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American Understandings of The United States’ Role in the World: Findings from Cognitive Interviews

Authors
Axel Aubrun and Joseph Grady of Cultural Logic

Research Objective
To uncover the cultural models that underlie Americans’ views of international relations.

Method
The research team conducted in-depth one-on-one interviews with 15 Americans of different ages, ethnicities, socioeconomic backgrounds, and political persuasions. The interviewing method provides an in-depth view of strong, recurrent patterns in thinking – a set of values and beliefs that underlie a distinctive American view of international relations.

Key Findings and Conclusions
The average person has no cultural model for international relations, other than those that are borrowed from the interpersonal domain. Americans treat countries as persons, and understand international engagement by reference to their experiences with parents, children and neighbors.

The American experience of parents, children and neighbors, is heavily colored by the basic value of self-reliance or individualism. Individualism has weakened social bonds in general, fundamentally reshaping models of both neighbor and family in American culture. Thus, the neighbor model refers mainly to casual and episodic interactions, or to unwanted ties and intrusions. Most of the time, Americans tend to feel and act as though they have no neighbors, except in times of crisis. In the family, Americans tend to operate on a “self-reliance” model, in which the goal is to reduce and eliminate interdependence between parents and children, by teaching kids to be self-reliant.
These cultural models of social relationships help explain and predict a variety of patterns in thinking about international engagement:

- Emotional and social factors are more central to Americans’ thinking on international relations than financial or other practical considerations.

- American reluctance to engage internationally results as much from inner conflicts as from indifference.

- Thinking about mutual interdependence does not come naturally for most Americans, because there are no salient interpersonal analogies for this kind of relationship. It is more natural for Americans to think about one-way dependence or complete independence.

- Due to these models, Americans are eager to help in times of crisis, but reluctant to get involved in long-term relationships of international interdependency. This is why appeals for help after a natural disaster are effective, but why chronic problems framed as crises may be less successful.

- Americans make extensive use of the parenting model in reasoning about international relations – making it difficult to treat other countries as equal partners.

- There is less difference between conservatives and liberals in their view of international relations than in other areas of public life.

- Americans are uncomfortable with interfering in the affairs of other countries.

- The false but stubborn American belief that the US spends far more money on foreign aid than any other country reflects the tendency to see the US as alone in the world. Combating this belief through messages suggesting Americans are not generous enough are unlikely to be successful.

- If used carefully, the theme of parenting for autonomy is an appropriate and effective way of promoting aid to developing nations.
Four Habits of International News Reporting

Authors

Susan Moeller, Director, Journalism Program, Brandies University

Research Objective

To outline the journalism conventions that result in certain types of frames and narratives.

Method

This paper is based on an analysis of international news coverage from June 21-July 10, 1999, collected from major US newspapers, *Time*, *Newsweek* and *US News and World Report*, and the evening network news programs. This collection was supplemented with full copies of the *New York Times, The Boston Globe*, and *Time*, and full videos of “NBC Nightly News.”

Key Findings and Conclusions

Moeller discusses Four Habits of News Reporting:

1. Formulaic Coverage – Much of news is reported in a series of formulas, such as good v. evil, or a simplified version of a crisis with no cause or solution, an expected shelf-life for a story, etc. Images are central to a story even being covered. This packaging of news as a product tends to make all events uniform, and boringly familiar.
2. Sensationalized Language – It takes more and more dramatic coverage to elicit the same level of sympathy as the last catastrophe.
3. Analogies, Metaphors and Images – The media’s use of historical analogies, of metaphors and of imagery can be an extension of their tendency toward sensationalism, but it can also be an attempt through vivid shorthand to replace complexity with a known quantity.
4. An American Connection – Coverage of international affairs is often viewed through the lens of “what does this mean for us?”

Two case studies are provided. A study of images of children found:

1. “Angel” images are used to darken the villains by contrasting their evil or misdeeds with the children’s innocence.
2. “Martyr” images are used to emphasize the horror or wrongdoing by describing children’s deaths or injuries, or to verify the horror or wrongdoing of others through an enumeration of child victims.
3. “Victims to be Rescued” images are used to provide a reason for the actions of adults, or to goad outsiders into a response.
4. “Torchbearer” images are used to stand in as a synecdoche for a potentially compromised future, or for a future already compromised.
5. “Literary Crutch” images are used to fulfill an aesthetic need in the story telling.

A study of human rights coverage found that there are three types of stories:

1. News stories in which either a discrete event is described or a process is discussed.
2. Editorials and/or opinion pieces that debate philosophical points or public policy questions relating to the concept of humanitarian intervention, the definition of a “just war,” the ascribing of blame for war crimes and atrocities or the apportioning of legal versus moral responsibility
3. News stories or feature articles that use a description of a human rights abuse to provide evidence for the charge of war crimes, to draw in readers or viewers with a human interest story, to validate the enemy as “evil” or to set a tone of pathetic fallacy.
Metaphorical Thought In Foreign Policy
Why Strategic Framing Matters

Authors

George Lakoff, University of California at Berkeley and the Rockridge Institute

Research Objective

• To demonstrate that the strategic framing of issues matters to foreign policy.
• To show that foreign policy is understood implicitly using systems of metaphorical thought.
• To provide a short guided tour through some of those systems and demonstrate how they mattered in the Gulf War and Kosovo.
• To show why an understanding of such framing, together with a systematic reframing, is necessary for the Global Interdependence Initiative.

Method

This analysis is grounded in the field of cognitive linguistics.

Key Findings and Conclusions

Mechanisms of understanding are mostly unconscious. We have a system of conceptual structures to understand situations in the world. Our understanding makes use of a system of conceptual metaphors – ways to understand concepts in terms of other concepts. Language is directly connected to such unconscious conceptual systems and metaphors. If you can affect how others understand situations, you can affect what they do in those situations.

An analysis of conservative and progressive moral systems indicates that both use a common metaphor – the Nation as Family – but with opposite versions of what constitutes an ideal family. For conservatives, it is a Strict Father family – the father is the leader of the family and is the moral authority who teaches right from wrong through discipline; through self-discipline, children learn self-reliance. For progressives, it is a Nurturant
Parent family, which requires two central values – empathy and responsibility; to nurture a child requires understanding what a child needs and children should learn to be responsible for themselves and others.

Common metaphors for international relations include:

- World Community – nations as people living in a community
- National Interest – National interest is self interest, health is economic health and strength is military strength
- Maturity is Industrialization – industrialized nations are grown-ups, non-industrialized are “undeveloped”

Experts hold different metaphors:

- Clausewitz: War as Politics, Politics as Business – each nation has political objectives and war may best serve those objectives. “Gains” should be weighed against “costs” with war a matter of cost-benefit analysis.
- Rational Actor – acting in one’s own self-interest
- Balance of Power – opposing states are physical objects exerting force on each other
- Faux Darwinian – states are animals, maintaining sovereignty is living, must compete to survive
- National Interest – National interest is self interest, health is economic health and strength is military strength
- States are Firms – large states are dominating firms, the international system is an economic market

In justifying a war, there is a common narrative based on fairy tales – villain, hero, innocent victim, victory restores the moral balance.

Using the Gulf War and Kosovo as examples, Lakoff illustrates the use of these metaphors in action.

Since the end of the Cold War, the World Community metaphor has been extended to the International Social Norms metaphor, where social norms for reasonable behavior are expected. This is an appropriate umbrella for the overall goals of the GII.
Policymakers and International Engagement
Findings from Cognitive Elicitations

Authors
Axel Aubrun and Joseph Grady of Cultural Logic

Research Objective
To understand the ways in which professionals with international experience think and talk about international affairs, to be able to develop a language in common with the public about the issue of cooperative international engagement.

Method
The findings are based on elicitations (one-on-one, semi-structured interviews) with ten individuals in government or organizations involved in international activities. The group included a mix of political conservatives and liberals, and varied experience. The interactive nature of this approach makes it possible to explore general aspects of the reasoning style of expert practitioners.

Key Findings and Conclusions
Like the public, policymakers use simplifying models and metaphors to reason about international relations, even though they may possess broader and deeper knowledge on the issue. So simple frames and metaphors are just as likely to be effective with policymakers as they are with the public. Furthermore, they tend to place new information into familiar frames of reference, so factual information, is not, in itself, persuasive.

Like the public, policymakers are, to some extent, constrained by the discourse of their peers. Individual policymakers often seem less political and polarized in a private context, but are forced into accepted modes of thought and discourse when working publicly.

Policymakers and the public share certain understandings, e.g. that the United States is fundamentally moral, and that it shoulders more than its share of the burden in international affairs.
Like all experts, policymakers tend to create and use “bird’s eye view” models of the world, which entail much broader knowledge than the public’s (even when the knowledge isn’t necessarily much deeper). This tendency to view the world from above – rather than from the perspective of a person “on the ground,” which would be more typical for a member of the public – has a number of consequences for how policymakers understand and communicate about international issues.

The mental models used by policymakers may resemble games, in which complex phenomena such as policies, resources, and populations are represented as pieces; and leaders and governments as players.

Policymakers tend to be especially ready to see the US as a leader in world affairs. Therefore, it is critical that new frames not diminish US status or importance.

Like most leaders and experts, policymakers tend to exude an “air of authority,” whatever topic they address. Therefore, to incorporate new frames into elite discourse, the frames need to harmonize with those currently used by experts.

Policymakers tend to adopt a cool and somewhat distant attitude to the events they deal with. This indicates that new frames should not be based on emotional appeals, since policymakers think in terms of pragmatic outcomes or ideological principles.

Policymakers tend to be skeptical about the public’s competence, interest and good will, in the area of international relations. This means that they often feel little incentive to engage with the public.
Primed and Suspect: How the Public Responds to Different Frames on Global Issues

Author

Meg Bostrom, Bostrom Consulting

Research Objective

To quantify the effect of different frames on public opinion, and to determine if it is possible to: increase public willingness for an active role in world affairs; decrease the perception that the US is doing more than it should; elevate the importance of the GII issue agenda; and, build a commitment to cooperation.

Method

This analysis is based upon the results of a survey of 2400 adults in the United States, conducted via phone. Survey respondents were exposed to a certain set of questions at the beginning of the survey, designed to “prime” a particular way of thinking. Then all interviewees responded to the same set of core questions about international affairs. By comparing the responses of those exposed to different priming experiments with the responses of a control group, it is possible to determine the effect of the priming experiment on public attitudes, therefore indicating the effects of a specific communications frame on public opinion.

The research team selected two issue frames (the environment and infectious disease) and two metaphorical frames (Social Norms and Partners), as well as a frame designed to reflect the dominant view presented by media today and a control group with no prime. Within the two issue areas, respondents were further primed to see the issue as either a domestic or international issue.

Each split or division consisted of a national sample of 400 adults 18+ drawn geographically proportionate to population (for a total sample size of 2400). Demographic characteristics (gender, age, education, political party identification) were weighted when necessary to be consistent across splits. Most percentages in this document refer to a base sample size of 400 interviews, which results in a sampling error of no more than +/- 5%.
Key Findings and Conclusions

This research suggests that alternative frames can move opinion toward a more interdependent view of the world. The global environment prime was the most successful in shifting attitudes toward interdependence. This issue frame conjures up a sense of balance and interrelationship that creates fertile ground for discussing international affairs. It moves nearly all interdependence indicators in the right direction: elevates desire for an active role in world affairs; increases the perception the United States is doing less than it should; increases support for economic assistance; shifts attitudes toward cooperation; and increases the priority of all other issues tested.

While the environment is the strongest of the tested frames, other alternatives have promise. The Social Norms frame based on Lakoff’s analysis elevates the importance of every issue tested, but does not lead to United States’ responsibility. The Partnership frame based on Aubrun and Grady’s work increases support for an active role in the world and suggests a business model that increases support for trading partners as a focus of economic aid. However, it also increases opposition to economic assistance generally, increases the belief the United States is doing more than it should and depresses interest in cooperation. Infectious disease, the international issue demonstrating the highest levels of public concern in this survey, is currently a poor frame for interdependence. It shifts nearly every interdependence indicator in the wrong direction.

The “global mayhem” coverage dominating the media does not have as much negative impact on opinion as was presumed. It causes Americans to have sympathy for the poor internationally, believe we are doing less than we should, and elevates desire to provide economic aid and cooperate to improve standards. But it also depresses belief that the United States is an effective source of assistance, creating a barrier to an interdependent view of the world.

There are distinct differences in opinion on international issues among various subgroups. Men are more supportive of an active role in the world but believe the United States is already doing too much, while women think more cooperatively and want to help the poor. College graduates think more interdependently than those without a college degree. Democrats want to cooperate with other nations and help the poor, while
Republicans disproportionately support pursuing national interests and assisting countries important to United States’ security.

Each frame creates a different pattern of response among these subgroups. Democrats and college graduates generally shift more in opinion on this issue, particularly in response to the environmental frame.
Promoting American Engagement
A Catalog of Recommended Frames and Language

Authors
Axel Aubrun and Joseph Grady, of Cultural Logic

Research Objective
To provide suggestions for language that will promote a public discourse in which cooperative global engagement is seen as natural and unavoidable. This language should communicate that Americans should care about what happens abroad and America should work with other countries more often.

Method
This paper builds on the findings from prior research reports also summarized in this toolkit (Aubrun and Grady 1999, Grady and Aubrun 1999, Bales 2000, Bostrom 1999, Lakoff 1999).

Key Findings and Conclusions
This report provides a catalog of frames that effectively promote and reinforce the goals of the GII.

Both experts and the public toggle back and forth between two basic and unavoidable frames, the “Country as Person” metaphor and the “Global System” frames. When a country is referred to as a “neighbor” or an “enemy,” the “Country as Person” metaphor is being invoked. The terms “global markets” or “Earth Day” imply a global system.

To avoid the negative consequences of the “Countries as People” model, Aubrun and Grady recommend models based on workplace relationships, mentoring relationships, and more general understanding of relating as a “decent person” to those around you:

Workplace Cooperation – Partnership I: This approach uses Americans’ model of how the workplace operates and translates that understanding to international engagement. It should build on the
understanding that cooperation leads to effectiveness. It allows for a conversation free of “do-gooder” critique, but must also avoid shifting into the negative aspects of the workplace model – competition, human and social concerns can be overridden, etc. Examples of specific language include: “partnership,” “joint decision-making,” and “burden sharing” among others.

**Workplace Cooperation – New Management II:** Inherent in the workplace frame is an understanding of hierarchy. The shift toward a more cooperative model of management offers an opportunity to build an appropriate understanding of relationships with other countries, i.e., that successful enterprises are those that cooperate rather than dictate. Examples of specific language include: “good managers listen and use the best ideas,” and “good managers appreciate individual differences,” among others.

**Investment:** An aspect of business which people understand and apply to their daily lives is the importance of investing in the future. Examples of specific language include: “a development dollar now could save an American soldier’s life later,” and “development aid is the cheapest form of defense – gives the most bang for the buck,” among others.

**Mentoring for Autonomy:** This approach attempts to reframe Americans’ current tendency to see the US relationship with other countries as one between a parent and dependent child, into a relationship between a mentor and a student learning to be independent. Examples of specific language include: “a helping hand, not a handout,” and “setting people free,” among others.

**America as a Decent Person:** This model is based on internal motivations to treat others in a certain way and is a complement to the Social Norms model discussed by Lakoff. Examples of specific language include: “fairness” and “making our kids proud,” among others.

Another set of frames is outlined in this report that help to underscore the view of the world as a Global System. The intent of this approach is to tie international issues to self-interest by creating an understanding that events in any part of the world may depend on the state of affairs in other parts of the world. Examples of specific language include: “it’s a small world and getting smaller” among others.

Lastly, this analysis outlines several issues that lend themselves particularly well to an interdependent view. Health or infectious disease, global environment, and children as a yardstick of success are three examples of issues that are useful in introducing the more general attitude
of long-term equilateral cooperation to the public and policy elites. Other issues (starvation, war, suffering children, poverty, just 1%, and fear-based appeals) tend to lead to disengagement as they are currently framed.
Public Attitudes Toward Foreign Affairs
An Overview of the Current State of Public Opinion

Authors
Meg Bostrom, Bostrom Consulting

Research Objective
To understand the current state of public opinion on international engagement and key international issues.

Method
This analysis summarizes existing public attitudes based upon publicly available survey research. An aggressive search for poll data resulted in thousands of relevant questions that had been asked in the three years prior to this review, as well as several indicator questions that had been trended for several years.

Key Findings and Conclusions

Americans feel the weight of world leadership. They have no doubt the United States shoulders responsibility for the world’s problems and want to move to a position of shared responsibility and shared leadership. This assumption may be the driving force behind many of the opinions the public holds, such as:

- the belief the United States spends too much on foreign aid;
- the support for shifting away from military intervention and toward humanitarian aid;
- the desire to focus on domestic, rather than international, issues; and
- the strong support for the UN and NATO, as organizations that allow countries to act in concert to solve global issues.

Importantly, disabusing the public of this core belief in singular world leadership may not move people toward support for an additional focus on global concerns. Some of the research indicates that people are too wedded to their belief in America’s disproportionate role to accept any
contradictory opinion. They reject the narrow definition of foreign aid to justify their interpretation that all foreign policy involvement by the United States constitutes foreign aid, and is therefore a large percentage of the federal budget.

The public has little interest in news about other countries and generally holds unformed, malleable opinions on most international issues. The challenge is how to break through this disinterest and create a debate through which the public can come to resolution on key issues. Strong leadership, with a sensitive understanding of the value structure underlying the public’s attitudes on international issues, can have a dramatic impact on forming opinion.

*Though Americans express little interest in international news, they care more about global problems than most polls indicate.* First, few polls rate domestic and international concerns on equal footing. Instead, polls that are primarily focused on domestic issues point to lack of support for foreign aid as the sole expression of the public’s isolationism. However, this simplistic assessment does not address the public’s underlying assumptions about foreign aid, which work to undermine support. When a variety of domestic and international issues are rated on the same measures, domestic issues still top the list, but some international concerns compete for the public’s attention.

Terrorism, war, and weaponry consistently emerge in the top tier of concerns when people are thinking about critical threats facing the country or goals for the U.S. government. American priorities for foreign aid look very different. Rather than self-preservation issues, these concerns are much more altruistic, centering on relieving human suffering around the world. In fact, since the Cold War, people have shifted their priorities for foreign aid away from U.S. security and toward helping others. Global health, frequently ignored in survey questions, may in fact prove to be a top tier issue that bridges the values of self-preservation and altruism.

Surveys that have attempted to document a self-interest reason for support on many of these issues have failed. Americans want to give foreign aid to relieve pain and suffering, not to build trading partners. The public continues to support free trade in principle, even though Americans believe free trade has generally hurt the U.S. economy. They have acted on behalf of the environment, even though most feel good about the quality of the environment where they live. The answer may not lie in
addressing or creating a shallow self-interest, but rather in tapping a fundamental value.

There are a handful of core values that act as a prism through which Americans see the world. Individual freedom, opportunity, fairness, and individual responsibility are dearer to the American spirit than prosperity and democracy. Only by identifying how these values play out in the international arena will we discover how to engage the public in foreign affairs.
Ten Differences Between Public and Expert Understandings of International Affairs
Findings from the Mainstream American Press

Authors

Joseph Grady and Axel Aubrun of Cultural Logic, Inc.

Research Objective

To uncover the similarities and differences between the public and expert models of international engagement (as covered in the media), which will lead to the development of a common language for cooperative global engagement.

Method

These findings are based on an analysis of roughly one hundred news articles and opinion pieces on foreign affairs from the mainstream print media – including the Washington Post, Time, Newsweek, San Francisco Chronicle, Wall Street Journal, Christian Science Monitor, and Forbes. It also builds on the findings from earlier research with the American public.

Key Findings and Conclusions

The media typically frames international issues in terms of two distinct, over-arching frames: the “Discrete Country” frame and the “Global System” frame. The “Discrete Country” frame is strongly rooted in the metaphor that countries are persons. This frame assumes that individual countries (acting as persons) act principally based on self-interest, and that encounters have winners and losers. The “Global System” frame is very different. It implies a strong interconnectedness, sometimes to the point of minimizing the existence of national borders and interests. One example is discussions of “the global economy,” which puts the US into a larger system. Most issues can be framed in either model, and international engagement can, in principle, be promoted using either model.
The frames used by experts and the public overlap in the following views: “cooperation is not a priority”; “the US does the heavy lifting”; “the US knows best”; and, “Americans are good”.

The media provides a perspective on international relations that is close to the models held by experts, but public understandings are not closely based on media representations, even though those representations are a major source of information for the public. Public understandings tend to be based more closely on lived experience.

Ten Differences Between Public and Expert Understandings of International Affairs

1. Experts pay more attention to foreign governments – The Public pays more attention to foreign populations.
2. Expert models give much more prominence to the rest of the world – Public models downplay the existence of the rest of the world.
3. Experts often think in terms of inclusion within or exclusion from a world community.
4. Experts, but not the Public, are interested in “sending messages” to other countries, as a basic goal of foreign policy.
5. Experts use a much richer Country-as-Person metaphor.
6. The Public is much more concerned with social and moral values. Experts are much more concerned with security and national interest – they are much more macho.
7. Experts are more interested than the Public in making other societies more American.
8. Experts are much more concerned with American autonomy; the Public is much more willing to “play along” with other countries.
9. Expert frames are much more polarized than Public frames.
10. Experts are more likely to make use of the global system frame, and to treat it as an abstract thing-in-itself.
The Myopic Neighbor: Local and National Network Television Coverage of the World

Authors
Daniel R. Amundson, Linda S. Lichter, S. Robert Lichter, all of the Center for Media and Public Affairs

Research Objective
To examine national and local media coverage of international events and situations, to provide an understanding of how international news is presented to the public.

Method
The analysis included both national and local news coverage. National news outlets included ABC “World News Tonight,” CBS “Evening News,” NBC “Nightly News,” and the CNN news at 6 pm. Also included in the research was 15 local stations from 5 television markets (Los Angeles, Chicago, Boston, Seattle, and Columbia, South Carolina). All international news was included, using a definition of “international news” as all coverage of events in countries outside the US, stories about US foreign policy and the activities of international organizations. Stories were collected from two time periods. The first four-week period, September 29 – October 24, 1999, was considered a “benchmark” period with no major international events. The second period, November 28 – December 5, 1999, allowed an examination WTO coverage. This method provided a combined local and national sample of 10,243 stories and 206 hours 14 minutes of airtime.

Key Findings and Conclusions
Little local or national news coverage could reasonably be expected to increase either the comprehension ordinary citizens have of global issues, or their representation in the public debate over America’s role in the wider world.
The volume of global news on the networks has declined and is minuscule on most local newscasts. Over the past decade, the proportion of global news has declined from about one-third to only one-fifth of the national network news agenda. In our sample period, global news was only 7 percent of local news coverage.

The coverage that does exist is largely episodic in format, prosaic in presentation, and shallow in context. The global news agenda is skewed heavily toward war, natural disasters, industrial accidents, crimes, and demonstrations. The news focuses on discrete events and short-term crises rather than broader trends and processes or long-term problems. Out of over 1000 local and national television news stories, only 84 took a thematic approach to international news. Attention is directed to what is about to happen, not why is it happening or how it fits into broader patterns. Only one out of six national stories and one out of five local stories contain even one opinion on the cause or solution to any problem.

Television news typically emphasizes the “otherness” of the world outside our borders, portraying the international arena as a subsidiary sphere of little concern to most Americans except as a place where bad things happen, and the United States occasionally needs to intervene to set them right. Beyond a humanitarian interest in helping disaster victims, global news rarely conveys the impression that Americans have a stake in global issues. In the rare instances when the implications for the United States are discussed, two-thirds of the statements stress negative implications.

There is little discussion of America’s role in the world, and when it is discussed, it is presented in unilateral rather than multilateral context. When there is debate, it is presented as a debate among elites, i.e. government sources, academics, and foreign policy experts. When ordinary American voices were used in the WTO coverage, it was typically to demonstrate their lack of knowledge or interest.
Veterans of Perception:  
GII Antecedents in the Literature on Media and Foreign Policy

Author

Susan Nall Bales, President, FrameWorks Institute

Research Objective

To ground the Global Interdependence Initiative in an existing body of work; to connect the current GII research effort to relevant aspects of recent literature on the subject of communicating foreign policy.

Method

A subjective review and analysis of the literature of foreign policy communications, with an emphasis on those aspects that have the greatest potential utility for the work of the GII.

Key Findings and Conclusions

Bales explores five key themes that arise from the recent literature on media and international affairs. Under each theme Bales discusses the assumptions, beliefs, tensions and controversies:

1. Bad News, or limitations in the quality and quantity of foreign affairs news coverage, i.e., the media as agenda setter, accuracy, conventions, decision making, sources, credentials, and ability to sustain foreign coverage. The assumption underlying this literature is that more news devoted to foreign affairs, with more contextualized and informed reporting, would result in greater public understanding of, and support for, enlightened public policy.

2. Bad Views, or public opinion and the media’s role in forming and informing it, i.e. where the public gets its views, what their views mean, the difference between opinion and values, how the media
cues the public, how media favor elites and lock out dissenters, what prevents the public from holding policymakers accountable.

3. Whose News, or tensions between elite diplomacy, democracy and mass media, i.e., whether the mass media can and should perform the job of educating the electorate.

4. Shutterbug Diplomacy, of the press as policymaker, i.e., the way news coverage sets the agenda, distorts or distracts, and frames the issues for policymakers. The literature also discusses the way policymakers attempt to influence coverage, the amount of time they spend doing so, and their success in managing press relations.

5. Getting Framed, or the language of foreign policy debate and its implications, i.e., the storytelling power of the media and its ability to convey meaning.