

## US Foreign Policy towards Pakistan, India and Afghanistan (2011-2012): Framing of Pakistani Press

Dr. Mian Ahmad Hanan<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Noshina Saleem<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Professor and Chairman, Department of Mass Communication, Forman Christian College  
(A Chartered University) Lahore, Pakistan

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, In-charge Director, Institute of Communication Studies, University of the Punjab,  
Lahore, Pakistan

Received: April 7, 2014

Accepted: June 8, 2014

---

### ABSTRACT

This study provides a detailed quantitative and qualitative analysis of coverage of Pakistani press regarding US policy towards Pakistan, Afghanistan and India in the context of war against terrorism from January 2011 to December 2012. All unsigned editorials appeared in *The News* and *Dawn* examined by applying content analysis method containing themes related to US policy towards Pakistan such as: Drone attacks and USAID to Pakistan; US policy towards Afghanistan and US policy towards India. The study maintains that both *Dawn* & *The News* were critical to US policy towards Pakistan regarding Drone Attacks but the tone of *The News* was intense in nature. Moreover, the *Dawn* supported US policy to provide USAID to Pakistan, while *The News* was critical to it. On US policy towards India, *The News* supported the US policy to maintain friendly relations with India despite of Kashmir issue. On US policy towards Afghanistan, *The News* framed a negative picture of US while *Dawn* adopted a balance stance. The pattern of coverage supports the argument that the press and foreign policy relationship is issue-specific and it also has linked with media organization's policy. This study also asserts that on foreign policy issues press framing is not necessarily influenced by country's defined foreign policy objectives.

**KEYWORDS:** Drone attacks, Framing, Media, USAID to Pakistan, US policy, War on terror

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The media farming of foreign policy issues always have great importance for political scientists and communication scholars because of changing nature of government-media relations and politico- economic and strategic environment of the country and media's power to get support or opposition for policy issues. Kellner (1995) maintains that media frame [foreign policy] issues within the context of ideology, politics and culture in such a way that cultivate representational picture in the audience mind. Galtung and Ruge (1970) acknowledged media as a powerful tool of "image former" (p. 260). The media images are based upon the frames that may be positive, neutral or negative in their tones. According to Berenger (2004), "frames make messages memorable and understandable" (cited in King & Lester, 2005, p. 626). Neuman et al. (1992) labeled frames as 'conceptual tools' used to convey, interpret, and evaluate information (p. 60).

Norris (1995) argues news frames as cognitive schemata, and journalists usually work with news frames to simplify, prioritize and structure the narrative flow of events. Therefore, media has power to shape the mind set of people and has ability to frame the issue/event in the perspective of newspaper organization. The basic objective of this study is to investigate how US foreign policy towards Pakistan, Afghanistan and India was framed in the editorials of the leading English newspapers of Pakistan; the *Dawn* and *The News*. This study also explores how the *Dawn* and *The News* converged or diverged in their in their editorial framing of US policy and to what extent coverage trends reflects newspaper organization policy/ideology. Moreover, this study examines the issue-specific nature of foreign policy coverage of Pakistani press despite of high level of foreign policy interest involved regarding war on terror.

The period of study has significant importance with reference to US policy towards Pakistan because of the following reasons: (1) Assassination of Osama bin Laden in a US military operation on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2011 carried out in Pakistan that created strong anti-American sentiments among the people of Pakistan who considered this military operation as a breach of their country's sovereignty. (2) US Drone attacks in northwest region of the Pakistan. (3) US pressure to launch a military operation in North Waziristan against terrorists' networks. (4) Public and political pressure on Pakistan government to stop NATO supplies through Pakistan and (5) USAID to Pakistan and its link with Pakistan's support in the war on terror. In addition, the importance of US policy towards Afghanistan has increased after the President Barack Obama statement regarding the withdrawal of NATO troops from Afghanistan in 2014. He stated:

[We've] begun a transition to Afghan responsibility for security. Already, nearly half of the Afghan people live in places where Afghan security forces are moving into the lead. This month, at a NATO

Summit in Chicago, our coalition will set a goal for Afghan forces to be in the lead for combat operations across the country next year. International troops will continue to train, advise and assist the Afghans, and fight alongside them when needed. But we will shift into a support role as Afghans step forward (“Remarks by President Obama,” 1, May 2012, The White House).

Therefore, changed geo-strategic situation of the region has enhanced the importance of this study.

## 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The “Shoemaker & Reese (1996) “Hierarchical Model of influence on media contents” Herman & Chomsky (1988) “The Propaganda Model” and “Framing” provide theoretical basis for this study. Shoemaker & Reese (1996) hierarchical model presents five levels of influence that shape media contents according to media organizational viewpoint including (1) individual influence (2) daily work routines within the newsrooms (3) organizational influences, (4) extra-media influences & (5) Ideology (p. 65). In addition, Herman & Chomsky (1988) “Propaganda Model” maintained that the American media usually proclaim their independence from government and other institutions such as advertisers and, but in reality, it functions virtually as an extension of state propaganda. Their model present five filters that plays significant role in shaping media contents including: (I) owner influence; (2) advertisers’ influence; (3) the reliance of the media on government sources; (4) “flak” as a means of disciplining the media; and (5) “anticommunism” as a national religion and control mechanism (p. iii). Moreover, they also maintained that U.S. media marginalizes of opposition’s point of view and supports dominant perspective (ix).

The “Frame analysis” theory is presented by Goffman (1974) that offer a systematic account of how we use expectations to make sense of everyday life situations and the people in them (Baran& Davis, 2003, p. 274). Social experience is organized by frames, which he defines as principles of organization, which govern the subjective meanings we assign to social events (Goffman, 1974, p. 11). Entman maintains that ‘Framing essentially involves selection and salience. To frame is to select some aspects of perceived reality and make them more salient in communication text in such a way to promote certain problem definition, casual interpretation, moral evaluation and/or treatment recommendation for the item described’ (Entman, 1993). According Gitlin (1980) framing is “persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation of selection, emphasis, and exclusion, by which symbol-handlers routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or visual”. Herman and Chomsky (2000) definition says, media frames have the power of making the picture of any incident extra ordinary and ordinary as well. Entman (1997) also draws another definition which says “a frame operates to select and highlight some features of reality and obscures others in a way that tells consistent story about problem their causes, moral, implications and remedies”. Saleem (2007) maintain that media frames are devices that reveal the “tone,” “stance” or “direction” of media coverage of a particular event or issue. Frames have power to shape public mind according to media’s perspective. In addition, Vliegenthart & Schroder (2010) argue that national interests of any country, political context, political ideology or inclination of media content producers and level of conflict in any country can create on major variation the way any event and issue happens and the way it is presented in front of public (Vliegenthart & Schroder, 2010). Nelson, Clawson & Oxley stated that framing is method through which media content producers i.e. news organizations etc formulate and construct “political issue or public controversy” (Nelson, Clawson, & Oxley, 1997). Tankard et al. (1991) defines that “A frame is a central organizing idea for news content that supplies a context and suggests what the issue is through the use of selection, emphasis, exclusion, and elaboration”(p. 11).

Reese (2001) explains that framing is based on the patterns on which different “interest, communicator, sources and culture” fuse to give a persistent cognition of event and issues through all verbal and nonverbal available means. He says “Frames are *organizing principles* that are socially *shared* and *persistent* over time, that work *symbolically* to meaningfully *structure* the social world.” (1) Organizing: media messages are organized cognitively and on bases of culture by framing. (2) Principles: frames works as principles of organizing all information related to any particular event so that it can leave coherent impact on audience. (3) Shared: “The frame must be shared on some level for it to be significant and communicable.” (4) Persistent: frames are long lasting and used by producer over a period of time for a particular issue. (5) Symbolically: frames work symbolically in different media text. (6) Structure: frames have the power to construct reality. They structure the reality in consumers mind about any event or issue (Reese, 2001).

To sum up, framing is giving an angle to news which gives specific meaning to its consumers about particular issue. Therefore media frames have power to construct a picture in heads of the audience according to media’s organizational viewpoint.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

This study is based on content analysis of editorials appeared in the *Dawn* and *The News* from January 2011 to December 2012 with reference to war on terror. According to Berelson (1952) ‘content analysis is a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication’. Krippendorff (1980) maintains that “content analysis as a research technique for making

replicable and valid inferences from data to their context”. Sample taken for this study was included all unsigned editorials discussing US policy towards Pakistan: (1) Drone attacks, (2) USAID to Pakistan, US policy towards Afghanistan and US policy towards India. A list of frames was constructed on the bases of editorials contents to measure the stance/direction/orientation of data with five point scale including: 1. Highly positive, 2. Positive, 3. Neutral, 4. Negative, 5. Highly negative (see Figure 1).

The *Dawn* & *The News* were selected for this study because both newspapers have large circulation and credibility among readers. The *Dawn* is considered as influential newspapers due to its vast readership and editorial commentary on local and international issues. The *Dawn* is one of oldest English newspaper of the country founded by Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah in 1940. *Dawn* is enjoyed good reputation among its readers because of its balanced editorial policy. On the other hand, *The News* was founded by Mir Khalil-ur-Rahman in 1947 It is publication of Jang group of newspapers. It targets the educated segment of society. It is well-known because of its radical approach towards local and international issues.

The rationale behind taking time period from January 2011 to December 2012 was that the US-Pakistan relations had undergone several up and downs including assassination of Osama Bin Laden, Drone attack, NATO attacks on Salala check post, blocking NATO supplies, American pressure for North Waziristan operation etc. Similarly as US is approaching towards ending war in Afghanistan this study look in to how US is designing its exit strategies from the region and involving regional player i.e. India in reconciliation process. This study is looking how Pakistani print media framed US policy towards South Asian region after these incidents with reference to war against terrorism.

**Figure 1. List of Frames**

<p><b>Highly Positive</b> ‘American drones have once again proved their efficacy in taking out dangerous militants’ (Drone attacks, 2011), ‘America is increasingly the focus of public resentment, especially given the increase in drone attacks, and not much has been done to get the nation to collectively confront the reality that something is rotten in the state of Pakistan itself’ (Still at war, 2012), ‘Drones reach areas the army cannot and cause fewer casualties than traditional air strikes’ (Going forward, 2012), and ‘By giving aid all the Americans seek in return is that we lend an ear to the sound advice they are keen to offer us’ (As American see us, 2011).</p>	<p>‘The US is also pushing for an improvement in Pak-India relations’ (Beyond the summit, 2011)</p>	<p>(Punishment model, 2011). ‘serious question marks over American claims that the foreign forces have checked the momentum of the Taliban and produced a fragile recovery in parts of Afghanistan’ (Flawed US strategy, 2011), ‘the entire programme is riddled with doubts and uncertainties’ (Training for trouble, 2012), ‘anxiety of all stakeholders in a post-US set-up’ (Afghan misery, 2011), ‘US Senate report notes “any perceived reduction in water flows magnifies this distrust, whether caused by India’s activities in the Indus Basin or climate change” (Dangerous waters, 2011)</p>
<p><b>Positive</b> ‘security establishment has acknowledged the efficacy and desirability of drone strikes’ (The denial syndrome, 2011), ‘the Pentagon and the White House clearly shows an acknowledgment of the error on the part of the US military and a sense of regret’ (Time to move on, 2012) and ‘US is actively trying to defuse tensions after last month’s NATO strike’ (US overtures, 2011).</p>	<p><b>Neutral</b></p>	<p><b>Highly Negative</b></p>
<p>‘the Americans want some concrete steps taken by the Pakistani administration to demonstrate its commitment to economic reform’ (Fiscal emergency, 2011), ‘In the current circumstances, US aid is one of the programmes keeping it going’ (American aid, 2011), and ‘US wouldn’t dream of cutting assistance to Pakistan’ (No room for complacency, 2011). ‘a sign of a rekindling of civilisation amidst the ruins’ (Afghan heritage, 2011), ‘US to get some kind of peace process going’ (Karzai’s offensive, 2011). ‘US is encouraged by dialogue between India and Pakistan’ (Pakistan, India &amp; Clinton, 2011),</p>	<p>‘Pakistan is believed to be demanding a scaling back of the drone-strike programme in Fata’ (Fresh tentions, 2011), ‘release of coalition support fund payments by the US’ (Not a long-term solution, 2012), ‘US has promised to resume disbursement of suspended Coalition Support Funds of \$1.2bn’ (Moody’s downgrade, 2012), ‘Pakistan and the US had reached some degree of agreement about their respective roles in the process and that plans were finally going to be put into action’ (Regional solution, 2011), ‘US/NATO plan to hand over Afghan security to these forces by the end of 2014’ (Afghan security forces, 2011), ‘Washington signed a comprehensive civil nuclear deal with New Delhi some years ago’ (Nuclear needs, 2012).</p>	<p>‘addictive tool for the Americans’ (Possible compromise?, 2011), ‘drone attack barely 24 hours after he had been whisked away would have been insulting enough’ (Insult to injury, 2011), ‘Americans will certainly parade the incident as a powerful incentive to continue with the much hated strategy of drone strikes’ (Drones stalemate, 2012), ‘Pakistan’s retaliation and anger at US stupidity and arrogance is also justifiable’ (The fallout, 2011), ‘the natural sense of rage that would run through the heart of any father when he sees his child torn to pieces by a US plane’ (Death by drone, 2012), ‘Most importantly, the US needs to understand that that it cannot bully Pakistan’ (The plot thickens, 2011) and ‘To make matters worse, beyond the promise of American aid, we have heard only a few small coins jangle into the outstretched bowl’ (Seeking help, 2011). ‘Unwarranted US aggression will only lead to more anti-American sentiment in the region’ (Desecration of the dead, 2012), ‘The biggest failure of Mr Obama’s counter- insurgency strategy in Afghanistan isn’t that his military has failed to defeat the Taliban’ (UN sanctions list, 2011).</p>
	<p><b>Negative</b> ‘intense anger’ (New drone policy?, 2011), ‘Pentagon has been restraining the White House from offering a formal apology from President Obama’ (Military positions, 2011), ‘led to Uncle Sam being unceremoniously bundled out of the airbase’ (Shamsi and Obama, 2011), ‘Pakistan animosity towards Americans has grown’ (US and mistrust, 2012), ‘both locked in a serious conflict which has been worsened by the arrogance exhibited by the US’ (Need for clarity, 2011). ‘pressuring and punishing each other publicly’ (Military aid cut, 2011), ‘add to tensions is the Secretary of State’s public disapproval and the Congressional aid cut’ (Regional relationships, 2012), ‘US, the idea of putting conditions on future aid is premised on trying to punish Pakistan for a range of measures it has taken’</p>	

**Table 1. Total Coverage: US Foreign Policy towards Pakistan, Afghanistan and India**

Policy Posture	Policy Issues	Newspapers			
			<i>Dawn</i>	<i>The News</i>	Total
US Policy towards Pakistan	Drone attacks	No.	48	60	108
		% Within Newspaper	36.64%	52.17%	43.90%
		% Cross Newspaper	44.44%	55.56%	100%
US Policy towards Pakistan	US AID to Pakistan	No.	23	22	45
		% Within Newspaper	17.55%	19.13%	18.29%
		% Cross Newspaper	51.12%	48.88%	100%
US Policy towards Afghanistan		No.	54	27	81
		% Within Newspaper	41.22%	23.47%	32.92%
		% Cross Newspaper	66.66%	33.34%	100%
US Policy towards India		No.	6	6	12
		% Within Newspaper	4.58%	5.21%	4.89%
		% Cross Newspaper	50%	50%	100%
Grand Total		No.	131	115	246
		% Within Newspaper	100%	100%	100%
		% Cross Newspaper	52.02%	47.98%	100%

**Table 2. U.S. Policy towards Pakistan**

Policy Issue A- Drone Attacks							
Newspapers		Highly Negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Highly Positive	Total
<i>Dawn</i>	Count	3	33	4	6	2	48
	%	6.3%	68.8%	8.3%	12.5%	4.2%	100%
<i>The News</i>	Count	12	43	4	0	1	60
	%	20%	71.7%	6.7%		1.7%	100%
Total	Count	15	76	8	6	3	108
	%	13.9%	70.4%	7.3%	5.6%	2.8%	100%
Chi square = 11.862				p-value = 0.018**			
Policy Issue B- USAID to Pakistan							
<i>Dawn</i>	Count	2	5	6	9	1	23
	%	8.6%	21.7%	26.1%	39.1%	4.3%	100%
<i>The News</i>	Count	2	14	4	2	0	22
	%	9.09%	63.63%	18.18%	9.09%		100%
Total	Count	4	19	10	11	1	45
	%	8.9%	42.2%	22.2%	24.4%	2.2%	100%
Chi square = 10.100				p-value = 0.039**			

**Table 3. US policy towards Afghanistan**

Newspapers		Highly Negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Highly Positive	Total
<i>Dawn</i>	Count	6	18	26	3	1	54
	%	11.1%	33.3%	48.1%	5.6%	1.9%	100%
<i>The News</i>	Count	2	17	5	3	0	27
	%	7.4%	63.0%	18.5%	11.1%		100%
Total	Count	8	35	31	6	1	81
	%	9.9%	43.2%	38.3%	7.4%	1.2%	100%
Chi square = 9.286				p-value = 0.054***			

**Table 4. US policy towards India**

Newspapers		Highly Negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Highly Positive	Total
<i>Dawn</i>	count	0	3	2	1	0	6
	%		50%	33.3%	16.7%		100%
<i>The News</i>	count	0	1	0	5	0	6
	%		16.7%	.0%	83.3%		100%
Total	count	0	4	2	6	0	12
	%		33.3%	16.7%	50%		100%
Chi square = 5.667				p-value = 0.059***			

**Table5.Overall US Foreign Policy: Statistical Analysis**

Policy Issues	News Paper	No. of Articles	Standard deviations	Leven's test of equality of var	p-value	Means	ANOVA	
							F - Ratio	p-value
<b>U.S. Policy towards Pakistan</b>								
(1) -Drone attacks	<i>Dawn</i>	48	.93943	10.555	.002*	2.3958	F(1,107)=9.824	.002*
	<i>The News</i>	60	.64550			1.9167		
(2) -US AID to Pakistan	<i>Dawn</i>	23	1.08347	3.407	.072***	3.0870	F(1,44)=8.394	.006*
	<i>The News</i>	22	.76730			2.2727		
<b>U.S. Policy towards Afghanistan</b>								
	<i>Dawn</i>	54	.84033	.576	.450	2.5370	F(1,80)=1.104	.296
	<i>The News</i>	27	.78446			2.3333		
<b>U.S. Policy towards India</b>								
	<i>Dawn</i>	6	.81650	.172	.687	2.6667	F(1,11)=4.500	.060***
	<i>The News</i>	6	.81650			3.6667		

\*sig at 1%, \*\*sig at 5%, \*\*\*sig at 10%

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Hypotheses**

**H1: The News will be more critical to US policy regarding Drone attacks in Pakistan compare to Dawn.**

Table 2 indicates that both the *Dawn* & *The News* were critical to US policy regarding Drone attacks in Pakistan. Out of 48 (100%) editorials, 33 (68.8%) editorials published in the *Dawn* framed US policy as negative. Similarly, *The News* coverage was also critical with 43 (71.7%) editorials out of 60 regarding Policy Issue 1-Drone attacks. Chi-square analysis also reveals that data is statistically significant  $X^2=11.862$ ,  $P=0.018$ . Similarly, ANOVA test analysis (Table 5) also confirms that results are statistically significant  $F(1,107)=9.824$ ,  $P=.002$ . In addition, Table 1 reveals that 12 (20%) editorials appeared in *The News* were highly critical to US policy regarding Drone attacks compare to 3 (6.3%) editorials published in the *Dawn*. For instance, *The News* stated that ‘the natural sense of rage that would run through the heart of any father when he sees his child torn to pieces by a US plane’ (Death by drone, 2012). The qualitative and quantitative results confirm this hypothesis.

**H2: The Dawn will give more favorable coverage to US policy of providing USAID to Pakistan than The News.**

Table 2 reveals that out of 23, 9 (39.1%) editorials published in the *Dawn* supported US policy of providing UDAID to Pakistan. In an editorial the *Dawn* maintained, ‘In the current circumstances, US aid is one of the programs keeping it going’ (American aid , 2011) because it helped Pakistan for sustaining its efforts against war on terror. On the contrary, *The News* gave more negative coverage to US policy on this issue. For instance, Out of 22,14 (63.6%) editorials framed US Policy regarding Policy Issue 2-USAID to Pakistan as negative. The editorial commentary reveals that the dependence upon USAID to Pakistan would increase US pressure on Pakistan regarding war on terror. Overall coverage trend was statistically significant as  $X^2=10.100$ ,  $P=0.039$ . Similarly, Table 5 also confirms the statistical significant of data as  $F(1,44)=8.394$ ,  $P=.006$ . Findings support this hypothesis.

**H3: Dawn will give more neutral coverage to US policy towards Afghanistan than The News.**

The *Dawn* was more neutral in its coverage regarding US policy towards Afghanistan in comparison with *The News* (see Table 3). Out of 54, 26 (48.1%) editorials were having neutral stance on US policy towards Afghanistan while *The News* was critical in its editorial commentary. For example, out of 27 editorials, 17 (63%) editorials portrayed US policy towards Afghanistan in a negative context. *The News* labeled the US policy towards Afghanistan as a ‘failure of strategy’ (Get real, 2011). In addition statistical results also confirms the hypothesis ( $X^2=9.286$ ,  $P=0.054$ ).

**H4: The News will give more positive coverage to US policy towards India than the Dawn.**

Table 4 shows that *The News* gave more positive coverage to US policy towards India compare to the *Dawn* which was more critical in tone. Out of 6, 5 (83.3%) editorials published in *The News* were supportive to US policy towards India. For example *The News* states that ‘‘The US is also pushing for an improvement in Pak-India relations’(Beyond the summit, 2011). On the other hand, *Dawn* framed US policy towards India more negatively. For example, out of 6,3 (50%) editorials gave negative coverage. It also found that coverage pattern is statistically significant  $X^2=5.667$ ,  $P=0.059$ . The results certifies this hypothesis.

## Research Questions

### **RQ1: Which newspaper- *the Dawn* and *The News*- gave more attention to US policy regarding Drone attacks?**

Table 1 indicates that both newspapers the *Dawn* & *The News* gave maximum coverage to Policy Issue 1- Drone attacks compare to the Policy Issue 2- USAID to Pakistan. While comparing the *Dawn* and *The News*, later gave more coverage to this issue. Out of 108, 60 (55.56%) editorials appeared in *The News* compare to the *Dawn* which published 48 (44.44%) on this topic. In addition the coverage pattern of both newspapers is statistically significant  $X^2=14.282$ ,  $P=0.006$  (Table 2). Likewise, ANOVA analysis also confirms that coverage trends are statistically significant  $F(1, 60)=13.452$ ,  $P=.001$  (Table 5).

### **RQ2: Which Policy Issue- Drone attacks and UDAID to Pakistan- was gained more negative attention regarding US policy towards Pakistan?**

Both the *Dawn* & *The News* framed US policy regarding Drone attacks in negative context. Table 2 reveals that out of 108, 76 (70.4%) editorials framed US policy on Drone attacks in a negative context. Similarly, majority coverage of both newspapers were negative (19, 42.2%) on Policy Issue 2-USAID to Pakistan. Overall, Policy Issue 1-Drone attacks gained more negative attention.

### **RQ3: Which newspaper has been more neutral to US policy towards Afghanistan?**

Table 3 reveals that the *Dawn* coverage was neutral compare to *The News* that was critical in its stance. Out of 54, 26 (48.1%) editorials were having neutral stance on US policy towards Afghanistan. While, 17(63%) editorials regarding US policy towards Afghanistan appeared in *The News* were negative in tone. To sum up, both newspapers reflected diverged pattern of coverage in their editorials.

### **RQ4: How far the coverage pattern of the *Dawn* and *The News* were converged or diverged regarding US policy towards India?**

Both newspapers gave similar amount of coverage to US policy towards India (Table 4). As far as coverage trends are concerned, the *Dawn* was critical (3, 50%) while *The News* framed highly favorable coverage to US policy towards India. This positive coverage (5, 83.3%) by *The News* was may be the result of newspaper organizations initiative to maintain peace with India under the title *Amanki Aysa* (Desire for Peace).

### **RQ5: Which newspaper- the *Dawn* or *The News*- gave more attention to the US policy towards Pakistan, Afghanistan and India?**

Table 1 indicates that the *Dawn* gave more coverage to US foreign policy compare to *The News*. For instance, out of 246, 131 (52.2%) editorials were appeared in the *Dawn*. Historically, the *Dawn* is the only Pakistani Newspaper that usually focuses more on foreign policy issues compare to other dailies.

### **RQ6: What were the similarities or dissimilarities in the coverage trends of the *Dawn* and *The News* regarding US policy towards Pakistan, Afghanistan and India?**

Table 2 indicates that both the *Dawn* and *The News* showed similar trend of coverage regarding Policy Issue 1- Drone attacks. Majority of editorials appeared in both newspapers had critical tone on this Policy Issue because of the following reasons. (1) Both newspapers considered Drone attacks in Pakistan as violation of international law and a threat to Pakistani sovereignty. (2) Killing of civilian population as the result of drone attacks. On the other hand, on Policy Issue 2-USAID to Pakistan, the *Dawn* gave positive coverage while *The News* was critical in tone. On US policy towards Afghanistan, the *Dawn* was neutral in its coverage while majority editorials appeared in *The News* were negative in tone. On US policy towards India, the *Dawn* gave negative coverage while *The News* was positive in tone.

## 7. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the coverage pattern of the *Dawn* and *The News* regarding US foreign policy towards Pakistan, Afghanistan and India is dependent upon the changing dimensions of US-Pakistan relations, regional and global political and strategic dynamics. In addition, the convergence or divergence of the coverage trends of the *Dawn* and *The News* is largely based upon their organizational policy/ideology.

The *Dawn* & *The News* both were critical to US policy regarding Drone attacks in Pakistan. Whereas, on US AIDS to Pakistan the *Dawn* gave positive coverage while, *The News* was critical in tone. On US policy towards Afghanistan, the *Dawn* adopted a neutral stance while *The News* was critical in tone. *The News* was supportive to US policy while the *Dawn* criticized it. In addition, Pakistani newspapers gave more coverage to US policy towards Pakistan compare to US policy towards Afghanistan and India. This study also reveals that the Pakistani press gave maximum coverage to Drone attacks in Pakistan.

## REFERENCES

- Afghan heritage. (2011).*Dawn*.
- Afghan misery. (2011).*Dawn*.
- Afghan security forces. (2011).*Dawn*.
- American aid.(2011).*Dawn*.
- As American see us. (2011).*Dawn*.
- Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2003).*Mass communication theory: Foundation ferment, and future*(3rd ed.). Canada: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Berelson, B.(1952). *Content analysis in communication research* : New York, Free Press.
- Beyond the summit. (2011).*The News*.
- Dangerous waters. (2011).*The News*.
- Death by drone. (2012),*The News*.
- Desecration of the dead. (2012).*Dawn*.
- Drone attacks. (2011).*Dawn*.
- Drones stalemate. (2012).*The News*.
- Fiscal emergency. (2011).*Dawn*.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing towards clarification of fractured paradigm.*Journal of Communication*, 52.
- Entman, R.M. (1997). Manufacturing discord: Media in the affirmative action debate. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 2(4),32-51.
- Flawed US strategy. (2011).*Dawn*.
- Fresh tentions. (2011).*Dawn*.
- Galtung, J., & Ruge, M. H. (1970).The structure of foreign news. In J. Tunstall. (Ed.), *Mediasociology: A reader* (258-260). Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974).*Frame analysis*.NY: Harper Colophon.
- Going forward. (2012).*Dawn*.
- Herman,E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1988),*Manufacturing consent: The political economy of mass media*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (2000),*Manufacturing consent: The political economy of mass media* (2nd ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Insult to injury. (2011).*Dawn*.
- Kellner, D. (1995). *Media Culture: Media studies, identities and politics between the modern and postmodern*. London: Routledge.
- King, C.,&Lester, M. P. (2005).Photographic Coverage during Persian Gulf andIraq Wars in Three U.S. Newspapers. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(3),623-637.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*, London: Sage.
- Military aid cut. (2011).*Dawn*.
- Military positions. (2011).*Dawn*.
- Moody's downgrade. (2012).*Dawn*.
- Need for clarity. (2011).*The News*.

- Nelson, T. E., Clawson, R. A., & Oxley, Z. M. (1997). Media framing of civil liberties conflict and its effects on tolerance. *American Political Science Review*, 567.
- Neuman, W. R., Just, M. R., & Crigler, A. A. (1992). *Common knowledge: News and the construction of political meaning*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- No room for complacency. (2011). *The News*.
- New drone policy? (2011). *Dawn*.
- Not a long-term solution. (2012). *Dawn*.
- Norris, P. (1995). The restless search light: Network news framing of the Post-Cold war world. *Political Communication*, 12, 357-470.
- Nuclear needs. (2012). *Dawn*.
- Possible compromise? (2011). *Dawn*.
- Punishment model. (2011). *The News*.
- Reese, S. D. (2001). Prologue-Framing public life: A bridging model for media research. 5.
- Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, D. S. (1996). *Mediating the message: Theories of influence on mass media content* (2nd ed.). White Plains: New York Longman.
- Regional solution. (2011). *Dawn*.
- Remarks by President Obama in Address to the Nation from Afghanistan. (1, May 2012). *The White House*, Retrieved on March 22, 2014 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/05/01/remarks-president-address-nation-afghanistan>
- Saleem, N. (2007, April). U.S. media framing of foreign countries image: An analytical perspective. *Canadian Journal of Media Studies*, 134-135.
- Seeking help. (2011). *The News*.
- Shamsi and Obama. (2011). *The News*.
- Still at war. (2012). *Dawn*.
- The denail syndrome. (2011). *Dawn*.
- The fallout. (2011). *The News*.
- he plot thickens. (2011). *The News*.
- Time to move on. (2012). *Dawn*.
- Training for trouble. (2012). *The News*.
- UN sanctions list. (2011). *Dawn*.
- US and mistrust. (2012). *The News*.
- US overtures. (2011). *Dawn*.
- Vliegenthart, R., & Schroder, H. (2010). Framing the Iraq War A Cross-National comparison of Newspaper framing in Four westren countries, *Journalistica*, 60.