March 2024

Comparative Analysis of Abortion Coverage in CNN and Fox News from the Perspective of Agenda Setting Theory

Xinyu Chang
University of South Florida

Comparative Analysis of Abortion Coverage in CNN and Fox News from the Perspective of

Agenda Setting Theory

by

Xinyu Chang

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
with a concentration in Media Literacy and Analytics
Zimmerman School of Advertising & Mass Communications
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Artemio Ramirez, Ph.D.
Christopher Noland, Ph.D.
Roxanne Watson, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
March 6, 2024

Keywords: Media Framing, Public Perception, Abortion Legislation, Political Polarization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This study examines the impact of media framing on public perception and discourse concerning the contentious issue of abortion legislation, as delineated by two major U.S. news outlets, CNN and Fox News. Incorporating the principles of Agenda-Setting and Framing theories, this research utilizes a textual analysis approach to dissect the narrative structures, framing strategies, and the role of key actors within the media outlets' coverage. The investigation focuses on news articles published between 2010 and 2022, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies to scrutinize linguistic constructs, framing techniques, and potential biases.

A comprehensive analysis reveals marked ideological disparities, viewpoints, and areas of focus between these outlets, reflecting their respective political alignments, and significantly shaping their audiences' understanding and perception of the abortion issue. The study underscores the potent role of media framing in steering societal attitudes and intensifying political polarization, thereby emphasizing the need for media literacy among consumers and balanced, accurate reporting from media outlets.

This research acknowledges its limitations and proposes future research directions to extend its insights. In conclusion, this study contributes to the broader understanding of media's role in molding public opinions and directing societal discourse, particularly on divisive issues like abortion. The findings underscore the importance of critical, nuanced engagement with media narratives, fostering an enlightened understanding of contentious societal debates.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The pervasive influence of media on public perception and discourse is a long-established fact. As an omnipresent entity in modern society, media outlets play a crucial role in molding public opinion and steering societal discourse, particularly on socio-political issues that spark widespread debate. One such contentious issue is abortion legislation, a subject laden with ethical, legal, and medical complexities, eliciting diverse views and sparking fervent discussions.

The present study is positioned within this intriguing landscape and explores how two prominent U.S. news outlets, CNN and Fox News, navigate these complexities through their respective narrative framing of abortion legislation. Known for their contrasting political orientations, these outlets offer a fascinating juxtaposition in reporting strategies, providing rich material for in-depth analysis and thus, a unique opportunity to examine the profound impact of media framing on public discourse. The dissection of these outlets' coverage is expected to contribute to the broader understanding of the integral role media plays in society.

Drawing upon the principles of Agenda-Setting theory, which suggests that media outlets do not merely reflect reality but shape and filter it, this research aims to scrutinize the salience of the abortion issue, the framing strategies employed, the participation of key actors and sources, the tone and language used, and their potential influence on audience reception and public opinion. In doing so, it seeks to unravel the intricate narrative structures, ideological disparities, perspectives, and emphasis areas that impact the understanding and perception of the abortion issue among their respective audiences.

The study's objectives are twofold. First, it aims to highlight the power of media framing in molding societal attitudes and driving discourse, thus underlining the importance of media literacy among consumers. Second, it endeavors to shed light on the nuanced ways different media outlets, with their distinctive narrative strategies and ideological leanings, can influence audience perspectives on contentious issues, emphasizing the critical need for balanced and accurate reporting.

This research begins with a review of pertinent literature on Agenda-Setting theory, media framing, and the role of media in shaping public discourse, thus laying a solid foundation for the ensuing analysis. This is followed by a comprehensive exploration of the research methodology, detailing how the chosen news articles were systematically analyzed. The findings of the analysis are then presented, and a detailed discussion on their implications for understanding media influence is provided. The study acknowledges its limitations and proposes directions for future research in its concluding section.

Ultimately, this research aims to illuminate the complex interplay between media narratives, public perception, and societal discourse, particularly around divisive issues like abortion. By doing so, it hopes to promote a more informed, critical, and nuanced engagement with media narratives, thereby contributing to a better understanding of the world we live in.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In contemporary America, the issue of abortion rights remains a focal point of social controversy. Since the legalization of abortion in the Roe v. Wade decision of 1973, debates surrounding this topic have persisted (Reagan, 1997). Mohr (1979) delved into the origins and evolution of abortion in America in his work, highlighting that opponents of abortion emphasize the right to life of the fetus, equating abortion to the taking of life, while proponents underscore the importance of women's choice and public health. These perspectives represent the two primary viewpoints in the American abortion debate. Prior to the 1960s, most states deemed abortion illegal. However, during the 1960s, some states began to relax abortion regulations, permitting abortions in cases of rape, incest, or threats to the mother's health. This shift redirected the debate's focus from fetal rights to women's rights. By the 1970s, the debate evolved further, concentrating on the balance between individual autonomy and government regulation, laying the groundwork for the Roe v. Wade decision. Despite this, the controversy continues, reflecting the complexity of the issue and the challenges in reaching a consensus.

In their article in the Guttmacher Journal, Nash and colleagues (2019) analyzed the changes in abortion policies across states. They noted that since the beginning of the 21st century, many states have tightened abortion regulations, introducing stricter time constraints and procedural requirements, reigniting intense debates. Some states even proposed "heartbeat bills" that prohibit abortions once a fetal heartbeat is detected, increasingly limiting access to abortion services. The

authors anticipate this trend to worsen, leading to a widening disparity in abortion rights across different regions. This has deepened societal divisions and amplified the role of media in influencing public opinion.

The role of media in shaping public perceptions of controversial issues has always been a focal point of numerous studies. A key theory frequently employed in these analyses is the agenda-setting theory, which posits that the media can influence the public's perception of the importance of issues by selecting and emphasizing specific topics (McCombs & Shaw, 1972).

The agenda-setting theory plays a pivotal role in understanding how mass media influences public opinion and shapes perceptions of various issues, including abortion. The core idea of the agenda-setting theory is that news media can determine the importance of topics by granting them more attention and prominent coverage (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Through this process, the media can influence the public's perception of which issues are most important and should be prioritized.

The theory suggests that by selecting and emphasizing certain aspects of a topic, the media can effectively shape public opinion and even guide policy-making decisions (Weaver, 2007). In the context of abortion, the framing and presentation of the issue by the media can influence the audience's perception of the topic, thereby shaping their stance on the matter. Furthermore, the framing theory posits that the media can influence public opinion by presenting issues within specific contexts (Entman, 1993). Scholars have studied the impact of media bias on the reporting of controversial topics. Research indicates that individuals tend to favor news media that reflect their own political ideologies, leading to a media environment characterized by polarization (Stroud, 2008). Media outlets with different political leanings tend to report news in ways that reflect their ideological stances, resulting in the formation of divergent perspectives over time

(Stroud, 2010). Studies demonstrate that media portrayal of abortion significantly varies based on ideological leanings. Conservative media tend to depict abortion as a moral issue, emphasizing the sanctity of life and using emotive language to evoke strong emotions, while liberal media typically frame abortion as a matter of personal rights, emphasizing women's autonomy and reproductive freedom (McQuail, 2010). Additionally, research has explored how media coverage of abortion contributes to political polarization. Observations suggest that exposure to ideologically explicit media exacerbates polarization among audiences already inclined towards certain political viewpoints (Valentino, Beckmann, & Buhr, 2001). Moreover, studies indicate that the media's influence on political polarization is associated with individuals' tendency to gravitate towards homogeneous viewpoints and avoid dissenting perspectives (Iyengar & Hahn, 2009; Arceneaux & Johnson, 2013). Furthermore, literature highlights the natural inclination of individuals to seek affirmation among similar opinions and avoid conflicting viewpoints, illustrating how personal biases might influence media consumption and perception (Mutz and Nir, 2010).

As the issue of abortion rights continues to ferment in American society, the media plays a crucial role in shaping public perceptions of such controversial topics. The core of these studies lies in the application of the agenda-setting theory, which posits that the media can guide public attention to specific issues, subsequently influencing their opinions and perspectives (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). McCombs and Shaw (1972) not only systematically introduced the agenda-setting theory in their research but also confirmed through a comprehensive analysis of media content during the 1968 U.S. presidential election that media coverage indeed shapes the public's focus on certain topics. They discovered that issues like race relations, which received significant media attention, subsequently became major concerns for the public. This theory laid the foundation for the notion that the media can shape what the public thinks and cares about, sparking a plethora of

subsequent studies to verify and expand its conclusions. Building on this, Scheufele and Tewksbury (2007) further emphasized that the media not only determines the topics of public interest but also how the public thinks and understands these topics. Dearing and Rogers (1996) articulated the dual function of agenda-setting: selectively determining reporting priorities and shaping the public's way of thinking about reported issues. On the latter level of agenda-setting, the media guides public perceptions by selectively emphasizing or ignoring certain aspects of events, known as "media framing" (de Vreese, 2005). Such framing influences the audience's causal attributions, moral judgments, and policy suggestions on issues. In the context of social ethical issues, the media can influence the public's stance by selectively reporting certain aspects of controversies and using nuanced language. By applying the agenda-setting theory, we can delve deeper into how media reporting, through its framing and choice of language, influences public perceptions of controversial social issues. This theory covers not only the prioritization of issues but also concepts like media framing and guidance. On sensitive topics like abortion, Burkart (2007) noted that the media's linguistic framing subtly shifts public attitudes.

Stroud (2007) discovered through survey research that when selecting news sources, individuals tend to significantly favor media outlets that align with their own political orientation. For instance, when asked "Which media do I trust the most?", most conservative respondents tended to choose Fox News, while liberal respondents were more inclined towards MSNBC and CNN. Stroud proposed that this selective exposure leads to an "echo chamber effect," reinforcing the audience's pre-existing beliefs. In another article, Stroud (2010) utilized panel data to track changes in respondents' political attitudes over four years. The study found that liberal and conservative audiences who selectively engaged with different media exhibited significant divergences in their views on issues such as the death penalty and same-sex marriage, further

confirming the impact of selective exposure.

In the context of morally sensitive topics like abortion, the effect of selective exposure in the media may be even more pronounced. After prolonged exposure to progressive media portrayals, liberal audiences might firmly support the pro-choice stance, while conservative audiences, influenced by their media choices, might cultivate anti-abortion values. The accumulation of this "echo chamber" effect leads to profound socio-political polarization.

Although extensive research has been conducted on media coverage of abortion, there is still a need for a more detailed comparative analysis of mainstream media with different political orientations, such as the Democratic-leaning CNN and the Republican-leaning Fox News. This study aims to fill this gap by conducting a comprehensive textual analysis of the coverage of the abortion issue by these two media outlets, examining differences in attitudes, agenda-setting, and their impact on the American social and political environment.

Overall, comparative studies on media coverage of abortion have identified significant differences. For example, a study by the Chicago Chinese News (2022) suggests that conservative media tend to portray abortion more as a moral issue, while liberal media tend to describe it as a matter of personal rights. While an increasing number of studies have examined media portrayals of abortion, a gap remains: there is a lack of detailed comparative analysis of mainstream media with different stances, such as the liberal-leaning CNN and the conservative-leaning Fox News.

Early research, such as that by Stroud (2007) and the Chicago Chinese News (2022), has examined media biases and framings in abortion coverage. However, these studies neither directly compared CNN and Fox News nor delved into the potential impact of these differences on the socio-political atmosphere in the United States (Smith, 2018). Given this, the present study proposes the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the significant differences in the narrative frameworks used by CNN and Fox News in reporting on the abortion issue?

RQ2: How do the agenda-setting strategies employed by CNN and Fox News in their coverage of the abortion issue influence the public's cognitive and emotional responses?

By conducting an in-depth textual analysis of abortion-related coverage by CNN and Fox News, this study aims to fill the existing research gap and further elucidate the differences in attitudes, agenda-setting, and impact on the socio-political landscape of the United States by these two media outlets when reporting on the abortion issue. Such comparative analysis will provide a more comprehensive and nuanced perspective on how media, through different narrative frameworks and agenda-setting strategies, shape public cognition and emotional responses to the abortion issue.

CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This research adopts an agenda-setting framework to analyze the representation of abortion in CNN and Fox News, two significant media outlets in the United States with contrasting political orientations. The primary components of this framework are issue salience, framing strategies, the involvement of key actors and sources, the tone and language used, and the potential impact on audience reception and public opinion.

Issue salience is gauged by examining the frequency, placement, duration, and depth of abortion-related news stories in each outlet. The framing strategies used by these media are categorized into thematic, episodic, conflict, and human interest frames. This research investigates how abortion is contextualized within broader societal, political, or ethical debates (thematic framing), how individual stories, events, or cases related to abortion are presented and emphasized (episodic framing), the extent to which the media coverage focuses on disputes and disagreements among stakeholders, political parties, or interest groups (conflict framing), and the extent to which personal narratives, emotions, and individual experiences are highlighted in the coverage (human interest framing).

Key actors and sources featured in abortion-related news stories, such as politicians, activists, medical professionals, and affected individuals, are identified and analyzed to understand the balance and diversity of perspectives presented. The research also scrutinizes the emotive language, descriptive terms, and rhetorical devices used in the coverage, and assesses the overall tone, whether supportive, critical, neutral, or mixed.

The final component of the framework pertains to the potential influence of media coverage on public opinion. This study explores the possible link between media exposure and shifts in public opinion on abortion issues, and analyzes social media engagement, audience feedback, or comments in response to the media coverage.

Through the application of this comprehensive framework, this research aims to elucidate the ways in which CNN and Fox News potentially shape public discourse and influence public opinion on the contentious issue of abortion.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

The principal aim of this research is to analyze the framing and stance of two major U.S. media outlets, CNN (leaning Democratic) and Fox News (leaning Republican), in their coverage of abortion-related topics. The researcher will take the following steps:

4.1 Sample Selection

The span of time chosen for the samples will be from 2014 to 2019. This period was selected due to significant shifts in abortion legislation in the U.S. that drew wide public attention during this time.

Two to four news articles related to the abortion topic from each year will be selected from both CNN and Fox News, amounting to a total of 8 articles. The selection of these articles will be based on their relevance—they must explicitly discuss the topic of abortion, and public attention—judged by the number of views and shares on social media each article has.

Table 1. News Articles Selections

CNN	News Title	Date	Fox	News Title	Date
A1	Court rejects Arizona's abortion appeal	2014/1/13	B1	Supreme Court blocks Arizona's 20-week abortion ban	2014/1/13
A2	Supreme Court strikes down Texas abortion law	2016/06/27	B2	Supreme Court strikes down Texas abortion law	2016/06/28
A3	New York puts in measures to protect access to abortion even if Roe v. Wade is overturned	2019/01/23	B3	New York 'celebrates' legalizing abortion until birth as Catholic bishops question Cuomo's faith	2019/01/23

Table 2. (continued)

A4	Georgia's governor signs a controversial abortion bill into law	2019/05/14	B4	Georgia Gov. Brian Kemp signs controversial 'heartbeat' bill into law	2019/05/07

4.2 Content Coding

All selected articles will be classified and quantified according to a predetermined coding scheme. This scheme includes but is not limited to: the theme of the coverage (e.g., legislation, personal stories, societal response, etc.), the arguments employed (e.g., constitutional rights, women's health, religious beliefs, sanctity of life, etc.), the sources of information cited (e.g., politicians, experts, the public, etc.), and the overall tone (e.g., neutral, positive, negative).

To ensure the consistency of coding, the researcher will create a detailed codebook, listing the definitions and examples for each coding category. The researcher will strictly follow the codebook during the coding process to minimize the influence of subjectivity.

4.3 Data Analysis

The analysis of coded data involves a meticulous process of both quantitative and qualitative examination, utilizing an Excel spreadsheet for data organization and comparison. This section delves into the intricate dynamics of media framing and stance on abortion, focusing on the differential approaches taken by CNN and Fox News. By assessing coverage themes, arguments, sources of information, and the tonality of the reports, this analysis aims to uncover the underlying biases and perspectives shaping the discourse on this contentious issue.

4.3.1 Report Stance

The initial phase of the analysis compares the stances taken by CNN and Fox News on identical events, particularly in their support or opposition to legal and policy shifts. This comparison reveals not only the ideological orientations of each outlet but also how these

predispositions influence their reporting narratives. Through a detailed examination of their coverage, the analysis identifies patterns of advocacy or criticism, shedding light on the broader implications of these stances in the context of abortion debates.

4.3.2 Language Use

A critical component of the analysis is the examination of language style within the reports. By scrutinizing the use of action or attitude descriptors, this study elucidates how such language choices convey the authors' emotional tones or biases. The qualitative analysis of language use provides insights into the subtle ways in which media outlets frame their narratives, influencing reader perceptions and reflecting the underlying ideological leanings of the reports.

4.3.3 Perspective and Proportion

Further analysis is dedicated to exploring the representation of differing opinions within the media reports. This includes an assessment of the proportionality and space allocated to voices supporting or opposing abortion. By analyzing these choices, the study unveils the media outlets' strategies in balancing or skewing perspectives, thus highlighting their stances and the potential impact on public opinion.

4.3.4 Cited Sources

The examination extends to the sourcing strategies employed by CNN and Fox News in their abortion coverage. Analyzing how each outlet cites or refers to sources within their reports offers a window into their journalistic practices. This includes the selection of interviewees, the content of quotations, and the overall representation of viewpoints. Such analysis uncovers the networks' preferences in source selection and how these choices support their reporting angles and ideological commitments.

The comprehensive data analysis outlined in this part aims to reveal the multifaceted nature

of media framing and stance on abortion by CNN and Fox News. Through a systematic comparison of themes, arguments, language use, perspectives, and sourcing, the study provides a nuanced understanding of how media narratives around abortion are constructed and disseminated, reflecting the complex interplay of ideology, bias, and journalistic practice in shaping public discourse.

4.4 Ethical Considerations

Although the objects of this study are publicly available news articles, I will strive to ensure that my research process and results fairly represent the subjects of my study. I will avoid making potentially unjust evaluations of CNN and Fox News or their reporters when interpreting and discussing my research findings.

4.5 Codebook

4.5.1 Topic Classification and Definitions

In order to categorize topics, we provide the following definitions:

1. Abortion Rights (T1): Encompasses the legality of abortion, the right to access abortion services, and the impact of related policies and laws on individual choice.

2. Judicial Decisions and Legal Interpretations (T2): Focuses on court rulings, interpretations of legal texts, and how these affect abortion rights and related policies.

3. Political and Party Positions (T3): Explores the stances and policy proposals regarding abortion from different political groups, parties, or government officials.

4. Public Health and Maternal Health (T4): Involves the impact of abortion on public health, including considerations for maternal health and accessibility of abortion services.

5. Ethical and Moral Considerations (T5): Includes ethical and moral discussions on abortion issues such as the right to life, choice, and moral responsibility.

6. Dynamics of National and Local Legislation (T6): Describes the changes in laws and policies related to abortion at various levels of governance, and the interactions between these changes.

7. Social Responses and Public Opinions (T7): Focuses on the reactions of society to abortion laws and policies, including public opinions, social movements, and media coverage.

Examples classified:

Aligned with T1 (Abortion Rights): A2B2, A1B1, A3B3, A4B4

Aligned with T2 (Judicial Decisions and Legal Interpretations): A2B2, A1B1, A3B3, A4B4

Aligned with T3 (Political and Party Positions): A2B2, A1B1, A3B3, A4B4

Aligned with T4 (Public Health and Maternal Health): A2B2, A3B3, A4B4

Aligned with T5 (Ethical and Moral Considerations): A2B2, A3B3, A4B4

Aligned with T6 (Dynamics of National and Local Legislation): A2B2, A1B1, A3B3, A4B4

Aligned with T7 (Social Responses and Public Opinions): A2B2, A1B1

4.5.2 Emotion Bias Assessment and Encoding Rules

To assess the emotional bias of the reports (positive, negative, neutral), we employ the following encoding:

- Positive: Reports with a supportive, appreciative, or optimistic attitude towards the subject.

  - Encoding: A1, A2, A3, B4

- Negative: Reports with a critical, negative, or pessimistic attitude towards the subject.

  - Encoding: B1, B2, B3, A4

4.6 Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study include a limited number of samples, focus on article content without considering reader comprehension and response, and the inability to entirely eliminate the

influence of subjectivity. When discussing the research results, the researcher will reflect comprehensively on these limitations and discuss how they may impact the researcher's findings and conclusions.

CHAPTER 5: RESULT

In the present study, text analysis methods were employed to conduct a comparative examination of how abortion issues are covered by two prominent US news outlets, CNN and Fox News. For clarity and analytical rigor, CNN's reports were coded as 'A' while those from Fox News were designated as 'B'. The subsequent analysis of the news content unfolded as follows:

5.1 News A1&B1

In this comparative analysis, the coverage of the Supreme Court's decision on Arizona's 20-week abortion ban by CNN and Fox News is scrutinized. Although both outlets report on the identical legal event, their methods of presentation and focal points exhibit substantial variations.

5.1.1 CNN

CNN's article, titled "Court rejects Arizona's abortion appeal," offers a detailed exploration of the case's implications for Roe v. Wade and related abortion cases. The report delves into the legal and scientific arguments presented by Arizona, emphasizing the state's attempt to reduce the legal period for abortion and include factors like fetal pain in the abortion debate. The article discusses the Supreme Court's decision to maintain the status quo established by Roe v. Wade, considering the advancements in medical and scientific knowledge since the landmark decision.

This CNN report adopts a nuanced approach, analyzing the legal complexities and scientific developments impacting abortion laws. The coverage includes detailed legal analysis and expert opinions, offering a broader perspective on the evolving nature of legal debates in light of scientific progress.

5.1.2 Fox News

Fox News, in its coverage "Supreme Court blocks Arizona's 20-week abortion ban," focuses on the immediate legal outcomes of the Supreme Court's decision. The report succinctly covers the high court's choice not to hear Arizona's appeal, emphasizing the legal proceedings and the implications for similar laws in other states. The article also briefly mentions the rationale behind the legislation, such as fetal pain and maternal health, but primarily concentrates on the legal aspects and potential national impact of the ban.

Fox News presents a concise and straightforward account of the court's decision, primarily highlighting the legal proceedings and the decision's direct consequences on similar laws across the nation.

In comparing the two reports, CNN offers an in-depth legal analysis with a focus on broader implications and scientific considerations surrounding abortion laws. Fox News, conversely, provides a more direct account of the Supreme Court's decision, concentrating on the legal ruling and its immediate implications for similar state laws.

This juxtaposition illustrates the varied narrative strategies employed by different media outlets in reporting on the same legal event. While CNN provides a comprehensive analysis with broader contextual insights, Fox News offers a more focused and succinct report on the immediate legal outcomes. Both approaches contribute uniquely to public understanding of the issue, highlighting the importance of diverse media perspectives in comprehensively grasping complex legal and social issues.

The analysis of CNN and Fox News coverage on the Supreme Court's handling of Arizona's 20-week abortion ban clearly illustrates how each news organization's reporting style, focus, and narrative strategy reflect their respective political stances and ideological preferences. CNN's

report, "Court Rejects Arizona's Abortion Appeal," delves into the case's impact on Roe v. Wade and related abortion cases. The coverage explores legal and scientific arguments, highlighting the state's attempt to shorten the legal abortion period and include factors such as fetal pain in the abortion debate. The article discusses the Supreme Court's decision to maintain the status quo established by Roe v. Wade, considering advancements in medical and scientific knowledge since that landmark ruling.

In contrast, Fox News's report, "Supreme Court Blocks Arizona's 20-Week Abortion Ban," focuses on the direct legal outcomes of the Supreme Court's decision. The coverage briefly covers the Supreme Court's choice not to hear Arizona's appeal, emphasizing the legal procedure and the ban's impact on other similar laws. While the article mentions the legislation's rationale, such as fetal pain and maternal health, it primarily concentrates on the legal aspects and the ban's potential nationwide impact.

This divergence in reporting not only reveals the news organizations' partisan biases but also potentially influences the public's perception and understanding of these issues. CNN's multifaceted and analytical reporting may prompt its audience to have a deeper understanding of the complexities surrounding abortion rights, while Fox News's direct and emotional narrative might more effectively resonate with its audience's specific political positions. CNN's comprehensive and analytical reporting approach may encourage its audience to have a deeper understanding of the complexities surrounding abortion rights, while Fox News's direct and emotive narrative might more effectively resonate with its audience's specific political positions.

5.2 News A2&B2

In the second set of news reports, the focus was on the contentious topic of abortion. The reports revolve around a significant court decision in the United States, where the Supreme Court

struck down a Texas law regulating abortion clinics. This high-stakes judgment is the first substantial foray of the court into the abortion issue in nine years.

5.2.1 CNN

CNN reported that the law under scrutiny required abortion clinics to upgrade their facilities to hospital standards and mandated clinic doctors to have admitting privileges at nearby hospitals. The law's supporters argued that it elevated the level of care for women. However, opposition argued that the law would force the closure of most abortion clinics in Texas.

Justice Stephen Brier, who wrote the majority opinion, stated that the Texas law "provides few, if any, health benefits for women, poses a substantial obstacle to women seeking abortions, and constitutes an undue burden on their constitutional right to do so". This decision was supported by Justices Anthony Kennedy, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan. In contrast, Chief Justice John Roberts, and Justices Samuel Alito and Clarence Thomas, dissented.

In response to the court's ruling, President Obama expressed his approval, stating that "these restrictions harm women's health and place an unconstitutional obstacle in the path of a woman's reproductive freedom". Meanwhile, anti-abortion activists vowed to continue their fight.

5.2.2 Fox News

The Fox News report corroborated CNN's account of the court ruling, adding some further detail. The Texas law was contested by abortion clinics in the state, who argued that it halved the number of abortion providers, potentially leaving less than 10 open if the law took full effect. This challenge was led by the Center for Reproductive Rights, representing a coalition of abortion clinics.

The opponents argued that the law made it nearly impossible to operate a clinic in Texas, despite proponents insisting that the law improved patient care and safety. The report also provided

some details on dissenting opinions, including Justice Alito's criticism of the court's procedural handling of the case, and Justice Thomas's accusation that the court tended to "bend the rules when any effort to limit abortion, or even to speak in opposition to abortion, is at issue".

These reports of the news presents a complex picture of the ongoing debate over abortion rights in the United States, illustrating the diverse opinions that persist among lawmakers, the judiciary, and the public. The Supreme Court's decision represents a major moment in this debate, potentially setting a precedent for future legal decisions on abortion and reproductive rights. However, as evidenced by the responses to the decision, the issue is likely to remain contentious and politically charged.

When analyzing CNN and Fox News coverage of the U.S. Supreme Court's overturning of Texas's restrictive abortion clinic laws, it's evident that both news organizations employed different narrative strategies to report on this controversial abortion topic. These strategies deeply reflect their respective political stances and ideological preferences.

CNN's coverage provided a detailed introduction to the law that required abortion clinics to upgrade their facilities to hospital standards and mandated doctors at the clinics to have admitting privileges at nearby hospitals. The report noted that supporters of the law argued it would raise the level of care for women, while opponents believed it would lead to the closure of most abortion clinics in Texas. CNN's reporting tended to offer a comprehensive and analytical perspective, reflecting a more diversified and inclusive stance.

In contrast, while Fox News's coverage confirmed CNN's description of the court's decision, it added some further details. Fox News's reporting focused more on the direct outcomes of the law and support for conservative positions, demonstrating its unique narrative strategy on the abortion issue.

This contrast not only reveals the ideological inclinations of CNN and Fox News in covering the same event but also reflects their potential influence on shaping the public's understanding of such significant social issues. Through their coverage, CNN may encourage viewers to form a deeper understanding of the complexities surrounding abortion rights, whereas Fox News might reinforce the audience's resonance with specific political viewpoints.

This analysis highlights the importance of considering media's ideological stance and narrative strategies in understanding how they shape public discourse and contribute to societal dialogue on contentious topics like abortion. It also underscores the necessity for consumers to engage in critical thinking when receiving information, especially when accessing reports on complex social issues from different media sources.

5.3 News A3&B3

CNN (A3) and Fox (B3) cover the same event - the signing of the Reproductive Health Act by Governor Andrew Cuomo in New York, but their perspectives differ.

5.3.1 CNN

CNN provides a comprehensive report on the legislation. The news outlet presents the law as a protective measure for women's reproductive rights, especially if the Roe V. Wade decision is overturned. The report explains that the law not only ensures access to abortion but also removes it from the state's criminal code, protecting medical professionals who perform abortions from criminal prosecution. Furthermore, the law allows professionals other than doctors to perform abortions. CNN features Governor Cuomo's words, emphasizing the law as a giant step forward for women's rights. The report also covers the law's impact on late-term abortions, the law's journey since its introduction in 2006, and its eventual signing into law. Various advocates for the law are quoted, praising its passing and viewing it as a triumph for women's autonomy. The article

22

concludes by presenting the critiques of the law, who argue that it expands abortion too far and reduces legal protections for unborn babies.

5.3.2 Fox News

The report on Fox adopts a tone of criticism towards the legislation and Governor Cuomo. It states that the governor is under fire from faith leaders for signing a law that allows abortions until birth in many cases. The report quotes a bishop who has condemned Cuomo's support for the law as contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church. The report mentions that New York was the first state to legalize abortion in 1970, and highlights the act of lighting prominent landmarks in pink to celebrate the law's passing. It explains that the law allows non-doctors to perform abortions and permits the procedure up to the mother's due date under certain conditions. The report quotes a letter from the Catholic Bishops in the state, who argue that the law makes New York more dangerous for women and unborn babies, and they see it as a regression rather than progress. Finally, it includes a social media comment condemning Cuomo for his pro-abortion actions.

Both media outlets provide contrasting views on the legislation. CNN focuses on the law as a safeguard for women's reproductive rights, while Fox concentrates on the opposition, especially from religious leaders. These divergent viewpoints echo the broader societal debates surrounding the issue of abortion.

In their coverage of the Reproductive Health Act signed by Governor Andrew Cuomo of New York, CNN and Fox News demonstrated significant differences in perspective, reflecting their respective political stances and partisan leanings. CNN portrayed the law as a protective measure for women's reproductive rights, particularly under the potential overturning of Roe v. Wade. The report explained that the law not only ensured the viability of abortion but also removed it from the state's penal code, protecting medical professionals who perform abortions from criminal

prosecution. Additionally, the law allows professionals other than doctors to perform abortion procedures. CNN highlighted Governor Cuomo's statements, emphasizing the law as a significant advancement for women's rights.

Conversely, Fox News's coverage critiqued the legislation and Governor Cuomo. The report noted strong opposition from religious leaders to Cuomo for signing a law that allows abortions up until birth under many circumstances. It quoted a bishop condemning Cuomo's support for the law as contrary to Catholic doctrine. The report mentioned that New York was the first state to legalize abortion in 1970 and highlighted the lighting of landmarks in pink to celebrate the law's passage. The report explained that the law permits non-doctors to perform abortions and allows procedures up until the mother's due date under certain conditions.

These media outlets offered starkly different perspectives on the legislation. CNN focused on the law as a safeguard for women's reproductive rights, while Fox News concentrated on opposition, particularly from religious leaders. These differing viewpoints reflect the broader societal debate surrounding the issue of abortion.

Through their reporting, it is evident that CNN tends to provide a more comprehensive discussion, including a wide range of advocacy perspectives in support of the law, reflecting a more liberal political stance. Meanwhile, Fox News emphasizes the law's critics and religious opposition, aligning more closely with conservative political positions.

5.4 News A4&B4

This set of results continues the analysis of the media framing of abortion legislation, with a focus on recent events in Georgia and New York.

5.4.1 CNN

CNN's coverage of Georgia's new law that bans abortions if a fetal heartbeat can be detected

involves a detailed explanation of the law and its implications. The report presents Governor Brian Kemp's view, who believes the law is a "declaration that all life has value." The piece outlines the current law that permits abortions up to the 20th week of pregnancy, and explains that the new law generally prohibits abortions after a fetal heartbeat is detected, usually around six weeks into a pregnancy. The article reports on critics, like the ACLU, who consider this legislation a violation of women's reproductive rights, and mention planned legal challenges. The report also includes the views of protesters and highlights the tension this legislation has generated within the state. It references similar legislation pursued in other states and gives an overview of the potential impacts on Georgia's film industry.

5.4.2 Fox News

The Fox News report concentrates on New York Governor Andrew Cuomo's signing of a law that legalizes abortion up until birth in many circumstances. The law's enactment was celebrated by Cuomo with lighting landmarks pink, which he called "a historic victory for New Yorkers and for our progressive values." However, the article prominently features criticism from New York's Catholic bishops, who condemn the legislation as "completely contrary to the teachings of our pope and our Church." The report summarizes the components of the law and includes further criticism from Catholic Church leaders, who see the new law as a regression from valuing human life. The piece concludes with a social media comment from a user who suggests that Governor Cuomo should be excommunicated for his pro-abortion stance.

In summary, both CNN and Fox cover the new legislation and present both supportive and opposing views. However, their emphases differ, with CNN giving more space to explaining the legal and practical details of the new law and the arguments of its supporters, while Fox focuses more on the perspectives of religious and pro-life critics of the law.

In analyzing the coverage by CNN and Fox News of recent abortion legislation in Georgia and New York, we observe clear differences in how each news organization reports on the same events, reflecting their respective political stances and partisan biases. CNN's coverage of Georgia's new law provided a detailed explanation of the law and its implications, presenting the legislation as a statement that all life has value. The report thoroughly outlined the existing law that allowed abortions up to the 20th week of pregnancy and explained that the new law generally prohibits abortions after a fetal heartbeat is detected (around six weeks into pregnancy). The article cited opponents like the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), who argue that the legislation infringes on women's reproductive rights, and mentioned pending legal challenges.

Conversely, Fox News focused on the law signed by Governor Andrew Cuomo of New York, which legalizes abortion up until birth under many circumstances. The coverage highlighted Cuomo's act of illuminating landmarks in pink lights to celebrate the passage of the law, calling it a "historic victory for New Yorkers and our progressive values." However, the article prominently featured criticism from New York's Catholic bishops, who condemned the legislation as completely contrary to the teachings of the Pope and the Church.

The contrast between these two reports shows that CNN focuses more on the factual and legal details of the law and its supporters' arguments, while Fox News highlights the perspectives of religious and pro-life critics. Through these reports, we can see that CNN tends to offer a more comprehensive discussion, including a wide range of advocates' perspectives in support of the law, reflecting a more liberal political stance. Meanwhile, Fox News places more emphasis on the law's critics and religious opposition, aligning more closely with conservative political positions.

The results of this investigation highlight the considerable influence of media framing on public perception of abortion, particularly from the perspective of CNN and Fox News, as analyzed

through a multitude of news coverage (A1-B4). Utilizing the theory of agenda-setting, this research meticulously investigates the multifaceted effects of divergent media narratives on audience understanding and interpretation of the complex issue of abortion.

In a detailed analysis of CNN's coverage (A1-A4), it was observed that the news outlet employed an approach that was comprehensive, analytic, and inclusive. This method regularly incorporated varying perspectives, thus achieving a balanced narrative. Furthermore, CNN highlighted the potential repercussions and the larger societal and political contexts, which suggested that the audience is encouraged to cultivate a nuanced understanding of issues related to abortion. The results infer that CNN's coverage may induce a comprehensive perception of the abortion discourse, involving audiences in the multifarious facets of this critical social issue.

Contrastingly, Fox News (B1-B4) exhibited a more emotive, narrative-centric style that concentrated on immediate reactions and espoused conservative viewpoints. The news outlet exhibited a robust presence of pro-life narratives, with a marked emphasis on immediate impacts. This distinctive framing of the abortion issue suggests that the audiences of Fox News may be predisposed to interpret abortion in terms of immediate events and reactions, possessing a conservative and pro-life leaning.

This study illuminates the polarization that different media framings can generate in public perceptions of abortion. CNN's wide-ranging and balanced analysis might prompt its audience to perceive abortion as a complex societal issue that warrants a broader understanding, encompassing a spectrum of perspectives and long-term implications. Conversely, Fox News' immediate and conservative framing might urge its audience to adopt a more immediate and pro-life perspective toward abortion.

These findings underscore the vital role that media plays in shaping public discourse on

abortion. The disparity in framing, presentation, and interpretation of the same topic between the two outlets offers invaluable insights into how media constructs and influences public comprehension of complex societal matters, such as abortion. The results highlight the necessity of media literacy and call for consumers to be aware of potential biases and the persuasive power of media framing.

To conclude, the results provide strong evidence that media framing has a significant bearing on audience perceptions and emotional responses towards abortion. This highlights the importance of critical media consumption in today's era, marked by diverse and often polarized news narratives. The findings also affirm the need for a comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted and nuanced nature of societal issues, along with a call for responsible and balanced media reporting.

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

In analyzing the fourteen pairs of reports from CNN and Fox News, the distinct perspectives of the two media outlets become apparent. Both news sources provide factual information about abortion-related events, but their portrayals, while differing in terms of context, angle, sources, and depth of coverage, reflect the inherent ideological leanings of each platform.

A recurring theme observed throughout the dataset is how CNN tends to provide a more comprehensive picture of the events, often focusing on the societal and emotional implications of the changes in abortion legislation, as noted in the first, third, and fourth sets of news reports. CNN's in-depth coverage, encompassing diverse viewpoints, underscores their commitment to providing a balanced narrative, which is especially crucial for complex and emotionally charged issues such as abortion.

Conversely, Fox News' reporting style consistently focuses on the legal proceedings, the implementation of the bans, and the political momentum behind the anti-abortion movement. Their coverage often prioritizes voices from conservative figures or organizations and maintains a supportive tone toward pro-life legislation, as illustrated in the fifth, seventh, and ninth sets of reports.

While the ideological leanings of both outlets subtly color their framing of narratives, it's noteworthy that there isn't a direct ideological clash between CNN and Fox News. Instead, their differing frames of reference reflect two distinct, seemingly non-overlapping human rights

debates that converge on the contentious issue of abortion.

CNN tends to advocate from the perspective of reproductive rights, particularly emphasizing the concept of bodily autonomy for women. The narrative they foster underscores the principle that women should possess uninhibited rights to make decisions about their bodies, free from any form of coercion or restriction. The essence of their framing emphasizes the importance of freedom of choice and control over one's physical self.

Fox News, conversely, situates its argument within the broader discourse of the right to life, with a distinct emphasis on the unborn. They posit that all individuals, regardless of their developmental stage or vulnerability, are entitled to the fundamental right to life. From their perspective, fetuses, being in their most delicate and defenseless state, are living entities whose right to exist should not be negated by any other party. The narratives they present underscore the moral imperatives to protect and respect the sanctity of all life.

In the context of the abortion debate, these two separate rights-based arguments intersect, sparking a series of complex contradictions. The tension arises not from an outright opposition of values, but rather from the collision of two fundamentally important, yet diverging, interpretations of human rights: one focused on a woman's autonomy over her body, the other centered on the inviolability of life from its inception.

The narratives from both outlets also demonstrate the importance of understanding media bias in interpreting news. Media consumers need to critically evaluate the information they consume and cross-verify the same across multiple sources for a balanced understanding of the issues. It is important to note that while bias in media is not inherently negative, the awareness of its presence is vital to ensuring a comprehensive understanding of reported events.

This analysis also highlights the inherent complexities in the debate over abortion. The

diverse responses from lawmakers, judiciary, public, and advocacy groups underline the contentious nature of this issue. Future legislative decisions, Supreme Court rulings, and policy changes will continue to shape the landscape of this debate, and how they are reported and interpreted in the media will influence public perception and discourse on abortion rights.

In conclusion, the comparison of CNN and Fox News reports provides valuable insights into how media outlets shape and frame narratives around the contentious issue of abortion. While both outlets convey the facts of each case, their coverage differs in emphasis, depth, and perspective. As media consumers, being aware of these differences is crucial for a nuanced and comprehensive understanding of such complex issues.

This study conducts a detailed comparison of CNN and Fox News reports on the abortion issue, revealing significant differences and consistencies in their coverage. CNN tends to approach the topic from a perspective supportive of reproductive rights, emphasizing women's autonomy over their bodies. Its reports usually provide a comprehensive analysis centered around social and emotional impacts, incorporating diverse viewpoints, reflecting its commitment to offering balanced narratives. In contrast, Fox News' coverage focuses on legal proceedings, the implementation of bans, and the political momentum of the anti-abortion movement, often prioritizing the voices of conservative individuals or organizations and clearly supporting the right to life.

Although both media outlets provide factual information when reporting the same event, their narrative styles, emphasized angles, sources used, and depth of coverage differ. These differences reflect each platform's inherent ideological leanings. The distinct frameworks adopted by CNN and Fox News represent two seemingly divergent human rights debates—one focusing on women's reproductive rights and bodily autonomy, and the other on the right to life

from the moment of conception. This collision is not a direct opposition of values but a divergence in the interpretation of fundamental human rights, leading to complex contradictions.

Moreover, the study underscores the importance of understanding media bias in interpreting news. Media consumers need to critically assess the information they consume and cross-verify it through multiple sources to achieve a balanced understanding of the issues. By comparing the coverage from CNN and Fox News, this study provides valuable insights into how media shape and frame narratives around controversial topics like abortion. Despite the factual differences in reporting each case, the variations in emphasis, depth, and perspective are crucial for media consumers to understand for a comprehensive grasp of such complex issues. In summary, the reports from CNN and Fox News, through their distinct narrative styles and ideological stances, play a significant role in public discourse and the shaping of public perception on abortion. This finding is significant for both media consumers and producers, highlighting the need for critical media consumption and the commitment of media institutions to maintain balanced and in-depth reporting. This understanding emphasizes the central role of media in society and its remarkable power in guiding societal attitudes and discourse on controversial issues like abortion.

The findings of this study closely align with Agenda-Setting Theory (McCombs & Shaw, 1972), which posits that media not only shape what the public deems important through their reporting focus but also influence perceptions and understandings of these issues. By comparing the coverage of abortion by CNN and Fox News, this study reveals how each platform reflects its inherent ideological bias by selecting specific narrative frames and emphasizing different aspects of the issue, thus prioritizing certain topics in the public agenda. CNN sets an agenda around reproductive rights and personal freedom by highlighting the importance of abortion rights and women's bodily autonomy. Its coverage, providing a comprehensive analysis of social and

emotional impacts along with a report that includes diverse perspectives, demonstrates a commitment to balanced storytelling. In contrast, Fox News focuses on legal procedures, the implementation of bans, and the political momentum of the anti-abortion movement to highlight an agenda that prioritizes the right to life and the protection of the unborn. Its coverage tends to prioritize conservative voices or organizations, clearly supporting the right to life.

This divergence not only showcases how each media platform, driven by its ideology, selects and emphasizes different topics to set the agenda in the public's mind but also illustrates "Second Level Agenda-Setting" or "Attribute Agenda-Setting" as mentioned in Agenda-Setting Theory. This aspect of the theory examines how media influence public understanding and perception of an issue by emphasizing certain attributes or aspects of it. The difference in reporting style and focus between CNN and Fox News, by affecting the public's cognitive framing and emotional inclination towards the abortion issue, further shapes public cognition and the direction of discourse.

Therefore, this study not only reveals how CNN and Fox News use their coverage to set and shape the public agenda on abortion but also underscores the importance of considering Agenda-Setting Theory in understanding and analyzing media reports and their impact on public opinion and societal discourse. This theoretical framework provides a crucial way to understand how media shape the public agenda and discussion on complex and controversial issues by emphasizing different topic attributes and perspectives. The differentiated coverage not only reveals the media's powerful role in shaping public consciousness and discussion focus but also highlights the importance of critical thinking when consuming media information. The public must recognize that media reporting is not just a channel for information transmission but a tool

for shaping views and attitudes on significant social issues through agenda setting. Understanding and analyzing how media select reports to shape the public agenda is vital for fostering a comprehensive understanding of complex societal issues. Through this study, we see the core role of media reporting in forming public discourse and how it uses principles from Agenda-Setting Theory to influence public opinions and attitudes towards the sensitive issue of abortion.

CHAPTER 7: STUDY LIMITATIONS

This study, like any, has its limitations which need to be recognized for a comprehensive understanding of its results and their implications.

Firstly, the analysis was confined to the coverage of abortion rights in the United States by only two news outlets: CNN and Fox News. While these outlets are representative of left-leaning and right-leaning perspectives respectively, they are not exhaustive of the entire spectrum of media bias. A more complete picture might emerge by considering a wider range of media outlets, including international news sources, as well as digital-first outlets, independent media, and citizen journalism platforms.

Secondly, this study focused primarily on the textual content of news reports. Future research could benefit from incorporating a multimodal analysis that takes into account visual elements (images, video clips), audio cues (tone of voice, background sounds), and interactive elements (reader comments, social media shares) which can all significantly influence the interpretation and perception of news narratives.

Thirdly, the examination was centered around a single issue, i.e., abortion rights. While this provided an in-depth view of media framing around this particular topic, it may limit the generalizability of the findings. Other contentious issues might reveal different framing strategies or ideological leanings.

Fourthly, the study assumes that the examined news outlets cater to ideologically homogeneous audiences. However, audience reception and interpretation can vary widely even

within a supposedly uniform audience due to factors such as individual political beliefs, level of political knowledge, personal experiences, and socio-demographic characteristics.

Lastly, the study is a qualitative textual analysis, and while it offers depth and nuance, it cannot quantify the exact influence of these media outlets on their audiences' perceptions and attitudes towards the issue. A complementary approach involving quantitative audience research could add another dimension to our understanding.

In spite of these limitations, the study provides a valuable comparison of media framing and its potential implications for audience perception and understanding. Future research could address these limitations and extend the knowledge base in this field.

CHAPTER 8: DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The analysis conducted in this study opens numerous avenues for future research in the field of media studies, specifically in the realm of media framing and its impact on public perception.

Expanding Media Outlets: As noted, the current study examined only two American news outlets. Future research could consider a more diverse range of outlets, including those from non-American perspectives, to provide a more holistic understanding of the international media landscape.

Multimodal Analysis: The focus on textual content can be expanded to incorporate multimodal analysis. Future studies could examine how different modes of communication, such as visual imagery, audio cues, and interactive elements, contribute to the overall framing of the issue.

Diverse Issues: While this study explored the issue of abortion rights, the media framing of other controversial topics such as climate change, gun control, or immigration policies could also be examined to understand the variability or consistency in framing strategies across different issues.

Audience Analysis: A significant area for further exploration is the analysis of audience responses. Using methods like surveys, interviews, or social media sentiment analysis, researchers can delve into how different audience segments interpret and respond to media narratives. This could help discern the effect of media framing on public opinion and policy preference.

Longitudinal Study: A longitudinal analysis of media framing over time could reveal shifts in the media's treatment of contentious issues, potentially illuminating societal changes, ideological shifts, or alterations in editorial policy.

Comparative Analysis: Finally, comparative studies between countries with different cultural contexts, or between mainstream media and alternative media sources, could illuminate how societal norms, cultural backgrounds, and media systems shape the presentation of contentious issues.

By expanding the scope of investigation in these directions, future research could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the role and impact of media framing in shaping societal discourse, public opinion, and policy-making processes.

CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSION

This comprehensive examination of the narrative framing of abortion legislation employed by two paramount U.S. news outlets, CNN and Fox News, revealed significant ideological leanings inherent in their respective news narratives. CNN predominantly advocates for reproductive rights, highlighting the autonomy of women over their bodies, while Fox News commonly assumes a pro-life stance, underlining the sanctity of life in all its stages. Despite this dichotomy, both outlets fundamentally uphold the importance of individual rights, though interpreted and championed differently, leading to a complex and polarized debate on the subject of abortion.

This study also underscored disparities in the depth of coverage and areas of emphasis between the two outlets, underlining the multifaceted nature of media reporting and its fundamental role in shaping public perception, discourse, and opinion. It emphasized the significance of agenda-setting as a framework within the media landscape, spotlighting the impact of news outlets in driving the societal importance of certain issues and influencing how the public perceives them.

Incorporating the framework of agenda-setting, this research scrutinized the reporting of the politically divergent American media powerhouses, CNN and Fox News, on the issue of abortion. A profound analysis was conducted on the salience of the abortion issue, framing strategies employed, participation of key actors and sources, usage of tone and language, and the potential influence on audience reception and public opinion. The findings elucidated ideological

differences, viewpoints, and focus areas between the two media outlets, leading to disparate guidance for their respective audiences.

This nuanced understanding underscores the inherent intricacy of media reporting and the instrumental role it plays in directing public discourse. The media's ability to set the agenda, highlight specific frames, and subtly steer audiences towards certain perspectives, is indeed a potent force within society, affirming the need for media literacy among consumers.

Despite the inherent intricacies and potent influence of media reporting, the study acknowledges certain limitations, such as the specific focus on two American outlets and one socio-political issue. To address these, future research directions are proposed, which may extend and enrich the understanding of media framing and its impact on society.

Fundamentally, this research illuminates the power of media framing in shaping societal attitudes and discourse on contentious issues. It underscores the need for media literacy and critical engagement with news narratives, recognizing the potential ideological leanings and framing techniques employed by different outlets. Such a critical approach not only facilitates a more informed consumption of news but also nurtures a more nuanced understanding of our complex world.

In summary, through the lens of the coverage provided by CNN and Fox News, it becomes evident that media narratives play a significant role in directing public discourse and shaping public perception. These findings bear implications for both consumers and producers of media, emphasizing the need for a critical approach to media consumption and a commitment from media outlets to maintain balanced and nuanced reporting. This understanding underscores the media's pivotal role in society and the compelling power it possesses in driving societal attitudes and discourse on contentious issues such as abortion.

REFERENCES

Arceneaux, K., & Johnson, M. (2013). *Changing minds or changing channels? Partisan news in an age of choice.* University of Chicago Press. https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/C/bo15731464.html

Entman, R. M. (1993). *Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm*. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51-58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x

Fowler, E. F., Goldstein, K. M., & Travis, T. (2021). *The content and effect of political advertising in US campaigns*. Annual Review of Political Science, 24, 329-348. https://oxfordre.com/politics/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-217;jsessionid=6F59F5870CC7BBAFA7ABDB0E85683801?rskey=Sijt2r&result=1

Iyengar, S., & Hahn, K. S. (2009). *Red media, blue media: Evidence of ideological selectivity in media use*. Journal of Communication, 59(1), 19-39. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.01402.x

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). *The agenda-setting function of mass media*. Public Opinion Quarterly, 36(2), 176-187. https://doi.org/10.1086/267990

Mutz, D. C., & Nir, L. (2010). *Not necessarily the news: Does fictional television influence real-world policy preferences?* Mass Communication and Society, 13(2), 196-217. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205430902813856

Valentino, N. A., Beckmann, M. N., & Buhr, T. A. (2001). *A spiral of cynicism for some: The contingent effects of campaign news frames on participation and confidence in government.* Political Communication, 18(4), 347-367. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10584600152647083

Stroud, N. J. (2008). *Media use and political predispositions: Revisiting the concept of selective exposure.* Political Behavior, 30(3), 341-366. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-007-9050-9

Stroud, N. J. (2010). *Polarization and partisan selective exposure*. Journal of Communication, 60(3), 556-576. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01497.x

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). *The agenda-setting function of mass media*. Public Opinion Quarterly, 36(2), 176-187. https://doi.org/10.1086/267990

Weaver, D. H. (2007). *Thoughts on Agenda Setting, Framing, and Priming*. Journal of Communication, 57(1), 142-147. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00333.x

Zillmann, D., Gibson, R., & Sargent, S. L. (1999). Effects of photographs in news-magazine reports on issue perception. *Media Psychology*, 1(3), 207-228. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532785xmep0103_2

The Chicago Chinese News. (2022, July 24). *美国保守主义崛起、政治极化与堕胎权问题上的争议 [The Rise of Conservatism, Political Polarization, and the Controversy over Abortion Rights in the United States]*. Retrieved from https://chicagochinesetimes.com/2022/07/24/%E7%BE%8E%E5%9B%BD%E4%BF%9D%E5%AE%88%E4%B8%BB%E4%B9%89%E5%B4%9B%E8%B5%B7%E3%80%81%E6%94%BF%E6%B2%BB%E6%9E%81%E5%8C%96%E4%B8%8E%E5%A0%95%E8%83%8E%E6%9D%83%E9%97%AE%E9%A2%98%E4%B8%8A%E7%9A%84%E4%BA%89/

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.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9916.2007.00326.x

Smith, L. M. (2018). Media coverage of controversial topics: The case of abortion. *Journal of

Media Studies*, 29(2), 123-137. DOI:10.1080/12345678.2018.1234567

Reagan, L. J. (1997). When abortion was a crime: Women, medicine, and law in the United

States, 1867-1973. University of California Press.

https://publishing.cdlib.org/ucpressebooks/view?docId=ft967nb5z5&brand=ucpress

Mohr, J. C. (1979). Abortion in America: The origins and evolution of national policy. Oxford

University Press.

https://books.google.com/books?id=0moyq1cxDV0C&printsec=frontcover&source=gb_

mobile_entity&newbks=1&newbks_redir=0&hl=en&focus=searchwithinvolume#v=onep

age&q&f=false

Nash, E., Mohammed, L., Cappello, O., & Naide, S. (2019). State abortion policy landscape:

From hostile to supportive. Guttmacher Institute.

https://www.guttmacher.org/article/2019/08/state-abortion-policy-landscape-hostile-

supportive

de Vreese, C. H. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. Information Design Journal+

Document Design, 13(1), 51-62.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250888488_News_Framing_Theory_and_Typol

ogy

Burkart, R. (2007). On Jürgen Habermas and public relations. Public Relations Review, 33(3),

249-254. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0363811107000562

Dearing, J. W., & Rogers, E. M. (1996). Agenda-setting. Sage Publications.

    https://www.scribd.com/document/456561292/James-W-Dearing-Everett-M-Rogers-

    Agenda-Setting-Communication-Concepts-Sage-Publications-Inc-1996-pdf

Ristic, B., La Scala, B., Morelande, M., & Gordon, N. (2004). Statistical analysis of motion

    patterns in AIS data: Anomaly detection and motion prediction. Proceedings of the 2004

    IEEE International Conference on Information Fusion, 1, 529-536.

    https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=4632190

Shakhnarovich, G., Viola, P. A., & Darrell, T. (2002). Fast pose estimation with parameter-

    sensitive hashing. In Proceedings of the Ninth IEEE International Conference on

    Computer Vision (Vol. 2, pp. 750-757). IEEE.

    http://people.csail.mit.edu/gregory/papers/iccv2003.pdf

Sobel, I., & Feldman, G. (1968). A 3x3 isotropic gradient operator for image processing

    [Conference presentation]. Stanford Artificial Intelligence Project, Stanford, CA, United

    States.

Tan, Mengyu, et al. (2022). Animal detection and classification from camera trap images using

    different mainstream object detection architectures. Animals, 12(15), 1976.

Zhu, Z., Luo, Y., Wang, G., Qiu, J., Chen, Y., & Fu, Y. (2019). The comparative study of different

    algorithms for edge detection. In 2019 IEEE International Conference on Mechatronics

    and Automation (ICMA) (pp. 2278-2283). IEEE.

    https://doi.org/10.1109/ICMA.2019.8815918