Framing the Anti-Extradition Bill Movement: A Content Analysis of Apple Daily, Wen Wei Po, and The New York Times

Magdalene Che[1], Nerilee Hall[1#] and Debs Taylor[1#]

[1]International Christian School, Hong Kong
[#]Advisor

Abstract

The 2019 Anti-Extradition Bill Movement in Hong Kong brought on a series of late-night protests and large scale destruction over an unprecedented long period of time. This caught the attention of local and international media. The contrasting coverage provided opportunities to analyse the framing in local and international newspapers in Hong Kong. Framing, how newspapers portray controversy, can influence a reader's stance on an event. The framing of the Anti-Extradition Bill movement, in particular, may sway Hong Kong citizens to support a specific political stance. Using coding, this study analysed differences in framing device frequency between local pro-Beijing, local pro-democracy, and international newspapers and the association between tone and framing devices. Differing frequencies between newspapers implied a newspaper's political stance influenced the framing devices utilised. There was also no predictable association between tone and framing devices due to the lack of consideration of the particular nature of the newspapers.

Background Context

July 1 marks the anniversary of the 1997 Handover of Hong Kong (HK) (Yeoh, 2017). At that time, China announced a "One Country Two Systems" policy, establishing HK as a Special Administrative Region (Wong, 2017). The policy stated HK would be allowed to practice their legal system called the Basic Law[1] (Basic Law, 2017; Tai, 2018). According to the Basic Law, HK would be allowed to conduct their Chief Executive elections through the "method of universal suffrage" in 2017, and the Legislative Council would also be able to implement "the method of electing all the members by universal suffrage[2]" (Basic Law, 2017). In 2014, the legislative branch of the Communist Party of China issued new regulations about the upcoming HK elections in August (Tai, 2018; Tai, 2019). In essence, HK people could only elect their Chief Executive based on candidates the Beijing authorities had approved of (Cheng, 2017). This move was considered a breach of credibility from Beijing (Chen, 2014) and led to the beginning of the 2014 Umbrella Movement[3] (Cheng, 2017; Rühlig, 2017; Tai, 2018; Tai, 2019; Wong, 2017). Student protestors conducted illegal gatherings in public areas, with the police force using tear gas and pepper spray to disperse crowds (Martin, 2014). Throughout the movement, a difference in media coverage was present. In China, social media such as Weibo[4], Twitter, Facebook, and more[5] blocked and deleted posts about the movement (Ye, 2016). In HK, media organisations affiliated with China were seemingly pressured to highlight the negativity of the protests (Cheng, n.d.; Yu, 2015). In response, it led some protesters to turn to international media to gain a voice during the movement (Cheng, n.d.). In comparison to Chinese and HK newspapers, international newspapers, specifically American newspapers, were more liberal and were able to present more objective, on-the-spot news (Ye, 2016; Yu, 2015).

Literature Review

The variations in media coverage during the Umbrella Revolution underwent analysis in multiple case studies utilising content analysis. These studies aimed to discover the various ways different media framed the Umbrella Revolution (Cheng, n.d.; Ye, 2016; Yu, 2015). Framing[6] is vital as it highlights aspects of an event while using particular types of word choice to establish a specific viewpoint (Baresch et al., 2020). Framing allows media to direct viewers and readers to a certain mindset, influencing their opinion on a certain matter (Cissel, 2012). In the context of the Umbrella Revolution, framing may influence HK citizens to support a specific stance (i.e., protesters, the government, neither). An analysis of a qualitative framework (i.e., a movement) may require coding[7], the summarisation of categorical data, so that the researcher can make sense of the data (Elliott, 2018).

Yu (2015), in a graduate thesis paper[8], analysed newspapers from HK, America, and England that covered the Umbrella Revolution (Yu, 2015). The study hypothesised that the HK newspaper would frame the movement negatively as it was under a Chinese corporation (Yu, 2015). This included establishing the protesters in a negative light, concentrating on the negative impacts of the protest, and setting government officials in a more positive light (Yu, 2015). The American and British newspapers would not frame the movement as negatively as the HK newspaper. The study coded using five different news frames: *protests*, *protesters*, *HK government*, *News Censorship*, and *mentioning of politically sensitive issues* (Yu, 2015). The first four frames were coded as *positive*, *neutral*, *negative*, or unclear, while the last frame was coded as *yes* or *no* (Yu, 2015). After undergoing significance tests, the study discovered that its hypothesis was correct (Yu, 2015). The pro-China newspaper was inclined to highlight the negativity of the protests because its owner was a Chinese corporation with strong business affiliations in China. In contrast, the international newspapers were more willing to mention politically sensitive issues, taking a more liberal stance.

[1] An integration of the Chinese legal system and the laws of the Special Administrative Region

[2] "Universal suffrage" was seen as a process of all HK citizens expressing their preferences and being able to pick their prefered Chief Executive (Bush, 2016).

[3] The use of umbrellas as shields against the police force inspired the protesters to use the umbrella as the symbol and name of their movement (Martin, 2014).

[4] Weibo saw a massive spike in deleted posts where at the peak, they deleted over 150 per 10000 posts throughout the first weeks of the protest (Andrelczyk, 2016).

[5] On September 28, the day riot police began to make tactical moves against protesters, Instagram reported that photos of the movement were inaccessible in China (Andrelczyk, 2016; BBC, 2014).

6 Framing, in the context of the news, is how organisations try to achieve news coverage and how controversies are portrayed in the news (Hallahan, 2007).

7 Coding often looks for patterns that are consistent throughout and groups specific attributes of writings based on similarities (Witt, 2013).

8 Approved by Associate Professor Dr. Scott Liu, University of Florida

In another study by Cheng (n.d.) for his master's degree[9], Cheng (n.d.) studied HK, Chinese, and American newspapers. The coding framework of this study differed from Yu (2015) as it used *actors*, *political reform*, *protest*, and *police action* as the frameworks. Rather than coding each framework based on its tone or through binary *yes* or *no*, this study chose to measure the frequency of each framing device per newspaper, then attempted to measure the objectivity of a newspaper based on the frequency of framing devices. The study concluded that local media failed to reflect what occurred during the Umbrella movement (Cheng, n.d.).

Both Yu (2015) and Cheng's (n.d.) study claim HK media is relatively biased against the Umbrella movement compared to international media due to the HK media's affiliations with China. However, both studies did not manage to acknowledge the presence of other newspapers in HK. The HK newspaper studied in both studies was a pro-China newspaper that had Chinese affiliations to appease. There was no mention of pro-democracy local newspapers that may have presented a contrasting perspective of the movement. Cheng's study (n.d.), in particular, had prejudice due

to Cheng being an activist supporting the Umbrella Movement. Cheng's research was conducted based on the research question, "Why the local media reported the Umbrella Movement in a largely negative manner while their international counterparts tend to be the opposite" (Cheng, n.d.). The research question itself had automatically assumed local media did report the Umbrella Movement in a negative light. The inherent bias may have shaped the study's results.

Though both studies displayed limitations, the coding frameworks in the studies answered their research question. Yu's (2015) coding framework used significance tests to determine whether there was a significant difference in frameworks between newspapers. Cheng's (n.d.) study used the frequency of framing devices to compare the usage of framing devices between newspapers. Both methods were able to use coding to provide evidence for their findings.

The Anti-Extradition Bill Movement

The Anti-Extraditional Law Amendment Bill is part of the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance (FOO) 2019. In April 2019, amendments to the FOO were made (Martin, 2019). Part of the proposal was to include the extradition of alleged criminals and "fugitive offenders" and for them to be "surrendered" from HK to "parts of the PRC" (Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, 2019). Any convicted person being accused of a crime in HK can be 'extradited' to China, Taiwan, or Macau to be judged accordingly. The Bill's amendments sparked the Anti-Extradition Bill movement or the Anti-ELAB movement. (Brancati & Law, 2019; Barnes, 2019).

The Bill raised concerns about political persecution. China is known to be a country under a strict authoritarian regime, regulating media and speech censorship, especially in regards to politics (Negriff, 2011). With the FOO changed, some members of the HK public fear the FOO would be used to persecute those who speak out against China. According to the Basic Law, the FOO should not affect HK's freedom of political speech (Basic Law, 2017). Therefore, some members of the HK public are against the FOO's changes, hence the large-scale demonstrations and late-night destruction of property of the Anti-ELAB movement (Brancati & Law, 2019).

Research Gap

The Anti-ELAB movement is similar to the Umbrella Movement. Both movements have parties that oppose the government, involve protesters, and have caught the attention of local and international media. This means there could be a difference in framing between local and international newspapers, similar to the Umbrella Movement. This study's gap aims to study the portrayal of the Anti-ELAB movement in both local and international newspapers through content analysis and coding. While previous studies (Cheng, n.d; Yu, 2015) have studied local pro-China newspapers, this study will look at both local pro-China and pro-democracy newspapers to capture the variety of political stances amongst local newspapers. The study will also look at an international newspaper.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis is that there is a difference in frequency of framing devices in articles covering the Anti-ELAB movement and that the usage of different framing devices is associated with the differing tones towards the Anti-ELAB movement. Before the content analysis is conducted, the research questions had to be set.

RQ1: What is the difference in frequency of the framing devices in articles covering the Hong Kong Extradition Bill movement?

RQ2: Is there an association between the tones of the three different newspapers towards the Anti-Extradition Bill protest groups and the framing devices?

---

[9] Supervised by Marianne Franklin, Professor of Media, Communications, and Cultural Studies at Goldsmiths University of London

Looking at the frequency of different framing devices used throughout the articles, RQ1 seeks to find the difference in framing devices between the three newspapers. RQ2 sets out to see if the usage of different framing devices affects how readers comprehend an article. RQ2 may also be used to determine whether newspapers of certain political stances use specific framing devices to convey a certain tone to influence the reader's opinion of the movement.

Methodology

This study chose to use coding that would involve both frequencies of framing devices along with significance tests of differences between newspapers, modelled after Cheng (n.d.) and Yu's (2015) studies. A study conducted by Kaibin Xu[10] (2013) satisfied both conditions[11]. Though the study framed the Occupy Wall Street movement, the coding framework was replicable, answered the above research questions, and provided evidence for the hypothesis of the study. Therefore, the below steps were replicates of what Xu's study (2013) had conducted. When needed, changes were made to the steps to fit the context of this study.

Sample

Data for this study were collected from *Wen Wei Po* (*WWP*), a state-owned pro-Beijing newspaper, *Apple Daily*, a local-owned pro-democracy newspaper, and *The New York Times* (NYT), an international newspaper. The time frame of articles was chosen from June 12, 2019, to January 1, 2020. Articles were found via the WiseNew database[12] platform using "extradition bill" as the keyword, restricted to only display articles from "local news highlight" or "headline" sections for high relevance. There were 723 *WWP* articles, 318 *Apple Daily* articles, and 302 *NYT* articles. Each article was then double-checked, with repeating or irrelevant articles removed. A non-repeating random integer generator was then used to choose 150 articles per newspaper, reducing the number of articles. In the end, there were a total of 450 articles.

Coding

The coding unit was the article due to its efficiency in capturing the theme of the article (Xu, 2013). A binary *yes* versus *no* system was used to test the framework devices in each article. The framing devices were replicates of Xu's (2013), but the devices' criteria were slightly altered to fit the Anti-ELAB movement's context. This system would work as the framework's two categorizations are mutually exclusive (*yes* or *no*) (Xu, 2013). Below are the frameworks.

Official Sources. Article coded *yes* if article included official quotes from Chinese and HKSAR government officials, Legislative Council members, civil servants, or pro-democracy camp leaders (example in **Appendix A**). Article coded *no* otherwise.

Lawlessness Government. Article coded *yes* if article mentioned incidents of police brutality, usage of excessive force during the clearing of protestors, injury of bystanders due to police, unlawful arrests, or the Anti-Mask law. Anti-Mask law included due to it being labelled "unconstitutional" by the High Court (Siu & Lum, 2019) (example in **Appendix A**). Article coded *no* otherwise, or if it justified the force used against protestors.

Lawlessness Citizens. Article coded *yes* if article mentioned protestors throwing petrol bombs, vandalizing buildings and streets, blocking roads, setting fires, attacking bystanders, or participating in an illegal gathering (example in **Appendix A**). Article coded *no* if article did not mention the above actions or mentioned that the protestors were part of a legal protest and were following the regulations of the protest.

Youthfulness. Article coded *yes* if article mentioned the age of the protester as below 30, states that the protester is a student, or mentions immature appearance of protester (example in **Appendix A**). Article coded *no* otherwise.

---

[10] Associate professor in the Department of Communication Studies at Hong Kong Baptist University

[11] The study aimed to see how different American media framed the Occupy Wall Street movement, specifically the usage of different framing devices and its association with the overall tone of the article.

[12] The researcher gained access to the data via the help of expert advisor Dr. Timothy Fung, Program Director of the Organizational Communication Concentration of Hong Kong Baptist University

Radical or Illogical. Article coded *yes* if article mentioned the action of the protesters as useless, without a goal, or said that the protesters are radicals and extremists (example in **Appendix A**). Article coded *no* if article said that the protestors were organised, had a clear end goal, or that the protesters were rational.

Public Disapproval. Article coded *yes* if article mentioned that the public disapproved of the protest, that there were movements against the protester's actions, or that the public did not pay attention to the protesters (example in **Appendix A**). Article coded *no* if there were no negative remarks about the protest or the protestors or if it mentioned the public approval and support for the protest.

Negative Impact. Article coded *yes* if article mentioned the negative influence of the protests, inconvenience in transport due to protestor's blocking roads, negative growth in the economy, or a decrease in tourism (example in **Appendix A**). Article coded *no* if there was no mention of the negative influence of protests or included statements mentioning the positive influence of the protests.

Overall Tone

Overall tone is the tone towards the protesters or the protest itself. Following Xu's study (2015), the entire article must be read before the tone is decided. If the overall tone was positive or neutral, it was coded as *yes*. A positive tone would view the protests as a positive influence, and the article, in general, would imply the protests should be supported. A neutral tone would narrate the protests as a series of events and would remain somewhat objective towards the protest. If the overall tone was negative, it was coded as *no*. A negative tone would highlight the negativity of the protests and put the protesters in a negative role. As all framing devices are negative, we are trying to see if the overall negative tone can be associated with the negative devices. Therefore, positive or neutral tones can be considered as one variable and can create a binary system with an overall negative tone.

Coding Reliability

The researcher coded the first eight devices by using the digits 0 and 1, with 0 associated with *no* while 1 associated with *yes*. To prevent bias and increase the reliability of the study, the researcher invited six high schoolers to read through the articles and rate the overall tone. The high schoolers were students who were able to read Cantonese and English and had taken literature classes. Two high schoolers were assigned to each newspaper and were asked to read through each article, then state the overall tone of the article. The researcher recorded their answers by marking down a positive/neutral tone as the digit 1 while marking down a negative tone as the digit 0. After reading all articles, the researcher cross-checked their results, marked down conflicting results, and arranged a meeting between each high schooler, asking them to discuss and decide the overall tone of the articles that had conflicting results. The researcher then recorded their final decision.

Association with Overall Tone

To answer RQ2, a 2 by 2 chi-square test of independence was conducted between each framing device and the overall tone. All conditions of the test were met - a random sample was taken from one population, each outcome was classified into one category, and the expected number in each cell was five or more. The null hypothesis was that the two variables were independent. The alternate hypothesis was that the two variables were not independent.

Table 1: Frequency of Framing Devices by Newspaper

	Apple News	Wen Wei Po	New York Times
Official Sources	38.0%	56.0%	68.0%
Lawlessness Citizen	23.3%	56.7%	50.7%
Lawlessness Government	38.7%	6.7%	42.0%
Youthfulness	38.0%	22.7%	44.7%
Radical/Illogical	6.0%	35.3%	22.0%
Public Disapproval	4.0%	18.0%	8.0%
Negative Impact	8.0%	28.7%	22.7%
Overall Tone	51.3%	22.7%	70.7%
Note: n = 150 for each newspaper			

Results and Discussion

Looking at RQ1, the differences in frequency of framing devices between newspapers can be analysed based on political stances. For instance, numerous articles from WWP (35.3%) called protestors "extremists" or "black shirt devils" to discount the effectiveness of the protest (example in Appendix A). Apple Daily (6.0%) did the opposite, calling protestors "heroes" or "fighters of justice", that the protestors responded against police brutality and government corruption. Some articles separated "peaceful protesters" from "violent rioters," implying only a minority of protesters used violence while the majority used legal means (example in Appendix A). NYT (22.0%) was more conservative in their language and often referred to each party as "protesters" or "police." The difference in frequency of radical/illogical is connected to the differences in the frequency of the negative impact, lawlessness citizens, and public disapproval. The negative labelling of protestors in WWP was sometimes paired with statements describing the illegal action of the protesters (56.7%) and their negative impacts (28.7%), leading to public disapproval (18%). The movement and the protesters are mostly seen through a negative lens (example in Appendix A).

Apple Daily's positive labelling of protesters displayed a decrease in articles with statements about illegal protest activities (23.3%), negative impacts (8.0%), and public disapproval (4.0%). Rather than directly labelling protesters' actions as "illegal," Apple Daily stated the actions were defensive responses against police brutality. Arrested protesters were sometimes labelled as "victims", forced to commit violence to defend themselves, leading to their arrest. Some articles made a distinction between "peaceful" and "violent" protesters, claiming only "violent" protesters committed illegal actions. Articles in Apple Daily also claimed illegal actions and negative impacts of the protests were due to the government's inability to listen to the public's requests (example in Appendix A). The neutral labelling of protesters and police in NYT is seen as the frequency of lawlessness citizens (50.7%) and negative impact (22.7%) is in between the frequency of the same framing devices for the other two newspapers. NYT, while listing out the illegal actions of protesters, also lists out events of police brutality, portraying both parties' actions in an equally negative light.

Apple Daily had a higher frequency of lawlessness government than lawlessness citizens. WWP has the opposite. As a pro-democracy newspaper, it is understandable why Apple Daily has placed a significant emphasis on

police brutality and has articles supporting the protester's movement. WWP, as a pro-China newspaper, had an extremely low frequency of the framing device lawlessness in government due to its material being processed by the Central government and the Central government's lack of tolerance towards articles criticising the Central government or the HKSAR. The framing device youthfulness had different connotations in different newspapers. In Apple Daily, mentions of a protester's age were mostly used to highlight the cruelty of the police. Statements about police beating minors and arresting large crowds of youth portrayed protesters as helpless. In comparison, WWP rebuked protesters for "brainwashing" youth and "pushing" them to the front lines, using them as shields against the police. Most articles in NYT list out the protesters' ages. They view the youth as people who are taking the initiative to create an impact in society, whether it may be through legal or illegal means.

Official sources was widely used in all three newspapers, NYT, the most frequent. Apple Daily had multiple articles with quotes from Carrie Lam and used the quotes to point out Carrie Lam's flaws. WWP also used quotes from pro-democracy camps to point out moments of hypocrisy among the protesters, undermining the movement. NYT included both parties' quotes to present a story in which both perspectives were seen. They often used the quotes of officials or Legislative Council members to get their opinion on the Anti-ELAB movement.

Table 2 displays the results of RQ2, the association between the overall tone and the framing devices. A 2 by 2 chi-square test of independence was conducted between each framing device and the overall tone for each newspaper. The null hypothesis was that the two variables were independent, while the alternate hypothesis was that the two variables were not independent. See Appendix B (Apple News), Appendix C (Wen Wei Po) and Appendix D (New York Times) for full details of coding counts for each framing device.

Table 2: Chi-Square Analyses of the Association Between Framing Devices and Overall Tone

	Apple News (x^2)	Wen Wei Po (x^2)	New York Times (x^2)
Official Sources	0.8605	0.6975	6.658*
Lawlessness Citizen	7.2401*	23.3055*	0.7579
Lawlessness Government	15.5971*	0.0435	5.2803*
Youthfulness	11.6257*	0.1084	1.4574
Radical/Illogical	1.2417	20.8547*	1.7779
Public Disapproval	3.0066	4.3738*	0.1007
Negative Impact	0.2558	11.1613*	41.4289*
*Note: Outcome Variable = Overall Tone; n = 150; df = 1; *p< 0.05; null rejected*			

The chi-square analyses for *official sources* for *Apple Daily* and *WWP* displayed independence, supporting Xu's (2013) results. Both newspapers used quotes from their political party for authoritative information while simultaneously using quotes from opposing parties to highlight the fallacies in the opposing parties. As authoritative sources from both parties are used, the sources in both newspapers are not necessarily predictors of the overall tone as the quotes' context is not quantified in the analysis. *NYT*, however, displays a significant relationship between *official sources* and *overall tone,* meaning *official sources* is a predictor of *overall tone*, different from what Xu's (2013) study found. The reason behind this difference may be due to *NYT* having a considerably greater amount of pro-Beijing officials' quotes compared to the other newspapers. Both high schoolers who had coded the overall tone for *NYT* noted when reading quotes from officials, they treated the quote as a sign of objectivity and would more likely note down the article's tone as neutral despite the quoted content. The preconception official sources equals neutrality may have affected the results of the chi-square analyses as there would be a greater number of articles in the cell *official sources* and *positive/neutral* than reality, thus resulting in biased results.

The chi-square analysis for *lawlessness citizen* for *Apple Daily* and *WWP* displayed a significant relationship. For *lawlessness government*, *Apple Daily* presented a significant relationship with *overall tone* while *WWP* did not. For *WWP*, it is understandable that the higher frequency of *lawlessness citizen* would lead the public to view the Anti-ELAB movement in a negative light. The emphasis and constant description of protesters throwing petrol bombs,

blocking streets, and violating the law creates a negative tone towards the protesters, potentially undermining the Anti-ELAB movement. The lack of association between *lawlessness government* and *overall tone* is due to the lack of tolerance for criticism towards the Central Government (HKPOP, 2018). *Lawlessness government* will not be prevalent in most articles and therefore, cannot be a good predictor for *overall tone*. For *Apple Daily*, the frequency of the framing devices portrays the government as unlawful and condemning while presenting the protesters as justice enforcers. These images would shed a positive light on the Anti-ELAB movement, and the articles would most likely have an overall neutral/positive tone. *NYT* did not display an association between *lawlessness citizens* and *overall tone* but displayed an association between *lawlessness government* and *overall tone*, different from Xu's (2013) results. This may be because this study uses two framing devices (*lawlessness citizen* and *lawlessness government*) rather than one device (*general lawlessness*).

The chi-square analysis for *youthfulness* is significant for *Apple Daily* while *WWP* and *NYT* have no such association. In Xu's (2013) study, the results displayed a significant association between *youthfulness* and *overall tone*. For *WWP* and *NYT*, however, the results of this study differ, potentially because of the way the youth are presented. In *Apple Daily*, the youth are portrayed as brave, knowledgeable protesters fighting for their future as Hong Kong citizens, putting the Anti-ELAB movement in a positive light as it is seen as a movement for the betterment of students' futures. This is similar to how the youth in the articles in Xu's (2013) study are presented. In *WWP*, the youth are presented as brainwashed or ignorant of the Anti-ELAB movement's entirety. It is as if they are considered as a separate group and do not have much influence over the movement itself. Therefore, despite the tone of the articles, the youth is not considered an influencer of the movement, so there is no association between the youths' actions and the movement's portrayal. *NYT*, like *WWP*, presents the youth less as leading influencers but more as followers in the movement. However, *NYT's* presentation of youth is less extreme than *WWP* and treats the youth as people who lack experience rather than people who are ignorant and brainwashed.

The chi-square analysis for *radical/illogical* and *public disapproval* displays a significant relationship for *WWP*, while there is no such association for *NYT* and *Apple Daily*. *Radical/illogical* is a predictor for *overall tone* as the usage of terms such as "black shirt devils" and "extremists" put the majority of the protesters in a negative light, creating an overall negative tone towards the movement. However, for *NYT* and *Apple Daily*, the language used towards the protesters are less extreme, as seen by the lesser frequency of *radical/illogical* for both newspapers. The results of Xu's (2013) study, however, display an association between *radical/illogical* and *overall tone*. The difference in the study could be due to the difference in coding frameworks. In Xu's (2013) study, the protesters' goals were evaluated as radical or illogical. In this study, the protesters' actions itself were evaluated along with their goals.

In *Apple Daily* and *NYT*, radical protesters were also labelled as a separate group to the leading group of protesters and were treated as separate from the Anti-ELAB movement. Thus the news coverages would portray the radical protesters in a negative light while simultaneously portraying the main protest movement in a neutral or positive light. A similar case happens to *public disapproval*. The public disapproval is treated as a consequence of the radical movement. In *WWP*, as the protesters as a whole are considered radical and extremists, any public disapproval about the movement would be towards the entire group of protesters. For *Apple Daily* and *NYT* isolates the radicals and implies that the public disapproval is towards the radical minority and does not concern the entire movement., so *public disapproval* is not a predictor of the overall tone towards the protest.

The chi-square analysis for *negative impact* displays a significant association for *WWP* and *NYT*. *Apple Daily* displays no such association, because the negative impact is associated with radical minorities. Thus, it would not affect the overall tone towards the major movement group. For *WWP*, as the entire movement is considered radical or extremist, any negative impact on the protesters would affect the view the public has towards the movement, thus influencing the overall tone of the news coverage. However, for *NYT*, there is an association between *negative impact* and *overall tone*. As *NYT* is an international newspaper, there would be more emphasis on the global economy and the worldwide repercussions of the movement. Readers may see the emphasis as a sign of the severity of the movement's impact, thus perceiving the movement in an overall negative light.

Limitations

Throughout this study, a limitation present was the language barrier. Though the high schoolers who coded the framing device *overall tone* knew moderate levels of Cantonese (except those reading *NYT*), the high schoolers studied in an international school for the majority of their education and thus had a harder time reading the Cantonese articles compared to average HK students. The lack of a complete understanding of the articles may have influenced their ability to interpret and code the articles. Using Cohen's kappa[13], the reliability for the high school pair reading *Apple Daily*, *WWP*, and *NYT* were 0.166 (slight agreement), 0.297 (fair agreement), and 0.321 (fair agreement) respectively. This means that while some articles were coded similarly by the pair of high schoolers, there were also multiple articles coded differently. In Xu's (2015) study, the intercoder reliability for his study was higher than this study. After de-briefing with the intercoders, the differences in agreement were discovered mostly due to differences in reading ability. To reduce the limitation, the high schoolers were asked to discuss and talk through articles with uncertainties. While discussing, if they were uncertain about the meaning of specific phrases or words, the high schoolers would discuss it through with the researcher and then conclude the article.

The researcher struggled with bias throughout the coding of the articles. As a HK citizen living through this movement, the researcher has many personal opinions about the movement. This inherent bias may have affected how the researcher perceives specific phrases or language usage, resulting in data being favourable to the biased side. This is why the researcher would read a few articles from each newspaper per day. This disparity of articles allowed the researcher to read differing perspectives as the researcher coded and reminded the researcher that each newspaper had their differing political stances.

Conclusion

The hypothesis of this study states that there is a difference in frequency of framing devices in articles from *Apple Daily*, *WWP*, and *NYT* covering the Anti-ELAB movement. While not all differences were significant, overall, the differing frequencies between newspapers imply a newspaper's political stance influences which framing devices it utilises. The pro-democracy newspaper *Apple Daily* had a higher frequency of framing devices that were supportive of the newspaper's cause (*lawlessness in government*) while having a lower frequency of framing devices that were negative towards the movements (*negative impact, radical/illogical, lawlessness in citizen*). *WWP*, the pro-Beijing newspaper, was the opposite, having a higher frequency of framing devices that were supportive of the government's actions during the movement (*lawlessness in citizen*) while having a lower frequency of framing devices that were critical of the government's actions (*lawlessness in government*). *NYT*, a politically unaligned newspaper, had a moderate frequency of framing devices, often between the frequencies of the other newspapers, and displayed a comparatively objective standpoint about the movement. The results of the study are congruent to Chen's (n.d.) and

---

[13]Cohen's kappa is the statistical measure of the difference in observant agreement (Viera & Garrett, 2005) and is used in Xu's (2013) study to measure intercoder reliability.

Yu's (2015) studies, indicating pro-Beijing papers potentially tend to highlight the negativity of protests while American newspapers tend to be more liberal when writing about HK events.

This study also discovered that the overall tone did not necessarily associate with framing devices. Framing devices such as *radical/illogical, negative impact, public disapproval* had different tones associated with the device amongst different newspapers due to how the newspapers presented the framing devices to the viewers. The nature of the newspaper itself was a factor that influenced how viewers may comprehend the framing devices. There did not seem to be a predictable association between the overall tone and framing devices due to the three newspapers' conflicting nature.

Future research could expand on the association between political stances and framing devices. This study looked at one newspaper that was either pro-Beijing, pro-democracy, or liberal. Perhaps future studies could include the framing of different local newspapers of similar political stances to examine whether political stances or the nature of particular newspapers drives the frequency of specific framing devices.

Acknowledgments

References

Andrelczyk, C. (2016, March 14). In The Shadow Of The Great Firewall: Censorship And Surveillance During Hong Kong 's Umbrella Movement. Retrieved May 04, 2020, from https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1487&context=etd

Apple Daily. (2019, June 17). 全家齊心抗爭「真正公民教育」. Apple Daily. Retrieved from https://hk.news.appledaily.com/local/daily/article/20190617/20706158

Apple Daily. (2019, September 25). 愛爾蘭發旅警 日韓籲防襲. Apple Daily. Retrieved from https://hk.news.appledaily.com/local/daily/article/20190725/20736929

Baresch, B., Hsu, S., & Reese, S. D. (2020). The power of framing: New challenges for researching the structure of meaning in news. *Journalism's Future,* 637-647.

Barnes, M. (2019). Hong Kong in Protest. Origins: Current Events in Historical Perspective, 12(12).

Basic Law Art 2, The Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China (2017).

BBC. (2014, September 29). Instagram appears blocked in China. Retrieved May 04, 2020, from https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-29409533

Brancati, D., & Law, N. (2019, November 14). Why the Hong Kong Protests Have Gone Global. Retrieved May 16, 2020, from https://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/why-hong-kong-protests-have-gone-global

Bush, R. (2016, July 29). China's Decision on Universal Suffrage in Hong Kong. Retrieved May 04, 2020, from https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2014/09/02/chinas-decision-on-universal-suffrage-in-hong-kong/

Chan, Y. Y. (2019, June 18). Why Hong Kong Is Still Marching. The New York Times.

Chen, G. (2014, September 11). China to Hong Kong: You Can Vote, We Select the Candidates. Retrieved May 04, 2020, from https://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/china-hong-kong-you-can-vote-we-select-candidates

Cheng, D. (n.d.). Representing the Umbrella Movement: A Comparative Frame Analysis. Retrieved May 04, 2020, from https://www.academia.edu/17092009/Representing_the_Umbrella_Movement_A_Comparative_Frame_Analysis

Cheng, J. Y.-S. (2017). The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region: 1997-2017. Contemporary Chinese Political Economy and Strategic Relations: An International Journal, 3(2), 550–571.

Cissel, M. (2012). Media Framing: A comparative content analysis on mainstream and alternative news coverage of Occupy Wall Street. *The Elon Journal of Undergraduate Research in Communications, 3*(1), spring, 67-77.

Elliott, V. (2018). Thinking about the Coding Process in Qualitative Data Analysis. *The Qualitative Report, 23*(11), 2850-2861.

Fugitive Offenders Ordinance, Cap 503 s Section 2, Laws of Hong Kong (2019).

Goldman, R., Yu, E., & Lam, Y. F. (2020, January 1). Hong Kong Protesters Return to Streets as New Year Begins. The New York Times.

Hallahan, K. (2007). Strategic Framing. *International Encyclopedia of Communication.*

Ives, M., & Wong, E. (2019, October 7). Thousands in Hong Kong Defy Ban on Masks, and Protests Turn Violent. The New York Times.

Martin, M. F. (2014). Protests in Hong Kong: The "Umbrella Movement." Congressional Research Service.

Martin, M. F. (2019). Hong Kong's Proposed Extradition Law Amendments. Congressional Research Service.

Negriff, L. (2011). The Past, Present, and Future of Freedom of Speech and Expression in the People's Republic of China. Human Rights and Human Welfare, 130–144.

Ramzy, A., Ives, M., & May, T. (2019, August 6). Hong Kong Protesters Back Strike; Authorities Fight Back. The New York Times.

Ramzy, A., & Yu, E. (2019, September 5). Bill That Riled Hong Kongers Will Be Pulled. The New York Times.

Rühlig, T. N. (2017). Listening to the Voices of Hong Kong's Umbrella Movement Protesters. Contemporary Chinese Political Economy and Strategic Relations: An International Journal, 3(2), 747–818.

Siu, J., & Lum, A. (2019, December 10). Hong Kong mask ban lifted: court refuses government request to suspend earlier ruling that it was unconstitutional. South China Morning Post. Retrieved from https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/law-and-crime/article/3041440/hong-kong-mask-ban-court-refuses-government-request

Tai, B. Y.-ting. (2018). Hong Kong No More. Contemporary Chinese Political Economy and Strategic Relations: An International Journal, 4(2), 397–422.

Tai, B. (2019). 30 Years After Tiananmen: Hong Kong Remembers. *Journal of Democracy 30(2),* 64-69. doi:10.1353/jod.2019.0025

Viera, A. J., & Garrett, J. M. (2005). Understanding Interobserver Agreement: The Kappa Statistic. Family Medicine, 37(5), 360–363. Retrieved from http://web2.cs.columbia.edu/~julia/courses/CS6998/Interrater_agreement.Kappa_statistic.pdf

Wen Wei Po. (2019, June 13). 外力介入變質市民勿當炮灰. Wen Wei Po.

Wen Wei Po. (2019, October 7). 「6.9」踢傷眼角「7.1」狂撒石灰. Wen Wei Po.

Wen Wei Po. (2019, June 12). 中律協婦聯青聯挺警嚴正執法. Wen Wei Po.

Wen Wei Po. (2019, November 8). 暴力衝擊重創港四大行業料損四千億 黑色恐怖五個月 經濟蕭條半停擺. Wen Wei Po.

Witt, N. H.-de. (n.d.). Coding: An Overview and Guide to Qualitative Data Analysis for Integral Researchers (1st ed., pp. 1–22). Integral Research Centre.

Wong, Y.-chung. (2017). Localism in Hong Kong. Contemporary Chinese Political Economy and Strategic Relations: An International Journal, 3(2), 618–650.

Xu, K. (2013). Framing Occupy Wall Street: A Content Analysis of The New York Times and USA Today. International Journal of Communication, 7, 2412–2432. doi: 1932-8036/20130005

Ye, L. (2016). Framing 2014 Hong Kong Protest. Retrieved May 04, 2020, from
https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=8045&context=etd

Yeoh, E. K.-K. (2017). Upon the Twentieth Anniversary of the Hong Kong Handover: An Update on State-Civil Societal Relations. Contemporary Chinese Political Economy and Strategic Relations, 3(2), 523–548.

Yu, M. (2015, October 28). Framing Occupy Central: A Content Analysis of Hong Kong, American and British Newspaper Coverage. Retrieved May 04, 2020, from
https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7251&context=etd

Appendix A: Examples and Quotes

Example for *Official Sources*

"Incidents over these past two months have shocked and saddened Hong Kong people," [Carrie Lam] said in an eight-minute televised statement broadcast shortly before 6 p.m. "We are all very anxious about Hong Kong, our home. We all hope to find a way out of the current impasse and unsettling times." (Ramzy & Yu, 5 September 2019)

Example for *Lawlessness in Government*

The police hit unarmed protestors with batons and fired rubber bullets at individuals or crowds without warning. They aimed at body parts. Hong Kong had never seen such a level of police brutality, and so brazenly too - the authorities apparently unfazed by being recorded on live video and broadcast around the world (Chan, 18 June 2019).

Example for *Lawlessness in Citizen*

In recent weeks, the protesters' anger has largely shifted to focus on the scale and intensity of the police response. On Monday they surrounded and vandalized several police stations, setting fires outside at least two of them (Ramzy et al., 6 August 2019).

Example for *Youthfulness*

Jeannie Mok, a 19-year-old student who was protesting on the Kowloon Peninsula on Sunday, said the ban had given the movement another rallying cry (Ives & Wong, 7 October 2019).

Example for *Radical or Illogical*

民陣今年6月9日發起遊行當晚，既有「黑衣魔」搞事襲警察，逾20名警員當晚受傷，有警員血流披面 （*Wen Wei Po*, 7 October 2019)。

During a Civil Human Rights Front organised movement on June 9, the "black shirt devils" were causing trouble and were attacking police. 20 police members were injured, a member had broken skin and was bleeding (*Wen Wei Po*, 7 October 2019).

Example for *Public Disapproval*

香港島婦女聯會一眾代表昨晨則手持寫有「香港警察加油」、「向前線警務人圓致敬」等字句的自製標語，到政府總部廣場集會。她們高喊「支持警察，維護法紀，譴責暴力，保衛家園」的口號，向前線警務人員致以慰問，並譴責違法示威者衝擊立法會傷害警員。(*Wen Wei Po*, 12 June 2019)

The Hong Kong Island Women's Association displayed slogans such as "Go Hong Kong Police", "Respect For Front Line Police" etc. and gathered at the Central Government Office Court Area. They shouted the slogan, "Support the police, maintain the law, rebuke violence, protect our homes" and encouraged front-line policemen while rebuking law-breaking protesters for storming the Legislative Council headquarters and injuring policemen (*Wen Wei Po*, 12 June 2019).

Example for *Negative Impact*
It is also unclear how long [Hong Kong] itself can endure a movement that has already resulted in 6,000 arrests and an economic recession (Goldman, Yu & Lam, 1 January 2020).

Example for RQ1, *Wen Wei Po, Radical or Illogical*
現在，香港的執法人員卻因公受傷，被暴徒攻擊，「如果反對派是他們平時所說的和平、理性、非暴力，那他們就應該譴責今次所有非和平、非理性、暴力的違法者。」（Wen Wei Po, 13 June 2019)
Right now, Hong Kong law enforcement officers have been attacked by thugs while protecting the public. "If the opposition is what they call peaceful, rational, and without violence, they then should condemn all non-peaceful, non-rational, violent offenders." (Wen Wei Po, 13 June 2019)

Example for RQ1, *Apple Daily, Radical or Illogical*
「遊行是一大群人用合法的方法去表達自己意見，暴動是大家不再理性，用激烈而不合法、甚至暴力來表達憤怒，忘記了自己的原意...」(Apple Daily, 17 June 2019)
"Protests are when a large group of people use legal means to express their own opinion, while violence is when people are not being rational and use extreme, illegal, and violent means to express anger, when they have forgotten their purpose... " (Apple Daily, 17 June 2019)

Example for RQ1, *Wen Wei Po*, Negative Labelling
在一片黑色恐怖籠罩下，香港經濟近乎「半停擺」，港鐵提早收車，食肆夜店無法做生意；道路被堵，搵食車怕「私了」減少開工；貨主怕交通受阻延誤交貨要賠錢，索性改經其他港口轉口貨物，重創本港出入口貿易業；旅遊業更嚴重「吊鹽水」。(Wen Wei Po, 8 November 2019)
Shrouded in black terror, Hong Kong's economy is nearly at a "half standstill", MTR train stops have to close earlier, restaurants and nightclubs are unable to do business. Roads are being blocked, delivery drivers are afraid they will have less business. Cargo owners are afraid they would have to pay for the delay of cargo due to blockage of roads, so they have tried to divert cargo through other ports, heavily impacting the import and export trade in Hong Kong. The impact on tourism is even more serious (Wen Wei Po, 8 November 2019).

Example for RQ1, *Apple Daily, Radical or Illogical*
愛爾蘭外交和貿易部上週二更新針對香港及澳門的外遊建議，指香港因反對《逃犯條例》修訂而出現大型示威，「絕大多數示威是和平的，但個別少數示威者與警方發生衝突，警方有使用催淚氣體、胡椒噴霧和橡膠子彈」，將港澳的旅遊保安級別列為「高度警戒」，有關建議仍然生效。（Apple Daily, 25 September 2019)
Last week on Tuesday Iceland's trade business had new outbound travel advice for Hong Kong and Macau, stating that because of the Anti-ELAB bill there have been large scale protests. "Most protesters are peaceful, but a few protesters have clashed with police and police have used tear gas, pepper spray, and rubber bullets," changing the tourism security level in Hong Kong and Macau to "high alert" and keeping previous alerts (Apple Daily, 25 September 2019).

Appendix B: Apple Daily

APPLE NEWS	LAWLESS C	LAWELESS G	NEG IMPACT	RADICAL	DISAPPROVAL	YOUTH	SOURCES	TONE HERM	TONE MICH	OVERALL TONE	
17	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	
20	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
28	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	
29	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	
30	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	
34	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	
37	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	
48	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
49	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
52	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	
60	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
66	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
69	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
71	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
73	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
94	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
108	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	
112	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	
113	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
123	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	
129	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	
134	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	
144	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
146	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
158	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
168	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
170	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
171	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
174	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
177	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
183	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
185	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
192	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
197	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
222	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
234	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
240	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
248	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
252	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
253	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
254	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
257	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
262	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
263	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
266	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
274	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
278	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
279	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
290	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
346	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
353	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
355	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
365	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
367	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
369	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
371	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
374	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
379	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
384	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
397	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1

www.JSR.org 14

398	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
404	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
408	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
415	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
417	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
418	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
422	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
424	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
430	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
433	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
434	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
437	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
441	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
444	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
447	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
457	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
458	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
463	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
467	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
469	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
477	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
479	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
481	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
496	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
497	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
505	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
506	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
518	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
522	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
523	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
529	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
533	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
540	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
543	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
544	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
555	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
560	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
561	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
563	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
569	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
580	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
588	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
592	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
594	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
599	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
606	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
611	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
614	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
616	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
618	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
623	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
628	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
629	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
631	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
643	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
644	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
649	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
652	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
655	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
656	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
660	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
661	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
663	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
668	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
670	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
671	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
690	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
691	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
692	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
697	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
707	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
708	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
712	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
717	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
718	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
SUM	0.2333333333	0.3866666667	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.38	0.38	0.5533333333	0.42	0.5133333333

Appendix C: Wen Wei Po

WEN WEI PO	LAWLESS C	LAWLESS G	NEG IMPACT	RADICAL	DISAPPROVAL	YOUTH	SOURCES	TONE ARIA	TONE PRIS	OVERALL TONE
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
5	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
6	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
7	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
9	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
17	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
22	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
24	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
28	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
30	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
31	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
37	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
40	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
42	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
44	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
46	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
48	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
51	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
57	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
63	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
67	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
73	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
79	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
81	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
82	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
84	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
85	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
87	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
88	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
91	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
95	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
96	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
98	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
102	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
104	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
105	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
106	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
109	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
112	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
117	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
122	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
123	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
125	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
127	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
133	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
134	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
135	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
137	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
143	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
145	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
146	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
149	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

150	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
151	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
152	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
154	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
155	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
157	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
158	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
161	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
162	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
165	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
167	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
168	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
169	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
172	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
173	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
174	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
176	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
177	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
180	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
181	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
183	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
185	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
187	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
189	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
190	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
193	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
198	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
200	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
201	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
206	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
208	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
211	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
212	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
213	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
215	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
218	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
219	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
222	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
223	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
225	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
227	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
229	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
233	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
235	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
237	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
239	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
241	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0
242	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
245	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
246	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
249	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
250	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
254	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
258	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
261	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
262	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
263	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
264	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
266	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
268	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
269	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
271	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
274	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
276	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
279	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
281	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
284	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
288	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0
289	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0

290	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
292	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
293	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
294	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
297	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
298	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
299	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
300	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
302	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
307	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
308	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
311	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
313	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
315	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
316	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
317	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
318	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
SUM	0.5666666667	0.06666666667	0.2866666667	0.3533333333	0.18	0.2266666667	0.56	0.3466666667	0.2266666667	0.2266666667

Appendix D: The New York Times

NY TIMES	LAWLESS C	LAWLESS G	NEG IMPACT	RADICAL	DISAPPROVAL	YOUTH	SOURCES	TONE CHAR	TONE KARA	OVERALL TONE
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
17	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
18	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
19	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
21	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
22	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
25	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
29	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
30	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
31	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
35	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
37	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
41	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
43	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
46	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
56	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
57	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
58	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
59	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
60	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
61	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
66	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
67	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
69	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
74	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
76	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
91	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
94	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
95	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
107	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
111	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
112	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
113	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
114	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
115	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
116	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
117	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
120	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
127	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
130	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
131	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
132	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
133	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
134	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
136	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
138	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
139	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
140	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
144	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
145	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
147	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
148	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
149	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
150	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
151	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
152	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
153	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
156	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
157	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
159	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
160	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1

164	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
165	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
166	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
168	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
169	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
170	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
171	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
176	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
178	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
181	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
183	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
184	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
186	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
187	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
188	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
189	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
190	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
191	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
192	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
193	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
194	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
195	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
196	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
202	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
203	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
205	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
208	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
210	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
211	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
214	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
216	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
217	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
219	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
227	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
229	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
234	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1
235	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
238	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
239	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
240	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
242	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
243	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
244	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
245	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
248	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
249	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
250	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
251	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
252	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
253	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
254	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
256	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
258	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
259	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
260	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
263	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
266	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
268	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
271	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
277	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
281	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
284	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
285	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
288	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
289	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
290	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
292	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
293	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
294	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
296	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
298	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
299	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
304	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
307	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
SUM	0.7066666667	0.42	0.2266666667	0.22	0.1466666667	0.68	0.6266666667	0.6266666667	0.7066666667