

FRAMING OF THE SINGAPORE SUMMIT IN *THE NEW YORK TIMES* AND *ASAHI*
SHIMBUN

by

Andrew Michael Ransleben Villarreal, B.A.I.S.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
with a Major in International Studies
May 2019

Committee Members:

Sandhya Rao, Chair

Alexander Y. Muk

Paul Hart

COPYRIGHT

by

Andrew Michael Ransleben Villarreal

2019

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgement. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

As the copyright holder of this work I, Andrew Michael Ransleben Villarreal, authorize duplication of this work, in whole or in part, for educational or scholarly purposes only.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Joe Villarreal Jr. (1939-2012) and Susie Villarreal, the memory of my brother, Vincent Villarreal (1988-2000), the memory of my grandfather, Arno Ransleben (1916-2003), and the memory of my grandmother, Ernestine Ransleben (1921-2019).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first thank my mother, Susie Villarreal, for always supporting my passions and encouraging me to do the right thing. I would also like to thank all of my professors that I have had throughout my career at Texas State University, from entering as a freshman in 2012 to my last semester taking courses in Fall 2018. The path has been long, but their guidance and support has helped shape who I am becoming as an academic. I would like to thank Dr. Dunn for his dedication to the Center for International Studies for 50 years and for his recommendation to the Graduate Program. It was through the Center that I discovered my passion for international relations.

I would like to thank my committee Dr. Sandhya Rao, Dr. Alexander Muk, and Dr. Paul Hart for their guidance and support throughout the thesis process. Dr. Rao, thank you for bearing with me through the writing and revising process and guiding me to make this thesis as good as possible.

Lastly, I would like to thank my husband, Alexander Cruz, for being by my side the entire time. Late nights spent writing were always met with understanding and supportive words of encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW	8
III. METHODOLOGY	20
IV. FINDINGS.....	24
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	37
APPENDIX SECTION	43
REFERENCES	44

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4.1 <i>The New York Times</i> and <i>Asahi Shimbun</i> Framing	24
4.2 <i>The New York Times</i> and <i>Asahi Shimbun</i> Tones	25
4.3 <i>The New York Times</i> and <i>Asahi Shimbun</i> Level of Importance	26
4.4 <i>New York Times</i> Tone before and after the Summit	27
4.5 <i>Asahi Shimbun</i> Tone before and after the Summit	27
4.6 <i>New York Times</i> Frame before and after the Summit	28
4.7 <i>Asahi Shimbun</i> Frame before and after the Summit	29
4.8 <i>New York Times</i> level of importance before and after the Summit	30
4.9 <i>Asahi Shimbun</i> level of importance before and after the Summit	30
4.10 Summary of Hypotheses	31

1. INTRODUCTION

American President Donald J. Trump made history on June 12, 2018 by being the first sitting United States President to meet with any Democratic People's Republic of Korea Supreme Leader. The meeting was officially called the 2018 North Korea-United States Summit but is otherwise called the Singapore Summit. During the meeting, President Trump and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un discussed the issue of nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula. The meeting also aimed at building stable peace between the United States and North Korea and for the region. At the end of the five-hour summit, both President Trump and Kim Jong-un signed a one-page agreement containing four commitments with no specifics on how the two leaders' countries would accomplish them. The four commitments made in the agreement are: establish a new U.S.-DPRK relations for peace and prosperity, join efforts together to build a lasting and stable peace regime on the Korean Peninsula, reaffirm the commitment by North Korea to work toward complete denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, and the recovery of POW/MIA remains including immediate repatriation of those already identified (Joint Statement, 2018).

While President Trump may have been the first sitting president to meet with a North Korean leader, he was not the first American President to attempt to deescalate tensions between the United States and North Korea.

Despite close proximity to North Korea and being a target for North Korean aggression, Japan has been noticeably absent from representation while both the United States and South Korea have had talks with Kim Jong-un. Besides being neighbors, Japan and the Korean Peninsula have a sordid past dating back to Imperial Japan's rule over the peninsula and the controversy of women who were stolen from Korea, and other

East Asian countries, by the Imperial Japanese Army to be used as “comfort women” (Getz, 2018). Because peace talks with the North Korean leader Kim Jong-un are historic, it is important to document and analyze coverage of these events in American and Japanese newspapers.

In doing a cross-cultural content analysis of American and Japanese newspaper coverage before and after the Singapore Summit based on framing theory, it is hoped that we can better understand how American and Japanese newspapers framed the Summit itself. Identifying the frames used in the coverage of such a historic event will help in better understanding the perspectives surrounding this issue and also possibly have implications for future American foreign policy.

Goals

This study aims to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a difference in the way American and Japanese newspaper coverage framed the Singapore Summit?
2. Is there a difference in the tone of American and Japanese newspaper coverage of the Singapore Summit?
3. Is there a difference in the level of importance given to the Singapore Summit?
4. Is there a difference in the types of frames, tone of coverage, and level of importance given to the Singapore Summit before and after the summit?

In addition to conducting a content analysis of news articles, this study will include a subjective analysis of editorials to shed additional light on the topic.

Background of US-North Korea Negotiations

Based upon three key events and agreements that have taken place from 1968 until 2018, a background of negotiations will be addressed and presented. During these

three events and agreements Japan has had a role at the negotiation table as a close ally to the United States. The three key agreements are as follows: (1) the 1968 Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; (2) the Agreed Framework of 1994; and (3) the Six-Party Talks from 2003 to 2009.

(1) Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)

The Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or NPT, was opened for signature in 1968 and went into effect in 1970. According to the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), the NPT was ratified by 191 states, including the five nuclear-weapon states (UNODA, 2018). The objective of the NPT is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and technology, promote cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and advance the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament (UNODA).

(2) Agreed Framework 1994

During the Clinton Administration, former president Jimmy Carter went to North Korea and was able to persuade the then North Korean leader Kim Il-sung to dismantle the graphite nuclear reactors, which led to the American and North Korean governments to conduct negotiations that culminated in the October 1994 Agreed Framework, after Kim's death in July 1994. Under this framework the United States agreed to slowly normalize relations with North Korea and open up trade and other economic relations if North Korea gave up its nuclear and weapons programs (Bell & Gilbert, 2017; Clemens, 2016a).

Despite both countries having this agreement, the implementation of the agreement did not take place promptly because both sides were still wary of the other; the United States saw the agreement as a non-proliferation tool, while North Korea saw it as a way to gain political and economic normalization of relations. To add on to the

wariness from the American side, in 1998 North Korea launched a missile over Japanese territory, resulting in former defense secretary William Perry heading up a review of American policies on North Korea. At the end of his review, Perry recommended offering North Korea a choice between improving relations or confrontation (Kang, 2016).

North Korean Vice Marshall Jo Myong Rok visited Washington in October 2000 to invite President Clinton to Pyongyang to have a summit with North Korean leader Kim Jong-Il, who became the leader after his father's death, offering some proposals about missile programs. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright flew to Pyongyang later in the month to prepare for a summit meeting between President Clinton and Kim Jong-Il, with preparations for Clinton to travel being made back in the United States. These plans were put on hold when George W. Bush was declared as the next President of the United States in November 2000 (Kriesberg, 2015a; Cohen, 2016).

President George W. Bush chose Colin Powell to be his Secretary of State and was updated on the progress that had been made regarding the North Korean nuclear issue. Powell stated that he would continue the work that was underway (Kriesberg, 2015a; Cohen, 2016).

After close to two years of no dialogue between the United States and North Korea, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs James Kelly traveled to Pyongyang for a two-day talk with North Korean officials in October 2002 (Clemens, 2016a). According to Clemens, Kelly told the North Korean officials that there was evidence that a weapon program based on enriched uranium had been found, which caused the United States to halt oil shipments to the country. North Korea responded in kind, and reversed progress taken to comply with parts of the agreement. International

Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspectors were kicked out of North Korea, IAEA monitoring cameras were dismantled, and the Yongbyon nuclear facility began to operate again. Finally, in January 2003 North Korea announced its withdrawal from the NPT, creating a nuclear crisis in the eyes of the United States.

(3) Six Party Talks 2003-2009

The first round of Six-Party Talks took place in Beijing in August 2003 among six participating states: The United States, China, Japan, South Korea, North Korea, and Russia. The aims of the Six Party Talks were similar to the Agreed Framework. They wanted to find a peaceful resolution to security concerns regarding North Korean nuclear weapons programs, denuclearize North Korea, and normalize relations between the United States and North Korea. However, unlike the Agreed Framework, the Six-Party Talks were precipitated by an announcement from North Korea about withdrawing from the NPT (Kriesberg, 2015b).

Agreements were made during the next rounds of talks committing to actions such as denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and North Korea rejoining the NPT; United States normalization of relations with North Korea; peaceful use of nuclear energy; United States non-aggression towards North Korea; and 'commitment for commitment, action for action' (Clemens, 2016b).

Just like the Agreed Framework in 1994, actions taken by North Korea caused great stress to the trustworthiness of the Six-Party Talks and the agreements contained within them. After having its assets at Banco Delta Asia frozen in 2005, North Korea tested its first nuclear weapon in October 2006, in contrast to agreements in the Six-Party Talks. On October 31, 2006 Christopher Hill met with North Korean official Kim Gye Gwan, and came to an agreement that North Korea would return to the Six-Party Talks

and allow IAEA inspectors back in once the Banco Delta Asia issue was resolved. This finally happened in 2008 when the United States removed North Korea from the list of state sponsors of terrorism (Kriesberg, 2015b).

Believed to have launched a test of intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) technology in April 2009, the international community condemned North Korea, which brought about the collapse of the Six-Party Talks. North Korea vowed to never take part in, nor be bound by any agreements reached from, the Six-Party Talks (Kang, 2016). On 25 May 2009, North Korea detonated a nuclear device underground, which was once again condemned by the international community, including the other five members of the Six-Party Talks.

Even though the Six-Party Talks had officially been discontinued after the announcement from North Korea, between 2009 and 2018 the United States still had communications with North Korean officials (Fact Sheets & Briefs, 2018). On April 5, 2018, there was an announcement by Chinese President Xi Jinping that North Korean leader Kim Jong-un was willing to resume talks (Nagai, 2018). On February 28, 2019 President Donald J. Trump met with Leader Kim Jong-un in Hanoi, Vietnam, for a second summit about denuclearization. At the Hanoi Summit, President Trump and Leader Kim walked away after failing to agree on steps toward lifting sanctions and denuclearization.

As will be shown, the framing and tone of coverage of events and issues can have effects on policy decision-making and public opinion. It is the hope of the researcher to add to the current literature of frames and tones used in the media, and the implications of this research will primarily be in the field of international communication field as it relates to political science and foreign policy decision-making.

Organization of Thesis

The thesis is organized into five chapters. The first chapter provides a brief background of U.S.-North Korean negotiations and the Singapore Summit, and introduces the goals of the study.

Chapter 2 lays down the theoretical framework used for the study, gives a literature review of previous studies and provides the justification for the study.

Chapter 3 discusses the methodology used for the study, the time frame of data collection, and an explanation of data collection and coding procedures.

Chapter 4 reports the findings of the content analysis as well as the subjective analysis of editorials.

Chapter 5 discusses the results, strengths and limitations of the study, and makes recommendations for applications of the results, as well as for further research in this area.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

This study will use framing theory as its theoretical underpinning. Framing has been used across various different disciplines as a theoretical construct in order to understand and investigate mediated communication and behavior of individuals, and how they interpret and interact with the world around them. As the father of framing theory, Goffman (1974) defined frames as representations of structure “used to hold together an individual’s context of what they are experiencing in their lives” by using a picture frame to explain the theory. Feldman (1995) stated that frames “focus attention on specific dimensions (explanations) for understanding issues,” “highlight issues and particular considerations,” and increase the “likelihood that these considerations will be retrieved when thinking about an issue” (p.267-268).

McCombs (1995) has argued that framing should be considered as the second level of agenda setting theory, which focuses on the transference of issue salience and suggests that media messages contain agendas of objects and attributes.

Framing at its core can be described as a cognitive function, concerned with how issues are depicted in the media, that helps make the world around us knowable and understandable (Durham, 1998). Because the framing was described by Goffman (1974) as organizational to events, the visualization of picture frames makes the concept of framing easier to conceptualize within research literature because it relates back to the way that people use their experiences to understand the world around them.

Since the introduction of framing as a theoretical framework for studying communication, framing has outstripped agenda-setting and priming theories in sheer numbers of studies done. Weaver (2007) shows that from 2001 to 2005 there were 165

framing studies, while in the same time span there were only 43 studies relating to agenda-setting and 25 studies relating to priming.

Goffman (1974) points out that a primary framework in news media is one that gives greater meaning to events and issues that would otherwise be meaningless aspects. These primary frameworks work as primers for the audience by categorizing experiences and allowing the audience to perceive an issue or event in terms that they can relate to. According to Goffman, primary frameworks can be divided into two sub-frames: social and natural. The social sub-frame pertains to the “will, aim, and controlling effort of an intelligence, a live agency, the chief one being the human being” that provide a background understanding of events (Goffman, 1974, p.22). Goffman describes the natural sub-frame, on the other hand as dealing with interpretation of the physical world and not opinion (Goffman, 1974).

Framing has been described by Tankard (2002) as the central idea of news content which gives context and suggestions to what the issue is through selection, emphasis, exclusion, and elaboration. The selection of what to include in the content of news and media is important in the framing of an issue, but the exclusion of details pertaining to an issue is just as important as what is selected. Emphasis given to the selected content of newspaper media highlights aspects of the issue that are believed to be more important, and through this the public perception of the issue is influenced.

The purpose of frames is to make some things more salient than others. Salience here meaning “making a piece of information more noticeable, meaningful, or memorable” (Entman, 1993). According to Entman (1993), frames have four functions. These are to define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgements, and suggest remedies. He also pointed out that “frames have at least four locations in the

communication process: the communicator, the text, the receiver, and the culture” (p.52). By highlighting certain pieces of information, frames increase the salience of that information. Though the presence of frames does not guarantee influence in the thinking of the audience. Framing, however, does not give an explanation of “how frames become embedded” or “how framing influences thinking” (p.51).

types of frames.

There are multiple types of frames within framing theory. A few of the different types of frames that exist within the framing theory and literature regarding politics and policy, as pointed out by Mintz and Redd (2003) are: purposeful framing; thematic vs. evaluative framing; productive vs. counterproductive framing; and successful vs. failed framing. Purposeful framing is “an attempt by leaders and other influential actors to insert into the policy debate...themes that will affect how the targets themselves as well as the public...perceive an issue” (Mintz and Redd, 2003, p.194). According to Mintz and Geva (1997), the thematic frame revolves around national leaders communicating toward the public, by way of content-based communication, concerning policy or product which would introduce themes into the policy debate. Evaluative framing, on the other hand, manipulates reference points, operating as an anchor and evaluating the environment in order to shift the meaning. In productive framing, attempts are made to fulfill the initial intent of the frames, according to Mintz and Redd (2003). If the outcomes are different than initially intended, the frames are then considered counter-productive or failed. Counter-productive frames produce contrary outcomes, while failed frames fail to bring the desired outcome.

In *Projections of Power*, Entman (2004) points out two more types of frames: substantive and procedural. Substantive frames perform at least two of the functions of

frames defined earlier as: to define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgements, and suggest remedies. Procedural frames are narrower in both function and focus, evaluating legitimacy, and Entman stated that procedural frames occupy much of the news.

media frames.

The focus of this study is the media frame. Media frames can be split into two types of frames: generic and issue-specific (Wasilewski, 2018). Generic frames include episodic and thematic framing; event-based news reporting and broader perspectives in wider contexts.

Among the generic frames, there are five that Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) say news organizations use most frequently. These are the conflict frame, human-interest frame, economic consequence frame, morality frame, and responsibility frame. Issue-specific frames on the other hand, are just that, specific to single issues or events that may (or may not) “lack deeper historical or social contexts” (Wasilewski, 2018, p.34). Types of conflict frames include war framing and the framing of conflict between individuals, groups, or institutions.

frames and their influence on opinion.

Media frames, as pointed out above, play a role in the way people perceive and understand the world. Dominating frames can strengthen, weaken, or alter the receiver’s beliefs or positions on issues being presented in the media. Edelman (1993) observed that the characters, causes, and consequences of phenomena change as what is displayed, repressed, and how observations are classified also change.

Gamson (1992) argues that frames are built on three levels: cultural, personal, and integrated. At the integrated level, Gamson includes media discourse. When personal

beliefs and expectations match-up with the media discourse, the frames will have the greatest impact and have a higher likelihood of being accepted. Should there be a disconnect between them, then the frame is more likely to be rejected or misunderstood.

Literature Review

Many framing studies have been conducted, but few deal with comparative framing of different countries' news reporting of peace negotiations and peace talks regarding North Korea.

differences in media coverage.

The role of the media in peace processes has been studied by researchers. Citing a change in the media environment post-Cold War, Shinar (2000) looked at the way the press covered peace processes in the Middle East and Northern Ireland, with the framing discourse divided among war discourse, trivialization, and ritualization. Stories collected were from the Hebrew tabloid *Yediot Aharonot*, *Time Magazine*, and the Israeli English-language daily *Jerusalem Post*. He found that war discourse was the most frequently used framing of peace processes, using terminology of violence, and using different types of materials: symbolic clichés, direct quotations of leaders' military discourse, and signed copy and editorials. Trivialization was found to fill the void left by information black-outs and focused on: general 'gossip', and media personalities as news items. Ritualization was found to focus on: symbols, symbolic transition, time dimension, last minute crises, and opinion measuring. Direct peace-framing featuring non-violent symbols, terms and image of peaceful change, rehabilitation, and development were less popular when pitted against war frames.

Lee and Maslog (2005) carried out a content analysis of 1,338 stories from ten newspapers covering four Asian regional conflicts involving India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka,

Indonesia, and the Philippines. They found that war frames in journalism were more prominent in their study than peace journalism or neutral frames, with the three most salient indicators of war journalism frames being: a focus on the here and now, an elite orientation, and a dichotomy of the good and the bad.

Lim and Seo (2009) studied the effects of government and media frames on the American public by looking at the framing of North Korea. Both the U.S. government and media used terms that affected public perception like ‘security threat’ or the ability of the government to negotiate productively with North Korea. Framing, and frame competition drove the study, which looked at the difference in the competing government frames and media frames when it concerned foreign policy. In order to study these effects, Lim and Seo (2009) used content analysis of U.S. government policy statements and *The New York Times*’ news stories from January 2002 to May 2002. Frames isolated were the ‘military threat’ frame that portrayed North Korea as a terrorism-sponsoring country pursuing nuclear weapons, the ‘human rights’ frame that focused on human rights abuse of the North Korean leadership, and the ‘dialogue partner’ frame that described North Korea as a country that could resolve issues through dialogue with the United States.

Jang (2013) studied the difference in American and Korean press coverage of the Six-Party Talks between 2003 and 2007. Driving the study was the idea of news as propaganda. Jang (2013) carried out a content analysis of the *Associated Press* (AP), North Korea’s *Korean Central News Agency* (KCNA), and South Korea’s *Yonhap* News Agency. The study found that AP coverage of the Six-Party talks depicted the United States, South Korea, and North Korea negatively, with North Korea being covered the most negatively. Both *Yonhap* and KCNA depicted their respective countries positively,

and the opposing country negatively. Also found in the study was the use of the common interest frame, focused on peace and negotiations, for both AP and *Yonhap*, but the use of conflict frames, defined by keywords like ‘denuclearization’ and ‘sanctions,’ for KCNA.

Jang, Hong, and Frederick (2015) studied the difference in framing of the North Korean Six-Party Talks by Chinese and North Korean news agencies. Jang et al. (2015) looked at China’s *Xinhua News Agency* and North Korea’s KCNA from 2003 to 2007. They found that both news agencies adopted frames that were consistent with the dominant ideology in their respective countries. *Xinhua News Agency* uses the ideology from Mao Zedong that the role of the news media is to indoctrinate readers into the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) political ideology. The *Korean Central News Agency* adopted a frame using the North Korea ideology of *Juche*, emphasizing national security, military power, political and economic independence, and a goal of reunification with South Korea (under North Korean political dominance). Jang et al. (2015) found that North Korea used more threatening and conflicting frames against the United States and Japan, while China used more cooperative framing for the United States. China wanted to frame the Six-Party Talks in a way that would bolster China’s standing in the international community and extend its influence in Asia. Both *Xinhua* and KCNA depicted their own countries positively in coverage, while KCNA did not frame China positively when *Xinhua* depicted North Korea positively.

Cho, Ahmed, Park and Keum (2016) studied the value framing effects on the decision-making process concerning North Korea’s nuclear development. Cho et al. (2016) found that value framing of news stories manipulated to highlight either ethical or material dangers of the nuclear development in North Korea had subtle effects on the way participants would respond to the nuclear crisis. The framing effects were also found to

have little direct influence in government policy. Cho et al. (2016) also found that despite the wealth of framing effects research, there is a need for more research into the effects of framing on decision-making models of individuals.

Choi (2018) applied framing theory to analyze the representation of North Korea's image in South Korean newspapers, *Chosun Ilbo* (a conservative newspaper) and *Hankyoreh Sinmon* (a liberal newspaper). Choi found that because of the special relationship that South Korea has with North Korea, as both countries perceive themselves as one people and South Korea hopes to one day re-unify with North Korea, South Korean newspapers portrayed North Korea positively, and criticized President Bush's "axis of evil" frame. Choi found that the presentation of North Korean image was positive in both newspapers.

tone of media coverage.

Tone of media coverage gives us a glimpse into how different media outlets think about an event or issue. Mo and Hahn (2005) looked at the diverging effects of messages in the United States and South Korea on North Korean policy. They used issue framing to drive their study into policy actions and statements made by the Bush Administration. The study found that 64.4 percent of South Koreans supported a diplomatic solution to North Korea, with a continuation of humanitarian aid. For the United States, according to an April 16, 2003 *ABC News/Washington Post* poll, 88 percent of Americans supported diplomacy or economic pressure, 43 percent supported military action, and 35 percent supported full-scale war. Percentages in their study were not cumulative but based on answers to each individual question. Further, they found that messages coming from the United States produced different responses from Americans and South Koreans. In the United States, messages from the Bush Administration that made it into the news

produced positive effects from the American public, with security and humanitarian messages being used. South Koreans, however, were more reluctant to accept the messages of a hardline strategy to take tough measures against North Korea.

Research into the media's role in international conflict has also looked into the tone of coverage (Ozohu-Suleiman & Ishak, 2014). In their research into the effects of local media tone on coverage of conflicts, Ozohu-Suleiman and Ishak (2014) found that the major local media in Malaysia, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Thailand reported on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in 2009 in varying ways. Predominantly Muslim environments in Malaysia and Indonesia produced stories that were sympathetic towards the Palestinian struggle and displayed strong alignment with Palestine. The Philippines was found to display strong alignment with Israel produced stories that were strongly sympathetic towards Israel in its predominantly Christian environment. Thailand was the only country researched to not have an alignment to Palestine or Israel. While Ozohu-Suleiman and Ishak included alignment in their study, and this study does not, their research inclusion of tone is important to note as applicable to stories produced by American newspapers regarding the Singapore Summit because American newspapers have a national stake in the meeting. It is also applicable to the tone of coverage in Japanese media because the research found tone to be affected by events where a nation is not directly involved in an event.

Tone of coverage has been found to reflect the political orientation of a ruling party (Daniels et al., 2017; Sheafer & Dvir-Gvirsman, 2010). In coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and peace processes, tone of coverage analyzed between 1995 and 2003 focused on the impact of coverage on public support for the peace process (Sheafer & Dvir-Gvirsman, 2010). This support for or against peace processes is impacted by the

tone of coverage, with negative tones having a significantly higher negative impact on support and positive tones having an insignificant impact positively. Daniels et al. (2017) also found that in covering the Syrian use of chemical weapons in 2013, both *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* used neutral tones after President Obama's decision for military intervention countered congressional and public opinion. The potential advantage for research into the public support for future peace processes makes this research applicable to the current study on the tone of coverage around the Singapore Summit.

As shown above, previous research has found that both frames and tones used in coverage of events and issues has an effect on the understanding of those events and issues. As different frames are activated, the tone of coverage shifts to match with the frame and affects public opinion on the event or issue being presented.

Significance

This study aims to add to the literature discussing the framing of North Korea in American and Japanese newspapers. Research in this area is important because previous literature is sparse on the framing of North Korea in American and Japanese newspapers as is the lack of a cultural explanation for the framing of North Korea. This is the first study of newspaper coverage of the Singapore Summit before and after it took place, and U.S.-North Korean relations under the Trump Administration in newspapers of different countries using two different methods; a content analysis of newspaper articles, and a subjective analysis of editorials.

The June 12, 2018 Singapore Summit between President Donald J. Trump and North Korean Leader Kim Jong-un was a historic meeting, it being the first time that a sitting United States President met with the Supreme Leader of North Korea. 2018 saw

North Korea meet with other world leaders, including Russian President Vladimir Putin, Chinese President Xi Jinping, and South Korean President Moon Jae-in. The frames used by newspapers to cover these one-on-one diplomacy style summits could impact the perceptions that people have about the issues they are trying to resolve and could also impact future American foreign policy on North Korea and the Asian region.

Hypotheses

This study looked into the role framing had on the salience of coverage for the Singapore Summit and North Korea. Based on the theoretical framework of framing and findings of previous studies, the following hypotheses were formed.

H₁: Overall, there will be a difference in the type of frames used overall to cover the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* and *The Asahi Shimbun*.

H₂: Overall, there will be an overall difference in the tone of coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* and *The Asahi Shimbun*.

H₃: Overall, there will be a difference in the level of importance given to the coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* and *The Asahi Shimbun*.

H₄: Is there a difference in the tone of coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?

H₅: Is there a difference in the tone of coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The Asahi Shimbun* from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?

H₆: Is there a difference in the type of frame used in the coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?

H₇: Is there a difference in the type of frame used in the coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The Asahi Shimbun* from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?

H₈: Is there a difference in the level of importance given to the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?

H₉: Is there a difference in the level of importance given to the Singapore Summit in *The Asahi Shimbun* from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?

3. METHODOLOGY

A content analysis was carried out to test the hypotheses of this study. In addition, a subjective analysis of editorials was carried out to add depth to the study. This thesis examined how the American newspaper, *The New York Times*, and the Japanese newspaper, *The Asahi Shimbun*, framed the Singapore Summit in their news articles in two different timeframes.

Timeframe

The start date for data collection for Time Frame 1 was selected as May 10, 2018, the day that American President Donald J. Trump announced the summit would take place in Singapore. The end date for Time Frame 1 was selected as June 11, 2018, the day before the summit. Data collection for Time Frame 2 was selected as from June 12, 2018, the day of the summit, to June 18, 2018, one week after the summit, because the goals of the thesis included examining if there was a change in frame, tone and importance given during the two timeframes. June 12, 2018 was included in Time Frame 2 because coverage of an event can only happen after the event has taken place.

Selection of Newspapers

The New York Times and *The Asahi Shimbun* were selected for analysis because both newspapers are well established in their respective countries, and both are considered as liberal-leaning newspapers. *The New York Times* is the second largest daily newspaper by total circulation in the United States, and *The Asahi Shimbun* is the second largest circulated daily newspaper in Japan. *The New York Times* had total average circulation of 2.1 million copies including online editions according to WorldAtlas (<https://www.worldatlas.com>). *The Asahi Shimbun* boasts circulation of 6.41 million copies of its morning edition, and 2.02 million copies of its evening edition in its 2018

Company Overview (<http://www.asahi.com>).

Sample Size

A query for “North Korea” and “Singapore Summit” in NexisUni garnered 122 news articles from *The New York Times* for the May 10 – June 18 time frame. Because NexisUni does not contain articles from *The Asahi Shimbun*, a search for articles was carried out on *The Asahi Shimbun* website (<http://www.asahi.com/ajw/>) using the same query terms and time frame resulted in 146 news articles. For the purpose of this part of the study only news articles were used. The individual news articles were the units of analyses. During the same May 10 – June 18 timeframe, five editorials were found using NexisUni for *The New York Times*, and four editorials from the *Asahi Shimbun* website.

Analysis of Editorials

A subjective analysis of editorials from *The New York Times*, *The Asahi Shimbun*, and *The Straits Times* pertaining to the Singapore Summit that appeared during the same time frame as the content analysis was carried out by the researcher to add depth to the study. Because the summit was held in Singapore, editorials from *The Straits Times* were included to give context of the neutral country’s newspaper coverage. Through the subjective analysis of editorials, it was expected to give better understanding of all the newspapers’ editorial stances on the Singapore Summit.

Definitions of Terms

Type of Frames. The two types of frames examined in this study was conflict frame and human-interest frame. A conflict frame was if the article focused on the non-proliferation/proliferation of nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula. A human-interest frame was if the article focused on human/emotional impact, evoked sympathy or

involved human rights issues. If a different frame was used other than the two being measured for this study, then it fell into the “other frame” category.

Tone of Coverage. Tone of coverage was categorized as positive, negative, or neutral based on the tone that appeared to be the most prominent tone used within the article. Positive stories were those that are supportive of peace efforts between President Trump and Leader Kim. Negative stories were those that used a critical tone of the talks between President Trump and Leader Kim. Lastly, neutral stories were those that were more descriptive of the event without taking a critical or supportive tone.

Importance. The importance of the article was coded by length of the article measured in average number of words, whether the article had a picture attached to the article, and the total number of stories published about the event. Brzozowski (2001) used length in column inches as a metric for measurement, but in this study average number of words was used because the sources were pulled from online databases. Front-page placement was also not used as a metric for measurement because of the same reason. Importance of the article was not coded by the independent coders because the information as defined in this study is free of any bias that could have been placed upon it by the researcher.

Coding

27 articles were randomly picked and coded for reliability. Coders were trained under supervision and provided with the definitions of terms. Inter-coder reliability was established by using Holsti’s method of composite reliability and garnered a high reliability of .9791.

The rest of the 241 articles were individually coded by three independent coders. Articles were coded based on two broad categories: type of frame and tone of coverage. The coding sheet used is attached at Appendix A.

4. FINDINGS

H₁ tested the relationship between *The New York Times* and *The Asahi Shimbun* in terms of frames used to cover the Singapore Summit. A Chi Square statistic was run on both newspapers for three categories: conflict frames focusing on proliferation/non-proliferation of nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula; human-interest frames focusing on human/emotional impact, evoking sympathy, and/or involving human rights issues; and other frames outside of conflict frames and human-interest frames. Conflict frames were found to be 71 percent of all frames used in both newspapers (See Table 4.1). Human Interest frames comprised 11 percent of *The New York Times* coverage, and 10 percent of *The Asahi Shimbun* coverage, with 11 percent of all coverage. Other frames were found to be used 18 percent of the time in coverage for both newspapers and overall coverage of the Singapore Summit. There was no significant difference found between the use of frames in the coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* and *The Asahi Shimbun*.

Table 4.1 *The New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* Framing

	Conflict Frame N (%)	Human Interest Frame N (%)	Other Frame N (%)	Article Total
NYT	87 (71%)	13 (11%)	22 (18%)	122
AS	104 (71%)	15 (10%)	27 (18%)	146
Frame Total	191 (71%)	28 (10%)	49 (18%)	268

$$X^2 (1, N=268)=0.017, p=0.992$$

H₂ evaluated the relationship between the tone of coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* and *The Asahi Shimbun*. The three categories analyzed were positive tones supporting the peace efforts between American President Donald

Trump and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, negative tones critical of the talks between the two leaders, and neutral tones giving a descriptive account of the event without a supportive or critical tone. For *The New York Times*, 17 percent of the articles used a positive tone, 44 percent used a negative tone, and 39 percent used a neutral tone (See Table 4.2). For *The Asahi Shimbun*, 22 percent used a positive tone, 43 percent used a negative tone, and 25 percent used a neutral tone. Overall, 20 percent of the coverage of the Singapore Summit used a positive tone, 44 percent used a negative tone, and 37 percent used a neutral tone. However, there was no significant difference found between tones of coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* and *The Asahi Shimbun*. Tones measured in this study were not dependent upon frames used within each article.

Table 4.2 *The New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* Tones

	Positive Tone N (%)	Negative Tone N (%)	Neutral Tone N (%)	Article Total
NYT	21 (17%)	54 (44%)	47 (39%)	122
AS	32 (22%)	63 (43%)	51 (35%)	146
Tone Total	53 (20%)	117 (*44%)	98 (*37%)	268

$$X^2 (1, N=268)=0.9973, p=0.607$$

H₃ looked at the level of importance given to coverage of the Singapore Summit in both *The New York Times* and *The Asahi Shimbun*. The three categories that were tested were the total number of news articles appearing in each newspaper, the number of articles containing a picture, and the average length of articles in number of words. In *The New York Times*, 122 articles were published from May 10 to June 18, with an average of 1264 words per article (See Table 4.3). Eighty-nine percent of the articles in *The New York Times* contained an accompanying picture. In *The Asahi Shimbun*, 146

articles were published, with an average of 719 words per article. Sixty-nine percent of the *Asahi Shimbun* articles published contained a picture. There was a significant difference in the level of importance given to the coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* and *The Asahi Shimbun*.

Table 4.3 *The New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* Level of Importance

	Number of News Articles	Articles w/Picture N (%)	Average length of Articles in Words
NYT	122	108 (89%)	1264
AS	146	101 (69%)	719
Total	268	209 (77%)	992

$$X^2=40.7184, p=<0.001$$

H₄ sought to find out if there was a difference between tone of coverage in *The New York Times* from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2. 18 percent of the coverage in Time Frame 1 used a positive tone, 47 percent used a negative tone, and 35 percent used a neutral tone (See Table 4.4). In Time Frame 2, 16 percent of the coverage used a positive tone, 40 percent used a negative tone, and 44 percent used a neutral tone. Overall, 17 percent of the coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* used a positive tone, 44 percent used a negative tone, and 39 percent used a neutral tone. The number of articles published in *The New York Times* in Time Frame 1 was higher than the number of articles published in Time Frame 2 (79 and 43, respectively). No significant difference was found between the tone of coverage in Time Frame 1 and Time Frame 2.

Table 4.4 New York Times Tone before and after the Summit

	Positive Tone N (%)	Negative Tone N (%)	Neutral Tone N (%)	Total
NYT Time Frame 1	14 (18%)	37 (47%)	28 (35%)	79
NYT Time Frame 2	7 (16%)	17 (40%)	19 (44%)	43
Total	21 (17%)	54 (44%)	47 (39%)	122

$$X^2(1, N=122)=0.9214, p=0.631$$

H₅ sought to find out if there was a difference in tone of coverage between Time Frame 1 and Time Frame 2 in *The Asahi Shimbun*. The categories for examination were positive, negative, and neutral tones. In Time Frame 1, 21 percent of the articles published used a positive tone, 45 percent used a negative tone, and 34 percent used a neutral tone (See Table 4.5). For Time Frame 2, 24 percent of the articles published used a positive tone, 39 percent used a negative tone, and 37 percent used a neutral tone. Overall, 22 percent of the total articles published in *The Asahi Shimbun* used a positive tone, 43 percent used a negative tone, and 35 percent used a neutral tone. The number of articles published in Time Frame 1 was higher than the number of articles published in Time Frame 2. No significant difference was found between the tone of coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The Asahi Shimbun* in Time Frame 1 and Time Frame 2.

Table 4.5 Asahi Shimbun Tone before and after the Summit

	Positive Tone N (%)	Negative Tone N (%)	Neutral Tone N (%)	Total
AS Time Frame 1	21 (21%)	45 (45%)	34 (34%)	100
AS Time Frame 2	11 (24%)	18 (39%)	17 (37%)	46
Total	32 (22%)	63 (43%)	51 (35%)	146

$$X^2(1, N=146)=0.4524, p=0.798$$

H₆ sought to find out if there was a difference in the types of frame used for coverage of the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times*. The categories of frames examined were conflict frame, human-interest frame, and other frames. In Time Frame 1, 75 percent of the articles published used a conflict frame, and 6 percent used a human-interest frame (See Table 4.6). In Time Frame 2, 65 percent of the articles published used a conflict frame, and 18 percent used a human-interest frame. A Chi Square statistic was calculated only for conflict and human-interest frames because they were the focus of this study and did not include articles that used other types of frames. A significant difference was found between the frames used in Time Frame 1 and Time Frame 2 in *The New York Times* to cover the Singapore Summit, with more articles being published in Time Frame 1 than in Time Frame 2.

Table 4.6 New York Times Frame before and after the Summit

	Conflict Frame N (%)	Human Interest Frame N (%)	Articles Published
NYT Time Frame 1	59 (75%)	5 (6%)	79
NYT Time Frame 2	28 (65%)	8 (18%)	43
Total	87 (71%)	13 (11%)	122

$X^2(1, N=122)=4.2299, p<0.05$

H₇ focused on finding if there was a difference between Time Frame 1 and Time Frame 2 regarding frames used in *The Asahi Shimbun*. Because this study focused on conflict and human-interest frames, only conflict and human-interest frames were used in a Chi Square statistic, but no significant difference was found. In Time Frame 1, 72 percent of the articles published used a conflict frame, and 11 percent used a human-

interest frame (See Table 4.7). In Time Frame 2, 70 percent of the articles used a conflict frame, and 9 percent used a human-interest frame.

Table 4.7 *Asahi Shimbun* Frame before and after the Summit

	Conflict Frame N (%)	Human Interest Frame N (%)	Articles Published
AS Time Frame 1	72 (72%)	11 (11%)	100
AS Time Frame 2	32 (70%)	4 (9%)	46
Total	104 (71%)	15 (10%)	146

$$X^2(1, N=146)=0.1046, p=0.746$$

H₈ looked to see if there was a difference in the level of importance given to the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* before and after the summit. The categories tested were the number of articles published before and after the summit, the number of articles with a picture, and the average length of the articles in words. A significant difference was found in the level of importance given to the summit before and after the summit. Ninety-two percent of the articles published before the summit contained a picture, and each article averaged 1289 words (See Table 4.8). After the summit, 81 percent of the articles contained a picture, and each article averaged 1217 words. In total, 88 percent of the articles contained a picture, and each article averaged 1264 words. Sixty-five percent of the articles were published before the summit, and 35 percent were published after the summit.

Table 4.8 New York Times level of importance before and after the Summit

	Number of News Articles	Articles w/Picture N (%)	Average length of Articles in Words
NYT Time Frame 1	79	73 (92%)	1289
NYT Time Frame 2	43	35 (81%)	1217
Total	122	108 (88%)	1264

$$X^2 (1, N=122)=18.4951, p<0.001$$

H₉ sought to find if there was a difference in the level of importance given to the Singapore Summit in *The Asahi Shimbun* before and after the summit. The categories tested were the number of articles published before and after the summit, the number of articles with a picture, and the average number of words per article. Chi Square statistics showed a significant difference in the level of importance given to the issue before and after the summit. Sixty-seven percent of the articles published before the summit contained a picture and averaged 716 words (See Table 4.9). After the summit, 74 percent of the articles contained a picture, with each article averaging 723 words. In total, 69 percent of the articles contained a picture and averaged 719 words per article.

Table 4.9 Asahi Shimbun level of importance before and after the Summit

	Number of News Articles	Articles w/Picture N (%)	Average length of Articles in Words
AS Time Frame 1	100	67 (67%)	716
AS Time Frame 2	46	34 (74%)	723
Total	146	101 (69%)	719

$$X^2 (1, N=146)=27.0538, p<0.001$$

Overall, four out of the nine hypotheses tested were supported. The following table provides a summary of the hypotheses tested and their results.

Table 4.10 Summary of Hypotheses

H	Hypothesis	Result
H ₁ :	There will be a difference in the type of frames used overall to cover the Singapore Summit in <i>The New York Times</i> and <i>The Asahi Shimbun</i> .	Not Supported
H ₂ :	There will be a difference in the tone of coverage of the Singapore Summit in <i>The New York Times</i> and <i>The Asahi Shimbun</i> .	Not Supported
H ₃ :	There will be a difference in the level of importance given to the coverage of the Singapore Summit in <i>The New York Times</i> and <i>The Asahi Shimbun</i> .	Supported
H ₄ :	Is there a difference in the tone of coverage of the Singapore Summit in <i>The New York Times</i> from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?	No
H ₅ :	Is there a difference in the tone of coverage of the Singapore Summit in <i>The Asahi Shimbun</i> from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?	No
H ₆ :	Is there a difference in the type of frame used in the coverage of the Singapore Summit in <i>The New York Times</i> from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?	Yes
H ₇ :	Is there a difference in the type of frame used in the coverage of the Singapore Summit in <i>The Asahi Shimbun</i> from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?	No
H ₈ :	Is there a difference in the level of importance given to the Singapore Summit in <i>The New York Times</i> from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?	Yes
H ₉ :	Is there a difference in the level of importance given to the Singapore Summit in <i>The Asahi Shimbun</i> from Time Frame 1 to Time Frame 2?	Yes

Analysis of Editorials

Editorials from *The New York Times*, the *Asahi Shimbun*, and *The Straits Times* were analyzed for the same categories as the newspaper articles analyzed for this study: type of frame, tone of coverage, and level of importance given to the Singapore Summit. The inclusion of *The Straits Times* was to add another dimension to this study and give

the perspective of the neutral country where the summit was held. This was done in order to add depth to this study and give a better understanding of the editorial stances of each newspaper on the Singapore Summit.

The New York Times ran five total editorials about the Singapore Summit during the same timeframe of this study, May 10 to June 18. One editorial was published before the summit took place, and four were published after the summit. Three of the editorials primarily used a conflict frame, with the other two primarily using a human interest frame. Two editorials with a conflict frame had a positive tone and one had a negative tone. The two human interest frame editorials both had a positive tone. All the editorials that were published from May 24 to June 13 had an accompanying photograph, and the average word count for all of them was 999 words.

The editorial in *The New York Times* that used a conflict frame and a negative tone saw the Singapore Summit as a stroking of egos for President Trump and were disappointed with the sparseness of details within the joint agreement. They were also critical of the concessions made by President Trump while Kim Jong-un committed to less than previous talks and agreements. The summit itself was characterized as more of a performance than real diplomacy but the articles that had a positive tone agreed that the summit was a historic first and gave credit to President Trump for making it happen.

The photos that were used in the *New York Times* editorials were of President Trump alone, either at the White House or a news conference following the Singapore Summit. One illustration used showed President Trump and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un walking towards each other on a see-saw tipped in Kim's favor with hands outstretched. The use of this illustration is compelling and follows the stance of the editorial board that despite being historic in nature the winner of the Singapore Summit

seems to have been Kim Jong-un.

The headlines of the editorials after the summit use very deliberate language: “Trump gushes,” “a grand stage,” “North Korea meeting was the Trumpiest,” and “another tyrant to admire.” Each headline portrays President Trump in the light of someone in an act and not so much as a president meeting with another leader. Despite the headlines, however, each of these articles had an overall positive tone, because of the hopefulness of a peaceful outcome.

The *Asahi Shimbun* ran four total editorials during the timeframe used in this study, May 10 to June 18, having two published before the summit and two published after the summit. Three of the editorials used a conflict frame, and one used a human-interest frame. Of the editorials that used a conflict frame, two of them used a negative tone, and one used a positive tone. The one human-interest frame used a negative tone. Just like the editorials appearing in *The New York Times*, all the editorials in appearing in the *Asahi Shimbun* were accompanied by a photograph. The average word count for all of the editorials from May 10 to June 18 was 774 words.

The titles of the editorials appearing in *The Asahi Shimbun* all had a theme of trying to give advice to Japan. The two editorials appearing before the Singapore Summit shared a theme of skepticism about a meeting happening between President Trump and Leader Kim. One even suggested that Japan was in a troubling spot if it continued to rely on America for diplomacy with North Korea because of President Trump’s “unpredictable foreign policy.” But every editorial had the theme of wanting Japan to pursue its own diplomacy with North Korea and not depend on the United States.

One editorial published on June 9 quoted Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe as saying that “Japan and the United States are always together.” The same editorial pointed

out that Prime Minister Abe was the only leader who supported President Trump's decision to cancel the summit, and then expressed a strong hope that the meeting would take place when President Trump announced it was back on. Later in the editorial Prime Minister Abe was called undisciplined and inconsistent.

Both editorials in *The Asahi Shimbun* published after the Singapore Summit expressed surprise and concern about the lack of detail within the joint agreement signed by both President Trump and Leader Kim. Both of the editorials also suggested that Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe meet with North Korean leader Kim Jong-un in order to get out from under American dependence for diplomacy and wanted human rights issues and the abduction issue to be on the table for discussion.

The Straits Times ran the greatest number of editorials of all the newspapers during this study's time frame, with thirteen total editorials from May 10 to June 18. Five of the editorials were published before the summit, and eight were published after the summit. Three of the five published prior to the summit used a conflict frame and had a positive tone, and the other two both used a frame that was neither conflict nor human-interest and had a neutral tone. One of the editorials published after the summit used neither a conflict nor human-interest frame with a neutral tone; two used neither a conflict nor human-interest frame with positive tones; three used a conflict frame with positive tones; and two used a conflict frame with a negative tone. Only five of the thirteen editorials appearing in *The Straits Times* had an accompanying photograph, but the average word count for all the editorials was 1118 words.

All the editorials appearing in *The Straits Times* characterized the Singapore Summit as historic and important for Singapore. However, one editorial made a point that even though it was historic that does not mean that it was successful, going so far as to

say that it could have a dangerous outcome. Some of the editorials brought up previous talks and agreements, like the Six-Party Talks, where China acted to pursue peace on the Korean Peninsula. A few editorials highlighted the fact that Singapore's position in the international community will be elevated as a result of hosting the summit and pointed out the economic gain that can come from it.

One editorial compared the high-profile summit to the visit of Deng Xiaoping in 1978 and hoped that North Korean leader Kim Jong-un will do for North Korea what Deng Xiaoping did for China; open up and change politically and economically for the betterment of his country. This hope was bolstered in another editorial that suggested the April 27 Panmunjon Declaration signed by North Korean leader Kim Jong-un and South Korean President Moon Jae-in signaled Leader Kim's desire to pursue peace.

Photos that appeared in *The Straits Times* ranged from photos of Kim with Chinese President Xi Jinping to photos of the Capella Hotel where the summit took place. Overall there were more photos of places than people.

Comparative Analysis

Overall, the editorials that appeared in *The New York Times* suggested that the editorial board had higher hopes from the Singapore Summit, but were amazed that the summit took place, even if their headlines showed a displeased attitude with President Trump. The historic nature of the event was not lost on *The New York Times*.

For *The Asahi Shimbun* there seemed to be a sour taste left in the mouth of the editorial board after the summit. The displeasure seems to stem from how they felt Prime Minister Shinzo Abe has reacted towards President Trump's announcements and policy actions regarding North Korea. There is also a sense of urgency being placed upon Prime Minister Abe to have a similar meeting with North Korean leader Kim Jong-un in order

to pursue Japanese oriented foreign policy not dominated by American policies.

The *Straits Times* was by far the most optimistic of the editorial boards; less concerned with human rights, the North Korean nuclear issue or regional security concerns, and more focused on how hosting the summit could benefit the small city-state.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Discussion

This study aimed to find out how the historic Singapore Summit between American President Donald J. Trump and North Korean Leader Kim Jong-un was framed in the American newspaper, the *New York Times*, and the Japanese newspaper, the *Asahi Shimbun*; what kind of tones were used in covering the Singapore Summit in each of these newspapers and the level of importance given to the Singapore Summit in each newspaper. In addition, differences in tone, types of frames used, and level of importance given were measured for each newspaper before and after the summit.

The New York Times and *Asahi Shimbun* framed and used tone of coverage that were not significantly different. A possible explanation for the lack of difference in the framing and tone of coverage in the two newspapers is that Japan is a close ally of the United States, as was pointed out in the introduction of this study and as stated by Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe that Japan and the United States are always together. Because of this close economic and diplomatic relationship, it is implied that Japan will follow close in tow with the United States on issues of policy and economics, which can be echoed in news reporting of events.

Connecting back to framing theory, it would appear that *The New York Times* did use conflict frames that dominated coverage of the Singapore Summit and were influenced by the political atmosphere of the United States during the time of the Singapore Summit in the summer of 2018, which would support previous research findings that conflict frames dominate news coverage (Shinar, 2000; Semetko and Valkenburg, 2000; Lee and Maslog, 2005). *The Asahi Shimbun* followed this same pattern of conflict frames being more abundantly than other frames of news coverage.

There was the surprise in the forms of the tones that were used by each newspaper to cover the Singapore Summit. Unlike what previous research had suggested (Choi, 2018), the proximity of Japan to North Korea did not make the tone of coverage in *The Asahi Shimbun* any more positive or neutral, and followed the same percentage of negatively toned articles as *The New York Times* articles. This could be due to the close relationship that Japan has with the United States, the animosity that Japan has towards North Korea because of the comfort women issue from World War II (Getz, 2018) and the abduction issue (Ota, 2018). As stated in one *Asahi Shimbun* editorial, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe has said that Japan and the United States are together always, and according to the *Asahi Shimbun* Prime Minister Abe's policy actions have confirmed this, with policies changing to realign themselves with those of the Trump Administration.

Normally people perceive conflict with a negative connotation. Despite this, 23 percent of articles that had a conflict frame used a positive tone of coverage. One possible explanation for this phenomenon is that it is possible to talk about a conflict with a positive tone filled with hope of a peaceful resolution or outcome, or even a neutral tone that is simply stating what is happening in a conflict. Unlike in a time of war, this situation is about denuclearization and is being approached in way to pursue peace.

While there was no significant difference in framing and tone of coverage between the two newspapers, there was a difference in the level of importance given to coverage of the Singapore Summit. With the United States being a key player in the Singapore Summit by way of President Trump, it would logically follow that an American newspaper would give the event a higher level of importance, which was borne out in the data and analysis. Japan not being directly involved in the Singapore Summit may have played a role in the level of importance in *The Asahi Shimbun* being lower than

that of *The New York Times*. This is not to say that the Singapore Summit was not an important event for *The Asahi Shimbun*, because of Japan's proximity to North Korea and the security concerns in the region, and *The Asahi Shimbun* published more stories overall compared to *The New York Times* but had a much lower word count on average for each article.

The difference found in the level of importance given to the Singapore Summit in *The New York Times* suggests that the level of importance, while still higher than in *The Asahi Shimbun*, fell from before the summit to after the summit. While the difference found in *The Asahi Shimbun* suggests that the level of importance given rose from before the summit to after the summit. One possible reason for this is that both *The New York Times* and *The Asahi Shimbun* saw the summit as historic, but also drove a narrative that American President Donald Trump gave North Korean leader Kim Jong-un more concessions for less commitments.

In the editorials, *The New York Times* wanted to be positive about the summit because it was historic and tried to downplay some of the concessions made by President Trump. *The Asahi Shimbun* editorials were more negative, possibly because of the changing security landscape around Asia because of the concessions made by President Trump and because they want Japan to be more independent with policy making. Finally, in the *Straits Times* there was a positive attitude towards the summit because of what the summit could do for Singapore's economy or international standing, and not necessarily what the summit could mean for the security of the region or the United States.

Strengths

This study is a first of its kind studying the relationship between framing theory and newspaper coverage of U.S.-North Korean relations under the Trump

Administration. As such, it contributes to the understanding of framing research and studies. This study also adds to knowledge pertaining to peace talks and denuclearization from a historical-political perspective. The addition of a subjective analysis of editorials added dimension to this study, allowing the researcher to use more than just one method to understand the situation of U.S.-North Korean relations under the Trump Administration in an international and cross-cultural context.

Limitations

This study has a few inherent limitations. Only two newspapers were looked at for the content analysis portion of the study; one from America and one from an American ally, Japan. Another limitation is that articles from the Japanese newspaper *Asahi Shimbun* were in English and not in Japanese, so there is a possibility that the English articles were catered to a different demographic for consumption in Japan. Because content analysis findings cannot be generalized, this study's findings are only applicable to the context of *The New York Times* and *Asahi Shimbun* coverage of the Singapore Summit, and cannot be applied to American and Japanese newspapers as a whole.

Recommendations

More research needs to be conducted on the coverage of the Singapore Summit from multiple newspapers in the United States and internationally. The addition of multiple newspapers from around the world will allow for a wider range of perspectives and political leanings to be studied. Along with this, the researcher recommends translating Japanese language newspapers, and other language newspapers, into English in order to get a truer picture of international newspaper coverage of the Singapore Summit. The addition of newspapers from Russia, South Korea, North Korea, and China would give insight into the opinions of the rest of the member states of the Six-Party

Talks, and how they perceived the Singapore Summit and future summits. Research needs to be ongoing because the Singapore Summit was the first major step in U.S.-North Korean relations and negotiations under the Trump Administration, followed by a second summit in Hanoi. Because of this, studies documenting any changes in policy towards North Korea will be necessary.

Research about the newspaper coverage of the Singapore Summit, the February 28, 2019 Hanoi Summit, and any following summits is recommended in order to document the full impact of peace talks and denuclearization efforts by the Trump Administration on foreign policy with North Korea.

It is also recommended that future research into peace talks and denuclearization have a section dedicated to the way in which the United States has dealt with other denuclearization issues in Libya and Iran. This inclusion in future research will be able to give more context into American geo-political interests and how American newspapers cover them. In this section it could be added that the United States is the second largest nuclear power, behind the Russian Federation, and that American media would seem to not highlight this fact when the United States exerts pressure on countries to denuclearize.

Because the purpose of this study was to examine international communication in a historical context for documentation purposes, future research can have a different perspective to study the Singapore Summit. Whether that be the political science perspective or any other perspective outside of history and mass communication.

Conclusion

This study has contributed toward a better understanding of how the Singapore Summit was framed and what tones were used in the coverage of the event in the

American newspaper, *The New York Times*, and the Japanese newspaper, *The Asahi Shimbun* within the theoretical framework of framing theory. This study is the first study over the Singapore Summit coverage in different countries' newspapers, and the results from this study could be used for future policy decisions based on the content analysis and editorial analysis.

APPENDIX SECTION

Appendix A Coding Sheet

Article number:

Type of Frames: A conflict frame is if the article focuses on the non-proliferation/proliferation of nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula. A human-interest frame is if the article focuses on human/emotional impact, evokes sympathy or involves human rights issues.

1. Was the prominent frame used a conflict frame?

1 = Yes 0 = No

2. Was the prominent frame used a human-interest frame?

1 = Yes 0 = No

3. Was the prominent frame used neither?

1 = Yes 0 = No

Tone: Positive tone is if the article is supportive of peace efforts between President Trump and Leader Kim. Negative is if the article uses a critical tone of the talks between President Trump and Leader Kim. Lastly, neutral tone is if the article is more descriptive of the event without taking a critical or supportive tone.

1. Was the prominent tone of the article:

Positive?	1 = Yes	0 = No
Negative?	1 = Yes	0 = No
Neutral?	1 = Yes	0 = No

REFERENCES

- Bell, P. M., & Gilbert, M. (2017). The wounded hegemon. In *The world since 1945: An international history* (pp. 486-514). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Brzozowski, J. V. (2001). U.S. newspaper coverage on the Afghanistan and Chechen conflicts: The framing of Russia in changing times (Unpublished master's thesis). Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas.
- Cho, J., Ahmed, S., Park, J. W., & Keum, H. (2016). Value framing effects on the decision-making process: Ethical and material frames and opinions about North Korean nuclear development. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 5123–5142. Retrieved from <https://ijoc.org>
- Choi, J. (2018). National image of North Korea in South Korean news media. *Journal of Public Affairs*. <https://doi-org.libproxy.txstate.edu/10.1002/pa.1710>.
- Clemens, W. C. (2016a). Six-party hopes and missed opportunities. In *North Korea and the world: Human rights, arms control and strategies for negotiation* (pp. 216-235). Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Clemens, W. C. (2016b). The agreed framework sets the stage for a grand bargain. In *North Korea and the world: Human rights, arms control and strategies for negotiation* (pp. 195-206). Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Cohen, E. A. (2016). Dangerous states. In *The big stick: The limits of soft power and the necessity of military force* (pp. 149-172). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Durham, F. (1998). News frames as social narratives: TWA flight 180. *Journal of Communication*, 48(4), 100-117. Retrieved from <https://academic.oup.com/joc>
- Edelman, M. J. (1993). Contestable categories and public opinion. *Political Communication*, 10, 231–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.1993.9962981>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x
- Entman, R. M. (2007). *Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion, and U.S. foreign policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fact Sheets & Briefs. (2018). Retrieved from <https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/dprkchron>
- Gamson, W., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media images and the social construction of reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18, 373-393. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2083459>

- Getz, G. (2018). Honour and dignity: trauma recovery and international law in the issue of the comfort women of South Korea. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 19(1), 63–77. Retrieved from <https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/>
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Jang, W. Y. (2013). News as propaganda: a comparative analysis of US and Korean press coverage of the six-party talks, 2003-2007. *The International Communication Gazette*, 75(2), 188-204. DOI: 10.1177/1748048512465555
- Jang, W. Y., Hong, J., & Frederick, E. (2015). The framing of the North Korean six-party talks by Chinese and North Korean news agencies: communist propaganda and national interests. *Media International Australia*, (154), 42–52. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.txstate.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libproxy.txstate.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edswss&AN=000357965800006&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Joint Statement of President Donald J. Trump of the United States of America and Chairman Kim Jong Un of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea at the Singapore Summit. (2018). Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/joint-statement-president-donald-j-trump-united-states-america-chairman-kim-jong-un-democratic-peoples-republic-korea-singapore-summit/>
- Kang, David C. (2016). Nuclear WMD regimes in East Asia. In *Asian designs governance in the contemporary world order* (pp. 95-115). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kriesberg, L. (2015a). North Korean relations. In *Realizing peace a constructive conflict approach* (pp. 170-171). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Krisberg, L. (2015b). Confronting North Korea. In *Realizing peace a constructive conflict approach* (pp. 213-217). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, S. T., & Maslog, C. (2005). War or peace journalism? Asian newspaper coverage of conflicts. *Journal of Communication*, 55(2), 311-329. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb02674.x>
- Lim, J., & Seo, H. (2009). Frame flow between government and the news media and its effects on the public: Framing of North Korea. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 21(2), 204–223. <https://doi-org.libproxy.txstate.edu/10.1093/ijpor/edp011>
- McCombs, M. (1993). The future agenda for agenda-setting research. *Journal of Mass Communication Studies*, 45, 181-217. https://doi.org/10.24460/mscom.45.0_171
- Mintz, A., & Geva, N. (1997). Why don't democracies fight each other? An experimental study. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 37, 484-503.

- Mintz, A., & Redd, S. B. (2003). Framing effects in international relations. *Synthese*, 135(2), 193-213. doi:1023460923628
- Misachi, J. (2017). The 10 most popular daily newspapers in the United States. Retrieved from <https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/the-10-most-popular-daily-newspapers-in-the-united-states.html>
- Mo, J., & Hahn, K. (2005). Public diplomacy and North Korea policy: diverging effects of U.S. messages in the United States and South Korea. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 5, 191–214. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1598240800005749>
- Nagai, O. (2018, April 5). Kim Jong Un offers to return to six-party talks. *Nikkei Asian Review*. Retrieved from <http://asia.nikkei.com>
- Ota, N. (2018, June 6). Abe to make last-minute plea to Trump on abduction issue. *The Asahi Shimbun*. Retrieved from <http://asahi.com>
- Ozohu-Suleiman, Y., & Ishak, S. A. (2014). Local media in global conflict: Southeast Asian newspapers and the politics of peace in Israel/Palestine. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 8(2), 284–295. DOI: 10.4119/UNIBI/ijcv.287
- Semetko, H., Valkenburg, P. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news, *Journal of Communication*, 50(2), 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2000.tb02843.x>
- Sheafer, T., & Dvir-Gvirsman, S. (2010). The spoiler effect: Framing attitudes and expectations toward peace. *Journal of Peace Research*, 47(2), 205-215. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.txstate.edu/stable/25654556>
- Shinar, D. (2000). Media diplomacy and ‘peace talk’: the Middle East and Northern Ireland.’ *Gazette*, 62(2), 83–97. <https://doi-org.libproxy.txstate.edu/10.1177/0016549200062002001>
- Tankard, J. (2010). The empirical approach to the study of media framing. In *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (S. D. Reese, O. H. Gandy Jr., & A. E. Grant, Eds.). (pp. 95–106). New York: Routledge.
- The Asahi Shimbun Company Overview 2018. (2018). Retrieved from http://www.asahi.com/shimbun/company/csr/eng_overview2018.pdf
- Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) – UNODA. (2018). Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/disarmament/wmd/nuclear/npt/>
- Wasilewski, K. (2018). Media framing and intercultural communication: a critical review of studies on framing of migration. *Media Studies / Mediální Studia*, (1), 30–47. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.txstate.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libproxy.txstate.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cms&AN=130860579&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Weaver, D. (2007). Thoughts on agenda setting, framing, and priming. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 142–147. Retrieved from <https://academic.oup.com/joc>