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ABSTRACT

The reclaiming of land can provide for heated controversy between communities. The controversy at the outset may seem simple, but is actually quite complex involving hegemonic factors such as social, political, and economic influence. One such factor is the media. This research examines media coverage via framing in a battle between the United States Navy and the Hawaiian people to claim ownership of a Hawaiian island named Kaho’olawe. This research analyzes 519 newspaper articles from two Hawaiian newspapers—The Honolulu Star Bulletin and The Honolulu Advertiser—over a seven-year period. Six framing devices—advocate, economic, environment, Hawaiian, military, and political—are devised and implemented. This analysis shows that media frames change over time, when a frame changes so does the tone of the article, and each level of article showed different frame usage. For example, the headline of an article tended to use the political frame most. In addition, this analysis is one of the first to examine the use of pictures within each article and between newspapers. The findings suggest that the media’s coverage of land debates needs to be examined further to include the use of media frames, quotes, and pictures.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Paradise, once lost to its indigenous peoples, was returned to the State of Hawai’i in May of 1994. The situation seemed rather simple: after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the territory of Hawai’i was placed under martial law. Martial law enabled the United States Navy to gain almost exclusive access over the Hawaiian island Kaho’olawe for emergency military training practices. A lease over the island, by cattle rancher Agnus MacPhee, permitted ranching on a small section while the Navy’s bombing practices continued on the remainder of the island. In 1953, an executive order by President Dwight D. Eisenhower placed Kaho’olawe under the jurisdiction of the Navy. Over the next 40 years, naval training practice decimated the island. Among the effects, 500 tons of TNT was detonated by the Navy causing a large crater, many air and water bombardments left unexploded ordnance littered throughout the island and in the Pacific waters, dearth of wildlife and foliage created hardpan erosion (a clay rich decomposed rock). In the mid 1970s, a number of social movements, the state’s congressional delegation and Senator Daniel Inouye vehemently voiced opposition to the bombing of Kaho’olawe and asked that the island be returned to the state of Hawai’i (Report to Congress, 1993; Blackford, 2004).

The purpose of this study is to examine newspaper coverage about the pursuit by two communities making claims to a Hawaiian island named Kaho’olawe. The size of Kaho’olawe is comparable to New York’s borough of Manhattan twice. In the tradition of framing, two newspapers, The Honolulu Advertiser and The Honolulu Star Bulletin, are analyzed. A case study of Kaho’olawe is important because it adds to the growing body of literature demonstrating that the media tend to provide unequal power distributions when covering disputes dealing with land acquisition. To understand the connection of Kaho’olawe to the Hawaiian people, one must
understand that the Hawaiian people consider Kaho’olawe as a family member. McGregor (2007) references a description of what Kaho’olawe means to Native Hawaiian elders, and this Hawaiian meaning is passed on through generations. “Native Hawaiians respect, treasure, praise, and worship the land and all natural elements as deities and the source of universal life” (p. 264). The land is a narrative that tells the history of the Hawaiian people, and this history is passed on through generations.

Disputes over land use can provide for heated debates among rivals. In the United States, the identity of a group of people significantly influences citing who has ownership to land. Sokolove, Fairfax, and Holland (2002) suggest, “Geographical links among identity, landscape, and history are actively constructed through political work and rarely are as obvious as they first appear” (p. 1). Therefore, land disputes are quite complex and multifaceted. Because social, political and economic factors all have a place in the reclaiming of Kaho’olawe, the media play a critical role with the frames they use to represent both sides of a dispute. Hise and Deverell (2000) suggest that land actuation debates consistently provide for an unequal distribution of power. If the power distribution from the media is unequal, how does the audience react to a slanted portrayal of an event? Shah, Fan, Domke, and Watts (2002) point out that most people do not experience news events personally, “nor do they hold strong, stable attitudes about many social topics; rather people form attitudes ‘on the fly’, often in response to particular features of the information environment” (p. 221).

The Hawaiians felt that Kaho’olawe was a wahi pana (special place) where they could, in essence, reclaim their cultural identity by passing on traditions, legends and chants. On the other hand, the Navy felt the island was pertinent to their Pacific training needs. The Navy declared the island as a place that would help the nation because soldiers heading to war would be more
prepared because of training regimes practiced on the island (Ashdown, 1979). In addition, the Navy suggested that it provided a large amount of economic funding within the Hawaiian Islands and that to lose Kaho’olawe would be to lose much of the Hawaiian economy (Aiu, 1997). The struggle between the communities would start a battle, in itself, that lasted until the return of the island to the state of Hawai’i.

History of Kaho’olawe

In the early years, Kaho’olawe was used for navigational training purposes for ships en-route between Hawai’i and Tahiti (McGregor, 2007). In the late nineteenth century, the island was used as a penal colony. Ranching of sheep and cattle took over the island in 1858 (McGregor, 2007). In the late 1930s, the U.S. Navy used the western portion of the Hawaiian Island, Kaho’olawe, as a military testing ground; however, it was not until after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor that the Navy would invade the entire island for routine, quite severe, air and water bombardment testing. Even after World War II, the Navy would continue to consider the island “necessary” for training purposes. In 1953, President Dwight D. Eisenhower transferred jurisdiction of Kaho’olawe to the Navy by executive order number 10436. The order clearly stated that the Navy would return the island—when it deemed it unnecessary to its training purposes—of Kaho’olawe to the territory of Hawai’i in a condition “reasonably safe for human habitation” (p. 110). In addition, the order stated that there would be no cost to the territory of Hawai’i to return Kaho’olawe to this condition; the Navy would be responsible for the cleanup of the island and its surrounding waters (Blackford, 2004; Report to Congress, 1993).
On August 21, 1959, Hawai‘i became the 50th state of the union. Based on The Hawai‘i Admission Act of 1959, the U.S. government had to relinquish all land to the new Hawai‘i state government; one exception was land that was taken by an executive order, leaving Kaho‘olawe under the United States government jurisdiction.

With Hawai‘i becoming a state, and with more people starting to use air transportation as a means of travel, Hawai‘i became a popular destination for many. For one leading politician, Elmer Cravalho, there was a fear that those tourists visiting Maui would not return because of the bombing practices happening just seven miles away on Kaho‘olawe. Cravalho believed that with Maui becoming a desired tourist destination, the bombing of Kaho‘olawe would be economically bad for Hawai‘i and more specifically, for Maui. In 1969, an unexploded 500-pound bomb was found on Maui, which sparked a lot of fear among the Maui residents as well as irritating Cravalho, who had commercial stakes in the land where the bomb had landed (Blackford, 2004).

In addition, environmental issues were coming to the forefront across the nation; Hawai‘i was no exception. Thus, Cravalho created the first major opposition to the military use of Kaho‘olawe (Report to Congress, 1993). He gained momentum in his opposition to include other individuals and organizations that agreed with his antagonistic reasoning. One such individual was Tony Hodges, who filed a suit against the Navy suggesting that the use of Kaho‘olawe as a bombing target violated the National Environmental Protection Act of 1969 (Blackford, 2004). The lawsuit forced the Navy to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Within the statement, the Navy admitted that the bombing had indeed hurt the island, but the Navy also argued that the bombing of the island had actually “slightly improved the balance of the island’s ecosystems” (Navy Report, p. 15; Blackford, 2004). The report also revealed that, as the Navy
cited, Kaho‘olawe had no aesthetic value and was unsuitable for any recreational purpose (Navy Report; Blackford, 2004).

In 1972, the federal court dismissed the case based on the findings in the EIS report. An emergence of advocate groups brought more opposition to the bombing of Kaho‘olawe. Three such groups formed over the next six years: Aboriginal Lands of Hawaiian Ancestry (Aloha), formed by Charles Maxwell; Hui Aloha (the group of long trails), formed by Walter Ritte Junior; and PKO (Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana), formed by Emmett Aluli, Walter Ritte and George Helm. The PKO became the leading force against the fight to halt the bombing and reclaim the land (Blackford, 2004).

In 1976, to show support for the “stop the bombing” initiative, nine native Hawaiians ventured eight miles across the ocean from Maui to Kaho‘olawe. For the next year, frequent trespassing on the island caused the Navy to stop bombing practices, which infuriated Navy officials. One such illegal access, in 1977, brought marked awareness to the opposition efforts when two native Hawaiian leaders mysteriously died at sea and were never found (Report to Congress, 1993).

In addition, in 1976, the PKO and one of its members, Hawaiian physician Noa Emmett Aluli, filed a civil suit in Aluli v. Rumsfeld. The suit actions required the Navy to prepare an updated EIS report and provide detailed descriptions about historic sites on the island. The list of historic sites had to specify how the Navy was caring for these fragile areas. As a result, in 1981, the National Register of Historic Places designated Kaho‘olawe as such (Blackford, 2004).

Although most Hawaiians disagreed with the Navy’s bombing of the island, many residents did not agree with the social movement’s tactics (e.g., trespassing) (McGregor, 2007). In the years to come, this disagreement took a drastic change. The power of the Navy seemed to
diminish and the power of the Hawaiian advocates gained momentum. In fact, the Hawaiians would gain so much momentum that it ultimately provided for the return of Kaho’olawe to the State of Hawai’i (Tanji, 1991).

In 1990, President George Bush, in a memorandum to the secretary of defense, stated the following:

You are directed to discontinue use of Kaho’olawe as a weapons range effective immediately. This directive extends to use of the island for small arms, artillery, naval gunfire support, and aerial ordnance training. In addition, you are directed to establish a joint Department of Defense-State of Hawaii commission to examine the future status of Kaho’olawe and related issues (Presidential Memorandum, see appendix C).

Hence, for the next three years, the Kaho’olawe Island Conveyance Commission compiled a comprehensive report recommending the return of the island to the state of Hawai’i. The Kaho’olawe hearings (discussed later in this thesis) were instrumental in the final report by the KICC submitted to Congress (Report to Congress, 1993).

In May of 1994, the island of Kaho’olawe was returned to the state of Hawai’i. The Navy provided for cleanup of the island at a cost of 400 million dollars (Blackford, 2004).

The purpose of this study is to examine newspaper coverage about the pursuit by two communities making claims to a Hawaiian island. This study examines newspaper articles from a 19-year period in which the researcher samples seven years: 1976, 1977, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994. In 1976, the progression of a movement by the advocates to reclaim Kaho’olawe became forefront. In 1977, two Hawaiians, returning from an illegal occupation, lost their lives at sea and were never found. The years in the early 1990s brought large amounts of political attention. George Bush halted bombing on Kaho’olawe and implemented a commission to
outline guidelines for the possible return of the island to the state of Hawai’i. In 1994, hegemony prevailed for the Hawaiians and the island was transferred from the U.S. Navy back to the state of Hawai’i.
CHAPTER TWO: FRAMING THEORY

Different media portray the same events differently. This can be said for and across different media outlets such as newspaper, television (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000) and media from different countries (Acosta-Alzuru & Lester, 1996). The way in which the media decide to portray a story is called media framing. Framing is a media-constructed reality. The media apply frames to people, groups, issues and topics. It is the media that give and place importance on news stories, it is the media that decide whether a story will be used or not and it is the media that decide which angles of a story are presented to the public (Curtin, 1995). Because framing is a media-constructed reality, the news can, in essence, alter the public’s opinion of an issue, controversy, or event by promoting or demoting a certain frame (Shah et al., 2002).

Many factors contribute to the production of a news frame. The frame needs to be easily understood by the public as well as by the journalist. The more a certain frame is used by the journalist, the more an audience will come to understand its identity. The media tend to use general frames that are familiar (Price, Powers & Tewksbury, 1997). Thus, one could say the more a frame is used by a journalist the more the audience will relate to the message being sent, which may result in a preferred reading (the point of the story in the eyes of the journalist, otherwise known as a frame) of the story where the frame intended is the frame perceived (Gamson, 1989).

Another layer in the construction of a frame is ideology (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989), meaning journalists will react differently based on their own socialization factors. For example, a journalist from the U.S. will build upon his own experiences based on his knowledge from within the U.S.; however, a journalist from Ukraine will, likewise, construct a frame based on his
own principles. Ideology between countries should also be included in this process (Acosta-Alzuru & Lester, 1996). To illustrate, to run any type of business in Ukraine is fraught with close ties to presidential echelons (Baysha & Hallahan, 2004). Thus, there is pressure on the journalist to consciously or unconsciously project certain biases based on political ramifications pertaining to and depending upon the country where the story is produced. For example, a journalist born in the Soviet Union may present a conflict frame that is based upon and in line with the country’s foreign policy stance (Baysha & Hallahan, 2004). Of course, the same is true of a journalist born and raised in United States; the use of his conflict frame will have a different view on foreign policy. In the U.S., the conflict frame is the most popular frame used by journalists (Neuman, Just & Crigler, 1992).

In examining the conflict frame, take the case of abortion rights; some people are pro-choice, some people are pro-life and then there are those people who are undecided. People who have already chosen a side are most likely to stick to that belief, but the undecided portion of the population warrants influence by the media based on the frame used. Television news usually depicts anything that has to do with abortion rights using the conflict frame.

Likewise, global warming provides an environment frame. Ungar’s (1992, 1995) study (as cited in Shanahan & McComas, 1999) discussed the construction of the environment frame pertaining to global warming in the late 1980s. He implied that based on the horrid weather conditions of 1988, the media and the media’s audience were feeling first-hand the effects of global warming, which provided a sort of social scare. The social scare forced the media to focus on the issue, making the issue salient. Hence, the issue of the environment probably would not have been on the media’s agenda, but because of the social scare, the media had to react to what society was reacting to, which promoted an environment frame. Early on, the frame symbolized
the issues of global warming; scientists were frequently quoted giving a cause-effect relationship. In addition, the media showed some politicians and social-interest groups as providing judgments about global warming. Later, a shift in media frames occurred. In society, the environmental advocate groups were becoming more popular, so the focus on scientists tended to fade, which brought more focus and attention to the environment in terms of political and social advocates in the discussion of global warming. Thus, the framing of global warming started out as a cause/effect frame, but over time as the public’s definition of global warming changed, so too, did the media’s perception change. In a sense, framing of issues mirrors reality (McComas & Shanahan, 1999).

As noted earlier, many political, economic and social dynamics play a role in land-acquisition outcomes. With the media being one such factor, the frames they use to represent people and events can and do have an impact on the public’s perception of issues. Entman (1993) provides an exceptional definition of this phenomenon.

Framing essentially involves selection and salience. To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described (p. 52).
Conflict

Acosta-Alzuru and Lester (1996) provided an analysis of the media coverage surrounding the Falklands/Malvinas War. Though each newspaper reported on the same event, each newspaper took a stance that was in line with its foreign policy stance.

In this study, four newspapers were examined: The New York Times (U.S.), El Mercurio (Chile), Excelsior (Mexico), and El Universal (Venezuela). Acosta-Alzuru and Lester’s findings suggest that each country’s newspaper coverage choices depicted a presentation of the Falklands/Malvinas War that was in line with that country’s foreign policy stance. Therefore, each newspaper provided a different version or way of looking at the war. These differences may be based on cultural, economic, political and ideological factors within the preferences of writing a news story. For example, Acosta-Alzuru and Lester (1996) point out, on the front page of The New York Times (1982, April 3) the headline read, “Argentina seizes Falkland Islands; British Ships Move.” Thus, The New York Times implies that Argentina took the Falkland Islands. The omission of “Malvinas” in The New York Times suggests a certain point of view that is in order with Great Britain. In addition, the word choice of “seize” in The New York Times article takes on a very harsh reality. On the other hand, the coverage of the war in El Universal and Excelsior takes the position of pro-Argentina. Excelsior’s banner headline read “Argentina occupies the Malvinas; GB breaks with tie” (April 3, 1982). Acosta-Alzuru and Lester (1996) identify the use of this headline as an “Us: other ratio, with the ‘other’ being Great Britain”
(Acosta-Alzuru and Lester, 1996, p. 8). In addition, when one puts the two words “occupies” and “seize” side by side the connotations of the two words show a representation of two different symbols.

One could say that the construction of a news article takes on many circumstantial factors. For example, a Venezuelan journalist will construct a news article differently than a journalist from the United States.

Rachlin, in his (1988) book, “News as Hegemonic Reality: American Political Culture and the Framing of News Accounts,” examined the shooting down of a Korean airline flight (KAL 007) by a Soviet fighter plane. The tragedy was the result of KAL 007 veering off track and ending up over sensitive Soviet territory. The findings revealed a vast difference of news accounts pertaining to the same incident. American, Canadian, and Cuban print news sources were analyzed to find similarities and differences about news coverage surrounding KAL 007. Of particular interest, two of the findings suggest that in the U.S. and Cuban coverage, the articles never questioned or doubted their own governments. Secondly, both countries’ newspapers focused on a good vs. evil theme; the evil was mostly discussed as being the opposition and was never the side of the country where the article was composed by a journalist (Rachlin, 1988).

Canadian accounts were considered more open-minded and not as absorbed in the good vs. evil theme. The tone was more understanding in nature and both sides showed vulnerabilities. Rachlin observed that, “The American press was more distant from the journalistic ideal” (Rachlin, 1988, p. 87) than its counterpart in Canada.

In Newsweek and Time, the crisis of KAL 007 made the cover on both magazines. The front-page visual images in both magazines, in some fashion or another, revealed a Korean
airliner being pursued by a Soviet plane. The cover of *Newsweek* declared “Murder in the Air” (1983, September 12); “Shooting to Kill” was the headline in *Time* magazine, (1983, September 12). In the days that followed, both magazines provided articles that projected different interpretations as to why the plane veered so far of course. Most involved some sort of reason as to why this crisis happened. Among reasons discussed were navigational error problems, the plane falling between the radar cracks and whether the Soviets actually knew that they were shooting down a 747-passenger flight (Rachlin, 1988).

One day after the crisis was reported, *The New York Times*, (1983, September 1) suggested that the plane accidentally veered off-course. However, future articles in *The New York Times’ revealed ambiguity and uncertainty about the crisis. Although, the tone of the articles in *The New York Times* was one of “this must have been a mistake,” one columnist from *The New York Times* produced stories centering on how inattentive the crew was to let computer errors happen erroneously. In addition, this same opinioned writer implied that the White House Administration was in some respects, guilty of the shooting down of KAL 007. He justified this by citing a rocky relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union (Rachlin, 1988).

Rachlin (1988) examined the KAL 007 crisis in three Canadian newspapers: *MacLean’s*; the *Globe*, and the *Mail* (Rachlin, 1988). On September 12, the cover picture in *MacLean’s* showed a Soviet plane firing a missile at a KAL plane; the headline read “Flight into Darkness”, (1983, September 12). Early on, the tone in *MacLean’s* seemed to reveal accounts that were more detailed (than the U.S.). *MacLean’s* frequently addressed the how and why of the occurrence. Yet, as time progressed *MacLean’s* as well as the *Globe*, and *Mail* took stances that were in line with the position of the U.S. Washington Administration (Rachlin, 1988).
The *Globe* and the *Mail* (1983, September 1) reported one day after the crisis that KAL 007 had landed safely on Soviet Sakhalin Island. This information had apparently been quoted by the state department, but as more information was known, this quote would be known as totally wrong (Rachlin, 1988).

The Cuban paper, *Granma*, used the following headline: “Disinformation and Mass Deception” (1983, September 11), providing a theme that suggests the American administration was malevolent. *Granma* provided an editorial that evil did not rest in the journalists’ portrayals or the American people, but with the political power of the U.S. (Rachlin, 1988). Thus, news operates within a narrow scope of dominant ideology. In other words, the processing of news pulls from common themes that are easily recognizable (Hall, 1977).

Zhang (2005) examined the Sino-U.S. spy plane collision between an American surveillance plane and a Chinese fighter jet. The results suggest that the *Peoples’ Daily* (China) newspaper used contextual framing more than 60 percent of the time, while *The New York Times* (U.S.) used contextual framing only 40 percent of the time. According to Zhang’s (2005) study, contextual framing is built on real-world experiences over time. Therefore, the experiences that one has influence the way in which one sees the world.

Operational framing was used by *The New York Times* 40 percent of the time. *People’s Daily* used operational framing only 15 percent of the time. Zhang (2005) suggests operational framing portrays the journalistic ideal (e.g., balance of power equally). Thus, Zhang’s study suggests that the coverage in these newspapers (*The New York Times* and *People’s Daily*) provided for different interpretations based on ideology and unbalanced power.
Zhang points out the choice of words used to report and describe this crisis were constructed differently in the two newspapers. For example, “the word (Accident) implied there was no actual fault, while the word (Incident) connoted a controversy” (Zhang, 2005, p. 44).

Additionally, Zhang (2005) asserts that contextual framing differences within the two newspapers might be based on political diplomacy. The Communist Party controlled China, and the party may have wanted to represent a certain point of view that could have implications for economic relations within the United States. Last, Zhang asserts that, although, The New York Times and People’s Daily downplayed the event and provided happy pictures implying that everything was fine on their side (U.S. or China), so too, did each side downplay the side of the opposition (Zhang, 2005).

Politics

The following studies are particularly relevant because politics are suggestive in the outcomes of land disputes. The political arena provides an interesting view in which to examine media framing. An analysis of the 2000-2001 Ukrainian political crisis revealed that the media coverage from five different Ukrainian outlets—one newspaper (den), one Internet site (Pravda), and three television channels (Inter, I + 1, and UT-1)—produced coverage outcomes that were different (Baysha & Hallahan, 2004). Baysha and Halahan (2004) suggest that of the five media outlets they examined, none presents the Ukrainian political crisis (2000-2001) in a balanced manner. To illustrate, the state-owned television station UT -1 often framed political events pertaining to the crisis, in a way that recurrently sided with and promoted the Ukrainian president. Pravda used both pro-oppositional and neutral media frames in its presentation of the political crisis. Thus, promoting a more balanced journalist ideal, but nonetheless, still not completely balanced, as there were no pro-presidential media frames used.
These differences of media coverage lie in the different choices of media frames that the journalist used to tell the same story. Baysha and Hallahan (2004) posited that the framing choices used exposed a large presence of media outlet ideology. Overt propaganda and hidden manipulation were used frequently in the presentation of the Ukrainian political crisis, 2000-2001 (Baysha & Hallahan, 2004).

Baysha and Hallahan (2004) suggest that the four most popular frames, out of 19, were as follows: Political Game (who is losing/gaining points); Reforming (crisis cures the political system, crisis is evaluated and negotiation discussed); East-West (organizations and governments comment on the crisis); and Investigation (Geopolitical aspects, criminal cases, protests and evidence is presented). Each frame was listed under a subheading denoting one of three positions (pro-presidential, pro-oppositional or neutral). The use of certain frames and the three positions (listed above) provided insight of political presence for each of the media outlets. For example, the television station UT-1, which was state-owned, used only frames that were pro-presidential. By contrast, the Internet site Pravda used frames listed under pro-oppositional or neutral; the frames were highly conspirator-type frames that implied an underground connection to Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma. Consequently, an independent outspoken journalist, Gregory Gongadze, owned the Internet site Pravda. Gongadze was killed, and audio recordings were later found that apparently resembled the voice of President Kuchma. Baysha and Hallahan (2004) were able to classify the five media outlets by political orientations as presidential (UT-1, Inter, and den), or oppositional (1+1 and Pravda).

Because certain metaphors and depictions were frequent in the news coverage of the Ukrainian political crisis, Baysha and Hallahan (2004) focused on themes. All five media outlets used the metaphor “show”; UT-1, Inter, and den used “show” to describe the crisis using pro-
presidential frames of People’s Condemnation, Conspiracy, and Renegades. The other media outlets used the same metaphor in constructing frames about the crisis, but with the frames of Tyrants and Criminal Regime that were considered pro-oppositional (Baysha & Hallahan, 2004).

Similar to the research of Baysha and Hallahan (2004), Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) examined framing of European politics in four newspapers and three television news programs.

The results suggest a difference in frequencies per frames and across media outlets. Most media outlets used the Attribution of Responsibility frame (the problem was presented in a way that renders a cause or solution by the government, group or individual) on a frequent basis; however, Semetko and Valkenburg (2004) propose the more serious newspaper outlet NRC employed the frame more often than its counterparts Telegraaf and Volkskrant. In comparison, the two television outlets, NOS and RTL, produced serious-type programs using the Attribution of Responsibility frame, but there was no indication between these two television outlets that one used the frame more than the other did. In addition, the television news outlet, Hart van Nederland, which was considered a sensationalist-type program, tended to use the Attribution of Responsibility frame less frequently than any of the other media outlets examined in this research (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000).

Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) found that the serious newspaper NRC used the Conflict frame (story provides a disagreement between groups, organizations or individuals) more than any of the other media outlets. Again, like the Attribution of Responsibility frame, the Conflict frame was used by NOS and RTL but revealed no difference in frequency used between the two outlets (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000).

The Human Interest frame (uses the emotional angle to present an issue or problem) provided a difference in framing across media outlets. The television outlets used the human
interest frame regularly, but the frame usage among newspaper outlets showed that the more sensationalist paper *Telegraaf* used the frame more than the other serious papers *Volkskrant* and *NRC* did (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000).

Other findings suggest that the television outlets *NOS* and *RTL* carried mostly newsworthy stories (other than crime), but *Hart van Nederland* focused mostly on stories that dealt with crime (no other issues). The same was true for *Telegraaf*, which carried more stories about crime, but *NRC* carried stories that were salient at the time (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000).

Providing further understanding of media frames and politics, Gan, Teo and Detenber (2005) examined patterns of news framing during the 2000 U.S. presidential election. The outcome suggests that there were differences between the two newspapers examined--Singapore’s *The Straits Times* and France’s *Le Monde*--in their reporting of the election vis-à-vis their use of frames. The framing differences found in this study suggest a connection to journalistic ideologies; thus, creating a different construction of reality.

Gan’s et al. (2005) research employed six frames. The most used frames were: Horse Race (performance, results, and financial strength); Issues/Policies (addressed specific issues/policies); Constitutional Crisis (dealt with events leading to or creating a crisis); and Human Interest (implements an emotional approach).

Gan et al. (2005) found that pre-election frames and the post-election frames were different. For instance, the pre-election results suggest that *The Straits Times* employed the Horse Race frame 35 percent of the time, followed by the Human Interest frame. *Le Monde* used the Issue/Policy frame 30 percent of the time, followed by the Horse Race frame. Post-election results showed that 30 percent of the time, *The Straits Times* was still employing the Horse Race
frame, but *Le Monde*’s use of frames changed. The frame shifted to the Constitutional Crisis (see description above) frame.

These findings (Gan et al., 2005) provide support for the idea that since both newspapers were similar, the type of frames used in the reporting of the 2000 U.S. presidential election were related to the newspapers’ stance on journalistic principle of objectivity. In addition, framing devices could have been influenced, at least in part, by sociopolitical contextual factors (e.g., each country’s experience with democracy, a free press, and its relationship with the U.S).

Shah, Domke, Fan, and Watts (2002) suggest that media frames can and do have an impact on the public’s perception of certain issues. This study suggests that the public was predisposed by scandal coverage during the Clinton/Lewinsky events, which aided in promoting the outcome of Clinton’s continued popularity. Thus, the examination of media frames to predict public opinion on controversial issues is fairly accurate.

In an examination of President Clinton’s popularity during the Monica Lewinsky scandal, Shah et al. (2002) found that Clinton’s popularity throughout and even during the process of impeachment, was unwavering. This constant approval was not based on “presidential performance” (p. 366), but was the ability of the media to frame issues in a way that focused negative attention on Republicans. This focus was a conspiracy theory of sorts, in that conservatives were considered to have a political agenda.

Shah’s et al. (2002) research employed three frames: Clinton Behavior (sexual controversy) frame, Conservative Attack (those out to get Clinton, like the Republicans) frame and Liberal Response (in defenses of Clinton) frame. The findings in this study suggest that the Conservative Attack frame displayed “those out to get Clinton” in a way that revealed the conservatives would do or say anything to get Clinton out of office. A backlash prevailed in
which the Liberal and Conservative frames, essentially, disputed with one other bringing less media attention to the Clinton Behavior frame. The Liberal Response (provided the issues) frame acted together denoting a political presence.

To conclude, Shah et al (2002) found that the public’s political preferences “are influenced substantially by frames and cues provided by the media” (p. 339).

**Environmental Debates**

An examination of media framing of environmental debates is important because in the case of Kaho’olawe environmental issues provided a media frame.

Gamson and Modigliani (1989) examined media coverage of Hiroshima and Nagasaki (1945-1969). Obviously, during this time there was not an abundance of media coverage addressing nuclear power, however, the media framing that was relevant showed “images of sudden enormous destruction, symbolized in the rising mushroom cloud of a nuclear bomb blast” (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989, p.12).

In media outlets, the only frame used during this time period was the Progress frame (the issue of nuclear power was examined through society’s understanding to new technologies and economic development). In addition, Gamson and Modigliani (1989) suggest that “the dominant metaphor was a road that branches into two alternative paths--one leading to the development of weapons of destruction, the other to the eradication of human misery” (p.13). Fuller’s (1974) study (as cited by Gamson and Modigliani, (1989) addressed the media’s reactions to a meltdown, in 1966, at the Fermi reactor in Michigan. Subsequently, the media did nothing with the story until five weeks later, when *The New York Times* published a story that was headlined “mishap” at the Fermi reactor (November 13, 1966).
Media attention to the Three Mile Island accident in the 1979 was more pronounced. President Carter’s administration, for the most part, supported nuclear power, which added to an increased media discourse that, in turn, affected public opinion about the topic (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989). Moreover, a couple of environmentally friendly organizations emerged at this time addressing safety issues involved with nuclear power (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989). The above factors produced three new media frames: The Soft Paths frame (in support of safe environmental friendly initiatives); Public Accountability frame (concerned that the corporate world was involved only to protect the industry and not the public); and the Not Cost Effective frame (the huge cost of nuclear power does not compare with other cost effective alternatives) (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989).

With these frames came change; the public was starting to accept that new technology was inevitable, but this did not change the fact that many environmental groups were starting to emerge and the public was worried about the safety of nuclear power (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989).

Illustrative cartoons revealed the most significant changes within media outlets. In addition, the progress frame was replaced by the Runaway (fatalism and resignation more than antinuclear) and Public Accountability frame (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989).

The third time frame examined was The Three Mile Island accident through Chernobyl. Similarly, as with the Three Mile Island accident, the next time frame revealed changes in Public Opinion. Again, these changes were addressed through the use of different frames (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989).

In television news, the Runaway and Public Accountability frames were the most prevalent, while the Devil’s Bargain frame (for and against nuclear power) was introduced. The
Progress frame re-emerged in television news, and the Public Accountability frame lost momentum. In newsmagazines, Runaway and Progress were the dominant frames. The Runaway frame takes the lead in cartoon coverage as well as the opinion columns. Moreover, the opinion columns also showed a high use of the Progress frame. To clarify, both cartoon and opinion outlets portrayed humorous reflections about nuclear power (hidden radiation, nuclear catastrophes and out of control technology) (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989).

McComas and Shanahan (1999) focused on media construction of narratives about global climate change. McComas and Shanahan propose that global warming received more media coverage when the frames portrayed danger or consequences because of global warming. In addition, McComas and Shanahan (1999) suggest that different narratives emerge at different times. These narratives are media frames that over time have turned into a cyclical cycle. Down’s (1972) research (as cited in McComas & Shanahan, 1999) suggests three stages in media narratives. When attention is brought to an issue, via the public interest or the media, the media coverage of the issue is often more frequent; thus, one could say, the issue is on the way up (referring to the rising amount of coverage surrounding the issue). The issue will then peak (lots of media coverage), until it begins its descent (decline or absence of media coverage).

McComas and Shanahan (1990) found that when the issue was on the rise, narratives about consequence or implied danger pertaining to global climate change increased in the media. When coverage peaked, implied danger became less important, but the scientists involved in studying global climate change became more prominent via a narrative looking for a solution to the problem (McComas & Shanahan, 1990).

Interestingly, McComas and Shanahan (1990) found that 67 percent of the articles analyzed in two newspapers—The Washington Post and The New York Times—used their own
reporters with bylines. Moreover, over two thirds of the articles appeared in the first section of the newspaper.

**Medical Debate**

In examining frame building and agenda setting, Brossard, Kroepsch and Nisbet (2004) follow a timeline of media coverage examining media frames used to address stem-cell research. The results show that in 2001, when Congress and the president were discussing stem-cell research, the issue became forefront in the news. Brossard et al. (2004) found that media frames work best when the journalist uses a frame that has been frequently used in the past and the context reveals more of a narrative format.

In this study, the frames most frequently used by the media were Strategy/Conflict (winning or losing political legislation/actions or deliberations), Ethics/Morality (religious or traditional values), Policy Background (stem-cell related research), and Scientific Background (medical background of stem-cell research). The Strategy/Conflict frames repeatedly took dominant placement positions; however, the Ethics/Morality frames were more likely to take a secondary placement within an article (Brossard et al., 2004).

Framing of stem-cell research was almost nonexistent in the 1970s and 1980s, but in the mid-1990s the focus on stem-cell research dramatically increased, thus promoting the Ethics, Morality, and Policy Background frames (Brossard et al., 2004).

In 2001, President Bush concluded that federal funding would sanction only existing stem-cell lines. Therefore, Bush would not promote the life and death decisions associated with stem-cell research, which created a lot of controversy (Brossard et al., 2004). The media’s coverage of this controversy provided for an abundance of news coverage. After, September 11,
2001, one would think that stem-cell research would be knocked off the media’s agenda, but research (Brossard et al., 2004) indicated that September and October of 2001 brought the most coverage of stem-cell research.

Brossard et al. (2004) suggest that in the late 1990s and early 2000, media framing coincided with congressional interests and agenda. Earlier framing of stem cell research brought articles addressing bone-marrow transplants and gene therapy, in which stem-cells were briefly mentioned in the body of the article. As stated earlier, until 1998, the largely controversial issue of using human embryos for stem-cell research was not a major agenda for the media. In fact, Brossard et al. (2004) suggest that the media often took the “noncontroversial” (p. 52) side of human and animal stem-cell research. This is interesting, since normally the media like to frame issues based on conflict and controversy. Thus, it is believed that the Conflict frame is usually an attempt to put a dramatic flair on the story to make it more interesting for the public.

Land Acquisition Debates

As in the case of Kaho’olawe, media coverage played a role in contested land use in Los Angeles’ Taylor Yard case (Roth & Vander Haar, 2006). In this study, media framing was prominent on the park advocate side, a side that was deemed as having less power. Roth and Vander Haar point out that news reporting should be balanced and both sides of an issue should be employed. However, Roth and Vander Haar suggest that frequently this balance is unequal and sways toward the side with power. This power is called media standing and has been examined in prior research (Gamson, 2001). Gamson explains the power struggle process of media standing.

Standing refers to a group being treated as an agent… [T]he granting of standing
is anything but arbitrary. Sources are selected, in this view, because they speak as or for serious players in any given policy domain: individuals or groups who have enough political power to make a potential difference in what happens. Standing is a measure of achieved cultural power (Gamson, 2001, p. 9471).

In the case of Taylor Yard, as in the case of Kaho’olawe, two communities want the same thing, but for different reasons. Environmentalists, private citizens and parkland advocates wanted the land for park and recreation purposes. Lennar Partners, who were the landowners at the time, wanted the land for industrial and retail development (Roth & Vander Haar, 2006). Do the media portray both sides, or do they offer more prominence to one side?

In analyzing newspaper quotes, Roth and Vander Haar suggest that the two rival communities incorporated different frames. Advocates for park use framed their side of the issue in terms of social interests and recreational opportunities. In contrast, the industrial advocates stressed topics in economic terms. For example, the Economic Industrial advocates presented the notion that building on the land would provide for more jobs and paychecks for people in the community, whereas the Park Advocates stressed a park for our kids to play in as much more beneficial (Roth & Vander Haar, 2006).

The balance of both communities was eventually interrupted when three events swayed the power: A new mayor, without ties to Lennar, was appointed, the state of California now had the money to buy Lennar’s share of Taylor Yard, and a suit was filed against Lennar and the City of Los Angles requiring an environmental impact statement before building could proceed. The examination of newspaper quotes revealed media standing of the park advocates as prominent. Lennar would later sell the land to the American Land Conservancy, who would, in turn, sell the
land to the state of California. Gamson’s research suggested that (as cited in Roth & Vander Haar, 2006) when the newspaper quoted Lennar, the Economic media frame disintegrated.

The sentiments of the community have changed,” [according to Lennar’s vice president of acquisitions, Gregory Morell]. “While it has always been the intent of Lennar Partners to develop this property, in the interest of the community we have agreed to sell the land” (p. 144).

Thus, a Symbolic Social frame emerged as pre-eminent (Roth & Vander Haar, 2006).

Other research by Kaniss (1991) proposed the notion that most local news media construct news using three symbolic themes: “public versus private interest; adopting a regional perspective; and blending nostalgia with progress” (p. 183). Conclusively, Roth and Vander Haar point out, that in their study, the use of symbolic themes all emerged in the case of Taylor Yard (Roth & Vander Harr, 2006).

Gibson (2004) found that media coverage was not objective in the case of Seattle’s urban redevelopment. In all four eras (discussed below), The Seattle Times and The Seattle Post Intelligencer, quoted downtown business sources four times more often than nonprofit/advocacy sources. In fact, the only time that the emergence of other sources became prevalent was in the ultimatum and election stages (discussed below). Gibson proposed that this shift during the two stages (ultimatum and election), but mostly during the election stage, was due to framing changes that transpired when Nordstrom’s gave an ultimatum to pro-development officials. Hallins’s (1994) work (as cited by Gibson, 2004) was used as a framework in analyzing framing changes within the media.

During the negotiation stage, the media employed a Consensus frame (only benefits would come from this project), but with the ultimatum came a frame that spoke of rightful
controversy (taxpayers are paying for beautifying, not sending cars down the heart of the city),
giving rise to a return of balanced journalistic construction. Gibson suggests that this case in point reveals a plethora of information regarding urban building with public funds. The media may only address the perspectives of urban business leaders, without giving due process to the other sides that are involved (Gibson, 2004).

Audience Analysis

Cognition

Framing plays a role in cognition, too. The presentation of news frames has an impact on the participants’ cognitive responses, as well as precipitated thoughts that were not directly related to a hypothetical research news report. Price, Tewksbury and Powers (1997) found that the use of certain news frames enhanced cognitive responses of the participants. These responses were more in tune with the frame that was presented.

Price et al.’s (1997) research entailed the distribution of four news articles handed out to participants. The main body of the article was the same in all four groups; however, the introduction and conclusion of each group’s articles was different. The difference was the way in which each article was presented; thus, producing a Conflict frame, Human-Interest frame, Consequence frame, and a Control frame (Price et al., 1997).

The core of the news article advised readers that the state was facing budget cuts, which would have insurmountable implications for cutbacks at the university. The Conflict frame began with a presentation about two groups with diametrically opposed positions over budget cuts. The Human-Interest frame employed an opening that revealed the retirement of an experienced
budget advisor. The Consequence frame admonished that students might be able to feel tuition increases because of stated budget cuts (Price et al., 1997).

Price et al. (1997) suggest that a news frame can enhance ones cognitive thoughts about the issues at hand. Two of the frames used in this experiment, Human Interest and Conflict, had a negative effect on participants’ reactions to budget cuts and retirement of the budget advisor, while the Consequence frame provided positive cognitive thoughts. The consequence frame provided an issue that was directly related to and might have impact upon the student. The frames tended to increase or decrease the response by a participant.

Science

Media-framing research is also implemented in science. Nanotechnology is an umbrella term for describing research and technology development that allows for the manipulation and control of materials at the atomic or molecular levels in order to build novel structures and devices. Research by Cobb (2005) examined potential framing effects on peoples’ opinions about nanotechnology.

The results suggest that for framing to be successful, a specific risk or benefit must be associated with nanotechnology. Neither, the Conservative Humanism (not convinced that science can solve deficiencies in the human condition) frame or the Cornucopian (science solves all problems) frame was influential in promoting a merit of science alone. Frames that included risks were more successful than ones mentioning benefits. Those participants exposed to risk frames were less likely to expect benefits. Participants in the benefit-framing conditions were considered to be less angry (in general), less worried about nanotechnology, and more likely to
think the benefits of nanotechnology would outweigh its costs. Two-sided frames generally failed to produce opinion change (Cobb, 2005).

Respondents were randomly assigned to one of ten experimental conditions: A control group or one of nine unique framing conditions about the risks or benefits of nanotechnology. All groups heard a brief objective description about nanotechnology, then, each of the participants in the nine framing conditions heard a distinct way of framing nanotechnology. For six of the experimental conditions, participants listened to one-sided frames, three of which were “pro-nanotechnology” and three of which were “anti-nanotechnology”. The last three conditions were two-sided frames that set in opposition each of the preceding frames against their counterparts. The baseline frames represented two contrasting philosophical values about the role of science. One was labeled Conservative Humanism (detailed earlier) frame and the other was labeled the Cornucopian (detailed earlier) frame (Cobb, 2005).

The first frame used was Conservative Humanism, followed by the Potential Risks of nanotechnology (second and third). The fourth frame was Cornucopian and the fifth and sixth frames discussed Potential Benefits of nanotechnology (health benefits). The last three frames mentioned both Risks and Benefits of nanotechnology. Survey participants were asked to predict whether the risks of nanotechnology would be greater than, equal to, or less than benefits. Secondly, participants were asked how much trust they have in industry officials to minimize risks to humans based on emotions (hope, anger and worry) (Cobb, 2005).

This Land is Our Land: The Kahoʻolawé Hearings

The Kahoʻolawé hearings are one focal point in the timeline of events analyzed in this study.
The conclusion of this analysis on the Kaho’olawe hearings was that two communities—Hawaiian and military—wanted the same thing, but for totally different reasons. To analyze how these two communities define an ownership to Kaho’olawe, the language of each community must be addressed and understood. Thus, metaphors, social dramas, and narratives were analyzed in this research.

Aiu (1997) examines the social reconstruction of the Hawaiian island Kaho’olawe. In simpler terms, Aiu’s (1997) dissertation analyzes hearings that were conducted on six of the major Hawaiian Islands from April 9-May 30, 1991. The Kaho’olawe testimonies included 252 self-selected people’s accounts about why the island should be returned to the peoples of Hawaii and/or why the land should be kept fully or partially in the hands of the Navy. Hence, the purpose of the hearings was to gather testimony regarding public opinion about the future of the island. The hearing participants addressed a commission of five people.

Over the years 1976-1994, many Hawaiians became very aware of their claims to land in the state of Hawai’i (McGregor, 2007). This awareness started a progression of many events that unraveled over the next 19 years. The Navy used the island for water and air bombardment; the land was considered the Navy’s practice ground. Hence, the military wanted to keep using Kaho’olawe because the land provided a good training space, based on its terrain, location, and airspace. The Hawaiians wanted the land back because they felt it was a sacred resource for their culture. In 1976, nine Hawaiians trespassed on the island, causing the Navy to cease bombing. From this point on, many island peoples became instrumental in working together toward a common goal of getting the island back (Aiu, 1997).

Participants that testified in the hearings were asked to address five areas of interest to the commission: The areas were as follows: 1) the significant cultural history of
Kahoʻolawe 2) the restoration and rehabilitation of natural and cultural resources 3) future uses of Kahoʻolawe 4) military use of Kahoʻolawe 5) title to and jurisdiction of Kahoʻolawe (Aiu, 1997, p. 60).

For example, during a hearing on Oʻahu, the significance of cultural history was addressed.

I believe that Hawaiian culture, beliefs and practices are very important to the people of Hawaiʻi, especially the children. I believe that the children of Hawaiʻi should experience ʻaina, the land, firsthand. They need to be able to touch, smell, hear and see for themselves where their kupuna came from and experience their lifestyles. We need to preserve Kahoʻolawe so that our children can be taught the traditions (Public Hearing, Oʻahu, H. Mahoe, delivered by K. Whittaker, pp., 96-97).

In addition, during the Oʻahu hearing, the military addressed the naval use of Kahoʻolawe: “The bottom line is that Kahoʻolawe is the sole area, which provides the training realism so critical to our operational readiness” (Public Hearing, Oʻahu, Colonel Jackson, p. 57).

The Hawaiian witnesses spoke mostly in a narrative style, and their focus was to tell about themselves and their relationship to the land. The military usually gave facts put into the form of a deductive argument and ended with a plea that the military would not have any place to train if the land was taken away from it (Aiu, 1997).

Thus, two different ways of communicating and interpreting significance to a place can and does mean different things to different peoples and/or groups. Even though both parties may use some of the same symbols to communicate place, their meaning can have very different connotations. As stated earlier, three different concepts were used to analyze the Kahoʻolawe testimonies: metaphors, social drama and narratives.
Using the work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Aiu examines the use of metaphors used in the Kahoʻolawe hearings. As Lakoff and Johnson’s metaphor theory, (1980) implies, metaphors must be understood within the social context of their use. Thus, metaphors can give meaning to a culture, revealing many social aspects and undertones about a culture. In the Kahoʻolawe hearings, Aiu suggests that the Hawaiians frequently used the metaphor “Ohana”, which means family. Even though the word ‘Ohana means one thing, the use of the word during the testimonies was not only used to describe one’s actual family unit, but Kahoʻolawe was considered ‘Ohana, too. One witness at the testimonies addresses the relationship of ‘Ohana:

I’ve been privileged to be on a number of accesses, and I see people here in the audience that have gone with me on the small boat, anchoring offshore, diving into the waters, not quite sure what’s underneath you, swimming ashore, and then forming the human chain as we bring our baggage ashore wrapped in garbage bags to keep it water tight…I’m not Hawaiian, but it’s as close as I could ever come to being Hawaiian when I am on the island with the ‘Ohana (Public Hearing, O’ahu, C. Thielen, p. 85).

For the ‘Ohana, land meant a place to practice their culture and to deny them of this land would, in essence, deny them of their Hawaiian cultural history (Aiu, 1997).

During the hearings, the military testimonies recurrently used the metaphor citizen. If the word was to be understood in a military context, one would assume that based on this understanding, a certain type of society should be broadly defined. A military witness discusses the metaphor “citizen”:

We enjoy the privileges that today represents because many, many members of our citizen soldiers and our marines and our sailors have laid down their
lives to defend the system of government that we are practicing right here today (Public Hearing, O’ahu, A. Lloyd, p. 103).

The military looked at the land as pertinent to naval training needs. When Navy testimonies included the word *family*, the military addressed the notion that military personnel who train on Kaho’olawe would be geographically closer to their families. Hence, the use of the land would mean that the military personnel would have more time with their families (Aiu, 1997).

Using Victor Turner’s theory of Social Drama, (1971, 1974, 1981), Aiu (1997) examines where Kaho’olawe fits in modern Hawaiian history and culture. Turner’s four-step process involves breach in communication, mounting crisis, redress (one party takes action), and reintegration into society. The Kaho’olawe testimonies illustrate the third phase of Turner’s theory. They were an attempt at communicating the concerns of Native Hawaiians. Based on testimonies from the hearings, the breach of communication started in the mid-1970s, when there were vocal and physical attempts by the Hawaiians to get Kaho’olawe back from the military. For example, Aiu, (1997) describes the breach using testimony from a participant that spoke at the hearings on Moloka’i:

I was part of the first landing on Kaho’olawe and other landings and became actively involved in trying to get the military to stop bombing there criminal charges brought against me included conspiracy against the federal government, criminal trespass and contempt of court. I was chained and handcuffed publicly and spent six months in Halawa maximum-security prison. Two of my cellmates were in for multiple murders and the other two were rapists. I’d like to, with that kind of background, to speak about the future of Kaho’olawe (Public Hearing, Molokai’i, W. Ritte, p. 17).
On the other hand, the Navy believed that at the time of the arrests, the land was considered “Navy Land”; thus, they had a right to arrest illegal trespassers (Aiu, 1997).

Secondly, the mounting crisis for the Hawaiians came with the death of a Hawaiian who was attempting to access Kaho’olawe illegally. During this time, the military reiterated that no wrong had been done and in most circumstances remained silent about the events that had transpired (Aiu, 1997).

The Kaho’olawe hearings are set within Turner’s (1971, 1974, and 1981) Redress phase. In examining this stage, Aiu (1997) concludes that Hawaiians identify Kaho’olawe as a place where Hawaiian traditions could be practiced without having to be on display. The military was connected to the land because it was deemed as a place where full-scale mock battles could take place for training purposes. The military went on to discuss that if they had no place to practice water and air bombardments, they would have to go elsewhere and this could mean base closures, which could be bad for the Hawaiian economy. The tone of these two perspectives left a definite line down the center showing a distinct separation of “local” vs. “national” (Aiu, 1997).

Using Barbara Johnstone’s (1990) theory of narrative analysis, Aiu, (1997) examines two very different testimonies: one by a Hawaiian and one by a military person. The outcome of these narrative analyses was that both communities wanted the same thing, but the meanings about how the communities communicated what Kaho’olawe meant to each community was very different. “The value systems of the two communities are inimical to each other. One demands mobility and denies the rootedness of place, while the other demands recognition of place, both physically and socially” (Aiu, 1997, p.163).
Aiu (1997) addresses the notion that there was a big gap between the two cultures analyzed in this dissertation. Hawai‘i’s senior congressional representative, Senator Daniel Inouye, made a bridge that was able to connect the two cultures.

We in Hawai‘i have provided the U.S. Navy with a target practice site for 36 years, six years longer than Hawai‘i has been the 50th state of the Union. We have paid our dues and done our part to ensure a strong and skilled U.S. military force. We in Hawai‘i have done so at substantial cost (Public Hearing, O‘ahu, Senator Daniel Inouye, p. 66-67).

Inouye’s bridge, the testimonies and the downsizing of the Navy all played a substantial role in the return of the island to the peoples of Hawai‘i.

Last, as Turner (1971, 1974, and 1981) had suggested in his analysis of social drama, the fourth stage was reintegration of the community. Thus, the Hawaiians were reintegrated into a society that was their own Hawaiian society. The Hawaiians’ way of looking at the land won out over the Navy’s way of looking at the land (Aiu, 1997).

Research Questions

The concept of framing and its empirical application is relatively new, but previous research on framing especially in the arena of land acquisition leads to the research questions:

Research Question 1: What are the dominant media frames?

Research Question 2: How do media frames change over time?

Research Question 3: Does a journalist’s family name have an impact on the media frames he or she uses?

Research Question 4: Does the journalist’s gender have a correlation with the frames used?
Research Question 5: Which media frames favored one side (military or Hawaiian) over the other side?

Research Question 6: Is there a difference in the use of media frames between the two newspapers?

Research Question 7: To what extent were pictures used to frame a story?
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This study proceeded from a quantitative content analysis of the media frames used in two Hawaiian newspapers for an inconsecutive seven-year period. The years analyzed were 1976, 1977, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994.

Research has already documented qualitative analysis examining metaphors, social drama, and narratives within the Kaho’olawe hearings (Aiu, 1997). In this study, a quantitative content analysis was used to answer five research questions. Newspaper articles from two popular Hawaiian newspapers, The Honolulu Advertiser and The Honolulu Star Bulletin, were retrieved from microfiche and microfilm.

The years 1976 and 1977 were marked with advocate groups launching protests in an effort to halt the Navy’s bombing of the island. During these protests, two Hawaiians lost their lives at sea, making tensions that were already tumultuous even greater between the two groups. In addition, Alui (a Hawaiian activist) filed a suit in, Alui v. Rumsfeld that required the Navy to provide a report detailing all historic sites on Kaho’olawe (Report to Congress, 1993).

In 1990, President George Bush put a temporary halt on the Navy’s bombing of Kaho’olawe. This halt enabled Congress to put together a commission that would be instrumental in compiling a report detailing why Kaho’olawe should be returned to the state of Hawai’i. Part of this report would involve the Kaho’olawe hearings (Report to Congress, 1993).

The hearings were on each island and were open to anyone wanting to voice his or her opinion on continued Military use of the island or designating an opinion that the island be returned to the state of Hawai’i for cultural use. Thus, in 1991, as detailed in Aiu’s (1997) dissertation, interviews were conducted.
In 1993, the final report of the Kaho’olawe Island Conveyance Commission was turned over to the United States Congress. Congress decided to return Kaho’olawe to the state of Hawai’i and guidelines would be set in place for restoring the island to a habitable state. Moreover, Senator Daniel K. Inouye supported the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, otherwise known as Title X. Title X implemented guidelines for the Navy to follow, (e.g. removing unexploded bombs and environmental restoration) (Report to Congress, 2003). With the agreement, the Navy had ten years to complete all details of Title X. On May 9, 1994, the Navy transferred the title of Kaho’olawe to the state of Hawai’i (Report to Congress, 2003).

Articles from two Hawaiian newspapers, *The Honolulu Star Bulletin* and *The Honolulu Advertiser*, were coded. Geographically, the publication of both of these newspapers was 100 miles away from the island of Kaho’olawe. Both newspapers were considered mainstream O’ahu papers with different circulation rates. *The Honolulu Advertiser’s* readership is about 150,000 (Retrieved September 15, 2006, from *The Honolulu Advertiser* Online at http://www.gannett.com/map/ataglance/honolul.htm), whereas *The Honolulu Star Bulletin’s* circulation is about half of the *Advertisers*, with 80,000 (Retrieved September 15, 2006, from *The Honolulu Star Bulletin* Online at http://www.starbulletin.com/info/about.html) readers. *The Star Bulletin* claims to be more in tune with the local Hawaiian culture (Retrieved September 15, 2006, from *The Honolulu Star Bulletin* Online at http://www.starbulletin.com/info/about.html). The administration and publication of both newspapers was housed in the same building until 1993, when the owner of *The Honolulu Star Bulletin*, Gannett Group, shocked the Bulletin’s staff when it was announced that Gannett was selling, *The Honolulu Star Bulletin*, and buying, *The Honolulu Advertiser*. Liberty Newspapers, controlled by a Florida investor bought *The Star Bulletin*. 
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Using the news article as the unit of analysis, the Hawai‘i newspaper index file was accessed online through the Hawai‘i Public Library system Web site. The online index indexed articles only for years in the 1990s and did not contain article location. The researcher was able to access the newspaper indexes for all seven years from The University of Hawai‘i at Manoa. The university sent the indexes via a PDF file, and the articles themselves were retrieved from microfilm and microfiche and sent in installments via a PDF file. The indexes listed the name of the article, the date, the location, and the paper in which the articles appeared.

The indexes showed, 629 articles pertaining to Kaho‘olawe for the seven-year time frame. In a close examination of the articles, the researcher found that the Sunday edition of the papers was combined into one paper; thus; the researcher excluded all articles published on Sundays. This left 519 articles that were analyzed for this study. Based on the indexes and duplicate copies of articles, it was found that a small percentage of the articles appeared in both newspapers. These articles were put into a third category of dual papers. For the dual category, the researcher coded only one of the articles. The article coded was the article that appeared closest to the first page, which was found via the indexes. Each article was numbered for article identification.

Coding

The development of framing devices was influenced by other framing research (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; Gan et al., 2005; McComas & Shanahan, 1999; and Brossard et al., 2003). The researcher examined other journal articles dealing with framing to identify different types of frames. The Sunday articles that the researcher discarded were used for pilot tests to find subject trends in an aid in devising the framing questions. Framing questions were devised and
implemented in a number of test studies. The six frames were Advocate, Economy, Environment, Military, Hawaiian, and Political.

To test frame validity, two coders coded articles (see appendix A and B); then disagreements on the coding process were discussed and frames were modified. Then, the entire process began again and after about repeating the process five times, the current set of framing questions was actually implemented (see appendix A). In addition, framing typology validity was enhanced through a series of pilot studies that were used to train two coders to accurately use the framing questions. A high percentage rate of approximately 90-92 percent was attained.

As the coding process began, each article was examined for article number, newspaper, date (month, day, and year), journalist’s family name, journalist’s gender, location of article, and type of article (editorial or regular). The researcher used the indexes to look up each article location and the designation of each article as a regular article or an editorial. If the article was cited as an editorial, the coder read and coded the article headline and the entire article. If there was no designation on the article indexes, the coder only coded the headline and the first six paragraphs of the article. The article headline was coded separately from the article body. The two were then combined and a frame winner was found (see appendix A and B).

In addition to the measurement of frames, the first person quoted in the article and the number of times a person was paraphrased in an article was coded (see appendix B). If two frames appeared with the same high number of framing questions, a tie was broken by looking at whom the first quote came from. If the quote could not break the tie, the person paraphrased most frequently was examined and used. Last, if a tie was not broken through the two devices listed above, the coder pulled the article and read the first paragraph to get the main point of the article. The main point was used to find a frame winner and break the tie.
The headline and subhead line of each article was read and coded based on the framing questions (see appendix A). The article body was read (based on type of article, either the entire article or the first six paragraphs) and coded based on the coding questions (see appendix A). The headline and body were combined for a possible score of 0 – 8 (0 = no frame present, 1 = 1 framing question was answered, 2 = 2 framing questions answered and so on). Based on the highest number of frames present, a frame winner was found for each article. (6 = Advocate, 5 = Economy, 4 = Environment, 3 = Military, 2 = Hawaiian, 1 = Political, and 0 = no frame present). A frame second winner was also cited (see appendix B).

Each article was logged on a separate coding sheet. All data from the coding sheets was entered in SPSS. An Excel file was kept with each article’s title and the author and any duplicate articles were deleted.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Data were collected from 519 newspaper articles in two Hawaiian newspapers—The Honolulu Star Bulletin and The Honolulu Advertiser. Frequencies showed 48.2 percent of the articles examined were from The Honolulu Advertiser, 45.7 percent were from The Honolulu Star Bulletin and 6.2 percent of the articles appeared in both newspapers (see table 1). Of the 519 newspapers examined in these analyses, 86.3 percent were considered regular newspaper articles while 13.7 were of editorial nature (see table 2). Frequencies also showed that, 33.3 percent were written in 1977, followed by 16.6 percent of articles that were written in 1976. Of the five years examined in the 1990s, 1993 showed the highest percentage of articles, 14.5 percent, with the other years trailing behind (see table 3).

Frequencies showed February as the month with the highest presentation of articles accounting for 15 percent, followed by the month of May, which accounted for 11.9 percent of articles appearing in one of the two newspapers and/or both (see table 4). Section one, page three of the newspapers were most prevalent in article placement with 21.8 percent of the articles appearing in this location. This location was followed by section one, page one where 15.8 percent of the articles appeared (see table 5).

Over half of newspaper journalists reporting on issues dealing with Kahoʻolawe were male, 53 percent 13.9 were female (see table 6). Both newspapers used their own journalists in writing articles about Kahoʻolawe most of the time, while wire services were used only 2.5 percent of the time (see table 7). A large number of the journalists wrote about Kahoʻolawe only sporadically. Only five reporters wrote about Kahoʻolawe more than 1.5 percent of the time. One journalist, Edwin Tanji, who wrote for The Honolulu Advertiser, Maui County Bureau, had
written 13.3 percent of the articles examined in this analysis (see table 8). Only 7.1 percent of the journalists were of Hawaiian/Portuguese descent (see table 9).

Frequencies showed the person most quoted in the newspaper articles was that of a politician with 20.4 percent (see table 15). Likewise, the person most paraphrased in the articles was some type of political figure with 19.3 percent of the paraphrases (see table 16).

The first research question was interested in the dominant media frames. Using the framing devices implemented in this study, the newspaper article headline showed the Political frame was most prevalent being used 26 percent of the time (see table 17). In contrast, the newspaper article body showed the Military frame as the most used frame being used 58.6 percent of the time (see table 18). Similarly, the newspaper article headline and newspaper article body combined showed the Military frame being used most with 47.4 percent of the frames (see table 19). The article headline and body winner showed the Advocate frame as the frame winner with 28.3 percent of the frames (see table 20).

The second research question asked how frames changed over time. As the frequencies showed different frames were prevalent at different periods. A 3 x 6 chi-square test of independence was calculated comparing the six frames with the three time-frames (frequencies for years combined are shown in table 14). A significant interaction was found ($X^2 (10) = 100.624, p < .01$), showing the Advocate frame as the frame used most by journalists in the 70s; being used 44 percent of the time. These analyses showed the second most used frame as the
Military frame; it was used 18.1 percent of the time (see table 21 and figure 1)

Figure 1: Frame Winners and Years Grouped

In the early 1990s, the most prevalent frame was the Political frame appearing 36 percent of the time. The Environment frame increased too, being used 19.4 percent of the time. In 1993 and 1994 the Political frame was the prevalent frame being used 35.3 percent of the time (see table 21 and figure 1).

The next research question focused on the journalist’s family name and the frequency of frames. A 4 x 6 chi-square test of independence was calculated comparing the journalist’s family name with the frequency of frames (see table 22). The data (X²(15) = 15.122, p > .05) indicates no consistency with the expected values. Thus, there was no significant deviation between a journalist’s family name and the frames he or she used. Despite the findings, there were some results that should be noted. Journalists with a family name of Hawaiian/Portuguese
descent were more likely to write an article about advocates, 35 percent of the time, but were less likely to write about the military, 5 percent of the time (see table 22).

The next research question focused on a journalist’s gender and his or her use of frames in writing articles about Kaho’olawe. The researcher conducted a 3 x 6 chi-square test of independence to calculate the relationship between a journalist’s gender and the six frames. No significant relationship was found (X2(15) = 0.546, p > .05). The gender of a journalist and the frames he/she chose to use were independent of each other, however, cross tabulation showed that men tended to report fairly equally on all of the six frames (see table 23). Women tended to report on the advocates most, 38 percent of the time (see table 23).

The data supported the fifth research question, which was interested in media frames that favored one side (Navy or Hawaiian) over the other side. A one-way ANOVA was computed analyzing the tone of the newspaper articles with the six frames. The ANOVA showed a significant difference between the tone of a newspaper article (F (5) = 31.196, p < .01) and the frames used. Because the ANOVA is an omnibus test not revealing which of the groups’ means were different from each other, Bonferroni’s Post Hoc Test was calculated. Bonferroni’s Post Hoc Test revealed that the six frames all showed tone differences. Especially evident were the differences between the military (m = 2.7536, sd = 1.29939) frame and the Hawaiian (m = .4500, sd = .99534) frame (see tables 25 and 26).

The sixth research question asked if there were differences between The Star Bulletin and The Honolulu Advertiser and the frames they used in writing articles pertaining to Kaho’olawe. An independent-samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of The Honolulu Star Bulletin and the mean score of The Honolulu Advertiser. No significant difference was found (t (482.404) = 0.218, p > .05, showing that the mean of the Star Bulletin (m = 1.1435, sd =
1.40387) was not significantly different from the mean of *The Honolulu Advertiser* (m = 1.116, sd = 1.37627). Both papers tended to report the same frames equally (see table 27).

In addition to the independent samples t test a 3 x 6 chi-square test of independence was calculated comparing the newspapers, the dual category and the frames (see table 24). No significant relationship was found (X²(10) = 7.175 p > .05).

The last research question was interested in picture frequency within an article. A picture accompanied an article 23.5 percent of the time (see table 11). Of the 122 articles that implemented a picture, more than half appeared in *The Honolulu Advertiser* (see table 12). An advocate was displayed in 23 percent of the pictures followed by a politician 19 percent of the time (see table 13).
Table 1: Frequencies for Name of Newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Star Bulletin</th>
<th>Honolulu</th>
<th>Dual Paper</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 519</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Frequencies for Type of Newspaper Article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Editorial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 519</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Any article that was not listed as an editorial in the indexes was considered a regular article

Table 3: Frequencies for Newspaper Article Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Frequencies for Newspaper Article Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 519</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Frequencies for Newspaper Article Location (section of paper)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page of Paper</th>
<th>First page</th>
<th>Second page</th>
<th>Third page</th>
<th>All Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 519</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Frequencies for Newspaper Journalist Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Reporter</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Can’t Tell</th>
<th>No Reporter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages = 100.00%</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 519</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Frequencies for Newspaper Journalist Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Newspaper’s Own Reporter</th>
<th>The Associated Press</th>
<th>No Byline</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 519</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 4 = newspaper’s own reporter, 3 = newspaper’s state bureau (any reporter from any other island), 2 = the associated Press, 1 = other bureau/newspaper, 0 = can’t tell (see appendix B). Newspaper’s own reporter, state bureaus and other island bureaus were combined in this table.
Table 8: Top Ten Frequencies for Newspaper Article Journalists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Tanji</th>
<th>Fujimoto</th>
<th>Matsunaga</th>
<th>McCoy</th>
<th>Yoshishige</th>
<th>Haugen</th>
<th>Alton</th>
<th>Ashizawa</th>
<th>Yamaguchi</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages=100.00%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 519</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (see appendix B).

Table 9: Frequencies for Journalists Family Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Hawaiian/Portuguese</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Japanese/Chinese</th>
<th>Can’t Tell/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages = 100.00%</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 519</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 3 = Hawaiian/Portuguese, 2 = American (any other ethnicity than the ones listed), 1 = Japanese/Chinese, 0 = cannot Tell (see appendix b).
Table 10: Frequencies for Tone of Newspaper Article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>Strong Hawaiian</th>
<th>Moderate Hawaiian</th>
<th>Neutral Military</th>
<th>Moderate Military</th>
<th>Strong Military</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages =</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>11.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 519</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Likert scale used, 0 = strong Hawaiian, 1 = moderate Hawaiian, 2 = neutral, 3 = moderate military, 4 = strong military (see appendix B).

Table 11: Frequencies for Newspaper Article Picture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was there a visual picture?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages = 100.00%</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 519</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Number of Pictures within Newspaper Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Number of pictures within newspaper articles for an inconsecutive seven-year period.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Honolulu Star Bulletin</em></td>
<td>Number = 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Honolulu Advertiser</em></td>
<td>Number = 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Paper</td>
<td>Number = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Articles</td>
<td>Number = 122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: Frequencies for Representation of a Picture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Economist</th>
<th>Environmentalist</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Politician</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 122</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The picture may represent: 6 = advocate, 5 = economist, 4 = environmentalist, 3 = military, 2 = Hawaiian, 1 = politician, 0 = other, and 99 = no picture (see appendix b).

Table 14: Frequencies for Years Grouped Together in Three Time Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 519</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Years recoded and grouped together.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Quoted</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Quote</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalist</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total =</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Coded 7 = no quote, 6 = advocate, 5 = economic, 4 = environment, 3 = military, 2 = Hawaiian, and 1 = political (see appendix b).
Table 16: Frequencies for Number of Times Each Type of Person Was Paraphrased in a Newspaper Article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Political</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N -</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total =</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 100.00% Coded: 6 = advocate, 5 = economic, 4 = environment, 3 = military, 2 = Hawaiian, 1 = political (see appendix B).
### Table 17: Frequencies of Frames Represented in Newspaper Article Headline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Political</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total =</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Possibility of 4 questions per frame (see appendix A for framing questions). 0 = no frame present, 1 = coder answered yes to one framing question, 2 = coder answered yes to two framing questions, 3 = coder answered yes to three framing questions, 4 = coder answered yes to four framing questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Political</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N -</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total =</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Total=</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Possibility of 4 questions per frame. (See appendix A for framing questions). 0 = no frame present, 1 = coder answered yes to one framing question, 2 = coder answered yes to two framing questions, 3 = coder answered Yes to three framing questions, 4 = coder answered yes to four framing questions.
Table 19: Frequencies of Frames Represented in Newspaper Article Headline and Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Political</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total =</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Total =</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number = 519. Note: Possibility of 8 points total. Article headline and article body combined to give a Score of 0 – 8 (see appendix A for framing questions).
Table 20: Frequencies of Newspaper Article Frame Winner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The frame with the most points 0 – 8 won. If a tie resulted, the winner was differentiated based on the first person quoted. Who was quoted first used the following scale, 7 = no quote, 6 = advocate, 5 = economic, 4 = environment, 3 = military, 2 = Hawaiian, and 1 = political. If the quoted could not break the tie, we looked to the person most paraphrased. How often was each type of person paraphrased? The coder listed next to each frame 6 = advocate, 5 = economic, 4 = environment, 3 = military, 2 = Hawaiian, and 1 = political how many times a person was paraphrased (0-6). If a tie could not be broken based on the quote or paraphrase, the coder pulled the article and read the first paragraph to determine the main point of the article.
Table 21: Percentages and Chi-Square for Years Grouped and Article Frame Winner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76 &amp; 77</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.624</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90, 91, 92</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 &amp; 94</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22: Percentages and Chi-Square for Journalist Family Name and Frame Winner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>15.122</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese/Chinese</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Portuguese</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23: Percentages and Chi-Square for Journalist Gender and Frame Winner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>13.736</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t Tell</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reporter</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Bulletin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Advertiser</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25: One Way ANOVA for Tone of Article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.196</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>513</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>P &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>.8571</td>
<td>1.15564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>1.6071</td>
<td>1.25725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>.9677</td>
<td>1.25408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>2.7536</td>
<td>1.29939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>.4500</td>
<td>.95334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>.8571</td>
<td>1.15564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p < .01, p < .05. Tone of Story (more Hawaiian or more military)
Table 26: Bonferroni's Post Hoc Test for Tone of Article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>0.4071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>-1.8964*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>-0.1106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>-0.2653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>-0.4071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>-2.3036*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>-0.5177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>-1.1571*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>-0.6724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>1.8965*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>2.3036*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1.7859*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>1.1465*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>1.6312*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>0.1106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>0.5177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>-1.7859*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>-0.6394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Advocate -0.1547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Political 0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian 1.1571*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military -1.1465*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment 0.6394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate 0.4847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Independent Samples T-Test between Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Star</th>
<th>Honolulu</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin</td>
<td>Advertiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means &amp;</td>
<td>Means &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1435</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.40387)</td>
<td>(1.37627)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p <.01, p <.05.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Disputes over land use provide for heated controversy between communities. The way in which the media address these controversies is not well documented or understood. To add to the current literature addressing land disputes, this study was interested in examining newspaper coverage about the struggles between communities claiming ownership of a Hawaiian island. On one side were the Hawaiians who wanted the island returned to the state in order to teach Hawaiian culture and tradition. On the other side was the military who felt that they should have continued use of the island for military training purposes. At first glance, disputes involving land may seem simple, but many complex factors involving political, economic and social ramifications contribute to the outcomes of land disputes. The media are one such factor that can impact public opinion. Therefore, media frames do have an influence on outcomes between communities for land acquisition.

In analyzing news coverage on the quest of Kahoʻolawe, the researcher found that media frames changed over time, and as frames changed so did the tone of an article and in the end, the Hawaiians gained media standing.

Frequencies showed that the headline of an article employed the Political frame most; however, the body of an article showed the Military frame as dominant. When the article headline and body were combined, the Military frame still appeared as the dominant frame. Overall, when a tie was broken between frames, the Advocate frame was most prevalent. Interestingly, different parts of the article showed different frame usage. The data suggests that the article headline tended to promote political figures and/or politics in some manner. Similarly, politicians were quoted more than advocates, military, Hawaiians, economists, and
environmentalists. It was not surprising that the Advocate and Military frames appeared most
dominant in the 1970s because the tumultuous relationship between them was exasperated when
two advocates lost their lives at sea while returning to Maui after an illegal protest on
Kaho’olawe. In addition, on several occasions, the military had to cease bombing practices while
trespassers were found and escorted off the island and taken to jail. What is surprising is the
frequent use of the Political frame in the article headlines. Another interesting finding was the
almost nonexistent Economy frame during this time period, because lingering in the background
of the controversy between the rivals were ramifications of a possible economic tragedy. Just
miles away from the bombing of Kaho’olawe sat Maui, a popular tourist destination. At one
point, the military had accidentally dropped a bomb on Maui (1969), alarming political officials
as well as residents. Potentially, this notion could have hurt the Hawaiian economy greatly, but
this research showed that the media rarely used the Economy frame to show this possible
problem.

In 1990, 1991, and 1992 the Political frame was the most dominant frame, followed by
the Environment frame. These findings are in line with social events that were occurring locally
and to some extent nationally. In 1990, President George Bush halted bombing practices on
Kaho’olawe. Sen. Daniel Inouye was a voice in Congress in the process of returning Kaho’olawe
to the State of Hawai’i. In addition, in the 1990s political figures started to take on the fight for
the return of Kaho’olawe to the state of Hawai’i. Environmentally, as a nation, we were
becoming more adept at saving our environment and making better choices pertaining to the
environment. Thus, the bombing of an island and the surrounding Pacific waters became an
important issue for environmentalists, and for the media.
In 1993 and 1994, the Political frame continued as the most dominant frame followed by the Hawaiian frame. In 1993 political ramifications were set in place for the return of Kaho’olawe to the state of Hawai’i. In 1994 the military signed over the island of Kaho’olawe to the state of Hawai’i.

A journalist’s family name and the frames he or she chose to use in reporting issues about Kaho’olawe revealed no correlation. Some findings showed that journalists with a family name of Hawaiian/Portuguese tended to use all the media frames more frequently, with the exception of the Military and the Economic frames. In addition, The Japanese/Chinese family name used the economic frame most predominately. The use of the economic frame by the Japanese/Chinese was interesting since the Japanese were frequently in the Hawaiian news for buying highly expensive Hawaiian real estate.

The researcher included an analysis of journalist gender because other research (Sutcliffe, Lee, & Soderlund, 2005) suggested differences between the use of media frames and the journalist’s gender. In addition, the same study found that female reporters were more apt to use “female sources in their stories” (p.99). The gender of a journalist and his or her use of media frames showed findings relevant enough to mention. Men tended to use frames equally in their reporting on issues about Kaho’olawe. Women used the Advocate frame the most frequently followed by the Political frame. Gan et al. (2005) found that the use of media frames was, indeed, related to a journalist’s ethnicity and gender.

The fifth research question asked if the tone of the story (more Hawaiian or more military) varied with the six frames. Significant differences were found among the frames used and tone (more Hawaiian or more military) of the story. The most significant differences were with the use of the Military frame. This frame showed significant differences with all five of the
frames, with the largest difference between the Hawaiian and Military frames. The findings suggest that media frames do, in fact, provide an outlet for the journalist in providing coverage of an event that may represent one side more or less than the other side.

The last research question asked whether media frames used by the two newspapers differed. Results showed that both newspapers used the same frames fairly equally, however, a couple of interesting themes emerged. First, *The Honolulu Star Bulletin* was considered a newspaper more in tune with Hawaiian culture and tradition. The results showed that *The Star Bulletin* used the Political, Military, and Environment frames more than *The Advertiser*. *The Advertiser* used the Advocate and Economic frames more frequently than *The Star Bulletin*. Secondly, both *The Star Bulletin* and *The Honolulu Advertiser* used the Hawaiian frame equally. Being that *The Honolulu Star Bulletin* was considered a newspaper that was more in tune with Hawaiian culture, it was predicted that the two papers would differ in their use of the Hawaiian frame. Likely implications are that since both newspapers were housed in the same building until 1993, they may have adopted a regional frame approach while housed together.

What does the performance of O’ahu’s two local newspapers tell us about events surrounding the fight and eventual return of Kaho’olawe? It suggests that the media do not always provide balanced coverage. It may appear that the media sit on the sidelines and wait for the power to shift. In fact, when a frame changed, so did the tone of the story. Implications for this notion suggest that journalists are not always objective in their reporting.

The findings in this study are consistent with other research (Gibson, 2004; Roth & Vander Harr, 2006). In all three case studies, the power shifts giving way to a more equal consensus of reporting. The question is why haven’t journalists learned to report all sides of an issue from the start?
Gibson (2004) in his research on the media and Seattle’s politics of urban redevelopment found that the media quoted business sources 64 percent of the time, while advocates were only quoted 1 percent of the time. Later, however, when an ultimatum was given, thus, shifting the power, business sources were quoted 33 percent of time and the quotes from advocates rose to 23 percent. Gibson equates these shifts by the media through a shift in media frames from a consensus frame to a Controversial frame. He explains the Consensus frame as drawn on by Hallin (1994) was implemented when the media considered an event as uncontroversial. A shift to the Controversial frame means the issue at hand is controversial. In the case of Kaho’olawe, the media may have been in a consensus phase prior to the start of this research. The first year researched in this study was 1976, and by this time the case of Kaho’olawe had become quite controversial.

Roth and Vander Harr (2006) found that the rivals in the case of Taylor Yard adopted two different interests. People in favor of industrial development portrayed redevelopment purely in the economic sense. In the other vein, people who favored a park over redevelopment projected a social interest. According to Kaniss (1991), the Economic frame should prevail as it symbolically represents the power. In addition, Kaniss suggests that the media tend to zoom in and focus on how redevelopment will beautify the economy at a local level, but on the other end of the spectrum, the media leave out social and economic implications, such as cost to the taxpayers and/or uprooting citizens. Instead, the media focus on the wonderful redevelopment for all involved. This shows that the media can indeed promote certain issues, events, or voices by their use of media frames. However, in the case of Taylor Yard and Kaho’olawe, the media may have unknowingly implemented Kaniss’ findings in the beginning, but as time progressed the power did not prevail, showing that Kaniss’ findings should be re-considered.
Aiu (1997) suggests that language defines social life, in a parallel analogy, so too, can the use of framing devices mirror the events happening within a culture. “For Native Hawaiians, the island of Kaho’olawe represented a safe haven for their culture: a place where traditional cultural practices are reborn. For the military, Kaho’olawe represented a space unique to their military needs” (Aiu, 1997). Other research (Roth & Vander Harr, 2006) demonstrates how media framing takes two distinct angles. One side reveals economic ramifications while the other side portrays social aspects. If language defines social life, as Aiu (1997) suggests, the media frames employing social aspects in the return of Kaho’olawe should prevail. Perhaps the military felt their sense of power would prevail so they kept their sense of secrecy, which came across in the press coverage in the two newspapers.

In the case of Kaho’olawe, it almost seemed implausible that the military would lose the island to the state of Hawai’i. Not only was the military viewed as having more symbolic power than the Hawaiians, but the cost shouldered by taxpayers to clean the island of unexploded ordnance suggested the return of the island as unlikely. The repeated social aspects of the advocates, Hawaiians, and then political figures describing Kaho’olawe as a sacred place in which to teach Hawaiian culture and tradition over time resonated with the media. Thus, the projected use of the island for Hawaiians became a symbolic media frame in itself that picked up momentum and gained the support of influential political figures and environmental activists. This transformed the power of the military into a political alliance that backed the Hawaiians. In addition, the military’s sense of secrecy and their perceived notion of economic tragedy if the island was returned, perhaps hindered their projection of the Military frame, providing the advocate frame as dominate.
To date, there have been only a few studies (Rachlin, 1989; Gamson & Modigliani, 1989) that have implemented the study of a picture within a newspaper article. Rachlin examined *Time* and *Newsweek* covers, Gamson and Modigliani researched cartoons pertaining to nuclear power. This study found that one in four of the articles examined employed a picture. *The Honolulu Advertiser* included a picture with an article twice as much as *The Honolulu Star Bulletin* did. As discussed earlier, different levels of an article tend to emphasize different things. Like, article headlines, which engaged in political suggestions, overall, most article pictures, portrayed an advocate. There was, however, an increase in the early 1990s of pictures showing political and environmental figures and in 1993 and 1994, pictures of Hawaiians became more frequent.

The findings suggest that the relationship between the media and their coverage of land disputes through frames, quotes and pictures need to be investigated further.

Limitations

Recently, framing has been used for studies dealing with land acquisition. One limitation is that there are many different topics covered in framing research. Not any one topic is deep in framing literature. A researcher must look at a wide array of studies as opposed to studies dealing with one topic. A more precise tool for devising framing devises could lead to a solid background backing framing research.

Acquiring newspaper articles from other island newspapers via an index is a problem because none of the other papers have indexes. To analyze *The Maui News*, one would have to go through years of papers. This research had set out in the beginning to include an examination of *The Maui News* along with the O‘ahu papers, but because of the time factor involved to weed through seven years of papers, *The Maui News* was not examined in this study. Both newspapers
examined in this research were considered mainstream papers, but a drawback was that both were from O’ahu and both were housed in the same location until 1993.

Future Research

Future research should investigate newspaper articles from the start of the military takeover of Kaho’olawe through the return. Did a media consensus take place before the controversy? In addition, newspapers from each Hawaiian island should be examined to find out if different newspapers framed the events differently based on their geographic locations. Other media outlets, like television news should be incorporated into the research to find out if there are differences between media strategy. Any type of military paper might give more insight into media frames from a military perspective. Last, a qualitative study involving interviews of the journalists who frequently wrote about Kaho’olawe and/or an anthology of pictures by photo journalists would be an interesting research topic.
APPENDIX A: FRAMING QUESTIONS
Advocate Frame
1. Does the story mention activists or holdouts (e.g., Aluli, Ritte, Sawyer, Helm, Mitchell) or groups (e.g., Protect Kaho’olawé ‘Ohana)?
2. Does the story mention trespassing or any type of protest or occupation?
3. Does the story mention any repercussions to the advocates?
4. Does the story refer to disagreements between the advocates and the military or the advocates and the Hawaiians?

Economic Frame
1. Does the story discuss economic consequences if there was a halt in bombing or continuation of bombing?
2. Is there any mention of clean-up costs?
3. Does the story mention any type of economic report or survey?
4. Is there any mention of the bombing of the island being bad for local tourism on the other islands?

Environment Frame
1. Does the story make any mention of the environment?
2. Is there any mention of the repercussions on the environment because of the bombing?
3. Is there any mention of people “environmentally” helping the island?
4. Is there any reference to animals that had or are living on the island? including animals in the surrounding waters?
Military Frame

1. Does the story mention the military?

2. Is there any mention by the military that the island is of little or no use (e.g., nothing of aesthetic value, no vegetation).

3. Is there any mention of how the military treats trespassers on the island?

4. Does the story defend the military’s use of the island for military training?

Hawaiian Frame

1. Does the story talk about Hawaiians (‘Ohana and/or Family).

2. Is there any mention of native claims? (Anything to do with Hawaiian culture, religious practices or symbolism).

3. Does the story emphasize how Hawaiians feel about the bombing of Kaho‘olawe?

4. Is there any mention of how the Hawaiians feel about movements to reclaim the island?

Political Frame

1. Does the story present information from a politician (including sheriffs and judges)?

2. Does the story discuss the return of the island to the state of Hawai‘i?

3. Is there any mention of one political side feuding with another political side?

4. Is there any mention of administrations (Congress, White House, etc…) supporting either side (Navy or Hawaiian)?
APPENDIX B: CODING QUESTIONS
V1: Story Identification Number# ________________________.

Each newspaper article will have a number to identify it. Please write the number on the article and write the same number above.

V2: Story Headline. Write down the headline of the newspaper article you are examining.

V3: Story Day (day and month). Write down the month and day of the article.

V4: Story Year. Circle the year the article was written.


1977  1991  1993

V5: Newspaper Name. The Star Bulletin = (0), The Honolulu Advertiser = (1), Dual Papers = (2). Look at the title of the newspaper and write the number down that corresponds with the correct newspaper.

V6: Is the reporter Male or Female? If you can determine by the journalist’s name if he/she is male or female, please circle the correct choice below. If there are two reporters listed, please list the reporter whose name appears first. 3 = No Reporter Listed  Male = (2)  Female = (1) Can’t Tell = (0)

What is the name of the reporter/s? ________________________________.

V7: Reporter’s Family Name. Based on the journalist’s name, try to distinguish her/his ethnicity. Circle the number that corresponds with the correct choice below.

Hawaiian/Portuguese = (3)

American (any other ethnicity than the ones listed) = (2)

Japanese/Chinese = (1)

Cannot Tell = (0)
V8: Story Type. For all articles, with the exception of editorials, please read only the first six paragraphs, if the article is an editorial, please read the entire article. If the story is identified as an editorial in the index, please write “editorial” in the space provided and read the entire article. ________________.

(0) = editorial; (1) = regular article.

V9: Story Origin. Some articles will list what type of reporter wrote the story (usually under the journalist’s name. If you can find this information, please circle the correct option (4 – 0) below. If you can’t find this information, please circle (0) below.

Newspaper’s own reporter = (4)
Newspaper’s state bureau (any reporter from any other island) = (3)
The Associated Press = (2)
Other bureau/newspapers = (1)
Can’t tell = (0)

V10: Story location. Look up article location in the newspaper index. Coded as the following: The placement of the story within the newspaper (meaning section).

For example, if the story is in section 1 (A) on page (12), the code will be (12). If the story is in section 2 (B) on page (22), the code will be (222). If the story is in section 3 (C) on page (31), the code will be (331). Please follow this format for all sections.

Section 1 (1-99)
If the story appears in the first section on the front page = 1
If the story appears in the first section on the second page = 2
If the story appears in the first section on the third page = 3
Section 2 (100-199)
If the story appears in the second section on the first page = 100
If the story appears in the second section on the second page = 102
If the story appears in the second section on the third page = 103
Section 3 (200-299).
If the story appears in the third section on the first page = 200
If the story appears in the third section on the second page = 202
If the story appears in the third section on the third page = 203
Please follow this format for remaining sections in section 3.
Section 4 (300-399)
If the story appears in the fourth section on the first page = 300
If the story appears in the fourth section on the second page = 302
If the story appears in the fourth section on the third page = 303
Section 5 (400-499)
If the story appears in the fifth section on the first page = 400
If the story appears in the fifth section on the second page = 402
If the story appears in the fifth section on the third page = 403
Section 6 (500-599)
If the story appears in the six section on the first page = 500
If the story appears in the six section on the second page = 502
If the story appears in the six section on the third page = 503
V11: Story Headline. Read the story headline and read the set of framing questions provided for each frame. Assign a number (4 -1) to each question. For example, if you answer (Yes) to all four questions in the Advocate frame, you will assign a number (4) to the Advocate frame. If you
answer (Yes) to three questions in the Military frame, you will assign a number (3) to the Military frame. Again, assign a number based on the questions you answer (YES) to, to the corresponding frame.

Advocate frame (4-1)
Economic frame (4-1)
Environment frame (4-1)
Military frame (4-1)
Hawaiian frame (4-1)
Political frame (4-1)

V12: The Body of the Story. Read the body of the article and then answer appropriately based on the framing questions. Assign a (4 -1) to each question. For example, if you answer (Yes) to all four questions in the Advocate frame, you will assign a number (4) to the advocate frame. If you answer (Yes) to three questions in the Military frame, you will assign a number (3). Again, assign a number based on the questions you answer (YES) to, to the corresponding frame.

Advocate frame (4-1)
Economic frame (4-1)
Environment frame (4-1)
Military frame (4-1)
Hawaiian frame (4-1)
Political frame (4-1).

V13: Dominant Theme of the Story. For the headline and the body of the story, look at the numbers you placed next to the frames above. Add these two numbers up and write the number down next to the corresponding frame. For example, if you assigned a (4) to the Advocate frame
in the first section (headline) and then you assigned a (2) to the Advocate frame in the second section you will add \((4 + 2) = (6)\). Another example is as follows: If you assign a (4) to the Economic frame in the first section (headline) and then you assign a (4) to the Economic frame in the second section (body), add these two numbers \((4 + 4) = (8)\).

V14: Frame Winner (what frame was the winner)?

If there is a tie between frames, please label as such and leave for the researcher. A tie will be broken based on who the quotes came from. If the tie cannot be broken based on the quote, look to the person who was paraphrased in the article the most. Lastly, if the paraphrases do not break the tie, pull the article, read the first paragraph and go with the primary topic of the article.

6 = Advocate

5 = Economist

4 = Environmentalist

3 = Military

2 = Hawaiian

1 = Political

V15: Second Headline + Body Winner. Only list if there is a second winner, if another tie arises, please list as no second winner. Advocate (6); Economist (5); Environmentalist (4); Military (3); Hawaiian (2); Political (1); No Second Winner (99).

V16: Person Quoted First. Circle below whom the first quote in the article is from:

No Person Quoted   (7)
Advocate           (6)
Economist          (5)
Environmentalist   (4)
Military (3)
Hawaiian (2)
Political (1)
Other (0)

V17: Person Paraphrased. List how many times each type of person was paraphrased.

Advocate
Economist
Environmentalist
Military
Hawaiian
Politician/s
Other/None

V18: What is the Tone of the Story? Is it more for the (Hawaiians) or more for the (military) or (Neutral)? Using the Likert scale below, please circle the number (4 – 0) that corresponds with the tone of the story. For example, when you read the headline, does it make you feel like the headline is very strongly suggesting a tone that points toward Strongly Hawaiian? If so, circle (0) on the scale. Alternatively, when you read the headline, do you feel like the headline is very strongly suggesting a tone that points toward strongly military? If yes, circle (4) on the following scale. Or, does the article moderately sway toward the Hawaiians or the military (Moderate Hawaiian or Moderate military If the article headline feels only Moderate toward the military, circle (3), if the article feels only moderate toward the Hawaiians, circle (1). If you read the article and you feel that it sides with the Hawaiians and the Military equally, please circle (2) Neutral on the Likert scale.
0 = Strong Hawaiian
1 = Moderate Hawaiian
2 = Neutral
3 = Moderate Military
4 = Strong Military

V19: Does the story have a visual picture?
0 = No
1 = Yes

V20: Who does the picture primary represent? Please circle one of the choices below.
6 = Advocate/s
5 = Economist
4 = Environmentalist or anything to do with the environment
3 = Military, bombs, etc…
2 = Hawaiian/s
1 = Politician/s
0 = Other
Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense

Subject: Use of the Island of Kaho‘olawe, Hawaii, as a Weapons Range

You are directed to discontinue use of Kaho‘olawe as a weapons range effective immediately. This directive extends to use of the island for small arms, artillery, naval gunfire support, and aerial ordnance training. In addition, you are directed to establish a joint Department of Defense-State of Hawaii commission to examine the future status of Kaho‘olawe and related issues.

George Bush
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