

# THE EFFECT OF TRAINING PROGRAMS ON INTERNATIONAL GATEKEEPING

by

STEPHANIE HANISAK

(Under the Direction of Lee B. Becker)

## ABSTRACT

Current research on training programs and journalism fails to address the effectiveness of training programs. This thesis focuses on the number and types of articles published by media organizations that sent a gatekeeper to participate in the International Reporting Project. It was hypothesized that the IRP would increase the number of stories published about international conflict, the number of sources and direct quotes, the number of female sources, the number of non-government and military officials used as sources, the number of foreign sources. It was also hypothesized that there would be an increase in regional coverage. This thesis also takes into consideration the current state of the media industry.

INDEX WORDS: Gatekeepers, International News, Media Content, Hierarchy of Influences, Professionalism, Training Program, International Reporting Project

THE EFFECT OF TRAINING PROGRAMS ON INTERNATIONAL GATEKEEPING

by

STEPHANIE HAINSAK

B.A., Rollins College, 2007

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

© 2009

Stephanie Hanisak

All Rights Reserved

# THE EFFECT OF TRAINING PROGRAMS ON INTERNATIONAL GATEKEEPING

by

STEPHANIE HANISAK

Major Professor: Lee B. Becker

Committee: Ann Hollifield  
Tudor Vlad

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
August 2009

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents for always believing in me, and to Trouble for always being there for me during those late nights of reading and writing.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Becker for giving me an opportunity to work at the Cox Center and introducing me to the International Reporting Project. I would also like to thank everyone else who has been involved with the Cox Center in the past two years: Dr. Vlad, Melanie, Donna, Megan, Joel, Jessie, Nicole, Jake, Alex, Amanda, Tiffany, Ginny, and all the rest of the clerks. The Cox Center has been an important part of my graduate school experience, and I am forever grateful.

I would also like to acknowledge all of the great friends I have made during my time at UGA – Donna, Cindy, Haley, Melissa, Jeremy, Whitney, Renata, Lauren, and Gina.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
Problem Statement .....	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW .....	3
From Lewin to Shoemaker: The History of Gatekeeping .....	3
The Hierarchy of Influences .....	5
A Profession or Just Another Job: The Professionalization of Journalism .....	8
International News Coverage.....	11
Hypotheses.....	12
3 METHODS .....	15
International Reporting Project.....	15
The Media Organizations .....	17
Lexis/Nexis .....	18
Article Exclusions .....	18
Regional Coverage .....	19
Coding Protocol .....	21
Intercoder Reliability.....	23

Significance Levels .....	24
4 RESULTS .....	25
Types of News Frames .....	25
Amounts and Types of Sources .....	26
Breakdown of Southeast and East Asia Coverage .....	27
News Frames Used in Southeast and East Asia .....	29
Datelines in Southeast and East Asia .....	30
Number and Types of Sources in Southeast and East Asia .....	30
5 CONCLUSIONS .....	32
REFERENCES .....	36
APPENDICES .....	41
I EXAMPLES OF EXCLUDED ARTICLES .....	41
II CODING SHEET .....	46
III REGIONAL CODING SHEET .....	49



## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 3.1: Media Organization Pairings .....	53
Table 3.2: Number of Gatekeepers per Media Organizations.....	54
Table 3.3: Total Number of Retrieved Articles.....	55
Table 3.4: Number of Articles Before and After Trip .....	56
Table 3.5: Number of Retrieved Articles – Southeast Asia .....	62
Table 3.6: Number of Retrieved Articles – East Asia .....	63
Table 3.7: Intercoder Reliability – Percent Agreement .....	64
Table 3.8: Intercoder Reliability – Cohen’s Kappa .....	65
Table 4.1: News Frames for Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations .....	66
Table 4.2: Number of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations.....	67
Table 4.3: Number of Direct Quotes in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations.....	68
Table 4.4: Types of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations .....	69
Table 4.5: Sex of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations.....	70
Table 4.6: Nationality of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations .....	71
Table 4.7: Total Number of Usable Articles for Southeast Asia.....	72
Table 4.7b: Total Number of Usable Articles for Southeast Asia – Indonesia Excluded.....	73
Table 4.8: Total Number of Usable Articles for East Asia .....	74
Table 4.8b: Total Number of Usable Articles for East Asia – Indonesia Excluded.....	75
Table 4.9: Regional Word Counts .....	76

Table 4.10: News Frames for Southeast Asia .....	77
Table 4.11: News Frames for East Asia.....	78
Table 4.12: Datelines for Southeast Asia .....	79
Table 4.13: Datelines for East Asia .....	80
Table 4.14: Number of Sources for Southeast Asia.....	81
Table 4.15: Number of Sources for East Asia.....	82
Table 4.16: Number of Direct Quotes for Southeast Asia .....	83
Table 4.17: Number of Direct Quotes for East Asia.....	84
Table 4.18: Types of Sources for Southeast Asia.....	85
Table 4.19: Types of Sources for East Asia .....	86
Table 4.20: Sex of Sources for Southeast Asia .....	87
Table 4.21: Sex of Sources for East Asia.....	88
Table 4.22: Nationality of Sources for Southeast Asia.....	89
Table 4.23: Nationality of Sources for East Asia .....	90

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### **Problem Statement**

In their book, Shoemaker and Reese (1996) argue for a theory of media content that focuses on the content published by media organizations. They theorize that the characteristics of the journalists who produce the news and their media organizations significantly influence the coverage of events and the types of events that are covered in mass media organizations.

The professional backgrounds, experiences, roles and ethics combine with personal attitudes, values, beliefs, and roles to influence gatekeepers, and their decisions on what content is published. Everything from a journalist's ethnicity and sexual orientation to their educational background and previous career choices influence the stories they pitch and/or produce.

Within journalism education, there is a debate about what constitutes a good foundation for a journalist (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996). Shoemaker and Reese (1996) argue that some editors prefer to hire graduates of communication programs, while others prefer to hire graduates of other majors like American Studies. Similar to this debate, there is another debate currently raging in the journalism field regarding the professionalization of journalism. Is journalism a profession? Are journalists professionals like doctors and lawyers?

Based on Shoemaker and Reese's theory of media content, it is reasonable to expect that the types of extra training journalists participate in should also influence the types of media

content they produce. Do training programs and fellowships influence the types of news stories that are produced from media organizations? Do training programs and fellowships influence the types of news stories that gatekeepers allow to pass through their “gates”?

Shoemaker and Reese (1996), also, discuss the different types of news patterns that are traditionally seen within the mass media. One section of their book focuses on the treatment of international news. Shoemaker and Reese (1996) argue that international news tends to focus only on a few news themes (mainly conflict, crime, and disasters), and typically stories are only presented if there is an American connection. Will these patterns of media content be altered if the characteristics that influence journalists and gatekeepers are altered? For example, if journalists participate in a two-week long extensive training program within a foreign country, which is typically undercovered in mainstream media, will the types of news stories produced upon their return be different than those before. The theory of media content would suggest that such a training program would alter the content produced.

This thesis will test this expectation drawing on data originally gathered as part of an evaluation of a training program for international journalists conducted by the International Reporting Project at Johns Hopkins University. Additional data not included in the initial evaluation also have been gathered and analyzed for this thesis.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### **From Lewin to Shoemaker: The History of Gatekeeping**

In his 1947 posthumous publication, social scientist Kurt Lewin used the “theory of channels and gate keepers” to explain how food travels from the grocery store and the garden to the table. Using this theory, Lewin focused on how social changes can be produced in communities. Gatekeepers are those who control the gates and movement through around the gates. He further explained that Gatekeepers exhibit the power to make decisions for certain individuals or groups of what is allowed “in” and “out.” Lewin places a strong emphasis on the decision-making process of the gatekeeper – as do many current researchers in the field – and their ideology. Lewin ascertained that the same idea could be applied to communication:

This situation holds not only for food channels but also for the traveling of news item through certain communication channels in a group, for movement of goods, and the social locomotion of individuals in many organizations (1951, pg 187).

It was not until three years after Lewin coined and described the term “gate keeping” that it was applied to the field of communication via actual research. David Manning White published “The ‘Gate keeper.’ A Case Study in the Selection of News,” which explored the role of the gatekeeper in the newspaper setting by analyzing the rejected wire stories of “Mr. Gates” and the reasoning behind these rejected stories (1950). “Mr. Gates” is the pseudonym given to the wire editor of a morning newspaper in the Midwest, who White studied. According to White, “Mr. Gates” was a middle-aged journalist with 25 years combined experience as a

reporter and a copy editor for an unknown newspaper. Mr. Gates chose stories based on his preferences and what he thought were the preferences of his readers. One third of the rejected articles were rejected based on personal decisions. The remaining stories were rejected due to space issues or overlapping of stories. Since 1950, researchers have reexamined Mr. Gates and found similar results.

The name “Mr. Gates” has become synonymous with gatekeeping research, and, although White’s case study included one editor, he concluded that a gatekeeper’s individual set of experiences, attitudes, and expectations makes the process of news selection subjective. Since its publication, White’s study of Mr. Gates has been revisited and expanded on by other researchers (Snider, 1966; Bleske, 1991; Reese & Ballinger, 2001). Sixteen years later, Snider published a study replicating White’s, which used the same “Mr. Gates.” The results were similar. Although he was older, “Mr. Gates” still made decisions based on his personal preferences and what he thought his readers would like (Snider, 1966). On top of the “Mr. Gates” studies, many researchers have looked at gatekeeping and the news selection process (Shoemaker, 1991; Shoemaker & Reese, 1996; Berkowitz, 1997)

Gieber challenges White in two separate studies (1956; 1964). First, he concludes that despite White’s findings, organizations and their routines are more influential than specific people within the organization (Gieber, 1956). In a study 12 years later, he further challenges White by suggesting that personal subjectivity does not play a factor in editorial decisions (Gieber, 1964). Years later, Shoemaker et al. (2001) came to a similar conclusion that routine forces are more influential on decisions than individual forces. Despite making that conclusion, in another article Shoemaker et al. explained that gatekeepers are “either the individuals or the sets of routine procedures that determine whether items pass through the gates.” These

conflicting findings have sparked many studies on what influences gatekeepers. These influences will be discussed later in this literature review.

Gatekeeping studies encompass more than just news selection and the reasons behind selections (Shoemaker, 1991). The body of literature regarding the decision-making process is quite extensive. Specific areas of research include: decision-making for broadcast news (Whitney, 1981; Riffe et al., 1986; Abbott & Brassfield, 1989; Berkowitz, 1990; Berkowitz, 1991), decision-making for print news (Whitney, 1981; Abbott & Brassfield, 1989; Cassidy, 2006), decision making for online/electronic news (Garrison 1980; Singer, 2001; Cassidy, 2006), decision-making input from reporters (Joseph 1981; Joseph, 1982; Joseph, 1985), decision-making and foreign news (Peterson, 1976; Riffe & Belbase, 1982; Logan & Garrison, 1983; Riffe et al., 1986; Semetko et al., 1992; Beaudoin & Thorson, 2001; Reese, 2001; Beaudoin & Thorson, 2002; Hargrove & Stempel, 2002; Kim, 2002).

### **The Hierarchy of Influences:**

Donohue, Tichenor and Olien (1972) expanded gatekeeping to involve the entire process of message selection and how gatekeepers are influenced. Researchers agree that positive and negative forces facilitate or constrain the process of gatekeeping (Shoemaker et al., 2001). Forces exist on various levels with different intensities and directions (Shoemaker et al., 2001).

In the opening paragraphs of their book, Shoemaker and Reese (1996) ask “What factors inside and outside media organizations affect media content?” News selection is based on many factors (Berkowitz, 1990). Factors in the decision-making process include: ideology and culture, communication routines and organizational characteristics, and intraindividual (Shoemaker, 1991). Shoemaker and Reese (1996) list out the hierarchy of influences on content as:

individuals, organizational, media routines, factors outside of the media organization, and personal ideology. Research exists on each of these five influences: individuals (Berkowitz 1990; Shoemaker & Reese 1996), organizational (Breed, 1955; Bantz, 1985; Soloski, 1989; Donohew, 2001), media routines (Tuchman, 1973; Molotch & Lester, 1974; Eliasoph, 1988; Shoemaker & Reese, 1996; Shoemaker et al., 2001), factors outside the Media Organization (Berkowitz, 1990, Berkowitz, 1992; Shoemaker & Reese, 1996; Donohew, 2001), ideology (Reese, 1990; Zelizer, 1993; Shoemaker & Reese, 1996). Donohue, Olien & Tichenor (1989) refer to these same influences as structure and constraints.

Individual forces include: personal and professional background, attitudes, values, and beliefs (Shoemaker & Reese, 2001). Routines are the daily practices of journalists (Cassidy, 2006). Routines are believed to have a larger influence than individual forces in both print and online journalism (Cassidy, 2006). Timeliness, significance, proximity, and human interest are all traditional news values (Abboot & Brassfield, 1989). Proximity ranks as a very important factor regarding news selection for both print and television gatekeepers (Abott & Brassfield, 1989). Resource constraints and news judgments are both important factors in the decision-making process for gatekeepers (Berkowitz, 1991). Cultural differences affect the news selection process (Perterson, 1979).

Gatekeepers, who select news for local television news, rely mainly on the following types of news stories: government/politics, accidents/disasters, and crime (Berkowitz, 1991; Whitney & Becker, 1982). Stories that are unplanned are favored by gatekeepers over stories on planned events (Berkowitz, 1991). Some gatekeepers rely heavily on their instincts when deciding what types of stories qualify as good news (Berkowitz, 1992). Resources and logistics affect what stories are produced and shelved (Berkowitz, 1991).



Gatekeeping is no longer a simplistic theory, but rather one of the most complex theories of mass communication (Shoemaker et al, 2001). Other areas of research, important to the gatekeeper literature, are the studies that focus on journalism education (Hart, 1990; Ramsey, 1990; Bales, 1992; Izard & Morgan, 2004), training (Bennett, 1985; Cruthers, 1990; Hu, 1999; McLellan, 2006; Zaitz & Walth, 2008), standardization (Stempel, 1985), and professionalization (Aldridge & Evetts, 2003; Nerone & Barnhurst, 2003; Chan, Pan & Lee, 2004; Izard & Morgan, 2004; Deuze, 2005; Elasaka, 2005; Hanitzach, 2005; Kunelius, 2006; Ruusunoksa, 2006; Musa & Domatob, 2007).

As previously mentioned, theory suggests that the personal and professional background of journalists impact the content they produce. Under the hierarchy of influences model, the amount and types of education and training programs that journalists participate in influence their work. The goals of most training programs are to “increase knowledge, improve skills, and change attitudes” (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) suggest that training programs should be evaluated on four levels: reaction, learning, behavior, and results. Reaction considers how participants respond to the program. Learning focuses on what skills are improved or how knowledge of the subject is increased. Behavior emphasizes how the participants behavior towards subjects changes or is influenced by the program. Training programs evaluated by the results focus on physical changes that are produced from the program. An example of this would be looking at the number of articles produced on specific topic after a newspaper staff participated in a training program about the specific topic. Journalists who participate in large amounts of extra training can be seen as more professional than journalists who do not participate in training programs.

## **A Profession or Just Another Job: The Professionalization of Journalism**

“Professionalization implies standardization and homogeny; it accounts not for differences among journalists but for what journalists have in common.”

-- Theodore Glasser

In recent years, a large amount of scholars have asked, “Is journalism a profession?”

Many of these scholars have come to similar conclusions – yes and no. Before this can be answered, a definition of what a profession is needs to be established. Typically, autonomy, service orientation, licensing and testing, and codes of conduct are characteristics of what constitutes a profession (Zelizer, 2004). McLeod and Hawley’s 1964 seminal study on the professionalism of newsmen remains an important piece of literature when discussing professionalism in journalism (Becker et al., 2005). Hawley and McLeod (1964) define eight criteria that constitute a profession:

“it must perform a unique and essential service, it must emphasize intellectual techniques, it must have a long period of specialized training to acquire a systemic body of knowledge based on research, it must be given a broad range of autonomy, its practitioners must accept broad personal responsibility for judgments and actions, it must place greater emphasis on service than on private economic gain, it must develop a comprehensive self-governing organization, and it must have a code of ethics which has been clarified and interpreted by concrete cases.”

Journalists are not required to obtain or follow any of these, which is why many do not consider journalism a profession. In fact, journalism education is not even a requirement (Bales, 1992; Shoemaker & Reese, 1996). Doctors and lawyers are required to attend medical school and law school, respectively. Journalists, on the other hand, are not required to attend journalism school, even though many programs exist throughout the country. Unlike doctors and lawyers, journalists are not required to pass any type of test or obtain any type of license. Many people who want to become journalists use their own evaluation of their writing skills to evaluate their

ability to be a good journalist (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996). Once a person becomes a journalist, there is a lack of criteria of what constitutes a professional news story (Weinthal & O'Keefe, 1974). These varying levels of quality and different definitions of what constitutes good news makes it difficult to develop journalism as a field (Kunelius, 2006).

While journalism does not resemble traditional profession by having required licenses and education, it does exhibit many professional characteristics (Reese, 2001). Within the field, journalists have their own set of debates. Journalists and editors who attended journalism school or graduated from a journalism/communication program tend to rate those experiences as being more important than journalists who did not and vice versa (Bales, 1992). Bales suggests internships and fellowships as a way to improve relationships within the field and among journalists and editors (1992).

Scholars suggest that while journalism may not be a profession, some journalists are more professionally oriented than other journalists (Weinthal & O'Keefe, 1974). Weinthal and O'Keefe (1974) suggest that instead of classifying occupations as either professional or nonprofessional, professions should be ranked along a professional continuum. These professionally oriented journalists typically associate themselves with higher levels of education, the desire to improve their organization and its standards, the ability to criticize their organization, and the belief that journalism is a public service (McLeod & Hawley, 1964; Weinthal & O'Keefe, 1974).

Within the United States and Canada, journalism education is university focused. This issue is not limited to the United States. Currently, no countries offer the same types of journalism training or education. Journalists around the globe are focusing on the

professionalization of journalism. In Indonesia, for example, the level of professionalism surrounding journalism is increasing (Hanitzsch, 2005). Despite practiced bribery, Indonesian journalists are well-educated and view their role as “neutral disseminators of news” (Hanitzsch, 2005).

It is also important that journalists see themselves as professionals. McLeod and Hawley (1964) argue that this statement is an important part of the profession debate. If journalists do not view themselves as professionals or their work at a professional standard, how are others supposed to view journalism as a profession? The public’s perception also determines what occupations are professions (McLeod and Hawley, 1964). Doctors and lawyers are viewed by the public as the most professional of professions.

Reese (2001) connects the hierarchy of influences and professionalism. Reese suggests that professionalism can be considered at each level of influence: individual, routine, organizational, extra-media, and ideological. On the individual level, codes of ethics are viewed as guidelines for professionals (Reese, 2001). Education and training programs are also important to the professionalization of journalism. While there are many studies that focus on education and journalism, the literature on training programs and journalism is small, and the majority of literature that does exist does not look at whether or not the training programs are affective.

Improvement at the individual level is essential to professionals. Education, training programs, and certifications are the most common types of ways to achieve individual improvement. Davis et al. (1999) found mixed results in their study of the impact of continuing education for doctors. They found that continuing medical education (CME) that allows doctors

to practice skills can improve health care outcomes. Didactic CME, or continuing medical education that involved large groups, was not found to improve healthcare outcomes. An extensive amount of research has not been conducted regarding journalism and training programs. Bennett (1985) found that of the editors he surveyed 62% participated in management training – through either management training seminars or on-the-job training. Fifty four percent of these editors believed their training to be very valuable. Also, the majority of the training programs available to these editors were sponsored by the media organizations for which they were employed.

The specific training program that this study is going to focus on is one whose goal is to increase international news coverage. In order to better understand the goals of the International Reporting Project, the current state of international news research should be discussed.

### **International News Coverage**

International news does not rank high on the news totem pole (Riffe & Belbase, 1983; Schiltz, 1996). Debate exists regarding reader preference for foreign news (Riffe & Belbase, 1983). Despite this debate, Riffe and Belbase (1983) found that 70% of American Society of Newspaper Editors (ASNE) members believe the amount of international news coverage published in their newspaper has increased in recent years. ASNE members feel foreign news is important, and that their readers are interested despite the facts (Riffe & Belbase, 1983). Opposing thoughts suggest that international news is not highly valued by television or newspaper editors (Whitney & Becker, 1982).

Contrary to the news stories that are actually published, readers prefer news that has a positive slant (Hargrove & Stempel, 2002). Readers are interested in stories about “the everyday man/woman” doing things that are newsworthy (Hargrove & Stempel, 2002). Newspapers prefer

to include foreign news stories about issues that have ties with and impact the local community (Logan & Garrison, 1983). Not surprisingly, readers agree and prefer stories with an American connection (Hargrove & Stempel, 2002). Women enjoy international news far more than men (Hargrove & Stempel, 2002). Kim found that international news meets the audiences demand, but since international news does not have a large attraction, this demand is rather small (2002). Regarding their opinion on international news, journalists fit into one of three categories: pragmatic idealists, global diplomats, and bottom-line realists (Kim, 2002).

Currently, the International Reporting Project at Johns Hopkins University offers editors the chance to travel to another country and become engulfed in that country's culture, but do these trips result in more coverage? If so, is this coverage more complete (i.e. What types of stories are being covered? Are there more direct quotes? Who are being used as sources in the stories?). Research shows that organizational budgets and time are one of the reasons that international news coverage has decreased in recent years (Kim, 2002). The IRP gives editors the money and time to visit a country, and learn from government officials, military officials, and ordinary citizens what the biggest issues are at that time. The IRP hopes that the experience by the gatekeepers is one that will result in positive impacts on their media organizations. While research suggests that the field of journalism would benefit and possibly be considered more professional if journalists received more training. The literature lacks in studies that actually look at how training programs impact what is published by those media organizations that participate in such programs.

## Hypotheses

Based on what is known about gatekeepers and the importance of their experiences and beliefs in making editorial decisions combined with the goals of the IRP, there are six hypotheses.

H1: Research proves that the majority of international stories published are hard news stories. International news coverage tends to focus more on developing nations and conflict with negative domains (Beaudoin & Thorson, 2002). It is hypothesized that after participating in the IRP, there will be more stories published about international conflict.

H2: One of the goals of the IRP is to increase relationships between editor and sources. After participating in the IRP, the number of sources and direct quotes and sources will increase.

H3: Men are the dominant source used within international news stories – with the voice of women, children, and the elderly almost completely absent from news (Beaudoin & Thorson, 2002). With this being said, it is hypothesized that there will be more male sources than female sources. Another goal of the IRP is that the sources will diversify after gatekeepers participate. After participating in the IRP, the number of male sources will decrease, while the number of female sources will increase.

H4: Past research has found the majority of sources within international news stories to originate from government or military officers (Beaudoin & Thorson, 2002). It is hypothesized that there will be more government and military officials used as sources than everyday citizens. After participating in the IRP, the number of government and military officials used as sources may decrease.

H5: Also, it is hypothesized the number of foreign sources will increase after participating in the IRP.

H6: After participating in the IRP, there will be an increase in the amount of articles printed pertaining to the countries of Southeast Asia and East Asia. The number of words written about each region will also increase after the trip.



## CHAPTER 3

### METHODS

In December 2008, the James M. Cox Jr. Center for International Mass Communication Research and Training at the University of Georgia evaluated the International Reporting Project. Its evaluation included a content analysis on seven characteristics (title, date, byline, section, word count, contributor, and dateline) regarding the newspaper articles published by the IRP participants. This thesis expands the IRP content analysis in two areas. First, a content analysis of 56 media organizations and their controls was conducted to identify and analyze the amount and types of international news coverage produced by the International Reporting Project's Gatekeepers' media organizations about the eight countries visited between 2000-2008. A second content analysis was conducted on the regional coverage produced by the International Reporting Project's Gatekeepers' media organizations about the Southeast Asia and East Asia regions.

The following sections describe the International Reporting Project, how the media organizations were selected and matched with their controls, searching for articles in Lexis/Nexis, criteria for included and excluded articles, and the coding protocol for the two content analyses.

#### **The International Reporting Project**

The International Reporting Projects (IRP) was founded in 1998 as a nonprofit organization with the goal of providing U.S. journalists with the opportunity to travel abroad for

an international reporting experience. Located at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) at The Johns Hopkins University, this program has provided over 270 journalists with reporting fellowships in over 85 countries. Two different fellowship programs are offered by the IRP. The first fellowship provides American journalists with an opportunity to spend about five weeks in a country, whose issues are undercovered by United States media, researching potential stories for their organizations.

In 2000, the IRP added a second fellowship specially tailored for the editors and decision makers of media organizations, which is now the largest component of their organization. Senior editors and producers, who are fundamental in their organization's news selection process, are eligible for the Gatekeeper fellowship. Since its conception, 119 editors and producers have participated in the program. While the program began with only one trip per year, now up to a dozen media gatekeepers are selected twice a year to participate in a two-week long trip to an important and under-covered country. Past trips have visited Indonesia, Brazil, South Africa, Lebanon/Syria, India, Egypt, Nigeria, Korea, Uganda and, most recently, Turkey.

During the fall of 2007, the James M. Cox Jr. Center for International Mass Communication Training at Research at the University of Georgia was contracted to evaluate the International Reporting Project. This project consisted of three components. Component One analyzed and organized the existing database of the IRP. Component Two evaluated the Fellows through telephone interviews. Component Three focused on the Gatekeepers. Similar to the Fellows, the Gatekeepers were interviewed over the telephone about their experiences during and after their participation in the fellowship. On top of these interviews, a content analysis was conducted of media organizations with Gatekeepers who participated in the IRP. The purpose

of the content analysis was to identify any trends in the media coverage of the visited countries for the selected media organizations before and after their Gatekeepers participated in the IRP.

In their report, the Cox Center concluded that the IRP impacts its participants and their media organizations in all the ways that it hopes to. But, the report suggests more could be known. The idea for this study developed from this Cox Center project. The Cox Center project concludes that a more extensive content analysis could be done to further look at the impacts of the project on the media organizations that participate in their program.

### **The Media Organizations**

The IRP Gatekeepers worked for 70 unique media organizations. These media organizations were narrowed down to 35. Although gatekeepers from television have participated in the International Reporting Project, only newspapers and news magazines were used in this study. Television and radio content could not be easily retrieved. In fact, some newspapers were eliminated because their content could not be retrieved.

The 35 media organizations were paired with a control media organization. Table 3.1 lists all the Gatekeeper media organizations and their matched controls. Control organizations were matched based on their circulation size, location, and type of publication. For example, the Charlotte Observer was paired with the Raleigh News & Observer; the New York Times was paired with the Washington Post; and Slate Magazine was paired with the Huffington Post.

Duplicate media organizations were not disregarded if their trips were in different years. For example, five editors from the San Francisco Chronicle have participated as Gatekeepers with the IRP. Of these, all five participated in different years and travelled to a different country. Table 3.2 shows the number of editors per media organization that participated in the program.

After the control pairings, there was a total of 51 media organizations (original and controls).

Some media organizations served as both experimental and control media organizations because they were the best fit for pairings.

### **Lexis/Nexis**

Lexis/Nexis is a searchable academic database of more than 40,000 legal, news and business sources. Lexis/Nexis was chosen for this study for a few reasons. First, Lexis/Nexis is accessible through the University of Georgia library website. Second, Lexis/Nexis allows for searches of specific media organizations to be conducted. Also, once a specific source has been selected, Lexis/Nexis allows researchers to narrow the search results down by key word and date. Previous studies that analyzed newspaper content used Lexis/Nexis (Calloway et al 2006; Dittmer 2005; Erugan 2008).

To conduct each search, the media organization of focus was located in Lexis/Nexis. For every media organization and each fellow, the search parameters were set for six months before the trip took place and ended six months after the trip ended. The country visited by each fellow was typed into the search box, and “search” was clicked. Not all articles returned were usable.

### **Article Exclusions**

Table 3.3 includes the total number of articles retrieved for all of the Gatekeeper’s media organizations and all of the control media organizations. It quickly became apparent after searching through the articles that many of the articles retrieved were not actually about the searched countries. This meant that each article needed to be read to determine whether or not it should be kept in the study. The total number of retrieved articles for all 56 pairings was 26,042 with 8,878 articles from Gatekeeper media organizations and 17,164 from control media

organizations. It was determined that to read every single one of these articles would take an exurbanite amount of time. Criteria were developed to guide the coders. In order for the article to be included in the study, one of the following criteria needed to be met:

1. The country name is in the article's title.
2. The country name or a city within the country is included in the dateline.
3. If criteria one or two do not occur, the coder must ask himself or herself "if the story is altered if the country being searched is excluded from the article?"

The goal of these criteria was to eliminate articles that had only a passing reference to the country. This process eliminated 22,431 articles, leaving 1,331 articles from the media organizations that had Gatekeepers participate in the IRP program and 2,280 articles from the control media organizations. Table 3.4 shows the total number of usable articles and the total number of control articles for each media organization. Appendix I includes two examples of excluded articles and the reason why they were excluded from this study.

### **Regional Coverage**

The original Cox Center project focused on the specific countries visited by the fellows. At the end of the project, a decision was made to look at the impact of the program on one of the eight regions visited. Southern Africa was chosen. In 2002, the IRP Gatekeeper trip visited South Africa. Using the United Nations subregions list, which was retrieved from the United Nations website, the same content was conducted on Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, and Swaziland that was conducted on the eight visited IRP countries. The Cox Center report concluded that the regional analysis was limited, and that, while the coverage of the host country increased, it was not as clear if the regional coverage increased.

In order to determine if there was a regional affect of the IRP, a content analysis was conducted to examine if the IRP had an affect on the regional coverage surrounding the visited countries. Two regions were chosen from the remaining seven regions that were not included in the original Cox Center project. It was decided to look at the regional impact of the Gatekeeper project on the first trip to Indonesia and the most recent trip to North and South Korea. Again, the listing of “World Macro Regions and Components ” from the United Nations website was used to identify the countries of the two regions. Indonesia is located in Southeast Asia along with the following countries: Brunei, Cambodia, East Timor, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam. North and South Korea is located in East Asia with China, Hong Kong, Japan, Macau, Mongolia, and Taiwan. Eight editors visited Indonesia, and seven editors visited Korea. Using Lexis/Nexis, a search was conducted for every country in the two regions for each of the Gatekeepers’ media organizations who visited Indonesia and Korea. The search was also conducted for the control media organizations.

The selection criteria used for the previous content analysis was used for this one. Tables 3.5 and 3.6 show the total number returned articles and the total number of usable articles for the Southeast Asia and East Asia regions, respectively. China was excluded from this study because there were too many articles written about China that Lexis/Nexis could not retrieve all of the articles. For four of the seven of the media organizations that sent Gatekeepers to Korea (including the Los Angeles Times, USA Today, and Washington Post), an error message was returned when trying to search for China. The message said there were too many results to be displayed, and that only the first 1,000 articles could be displayed. It was decided to exclude China from the East Asia region because of this technical difficulty. These articles were coded for the same variables as the previous content analysis.

## **Coding Protocol**

A code sheet for each content analysis was created. The first code sheet dealt with the original countries visited by the IRP Gatekeepers, and the second code sheet was for the regional content analysis. In the first content analysis, each article was coded for 14 items. The first eight items – gatekeeper or control, country of focus, media organization, article date, article type, contributor, word count, and dateline – were included in the original content analysis conducted by the Cox Center. The variables new to this content analysis were the following: the type of news, number of sources, types of sources, sex of sources, foreign or domestic sources, and the number of direct quotes. Appendix II is a copy of this coding sheet. This study, also, added a regional analysis of Southeast Asia and East Asia. For the regional aspect of the study, each article was coded for 15 items: gatekeeper or control, country of focus, region of focus, media organization, article date, article type, contributor, word count, dateline, type of news, number of sources, types of sources, sex of sources, foreign or domestic sources, and the number of direct quotes. Appendix III is a copy of the regional code sheet.

One benefit of using Lexis/Nexis is that the country of focus, media organization, article date, contributor, word count, and dateline are all listed at the top of each article. The remaining characteristics required a little more work on behalf of the coders. The three types of news that were coded for were news, feature, and opinion/editorial. News articles included any articles in the first/main section of the media organization. News articles also included international, sports, and financial news stories that had a hard news viewpoint. Feature articles included all articles in the arts and leisure, travel, and entertainment sections. Also, international, sports, and financial news stories that could be considered soft news stories were also included as feature articles.

In their 2000 content analysis of political news in Europe, Semteko and Valkenburg analyzed content based the five news frames: attribution of responsibility, conflict, human interest, economic consequences, and morality. They found the most prevalent types of news frames used in television and print stories to be attribution of responsibility followed by conflict and economic consequences (Semteko and Valkenburg, 2000). These same five news frames were used in this content analysis. For the type of news, coders identified which news frame the story fit into: news (which referred to attribution of responsibility), conflict, human interest, economic consequences, and morality.

The next items dealt with the number and types of sources used in the articles. In the original IRP evaluation, the fellows were asked a series of questions regarding the types of sources they meet while participating in their fellowship, and if they maintained these relationships. One of the goals of the IRP was to create relationships between the journalists and potential sources that could be used in future stories. In this study, it was important to look at the use of sources. First, the coders counted the number of sources included in each articles. Sources were determined to be any named or unnamed person or organization that was mentioned as a source for specific information in an article. The types of sources included: government officials, military officials, expert involved, expert not involved, family/friend, regular citizen, academic, and other. If an article included a combination of sources types, it was coded for a mixture. The sexes of the sources were coded as male, female, a combination of male and female sources, or unknown. One of the questions asked in the IRP evaluation, was whether or not the fellows developed relationships with sources in the countries they visited. Knowing whether the sources were foreign or domestic is an important question to the IRP. Articles were coded for having all foreign sources, all domestic sources, a mixture with mainly



foreign sources, a mixture with mainly domestic sources, and about an equal number of foreign and domestic sources. Lastly, the number of direct quotes in each article were counted.

Using the code sheets, two graduate students coded the articles over a three-month period. Along with the code sheets, examples were given to demonstrate the different characteristics included on the code sheets. Anytime one coder had a question regarding how to code something, the two coders discussed the item and came to a decision together. Also, anytime there was a difference in how an item was coded in a specific article, the two coders would decide together how the item should be coded.

### **Intercoder Reliability**

The intercoder reliability was determined using two different tests, percent agreement and Cohen's kappa (k). Many tests exist to test intercoder reliability, and there is not one set standard (Lombard, Snyder-Dutch and Bracken 2008). Both intercoder reliability tests used the data collected from the first 105 gatekeeper and control articles. Using PRAM (Program for Reliability Assessment with Multiple Coders), a computer program created by Skymeg Software, both the percent agreement and Cohen's kappa was calculated for the following variables: Gatekeeper or Control media organization, country of focus, news frame, number of sources, type of sources, sex of sources, foreign or domestic sources, and number of direct quotes. Table 3.7 and 3.8 contain the results for each variable for both tests. For the percent agreement, the average was 0.992. For Cohen's Kappa (k), the average intercoder reliability is 0.981. Both tests reveal a very strong amount of intercoder reliability. Lombard, Snyder-Dutch and Bracken (2008) suggest that intercoder reliability indices of 0.90 or greater should almost always be acceptable levels of reliability.

## **Significance Levels**

The articles retrieved represent a census of data published by the editors that participated in the IRP rather than a sample. The articles retrieved for this study are all of the articles produced by a specific set of media organizations, which sent editors to participate in the IRP. The articles selected are not a probabilistic subset of any larger group of stories having been selected only at one point in time intentionally. A traditional test of significance is therefore not an appropriate decision rule for testing for hypotheses offered here.

Error does exist from measurement, but it is difficult to know how much that might affect tests of difference between groups. The decision was made to develop a practical rule for assessing the observed differences. If the programs being evaluated did not produce at least a five percentage point difference compared to the before articles, it was not treated as significant.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

In Shoemaker and Reese's theory of media content, they suggest that the types of extra training journalists participate in should influence the types of media content they produce. It was hypothesized that the International Reporting Project fellowship would have an affect on the content produced after participating in the program. A content analysis focusing on news frames and sources was conducted using articles retrieved from Lexis/Nexis.

#### **Types of News Frames**

In regards to the types of news frames used in the articles, Table 4.1 shows that for the media organizations of the Gatekeepers who participated in the program, the number of articles focusing on news and conflict decreased. The number of articles focusing on economic consequences, human interest, and morality frames increased. Before the program, 45.6% of articles fell within the news frame, 30.9% of articles fell within the conflict/war frame, 7.3% of articles fell within the economic consequences frame, 15.4% of articles fell within the human interest frame, and 0.9% of articles fell within the morality frame. After the program, 41.3% of articles fell within the news frame, 25.8% of articles fell within the conflict/war frame, 15.3% of articles fell within the economic consequences frame, 16.3% of articles fell within the human interest frame, and 1.4% of articles fell within the morality frame. The opposite was hypothesized, but this result makes sense. One of the purposes of the IRP's Gatekeeping program is to change the types of news stories that are produced. It is very clear that the

majority of stories, both before and after the trips, are focused on news and conflict frames. For the control media organizations, the types of news frames used within the articles remained basically unchanged, with the majority of the stories being, also, about news and conflict.

### **Amounts and Types of Sources**

Tables 4.2 and 4.3 show that the number of sources and number of direct quotes for both the media organizations who sent Gatekeepers to the program and the control media organizations remained virtually the same after the trip. In regards to the types of sources, Table 4.4 shows that there were very small changes in the types of sources used for both the Gatekeeper media organizations and the control media organizations after the program. For the media organizations that sent Gatekeepers, the combined number of government and military officials decreased from 15.8% before the program to 12.5% after the program. This result supports the previous results that suggest that the news and conflict frames have decreased.

Table 4.5 shows that for the control media organizations the sex of the sources remained virtually unchanged after the program ended. For the media organizations who sent Gatekeepers to the program, the percentage of articles using only male sources decreased by 2.6% after the trip, while the percentage of articles using only females sources remained about 4.6%. For the media organizations that had Gatekeepers participate, the percentage of articles that used all foreign sources increased slightly (0.5%), while the percentage of articles that used all domestic sources decreased by 6.1% (Table 4.6). Also, for the media organizations that had Gatekeepers participate in the program, the percentage of articles that used a combination of sources, but mainly foreign sources decreased by 2.4%, while the percentage of articles that used mainly domestic sources increased by 4.5% (Table 4.6). For the control media organizations, the

percentage of articles that used all foreign sources decreased 1.5%, and the percentage of articles that used all domestic sources decreased slightly by 0.2 % (Table 4.6). Also, for the control media, the percentage of articles that used a combination of sources, but mainly foreign sources increased by 1.1%, and the percentage of articles that used mainly domestic sources increased by 1.2% (Table 4.6).

### **Breakdown of Southeast and East Asia Coverage**

Table 4.7 shows the total number of articles published by the media organizations of the Gatekeepers and the control media organizations for the eleven countries of Southeast Asia. The table breaks down the total number of articles by two variables. First, this table shows the number of print articles published before and after the Gatekeeper trips for the media organizations that had an editor participate in the Gatekeeper program. Also, this table shows the number of print articles published before and after the Gatekeeper trips for the matched control media organizations. Percentages were computed to establish whether or not there was an increase in coverage. If the Gatekeeper program did not have an effect, there would not be a change in the percentage of stories before and after the trip. For the region of Southeast Asia, there was an increase in regional coverage for the media organizations that sent Gatekeepers and the control media organizations. For the media organizations that sent Gatekeepers, the table shows that 47.4% of the articles were written before the trip, and 52.6% of the articles were written after the trip. For the control media organizations, there was not as large of a difference in percentages before (48.8%) and after (51.5%) the trips.

Table 4.7b shows the total number of articles published by the media organizations of the Gatekeepers and the control media organizations for the eleven countries of Southeast Asia with

Indonesia removed. For the media organizations that sent Gatekeepers, the table shows that 52.9% of the articles were written before the trip, and 47.1% of the articles were written after the trip. Unlike when Indonesia was included in the region, the percentage decreased after the trip. For the control media organizations, there was a larger increase in percentages before (43.1%) and after (51.5%) the trips.

The total number of print articles written about the region of Southeast Asia visited by the Gatekeepers media organizations increased from 1198 articles before the trip to 1332 articles after the trip. The total number of print articles written by the control media organizations increased from 1526 articles before the trip to 1612 articles after the trip. While there were more articles written in the control media organizations about the countries visited by the Gatekeepers, the overall percentage of increase is about three percentage points more. For the media organizations that had Gatekeepers participate in the program, the coverage increased about five percentage points

Table 4.8 is similar to table 4.7, but it focuses on the countries of East Asia. For the media organizations that sent Gatekeepers to the IRP, the number of articles published about the six countries of East Asia increased from 846 to 1096, which is an increase of 12.8 percentage points. Unlike Southeast Asia, the control media organizations did not have a similar result. In fact, the number of articles published before and after the IRP trip remained essentially the same.

Table 4.8b shows the total number of articles published by the media organizations of the Gatekeepers and the control media organizations for the eleven countries of East Asia with Korea removed. For the media organizations that sent Gatekeepers, the table shows that 44.2% of the articles were written before the trip, and 55.8% of the articles were written after the trip.

This is an increase of 11.6 percentage points. For the control media organizations, there was essentially no change in the percentages of articles before (50.4%) and after (49.6%) the trips.

Table 4.9 shows the mean and standard deviations for the lengths of the articles written before and after the Gatekeeper trips by both the Gatekeeper media organizations and the control media organizations for countries of Southeast and East Asia. For Southeast Asia, the media organizations that sent Gatekeepers to the program saw an increase in the mean length of articles. The mean article length before participating in the program was 601.8 words, and after the mean increased to 615.1 words. The control media organizations only increased their mean article length by one word for the articles covering the countries of Southeast Asia. For East Asia, the mean article length for the Gatekeepers' media organizations increased from 640.1 words before the program to 652.2 words after the program. The control media organizations saw a decrease for the mean article length for East Asia regional coverage.

### **News Frames Used in Southeast and East Asia**

While there were not hypotheses made about the news frames used, datelines, number of sources, number of direct quotes, types of sources, sex of sources, and foreign vs. domestic sources for Southeast Asia and East Asia, the content analysis was expanded during the data collection phase to code for this data.

For the types of news frames used in the coverage of the countries of Southeast Asia, Table 4.10 shows that for the media organizations of the Gatekeepers who participated in the program, the number of articles focusing on news, economic consequences, and morality frames decreased. The number of articles focusing on conflict and human interest frames increased. Before the program, 48.9% of articles fell within the news frame, 25.5% of articles fell within

the conflict/war frame, 9.2% of articles fell within the economic consequences frame, 14.1% of articles fell within the human interest frame, and 2.3% of articles fell within the morality frame. After the program, 48.1% of articles fell within the news frame, 26.3% of articles fell within the conflict/war frame, 5.5% of articles fell within the economic consequences frame, 19.9% of articles fell within the human interest frame, and 0.2% of articles fell within the morality frame. There were similar results for the types of news frames used in the coverage of the countries of East Asia, with news, economic, and morality frames decreasing and conflict and human interest frames increasing (Table 4.11).

### **Datelines in Southeast and East Asia**

Table 4.12 and Table 4.13 display the datelines for the Gatekeeper and control media organizations for Southeast Asia and East Asia, respectively. While the control media organizations for Southeast Asia did not see much of a change in the location of the datelines after the IRP program, there were some obvious differences for the media organizations that had Gatekeepers participate in the program. The number of articles with datelines from within the region of Southeast Asia increased from 538 articles before the program to 584 articles after the program. The datelines for East Asia remain pretty constant before and after the IRP program.

### **Number and Types of Sources in Southeast and East Asia**

In Table 4.14 and 4.15, we see there are only small differences in the number of sources used by Gatekeeper and control media organizations for the articles about Southeast Asia and East Asia. The same is true for the number of direct quotes in these articles. Table 4.16 and 4.17 show that there are only small increases for the number of direct quotes for Southeast Asia (0.24 quotes) and East Asia (0.21 quotes). The number of direct quotes for the control media



organizations for both Southeast Asia and East Asia remain almost constant. In regards to the type of sources, sex of sources, and foreign vs. domestic sources (tables 4.18-4.23), there were only small increases and decreases after the trips for both Southeast Asia and East Asia.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSIONS

The hierarchy of influences suggests that experiences on an individual level affect what content is published, and that training programs are important to journalists and journalism as a profession. What previous research fails to address is whether or not training programs actually influence what news is published. In this study, a content analysis was conducted on the articles published by the media organizations that sent editors to the International Reporting Project. The Gatekeepers, who participated in the IRP program, were given a unique opportunity to spend two weeks abroad completely immersed in another country's culture. The overarching goal of the program was to increase the coverage of undercovered countries and stories. This content analysis revisits a previous project that was conducted by the Cox Center at Grady College at the University of Georgia. The Cox Center found that the coverage of countries did increase in the Gatekeepers' media organizations after participating in the IRP. The purpose of this study was to focus on how the countries were being covered. For example, were the majority of the stories still being produced about Syria and Lebanon focusing on conflict or were there more human-interest stories? How many sources are used on articles about North Korea? Are those sources experts from North Korea or are they United States government officials? Literature predicts that the majority of news covered focuses on conflict, disaster, and strictly news stories with the majority of sources being male, domestic officials.

It was hypothesized that after participating in the IRP, there would be more stories published about international conflict, that the number of sources and direct quotes and sources would increase, that there would be more male sources than female sources used in articles, that the number of male sources would decrease and the number of female sources would increase, that the number of government and military officials used as sources would decrease, and that the number of foreign sources would increase.

The findings of this study suggest that, while the majority of international stories produced by the media organizations that participated in the IRP focused on news and conflict frames, these numbers decreased, and the number of articles with economic, human interest, and morality frames increased. These increases were found not to be significant. While the number of sources and direct quotes remained virtually unchanged after the program, there were some slight, but not significant, changes in the types of sources being used. Less government and military officials were being used as sources. After participating in the IRP, articles used fewer males as sources, and more females and combinations of males and females as sources, but again these differences are not significant. Despite these differences, it cannot be concluded that these changes were substantial because they were not found to be significant according to the specifications outlined. The results suggest that the IRP actually only had a small impact on the coverage of the countries visited.

It was also hypothesized that after participating in the IRP, there would be an increase in the amount of articles printed pertaining to the countries of Southeast Asia and East Asia and that there would be an increase in the number of words written about each region. In regards to Southeast Asia, the coverage of the region as a whole increased by 5.2%, but when Indonesia was removed from the region, the coverage decreased by 5.8%. This suggests that in terms of

Southeast Asia, there is not a regional affect of IRP. For East Asia, the coverage of the region as a whole and with Korea removed still increased by over 10 percentage points. This suggests that for East Asia, there is a regional affect of the IRP. The results are conflicting between the regional impact of the IRP on Southeast Asia and East Asia suggesting the impact must be region by region. In order to know which regions the program affects, more analysis is needed. As with the first set of hypotheses, the regional articles did not prove to have meaningful differences found in the stories published about international conflict, the number of sources and direct quotes, the number of male sources and female sources, the number of government and military officials used as sources, and the number of foreign sources.

While these findings suggest that the IRP did not have as big of an impact that was hypothesized, there might be an explanation that needs to be considered. Part of the original Cox Center project interviewed the Gatekeepers who participated in the IRP. The majority of these Gatekeepers believed that the program was meaningful and beneficial. There was also an overarching theme discussed by the Gatekeepers that might limit the affects of the program. The current state of the media industry is bleak. Many of the Gatekeepers' media organizations have cut their foreign news coverage, and many have even eliminated their foreign news bureaus. According to these Gatekeepers, the lack of funding significantly affects what is and is not published. So even though the Gatekeepers found the program to be a success, many were not able to increase news coverage once their returned from their trips. The results of this content analysis prove their beliefs to be true.

Shoemaker and Reese (1996) theorize in their theory of media content that an individual's professional backgrounds, experiences, roles and ethics combine with their personal attitudes, values, beliefs, and roles to influence gatekeepers, and their decisions on what content

is published. Within the theory of media content, Shoemaker and Reese (1996) outline five influences that impact media content: individuals, organizational, media routines, factors outside of the media organization, and personal ideology. Little research exists on the effectiveness of training programs on the media content. This thesis focused on individual influences by analyzing the affect of the IRP program on the content produced by selected media organizations. The IRP program was found to not significantly impact the content published by the media organizations that had gatekeepers participate. The conclusions suggest that it is important to consider the relationship between the all of the influences, not just how one or another impacts content.

When interviewed, the gatekeepers admitted that media routines, specifically financial issues, probably influenced the content produced more than their experiences with the IRP. According to the interviewed gatekeepers, if their media organizations did not cut their foreign news budgets, they would have increased coverage and better covered the regions they visited during the IRP. When considering the current state of the media industry, it is not surprising that financial issues of media organizations seem to be having a more significant affect on media content than individual influences, specifically training programs. This suggests that within the hierarchy of influences some influences can have more of an impact than others.

Of course, more research is still needed on the hierarchy of influences and on the effects of training programs on media content. The IRP represents only one fellowship among many other fellowships and training programs. Under the hierarchy of influences, it is important for the people who create and implement training programs to take into consideration how the other influences may impact their programs.

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, E. A., & Brassfield, L. T. (1989). Comparing decisions on releases by TV and newspaper gatekeepers. *Journalism Quarterly*, 66(4), 853-856.
- Aldridge, M., & Evetts, J. (2003). Rethinking the concept of professionalism: The case of journalism. *British Journal of Sociology*, 54(4), 547-564.
- Bales, F. (1992). Newspaper editors' evaluations of professional programs. *Journalism Educator*, 47(3), 37-42.
- Bantz, C. R. (1985). News organizations: Conflict as a crafted cultural norm. *Communication*, 8, 225-225-244.
- Barzilai-Nahon, K. (2008). Toward a theory of network gatekeeping: A framework for exploring information control. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 59(9), 1493-1512.
- Beaudoin, C. E., & Thorson, E. (2001). LA times offered as model for foreign news coverage. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 22(1), 80.
- Beaudoin, C. E., & Thorson, E. (2002). Exploring reader interest in international news. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 23(4), 46.
- Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., Gans, E.M., Edwards, H.H., Daniels, G.L., & Park, N. (2005). Professionalism of news workers. In S. Dunwoody (Ed.), *The Evolution of Key Mass Communication Concepts*. (79-111). Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Becker, L.B., Vlad, T., Hanisak, S.A., Wilcox, D., & Turner, W. (2009). Evaluation of the International Reporting Project at the Johns Hopkins University of Advanced International Studies. Athens: James M. Cox JR. Center for International Mass Communication Training & Research. University of Georgia.
- Bennett, D. (1985). Editors as managers: Their perceived need for specialized training. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 6(4), 24-36.
- Berkowitz, D. (1991). Assessing forces in the selection of local television news. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 35(2), 245.
- Berkowitz, D. (1990). Refining the gatekeeping metaphor for local television news. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 34(1), 55-68.
- Bleske, G. L. (1991). Ms. gates takes over. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 12(4), 88-97.

- Breed, W. (1955). Social control in the newsroom: A functional analysis. *Social Forces*, 33(4), 326-335.
- Cassidy, W. P. (2006). Gatekeeping similar for online, print journalists. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 27(2), 6-23.
- Chan, J.M, Pan, Z., & Lee, F.L. (2004). Professional aspirations and job satisfaction: Chinese journalists at a time of change in the media. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81 (3), 254-273.
- Crothers, C. (1990). 'Well train them here'. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 11(4), 64-71.
- Davis, D., O'Brien, M.A., Freemantle, N., Wolf, F.M., Mazmanian, P., & Taylor-Vaisey, A. (1999). Impact of formal medical continuing medical education: Do conferences, workshops, rounds, and other traditional continuing education activities change physician behavior or health care outcomes? *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 282 (9), 867-874.
- Deuze, M. (2005). Popular journalism and professional ideology: Tabloid reporters and editors speak out *Media, Culture and Society*, 27(6), 861-882.
- Donohew, L. (1967). Newspaper gatekeepers and forces in the news channel. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 31(1), 61-68.
- Donohue, G. A., Olien, C. N., & Tichenor, P. J. (1989). Structure and constraints on community newspaper gatekeepers. *Journalism Quarterly*, 66(4), 807-845.
- Donohue, G.A., Tichenor, P.J., & Olien, C.N. (1972). Gatekeeping: Mass media systems and information control. In F.G. Kline & P.J. Tichenor (Eds.), *Current perspectives in mass communication research* (pp. 41-70). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Eliasoph, N. (1988). Routines and the making of oppositional news. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 5(4), 313.
- Elsaka, N. (2005). New zealand journalists and the appeal of "professionalism" as a model of organisation: An historical analysis. *Journalism Studies*, 6(1), 73-86.
- Galtung, J., & Ruge, M.H. (1964). The structure of foreign news: The presentation of the Congo, Cuba, and Cyprus crises in four Norwegian newspapers. *Journal of Peace Research*, 2(1), 64-91.
- Garrison, B. (1980). The electronic gatekeeper: Editing on the copy desk of a metropolitan newspaper. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 1(3), 7-17.
- Geiber, W. (1964). News is what newspapermen make it. In L.A. Dexter & D. M. White (Eds.), *People, society, and mass communications* (pp. 173-182). New York: The free press.

- Hanitzsch, T. (2005). Journalists in indonesia: Educated but timid watchdogs. *Journalism Studies*, 6(4), 493-508.
- Hargrove, T. & Stempel III, G. H. (2002). Exploring reader Interest In International News. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 23(4), 46-51.
- Hart, J. (1990). The classroom & the newsroom. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 11(4), 38-50.
- Hu, W. (1999). The training track. *American Journalism Review*, 21(8), 56.
- Hun, S. K. (2002). Gatekeeping international news: An attitudinal profile of U.S. television journalists. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 46(3), 431.
- Izard, R., & Morgan, A. (2004). Mosaic of scholarship, professional experience needed. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 25(4), 6-12.
- Joseph, T. (1981). Existing decision-making practices on american dailies. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 2(4), 56-60.
- Joseph, T. (1982). Decision-making preferences and practices. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 3(3), 37-44.
- Joseph, T. (1985). Daily publishers' preferences on reporter decision-making. *Journalism Quarterly*, 62(4), 899-901.
- Kim, H.S. (2002). Gatekeepeing international news: An attitudinal profile of U.S. television journalists. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 46(3), 431-452.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). Evaluating training programs: The four levels. San Francisco, CA: Berrett Koehler Publishers Inc.
- Kunelius, R. (2006). Good journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 7(5), 671-690.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: II. Chanel of group life, social planning and action resource. *Human Relations*, 1, 143-153.
- Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers. New York: Harper.
- Logan, R., & Garrison, B. (1983). Factors affecting news coverage: Two florida papers and the mariel refugee influx. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 5(1), 43-52.
- Macdonald, I. (2006). Teaching journalists to save the profession. *Journalism Studies*, 7(5), 745-764.
- McLellan, M. (2006). Training frontline editors: Once overlooked, now happening. *Nieman Reports*, 60(1), 73-74.



- McLellan, M., & Porter, T. (2007). *News, improved: How America's newsrooms are learning to change*. Washington, DC: CQ Pres
- McLeod, J.M., & Hawley, S.E. (1964). Professionalization Among Newsmen. *Journalism Quarterly*, 41: 529-538.
- Molotch, H., & Lester, M. (1974). News as purposive behavior: On the strategic use of routine events, accidents, and scandals. *American Sociological Review*, 39(1), 101-112.
- Musa, B. A., & Domatob, J. K. (2007). Who is a development journalist? perspectives on media ethics and professionalism in post-colonial societies. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 22(4), 315-331.
- Nemeth, N. (2007). How three editors explain decisions to their readers. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 28(2), 6-21.
- Nerone, J., & Barnhurst, K. G. (2003). US newspaper types, the newsroom, and the division of labor, 1750-2000. *Journalism Studies*, 4(4), 435.
- Parboosingh, J. (2000). Continuing education and professional development for hospital doctors and dentists. *Medical Education*, 34(6), 421-423.
- Perry, L. (1995). Continuing professional education: Luxury or necessity? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 21(4), 766-771.
- Peterson, S. (1976). Foreign news gatekeepers and criteria of newsworthiness. *Journalism Quarterly*, 56(1), 116-125.
- Ramsey, D. (1990). Educating professional journalists. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 11(4), 72-79.
- Reese, S. D. (2001). Understanding the global journalist: A hierarchy-of-influences approach. *Journalism Studies*, 2(2), 173-187.
- Reese, S. D., & Ballinger, J. (2001). The roots of a sociology of news: Remembering mr. gates and social control in the newsroom. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(4), 641-658.
- Riffe, D., & Belbase, S. (1983). Decision-maker views on foreign news. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 4(3), 17-24.
- Riffe, D., Ellis, B., Rogers, M. K., Van Ommeren, R. L., & Woodman, K. A. (1986). Gatekeeping and the network news mix. *Journalism Quarterly*, 63(2), 315-321.
- Ruusunoksa, L. (2006). Public journalism and professional culture. *Javnost-the Public*, 13(4), 81-97.

- Ryan, M., & Masterson, D. L. (1999). Perceived problems in evaluation of mass communication scholarship. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 54(1), 69-78.
- Schoenfeld, A. C. (1980). Newspersons and the environment today. *Journalism Quarterly*, 57(3), 456-462.
- Semetiko, H.A., & Valkenburg, P.M. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of Communication*,
- Semetko, H. A., Brzinski, J. B., Weaver, D., & Willnat, L. (1992). TV news. *Int J Public Opin Res*, 4(1), 18-36.
- Shoemaker, P. J. (1991). *Gatekeeping*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Shoemaker, P. J. (1996). Media gatekeeping. In M.B. Salwen & D.W. Stacks (Eds.), *An integrated approach to communication theory and research* (pp.79-91). Mahwah, NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shoemaker, P.J., & Reese, S.D. (1996) *Mediating the message: Theories of influences on mass media content*. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.
- Shoemaker, P. J., Eichholz, M., Kim, E., & Wrigley, B. (2001). Individual and routine forces in gatekeeping. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(2), 233-246.
- Sigelman, L. (1973). Reporting the news: An organizational analysis. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 79(1), 132-151.
- Singer, J. B. (2001). The metro wide web: Changes in newspaper's gatekeeping role online. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(1), 65-80.
- Soloski, J. (1989). News reporting and professionalism: Some constraints on the reporting of the news. *Media, Culture and Society*, 11, 207-207-228.
- Stempel III, G. H. (1985). Gatekeeping: The mix of topics and the selection of stories. *Journalism Quarterly*, 62(4), 791-815.
- Sylvie, G., & Huang, J. S. (2008). Value systems and decision-making styles of newspaper front-line editors. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 85(1), 61-82.
- Tuchman, G. (1973). Making news by doing work: Routinizing the unexpected. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 79(1), 110-131.
- Weaver, J.B., Porter, C.J., & Evans, M.E. (1984). Patterns in Foreign News Coverage On U.S. Network TV: A 10-Year Analysis. *Journalism Quarterly*, 61(2), 356-363.
- Weinthal, D.S. & O'Keefe, G.J. (1974). Professionalism among broadcast newsmen in an urban area. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 18(2), 193-210.

- White, D. M. (1950). The "gate keeper:" A case study in the selection of news. *Journalism Quarterly*, 27, 383-396.
- Whitney, D. C. (1981). Information overload in the newsroom. *Journalism Quarterly*, 58(1), 69-161.
- Whitney, D. C., & Becker, L. B. (1982). 'Keeping the gates' for gatekeepers: The effects of wire news. *Journalism Quarterly*, 59(1), 60-65.
- Zaitz, L., & Walth, B. (2008). Redefining a newspaper's watchdog approach. *Nieman Reports*, 62(1), 60-61.

## APPENDIX I

## EXAMPLE OF EXCLUDED ARTICLES

Reason for article rejection: Article mentions Indonesia one time in passing.

Crowds Jam Hanoi to See Clinton; President honors war sacrifices in televised speech

SOURCE: New York Times

BYLINE: David E. Sanger

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A1

LENGTH: 1231 words

DATELINE: Hanoi

Tens of thousands of Vietnamese, many of them former soldiers who once battled the United States, poured into the streets of Hanoi yesterday to welcome President Clinton, waving to his motorcade and watching on television as he told the nation that "shared suffering has given our countries a relationship unlike any other."

Speaking at the Vietnam National University, a bust of Ho Chi Minh just over his right shoulder, Clinton repeatedly went out of his way to honor soldiers on both sides of "the conflict we call the Vietnam War and you call the American War," equating their sacrifices, but never delving into the causes they represented.

Instead, he gave his Vietnamese audience -- no one knows how many of the country's 78 million people were watching -- a description of the Vietnam memorial on the Mall in Washington, where the names of the American dead are etched in black stone.

"Some American veterans also refer to the 'other side of the wall,' the staggering sacrifice of the Vietnamese people on both sides of that conflict -- more than 3 million brave soldiers and civilians," Clinton said.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

For his part, Clinton stepped extremely carefully when he raised Vietnam's suppression of dissent and its limits on emigration. While clearly calling for more openness, Clinton said in his speech that "we do not seek to impose these ideals, nor could we."

That was a far cry from his challenge to Jiang Zemin, China's president, that Beijing was "on the wrong side of history," or his repeated harsh critiques of Fidel Castro.

Though Clinton scaled back his human rights message, President Tran Duc Luong and the government's chief economic reformer, Prime Minister Phan Van Khai, stiffened yesterday when he brought up the subject in private meetings.

Both men, according to U.S. officials, said "we may have different definitions of human rights," and said they had to worry about the rights of Vietnamese to eat and get an education

before they moved toward America's agenda.

### STARTLING IMAGES

But the diplomatic wordplay was overwhelmed by the dramatic images, starting with the sight of the presidential limousine winding through Hanoi's streets with a Vietnamese flag on one fender, the Stars and Stripes on the other.

Yesterday morning, as Clinton was officially welcomed at the presidential palace, the sounds of "The Star Spangled Banner" echoed across one of the lakes at the center of this gracious city. More than three decades ago, John McCain, the senator who sought the Republican nomination earlier this year, was plucked from the same waters, beaten by a crowd and held for years as a prisoner of war.

Clinton's visit was not a secret, but the government had done nothing to promote a large turnout to greet him. The articles that ran in Vietnam's obedient newspapers about the president's imminent arrival were small and understated. A hard-fought soccer match pitting Vietnam against **Indonesia** won far larger billing on television, along with details of government plans to build new roads.

There was only one banner celebrating the arrival of "President William Jefferson Clinton and Spouse" visible to those entering the city. Yesterday was an ordinary workday.

### LARGEST MOTORCADE EVER

But people came anyway, pedaling their bicycles and revving up their Honda "Dreams," the small motorcycles that have changed the nature and the risks of a once-placid morning commute in Hanoi. The crowds lined Clinton's route, never cheering but constantly waving, children and grandchildren held aloft to catch a glimpse of the largest motorcade this city has ever seen.

Just before 4 p.m. people gathered in front of television sets in storefronts to catch Clinton's half-hour speech, an oddity in a country where the leadership feels no need to explain itself.

Clinton said he arrived here "conscious that the histories of our two nations are deeply intertwined in ways that are both a source of pain for generations that came before, and a source of promise for generations yet to come."

He traced earlier contacts between the two lands, including Thomas Jefferson's efforts to obtain rice seeds from Indochina to grow at Monticello and the phrases about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness that Ho Chi Minh lifted from Jefferson in writing Vietnam's own version of a declaration of independence.

But Clinton quickly moved to his now-familiar arguments about the new age of mutual dependence, telling his audience that globalization "is the economic equivalent of a force of nature" and that it "is not going away." Vietnam, he said, must learn to harness it "like wind or water." And he told the student elite that "your next job may well depend on foreign trade and investment."

He delicately argued that Vietnam's people should support the reformers in the government who are pressing for a loosening of the state controls that have choked the economy here and sent foreign investors fleeing.

"Only you can decide if you will continue to open your markets, open your society and strengthen the rule of law," he said. "Only you can decide how to weave individual liberties and

human rights into the rich and strong fabric of Vietnamese national identity."

Today, Clinton visited a site on Hanoi's outskirts where searchers are combing through acres of mud for the remains of a U.S. pilot shot down in 1967. The president rode 50 minutes outside Hanoi, past farms and water buffaloes, to a site where dozens of Vietnamese and a few Americans toiled, passing buckets of mud to a platform where it is put through a sieve. It is one of six sites being excavated in Vietnam for MIA remains.

"Whether we are American or Vietnamese," the president said, "I think we all want to know where our loved ones are buried. I think we all want to be able to honor them and be able to visit their grave site."

Clinton was accompanied by his wife, Hillary, and their daughter, Chelsea. He also was joined by Dan and David Evert, whose father, Air Force Capt. Lawrence G. Evert, of Cody, Wyo., was shot down during a bombing raid on a railroad bridge at the site.

As an aid to Vietnam, still searching for 300,000 of its own citizens not unaccounted for, Clinton brought 350,000 pages of Pentagon battle reports, casualty estimates and records of Vietnamese who died under U.S. medical care over the course of the war. He said he would hand over another 1 million pages of similar documents before the year is out.

"The desire to be reunited with a lost family member is something we all understand," Clinton said at the National University. "No two nations have ever before done the things we are doing together to find the missing." The Associated Press contributed to this report.

Reason for article rejection: Article mentions Egypt as title of play one time

Symphony meanders around Mozart's catalog

BYLINE: Joshua Kosman, Chronicle Music Critic

SECTION: DAILY DATEBOOK; Pg. E4

LENGTH: 693 words

Michael Tilson Thomas and the San Francisco Symphony are billing their current program as "A Mozart Journey," but a journey implies a passage from somewhere to somewhere else. Thursday's concert in Davies Symphony Hall -- yet another observance of the composer's 250th birthday year -- was more like a country ramble.

For more than two hours, Thomas and the orchestra, along with the Symphony Chorus and a handful of crackerjack soloists, took listeners hither and yon and round about, up hill and down dale, stopping along the way to pick flowers and dandelions. The result was pleasant, aimless and not particularly compelling.

The lineup seemed designed with an almost willful determination to mix things up. Single movements excerpted from various serenades and concertos segued into concert arias. The little piano pieces that are the first entries in the chronological Köchel catalog, written when Wolfgang

was about 6, gave a nod to an equally generic German Dance from the composer's final year, and the "Paris" Symphony -- apparently chosen more or less at random -- concluded the evening.

In theory, an eclectic helping of this 'n' that could have cohered into a kaleidoscopic portrait of Mozart's work. But the actual event was too haphazard for that -- and besides, the far-reaching scope and nature of Mozart's achievement is pretty old news at this stage.

The lesson of this "Mozart Journey" -- what our friends in corporate would call the "takeaway" -- is that he wrote a lot of different stuff. Thanks, but we knew that already. The lingering mystery is just how that music works its breathtaking magic, and exploring that mystery would require more explanatory rigor -- of the kind currently on display in the television series "Keeping Score" -- not less.

Thomas introduced the "Journey" idea in 1999 in connection with Charles Ives, a composer to whom the grab-bag format was ideally, perhaps even exclusively, suited. For Ives, unabashed miscellany was practically an aesthetic principle, and it made perfect sense to throw a bunch of his music onto the stage -- like fighting cocks in a pit -- and let them go at it.

Not so with Mozart. There were some excellent performances to be heard Thursday night, including a fiercely focused account of the "Paris" Symphony and a brisk, punchy sprint through the finale of the "Gran Partita," K. 361 (370a). But it all sounded fragmentary and ripped from context.

Perhaps the most exciting offering was a rarely heard excerpt from Mozart's incidental music for the stage play "Thamos, King of **Egypt**." This is grandiose writing, at once ceremonial and dramatically charged, that looks forward to the even more nuanced strains of "The Magic Flute," and the Chorus, together with bass Jeremy Galyon, delivered it with thunderous fervor.

Soprano Laura Aikin, still best remembered here for her 2002 turn as the Angel in Messiaen's "Saint François d'Assise" at the San Francisco Opera, made a brilliant, bright-toned run through the coloratura aria "Marten aller Arten" from "The Abduction From the Seraglio" (she'll return in April for a solo recital with Chamber Music San Francisco). And pianist Jeremy Denk, underused in his Symphony debut, offered a thoughtful, beautifully weighted account of the last two movements from the A-Major Piano Concerto, K. 488.

The rest, though, was often lackluster. Aside from the "Thamos" music, the Chorus sounded patchy and uncertain in some early liturgical works, and again in the a cappella canons that range from the sentimental to the scatological.

And in the final reckoning, a number of the pieces simply didn't merit our undivided attention. The last of the Three German Dances, K. 605, for instance, titled "The Sleigh Ride," uses some merrily jingling bells to enliven what is otherwise perfectly ordinary ballroom music. I yield to no one in my love for Mozart, but in this instance, I'm afraid he takes second place to Leroy Anderson.

## APPENDIX II

## CODING SHEET

**A. GATEKEEPER OR CONTROL:**

- 1=Gatekeeper
- 2=Control

**B. COUNTRY OF FOCUS (COF):**

- 1=Indonesia
- 2=Brazil
- 3=South Africa
- 4=Lebanon/Syria
- 5=India
- 6=Egypt
- 7=Nigeria
- 8=Korea

**C. NAME OF MEDIA ORGANIZATION:**

- 1= Akron Beacon Journal
- 2=Baltimore Sun
- 3=Boston Globe
- 4=Charlotte Observer
- 5=Chicago Sun Times
- 6=Chicago Tribune
- 7=Columbus Dispatch
- 8=Dallas Morning News
- 9=Dayton Daily News
- 10=Hartford Courant
- 11=Houston Chronicle
- 12=Huffington Post
- 13=Kansas City Star
- 14=Lexington Herald-Leader
- 15=Lincoln Journal Star
- 16=Los Angeles Times
- 17=Louisville Courier Journal
- 18=Miami Herald
- 19=Minneapolis Star Tribune
- 20=New York Daily News
- 21=New York Times
- 22=Newark Star Ledger
- 23=Newsday
- 24=Newsweek
- 25=Omaha World Herald
- 26=Orange County Register
- 27=Philadelphia Inquirer



28=Pittsburgh Post Gazette  
 29=Providence Journal  
 30=Quad City Times  
 31=Raleigh News and Observer  
 32=Richmond Times Dispatch  
 33=Sacramento Bee  
 34=San Diego Union Tribune  
 35=San Francisco Chronicle  
 36=San Jose Mercury News  
 37=Seattle Post-Intelligencer  
 38=Seattle Times  
 39=Slate Magazine  
 40=South Florida Sun-Sentinel  
 41=St. Louis Post-Dispatch  
 42=St. Petersburg Times  
 43=St. Paul Pioneer Press  
 44=Tampa Tribune  
 45=The Oregonian  
 46=Time  
 47=Toledo Blade  
 48=U.S. News & World Report  
 49=USA Today  
 50=Washington Post  
 51=Wisconsin State Journal

**D. DATE: MM/DD/YY**

**E. ARTICLE TYPE:**

1=News story  
 2=Feature story  
 3=Opinion/Editorial  
 98=Other  
 99=Unknown

**F. CONTRIBUTOR:**

1=Staff  
 2=Staff Service  
 3=Wire Service  
 4=Op Ed/Special  
 98=Other  
 99=Unknown

**G. WORD COUNT: #**

**H. DATELINE: ONLY IF DATELINE IS INCLUDED**

1=W/in Country (Any City w/in the COF)

2=W/in Region (Any City/Country w/in the Region; NOT from COF)  
 3=Washington D.C.  
 4=National  
 98=Other  
 99=Unknown

**I. TYPE OF NEWS:**

1=News  
 2=Conflict/War  
 3=Economic Consequences  
 4=Human Interest  
 5=Morality Frames  
 98=Other  
 99=Unknown

**J. NUMBER OF SOURCES: #**

**K. TYPES OF SOURCES:**

1=Government Official  
 2=Military Official  
 3=Expert Involved  
 4=Expert Not Involved  
 5=Family/Friend  
 6=Regular Citizen  
 7= Academic  
 98=Other  
 99=Unknown

**L. SEX OF SOURCES:**

1=Male  
 2=Female  
 3=Combination  
 99=Unknown

**M. FOREIGN OR DOMESTIC SOURCES:**

1=All Foreign Sources  
 2=All Domestic Sources  
 3=Mixture, but mainly Foreign Sources  
 4=Mixture, but mainly Domestic Sources  
 5=About Equal

**N. NUMBER OF DIRECT QUOTES: #**

## APPENDIX III

## REGION CODING SHEET

**A. GATEKEEPER OR CONTROL:**

- 1=Gatekeeper
- 2=Control

**B. COUNTRY OF FOCUS (COF):**

- 1=Indonesia
- 2=Cambodia
- 3=Laos
- 4=Myanmar
- 5=Thailand
- 6=Vietnam
- 7=Malaysia
- 8=Brunei
- 9=East Timor
- 10=The Philippines
- 11=Singapore
- 12=South Africa
- 13=Botswana
- 14=Lesotho
- 15=Namibia
- 16=Swaziland
- 17=Korea
- 18=Hong Kong
- 19=Japan
- 20=Mongolia
- 21=Macau
- 22=Taiwan

**C. REGION OF FOCUS (ROF):**

- 1=Southeast Asia
- 2=Southern Africa
- 3=East Asia

**D. NAME OF MEDIA ORGANIZATION:**

- 1= Akron Beacon Journal
- 2=Baltimore Sun
- 3=Boston Globe
- 4=Charlotte Observer
- 5=Chicago Sun Times
- 6=Chicago Tribune
- 7=Columbus Dispatch
- 8=Dallas Morning News

9=Dayton Daily News  
10=Hartford Courant  
11=Houston Chronicle  
12=Huffington Post  
13=Kansas City Star  
14=Lexington Herald-Leader  
15=Lincoln Journal Star  
16=Los Angeles Times  
17=Louisville Courier Journal  
18=Miami Herald  
19=Minneapolis Star Tribune  
20=New York Daily News  
21=New York Times  
22=Newark Star Ledger  
23=Newsday  
24=Newsweek  
25=Omaha World Herald  
26=Orange County Register  
27=Philadelphia Inquirer  
28=Pittsburgh Post Gazette  
29=Providence Journal  
30=Quad City Times  
31=Raleigh News and Observer  
32=Richmond Times Dispatch  
33=Sacramento Bee  
34=San Diego Union Tribune  
35=San Francisco Chronicle  
36=San Jose Mercury News  
37=Seattle Post-Intelligencer  
38=Seattle Times  
39=Slate Magazine  
40=South Florida Sun-Sentinel  
41=St. Louis Post-Dispatch  
42=St. Petersburg Times  
43=St. Paul Pioneer Press  
44=Tampa Tribune  
45=The Oregonian  
46=Time  
47=Toledo Blade  
48=U.S. News & World Report  
49=USA Today  
50=Washington Post  
51=Wisconsin State Journal

**E. DATE:** MM/DD/YY

**F. ARTICLE TYPE:**

- 1=News story
- 2=Feature story
- 3=Opinion/Editorial
- 98=Other
- 99=Unknown

**G. CONTRIBUTOR:**

- 1=Staff
- 2=Staff Service
- 3=Wire Service
- 4=Op Ed/Special
- 98=Other
- 99=Unknown

**H. WORD COUNT: #****I. DATELINE: ONLY IF DATELINE IS INCLUDED**

- 1=W/in Country (Any City w/in the COF)
- 2=W/in Region (Any City/Country w/in the Region; NOT from COF)
- 3=Washington D.C.
- 4=National
- 98=Other
- 99=Unknown

**J. TYPE OF NEWS:**

- 1=News
- 2=Conflict/War
- 3=Economic Consequences
- 4=Human Interest
- 5=Morality Frames
- 98=Other
- 99=Unknown

**K. NUMBER OF SOURCES: #****L. TYPES OF SOURCES:**

- 1=Government Official
- 2=Military Official
- 3=Expert Involved
- 4=Expert Not Involved
- 5=Family/Friend
- 6=Regular Citizen
- 7= Academic

98=Other  
99=Unknown

**M. SEX OF SOURCES:**

1=Male  
2=Female  
3=Combination  
99=Unknown

**N. FOREIGN OR DOMESTIC SOURCES:**

1=All Foreign Sources  
2=All Domestic Sources  
3=Mixture, but mainly Foreign Sources  
4=Mixture, but mainly Domestic Sources  
5=About Equal

**O. NUMBER OF DIRECT QUOTES: #**

**Table 3.1 Media Organizaion Pairs (Gatekeeper and Control)**

	Gatekeeper Organization	Control Organizaiton
1	Akron Beacon Journal	Dayton Daily News
2	Baltimore Sun	Richmond Times Dispatch
3	Blade(Toledo)	Dayton Daily News
4	Boston Globe	Philadelphia Inquirer
5	Charlotte Observer	News & Observer (Raleigh)
6	Chicago Tribune	Chicago Sun Times
7	Dallas Morning News	Houston Chronicle
8	Journal Star (Lincoln, NE)	Omaha World Herald
9	Kansas City Star	St. Louis Post-Dispatch
10	Lexington Herald-Leader	Louisville Courier Journal
11	Los Angeles Times	New York Times
12	Miami Herald	South Florida Sun-Sentinel
13	Minneapolis Star Tribune	St.Paul Pioneer Press
14	New York Times	Washington Post
15	Newsday (Long Island)	Daily News
16	Newsweek	Time
17	Omaha-World Herald	Lincoln Journal Star
18	Orange County Register	San Diego Union Tribune
19	Philadelphia Inquirer	The Star-Ledger (Newark)
20	Pittsburgh Post-Gazette	Columbus Dispatch
21	Providence Journal	Hartford Courant
22	Sacramento Bee	San Jose Mercury News
23	San Francisco Chronicle	San Diego Union Tribune
24	San Jose Mercury News	San Diego Union Tribune
25	Seattle Post-Intelligencer	The Oregonian
26	Seattle Times	Seattle-Post Intelligencer
27	Slate Magazine	Huffington Post
28	St. Petersburg Times	Tampa Tribune
29	St.Louis Post-Dispatch	The Kansas City Star
30	St.Paul Pioneer Press	Minneapolis Star Tribune
31	Tampa Tribune	St. Petersburg Times
32	U.S. News & World Repd	Time
33	USA Today	New York Times
34	Washington Post.com	New York Times
35	Wisconsin State Journal	Quad City Times (Davenport)

**Table 3.2 Number of Gatekeepers Per Media Organization**

Gatekeeper Organization	# of Gatekeepers
Akron Beacon Journal	1
Baltimore Sun	2
Blade(Toledo)	1
Boston Globe	3
Charlotte Observer	1
Chicago Tribune	1
Dallas Morning News	4
Journal Star (Lincoln, NE)	2
Kansas City Star	4
Lexington Herald-Leader	1
Los Angeles Times	2
Miami Herald	2
Minneapolis Star Tribune	1
New York Times	1
Newsday (Long Island)	1
Newsweek	1
Omaha-World Herald	1
Orange County Register	1
Philadelphia Inquirer	1
Pittsburgh Post-Gazette	2
Providence Journal	1
Sacramento Bee	1
San Francisco Chronicle	5
San Jose Mercury News	1
Seattle Post-Intelligencer	1
Seattle Times	2
Slate Magazine	1
St. Petersburg Times	1
St.Louis Post-Dispatch	1
St.Paul Pioneer Press	2
Tampa Tribune	1
U.S. News & World Report	1
USA Today	2
Washington Post.com	1
Wisconsin State Journal	1
Total	55



**Table 3.3 Total Number of Articles Retrieved Using Lexis/Nexis**

Gatekeeper Media Organizations	9062
Control Media Organizations	17164

Table 3.4: Total Number of Articles from Each Trip Before and After

ID	Year	Focus Country	Media Organization	Total # of Articles	# of Articles Before Trip	# of Articles After Trip
2001	2000	Indonesia	San Francisco Chronicle	24	4	20
2034	2000	Indonesia	Dallas Morning News	3	0	3
2054	2000	Indonesia	St.Paul Pioneer Press	49	20	29
2013	2000	Indonesia	Orange County Register	0	0	0
2017	2000	Indonesia	Wisconsin State Journal	0	0	0
2081	2000	Indonesia	Seattle Times	29	9	20
2084	2000	Indonesia	Dallas Morning News	3	2	1
2107	2000	Indonesia	San Jose Mercury News	72	26	46
			Total	180	61	119
			% of Total		33.33%	66.66%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Media Organization	Total # of Articles	# of Articles Before Trip	# of Articles During/After Trip
2014	2001	Brazil	Dallas Morning News	8	2	6
2024	2001	Brazil	Miami Herald	7	1	6
2031	2001	Brazil	St.Paul Pioneer Press	58	12	46
2068	2001	Brazil	Akron Beacon Journal	0	0	0
2074	2001	Brazil	Philadelphia Inquirer	32	17	15
2090	2001	Brazil	Journal Star (Lincoln, NE)	0	0	0
2103	2001	Brazil	Pittsburgh Post-Gazette	58	29	29
			Total	163	61	102
			% of Total		37.42%	62.47%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Media Organization	Total # of Articles	# of Articles Before Trip	# of Articles During/After Trip
2011	2002	South Africa	San Francisco Chronicle	16	0	16
2046	2002	South Africa	Seattle Post-Intelligencer	21	11	10
2050	2002	South Africa	Boston Globe	53	24	29
2058	2002	South Africa	Pittsburgh Post-Gazette	12	3	9
2075	2002	South Africa	Omaha-World Herald	3	1	2
2098	2002	South Africa	USA Today	9	8	1
			Total	114	47	67
			% of Total		41.23%	58.77%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Media Organization	Total # of Articles	# of Articles Before Trip	# of Articles During/After Trip
2026	2004	Syria/Lebanon	Newsweek	29	19	10
2047	2004	Syria/Lebanon	Baltimore Sun	0	0	0
2057	2004	Syria/Lebanon	USA Today	8	2	6
2065	2004	Syria/Lebanon	Kansas City Star	2	1	1
2073	2004	Syria/Lebanon	Blade(Toledo)	0	0	0
2086	2004	Syria/Lebanon	Boston Globe	15	8	7
2109	2004	Syria/Lebanon	Miami Herald	2	2	0
			Total	56	32	24
			% of Total		57.14%	42.86%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Media Organization	Total # of Articles	# of Articles Before Trip	# of Articles During/After Trip
2002	2005	India	New York Times	431	207	224
2004	2005	India	S. News & World Rep	5	1	4
2023	2005	India	Charlotte Observer	0	0	0
2025	2005	India	exington Herald-Lead	1	0	1
2043	2005	India	Newsday (Long Island	0	0	0
2072	2005	India	San Francisco Chronicle	24	7	17
2099	2005	India	Providence Journal	0	0	0
			Total	461	215	246
			% of Total		46.64%	53.36%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Media Organization	Total # of Articles	# of Articles Before Trip	# of Articles During/After Trip
2021	2006	Egypt	San Francisco Chronicle	16	4	12
2029	2006	Egypt	Tampa Tribune	2	0	2
2048	2006	Egypt	Kansas City Star	1	0	1
2063	2006	Egypt	Dallas Morning News	1	0	1
2067	2006	Egypt	St.Louis Post-Dispatch	57	34	23
2069	2006	Egypt	Minneapolis Star Tribune	15	1	14
2094	2006	Egypt	Chicago Tribune	2	0	2
			Total	94	39	55

			% of Total		41.50%	58.50%
--	--	--	------------	--	--------	--------

ID	Year	Focus Country	Media Organization	Total # of Articles	# of Articles Before Trip	# of Articles During/After Trip
2007	2007	Nigeria	San Francisco Chronicle	7	3	4
2018	2007	Nigeria	St. Petersburg Times	14	3	11
2030	2007	Nigeria	Boston Globe	23	8	15
2041	2007	Nigeria	Los Angeles Times	0	0	0
2070	2007	Nigeria	Journal Star (Lincoln, NE)	6	1	5
2096	2007	Nigeria	Slate Magazine	3	0	3
			Total	53	15	38
			% of Total		28.30%	71.69%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Media Organization	Total # of Articles	# of Articles Before Trip	# of Articles During/After Trip
2016	2007	Korea	Seattle Times	132	62	70
2020	2007	Korea	Baltimore Sun	1	0	1
2022	2007	Korea	Los Angeles Times	33	0	33
2049	2007	Korea	USA Today	15	7	8
2056	2007	Korea	Sacramento Bee	10	6	4
2083	2007	Korea	Kansas City Star	2	1	1
2088	2007	Korea	Kansas City Star	2	1	1
2091	2007	Korea	Washington Post.com	15	4	11
			Total	210	81	129
			% of Total		38.57%	61.43%

Table 3.4: Total Number of Articles from Each Trip Before and After -- CONTOL MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS

ID	Year	Focus Country	Control Organizations	# of Control Articles	# of Control Articles Before Trip	# of Control Articles After Trip
2001	2000	Indonesia	San Diego Union Tribune	81	30	51
2034	2000	Indonesia	Houston Chronicle	74	38	36
2054	2000	Indonesia	Minneapolis Star Tribune	0	0	0
2013	2000	Indonesia	San Diego Union Tribune	81	30	51
2017	2000	Indonesia	Quad City Times	0	0	0
2081	2000	Indonesia	Seattle Post-Intelligencer	21	16	5
2084	2000	Indonesia	Houston Chronicle	83	35	48
2107	2000	Indonesia	San Diego Union Tribune	81	30	51
			Total	421	179	242
			% of Total		42.52%	57.48%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Control Organizations	# of Control Articles	# of Control Articles Before Trip	# of Control Articles After Trip
2014	2001	Brazil	Houston Chronicle	120	62	58
2024	2001	Brazil	South Florida Sun-Sentine	0	0	0
2031	2001	Brazil	Minneapolis Star Tribune	1	0	1
2068	2001	Brazil	Dayton Daily News	10	8	2
2074	2001	Brazil	The Star-Ledger (Newark)	24	13	11
2090	2001	Brazil	Omaha World Herald	2	1	1
2103	2001	Brazil	Columbus Dispatch	1	1	0
			Total	158	85	73
			% of Total		53.80%	46.20%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Control Organizations	# of Control Articles	# of Control Articles Before Trip	# of Control Articles After Trip
2011	2002	South Africa	San Diego Union Tribune	40	31	9
2046	2002	South Africa	The Oregonian	2	0	2
2050	2002	South Africa	Philadelphia Inquirer	27	22	5
2058	2002	South Africa	Columbus Dispatch	5	2	3
2075	2002	South Africa	Lincoln Journal Star	1	1	0
2098	2002	South Africa	New York Times	124	58	66
			Total	199	114	85
			% of Total		56.78%	43.22%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Control Organizations	# of Control Articles	# of Control Articles Before Trip	# of Control Articles After Trip
2026	2004	Syria/Lebanon	Time	4	2	2
2047	2004	Syria/Lebanon	Richmond Times Dispatch	6	4	2
2057	2004	Syria/Lebanon	New York Times	146	77	69
2065	2004	Syria/Lebanon	St. Louis Post-Dispatch	38	15	23
2073	2004	Syria/Lebanon	Dayton Daily News	3	1	2
2086	2004	Syria/Lebanon	Philadelphia Inquirer	45	28	17
2109	2004	Syria/Lebanon	South Florida Sun-Sentinel	0	0	0
			Total	242	127	115
			% of Total		52.48%	47.52%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Control Organizations	# of Control Articles	# of Control Articles Before Trip	# of Control Articles After Trip
2002	2005	India	Washington Post	86	49	37
2004	2005	India	Time	10	7	3
2023	2005	India	News & Observer (Raleigh)	26	11	15
2025	2005	India	Louisville Courier Journal	0	0	0
2043	2005	India	Daily News	4	2	2
2072	2005	India	San Diego Union Tribune	23	10	13
2099	2005	India	Hartford Courant	0	0	0
			Total	149	79	70
			% of Total		53.02%	46.98%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Control Organizations	# of Control Articles	# of Control Articles Before Trip	# of Control Articles After Trip
2021	2006	Egypt	San Diego Union Tribune	1	1	0
2029	2006	Egypt	St. Petersburg Times	35	25	10
2048	2006	Egypt	St. Louis Post-Dispatch	30	14	16
2063	2006	Egypt	Houston Chronicle	98	47	51
2067	2006	Egypt	The Kansas City Star	0	0	0
2069	2006	Egypt	St. Paul Pioneer Press	53	32	21
2094	2006	Egypt	Chicago Sun Times	50	31	19
			Total	267	150	117
			% of Total		56.18%	43.82%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Control Organizations	# of Control Articles	# of Control Articles Before Trip	# of Control Articles After Trip
2007	2007	Nigeria	San Diego Union Tribune	1	1	0
2018	2007	Nigeria	Tampa Tribune	0	0	0
2030	2007	Nigeria	Philadelphia Inquirer	28	25	3
2041	2007	Nigeria	New York Times	77	25	52
2070	2007	Nigeria	Omaha World Herald	1	1	0
2096	2007	Nigeria	Huffington Post	2	0	2
			Total	109	52	57
			% of Total		47.71%	52.29%

ID	Year	Focus Country	Control Organizations	# of Control Articles	# of Control Articles Before Trip	# of Control Articles After Trip
2016	2007	Korea	Seattle-Post Intelligencer	68	28	40
2020	2007	Korea	Richmond Times Dispatch	1	0	1
2022	2007	Korea	New York Times	162	68	94
2049	2007	Korea	New York Times	162	68	94
2056	2007	Korea	San Jose Mercury News	38	18	20
2083	2007	Korea	St. Louis Post-Dispatch	71	45	26
2088	2007	Korea	St. Louis Post-Dispatch	71	45	26
2091	2007	Korea	New York Times	162	68	94
			Total	735	340	395
			% of Total		46.26%	53.74%



**Table 3.5: Southeast Asia Returned and Usable Articles**

	Media Organizations of Gatekeepers	
Country	# of Articles Returned by Lexis/Nexis	# of Usable Articles
Brunei	66	24
Cambodia	339	109
East Timor	155	66
Indonesia	245	180
Laos	348	101
Malaysia	529	267
Myanmar	182	29
Singapore	429	189
Thailand	964	561
The Philippines	866	334
Vietnam	2013	670
Total	6136	2530
Total w/out Indonesia	5891	2350
	Control Media Organizations	
Country	# of Articles Returned by Lexis/Nexis	# of Usable Articles
Brunei	282	98
Cambodia	760	289
East Timor	766	76
Indonesia	785	421
Laos	321	129
Malaysia	998	409
Myanmar	408	196
Singapore	765	322
Thailand	794	381
The Philippines	1573	596
Vietnam	532	211
Total	7984	3128
Total w/out Indonesia	7199	2707

**Table 3.6: East Asia Returned and Usable Articles**

Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
Country	# of Articles Returned by Lexis/Nexis	# of Usable Articles
Hong Kong	853	356
Japan	3738	1281
Korea	2805	208
Macau	41	1
Mongolia	139	32
Taiwan	530	64
Total	8106	1943
Total w/out Korea	5301	1735
Control Media Organizations		
Country	# of Articles Returned by Lexis/Nexis	# of Usable Articles
Hong Kong	2572	913
Japan	8619	3402
Korea	2254	664
Macau	360	102
Mongolia	432	113
Taiwan	1626	812
Total	15863	6006
Total w/out Korea	13609	5342

**Table 3.7: Inter-coder Reliability Test Using Percent Agreement**

	Variable								
Coder Pair	GateCont	COF	News Frame	Source #	Source Type	Source Sex	Foreign or Domestic Source	Direct Quote #	Average
1,2	1	1	0.981	0.99	0.981	0.971	0.99	0.99	0.992
Average	1	1	0.981	0.99	0.981	0.971	0.99	0.99	0.992

**Table 3.8: Inter coder Reliability Test Using Cohen's Kappa (k)**

	Variable								
Coder Pair	GateCont	COF	News Frame	Source #	Source Type	Source Sex	Foreign or Domestic Source	Direct Quote #	Avg.
1,2	1	1	0.961	0.988	0.977	0.954	0.988	0.987	0.981
Average	1	1	0.961	0.988	0.977	0.954	0.988	0.987	0.981

**Table 4.1: News Frames in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations**

News Frame		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
		Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
News	Number of Articles	251	322	573
	% of Articles	45.6%	41.3%	43.1%
Conflict/War	Number of Articles	170	201	371
	% of Articles	30.9%	25.8%	27.9%
Economic Consequences	Number of Articles	40	119	159
	% of Articles	7.3%	15.3%	11.9%
Human Interest	Number of Articles	85	127	212
	% of Articles	15.4%	16.3%	15.9%
Morality Frame	Number of Articles	5	11	16
	% of Articles	0.9%	1.4%	1.2%
Total	Number of Articles	551	780	1,331
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
News	Number of Articles	582	602	1,184
	% of Articles	51.7%	52.2%	51.9%
Conflict/War	Number of Articles	376	375	751
	% of Articles	33.4%	32.5%	32.9%
Economic Consequences	Number of Articles	90	106	196
	% of Articles	8.0%	9.2%	8.6%
Human Interest	Number of Articles	70	58	128
	% of Articles	6.2%	5.0%	5.6%
Morality Frame	Number of Articles	8	13	21
	% of Articles	0.7%	1.1%	0.9%
Total	Number of Articles	1,126	1,154	2,280
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.2: Number of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations**

	<b>Before Trip</b>				<b>After Trip</b>				<b>Total</b>			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max
Gatekeeper	3.06	2.814	0	18	3.07	2.823	0	15	3.06	2.818	0	18
Control	2.63	2.603	0	16	2.60	2.541	0	21	2.62	2.571	0	21
Total	2.77	2.680	0	18	2.79	2.668	0	21	2.78	2.673	0	21

**Table 4.3: Number of Direct Quotes in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations**

	<b>Before Trip</b>				<b>After Trip</b>				<b>Total</b>			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max
Gatekeeper	2.97	2.814	0	26	2.99	2.808	0	20	2.98	2.809	0	26
Control	2.52	2.511	0	16	2.41	2.360	0	21	2.46	2.436	0	21
Total	2.67	2.623	0	26	2.65	2.565	0	21	2.66	2.592	0	26

**Table 4.4: Types of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations**

Type of Source		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
		Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
Government Official	Number of Articles	33	45	78
	% of Articles	6.0%	5.8%	5.9%
Military Official	Number of Articles	54	52	106
	% of Articles	9.8%	6.7%	8.0%
Expert Involved	Number of Articles	18	36	54
	% of Articles	3.3%	4.6%	4.1%
Expert NOT Involved	Number of Articles	8	20	28
	% of Articles	1.5%	2.6%	2.1%
Family/Friend	Number of Articles	5	10	15
	% of Articles	0.9%	1.3%	1.1%
Regular Citizen	Number of Articles	7	11	18
	% of Articles	1.3%	1.4%	1.4%
Academic	Number of Articles	2	0	2
	% of Articles	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
Other	Number of Articles	11	11	22
	% of Articles	2.0%	1.4%	1.7%
Combination	Number of Articles	284	386	670
	% of Articles	51.5%	49.5%	50.3%
No Sources	Number of Articles	129	209	338
	% of Articles	23.4%	26.8%	25.4%
Total	Number of Articles	551	780	1,331
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
Government Official	Number of Articles	65	67	132
	% of Articles	5.8%	5.8%	5.8%
Military Official	Number of Articles	104	117	221
	% of Articles	9.2%	10.1%	9.7%
Expert Involved	Number of Articles	55	38	93
	% of Articles	4.9%	3.3%	4.1%
Expert NOT Involved	Number of Articles	27	29	56
	% of Articles	2.4%	2.5%	2.5%
Family/Friend	Number of Articles	4	12	16
	% of Articles	0.4%	1.0%	0.7%
Regular Citizen	Number of Articles	22	13	35
	% of Articles	2.0%	1.1%	1.5%
Academic	Number of Articles	7	1	8
	% of Articles	0.6%	0.1%	0.4%
Other	Number of Articles	30	27	57
	% of Articles	2.7%	2.3%	2.5%



Combination	Number of Articles	507	529	1,036
	% of Articles	45.0%	45.8%	45.4%
No Sources	Number of Articles	305	321	626
	% of Articles	27.1%	27.8%	27.5%
Total	Number of Articles	1,126	1,154	2,280
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.5: Sex of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations**

		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
Sex of Source		Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
Male	Number of Articles	267	358	625
	% of Articles	48.5%	45.9%	47.0%
Female	Number of Articles	26	35	61
	% of Articles	4.7%	4.5%	4.6%
Combination	Number of Articles	105	145	250
	% of Articles	19.1%	18.6%	18.8%
Unknown	Number of Articles	24	33	57
	% of Articles	4.4%	4.2%	4.3%
No Sources	Number of Articles	129	209	338
	% of Articles	23.4%	26.8%	25.4%
Total	Number of Articles	551	780	1,331
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
Male	Number of Articles	621	629	1,250
	% of Articles	55.2%	54.5%	54.8%
Female	Number of Articles	40	47	87
	% of Articles	3.6%	4.1%	3.8%
Combination	Number of Articles	133	135	268
	% of Articles	11.8%	11.7%	11.8%
Unknown	Number of Articles	27	22	49
	% of Articles	2.4%	1.9%	2.1%
No Sources	Number of Articles	305	321	626
	% of Articles	27.1%	27.8%	27.5%
Total	Number of Articles	1,126	1,154	2,280
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.6: Foreign or Domestic Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations**

		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
		Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
All Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	78	115	193
	% of Articles	14.2%	14.7%	14.5%
All Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	160	179	339
	% of Articles	29.0%	22.9%	25.5%
Combination, Mainly Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	89	114	203
	% of Articles	16.2%	14.6%	15.3%
Combination, Mainly Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	70	134	204
	% of Articles	12.7%	17.2%	15.3%
Equal Number Foreign and Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	24	29	53
	% of Articles	4.4%	3.7%	4.0%
Unknown	Number of Articles	1	0	1
	% of Articles	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%
No Sources	Number of Articles	129	209	338
	% of Articles	23.4%	26.8%	25.4%
Total	Number of Articles	551	780	1,331
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
All Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	174	161	335
	% of Articles	15.5%	14.0%	14.7%
All Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	269	273	542
	% of Articles	23.9%	23.7%	23.8%
Combination, Mainly Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	183	201	384
	% of Articles	16.3%	17.4%	16.8%
Combination, Mainly Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	143	160	303
	% of Articles	12.7%	13.9%	13.3%
Equal Number Foreign and Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	46	31	77
	% of Articles	4.1%	2.7%	3.4%
Unknown	Number of Articles	6	7	13
	% of Articles	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%
No Sources	Number of Articles	305	321	626
	% of Articles	27.1%	27.8%	27.5%
Total	Number of Articles	1,126	1,154	2,280
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.7: Total Number of Articles in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for Southeast Asia Region**

	Before Trip		After Trip		Total	
Country	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles
	Media Organizations of Gatekeepers (N=7)					
Brunei	10	41.7%	14	58.3%	24	100.0%
Cambodia	59	54.1%	50	45.9%	109	100.0%
East Timor	26	39.4%	40	60.6%	66	100.0%
Indonesia	60	33.3%	120	66.7%	180	100.0%
Laos	61	60.4%	40	39.6%	101	100.0%
Malaysia	108	40.4%	159	59.6%	267	100.0%
Myanmar	14	48.3%	15	51.7%	29	100.0%
Singapore	89	47.1%	100	52.9%	189	100.0%
Thailand	263	46.9%	298	53.1%	561	100.0%
The Philippine	198	59.3%	136	40.7%	334	100.0%
Vietnam	310	46.3%	360	53.7%	670	100.0%
<b>Region Total</b>	<b>1198</b>	<b>51.4%</b>	<b>1132</b>	<b>48.6%</b>	<b>2330</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
	Control Media Organizations (n=7)					
Brunei	42	42.9%	56	57.1%	98	100.0%
Cambodia	170	58.8%	129	44.6%	289	100.0%
East Timor	26	34.2%	50	65.8%	76	100.0%
Indonesia	179	42.5%	242	57.5%	421	100.0%
Laos	62	48.1%	67	51.9%	129	100.0%
Malaysia	209	51.1%	200	48.9%	409	100.0%
Myanmar	100	51.0%	96	49.0%	196	100.0%
Singapore	172	53.4%	150	46.6%	322	100.0%
Thailand	180	47.2%	201	52.8%	381	100.0%
The Philippine	286	48.0%	310	52.0%	596	100.0%
Vietnam	100	47.4%	111	52.6%	211	100.0%
<b>Region Total</b>	<b>1526</b>	<b>48.8%</b>	<b>1612</b>	<b>51.5%</b>	<b>3128</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 4.7a: Total Number of Articles in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for Southeast Asia Region Excluding Indonesia**

	Before Trip		After Trip		Total	
Country	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles
	Media Organizations of Gatekeepers (N=7)					
Brunei	10	41.7%	14	58.3%	24	100.0%
Cambodia	59	54.1%	50	45.9%	109	100.0%
East Timor	26	39.4%	40	60.6%	66	100.0%
Laos	61	60.4%	40	39.6%	101	100.0%
Malaysia	108	40.4%	159	59.6%	267	100.0%
Myanmar	14	48.3%	15	51.7%	29	100.0%
Singapore	89	47.1%	100	52.9%	189	100.0%
Thailand	263	46.9%	298	53.1%	561	100.0%
The Philippine	198	59.3%	136	40.7%	334	100.0%
Vietnam	310	46.3%	360	53.7%	670	100.0%
<b>Region Total Excluding Indonesia</b>	<b>1,138</b>	<b>52.9%</b>	<b>1,012</b>	<b>47.1%</b>	<b>2,150</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
	Control Media Organizations (n=7)					
Brunei	42	42.9%	56	57.1%	98	100.0%
Cambodia	170	58.8%	129	44.6%	289	100.0%
East Timor	26	34.2%	50	65.8%	76	100.0%
Laos	62	48.1%	67	51.9%	129	100.0%
Malaysia	209	51.1%	200	48.9%	409	100.0%
Myanmar	100	51.0%	96	49.0%	196	100.0%
Singapore	172	53.4%	150	46.6%	322	100.0%
Thailand	180	47.2%	201	52.8%	381	100.0%
The Philippine	286	48.0%	310	52.0%	596	100.0%
Vietnam	100	47.4%	111	52.6%	211	100.0%
<b>Region Total Excluding Indonesia</b>	<b>1,347</b>	<b>49.6%</b>	<b>1,370</b>	<b>50.4%</b>	<b>2,717</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 4.8: Total Number of Articles in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for East Asia Region**

	Before Trip		After Trip		Total	
Country	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles
	Media Organizations of Gatekeepers (n=7)					
Hong Kong	170	47.6%	186	52.2%	356	100.0%
Japan	558	43.6%	723	56.4%	1281	100.0%
Korea	80	38.5%	128	61.5%	208	100.0%
Macau	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Mongolia	14	43.8%	18	56.2%	32	100.0%
Taiwan	24	37.5%	40	62.5%	64	100.0%
<b>Region Total</b>	<b>846</b>	<b>43.6%</b>	<b>1096</b>	<b>56.4%</b>	<b>1942</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
	Control Media Organizations (n=7)					
Hong Kong	269	29.5%	644	70.5%	913	100.0%
Japan	1950	57.3%	1624	42.7%	3402	100.0%
Korea	295	44.4%	369	55.6%	664	100.0%
Macau	69	67.6%	33	32.4%	102	100.0%
Mongolia	73	64.6%	40	35.4%	113	100.0%
Taiwan	419	51.6%	393	48.4%	812	100.0%
<b>Region Total</b>	<b>3075</b>	<b>49.7%</b>	<b>3103</b>	<b>50.3%</b>	<b>6178</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 4.8: Total Number of Articles in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for East Asia Region Excluding Korea**

	Before Trip		After Trip		Total	
Country	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles	Number of Articles	Percent of Articles
	Media Organizations of Gatekeepers (n=7)					
Hong Kong	170	47.6%	186	52.2%	356	100.0%
Japan	558	43.6%	723	56.4%	1281	100.0%
Macau	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Mongolia	14	43.8%	18	56.2%	32	100.0%
Taiwan	24	37.5%	40	62.5%	64	100.0%
<b>Region Total Excluding Korea</b>	<b>766</b>	<b>44.2%</b>	<b>968</b>	<b>55.8%</b>	<b>1734</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
	Control Media Organizations (n=7)					
Hong Kong	269	29.5%	644	70.5%	913	100.0%
Japan	1950	57.3%	1624	42.7%	3402	100.0%
Macau	69	67.6%	33	32.4%	102	100.0%
Mongolia	73	64.6%	40	35.4%	113	100.0%
Taiwan	419	51.6%	393	48.4%	812	100.0%
<b>Region Total Excluding Korea</b>	<b>2780</b>	<b>50.4%</b>	<b>2734</b>	<b>49.6%</b>	<b>5514</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 4.9: Word Counts for Regions for Gatekeeper Media Organizations and Control Media Organizations**  
**Southeast Asia Region (w/out Indonesia)**

	Before Trip			After Trip			Total		
	N	Mean	Std. Dev	N	Mean	Std. Dev	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Media Organization of Gatekeepers	1138	601.8	578.8	1,012	628.4	607.4	2,150	615.1	599.4
Control Media Organization	1,347	501.8	472.8	1,370	502.9	454.5	2,717	502.3	451.7
Total	2,485	551.8	525.8	2,382	580.3	580.3	4,867	558.7	525.6

**East Asia Region (w/out Korea)**

Media Organization of Gatekeepers	766	640.1	628.8	968	652.5	634.6	1,734	646.3	621.4
Control Media Organization	2,780	520.4	502.4	2,734	504.6	487.3	5,514	512.5	498.2
Total	3,546	580.3	580.3	3,702	580.3	524.1	7,248	580.3	580.3



**Table 4.10: News Frame in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for Southeast Asia Region (w/out Indonesia)**

News Frame		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
		Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
News	Number of Articles	556	487	1,043
	% of Articles	48.9%	48.1%	48.5%
Conflict/War	Number of Articles	290	266	556
	% of Articles	25.5%	26.3%	25.9%
Economic Consequences	Number of Articles	105	56	161
	% of Articles	9.2%	5.5%	7.4%
Human Interest	Number of Articles	160	201	361
	% of Articles	14.1%	19.9%	17.0%
Morality Frame	Number of Articles	26	2	28
	% of Articles	2.3%	0.2%	1.3%
Total	Number of Articles	1,138	1,012	2,150
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
News	Number of Articles	617	619	1,236
	% of Articles	45.8%	45.2%	45.5%
Conflict/War	Number of Articles	353	398	751
	% of Articles	26.2%	29.1%	27.7%
Economic Consequences	Number of Articles	201	169	370
	% of Articles	14.9%	12.3%	13.6%
Human Interest	Number of Articles	150	158	308
	% of Articles	11.1%	11.5%	11.3%
Morality Frame	Number of Articles	27	25	52
	% of Articles	2.0%	1.8%	1.9%
Total	Number of Articles	1,347	1,370	2,717
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.11: News Frames in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for East Asia Region (w/out Korea)**

News Frame		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
		Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
News	Number of Articles	377	313	690
	% of Articles	49.2%	44.9%	47.1%
Conflict/War	Number of Articles	230	300	530
	% of Articles	30.0%	31.0%	30.5%
Economic Consequences	Number of Articles	80	97	177
	% of Articles	10.5%	10.0%	10.3%
Human Interest	Number of Articles	64	125	189
	% of Articles	8.3%	12.9%	10.6%
Morality Frame	Number of Articles	15	12	27
	% of Articles	2.0%	1.2%	1.6%
Total	Number of Articles	766	968	1,734
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
News	Number of Articles	1,276	1,233	2,509
	% of Articles	45.9%	45.1%	45.5%
Conflict/War	Number of Articles	776	741	1,517
	% of Articles	27.9%	27.1%	27.5%
Economic Consequences	Number of Articles	450	454	904
	% of Articles	16.2%	16.6%	16.4%
Human Interest	Number of Articles	236	271	507
	% of Articles	8.5%	9.9%	9.2%
Morality Frame	Number of Articles	57	27	84
	% of Articles	2.0%	1.0%	1.5%
Total	Number of Articles	2,780	2,734	5,514
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.12: Datelines in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for Southeast Asia Region (w/out Indonesia)**

Dateline		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
		Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
W/in Country	Number of Articles	422	408	830
	% of Articles	37.1%	40.3%	38.7%
W/in Region	Number of Articles	89	114	203
	% of Articles	7.8%	11.3%	9.6%
Washington D.C.	Number of Articles	90	103	193
	% of Articles	7.9%	10.2%	9.1%
National	Number of Articles	188	87	275
	% of Articles	16.5%	8.6%	12.6%
Other	Number of Articles	63	26	89
	% of Articles	5.5%	2.6%	4.1%
Unknown	Number of Articles	286	273	559
	% of Articles	25.1%	27.0%	26.1%
Total	Number of Articles	1,138	1,012	2,150
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
W/in Country	Number of Articles	497	510	1,007
	% of Articles	36.9%	37.2%	37.1%
W/in Region	Number of Articles	135	140	275
	% of Articles	10.0%	10.2%	10.1%
Washington D.C.	Number of Articles	42	42	84
	% of Articles	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%
National	Number of Articles	158	136	294
	% of Articles	11.7%	9.9%	10.8%
Other	Number of Articles	97	108	205
	% of Articles	7.2%	7.9%	7.6%
Unknown	Number of Articles	419	433	852
	% of Articles	31.1%	31.6%	31.4%
Total	Number of Articles	1,347	1,370	2,717
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.13: Datelines in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for East Asia Region (w/out Korea)**

Dateline		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
		Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
W/in Country	Number of Articles	306	191	249
	% of Articles	40.0%	41.8%	40.9%
W/in Region	Number of Articles	79	118	99
	% of Articles	9.9%	12.2%	11.1%
Washington D.C.	Number of Articles	40	45	43
	% of Articles	5.2%	4.7%	5.0%
National	Number of Articles	100	99	100
	% of Articles	13.1%	10.2%	11.7%
Other	Number of Articles	52	47	50
	% of Articles	6.8%	4.9%	5.9%
Unknown	Number of Articles	192	253	223
	% of Articles	25.1%	26.1%	25.6%
Total	Number of Articles	766	968	1,734
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
W/in Country	Number of Articles	990	962	976
	% of Articles	35.6%	35.2%	35.4%
W/in Region	Number of Articles	178	189	184
	% of Articles	6.4%	6.9%	6.7%
Washington D.C.	Number of Articles	131	170	151
	% of Articles	4.7%	6.2%	5.5%
National	Number of Articles	208	139	174
	% of Articles	7.5%	5.1%	6.3%
Other	Number of Articles	186	213	200
	% of Articles	6.7%	7.8%	7.3%
Unknown	Number of Articles	1,087	1,058	1,073
	% of Articles	39.1%	38.7%	38.9%
Total	Number of Articles	2,780	2,734	5,514
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.14: Number of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for Southeast Asia Region**

	Before Trip				After Trip				Total			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max
Gatekeeper	3.20	2.906	0	17	3.40	2.983	0	22	3.30	2.945	0	20
Control	2.69	2.803	0	16	2.60	2.734	0	19	2.65	2.768	0	18
Total	2.95	2.85	0.00	17.00	3.00	2.86	0.00	21.00	2.97	2.86	0.00	19.00

**Table 4.15: Number of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for East Asia Region (w/out Korea)**

	Before Trip				After Trip				Total			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max
Gatekeeper	3.19	2.781	0	18	3.11	3.082	0	22	3.15	2.932	0	22
Control	2.85	2.690	0	19	2.60	2.654	0	21	2.73	2.672	0	21
Total	3.02	2.74	0	19	2.79	2.87	0	22	2.78	2.673	0	21

**Table 4.16: Number of Direct Quotes in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for Southeast Asia (w/out Indonesia)**

	Before Trip				After Trip				Total			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max
Gatekeeper	2.90	2.698	0	22	3.15	2.981	0	23	3.03	2.839	0	23
Control	2.72	2.625	0	21	2.78	2.584	0	24	2.75	2.604	0	24
Total	2.81	2.66	0	22	2.97	2.78	0	24	2.66	2.592	0	24

**Table 4.17: Number of Direct Quotes in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for East Asia (w/out**

	Before Trip				After Trip				Total			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max
Gatekeeper	2.74	2.814	0	23	3.12	2.978	0	25	2.93	2.896	0	25
Control	2.54	2.511	0	22	2.56	2.536	0	23	2.55	2.524	0	23
Total	2.64	2.66	0	23	2.84	2.76	0	25	2.74	2.71	0	25



**Table 4.18: Types of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for Southeast Asia Region (w/out Indonesia)**

Type of Source		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
		Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
Government Official	Number of Articles	96	89	185
	% of Articles	8.4%	8.8%	8.6%
Military Official	Number of Articles	89	81	170
	% of Articles	7.8%	8.0%	7.9%
Expert Involved	Number of Articles	16	6	22
	% of Articles	1.4%	0.6%	1.0%
Expert NOT Involved	Number of Articles	25	16	41
	% of Articles	2.2%	1.6%	1.9%
Family/Friend	Number of Articles	20	28	48
	% of Articles	1.8%	2.8%	2.3%
Regular Citizen	Number of Articles	10	19	29
	% of Articles	0.9%	1.9%	1.4%
Academic	Number of Articles	11	18	29
	% of Articles	1.0%	1.8%	1.4%
Other	Number of Articles	16	14	30
	% of Articles	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%
Combination	Number of Articles	546	489	1,035
	% of Articles	48.0%	48.3%	48.2%
No Sources	Number of Articles	306	251	557
	% of Articles	26.9%	24.8%	25.9%
Total	Number of Articles	1,138	1,012	2,150
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
Government Official	Number of Articles	123	103	226
	% of Articles	9.1%	7.5%	8.3%
Military Official	Number of Articles	137	127	264
	% of Articles	10.2%	9.3%	9.8%
Expert Involved	Number of Articles	32	29	61
	% of Articles	2.4%	2.1%	2.3%
Expert NOT Involved	Number of Articles	39	30	69
	% of Articles	2.9%	2.2%	2.6%
Family/Friend	Number of Articles	0	9	9
	% of Articles	0.0%	0.7%	0.4%
Regular Citizen	Number of Articles	0	5	5
	% of Articles	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%
Academic	Number of Articles	115	127	242
	% of Articles	8.5%	9.3%	8.9%
Other	Number of Articles	47	62	109
	% of Articles	3.5%	4.5%	4.0%
Combination	Number of Articles	676	677	1,353
	% of Articles	50.2%	49.4%	49.8%
No Sources	Number of Articles	176	191	367
	% of Articles	13.1%	14.0%	13.6%
Total	Number of Articles	1,347	1,370	2,150
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.19: Types of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for East Asia Region (w/out Korea)**

Type of Source		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
		Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
Government Official	Number of Articles	70	84	155
	% of Articles	9.2%	8.7%	9.0%
Military Official	Number of Articles	58	76	135
	% of Articles	7.6%	7.9%	7.8%
Expert Involved	Number of Articles	5	13	17
	% of Articles	0.6%	1.3%	1.0%
Expert NOT Involved	Number of Articles	14	23	37
	% of Articles	1.8%	2.4%	2.1%
Family/Friend	Number of Articles	9	25	34
	% of Articles	1.2%	2.6%	1.9%
Regular Citizen	Number of Articles	28	37	64
	% of Articles	3.6%	3.8%	3.7%
Academic	Number of Articles	18	38	56
	% of Articles	2.4%	3.9%	3.2%
Other	Number of Articles	77	81	158
	% of Articles	10.0%	8.4%	9.2%
Combination	Number of Articles	296	381	678
	% of Articles	38.7%	39.4%	39.1%
No Sources	Number of Articles	191	209	400
	% of Articles	24.9%	21.6%	23.3%
Total	Number of Articles	766	968	1,734
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
Government Official	Number of Articles	239	252	491
	% of Articles	8.6%	9.2%	8.9%
Military Official	Number of Articles	336	323	659
	% of Articles	12.1%	11.8%	12.0%
Expert Involved	Number of Articles	78	30	108
	% of Articles	2.8%	1.1%	2.0%
Expert NOT Involved	Number of Articles	150	131	281
	% of Articles	5.4%	4.8%	5.1%
Family/Friend	Number of Articles	44	57	102
	% of Articles	1.6%	2.1%	1.9%
Regular Citizen	Number of Articles	22	36	58
	% of Articles	0.8%	1.3%	1.1%
Academic	Number of Articles	39	74	113
	% of Articles	1.4%	2.7%	2.1%
Other	Number of Articles	181	197	378
	% of Articles	6.5%	7.2%	6.9%
Combination	Number of Articles	1,029	1,017	2,046
	% of Articles	37.0%	37.2%	37.1%
No Sources	Number of Articles	662	618	1,280
	% of Articles	23.8%	22.6%	23.2%
Total	Number of Articles	2,780	2,734	5,514
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.20: Sex of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for Southeast Asia (w/out Indonesia)**

		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
Sex of Source		Media Organizations of Gatekeepers		
Male	Number of Articles	561	455	1,016
	% of Articles	49.3%	45.0%	47.2%
Female	Number of Articles	36	52	88
	% of Articles	3.2%	5.1%	4.2%
Combination	Number of Articles	208	230	438
	% of Articles	18.3%	22.7%	20.5%
Unknown	Number of Articles	26	24	50
	% of Articles	2.3%	2.4%	2.4%
No Sources	Number of Articles	306	251	557
	% of Articles	26.9%	24.8%	25.9%
Total	Number of Articles	1,138	1,012	2,150
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
Male	Number of Articles	649	689	1,338
	% of Articles	48.2%	50.3%	49.3%
Female	Number of Articles	82	99	181
	% of Articles	6.1%	7.2%	6.7%
Combination	Number of Articles	348	355	702
	% of Articles	25.8%	25.9%	25.9%
Unknown	Number of Articles	92	36	127
	% of Articles	6.8%	2.6%	4.7%
No Sources	Number of Articles	176	192	426
	% of Articles	13.1%	14.0%	13.6%
Total	Number of Articles	1,347	1,370	2,717
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.21: Sex of Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for East Asia (w/out Korea)**

		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
Sex of Source		Media Organizations of Gatekeeper		
Male	Number of Articles	372	455	414
	% of Articles	48.6%	47.0%	47.8%
Female	Number of Articles	36	51	44
	% of Articles	4.7%	5.3%	5.0%
Combination	Number of Articles	61	82	71
	% of Articles	7.9%	8.5%	8.2%
Unknown	Number of Articles	106	170	138
	% of Articles	13.9%	17.6%	15.8%
No Sources	Number of Articles	191	209	400
	% of Articles	24.9%	21.6%	23.3%
Total	Number of Articles	766	968	1,734
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
Male	Number of Articles	1,368	1,331	1,350
	% of Articles	49.2%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	Number of Articles	145	189	167
	% of Articles	5.2%	6.9%	6.1%
Combination	Number of Articles	286	276	281
	% of Articles	10.3%	10.1%	10.2%
Unknown	Number of Articles	320	320	320
	% of Articles	11.5%	11.7%	11.6%
No Sources	Number of Articles	662	618	1,280
	% of Articles	23.8%	22.6%	23.2%
Total	Number of Articles	2,780	2,734	5,514
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.22: Foreign or Domestic Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for Southeast Asia (w/out Indonesia)**

		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
		Media Organizations of Gatekeeper		
All Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	158	144	151
	% of Articles	13.9%	14.2%	14.1%
All Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	355	308	331
	% of Articles	31.2%	30.4%	30.8%
Combination, Mainly Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	130	129	129
	% of Articles	11.4%	12.7%	12.1%
Combination, Mainly Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	117	116	117
	% of Articles	10.3%	11.5%	10.9%
Equal Number Foreign and Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	58	55	56
	% of Articles	5.1%	5.4%	5.3%
Unknown	Number of Articles	14	10	12
	% of Articles	1.2%	1.0%	1.1%
No Sources	Number of Articles	306	251	557
	% of Articles	26.9%	24.8%	25.9%
Total	Number of Articles	1,138	1,012	2,150
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
All Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	172	211	192
	% of Articles	12.8%	13.1%	13.0%
All Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	453	448	450
	% of Articles	33.6%	32.7%	33.2%
Combination, Mainly Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	202	230	216
	% of Articles	15.0%	16.8%	15.9%
Combination, Mainly Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	247	211	229
	% of Articles	18.3%	15.4%	16.9%
Equal Number Foreign and Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	86	92	89
	% of Articles	6.4%	6.7%	6.6%
Unknown	Number of Articles	11	18	14
	% of Articles	0.8%	1.3%	1.1%
No Sources	Number of Articles	176	192	426
	% of Articles	13.1%	14.0%	13.6%
Total	Number of Articles	1,347	1,370	2,717
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.23: Foreign or Domestic Sources in Gatekeeper and Control Media Organizations for East Asia Region (w/out Korea)**

		Before Trip	After Trip	Total
		Media Organizations of Gatekeeper		
All Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	91	138	115
	% of Articles	11.9%	14.3%	13.1%
All Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	239	318	278
	% of Articles	31.2%	32.8%	32.0%
Combination, Mainly Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	85	107	96
	% of Articles	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%
Combination, Mainly Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	92	127	109
	% of Articles	12.0%	13.1%	12.6%
Equal Number Foreign and Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	47	57	52
	% of Articles	6.1%	5.9%	6.0%
Unknown	Number of Articles	21	12	17
	% of Articles	2.8%	1.2%	2.0%
No Sources	Number of Articles	191	209	400
	% of Articles	24.9%	21.6%	23.3%
Total	Number of Articles	766	968	1,734
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Control Media Organizations		
All Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	284	298	291
	% of Articles	10.2%	10.9%	10.6%
All Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	862	853	857
	% of Articles	31.0%	31.2%	31.1%
Combination, Mainly Foreign Sources	Number of Articles	395	385	390
	% of Articles	14.2%	14.1%	14.2%
Combination, Mainly Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	356	364	360
	% of Articles	12.8%	13.3%	13.1%
Equal Number Foreign and Domestic Sources	Number of Articles	172	175	174
	% of Articles	6.2%	6.4%	6.3%
Unknown	Number of Articles	50	41	46
	% of Articles	1.8%	1.5%	1.7%
No Sources	Number of Articles	662	618	1,280
	% of Articles	23.8%	22.6%	23.2%
Total	Number of Articles	2,780	2,734	5,514
	% of Articles	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%