

Framing the Cow-Head Protest: A Comparative Analysis of The Star and Malaysiakini

Yang Lai Fong* and Leong Wai Kit†

School of Communication, Taylor's University Malaysia

© The Author(s) 2017. This article is published with open access by Taylor's Press.

ABSTRACT

The last few years have seen a number of religious and ethnic tensions in Malaysia, which continue to impact the lives of Malaysians from all walks of life. Furthermore, religion, ethnicity and related issues have always been a difficult area for reporting in multicultural societies. Framing analysis allows researchers to examine the roles of the media in the development of social and political issues. Framing also reflects a conflict between dominant social norms and efforts for change. This study examined what aspects the mainstream and alternative newspapers have created for readers' understanding of the Cow-Head protest, an inter-religious conflict that took place in Shah Alam, Selangor on August 28, 2009. The findings indicated that the newspapers reported the dispute with different intensity and prominence. It was found that although conflict appeared to be the most salient frame found across the dailies, the aspects highlighted by them varied. The dissimilar coverage of the same issue by the newspapers denoted the varied points of view held by them, which were rooted in different political beliefs and institutional practices.

Keywords: framing, inter-religious conflict, interethnic conflict, interethnic relations, "cow-head" protest

1. INTRODUCTION

On August 28, 2009, a day during the Ramadan month and just three days before the National Independence Day of Malaysia, some 50 residents from Section 23 in Shah Alam marched from the state mosque after their Friday prayers to the secretariat building with a severed cow's head. Some of the protesters were also seen spitting and stepping on the cow's head, while at the same time threatening to "shed blood" (*Malaysiakini*, 28 August 2009). The march was aimed to protest against a proposed relocation of a 150-year-old Hindu temple to Section 23 in Shah Alam, Selangor. The protesters claimed that it was not appropriate to build a Hindu temple in a Muslim-majority area. The cow is considered sacred by Hindus, and the protest has evoked condemnation from various quarters while even making international news. The Selangor state is governed by the *Pakatan Rakyat* (People's Alliance, PR), which

*Correspondence email: nicoleylf@hotmail.com

†Correspondence email: WaiKit.Leong@taylors.edu.my

is a political rival of the *Barisan Nasional* (National Front, BN). Consequently, the PR state government accused rival BN, especially UMNO (United Malays National Organization) of instigating the crowd to protest the relocation while the latter denied any involvement in it (*Malaysiakini*, 28 August 2009).

The last few years have seen a number of religious and ethnic tensions in Malaysia, which continue to impact the lives of Malaysians from all walks of life. At the same time, Islam is increasingly becoming a major symbol of Malay-ness in Malaysia in which faith is inseparable from the Malay ethno-cultural heritage (Syed Husin, 2008). The division between the Malays and non-Malays is widened by the religious divide between Muslims and non-Muslims, creating a distinct and acute awareness of the “other”. This has resulted in the aggravation of the inter-ethnic fracture in Malaysian society (Kahn, 2005; Ong, 2007).

Furthermore, religion, ethnicity and related issues have always been a difficult area for reporting in multicultural societies. Where stories on religion are routinely judged and framed by the media to, albeit inadvertently, misrepresent and disrespect the essence of what adherents of different faiths believe in, stories on religion do provide the fuel for prolonged conflicts—even violence in societies that are historically divided by tribal and cultural rivalries (Mustafa, 2010). Therefore, this paper aims to examine the coverage of the Cow-Head protest by mainstream and alternative newspapers in Malaysia, where religions, politics and media are intertwined in many powerful and profound ways.

2. OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The objective of this study is to examine the framing of the Cow-Head protest by mainstream and alternative newspapers in Malaysia. Specifically, it asks the following questions:

RQ1: What was the intensity of newspapers coverage of the Cow-Head protest?

RQ2: What were the news sources used by the newspapers?

RQ3: What were the news frames employed by the newspapers?

RQ4: What was the valence of the news articles?

3. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The census of 2014 shows that Malaysia has a total population of 30.2 million comprising multi-ethnic citizens who are Malays/indigenous groups (68.2%), Chinese (24.6%), Indians (6.4%) and Others (0.8%). Malays are predominantly Muslims while other religions embraced by the people are Buddhism (19.8%), Christianity (9.2%) and Hinduism (6.3%) (Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2014).

Race is a social construct, it may have been the most powerful ideological perspective to construct nations, while building base and super-structural foundations of the state (Azly, 2013). Farish (2005) mentioned that the demographic factors in Malaysia dictate that whoever controls the Malay-Muslims of the country will be able to control the rest of the country by extension. This is simply due to the fact that the Malay-Muslim community now represents the biggest block-vote. Winning the Malay vote is therefore

the key to winning power in Malaysia. The Malaysian Constitution defines Malays as persons who profess the religion of Islam, habitually speak the Malay language and conform to Malay custom. Gatsiounis (2006) commented that Islam became the defining element of the Malay identity after other Malaysians adopted some aspects of the Malay culture like food, dress and language. Holst (2012, p. 69) also pointed out that one can *masuk Melayu* (to become Malay) by converting to Islam. The author then asserted that Malayness is defined on the basis of socio-cultural aspects rather than purely on bloodlines. Similarly, Nah (2006) remarked that one ‘can effectively become “Malay” by embracing Islam’ and is a beneficiary of the affirmative action policies that such a status brings about. Azly (2013) even addressed that immigrant groups coming into Malaysia will reconstruct themselves to become “Malay” in order to enjoy the privilege it could bring about.

Nonetheless, in their analysis of Malay identity politics, Maznah and Syed Muhd Khairudin (2011) challenged the prevalent view that Malayness is a uniform, static and homogeneous concept bound to restrictive notion of ethnicity. The authors rejected the politically convenient notion of Malayness imposed by a ruling party in power. Nagata (2011) also argued that the promotion of a homogeneous conception of being a Malay in Malaysia which is “based on conformity to a political party and agenda, and the official range of expressions of Malayness is now one of the narrowest in history” (p. 4).

Kua (2010) noted that racism has been part of Malaysian political, economic, social and cultural realities ever since colonial times. Today, race has been so deeply institutionalized that it is a key factor in determining benefits from government development policies, bids for business contracts, education policy, social policy, cultural policy, entry into educational institutions, discounts for purchasing houses and other official policies. The author criticized that the ruling coalition BN is still dominated by racially-defined component parties like UMNO, MCA (Malaysian Chinese Association) and MIC (Malaysian Indian Congress). These parties compete for electoral support from their respective racial constituencies by pandering to racial interests. Meanwhile, some opportunistic opposition parties likewise pander to their constituencies using racist propaganda to win electoral support, and this practice has also contributed to the vicious circle of racial politics which has characterized Malaysian politics all these years.

Similarly, Maznah (2008, p. 445) also addressed that the three main opposition parties, namely the Democratic Action Party (DAP), Pan-Malaysian Islamic Party (PAS) and People’s Justice Party (PKR) can be distinguished by their “ethnic interest” representation rather by ideological stripe. DAP is multiethnic, liberal and democratic in principle but has come to be identified as a “Chinese” party over the years because of its espousal of equal rights and criticism of discriminatory, pro-Malay policies. PAS, which is by-and-large a Malay party but distinguishes itself from UMNO by proclaiming that its principles are more genuinely Islamic than that of its counterpart and also because of the wider participation of religious leaders and scholars within it. Although PKR’s membership is not defined by ethnicity, it is still popularly recognized

to be a Malay-based party.

4. CONTROL OF MASS MEDIA IN MALAYSIA

As a result of the nation's multi-ethnic and lingual population, newspapers in Malaysia are published in different languages to cater to the respective major ethnic groups. There are currently 50 newspapers in Malaysia, and 16 of them are published in English, 13 in Bahasa Malaysia, 19 in Chinese and 2 in Tamil. Bahasa Malaysia dailies reach 46.5% of the Malaysian population, followed by English dailies (28.7%), Chinese dailies (24.1%) and Tamil dailies (0.7%) (Selva, 2014).

Political scientists categorized the Malaysian system as a 'quasi democracy', 'semi democracy' or 'modified democracy'. This implies that the political system perches uneasily between democracy and authoritarianism (Abbott, 2001; Case, 2009; Lee, 2004; Maznah, 2008; Puyok, 2005; Zaid, 2013). Scholars highlighted that media freedom in Malaysia is heavily curtailed by legislation and ownership (Netto, 2002; Rodan, 2005). Various laws such as the Printing Presses and Publication Act, Internal Security Act, Official Secret Act, Sedition Act and Multimedia and Broadcasting Act allow the Government to impose prior restraints on publication, post-publication punishments and penalties for the acquisition of official information.

The structure of media ownership in Malaysia is directly and indirectly controlled by the Government or government-linked individuals. *Radio Televisyen Malaysia* (RTM) has been owned and controlled by the Government since its inception. Media Prima is an investment arm of UMNO and it owns *News Straits Times*, *Business Times*, *Malay Mail*, *Berita Harian*, *Harian Metro* and *Shin Min Daily News*, TV3, NTV7, 8TV, TV9, Fly FM and Hot FM. Besides, *Utusan Malaysia* and *Kosmo!* are published by Utusan Melayu (M) Berhad, which is also related to UMNO (Netto, 2002; Tan and Zawawi, 2008). The MCA and MIC also control a substantial part of the mainstream media. MCA, through its official holding company, Huaren Holding Sdn Bhd, owns *The Star*, RedFM 104.9 and 988 (Tan and Zawawi, 2008). There are two Tamil newspapers in Malaysia – *Tamil Nesan* and *Malaysia Nanban* and their ownership rests mainly in the hands of the former MIC president Samy Vellu and his wife (Brown, 2005; Wang, 2001).

Business tycoon Vincent Tan, a close associate of the former Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir and other BN leaders, owns *The Sun* and MiTV (Brown, 2005; Wang, 2001). On the other hand, the All Asia Television and Radio Company (ASTRO) is owned by Ananda Krishnan and Tunku Mahmud Besar Burhanuddin. It was also revealed that Krishnan has a close relationship with Mahathir and was therefore able to secure a media license (Brown, 2005; Mohd Azizuddin, 2005).

McDaniel (2002) found that the Chinese-language newspapers in Malaysia are relatively more independent when compared to their Malay- and English-language counterparts. *Sin Chew Daily*, *Guang Ming Daily*, *Nanyang Siang Pau* and *China Press* are owned by yet another business and media tycoon Tiong Hiew King, while the *Oriental Daily* is owned by Lau Hui Kang (Tan and Zawawi, 2008).

In regard to the close media-state partnership in Malaysia, Wong (2004) addressed

that such a relationship would influence the journalists to engage in self-censorship in order not to offend the Government. It cultivates a culture of fear – starting with journalists and other writers and spreading to the publishers or broadcasters, distributors and even the public at large when confronted with anything that smacks of the slightest critical commentary on the Government. Moreover, the greater concern is that the vast majority of journalists, editors, commentators and politicians in Malaysia accept the existing conditions, even as they suffer with the restrictions (Randhawa, Puah & Loone, 2005). Significantly, Mustafa (2003) stated that the public sphere in Malaysian society has been constrained so that ordinary citizens and concerned civil society groups have not been able to fully express their views and to directly participate in the country's democratic processes. He also contended that the mainstream press is instrumental in helping to promote the state's hegemonic influence over the society.

In 1997, Malaysia announced a no-censorship guarantee for the Internet, which is known as the Multimedia Super Corridor (MSC) Malaysia Bill of Guarantees. The then Prime Minister Mahathir was trying to attract investors to the proposed MSC, which would serve as the nation's bridge from the Industrial to the Information Age. The MSC is about 15 km wide by 50 km long, and stretches from the Petronas Twin Towers in Kuala Lumpur to the Kuala Lumpur International Airport (the region's largest airport). Estimated to take 20 years to reach its full potential at an approximate cost of US\$20 billion, the MSC would help to diversify the Malaysian economy at a time when the nation faced increased competition from lower wage countries in the region, such as China and Vietnam (Abbott, 2004; George, 2005; Wilson, Azizah & Khattab, 2003). In addition, Abbott (2004) pointed out that Mahathir was determined to give Malaysia a competitive advantage over its neighbor Singapore where stringent controls had been imposed on Internet Service Provider (ISPs).

The Internet and online journalism have been much celebrated in Malaysia by those who crave for alternative perspectives (Wilson, Azizah & Khattab, 2003). Furthermore, it is clear that the Internet has had a discernible impact on Malaysian politics (Brown, 2005; Tan and Zawawi, 2008). Commenting on the loss of BN in the online war during the 12th General Election, the former Prime Minister Abdullah Badawi admitted:

We didn't think it was important. It was a serious misjudgment...
We thought that the newspapers, the print media, the television were important but young people were looking at text messages and blogs.
It is painful to admit the influence of the alternative media.
(quoted in Tan and Zawawi, 2008: 86)

5. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: FRAMING

Tuchman and Gitlin were two of the earliest scholars to introduce framing to media studies in 1978 and 1980 respectively (Zhou, 2008). They used the concept of framing as a tool to understand news as a social construction and social resource. Framing differs significantly from the repetition- and accessibility-based models in agenda setting and priming (Scheufele and Tewksbury, 2007). According to Entman (1993),

framing is

to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described. (Entman, 1993, p. 52)

Tankard (2008) enumerated several news features that commonly convey frames. They are headlines and kickers, subheads, photographs, photo captions, leads etc. Wong (2004) outlined four major dimensions of framing that could be studied: (1) presentation of news items (their size and placement); (2) news topic items (or what issues are included in the frame); (3) cognitive attributes (or the specific details of issues included); and (4) affective attributes (valence or tone of the article/picture). Manheim (1994) also explained that valence is the tone of a news story or comment regarding certain frames. It is believed to have the potential to generate behavioral effects. By indicating discourse valuations or carrying positive and/or negative elements, valenced news frames present the extent to which the coverage reflects favorably or unfavorably on the event/issue. In addition, Weaver (2007) mentioned that frame can be studied by means of systematic content analysis, interpretive textual analysis or discourse analysis. Tankard (2008) remarked that framing gives quantitative researchers a way to approach ideology, a subject mostly dealt with by critical theorists to date. Framing may even give quantitative researchers a means to examine the hypothesis of media hegemony, one that has been difficult to validate empirically.

The literature to date has identified a handful of frames that occur commonly in the news (Iyengar, 1991; Cappella and Jamieson, 1997; Patterson, 1993). A study by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) identified five news frames (attribution of responsibility, conflict, human interest, economic consequences and morality) that were common in the Dutch national news media coverage of the Amsterdam meetings of European heads of state in 1997. It was found that the use of news frames depended on both the type of outlet and the type of topic. Most significant differences were not between media (television vs. the press) but between sensationalist vs. serious types of news outlets. Sober and serious newspapers and television news programs more often used the responsibility and conflict frames, whereas sensationalist outlets more often used the human interest frame. The five generic news frames constructed by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) have been widely used in the framing analysis of a range of issues, including racial-ethnic issues, integration, immigration, drugs or crime (Matthes and Kohring, 2008).

News is socially constructed and it reflects not just what happens but also the context within which it was gathered and processed (Spratt, Bullock and Baldasty, 2007). It was stressed that which events were covered (or not) and how they were covered were influenced by many considerations, including law, economics, political forces, culture, race, organizational structure of media and work routines of journalists (Gan, Teo

and Detenber, 2005; Van Gorp, 2007). When it comes to ideologically sensitive issues, Song (2007) found that the mainstream news media serve as an institution of social control by imposing frames that marginalize causes or movements that challenge the values of the mainstream society. Alternative media, on the other hand, often serve as a communication outlet for movements and causes that are ignored or marginalized by the mainstream media.

Building upon previous literature, the current study examines the framing of the Cow-Head protest by *The Star* (mainstream) and *Malaysiakini* (alternative). *The Star* enjoys the highest circulation in the English-language stream. It has nationwide circulation, although predominantly within peninsular Malaysia (Selva, 2014). The MCA is a major shareholder of *The Star*. The English newspapers in Malaysia are usually read by the elites and English-educated readers, who are mostly concentrated in the urban areas. Lent (1990) stated that it is only the readership of English newspapers that could transcend racial groupings in Malaysia. Hence, the author claimed that the English press also serves as an interethnic medium. It is noteworthy that Brown (2005) found *The Star* often emphasized the process of reaching a compromise as well as the spirit of *muafakat* (consensus) within the BN. Controversies were downplayed, while reports regularly highlighted conciliatory comments from UMNO ministers and officials, and the differences were presented simply as a matter of implementation rather than policy disagreement. In addition, Yang and Md Sidin (2015) also mentioned that *The Star* had a tendency to tone down interethnic conflicts in its coverage.

Malaysiakini is the country's first commercial online newspaper launched by Steven Gan, just nine days before the 1999 general election with funding from international press freedom groups, including the South East Asian Press Alliance (SEPA). The alternative newspaper began with only three journalists producing two or three stories per day. However, *Malaysiakini* expanded its content dramatically within four years, producing a total of 40–50 items per day, including 10–15 local stories, 3–4 opinion pieces, 10–11 letters and some foreign news sourced from the *L'Agence France-Presse* (AFP) (George, 2005). Furthermore, *Malaysiakini* has won warm praise from around the world as well as a number of international awards for journalism (Chandran, 2006; Steele, 2009; Tong, 2004). Significantly, Yang and Md Sidin (2015) pointed out that *Malaysiakini* reflected a counter-hegemonic discourse in its coverage of interethnic conflicts. Steele (2009) also asserted that in the specifics of Malaysian political culture, where the Government has de facto control of the press and laws preventing journalists from reporting on sensitive issues as ethnicity and religion, *Malaysiakini* has always been singled out for its independence and gusto (Steele, 2009). The author also maintained that there was no question that *Malaysiakini* journalists saw themselves as agents of change. Considering the ideological differences of *The Star* and *Malaysiakini*, this study therefore aims to investigate the framing of the Cow-Head protest from four different dimensions: 1) intensity of coverage, 2) news sources, 3) news frames; and 4) valence of the articles.




Figure 1. Research Framework of the Study

6. METHOD

6.1 Sampling and Coding Procedures

Content analysis was employed as the research method for this study. A purposive sample, which contains the peak period of the Low Yat incident, was used. The sample was drawn from August 28 to October 30, 2009. The unit of analysis was the article, which included straight news, editorials, columns, opinions and letters. The articles were collected via database search, which were pulled from the respective newspaper's online archive by using "cow's head" and "Cow-Head protest" as the keywords.

The intensity of coverage was studied from three angles: 1) number of news items, 2) type of news items, and 3) mean size of news items (measured by word count). This study employed the inductive or emergent coding approach for analyzing the news sources. The researchers outlined the coding categories after a preliminary examination of the data. The categories for news sources used in this study were: 1) Civilians; 2) UMNO leaders; 3) Other BN component parties' leaders; 4) Royal Police Malaysia (PDRM); 5) non-governmental organization representatives (NGOs); 6)

opposition leaders; 7) religious leaders; 8) protesters; and 9) others.

This study adopted and modified the five most commonly used news frames (conflict, human interest, economic consequence, moral and responsibility) identified by Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) (refer Appendix A). The following were the frames used in this study with their theoretical definitions:

1. Conflict – emphasizes disagreement and conflict between individuals, groups, parties or institutions; an individual, group, party or institution reproach another; dichotomizes or labels the good and bad.
2. Consequences – reports the consequences of an event, issue or problem has on individuals, groups, parties, institutions or the country; reports the outcome of a court case; reports the investigation or legal action taken against any individual, groups, parties or institutions.
3. Responsibility – presents an event, issue or problem in such a way as to attribute responsibility for its cause or solution to either the government or to an individual, group, party or institution.
4. Moral – puts the event, issue or problem in the context of religious tenets or moral prescriptions; emphasizes on collaboration and fellowship.
5. Human interest – brings a human face or an emotional angle to the presentation of an event or issue; refers to an effort to personalize the news.

Valence (also known as tone, slant or direction) of the articles refers to the attitude expressed towards any individual, group, party or institution by its user (Baumgartner and Wirth, 2012; Feeley and Frederick, 2007). This study uses the categories of supportive, critical and neutral for the analysis of attitude expressed towards the Cow Head protesters.

1. Supportive – conveys a favorable impression towards the Cow-Head protesters; supports or justifies their behaviors; contains quotes by individuals who approve their behaviors.
2. Critical – conveys a negative impression towards the Cow-Head protesters; causes the readers to form a negative opinion towards them and their behavior; contains unfavorable descriptions of their behaviors.
3. Neutral – neither favorably nor unfavorably portrays the Cow-Head protesters.

6.2 Data Analysis and Inter-Coder Reliability

The 153 articles collected from the four newspapers were analyzed by the first author using descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentage. To ensure the reliability of this study, a communication graduate was chosen as the second coder. During the training session, the first author (who was also the first coder) and the second coder coded 50 articles that were chosen randomly from the sample of this study. Disagreements were analyzed and some additional explanations were included to the coding instruction in the code book.

Riffe, Lacy and Fico (2005) advocated random selection of content samples for inter-coder reliability testing. Meanwhile, Wimmer and Dominick (2006) suggested that between 10% and 25% of the body of content should be tested. Therefore, the inter-coder reliability for this study was established by randomly selecting 10% of the news items, which was equivalent to 15 articles. Using Holsti's formula (cited in Wimmer and Dominick, 2006), it was found that the inter-coder reliability for intensity of coverage and news sources was 1.0; while news frames was 0.97 and for valence, 0.99.

7. FINDINGS

The following are some basic information regarding the frequency and percentage of the variables suggesting the importance of conceptual differentiation between the two newspapers.

7.1 Intensity of Coverage

Table 1 shows that the total number of news items found in *Malaysiakini* (100 articles) is almost double of the amount collected from *The Star* (53 articles). In addition, *Malaysiakini* was found to publish a bigger mean size of news items (590 words) compared to *The Star* (402 words). By giving much less coverage to the Cow-Head dispute, *The Star* did not report several related developments of the incident, which will be elaborated in the later section of this paper. Nonetheless, both the newspapers published most of their coverage in the form of straight news, followed by columns and letters. A finding of interest was that only *The Star* devoted some space for editorial.

Table 1. Types of News Items for the Cow-Head Protest

	<i>The Star</i> (n = 53) %	<i>Malaysiakini</i> (n = 100) %
Straight news	58.5	62.0
Editorials	1.89	0
Columns	15.1	17.0
Letters	17.0	12.0
Opinions	7.55	9.0
Size (mean):	402 words	590 words

7.2 News Sources

Both *The Star* (44.44%) and *Malaysiakini* (60.0%) relied on civilians as their most important news sources for the coverage of Cow-Head dispute (see Table 2). UMNO was found to be the second dominant news sources in *The Star*, while *Malaysiakini* used NGOs as its second main news sources.

Table 2. News Sources for the Cow-Head Protest

	<i>The Star</i> (n = 53) %	<i>Malaysiakini</i> (n = 100) %
Civilians	44.44	60.0
UMNO	21.11	3.67
Other BN component parties	8.88	4.09
Royal Police Malaysia	8.88	4.08
NGOs	8.88	11.84
Opposition	2.22	8.98
Religious leaders	2.22	0.41
Protesters	2.22	1.22
Others	1.11	5.71

7.3 News Frames

7.3.1 Conflict Frame

As demonstrated in Table 3, conflict was found to be the most salient frame in both *The Star* (40.68%) and *Malaysiakini* (63.48%). A finding of interest was that most of the conflict frames in *The Star* was found in its opinion pieces like editorials, columns, letters and opinions rather than straight news. Through the conflict frame, *The Star* mostly condemned the act of the protesters. For example, a columnist wrote that the Cow-Head protest left him feeling utterly disgusted. He mentioned that the men who organized and participated in the foul act are nothing but rank racists, and by cloaking their activities in a veil of piousness they show themselves to be even more despicable (*The Star*, 3 September 2009a).

Table 3. News Frames for the Cow-Head Protest

	<i>The Star</i> (n = 53) %	<i>Malaysiakini</i> (n = 100) %
Conflict	40.68	63.48
Consequences	35.6	27.83
Responsibility	13.56	2.61
Moral	10.17	6.09

Another columnist criticized that the protest was not a spontaneous outburst but a cold-blooded transgression and crafted so as to give maximum offence. He also slammed police failure to intervene during the protest and raised questions about their seriousness in maintaining racial harmony (*The Star*, 1 September 2009a).

Furthermore, a columnist pointed out that no religious text forbids the worship of another religion in any neighborhood. The author stated that the Malaysian Constitution guarantees freedom of worship throughout the land, with no conditions on where the freedom might be curtailed. Therefore, the author criticized that the Cow-Head protest was unreasonable, unlawful, unconstitutional, inflammatory and irreligious (*The Star*, 6 September 2009a).

The Group Chief Editor of *The Star*, Wong Chun Wai wrote that the protesters might have carried the cow's head to insult the state government. However, he condemned the act, stating that the protesters simply did not use their head to think it over because the protest was over a Hindu temple, and to use a cow's head was sheer stupidity. He also warned that we have to be careful when we use terms like "majority" and "minority" because Malaysia is a multi-racial country where one community would outnumber another in some areas (*The Star*, 6 September 2009b). In addition, a Muslim reader sent in her opinion through SMS saying "As a Muslim I can't believe that people, after Friday prayers, especially during holy month of Ramadan, could do that awful protest with a cow's head" (*The Star*, 2 September 2009).

The Star also reported that the chairman of the action committee for the protest, Mahayuddin Manaf said the residents were merely protesting the relocation of the Hindu temple but it had been "hijacked" by another group that brought along a cow's head to the state secretariat building. He then claimed that the residents have been victimized and unfairly accused of stroking racial and religious intolerance (*The Star*, 1 September 2009b).

While condemning the protesters, the conflict frame in *Malaysiakini* also devoted much space to criticize the police, UMNO and the Government for taking sides with the protesters. It is noteworthy that only *Malaysiakini* reported that the Selangor state government accused UMNO of instigating the Cow-Head protest while *The Star* did not publish such news. Shah Alam PAS (Pan-Malaysian Islamic Party) Member of Parliament (MP) Khalid Abdul Samad was quoted by *Malaysiakini* saying that he only saw five Section 23 residents at the protest whereas "the rest were all outsiders". He also believed that the five residents were UMNO members as he had met them previously (*Malaysiakini*, 29 August 2009a). Furthermore, some Section 23 residents told the *Malaysiakini* reporters that five of the protesters came from the same neighborhood and "they are all UMNO members" (*Malaysiakini*, 3 September 2009a).

In addition, DAP (Democratic Action Party) MP Charles Santiago said it was "weird" that dozens of policemen "watched silently" when the protesters were spitting on and kicking the bloodied cow's head. He strongly condemned the lack of action on the part of the police. He accused them of being accomplices to the act which was disrespectful of Hindus (*Malaysiakini*, 29 August 2009a). The Hindraf's (Hindu Rights Action Force) London-based leader P. Waythamoorthy alleged that UMNO and certain police cohorts organized the unsavory and inflammatory Cow-Head protest intended to incite racial hatred and ill-feeling among Malaysian Muslims and Hindus. He also slammed the Selangor police chief Khalid Abu Bakar for suggesting that the police would only probe the incident if a report was lodged (*Malaysiakini*, 1

September 2009).

Furthermore, the Shah Alam district police chief Noor Azam Jamaluddin conveyed his apology to several PR leaders during a meeting and explained that the police officers at the scene were "juniors", suggesting that they were inexperienced in handling such matters. The police chief also gave his word that action will be taken immediately against those responsible for the protest (*Malaysiakini*, 29 August 2009a).

Malaysiakini reported that the Home Minister Hishammuddin defended the Cow-Head protesters, while arguing that the latter cannot be blamed for the controversy. It was reported that Hishammuddin had an hour-long closed-door meeting with residents' representatives. He then defended the protesters saying that "they just wanted their voices to be heard". He further stated that it was unfortunate that the protest was given negative publicity because it was linked to religious and racial sentiments (*Malaysiakini*, 2 September 2009). Following Hishammuddin's statement, opposition parliamentarians and non-governmental groups lodged a police report against him, demanding that he be either sacked or he resigned. The complainants criticized that Hishammuddin exonerated the offenders of all blame and used his powers to influence the course of the ongoing investigation and the final action to be taken against the offenders (*Malaysiakini*, 3 September 2009b). It is significant to note that this news was not reported by *The Star*.

7.3.2 Consequences Frame

By adopting the consequences frame, *The Star* mainly reported about the legal action taken against the Cow-Head protesters. On September 10, 2009, 12 men were charged under the Sedition Act (carrying and stepping on the cow's head) and Police Act (illegal assembly). It was reported that the 12 men arrived at the court accompanied by local and outstation supporters, and they shouted out to the media that they were not guilty and that they were united in their stand (*The Star*, 10 September 2009).

The consequences frame in *Malaysiakini* focused on the action taken against the alternative newspaper by the Malaysian Communication and Multimedia Commission (MCMC). Following *Malaysiakini*'s coverage of the Cow-Head protest, the MCMC sent a letter to the newspaper, requesting it to remove two "provocative" videos from its website. The videos included the footage of the controversial Cow-Head protest and the press conference held by the Home Minister Hishammuddin. The MCMC claimed that those videos "contain offensive contents with the intent to annoy any person, especially Indians" (*Malaysiakini*, 4 September 2009).

Commenting on MCMC's request, *Malaysiakini* editor-in-chief Steven Gan said that the videos were news events which were of public interest. He also stated that the intention in putting up the videos was not to 'annoy' anyone, but to do their job as journalists to draw attention to the protest and to ensure action is taken so that similar incidents would not happen again in Malaysia. Gan also said that there was no plan for *Malaysiakini* to take down the videos and the newspaper was seeking legal advice on the matter (*Malaysiakini*, 4 September 2009).

The MCMC followed up its investigations on *Malaysiakini* by conducting four

visits to the newspaper's office. It included an eight-hour questioning session involving the newspaper's 12 staff members. Among those questioned were *Malaysiakini* chief executive officer Premesh Chandran, editors, journalists, video team members and one technical staff (*Malaysiakini*, 8 September 2009a). The MCMC also sent digital forensics experts to *Malaysiakini*'s office and demanded the newspaper to hand over the original tapes of the two videos (*Malaysiakini*, 10 September 2009). Furthermore, *Malaysiakini.tv*'s servers hosted at the Internet service provider Jaring in Bukit Jalil Technology Park Malaysia was inspected by the authorities. *Malaysiakini* believed that the authorities were adamant in charging them, while they were preparing to defend themselves in court (*Malaysiakini*, 11 September 2009). While *Malaysiakini* reported much furious reaction from various parties against the MCMC's actions, *The Star* was rather silent about these incidents. Those who backed *Malaysiakini* included pro-human rights NGOs, academics, members of civil society and even political leaders from BN component parties.

In addition, as a consequence of the Cow-Head protest, the Shah Alam City Council organized a public dialogue with Section 23 residents over the relocation of the 150-year-old Hindu temple. It was reported in *Malaysiakini* that some of the participants shouted profanities at the then Chief Minister of Selangor Abdul Khalid Ibrahim, calling him "MB *bodoh*" (stupid Chief Minister) and "Khalid *babi*" (Khalid the pig). Also heard above the din were "you should be ashamed of being a Malay" and "don't be like a cow led by a ring through the nose". It was also reported that the interruptions, boos and profanities continued throughout the dialogue while the Indian residents sitting on the other side of the hall, remained mostly quiet (*Malaysiakini*, 5 September 2009). Besides being muted on the MCMC incidents, *The Star* also did not report about this public dialogue.

Malaysiakini reported that 16 people, including former Internal Security Act detainee P Uthayakumar, were arrested at a candlelight vigil near Dataran Merdeka. The vigil was organized by Hindraf with a march of a 100 participants marching from nearby Masjid Jamek, while singing songs, carrying roses and candles. However, before they could reach Dataran Merdeka, the crowd was confronted by two dozen police officers. It was reported that several police personnel pounced on Uthayakumar until he fell to the ground. He was then held on all fours and rushed to an awaiting police truck (*Malaysiakini*, 5 September 2009). Significantly, this news was not found in *The Star*.

Instead, *The Star* published straight news to specifically report on Hishammuddin's statement about his role in the Cow-Head incident. Hishammuddin told *The Star* through text messages that he was not supportive of the Cow-Head protesters' unruly act and wanted the police to act against them. He also insisted that he did not instruct the MCMC to demand *Malaysiakini* to remove the two videos from its website (*The Star*, 13 September 2009).

7.3.3 Responsibility Frame

By employing the responsibility frame, *The Star* reported that Sultan Sharafuddin

Idris Shah of Selangor called upon the then Chief Minister of Selangor Khalid Ibrahim to amicably settle the issues surrounding the relocation of the Hindu temple without hurting the feelings of both Hindus and Muslims (*The Star*, 3 September 2009b). The minister in the Prime Minister's Department Koh Tsu Koon suggested that the police should have a standard procedure to deal with public protest to show it is consistent and fair in its action. He addressed that the Cow-Head protest had raised many doubts and unhappiness, hence he mentioned that the police must be sensitive to public perception and not just carry out their duty as the image of the police is a reflection of the Government (*The Star*, 7 September 2009).

While *The Star* devoted 13.56% of its coverage to the responsibility frame, the same frame only accounted for 2.61% in *Malaysiakini*. A columnist of *Malaysiakini* stressed that it was time for journalists from mainstream and online media to take stock and write – on behalf of their readers – and reach out across faith lines and ethnic boundaries. He added that the journalists have an obligation to work towards a more open society (*Malaysiakini*, 31 August 2009).

7.3.4 Moral Frame

The Star reported that the Prime Minister Najib Razak urged the people to refrain from condemning or insulting other religions and their believers. He also advised Muslims to follow the true Islamic teachings of showing respect. Najib added that both Surah Al-Maidah and Surah Al-An'am warned Muslims if they went against other religions, it would cause the other believers to act violently against Muslims. He also reminded that Muslims were forbidden from insulting or desecrating items considered sacred to followers of other religions, so that, in turn, the non-Muslims would show respect to Islam (*The Star*, 5 September 2009).

In its opinions section, *Malaysiakini* published readers' voices towards the Cow-Head protest. A Muslim reader mentioned that he would like to apologize to the Hindus in Malaysia for the unforgivable action in the absence of an outright apology from the Malay-Muslim leadership. The reader also stated that what the protesters have done have nothing to do with Islam or the Malays. Instead, they have brought shame to Islam in the holy month of Ramadan. In response to this, a Hindu reader expressed that he was touched with the very rational and sensitive comments given by the Muslim brothers. He called for the nation to value the diversity and respect each other's faith and religion. He also remarked that the people should not be emotional and fall for the trap of May 13 (*Malaysiakini*, 29 August 2009b).

Furthermore, *Malaysiakini* also published a lengthy column article that commented on the statesmanship of the then Chief Minister of Selangor Khalid Ibrahim. The columnist wrote that Khalid has shown himself to be the kind of mature and even-keeled leader Malaysians desperately need. The author pointed out that it was interesting to compare two official responses to the Cow-Head protest: Home Minister Hishammuddin's closed-door meeting with the protest organizers, and Khalid's public dialogue with a wider range of residents from both sides of the debate. Furthermore, it was commented that Khalid was not disappointed by the boorish, disruptive behavior

of the few, saying “We understand (the residents’ feeling)”, and adding: “We should not be owned by this group of people. Although this group will continue to be there... we should not take this as a deterrent but as a challenge for us to prove them wrong”. The columnist remarked that Khalid behaved like a statesman, a leader who listens seriously to all Selangorians regardless of race, religion or partisanship (*Malaysiakini*, 8 September 2009b).

7.4 Valence

This study found that both *The Star* (80.0%) and *Malaysiakini* (82.0%) were highly critical towards the Cow-Head protesters (see Table 4). Through their coverage, both the mainstream and alternative newspapers conveyed a negative impression towards the protesters; causes the readers to form a negative opinion towards them and their behavior, while containing unfavorable descriptions of their behaviors.

Table 4. Valence for the Cow-Head Protest

	<i>The Star</i> (n = 53) %	<i>Malaysiakini</i> (n = 100) %
Supportive	2.5	3.0
Critical	80.0	82.0
Neutral	17.5	15.0

8. DISCUSSION

The differences in the number and size of articles published by *The Star* and *Malaysiakini* indicated that they carried unequal weight of attention for the Cow-Head dispute. The findings also reflected that *The Star* adopted some gatekeeping, agenda-setting and framing practices to control the coverage in order to construct a certain “reality” for the readers, or even shaping their opinions and attitudes towards the Cow-Head dispute. Tewksbury and Scheufele (2009) asserted that when journalists decide how to describe the political world, they often subconsciously engage themselves in the framing process. They choose words and images that have the power to influence how audiences interpret and evaluate issues or policies.

This study found that both *The Star* and *Malaysiakini* relied on civilians as their most important news sources. This is in fact a very interesting finding as previous studies (e.g. Yang & Md Sidin, 2011; Yang & Md Sidin, 2012, Yang & Md Sidin, 2014; Yang & Md Sidin, 2015) found that mainstream newspapers relied heavily on UMNO leaders as their news sources for coverage of inter-religious or interethnic conflicts. Significantly, Loo and Mustafa (2010) emphasized that information should be sourced from more parties to obtain a diversity of opinions surrounding interethnic issues. Nonetheless, the voices of reason and moderation ought to be given prominence over extreme views. Newspapers should avoid letting dominant parties define themselves

simply by quoting their leaders’ restatement of familiar demands or positions. Instead, newspapers should ask civilians and grassroots organizations for their sentiments and viewpoints, or even what solutions they could suggest for the interethnic conflicts. The newspapers should also find out from civilians whether the position stated by their leaders or the Government is the only way or the best way to achieve the changes they want. Subsequently, the newspapers should query the Government regarding the ideas or peace perspectives put forward by the civilians and grassroots organizations. In addition, Tan and Zawawi (2008) believed that media should flash out the entire range of perspectives that various individuals and organizations have taken over time. It is hoped that through a gathering of seemingly irreconcilable positions, a better level of understanding and empathy may arise.

Although conflict was the most salient frame found in both *The Star* and *Malaysiakini*, the aspects of conflict highlighted by them were different. *The Star* focused on condemning the Cow-Head protesters, while refraining from criticizing the police, UMNO, BN or the Government. This pattern was also reflected in the editorial article written by the Group Chief Editor of *The Star*, Wong Chun Wai, whereby he slammed the protesters rather harshly but failed to address the incompetency of the police in handling the issue, or the manner in which UMNO leaders reacted to the dispute. In fact, *The Star* portrayed UMNO as taking a moderate approach. As mentioned earlier, the close media–state partnership in Malaysia influences the journalists to engage in self-censorship in order not to offend the Government (Wong, 2004). Mustafa (2003) also contended that the mainstream press is instrumental in helping to promote the state’s hegemonic influence over the society. Furthermore, in their study to examine the gatekeeping process undertaken by Malaysian newspapers in reporting interethnic conflicts, Yang and Md Sidin (2015) found that the reporters at *The Star* were very careful in choosing their words, while toning town radical political rhetoric. The authors also documented that *The Star’s* editorial would always make a more moderate approach although the newspaper recognized that the method has not always been appreciated as people tend to see moderation as an act of cowardice.

As aforementioned, *The Star* often emphasized the process of reaching a compromise as well as the spirit of *muafakat* (consensus) within the BN. Nevertheless, the former MCA president Ong Ka Ting claimed that the BN coalition’s power-sharing was not effective:

[T]here is a situation which is not right and needs to be rectified. A lot of people have the perception that the BN power sharing was not effective and not practiced according to its original principles. UMNO is seen as a party which is far more dominant than other component parties...BN leaders must rectify the situation and allow component parties to participate in making important decisions. It shouldn’t look like as though UMNO is the (sole) decider in important policies while other parties are (merely) asked to defend (the policies) to uphold the BN spirit. The power sharing slogan is often used and (but) it is deemed lip service. (*Malaysiakini*, 18

October 2008)

While some of the Cow-Head protesters threatened to “shed blood” (*Malaysiakini*, 28 August 2009), similar threatening rhetoric has been heard in precedent occasions. During the 1987 political crisis, Najib Razak in his position as the then UMNO Youth Chief allegedly said that the *keris* (Malay dagger) would be soaked with Chinese blood to defend the “Malay race” and that May 13 racial riot might be repeating itself (Holsti, 2012, p. 121). In addition, Hishamuddin Hussein, also the then UMNO Youth Chief, has repeatedly wielded the *keris* as a sign of *ketuanan Melayu* (Malay supremacy) at the UMNO General Assembly from 2005 to 2007. More intimidating are statements by delegates such as Hasnoor Sidang Hussein in their speeches to warn the political and societal groups outside UMNO:

It’s time to raise our voice and defend the Malays and Islam. UMNO is willing to risk lives and bathe in blood in defense of race and religion. Don’t play with fire. If they mess with our rights, we will mess with theirs. UMNO faces challenges from DAP who are Chinese chauvinists, the ignorant PAS and threats from overseas. Friends in Barisan Nasional, too, have questioned us. (*Malaysiakini*, 16 November 2006)

Other references, such as declaring ethnized Chinese and Indians as *penumpang* (temporary settlers) or *pendatang* (immigrants), further added to a process of alienation. For example, the then UMNO deputy chairperson Badruddin Amiruldin said in 2004:

Don’t poke at this nest, for if it were disturbed, these hornets will strike and destroy the country...Fifty-eight years ago we had an agreement with the other races, in which we permitted them to *menumpang* (temporarily reside) on this land. In the Federal Constitution, our rights as a race have been enshrined. Let no one from other races ever question the rights of Malays on this land. Don’t question the religion because this is my right on this land. (*Malaysiakini*, 24 September 2004)

In 2008, Ahmad Ismail, the then division chief of Bukit Bendera UMNO, allegedly said during a political *ceramah* (lecture) in the run-up to the Permatang Pauh by-election that ethnic Chinese were “immigrants squatting in the country, thus were not entitled to equal rights in Malaysia” (Holsti, 2012, p. 121). The report about this incident in *Sin Chew* even led the then secretary of Penang UMNO, Azhar Ibrahim, to insist that “the journalist deserved to be shot if her article causes another May 13” (Holsti, 2012, p. 121).

Studies on alternative media showed that they often provide a space for the rational-critical discourse, which is crucial to the creation of a public sphere (Atton, 2009;

Harcup, 2003). As compared to *The Star*, *Malaysiakini* painted a rather different picture of the Cow-Head protest through its news frames. More often than not, the articles published by *Malaysiakini* tended to question the power and authority, which was described by Steele (2009) as “aggressively pursuing the bottom line without opposing the Government.” The editor-in-chief of *Malaysiakini* Steven Gan also mentioned that the alternative newspaper “cover things that are not being covered by the mainstream, [so that] readers can at least have an alternative opinion on the issues” (Yang and Md Sidin, 2015). Similarly, Kenyon (2010) recorded that one of the routines in the *Malaysiakini* newsroom is to look out for political stories that other media downplay or ignore. It was also found that the journalists of *Malaysiakini* look at issues from a “big picture” point of view, such as identifying what a particular story had to do with the Constitution and freedom, what it is in terms of the larger political picture and its implications in a multiracial society.

Steele (2009) even underscored that in the specifics of Malaysian political culture, where the Government has de facto control of the press and laws preventing journalists from reporting on sensitive issues as ethnicity and religion, *Malaysiakini* has always been singled out for its independence and guts. At a time when mainstream media had lost credibility due to their pro-government stance, *Malaysiakini* gained immediate attention and international accolades for its independence reporting. Steele (2009) also argued that *Malaysiakini* uses the norms of good journalism to legitimize alternative views of events, thus challenging the authoritarianism of the BN. Significantly she recognized that some of *Malaysiakini*.tv’s most influential videos have been of the destruction of Hindu temples and immigrant squatter communities.

Holsti (2012) stated that competitive authoritarian regimes like Malaysia are characterized by violations of democratic principles that could lead to abuse of state resources by the incumbent government, denial of adequate media coverage or harassment of opposition candidates, journalists, or government critics. The author added that institutions such as the Malaysian Anti-Corruption Commission (MACC) are an integral part of the executive and appear to focus more on opposition parliamentarians or non-BN-governed states rather than on curbing corruption within the government, which is widely known to exist. Similarly, the police’s failure to intervene the Cow-Head protest as well as the harassment of *Malaysiakini* by MCMC reflected the biasness of the executive in Malaysia.

9. CONCLUSION

Framing analysis allows researchers to examine the roles of the media in the development of social and political issues. Framing also reflects a conflict between dominant social norms and efforts for change. This study examined what aspects the mainstream and alternative newspapers have created for readers’ understanding of the Cow-Head protest. The findings indicated that the newspapers reported the dispute with different intensity and prominence. It was found that although conflict appeared to be the most salient frame found across the dailies, the aspects highlighted

by them varied. The dissimilar coverage of the same issue by the newspapers denoted the varied points of view held by them, which were rooted in different political beliefs and institutional practices. As for future research, in order to investigate the impact of news frames on people's perception of an issue, it would be interesting to juxtapose the findings of this study with public opinion data to measure public perceptions towards the Cow-Head protest.

Open Access: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY 4.0) which permits any use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, J. P. (2001). Democracy @ internet.asia? The challenges to the emancipatory potential of the net: Lessons from China and Malaysia. *Third World Quarterly*, 22(1), 99-114.
- Abbott, J. P. (2004). The Internet, *reformasi* and democratization in Malaysia. In E. T. Gomez (Ed.), *The State of Malaysia: Ethnicity, equity and reform*. (pp. 79-104). New York: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Atton, C. (2009). Why alternative journalism matters. *Journalism*, 10(3), 283-285.
- Azly Rahman. (2013). *The "Allah" controversy and other essays on Malaysian hypermodernity*. Petaling Jaya: Strategic Information and Research Development Centre.
- Baumgartner, S. E., & Wirth, W. (2012). Affective priming during the processing of news articles. *Media Psychology*, 15(1), 1-18.
- Brown, G. (2005). The rough and rosy road: Sites of contestation in Malaysia's shackled media industry. *Pacific Affairs*, 78(1), 39-56.
- Cappella, J., & Jamieson, K. (1997). *Spiral of cynicism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Case, W. (2009). Low-quality democracy and varied authoritarianism: Elites and regimes in Southeast Asia today. *The Pacific Review*, 22(3), 255-269.
- Chandran, P. (2006). Malaysiakini: Surviving the state and market. In J. Son, S. Sivaraman & S. Pradhan (Eds.), *Asia media report: A crisis within*. (pp. 49-54). Bangkok: Inter Press Service Asia-Pacific Centre Foundation Inc.
- Department of Statistics Malaysia. <http://www.statistics.gov.my/main/main.php>. Accessed on March 19, 2015.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Farish A. Noor. (2005). *From Majapahit to Putrajaya*. Kuala Lumpur: Silverfishbooks.
- Feeley, T. H., & Frederick, D. V. III. (2007). How organ donation is represented in newspaper articles in the United States. *Health Communication*, 21(2), 125-131.
- Gan, F., Teo, J. L., & Detenber, B. H. (2005). Framing the battle for the White House: A comparison of two national newspapers' coverage of the 2000 United States presidential election. *Gazette*, 67(5), 441-467.
- Gatsiounis, I. (2006). Islam Hadhari in Malaysia. *Current Trends in Islamist Ideology*, 5(1), 78-88.
- George, C. (2005). The Internet's political impact and the penetration/participation paradox in Malaysia and Singapore. *Media, Culture & Society*, 27(6), 903-920.
- Harcup, T. (2003). "The unspoken said": The journalism of alternative media. *Journalism*, 4(3), 356-376.
- Holst, F. (2012). *Ethnicization and identity construction in Malaysia*. New York: Routledge.
- Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kahn, J. S. (2005). The making and unmaking (?) of a Malay race. *Social Analysis*, 49(2), 164-172.
- Kenyon, A. T. (2010). Investigating chilling effects: News media and public speech in Malaysia, Singapore and Australia. *International Journal of Communication*, 4(1), 440-467.
- Kua, K. S. (2010). *The patriot game: Writings on the Malaysian wall*. Kuala Lumpur: The Oriengroup Sdn Bhd.
- Lee, R. L. M. (2004). The transformation of race relations in Malaysia: From ethnic discourse to national imagery, 1993-2003. *African and Asian Studies*, 3(2), 119-142.
- Lent, J. A. (1990). The development of multicultural stability in ASEAN: The role of mass media. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 4(1), 45-58.
- Loo, E. G. & Mustafa K. Anuar (2010). *Journalism in good faith: Issues and practices in religion reporting*. Selangor: Marshall Cavendish (Malaysia) Sdn Bhd.
- Malaysiakini. (2004, September 24). *Don't stir the hornet's nest called Malay rights*.
- Malaysiakini. (2006, November 16). *UMNO willing to bathe in blood*.
- Malaysiakini. (2008, October 18). *...but MCA says UMNO dominates BN*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, August 28). *Temple demo: Residents march with cow's head*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, August 29a). *Cops say sorry, promise prompt action*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, August 29b). *Calls for calm and forgiveness*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, August 31). *Need to calibrate our moral meter*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, September 1). *US-based Hindu foundation condemns 'cow head' mob*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, September 2). *Hisham: Don't blame cow-head protesters*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, September 3a). *Hindu Sangam: No contact from Section 23 residents*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, September 3b). *Police report made against home minister*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, September 4). *MCMC tells Malaysiakini: Take down videos*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, September 5). *16 arrested at Hindraf candlelight march in KL*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, September 8a). *Malaysiakini videos: 12 questioned by MCMC*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, September 8b). *Cool mature head vs cow heads*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, September 10). *Cow-head videos: MCMC comes a-calling again*.
- Malaysiakini. (2009, September 11). *MCMC gathers final evidence, charges expected*.
- Manheim, J. B. (1994). *Strategic public diplomacy and American foreign policy: The evolution of influence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Matthes, J., & Kohring, M. (2008). The content analysis of media frames: Toward improving reliability and validity. *Journal of Communication*, 58(2), 258-279.
- Maznah Mohamad. (2008). Malaysia – democracy and the end of ethnic politics? *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 62(4), 441-459.
- Maznah Mohamad, & and Syed Muhd Khairudin Aljunied. (2011). *Melayu: Politics, Poetics and Paradoxes of Malayness*. Singapore: NUS Press Pte Ltd.

- McDaniel, D. (2002). Southeast Asia's electronically charged media revolution. *Nieman Reports*, 56(2), 63-64.
- Mohd Azizuddin Mohd Sani. (2005). Media freedom in Malaysia. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 35(3), 341-367.
- Mustafa K. Anuar. (2003). The role of Malaysia's mainstream press in the 1999 general election. In F. K. W. Loh & J. Saravanamuttu (Eds.), *New politics in Malaysia*. (pp. 53-65). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Mustafa K. Anuar (2010). *Epilogue*. In E. G. Loo, E. G. & Mustafa K. Anuar (Eds.), *Journalism in good faith: Issues and practices in religion reporting* (pp.196-201). Shah Alam: Marshall Cavendish (Malaysia) Sdn Bhd.
- Nagata, J. (2011). Boundaries of Malayness: 'We have made Malaysia: Now it is time to (re) make the Malays but who interprets the history?'. In Maznah Mohamad & Syed Muhd Khairudin Aljunied (Eds.). *Melayu: The politics, poetics and paradoxes of Malayness* (pp. 3-33). Singapore: National University of Singapore Press.
- Nah, A. M. (2006). (Re)mapping indigenous "race"/place in postcolonial Peninsular Malaysia. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 88(3): 285-297.
- Netto, A. (2002). Media freedom in Malaysia: The challenge facing civil society. *Media Asia*, 29(1), 17-23.
- Ong, P. L. (2007). Identity matters: Ethnic salience and perception in Malaysia. In Abdul Rahman Embong (Ed.), *Rethinking ethnicity and nation building: Malaysia, Sri Lanka and Fiji in comparative perspective* (pp. 216-234). Kajang: Persatuan Sains Sosial Malaysia.
- Patterson, T. (1993). *Out of order*. New York: Knopf.
- Puyok, A. (2005). The 2004 Ba' Kelantan by-election in Sarawak, East Malaysia: The Lun Bawang factor and whither representative democracy in Malaysia. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 27(1), 64-79.
- Randhawa, S., Puah, P., & Loone, S. (2005). *Freedom of expression and the media in Malaysia*. Petaling Jaya: SUARAM.
- Riffe, D., Lacy, S. & Fico, F. (2005). Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rodan, G. (2005). *Transparency and authoritarian rule in Southeast Asia: Singapore and Malaysia*. New York: Routledge.
- Scheufele, D.A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 9-20.
- Selva, J. (2014). *Media Planning Guide Malaysia 2014*. Kuala Lumpur: Perception Media Sdn Bhd.
- Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of Communication*, 50(2), 93-109.
- Song, Y. H. (2007). Internet news media and issue development: A case study on the roles of independent online news services as agenda-builders for anti-US protests in South Korea. *New Media & Society*, 9(1), 71-92.
- Spratt, M., Bullock, C. F., & Baldasty, G. (2007). News, race, and the status quo: The case of Emmett Louis Till. *The Howard Journal of Communication*, 18(3), 169-192.
- Steele, J. (2009). Professional online: How *Malaysiakini* challenges authoritarianism. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 14(1), 91-111.
- Syed Husin Ali. (2008). *Ethnic relations in Malaysia: Harmony and conflict*. Petaling Jaya: Strategic Information and Research Development Centre.
- Tan, J. E., & Zawawi Ibrahim. (2008). *Bloggging and democratisation in Malaysia: A New Civil Society in the Making*. Petaling Jaya: The Strategic Information and Research Development Centre.
- Tankard, J. W. (2008). The empirical approach to the study of media framing. In S. D. Reese, O. H. Gandy & A. E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world*. (pp. 95-105), New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tewksbury, D. & Scheufele, D. (2009). News framing theory and research. In J. Bryant & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*. (pp. 17-33). New York: Routledge.
- The Star. (2009, September 1a). *Beware the tipping point*.
- The Star. (2009, September 1b). *Our protest was hijacked, say residents*.
- The Star. (2009, September 2). *SMS your views*.
- The Star. (2009, September 3a). *Let's stamp out racism*.
- The Star. (2009, September 3b). *Sultan calls on Khalid to settle temple issues*.
- The Star. (2009, September 5). *PM: Don't slur others*.
- The Star. (2009, September 6a). *Vision and courage needed against chauvinist herd*.
- The Star. (2009, September 6b). *Use your head, not your heart*.
- The Star. (2009, September 7). *Koh: Cops need to be fair and consistent*.
- The Star. (2009, September 13). *Hisham explains his role in the affair*.
- Tong, Y. S. (2004). Malaysiakini: Threading a tightrope of political pressure and market factors. In S. Gan, J. Gomez, & U. Johannan (Eds.). *Asian cyberactivism: Freedom of expression and media censorship* (pp. 270-317). Singapore: Friedrich Naumann Foundation.
- Van Gorp, B. (2007). The constructionist approach to framing: Bringing culture back in. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 60-78.
- Wang, L. K. (2001). Media and democracy in Malaysia. *Javnost – The Public*, 8(2), 67-87.
- Weaver, D. H. (2007). Thoughts on agenda setting, framing, and priming. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 142-147.
- Wilson, T., Azizah Hamzah, & Khattab, U. (2003). The 'cultural technology of clicking' in the hypertext era. *New Media & Society*, 5(4), 523-545.
- Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2006). *Mass media research: An introduction*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Wong, K. L. (2004). Asian-based development journalism and political elections. *Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies*, 66(1), 25-40.
- Yang, L. F. & Md Sidin Ahmad Ishak. (2011). Framing religious dispute: A comparative analysis of the Lina Joy controversy by the Malaysian Newspapers. *Journal of the South East Asia Research Centre for Communications and Humanities*, 3(2), 21-38.
- Yang, L. F. & Md Sidin Ahmad Ishak. (2012). Framing interethnic conflict in Malaysia: A comparative analysis of newspaper coverage on the Hindu Rights Action Force (Hindraf). *International Journal of Communication*, 6(1), 166-189.
- Yang, L. F & Md Sidin Ahmad Ishak. (2014). Framing interethnic conflict in Malaysia: A

- comparative analysis of newspapers coverage on the *Keris* polemics. *Ethnicities*, 14(2), 252-278.
- Yang, L. F. & Md Sidin Ahmad Ishak. (2015). Gatekeeping in the coverage of interethnic conflicts: An analysis of mainstream and alternative newspapers in Malaysia. *Journal of the South East Asia Research Centre for Communications and Humanities*, 17(1), 23-49.
- Zaid Ibrahim. (2013). Malaysia : This is no election. *The Round Table*, 102(3), 303-304.
- Zhou, X. (2008). Cultural dimensions and framing the Internet in China: A cross-cultural study of newspapers' coverage in Hong Kong, Singapore, the US and the UK. *International Communication Gazette*, 70(2), 117-136.

Appendix A

The Five Most Commonly Used News Frames

1. Attribution of responsibility

- Does the story suggest that some level of government has the ability to alleviate the problem?
- Does the story suggest that some level of the government is responsible for the issue/problem?
- Does the story suggest solution(s) to the issue/problem?
- Does the story suggest that an individual (or group of people in society) is responsible for the issue/problem?
- Does the story suggest the problem requires urgent action?

2. Human interest frame

- Does the story provide a human example or “human face” on the issue?
- Does the story employ adjectives or personal vignettes that generate feelings of outrage, empathy-caring, sympathy or compassion?
- Does the story emphasise how individuals and groups are affected by the issue/problem?
- Does the story go into the private or personal lives of the actors?
- Does the story contain visual information that might generate feelings of outrage, empathy-caring, sympathy or compassion?

3. Conflict frame

- Does the story reflect disagreement between parties-individuals-groups-countries?
- Does one party-individual-group-country reproach another?
- Does the story refer to two sides or to more than two sides of the issue/problem?
- Does the story refer to winners and losers?

4. Morality frame

- Does the story contain any moral message?
- Does the story make reference to morality, God and other religious tenets?
- Does the story offer specific social prescriptions about how to behave?

5. Economic frame

- Is there a mention of financial losses or gains now or in the future?
- Is there a mention of the costs/degree of expense involved?
- Is there a reference to economic consequences of pursuing or not pursuing a course of action?
- Does the story contain visual information that might generate feelings of outrage, empathy-caring, sympathy or compassion?

Source:

Semetko, H. A., and Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of Communication*, 50(2), 93-109.

Yang Lai Fong is a senior lecturer at the School of Communication, Taylor's University, Malaysia. Currently she teaches *Communication Theory* to undergraduates, and *Political Communication* and *Advanced Communication Theories* at graduate level. Her areas of research include media and ethnicity, media and diplomacy, political communication, and media sociology. Her publications can be found in the *Asian Journal of Communication*, *International Journal of Communication*, *Ethnicities*, *Chinese Journal of Communication*, *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, *Malaysian Journal of Communication* among others. She is also the sub-editor of *SEARCH Journal*, which is published by Taylor's University Malaysia, and indexed in SCOPUS since 2012.

Leong Wai Kit is a lecturer at the School of Communication, Taylor's University, Malaysia. She obtained her Master of Art in Mass Communication at the National University of Malaysia. Her areas of research include broadcasting, media and teaching technology, visual communication and media reception. Currently she teaches *Photography* at the degree level, *Television Production* at the diploma level, and *Audio Visual Production* at the foundation level. She is also a member of the Film Directors' Association of Malaysia since 2008 and member of PSPJ (Photography Society of Petaling Jaya).