1992

Newspaper Coverage and Cultural Values: American and Japanese News Coverage of the Tokyo Summit Meeting

Yoshiko Okano

The University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

The Golda Meir Library

Manuscript Theses

Unpublished theses and dissertations submitted for the Master's and Doctoral degrees at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee are deposited in the Golda Meir Library. These manuscript theses are open for inspection, but are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors. Bibliographical references may be noted, but passages may be copied only with the permission of the authors, and proper credit must be given in subsequent written or published work. Extensive copying or publication of the thesis or dissertation in whole or part also requires the consent of the Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

This thesis or dissertation by

Yoshiko Okano

has been used by the following persons, whose signatures attest their acceptance of the above restrictions.

A library which borrows this thesis or dissertation for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.

NAME AND ADDRESS DATE

Newspaper Coverage and Cultural Values: American and Japanese News Coverage of the Tokyo Summit Meeting

By

Yoshiko Okano

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Mass Communication

at

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

August 1992

Newspaper Coverage and Cultural Values:
American and Japanese News Coverage of the Tokyo Summit Meeting

By

Yoshiko Okano

A Thesis Submitted in
Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Mass Communication

at
The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

August, 1992

Dom R Le Duc 8/28/92
Major Professor Date

George W. Kreutke 8-31-92
Graduate School Approval Date

Newspaper Coverage and Cultural Values:
American and Japanese News Coverage of the Tokyo Summit Meeting

By

Yoshiko Okano

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1992
Under the Supervision of Dr. Don R. LeDuc

This thesis will examine these two questions:

1) Based on the value systems in one's culture, do American and Japanese newspapers describe the same public events differently?

2) If so, do these differences reflect underlying differences in national cultures?

No effect will be made to answer these questions in detail; instead, this thesis will focus on one purposeful sample to illustrate the possible significance of these questions in evaluating the qualities of international news coverage.

Don R LeDuc 8/20/92
Major Professor Date

Acknowledgments

My special appreciation goes to my father, Shigemichi Okano, mother, Kikue Okano, Roger Stephen Guy, and all my friends who always gave me their support and encouragement to me. This project brought me not only an interest in studies in news coverage, but also precious friends.

I also would like to thank my major advisor, Dr. Don R. LeDuc, and my committee members, Dr. George Bailey and Professor Hoffmann for leading me to complete this thesis.

I could never have finished this project without their help and encouragement. This thesis is dedicated to all of them.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Background

> Relations between the United States and Japan have grown downright nasty. One Japanese diplomat fretted that the situation was "as serious a deterioration in relations between our two countries since the war."[1]

Many Americans seem to believe that the Japanese have simply exchanged their military weapons for economic arms in waging war on the United States.[2] Reflecting the image of the Pearl Harbor attack, television news programs and newspapers have been discussing the trade imbalance between the United States and Japan. The collapse of the Soviet Union, coupled with the continued decline of the United States economy brought on in part by global competition has made trade issues increasingly important for Americans.[3]

In Detroit, demonstrators with American flags and a placard, "NO TO JAPANESE, SUPPORT THE U.S.A." in front of a Toyota dealership appeal to people not to buy Japanese automobiles.[4] In Los Angeles, the county canceled a contract of $122 million public rail cars, and chose an American

---

[1] John Schwartz et al., "The Push to 'buy American': Will the Latest Form of Japan-Bashing Work?" *Newsweek*, February 3, 1992, pp. 32-35.

[2] Lee Smith, "Fear and Loathing of Japan," *Fortune*, February 26, 1990, pp. 50-60.

[3] Robert Neff and Bill Javetski, "The Japan That Can Say 'Get Lost,'" *Business Week*, October 14, 1991, pp. 58-59.

[4] Schwartz et al., *Newsweek*, February 3, 1992.

company due to a pressure from union workers.[5] Furthermore, a Japanese company, Nintendo bid for the Seattle Mariners baseball team that has called for its financial support. This brought about Americans' antipathy.[6] These various forms of Japan-bashing have come to be common place throughout the United States. More recently Senator Ernest Holling of South Carolina wryly reminded the Japanese that American workers made the atomic bomb and tested it in Japan.[7] Clearly the prevailing mood in the United States is anything but gentile.

The anti-Japanese sentiments most exemplify the automobile industry, which is sometimes described as a native American culture, because it is closely tied to the United States culturally and economically. During the recession era in the 1930s, for instance, the automobile industry was not seriously affected. Indeed, the automobile industry helped fuel various other industries such as rubber and steel and more recently electronics. Charles Wilson, chairman of General Motors and Secretary of Defense under President Eisenhower said, "What [is] good for our country [is] good for General motors and vice versa."[8]

---

[5] Robert Reinhold, "Los Angeles Cancels Huge Contract With a Japanese Maker of Rail Cars," *The New York Times*, January 23, 1992, p. A8.

[6] Timothy Egan, "Japanese Bid for Seattle Team Gets Baseball's Cold Shoulder," *The New York Times*, January 24, 1992, pp. A1, B10.

[7] "Japanese React Angrily to Hollings Remark," *The New York Times*, March 5, 1992, p. A6.

[8] Kenneth Hey, "Cars and Films in American Culture, 1929-1959," in *The Automobile and American Culture*, David L. Lewis and Laurence Goldstein, eds., (University of Michigan Press, 1983), p. 198.

In Japan, the word that described attitudes toward Americans was coined; *Kenbei* meaning a hatred toward the United States and Americans.[9] The Gulf Crisis in 1991 eventually made both nations realize that they possessed different value systems and ways of thinking. Seeing the American brash self-righteousness during the crisis, many Japanese felt that Americans force their own values on others. The Japanese thought that the United States would perceive Japan as their spiritual colony.[10]

A Japanese politician, Sakurauch said that American workers are lazy and 30 percent of them are illiterate in January 1992 soon after Bush's visit to Japan. He delivered his statement in his hometown for the comment about the trade issues in the automobile industry.[11] Prime Minister Miyazawa, moreover, later criticized Americans' work ethics, saying that America "may lack a work ethic."[12] He meant that many Americans looked for job in a field of the stock markets instead of the productive industries, which brought on a

---

[9] Steven R. Weisman, "Japanese Coin Word for Their Unease About U.S.," *The New York Times*, October 16, 1991, p. A14.

[10] 'Kenbei' To 'Ishitsu Ron' Fuan na Kankei ('Kenbei' and 'Uniqueness': Insecure Relations Between Japan and the United States)," *Asahi Shimbun*, January 23, 1992, p. 4; Christopher Knowlton, "Germany & Japan: Missing in Action," *Fortune*, March 11, 1991, pp. 57-60.

[11] Akihisa Okuda, "Han-Nichi no Hi ni Abura o Sosoida 'Hodo Masatsu' no Shikake-Nin wa Bei Masukomi (The One Who Aggravates Anti-Japan Movements is American Mass Media)," *Syukan Asahi*, February 7, 1992, pp. 148-150.

[12] David E. Sanger, "Japan Premier Joins Critics of Americans' Work Habits," *The New York Times*, February 4, 1992, pp. A1, A9.

decline in economy.[13] These statements led to furor among Americans.

President George Bush, along with the chairmen of the American Big Three automobile corporations, visited Japan in January 1992. Overcoming a series of trade disputes between the United States and Japan since as early as the late 1970s, they were supposed to come to an agreement on the imbalance of trade between the two countries.[14]

In the late 70s, in the United States, Japanese automobiles increased their market share, 12.2 percent in 1977, 16.5 percent in 1979, and 21.2 percent in 1980. In 1981, having feared the rise of imported cars from Japan, the United States urged the Japanese government to impose voluntary export restraints on Japanese automobile makers. In May 1981, the Japanese government announced the voluntary export restraints (VER) in order to cut the number of exported cars to the United States by 7.7 percent. By the VER, the total of cars that Japanese auto makers are able to export to the United States would be limited to 1,680,000.[15]

---

13 "Hataraku Riron-Kan Kakeleirunodewa (Is There a Lack of Working Ethics?" *Asahi Shimbun*, February 4, 1992, p. 2.

14 Michael Duffy, "Mission Impossible," *Time*, January 20, 1992, pp. 14-16; Bill Powell, "Who's in Charge?" *Newsweek*, January 13, 1992, pp. 26-27.

15 "Auto Export to U.S. by 1,680,000," *Yomiuri Shimbun*, May 1, 1981, p. 1; Clyde H. Farnsworth, "Tokyo's Car Curbs Hailed in U.S., But Japanese Makers Are Angered: Congress Move Now Unlikely," *The New York Times*, May 2, 1981, pp. A1, 33; Sam Jameson, "Bill Curbing Car Imports Shelved: Japan to Cut Auto Sales to U.S. by 7.7%," *The Los Angeles Times*, May 2, 1981, pp. A1, 6, 8; "1,680,000 Cars Annually From April," *Asahi Shimbun*, May 1, 1981, p. 1.

Although the VER was initially only a three-year plan, the Japanese government having responded to requests from the United States renewed the VER in 1983.[16] In March 1985, the Japanese government again declared an extension of the VER, saying that the number of exported cars to the United States would be limited to 2,300,000. Although the government announced that the VER was limited to one more year, this decision provoked severe criticisms from the United States and within Japan. American auto makers denounced this, saying that the figure, 2,300,000 is too many to affect the American automobile market.[17] Moreover, the Japanese as well as the Americans blamed the Japanese government for the decision that would bring about the protectionism.[18]

In January 1991, the Japanese government once more declared the maintenance of the status quo of the VER. Since the early 1980s, a number of bilateral talks relating to the voluntary export restraints have been conducted between the American and Japanese governments as well as between car makers in the two nations. In January 1992, President Bush

---

16 *Theory of The International Relations Series: International Competition in Auto Industry*, 5 (Tokyo: Gakken, 1992), pp. 152-157.

17 Sam Jameson and James Risen, "Japan's Trade Barriers Stir Congress to Anger: Analysts See Return to Free Market in Cars," *The Los Angeles Times*, March 29, 1985, pp. A1, 27.

18 "Auto Makers Offending and Concerned About Distribution," *Asahi Shimbun*, March 29, 1985, p. 9; "Auto Restriction to U.S. by 2,300,000," *Yomiuri Shimbun*, March 29, 1985, p. 1; Susan Chira, "Rise in Car Exports Confirmed by Japan," *The New York Times*, March 29, 1985, p. D15.

visited Japan after the long trade disputes between the two nations.[19]

Changes in Economy in the United States

In the late 1970s through the early 1980s, not only in the United States, but also in other major industrialized countries, the economic structures have been changing. All the industrialized countries produce the same products such as shoes, steel, and automobiles. They have moved their factories to other countries, and import and export the similar products. Foreign competition has gradually taken parts of the United States' once extensive market share of certain products. This has resulted in shrinking corporate profits, a gradual erosion of median family income and thousands of layoffs.

In the United States, the number of imported goods has increased, especially since the 1970s. Imported merchandise for the manufacturing domestic products has soared: 13.9 percent in 1969, 37.8 percent in 1979, and 44.7 percent in 1986. In other words, a made-in-America product consists of about 45 percent of imported merchandise.[20]

---

[19] *Theory of The International Relations Series: International Competition in Auto Industry*, pp. 1-4.

[20] Bennet Harrison and Barry Bluestone, *The Great U-Turn: Corporate Restructing and the Polarizing of America* (Basic Books, 1988).

While American corporations were dealing with the squeezed corporate profit, they at the same time had a burden in high cost of wages and pension. Average wages had showed a smooth increase by the time oil crisis hit the nation in 1973. In light of the economy, the United States in the 1970s came to have a transition period; the economy has stopped growing. The gross national product, although boosted 50 percent during the 1960s, ceased increasing in the 1970s; it gained only 2.9 percent per year.

In order to stave off decline companies opted for restructuring in an effort to reduce operating costs. They cut full-time workers and a middle management, increased part-time workers; to whom companies do not have to guarantee employment benefits. Second, looking to further reduce production costs, they opened plants abroad such as Mexico and Philippines, and closed plants in the United States. This capital flight resulted in twenty automobile factories with over 50,000 workers shutting down in the United States from January 1979 to December 1980. Consequently, other automobile related industries were forced into closing or reducing their operations. Nearly 100 factories were shut down, and 80,000 workers were left without a job.[21]

Finally, companies looked for a short-term gain in stocks, junk bonds, mergers, and acquisitions for rebuilding

---

21 Barry Bluestone and Bennet Harrison, *The Deindustrialization of America* (Basic Books, 1982).

the corporate profitability, and to satisfy corporate boards. Since they did not invest in research and facilities, they could not realize any long term yield. In light of the business structure, the United states shifted from a productive nation toward "casino society"[22] between the 1970s and the early 1980s. Government policy was aimed at shoring up failing corporations through deregulation, regressive tax reform and privatization. During the 80s, the Reagan administration supported guaranteed federal loans to save Lockheed and Chrysler from bankruptcy. Government regulation of business was relaxed in an effort to breathe some life into American business. In addition, unions became the target of government attacks; the most obvious example being the disbanding of the air traffic controller's. "Unions were deliberately made the scapegoat of an economy that increasingly seemed unable to perform acceptably at home or abroad."[23]

Changes in Economy in Japan

Between the end of 1985 and 1987, the exchange rate of the yen shot up drastically. The exchange rate of the 240 yen-mark to the United States dollar in the early 1985

---

22 Harrison and Bluestone, *The Great U-Turn*, p.13.
23 Harrison and Bluestone, *The Great U-Turn*, p.15.

reached the 150 yen-mark in 1986. Thereafter, it has kept a tendency of the high exchange rate until today. In consequence, the interest rate was lowered in order to prevent further increase in the exchange rate. Synergistic effects of government policies and the high exchange rate brought about a business upturn in Japan.[24]

As a result of rising an exchange rate of the yen, a price of imported goods declined; moreover, the number of overseas investment by Japanese companies has been flourished. During those days, the companies could afford a long-term investment, purchasing real estate and building plants abroad. Consequently, Japan was able to recover from the inflation brought on by the oil crisis in 1973.[25]

Unlike American companies, Japanese have secure relations between business and labors through lifetime employment and employers' benefits such as retirement pensions and housing allowance. Once hiring workers, companies rarely layoff or dismiss workers. Thus, compared to the United States, the unemployment rate in Japan is overwhelmingly low and job security high.

The relationship between the government and business, moreover, is different from that of the United States. The

---

[24] Katsuhide Takahashi, "Heisei Keiki no Yomikata (Understanding the Prosperity in Heisei Era)," *Nihon Keizai Shimbun*, January 7, 1992, p. 27.

[25] Jeff Copeland, "Nippon Shindan: Gekido no Rokunen--Keizai (Examining Japan: The Six Years of Change--Economy)," *Newsweek: Japan*, February 6, 1992, pp. 12-15.

government is closely related to the business through the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI). MITI, giving advice in industrial planning, supports business in order for an effective operation. For instance, it plays a mediating role between the companies in the industry to reach an agreement. By the activity, it is possible to keep a balanced operation within the industry. Furthermore, MITI assists in long-term investment with non- and low-interest loans by a public bank, Development Bank and Export-Import Bank, or a private bank the government encourages.[26]

Regarding the Japanese automobile industry, a compact car has long been a mainstay in the Japanese market since it is suited to road conditions and the confined spatial arrangements in Japan. Besides, Japanese consumers demand high fuel efficiency, especially, since OPEC increased the oil price in 1973. The trend in the Japanese market toward small, fuel efficient cars fortunately caught on in the international market for some of the same reasons as well in the 1980s.[27]

---

26 Bluestone and Harrison, *The Deindustrialization of America.*

27 Howard Schlossberg, "Carmakers Try to Boost Sales by Satisfying Buyers," *Marketing News*, 1990, May 28, 1990, pp. 2, 11, 19; *Theory of The International Relations Series*, pp. 160-172.

Disputes Between the United States and Japan

Vice-president Dan Quayle criticized *Keiretsu*--an affiliation system in the business--prevents foreign companies from penetrating the Japanese market, while listening complaints from the American Big Three automobile makers. In the *keiretsu* system, Japanese automobile makers purchase auto parts from their affiliated companies. Although a number of Japanese companies have been doing business in the United States, the number of American companies in Japan is still limited due to the *keiretsu* system.[28]

On the other hand, many leaders of the Japanese automobile corporations contend that a major reason for the trade imbalance is attributed to insufficient effort to make products attractive to Japanese consumers, rather than a closed market.[29] Compared to Japanese automobiles, American automobiles are mechanically less reliable and less fuel efficient, for which are often among Japanese consumers' prerequisites for choosing an automobile. Until recently,

---

[28] Jim Impoco, "Behind Diplomatic Smiles," *U.S. News & World Report*, November 11, 1991, pp. 51-53.

[29] Ako Washio and Emiko Ohki, "Distribution Problems Blamed for Poor Sales of U.S. Autos," *Japan Times Weekly International Edition*, September 23-29, 1991, p. 17.

American exports did not have the steering wheel on the appropriate side to drive legally in Japan.[30]

For a main reason of the trade imbalance between the United States and Japan, many Americans (66 percent) felt that Japan's trading policies were unfair and that the country was a closed market, according to an interview conducted by a *Time* magazine and CNN in the end of January 1992.[31] Compared to the Americans, only 33 percent of the Japanese respondents said that "Japan unfairly keeps American products out of the country."[32] On the other hand, 44 percent of the Japanese and 22 percent of the Americans said that the main reason was that "American products are not as good as Japanese products."[33]

The Japanese sometimes seem to feel that Americans, seeking for an excuse of a decline in the business, use Japan as a scapegoat. The Japanese think that, for the problem that Americans themselves have created, Japan has been blamed. The *Newsweek* describes, from the Japanese view point, that Americans are "overwrought crybabies"[34] who are grumbling at the problems they make since they cannot solve the problems.[35]

---

30 *Theory of The International Relations Series*, pp. 160-172.

31 Lance Morrow, "Japan in the Mind of America: America in the Mind of Japan," *Time*, February 10, 1992, pp. 16-26.

32 Ibid., p.22.

33 Ibid., p.22.

34 Bill Powell and Bradley Martin, "What Japan Thinks of Us," *Newsweek*, April 2, 1990, p. 19.

35 Ibid., pp. 18-25.

Furthermore, *The New York Times*, CBS News, and the Tokyo Broadcasting System conducted an opinion poll about how Americans and Japanese perceive relations between the United States and Japan in 1991.[36] Most Americans and Japanese described relations between the two countries as friendly; 80 percent and 60 percent, respectively. Also, majorities of both Americans and Japanese saw their nations as being mutually dependent on each other. Opinions diverged on more emotional issues, however. Among Japanese, 70 percent felt that most Americans looked down on them, compared to 43 percent of the American respondents. Moreover, 43 percent of American respondents said that most Japanese looked down on Americans, compared with 28 percent of Japanese. Regarding economic issues, 76 percent of Japanese respondents said that the United States was blaming Japan for its own economic problems, while 47 percent of American chose the same answer. An alternative answer, "Japanese companies are competing unfairly with American companies,"[37] was selected by 32 percent of the American respondents and 21 percent of the Japanese.

What brought about those disagreements? Unless people can see what has been going on between those countries by themselves, they have to rely on other sources. The mass

---

[36] Steven R. Weisman, "Japan and U.S. Struggle With Resentment," *New York Times*, December 3, 1991, pp. A1, A6.

[37] Ibid., p. A6.

media is the primary vehicle for providing news about the United States and Japan as facts to people in both countries.

Presupposing that the media influences public opinion, this study will examine newspaper coverage of the international trade issue relating to automobiles, which have long been seen as a made-in-American culture, in the United States and Japan. This study, in particular, will attempt to determine whether such coverage increases the understandings or promotes misunderstandings between the two countries. The trade issue has been recurring problem between the nations since the late 1970s. It is likely that the increased globalization of the economy will serve to continually bring this issue to the forefront of public concern.

Questions to Be Examined

The issues to be considered in this study are:

1) Based on the value systems in one's culture, do American and Japanese newspapers describe the same public events differently?

2) If so, do these differences reflect underlying differences in national cultures?

No effect will be made to answer these questions in detail; instead, this thesis will focus on one purposeful

sample to illustrate the possible significance of these questions in evaluating the qualities of international news coverage.

Limitations of The Study

This study is limited to the international trade issues relating to automobiles between the United States and Japan. It is beyond the scope of this study to examine all issues relating to Japan and the United States. Consequently, it should be pointed out that public opinion may be affected not only by the trade issues, but also by peripheral incidents in which both the United States and Japan have been involved in such as the Gulf War. The trade issue was selected for analysis because of its close link to the economy; a seemingly divisive issue between the two countries recently.

Methodology

This study relies heavily on existing literature because it is necessary to determine what cultural differences exist between the United States and Japan. First, I will review literature about values and norms of making news, and then I will review the literature that describes cultural traditions

of the United States and Japan. In addition, I will look at the literature that discusses the cultural differences that can bring about misunderstandings between the people in these countries.

Second, based on the findings from the literature review, I will attempt to determine whether newspaper coverage of the trade disputes reflects these cultural differences. Furthermore, I will attempt to investigate whether the news coverage can contribute to misunderstandings rather than understandings between the two nations.

This study will be an interpretive analysis. For the purpose of the study, I conceive that it is more appropriate to employ qualitative analysis than quantitative analysis which usually looks at manifest content. Examining language in news stories, I will investigate if language in news texts reflects cultural differences between the two countries. This study thus will look into both manifest and latent content.

The articles that I will examine are drawn from national newspapers that have a large circulation: *The Los Angeles Times* and *The New York Times* from the United States, and *Yomiuri Shimbun* and *Asahi Shimbun* from Japan. Both *The Los Angeles Times* and *The New York Times* are known as independent and responsible newspapers in coverage of national and

international affairs.[38] *The Los Angeles Times* has the third largest circulation in the United States with 1,242,864 of a weekday edition and 1,576,425 of a Sunday edition. *The New York Times* ranking second to *The Los Angeles Times* has circulation of 1,149,683 for a weekday edition, and 1,706013 for a Sunday edition. The Japanese newspapers, *Yomiuri Shimbun* and *Asahi Shimbun*, have the largest circulations in the world--9,725,304 of a morning edition and 4,745,509 of an evening edition; and 8,191,810 of a morning edition and 4,741,599 of an evening edition, respectively.[39]

These newspapers are also viewed as the elite press that is not only a mainstream in the society, but also influences other newspapers in the nations. Moreover, they have a great impact on opinion leaders, and consequently reflect the prominent opinion in the nations. In short, national elite newspapers are a substantial source of news for the people.

This study will focus on investigating the newspaper coverage of the Tokyo summit meeting between the United States and Japan in which the automotive trade issues were heavily discussed. There have been many trade disputes between American and Japanese corporations over the years, yet those corporations tended to first pursue their own profits rather than the national interest. A governmental

---

[38] John C. Merrill, *Global Journalism: A Study of the World's Mass Media* (New York: Longman, 1983).

[39] *International Media Guide: Newspapers Worldwide Edition* (Connecticut: International Media Enterprises, Inc., 1990).

level dispute, however, theoretically involves the national interest of the country it represents. In investigating whether newspaper coverage contributes to the mutual understanding between Americans and Japanese in general, it is more appropriate to focus the governmental level dispute than the corporate level dispute.

The news articles on the Tokyo summit meeting appeared in the four newspapers on January 10, 1992, will be examined. After a long negotiations between the Americans and the Japanese, on January 9, President Bush and Prime Minister Miyazawa declared two documents: The Tokyo Declaration and the Action Plans. The Tokyo Declaration emphasizes the importance of the global partnerships between the United States and Japan. The Action Plans states detailed plans of how the two nations settle the disputes in various areas including the automotive trade issues. This study will focus on whether the American and Japanese newspapers covered these two documents differently. By examining this, this study will furthermore attempt to investigate whether the news coverage from the two different nations reflects underlying different cultural values.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature: Theory of News Selection

In studying news story selection, a number of scholars have attempted to construct theory. Although there are many theories, most of them can be classified into two major paradigms. The first type is journalist-centered. This posits that journalists determine what to report based on their professional judgment. The second type is grounded in organizational theory. Interests and requirements of news organizations influence news selection.

The selection of a news story, however, cannot be explained by a single theory. Instead, elements of these two theories influence the news gathering process, and in turn news selection. Journalists cover news stories, dealing with their organizational requirements: limitations of time and space.[1] Moreover, journalists consider audience demands and interests for marketability because of keen competition in the newspaper industry.[2]

---

[1] Herbert J. Gans, *Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1979); Todd Gitlin, *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making & unmaking of the New Left* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980).

[2] Hiroshi Fujita, *Amerika no Janarizumu (American Journalism)* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1991).; Gans, *Deciding What's News*; Edward S. Herman and Norm Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988).

Journalist-Centered Theory

Gans,[3] Tuchman,[4] and others have found that journalists are unable to cover all news, thus they have to choose what to include and what to exclude based on their professional judgment. They argued that one of the important ideals in journalistic professionalism is objectivity. Journalists pursuing objectivity intend to serve the public interest.

Schudson, reviewing American journalism history, discussed the notion that objectivity originated as an ideal in journalism in the United States in the 1930s. As journalists were aware of professionalism, they came to think that facts should be separated from values in order to distinguish between conveying information and commenting about news. For objective reporting, scientific methods in the news gathering process came to be emphasized by enhancing evidence, presenting opposing views, and identifying news sources.[5]

Journalistic method, moreover, has changed from informative to interpretive reporting, thus giving people the opportunity to construct their own social reality. Because

---

[3] Gans, *Deciding What's News.*

[4] Gaye Tuchman, *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality* (New York: The Free Press, 1978).

[5] Michael Schudson, *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1978).

of the propaganda during World War I, people no longer trusted the facts that press reported. Schudson also stated that politics, economics, and social affairs became more complex after World War I. Thus, journalists were urged to interpret news.[6]

Objectivity is a principle of journalism not only in the United States, but also in Japan.[7] In Japan, however, it was not until the 1950s that journalists turned to serve the public interest, Arai said.[8] During World War II, the mass media were under the control of the government, playing a propaganda role. In the democracy movement of the post-war era, the media were separated from the government. The media then came to be in private hands.

Fujita stated that although objectivity is also a goal of Japanese journalism, news sources are rarely identified in stories. He pointed out conceivable reasons. First, articles have to be concise because the length of an article as a whole is very short, compared to American newspapers. Space requirements of Japanese newspapers are more stringent than American newspapers. An average top news article contends between 1,000 and 1,200 words in American newspapers; however, a Japanese top news article has only

---

6 Schudson, *Discovering the News.*

7 Fujita, *Amerika no Janarizumu (American Journalism).*

8 Naoyuki Arai, "Gendai Janarizumu no Henyo (Changes in the Modern Journalism)," in *Nihon Janarizumu: Taishyu no Kokoro o Tsukandaka (Japanese Journalism: Does it Catch the Public Minds?)*, Yoshimi Uchikawa and Naoyuki Arai, eds., (Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 1983), pp. 121-152.

between 320 and 400 words. The difference in the volume of words results from a difference in a volume of pages. American newspapers average about 70 pages in a weekday edition, while Japanese newspapers have approximately 30 pages. In order to shorten an article, journalists exclude an identification of news sources; and instead, they include as much information as possible.[9]

Moreover, in dealing with an identification of news sources, there is a significant perception gap between American and Japanese journalists. As mentioned by Schudson, American journalists think that identifying news sources is among their professional responsibilities. By doing so, journalists are able to remain separated from the news sources. Identifying news sources is a means of maintaining objectivity for American journalists.[10] On the other hand, Fujita argued that Japanese journalists tend to identify news sources to avoid responsibility in case of errors or misinterpretation. For instance, by attributing a news source as a government investigation, journalists imply that they just accept what they are told by the government, and that the government is responsible for any errors.[11]

As a means of maintaining objectivity, Japanese journalists have a different approach than American

---

9 Fujita, *Amerika no Janarizumu (American Journalism).*
10 Schudson, *Discovering the News.*
11 Fujita, *Amerika no Janarizumu (American Journalism).*

journalists. Japanese attempt to exclude any interpretations into news stories. Instead, according to Arai, they emphasize information on "who," "what," "where," and "when" rather than "how," and "why."[12] Despite the fact that both Japanese and American journalists pursue objectivity, Japanese report news stories informatively, while Americans report interpretively.

Whatever approach journalists take, objectivity is an ideal common to both the United States and Japan. Schudson, however, questioned objectivity itself. He argued that it is impossible to maintain real objectivity because journalists interpret reality based on their values.[13] Gans also noted that an attempt to exclude values is in fact accompanied by including values.[14] Furthermore, a philosopher Bloor said, "Objectivity is social."[15] Objectivity is not based on personal preferences, but attached to individuals' beliefs and values which derive from their society. In short, objectivity is socially constructed. Therefore, he stated, objectivity varies from one social institution to another.[16]

---

12 Arai, "Gendai Janarizumu no Henyo (Changes in the Modern Journalism)."

13 Schudson, *Discovering the News.*

14 Gans, *Deciding What's News.*

15 David Bloor, "A Sociological Theory of Objectivity," in *Objectivity and Cultural Divergence*, Stuart C. Brown, ed., (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 229.

16 Bloor, "A Sociological Theory of Objectivity," pp. 229-245.

Organizational Theory

Most research based on an organizational theory falls into two areas of study: economic factors and organizational requirements. Dealing with economic factors, Gans distinguished them along two lines. First, journalists attempt to reduce the costs of producing news.[17] Herman and Chomsky discussed limitations of resources in news gathering such as the number of cameras and reporters. They said that since journalists cannot wait for news everywhere, they selectively concentrate their resources where they often reach news sources such as the White House and government offices.[18]

Second, news organizations are concerned with their bottom line. In the United States newspaper industry, fierce competition for circulation has existed, resulting from an increase in the number of newspapers. Gans acknowledged that a news organization is a money maker which sells information to its audiences. Journalists, editors for the most part, think about the suitability of a news story--whether it is marketable or not. Consequently, by pursuing audience demands, a news organization produces a news story aimed at

---

17 Gans, *Deciding What's News*.

18 Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent*.

pleasing its audience.[19] Schudson also noted that newspapers face a potential conflict in that they must simultaneously report the facts, and be entertaining to readers.[20]

As in the United States, Japanese newspapers face stiff competition. The most severe competition for circulation exists among three major national newspapers--*Yomiuri Shimbun*, *Asahi Shimbun*, and *Mainichi Shimbun*--rather than among a number of newspapers. Ishizaka acknowledged that in the late 1950s, advanced technology was introduced in the Japanese newspaper industry. The issues that are edited and printed in headquarters are transmitted by microwave to other regions, and then printed out there; much like *The New York Times* is in the United States. Thus, it became possible to simultaneously print identical issues throughout the nation. The three national newspaper companies have energetically expanded their business into a regional market. Accordingly, they have competed aggressively for circulation, resulting in an oligopolistic marketing.[21]

In dealing with organizational requirements, researchers look at how limitations in the news gathering process influence news story selection. A major limitation is

---

[19] Gans, *Deciding What's News.*

[20] Schudson, *Discovering the News.*

[21] Etsuo Ishizaka, "Masu Media Sangyo no Kozo Henka To Janarizumu (The Structural Changes in the Mass Media Industry and Journalism)," in *Nihon Janarizumu: Taishyu no Kokoro o Tsukandaka (Japanese Journalism: Does it Catch the Public Minds?)*, Yoshimi Uchikawa and Naoyuki Arai, eds., (Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 1983), pp. 153-187.

considerations of deadlines and space of a news story. Journalists distill a news story from larger amounts of information they receive everyday, with little time. Gans suggested that the news selection process begins with dealing with organizational limitations, and ends with considerations of suitability of news. During the process, a tug of war is played out between reporters who consider possibility to access to news sources, and editors who consider marketability of a news story. Journalists compete not only with other news organizations, but also other journalists within the same organization.[22]

Gans asserted, however, that availability of news sources is a significant determinant in news story selection. Even though journalists consider audience demands, they cannot get a news story unless the media sources provide information to them. Not everyone can have an access to media. Gans said that availability of media access reflects the social structure. It is far easier for government officials to reach the media than a homeless person, for example. This also implies that media access is class-based.[23]

---

22 Gans, *Deciding What's News.*

23 Ibid.

Media Sources

In considering sources, Gans noted that journalists tend to frequently use government officials. The time constraints of news organizations affects the selection of sources. Looking for a quick and inexpensive means of news reporting, journalists often depend on the government official sources.[24] Journalists are able to receive news stories through press releases which government officials usually provide.

Sigal analyzed media sources and channels for international and national news in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* from 1949 to 1969. Results showed that 46.5 percent of the total news comes from the United States government officials, 27.5 percent comes from foreign government officials, and 4.1 percent comes from local and state government officials. In short, as much as 78.1 percent of the total news stories emanated from the government.[25]

Regarding channels of the news stories, Sigal found that 58.2 percent of the news stories as a whole emerge through routine channels such as press releases and press conferences. Informal channels including background briefing and leaks account for 15.7 percent of the total sources. The

---

24 Ibid.

25 Leon V. Sigal, *Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking* (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C Heath, 1973).

final category, enterprise channels which journalists get news stories on their own initiative accounts for 25.8 percent. Furthermore, he looked at news channels in Washington D.C. where most of news relating to the nation and international affairs originates. He concluded that journalists rely heavily on routine channels (72.3 percent). Informal and enterprise channels account for 20.1 percent and 7.7 percent, respectively.[26]

In Japan, government affairs are disseminated through the press clubs which are exclusive news gathering agencies. Yamamoto acknowledged that only the journalists that are allowed to participate in these elite press clubs are able to receive the information from government officials. Most news relating to the government decisions are released by the government officials through routine channels. Accordingly, news articles tend to have similar perspectives, he contended.[27]

Crouse described journalists who traveled with presidential candidates to report the presidential campaign in 1972.[28] During the trip, the journalists received the same information from the same sources, and discussed what and how they covered the stories. At times, they even exchanged

---

[26] Ibid.

[27] Taketoshi Yamamoto, "The Press Clubs of Japan," *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 15(2), 1989, pp. 371-388.

[28] Timothy Crouse, *The Boys on the Bus* (New York: Random house, 1973).

information and collaborated with each other. As a result, their news stories revolved around similar perspectives. Crouse coined this phenomenon "pack journalism."[29]

Gitlin (1980) also acknowledged that reporters have such professional cooperation. Reporters usually do not have a lot of knowledge about the subject they will cover. Yet, due to the limitation of time, they are not able to take time to fully understand the subject. Because of that, reporters rely on their colleagues for vital front-end information, he noted.[30]

Objectivity, however, may be compromised for pack journalism. Bennett claimed that a lack of diversity in news brings into misconceptions of reality. If only single perspective comes to dominate in news coverage, it tends to be considered as objective reporting. Moreover, Bennett argued that the government official versions of reality are likely to be legitimized as objectivity. Because of a heavy reliance on the government official sources in the news gathering process, the official versions of reality dominate news contents.[31]

---

[29] Ibid., p. 7.

[30] Gitlin, *The Whole World Is Watching.*

[31] Lance W. Bennett, *News: The Politics of Illusion* (New York: Longman, 1988).

News Frames

Tuchman argued that news does not cover every aspect of everyday occurrences but focuses its parts. In her book, *Making News*,[32] she stated:

> News is a window on the world. Through its frame, Americans learn themselves and others, of their own institutions, leaders, and life styles, and those of other nations and their peoples...the news aims to tell us what we want to know, need to know, and should know....The view through a window depends upon whether the window is large or small, has many panes or few, whether the glass is opaque or clear, whether the window faces a street or a backyard. The unfolding scene also depends upon where one stands, far or near, craning one's neck to the side, or gazing straight ahead, eyes parallel to the wall in which the window is encased.[33]

Tuchman insisted that a news frame results from organizational needs. A news frame is not invented for individual occurrences, rather it is drawn up by past experience. She argued that based on past experience, people define meanings for occurrences. Journalists, therefore, considering a public definition of occurrences dismiss and emphasize some elements of events in order to make a news story marketable. They transform incredible occurrences into a news story which audience makes sense of. For instance, coverage of the women's movements in the 1960s focused on events rather than social movements as ideological issues

---

[32] Tuchman, *Making News*.

[33] Ibid., p. 1.

such as women's place in the society. She suggested that since issues are not observable, they tend to be considered as "not newsworthy."[34] Ideological and philosophical issues make it difficult for the "man on the street" to grasp. A news story has to interest everyone, she noted.

Tuchman also discussed the notion that beliefs and a public definition of events influence news coverage, by emphasizing and dismissing some elements of events. She noted, for example, that due to the fact that dominant ideologies are male, the news coverage of the women's movements attributed to a male vision of the movements. Not many people had accepted the women's social movements in the 1960s. This social condition affected news coverage of the movements. For instance, *The New York Times* covered the International Women's Year Conference in Mexico City. The article emphasized the disorganization of the conference without mentioning the fact that all international conferences are disorganized.[35]

Bennett, moreover, argued that news tends to support the status quo. News is shaped by a stereotype of events pre-existing in society, he noted. News reflects these stereotypes rather than offering an alternative vision or interpretation of an event.[36]

---

[34] Ibid., p. 139.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Bennett, *News*.

From the journalist-centered perspective, Gitlin discussed a news frame which simplifies the news making process. Dealing with organizational requirements, journalists are always urged to make decisions on what to include and exclude in a news story with limited time. He noted that a news frame enables journalists to produce a news story quickly and easily. At the same time, however, a news frame routinizes the news making process. Furthermore, a news frame in turn routinizes a news story itself, Gitlin pointed out.[37]

Journalists who have to consider organizational interests and requirements often fall into the pitfall of pursuing a particular news frame. Tuchman noted that by seeking suitability of news and by standardizing news coverage through professional cooperation, most news stories of the same occurrence eventually focus on similar aspects of the event.[38] In fact, studying a news frame of the student demonstrations in the 1960s, Gitlin found that news coverage reflected a government frame. Like coverage of the women's movements, coverage of the student demonstration emphasized events rather than issues. Instead of reporting the underlying ideology of the student movements, news focused on the apparent facts; arrests. He argued that the fact of arrests is an out of the ordinary event which should satisfy

---

[37] Gitlin, *The Whole World Is Watching.*

[38] Tuchman, *Making News.*

human interests. Besides, journalists were able to receive information on arrests from the police beat quickly and easily. Accordingly, journalists relied heavily on an official sources, receiving little stories from student demonstrators. Reporting the number of students who had been arrested, news came to follow a government frame. Gitlin insisted that following a certain news frame results in a lack of broad views in a news story which brings into imbalanced coverage. News is a production of selecting a frame which screens other scenes from sight, he noted.[39]

Through a news frame, people acknowledge and comprehend what is happening in society. Communication scholar, Carey stated that communication is not only transmitting information, but also producing reality.[40] He said, "Communication is a symbolic process whereby reality is produced, maintained, repaired, and transformed."[41]

Speaking about the importance of symbolic forms, Carey further discussed dual abilities of a symbol: a symbol "of" reality and "for" reality. He explained those abilities with an example of a blueprint of a house. A blueprint is used for a guide to build the house. Seeing the blueprint (symbol), people construct the house (reality). The same

---

[39] Gitlin, *The Whole World Is Watching.*

[40] James W. Carey, "A Cultural Approach to Communication," in *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*, James W. Carey, ed., (Boston: Unwin Hyman, Ltd., 1988), pp. 13-36.

[41] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

blueprint would also be used for describing the house later. Asked how the house (reality) is like, people would show the blueprint (symbol). In short, the symbol that influences constructing reality in people's perception, in turn, defines the reality.[42]

Tuchman discussed the notion that news constructs reality. News converts general ideas of happenings into the specific meanings. In coverage of riots, for example, she noted that news tends to focus on the number of arrests and victims, and the subsequent activities such as looting. By reading such news coverage, people will perceive what a riot is and how a riot is like. People then later use the ideas of the riots as a reference. In other words, the news constructs a public perception of the concept of riots.[43]

Problems in Use of Language

A question of what role language plays in the human communication process has been a major concern for scholars in various areas. Language is a cohesive force. As early as in 1690, philosopher Locke discussed the relationships among language, human communication, and society. In his book, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, he pointed out that in

---

[42] Ibid.

[43] Tuchman, *Making News*.

the communication process, language is directly linked to the individual's mind and society. According to him, by using words which are distinct from those of another society, human beings are able to interact with each another and consequently tie to their society. Language as a set of concepts enables people to present their thoughts in their minds to others, whereby human communication can take place. In short, language is not merely words, but individuals' internal meanings. Moreover, language bonds individuals with their society.[44]

Belonging to the school of Locke, Herbert Blumer and George Mead developed a new theoretical paradigm, symbolic interactionism in the 1930s. From the social psychological perspectives, symbolic interactionism focuses on the relationships between the individual internal process and his or her society. A basic assumption of this theory is that human communication is a goal-oriented activity. Symbolic interactionism takes the view that "society consists of individuals interacting with one another."[45] By interpreting or taking into account reactions of others through exchanging significant symbols, individuals shape their beliefs about themselves and others. Accordingly, they adapt themselves to

---

44 Melvin L. De Fleur and Sandra Ball-Rokeach, *Theory of Mass Communication* (New York: Longman, 1982).

45 J. David Lewis and Richard L. Smith, *American Sociology and Pragmatism: Mead, Chicago Sociology, and Symbolic Interaction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 173.

their society. In other words, taking functional approaches, human beings influence their cognitive and affective orientations toward others, society, and even themselves, whereby society is developed and maintained.[46]

Mead discussed the human communication process through language in depth. He contended that language (as a significant symbol, which can be acquired by learning rather than by nature) is essential for the cognitive process. On the basis of a significant symbol, human beings are able to respond to each another and behave in patterned ways. Furthermore, he insisted that without a significant symbol, human communication cannot take place.[47]

De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach noted that as people communicate with each other through language, selected assertions which individuals talk about over the years become considered as true representations of realities, which are called "beliefs."[48] They stated that beliefs influence the cognitive process in not only conceptions of self, but also attitudes toward others. People use beliefs "to make assertions about the world they perceive around them that they can develop shared understandings about the nature of

---

46 Herbert Blumer, "Society as Symbolic Interaction," in *Symbolic Interactionism: A Reader in Social Psychology*, Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer, eds., (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972), pp. 14-153.

47 George Herbert Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934).

48 De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach, *Theory of Mass Communication.*

reality."[49] De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach stated that stereotypes and opinions about other nations and the people, for instance, are formed based on such beliefs.

Considering beliefs, people perceive realities and evaluate aspects of realities. According to Mead, perception is an elaboration of interpreting self and others' responses to realities. Individuals respond to occurrences based on their beliefs and thoughts. In other words, perceptions of realities are determined not by instant judgment in each time of occurrences, but by beliefs which have already formed in individuals' minds through symbolic interaction.[50] Indeed, arguing how public opinion is manufactured, Lippmann noted, "For the most part we do not first see, and then define, we define first and then see."[51]

De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach discussed the notion that although language plays an important role in human communications, it does not constitute beliefs and thoughts. Instead, beliefs and thoughts are constituted in the social act. Beliefs about reality are elaborated through participation in the communication process. In short, beliefs are socially constructed. Accordingly, beliefs vary from one society to another. Two different societies are

---

49 Ibid., p. 138.

50 Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society.*

51 Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York: MacMillan, 1922), pp. 54-55.

different in constructing interpretations of reality from each other.[52]

Symbolizing what happened and what is happening in the society, language enables human beings to efficiently exchange information with others. Mead stated:

> Symbolization constitutes objects not constituted before, objects which would not exist except for the context of social relationships wherein symbolization occurs. Language does not simply symbolize a situation or object which is already there in advance; it makes possible the existence or the appearance of that situation or object, for it is a part of the mechanism whereby that situation or object is created.[53]

The process of making occurrences into existence has the risk in distorting reality or particular aspects of reality. De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach noted that in the communication process, messages should be understandable to receivers. Therefore, when implicit messages are passed from one person to another, those messages turn to be explicit in order that receivers are able to respond to. In the communication process, information is transformed into receiver's understandable forms each time information is exchanged. A critical problem lies in the encoring process.[54]

Hayakawa argued that any languages involve some abstractions. By emphasizing some details and dismissing the

---

52 De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach, *Theory of Mass Communication.*

53 Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society*, p. 78.

54 De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach, *Theory of Mass Communication.*

other details, objects with a variety of characteristics are encoded into a word.[55] Severin and Tankard stated that except for proper nouns, "our language has no words for unique events, feelings, and relationships. We speak, perceive, and think of the world in categories."[56] Furthermore, they noted that categorizing objects into a word varies depending on purpose and evaluation of an encoder. Considering language as influential in human relationships, general semanticists such as Hayakawa attempt to understand the relationships between words and meanings to which the words refer.[57]

Hayakawa discussed the notion that language has a great influence on shaping knowledge. There are two types of knowledge. First, people know happenings around them through their personal experiences. This "first-handed knowledge" is extremely limited. If people rely on only the first-handed knowledge, it would be impossible to know what happened and what is happening in another country. According to Hayakawa, people acquire most of their knowledge from someone else through interpersonal communication and the mass media such as television, radio, and newspaper. Regardless of the means of knowledge acquisition, language is a significant device

---

[55] S. I. Hayakawa, *Language in Thought and Action* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964).

[56] Werner J. Severin and James W. Tankard, Jr., *Communication Theories: Origins, Methods, and Uses in the Mass Media* (New York: Longman, 1992), p. 76.

[57] De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach, *Theory of Mass Communication.*

for information flow. By passing words to one another, a map of knowledge is manufactured in people's minds as reality.[58]

In modern societies, it is necessary to consider the mass media in the communication process. Looking at a role of the mass media in society, Lasswell argued that the media have both functions and dysfunctions. The media function to maintain social stability. For instance, by exposing deviance, the media provide what is acceptable in society. The media enforce social norms. On the other hand, by overemphasizing selected issues, the media often manufacture stereotyped images of certain objects such as nations or people. This is what Lasswell called functions and dysfunctions of the media.[59]

Having seen society as a system of interrelated parts, the mass media which are parts of societal subsystems contribute to making social stability. However, if the mass media are dysfunctional, they contribute to disharmony rather than stability.[60] Through the media, people develop their beliefs of social events and issues about which they cannot readily get information. In fact, Merrill discussed that

---

[58] Hayakawa, *Language in Thought and Action.*

[59] Harold D. Lasswell, "The Structure and Function of Communication in Society," in *Institute for Religious and Social Studies*, Lyman Bryson, ed., (Harper & Brothers, 1948), pp. 37-51.

[60] De Fleur and Ball-Rokeach, *Theory of Mass Communication*; Denis McQuail, *Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction* (Sage Publications, 1991).

people build conceptions of other nations and the people often based on international news they receive.[61]

Hayakawa likened beliefs of realities to drawing a map. He argued that people often draw up false maps which are dangerous to society. People consider false maps to be accurate unless they can compare the map with their knowledge from their own experiences.[62] Consequently, based on a false map, people guide themselves to certain attitudes. According to Merrill, many people perceive other nations and people based on the stereotypes of the nations they have.[63] Furthermore, discussing ways of having false maps, Hayakawa pointed out that people often draw false maps based on inaccurate information they receive.[64]

Applying the concept of general semantics, a number of studies on objectivity in news stories have been conducted. Hayakawa discussed two major statements preventing an objective news story. A first statement is an inference. On the basis of known facts, journalists sometimes state unknown events. For example, by knowing the fact that a man pounded on a table, a journalist reports that he was angry. A second statement is a judgment. Based on own values and preference, journalists sometimes approve or disapprove occurrences. For

---

61 John C. Merrill, *Global Journalism: A Survey of the World's Mass Media* (New York: Longman, 1983).

62 Hayakawa, *Language in Thought and Action.*

63 Merrill, *Global Journalism.*

64 Hayakawa, *Language in Thought and Action.*

example, the following statements are judgments: "The senator was stubborn, defiant, and uncooperative,"[65] and "The senator courageously stood by his principle."[66] Hayakawa insisted that journalists should avoid both inferences and judgments which cannot be verified as much as possible in order to maintain objectivity.

Hayakawa, furthermore, argued that another factor, "slanting" also has to be considered in achieving objectivity. Slanting is "selecting details favorable or unfavorable to the subject being described."[67] He noted that depending on whether a story includes favorable or unfavorable details, impressions of the story as a whole are changed dramatically.

Herman and Chomsky studied on news bias in international news stories. They compared the media coverage of the elections in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua between 1982 and 1985. El Salvador and Guatemala were supported by the United States government, while Nicaragua was opposed by the United States government. The elections in El Salvador and Guatemala were far from free. Dissidents were killed and journalists were suppressed. Accordingly, candidates from the opposition parties as the party in power were forced to leave the elections by violence. Although there were some

---

65 Ibid., p. 43.
66 Ibid., p. 43.
67 Ibid., p. 48.

restrictions, the range of the candidate selection was much greater in Nicaragua than in El Salvador and Guatemala. In Nicaragua, dissidents could speak out freely without threats of murder. Besides, voting was required by law in Guatemala and El Salvador; however, it was not required by law in Nicaragua.[68]

Herman and Chomsky concluded that despite the fact that electoral conditions in El Salvador and Guatemala were far less favorable than those in Nicaragua, the news coverage of the El Salvador and Guatemala was far more favorable than that of Nicaragua. The news coverage ignored most of the electoral conditions in El Salvador and Guatemala, while emphasizing those of Nicaragua. For instance, an article in *Time* magazine (October 29, 1984) stated, "'A campaign without suspense,' voters 'too apathetic to go to the polls at all.'"[69] On the other hand, *Time* (April 9, 1984) reported the El Salvador election, saying that "hundreds of thousands... braved the threats, and sometimes the bullets, of the Marxist-led to join long serpentine polling lines for the country's much awaited presidential elections."[70] Similarly, the Guatemalan election also got favorable coverage. Ignoring the fact that voting was required by law in El Salvador and Guatemala, the news covered the elections

---

68 Herman and Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent.*

69 Ibid., p. 118.

70 Ibid., p. 118.

of these countries enthusiastically. However, the Nicaraguan election was reported negatively, emphasizing apathy or fear of the government.

Researchers consider not only imbalanced coverage of events, but also language that is used to describe events. When journalists encode occurrences into words, they face trying to find appropriate words. Yet, there is "no words for unique events, feelings, and relationships."[71] Because of that, language sometimes can describe events only in a rough way. Hayakawa argued that people often divide events into only two opposing views such as "good" or "bad" and "right" or "wrong." He termed this tendency the "two-value orientation."[72] In light of the two-value orientation, many words in a news story are either favorable or unfavorable rather than neutral.

Merrill analyzed how *Time* magazine depicted three presidents: Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.[73] He examined the language that described each president, and whether the language biased a story in favor of a president or against him. As a result, the coverage of Truman was biased negatively such as "said coldly."[74] Of 93 total bias cases, as many as 92 were negative and only one was positive. On

---

71 Severin and Tankard, Jr., *Communication Theories*, p. 76.

72 Hayakawa, *Language in Thought and Action*, p. 230.

73 John C. Merrill, "How *Time* Stereotyped Three U.S. Presidents," *Journalism Quarterly*, 42, 1965, pp. 563-570.

74 Ibid., p. 568.

the other hand, *Time* provided positive bias toward Eisenhower such as "chatted amiably."[75] Of 82 total bias cases, 81 were positive and one was negative. Unlike Truman and Eisenhower, Kennedy got a balanced portrayal. In the coverage of Kennedy, 45 bias cases were found. Fourteen were negative and 31 were positive bias. He concluded that *Time* created and developed the following stereotypes of the presidents: Truman as an unpopular man, Eisenhower as a warm-hearted and sincere leader, and Kennedy as a wealthy and sociable person. He pointed out that the stories created and reinforced the stereotypes of the presidents by emphasizing their personalities rather than their news activities.

Fedler, Meeske, and Hall also examined the stereotypes of presidents in *Time* magazines.[76] Stories about four president--Johnson, Nixon, Ford, and Carter--were selected. The coverage of Johnson was more or less balanced (46 positive and 41 negative bias). Nixon was depicted favorably before the Watergate scandals (42 positive and 16 negative bias) but negatively after the scandals (7 positive and 70 negative). Ford was supported (53 positive and 34 negative bias), and Carter was opposed (24 positive and 63 negative). Furthermore, they concluded that the tendency that Merrill[77]

---

75 Ibid., p. 568.

76 Fred Fedler, Mike Meeske, and Joe Hall, "*Time* Magazine Revisited: Presidential Stereotypes Persist," *Journalism Quarterly*, 56, 1979, pp. 353-359.

77 Merrill, "How *Time* Stereotyped Three U.S. Presidents."

pointed out, emphasizing personalities of the presidents, was found in this study as well.

Studying the news frame of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) movement, Gitlin examined language as well.[78] According to him, the language describing the SDS members changed along with the changes in a news frame. In March 1965, the news covered the SDS's politics and approach respectfully. *The New York Times* described SDS as a "new student left."[79] However, by fall of 1965, the media frame shifted from respectful views toward the SDS movements to anti-movement views. At the same time, the news came to depict the SDS members as deviant and extremist. In October 1965, *The New York Times* portrayed the SDS movement as deviant behavior, saying "student riots."[80]

According to Lule, language in a news story is closely connected to the social and cultural context. He conducted qualitative analysis on the coverage of launching the Soviet satellite Sputnik in 1957 by the three elite newspapers: *The New York Times*, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, and *The Los Angeles Times*. In the late 1950s, relations between the United States and the Soviet Union were strained from the Cold War. Besides, the United States had own problems such as racial segregation and economic downturn. By reflecting these

---

[78] Gitlin, *The Whole World Is Watching*.
[79] Ibid., p. 26.
[80] Ibid., p. 80.

problems, the coverage of Sputnik was dramatized. The language portrayed the event as America's defeat, mortification, and dread by the Soviet Union. The news reinforced and created anxiety about the Soviet Union among Americans. He concluded that although the launch of Sputnik itself was not significant, the language gave its stories significant meanings.[81]

Scholars have argued that national images often obstruct international understanding, and bring about international friction. In the recent hostility between the United States and Japan, what role do the media play? Looking at media coverage of identical international trade issues between the United States and Japan, this study investigates how the media in these different countries presented the issues. In the next section, I will discuss cultural differences in traditional values and beliefs between the United States and Japan. This will help to foreshadow potential issues that may be emphasized differently in the United States and Japan.

---

[81] Jack Lule, "Roots of the Space Race: Sputnik and the Language of U.S. News in 1957," *Journalism Quarterly*, 68, 1991, pp. 76-86.

Chapter 3

Review of the Literature: The Value System in the United States and Japan

Cultural anthropologist Ruth Benedict, having been assigned to studying about Japan as an enemy in 1944, wrote a book, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword.*[1] The book begins with the following statement:

> The Japanese were the most alien enemy the United States had ever fought in an all-out struggle. In no other war with a major foe had it been necessary to take into account such exceedingly different habits of acting and thinking.[2]

In those days, many Americans (as did many Japanese) believed that Japanese culture was incomprehensibly different from American culture. Benedict contended that by looking into details of people's behavior in commonplaces, the incomprehensible differences would be revealed in cultural patterns. Having had a premise that human behavior is learned in everyday life, she attempted to discern Japanese cultural patterns. From the Benedict's study onward, a number of studies about cultural differences between the

---

[1] Ruth Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1946).

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

United States and Japan have been conducted mostly from anthropological and psychological perspectives.

Anthropologist Kearney discussed the notions of Self and others as determinants of a world view. From the anthropological view point, a world view is associated with culture. The view thus varies from culture to culture. According to him, the concept of Self in general consists of two aspects. The first aspect is how an individual perceives Self separated from others. The second aspect is the idea of relationships between Self and others.[3]

Taking account of these two aspects, I examine the concepts of Self and others in the United States and Japan. This chapter reviews cultural differences in the value system between the two countries. I first review Self in the relationships with others and their societies. Based on findings, I furthermore discuss how those values influence behavioral patterns.

---

[3] Michael Kearney, *World View* (California: Chandler & Sharp Publications, Inc., 1984).

Concepts of Self, Others, and Society

Stewart and Bennett dealt with American individualism in depth.[4] According to them, Americans believe that Self is "the basic unit of the culture."[5] Americans perceive Self as unique and others as "competitive but capable of cooperation."[6] Americans are usually taught to be conscious of Self separated from others. Moreover, Kearney said that individuals are a major consideration in the American society. The people demand their individual rights and privacy. Considering Self as an axis of the society, Americans clearly distinguish between Self and others.[7]

Individualism plays an important role in the American value system. Kearney argued that the clear distinction between Self and others leads individuals to take the Self as the primary reference for value judgments.[8] Indeed, Stewart and Bennett said that value derives from an individual's preference. If an individual likes an object, it is considered to be good. Americans emphasize personal preferences rather than opinions of others.[9]

---

[4] Edward C. Stewart and Milton J. Bennett, *American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Maine: International Press, Inc., 1991).

[5] Ibid., p. 136.

[6] Ibid., p. 13.

[7] Kearney, *World View*.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Stewart and Bennett, *American Cultural Patterns*.

Analyzing Japanese psychology, Doi as a psychiatrist dealt with Japanese behavior. He pointed out that mutual dependency between individuals exists at the bottom of Japanese society. An individual often depends on others such as family and friends in everyday life.[10] Although Self is the primary reference in constructing opinion to Americans, others are major reference to Japanese.[11]

As a cause of such mutual dependency, Doi discussed Japanese unique mental attribute, *amae*.[12] He defined the *amae* mentality as "the attempt to deny the fact of separation that is such an inseparable part of human existence and to obliterate the pain of separation."[13] According to him, *amae* is essential in understanding Japanese mentality and society. *Amae* is originally a unique mentality of a baby toward his mother. The first state of emotion that a baby has is passive love from his mother. This is called *amae*. Yet, Doi argued that human beings have the *amae* mentality not only in the childhood, but also in the adulthood.

People, moreover, naturally have the *amae* mentality regardless of culture. Nevertheless, Doi noted that the mentality is a basic in Japanese character structure but not in American character structure. From the Western

---

[10] Takeo Doi, *The Anatomy of Dependence: The Individual Versus Society* (Tokyo: Kodansha International Ltd., 1974).

[11] Stewart and Bennett, *American Cultural Patterns.*

[12] Doi, *The Anatomy of Dependence.*

[13] Ibid., p. 75.

psychological perspective, the *amae* mentality is usually associated with the psychological development. The mentality therefore is believed to be a manifestation of immaturity in Western culture. It is thus not acceptable in Western countries in which individualism has developed. The *amae* mentality is, however, desirable in most Eastern countries including Japan.[14] Confucianism had a great influence on the development of Japanese culture. Confucianism values unity of family and consideration toward others.[15] Individualism, however, played a major role in the development of American culture.[16] Accordingly, the *amae* mentality is developed in the relationships between Self and others in Japan, while it is ignored in the United States. By taking account of an individual's *amae* mentality, Japanese maintain interdependent relationships with others.[17]

Doi claimed that self-identification is different among Japanese and Americans. Although Self is clearly distinguished from others in the United States, a distinction between Self and others is blurred in Japan. Japanese identify Self through integration with surroundings, he noted.[18] Nakane also argued that Japanese maintain group

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] Edwin O. Reichauer, *The Japanese Today: Change and Continuity* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988).

[16] Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword.*

[17] Doi, *The Anatomy of Dependence.*

[18] Ibid.

identification rather than individual identification. Japanese tend to classify individuals according to the institution they belong to. For instance, Japanese usually introduce themselves by saying, "I belong to ABC Company," instead of saying, "I am an engineer." Such group identification results in the assimilation of Self and others. For Japanese, consideration of the group they belong to comes before consideration of Self. Japanese are involved in the group even emotionally.[19]

In fact, Kearney discussed a society based on interdependency from anthropological perspectives. In such a society, an individual's conditions such as his emotion are potentially affected by perceptions of others toward him. Seeing people interconnecting with each other, they think that their well-being is dependent on others' well-being. Therefore, people's consideration for others in such a society is in a great degree. He argued that human relationships based on mutual dependency result in binding individuals and others. In short, interdependency among individuals is a cohesive force.[20]

Benedict and Doi also dealt with the distinction between private and public matters. They pointed out that this distinction is also blurred in Japan, as compared to the

---

[19] Chie Nakane, "Criteria of Group Formation," in *Japanese Culture and Behavior*, Takie Sugiyama Lebra and William P. Lebra, eds., (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1974), pp. 155-173.

[20] Kearney, *World View*.

United States.[21] Benedict claimed that Japanese criticism of one's personality is closely related to a criticism of one's acts in a working area. For instance, Japanese consider that a poor skill in work results from a lack of discipline caused from problems in personality. This tendency as well as group identification brings into emotional involvement into a group.[22]

Benedict described Japan as a shame culture, and the United States as a guilt culture. According to her, shame is externally imposed. By taking account of external sanctions, Japanese orient Self toward the verdict of others. Unlike shame, guilt is associated with internalized conviction of sin. Americans determine their attitude based on their internalized morality rather than consideration of external sanctions. In short, Japanese emphasize the importance of shame, whereas Americans emphasize the importance of guilt.[23]

Regarding American individualism, Stewart and Bennett contended that society is a collection of individuals acting on self-interests. On the other hand, Japanese see that individuals interacting with each other contribute to society.[24] In this sense, Self and society are imseparatable. In other words, by having a sense of obligation to others,

---

[21] Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, Doi, *The Anatomy of Dependence*.

[22] Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Stewart and Bennett, *American Cultural Patterns*.

individuals are held together and woven into society. Japanese emphasize social meaning of Self rather than individualism.

Kearney argued that Japanese emphasize understanding and sharing general attitudes in the society. Seeking harmony with others, Japanese try to maintain a balanced relationship between Self and others in the society.[25] Indeed, Reischauer, a former ambassador to Japan, recognized the balance between the individual and society in Japan. He pointed out that the Japanese old saying, "The nail that sticks out gets banged down"[26] shows that Japanese emphasize harmony rather than individual. In short, Americans consider Self in the relations with the society, while Japanese illustrate Self in the society.

Japanese tend to define an individual based in the relations to others and society. By seeing such attitude, Benedict described Japan as a hierarchical society. A major concern for Japanese is "take one's proper station."[27] According to Benedict, Japanese first see an individual's standing, and then bear appropriate behavior in the relationships with others and society.

---

[25] Kearney, *World View*.
[26] Reichauer, *The Japanese Today*, p. 136.
[27] Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, p. 43.

Doi,[28] Minami,[29] and others also discussed such psychology. They called this, *giri*. They pointed out *giri* as well as the *amae* mentality bringing about a relationship of interdependence in Japanese society. *Giri* is defined as promise that an individual should bear proper behavior according to own station in the relationships with others.[30] For instance, one dealing with one's senior should show respect, and should be polite. The senior, in turn, should good take care of his junior. Accordingly, a good relationship between a senior and a junior can be maintained. In other words, *giri* binds individuals in the interdependent relationships the *amae* mentality makes up. In short, *giri* is an external sanction and the *amae* mentality is an internal incentive for the interdependent relationships.

From an anthropological perspective, Kearney sees at least two fundamental distinctions in any societies set by individuals: We and They. "We" refers to those who belong to the same group, and "they" refers to those who do not.[31] Doi argued that Japanese think that those whose relationships with Self based on the *amae* mentality are "we." Japanese,

---

[28] Doi, *The Anatomy of Dependence*.

[29] Hiroshi Minami, *Nihonjin no Shinri (Psychology of Japanese)* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shinsho, 1990).

[30] Ibid.

[31] Kearney, *World View*.

however, consider those who stand outside the *amae* world as "they."[32]

In Japanese thinking, one should hold back to those outside the *amae* world. This mentality is called *enryo*. As translated this literally, *en* means distance and *ryo* means consideration. Doi claimed that *enryo* is an inverted form of *amae*. Among "we," Japanese are able to bear interdependent relationships. To "they," however, Japanese should be holding back. For example, one holds the *amae* mentality to his parents, but he usually does *enryo* to his colleagues.[33] This attitude is again alien to Americans acting based on the value of equality and fairness.

In the contrast to the Japanese relationships based on interdependency, self-reliance is an important value in the United States. The sense of self-reliance is embodied in individualism. Americans are encouraged to be autonomous even at a very early age. For instance, Stewart and Bennett acknowledged that by the time Americans reach one year old, they are able to present their opinions at least regarding food preferences.[34] Doi also pointed out that the spirit of self-reliance has been significant in Western culture since as early as the 17th century. Evidence can be found in the

---

[32] Doi, *The Anatomy of Dependence*.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Stewart and Bennett, *American Cultural Patterns*.

fact that the proverb, "The Lord helps those who help themselves,"[35] became popular, he noted.

Americans value an individual's achievement by self-reliance. When Americans see an individual, they look at one's ability and achievement instead of one's social class and the group one belongs to. In the United States, exclusion of any privileges from birth is the principal sanction. In other words, Americans believe that a social standing is not fixed but able to be improved with effort.[36]

Significant Values

The value of equality is deeply rooted in American society.[37] As early as in 1776, the Declaration of Independence stated that "All men are created equal."[38] The United States was founded and built on such ideals. Benedict, moreover, noted that equality is a fundamental moral in the United States. She claimed that Americans

---

[35] Doi, *The Anatomy of Dependence*, p. 133.

[36] Minami, *Nihonjin no Shinri (Psychology of Japanese)*.

[37] Hidetoshi Kato, *Amerikajin: Sono Bunka to Ningen Keisei (Americans: Their Culture and the Formation of Their Characters)* (Tokyo: Kodansha Corporation, 1991); Kyoko Kato and Michael Berger, *Nihonjin o Shiranai Amerikajin, Amerikajin o Shiranai Nihonjin (Americans Who Do Not Know About Japanese, Japanese Who Do Not Know About Americans)* (Tokyo: TBS Buritanika, 1990).

[38] Kato, *Amerikajin (Americans)*, p. 67.

believe that a sense of equality is essential for a better world.[39]

Fair play is also significant value in the United States. Americans are concerned about not only their own fair share, but also others'.[40] As mentioned before, achievement is a primary care for Americans. Americans ideal that everyone has to have an equal chance to success, according to Kato.[41] Competitions therefore have to be maintained under fair conditions for everyone. An individual's achievement is dependent on one's effort rather than on one's inborn ability or privilege. In short, Americans are concerned about whether everyone equally has the same rights, and whether everyone is treated fairly under the same rule.

A significant value for Japanese, on the other hand, is harmony between individuals in society.[42] Inamoto claimed that the *enryo* mentality helps to reduce potential frictions between individuals.[43] Japanese usually give collective behavior priority over personal interests by being moderate

---

[39] Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword.*

[40] Stewart and Bennett, *American Cultural Patterns.*

[41] Kato, *Amerikajin.*

[42] Kato and Berger, *Nihonjin o Shiranai Amerikajin, Amerikajin o Shiranai Nihonjin (Americans Who Do Not Know About Japanese, Japanese Who Do Not Know About Americans),* Hiroshi Wagatsuma, *Nihonjin to Amerikajin Koko ga Oochigai (This Is a Significant Difference Between Japanese and Americans)* (Tokyo: Bungei Shunju Corporation, 1985).

[43] Noboru Inamoto, *Nihonjin Tai Amerikajin (Japanese vs. Americans)* (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1982).

in presenting own opinion. Indeed, Wagatsuma argued that the following norm has existed for a long time in Japan. If one anticipates that his opinion would give others unpleasant feelings, he should not present it.[44] Moreover, according to Inamoto, Japanese believe that one should be considerate of feelings of others in order for solidarity of a society.[45]

For Japanese, to maintain a good reputation (honor) is very important, according to Benedict.[46] Japanese are chiefly conscious of defending a good reputation not only of their own, but also of others. To lose face (incur shame) is a serious matter for Japanese. Therefore, if presenting an honest opinion hurts other's feelings and results in losing other's face, the act is considered as insincerity in Japan. However, Wagatsuma pointed out that whether opinion is pleasant or unpleasant, to manifest an honest opinion is the very sincerity in the United States. Americans view that a hypocritical remark to avoid hurting other's feelings is insincere.[47] Regarding the perceptions of sincerity and insincerity, Americans and Japanese contradict each other.

Benedict claimed that honor is a constant goal for Japanese. Whatever situation changes, Japanese attempt to keep a good reputation by changing their attitude. She

---

[44] Wagatsuma, *Nihonjin to Amerikajin Koko ga Oochigai (This Is a Significant Difference Between Japanese and Americans).*

[45] Inamoto, *Nihonjin Tai Amerikajin (Japanese vs. Americans).*

[46] Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword.*

[47] Wagatsuma, *Nihonjin to Amerikajin Koko ga Oochigai (This Is a Significant Difference Between Japanese and Americans).*

described such Japanese attitude as "extremely situational realism."[48] Americans pursue equality and fairness by constant value judgment. Japanese, however, change value judgment according to an individual's station in a society because they believe that appropriate behavior should be situationally changed in the relationships with others.

Benedict discussed changes in the Japanese attitude before and after World War II as an example. The Japanese that resisted the United States during the war completely changed their attitude after the war. Japanese turned to welcome Americans, and be friendly. This surprised many Americans who anticipated severe resistance. According to Benedict's analysis, Japan's station in the relationships with other nations changed from a world leader to a guided country. Consequently, its attitude should be changed along with its station in the world. Benedict noted that Japanese after the war turned to perceive Japan as a guided country. Japan thus should act on American's instructions. Benedict, however, pointed out that changes in attitude runs against the grain of Western morality.[49]

---

[48] Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, p. 175.

[49] Ibid.

Behavioral Patterns

Stewart and Bennett discussed American's attitude in the decision making process. According to them, American thinking is goal-oriented. Taking functional approaches, Americans focus on "getting things done." The functional style of thinking is embodied in American pragmatism. A primary concern of Americans is success. They inductively construct perceptions of events instead of taking a deductive approach from a theoretical goal. Stewart and Bennett noted that, on the other hand, Japanese first set a theoretical goal as a final decision which is derived from precedents and their rules. They then discuss their approaches toward the goal. In short, Japanese take the conceptual decision making process, whereas Americans take the pragmatic decision making by maintaining a functional approach.[50]

Because Americans focus on getting things done, they try to avoid failure in the future by taking action in the present. Americans tend to first analyze if any obstacles that may bring failure. If there are any, they consider how to overcome the obstacle to attain success. In the process of solving problems, Americans focus on relations between cause and effects. According to Stewart and Bennett, by identifying an agent who might be responsible for the

---

[50] Stewart and Bennett, *American Cultural Patterns.*

problems, Americans usually try to discover reasons why they have problems. In contrast, Japanese rarely identify an agent because the agent may "lose his face," Stewart and Bennett noted. Instead of identifying an agent, Japanese usually emphasize only *what* the problems are rather than *why* the problems occurred. Japanese then discuss how they can overcome the problems by everyone's collaboration.[51]

Stewart and Bennett, furthermore, discussed a manner in the decision making process in the United States and Japan. There is a significant difference between two countries in individuals' attitudes toward decision making. According to Stewart and Bennett, Americans assume that everyone has an equal chance to participate in the decision making process. Moreover, Americans expect that they can express their opinions and influence a final decision. For Americans, a majority opinion is a final decision which is considered as a concrete goal leading individuals in effective action to attain success. Because of that, Americans are concerned about a procedure of decision making. This attitude is deeply rooted in the value of equality and fairness.[52]

Stewart and Bennett claimed that, in contrast, Japanese decision making process is ritualistic. Japanese demand unanimity in decision making. If one party is completely defeated, members of the party "lose their faces." In order

---

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

to avoid losing anyone's face, the majority compromise to other opinions until a consensus is reached. Stewart and Bennett pointed out that at times, Japanese even reject a logical step for action in order to avoid losing face.[53] Indeed, Reischauer noted that Japanese seek an agreement for everyone in negotiation. They have consultations until no one has strong objections. The goal of the Japanese decision making process is consensus. Because of that, the American style of majority decisions often brings dissatisfaction to Japanese.[54] In short, the American majority rule does not apply to Japanese decision making.

Hall discussed a high and a low context communication forms. In the high context communication, a message contains minimal information with implied meanings. A low context communication, on the other hand, contains a lot of explicit information. In contrast to high context communication, low context communication does not need to be interpreted by considering what the internalized meanings are. Hall contended that the American communication style is classified into the low context, while the Japanese communication style is classified into the high context.[55]

The difference in the communication styles can be verified by differences in negotiation styles. According to

---

[53] Ibid.

[54] Reichauer, *The Japanese Today.*

[55] Edward T. Hall, *Beyond Culture* (New York: An Anchor Books, 1976)

Stewart and Bennett, Japanese try to avoid confrontation as much as possible in order to maintain group solidarity. When an individual disagrees, he sees others' reactions as suggesting his own views by implied messages. Unlike Japanese, Americans are quite comfortable discussing dissidence with others. In the decision making process, Americans see thoughts and actions of others, and straddle their own thoughts and others'.[56] Inamoto described such American's negotiation style as antagonistic cooperation. He argued that it is an American style that leads a final decision by presenting an objection.[57]

Reischauer pointed out that this American negotiation style seems to be threatening and obtrusive to Japanese.[58] Indeed, Stewart and Bennett noted that "The American norm of confrontation consistently irritates human relations and endangers intercultural communication with foreign students and workers both abroad and at home."[59] Likewise, Japanese compromise negotiation style confuses many Americans, according to Reichauer.

* * *

---

56 Stewart and Bennett, *American Cultural Patterns.*

57 Inamoto, *Nihonjin Tai Amerikajin (Japanese vs. Americans).*

58 Reichauer, *The Japanese Today.*

59 Stewart and Bennett, *American Cultural Patterns.*

Both the United States and Japan have unique cultural value systems. Differences in the value system bring about different behavioral patterns between Americans and Japanese. Those differences sometimes cause misunderstandings between those peoples. In the interpersonal relationships, misunderstandings may be removed quickly by getting to know an individual in the other country. However, if misunderstandings are abetted by the mass media, those misunderstandings would be dangers to the relationships between these countries.

Kato and Berger questioned a journalist's attitudes toward news coverage of international issues, especially related to trade issues between the United States and Japan. According to them, Japanese journalists tend to first consider that the fact that they are Japanese, and Americans journalists, too, tend to be primarily concerned about the fact that they are Americans. These facts come before the fact that they are professional journalists, Kato and Berger claimed.[60] In other words, based on cultural values of own countries, journalists tend to report the international news. In the chapter four, I will analyze the selected articles in American and Japanese newspapers. I will then discuss the

---

[60] Kato and Berger, *Nihonjin o Shiranai Amerikajin, Amerikajin o Shiranai Nihonjin (Americans Who Do Not Know About Japanese, Japanese Who Do Not Know About Americans)*

news contents reflecting cultural values of these two countries.

Chapter 4

Analysis of American and Japanese Newspaper: Coverage of the Tokyo Summit Meeting in 1992

This chapter takes a close look at Japanese and American newspaper coverage of the Tokyo summit meeting between President Bush and Prime Minister Miyazawa. President Bush took a trip to Asia in January 1992. In the finale of the summit meeting, on January 9, Bush and Miyazawa announced the two documents: the Tokyo Declaration and the Action Plans. On January 10, 1992, the meeting was covered as a front-page news item in the four selected newspapers: *The New York Times* and *The Los Angeles Times* in the United States, and *Yomiuri Shimbun* and *Asahi Shimbun* in Japan.

This chapter mainly consists of two focal investigations. The first point is to examine a news frame, what issue a news story includes and emphasizes. As mentioned in the chapter two, a news frame reflects a dominant ideology associated with the value system in a country. The second point, which is closely related to an investigation of a news frame, is to look at language describing issues. The literature review shows that language is determined by a journalist's values derived

from his society. In this sense, it is necessary to examine language which plays a significant role in constructing a meaning of the event.

A Headline and Opening of a Story

The New York Times:

Bush Reaches Pact With Japan, But Auto Makers Denounce It

Export Goal Unmet

Pledges by Japanese Fall Short of U.S. Hopes for Creating Jobs

TOKYO, Friday, Jan.10--President Bush left for home today with a Japanese offer to buy more American cars and $10 billion more in auto parts, but the car makers he brought with him denounced the Japanese pledges as woefully inadequate.

Even Bush Administration officials were saying the arrangements worked out in the long and often bitter negotiations fell far short of meeting the goals set by the White House for improving American exports to Japan and thus creating more jobs in the United States.

The Presidential party nonetheless contended that the talks were useful in drawing more attention to the continuing dispute over the trade in autos between the United States and Japan.[1]

---

[1] Michael Wines, "Bush Reaches Pact With Japan, But Auto Makers Denounce It," *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A1.

The Los Angeles Times:

Bush Bringing Home Little From Tokyo Quest for Jobs

*Trade: Although he calls the trip a success, his aides and business executives are disappointed with the results.

TOKYO--President Bush headed home today with little to show for a four-day crusade in Japan in which his proclaimed quest for "jobs, jobs, jobs" won a cordial hearing but a less than-eager reply from the Japanese.

"You never get all you want," Bush conceded, while proclaiming his trip a success. But other Administration officials made it clear that the White House is less than satisfied by the details of a U.S.-Japan accord announced here Thursday.

"It's somewhere between acceptable and a disappointment," a White House official said.

And business executives accompanying the President were glum about what the Bush trip accomplished.[2]

---

[2] Douglas Jehl, "Bush Bringing Home Little From Tokyo Quest for Jobs," *The Los Angeles Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A1.

Yomiuri Shimbun (Translated from Japanese):

Japan, U.S. Responsibility to Construct New Era

Summit Meeting Ended Announced Tokyo Declaration and Action Plans

Praises the GATT Agreement Plan

$10 Billion Increase in Imported Products in 1993

Regarding economic issues, the Tokyo Declaration pointed out that both the United States and Japan have a great influence on the world economy. The two nations pledge to fulfill their responsibility commensurate with their positions in the world "to make their economies the most open, productive and competitive in the world." As for the U.S.-Japan economic friction, the declaration states that two nations will "strengthen policy initiatives" to reduce structural impediments. The part II of the Action Plans lists detailed concrete plans to actualize the U.S.-Japan relations regarding economic matters the Tokyo Declaration proclaims.[3]

---

[3] *Yomiuri Shimbun*, "Japan, U.S. Responsibility to Construct New Era," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

Asahi Shimbun (Translated from Japanese):

Japan, U.S. Responsible for World in Post-Cold War Era

Japanese, U.S. Leaders Announced the Tokyo Declaration and the Action Plans

Premising Settlement of the Economic Friction, Miyazawa States Open Market Practices

The "Tokyo Declaration" the Japanese and U.S. leaders announced is set as an index to restructure the U.S.-Japan relationships in the post-cold war era. The declaration states that a goal for both Japan and the U.S. is "to preserve and stability in the region." The declaration, furthermore, emphasizes necessity to settle the economic and trade friction between Japan and the United States in order to maintain the worldwide cooperative relationships.

The "Action Plans" are an attached document to the Tokyo Declaration stating the extensive scopes of the U.S.-Japan cooperation including politics, security, and economy. In particular, the plans enthusiastically praise the comprehensive agreement plan introduced by Dunkel, the director-general of the GATT, by saying that the plan gives "a significant step" toward the settlement in the Uruguay Round of talks on trade liberalization.[4]

---

[4] *Asahi Shimbun*, "Japan, U.S. Responsible for World in Post-Cold War Era," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

News Frames

A distinct difference of a news frame between the American and Japanese newspapers was found. *The New York Times* and *The Los Angeles Times* covered the automotive trade issues between the United States and Japan as a main event in the summit meeting, emphasizing the contents of the agreement in the Action Plans. *Yomiuri Shimbun* and *Asahi Shimbun*, on the other hand, reported reconfirmation of the global partnerships between the United States and Japan contributing to the world order as a main event.

The New York Times devoted as much as the half of a front-page space to the summit meeting story. A lead story was headlined: "Bush Reaches Pact With Japan, But Auto Makers Denounced It" (See p.69).[5] Beneath, a large three-column photograph of three corporate chairmen, provided by Reuters, was presented. Lee A. Iacocca (the Chrysler Corporation), sitting between Yohei Mimura (Mitsubishi) and Eiji Toyoda (Toyota) during a breakfast meeting, looked sullen. Besides the lead story, the front-page carried another article about the meeting headlined, "A Trade Mission Ends in Tension As the 'Big

---

[5] Wines, *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A1.

Eight' of Autos Meet."[6] This article had a one-column photograph showing a tired face of President Bush.

The Los Angeles Times dealt with the summit meeting not so significantly as *The New York Times* did. A front page ran the story headlined, "Bush Bringing Home Little From Tokyo Quest for Jobs"[7] (See p.70). It was a small two-column space article at a right-hand lower corner without any pictures.

On front pages of both *Asahi Shimbun* and *Yomiuri Shimbun*, almost all of a news hole covered the summit meeting story. *Yomiuri Shimbun* had three articles related to the summit meeting. A lead story was headlined, "Japan, U.S.: Responsibility to Construct New Era"[8] (see p.71), presenting a big three-column photograph. The photograph showed that the United States and Japan's leaders smiling at each other exchanged a handshake. Attached to the lead story, another article talked about an interview to Bush and Miyazawa. It was headlined: "The Meeting Succeeded."[9] The final article at a left-hand upper corner ran a

---

[6] David E. Sanger, "A Trade Mission Ends in Tension As the 'Big Eight' of Autos Meet," *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A1.

[7] Jehl, *The Los Angeles Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A1.

[8] *Yomiuri Shimbun*, "Japan, U.S. Responsibility to Construct New Era," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

[9] *Yomiuri Shimbun*, "The Meeting Succeeded," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

headline, "U.S. Unsatisfied With 'Sales Cooperation'."[10] This article was not so conspicuous as the other two articles.

Asahi Shimbun displayed the same photograph as the *Yomiuri Shimbun* presented. A lead story ran the photograph of as big as four-column length under a headline: "Japan, U.S. Responsible for World in Post-Cold War Era"[11] (see p.72). Besides, *Asahi Shimbun* as well as *Yomiuri Shimbun* carried an article on the interview. It was headlined, "U.S. Continues Demands on Japan,"[12] with a subheadline: "U.S. President: The Trip Succeeded."[13]

By glancing at a front page, the Japanese and American newspapers seemed to report two different events. The summit meeting seemed to be a significant event in the world history in the Japanese newspapers. In the American newspapers, however, it seemed to be just another trade negotiation between the United States and Japan.

Both *The New York Times* and *The Los Angeles Times* stressed the Japanese pledges on the automobile issues in the Action Plans. These papers reported that the

---

[10] *Yomiuri Shimbun*, "U.S. Unsatisfied With 'Sales Cooperation,'" January 10, 1992, p. 1.

[11] *Asahi Shimbun*, "Japan, U.S. Responsible for World in Post-Cold War Era," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

[12] Ibid., p. 1.

[13] Ibid., p. 1.

pledges are insignificant because the Japanese did not make concessions to American's requests. The Japanese, moreover, used the pledges for an evasion of opening its market. The coverage also discussed the bitter negotiation with the Japanese, and the insufficient outcomes the United States got after all which would not improve the United States economic conditions.

In reporting the Japanese pledges, *The New York Times* began with President of the Ford Motor Company, Harold Poling's statement, "There is no agreement."[14] The story went on to how Poling thought about Japanese attitudes toward the negotiation: "the Japanese were unwilling to commit to a schedule to lower their $50 billion trade surplus with the United States, three-quarters of which comes from automobile trade."[15] The description was ended with a quotation from the Poling's statement, "The proposals on the table as far as the auto industry is concerned are inadequate."[16] The same paragraph appeared again in another article by another reporter, Sanger, with minor changes on the page A5.

The New York Times, moreover, talked about an agreement to attempt to increase the sale of American automobiles in Japan 20,000 per year. It said, "the

---

[14] Wines, *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A1.
[15] Ibid., p. 1.
[16] Ibid., p. 1.

trade concessions that Japan offered appeared too meager and uncertain either to affect the economy much or to ease tensions."[17] The story went on, "Administration negotiators repeatedly acknowledged... Japanese pledges of improvements in trade balances were either below White House expectations or were too murky and tentative to be readily measured."[18]

Sanger, furthermore, trivialized the Japanese pledges to the increase in purchasing auto parts from the United States. He argued that the Japanese have already planned to expand their manufacturing lines in the United States since a couple of years ago. He then said, "even without today's offer Japan's purchases of American parts seemed bound to rise."[19]

The Los Angeles Times said that despite the Bush's claim that the Japanese pledge to $19 billion increase in its purchases of American's auto parts was "the most significant Japan's agreement,"[20] the pledge represented "only a modest increase over what Tokyo had promised."[21] This article furthermore criticized that the Japanese commitments about automotive trade issues are insufficient, saying that "Bush failed to win the

---

17 Wines, *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A4.
18 Ibid., p. A4.
19 Sanger, *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A5.
20 Jehl, *The Los Angeles Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A12.
21 Ibid., p. A12.

broader commitment he had sought for Tokyo to open its markets and significantly reduce its trade deficit with the United States."[22]

News analysis in *The New York Times* headlined, "Bush's Painful Trip,"[23] also commented on an insufficiency of the outcomes. It stated:

> Instead of opening up its markets, Japan simply responded by pledging to purchase enough new imports to defuse anti-Japanese anger in Washington. Aside from revising some of its standardization and inspection procedures, Japan left the basic rules of free trade unchanged, particularly in the case of the auto accords.[24]

In addition to the front-page story, *The Los Angeles Times*, too, provided a detailed story in the business section. After a headline "Disappointment on Both Sides,"[25] a subheadline said, "Neither U.S. Nor Japan Came Away With What It Wanted."[26] Besides the article, a one-column-width picture showed two chairmen, Iacocca (Chrysler) and Toyoda (Toyota), sitting next to each other but facing the opposite directions.

---

[22] Ibid., p. A12.

[23] Steven R. Weisman, "Bush's Painful Trip," *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A5.

[24] Ibid., p. A5.

[25] Teresa Watanabe, "Disappointment on Both Sides," *The Los Angeles Times*, January 10, 1992, pp. D1.

[26] Ibid., p. D1.

This article discussed the contradict views between the United States and Japan toward the meeting which caused dissatisfaction on both sides. The Japanese sought improving their image as a global performer, while the Americans looked for settlement of the trade disputes. Because each side is out for the different interests, the Americans were disappointed with "lack of Japanese concessions in the trade agreements."[27] The Japanese were also upset because the Tokyo Declaration, which focuses on the global partnerships between the United States and Japan, was almost disappearing behind the economics negotiations. Accordingly, this story pointed out that "even the innocuous Tokyo Declaration disturbed some Japanese officials."[28]

The Japanese newspapers, in contrast to the American newspapers, focused on the Tokyo Declaration which reaffirms the relationships between the United States and Japan. The papers heavily reported that the two nations have responsibility to shape the post-cold war era. In the negotiations of the automotive issues, the Japanese newspapers discussed the differences in the American and Japanese attitudes. The Americans thrust a number of demands on the Japanese, while the Japanese

---

[27] Ibid., p. D1.
[28] Ibid., p. D2.

considering the United States as a partner made a substantial concession in the agreement.

In the coverage of the Tokyo Declaration, *Yomiuri Shimbun* said that the Japanese government succeeded in defining a goal of the cooperative relationships between the United States and Japan. Thinking of this goal, the two nations with strong economic power are able to fulfill their responsibility for the world in the post-cold war era. An article on page three by Kanda began with the following sentence: "How can Japan along with the United States play a role and fulfill its responsibility to maintain the world order after the Cold War?"[29] Kanda wrote that considering the cooperative relationships, "Japan and the United States included 'strengthening the global partnerships' into the Tokyo Declaration."[30]

Kanda, however, called the partnerships into question. He said, "As a proof of the partnerships, President Bush thrust a number of demands on Japan. Consequently, the issue of 'the global partnership' was pushed into the background of Americans' firm attitudes to the economic disputes with Japan."[31] Furthermore, he

---

[29] Toshimasa Kanda, "How To Construct 'Cooperative' Relationships on Equal Terms With U.S.," *Yomiuri Shimbun*, January 10, 1992, p. 3.

[30] Ibid., p. 3.

[31] Ibid., p. 3.

portrayed Bush diplomacy as "Push diplomacy,"[32] and stated that "the negotiations on the economic frictions reflected the United States as demanding as ever, and the Japan as yielding as ever."[33]

Asahi Shimbun also talked about the global partnerships in name only, saying that "The Tokyo Declaration and the Action Plans...emphasizing the global partnerships, urged Japan to settle the trade friction....Prime Minister Miyazawa turned to be burdened with a big task, called 'visible results.'"[34]

A story on page two in *Yomiuri Shimbun* subheadlined, "Japan Primarily Avoids Economic Frictions,"[35] discussed the Action Plans. Although the provision related to politics briefly lists up the commitments, the provision related to economics provides a number of commitments in detail. The article said, "In the Action Plans...the roles Japan has to play by far exceed the roles the United States has to play."[36] However, by considering the difficult economic

---

[32] Ibid., p. 3.

[33] Ibid., p. 3.

[34] *Asahi Shimbun*, "Japan, U.S. Responsible for World in Post-Cold War Era," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

[35] *Yomiuri Shimbun*, "In the Economic Issues, U.S. Took Practical Use," January 10, 1992, p. 2.

[36] Ibid., p. 2.

situations of the United States, the Japanese agreed to the Action Plans as visible results.[37]

Fukuie in *Asahi Shimbun*, too, pointed out that "The negotiations in the summit meeting highlighted two different attitudes: the Americans that only thrust its demands on Japan, and the Japanese that only yield to the Americans' demands....The Japanese concessions will rebound on Japan later."[38]

In the front page story in *Asahi Shimbun* headlined, "U.S. Continues Demands on Japan,"[39] a statement of President Bush was quoted: "I have resolved to further attempt to increase the exportation from the United States and the employment rate by taking all possible means."[40] The quotation was followed by such a comment, "President Bush showed his resolution that the United States continues to press its demands on Japan."[41]

Asahi Shimbun, furthermore, ran a story describing the Japanese victimized by the pushy Americans on page three as well. Beneath a headline, "'After the Party,'

---

[37] Sachio Sato and Miho Sugiyama, "The Declaration With Protectionism Overtones," *Yomiuri Shimbun*, January 10, 1992, p. 9.

[38] Yasunobu Fukuie, "'Ideal' & 'Pragmatic' in The Same Bed, Seeing Different Dreams," *Asahi Shimbun*, January 10, 1992, p. 2.

[39] *Asahi Shimbun*, "U.S. Continues Demands on Japan," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

[40] Ibid., p. 1.

[41] Ibid., p. 1.

a Big Burden,"[42] a story began with such a sentence: "'Bush typhoon' is leaving."[43] The story went on to a list of the areas the summit meeting dealt with. It then reported that some government officials said, "The guests who asked unreasonable demands are finally going home,"[44] and all the Japanese have after the meetings is "exhaustion and a question, what the relationships between the United States and Japan are."[45]

Discussion

In Chapter 3, I have discussed the differences in the cultural values between the United States and Japan. The concept of the relationships among Self, others, and society brings into unique world views and behavioral patterns in each culture. American thinking is goal-oriented, focusing on 'getting things done.' Americans are primarily concerned about self achievement. Because of that, they try to avoid failure in the future by eliminating obstacles in the present. On the other hand, by considering others, Japanese try to maintain

---

[42] *Asahi Shimbun*, "'After The Party,' A Big Burden," January 10, 1992, p. 3.

[43] Ibid., p. 3.

[44] Ibid., p. 3.

[45] Ibid., p. 3.

harmony between Self and others in society. Instead of self achievement, Japanese seek group achievement through cooperative relationships with others.

These cultural values affected the news coverage of the Tokyo summit meeting in 1992. The American newspapers covered the summit meeting differently from the Japanese newspapers. Regarding the coverage of the Tokyo Declaration, the Japanese newspapers treated the document as a significant event in the summit meeting. The coverage emphasized the importance of the global partnerships between the two nations for the world's sake. However, the American newspapers did not report this so importantly as the Japanese newspapers did. Indeed, the American newspapers trivialized the document. *The New York Times* merely described this as "a largely symbolic document,"[46] and *The Los Angeles Times* said an "innocuous" document.[47] For Americans seeking 'getting things done,' the Tokyo Declaration which stating an ideal goal does not have so much meanings as Japanese perceive.

In the coverage of the Japanese pledges on the automotive trade issues, the American newspapers reported that the pledges are insufficient and ineffective, and criticized the Japanese. The Japanese

---

[46] Wines, *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A4.
[47] Watanabe, *The Los Angeles Times*, January 10, 1992, p. D2.

refused to make concessions. The American newspapers in common covered that the Japanese made insufficient commitments to avoid opening its market. In light of the American thinking of goal-oriented, the pledges do not have direct effects to settle the trade disputes. By looking at what Americans need for a goal (opening Japanese market), the American newspapers emphasized what they failed to get rather than what they got.

The Japanese newspapers, on the other hand, reported that the Japanese were forced to have unreasonable commitments by Americans. Compared to Americans, Japanese take the conceptual negotiation process in order to avoid confrontation with others. For Japanese, those who straightly show their demands are considered to lack concern for harmony with others. Seeing the Americans' attitudes in the negotiation, the Japanese newspapers portrayed the Americans as pushy. There was a lack of concessions.

The Japanese newspapers, moreover, emphasized the consideration of the United States. Although the United States has weakened its power due to various social problems including declining economy, the United States should be a world leader in order to maintain the world order. Japan as a partner of America should support the United States not only for the two nations, but also for the whole world. By taking account of such a situation,

the Japanese always made concessions to Americans. In the Japanese coverage of the summit meeting in general, the Japanese victimized by the pushy Americans who took advantage of Japanese considerations of the United States.

Interestingly enough, both American and Japanese newspapers pointed out a lack of concessions in the other's attitudes toward the negotiation. The American newspapers presented a meaning of concession differently from what the Japanese newspapers viewed. The American newspapers perceived concessions associated with a goal. The agreements that cannot be measure easily or do not have visible effects are not considered to be concessions. In the Japanese newspapers, however, concessions are not always associated with a goal. By considering the United States, whether the outcomes are effective or not, the Japanese yielded their demands to the Americans. That is a meaning of making concessions in the Japanese newspapers.

This thesis shows that the American and Japanese newspapers reported the outcomes of the Tokyo summit meeting differently. News frames, which were enhanced by the use of language and photographs attached to the stories, were significantly different between the American and Japanese newspapers. As mentioned in Chapter 2, a news frame is socially constructed through

consideration of the organizational needs and it reflects cultural values in society. This thesis shows that the differences in the news coverage reflect underlying differences in cultures between the United States and Japan.

Conclusion

As I have attempted to demonstrate, national culture may be a significant variable in the determination of a news frame. However, it is not the only variable; instead, other factors are also conceivable such as politics. In the United States, the economic issues which directly affect the people's daily lives are the major public concern. Especially before the presidential election, the public interests could have been increased. Consequently, the American newspapers intentionally might have emphasized the economic issues. Moreover, the Japanese government was concerned about its reputation after being criticized for an insufficient contribution to the Gulf War. The government, therefore, might have provided convenient information to the Japanese newspapers. These different interests could have brought about the different news coverage of the summit meeting.

Another conceivable variable is the difficulty of accessing news sources. The difficulty of accessing news sources results from a language barrier. In the survey conducted by the East-West Center in Hawaii, both American and Japanese journalists mentioned language as the biggest obstacle in news coverage.[48] As discussed in Chapter 2, journalists exchanging information cooperate with each other at times. Indeed, such professional cooperation was found in *New York Times*. Sanger's article included the same description as his colleague, Wines' article.[49]

In sum, although there are other possible variables in shaping a news frame, this study suggests that cultural values may have affected reporting the outcomes of the Tokyo summit meeting in 1992. It is hoped that this study will lead to further examination of cultural variables and their relation to news coverage. One suggestion would be an analysis of long term trends in news coverage using cultural variables.

---

[48] The East-West Center, "Correspondents Give Their Views on Japan-U.S. News Coverage: Survey of Foreign Correspondents Based in Tokyo and Washington, D.C.," *East-West Center Special Report* (Hawaii: The East-West Center, January 1991).

[49] Sanger, *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A5; Wines, *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A1.

Bibliography

Arai, Naoyuki. "Gendai Janarizumu no Henyo (Changes in the Modern Journalism)," In Yoshimi Uchikawa and Naoyuki Arai (eds.) *Nihon Janarizumu: Taishyu no Kokoro o Tsukandaka (Japanese Journalism: Does it Catch the Public Minds?)*. Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 1983, pp. 121-152.

Asahi Shimbun. "'After the Party,' a Big Burden," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

Asahi Shimbun. "Auto Makers Offending and Concerned About Distribution," March 29, 1985, p. 9.

Asahi Shimbun. "Japan, U.S. Responsible for World in Post-Cold War Era," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

Asahi Shimbun. "'Kenbei' To 'Ishitsu Ron' Fuan na Kankei ("Kenbei" And "Uniqueness": Insecure Relations Between Japan and the United States)," January 23, 1992, p. 4.

Asahi Shimbun. "Hataraku Riron-kan Kaketeirunodewa (Is There a Lack of Working Ethics?)," February 4, 1992, p. 2.

Asahi Shimbun. "1,680,000 Cars Annually From April," May 1, 1981, p. 1.

Asahi Shimbun. "U.S. Continues Demands on Japan," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

Benedict, Ruth. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1946.

Bennett, W. Lance. *News: The politics of Illusion*. Second edition, New York: Longman, 1988.

Bloor, David. "A Sociological Theory of Objectivity," In Stuart C. Brown (ed.) *Objectivity and Cultural Divergence*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984, pp. 229-245.

Bluestone, Barry, and Bennett Harrison. *The Deindustrialization of America*. Basic Books, 1982.

Blumer, Herbert. "Society as Symbolic Interaction," In Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer (eds.) *Symbolic Interactionism: A Reader in Social Psychology*. Second edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972, pp. 145-153.

Carey, James W. "A Cultural Approach to Communication," In James W. Carey (ed.) *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, Ltd., 1988, pp. 13-36.

Chira, Susan. "Rise in Car Exports Confirmed by Japan," *The New York Times*. March 29, 1985, p. D15.

Copeland, Jeff. "Nippon Shindan: Gekido no Rokunen--Keizai (Examining Japan: The Six Years of Change--Economy)," *Newsweek: Japan*. February 6, 1992, pp. 12-15.

Crouse, Timothy. *The Boys on the Bus*. New York: Random House, 1973.

De Fleur, Melvin L. and Sandra Ball-Rokeach. *Theory of Mass Communication*. Fourth edition. New York: Longman, 1982.

Demaree, Allan T. "What Now for the U.S. and Japan," *Fortune*, February 10, 1992, pp. 80-95.

Doi, Takeo. *The Anatomy of Dependence: The Individual Versus Society*. Tokyo: Kodansha International Ltd., 1974.

Duffy, Michael. "Mission Impossible," *Time*, January 20, 1992, pp. 14-16.

The East-West Center. "Correspondents Give Their Views on Japan-U.S. News Coverage: Survey of Foreign Correspondents Based in Tokyo and Washington, D.C.," In *East-West Center Special Report*, January 1991. Hawaii: The East-West Center.

Egan, Timothy. "Japanese Bid for Seattle Team Gets Baseball's Cold Shoulder," *The New York Times*, January 24, 1992, pp. A1, B10.

Farnsworth, Clyde H. "Tokyo's Car Curbs Hailed in U.S., But Japanese Makers Are Angered: Congress Move Now Unlikely," *The New York Times*, May 2, 1981, p. A1, 33.

Fedler, Fred, Mike Meeske, and Joe Hall. "*Time* Magazine Revisited: Presidential Stereotypes Persist," *Journalism Quarterly*, 56, 1979, pp. 353-359.

Finkelstein, Barbara, Anne E. Imamura, and Joseph J. Tobin (eds.). *Transcending Stereotypes*. Maine: Intercultural Press, Inc., 1991.

Fujita, Hiroshi. *Amerika no Janarizumu (American journalism)*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1991.

Fukuie, Yasunobu. "'Ideal' & 'Pragmatic' in The Same Bed, Seeing Different Dreams," *Asahi Shimbun*, January 10, 1992, p. 2.

Gans, Herbert J. *Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1979.

Gitlin, Todd. *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making & Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

Hall, Edward T. *Beyond Culture*. New York: An Anchor Books., 1976.

Harrison, Bennett, and Barry Bluestone. *The Great U-Turn: Corporate Restructing and The Polarizing of America*. Basic Books, 1988.

Hayakawa, S. I. *Language in Thought and Action*. Second edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964.

Herman, Edward S., and Noam Chomsky. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.

Hey, Kenneth, "Cars And Films In American Culture, 1929-1959," In David L. Lewis and Laurence Goldstein (eds.) *The Automobile and American Culture*. The University of Michigan Press, 1983, pp. 193-205.

Impoco, Jim. "Behind Diplomatic Smiles," *U.S. News & World Report*, November 11, 1991, pp. 51-53.

Inamoto, Noboru. *Nihonjin Tai Amerikajin (Japanese vs. Americans)*. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1982.

International Media Guide: Newspapers Worldwide Edition. Connecticut: International Media Enterprises, Inc., 1990.

Ishizaka, Etsuo. "Masu Media Sangyo no Kozo Henka to Janarizunu (The Structural Changes in the Mass Media Industry and Journalism)," In Yoshimi Uchikawa and Naoyuki Arai (eds.) *Nihon Janarizumu: Taishyu no Kokoro o Tsukandaka (Japanese Journalism: Does it Catch the Public Minds?)*. Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 1983, pp. 153-187.

Jameson, Sam. "Bill Curbing Car Imports Shelved: Japan to Cut Auto Sales to U.S. by 7.7%," *The Los Angeles Times*, May 2, 1981, p. A1, 6, 8.

Jameson, Sam and James Risen. "Japan's Trade Barriers Stir Congress to Anger: Analysts See Return to Free Market in Cars," *The Los Angeles Times*, March 29, 1985, p. A1, 27.

Jehl, Douglas. "Bush Bringing Home Little From Tokyo Quest for Jobs," *The Los Angeles Times*, January 10, 1992, pp. A1, A12.

Kanda, Toshimasa. "How To Construct 'Cooperative' Relationships On Equal Terms With U.S.," *Yomiuri Shimbun*, January 10, 1992, p. 3.

Kato, Hidetoshi. *Amerikajin: Sono Bunka to Ningen Keisei (Americans: Their Culture And The Formation of Their characters)*. Tokyo: Kodansha Corporation, 1991.

Kato, Kyoko, and Michael Berger. *Nihonjin o Shiranai Amerikajin, Amerikajin o Shiranai Nihonjin (Americans Who Do Not Know About Japanese, Japanese Who Do Not Know About Americans)*. Tokyo: TBS Buritanika, 1990.

Kearney, Michael. *World View*. California: Chandler & Sharp Publishers, Inc., 1984.

Knowlton, Christopher. "Germany & Japan: Missing in Action," *Fortune*, March 11, 1991, pp. 57-60.

Lasswell, Harold D. "The Structure and Function of Communication in Society," In Lyman Bryson (ed.) *Institute for Religious and Social Studies*. Harper & Brothers, 1948, pp. 37-51.

Lewis, J. David and Richard L. Smith. *American Sociology and Pragmatism: Mead, Chicago Sociology, and Symbolic Interaction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Lippmann, Walter. *Public Opinion*. New York: MacMillan, 1922.

Lule, Jack. "Roots of the Space Race: Sputnik and the Language of U.S. News in 1957," *Journalism Quarterly*, 68, 1991, pp. 76-86.

McQuail, Denis. *Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction*. Second edition. Sage Publications, 1991.

Mead, George Herbert. *Mind, Self and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Merrill, John C. "How *Time* Stereotyped Three U.S. Presidents," *Journalism Quarterly*, 42, 1965, pp. 563-570.

Merrill, John C. *Global Journalism: A Survey of the World's Mass Media*. New York: Longman, 1983.

Minami, Hiroshi. *Nihonjin no Shinri (Psychology of Japanese)*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shinsho, 1990.

Morrow, Lance. "Japan in the Mind of America: America in the Mind of Japan," *Time*, February 10, 1992, pp. 16-26.

Nakane, Chie. "Criteria of Group Formation," In Takie Sugiyama Lebra and William P. Lebra (eds.), *Japanese Culture and Behavior*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1974, pp. 155-173.

National Institute for Research Advancement. *Nichi Bei oho no Keizai Masatsu o Meguru Seiji Katei (The Political Decision Making Process In Economic Conflicts: Japan, the United States, and European Countries)*. Tokyo: National Institute for Research Advancement, 1988.

Neff, Robert and Bill Javetski. "The Japan That Can Say 'Get Lost'," *Business Week*, October 14, 1991, pp. 58-59.

The New York Times. "Japanese React Angrily to Hollings Remark," March 5, 1992, p. A6.

Okuda, Akihisa. "Han-Nichi no Hi ni Abura o Sosoida 'Hodo Masatsu' no Shikake-Nin wa Bei Masukomi (The One Who Aggravates Anti-Japan Movements Is American Mass Media)," *Syukan Asahi*, February 7, 1992, pp. 148-150.

Powell, Bill. "Who's in Charge?" *Newsweek*, January 13, 1992, pp. 26-27.

Powell, Bill and Bradley Martin. "What Japan Thinks of Us," *Newsweek*, April 2, 1990, pp. 18-25.

Reinhold, Robert. "Los Angeles Cancels Huge Contract With a Japanese Maker of Rail Cars," *The New York Times*, January 23, 1992, p. A8.

Reichauer, Edwin O. *The Japanese Today: Change and Continuity*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Rudolph, Barbara. "Trade: Blame It on Japan," *Time*, February 3, 1992, pp. 38-40.

Sanger, David E. "A Trade Mission Ends in Tension As the 'Big Eight' of Autos Meet," *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, pp. A1, A5.

Sanger, David E. "Japan Premier Joins Critics of Americans' Work Habits," *The New York Times*, February 4, 1992, pp. A1, A9.

Sato, Sachio and Miho Sugiyama. "The Declaration With Protectionism Overtones," *Yomiuri Shimbun*, January 10, 1992, p. 9.

Schlossberg, Howard. "Carmakers Try to Boost Sales by Satisfying Buyers," *Marketing News*, May 28, 1990, pp. 2, 11, 19.

Schudson, Michael. *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1978.

Schwartz, John et al. "The Push to 'buy American': Will the Latest Form of Japan-Bashing Work?" *Newsweek*, February 3, 1992, pp. 32-35.

Severin, Werner J. and James W. Tankard, Jr. *Communication Theories: Origins, Methods, and Uses in the Mass Media*. Third edition. New York: Longman, 1992.

Sigal, Leon V. *Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking*. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1973.

Smith, Lee. "Fear and Loathing of Japan," *Fortune*, February 26, 1990, pp. 50-60.

Stewart, Edward C. and Milton J. Bennett. *American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Revised edition. Maine: Intercultural Press, Inc., 1991.

Takahashi, Katsuhide. "Heisei Keiki no Yomikata (Understanding the prosperity in Heisei Era)," *Nihon Keizai Shimbun*, January 7, 1992, p. 27.

Theory of The International Relations series: International Competition in Auto Industry, 5. Tokyo: Gakken, 1992.

Tuchman, Gaye. *Making News: A study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: The Free Press, 1978.

Wagatsuma, Hiroshi. *Nihonjin To Amerikajin Koko ga Oochigai (This Is a Significant Difference Between Japanese and Americans)*. Tokyo: Bungei Shunju Corporation, 1985.

Washio, Ako and Emiko Ohki. "Distribution Problems Blamed for Poor Sales of U.S. Autos," *Japan Times Weekly International Edition*, September 23-29, 1991, p. 17.

Watanabe, Teresa. "Disappointment on Both Sides," *The Los Angeles Times*, January 10, 1992, pp. D1, D2.

Weisman, Steven R. "Bush's Painful Trip," *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, p. A5.

Weisman, Steven R. "Japan and U.S. Struggle With Resentment," *New York Times*, December 3, 1991, pp. A1, A6.

Weisman, Steven R. "Japanese Coin Word for Their Unease About U.S.," *The New York Times*, October 16, 1991, p. A14.

Wines, Michael. "Bush Reaches Pact With Japan, But Auto Makers Denounce It," *The New York Times*, January 10, 1992, pp. A1, A4.

Yamamoto, Taketoshi. "The Press Clubs of Japan," *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 15(2). 1989, pp. 371-388.

Yomiuri Shimbun. "Auto Export to U.S. by 1,680,000," May 1, 1981, p. 1.

Yomiuri Shimbun. "Auto Restriction to U.S. by 2,300,000," March 29, 1985, p. 1.

Yomiuri Shimbun. "In The Economic Issues, U.S. Took Practical Use," January 10, 1992, p. 2.

Yomiuri Shimbun. "Japan, U.S. Responsibility To Construct New Era," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

Yomiuri Shimbun. "The Meeting Succeeded," January 10, 1992, p. 1.

Yomiuri Shimbun. "U.S. Unsatisfied With 'Sales Cooperation,'" January 10, 1992, p. 1.