

## **Comparative Frame Analysis of ‘War on Terror’: Content Analysis of USA and Pakistan’s Press**

\* Shazia Hashmat, PhD Scholar (Corresponding Author)

\*\* Dr. Bakht Rawan, Associate Professor

### **Abstract**

*This study explores the role of leading newspapers of both America and Pakistan on the war-on-terror (WoT). The comparative framing analysis of the WoT in the selected newspapers Dawn (Pakistan) and The New York Times (USA) was carried out. Content analysis in which Categorization Scheme was used with predefined categories that were made on the basis of Framing theory. Five different news frames are deduced by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) i.e. attribution of responsibility, human interest, conflict, morality, and economics were looked at in the selected newspapers. The coverage and framing of USA’s press related to the war on terror were dominated by regional foreign politics especially the framing of Pakistan and its role in the war on terror. The mean length of the news stories in The New York Times (USA) was significantly more than Dawn. The New York Times (USA) carried a more negative tone than Dawn (Pakistan). Frames used in Dawn (Pakistan) and The New York Times (USA) did not have a statistically significant difference. The conflict frame was used more than any other frame in the coverage of WoT in both the newspapers. This study revealed that the coverage trend of media reporting on WoT in the press of both Pakistan and USA. Also how frames in the press used are subjective to the internal politics of country in order to receive a sense of legitimacy and support.*

**Keywords:** Framing, War on Terror, Newspapers, Coverage, Conflict.

### **Introduction**

The paper aims to examine what are the frames used in coverage of War on Terror in the USA and Pakistan’s newspapers. Although both the USA and Pakistan are fighting WoT but many times it has been observed that they are not on the same page. Rather sometimes they are blaming one another when some terrorism or counter-terrorism act happens. Hence, this study has been designed to search through content analysis that what kind of accounts are developing on War on Terror in the US and Pakistani press during the past few years and to examine that how much coverage has been given to the WoT by American and Pakistani press. In other words, the study explored the US and Pakistani press agenda through framing on WoT. Gamson (1987) argued that News frames determine what is selected, what is excluded, what is emphasized. Frames used by journalists “assign meaning to and interpret relevant events and conditions” (Snow & Benford, 1988). This research has tried to identify the types of differential frames on the war on terror in the press of USA and Pakistan by examining news on the War on Terror for a period of three years (from the period of 2014 to 2016) in the selected newspapers: Dawn (Pakistan), and New York Times (USA).

Pakistan holds an important strategic position in the region of South Asia. Pakistan ascended as a key protagonist during the cold war period after the Russian invasion of Afghanistan. After the incident of 9/11, for action against Al Qaeda and the Taliban, the US needed Pakistan as a critical partner (Malik, 2008; Fair et al., 2010). The safeguard of long-term interest in the region of the United States requires bilateral, strong, and mutually beneficial relations with Pakistan. (Khan, 2013). For attaining these objectives it is necessary to have corporations at all points such as military, economic and diplomatic levels between Pakistan and the US (Hussain, 2016). Some conflicting interests and goals result in unsuccessful security measures, causes Pakistan and the US to blame each other for the

\* Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad Email: [Shazia\\_hashmat@yahoo.com](mailto:Shazia_hashmat@yahoo.com)

\*\* Department of Mass Communication, FM Radio Building, Allama Iqbal Open University, Sector H-8 Islamabad Email: [drbakhtrawanaio@gmail.com](mailto:drbakhtrawanaio@gmail.com)

failure. Resentment and distrust are mutual between the two countries, thus resulting in a declining relationship. (Fair & Hamza, 2016).

The friction between Pakistan and the US is caused due to the disagreements on the policies regarding operational aspects of how to conduct of the GWOT and this is further adding to the complexity of their relationship (Kapila, 2007). National cohesion, human rights, the state of law and order, strategic and defense concerns, economic prospects, and domestic stability of Pakistan all were greatly affected after terrorist attacks of 9/11 (Riedel, 2008; Nelson, 2009; Ali, 2010; Jawad, 2018). USA has been constantly ignoring apprehensions of Pakistan in War on Terror (WoT). Pakistan has paid dearly from the beginning of this war. Law enforcement personnel at borders, as well as performing their duties in tribal areas as well as settled areas have also been targeted equally by the terrorists (Raja, 2014; Jawad, 2018). Several factors that have contributed have resulted in an overall US-Pakistan "trust deficit." (Akhtar, 2008).

Furthermore, the USA demands constantly from Pakistan of "Do More". As the US is dissatisfied with the efforts of Pakistan related to the elimination of Islamic fundamentalism, extremism, and terrorism and thus US pressurizes Pakistan to do more (Khan, 2013). Unmanned attacks though drones in Pakistan's sovereign territory by US forces, military actions in the Western borders of Pakistan by NATO, and covert military operations by CIA within Pakistan have managed to shape anti-American feelings and distrust of the US in Pakistan (Ahmad et. al, 2017). To gain Pakistan's cooperation with minimum cost to the U.S, pressurizing tactics are used by USA such as military aid and economic assistance granted with conditions, building pressure by demands of doing more by high ranking US officials, and further strategic ties with Pakistan's foes like India (Haqqani, 2013; Khan, 2013).

The current situation of Pakistan in the Global War on Terror and its background history with the US, however, underlines the observation that there is an unequal partnership between the two countries. Also, there is the opinion that Pakistan is only a client state for the US to fulfill its extra-territorial aims (Niaz, 2015). Scholars thought that there should not be a single-sided relationship between Pakistan and the United States rather it should be an inter-reliant association (Soherwordi, 2010; Khan, 2013).

### **Objectives**

- To see the amount of coverage on War on Terror by the press of Pakistan and the USA.
- To examine the framing of War and Terror in the press of Pakistan and the USA.
- To find out that why differences in framing are there when both the countries are fighting WoT and what similarities in framing are there in the selected newspapers.

### **Research Questions and Hypothesis**

RQ1: What is the amount of coverage on the War on Terror in Pakistan and USA's newspapers?

H1: The mean length of a news story in Pakistan's newspapers will be less on WoT than USA's newspapers.

RQ2: Whether the amount of coverage of Pakistan and USA's newspapers on War on Terror in terms of the number of stories differ by topic?

H2: The topic of 'Religion and Terrorism' will be significant in the coverage of the War on Terror.

RQ3: Whether differential tones can be seen in the coverage of Pakistan and USA's newspapers on War on Terror?

H3a: The use of unfavorable tones in coverage of the war on terror will be more than the use of favorable or neutral tones in both the newspapers.

H3b: The tones in the USA newspaper will be more negative than Pakistan's newspaper.

RQ4: What is the extent of different frames used in coverage by Pakistan and USA's newspapers on War on Terror?

H4a: The coverage by Pakistan and USA's newspapers on War on Terror will have a statistically significant difference.

H4b: Conflict frame is used more often in coverage on War on Terror than any other frame.

### **Literature Review**

Encoding of communication message with such denotation so that an interpretation correlating with prevailing ideas and beliefs can emerge is called framing. The postulation on which framing is based that media contents can affect how audiences understand an issue. Framing has its roots in the subjects of sociology and psychology (Pan and Kosicki, 1993). How information is given to the

audience is framing. Goffman (1974) defined framing as “schemata of interpretation” that enables the individual to ‘locate, perceive, identify and label’ occurrences.

Tuchman (1978) and Gitlin (1980) were the pioneers in recognizing the application of the framing concept manifesting in communication especially in the process of news production. “Frames turn non-recognizable happenings or amorphous talk into a discernible event. Without the frame, they would be mere happenings of mere talk’ (Tuchman, 1978 p. 192). Gitlin on the other hand, described frames as ‘persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation, of selection, emphasis, and exclusion, by which symbol handlers routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or visual’ (1980, p.7).

In political communication and mass communication, the literature on framing points out that a key role is played by mass media to effects view of the public when it covers not only the issues of the day (McCombs, Shaw, & Weaver, 1997; Wanta, 1997), but how mass media covers (i.e., frames) these issues (e.g., Dimitrova, Kaid, Williams, & Trammell, 2005; Entman, 1991, 1993; Gitlin, 1980; Iyengar, 1991; Luther & Miller, 2005; Rhee, 1997; Shoemaker & Reese, 1996).

In the context of the terrorist attack, a framework was provided by President George W. Bush on September 20, 2001. Bush labeled it ‘War on Terror.’ A contextual theme was created through this framework so that a sense could be made out of the chaotic situation and loss of sense of security by the American public. The news media also generated the narrative of America versus terrorism. This framework was used for the interpretation of events even by the foreign news media (Ruigrok & Atteveldt, 2007). The reaction of the journalists to the September 11 incident has been thoroughly researched. Many studies by the researchers focused on the patriotic journalistic response and its resultant influence on the significance of discourse of terrorism on American culture (Carey, 2002; Nacos and Torres-Reyna, 2003; Norris et al., 2003; Zelizer and Allen, 2011). Norris et al., (2003) pointed out that the 9/11 incident marked a “critical culture shift in the predominant news frame used by the American mass media for understanding issues of national security” (, p. 4). The frame of war on terror frame replaced the previously dominant frame of the Cold War, (Kellner, 2004; Ruigrok and van Atteveldt, 2007; Silverstone, 2007). In the narrative on the war on terror, a well-documented inherent dichotomy of “us” versus “them” emerged (Norris et al., 2003; Pintak, 2006; Silverstone, 2007).

### **Methods and Results**

This research study looked at the coverage of two leading newspapers from Pakistan and the United States of America which were Dawn (Pakistan) and The New York Times (USA). The period of the study was 3 years i.e. from 2014 - 2016. All news and editorials related to the War on Terror during the selected period of the study was the population of the study. The proportional sampling technique was applied to have equal representative samples from each newspaper. After proportionate allocation systematic random sampling is used to select from the large sample. News and editorials were the units of analysis in the study. The sample size from each newspaper is accordingly proportionate to the total number stories published in the selected period of the study i.e. if a hundred news stories and editorials are analyzed in one newspaper from the total number of news stories and editorials then a hundred stories from each newspaper is the sample size. A total of 731 news and editorials were published by daily Dawn (Pakistan) and 568 news stories and editorials were carried out by The New York Times (USA) during the selected period. From 731 (Dawn) and 568 (The New York Times) news stories and editorials 100 each were selected from both newspapers through systematic random sampling. So the first step in sampling was the application of the Proportional sampling technique on total news and editorials of daily Dawn (Pakistan) and The New York Times (USA) to decide ‘how many’ will be analyzed through content analysis. The second step was the application of systematic random sampling to choose ‘which’ 100 news and editorials from the proportionally decided sample will be analyzed.

Research tool involved in this research is the Categorization scheme and coding sheet. The researcher made three major parts of the Categorization scheme (research tool) of the present study. They are Variables, Categories, and Rules. The variables in the following study were; Newspapers (Categories: Dawn (Pakistan) and New York Times (USA)), Type of Story (Categories: News, Editorial), Length of the Story (Categories: To be measured in the ratio), Year of Publication (Categories: the period of 2014 – 2016), Evaluative Tones (Favourable to War on Terror, Unfavourable to War on Terror, Neutral to War on Terror), Topics (Categories: Events of Terrorism,

Religion, and Terrorism, Counter-Terrorism, Statements/Visits of the leaders regarding the Issue and Policy Response to War on Terror, Unofficial Reaction.), Frames (Categories: attribution of responsibility frame, conflict frame, human interest frame, economic frame, and morality frame). This categorization scheme is adopted from Semetko & Valkenburg (2000). The rules defined the categories with either number assigned or indicators of the categories. These two newspapers from these countries were selected because of their high circulation.

**Amount of Coverage on War on Terror in the Pakistan and USA’s Newspapers**

Table 1 shows the sample of 200 news reports/coverages where length is defined in word from 1 to 2500. Cross tabulation was used with Chi-Square. The comparison has a statistically significant difference between the groups (Chi-Square = 48.729 p < 0.05), which indicates asymmetrical order having significance of 95%.

**Table 1: Length of the Story**

Mean Length	Dawn	New York Times	Total
1- 500 words	45	10	55
501 - 1000 words	46	43	89
1001 - 1500 words	7	38	45
1501 - 2000 words	1	5	6
2001 - 2500 words	1	2	3
More than 2500 words	0	2	2
Mean	1.67	2.52	2.10

The mean length of the news story in Dawn (Pakistan) was 1.67 whereas in The NY Times (USA) it was 2.52. The mean length of the stories in The NY Times (USA) was significantly more than Dawn (Table 1). Thus hypothesis 1 was supported.

The total number of stories from 1- 500 words was 55. Dawn (Pakistan) had 45 and, The NY Times (USA) had 10 news items falling in the range of 1- 500 words. The total number of stories from 501- 1000 words was 89. Dawn (Pakistan) had 46 and, The NY Times (USA) had 43 news items falling in the range of 501- 1000 words. The total number of stories from 1001- 1500 words was 45. Dawn (Pakistan) had 7 and The NY Times (USA) had 38 news items falling in the range of 1001- 1500 words. Dawn (Pakistan) had 1 and The NY Times (USA) had 5 news items falling in the range of 1501- 2000 words. Dawn (Pakistan) had 1 and The NY Times (USA) had 2 news items falling in the range of 2001 - 2500 words. Only NY Times (USA) had 2 stories with more than 2500 words.

**Table 2: Percentage of Topics Covered in Two Newspapers**

Newspapers		Events of Terrorism <sup>1</sup>	Religion and Terrorism <sup>2</sup>	Counter Terrorism <sup>3</sup>	Statements/Visits <sup>4</sup>	Policy Response <sup>5</sup>	Unofficial Reaction <sup>6</sup>
Dawn (Pakistan)	%age	10%	0%	12%	23%	32%	23%
	Mean	.10	.00	.12	.23	.32	.23
	Std. Dev.	.288	.000	.338	.423	.469	.423
	Variance	.083	.000	.114	.179	.220	.179
	%age	8%	2%	14%	10%	31%	35%
New York Times	Mean	.08	.02	.14	.10	.31	.35
	Std. Dev.	.273	.141	.349	.302	.465	.479
	Variance	.074	.020	.122	.091	.216	.230
	%age	9%	1%	13%	16.5%	31.5%	29%
Total	(18)	(2)	(26)	(33)	(63)	(58)	
	Mean	.08	.01	.14	.16	.32	.29
	Std. Dev.	.280	.100	.343	.372	.466	.455
	Variance	.078	.010	.117	.138	.217	.207

\* Values in parenthesis represent the total number of news stories/editorials related to the topic.

\*\*1. Chi square = 137.780; p = .000. 2. Chi square = 192.080; p = .000. 3. Chi square = 106.580; p = .000. 4. Chi square = 89.780; p = .000. 5 Chi square = 27.380; p = .000. 6 Chi square = 35.280; p = .000.

None of the news stories were related to the topic of ‘Religion and Terrorism’ in Dawn (Pakistan) but in The NY Times (USA), there were two stories that were related to the topic of ‘Religion and Terrorism’ (Table 2). This difference is not significant, therefore, *H2* is rejected.

Table 2 shows the sample of 200 news reports/coverages where 100 news stories/ editorials were taken from each of the two newspapers. There were 18 (9 percent) news stories related to the topic of ‘Event of Terrorism’. 10 of the news stories in Dawn and 8 of the news stories in The New York Times were related to the topic of ‘Event of Terrorism’. None of the news stories in Dawn were related to the topic of ‘Religion and Terrorism’ but The New York Times had 2 news stories related to the topic of ‘Religion and Terrorism’. There were 26 (13 percent) news stories related to the topic of ‘Counter-Terrorism’. 12 of the news stories in Dawn and 14 of the news stories in The New York Times were related to the topic of ‘Counter-Terrorism’. There were 33 (16.5 percent) news stories related to the topic of ‘Statements / Visits of the Leaders’. 23 of the news stories in Dawn and 10 of the news stories in The New York Times were related to the topic of ‘Statements / Visits of the Leaders’. There were 63 (31.5 percent) news stories related to the topic of ‘Policy Response’. 32 of the news stories in Dawn and 31 of the news stories in The New York Times were related to the topic of ‘Policy Response’. 58 (29 percent) news stories related to the topic of ‘Unofficial Reaction’. 23 percent of the news stories in Dawn and 35 percent of the news stories in The New York Times were related to the topic of ‘Unofficial Reaction’.

**Differential Evaluative Tones on WoT in the Pakistan and USA’s Newspapers**

Evaluative tones of news frames in the two newspapers were coded as: Favourable to War on Terror (negative tone), Unfavourable to War on Terror (positive tone), and Neutral to War on Terror. The presence or absence of an evaluative tone was marked with “Yes” or “No”. If evaluative tone was present then it was marked ‘Yes’ and if it was absent then ‘No’. “Yes” or “No” were assigned consecutive numbers i.e. Yes = 1 and No = 0.

**Table 3: Evaluative Tones by Topic in Selected Newspapers**

Topics	Newspapers	Evaluative Tone			Total
		Favorable	Unfavorable	Neutral	
Events of Terrorism	Dawn	0	5	4	9
	NY Times	1	4	3	8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>17 (8.5%)</b>
Religion and Terrorism	Dawn	0	0	0	0
	NY Times	0	1	1	2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2 (1%)</b>
Counter-Terrorism	Dawn	1	2	10	13
	New York Times	0	8	6	14
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>27 (13.5%)</b>
Statements/Visits of the Leaders Regarding the Issue	Dawn	2	7	14	23
	NY Times	0	7	3	10
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>33 (16.5%)</b>
Policy Response to War on Terror	Dawn	2	11	19	32
	New York Times	0	14	17	31
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>63 (31.5%)</b>
Unofficial Reaction to War on Terror	Dawn	2	15	6	23
	NY Times	0	26	9	35
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>58 (29%)</b>
<b>Total</b>	Dawn	7	40	53	100
	NY Times	1	60	39	100
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>200</b>
		(4%)	(50%)	(46%)	

\* Values in parenthesis represent the total percentage of news stories/editorials related to the topic.

Table 3 shows that 8 news stories/ editorials were ‘Favourable’, 100 news stories/ editorials were ‘Unfavourable’, and 92 news stories/ editorials were ‘Neutral’. The total of news stories/editorials with ‘Unfavorable’ tone was 50 percent, which was quite more than ‘Favourable’, and ‘Neutral’ tones (4 percent and 46 percent respectively). But although 60 percent coverage of the war on terror in The New York Times (USA) carried ‘Unfavourable’ tone but 53 percent coverage of

the war on terror in Dawn (Pakistan) had a neutral tone. Thus this hypothesis is rejected as only one newspaper had ‘Unfavourable’ tone dominant in its coverage, not both.

Table 3 indicates that Dawn had 40 (5 + 0 + 2 + 7 + 11 + 15 = 40), and New York Times had 60 (4 + 1 + 8 + 7 + 14 + 26 = 60) news stories/ editorials that carried ‘Unfavourable’ tone. The number of news stories/ editorials that carried ‘Unfavourable’ tone in New York Times (USA) was more than the number of news stories/ editorials that carried ‘Unfavourable’ tone in Dawn (Pakistan). Thus this hypothesis was supported.

**Extent of Different Frames on WoT in the Newspapers of Pakistan and USA**

Percentages/average of percentages all the indicators of the five frames showed that the extent of different frames used in coverage by Pakistan and USA’s newspapers on War on Terror were not very different. Both countries are involved in the war on terror and both countries have press that uses almost similar frames.

**Table 4: Rank Scale and Percentage of Five Frames of War on Terror by the Selected Newspapers**

Frame	Newspaper	Rank Order	Avg. %age	Overall Avg. %age
<b>Attribution of Responsibility Frame</b>	Dawn	101	40.2%	39.8%
	The NY Times	100	39.4%	
<b>Human Interest Frame</b>	Dawn	96	18%	23%
	The NY Times	106	28%	
<b>Conflict Frame</b>	Dawn	101	44.7%	44.4%
	The NY Times	100	44.2%	
<b>Morality Frame</b>	Dawn	99	1.7%	2.8%
	The NY Times	102	4%	
<b>Economic Frame</b>	Dawn	99	14%	15%
	The NY Times	102	16%	

Rank Scale and Percentage of five frames of War were applied (Table. 4). The comparison did not have a significant difference between the groups. So *H4a* was rejected.

39.8 percent, was total average percentage of attribution of responsibility frame covered in all the newspapers, 23 percent, was total average percentage of human interest frame, 44.4 percent was total average percentage of conflict frame, 2.8 percent was total average percentage of morality frame and 15 percent was total average percentage of economic frame. So this hypothesis was supported as the total average percentage of conflict frame was more than the total average percentage of the other frames.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

This research although found significant trends in the framing of war on terror and the localized war on terror framing and discourses among these newspapers but it must be acknowledged that the examination of data regarding framing on the war on terror is time-bound to the period selected for the research. The political environment nationally and internationally in the countries have considerably changed later on.

Statistical tests of research questions related to the coverage on War on Terror in the Pakistan and USA newspapers showed that there were statistically significant differences. There was a significant difference statistically in the amount of coverage of news stories of both the newspapers and the coverage of topics in terms of the number of stories. There was also the presence of differential tones in the coverage of the war on terror in both the newspapers. There was an overall significant difference among the means of the newspapers about the frames used in coverage by Pakistan and USA’s newspapers on War on Terror.

Three Hypothesis were rejected (2, 3a, and 4a) and three hypotheses (1, 3b, and 4b) were supported when different statistical tests were applied. Hypotheses that were rejected showed that the topic of ‘Religion and Terrorism’ was not significant in the coverage of War on Terror. The topic of Religion and Terrorism was used in a few news stories by The New York Times (USA) and none of the news stories/ editorials were related to this topic in Dawn (Pakistan). Although the use of unfavorable tone was more than favorable and neutral tone in coverage of the war on terror in The New York Times (USA) in Dawn (Pakistan), the use of neutral tones was more than an unfavorable tone. Thus it cannot be concluded that both the newspapers carried unfavorable tone on War on terror as Dawn had more neutral stories. The frames used in coverage by Pakistan, and USA’s newspapers

on War on Terror did not have significant statistical difference. Hypotheses that were supported revealed that in Dawn (Pakistan) the mean length of a news story on War on Terror was less than the USA's newspaper. The tones in the USA newspapers were more negative than the news outlets in Pakistan. The conflict frame was used more often in coverage on War on Terror than any other frame by both the newspapers.

The present study shows that the two newspaper's coverage depended upon the degree of that particular country's interest as well as their foreign policy. Theoretical contention of Shoemaker and Reese (1996) that the media content of international events is subjective to the foreign policy of that country is confirmed by the coverage of these two news outlets. Dawn (Pakistan) and The NY Times (USA) both reported more on events related to terrorism and the reaction of government and politicians on it, as both the countries have been continuously major players of war on terror from 2001 onwards. Coverage in The NY Times (USA) was very much influenced by its foreign policy towards other countries, especially Pakistan.

### References

- Ahmad Manzoor, Yousaf Naveeda & Shah Zahir, (2017). Sources and Impact of the Trust Deficit in Pakistan-US Relations. Margalla Papers.
- Akhtar Rizwan, (2008). US-Pakistan Trust Deficit and the War on Terror. Research Gate.
- Ali Arshad, (2010). Socio-Economic Cost of Terrorism: A Case Study of Pakistan. Pakistan Security Research Unit (PSRU). Department of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford, UK.
- Carey, J. W. (2002). Globalization is not new; Anti-globalization is not either: September 11 or the history of nations. *Prometheus*, 20(3), 289-294
- Dimitrova Daniela V., Kaid Lynda Lee, William Andrew Paul & Trammel Kaye D, (2005). War on the Web: The Immediate News Framing of Gulf War II. *The International Journal of Press and Politics*, 10: 1, 22-44, Sage.
- Entman, R. M. (1991). 'Framing US Coverage of International News, Contrast in Narratives of KAL and Iran Air Incident ', *Journal of Communication*. 41(4): 6-27.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). 'Framing; towards Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm ', *Journal of Communication*. 43(4): 51-58.
- Fair Christine, C., et al, (2010). Pakistan: Can the United States Secure an Insecure State? RAND Corporation.
- Fair, C. Christine, and Hamza Ali. (2016). From Elite Consumption to Popular Opinion: Framing of the US Drone Program in Pakistani Newspapers. *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 27(4), 578-607.
- Gamson, W. A., (1987). Goffman's Legacy to Political Sociology. *Theory and Society*, 14, 605 -621).
- Gitlin, T., (1980). *The whole world is watching: mass media in the making & unmaking of the New Left* (Rev. Ed.). Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Gofmann E., (1974). *Frame Analysis*, NY: Free Press.
- Haqqani, H. (2013). *Magnificent Delusions: Pakistan, the United States, and an Epic History of Misunderstanding* (First Edition). New York, NY: Public Affairs. 2013.
- Hussain Munawar, (2016). Pak-US Relations: An Historical Overview. *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 2, (2016).
- Iyengar, S. (1991) *is anyone responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jawad, Akram, (January 29, 2018). US - Pakistan Trust Deficit – Causes and Solutions". *Khaleej Mag*. <http://khaleejmag.com/news/us-pakistan-trust-deficit-causes-solutions/>
- Kapila, Subhash, (2007). Pakistan: United States Strategic Compulsions Prevail Over Political Imperatives", India: South Asia Analysis Group, Paper Number 2272.
- Kellner, Douglas. (2004). "9/11, Spectacles of Terror, and Media Manipulation: A Critique of Jihadist and Bush Media Politics." *Critical Discourse Studies* 1 (April).
- Khan Hidayat, (Winter 2013). Pakistan's Contribution to Global War on Terror after 9/11". *IPRI Journal* XIII no 1. 37 – 56.
- Luther Catherine A. & Miller. Mark, (2005). Framing of the 2003 U.S.-Iraq War Demonstrations: An Analysis of News and Partisan Texts. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, Sage Journal.
- Malik Hafeez, (2008) *US Relations with Afghanistan and Pakistan*. New York: Oxford University Press, 188-189.

- McCombs, M., Shaw, D. L., & Weaver, D. (1997). *Communication and democracy: Exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda-setting theory*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Nacos, Brigitte L., and Oscar Torres-Reyna, (2003). "Framing Muslim-Americans Before and After 9/11," in Pippa Norris, Montague Kern and Marion Just, eds. *Framing Terrorism: The News Media, the Government and the Public* (New York: Routledge
- Nelson, M. J., (2009). *Pakistan in 2008: Moving Beyond Musharraf*. *Asian Survey*, 49(1), (2009):16-27
- Niaz, A. S. (2015). *Representations of US Acts of Extra-territoriality as Illustrated in Pakistani-English Political Cartoons*. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. Doi: 1680273662.
- Norris, P., Kern, M., & Just M. R. (2003). *Framing terrorism*. In P. Norris, M.R. Just, and M. Kern (Eds.). *Framing terrorism: The news media, the government, and the public* (pp. 3-25). New York: Routledge.
- Pan Z; & Kiosicki G.M. (1993). 'Framing Analysis: An approach to news discourse', *Political Communication*. 10: 55–67.
- Pintak, L. (2006). *Reflections in a bloodshot lens: America, Islam, and the war of ideas*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Pluto Press.
- Raja, M. (March 27, 2014). *Pakistani Victims: War on Terror Toll put at 49,000*". *The Tribune*. <http://tribune.com.pk/story/527016/pakistani-victims-war-on-terror-toll-put-at-49000/>
- Rhee, June Woong, (1997). *Strategy and issue frames in election campaign coverage: a social cognitive account of framing effects*. *Journal of Communication*. Volume 47, Issue 3. Pp. 26-48
- Riedel, B., (2008). *Pakistan and Terror: The Eye of the Storm*. *Annual American Academic Political Social Science*, 618, 31-45.
- Ruigrok, N., & Van Atteveldt, W. (2007). *Global angling with a local angle: How U.S., British, and Dutch newspapers frame global and local terrorist attacks*. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 12, 68-90.
- Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). *Framing European Politics: A content analysis of press and television news*. *Journal of communication*, 50(2), 93-109.
- Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (1996). *Mediating the Message: Theories of Influences on Mass Media Content* (2nd Ed.). White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.
- Silverstone, R. (2007). *Media and Morality: On the Rise of the Mediapolis*. London: Polity.
- Snow, David A., and Robert D. Benford, (1988). *Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization*. In Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Sidney Tarrow (eds.), *From Structure to Action: Social Movement Participation Across Cultures*. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press. 197-217.
- Soherwordi Hussain Shaheed, (April 2010). *Pakistan-US Policies on the 'War on Terror' and the Taliban: Allies at Loggerheads*". *Pakistan Horizon*, Vol. 63, No. 2, Security Concerns in South and West Asia, Pakistan Institute of International Affairs. 51-67
- Tuchman Gaye, (1978). *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. The Free Press, New York.
- Wanta, W. (1997). *The Messenger and the Message: Differences across news media*. In: D. Shaw, M. McCombs, and D. Weaver, ed., *Communication and Democracy*, 1st ed. Mahwah: Lawrence, Erlbaum, and Associates.
- Zelizer, B. & Allan, S. (2011) *Journalism after September 11*, New York: Routledge.