Framing Analysis of Iran-Israel's 2024 Conflict in *Kompas.id*, *Aljazeera.com*, and *NYTimes.com*

Fira Pujia Nuraini[1], Deddy Mulyana[2], Maimon Herawati[3]

[1,2,3]Faculty of Communication Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia

Abstract

This research seeks to explore how the Israel-Iran conflict in April 2024 is framed by the online media *Kompas.id*, *Aljazeera.com*, and *NYTimes.com*. This research aims to investigate how different narratives about the long-standing conflict pertaining to Iran-Israel complex tensions are carried by these media that present distinct geopolitical perspectives. This study uses a qualitative approach employing Robert M. Entman's framing model analysis consisting of four elements: defining the problem, diagnosing causes, making moral judgments, and suggesting solutions. Data was captured from articles written during a specific period in April 2024. Examination may include determining bias, thematic emphases and narrative strategies for each story. It was found that each media outlet had different frames for conflict. *Kompas.id* tends to take a more neutral approach. *Aljazeera.com* emphasizes the implications of Middle Eastern geopolitics of the conflict, while *NYTmes.com* concentrates on the broader international impact as well as the foreign policy interests of America. Such variations are politically and culturally biased according to the diverse media outlets used. This research highlights the biases and priorities reflected in the media report of the geopolitics conflict presented by various media outlets and provides insight into how the conflict is portrayed by the large media.

Keywords: Iran-Israel conflict; news media; media bias; geopolitics; online media

Abstrak

Penelitian ini menelusuri bagaimana media online Kompas.id, Aljazeera.com, dan NYTimes.com membingkai konflik Israel-Iran pada bulan April 2024. Tujuan dari penelitian ini yaitu untuk meneliti bagaimana media-media ini, yang mewakili perspektif geopolitik yang berbeda dalam menyampaikan narasi mengenai konflik yang sudah berlangsung lama terkait ketegangan yang kompleks antara Iran dan Israel. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif dengan analisis framing model Robert M. Entman, yang berfokus pada empat elemen: mendefinisikan masalah: mendiagnosis penyebab, membuat penilaian moral, dan menyarankan solusi. Data-data dikumpulkan dari artikel yang diterbitkan selama periode April 2024. Analisisnya bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi bias, penekanan tematik, dan strategi naratif setiap berita. Hasilnya terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan dalam cara konflik dibingkai oleh masing-masing media. Kompas.id cenderung menampilkan sikap yang lebih netral, Aljazeera.com menekankan implikasi konflik tersebut terhadap geopolitik Timur Tengah, sementara NYTmes.com berfokus padadampak internasional yang lebih luas dan kepentingan kebijakan luar negeri Amerika Serikat. Perbedaan ini mencerminkan bias politik dan budaya masing-masing media. Penelitian ini menyoroti bias dan prioritas yang tercermin dalam pemberitaan media mengenai konflik geopolitik yang disajikan oleh berbagai media dan memberikan wawasan tentang bagaimana konflik tersebut digambarkan oleh media besar.

Kata kunci*: konflik Iran-Israel; media berita; bias media; geopolitik; media daring*

INTRODUCTION

The conflict between Iran and Israel has historically been characterized by clandestine operations and proxy wars. The relationship between two nations is commonly referred to as a shadow war; it could be described as a dangerous rivalry since their confrontation is related to ideological and historical aspects (Roomi, 2023, p. 5). In 2024, this long-standing conflict escalated dramatically, marking a significant shift from covert tactics to overt military engagements. This escalation was triggered by a series of events, including Israel's assassination of seven Iranian military commanders (Alam et al., 2024), a move that heightened tensions between the two nations. In response, Iran launched a retaliatory drone attack targeting Israeli military installations, escalating the conflict to a new level of intensity. This recent development raises crucial questions about the potential for these hostilities to expand into a broader, more devastating conflict in the Middle East.

Media, including online or digital media (Hoewe & Peacock, 2020, p. 21), plays an important role in shaping public perceptions and policy responses to these conflicts. With the development of new media, it cannot be denied that the public is seeking more information from online media, including to access the latest news (Martianto & Isnaini, 2021, p. 49). By framing events in particular ways, media inform their audiences and influence understanding and reactions to unfolding crises.

Saddiqi and Silab (2023) wrote that both traditional and new media had positive and negative impacts on society and human life. Media produces news as an information and commercial product, following certain considerations, routines, and standards. Karidi (2018) said that news produced by media is informative and commercial and should follow certain routines, considerations, and criteria. The media attempts to provide information that enriches and broadens readers' horizons based on their reporting (Miranda et al., 2016, p. 22).

Given the media's substantial role in shaping information and news, it is essential for it to always be fair. Nevertheless, the media follows its own patterns in news publication, particularly as written by Arrosyid and Halwati (2021) about the conflict between nations. One significant aspect of media work is media framing, which directs and guides audiences on how to perceive and understand a topic of news. According to Hoxha and Hanitzsch (2018), with framing, the news may no longer provide a complete picture of reality since it has been constructed. News becomes fragmented information and a perspective of reality.

This research is a qualitative descriptive study. Qualitative methods provide flexibility for researchers in interpreting data according to the social reality that occurs, with theory functioning as a non-binding guide (Cantelmi et al., 2021). This research refers to the Social Construction Theory of Berger and Luckmann (1966), which explains that social reality is created and maintained through language and communication. Social construction theory highlights that the media shapes and influences public perception by selecting and emphasizing certain aspects of social reality. In framing analysis, the media plays an important role in framing issues, influencing the audience's perspective by emphasizing certain aspects of reality (Entman, 1993).

Framing analysis examines how media construct reality, specifically in the context of the relationship between religion and the environment. It also explores how media messages are interpreted and framed (Eriyanto, 2002, pp. 115–116). The framing process is intended to make a message more prominent by highlighting some information to attract attention from the audience. Framing analysis is actually a modern discourse study specifically designed for media text analysis (Sobur, 2018, p. 173). Also, according to Sandi et al. (2022), selection and emphasis are key concepts in framing. In other words, framing assists journalists in selecting

news topics and writing about them in a specific manner from particular ideological perspectives (von Sikorski & Matthes, 2020). Framing methods adopted in this study can take different shapes depending on the aim and goal of the process of framing, which makes it complex.

The reason for choosing online media as a data source is its wide coverage (Dekker et al., 2016, p. 1). Additionally, Schulze (2020) added that online media has become one of the most important factors determining the opinion of the public today. Shapiro et al. (2022) noted that after reading news on Internet-based media, people can determine public opinion sentiment in three categories: positive, negative, or neutral. Therefore, media outlets are expected to present accurate information and have a deep understanding of the messages they convey. It is responsible for mass media fulfilling its functions, which include providing information, educating, entertaining, and balancing social control over both public and government behaviour (De Blasio & Selva, 2021, p. 836).

For references and comparisons, there are three previous studies that are similar to our research. The first research is *Media Framing on the Hamas-Israel Conflict: An Analysis of Kompas.com and CNBC Indonesia News in October 2023* by Septiani et al. (2024). This research analyses how two Indonesian media framed the Hamas-Israel conflict on October 7 2023, using William A. Gamson and Andre Modigliani's framing analysis. The results were that *Kompas.com* emphasized Israel's declaration of war and Israeli casualties, which appeared to create sympathy for Israel, while *CNBC Indonesia* took a more neutral stance. This research is different from our research, which uses Robert M. Entman's framing analysis to understand the framing of the different issue, which is the Iran-Israel conflict, in cross-border media, namely *Kompas.id, Aljazeera.com* and *NYTimes.com*, with a focus on four elements: problem definition, diagnosis of causes, moral judgments, and treatment recommendation.

The second research is *Of Friends and Foes: Israel and Iran in the Maghreb. Perceptions and Instrumentalisation* by Werenfels (2024) which discusses the political dynamics between Israel, Iran, and the *Maghreb* countries. This research focuses on how local leaders manipulate interstate relations for political and social ends. Its main findings suggest that *Maghreb* leaders use public sentiment toward Israel and Iran to divert attention from domestic problems, control public expression, and strengthen the security apparatus. Public sentiment in the *Maghreb* generally rejects Israel and varies in sympathy for Iran, influenced by the history of the conflict and geopolitics portrayed by the media. Even though this research also discusses Iran-Israel, it is different from our research, which uses Robert M. Entman's framing analysis to understand the framing of the Iran-Israel conflict by the media in three different regions, namely Southeast Asia *(Kompas.id),* the Middle East *(Aljazeera.com)*, and the United States *(NYTimes.com),* compared to the study which examined media in one region *(Maghreb)* only.

The third research is *Ethnocentrism in Conflict News Coverage: A Multimodal Framing Analysis of the 2018 Gaza Protests in The Times of Israel and Al Jazeera English,* which explored how two English language news media based in the region, namely *The Times of Israel (TOI)* and *Al Jazeera English (AJE*), reported on the 2018 Gaza protests. This research conducted by Doufesh and Briel (2021) uses multimodal content analysis to determine the influence of ethnocentrism in their reporting. The results showed that both media outlets had ethnocentric tendencies: TOI depicted the protesters as violent and responsible for the loss of life, while AJE portrayed them as peaceful and accused Israeli forces of causing the violence. The research highlights that ethnocentrism in conflict reporting also exists in major transnational media, not just local or regional media. That research is different from ours, which used Robert M. Entman's framing analysis to understand the framing of a different issue, i.e. the Iran-Israel conflict, in the media of three countries (*Kompas.id, Aljazeera.com,* and *NYTimes.com*),

without including media from countries that involved in the conflict.

The purpose of this research is to explore how the 2024 Iran-Israel conflict has been framed by three leading news platforms, namely *Kompas.id* in Indonesia, *Aljazeera.com* in Qatar and *NYTimes.com* in the USA. The choice of these platforms is meant to represent different geopolitical perspectives: Southeast Asian, Middle Eastern, and Western. This analysis is particularly important due to the strategic importance of the relations between Iranian and Israeli nations for international peace. The choice of these platforms is meant to represent divergent geopolitical perspectives: Southeast Asian, Middle Eastern, and Western. The selection of the three popular media for this research is based on their reputation in their regions.

Kompas.id is one of the largest news portals in Indonesia, has a high reputation, and is widely trusted. Apart from that, Kompas.id provides news in English that can be accessed by international audiences. Based on a 2023 survey from Kata Data, Kompas occupies the highest position as the most trusted media by Indonesian citizens (Annur, 2023). The in-depth and analytical quality of its journalism makes his articles ideal for drawing on data in the analysis of international conflict framing.

The next media is *Aljazeera.com,* which is one of the leading media in the Middle East with global influence. Known for its in-depth and critical reporting, Aljazeera provides content in multiple languages, including English, which makes it an important resource for understanding the Middle Eastern perspective on the Iran-Israel conflict. Moreland (2024) wrote that Aljazeera is included among the five most popular Middle Eastern news sites; to be precise, it is in second place, with the first place being *Al-Arabiya,* whose target audience is Arabic speakers only, so it might not used as a global reference because it does not have an English version.

The last media in this research is *the New York Times (NYTimes.com)*, which is an influential media outlet in the United States with the highest number of visits (Watson, 2024) because of its reputation for good journalism. With its global reach and in-depth reporting content, NYTimes.com provides important insights into how Western media frames geopolitical conflicts. By choosing these three media, it is hoped that this research can rely on sources that have high credibility and are widely recognized.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is a qualitative study based on the constructivist paradigm, using a descriptive qualitative approach to explore the framing of the Iran-Israel conflict in the media. The research method involves content analysis of news articles from three leading media: *Kompas.id*, *Aljazeera.com*, and *NYTimes.com*. The analysis focuses on identifying and evaluating framing patterns using Robert M. Entman's model, which includes four elements: problem definition, cause diagnosis, moral judgment, and solution suggestions. This approach enables an understanding of how differences frame conflicts and the narratives they construct.

The unit of analysis for this research is individual news articles from selected media. Each article is treated as a separate unit, providing a detailed examination of framing techniques in coverage of the Iran-Israel conflict. Data was collected online in April 2024, with articles from *Kompas.id, Aljazeera.com,* and *NYTimes.com.*

Data analysis was carried out using a qualitative descriptive approach through several practical steps to systematically evaluate media framing patterns. The process began with the collection of articles from all three media during April 2024. These articles were retained for analysis, ensuring that each article represented a variety of geographic regions and cultural

contexts.

Each article was read thoroughly in an initial review to understand its content and context. The articles are organized and labelled by source and publication date for easy reference and further analysis. Then, a comparative analysis was carried out to identify similarities and differences in framing patterns in the three media, with the aim of finding out whether certain themes are more prominent in one media compared to others and how this influences public perception. Findings from the comparative analysis are synthesized to draw broader conclusions regarding the framing of the Iran-Israel conflict.

For the last step, the analysis and findings are outlined in a detailed report that provides insight into how media from various regions frame international conflicts. With these steps, this research analyzes data systematically to reveal the framing patterns used by the media. The goal of this research is to provide insight into how media from various regions frame international conflicts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Framing of Iran-Israel Shadow War

For this research, six articles published in April 2024, when the conflict occurred, were taken as the data. The reason for the selection was that each article represents two main themes: a flashback of the Iran-Israel conflict as a shadow war and how it may expand towards the world war. These articles go beyond the surface by taking into account the long-term hostility between both countries as well as how it can even grow and result in global military conflict. In consideration of all these underlying factors, this study seeks to give a holistic overview of Iran-Israel conflicts moving from shadow wars to potential world wars together with their responses during April 2024.

Entman's Framing Model is used in this research for some reasons. First, Entman's model provides a detailed framework for analyzing media frame construction, which encompasses problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and recommendation for treatment (Entman, 1993). This approach helps to make an extensive examination of how each particular media presents the Iran-Israel conflicts. It is useful to identify prejudice in news reporting, more importantly, through analysis of specific elements chosen by the media for emphasizing or downgrading certain aspects. News media is one of the areas that this model handles well in order to uncover bias. Thus, by evaluating what each media chooses to underline and leave out, the researchers can identify the unnoticeable prejudices as well as how geopolitical perspectives shape them. This feature of the model is important because it helps us to understand how media tries to present events in a certain way.

Entman's (1993) theory on Media Framing explains further how media outlets choose and stress particular angles of war to influence public perception. It entails selecting some facts and highlighting some parts of a story while excluding others to create a narrative that aligns with specific standpoints. Moreover, for instance, Geopolitical perspectives are very significant in determining which aspects of the conflict are highlighted and which ones are undermined or ignored by doing so. Therefore, for instance, a media outlet within a country that has strong political or economic connections with Israel might frame the conflict more favourably, portraying Israel and emphasizing Iran's aggressive acts, while another media outlet favouring Iran may focus on Israeli aggression and consider Iranian actions as defensive.

Table 1 includes an analysis of three articles from each site that provide a comprehensive view of the shadow war between Iran and Israel. Each article has a unique framework that collectively underscores its ongoing conflict complexity and immense risks. These articles

contribute to the overall narration about shadow wars and how they can spill over into larger conflicts.

Table 1. Framing of Iran-Israel Shadow War

News Portal	*Kompas.id*	*Aljazeera.com*	*NYTimes.com*
Title of the news	After the Iran-Israel "Shadow War" broke out	Bombs and viruses: The shadowy history of Israel's attacks on Iranian soil	Iran's Attacks Bring Long Shadow War With Israel Into the Open
Publishing Date	April 15, 2024	April 15, 2024	April 14, 2024
Define problems	The article defines the problem as a significant escalation in the ongoing "shadow war" between Iran and Israel, highlighted by Iran's direct missile and drone attack on Israeli territory. This attack is framed as a response to Israeli aggressions, specifically the killing of Iranian military leaders. The immediate concern is whether Israel will retaliate or restrain, with the bigger implication of the possibility of pushing the conflict into open warfare.	The article defines the issue as Israel's long-standing latten operations against Iran, with a focus on cyberattacks, assassinations, and drone strikes. These operations are presented as part of Israel's efforts to disrupt Iran's alleged nuclear weapons program, which Israel views as a direct threat to its security. The issue is framed in the context of a larger geopolitical struggle in which Israel is taking aggressive action to counter what it considers to be a real threat.	The framing of the Iran-Israel conflict in this article emphasizes the severity and potential consequences of this long-standing shadow war. By moving from closed to open conflict, the situation is described as a tipping point that can lead to a further escalation of the existing conflict. This framing raises awareness of the complexity of the conflict and its global impact, thus encouraging both nations to take a cautious approach going forward.
Diagnose causes	The causal links are clearly laid out, attributing Iran's direct attack to specific Israeli actions, namely the targeted killings of key Iranian figures. This retaliatory attack by Iran is framed as a break from their usual restrained or proxy-based responses, signalling a possible shift in tactics and a more direct engagement in the conflict. This change is suggested to be due to accumulating pressures and a need to assert a stance of strength and capability.	Causality in this article is framed around Israel's perceived need to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapons capability. This perceived threat prompted a series of hidden Israeli actions, including cyberattacks such as Stuxnet and Flame, as well as physical attacks such as the assassination of a key Iranian nuclear scientist. The article implies that these actions are a direct response to the real threat posed by Iran's nuclear ambitions.	The causal narrative presented in this article focuses on the two countries' ongoing manoeuvres over the years, involving proxy wars, cyberattacks, and targeted assassinations. This long-standing shadow war slowly escalated as each action by one side led to retaliation by the other, culminating in a direct Iranian attack, presented as a response to Israel's cumulative aggression, particularly targeted assassinations of prominent important figures.

Table 1 (continued)

Make moral judgments	The article sets a moral evaluation by describing Iran's attacks as a form of self-defence and a justified response to repeated aggression. This also suggests a moral dilemma for Israel about how to respond without escalating the conflict further. Analyst comments interspersed in the article reinforce the view that the two countries are trapped in a cycle of action and retaliation, each justified by previous violations.	Moral evaluation in this framing is complicated. The article describes these actions as controversial but suggests that they were justified within narratives of self-defence and national survival. This moral stance is embedded in discussions regarding the threat posed by Iran's potential nuclear capabilities and the lengths to which Israel will go to neutralize that threat. The framing here tends to justify Israel's actions based on security interests.	The article's subtle moral evaluation, however, tends to portray the escalation as a result of continual intense policies on both sides. This demonstrates how dangerous such clandestine activities can be and the fact that when they persist, the only possible outcome is an escalation. The two countries have been acting in self-defence; nevertheless, their collective actions have resulted in instability in the region.
Treatment Recommendation	While not directly determining a course of action, the framing hints at the need for cautious and measured responses from both sides. The emphasis on restraint, particularly from Israel, suggests a preferred approach to de-escalation. Comments from analysts and international figures emphasize the potential consequences of failing to manage the conflict prudently, advocating for diplomatic engagement over further military strikes.	The article does not specifically recommend any action but implicitly supports ongoing vigilance and defensive actions by Israel. The narration suggests that, given the stakes, Israel is likely to continue its hidden operations to ensure its national security. This is framed as an almost inevitable response to the geopolitical tension between the two nations, with a subtle endorsement of the necessity of such	The article's subtle moral evaluation, however, tends to portray the escalation as a result of continual intense policies on both sides. This demonstrates how dangerous such clandestine activities can be and the fact that when they persist, the only possible outcome is an escalation. The two countries have been acting in self-defence; nevertheless, their collective actions have resulted in instability in the region.

Source: Data Analysis Results, 2024

According to the first article, "After the Iran-Israel 'Shadow War' broke out", the tension and conflict between Iran and Israel were intensified with reference made to Iran's direct involvement in the latter's soil through its use of drones and missiles. The changes in attacks reveal that conflict has moved from hidden war to open military activities between these two countries. In addition, it is noted that such a kind of military involvement can cause chaos, which further means that it is much more likely for both sides to display a more aggressive response towards each other. This narrative seeks to comprehensively bring out new dimensions in the Israel-Iran conflict and how it may influence security on a long-term basis globally and regionally.

The second of these articles is "Bombs and viruses: The shadowy history of Israel's attacks

on Iranian soil", which focuses on the covert activities that Israel has been undertaking against Iran, mainly aimed at monitoring its nuclear program. A range of tactics, such as cyber-attacks, targeted killings, and sabotage, have characterized this piece over time. In addition to that, it also underlines the importance of having a proactive approach in making sure that Iran does not develop any form of nuclear weaponry since it poses great danger to its national security. Moreover, it equally underscores how this operation necessitates tough, aggressive measures that can be used in combating the threats arising from Iran's nuclear weapon development procedure.

Meanwhile, the article "Iran's Attacks Bring Long Shadow War with Israel into the Open." looks at how the conflict has escalated to military operations, specifically Iran's direct missile and drone attacks on Israeli soil. The writer calls the events of recent weeks "a significant escalation" that shows a major turning point in the hostilities where what were hitherto covert engagements are now made public. This shift is considered as a turning point in the age-long hostilities between the two nations. It is not so much about the potential for further escalation and wider regional instability but rather the immediate and visible effects of overtly becoming involved in a conflict.

The first article gives a complete historical and strategic overview of Israel's underground offensives against Iran. In great detail, it lays out some of the many steps taken behind closed doors by Israel to counter Iranian influence and actions. By concentrating on these operations, the text allows readers to consider deep-rooted tactical moves carried out by Israel over time. This context is important for understanding the underlying strategies that have shaped current relations between the two nations.

The second article is widely open, and it stops looking at past hidden operations and focuses instead on how the conflict has evolved in a strategic manner. The article argues that where once a covert war was waged in the shadows, it has transformed into overt warfare. This change involves significant transformation of the nature of the war as both countries become more willing to acknowledge and engage in visible hostilities. The authors try to delve deeper into the broader changes in strategy by examining how this more open phase of conflict may predict regional stability and even global peace. This serves as an important bridge between historical secret wars and present-day open confrontations.

The third article narrows down to immediate choices about what to do next following a major escalation of the conflict. It focuses on different paths that could be taken by Israel or Iran after recent wars. This narrative looks at now and soon, giving its perspectives about how both nations may handle these frayed situations and which policies they are bound to adopt henceforth. The third article underscores the time-bound relevance of the ongoing struggle since it is possible for it to grow into a more complicated event.

The first article provides a detailed historical context from an Israeli perspective. However, the second and third articles are more focused on current events and how they will affect regional stability. The initial article has set the stage for later ones that examine how the conflict changes over time and what actions these two states will take reciprocally. This change of emphasis from the past towards the future/present underlines the fact that it is now turning out to be more and more confrontational. These articles come together to make a complete picture of a complicated, evolving conflict. Every article adds another level of understanding, from Israel's movement in its secret operations to shifts in strategy and immediate choices that shape the current and future landscape of the conflict.

Framing of Iran-Israel Conflict Possibility Becoming World War

Table 2 lists three articles from each source that provide diverse perspectives on rising

tensions between Iran and Israel. Each article frames the conflict and its implications for potential global escalation in a way that implies the war potential of the conflict. Aspects of conflict highlighted in the news include causes, impacts, moral views, and proposed solutions.

Table 2. Framing of Iran-Israel Conflict Possibility Becoming World War

News Portal	*Kompas.id*	*Aljazeera.com*	*NYTimes.com*
Title of the news	Could an Iranian attack trigger a world war?	Iran, Israel and the potential for miscalculation	Miscalculation Led to Escalation in the Clash Between Israel and Iran
Publishing Date	April 18, 2024	April 18, 2024	April 17, 2024
Define problems	The article frames the issue as a serious military conflict between Iran and Israel. The report begins with a provocative question about the potential for world war, with a tone that emphasizes the global stakes and risks. However, they allayed these initial concerns by stating that such an escalation was not expected in the near future.	The article presents the issue as increasing the possibility of accidental escalation between Iran and Israel, although neither side wants full-scale war. This is contextualized by Iran's recent historical pattern of mutual provocations and direct attacks, which have been described as unprecedented since 1991. The issue is framed not only regionally but also has potential global impacts involving allies like the United States.	The article attributes the issue to a potential accident created by Israeli leaders when they carried out airstrikes against Iranian targets in Syria. This miscalculation is believed to have led to Iran's unexpected countermeasures. This issue seems to raise the risk of conflict escalation that might involve global powers.
Diagnose causes	Retaliation and deterrence were presented as the reasons behind the attack. Iran's motivation was explained as a reaction to previous acts of aggression, particularly Israel's attack on the Iranian embassy in Syria. This narrative frames the attack as a response to ongoing dynamics rather than an act of unprovoked hatred.	The article connects the cause of the escalating tensions to a series of actions and reactions between Israel and Iran, highlighting the killing of a senior Iranian military officer in an Israeli airstrike. This event is explained as the tipping point that drove Iran to make an attack against Israel. This narration framed it as a cycle of revenge with deep-rooted geopolitical and military strategies.	The causal narrative in the article argues that the Israeli airstrikes carried out without prior notice to the United States, directly led to unexpected yet massive revenge from Iran. This series of events has been described as part of a pattern of escalating tensions and hostility that has been misunderstood by both nations. This article stresses failures in diplomatic communication and strategic vision and highlights how Israel and Iran underestimated each other's reactions.

Framing Analysis of Iran-Israel's 2024 Conflict in *Kompas.id*, *Aljazeera.com*, and *NYTimes.com*
(Fira Pujia Nuraini, Deddy Mulyana, Maimon Herawati)

Table 2 (continued)

Make moral judgements	The article contains evaluation with moral content. This highlights the barrier shown by both sides following the attack – Iran's use of limited, non-lethal force and the decision by Israel, along with its allies, not to retaliate forcefully. This framing shows the moral high ground in avoiding further escalation, and reflects both parties as acting responsibly amidst tensions.	The moral judgment in the article is conveyed subtly through the depiction of the actions of the two nations. The response of Iran was described as measured and within global standards, which perhaps suggests that Iran is more responsive to provocations than the one causing it. It was explained that Israel's actions were bolder, thus hinting that Netanyahu's government could have acted unnecessarily. This framing subtly probes whether Israel used appropriate and necessary military policy.	The article's moral judgment is shown through its depiction of strategic and ethical lapses on the part of both sides. Israel is presented as inconsiderate, irrational or reckless for deciding to attack without informing or contacting its closest partner – the United States. On the contrary, Iran's response while measured was also forceful and this is depicted as a defense act that did not violate international laws but still confined with in it as a moderated reaction step.
Treatment Recommendation	The article provides a nuanced moral evaluation. This emphasizes the restraint shown by both sides following the attack – Iran's use of limited, non-lethal force and Israel's decision, along with its alies, not to retaliate forcefully. This framing shows the moral high ground in avoiding further escalation and portrays both parties as acting responsibly amidst tensions.	The recommended treatment covers diplomatic engagement and restraint to prevent escalation. The article suggests international pressure, particularly from the United States, urging Israel to moderate its response to maintain regional stability and avoid dragging its allies into a wider conflict. The recommendation is to resume diplomacy and limit military response as a better alternative than creating another war.	This article does not explicitly recommend a specific action but can be interpreted that de-escalation and increased strategic communication being necessary to avoid further escalation. The emphasis is on the need for Israel and its allies to rearrange their approach to managing this conflict. That action aims for stronger and more proactive diplomatic engagement to prevent miscalculations that could lead to a wider conflict.

Source: Data Analysis Results, 2024

The first article, "Could an Iranian attack trigger a world war?" presents a cautious perspective on the potential for a global conflict resulting from an Iranian attack on Israel. The situation is seen as one that is serious but still manageable, implying that measures such as missile defence systems and diplomatic efforts are effectively preventing escalation. What they emphasize in the article is that though things stand on a knife's edge, they remain calm so as not to spill into a world war in the immediate future. The focus is on what exists to avoid further escalation and ensure regional stability.

In contrast, the article "Iran, Israel and the potential for miscalculation" has a more

sensationalist outlook with respect to strategic errors, which could be costly, leading to wider conflicts. It explores the historical background of recurrent Iran-Israel conflicts, implying that both sides may probably not wish for full-scale wars, but their action may accidentally lead to such wars. This framework, however, raises concerns about fragile balances maintained through redlines and strategic calculations, which, if misread or crossed, would draw in broader international involvement, possibly escalating into a global conflict.

In addition, we have "Miscalculation Causes Escalation of Clashes Between Israel and Iran," which mentions particular mistakes made by Israeli leaders which constitute a major factor contributing to this escalation. It finds fault with Israeli leadership's decision-making process. This narrative criticizes the decision-making process undertaken by the Israeli leadership and highlights various mistakes and errors that have increased the risk of a more serious conflict. The article plots a scenario in which persistent strategic missteps could lead to a wider war. It examines the Israeli leadership's strategy, questioning its effectiveness and arguing that this miscalculation not only increased tensions with Iran but also soured relations with key international allies. The narrative implies that inadequate communication and cooperation with partners like the United States have exacerbated the situation, making further escalation more imminent.

Collectively, these articles offer diverse perspectives on the potential for conflict escalation between Iran and Israel. While the first article maintains a relatively optimistic view, relying on existing defensive and diplomatic measures to prevent escalation, the latter two articles underscore the risks of strategic miscalculations and leadership errors. They suggest that the situation could deteriorate into a wider regional or even global conflict without careful management and improved international cooperation.

Discussions

It was said by Talani et al. (2023) that the construction of reality or reported events leads to media content concerning media and framing. Therefore, what they present is not just reality, but it is selected and organized in a certain manner. This issue is also seen in the framing of the six articles from three sources, as mentioned above. The construction of reality or reported events leads to media content (Valdeón, 2023, p. 204). Therefore, what they present is not just reality, but it is selected and organized in a certain manner. This issue is also seen in the framing of the six articles from three sources, as mentioned above.

Those explanations of the elements in the framework suggest that while global war may not occur, it remains possible. In geopolitics, this situation potentially continues to escalate in the absence of effective diplomatic intervention and a more thoughtful strategy (Ibonye, 2018). In terms of geopolitical efforts in diplomacy, when negotiations or other constitutional methods are not carried out, it will lead to acts of violence (Khaswara & Hambali, 2021, p. 658). Each framing highlights different aspects of the conflict, from military involvement and its limitations to the broader implications of tactical errors. This shows how actions at the regional level can affect global stability.

These different ways in which the conflict is framed influence our understanding of why it happened and how it might end. The first article suggests that everything is under control despite various risks, while the second article underscores historical and cyclical risks, implying the complexity and depth of the conflict; additionally, the third article places that recent political and military miscalculations are responsible for the escalation. These stories reflect the diverse focus on the military, past occurrences, or national politics that are related to warfare.

In the view of geopolitics and political communication, the framing of conflicts profoundly shapes public perception and understanding (Ojala & Pantti, 2017). Szostek (2020) also wrote

that the concept of information warfare includes several questionable assumptions regarding its influence on political communication. One assumption is that communication can be precisely aimed and controlled like a weapon to generate expected outcomes. Another assumption is that people interact with adversarial messages because they are "vulnerable." Additionally, it presumes that success in information warfare is defined by persuading the public to believe certain facts.

The first article, despite several risks, frames the conflict as being under control so that it can reassure the public and stakeholders and make them believe that everything is manageable while enabling them to trust authorities. This narrative tone supports the current policies and military strategies for a stable society, preventing panic reactions while maintaining peace in the country. In contrast, another article highlights historical and cyclical risks, suggesting that it has a long and complex history. Through this framing, we depict that this conflict exists within a broad historical context of recurrent patterns: we can see from this context that these same things have happened before, hence revealing the underlying persistent factors in such conflicts. On the contrary to this position, the third article attributes the escalation to recent political and military miscalculations looking at present actions and decisions made by particular politicians or individuals in army uniforms, thus implying that better judgment could have avoided or reduced its effects, thereby drawing attention to immediate causes with the aim of correcting these mistakes towards de-escalating tensions. These multiple narratives demonstrate how multifaceted conflicts are analyzed from different perspectives.

Still, a more detailed analysis proposes that the media often supports only one point of view in its representation of reality (Mulyana & Yaputra, 2020, p. 354). There is a form of media partiality towards both sides when reporting conflict. Septiani et al. (2024) said that every media has different approaches to presenting news that reflect different viewpoints as well.

Our research shows how different media outlets frame the Iran-Israel conflict in varied ways, affecting public perception and potentially influencing international policies. The analysis used Robert M. Entman's framing analysis to investigate the aspects of the conflict that are emphasized by *Kompas.id, Aljazeera.com,* and *NYTimes.com*. Previous studies, such as Septiani et al. (2024), show that media frames vary significantly with different regional and cultural contexts. Like our findings, each of these sites has its own perspective on the Iran-Israel conflict: *Kompas.id; Aljazeera.com; NYTimes.com*. Another relevant study was made by *The Times of Israel* and *Al Jazeera English* (Doufesh & Briel, 2021) regarding the Gaza protests. It found that *TOI* depicted protesters as violent, whilst *AJE* portrayed them as victims. This is an example of how two different narratives could be created by the same events by the media, similar to how this research found out that in most cases, *Aljazeera.com* puts more attention on the Iranian bad situation as well as criticizes Israeli actions in their reports whereas *Kompas.id* and *NYTimes.com* offer more neutral or contrary opinions.

Berger and Luckmann's (1966) social construction theory helps to explain these results. According to them, media shapes what is real through words or just talking. Additionally, Entman (1993) argues that framing selects areas of reality so that people can understand messages the way they were constructed.

In addition, the media can be a great agent in empowering and educating society when the media prioritizes the public interest, which leads to democracy and wise decision-making. Similarly, impartial and fact-based reporting can reduce the polarization that is usually triggered by one-sided reporting, thereby encouraging harmony among people when they interact with each other. The pace of information in online news is increasing rapidly, making the media

adapt by disseminating core information to the public in order to avoid any bias or partiality. As Benham (2020) said, news must be balanced on two indicators: two-sided and proportional. Journalists are obliged to present news fairly and impartially.

However, this research has some limitations. It only looked at three media outlets, which may not capture the full range of perspectives. Including more sources could provide a broader view. The study also used qualitative analysis, which could be complemented by quantitative methods to measure framing effects on public opinion. Lastly, the research period was limited to articles published when the conflict happened in April 2024. A longer timeframe could show how media framing changes over time.

We completely agree that it would be better for the media not to rely only on one news source, which, according to Adiprasetio and Taqiyya (2023, p. 45), would make the media become one-sided. If a news story is published with a one-sided view, it ignores other important sources that, as said by Spinde et al. (2020, p. 391), can lead to biased reporting. Journalists must realize the importance of presenting fair and impartial news to prevent public opinion from being influenced. Good journalistic practice also involves including points of view from various parties to ensure information is more comprehensive and unbiased. Researchers support the creation of a media environment that focuses on accuracy, objectivity, and human well-being.

CONCLUSION

The framing of the Iran-Israel conflict in 2024 in the news covered by *Kompas.id, Aljazeera.com,* and *NYTimes.com* shows that there are different regional bias points of view. *Kompas.id* from Indonesia looks at the conflict from an economic perspective, reports on the role of diplomacy that ASEAN countries can play, and advocates for the creation of peace with a news tone that tends to be neutral. *Aljazeera.com,* which originates from Qatar, provides an in-depth explanation of Iran's goals in the conflict with Israel and its impact on the Middle East. The emphasis on humanitarian and regional cooperation slightly shows a negative point on Israel's image. On the other hand, US-based *NYTimes.com* analyzes international law, US foreign policy, and global security from a diplomatic standpoint, which implies that Israel's actions are self-defence operations. As such, these different stories not only point out media opinions in each region but also how it views the perspectives taken by warring parties worldwide.

This research highlights the academic and practical implications of media framing in the context of international conflicts, specifically through the analysis of the Iran-Israel conflict using Robert M. Entman's framing model. Academically, it contributes to understanding how different media outlets frame conflicts, emphasizing the importance of media neutrality and integrity. It suggests future research opportunities, including the examination of other global conflicts and the potential for quantitative methods to explore the relationship between media framing and public knowledge. Practically, the findings provide valuable insights for journalists, policymakers, and the public, encouraging balanced reporting, informed policy communication, and enhanced media literacy to critically evaluate news sources and their impact on public perception.

REFERENCES

Adiprasetio, J., & Taqiyya, A. (2023). Blurring context and one-sided: Kompas.com in framing the West Papua crisis. *Jurnal Kajian Jurnalisme*, *7*(1), 27–39. https://doi.org/10.24198/jkj.v7i1.46688

Alam, H. A., Pourahmadi, A., John, T., Kent, L., & Goodwin, A. (2024). *Iran accuses Israel of killing Iranian military commanders and others in airstrike on consulate in Syria*. CNN World. https://edition.cnn.com/2024/04/01/middleeast/iran-syrian-consulate-attack-intl/index.html

Annur, C. M. (2023). *Inilah media yang paling dipercaya warga Indonesia pada 2023, ada favoritmu?* Databoks. https://databoks.katadata.co.id/datapublish/2023/06/15/inilah-media-yang-paling-dipercaya-warga-indonesia-pada-2023-ada-favoritmu

Arrosyid, H., & Halwati, U. (2021). Media framing on the Palestine-Israel conflict. *Komunika: Jurnal Dakwah Dan Komunikasi*, *15*(2), 217–224. https://doi.org/10.24090/komunika.v15i2.4949

Benham, J. (2020). Best practices for journalistic balance: Gatekeeping, imbalance and the fake news era. *Journalism Practice*, *14*(7), 791–811. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2019.1658538

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Anchor Books.

Cantelmi, R., Di Gravio, G., & Patriarca, R. (2021). Reviewing qualitative research approaches in the context of critical infrastructure resilience. *Environment Systems and Decisions*, *41*(3), 341–376. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10669-020-09795-8

De Blasio, E., & Selva, D. (2021). Who is responsible for disinformation? European approaches to social platforms' accountability in the post-truth era. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *65*(6), 825–846. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764221989784

Dekker, R., Engbersen, G., & Faber, M. (2016). The use of online media in migration networks. *Population, Space and Place*, *22*(6), 539–551. https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.1938

Doufesh, B., & Briel, H. (2021). Ethnocentrism in conflict news coverage: A multimodal framing analysis of the 2018 Gaza protests in the times of Israel and Al Jazeera. *International Journal of Communication*, *15*, 4230–4251. https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/14256/3562

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

Eriyanto. (2002). *Analisis framing: Konstruksi, ideologi, dan politik media*. LKiS.

Hoewe, J., & Peacock, C. (2020). The power of media in shaping political attitudes. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, *34*, 19–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2019.11.005

Hoxha, A., & Hanitzsch, T. (2018). How conflict news comes into being: Reconstructing 'reality' through telling stories. *Media, War & Conflict*, *11*(1), 46–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750635217727313

Ibonye, V. (2018). Strategic wisdom in the new greater middle eastern game? A de-escalatory rethinking of the Syrian conflict. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, *20*(3), 251–272. https://doi.org/10.1080/19448953.2018.1385268

Karidi, M. (2018). News media logic on the move? *Journalism Studies*, *19*(9), 1237–1256. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2016.1266281

Khaswara, F., & Hambali, R. Y. A. (2021). Conflict theory according to Johan Galtung. *Gunung Djati Conference Series*, *4*, 650–661. https://conferences.uinsgd.ac.id/index.php/gdcs/article/view/395/213

Martianto, R. W. U., & Isnaini, M. (2021). Kontra propaganda deklarasi negara Papua Barat dalam konstruksi pemberitaan Tempo.co. *Jurnal Kajian Jurnalisme*, *5*(1), 48–63. https://doi.org/10.24198/jkj.v5i1.31885

Miranda, S. M., Young, A., & Yetgin, E. (2016). Are social media emancipatory or hegemonic?

Societal effects of mass media digitization in the case of the sopa discourse. *MIS Quarterly*, *40*(2), 303–329. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26628908

Moreland, E. (2024). *Top 5 Arabic news websites*. Medium. https://medium.com/@morelanderik/top-5-arabic-news-websites-bb0ba43d2f21

Mulyana, D., & Yaputra, A. (2020). The contestation of cultural claims in online media between Malaysia and Indonesia. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi (Indonesian Journal of Communications Studies)*, *4*(2), 344–356. https://doi.org/10.25139/jsk.v4i2.2152

Ojala, M., & Pantti, M. (2017). Naturalizing the new cold war: The geopolitics of framing the Ukrainian conflict in four European newspapers. *Global Media and Communication*, *13*(1), 41–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742766517694472

Roomi, F. (2023). The Iran-Israel conflict: An ultra-ideological explanation. *Middle East Policy*, *30*(2), 94–109. https://doi.org/10.1111/mepo.12687

Saddiqi, Q., & Silab, S. (2023). Negative impacts of mass media on social and psychological life of human beings. *Sprin Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *2*(01), 58–68. https://doi.org/10.55559/sjahss.v2i01.80

Sandi, M. R., Herawati, M., & Adiprasetio, J. (2022). Framing media online Detik.com terhadap pemberitaan korban pengeroyokan oleh bobotoh. *Jurnal Kajian Jurnalisme*, *5*(2), 145–159. https://doi.org/10.24198/jkj.v5i2.28886

Schulze, H. (2020). Who uses right-wing alternative online media? An exploration of audience characteristics. *Politics and Governance*, *8*(3), 6–18. https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v8i3.2925

Septiani, P., Widiastuti, W., & Makhrian, A. (2024). Media framing on the Hamas-Israel conflict: An analysis of Kompas.com and CNBC Indonesia news in October 2023. *International Journal of Science and Society*, *6*(1), 475–490. https://ijsoc.goacademica.com/index.php/ijsoc/article/view/1029

Shapiro, A. H., Sudhof, M., & Wilson, D. J. (2022). Measuring news sentiment. *Journal of Econometrics*, *228*(2), 221–243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.07.053

Sobur, A. (2018). *Analisis teks media, suatu pengantar untuk analisis wacana, analisis semiotik, dan analisis framing*. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Spinde, T., Hamborg, F., Donnay, K., Becerra, A., & Gipp, B. (2020). Enabling news consumers to view and understand biased news coverage: A study on the perception and visualization of media bias. *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries in 2020*, 389–392. https://doi.org/10.1145/3383583.3398619

Szostek, J. (2020). What happens to public diplomacy during information war? Critical reflections on the conceptual framing of international communication. *International Journal of Communication*, *14*, 2728–2748. https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/13439/3092

Talani, N. S., Rahmatiah, R., Kerebungu, F., & Wiroto, D. W. (2023). Kategorisasi media siber Hulondalo.id dalam framing pemberitaan kekerasan dalam rumah tangga di Gorontalo. *Communicatus: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, *7*(1), 43–64. https://doi.org/10.15575/cjik.v7i1.19946

Valdeón, R. A. (2023). Agenda-setting and journalistic translation: The New York Times in English, Spanish and Chinese. *Across Languages and Cultures*, *24*(2), 203–220. https://doi.org/10.1556/084.2023.00358

von Sikorski, C., & Matthes, J. (2020). Framing and journalism. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.817

Watson, A. (2024). *Leading global English-language news websites in the United States in December 2023, by monthly visits*. Statista. https://www.statista.com/statistics/381569/leading-news-and-media-sites-usa-by-share-of-visits/#:~:text=In December 2023%2C the news,with just over 260 million.

Werenfels, I. (2024). Of friends and foes: Israel and Iran in the maghreb. *SWP Research Paper Isabelle*, *June*, 5–36.