The Battle of Framing on you Tube: Exploring How Citizen Journalists Covered The Dispersal of Muslim Brotherhood Sit-ins in Egypt.

Seham Mohamed Abdel Khalek *

ABSTRACT

This study presents a quantitative analysis of citizen-generated content uploaded on You Tube to discover the presence, valence, and substance of dominant news frames employed in the coverage of Muslim Brotherhood sit-ins dispersal in Cairo. Results showed that a highly polarized political environment caused citizen journalists to replicate the 'protest paradigm' found in mainstream media emphasizing the negative aspects of the dispersal. Even though substantive frames were used most of the time, the amount of ambiguous frames cannot be ignored.

Keywords: Sit-in Dispersal, Muslim Brotherhood, Protest Paradigm, Valence framing, Substance Framing, Citizen-generated Content

INTRODUCTION

On 14 August 2013, Egyptian security forces raided two camps of protesters in Cairo: one at al- Square near Cairo University and a larger one near Rabaa al-Adawiya mosque in Nasr City, a populous Cairo suburb. The two places witnessed protests by Muslim Brotherhood members and supporters of ousted Islamist President Mohamed Morsi, who was removed from office by the military after huge street protests against him. According to the National Council for Human Rights, 632 people had been killed during the dispersal of Rabaa Al-Adawiya sit-in, including eight police officers, with at least 1492 injured. (Daily News Egypt, 2014; Wikipedia, 2013). However, the Muslim Brotherhood and National Coalition for Supporting Legitimacy put the number of deaths from the Rabaa al-Adawiya Mosque sit-in alone at 2600. (Wikipedia, 2013) Social media websites have been divided between pro-and anti- Muslim Brotherhood, who turned to YouTube and other alternative media outlets to frame the dispersal according to their preferred point of view. Pro- Muslim Brotherhood uploaded their own videos to show the raid as a "massacre", while anti – Muslim Brotherhood shared videos to show that protest

camps had been cleared "in a civilized way".

In light of a highly polarized environment, this study used framing analysis to examine video footages created by pro-and anti-Muslim Brotherhood and uploaded on YouTube to discover how they chose to present the dispersal of Rabaa and el Nahda sit-in in Cairo. The objective of this quantitative study is to examine whether citizen journalists, with different political perspectives, offered more in-depth and contextualized news stories of the dispersal to the public opinion or conformed to the traditional "protest paradigm" found in mainstream media, focusing on negative, violent, and irrational elements of the protest. The concept of valence framing is here particularly helpful for understanding how citizen journalists provide issues in a positive, negative, or neutral manner. This study also develops research about the substantive/ambiguous frame classification. A substantive media frame is detailed and informative, therefore, potentially to citizens' understanding of political topics. An ambiguous media frame is vague and unclear, providing little information (Williams and Kaid, 2006).

The purpose of this study is important for many reasons. First: Cellphones, Black Berries or iPhones have created a new source of newsworthy information. An ordinary citizen is able to pick up a photo, record a video, add a caption or a short story, generate endless remixes and upload it on YouTube and other social media

platforms for a global audience to see (Antony and Thomas, 2010; Perlmutter, 2008). While the unprofessional and often shaken picture quality adds a sense of realism to the distributed content, it poses many risks affiliated with unethical practices and misrepresentation of facts (Wahl-Jorgensen et al., 2010). Considering online videos created by opponents and supporters of the Muslim Brotherhood sit-in dispersal is helpful for understanding how they presented the issue to the public, especially that this issue is subject to different presentations and interpretations causing a highly polarized political environment in Egypt. Second: While many studies have considered the protest paradigm in mainstream and new media, (Chan and Lee, 1984; Gitlin, 1980; McLeod and Hertog, 1999; Padovani, 2010; Harllow and Johnson 2011), this study extends previous researches by considering how citizens, with different political perspectives, frame a public demonstration and help audience members make sense of its causes and actions. Third: This study will shed more light on how the same information could be presented in either a positive or negative tone, which may subsequently 'influence the way people think about the topic'. Studies found that the valence of news frames affects both cognitive responses and attitudes (Schuck and de Vreese, 2006). While there have been many studies discussing valence framing, exploring the multi-faceted nature of video-sharing sites is needed.

Theoretical Framework
The "Protest Paradigm"

Previous research on media framing of protest events has often focused on a set routine and pattern of characteristics, employed by mainstream media , referred to as the "protest paradigm" (Chan and Lee, 1984). Coverage of protest events highlight confrontations between police and protesters (Swank, 1997), focus on the spectacle of the protest (Gitlin, 1980) and may criticize the strange appearance of demonstrators, in a way that frames protesters as an "isolated minority" (Douglas, 2007). According to the protest paradigm, news stories tend to be told from the perspectives of public officials, rarely quoting protesters themselves (McFarlane and Hay, 2003; Ryan et al., 2001; Smith et al., 2001). In addition, officials are more likely to be

shown in newspaper photos of collective action events (Brown and Wilkes, 2012). This traditional paradigm focuses on negative elements of the protest that may lead to the demonization of protesters, even if the majority of the protesters were nonviolent (McLeod and Hertog, 1999). Moreover, media coverage often fails to frame the issues protesters attempt to address. Boyle et al.,(2012) found that protester's tactics, the actions taken by a protest group to achieve their goals, rather than the underlying goals or reasons for the protest, play a substantial role in affecting media coverage. News stories about protests may get people's sympathy (Wolfsfeld, 1997) or de-legitimize activists' actions (Gitlin, 1980; McLeod and Hertog, 1999). Key frames associated with the "protest paradigm" are also employed by different ideological and traditional media sources to cover national right –wing movements (Weaver et al., 2013). However, scholars found that protest groups are not treated equally; there are differences in the application of the protest paradigm according to the cause of the protest. Protest groups tending to produce fundamental changes in political conditions, are more likely to set off coverage that adheres more closely to the protest paradigm, than more moderate groups (McLeod and Hertog,1999).

The current new media environment empowered previously marginalized protest groups to communicate independently of traditional media (Cottle, 2008). Easy access to political information, coupled with increased power of users to create their own media, offers anti-government activists new opportunities to combat the media's negative portrayals of protesters typically found in traditional media (Padovani,2010). Internet-based social media allows protesters to have an unprecedented impact on political information environment, (Postmes and Brunsting, 2002), legitimize the causes of protesters and provide an alternative view of the protest (Harlow and Johnson, 2011).

As this review illustrates, the majority of studies, concerning the news coverage of protests, have centered on how issues are framed by traditional and new media. Entman (1993) defines news framing in terms of the selection of certain information over other information. Framing involves processes of inclusion, exclusion; emphasis as well as elaboration of certain aspects of the news story. However, scholarly research, until now, has

mostly ignored how protesters, their supporters and their opponents, communicating independently of mainstream news media, frame a public demonstration and help audience members make sense of its causes and actions. Do activists and their opponents develop a different narrative structure that identify problems and recommend solutions, or does their coverage resemble the traditional media paradigm, highlighting dramatic actions of the events?

Considering the preceding literature regarding protest framing, the first questions this research will answer are the following:

RQ1a: What major frames are present in You Tube videos produced by pro- and anti- protesters?

RQ1b: How do frames vary between videos produced by pro- and anti – protesters?

Frames are also capable of carrying an inherent valence (De Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2003). Valence frames can cast the same information in either a positive or negative terms (Levin et al., 1998). A frame with positive valence may emphasize profitable or advantageous elements to consider. A frame with a negative valence may emphasize unprofitable or disadvantageous elements to consider. A frame with a neutral valence presents events without referring to a positive or negative value (De Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2003). A video clip, for example, which focuses on positive or negative consequences of a sit-in dispersal has a specific directional bias by inherently evaluating the dispersal as a 'good' or 'bad' thing. Many studies have explored frame valence in different contexts (Jha, 2007; Kaid et al., 2004; Mosemghvdlishvili and Jansz , 2013; Schuck and De Vreese , 2009). A large and growing body of literature has made it clear that negativity is more attention-getting than is positivity. (Jha, 2007; Pratto and John,1991).

Based on the literature about frame valence, the next questions this study will answer are the following:

RQ2a: What is the valence of frames in videos produced by pro- and anti – protesters?

RQ2b: How the valence found for frames differ between videos produced by pro- and anti – protesters?

Frames can also differ in levels of substance. Williams and Kaid (2006) differentiate between ambiguous and substantive framing. This discrimination between substantive and ambiguous framing examines the frame's depth, as being either empty or full in nature (Holody, 2006). An ambiguous frame is inaccurate and vague, providing little to no context and lacking frame of reference. A substantive news frame, by contrast, is accurate and explanatory, offering context and based on frame of references (Williams and Kaid, 2006). Moldoff (2007) found that providing more depth to positive information may increase one's political information potency. In addition, substantive news articles may have a positive relationship with information retention. Studies also found that while substantive news have negative effects on political cynicism among younger citizens, it did not significantly affect political cynicism among older ones (De Vreese et al., 2010; Moldoff, 2007). Substantive studies of framing also explain the relation between forming public opinions and the way by which information is transmitted to individuals. (Morgan et al.,2013).

Based on the literature about frame substance, the next questions this study will answer are the following:

RQ3a: What is the level of substance of frames in videos produced by pro- and anti- protesters?

RQ3b: How the levels of substance found for frames differ between videos produced by pro-and anti-protestors?

RQ3c: How frame substance and frame valence differ between videos produced by pro- and anti- protesters?

Method
Sample

The sample of this study is comprised of all user-created YouTube videos which were tagged with the word "dispersal of Rabaa al-Adawiya Mosque" or "Al Nahda sit-in" A preliminary inquiry retrieved 12,400 such videos. Only citizen-generated content were selected, other videos uploaded by television channels or organizations were excluded. Selected content included raw mobile phone footages and/ or professional videos (containing footages or photos in combination with text or music and/or a voice over and /or uploaded copies of current affairs programs or other existing audiovisual work). Two sampling procedures were combined. The first was to include the top 50 videos, produced by protesters and anti-protesters, shown in the relevance list,

by taking into account the numbers of views and comments. Selecting the most viewed videos was important due to their vast audience reach, a potential to be inherently more important to study than less popular videos (Reese and Danielian, 1989). Videos were classified as supporting or opposing the dispersal by the title and the content of the shots. Videos supporting the dispersal "praise the brave security forces and blame the Islamists for the loss of life, showing guns and other weapons in the camps of Muslim Brotherhood members". Videos opposing the dispersal "condemn the use of force in clearing the sit-ins showing security and military forces engaged in violent and anti-social activities and describing the raid as a massacre". The second procedure was to randomly select 100 videos uploaded by both camps during the period between 14 and 31 August 2013. The preliminary inquiry showed that material uploaded after 31 August contains repeated content. The selected sample included 30 repeated videos, which were ruled out from the analysis. Thus, the total number of coded videos contained 120 videos (from which 47 were from the relevance list: Protesters and their supporters uploaded 25 videos, counter-protesters uploaded 22 videos) and the remaining 73 videos were from the random list: Protesters uploaded 35 videos and counter-protesters uploaded 38 videos).

A framing analysis of You Tube videos was conducted to answer the overall research question. Based on the literature review, each shot (a single sequence of a motion picture shot without interruption), each snapshot (a quick rough capture to document a scene or event) and each "photograph" (an image of an object, person, scene, recorded by a camera) in the coded videos was examined for the existence of predominant frames, tone and level of substance. The codebook contained also identifying information, such as the video title, characteristics of the video (duration, number of scenes and quality). In total, a sample of 636 minutes was analyzed, with 52% of the minutes produced by protesters and 48% produced by counter-protesters.

Operationalization

In order for coding to take place, framing devices must first be identified. To analyze RQ1a-b, which questioned what major frames are present in pro-and anti-

protestor videos, this study relied on (a) tactics frames defined as the actions taken by the protesters / police during the dispersal; (b) legitimizing frames defined as portraying the protesters / police as having a real, legitimate reason to protest / disperse the protest; (c) demonization frames defined as portraying the protesters / police as wicked and threatening, to justify the killing, to make the enemy look as evil as possible; (d) sympathy frames, defined as provoking support, compassion, or sympathetic feelings for the protesters / police; (e)portrayal frames defined as the character of protesters / police officers projected to the public; (f) spectacle frames, defined as emphasizing the number of protesters, police officers , violence, emotion, drama and (g) opinion frames defined as all the human voices (official sources / citizens) quoted directly or paraphrased about the dispersal.

For analysis of RQ2a-b, which dealt with the valence of frames in videos produced by pro- and anti - protesters , each present frame was recorded whether its tone was positive, neutral or negative. Positive frames depicted the dispersal in a good light. Negative frames depicted the dispersal in a bad light. Such a positive or negative tone may come across by information provided by a scene or word choice. Neutral frames are presented neither positively nor negatively, or are presented as both equally. Valence does not describe the nature of the shot / photograph provided, but instead the tone used to describe the shot or photograph (De Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2003). For example, a police action might be negative in nature, but its frame is coded as positive if the material is in favor of the consequence, (e.g. support for arresting protesters accused of using weapons).

For analysis of RQ3a-b-c, which dealt with the level of substance of frames in videos produced by protesters and anti − protesters , videos were coded whether the frame was substantive (rich in context) or ambiguous (lacking in context) (Williams and Kaid, 2006). Substantive frames met the following criteria: The frame being coded is informative, provide clear information and offer detailed information and context. Ambiguous frames met the following criteria: The frame being coded is vague and indistinct, provide obscure information and offer little to no context. (Holody, 2006).

To avoid researcher bias, two postgraduate

communication students, unfamiliar with the direction of the study questions, were trained to use the codebook developed by the author. Before the actual coding started, the codebook was tested to achieve higher inter-coder reliability. The coders were assigned to code ten percent of the sample. This reliability test led to a 92% coder agreement, a standard that meets accepted criteria for inter-coder reliability (Rubin and Babbie, 2000).

RESULTS

Before addressing the research questions, it is important to examine the descriptive characteristics of the 120 coded videos. Videos posted on YouTube were short clips of an average duration of 5 minutes (M = 5.3; SD= 4). Among them were 64 amateur videos (recorded by a sit-in attendee or people witnessing the dispersal from surrounding buildings), 56 videos used professional videos, (containing video footages or photos in combination with text or music and/or a voice over). Among the professional material, however, 34 videos simply were 'cut-and-paste' productions in which the uploader did not add his own material, but simply uploaded copies of news items, current affairs programs or other existing audiovisual work, 20 videos were " cut and mix" as mixing text, music, still and moving images from a range of sources. Only eight of the amateur videos were uploaded by counter-protesters, as they were not participating in the event. The quality of 96 videos was high, 16 videos were of medium quality, (the scenes were visible but not clear), eight videos were of poor quality (some scenes were blurring). Most of the videos used natural sound (86 videos), other videos used natural sound in combination with the voice of sit-in participants, residents, friends or relatives of the sitters, doctors (26 videos). Only eight videos were typified as only testimonials of people talking to the camera and commenting on the event .

In answer to RQ1a, which asked which major frames were employed, analysis shows that protesters and their opponents adhered to the traditional protest paradigm of the mainstream media, as demonization (29.7%) and tactics (23.6%) constituted the predominant frames through which the dispersal was presented. (see table1) .Even when visual segments did not actually show violence perpetrated by protesters or policemen, spectacle

frames that show destruction , fires , number of corpses , injuries dominated the videos (17%). Portrayal of protesters as well as policemen engaged in the dispersal was featured (13.8%) of the time. Sympathy frames that provoked support and compassion for the protesters were employed (9.2%) of the time. Surprisingly videos provide the legitimizing frames only (4.8%) of the time. Opinion frames were found to be the least prevalent (1.9%).

When considering RQ1b, how do frames vary between videos produced by protesters and their opponents, analysis shows that protesters (35.4%) were significantly more likely than their opponents (19.5%) to use a demonization frame to portray the police as wicked as possible. Videos depicted the dispersal as a "massacre" featuring images that would be inappropriate to be broadcast on television. Close shots of burned corpses, wounded or dead children are used to exacerbate the emotional side of the story. Shocking images are often replicated in different videos. Since it is technically available to download a YouTube video, for some producers the footages found on social networking sites serve as material to create their own videos .(Mosemghvdlishvili and Jansz , 2013) .

Demonization frame, on the other hand, employed by counter-protesters aimed at "de-legitimizing" the protest and marginalize protesters' actions. Protesters were shown as terrorists, killers, vandals. Close-up scenes of remnants of dismembered bodies indicate that people were tortured and killed during the sit-in.

While protesters (13%) were significantly more likely than anti-protesters (2.4%) to rely on a sympathy frame, counter- protesters (30.7%) were more likely than protesters (19.7%) to employ tactics frames to show the violent actions used by protesters during the dispersal , in contrast to the "civilized "way followed by police to disperse both sit-ins. But this finding was not statistically significant.

Despite both camps relied on spectacle framing to depict the destruction occurred in the area following the dispersal, counter- protesters (21.3%) were significantly more likely to employ this frame than protesters (14.6%).

Surprisingly, anti- protesters (12.5%) were also significantly more likely than protesters (.5%) to rely on legitimizing frames. Portrayal frames were employed by both camps quite similar with protesters significantly

dominating use of the frame (14.9%).

Similarly, both groups failed to present an opinion frame. Opinion frame was only found in (1.9%) in all frames used in protesters' videos, and in (1.8%) in counter-protesters' videos, without any statistically significant differences. However , while protesters relied only on quoting doctors, sit-inners , families and friends of victims to represent the " massacres" of the dispersal, counter-protesters used official sources in four out of 12 presented quotes. Videos including citizen sources depicted the joy of the population when police succeeded in resolving the sit- in and cleaned the place.

Table (1): Frames Used in You Tube Coverage

FRAMES EMPOLYED	PROTESTERS		COUNTER-PROTESTERS		TOTAL	%	X2 DF=1	P
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
TACTICS	230	19.7	202	30.7	432	23.6	1.8148	0.178
Legitimizing	6	0.5	82	12.5	88	4.8	65.6364	0.000
Demonizing	414	35.4	128	19.5	542	29.7	150.915	0.000
Sympathy	152	13	16	2.4	168	9.2	110.095	0.000
Portrayal	174	14.9	78	11.8	252	13.8	36.5714	0.000
SPECTACLE	170	14.6	140	21.3	310	17.0	2.90323	0.088
Opinion	22	1.9	12	1.8	34	1.9	2.94118	0.086
TOTAL	1168	100	658	100	1826	100	142.442	0.000

In answer to RQ2a, which asked about the valence of frames presented in coded videos, results showed that the overall tone of the videos in the sample was not balanced: (63.4%) negative, (29.7 %) positive and (6.9%) neutral, a statistically significant difference. In other words, sit-in dispersal was rarely discussed using frames without a negative or positive slant. As shown in table 2, frames used in this discussion were negative a plurality of the time. Logically, demonization frames possessed negative valence in all 542 of its occurrences while sympathy frames were all found to be positive. The spectacle (84.5%), opinion (82.4%), and tactics (67.6%) frames were all found to be negative a majority of the time, with statistically significant differences. In contrast, legitimizing (93.2%) and portrayal (73.8%) frames were more often found to be positive, with statistically significant differences. Overall, frames were presented negatively in user –generated videos at a statistically significant (63.4%) of the time.

Table (2):.Valence of Frames Used in You Tube Coverage

Frames	Positive		Neutral		Negative		Total	X2 DF=2	P
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N		
TACTICS	70	16.2	70	16.2	292	67.6	432	228.167	0.000
Legitimizing	82	93.2	6	6.8	0	0	88	142.45	0.000
Demonization	0	0	0	0	542	100	542	1084	0.000
Sympathy	168	100	0	0	0	0	168	336	0.000
Portrayal	186	73.8	32	12.7	34	13.5	252	185.8	0.000
Spectacle	30	9.7	18	5.8	262	84.5	310	366.14	0.000
Opinion	6	17.6	0	0	28	82.4	34	38.35	0.000
Total	542	29.7	126	6.9	1158	63.4	1826	885.836	0.000

When considering RQ2b, whether the valence found for frames was significantly different between pro-and anti-protestor videos, analysis showed that both groups featured mostly negative frames. Pro-protesters featured four (tactics, demonization, spectacle and opinion frames) out of seven frames as significantly negative a majority of

the times they were utilized (see table 3). Legitimizing, sympathy and portrayal frames were significantly more often framed in a positive light. Overall, the negative frames found in pro-protesters' videos were statistically different (61.5 %) of the time from either the positive or neutral.

Three frames (tactics, demonization and spectacle) were coded as significantly negative a plurality or majority of the times they were found in counter-protesters' videos. While legitimizing and sympathy frames were significantly more often framed in a positive light , valence of portrayal and opinion frames were split between positive (50%) and negative (50%). All frames were statistically proven significant. Overall, frames were presented negatively in counter-protesters' videos at a statistically significant (66.9%) of the time.

Table (3): Chi-square of Differences in Valence used in You Tube Coverage

N= 1826

Frames	Protesters			Counter- protesters		
	Positive	**Neutral**	**Negative**	**Positive**	**Neutral**	**Negative**
Tactics			74.75 0.000			181.8 0.000
Motives	6* 0.002			130.63 0.000		
Demonization			828 0.000			256 0.000
Sympathy	269.4 0.000			32 0.000		
Portrayal	232.7 0.000			14.77 0.001		14.77 0.001
Spectacle			216.3 0.000			156.1 0.000
Opinion			44 0.000	6* 0.05		6* 0.05
Total (%)	366 31.3 %	84 7.2%	718 61.5% 518.29 0.000	176 26.7%	42 6.4%	440 66.9% 373.945 0.000

*This chi square calculation should be interpreted with caution since cells have values of less than 5**.**

For RQ3a which asked if the frames present were primarily ambiguous or substantive in citizen journalists' coverage, results found that overall, 1368 (74.6%) frames were found to be substantive, significantly different from the 458 (25.4 %) ambiguous frames found (see table 4). In other words, six out of seven frame categories were more often to be substantive in nature. Despite being found the most prevalent frame, demonization was found to be substantive only (59.4%) of the time. Spectacle (71.6%), tactics (73.6 %), Sympathy (89.3%), legitimizing (93.2 %) and portrayal (100%)frames were presented substantively a majority of the time. Each of these six frame categories were determined to be substantive at a chi-square statistically significant level. With one exception opinion frames were found to be by majority ambiguous, but this finding was not at a statistically significant level.

Table (4):.Level of Substance of Frames Used In You Tube Coverage

Frames	Substantive	Ambiguous	Total	X2 DF= 1	P
TACTICS	318 (73.6%)	114 (26.4%)	432	96.333	0.000
legitimizing	82 (93.2 %)	6 (6.8 %)	88	65.636	0.000
Demonization	322 (59.4%)	220 (40.6%)	542	19.195	0.000
Sympathy	150 (89.3%)	18 (10.7%)	168	103.714	0.000
Portrayal	252 (100%)	0 (0%)	252	252	0.000
Spectacle	222 (71.6%)	88 (28.4%)	310	57.922	0.000
Opinion	16 (47%)	18 (53%)	34	0.117	0.732
Total	1362 74.6 %	464 25.4 %	1826	441.6	0.000

When considering RQ3b, how the levels of substance found for frames in user-created videos are significantly different between protesters and anti-protesters videos , findings showed that six out of seven frame categories (tactics, legitimizing, demonization, sympathy, portrayal and spectacle) found in protesters' videos were presented substantively a majority of the time, only opinion frames were found more often to be ambiguous, with all of them statistically significant (see table 5).Overall, frames found in protesters 'videos were substantive (79.1%) of the time, significantly different from the number of ambiguous frames found.

In videos produced by counter-protesters, demonization was the only frame found to be significantly ambiguous rather than substantive. All other six frame categories (tactics, legitimizing, sympathy, portrayal, spectacle and opinion) were featured substantive rather than ambiguous. However, of these frames, only sympathy frame was not found to be significant. Frames found in counter -protesters 'videos were significantly substantive (66.6%) of the time.

Table (5): Chi-square of Differences in Level of Substance used in You Tube Coverage
N=1826

Frames	Protesters		Counter-protesters	
	Substantive	Ambiguous	Substantive	Ambiguous
Tactics	60.54 0.000		36.613 0.000	
Motives	6 0.014*		59.756 0.000	
Demonization	76.531 0.000			45.125 0.000
Sympathy	107.8 0.000		1.0 0.317	
Portrayal	174 0.000		78 0.000	
Spectacle	56.494 0.000		9.257 0.002	
Opinion		4.545 0.033	5.333 0.021	
Total (%)	924(79.1%) 395.8 0.000	244 (20.9%)	438 (66.6%) 72.225 0.000	220(33.4%)

*This Chi square calculation should be interpreted with caution since cells have values of less than 5.

When considering RQ3c, how frame substance and frame valence differ between videos covering the dispersal, analysis shows that in pro-protesters' videos, frames possessing positive valence, were significantly substantive (90.2%) rather than ambiguous (9.8%). Of neutral frames (92.8%) were significantly substantive rather than ambiguous (7.2%). Frames of negative frames were significantly substantive (71.9%) rather than ambiguous (28.1%) (see table 6).

In anti -protesters' videos, frames possessing positive frames, (96.6%) were significantly substantive rather than ambiguous (3.4%). Of neutral frames, (85.7%) were significantly substantive rather than ambiguous (14.3%). Of negative frames, (52.7%) were substantive and (47.3%) ambiguous. This distribution was not statistically significant.

This result suggests that frames that possess negative valence in counter-protesters' videos were just as likely to be ambiguous as they were substantive , whereas frames that possess negative valence in protesters' videos were more likely to be substantive .

Table (6): Differences in Valence and level of Substance used in You Tube Coverage
N=1826

Valence	Protesters					Counter-protesters				
	Sub.	%	Amb.	%	X2	Sub.	%	Amb.	%	X2
Positive	330	90.2	36	9.8	236.2 0.000	170	96.6	6	3.4	152.82 0.000
Neutral	78	92.8	6	7.2	72.8 0.000	36	85.7	6	14.3	21.43 0.000
Negative	516	71.9	202	28.1	137.32 0.000	232	52.7	208	47.3	1.3 0.25

DISCUSSION

This study examined how ordinary citizens framed the dispersal of two important sit-ins in Egypt on YouTube .In contrast to previous research (Cottle, 2008; Greer and McLaughlin, 2010; Harlow and Johnson, 2011; Padovani, 2010) where citizen journalists were recognized to broke away from the dramatic newsworthy images of protests found in mainstream media, the present study showed that political polarization prevalent in Egypt between pro- and anti- Muslim Brotherhood, enforced technologically empowered activists to adhere to the traditional negative de-legitimizing pattern found in mainstream media , that focuses on tactics, spectacles, and dramatic actions, to support their political view.

Research question one asked, "What major frames are present in You Tube videos, and how do frames vary between videos produced by pro- and anti-protesters?" The study found that protesters and their supporters highlighted a demonization frame (35.4%) indicating that making police look as evil as possible was more newsworthy and important, than legitimizing frame (.5%) to support their claims as having a real, legitimate reason

to continue the sit-in. They employed a tactic frame (19.7%) to show the violent and deviant behavior of police officers, reinforcing a finding reported by Boyle et al., (2012) that tactics have a greater influence on media coverage than the group's goals.

Even though previous studies have shown that media portrayal of protestors may influence public support of the causes and actions of protesters, (Detenber et al., 2007; McLeod, 1995; McLeod and Detenber, 1999) pro-protesters failed to escape the confines of the 'official' paradigm found in traditional media. While the spectacle frame was employed (17%), protesters were portrayed positively in only (14.9%) or as worthy victims (13%) in their overall coded frames. While their coverage broke away from the protest paradigm citing only citizens, but, surprisingly, it was coded only (1.9%) overall.

Struggling to delegitimize the sit-in and its causes, anti –protesters adopted tactics (30.7%) and spectacle frames (21.3%) to support the aggressive actions committed by protesters. Despite counter - protesters were less likely than pro- protesters to rely on demonization frame (19.5%); they replicated the de-

legitimizing protest-paradigm found in mainstream media by exaggerating threats to obfuscate the underlying issues that have fueled the sit-in. Videos focused on the negative appearance of the protesters (11.8%). Sources were also rarely cited in counter-protestor videos.

Media frames identify ideas that shape, through their presence, valence, and level of substance, the public's perception of an issue. (Holdoy, 2006). Research question two asked, "What is the valence of frames in YouTube videos and how the valence differ between videos produced by pro- and anti-protesters?" Valence was measured in this study to indicate the overall tone of the news frame toward the Muslim Brotherhood sit-in dispersal. The study supports prior research about frames possessing either a positive, neutral, or negative valence (De Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2006). Results support once again videos tendency to follow the traditional protest paradigm as the negative tone was dominant a plurality of the time (63.4%). Four (tactics, demonization, spectacle and public opinion) out of seven frame categories were presented negatively more often than positively. Emphasizing violence, negative spectacles, and confrontations between police and protesters in citizen journalism can be explained that politically divided groups tend to gain support to their issues by adhering to the negative tone in their videos. Many studies have shown that negative messages are more impactful on decisions, perceptions, and attitudes than positive messages (Ito et al., 1998; Klein, 1991).

When considering how the valence found for frames differ between pro-and counter- protesters' videos, results showed that negative frames were most prominent (over 50%) in video samples of both groups. However, the similarity ends here. The amount of negative valence found in videos produced by counter-protesters (66.9%) was slightly more than videos produced by protesters and their supporters (61.5%), which were mainly found in tactics and portrayal frames. Citations in protesters' videos were 100% with negative valence, whereas only half of the citations used in counter- protesters' videos possessed a negative tone.

The purpose of this quantitative study is also to discover the level of substance of dominant frames employed by videos covering the dispersal. Research question three asked, "What is the level of substance

found for frames in videos produced by pro- and anti-protesters and are there differences between coded videos?" Even though substantive frames (74.6%) were used a majority of the time, the amount of ambiguous frames (25.4%) cannot be ignored. Because each group focused most of its frames to demonize the other one , it is not surprising that (40.6%) of the more prevalent demonization frame was vague and indistinct, providing little to no context and lacking in clear information, turning the produced material into a heated debate with recriminations flying back and forth.

More than one quarter of the two other prevalent frames, tactics and spectacle frames, were also ambiguous in nature. That means that ambiguous information was presented in the more prevalent frames while the less prevalent frames were more substantive in nature. Image frames were overwhelmingly substantive. Only one type of frames interestingly, opinion, was found to be by majority ambiguous (18 out of 34 times).

When considering how the levels of substance found for frames differ between pro-and anti-protesters' videos , results found that in both videos six out of seven frames tend to be more substantively framed than ambiguously . It is true that protesters broke away from the protest paradigm depending on citing citizens to legitimize their issue, but more than half of the citations were indistinct and lacking clear information. On the other hand, demonization frames in counter- protesters' videos were found to be more ambiguous than substantive. This lack of substance is disheartening for its only confirms the recrimination concept followed by the two conflicting groups to support their political position. As Andsager (2000) indicated, groups involved in controversial issues strive to use the news media to sway public opinion to provoke support to their point of view.

Moldoff (2007) found that there is a positive correlation between frame substance and information retention. Contextual frames are likely to be retained regarding a certain news story. This study examined, "How frame substance and frame valence differ between videos produced by pro- and anti- protesters?" Results indicated that frames that possess negative valence in counter-protesters' videos were just as likely to be ambiguous (47.3%) as they were substantive (52.7%), whereas frames that possess negative valence in

protesters' videos were more likely to be substantive (71.9%). This finding, in tandem with Moldoffs' findings (2007) indicates that providing more depth to negative coverage, people are likely to remember the negative footages and photos uploaded by protestors and their supporters on You Tube. Perhaps we need to worry so much about news coverage's negativity disseminated on new media. Of course, more research is needed to explore this possible relationship.

CONCLUSION

YouTube is a platform for distributing user-created video content. Scrutinizing YouTube is valuable in developing insights into the nature and political significances of user – generated content (Dylko et al., 2011). However, very little research has examined how individuals use social media to portray public demonstrations. It is also be interesting to discover how You Tube become a forum for a " battle" of framing in which activists, with different political perspectives, within a single geographical location , compete to shape public understanding of a controversial issue.

This study addressed the notion of frame building and explored how a protest group that challenges mainstream society and their opponents, utilize frames, influence frames' valence and levels of substance to feature an event. Frames identify problems, causes, and recommend solutions. Frames tell the audience how to think about an issue (Reese, 2007).With You Tube empowering users to have a greater voice in public discourse, exploring social media content have not been and should not be put to rest.

This study has demonstrated that protesters and their opponents follow the protest paradigm used by traditional media to frame the protesters sit-in dispersal. Instead of giving a more detailed, contextualized aspect of the causes of the dispersal, examining its consequences, results found that demonization , tactics and spectacle frames were the driving force behind individual's coverage of the event. The overall tone of the videos in the sample was not balanced. Users competed to employ negative stimuli, to be more impactful on decisions, perceptions, and attitudes. It should be noted that videos on YouTube often used photos of victims, clips for wounded or dead children to exacerbate the emotional

side of the story. Some of the material is so explicit that it is published with a content disclaimer, warning that the images may not be suitable for minors.

Overall, frames tended to be substantive rather than ambiguous; though a great some of frames are notable for their lack of context. Analysis found that each group tried to de-legitimize the other one , depending on vague information, providing little to no context or clear interpretations, posing challenges to objectivity, fairness and the ethical standards of journalism . The result is a possible loss for the truth, distortion of reality and swaying public opinion.

While many studies have considered the protest paradigm in mainstream media, few scholarly researches examined how protests are covered in online media. Harllow and Johnson (2011) broke new ground by exploring protest coverage in Global Voices and Twitter. In contrast to their findings, this study found that the negative "protest paradigm" found in mainstream media coverage is replicated in social media. More framing analyses to explore protest coverage on social media should be conducted.

Limitations and future research:

This study is limited because it only examined the sit-in dispersal coverage on You Tube, so results cannot be generalized to all social media sources. Another limitation is the lack of identifying the demographics of the producer (sex / age / political ideology/ religion /education). Further, this study is also limited, because it only examined how citizens framed the dispersal on You Tube, and it did not consider how the coverage influenced public opinion.

Future research could examine how much citizen-generated content covering the sit-in dispersal of Muslim Brotherhood influenced You Tube users in Egypt and other countries. More research is needed also to explore news coverage's negativity disseminated on new media and the possible relationship between frame substance and information retention. Content analysis could be coupled with interviews with content producers to get a deeper understanding of how and why they covered the protests like they did and to gain an understanding of producers' motivations. Future researchers should also explore how ordinary political dissidents, within multiple

states, use new media to frame a single controversial issue and how these users successfully "win" the battle for the adoption of their frames by the new media. By comparing these frames, scholars can more richly understand the influence that citizen journalists have over the mediated discussion.

REFERENCES

Andsager, J.(2000). How interests groups attempt to shape public opinion with competing news frames. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 77(3): 577- 592.

Antony, M., and Thomas, R.2010. This is citizen journalism at its finest: YouTube and the public sphere in the Oscar Grant shooting incident. *New Media & Society* 12(8): 1280– 96.

Boyle, M., McLeod, D., and Armstrong, C. 2012. Adherence to the Protest Paradigm: The Influence of Protest Goals and Tactics on News Coverage in U.S. and International Newspapers . *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 17(2) : 127–44.

Brown, C., and Wilkes, R. (2012). Picturing Protest ,The Visual Framing of Collective Action by First Nations in Canada . *American Behavioral Scientist* 56 (2): 223-43

Chan, J., and Lee, C. 1984. The journalistic paradigm on civil protests: A case study of Hong Kong. In Arno, A.,Dissanayake, W. (editors) *The news media in national and international conflict* .Boulder CO: Westview , pp.183–202.

Cottle, S.(2008). Reporting Demonstrations: The Changing Media Politics of Dissent. *Media, Culture & Society* 30 (6): 853–72.

Daily News Egypt. (2014). NCHR releases full report on Rabaa sit-in dispersal. Available at http://www.dailynewsegypt.com/2014/03/17/nchr-releases-full-report-rabaa-sit-dispersal / # sthash . Tu1JYld2.

De Vreese ,CH., and Boomgaarden, H. (2003). Valenced news frames and public support for the EU. *The European Journal of Communication Research* 28(4): 361-81.

De Vreese, CH., Adriaansen, M., and Praag, P. (2010). Substance Matters: How News Content can Reduce Political Cynicism. International Journal of Public opinion research 22 (4): 433-57.

De Vreese, CH.,and Boomgaarden, H.(2006). Media effects on public opinion about the enlargement of the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44: 419-36.

Detenber, B.,Gotlieb, M., McLeod, D., and Malinkina, O. (2007). Frame intensity effects of television news stories about a high-visibility protest issue. Mass *Communication and Society* 10(4): 439–60

Douglas, M.(2007). News Coverage and Social Protest: How the Media's Protect Paradigm Exacerbates Social Conflict. *Journal of Dispute Resolution Volume* 12 (1): 185 –94

Dylko, I.B., Beam, M. A., Landreville ,K. D.,and Geidner, N. 2011. Filtering 2008 US presidential election news on YouTube by elites and nonelites: An examination of the democratizing potential of the internet. *New media & Society* 14(5): 832- 849.

Entman, R.(1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm .*Journal of Communication* 43(4):51– 8.

Gitlin, T. 1980. *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Greer, C.,and McLaughlin, E. (2010). We predict a riot? Public Order Policing, New Media Environments and the Rise of the Citizen. *British Journal of Criminology* 50 (6): 1041–59

Harlow,S., and Johnson, T. (2011). Overthrowing the Protest Paradigm? How The New York Times, Global Voices and Twitter Covered the Egyptian Revolution. *International Journal of Communication* 5: 1359–74

Holody, K. J. (2006). *Framing Death: The Use Of Frames In Newspaper Coverage Of And Press Releases About Death With Dignity.* Saarbr cken: VDM Verlag Dr. Miller.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/August_2013_Cairo_sit-ins_dispersal

http://www.soc.cornell.edu/faculty/morgan/papers/Morgan_ and_Taylor_Poppe_032813.pdf.

Ito, T. A., Larsen, J. T., Smith ,N. K., and Cacioppo, J. T. (1998). Negative information weighs more heavily on the brain: The negativity bias in evaluative categorizations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 75 (4) : 887-900.

Jha, S.(2007). Exploring internet influence on the coverage of social protest: Content analysis comparing protest coverage in 1967 and 1999. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 84(1): 40-57.

Kaid, L. L. , Postelnicu, M. , Landreville ,K. D. , Williams, A. P. , Hostrup-Larsen ,C. , Urriste, S. , Fernandes, J. , Yun, H., and Bagley, A. (2004) Campaigning in the new Europe: News media presentations of the 2004 European Union Parliamentary elections. In C. Holtz-

Bacha (editors), *Europawahl 2004: Massenmedien im Europawahlkampf* (European Vote 2004: The Mass Media in the European Election Campaign). Wiesbaden, Germany: VS-Verlag ,pp. 228-51

Klein, J. G. (1991). Negativity effects in impression formation: A test in the political arena. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 17 (4): 412–18.

Levin, I.P., Schneider, S.L., and Gaeth, G.J. 1998. All frames are not created equal: a typology and critical analysis of framing effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 76(2): 149–88.

McFarlane, T., and Hay, I. (2003). The battle for Seattle: Protest and popular geopolitics in the Australian newspaper. *Political Geography* 22 (2) : 211-32.

McLeod ,D. M. (1995). Communicating deviance: The effects of television news coverage of social protest. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 39(1): 4–19.

McLeod ,D. M., and Detenber, B. H. (1999). Framing effects of television news coverage of social protest. *Journal of Communication* 49(3): 3–23.

McLeod, D. M., and Hertog, J. K. 1999. Social control, social change and the mass media's role in the regulation of protest groups. In D. Demers and K. Viswanath (editors) *Mass media, social control and social change: A macrosocial perspective*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press, pp.305–30

Moldoff, J. (2007). *A tale of two turnouts: Effects of news frame valence and substance on college students 'levels of trust, cynicism, and political information efficacy*. Master's thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.

Morgan, S. L., and Poppe, E. S. (2013). *Models of Selection and Heterogeneity for Context Effects in Public Opinion Surveys: A National Survey Experiment on International Competitiveness Framing and Educational Policy*, Available at

Mosemghvdlishvili, L., and Jansz, J. (2013). Framing and praising Allah on YouTube: Exploring user-created videos about Islam and the motivations for producing them . *New Media & Society* 15(4): 482-500.

Padovani,C. (2010). Citizens'communication and the 2009 G8 summit in L'Aquila, Italy. *International Journal of Communication* 4: 416–39.

Perlmutter, D.D. (2008). *Blogwars: The New Political Battleground.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Postmes, T.,and Brunsting, S.(2002). Collective action in the age of the Internet: Mass communication and online mobilization. *Social Science Computer Review* 20(3): 290–301.

Pratto, F., and John, O. P. (1991). Automatic vigilance: The attention-grabbing power of negative social information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 61 (3): 380–91.

Reese, S. D. (2007). The framing project: A bridging model for media research revisited. *Journal of Communication* 57(1): 148–54.

Reese, S. D., and Danielian, L.H. (1989). Intermedia influence and the drug issue: Convergence on cocaine. In: Shoemaker, P.J. (editors) *Communication Campaigns about Drugs: Government, Media and the Public*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 29–46.

Rubin, A. and Babbie, E.(2000).Research Methods for Social Work, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ryan, C., Carragee, K., and Meinhofer, W. (2001). Theory into practice: Framing, the news media, and collective action. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 45(1): 175-81.

Schuck, A. R., and De Vreese, C. H. (2006). Between risk and opportunity: News framing and its effects on public support for EU enlargement. *European Journal of Communication,* 21(1): 5-32.

Schuck, A. R., and De Vreese, C.H. (2009). Reversed mobilization in referendum campaigns: How positive news framing can mobilize the skeptics. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 14(1): 40-66.

Smith, J., McCarthy, J. D., McPhail, C., and Augustyn, B(.2001). From protest to agenda building: Description bias in media coverage of protest events in Washington, DC. *Social Forces* 79 (4) : 1397-1423.

Swank,E. (1997). The ebbs and flows of gulf war protest. *The Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 25: 211-29.

Wahl- Jorgensen, K., Williams, A., and Wardle, C. (2010). Audience views on user-generated content: Exploring the value of news from the bottom up. Northern Lights. *Film and Media Studies Yearbook* 8(1): 177-94.

Weaver, D., and Scacco, J. (2013). The Tea Party as Filtered through Prime-Time Cable News. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 18 (1) : 61-84

Wikipedia (2013) Cairo sit-ins dispersal. Available at

Williams, A. P., and Kaid, L. L. (2006). Media framing of the European parliamentary elections: A view from the United States. In Meier, M. and Tenscher, J. (editors) *Campaigning in Europe -Campaigning for Europe: Political parties, campaigns' mass media, and the European parliamentary elections 2004*. Berlin: LIT Publishers ,pp. 295-304.

Wolfsfeld ,G. (1997). *Media and political conflict: News from the Middle East*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

معركة التأطير على اليوتيوب، تغطية صحافة المواطن لفض اعتصام الاخوان المسلمين فى مصر

سهام محمد عبد الخالق *

ملخص

قامت هذه الدراسة بتحليل مضمون عينة من مقاطع اليوتيوب المنتجة من قبل المواطن للتعرف على الأطر المستخدمة بهذه المقاطع واتجاهاتها ومدى موضوعيتها وذلك لتغطية عملية فض اعتصام الاخوان المسلمين بالقاهرة . تشير النتائج ان أجواء الاستقطاب السياسى الشديد دفعت صحافة المواطن لتكرار "نموذج الاحتجاج" المنتشر بوسائل الاعلام التقليدية وذلك بالتركيز على النواحى السلبية لفض الاعتصام. بالرغم من استخدام الأطر الموضوعية فى معظم الأحيان، الا ان عدد الأطر الغامضة لا يمكن تجاهلها.

الكلمات الدالة: الاخوان المسلمين، فض الاعتصام، الاطر المستخدمة.