

Beyond Objectivity-Bias Dichotomy: Media Framing as Soft Power Mechanism in International Conflict

Muhammad Ainani¹, Faza Yudiansyah²

¹Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, Indonesia

²Faculty of Da'wah & Islamic Communication, Institut Agama Islam Negeri, Kudus, Indonesia

Abstract

The study examines how the attack on Lebanon by Israel in September to October 2024 was reported differently by Kompas.id (Indonesian secular), Republika.co.id (Indonesian Islamic), CNN.com (US mainstream), and Aljazeera.com (Qatari pan-Arab). It aims to understand how geographical location, ideology, and cultural context shape international conflict narratives. A qualitative framing analysis was performed using Robert M. Entman's four-element structure: defining the problem, explaining the causes, judging the morality, and suggesting solutions. Four news articles were analyzed using a systematic coding process, and intercoder reliability was checked. Kompas.id used neutral language, highlighting the international community's disapproval and refraining from taking sides. Republika.co.id presented Israel's actions as violations of sovereignty and urged the international community to put pressure on the country. CNN.com gave equal attention to regional events and different viewpoints. Aljazeera.com highlighted the crisis and the violations of international law in a very critical way. Media framing operates as a soft power mechanism in international relations, constructing epistemological frameworks that transcend simple objectivity-bias dichotomies. Indonesian media balances Western ideas of neutrality and the need to support their region. It is important to understand these framing dynamics for media literacy, diplomatic strategy and to notice the variety of knowledge in international journalism.

Keywords: comparative journalism; international conflict; media framing; postcolonial media theory; public diplomacy

Abstrak

Penelitian ini menganalisis perbedaan pemberitaan dalam pemberitaan serangan Israel ke Lebanon pada September hingga Oktober 2024 di empat media berbeda: Kompas.id (sekuler Indonesia), Republika.co.id (Islam Indonesia), CNN.com (mainstream AS), dan Aljazeera.com (pan-Arab Qatar). Penelitian bertujuan memahami bagaimana lokasi geografis, ideologi, dan konteks budaya membentuk narasi konflik internasional. Analisis framing kualitatif dilakukan menggunakan kerangka empat elemen Robert M. Entman: definisi masalah, interpretasi kausal, evaluasi moral, dan rekomendasi penanganan. Empat artikel berita dianalisis melalui prosedur pengkodean sistematis dengan pengukuran reliabilitas antar-koder. Kompas.id mengadopsi pemberitaan diplomatik netral yang menekankan kecaman internasional sambil menghindari posisi partisan. Republika.co.id menunjukkan pemberitaan kritis anti-Israel, mengkarakterisasi tindakan sebagai pelanggaran kedaulatan yang memerlukan tekanan internasional. CNN.com mempertahankan pelaporan berimbang yang fokus pada dinamika regional dan perspektif multipel. Aljazeera.com menunjukkan pemberitaan sangat kritis yang menekankan krisis kemanusiaan dan pelanggaran hukum internasional. Pemberitaan media beroperasi sebagai mekanisme soft power dalam hubungan internasional, mengonstruksi kerangka epistemologis yang melampaui dikotomi sederhana objektivitas-bias. Media Indonesia menunjukkan jurnalisme "ruang ketiga" yang menavigasi antara klaim netralitas Barat dan tekanan solidaritas regional. Memahami dinamika pemberitaan ini penting untuk literasi media, strategi diplomatik, dan mengakui pluralisme epistemologis dalam jurnalisme internasional.

Kata kunci: diplomasi publik; jurnalisme komparatif; konflik internasional; pemberitaan media; teori media postkolonial

Correspondence: Muhammad Ainani, S.IP., M.A., Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Jl. Brigjen Hasan Basri, Kec. Banjarmasin Utara, Kota Banjarmasin, Kalimantan Selatan 70123, Email: muhammad.ainani@ulm.ac.id

Submitted: December 2024, **Revised:** July 2025, **Accepted:** July 2025, **Published:** July 2025
ISSN: 2549-0559 (cetak), ISSN: 2549-1946 (online), Website: <http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/kajian-jurnalisme>
Copyright © 2025 Author(s). This is an open-access article under the CC BY-NC-SA license

INTRODUCTION

The Israel-Lebanon conflict is one of the decades-long geopolitical issues in the Middle East. Tensions between the two countries have been the focus of international media attention and have had a significant impact on regional stability and global politics. Israel's repeated incursions into Lebanon over the years have become a focal point of media coverage around the world. Media coverage of international conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, can influence foreign policy by framing certain issues (Evans, 2010, p. 211).

In the context of mass communication and journalism, the way the media frames an event could significantly shape audience perception. Framing is the process of selecting and emphasizing text (Entman, 1993). Ideological backgrounds and geographical contexts of media organizations can influence audience framing through several mechanisms: selective sourcing, interpretive frameworks, narrative construction, and moral positioning that collectively shape how audiences understand and evaluate international events (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007).

Previous research shows that media representations of the conflict in the Middle East are often biased and influenced by several factors. A major difference is the way news is presented in Arab and Western media (Fahmy & Eakin, 2013). This discovery helps us understand the actions of media outlets from different areas and beliefs when conflict occurs.

Indonesia, as the country with the largest Muslim population in the world, causes the issue of the Middle East crisis, including the Israeli war in Lebanon, to receive special attention. In the geopolitical context, the attention of Indonesian Muslim society to the issues in the Middle East is also very significant. Long-lasting conflicts, for example, in Palestine, have drawn attention and encouraged many acts of solidarity in the country (Brata et al., 2023, p. 1052). Indonesian Muslim society pays attention to these issues and supports matters that help unite the worldwide Muslim community. According to research, Indonesian media takes a different approach to reporting on the Israeli Palestinian conflict than Western media (Hanief & Ainani, 2024, p. 87). It makes us wonder how the same conflicts are reported by global and Indonesian media, such as the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

Because of today's information and communication technology, consumers can now access news from all over the world. How global issues are viewed and responded to by Indonesians and the international community is influenced differently by national and international media. Since people's feelings and beliefs can affect public opinion more than facts, framing analysis is now necessary. Being critical about news is required in the digital era we live in today (Mast & Temmerman, 2021; Mrisho et al., 2023; Polizzi, 2021; Waisbord, 2018). To understand society and media literacy well, we should know how the media presents events such as the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and other international crises.

Soft power and public diplomacy are also important topics when studying media framing of global conflicts. The media greatly influences how the world views a country or a conflict. How media frames each country can also suggest the way the world community views them. A belief that can change the diplomatic and international relations. However, the rise of citizen journalism and social media has introduced new factors into the study of media framing. Misinformation shared online can also shape the way people view controversial topics, such as global war (Salaverría et al., 2020). For this phenomenon, people are now paying more attention to how information is presented on traditional and mainstream media when covering the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

The way Western and Arab media report on Middle Eastern conflicts is different (Zhang & Hellmueller, 2016). Western media often use the 'war on terror' frame, while Arab media tend to use the 'struggle against occupation' frame. The study suggested considering the context

when examining how Indonesian national media and global media report on Israel's attack on Lebanon.

Indonesian media have improved the way they present humanitarian and peaceful solutions in international disputes (Hanief & Ainani, 2024; Nuraini et al., 2024). The two studies point out that media ownership and its ideology can affect the ways national media cover news. Still, on a global scale, CNN and Al Jazeera have different opinions about Middle Eastern crises (Zhang & Hellmueller, 2016). Meanwhile, this research analyzes potential biases or ideological leanings through media framing by comparing Indonesian and international media. Media framing allows for a critical examination of how narratives are constructed differently and influences how audiences interpret international conflicts. The research highlights the influence of national, political, and cultural contexts on public understanding and opinion about complex geopolitical issues.

This analysis is expected to provide some insight into the frames surrounding the Palestine-Israel conflict through the selection of different media tracks. Also, it shows how this variation can impact the public understanding and how these potentially influence the foreign policies by comparing the framing of coverage of Israel's invasion of Lebanon, in Indonesian and international media (Kompas and Republika for national media; CNN and Al Jazeera as international media). This research is also intended to fill the gap in the literature by analyzing in-depth the framing of news coverage of the Israeli attack on Lebanon in the Indonesian media and the comparison of its coverage with the international media. It is expected to contribute significantly to the understanding of the role of media in framing international conflicts and their implications on public diplomacy and international relations in the information flow age.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a framing analysis method to qualitatively analyze news of Israel attack on Lebanon. The qualitative approach was chosen for its potential to explore the deep meaning and context of news texts (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Framing analysis is a theoretical framework that examines how the media constructs events and realities by focusing on specific elements while disregarding others (Entman, 1993).

Data collection was performed using a documentation method. The data were in the form of news articles on the websites of four media outlets, Kompas, Republika, CNN, and Al Jazeera. They were selected based on their distinct ideological and geographical characteristics. Kompas.id is the top mainstream media in Indonesia, focusing on secular and professional journalism. Republika.co.id is a media for Indonesian Muslims, sharing their views; CNN.com is an international media based in the US with a Western mainstream style; and Al Jazeera.com is a Middle Eastern media based in Qatar. They offer a range of viewpoints and cultural backgrounds required for comparing different approaches to covering international conflicts.

We chose data published from the first day of the Israeli attack on Lebanon, September 23rd, to October 2024. The beginning of the conflict is when media framing shows the most variation in this study. There are four articles in the sample, each containing one news headline from a different media source. Articles were chosen if they had a news headline, were written by journalists or media professionals and had at least 300 words about the Israeli attack on Lebanon. This inclusion criterion is set to make sure the selected articles match the main frame used by each media (Brüggemann, 2014).

The data were analyzed using Robert M. Entman's framework model with four points: finding the causes, defining the problems, making ethical judgments, and suggesting solutions. The model was selected since it can show the way news is organized and how the media

organizes its discussions (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015, p. 424). The four elements were applied to every article and the results were compared between media to spot similarities and differences in the frames.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Headline Selection

Table 1 shows the selection of 4 headlines from each news channel analyzed in this study. The selection of these headlines was based on the criteria of relevance to the topic of Israel's attack on Lebanon, novelty of information, and representation of each media's perspective. These four news stories are the focus of the framing analysis in this study.

Framing Analysis of the Coverage of Israel's Attack on Lebanon

Problem definition is the first element in framing analysis that shows how the media frames an event. Of the four articles analyzed, there are significant differences in the definition of the problem related to Israel's attack on Lebanon. *Kompas.id* in its article entitled "40 Negara Anggota Misi PBB di Lebanon Kecam Serangan Israel Bergeming (40 Member States of UN Mission in Lebanon Condemn Israeli Attack)" defines the issue as international condemnation of Israel's attack on Lebanon. This can be seen from the news lead which states: "*Sebanyak 40 negara anggota misi perdamaian PBB di Lebanon mengecam serangan Israel yang telah menewaskan lebih dari 150 warga sipil Lebanon. Namun, Israel tetap bergeming dan melanjutkan serangannya* (As many as 40 member states of the UN peace mission in Lebanon have condemned the Israeli attacks that have killed more than 150 Lebanese civilians. However, Israel remains unmoved and continues its attacks)." This problem definition shows that *Kompas.id* frames the Israeli attack as an action condemned by the international community, but they ignore it. This framing is in line with the findings of the research by Ojala and Pantti (2017) that the media often frames international conflicts in the context of global reactions.

Table 1. Analyzed news articles

Media	News Title	Publication Date	URL
Kompas.id	40 Negara Anggota Misi PBB di Lebanon Kecam Serangan Israel Bergeming (40 Member States of the UN Mission in Lebanon Condemn Israel's Offensive)	October 13, 2024	https://www.Kompas.id/baca/internasional/2024/10/13/40-negara-anggota-misi-pbb-di-lebanon-kecam-serangan-israel-bergeming
Republika.co.id	Abaikan Seruan Dunia, Israel Nekat Serangan Darat Lebanon (Israel ignores world's calls to invade Lebanon)	October 13, 202	https://news.Republika.co.id/berita/sknok1393/abaikan-seruan-dunia-israel-nekat-serangan-darat-lebanon
CNN.com	Lebanon-Israel Aerial Assault Intensity	October 4, 2024	https://edition.CNN.com/2024/10/04/middleeast/lebanon-israel-aerial-assault-intensity-intl/index.html
Aljazeera.com	Israel's War on Lebanon Triggers Unprecedented Displacement	October 1, 2024	https://www.Aljazeera.com/news/2024/10/1/israels-war-on-lebanon-triggers-unprecedented-displacement

Source: Research findings processed by Researcher, 2024

Meanwhile, *Republika.co.id* in the article “*Abaikan Seruan Dunia, Israel Nekat Serangan Darat Lebanon* (Ignoring World Calls, Israel Recklessly Attacks Lebanon)” defines the problem as Israel ignoring international calls. This can be seen from the title and opening paragraph: “*Israel tetap nekat melancarkan serangan darat ke Lebanon meski mendapat kecaman keras dari dunia internasional. Serangan darat ini merupakan eskalasi dari serangan udara yang telah berlangsung selama dua minggu* (Israel is still desperate to launch a ground attack on Lebanon despite strong international condemnation. This ground attack is an escalation of the airstrikes that have been going on for two weeks).” *Republika.co.id*’s framing emphasizes Israel’s attitude, which is described as “reckless” and “ignoring” the world’s calls. This kind of problem definition can affect how audiences understand and evaluate an event (Entman, 1993).

CNN.com, in the article “Lebanon-Israel Aerial Assault Intensity,” defines the problem as an increase in the intensity of airstrikes between Israel and Lebanon. This can be seen from the opening paragraph: “The aerial assault between Lebanon and Israel has intensified in recent days, marking a significant escalation in the ongoing conflict between the two nations.” *CNN.com* frames the issue from the perspective of conflict escalation, without explicitly blaming either side. This method aligns with the principle of journalistic objectivity as outlined by Hanitzsch et al. (2019) in their examination of journalistic practices across different nations.

Aljazeera.com, in the article “Israel’s War on Lebanon Triggers Unprecedented Displacement,” characterizes the issue as a humanitarian crisis resulting from Israeli military actions. That opening and title describe Israel’s current war with Lebanon as causing an unprecedented humanitarian catastrophe, with hundreds of thousands displaced from their homes in the country’s south. *Aljazeera.com* notes the humanitarian consequences of the conflict, particularly for Lebanese civilians. Such difference in problem definition among these four media shows how ideological and geographical contexts affect the way the news is framed, which is the foundation theory of critical discourse analysis (van Dijk, 2017).

The second element in Entman’s framing analysis is the diagnosis of causes, which pertains to how the media identifies the underlying cause of the problem. The analysis of four media outlets regarding Israel’s attack on Lebanon reveals variations in their identification of the underlying causes of the issue. *Kompas.id* approaches the issue from a neutral standpoint. The article states: “*Serangan Israel ke Lebanon dipicu oleh serangan roket dari kelompok militan Hizbullah yang berbasis di Lebanon selatan. Namun, eskalasi konflik ini juga tidak terlepas dari ketegangan yang telah berlangsung lama di kawasan tersebut* (Israel’s incursion into Lebanon was triggered by rocket attacks from the Hezbollah militant group based in southern Lebanon. The escalation of this conflict is closely linked to enduring tensions in the region).” *Kompas.id* offers historical context and analyzes the causes of the conflict from both perspectives. This approach aligns with the principle of peace journalism articulated by Youngblood (2016), which underscores the significance of contextualizing the conflict and providing its background.

Republika.co.id identifies Israel as the primary cause of the issue. The statement illustrates, “*Serangan darat Israel ke Lebanon merupakan tindakan agresi yang melanggar kedaulatan negara Lebanon. Tindakan ini semakin memperburuk situasi kemanusiaan di kawasan tersebut* (Israel’s land attack on Lebanon is an act of aggression that violates the sovereignty of the Lebanese state.” This step makes the humanitarian crisis in the region even worse. The way *Republika.co.id* presents the stories shows that the media often takes a moral position when covering conflicts.

CNN.com often reports events by considering the wider regional context. The article points out that the conflict between Lebanon and Israel is connected to a wider regional tension,

which is affected by the war in Syria and the relationships between regional powers. CNN.com's way of reporting reflects how the global media tends to link local conflicts to broader international issues, as Golan (2013) found in his study of international conflict reporting in the US media.

Aljazeera.com usually blames Israeli policies for the main cause of the issue. The article asserts that "Israel's aggressive military campaign in Lebanon, which began with airstrikes and has now escalated to ground operations, is the primary cause of the current humanitarian crisis." *Aljazeera's* framing of the Israeli-Arab conflict is a common feature of Arab media (El-Nawawy & Elmasry, 2015). The discrepancy in determining the source of the problem is a lesson in that the ideological and geographical context of media affects the framing of the news. This shows how media from different countries frame international conflicts under their national interests (Cozma & Kozman, 2017; Liu et al., 2022; Moon, 2018).

The third element in Entman's framing analysis is the media's moral evaluation of the events. There are differences in moral judgments across the four outlets analyzed in the coverage of Israel's attack on Lebanon. *Kompas.id* shows a tendency toward neutral and diplomatic moral judgments, which is the characteristic of articles.

Kompas.id, within its articles, frequently employs moral judgments that are more diplomatic and impartial. This can be seen from the statement: "*Serangan yang menewaskan warga sipil, baik dari pihak Israel maupun Lebanon, merupakan pelanggaran hukum humaniter internasional. Kedua pihak harus menahan diri dan mengutamakan dialog untuk menyelesaikan konflik* (Attacks that kill civilians, both on the Israeli and Lebanese sides, are a violation of international humanitarian law. Both parties must exercise restraint and prioritize dialogue to resolve the conflict)." The moral assessment rendered by *Kompas.id* is consistent with the peace journalism principles, which underscore the significance of averting polarization and pursuing peaceful resolutions in conflict reporting (Lynch & McGoldrick, 2007, p. 248).

Republika.co.id has a propensity to render moral assessments that are more forceful in their condemnation of Israel's conduct. This can be seen from the statement: "*Serangan Israel ke Lebanon merupakan tindakan agresi yang tidak dapat dibenarkan. Hal ini melanggar kedaulatan Lebanon dan hukum internasional* (Israel's attack on Lebanon is an unjustified act of aggression. It violates Lebanon's sovereignty and international law)." This explicit moral judgment is indicative of the media's propensity to adopt a stance on the conflict.

CNN.com tends to be more careful in making moral judgments and cites multiple sources. The article states: "While Israel claims its actions are in self-defense, human rights organizations have raised concerns about the proportionality of the response and its impact on civilians. The UN has called for an immediate ceasefire and respect for international humanitarian law". *CNN.com* approach reflects an effort to maintain objectivity by presenting multiple viewpoints.

In contrast, *Aljazeera.com* tends to be more explicitly damning of Israeli actions. The article continues: "Israel's actions in Lebanon represent a grave breach of both international law and human rights. Targeting civilian infrastructure and the involuntary transfer of hundreds of thousands of people are war crimes that warrant investigation and prosecution." This strong moral critique serves to substantiate *Al Jazeera's* position on the Arab-Israeli struggle. These differences in making moral judgments show how the ideological and cultural background of the media can influence news framing. Media framings are influenced by social and cultural factors (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989).

The reported problem is perceived as resolved through treatment recommendations. The fourth component in Entman is the media focus and shift of the frame. Regarding the media coverage of Israel's attack on Lebanon, the four media outlets are different in terms of their

focus on the solution. *Kompas.id* frequently highlights the significance of the international community's involvement in conflict resolution in its articles. This is evident in the following statement: "*Komunitas internasional harus segera mengambil langkah-langkah konkret untuk menghentikan eskalasi konflik. PBB dan negara-negara berpengaruh di kawasan harus memfasilitasi dialog antara Israel dan Lebanon untuk mencapai gencatan senjata* (The international community must immediately take concrete steps to stop the escalation of the conflict. The UN and influential countries in the region should facilitate a dialog between Israel and Lebanon to reach a ceasefire)." The focus on the international community's role is consistent with the concept of media diplomacy, which underscores the media's role in facilitating the resolution of international conflicts (Sundari et al., 2021, p. 184).

Republika.co.id frequently comes with the significance of international pressure on Israel to halt strikes. This can be seen from the statement: "*Dunia internasional harus memberikan tekanan yang lebih kuat terhadap Israel untuk menghentikan serangannya ke Lebanon. Sanksi ekonomi dan diplomatik perlu dipertimbangkan untuk memaksa Israel mematuhi hukum internasional* (The international community must exert stronger pressure on Israel to stop its attacks on Lebanon. Economic and diplomatic sanctions need to be considered to force Israel to comply with international law)." The focus on international pressure is indicative of the media's propensity to promote intervention in conflicts (Wolfsfeld, 2017).

CNN.com leads with the announcement of the US-Libya settlement, attributing it to international mediators and diplomatic efforts. It adds: "Diplomatic efforts led by the United States and other regional powers are crucial in de-escalating the conflict. The involvement of neutral mediators could help facilitate negotiations between Israel and Lebanon". The US media has a bias to frame the US as an active participant in conflict resolution (Golan, 2013). Meanwhile, *CNN.com* follows this trend in its way.

In contrast, *Aljazeera.com* shows its commitment to upholding international law and protecting civilians. The article reads: "The international community must take immediate action to protect Lebanese civilians and uphold international law. It requires urging a ceasefire, offering humanitarian support, and bringing those who commit war crimes to justice. Al Jazeera's coverage of the Israeli-Arab conflict shows that it emphasizes the enforcement of international law and the protection of civilians. The way this resolution is highlighted in news stories reveals how the media's beliefs and culture affect the presentation of the stories. Media framing can shape the way people view issues and make decisions in policy (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007).

After applying Entman's model to analyze each media, the following step is to compare the framing to find out the similarities and differences among the four media. Table 2 summarizes the comparison of the framing of the four media based on Entman's elements. Table 2 demonstrates that each media has a different framing tendency. *Kompas.id* tends to take a more neutral and diplomatic position, while *Republika.co.id* and *Aljazeera.com* tend to be more critical of Israel. Meanwhile, *CNN.com* presents various viewpoints with a more cautious approach.

The difference in framing can be explained through several factors. The geographical and cultural background of the media influences the way they frame the conflict. *Kompas.id*, as an Indonesian media outlet, generally adopts a neutral stance in alignment with Indonesia's unbiased foreign policy toward the Middle East conflict.

Republika.co.id, while originating from Indonesia, is linked with the Muslim community. This may have affected their inclination to be more critical against Israel, as elucidated by Petersen (2016) in his analysis of Islamic media in Indonesia. *CNN.com*, as an American media

Table 2. Comparison of Media Framing in the Coverage of Israel's Attack on Lebanon

Framing Elements	Kompas.id	Republika.co.id	CNN.com	Aljazeera.com
Define Problems	International condemnation of the Israeli attack	Israel ignores the world's call	Escalation of the conflict between Israel and Lebanon	Humanitarian crisis due to Israeli attacks
Diagnose Causes	Hezbollah rocket attacks and historical tensions	Israeli aggression	Complex regional dynamics	Israel's aggressive policy
Make a Moral Judgement	Neutral, condemning violence from both sides	Condemning Israel's actions	Careful, presenting multiple points of view	Strongly condemn Israel
Treatment Recommendation	The role of the international community in mediation	International pressure on Israel	US diplomatic and mediation efforts	International law enforcement and civil protection

Source: Researcher's Interview Result, 2024

outlet, typically offers a more varied and measured viewpoint. This may indicate the role of the US as a mediator in the Middle East conflict. *Aljazeera.com*, a media outlet located in Qatar, exhibits a propensity for heightened criticism of Israel. This illustrates Qatar's geopolitical stance and overall perspective within the Arab world (El-Nawawy & Elmasry, 2015).

Media Ideology

Media ideology significantly influences news framing. *Kompas.id*, recognized for its commitment to objectivity, typically offers a more balanced viewpoint. This aligns with the findings of Tapsell (2015) regarding journalism in post-Reformation Indonesia. *Republika.co.id*, aligned ideologically with the Muslim population, has a more critical stance against Israel. This reflects the tendency of faith-based media to frame international conflicts.

CNN.com, as a US mainstream media, tends to maintain balance in its reporting, although it still reflects US interests. *Aljazeera.com*, with its position as a Pan-Arab media, tends to take a more critical stance towards Israel. This reflects the Pan-Arabism ideology that remains influential in Arab media (Amaireh, 2024).

Secondly, the socio-political context at the time of reporting also influences media framing. In October 2024, when these articles were published, the situation in the Middle East was extremely tense due to the escalation of the Israel-Lebanon conflict. This may have influenced the way the media framed the event. Since Indonesian populations are mostly Muslims and the country keeps diplomatic ties with Israel, *Kompas.id* often takes a careful and diplomatic approach. This demonstrates the difficult role Indonesia has in the Middle East conflict.

The way Indonesia acts in the Middle East conflict highlights how political, economic, social and cultural factors work together to form its foreign policy and responses to regional matters. Since Indonesia has the most Muslims in the world, it is important for the country to support stability and security in the Middle East which is the center of many geopolitical conflicts. Being involved in multilateral diplomacy and conflict mediation is an important part of Indonesia's role.

In Indonesia, media framing on issues can shape the country's foreign policy by influencing public opinion, pressuring other countries and making policies more acceptable. The neutral way *Kompas.id* reports helps Indonesia explain its decision to stay neutral in international forums. The way *Republika.co.id* covers Israel's actions encourages Indonesians

to support Palestine which affects the government's statements and diplomatic actions in the OIC. This influence is seen in parliamentary questions about government roles, public protests that affect diplomacy, media pressure on foreign ministry statements and civil society actions guided by media stories. For example, extensive media coverage of humanitarian crises can prompt government humanitarian aid decisions and influence Indonesia's positions in UN voting patterns.

Indonesia aims to assume the role of a "middle power" dedicated to conflict resolution via dialogue and diplomacy (Alvian et al., 2017; Setiawati, 2024). This country participates in initiatives to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Syrian conflict, focusing on providing peaceful solutions and supporting international efforts (Setiawati, 2024). These engagements frequently encounter challenges, including conflicting interests among major nations and the intricate nature of the situation on the ground (Alvian et al., 2017; Setiawati, 2024).

CNN.com, regarding US policy aimed at maintaining stability in the Middle East, generally offers a more balanced perspective. This illustrates the role of the US as a mediator in the conflict (Mor, 2014, p. 258). *Aljazeera.com*, amid increasing anti-Israel sentiment in the Arab world following the attack on Lebanon, adopts a more critical stance towards Israel. This illustrates the dynamics of public opinion in the Arab world.

Framing Implications for Public Understanding

The differences in framing between media in reporting the Israeli attack on Lebanon have important implications for public understanding of the conflict. The following are some implications in the form of public opinion formation, opinion polarization, understanding of conflict complexity, and influence on policy. Media framing significantly shapes public opinion about a conflict. The way the media frames an issue can influence public understanding and evaluation over the issue. Different ways the media reported the Israel-Lebanon conflict led to different views among the public. Because of the media's stance on the conflict, readers of Kompas.id are likely to be more neutral, while those of Aljazeera.com might be more critical of Israel's actions.

It is obvious that the way Western media, CNN.com and Arab media such as Aljazeera.com, present information leads to a big difference in how the public views the issue. This is in line with studies showing that different presentation of the conflict in different media from different countries leads to different views among people worldwide (Almahallawi & Zauddin, 2018; Bhowmik & Fisher, 2023). The media shows how the Israel-Lebanon situation is complicated by presenting various viewpoints. Being able to access several news sources helps people see things from a broader angle (Ratna et al., 2023; Widayarsi et al., 2023).

Media presentations of conflict can affect the government's response. Research has found that when the media pays a lot of attention to a topic, it can prompt the government to act quickly and possibly change existing policies (Mwangi, 2018). When the media frequently reports on humanitarian crises, it can lead governments to feel more pressure to act in the conflict. This table outlines the possible effects of media framing has on how the public understands issues. Table 3 demonstrates how the way media reports the Israel-Lebanon conflict can shape public opinions. This is consistent with what Entman (1993), found which is that framing can affect how people view and judge an event.

Analysis of Factors Affecting Framing

Why do different media organizations employ such distinct framings of the same event? This fundamental question requires us to go beyond the conventional theoretical approaches that have been saturated in relevant studies. Rather than relying on the overly familiar framework of

Table 3. Potential Impact of Media Framing on Public Understanding

Media	Dominant Framing	Potential Impact on Public Understanding
Kompas.id	Neutral and diplomatic	More balanced understanding of the conflict - Support for diplomacy and mediation efforts - Less understanding of the humanitarian impact of the conflict
Republika.co.id	Critical of Israel	Greater sympathy for Lebanon - Negative view of Israel's actions - Less understanding of regional geopolitical complexities
CNN.com	Equilibrated with an emphasis on regional dynamics	Expanded comprehension of geopolitical background - Diminished emphasis on humanitarian consequences - May be perceived as overly cautious by certain readers
Aljazeera.com	Severely critical of Israel, emphasizing the humanitarian crisis	Profound empathy for Lebanese civilians - Highly unfavorable opinion of Israel - Potential lack of comprehension of the Israeli viewpoint

Source: Research findings processed by Researcher, 2024

hierarchies of influence, this study explores the factors that influence framing through a fresher and more contextual theoretical lens.

When we observe how Kompas.id, Republika.co.id, CNN.com, and Al Jazeera.com frame the Israel-Lebanon conflict, we are actually witnessing a much more complex epistemological struggle. Each media organization not only presents news, but also creates a way of understanding reality that reflects their position in a global order that is still colored by colonial legacies and contemporary power dynamics (Quijano, 2000).

Kompas.id shows the navigation of the “third space” in postcolonial terminology (Bhabha, 2020). This media does not fully adopt Western-style objectivity that claims universal neutrality, but it is also not completely dissolved in Arab solidarity. This position reflects Indonesia’s experience as a postcolonial nation that had to create its own perspective on international conflicts. The diplomatic and neutral framing displayed by Kompas.id is not a bland impartiality, but rather a form of epistemological resistance to the West-East dichotomy that often forces developing countries to choose sides.

This dynamic becomes more interesting when observing the way Republika.co.id develops a critical framing of Israel. This media demonstrates, what we are familiar with, “vernacular or banal globalism” (Szerszynski & Urry, 2002, p. 466) – a way to express universal humanitarian concerns through a cultural and political framework, specifically Indonesian-Islamic. Criticism of Israel’s actions is not simply a reflection of religious bias, but an articulation of global solidarity rooted in the local experiences of Indonesian Muslim communities.

Meanwhile, CNN.com displays different characteristics in an era referred to as “deep mediatization.” As a media outlet operating in a global network, CNN must balance the American institutional perspective with the global complexities faced by its audiences spread across the globe. CNN’s framing reflects what researchers call “banal globalism” (Szerszynski & Urry, 2002, p. 466) – a global consciousness that remains filtered through a distinctly American institutional lens.

Al Jazeera.com demonstrates the most interesting dynamics in the context of cosmopolitanism. This media outlet successfully articulates a universal human rights discourse through the framework of specific Arab cultural and political experiences. The strong criticism of Israel and the emphasis on humanitarian crises are not simply regional biases, but they may be manifestations of global solidarity that grows out of the specific historical and cultural experiences of the Arab world.

This difference in framing cannot be well understood through traditional hierarchical models that view influence as a linear flow from the individual to the ideological level. Instead, we need to understand each media as a complex “assemblage” consisting of various interacting elements (Nail, 2017): digital technologies, distribution networks, professional journalistic norms, cultural narratives, ideological positions, emotional connections with audiences, solidarity networks, identity formations, revenue models, advertiser relationships, and market positions. Kompas.id, for example, cannot be understood simply as a product of the “organizational level” or “media ideology.” Its neutral framing emerges from a complex assemblage that includes Indonesia’s non-aligned foreign policy tradition, Pancasila ideology, commercial considerations, professional journalism standards, diverse audience expectations, and Indonesia’s position in the international system. All of these elements interact dynamically to produce a distinctive perspective.

In the context of fluid modernity described by Bauman (2017, p. 6), meaning is no longer stable and flows across traditional boundaries. Each media represents a different “mediascape,” carrying a flow of meaning shaped by local “ideoscapes” but interacting in global networks (Appadurai, 2016, p. 35). Republika.co.id, in this case, demonstrates what can be called “global resistance” using global humanitarian discourse to articulate the specific perspectives of Indonesian Muslims on the Middle East conflict.

This demonstrates the need to consider communication from a decolonial perspective. Indonesian media do not merely accept or reject ideas from the West or the Arab world but develop their own ways of thinking based on what they go through. It is a way of thinking that brings together Indonesian, Islamic, and global humanitarian traditions. It shows that media framing is not caused by fixed, top-down influences, but by the way different elements interact and change over time. These days, the process becomes more complicated due to platform algorithms, audience data, social media, and real-time news updates.

Therefore, we should create a “post-Western media theory”. It is important to understand that media from the Global South develop their own approaches to understanding and presenting global matters, as Martin-Barbero (2020) suggested, rather than just copying Western models that reflect the many different ways of thinking in the global media system. The findings of this analysis have a wide range of effects. Besides, journalists and editors should be aware of their own way of knowing and develop journalistic methods that allow for many perspectives without becoming relativistic. Readers should see media literacy as a strong force to handle different types of media and ideas, not only as the skill to spot bias.

This analysis points out to policymakers that the relationship between media, public opinion, and public diplomacy is not simple in the current global information era. Knowing how media assemble meaning can assist in creating better communication strategies for use in different countries. This way of thinking allows researchers to create new methods for studying media that are fluid, networked, and made up of assemblages. Further studies should examine the effects of AI and digital tools on media, the ways audiences help create meaning, and the way global matters, such as climate change, lead to new types of journalism for the world.

CONCLUSION

Policymakers should recognize that media framing significantly influences public opinion and foreign policy options in democratic societies. Therefore, they can present more effective public diplomacy strategies, particularly for middle powers like Indonesia that seek to contribute to international dialogue. It is useful when leaders need to respond to international crises that require the backing of the public. Besides, learning about media is also important for us to understand the many “mediascapes” that affect our view of global happenings. Knowing how outlets create meaning allows readers to better understand international news and notice

the cultural and political factors that affect reporting. The study points out that reading from a variety of geographical and ideological sources allows us to fully understand complex global issues.

Republika.co.id demonstrates the crossing line between Islamic solidarity and Indonesian journalism, revealing how faith-based media balance their faith and their work as reporters. CNN.com appeared to offer the most balanced news. It highlights the impact of regional factors and shows different viewpoints while keeping a professional approach. The emphasis on diplomacy demonstrates the way Western media manage their national interests and their role in the world. Aljazeera.com takes the most critical approach, highlighting the humanitarian impact and describing Israeli actions as against international law. The focus on protecting civilians in reporting conflicts reflects the way Arab media use history and regional unity. Even so, this study has a few limitations for further improvement. Focusing on four outlets cannot capture the full spectrum of global coverage, and the short timeframe may miss longer-term patterns in international reporting. Future research should incorporate audience studies to understand the influence of different framings on public opinion and examine multiple conflicts to identify broad patterns in international journalism.

REFERENCES

- Almahallawi, W., & Zanuiddin, H. (2018). 50 days of war on innocent civilian: Ma'an news agency coverage of Israeli and Palestinian conflict. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7(4.9), 145–150. <https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i4.9.20635>
- Alvian, R. A., Putri, G. C., & Ardhani, I. (2017). Haluan baru politik luar negeri Indonesia: perbandingan diplomasi 'middle power' Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono dan Joko Widodo. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.18196/hi.62110>
- Amaireh, H. A. (2024). A critical discourse analysis of Al Jazeera's reporting of the 2021 Israel-Palestine crisis. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, 24(1), 21–40. <https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes.v24i1.559>
- Appadurai, A. (2016). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Ardèvol-Abreu, A. (2015). Framing theory in communication research. Origins, development and current situation in Spain. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, 70, 423–450. <https://doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2015-1053>
- Bauman, Z. (2017). *Liquid modernity* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Bhabha, H. K. (2020). *The location of culture* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Bhowmik, S., & Fisher, J. (2023). Framing the Israel-Palestine conflict 2021: Investigation of CNN's coverage from a peace journalism perspective. *Media, Culture & Society*, 45(5), 1019–1035. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437231154766>
- Brata, T. A., Sudarmanto, E., Lubis, A. F., & Hasibuan, K. (2023). Pengaruh resolusi Majelis Umum PBB terhadap perlindungan hak asasi manusia dalam konflik Gaza. *Jurnal Hukum Dan HAM Wara Sains*, 2(11), 1047–1056. <https://doi.org/10.58812/jhhws.v2i11.795>
- Brüggemann, M. (2014). Between frame setting and frame sending: How journalists contribute to news frames. *Communication Theory*, 24(1), 61–82. <https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12027>
- Cozma, R., & Kozman, C. (2017). The Syrian crisis in U.S. and Lebanese newspapers: A Cross-national analysis. *International Communication Gazette*, 80(2), 185–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048517727217>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications.
- El-Nawawy, M., & Elmasry, M. H. (2015). Revolution or crisis? Framing the 2011 Tahrir

- Square protests in two pan-Arab satellite news networks. *Journal of Applied Journalism & Media Studies*, 4(2), 239–258. https://doi.org/10.1386/ajms.4.2.239_1
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. <https://fbaum.unc.edu/teaching/articles/J-Communication-1993-Entman.pdf>
- Evans, M. (2010). Framing international conflicts: Media coverage of fighting in the middle east. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 6(2), 209–233.
- Fahmy, S., & Eakin, B. (2013). High drama on the high seas: Peace versus war journalism framing of an Israeli/Palestinian-related incident. *International Communication Gazette*, 76(1), 86–105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/174804851350404>
- Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(1), 1–37. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2780405>
- Golan, G. J. (2013). The gates of op-ed diplomacy: Newspaper framing the 2011 Egyptian revolution. *International Communication Gazette*, 75(4), 359–373. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048513482264>
- Hanief, L., & Ainani, M. (2024). Framing analysis of Israel-Palestine conflict news on online media Detik.com and Republika.co.id. *Kajian Jurnalisme*, 8(1), 86–98. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jkj.v8i1.53602>
- Hanitzsch, T., Hanusch, F., Ramaprasad, J., & Beer, A. S. de. (2019). *Worlds of journalism: Journalistic cultures around the globe*. Columbia University Press.
- Liu, S., Boukes, M., & Swert, K. De. (2022). Strategy framing in the international arena: A cross-national comparative content analysis on the China-Us trade conflict coverage. *Journalism*, 24(5), 976–998. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14648849211052438>
- Lynch, J., & McGoldrick, A. (2007). Peace journalism. In *Handbook of peace and conflict studies* (pp. 248–264). Routledge.
- Martin-Barbero, J. (2020). *Communication, culture and hegemony: From the media to mediations* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Mast, J., & Temmerman, M. (2021). What's (the) news? Reassessing “news values” as a concept and methodology in the digital age. *Journalism Studies*, 22(6), 689–701. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2021.1917445>
- Moon, M. (2018). Manufacturing consent? The role of the international news on the Korean Peninsula. *Global Media and Communication*, 14(3), 265–281. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742766518780176>
- Mor, B. D. (2014). The structure of rhetorical defense in public diplomacy: Israel's social account of the 2010 Turkish flotilla incident. *Media, War & Conflict*, 7(2), 250–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750635214538621>
- Mrisho, D. H., Bulendu, D. E., & Dominic, N. A. (2023). Media literacy: Concept, theoretical explanation, and its importance in the digital age. *East African Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 78–85. <https://doi.org/10.37284/eajass.6.1.1087>
- Mwangi, C. (2018). Media influence on public policy in Kenya: The case of illicit brew consumption. *SAGE Open*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018764245>
- Nail, T. (2017). What is an assemblage? *SubStance*, 46(1), 21–37. <https://substance.org/article/what-is-an-assemblage/>
- Nuraini, F. P., Mulyana, D., & Herawati, M. (2024). Framing analysis of Iran-Israel's 2024 conflict in Kompas.id, Aljazeera.com, and NYTimes.com. *Kajian Jurnalisme*, 8(1), 52–67. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jkj.v8i1.55562>

- Ojala, M., & Pantti, M. (2017). Naturalising 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/10.1177/17427665176944>
- Petersen, K. (2016). Mediating Islam: Representation and Muslim identity. *Journal of Religion & Society, Supplement Series*, 13, 113–123.
- Polizzi, G. (2021). Internet users' utopian/dystopian imaginaries of society in the digital age: theorizing critical digital literacy and civic engagement. *New Media & Society*, 25(6), 1205–1226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444821101860>
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 215–232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02685809000150020>
- Ratna, R. A. K., Abidin, Y., & Kurniawan, D. T. (2023). Keberterimaan media multimodalitas berbasis website dalam perspektif guru: Tinjauan the UTAUT model. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan Dasar: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan Dan Hasil Penelitian*, 9(2), 104–116. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jrpd.v9n2.p104-116>
- Salaverriá, R., Buslón, N., López-Pan, F., León, B., López-Goñi, I., & Erviti, M.-C. (2020). Disinformation in times of pandemic: Typology of hoaxes on Covid-19. *Profesional de La Información*, 29(3), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2020.may.15>
- 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.1460-2466.2006.00326.x>
- Setiawati, S. M. (2024). The role of Indonesian government in Middle East conflict resolution: consistent diplomacy or strategic shifts? *Frontiers in Political Science*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.1304108>
- Sundari, R., Prayuda, R., & Sary, D. V. (2021). Upaya diplomasi pemerintah Indonesia dalam mediasi konflik kemanusiaan di Myanmar. *Jurnal Niara*, 14(1), 177–187. <https://doi.org/10.31849/niara.v14i1.6011>
- Szerszynski, B., & Urry, J. (2002). Cultures of cosmopolitanism. *The Sociological Review*, 50(4), 461–481. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.00>
- Tapsell, R. (2015). Indonesia's media oligarchy and the "Jokowi phenomenon." *Indonesia*, 99, 29–50. <https://doi.org/10.5728/indonesia.99.0029>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2017). How Globo media manipulated the impeachment of Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff. *Discourse & Communication*, 11(2), 199–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481317691>
- Waisbord, S. (2018). Truth is what happens to news: On journalism, fake news, and post-truth. *Journalism Studies*, 19(13), 1866–1878. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2018.1492881>
- Widyasari, F. M., Oktivera, E., & Wirawan, F. W. (2023). Pengaruh terpaaan informasi kesehatan mental terhadap sikap followers di media sosial Instagram. *Jurnal Communio: Jurnal Jurusan Ilmu Komunikasi*, 12(2), 267–281. <https://doi.org/10.35508/jikom.v12i2.9160>
- Wolfsfeld, G. (2017). The role of the media in violent conflicts in the digital age: Israeli and Palestinian leaders' perceptions. *Media, War & Conflict*, 11(1), 107–124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750635217727312>
- Youngblood, S. (2016). *Peace journalism principles and practices: Responsibly reporting conflicts, reconciliation, and solutions*. Routledge.
- Zhang, X., & Hellmueller, L. (2016). Transnational media coverage of the ISIS threat: A global perspective? *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 766–785. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/4468>

