, 2002) that favors the status quo and undermines the personal integrity of journalists who are required to set aside their consciences” (Glasser, 1992, p.176-185). According to Tuchman (1978), framing is closely connected to personal subjectivity, which is inevitable for journalists in organizing events and making news.

Framing starts to take place when journalists select facts of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a media text, such as the ways to promote a particular

problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, or treatment recommendation for the covered issue (Entman, 1993). Those framed texts are also produced by using picked keywords, stock phrases, stereotyped images, sources of information, and sentences that provide thematically reinforcing clusters of facts or judgments. However, some people argue that journalists may unwittingly construct frames when they choose resources (Kerr & Moy, 2002). On one hand, journalists often “rely on quotes, insight, and analysis” from “individuals eager to promote a certain perspective to a broader public audience” (Nelson, Clawson & Oxley, 1997). On the other hand, they may “have an agenda they wish to propagate, and while such an agenda may be acceptable and even lauded when it is for things such as world peace or to combat hunger, and it can be deceptive when subtly applied to news as a frame” (Kerr & Moy, 2002).

As a research method, frames can be researched as both independent variables and dependent variables. When frames are considered as dependent variables, people study some factors which influence the process of creating frames. For instance, media framing might be influenced by some variables, such as several social structure, organization or ideology, while individual frames are frequently studied as the dependent variables when they are examined as a outcome of media frames (Scheufele, 1999). According to Scheufele (1999), frames are used as independent variables mostly when people study the effects of framing, and the impact on individual frames from media frames.

To examine the process of framing, frames are analyzed as dependent variables in this research. By studying articles from *China Daily* and *the New York Times*, we summarize the frames of Google's exit, compare the difference and try to find reasons.

#### Factors influencing Framing

Not only journalists' subjectivity is often criticized as an inevitable obstacle for news objectivity, but also some political, social and economic pressures (Croteau & Hoynes, 2002) are frequently questioned to impact news' selection and description, such as ownership, organization, market and political power.

According to the Marxist interpretation of the political economy of communications, owners of material production can influence the means of mental production (Williams, 2003). According to Williams, owners and managers can determine which person, facts, version of facts, and ideas can be heard by public (Williams, 2003). Williams thinks framing is an extension of Gramsci's hegemony theory which means that the ruling class use education and media to determine common sense for people to control the society. As a result, media become an effective carrier of ideology for domestic news coverage and a powerful weapon for ideological war for international news coverage. For instance, through analyzing the coverage of the student movement in China in 1989 from *the New York Times*, Wang (1991) showed that the ideology of anti-communism was a guiding principle for western newspapers, for protecting capitalism against the penetration from communism or socialism. In addition, Chomsky's (2006) research concerning about "measuring ownership control at *the New York Times*" examines memos between the owner and publisher of *the New York Times* and an editor. From the frequency and consistency of the memos, it is proved that

ownership intervention was a “routine and accepted practice” (Chomsky, 2006). The publisher gives a great amount of comments on existing coverage and suggestions for future stories. Meanwhile, by conjecturing the publisher’s thoughts, editors and reporters learn to please their employer for “promotions and higher incomes”. (Chomsky, 2006). In some cases, editors and reporters cover some stories which they don’t think newsworthy, but suggested by the owner. Furthermore, the owner may make “more politically and ideologically explicit interventions for the editorial page” (Chomsky, 2006) than news page. The researcher also finds that even the owner’s wife’s and mother’s interests may influence the newspaper content. Sometimes, the owner’s words or definitions to news stories are directly adopted, but editors usually remove the owner’s name to hide his influence.

With a little difference about the impact of ownership, the structural dimension of the media ownership theory, however, argues that because economic structures can shape the activities of owners, managers and workers, there is no need for owners to intervene in the determining process. However, “Marxist classical thinking witnessed a shift in the post-war period and it incorporated Althusser’s interpretation of ideology and culture into its focus on the economic basis of society. The Neo-Marxist viewpoint stresses ‘relative autonomy’ in ideological practices” (Biswas, 2007). Althusser believes that in performing their ideological task, all media have to work as independently and objectively as possible to gain the trust and credibility from audience.

After all, with growth of conglomeration and integration, the discussion of factors that may influence framing process are much broader than ownership issue, since ownership and the whole media market are getting increasingly complicated. Through

“free market” analysis, Herman and Chomasky (1988) came up with a propaganda model which consists of five filters impacting on mass media content. They are ownership of the medium, medium’s funding sources, sourcing, flak, and anti-communist ideology. Correspondingly, shares in stock market, income from advertising, information sources, discipline of media, and ideology need to be considered in the framing process. In terms of the stock market, Herman and Chomasky believe that those big shareholders may not directly control media content, but they can make themselves heard as large investors. The actions of these investors are closely related to the welfare and income of the media companies. If the investors are not satisfied, they may sell the stock shares. The reason the great media keep close relationship with government, according to Herman and Chomasky (1988), is for more general policy support.

Herman and Chomasky also found the difference of propaganda model between free market media and government controlled media. “In countries where the levers of power are in the hands of a state bureaucracy, the monopolistic control over the media, often supplemented by official censorship, makes it clear that the media serve the ends of a dominant elite”; but “it is much more difficult to see a propaganda system at work where the media are private and formal censorship is absent” (Chomasky& Herman, 1988, p.1).

In terms of ideology, it is well known that the fifth filter, “anti-communist ideology”, was the conclusion by studying the cold-war era. Some scholars argued that marketing lifestyles (Schiller, 1992) and consumerism (Ewen, 1976) are becoming the most prominent ideologies of mass media. From Schiller’s argument, it is ironical that

right cultural differences in media content stimulate audiences to make different cultures homogeneous and integrated.

In summary, ownership, political ideology and economic structure are generally considered as crucial roles in making news. This paper will try to compare frames of the same issue from contrary ideological societies and different economic systems to examine the impacts from those factors.

Related work: Newspaper Coverage of the issue of the Internet in China

McMillan and Hwang (2002) used content analysis to compare Chinese and U.S. newspaper coverage of the Internet in China from 1998 to 2001. The authors categorize all coverage to three topics: business and economic concerns, culture and social issues, and law and policy directions. Compared with the dominance that Chinese coverage focused on business news and was mostly positive, U.S. coverage had a strong business news orientation, too. “About one third of U.S. articles have that singular focus”. U.S. also frames the Internet as “an information superhighway leading to the land of glorious riches”, but meanwhile, U.S. worries about “impediments to investment and an under-developed consumer culture”. However, U.S. articles often “explore interrelationships among business and law. U.S. articles often are also likely to address culture and society topics as part of a larger story that also likely to address business and law topics. Human rights are a central social issue that underlies many of these articles”

The authors did not give any value judgments to various framings of the Chinese Internet between two countries. However, they thought that time will prove which framing is more fair. This research was eight years ago. In last eight years, the Internet

prevalence in China has increased a lot. It would be interesting to see if frames of the same issue have ever changed.

### The Google in China

Google launched its Chinese service on September 12, 2000, including traditional Chinese search service and simplified Chinese search service. By the end of 2002, Google amassed about 25 percent of search traffic in China, eluding Yahoo, which was the first International Internet company entering China's market. However, since September 3, 2002, Google had been blocked by China's Great Firewall due to the censorship, but because the company had no office inside the country before 2002, the Chinese government had no legal authority over it. The government had no ability to demand that Google voluntarily withhold its search results from Chinese users. According to a news article from *the New York Times* (Thompson, 2006), Google never did figure out exactly why it was knocked offline in 2002 by the Chinese government. The blocking ended abruptly after two weeks, as mysteriously as it had begun. But even after being unblocked, Google still had troubles. The Great Firewall tended to slow down all traffic coming into the country from the world outside.

After 2002, seeing the huge potential opportunity in China, Lee Kaifu, a Taiwanese who worked in Google, started to persuade Google to open an office in China. As a result, Google's Chinese department set two new offices in Beijing in 2005, and at the same year, Lee Kaifu was authorized as the CEO of Google's branch in China. In addition, Google announced that it would set a research center in China simultaneously. On January 26, 2006, Google officially started to use the website address [www.google.cn](http://www.google.cn) for the mainland China. On April 12, 2006, the CEO of Google

Eric Smith revealed the Chinese version of Google.cn: 谷歌, which meant that Google officially entered Chinese market. In 2006, Google developed very quickly in China, and its working offices area in Beijing was over 140,000 square meters.

Since 2007 March, when Chinese mainland users' typed Google.com, the address would be automatically transferred to Google.cn. On May 20, 2007, Google China launched its Pinyin typing software, but it was accused of plagiarizing from Sogou pinyin typing software that belongs to Sohu company. At last, Google apologized for its behavior to Sohu Company and its users. On August 20, 2007, Google China cooperated with Tianya which was a popular website of BBS (Bulletin Board System) in China to publish two services: "Tianya laiba" and "Tianya wenda". That was the first time for Google China to provide technological service for its cooperator. To adapt to Chinese culture and Chinese users' using hobby, on August 5, 2008, Google China started a MP3 downloading service for free, and they claimed that all the music products in the website were legal copies.

On June 18, 2009, Chinese media, such as CCTV, denounced Google of denouncing pornographic information. On the September 4, Lee Kaifu resigned from the CEO of Google China. On January 13, 2010, Google published an article on its official website, that it would pull out of China over censorship and close its office in China. On March 23, 2010, Google.cn was closed, and when people type the address, it would be automatically transferred to google.hk.

On January 21, 2010, Hillary Clinton gave a speech over the issue and said that companies such as Google should refuse to support "politically motivated censorship." ("Hillary Clinton Calls", 2010)

Research questions

How different when *the New York Times* and *China Daily* frame Google's withdrawal from China?

Which factors may lead to the differences if the frames are varied between the two newspapers?

## CHAPTER 3

### METHOD

#### Framing Analysis

There are two approaches of framing analysis: deductive and inductive approaches of framing. The inductive approach is frequently used in qualitative researches. It refers to “approaches that primarily use detailed readings of raw data to derive concepts, themes, or a model through interpretations made from the raw data by an evaluator or researcher” (Thomas, 2006). On the contrary, the deductive approach is trying to examine if strong definitions, system or frames could work in other new stories (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000). In this paper, we adopt the inductive approach of framing, which was based on “analytic sheets” created by Gamson and Modigliani (1989).

The “analytic sheets” includes analysis of metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions and visual images of articles. Since the electronic database does not supply the visual images as keywords, our research will focus on the first four elements.

#### Subjects of Analysis

We choose *the New York Times* as the representative of American newspaper and the *China Daily* as representative Chinese newspaper, both of which are English-language and influential newspapers with big circulations in their countries. Moreover, both of the ownerships are typical under their media systems.

*China Daily* is the only official English-language newspaper in China. Same with all newspapers in China, it is owned by Chinese government. It was founded in

1981, as a national English-language newspaper in China, it is “one of the most authoritative newspapers in the country”

(<http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cd/introduction.html>, September 20, 2010). During last three decades, it has a huge daily circulation of more than 300,000 in 150 countries and regions. Moreover, among all Chinese newspapers, *China Daily* is not only the most circulated newspaper in oversea market, but also the most frequently quoted newspaper by foreign media.

With more than 2 million circulations, *The New York Times* is one of the typical private and most influencing newspapers in the U.S., and it has been owned by The Ochs-Sulzberger family since 1896. According to its official website, the newspaper is now under *the New York Times* Company, which also owns The Boston Globe, the International Herald Tribune, and dozens of newspapers and websites. Though the publisher of the newspaper went public since 1960s, Ochs-Sulzberger family is still the biggest shareholders during the last forty years. By 2009, Harbinger Capital Partners and T. Rowe Price are the second and third major shareholders in the stock market (Siklos, 2009). *The New York Times* is considered as “the weatherman of American journalism” (Manoff 1985), and it tells both readers and professional journalists the direction of the political breezes (Hughes 1995). In addition, *the New York Times* does much more coverage of international affairs than other metropolitan newspapers in the U.S. (Xie, 2007).

To collect articles from *the New York Times*, we searched the word “Google” combined with “China” from *the New York Times* official website, with the time phase from January 13, 2010 when Google announced that they would leave Chinese market to

April 23, 2010, one month after Google moved its Chinese branch to Hong Kong. To collect articles from the *China Daily*, we searched its website with the same search terms and time phase. About the issue of Google pulling out of China, there are a total of 163 articles in *the New York Times*, and 120 articles in the *China Daily*.

We choose 20 percent for each newspaper, following the systematic sampling method (Riffe & Lacy & Flco, 2008). For both newspapers, we select every 5th unit from the search result, and the starting points are randomly determined. If any article we select is not very relative to the issue, we will take the next article to replace it. As a sampling result, 33 articles from *the New York Times* and 24 articles from the *China Daily* will be analyzed.

## CHAPTER 4

## RESULTS

## Difference in Framings of Main Reason Why Google Pulled out of China

*The New York Times* Frame

According to the New York Times, the main reason that Google pulling out of China is Chinese censorship and computer attacks, which concern Chinese peoples' right of free speech.

Each of the 32 articles talked about the issues of censorship and cyberattack in China when they introduced Google's withdrawal, and took these reasons as a part of the objective news story. For example, the article "Far-Ranging Support for Google's China Move" on January 14, 2010 starts with "Google's surprising decision this week to abandon cooperation with Chinese government censors". Besides, the words like "hacker," "firewall," "monitor," are key words which are mentioned repeatedly in these articles. In the report "China Puts Lid on Google Defiance" published on the next day of Google's announcement, Google is portrayed as "one of the largest and most admired technology companies" and China is described as a country that "has the most sweeping Web filtering system in the world".

To remind readers that cyberattack is a big concern in China, *the New York Times* did several coverages later to introduce the overall hacking industry in China. As portrayed in the articles "Hackers Said To Breach Gmail Accounts in China" (January 18, 2010), "Fearing Hackers Who Leave No Trace"(January 19, 2010), and "Hacking for Fun and Profit in China's Underworld" (February 1, 2010), hackers steal information and sell them for profit, and there are even "hacker conferences, hacker training

academies and magazines”. In the article “Journalists’ E-mails Hacked in China” (March 30, 2010), it says “nearly 30 percent of attacks originated from computers in China”.

Those articles also imply that there is a close connection between hacking and Chinese military or government, so that hacking is much broader than just individuals’ activities.

After two Chinese were accused of attacking Gmail accounts, *the New York Times* insinuates the background of Peoples’ Liberation Army behind the schools and analyzes “Jiaotong and Lanxiang are certain to come under close scrutiny”. In an article introducing Shanghai Jiaotong University as top university in China (February 21,2010), it also emphasizes some clues, such as “The school’s dean and chief professor have both worked on technology matters for the People’s Liberation Army”, “The school, which has received financing from a high-level government science and technology project”.

To prove that information is heavily censored in China, *the New York Times* wrote about Chinese media reaction of the news right after Google announced to quit from China. On January 13 and 14, *the New York Times* continuously published two articles to describe the silent situation in China, “China Puts Lid on Google Defiance” and “Google’s Threat Echoed Everywhere, Except China.” The articles say that only Xinhua News Agency and a few biggest Internet news portals responded to the news later in the day, but missing some key words like “free speech” or “surveillance”. To portray the lack of free speech right in China, *the New York Times* repeatedly points out interviewees’ fear of revenge, using words like “withheld her full name for fear it might cause her problems at school” in articles.

However, only three articles mentioned other reasons which might cause Google’s withdrawal. In one article on January 14, 2010, it says Chinese news “detail

portrayed Google's move as a cynical attempt either to embarrass Beijing or to escape its business failings in China". Yet, in the next paragraph, the articles turns to cover that more and more people found that their email accounts were attacked.

#### *China Daily* Frame

According to the *China Daily*, the main reason for Google's withdrawing is its economic failure in China, and Google intends to politicize the issue.

There are only ten articles from *China Daily* directly talking about the reason why Google withdrew from China. Among these ten articles, five of them deny the accusation of China hacking Gmail accounts, the newspaper even claims China is the biggest victim of cyber attacks (January 25, 2010).

Other five articles criticize Google of politicizing its business failure in China. Google's withdrawal is described as "charade" (March 25, 2010) a "pressure tactic" (January 14, 2010), and "hypocrisy" (January 18, 2010).

In terms of censorship, the newspaper says that "Internet security is an indispensable part of national security and China, just like any other country, has the right to regulate its Net laws" (January 29, 2010).

*China Daily* also gives readers some statistics to interpret Google's business failure. "The truth" that *China Daily* stresses repeatedly is "Google.cn made \$300 million last year, and this sum is trivial compared to the \$5.5 billion in overall revenue." In addition, "its share of the Chinese search engine market recently fell to between 14 and 17 percent, leaving it to trail Baidu, the homegrown and main search engine, further behind. Baidu, incidentally, holds two-thirds of the market" (January 21, 2010).

Difference in Framings of Economic Impact of Google Pulling out of China

*The New York Times* Frame

According to *the New York Times*, Google's economic failure is due to Chinese policy, and it is not optimistic for Chinese Internet companies to develop after Google has left China.

In the initial coverage, Google's withdrawal was portrayed as a big sacrifice of profit for fighting against Chinese censorship, since China is obviously a huge market for all industries. In the article "China Puts Lid on Google Defiance" (January 14, 2010), one interviewee from China thinks it would be "a big loss to Google", and analysts predict that the withdrawal will "reduce Google's long-term growth".

However, more articles talking about Google's business failure in China concretely analyze the uneven competition between foreign companies and China's domestic companies in Chinese market. Even in the same article "China Puts Lid on Google Defiance", the author mentioned Baidu and other Chinese domestic companies have "closer relationship with Chinese government". Those articles used other websites' failures in China, such as Yahoo, EBay, to show that Google's case is a representative one in China. Those articles think the primary reason why Google's business is not successful in China is because of Chinese "government protectionism" (March 24, 2010), "government censorship and favoritism of local firms" (January 15, 2010). There are also some articles pointing out that even though Baidu has more market share in China, Google wins the elite class, because its users are "more educated, wealthier and better informed than others" (January 14, 2010).

The later articles don't agree that Chinese Internet companies will develop better than American Internet companies, neither. They think that Baidu wins more users

because it provides a service for users to download music, videos and other files for free (January 15, 2010). Once Google leave China, Chinese Internet companies will be less competitive because they do not understand their foreign competitors (March 24, 2010). The statement is clearly given from the title “China's Booming Internet Giants May Be Stuck There” (March 24, 2010). In the article titled as “Google’s Profit and Revenue Rise, but Analysts Wanted More” published on April 15, 2010, make a point that even though that Google is fighting a war against Chinese government weighed down its stock, its net income still increased a lot.

*China Daily* Frame

According to the *China Daily*, Chinese market is a healthy and open market, withdraw from China is a big mistake for Google, and Chinese companies will gain a lot after Google withdraws.

Six articles talk about a prediction of Chinese Internet companies after Google pulled out of China. They all agree that Chinese companies will have good opportunities without Google as a competitor. One article collects statistics from stocking market to prove “Baidu Inc. could be the biggest beneficiary of a possible pullout from China by Internet major Google” (January 15, 2010). Besides Baidu, the newspaper also talks about opportunities for smaller search engines like Sougou and Sousou, and some Chinese e-commerce companies such as Alibaba, DHGate. The author believes in a long term, all these domestic companies will be beneficiaries of Google’s withdrawal (February 5, 2010). On contrast, Google is called “the biggest loser” (March 22, 2010).

Around the issue, there are two articles stressing the openness and stability of Chinese market. One article directly quotes from the statement announced by Ma

Xiuhong, vice-minister of commerce, "China remains the most attractive destination for foreign investment. We treat foreign companies that set up and register as Chinese companies, and products made in China as Chinese products. We give them national treatment" (April 15, 2010). The newspaper journalist also interviews a scholar, and stresses the strength of the market with a quotation, "China is the best FDI destination in the world due to its low labor costs and the huge domestic market" (April 8, 2010).

In conclusion, there is not any negative coverage about Chinese economy and economic policy in the *China Daily*.

#### Difference in Framings of Political Impact of Google Pulling out of China

##### *The New York Times* Frame

According to *the New York Times*, the Google incident has great significance in the relationship between two countries, and the active involvement of American government is generally seen as positive.

Although most articles mention this topic, among 32 articles, there are even four articles specifically discussing the relationship between two countries. The articles think the Google incident will "increase friction between Beijing and the Obama administration" (January 15, 2010). In the later coverage, when *the New York Times* covers the announcement from Chinese spokesman, it highlights China's opinion of governmental relationship, "the Google dispute is not a threat to relations with Washington" (March 13, 2010). The author also thinks that is "one of the reasons China is adamantly refusing to let the Renminbi rise further," which will cost "global imbalances."

When the newspaper covers American government involvement in the issue, the tone is generally positive. After Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton gave a speech about the issue on January 21, 2010, the newspaper reports that “Human rights groups applauded the speech”. It also use “A good fight” (January 23, 2010) as a catchphrase in an editorial two days later to make its statement. In the comment, the newspaper thought it was a “tough speech” and hoped it could change Chinese politics. In the same article, the writer also depicted Chinese government reaction, “On Friday, the day after the speech, a spokesman for China's Foreign Ministry called on the United States "to stop using the so-called Internet freedom question to level baseless accusations." The spokesman also insisted that "the Chinese Internet is open." However, he used sarcasm as the comment to the reaction and the end of the article, “the Chinese people know better. So should China's government.” In another article, the writer was very disappointed because of American government reluctance (April 1, 2010). He thought that American government’s fear is that China would be outraged, but he made a statement that “we shouldn’t let that dissuade us, for we have a powerful interest in chipping away at firewalls that protect dictatorships.” That is another kind of supporting to American governmental involvement.

#### *China Daily Frame*

According to the *China Daily*, Google is used by the U.S. government, and America treats China as an enemy. Twelve of 24 articles discuss the political tension between China and America. Ten of them treat Google of U.S. governmental tool to “act tough” (March 19, 2010) in order to accomplish its global hegemony, which is its “hidden agenda” (January 29, 2010) and the real reason why Google politicizes the issue.

The articles explain Google's behavior "seemed to have the support of the White House and the United States National Security Council every step of the way" (March 25, 2010).

Chinese articles also accuse the American government of repeating the cold-war era politics (February 14, 2010) when America treated the global eastern as "their enemies" (February, 23, 2010), which is also the comment given to Hillary's speech. From a letter written by readers, the author points out "that Google is not just another commercial company was confirmed a couple of nights ago when the spokesman for the US National Security Agency (NSA) said the authorities there are closely watching the Google-China situation" (March 30, 2010).

#### Difference in Framings of Chinese Peoples' Reaction to Google Pulling out China

##### *The New York Times* Frame

According to *the New York Times*, most audience stands by Google. There are four articles mentioning Chinese peoples' reactions. Among six Chinese interviewees, only one person thinks "Google may use politics as its excuse, which is easy for Westerners to accept, but in essence this is just a business failure," he said in an interview. "If I were the government, I wouldn't even bother to respond" (January 15, 2010), while others talk about how their accounts have been hacked. In another article, a writer points out the fact that Chinese people leave flowers and supportive notes at Google's headquarters in Beijing. He also tries to explain two opinions Chinese people hold. He thinks some Chinese citizens "aren't very political and aren't deeply upset by the lack of a ballot -- as long as living standards continue to improve. And many

Chinese prefer a local search engine, Baidu, to Google”. However, “ordinary Chinese are profoundly irritated by corruption, nepotism, lies, official arrogance -- and hassles when they try to use the Internet” (April 1, 2010). Moreover, one article reveals that a letter protesting against Google’s irresponsible decision written by Chinese advertising companies is found fake.

*China Daily* Frame

According to the *China Daily*, Chinese people do not support Google in this incident. There are not too many articles talking about Chinese netizens’ opinions to the issue. However, different from *the New York Times*, most articles in *China Daily* are written by Chinese people, so their attitudes to Google shown in articles can be considered as part of Chinese people general opinions to Google.

The majority of articles all show their negative comments to Google, especially, the two letters from Chinese readers. One is “Adios, Google, don’t return” (March 20, 2010). The author believes “Google has become a puppet, a slave of its own government which now dictates to the company what and how to do to achieve its objectives in foreign policy,” and “the sooner Google leaves China, the better for the country.” Another letter titled “Google alone will lose” (March 24, 2010), argues that it is not appropriate for a government to compromise with a foreign company no matter how big it is, and “the only party that is likely to lose is Google. It will be embarrassing for it to withdraw now and an ignominy to come back later.” Besides the two letters, other articles also talks about Chinese users’ reactions, such as “we are waiting now in incomparable pain and disquiet,” quoted from a letter written by 27 Google-authorized sales companies (March 19, 2010).

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

Generally, *the New York Times* frames the main reason for the Google's incident as being caused by Chinese censorship. Google's withdrawal will not benefit Chinese domestic companies in a long term and will hurt the relationship between two countries. The American governmental participation is necessary and effective, and most Chinese Internet users support Google in this dispute. While, *China Daily* frames the incident as being caused by Google's business failure in China, but Google tried to use politics as its excuse. Chinese Internet companies will gain interests after Google withdraw. Google's decision of pulling out of China is not clever, and it is used by American government to assault China. In their report, none of Chinese people will support Google if it pulls out of China.

With comparison, we can find an obvious contrary between *China Daily* and *the New York Times*. The coverage in *the New York Times* shows its steady support to the free market and free speech. Whereas what *China Daily* advocates for is country's autonomy. As an elite newspaper in the United States, the coverage about China in *the New York Times* still cannot avoid the ideological contrary. Even though the newspaper quoted the diplomatic words from Clinton, hoping that there is a "positive, cooperative, and comprehensive relationship" (January, 21, 2010) between two countries, the coverage of China is almost negative. The articles in *the New York Times* try to portray China as an irresponsible country that doesn't match its economic development. Besides the discussion over the lack of free speech in China, some articles also talks about

Renminbi exchange rate, climate problem, holding American dollar debt, etc. in China. The newspaper also implies that China support cyberattack in Vietnam in one article.

It would to say that this conflict comes from the ideology of promoting free market, rather than anti-communism ideology. In a world dominated by U.S.-based international companies, the blossom of Chinese economy is recognized as a threat to American authority. What a United States wants is a huge market and a cooperator, not a competitor. As a result, this contrary could be a power competition. In an article “Who Needs Who More” from *the New York Times*, such expectation to China is presented very clearly: “It hoped that China would join a U.S.-led world system and liberalism and democracy would follow in the wake of economic opening. Others — Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Germany — played big roles in China’s trade-led modernization, but only following a U.S. lead”.

However, compared with the *China Daily*, *the New York Times* has more diverse opinions when they frame the issue. Even though it quoted a lot from the Hilary and the Obama, it also showed its concerns of the government involvement, “A separate article noted that the United States Congress expanded the power of security agencies to monitor Americans' e-mail and Internet activities in the wake of the Sept. 11 attacks, and it accused Mrs. Clinton of preaching a double standard by criticizing China's limitations on Internet freedoms” (January 26, 2010). *The New York Times* also criticizes the government “reacted brusquely after Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, in a February speech, chided the Chinese government for restricting free speech online” (March 13, 2010). It shows that under privately owned structures, *the New York Times*

has more independence from the government, which shows up against *China Daily* as a governmental propaganda tool.

The diverse coverage may be caused by the more complicated ownership of *the New York Times*. Both Harbinger Capital Partners and T. Rowe Price, which are second and third major shareholders of the newspaper, have big and increasing investments in China. According to the official website of T. Rowe Price, the investments in China have added to 29.9% [see Appendix D] of its overall investments in Asia by September, 2010, which is more than 2 billion dollars<sup>1</sup>. Funds from China are also one of major sources of Harbinger Capital Partners that are listed in its Petition for Declaratory Ruling<sup>2</sup> [see Appendix C]. As what Herman and Chomasky (1988) found that big shareholders can make themselves heard by controlling the stock shares which closely related to the income of media companies, it is understandable that Harbinger Capital Partners and T. Rowe Price do not want to ruin the relationship with the Chinese government to guarantee their business go well in China, since the market in China is controlled not only by market law but also by the government.

Whereas *China Daily* is a newspaper that is totally owned by the Chinese government, accordingly, the statements in the newspaper are synchronous and exactly the same as government statements. The statement quotations all directly come from a spokesman of Chinese government.

The market-oriented party media in China is, on the one hand, keeping the same ideology and political position with the government, and on the other hand, is running as a capitalist company (Lee, 2001). Since China joined in WTO in 2001, it has wanted to show its new face of free market to appeal more investment and build an open and

1. <http://www3.troweprice.com/fb2/fbkweb/composition.do?ticker=PRASX>. Retrieved on November 1, 2010

2. <http://ecfsdocs.fcc.gov/filings/2010/04/14/6015555254.html>. Retrieved on November 1, 2010

positive country image in the world. That is the reason why Chinese newspaper coverage tried to dilute the political reason in articles and focused on Google's economic failure. However, the ideology difference still exists between two countries. The Chinese Communist Party has to use its newspaper to protect its ideology, and blames American government to use Google as a tool to accomplish its global hegemony. As a result, the media structure put China into a paradox: when China accuses Google of politicizing the issue, China itself is politicizing it too.

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION

There are obvious different orientations between the two newspapers from two countries. *The New York Times* expresses its supportive attitude to free market and free speech, whereas *China Daily* plays a role of body guide of Chinese government authority. From a macroscopic perspective, the difference looks more like a dispute of the balance between American dominance and other countries' autonomy in the globalization process, since Google has been increasingly criticized by not only China.

Our research has proved the varied ownerships and economic structures influence media framing of Google's exit from China, but given the limit time of research, this paper only chose twenty percent of articles, regardless their articles type, length and place in the newspaper. Some important and valuable articles may be ignored in the sampling procedure, which might lead to a little deviation in the results. It is hoped that later research can include more articles, or categorize articles by their article type, since owners give more opinions to editorial articles.

## REFERENCES

- Biswas, M. ,(2007). A FRAMING ANALYSIS OF ELECTORAL REFORM PROCESS COVERAGE IN BANGLADESH'S NEWSPAPERS. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, The Renaissance, Washington, DC Online <PDF>. 2010-03-13 from [http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p203055\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p203055_index.html)
- Croteau, D.&Hoynes,W. (2003), MEDIA SOCIETY. Third Edition, Sage Publication, Inc.
- Chomsky, D. (2006). "AN INTERESTED READER": MEASURING OWNERSHIP CONTROL AT *THE NEW YORK TIMES*. *CRITICAL STUDIES IN MEDIA COMMUNICATION*. Vol.23, No.1. PP.1-18
- Chomsky, N. &Herman, E. (1988). MANUFACTURING CONSENT: THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF THE MASS MEDIA. Pantheon Books.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). FRAMING: TOWARDS CLARIFICATION OF A FRACTURED PARADIGM. *Journal of Communication* 43 (autumn 1993):51-58
- Ewen, S. (1976). CAPTAINS OF CONSCIOUSNESS. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gamson, W. A., &Modigliani, A. (1987). The CHANGING CULTURE OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION. IN R. G. BRAUNGART &M. M. BRAUNGART (Eds.). *Research in Political Sociology* (Vol.3, pp137-177). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Glasser, T. L. (1992). OBJECTIVITY AND NEWS BIAS. *Philosophical Issues in Journalism*, ed. Oxford University Press

- Goffman, E. (1974). *FRAME ANALYSIS: AN ESSAY ON THE ORGANIZATION OF EXPERIENCE*. Harper & Row.
- GOOGLE DRAGS US INTO FIGHT. (2010, March 24). The Times of India. From <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/uk/Google-drag-US-into-fight/articleshow/5720336.cms>. Retrieved on November 6, 2020
- HILLARY CLINTON CALLS ON CHINA TO PROBE GOOGLE ATTACK. (2010, January 21). BBC News. From <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8472683.stm>. Retrieved on November 1, 2010.
- Hughes, W. (1995). THE “NOT-SO-GENERAL” CONSPIRACY: THE NEW YORK TIMES AND SIX PRESIDENTIAL “HONEYMOONS,” 1953-1993. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*. 72(4): 841-850.
- Kerr, P. A. & Moy, P. (2002). NEWSPAPER COVERAGE OF FUNDAMENTALIST CHRISTIANS, 1980-2000. *J&MC Quarterly*. Vol. 79, No.1
- Kluver, R. & Banerjee, I. (2005). “POLITICAL CULTURE, REGULATION, AND DEMOCRATIZATION: THE INTERNET IN NINE ASIA NATIONS.” *Information, Communication & Society*. (8) 2005: 30-46.
- Labiad, N. (n.d.). THE INTERNET AND THE GREAT FIREWALL OF CHINA. Retrieved on April 04, 2010. From [http://dialogues.rutgers.edu/vol\\_05/essays/documents/Labiad.doc](http://dialogues.rutgers.edu/vol_05/essays/documents/Labiad.doc).
- Lee, C.C. (1990). MASS MEDIA: OF CHINA, ABOUT CHINA. IN VOICES OF CHINA: THE INTERPLAY OF POLITICS AND JOURNALISM, edited by C. C. Lee, 3-32. NY: Guilford.

- Manoff, R. K. (1985). Q: IS THE TIMES TURNING CONSERVATIVE? A: YES AND NO. *The Progressive*, 11: 37-41
- McMillan, S. J., & Hwang J. (2002). NAILING JELL-O TO THE WALL AND HERDING CATS: A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF CHINESE AND U.S. NEWSPAPER COVERAGE OF THE INTERNET IN CHINA. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*. 31. 2 (2002): 107-125.
- Nelson, T., Clawson, R. & Oxley, Z. (1997), MEDIA FRAMING OF A CIVIL LIBERTIES CONFLICT AND ITS EFFECTS ON TOLERANCE. *American Political Science Review* 91. 567-83
- Neuman, R. W., Just, M. R., & Crigler, A. N. (1992). COMMON KNOWLEDGE. NEWS AND THE CONSTRUCTION.
- Riffe, D. & Lacy, S. & Fico, F.G. (2008), ANALYZING MEDIA MESSAGES, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Semetko, H. A. & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). FRAMING EUROPEAN POLITICS: A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF PRESS AND TELEVISION NEWS. *Journal of Communication* 50: 93-109.
- Scheufele D.A. (1999). FRAMING AS A THEORY OF MEDIA EFFECTS. Retrieved on March 30, 2010. From <http://www.asc.upenn.edu/usr/ogandy/C45405%20resources/Scheufele%20framing%20as%20effects.pdf>
- Schiller, H. (1992). MASS COMMUNICATION AND AMERICAN EMPIRE. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Siklos, R.(2009). WHO WILL CONTROL *THE NEW YORK TIMES*. *FORTUNE*.

Retrieved on October 1, 2010, from

[http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/11/news/companies/siklos\\_nyt.fortune/](http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/11/news/companies/siklos_nyt.fortune/)

Thomas, D.R. (2006). A GENERAL INDUCTIVE APPROACH FOR ANALYZING QUALITATIVE EVALUATION DATA. *American Journal of Evaluation*. 27: 237.

Tuchman, G. (1978). MAKING NEWS: A STUDY IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF REALITY. NEW YORK: FREE PRESS

Wang, M. (1991). WHO IS DOMINATING WHOSE IDEOLOGY? NEW YORK TIME S REPORTING ON CHINA. *Asian Journal of Communication* 2: 51-69.

Williams, K. (2003). UNDERSTANDING MEDIA THOERY. London: Oxford University Press Inc.

Xie, W.(2007). FRAMING CHINA: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF U.S. ELITE NEWSPAPER'S COVERAGE OF NIXON'S VISIT TO CHINA AND THE CHINESE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO THE U.S. The annual convention of International Communication Association, Montreal, Canada 2008.

## APPENDICES

Appendix A (32 Articles from *the New York Times*)

1. China Puts Lid on Google Defiance	January 14, 2010
2. Google's Threat Echoed Everywhere, Except Chi	January 13, 2010
3. Follow the Law, China Tells Internet Companies	January 14, 2010
4. Far-Ranging Support for Google's China M	January 14, 2010
5.LETTERS TO THE INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE; Google and China	January 16, 2010
6.Showdowns   Jan. 10-16	January 17, 2010
7. MEDIA CACHE; The Fragmentation of the World Wide Web	January 18, 2010
8.Hackers Said to Breach Gmail Accounts in China	January 18, 2010
9.Fearing Hackers Who Leave No Trace	January 19, 2010
10. Clinton Urges Global Response to Internet Attacks	January 21, 2010
11. A Good Fight	January 22, 2010
12. China Issues Sharp Rebuke to U.S. Calls for an Investigation on Google Attacks	January 26, 2010
13. As China Rises, Conflict With West Rises Too	January 26, 2010
14. Clinton Presses Beijing to Support Penalties for Iran	January 30, 2010
15. Hacking for Fun and Profit in China's Underworld	February 1, 2010
16. Who Needs Whom More?	February 3, 2010
17. China Announces 3 Arrests in a Crackdown on Hacking	February 9, 2010
18. Critics Say Google Invades Privacy With New Service	February 12, 2010
19. 2 China Schools Said to Be Tied to Online Attacks	February 18, 2010
20.Hacking Inquiry Puts China's Elite in New Light	February 21, 2010

21. New Scrutiny on Censorship Issues for U.S. Companies in China March 1, 2010
22. China's Cyberposse March 3, 2010
23. China Issues Another Warning to Google on Enforced Censorship of the Internet  
March 12, 2010
24. Letter From Chinese Ad Sellers to Google Appears Fake March 17, 2010
25. China's Internet Giants May Be Stuck There March 23, 2010
26. Google Calls for Action on Web Limits March 24, 2010
27. Not Creating Content. Just Protecting It. March 28, 2010
28. Journalists' E-Mails Hacked in China March 30, 2010
29. Google Links Web Attacks to Vietnam Mine Dispute March 31, 2010
30. Researchers Trace Data Theft to Intruders in China April 5, 2010
31. Google's Profit and Revenue Rise, but Analysts Wanted More April 15, 2010
32. For Chinese, Web Is the Way to Entertainment April 18, 2010

Appendix B (24 articles from the *China Daily*)

1.Google pullout threat 'a pressure tactic'	January 14, 2010
2.Google's loss could be Baidu's gain	January 15, 2010
3.Do No Evil' lays bare Web giant's hypocrisy	January 18, 2010
4.Let's google for truth behind search engine's pullout	January 21, 2010
5.Ministry refutes US claims China restricts Internet	January 23, 2010
6.China 'biggest victim' of cyber attacks	January 25, 2010
7.US duplicity in Internet freedom	January 28, 2010
8.Google should not play with politics	January 29, 2010
9.America should shed Cold War mentality	February 4, 2010
10.Google exit good for small players	February 5, 2010
11.Military not linked to attacks on Google	February 20, 2010
12.Nations must learn how not to catch a tiger by its tail	February 25, 2010
13.Mutual respect is the key	March 3, 2010
14.Impressions of a 'first date'	March 9, 2010
15.Google to 'bear consequences'	March 13, 2010
16.US using Google case to 'act tough'	March 19, 2010
17.The biggest loser	March 22, 2010
18.Letter	March 24, 2010
19.Politics not a wise way to cover failure	March 25, 2010
20.Sino-US tensions show no sign of easing	March 26, 2010
21.Letters	March 30, 2010
22.Questions follow Google exit	April 5, 2010

23.FDI barriers likely to be eased further

April 8, 2010

24.Open doors still welcome foreign investment

April 15, 2010

## Appendix C

## Investor Interests in the Harbinger funds in 2009

Annex 1 to Petition for Declaratory Ruling:  
Investor Interests in the Harbinger Funds

<i>Harbinger Class PE Holdings (Cayman) Ltd.</i>		
<i>Category of Investor</i>	<i>Aggregate % Equity</i>	<i>Country of Citizenship/Country of Organization/Principal Place of Business of Beneficial Owner of Equity Interest</i>
Individuals that are citizens of the United States	1.31%	United States
Individuals that are citizens of foreign countries	0.11%	United Kingdom, China, Cayman island
Banks, insurance companies, pension plans and foundations/endowments organized in the United States and controlled by U.S. citizens	2.1%	United States
Banks, insurance companies, pension plans and foundations/endowments controlled by foreign citizens or organized in foreign countries	13.9%	China, Finland, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Antilles, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, United Kingdom, British Virgin Islands

Any investors that do not fall into one of the foregoing categories that are organized in the United States and have their principal place of business in the U.S.	1.11%	United States
Any investors that do not fall into one of the foregoing categories that are organized in a foreign country or have their principal place of business in a foreign country	81.48%	Australia, Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Channel Islands, China, China (Hong Kong S.A.R.), Finland, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Antilles, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, United Kingdom, British Virgin Islands, Canada, Brazil, Japan, Panama, Italy, Bahamas

## Appendix D

## Composition of investments of T. Rowe Price in Asian Market by September

<b>Country Exposure</b>	<b>as of 09/30/2010</b>
China	29.9%
India	25.3%
South Korea	13.4%
Taiwan	7.0%
Indonesia	4.8%
Singapore	4.3%
Philippines	4.1%
Malaysia	3.4%
Hong Kong	2.5%
Thailand	2.2%

## VITA

Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University

Yezi Hu

Date of Birth: September 15, 1986

400, Southern Hills Drive, Apartment 11, Carbondale, Illinois 62901

E11-601, Fuchun Garden, Huaian, Jiangsu, China 223002

Yezi\_hu@hotmail.com

Nanjing University  
Bachelor of Arts, Journalism, June 2008

Research Paper Title:

NEWS FRAMING OF GOOGLE'S WITHDRAWAL FROM CHINA: A  
COMPARISON BETWEEN AMERICAN AND CHINESE NEWSPAPERS

Major Professor: Wenjing Xie