

Comparative analysis of Eastern and Western cultures crisis communication methods within the
Israel-Gaza conflict

By

Emma Patty

B.S., University of Kansas, 2023

A REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Journalism and Mass Communications
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, KS

2025

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Danielle LaGree

Copyright

© Emma Patty 2025

Abstract

This study examines the differences in crisis communication strategies between Eastern and Western media in their coverage of the Israel-Gaza conflict. Using framing theory and Hofstede's cultural dimensions as analytical frameworks, this research explores how victimhood, conflict escalation, and resolution are presented in news narratives. The findings indicate that Eastern media employ highly emotive storytelling, explicit blame attribution, and a focus on immediate crisis impacts, aligning with collectivist cultural values and high uncertainty avoidance tendencies. In contrast, Western media adopt a more analytical and policy-driven approach, integrating diplomatic efforts and expert commentary to provide structured narratives that mitigate uncertainty. These differences in framing have significant implications for global crisis communication, influencing audience perception, public sentiment, and international discourse. This study highlights the need for culturally sensitive media strategies that account for the diverse ways in which different societies interpret and respond to conflict narratives. Future research should explore audience reception to these framing strategies and the role of social media in shaping crisis communication.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Literature Review	1
Cultural Dimensions in Crisis Communication	1
Cultural Variability Theory and Crisis Communication	2
Cultural Comparative Studies on Crisis Communication	3
Framing Theory and Media Coverage of Crises	4
Israel-Gaza Conflict Context	4
Research Questions	5
Methodology	5
Data Collection	6
Coding and Analysis	7
Results	9
Addressing the Research Questions	10
Framing Differences in Media	10
Uncertainty Avoidance in Crisis Tone	10
Tonal Distinctions Between Cultures	11
Discussion	11
Theoretical Perspectives of Findings	11
Implications for Profession	12
Limitations and Future Research Directions	13
Conclusion	17
References	15
Appendix	17

Introduction

The study of crisis communication has revealed that cultural contexts fundamentally shape how crises are managed, communicated, and perceived. Cultural dimensions such as Hofstede's framework and Hall's concept of high- and low-context cultures provide insights into the divergent crisis communication approaches seen globally. In particular, distinctions between Eastern and Western responses have notable implications, influencing how organizations and media respond to crises based on societal norms around individualism, uncertainty avoidance, and power distance. These theories support the importance of tailored crisis communication strategies, where the underlying cultural norms and values must be understood and respected to effectively manage public perception and response.

This review aims to provide a comparative analysis of Eastern and Western crisis communication practices, with a specific focus on the recent Israel-Gaza conflict. It examines how cultural dimensions and framing theory inform media narratives, ultimately shaping public point of view and international perspectives. By investigating this complex relationship between culture and communication, this study seeks to identify the distinctions in crisis messaging and to contribute to a broader understanding of effective communication strategies in culturally diverse settings.

Literature Review

Cultural Dimensions in Crisis Communication

In crisis communication, it is essential to recognize the key role culture plays in shaping both crisis response strategies and public perception (Zhu et al., 2017). Culture influences not only how a crisis is handled but also how the media communicates with society. Hofstede's five cultural dimensions—individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, power distance, and long-term orientation (LTO)—are critical in understanding how responses differ across cultures (Wertz & Kim, 2010).

This distinction is further supported by Hofstede and Bond's (1984) findings on long-term and short-term orientations. In Eastern cultures, a high LTO reflects values such as perseverance and harmony,

shaping crisis responses to emphasize group stability and cohesion. In contrast, the short-term orientation prevalent in the U.S. and other Western countries prioritizes swift resolution and individual accountability (Wertz & Kim, 2010).

Hall (1976) adds another layer by differentiating between high and low-context cultures. High-context cultures, common in Eastern societies, rely on implicit communication and place great emphasis on relationships and hierarchy. In contrast, low-context cultures, typically seen in the West, favor direct and clear communication, influencing how crisis messages are conveyed (Low et al., 2011). These cultural frameworks reveal the contrasting crisis management styles between East and West, where collectivist societies focus on maintaining group harmony, while individualist societies emphasize transparency and accountability.

Cultural Variability Theory and Crisis Communication

Cultural variability theory (CVT) in crisis communication emphasizes the importance of considering cultural differences when developing and implementing crisis communication strategies. This theory recognizes that cultural factors have a clear influence on how people perceive, interpret, and respond to crises (Gudykunst, 1997). It builds on Hofstede's cultural dimensions discussed earlier, such as individualism and collectivism, explaining how different cultures receive and respond to crises. For example, while individualistic cultures, like the U.S., prioritize personal responsibility and direct communication, collectivist cultures, such as Japan, emphasize group responsibility and more indirect communication styles (Barkley, 2020).

CVT highlights that cultural background influences how crises are perceived. A situation deemed critical in one culture may not be viewed the same in another. It also draws attention to the need for cultural sensitivity, encouraging organizations to consider cultural norms, values, and taboos when crafting crisis messages (Gudykunst, 1997). This may require adapting the tone, content, and delivery methods of communications to better resonate with the intended audience.

The theory notes that stakeholder engagement expectations vary across cultures, requiring tailored approaches. By incorporating cultural variability into crisis communication, organizations can minimize misunderstandings and manage crises more effectively across diverse cultural contexts.

Cultural Comparative Studies on Crisis Communication

Cross-cultural studies of crisis communication highlight stark differences between Eastern and Western approaches, often rooted in cultural norms and social values. The situational crisis communication theory (SCCT), commonly applied in Western settings, categorizes crises based on perceived organizational responsibility and aligns response strategies accordingly (Lim, 2020). Western responses, particularly in the United States, prioritize accountability, corrective actions, and apologies when the organization holds responsibility, while they lean towards denial and justification in victim scenarios (Lim, 2020). This framework assumes that transparency and direct acknowledgment are effective in crisis resolution, reflecting Western individualistic and accountability centered ideals.

Conversely, crisis communication strategies in Eastern cultures, particularly in China, Korea, and Japan, are shaped by collectivism, face-saving practices, and relational harmony (Huang et al., 2016). For instance, face-saving is a key consideration; it encourages minimizing public conflict and often involves strategies such as cover-ups, denials, or indirect framing to uphold relational harmony (Chen, 2013). Studies also show that in China, public favor may tilt towards compensation or instructional guidance over apologies, which are sometimes perceived as hollow gestures (Lim, 2020). In addition, the collectivist orientation influences a strong adherence to collective interests, including government agendas, which can prompt organizations to frame crises around broader societal themes, like national prosperity (Huang et al., 2016).

Lim's (2020) comparison between American and South Korean crisis responses further illustrates these differences, with Korean firms employing more miscellaneous responses, blending apologies and corrective actions with denials when facing accusations. Korean organizations may even respond

aggressively in victim scenarios, a stance less common in the U.S., where responses remain largely restrained.

Framing Theory and Media Coverage of Crises

Framing theory helps understand how the media shapes public perception during crises by highlighting certain information while minimizing or omitting other details, effectively creating a lens through which audiences interpret events. The theory, initially articulated by scholars like Heider (1958) and later refined by Iyengar and Kinder (1987) and Pan and Kosicki (1993), contends that media frames not only establish what is salient but also influence how stories are understood and internalized by the public (Choi, 2018). In crisis contexts, research identifies dominant frames such as conflict, economic consequences, human impact, and morality as recurring tools used to shape narrative (Choi, 2018).

An and Gower's (2009) content analysis of crisis news suggests that the "attribution of responsibility" frame is prominent, especially in cases where intentional actions led to the crisis, with economic and conflict frames often closely following. For example, they note that preventable crises, such as corporate recalls, frequently employ the economic frame to reinforce organizational accountability, while individual responsibility is emphasized in cases perceived as accidental or due to personal errors (An & Gower, 2009).

Similarly, studies on health crises, such as Ogbodo et al.'s (2020) research on COVID-19 media framing, demonstrate that fear and human-interest frames can amplify public anxiety, potentially impacting mental health and response behaviors. Here, the framing of health crises serves not only as an information channel but also as an influence on public attitude, indicating the dual responsibility of the media to inform and carefully frame messages during crises.

Israel-Gaza Conflict

The Israel-Gaza conflict goes all the way back to the early 20th century amid escalating tension between Jewish and Arab populations in Palestine. Over the years, a deep-rooted division has persisted,

with numerous clashes between Israel and Palestinian factions. Hamas, an Islamist militant group controlling Gaza, has frequently been involved in hostilities with Israel, launching rockets into Israeli territories, to which Israel has responded with extensive military operations. The most recent escalation began on October 7, 2023, when Hamas launched a large-scale attack on Israel, resulting in the deaths of over 1,300 Israelis and the abduction of numerous civilians. Israel, in turn, initiated a massive offensive in Gaza, enforcing a siege and later launching a ground invasion. This retaliation has led to a severe humanitarian crisis in Gaza, with widespread casualties, infrastructure destruction, and severe shortages of essentials such as food, water, and medical supplies (Council on Foreign Affairs, 2024).

Global media outlets have adopted varied tones in covering the conflict, often reflecting regional biases. Western outlets generally emphasize Israel's right to defense against terrorism, while also highlighting the plight of Palestinian civilians under siege, leading to complex and sometimes polarized views among American audiences. Coverage in the United States has shown generational and partisan divides: many younger Americans and Democrats advocate for reduced military support to Israel and increased diplomatic efforts, whereas conservative and older groups generally support Israel's military responses (The Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 2024).

Meanwhile, media in many Eastern nations, including China and India, tend to focus more on humanitarian impacts and often present a neutral or pro-Palestinian stance. These outlets frequently criticize Western support for Israel and call for international pressure to prevent civilian casualties and encourage diplomatic resolution. This global media response reveals how methods of crisis communications differ while reporting on the same crisis (Council on Foreign Affairs, 2024).

Research Questions

RQ1: How is the Israel-Gaza conflict framed differently in Eastern and Western media outlets in terms of victimhood, conflict escalation, and resolution?

RQ2: How do uncertainty avoidance tendencies in Eastern vs. Western cultures affect the tone of crisis communication, particularly regarding assurances and promises of resolution?

RQ3: How does the tone of crisis communication in media coverage differ between Eastern and Western cultures when addressing the Israel-Gaza conflict?

Methodology

This study will use qualitative content analysis to examine how media outlets in Western and Eastern hemispheres differ in their crisis communication methods regarding the Israel-Gaza conflict. Qualitative content analysis is an appropriate methodology for this research as it allows for structured examination of news articles to identify themes, patterns, and latent content. The entirety of the articles—including headlines and subheadlines—will be examined to collect data. This approach aligns well with our research questions, which seek to uncover differences in framing, cultural tendencies, and communication tone between Eastern and Western media coverage.

Data Collection

To identify and analyze relevant media narratives, this study will utilize the media monitoring platform Muck Rack to collect news articles from high-engaging publishing companies in both Western and Eastern hemispheres. The article selection will focus on a time frame spanning October 2023 to December 2023. For each month, the article with the highest engagement published by a Western news outlet and the highest reach article from an Eastern news outlet will be selected. This approach will yield a total of six articles, ensuring a focused and comparative analysis of prominent crisis communication strategies across cultural contexts. This longitudinal approach will allow us to capture the evolution of crisis communication strategies over time.

Muck Rack articles were selected by first applying the "keyword" filter, using "Israel-Gaza conflict" to narrow the search. The results were then refined by filtering for media types classified specifically as "articles." Next, the "verified" filter was applied to ensure credibility. A date range filter was used, adjusting based on the specific month under review. Additionally, a location filter was applied to distinguish between articles from Eastern and Western countries.

Despite these filters, the search still yielded tens of thousands of articles. To further refine the selection, the "prominence" filter was used to prioritize articles based on the frequency of search terms within the content. After generating a coverage report, the articles were sorted by engagement, ranking them from highest to lowest. Finally, the top articles from October, November, and December were selected from both Eastern and Western media outlets for further analysis.

To address our research questions effectively, we will employ a prominence-based purposive sampling technique. This non-probability sampling method is designed to prioritize articles from high-reach, well-read publications and renowned publishers, ensuring that our analysis captures the most influential and widely disseminated media narratives surrounding the Israel-Gaza conflict.

Coding and Analysis

A coding scheme will be developed based on our research questions, focusing on the following key areas:

1. Framing of victimhood, conflict escalation, and resolution
2. Uncertainty avoidance tendencies in crisis communication
3. Tone of communication (e.g., assurances, promises of resolution)
4. Political orientation/context
5. Sources of information/actors

The coding process will involve both manifest and latent content analysis. Manifest content analysis will focus on explicit mentions of key terms and phrases related to our research questions. Latent content analysis will examine underlying meanings and contextual nuances in the articles.

Here is the coding scheme used to analyze the articles:

1. Framing of Victimhood, Conflict Escalation, and Resolution

- **Victimhood:**
 - *Explicit victim labels:* (e.g., referring to individuals as "victims," "survivors," or "casualties")
 - *Representation of suffering:* (e.g., descriptions of injuries, displacement, or emotional trauma)
 - *Attribution of blame:* (e.g., assigning responsibility to specific groups or individuals for the suffering)
- **Conflict Escalation:**
 - *Use of aggressive vs. neutral terminology:* (e.g., "attack" vs. "incident"; "massacre" vs. "clash")
 - *Emphasis on historical context vs. immediate events:* (e.g., providing background on longstanding issues vs. focusing solely on recent developments)
 - *References to international interventions:* (e.g., mentions of UN resolutions, peacekeeping missions, or foreign aid)
- **Resolution:**
 - *Calls for peace or military action:* (e.g., advocating for ceasefires, negotiations, or increased military presence)
 - *Role of diplomatic efforts:* (e.g., highlighting peace talks, mediations, or international summits)
 - *Use of hopeful vs. pessimistic tone regarding conflict resolution:* (e.g., optimistic language about potential agreements vs. skepticism about lasting peace)

2. Uncertainty Avoidance in Crisis Communication

- **Assurances and Promises of Resolution:**
 - *Definitive vs. cautious language:* (e.g., "will result in peace" vs. "may lead to a resolution")
 - *Speculative vs. conclusive statements:* (e.g., "it is possible that..." vs. "studies confirm that...")
 - *Expert analysis or official statements reinforcing certainty:* (e.g., citing authorities or experts to support claims)
- **Emphasis on Stability vs. Uncertainty:**
 - *Level of reassurance provided to the audience:* (e.g., emphasizing safety measures vs. highlighting potential risks)
 - *Focus on long-term vs. short-term solutions:* (e.g., discussing sustainable policies vs. immediate relief efforts)

3. Tone of Communication

- **Emotional vs. Neutral Tone:**
 - *Presence of emotive words:* (e.g., "devastating loss" vs. "significant decrease")
 - *Use of neutral vs. sensationalized descriptions:* (e.g., "the event resulted in casualties" vs. "the horrific tragedy claimed countless lives")
 - *Subjective vs. objective reporting styles:* (e.g., including personal opinions vs. sticking to factual reporting)
- **Responsibility Framing:**
 - *Use of passive vs. active voice when discussing responsibility:* (e.g., "mistakes were made" vs. "the committee made mistakes")
 - *Attribution of responsibility to specific groups or nations:* (e.g., "the government failed to act" vs. "there was a failure to act")

4. Political Orientation & Context

- **Identification of political bias:**
 - *Alignment with official government narratives vs. alternative perspectives:* (e.g., supporting governmental policies vs. presenting dissenting viewpoints)

- *Use of ideological framing*: (e.g., portraying events through a capitalist vs. socialist lens)

5. Sources of Information & Actors

- **Inclusion of government statements vs. independent sources:**
 - *Presence of eyewitness accounts vs. official press releases*: (e.g., testimonies from locals vs. statements from authorities)
 - *Use of international vs. local media citations*: (e.g., referencing global news outlets vs. regional newspapers)
 - *Reliance on expert analysis vs. emotional testimonies*: (e.g., quoting scholars vs. sharing personal stories)

Manifest vs. Latent Content Analysis

- **Manifest Analysis:**
 - *Identifying explicit mentions of key terms, phrases, and statements*: (e.g., counting occurrences of specific words like "terrorist" or "freedom fighter")
- **Latent Analysis:**
 - *Evaluating underlying meanings, contextual nuances, and implicit messaging*: (e.g., analyzing the portrayal of a group as "oppressed" to infer bias)

Results

The findings of this qualitative analysis call attention to key differences between Eastern and Western media in their crisis communication strategies regarding the Israel-Gaza conflict. Eastern media predominantly frame victimhood through sensitive storytelling, often using explicit labels, personal narratives, and direct attribution of blame, while focusing on immediate suffering rather than long-term resolution. Conflict escalation is framed aggressively, with heightened language and limited historical context. Resolution efforts receive little emphasis, and diplomatic interventions are rarely highlighted.

Contrary to Eastern media, Western media employ a more balanced or neutral approach, integrating political analysis and international diplomatic responses. While victimhood is acknowledged, reports are more likely to frame the crisis through carefully examining the issue rather than making emotional appeals. Uncertainty avoidance tendencies are seen, as Eastern media remain focused on immediate crisis impacts, whereas Western media incorporate expert opinions and governmental statements to provide cautious assurances about potential resolutions.

These results show how cultural values shape crisis communication, with Eastern media prioritizing emotional engagement and Western media favoring strategic, policy driven narratives. These

differences have major implications for global public perception of the conflict, influencing how audiences interpret responsibility, escalation, and potential pathways to resolution.

Addressing the Research Questions

RQ1: How is the Israel-Gaza conflict framed differently in Eastern and Western Media outlets in terms of victimhood, conflict escalation, and resolution?

Eastern media predominantly emphasize victimhood through emotional storytelling, explicit labels, and graphic depictions of suffering, often assigning direct blame to specific actors. The use of heightened language reinforces a narrative of injustice. In contrast, Western media take a more analytical approach, incorporating calculated and diplomatic considerations. While Western outlets also acknowledge suffering, they often frame it within the context of political decisions and military strategy. Conflict escalation is covered more aggressively in Eastern media, while Western media balance escalation narratives with historical background and diplomatic responses. Resolution is a minor focus in Eastern media, whereas Western media are more likely to highlight international mediation efforts.

RQ2: How do uncertainty avoidance tendencies in Eastern vs. Western cultures affect the tone of crisis communication, particularly regarding assurances and promises of resolution?

Uncertainty avoidance plays a clear role in shaping the tone of crisis coverage. Eastern media, which generally exhibit higher uncertainty avoidance, focus on immediate suffering and avoid making definitive predictions about resolution. Their coverage tends to reinforce fear and urgency, often portraying the crisis as an ongoing catastrophe with no clear end in sight. In contrast, Western media attempt to mitigate uncertainty by citing expert opinions, government statements, and diplomatic negotiations. Although they do not provide definitive solutions, they frame the crisis within a structured narrative that suggests potential pathways forward. This aligns with Western cultures' preference for measured, policy-driven crisis communication.

RQ3: How does the tone of crisis communication in media coverage differ between Eastern and Western cultures when addressing the Israel-Gaza conflict?

Tone serves as a key differentiator between Eastern and Western crisis communication. Eastern media adopt a highly emotive tone, using vivid descriptions, direct blame attribution, and a focus on personal tragedies to engage audiences. This aligns with collectivist cultural values, where shared emotional experiences foster group cohesion. In contrast, Western media maintain a more neutral or diplomatic tone, adhering to journalistic objectivity. Their narratives emphasize political consequences, policy discussions, and strategic military actions rather than solely focusing on emotional impact. The difference in tone affects how audiences interpret the crisis, with Eastern media fostering heightened emotional engagement and Western media encouraging analytical discourse.

Discussion

The results of this study reveal differences in how Eastern and Western media outlets frame the Israel-Gaza Conflict, reflecting broader cultural values in crisis communication. These variations align with Hofstede's framework and Hall high and low-context communication styles. By analyzing media narratives through the lens of the framing theory and uncertainty avoidance tendencies, this study provides insights into the ways crisis communication differs across cultural contexts.

Theoretical Perspectives of Findings

The findings align with Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory, particularly in the areas of individual-collectivism and uncertainty avoidance. Eastern media, which originate from more collectivist societies, emphasize shared suffering and direct blame, reinforcing a sense of group solidarity. Western media, rooted in more individualistic cultures, present narratives that prioritize institutional accountability and diplomatic processes. The presence of strong uncertainty avoidance in Eastern media manifests in a

tendency to focus on the immediate crisis rather than potential resolutions, while Western media attempt to mitigate uncertainty by integrating expert analysis and structures narratives.

Also, framing theory helps explain how these differences shape audience perception. Eastern media's emotional framing engages audiences by evoking sympathy and outrage, which can mobilize public sentiment but also contribute to heightened polarization. Western media's use of strategic framing provides context for policy decisions but may downplay the human cost of the conflict, leading to a perception of detachment. These contrasting approaches demonstrate how media outlets shape not only public understanding of a crisis but also international political discourse.

The findings support Hofstede's cultural dimensions, particularly individualism vs. collectivism and uncertainty avoidance, and framing theory, but they also expose tensions and limitations within these frameworks. While Hofstede categorizes Western cultures like the United States as individualistic and more emotionally detached in communication, my personal observations complicate that assumption. In domestic contexts, Americans often engage in highly emotional and activist-driven responses to social issues: attending rallies, advocating on social media, and forming personal connections to causes. However, U.S. media coverage of the Israel-Gaza conflict largely lacked that same emotive intensity, instead leaning into strategic, policy-focused reporting. This contrast raises questions about how cultural identity may shift based on context, particularly between domestic and international issues, and whether Hofstede's dimensions fully capture these fluctuations. The finding suggests a potential gap in the theory: while individualism explains the emphasis on autonomy and objectivity in reporting, it may not adequately account for when and why Western cultures choose to emotionally engage with certain crises over others. It challenges the idea that individualistic societies are consistently unemotional in their communication style, indicating that emotionality may be issue-specific rather than culturally constant.

Implications for Profession

These results show the importance of cultural sensitivity in crisis communication. Organizations, governments, and media outlets crafting crisis messages must recognize how cultural values influence

public perception. Western audiences may expect direct statements, accountability, and structured solutions, whereas Eastern audiences may respond more strongly to narratives that emphasize collective suffering and solidarity. Understanding these differences can help media outlets tailor crisis messages to diverse audiences, ensuring that responses are both culturally appropriate and effective.

The framing of crisis narratives has real world consequences. Sensationalized media coverage can intensify public outrage and deepen polarization, while strategic, diplomatic framing may facilitate more constructive international discourse. The role of media in shaping global perceptions of conflicts like the Israel-Gaza crisis reveals the ethical responsibility of journalists to present balanced, fact-based narratives. Journalism ethics should evolve to include cross-cultural awareness training, especially for international correspondents and editors. Professional standards would benefit from incorporating practices that encourage journalists to question their own cultural lenses. This includes providing newsroom support, workshops, or toolkits that help media personnel analyze how their reporting may be received differently in various regions. Equipping journalists with a deeper understanding of global media expectations can enhance both accuracy and fairness in crisis coverage.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

This study provides helpful insights into cultural differences in crisis communication, it is limited in scope due to its focus on a small sample of high-engagement news articles. Future research should expand the dataset to include a broader range of media outlets, including smaller, independent sources. Also, studies could examine how audiences in Eastern and Western Cultures react to different crisis communication strategies. Analyzing reader engagement, sentiment, and trust levels could offer further into the impact of media framing.

Another important avenue for research is the role of social media in shaping crisis communications. Digital platforms introduce new dynamics in framing and engagement, often amplifying emotional narratives or providing alternative perspectives that challenge mainstream coverage.

Understanding how social media interacts with traditional media coverage could provide a more holistic view of crisis communication.

Future research could also expand the sample size and include more diverse media sources beyond high-engagement articles from well-known outlets. This would allow for a richer comparison that considers the impact of independent or alternative journalism. In addition, studies should incorporate visual content analysis, examining the role of photographs and video stills accompanying high-engagement crisis stories. Since emotional reactions are often shaped by images just as much as text, researchers could explore how visual elements influence perception, public engagement, or the tone of reader comments.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that crisis communication strategies in Eastern and Western media differ greatly due to cultural values, framing techniques, and uncertainty avoidance tendencies. Eastern media prioritize emotional engagements, direct blame, and immediate crisis impact, while Western media favor political analysis, structured narratives, and highlight the need for culturally informed crisis communication strategies. By integrating cultural and framing theories, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of how media shape global perceptions of conflict. Recognizing these distinctions is crucial for journalists, policymakers, and crisis communicators seeking to navigate international crises with cultural awareness and ethical responsibility.

Reference List

- An, S. K., & Gower, K. K. (2009). How do the news media frame crises? A content analysis of crisis news coverage. *Public relations review*, 35(2), 107-112.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.01.010>
- Barkley, K. (2020). Does one size fit all? The applicability of situational crisis communication theory in the Japanese context. *Public Relations Review*, 46(3), 101911-.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2020.101911>
- Chen, Z. (2013). How publics in the United States and China respond to crisis communication strategies via social media: A cross-cultural comparative study (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia). https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/chen_zifei_201308_ma.pdf
- Choi, J. (2018). A framing analysis of the representation of the BP crisis in American newspapers: How do American news media frame the BP crisis?. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 18(4), e1691.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.1691>
- Falkheimer, J. and Heide, M. (2006), Multicultural Crisis Communication: Towards a Social Constructionist Perspective. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 14: 180-189.
<https://doi-org.er.lib.k-state.edu/10.1111/j.1468-5973.2006.00494.x>
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1997). Cultural variability in communication: An introduction. *Communication research*, 24(4), 327-348. <https://doi-org.er.lib.k-state.edu/10.1177/009365097024004001>
- Huang, Y. H. C., Wu, F., & Cheng, Y. (2016). Crisis communication in context: Cultural and political influences underpinning Chinese public relations practice. *Public Relations Review*, 42(1), 201-213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2015.11.015>
- Israeli-Palestinian Conflict | Global Conflict Tracker*. (n.d.). Global Conflict Tracker.
<https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/israeli-palestinian-conflict>
- Lim, J. R. (2020). How Organizations in Different Cultures Respond to Crises: Content Analysis of Crisis Responses between the United States and South Korea. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 14(4), 294–316.
<https://doi-org.er.lib.k-state.edu/10.1080/1553118X.2020.1812613>
- Low, Y. S., Varughese, J., & Pang, A. (2011). Communicating crisis: How culture influences image repair in western and asian governments. *Corporate Communications*, 16(3), 218-242.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1108/13563281111156880>
- Luo, H., & Ling, Q. (2023). A Study Media Coverage of College Crisis under Framing Theory. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 155, p. 01022). EDP Sciences.
<https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202315501022>

- Ogbodo, J. N., Onwe, E. C., Chukwu, J., Nwasum, C. J., Nwakpu, E. S., Nwankwo, S. U., ... & Ogbaeja, N. I. (2020). Communicating health crisis: a content analysis of global media framing of COVID-19. *Health promotion perspectives*, 10(3), 257. doi: [10.34172/hpp.2020.40](https://doi.org/10.34172/hpp.2020.40)
- Shell, D. S. E. B. R. R. (2024). Israel's war in Gaza: partisan, racial, and generational views on the US role in the conflict. Chicago Council on Global Affairs.
<https://globalaffairs.org/research/public-opinion-survey/israels-war-gaza-partisan-racial-and-generational-views-us-role>
- Wertz, E. K., & Kim, S. (2010). Cultural issues in crisis communication: A comparative study of messages chosen by south korean and US print media. *Journal of Communication Management*, 14(1), 81-94. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1108/13632541011017825>
- Zhu, Deepa Anagondahalli, Ai Zhang, (2017) Social media and culture in crisis communication: McDonald's and KFC crises management in China, *Public Relations Review*, Volume 43, Issue 3, 2017, Pages 487-492, ISSN 0363-8111, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.03.006>

Appendix

Eastern Culture Articles

Appendix A

October - Republic World - *'Being kidnapped was worse': Father recounts relief after news of daughter's murder by Hamas*

1. Framing of Victimhood, Conflict Escalation, and Resolution

- **Victimhood:**
 - *Explicit victim labels:* The article refers to the 8-year-old girl as a "victim" and mentions "innocent civilians" affected by the attacks.
 - *Representation of suffering:* It includes the father's emotional testimony and describes his tearful reaction.
 - *Attribution of blame:* The blame is directly assigned to "Hamas terrorists" for the killings.
- **Conflict Escalation:**
 - *Use of aggressive vs. neutral terminology:* Terms like "massacre" and "terrorists" are used to describe the events and perpetrators.
 - *Emphasis on historical context vs. immediate events:* The focus is on the immediate events of October 7, with limited historical context.
 - *References to international interventions:* There is no mention of international interventions or mediators.
- **Resolution:**
 - *Calls for peace or military action:* The article does not discuss calls for peace or military action.
 - *Role of diplomatic efforts:* Diplomatic efforts are not mentioned.
 - *Use of hopeful vs. pessimistic tone regarding conflict resolution:* The tone is somber, focusing on personal loss without addressing conflict resolution.

2. Uncertainty Avoidance in Crisis Communication

- **Assurances and Promises of Resolution:**
 - *Definitive vs. cautious language:* The article does not provide assurances or promises of resolution.
 - *Speculative vs. conclusive statements:* It avoids speculative statements, focusing on confirmed events.
 - *Expert analysis or official statements reinforcing certainty:* Official statements are included, such as the Israel Defense Forces' casualty updates.
- **Emphasis on Stability vs. Uncertainty:**
 - *Level of reassurance provided to the audience:* The article does not offer reassurance, highlighting the father's grief and the tragic events.

- *Focus on long-term vs. short-term solutions*: There is no discussion of solutions, either long-term or short-term.

3. Tone of Communication

- **Emotional vs. Neutral Tone:**
 - *Presence of emotive words*: Words like "heart-breaking" and descriptions of the father's tears convey an emotional tone.
 - *Use of neutral vs. sensationalized descriptions*: The article leans towards sensationalized descriptions to evoke empathy.
 - *Subjective vs. objective reporting styles*: The reporting is subjective, focusing on personal tragedy.
- **Responsibility Framing:**
 - *Use of passive vs. active voice when discussing responsibility*: Active voice is used, e.g., " Hamas terrorists... killed more than 1200 people."
 - *Attribution of responsibility to specific groups or nations*: Responsibility is attributed to Hamas.

4. Political Orientation & Context

- **Identification of political bias:**
 - *Alignment with official government narratives vs. alternative perspectives*: The article aligns with official Israeli narratives, lacking alternative perspectives.
 - *Use of ideological framing*: The framing is pro-Israel, portraying Hamas negatively.

5. Sources of Information & Actors

- **Inclusion of government statements vs. independent sources:**
 - *Presence of eyewitness accounts vs. official press releases*: The article includes the father's personal testimony and official statements from Israeli authorities.
 - *Use of international vs. local media citations*: It references an interview with CNN and a video posted by the official Israeli account on X (formerly Twitter).
 - *Reliance on expert analysis vs. emotional testimonies*: The narrative relies on emotional testimonies and official casualty figures.

Manifest vs. Latent Content Analysis

- **Manifest Analysis:**
 - *Identifying explicit mentions of key terms, phrases, and statements*: The article explicitly mentions the father's grief, the daughter's death, and attributes blame to Hamas.
- **Latent Analysis:**
 - *Evaluating underlying meanings, contextual nuances, and implicit messaging*: Implicitly, the article reinforces a narrative of Israeli victimhood and Hamas aggression, aiming to elicit empathy and support for Israel.

Appendix B

November - Republic World - *Israel's PM Benjamin Netanyahu, war cabinet meets with US Secretary of State Blinken*

1. Framing of Victimhood, Conflict Escalation, and Resolution

- **Victimhood:**
 - *Explicit victim labels:* The article refers to a "deadly terror attack in Jerusalem," implying victimhood but not specifying individuals.
 - *Representation of suffering:* It mentions the "endless war" and the plight of hostages, indicating ongoing suffering.
 - *Attribution of blame:* The term "terror attack" suggests blame on the perpetrators, presumably Hamas, though not explicitly stated.
- **Conflict Escalation:**
 - *Use of aggressive vs. neutral terminology:* Terms like "deadly terror attack" and "endless war" are used, indicating an aggressive tone.
 - *Emphasis on historical context vs. immediate events:* The focus is on immediate events, with limited historical context provided.
 - *References to international interventions:* The article discusses US involvement, mentioning Secretary Blinken's meetings and efforts to extend pauses in the conflict.
- **Resolution:**
 - *Calls for peace or military action:* Netanyahu emphasizes resuming military operations "in full force" after hostage releases, indicating a preference for military action.
 - *Role of diplomatic efforts:* The article highlights diplomatic engagements, including Blinken's meetings with Israeli officials and plans to visit Ramallah.
 - *Use of hopeful vs. pessimistic tone regarding conflict resolution:* The tone is cautiously optimistic, noting efforts to extend pauses and facilitate hostage releases.

2. Uncertainty Avoidance in Crisis Communication

- **Assurances and Promises of Resolution:**
 - *Definitive vs. cautious language:* Netanyahu provides definitive statements about resuming military action, while Blinken expresses a desire to extend pauses, indicating cautious optimism.
 - *Speculative vs. conclusive statements:* Blinken's statements are more speculative, aiming for extended pauses, whereas Netanyahu's are conclusive regarding military plans.
 - *Expert analysis or official statements reinforcing certainty:* The article relies on official statements from Netanyahu and Blinken to convey positions.
- **Emphasis on Stability vs. Uncertainty:**
 - *Level of reassurance provided to the audience:* Netanyahu's statements aim to reassure about military resolve, while Blinken's efforts suggest attempts to stabilize through diplomacy.

- *Focus on long-term vs. short-term solutions*: The focus is on short-term actions, such as hostage releases and immediate military operations, with less emphasis on long-term solutions.

3. Tone of Communication

- **Emotional vs. Neutral Tone:**
 - *Presence of emotive words*: Phrases like "deadly terror attack" and "endless war" add an emotional tone.
 - *Use of neutral vs. sensationalized descriptions*: The article balances between neutral reporting and sensationalized language when describing events.
 - *Subjective vs. objective reporting styles*: The reporting is primarily objective, though certain word choices introduce subjectivity.
- **Responsibility Framing:**
 - *Use of passive vs. active voice when discussing responsibility*: The article uses active voice, e.g., "Netanyahu clarified that IDF will resume its military operation."
 - *Attribution of responsibility to specific groups or nations*: Responsibility is attributed to Israeli leadership and US officials for their respective actions.

4. Political Orientation & Context

- **Identification of political bias:**
 - *Alignment with official government narratives vs. alternative perspectives*: The article aligns with official Israeli and US government narratives, lacking alternative perspectives.
 - *Use of ideological framing*: The framing supports Israeli government positions, particularly regarding military actions against Hamas.

5. Sources of Information & Actors

- **Inclusion of government statements vs. independent sources:**
 - *Presence of eyewitness accounts vs. official press releases*: The article relies on official statements from Netanyahu and Blinken, without eyewitness accounts.
 - *Use of international vs. local media citations*: It references statements from US and Israeli officials, indicating international and local sources.
 - *Reliance on expert analysis vs. emotional testimonies*: The narrative depends on official statements rather than expert analysis or emotional testimonies.

Manifest vs. Latent Content Analysis

- **Manifest Analysis:**
 - *Identifying explicit mentions of key terms, phrases, and statements*: The article explicitly mentions meetings between Netanyahu and Blinken, discussions on hostage releases, and plans for military operations.
- **Latent Analysis:**

- *Evaluating underlying meanings, contextual nuances, and implicit messaging:* Implicitly, the article implies that there is close coordination between the US and Israel, the prioritization of military solutions by Israeli leadership, and the cautious diplomatic approach of the US.

Appendix C

December - Republic World - *Israel moves into Gaza's second-largest city, intensifies strikes in bloody new phase of war*

1. Framing of Victimhood, Conflict Escalation, and Resolution

- **Victimhood:**
 - *Explicit victim labels:* The article refers to "wounded and dead Palestinians, including children," highlighting civilian casualties.
 - *Representation of suffering:* It describes scenes of destruction, such as "women screaming from an upper floor of a house shattered to a concrete shell" and medics attempting to resuscitate children, emphasizing the human cost.
 - *Attribution of blame:* The narrative attributes the suffering to Israeli military actions, noting intensified bombardment and ground offensives.
- **Conflict Escalation:**
 - *Use of aggressive vs. neutral terminology:* Phrases like "bloody new phase of the war" and "most intense day of battles" convey the severity of the conflict.
 - *Emphasis on historical context vs. immediate events:* The article focuses on immediate events, with brief references to the October 7 attack by Hamas as context.
 - *References to international interventions:* It mentions U.S. pressure on Israel to prevent further mass casualties, indicating international concern.
- **Resolution:**
 - *Calls for peace or military action:* The article does not explicitly call for peace or military action but reports on Israel's stated goal to dismantle Hamas' military infrastructure.
 - *Role of diplomatic efforts:* Diplomatic efforts are implied through the mention of U.S. pressure on Israel, but details are limited.
 - *Use of hopeful vs. pessimistic tone regarding conflict resolution:* The tone is pessimistic, emphasizing ongoing violence and humanitarian crises without suggesting imminent resolution.

2. Uncertainty Avoidance in Crisis Communication

- **Assurances and Promises of Resolution:**
 - *Definitive vs. cautious language:* The article presents definitive statements about military actions but offers no assurances of resolution.
 - *Speculative vs. conclusive statements:* Statements are conclusive regarding current events but do not speculate on future outcomes.

- *Expert analysis or official statements reinforcing certainty*: The article cites military officials and the Health Ministry for information, providing an official perspective.
- **Emphasis on Stability vs. Uncertainty**:
 - *Level of reassurance provided to the audience*: Little reassurance is provided; the focus is on the escalation and its consequences.
 - *Focus on long-term vs. short-term solutions*: The emphasis is on short-term military developments, with no discussion of long-term solutions.

3. Tone of Communication

- **Emotional vs. Neutral Tone**:
 - *Presence of emotive words*: Descriptive language evokes strong emotions, highlighting the tragedy of civilian suffering.
 - *Use of neutral vs. sensationalized descriptions*: While factual, the descriptions are vivid and may be perceived as sensationalized.
 - *Subjective vs. objective reporting styles*: The reporting is primarily objective but includes subjective elements through detailed depictions of suffering.
- **Responsibility Framing**:
 - *Use of passive vs. active voice when discussing responsibility*: Active voice is used, e.g., "Israel said that its troops had entered Gaza's second-largest city."
 - *Attribution of responsibility to specific groups or nations*: Responsibility is attributed to the Israeli military for the offensive and to Hamas for the initial attack.

4. Political Orientation & Context

- **Identification of political bias**:
 - *Alignment with official government narratives vs. alternative perspectives*: The article presents the Israeli military's perspective and casualty figures from the Gaza Health Ministry but lacks alternative viewpoints.
 - *Use of ideological framing*: The framing aligns with official narratives, emphasizing military objectives and humanitarian impacts without delving into political ideologies.

5. Sources of Information & Actors

- **Inclusion of government statements vs. independent sources**:
 - *Presence of eyewitness accounts vs. official press releases*: The article includes descriptions from an Associated Press reporter and official statements from the military and Health Ministry.
 - *Use of international vs. local media citations*: It references international news agencies and local health authorities.
 - *Reliance on expert analysis vs. emotional testimonies*: The narrative relies on official reports and vivid descriptions rather than expert analysis or personal testimonies.

Manifest vs. Latent Content Analysis

- **Manifest Analysis**:

- *Identifying explicit mentions of key terms, phrases, and statements:* The article explicitly mentions military actions, casualty figures, and locations of intensified conflict.
- **Latent Analysis:**
 - *Evaluating underlying meanings, contextual nuances, and implicit messaging:* Implicitly, the article highlights the severity of the conflict and the humanitarian crisis, highlighting the challenges in balancing military objectives with civilian protection.

Western Articles

Appendix D

October - CNN - *Biden warns Israel against occupying Gaza as ground invasion appears near*

1. Framing of Victimhood, Conflict Escalation, and Resolution

- **Victimhood:**
 - *Explicit victim labels:* The article does not prominently feature explicit victim labels such as "innocent civilians" or "martyrs."
 - *Representation of suffering:* There is limited depiction of suffering; the focus remains on political statements and strategic considerations.
 - *Attribution of blame:* The article does not assign explicit blame for the conflict or suffering, maintaining a neutral stance.
- **Conflict Escalation:**
 - *Use of aggressive vs. neutral terminology:* Terms like "ground invasion" and "occupying Gaza" are used, which are neutral descriptions of military actions.
 - *Emphasis on historical context vs. immediate events:* The article centers on immediate events, specifically President Biden's recent statements, with minimal historical context.
 - *References to international interventions:* The piece highlights U.S. involvement, particularly Biden's advisories to Israel, indicating international diplomatic engagement.
- **Resolution:**
 - *Calls for peace or military action:* President Biden advises against Israel occupying Gaza, suggesting it would be a "big mistake," which can be interpreted as a call for restraint.
 - *Role of diplomatic efforts:* Highlights diplomatic efforts, noting Biden's communications with Israeli leadership to influence their military strategy.
 - *Use of hopeful vs. pessimistic tone regarding conflict resolution:* The tone is cautiously optimistic, reflecting Biden's belief in Israel's adherence to the "rules of war" and the possibility of a measured approach.

2. Uncertainty Avoidance in Crisis Communication

- **Assurances and Promises of Resolution:**
 - *Definitive vs. cautious language:* Biden's language is definitive in advising against occupation but cautious regarding outcomes, acknowledging the complexity of the situation.

- *Speculative vs. conclusive statements*: Presents conclusive statements about Biden's position without delving into speculative outcomes.
- *Expert analysis or official statements reinforcing certainty*: The piece relies on official statements from President Biden, providing a sense of authority and certainty.
- **Emphasis on Stability vs. Uncertainty**:
 - *Level of reassurance provided to the audience*: Biden's confidence in Israel acting under the "rules of war" offers reassurance, though the potential for escalation remains implicit.
 - *Focus on long-term vs. short-term solutions*: The focus is on immediate military decisions rather than long-term solutions to the conflict.

3. Tone of Communication

- **Emotional vs. Neutral Tone**:
 - *Presence of emotive words*: Maintains a neutral tone, avoiding emotive language.
 - *Use of neutral vs. sensationalized descriptions*: Descriptions are neutral and factual, adhering to journalistic standards.
 - *Subjective vs. objective reporting styles*: The reporting is objective, presenting information without personal bias.
- **Responsibility Framing**:
 - *Use of passive vs. active voice when discussing responsibility*: Active voice is used, e.g., "Biden said it would be a 'big mistake' for Israel to occupy Gaza."
 - *Attribution of responsibility to specific groups or nations*: The article attributes statements and actions to specific actors, such as President Biden and Israeli officials.

4. Political Orientation & Context

- **Identification of political bias**:
 - *Alignment with official government narratives vs. alternative perspectives*: The article aligns with official U.S. government perspectives, primarily presenting President Biden's viewpoint without alternative perspectives.
 - *Use of ideological framing*: The framing reflects U.S. policy considerations, emphasizing caution against occupation and adherence to international norms.

5. Sources of Information & Actors

- **Inclusion of government statements vs. independent sources**:
 - *Presence of eyewitness accounts vs. official press releases*: The article relies on official statements from President Biden, with no eyewitness accounts.
 - *Use of international vs. local media citations*: The piece does not cite other media sources, focusing solely on the interview content.
 - *Reliance on expert analysis vs. emotional testimonies*: The article is based on official statements, without expert analysis or personal testimonies.

Manifest vs. Latent Content Analysis

- **Manifest Analysis**:

- *Identifying explicit mentions of key terms, phrases, and statements:* The article explicitly mentions President Biden's statements advising against Israel occupying Gaza and his confidence in Israel adhering to the rules of war.
- **Latent Analysis:**
 - *Evaluating underlying meanings, contextual nuances, and implicit messaging:* Implicitly, the article conveys the U.S. administration's caution towards potential escalation and the importance of strategic restraint in military operations.

Appendix E

November - BBC - *Macron calls on Israel to stop killing Gaza's women and babies*

1. Framing of Victimhood, Conflict Escalation, and Resolution

- **Victimhood:**
 - *Explicit victim labels:* The article refers to "Palestinian civilians" and "displaced people," highlighting the impact on non-combatants.
 - *Representation of suffering:* It describes the dire humanitarian situation, mentioning shortages of food, water, and medical supplies, and the displacement of hundreds of thousands of people.
 - *Attribution of blame:* The suffering is linked to the ongoing military actions, with mentions of Israeli airstrikes and ground operations contributing to the crisis.
- **Conflict Escalation:**
 - *Use of aggressive vs. neutral terminology:* Terms like "encircled," "intensified bombardment," and "ground offensive" are used, conveying the severity of military actions.
 - *Emphasis on historical context vs. immediate events:* The article focuses on immediate events, providing updates on the current military situation with limited historical context.
 - *References to international interventions:* It mentions international concerns, including calls for humanitarian pauses and the involvement of the United Nations in addressing the crisis.
- **Resolution:**
 - *Calls for peace or military action:* The article notes international calls for humanitarian pauses to allow aid delivery, indicating a push for temporary cessation of hostilities.
 - *Role of diplomatic efforts:* Diplomatic efforts are highlighted, with references to UN involvement and international appeals for ceasefires to address the humanitarian situation.
 - *Use of hopeful vs. pessimistic tone regarding conflict resolution:* The tone is cautiously optimistic, acknowledging the dire situation while highlighting ongoing diplomatic efforts to alleviate the crisis.

2. Uncertainty Avoidance in Crisis Communication

- **Assurances and Promises of Resolution:**
 - *Definitive vs. cautious language:* The article uses cautious language, reflecting the uncertainty of the situation and the challenges in achieving a resolution.
 - *Speculative vs. conclusive statements:* Statements are presented with caution, avoiding definitive conclusions about the outcome of the conflict.
 - *Expert analysis or official statements reinforcing certainty:* The piece includes statements from officials and international organizations, providing authoritative perspectives on the situation.
- **Emphasis on Stability vs. Uncertainty:**
 - *Level of reassurance provided to the audience:* Limited reassurance is provided, as the article emphasizes the ongoing challenges and uncertainties in the conflict.
 - *Focus on long-term vs. short-term solutions:* The focus is on immediate humanitarian concerns and short-term diplomatic efforts, with less emphasis on long-term solutions.

3. Tone of Communication

- **Emotional vs. Neutral Tone:**
 - *Presence of emotive words:* The article maintains a neutral tone, providing factual reporting without emotive language.
 - *Use of neutral vs. sensationalized descriptions:* Descriptions are neutral and objective, adhering to journalistic standards.
 - *Subjective vs. objective reporting styles:* The reporting is objective, presenting information without personal bias or subjective interpretation.
- **Responsibility Framing:**
 - *Use of passive vs. active voice when discussing responsibility:* Both passive and active voices are used; for example, "Israel says it has encircled Gaza City" (active) and "Hundreds of thousands have been displaced" (passive).
 - *Attribution of responsibility to specific groups or nations:* The article attributes actions to specific actors, such as the Israeli military's operations and Hamas's role in the conflict.

4. Political Orientation & Context

- **Identification of political bias:**
 - *Alignment with official government narratives vs. alternative perspectives:* The article presents information from multiple perspectives, including Israeli military statements and international humanitarian concerns, striving for balanced reporting.
 - *Use of ideological framing:* The framing is neutral, focusing on factual reporting without evident ideological bias.

5. Sources of Information & Actors

- **Inclusion of government statements vs. independent sources:**
 - *Presence of eyewitness accounts vs. official press releases:* The article includes official statements from the Israeli military and international organizations but lacks direct eyewitness accounts.

- *Use of international vs. local media citations:* It references international organizations like the United Nations, providing a global perspective on the situation.
- *Reliance on expert analysis vs. emotional testimonies:* The narrative relies on official reports and statements, with limited inclusion of expert analysis or personal testimonies.

Manifest vs. Latent Content Analysis

- **Manifest Analysis:**
 - *Identifying explicit mentions of key terms, phrases, and statements:* The article explicitly mentions the encirclement of Gaza City, the humanitarian crisis, and international calls for ceasefires.
- **Latent Analysis:**
 - *Evaluating underlying meanings, contextual nuances, and implicit messaging:* Implicitly, the article highlights the complexities of the conflict, the severe impact on civilians, and the challenges faced by the international community in addressing the crisis.

Appendix F

December - Washington Post - *Israel War Destruction in Gaza Reaches Record Pace*

1. Framing of Victimhood, Conflict Escalation, and Resolution

- **Victimhood:**
 - *Explicit victim labels:* The article refers to "Palestinian civilians" and "displaced families," highlighting the impact on non-combatants.
 - *Representation of suffering:* It details the extensive destruction in Gaza, noting that over 70% of buildings have been damaged or destroyed, leading to a significant humanitarian crisis.
 - *Attribution of blame:* The destruction is attributed to Israeli military actions, with specific mention of airstrikes and ground operations.
- **Conflict Escalation:**
 - *Use of aggressive vs. neutral terminology:* Terms like "intense bombardment," "devastating offensive," and "unprecedented destruction" are used, emphasizing the severity of the military actions.
 - *Emphasis on historical context vs. immediate events:* The article provides both immediate updates and historical comparisons, noting that the level of destruction is unparalleled in recent conflicts.
 - *References to international interventions:* It mentions international reactions, including statements from the United Nations and humanitarian organizations expressing concern over the escalating crisis.
- **Resolution:**
 - *Calls for peace or military action:* The article highlights calls from international bodies for a ceasefire and the need for humanitarian aid corridors.

- *Role of diplomatic efforts*: Diplomatic efforts are discussed, with references to ongoing negotiations and international appeals for de-escalation.
- *Use of hopeful vs. pessimistic tone regarding conflict resolution*: The tone is cautiously pessimistic, acknowledging the challenges in achieving a swift resolution given the scale of destruction.

2. Uncertainty Avoidance in Crisis Communication

- **Assurances and Promises of Resolution:**
 - *Definitive vs. cautious language*: The article employs cautious language, reflecting the uncertainty surrounding the conflict's outcome and the effectiveness of diplomatic efforts.
 - *Speculative vs. conclusive statements*: Statements are presented with caution, avoiding definitive conclusions about future developments.
 - *Expert analysis or official statements reinforcing certainty*: The piece includes analyses from experts and official statements, providing authoritative perspectives while acknowledging uncertainties.
- **Emphasis on Stability vs. Uncertainty:**
 - *Level of reassurance provided to the audience*: Limited reassurance is offered, as the article emphasizes the ongoing instability and humanitarian concerns.
 - *Focus on long-term vs. short-term solutions*: The focus is on immediate humanitarian needs and the pressing nature of the crisis, with some discussion of long-term reconstruction challenges.

3. Tone of Communication

- **Emotional vs. Neutral Tone:**
 - *Presence of emotive words*: The article uses emotive language to convey the gravity of the situation, describing scenes of "devastation" and "human suffering."
 - *Use of neutral vs. sensationalized descriptions*: While emotive, the descriptions aim to inform rather than sensationalize, maintaining journalistic integrity.
 - *Subjective vs. objective reporting styles*: The reporting balances objective facts with human-interest elements, providing a comprehensive view of the crisis.
- **Responsibility Framing:**
 - *Use of passive vs. active voice when discussing responsibility*: Both passive and active constructions are used; for example, "Buildings were destroyed by airstrikes" (passive) and "The Israeli military launched attacks" (active).
 - *Attribution of responsibility to specific groups or nations*: The article attributes actions to specific actors, notably the Israeli military, while also mentioning responses from Palestinian groups.

4. Political Orientation & Context

- **Identification of political bias:**

- *Alignment with official government narratives vs. alternative perspectives:* The article presents multiple perspectives, including official statements from Israeli authorities and critiques from international organizations, striving for balanced reporting.
- *Use of ideological framing:* The framing is primarily factual, focusing on the observable impacts of the conflict without overt ideological bias.

5. Sources of Information & Actors

- **Inclusion of government statements vs. independent sources:**
 - *Presence of eyewitness accounts vs. official press releases:* The article includes both official statements and accounts from affected civilians, providing a comprehensive view.
 - *Use of international vs. local media citations:* It references international organizations and local sources, offering a broad perspective on the crisis.
 - *Reliance on expert analysis vs. emotional testimonies:* The narrative balances expert analyses with personal stories, highlighting both the strategic and human elements of the conflict.

Manifest vs. Latent Content Analysis

- **Manifest Analysis:**
 - *Identifying explicit mentions of key terms, phrases, and statements:* The article explicitly discusses the scale of destruction, the humanitarian impact, and international reactions to the conflict.
- **Latent Analysis:**
 - *Evaluating underlying meanings, contextual nuances, and implicit messaging:* Implicitly, the article shows the severity of the crisis and the complex interplay of military actions and humanitarian concerns, highlighting the challenges in achieving a resolution.