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Based on the latest coronavirus corpus of the English corpus collection list (English-corpora), this paper aims to do the data mining of the China-related reports reported by the media of the United States, Canada, Britain, and Australia in public health emergencies. It tries to analyze how the English world media construct China’s national image on the basis of the theory of evidentiality. It is found that the national media in the English world media report on China’s national image show a dynamic process of “concern–worry–stigmatization–dumping.” The western media made the construction of China’s national image by subjective reports, objective but negative media discourse, and “double standards.”

1. Introduction

For a long time, English-speaking media have made use of their status as the global mainstream media to guide public opinion, influence the international public’s cognition and attitude towards the image of other countries, and form international relations and interaction behaviors conducive to their own interests [1]. Sudden global public health events provide a window to observe how English-speaking media construct the image of other countries. By the way, it provides enlightenment for the development of Chinese news media, that is, China-related media reports are reliable materials to study how English-speaking media construct China’s national image by using their discourse power and the dominant power of public opinion.

Based on the COVID-19 news reports on China from the coronavirus corpus of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia from January 1 to June 14, 2020, this paper studies how the National image of China under the mirror image of the English-speaking world is constructed by western media in order to provide a reference for China to cope with the construction of the national image in international reports through data statistics, categorization, and analysis.

1.1. The Process and Concrete Performance of the Construction of China’s National Image by English-Speaking Media

There are 360 million words capacity for the coronavirus corpus, and the news corpus is continuously updated at 4 million words per day until June 14, 2020. It covers news reports published in print and digital media in 20 countries, including the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada since the outbreak of COVID-19. In the process of studying the data, it found the dynamic “stigmatization” of China in English-speaking media.

1.1.1. The English-Speaking World’s Media “Blame” and “Stigmatize” the Performance of China. Based on the retrieval of the top 100 high-frequency words and their collocation verbs and nouns in Chinese-related news from English-speaking countries in the coronavirus corpus, it is found that the peak of global Chinese-related news occurred on February 1, 2020 (Table 1).

Table 1 confirms the collective “blame shifting” and “stigmatization” of China in the Western media. Among the top 100 high-frequency words matched with China, “virus” ranked first and second in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada. The collocation of these
words with China indicated that the mainstream media of the four countries believed that the virus originated from China. The words "cover up," "conceal," and "biological weapon" are 490, 210, and 77 frequency, respectively, in the data, which were keywords used by Western countries to insult China (Table 2).

The peak of China-related news in the USA, the UK, Australia, and Canada on March 21 is because Trump used the word "Chinese virus" on Twitter for the first time around March 16, 2020 and mentioned coronavirus as "Chinese virus" in the Press Conference on March 19, as shown in Table 3. The frequency performance of "transparency" should be concerned. The topic only made the top 70 in the UK (Table 3).

Another manifestation of the Western media's collective "blame shifting" and "stigmatization" of China is that they turned a blind eye to China's positive response to the epidemic in the early stage. At the same time, when the epidemic broke out around the world, Western media rarely mentioned China's timely assistance to countries in need and its active sharing of experience and contribution of solutions to other countries. In Table 3, the frequency of the collocation "help" in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada is not more than 2, and most of them praise the achievements made by other countries, such as Japan and South Korea, in the prevention and control of COVID-19 spreading around the world. The "China coronavirus" in the USA is 1,181 (m8.0), Canada at 7.0 (191), Australia at 220 (11), and the UK at 309 (9.8). It can be seen that there are many issues about the USA "stigmatizing" and "blaming" China, while those about the UK, Australia, and Canada "stigmatizing" China are concentrated. But "made in China" and "virus made in China" (US 141, UK 34, Canada 26, and Australia 19) are still the main ones who deliberately instigated the "demonization" of China. For example, the Wall Street Journal said in its report that "China is the real sick man of Asia" and used the epidemic to attack China with racist colors. The British media Henry Jackson published a report titled "Corona-virus Compensation? Assessing China's Potential Culpability and Avenues of Legal Response." It was an accurate calculation of how much China would have to pay.

2. The Way of Constructing China's National Image by English-Speaking Media

As China has become the second-largest economy in the world, its international influence has been greatly enhanced. It is helpful for China to construct a good national image with the help of the media. It also made the Western media worried to crack down on China to a large extent. The sudden outbreak of the epidemic has given some English-speaking countries an opportunity to deliberately defame, smear, discredit, and blame China and undermine the good national image of China.

2.1. Western Media Stigmatize China by Subjectively Reporting the Epidemic. 

Fairclough once proposed in his critical discourse analysis that language is subjective and reflects the speaker’s viewpoint and ideology [2]. Systemic functional linguistics is the mainstream of critical discourse analysis research. The analysis of modality, evidentiality, and discourse strategy is closely related to critical discourse analysis. The analysis of evidentiality not only makes language reflect reality but also explores different ideologies and different power relations. Franz Boas proposed evidentiality, a linguistic phenomenon that can indicate information source and degree of affirmation, to judge the objectivity of news report sources. The means to reflect the source of information is called "evidential," which helps judge how news reporters cover up the truth of the facts by using language skills or intentionally misleading the audience. And how can we judge the “evidence”? We can get the answer from the language.

For example, we have the following:

(i) It is great
(ii) It is particularly great
(iii) I am not sure if it is great
(iv) Probably, it is great
(v) It should be great

It can be noted that language forms such as "generally," "not sure," "probably," "should," and so on delivered the cognitive attitude of humans. Therefore, the forms of grammar are called evidentials [3]. Hu classified and integrated Chafe's evidentiality models: verbal evidence, sensory evidence, hypothesis, belief, and reliability [4]. Systematic analysis of a country’s mainstream media based on linguistic theory is rare [5]. In English news discourse with strong political nature, we can fully discover how political groups convey implicit will and views under the cloak of objective language through news media so that readers can clearly understand how the state and media power affect readers through news discourse. Through the analysis of the news discourse of "evidentiality," it is found that although western news reports purportedly emphasize the fair, objective, and true reflection of news events, in fact, the China-related reports of the epidemic are obviously marked by ideology and journalists’ personal views and attitudes. In news reports, evidentiality plays a very important role in evaluating meaning. It is often used to judge the reliability and source of
information. The sources of foreign media reports are unknown, and subjective: journalists often use language skills to cover up the truth of the facts or intentionally mislead the audience. The analysis of the national image in international public opinion under the evidentiality strategy provides a reference for improving China’s international communication power and establishing a good national image.

2.1.1. The Analysis of Evidential Factors Found That Western Media Reports on China Are Subjective. The USA media “Money Life” reports that “the major countries affected by COVID-19 are the United States, Spain, Italy, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom, with more than 1.64 million cases and an estimated 134,492 deaths. So who’s going to pay for it?” [6]. Several reasons are mentioned in the article, “The spread of COVID-19 could have been stopped. It goes without saying that China is also to blame very significantly for its lack of transparent sharing of information about COVID-19 (and its depth and spread within China), both to the WHO and the entire world during the period, from 1 December 2019 to 22 January 2020. Is it China? China, in my opinion, was neither forthcoming nor transparent about the outbreak (of COVID-19 in late 2019).” The article argues that China needs to take heavy responsibility for not sharing transparent information about COVID-19 (and its depth and spread in China) with the WHO and the world. This article is highly subjective. When he expresses that “China is neither honest nor transparent about the OUTBREAK of COVID-19,” the distribution of data implies the subjective attitude of the speaker. The expressions such as “Could have been,” “in my opinion,” and “significantly” show evidence of direct sensory perception by the speaker. There are also obvious signs of authorial involvement in the news, such as “I think, I guess, I believe, I suppose, I notice, I report, in my opinion, etc.” It is hard to say that the author is objective with objective expressions such as “it is obvious that…,” “everyone admits…,” and so on. Nuttys (1998) believes that if the speaker has doubts about the evaluated thing, it means that the author needs enough space to prove the reliability of the information [7]. The objective degree of news report discourse depends on the degree of intervention of the speaker. Of course, if there is no evidence to prove the authenticity of the event, as long as he has an evaluation of the facts described, it proves that he has evidence to confirm the credibility of the information. Although the reporter tries to make the information seem objective and the facts he or she states more credible to help him or her avoid responsibility, these seemingly objective expressions tend to be

| Collocates      | Freq | Pm  | Country | Ranking | Peak    |
|-----------------|------|-----|---------|---------|---------|
| Coronavirus     | 1181 | 8.5 | USA     | 1       | 20-1-1  |
| Virus           | 1131 | 8.1 | USA     | 2       | 20-1-1  |
| Outbreak        | 809  | 5.8 | USA     | 4       | 20-2-21 |
| Health          | 780  | 5.6 | USA     | 5       | 20-3-1  |
| Help            | 93   | 0.7 | USA     | 21      | 20-4-1  |
| People          | 387  | 2.8 | USA     | 8       | 20-3-21 |
| Virus           | 274  | 10.1| Canada  | 1       | 20-2-1  |
| Health          | 143  | 5.2 | Canada  | 6       | 20-1-1  |
| Coronavirus     | 191  | 7.0 | Canada  | 4       | 20-1-1  |
| Death           | 130  | 5.0 | Canada  | 15      | 20-2-1  |
| Help            | 17   | 0.6 | Canada  | 41      | 20-3-21 |
| Coronavirus     | 309  | 9.8 | UK      | 1       | 20-2-11 |
| Virus           | 143  | 4.5 | UK      | 2       | 20-1-1  |
| Effort          | 30   | 1   | UK      | 32      | 20-4-1  |
| Help            | 64   | 2.0 | UK      | 3       | 20-4-1  |
| Economy         | 121  | 3.8 | UK      | 5       | 20-2-11 |
| Transparency    | 19   | 0.6 | UK      | 68      | 20-4-21 |
| Coronavirus     | 220  | 11.0| AU      | 1       | 20-2-1  |
| Virus           | 131  | 6.6 | AU      | 4       | 20-2-21 |
| Help            | 18   | 0.9 | AU      | 6       | 20-4-1  |
| Cover up        | 490  | 2.2 | USA, UK, AU, Canada | 20-2-1 |
| Conceal         | 210  | 0.9 | USA, UK, AU, Canada | 20-1-1 |
| Biological weapon | 77  | 0.3 | USA, UK, AU, Canada | 20-2-21 |
| Transparency    | 102  | 0.4 | USA, UK, AU, Canada | 20-4-21 |

| Table 2: A list of frequently used words with “China.”

| Section | All | 20-01-01 | 20-02-01 | 20-02-11 | 20-03-01 | 20-03-11 | 20-04-01 | 20-04-11 | 20-05-01 | 20-05-11 | 20-06-01 | 20-06-11 | 20-02-11 |
|---------|-----|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Freq    | 666 | 37       | 15       | 4        | 3        | 17       | 60       | 301      | 87       | 79       | 38       | 25       | 0        | 0        |
| Words(m)| 237 | 7.3      | 4.8      | 4.0      | 5.7      | 17.6     | 26.8     | 55.5     | 38.4     | 35.8     | 33.8     | 31.3     | 30.5     | 36.1     |
| Per mil | 2.80| 5.05     | 3.15     | 1.00     | 0.52     | 0.96     | 2.74     | 5.42     | 2.26     | 2.21     | 1.12     | 0.80     | 0.00     | 0.00     |
subjective. For example, hearsay, whether quoted directly or retold secondhand, is often used in news. Journalists are objective observers who report objectively and truthfully without personal evaluation. Newspapers succeed in influencing readers' ideologies while shirking their responsibility as sources of information. Through the analysis of evidentiality, it is found that verbal evidence and sensory evidence occupy the main position in the transitive system framework of news discourse. Reporters often unconsciously add their own subjective attitudes and evaluation and try to influence readers.

2.1.2. According to the Analysis of the Sources of Information, It Is Found That Western Media's Reports on China Are Subjective. Information sources of Chinese-related news commonly used the subjective expressions such as “I think,” “I suppose,” and “China’s official news agency claims.” For example, WA today mentioned how the coronavirus will strengthen the Belt and Road Initiative. “We are now only beginning to pick up weak signals of Chinese ambitions on the international stage,” “We should not wait for them to be fully implemented to start thinking about policy options.” It takes China to a hegemonic power with ambitions, but the source of its information is a former French defense ministry official, whose objectivity cannot be guaranteed. The New York Times (October 20, 2020) titled a passage “China Says Australia’s Questions on Its COVID-19 Handling Groundless,” and the Australian government has called for an international investigation into the origin and spread of the virus. “In Beijing, a Foreign Ministry spokesman said Payne’s remarks were entirely without factual basis.” A Foreign Ministry spokesman said the source of the information was unclear. “China say”? Source: China? Chinese government or official daily? Behind the seemingly objective is the transmission of subjective consciousness.

In order to reflect the objectivity of this study, after retrieving “China + [N*],” the result is that the word frequency of China Daily is only 264, 1.1 million words. The word frequency of “China News” is 26, 0.1 million words. The word frequency of “China CDC” is 32. “A recent editorial in China Daily, a state-run newspaper, denied discrimination against foreigners, even as it said that “some foreigners choose to flout China’s rules on containment.” The source of the information is objectively stated as China Daily, but the appositive mark is not “a state-run newspaper,” emphasizing that China Daily is a government-run media, and the implied meaning is self-evident. “The epidemic is raging outside China, and foreigners are being shunned, barred from public places and even deported,” the report said. When it refers to “the expulsion of Africans,” “Africans in the city say they have been evicted and forced into quarantine.” According to the expression “Africans in the city say,” it can speculate the source of the information is “Africans.” It uses 2018 photos to tell readers that they have been evicted and quarantined. “An epidemiologist was quoted in the state-run newspaper China Daily as saying.” “China Daily = the state-run newspaper.” The article appears to be an objective statement of facts but later magnified the coronavirus death of Dr. Li Wenliang.

2.2. Western Media Reports Convey the Will of Construction of the National Image. We took “[V*]” verb and “[N*]” noun with China as the retrieval items and extracted high-frequency collocation verbs and content words in news reports of mainstream media in the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, as shown in Figure 1. The results show that mainstream media in English-speaking countries are generally subjectively “smearing,” “stigmatizing,” and “blaming” China. The United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada stayed on the sidelines during the first two months of 2020. The top 10 common high-frequency verbs are “visit, said, praised, surpassed, overtook, says, hit, blame, left, and so on.” In March 2020, some words including “targeting,” “blaming,” “accusing,” “criticized,” “bordering,” “punish,” “banned,” “attack,” and “China” appeared.

Statistics show that China’s national image is “misinterpreted” by Western countries led by the United States, as shown in Figures 2 and 3. The proportion of high-frequency verbs in the news reports of China in the United States in Figure 2, and four countries in Figure 3 are similar and highly correlated, but the difference is relatively low, indicating the dominant position of the United States in the world public opinion. We classified the proportion of stigmatized verbs in China-related news reports of the USA, the UK, Australia, and Canada during the period of COVID-19, as shown in Figure 4, and found that the proportion of misreading of China’s national image was lower than that of neutral classification. It is worth mentioning that when analyzing the data of the UK, “demonize China” (6 words frequency) appeared in the top 100 to demonize China.

There are nine elements that have an important impact on the selection and processing of news, such as time span, intensity, clarity, cultural proximity, consonance, unexpectedness, continuity, composition, and sociocultural values [8]. Both the intensity and unexpectedness make it more dramatic and more likely to be taken seriously by the media. Western English-speaking countries, led by the United States, are in a dominant position in new media communication, and China-related reports have been on a “rainy day” for a long time. By giving negative connotations to public health emergencies, it creates international attention and causes extensive adverse effects on the international communication of China’s national image. In particular, the early outbreak in the Western media objective evaluation is given, such as the United States (83 words frequency), Canada (21 words frequency), Britain (23 words frequency), and other expressions, and all comments are just said by the WHO, while countries such as Britain and America are suspicious about WHO during the outbreak of epidemic prevention skeptical. They criticized the WHO’s need to do the institutional reform and threatened to withdraw from the WHO.

As the New York Times said in an article titled “Japan and Thailand Confirm New Cases of Chinese Corona-virus” on January 18, World Health Organization officials have praised China’s aggressive response to the virus by closing transportation, schools, and markets. The expression seems objective and fair, but the source of information is the WHO, not the official attitude of the media. When Canada’s mainstream media CBC mentioned that the government had sent a chartered plane to repatriate Canadians trapped in the
coronavirus zone, Foreign Ministry spokesperson Hua Chunying said that “most countries appreciate and support China’s efforts in combating Corona-virus.” The article is a paraphrasing of Hua’s remarks without making any comments. And Australian state media quoted Nader Rowland, a senior fellow at the Lowy Institute, as saying China is coming, faster, bigger, more decisive, and more powerful. However, the text “an implicit threat” holds a threatening attitude. Evidentials have made no secret of their attitude toward “stigmatizing” China. “China has invested a great deal of energy in trying to prove itself as a savior through mask diplomacy,” the article said, quoting Robert Lemahieu, director of the Lowy Institute’s Asia Power Program. However, the real meaning of the article is that the global spread of the “Belt and Road Initiative” is an inevitable trend. Even though the epidemic has slowed down its spread, it still brings positive energy to the economic development of Australia.

It can be seen from the data analysis that media around the world make use of the power of public opinion to convey the implicit will under the cloak of seemingly objective
language under the monopoly and instigation of western mainstream media. Due to the strong influence of Western media in the field of international public opinion, such negative reports have affected the subjective will and source selection of some overseas journalists in specific news writing to varying degrees [9].

2.3. Western Countries Use “Double Standards” to Accuse China. The “double standard” of western countries is a common phenomenon in international politics. Western countries make arbitrary accusations and practice double standards by using western values and discourse on free democracy to point fingers at other countries. The “double standards” of the USA towards China have been fully demonstrated in other areas. For example, on one side, they flaunt freedom of the press, while on the other side, they obstruct normal reporting by Chinese media in the USA. The US side glorified the “Hong Kong independence” activists as “heroes,” “fighters,” and “beautiful scenery” while calling the people protesting against racial discrimination in the US “thugs.” They criticized Hong Kong police, China for their restraint and civilized law enforcement but threatened to shoot at domestic protesters and even used the National Guard.

Taking COVID-19 as an example, the New York Times reported that “China has blocked nearly 60 million people and imposed strict quarantine and travel restrictions on hundreds of millions of people to fight the corona-virus. This action has cost people their daily lives and their freedom,” on Facebook on March 7 and Twitter on March 8. However, the re-reporting of the Italian lockdown turned into “Update: Italy has locked down Milan, Venice and much of the north of the country at economic risk as it tries to contain Europe’s worst corona-virus outbreak.” There was only a 20-minute gap between the two news, and the illustration was a “double standard” between civilians and officials. The New York Times commented that China’s lockdown caused great loss to people’s life and freedom and was against human rights, while it said that Italy’s lockdown took an economic risk and was noble. This is a typical “double standard” of Western countries. The New York Times criticized China under the headline “The World needs Masks Made in China, but China hides Them from Others,” saying, “China not only stopped selling masks but also bought most of the rest of the world’s supply.” However, the fact that China donated masks and other protective items to 82 countries around the world makes the US “double standard” untenable. When China used big data drones for epidemic prevention and control, CNBC reported that China was accelerating the deployment of surveillance machines. However, when the United States needed to use big data and other technologies for epidemic prevention and control, the headline changed to “The United States can learn from China to use robots and telemedicine to combat novel Corona-virus outbreaks.” When the USA announced that it would donate to China in the early stage of the epidemic, it made a big name of humanitarian aid, but when China donated to other countries in the world, it said that China was “expanding the world” for political purposes. When China offered help to Europe, it was criticized by western countries for “China’s ambition” and “vigilance against China’s generous policies.” “Italian residents sing patriotic songs on balconies during lockdown,” read The Guardian’s headline about the “Spanish lockdown” are “What new restrictions?” “Spain calls for lockdown to fight COVID-19.” Britain’s Guardian newspaper said the lowdown was “a long-awaited moment of joy.” But, in reporting on China, sealing city is “the destruction of human rights,” “China's reaction to the coronavirus outbreak violates the human rights,” and “China’s coronavirus lockdown strategy in China: brutal but effective.” In addition to the “double standard” of the title content, the illustration also embodies the double standard. The image of Italian people enjoying music on their balconies is in stark contrast to the depressed Chinese elderly men in masks standing in front of rubbish dumps.

Table 4 shows the “double standard” of the English-speaking world’s media in reporting COVID-19 in China.
### 3. Conclusion

In communication activities, there must be receivers of the misinterpretation of the communicator’s intention [10]. However, this does not mean that media reports can deliberately distort and deviate from the actual situation to make negative reports. Since the outbreak of the epidemic, especially during the global outbreak, China has taken global epidemic prevention and control as a general situation, practiced the idea of “a community with a shared future for mankind,” and built its image as a responsible major country. However, the English world reports about the virus situation in China are subjective, lack of fair, and “double standards” and even makes negative construction of the image of China. In the face of this negative image crisis, on the one hand, we should constantly reveal the ideological

![Figure 4: Proportion of stigmatized verbs in China-related news reports in the USA, the UK, Australia, and Canada during the epidemic period.](Image)

| Table 4: Classification of “double standard” reports on China by media of English-speaking countries. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Lockdown** | **Donation** | **China’s aids** | **Mass surveillance** |
| Italians sing patriotic songs from their balconies and make harmonies across empty streets to lift spirits and pass time (*The Guardian GB*). Orderly, dour, cowed: How my beloved Italy is changed by coronavirus? (*The Guardian GB*). | Humanitarian aid | The World needs masks. China makes them but has been hoarding them. (*The New York Times)* | Coronavirus could be a catalyst for China to boost its mass surveillance machine, experts say (*CNBC USA)*. |
| China’s reaction to the coronavirus outbreak violates the human right (*The Guardian GB*). China’s corona-virus lockdown strategy is brutal but effective (*The Guardian GB*). The scale of China’s Wuhan shutdown is believed to be without precedent. (*The New York Times)*. | Political purpose; be aware of China’s generous policy | | |
| Spain orders nationwide lockdown to battle coronavirus (*The Guardian GB*). | | | What America can learn from China’s use of robots and telemedicine to combat the corona-virus (*CNBC USA)*? |
| UK | | | |
| USA | | | |
hegemony and double standards in Western media reports through evidentiality analysis and completely break their fictional illusions. On the other hand, we should make full use of various media, especially new media, to enhance the three-dimensional external publicity capacity of news media, strengthen the “self-molding” of China’s national image, turn crisis into opportunity, improve international communication power, tell the story of China’s fight against COVID-19, and actively build China’s image as a “responsible country.” Due to the limited effort, there are some shortcomings in this study, including the relatively objective conclusion. Due to the limited time, the media of Western countries in the early stage of the epidemic can better explain the implied meaning behind it.
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