International Journal of Advanced Academic Studies

KeerthanaThankachan
Doctoral Research Scholar,
Department of Communication
and Media Studies, Bharathiar
University, Coimbatore, Tamil
Nadu, India

Dr. PE Thomas
Professor, Department of
Communication and Media
Studies, Bharathiar University
Coimbatore

Media framing and its effects on conflict: A thematic approach to framing as a means of control

Keerthana Thankachan and Dr. PE Thomas

Abstract
Framing as a concept and theoretical perspective is well established in the modern political package to construct meanings. The messages are encoded and the essence of the angle or perspective induced into the audience for a predictable outcome is the key feature of any of the framing perspectives. Framing in conflict focuses attention on factors beyond what had actually happened. All frames that are used in conflict reporting do not carry equal weightage. This is where frames are often used as tools of political manipulations and to create social mobilisations as prime agents of control over the public. Use of media for exposure and as an agent of a leading character to divert the conflict frames always head-on to seek media as a primary tool of rein. Perceived as a working platform for information, modern media power is often controlled and manipulated by the elite with fixed and constant frames more often in conflicts. The capacities of media as an incredible strength are thus used as a weapon of destruction as the media power declines and political manipulations increase. In the language of control and conflict, media capabilities perform in different criteria. The media by far, is the most important source of information on conflict and politics, and the combined control of these two sources as an influence on '*public opinion*' is the focus of the paper. Framing as an absolute and relative influence of control in conflict reporting is the success of political communication. Categorising conflict frame under eight major categories-Intended Frame, Routine Frame, Indicative Frame, Identity Frame, Manipulative Frame, Motivational Frame, Peace Frame and Dispute Frame-the paper exemplifies different cases that can define the concept of media's controlled conflict framing. These frames are embedded in our personal, social and institutional lives and reinforce to exercise prevailing beliefs. The contemporary importance of media frames as a governing power and identity creators aim to exploit the media in order to nurture political goals by restructuring the perceived politics and conflicts in the minds of people. The paper is also a prefatory alternation of conflict management where media can play an integral role as a manager. The peace and routine frames that are often less identified in modern reports can serve as substitutes to manage conflict-promoting harmony. Further, the secondary discussion revolves around the control of mass media over conflict reporting that helps formulate the public perception of political reality in different types of conflict frames. It contributes a wide range of possibilities for analysing different facets of the frames as a means of control for affecting a collective conscience, thereby creating national interest.

Keywords: Media control, media frames, conflict, political communication, public opinion

Introductions
The fragmented approaches to framing in conflict political communication hold a potential utility value for communication research throughout ages. Significant contributions that define framing as a communicative agent than a cognitive construction, valued frames as a contested sites for covering the trends and constrains for perpetual judgements [1]. Exploring the characteristics, nature, features and types of frames that becomes an effective part of conflict projections in media provides a theoretical framework for explicating the dominance of particular frames for individual descriptions. The need of frames to enhance the patterns of political communication and thereby to form '*public opinion*' is a cognitive shortcut adopted by mass media to create incompatible interpretation of events. Framing involves both construction and its representations for interpretations often become a major element in conscious decision-making [2]. When frames are closely associated with emotions, emotions can play a vital role in decision making stimulating to form a collective public opinion. The political consequences of these media frames and its dynamics in the contemporary political scenario are sensitive to contextual cues when it comes to national affairs [3] which become a major source of conflict.

The paper points out a thematic framework to analyse how different disputants handle framing as an aid to control strategic communication in modern political systems.

Corresponding Author:
KeerthanaThankachan
Doctoral Research Scholar,
Department of Communication
and Media Studies, Bharathiar
University, Coimbatore, Tamil
Nadu, India

The effectiveness of framing to perceive, convince and to understand conflicts [4] and also how it works in filtering people's perceptions providing a narrow visibility to a problem is observed discovering the different effective frames used in conflict studies. Frames thus are used as an intentional distortion as a means of control and communication to formulate mass opinions especially in crisis and conflict situations.

What are Frame and Why Frames?
Frames are defined and interpreted in a number of ways from all over the world. The theory of Frame analysis attributed to Erving Goffman, [5] provides the core of framing research in conflict communication. When the political communication research progresses in the 1970's and 1980's, the attention of the researchers focused on the perception of audience's reactions to social phenomenon's and how it works in a segregated media atmosphere. Thus, framing provides a rhetoric analysis of text in presenting an issue from a specific perspective. The process of framing clearly worked as it started to make a focus point to certain aspects of an issue. This was the instance where political figures identified the long term effects of framing [6] to mobilise public opinion and to design communication in a way to motivate people for active political participation.

Frames are the cognitive process by which the audience define a situation and decides how to act in that situation. When fully accurate and totally balanced information's are manipulated by the journalist's, media frames take its birth. The rely on media by the audience is the primary step of framing a news story where the promotion for strategic advantage [7] clearly works through appropriate frames. Frames usually form a combination of metaphor, spin, story, narration and to an extent a thin layer of interpretation by itself. Framing as a prominent concern in the news story had its light from 1990's and the interest continues to grow even in the 21st century. Adding up the concept of framing along with the practice of political communication in conflict situations, it is easy to understand the ability of a news story in the manipulation of words and symbols [8] in communication. Apart from agenda setting, priming and propaganda that works on ideological acts, frames differ in their inherent ability to treat a story in different angles and its ability to play along with human 'common senses'.

The argument of McCombs and Shaw as the most important effect of mass media is "its ability to mentally order and organise our world for us" [9], is thus evident that, the way one frames a situation will determines what he will do about that situation. In sum, frames are not only the interpretations for an event but it encompasses the entire process of decision making formulating public opinions that can generate judgements. Frames are well executed conceptual confusions by media in political realms and a fruitful scope to describe conflict domains. The applicability of frames in interpreting conflicts is important in informing people from the conflict zones and examining the long tradition of presenting angles to tell a story. A sophisticated approach to frames in conflict that are embedded in personal, social and institutional levels of the society is explored in the later sections of the paper.

Framing of Conflicts
The concept of framing as a tool of analysing current trends is applied in various fields such as sociology, psychology and behavioural science. Attempt to understand the effect of frames in conflict that becomes a major resultant for conflict escalations is less subjected for research. A critical overview of the literatures on media and conflict on handling different types of political (intra and interstate) conflicts reveals the need of in-depth analysis on the content and context at which each news stories are projected. For researchers, framing is the capacity of the media to present and define a situation so as to further stimulate for discussions and debates. This definition is much more applicable when we talk about political conflicts as it can easily 'sell the news' with proper emotional background [10].

Framing used by political elites through various news media shapes opinions as they can activate the existing beliefs, feelings and evaluations. Framing does not work in vacuums. It supplements in altering the existing concepts for effective manipulations in conflicts through the process of mediatisation [11]. According to Goffman[Ibid.5], framing is considered as an effective approach to understand conflicts. Jay Rothman [12] a conflict theorist, finds framing as a process that "focus attention" and thus frames play an inevitable role in conflict reporting in the creation of a new separation i.e., "us" and "them" [13]. The way a conflict is framed depends on a number of factors. Formation of public opinion through the concept of framing in competitive environments is perpendicular to the attitude structure and persuasion of the integrated frames.

Identity-based conflicts that engage strong passions and destruction capabilities are often political and are mistaken for disputes over material resources[Ibid.12]. Framing such conflicts needs a higher amount of attention and evaluation as these are the sources of major exploders in later stages of conflict. This destructive and powerful prelude and the preventable action of media (print media) framing can be blamed highly for impelling 1994 genocide in Rwanda that resulted in the annihilation of over 800,000 lives [14a, 14b]. Framing is not merely persuading, but reflecting the routes by which a political communication can effectively influence attitude [15] leading to collective opinions. Attempts to resolve the misguided political instabilities generally fail as these conflicts do not address the real underlying facts and causes. Hence, identity-based or interest-based conflicts are framed in adversarial or win-lose terms rather than seeking a win-win solution.

In the evolution of a conflict, media create frames that can act as a riddle through which an insight is drawn for better understanding of conflict dynamics and developments[16]. Conflicts in political terms are closely associated with the frames including identity, characterisation, power, conflict resolutions, cognitions, emotions, risks and loss versus gains. Analytic techniques of framing include different aspects primarily focusing on the categorisation of framing that is often used in conflict studies. The paper therefore explores the major types or stratification of frames in which conflict reporting's can be included. Categorising conflict frames under eight major categories, such as Intended Frames, Routine Frames, Indicative Frames, Identity Frames, Manipulative Frames, Motivational Frames, Peace Frames and Dispute Frames, a better understanding of conflict dynamics is provided for future lessons in this paper.

Categorising Conflict Frames

Framing as an attempt of political manipulations [17] occurs when the capacity of the leaders to strategically market [18] their policies resulting in decision making [19] influencing the attitudes and behaviours [20] of the people. Crisis or conflict provides inherent excitement and emotional intensity [21] as the intrinsic drama of conflict overrides political leaders and media to focus and emphasis the news values of conflict as a central point of discussion. The framework of political advantage through conflict framing is carried through particular frames that can foster and trigger the inherent nature of human dispute. Understanding these frames and categorising them on the basis of particular context and content helps to identify framing as an effect of political manipulation.

The paper further classifies those particular frames used and reused by media in conflict environments from an extensive review of literature to offer an empirical analysis of public opinion formation which is the primary step of social mobilisation. To understand further about how framing as a process influence public knowledge and opinion, it is inevitable to see from the angle of how media and political influential's create a climate of analysis from framing theory.

Intended Frames

An intentional or non-objective viewpoint usually adopted for political intentions that rejects the traditional identity of objectivity can be marked under this genre. The outcome of such frames are pre-indented or previously known. In a diverse array of media outlets this takes the forms of a cognitive frames, dominant frames or human impact frames. The intense controversial nature of intended frames is more powerful as it can develop cognitive and emotional impulses in judgements and decision makings. It is a powerful weapon to create psychological constructions as in the case of emotional frames and furnishes with a prevailing point of view that manipulates prominence and relevance [Ibid.5] –the basic elements of a conflict. For Gamson [22], a frame is just a central organising idea to make sense for relevant events. But, intended frames takes a further step to frame what people cognitively use to understand and able to package and position to convey meanings [23] for issues through the text. Intended frames can also be thematic in its appearance. Focus on the trends over time and highlighting the contexts and environments, an intended frame has an inherent nature of an episodic frame applying a wide-angle lens to the coverage [24]. Intended frames can either focus on individual (like as in episodic frame) or on the issue (as in the case of thematic frame) based on the importance of reporting a conflict.

Intended frames that are subsequently used in conflict reporting allow individuals to create causal relationship with what they already know and understand about an issue [25]. When it is a controversial conflict environment with a long hatred history as in the case of Indo-Pak conflict, these frames are explored by political actors and special interest groups to influence the media coverage through manipulative and promotional frameworks so that the citizens will see the issue as the one appropriate for collective actions (i.e., for proposed outcomes). The uncertainties of the intended frames are also taken for consideration when we talk about such frames. For example an intended frame that often presents a conflict in a continuous negative or positive coverage may result in political cynicism. When choice of the frames is considered as a deliberate process in conflict coverage [26], the questions like who is making the choice and what is intended out of it also have a specific answer which is at most cases pre-detected. The choice of the frames and determining the required output of those frames are significant in intended frame analysis as the media forms the primary window for public to see through a conflict.

Routine Frames

The routine visible frames are aimed at organising the topics, main ideas and details about the particular incident. Routine frames are often consisting of a set of schemata where the journalists prefer as an agent of information transmitter and knowledge circuit. These frames are identified as the patterns of interpretation and classification of a basic news story. The elements of manipulative interventions are seen much less in those frames as these are just the carrier of information's and basic ideas. Frames such as interpretative frames and information frame that emphasis the aspects of perceived reality resulting to attributions, evaluations and consequences can fall under the category of routine frames. These frames may or may not stimulate decision making as the frames are not so powerful to induce indented output.

Political frames are one of the common referred frames in routine frames. So, when we analyse and associate conflict framing with these routine political frames, the contributions and conclusions by Robert Karl Manoff [27] in the *Center Magazine* is advisable to look at. When press is actually a handmaiden of power and allied with the state, reporting a conflict crisis even in a routine frame will have the associated ideologies of both the parties. Clearly stating as David Paletz and Robert Entman argue [28], by granting the power of the '*contents*' to the political power holders the media are often writing the manuscripts of the powerful.

Conflict, politics and faith have a strong association and they are intersected each other right from history. British colonialism choose a path of '*Divide and Rule*' as the best strategy for political manipulations since religion is the best weapon that can be used for the formation of public opinion. Scholars who are conscious of studying framing cannot overlook religious frames as religion is an important dynamic in generating conflict and democratic process [29]. The extent to which routine frames are communicated effectively with the audiences believes, relations and power of creating knowledge out of it determines the success of the frames (i.e. the process that takes place in evaluation). Routine frames are evaluative and sequential in presenting the ideas thereby exerting an influence on the receiver for productive outputs.

Routine framing in modern context with the advancements in technology provides better access to the battlefields and conflict environments. Conflicts in routine framework are exposed as a simplistic way more on a comprehensive way. This is where routine frames are capable of taking specific field of reference such as religion, politics, sequential, productive, evaluative or informational while reporting. For example, American and British coverage of 2003 Iraq War by scholars [30a, b] identifies a considerable space allotted for 'battle stories' and stories about war strategies than any other theme. Conflicts often adopt the above routine frames in terms of transparency, presenting the facts, filtering the information, and to convey the reality.

Indicative Frames

A systematic analysis of media framing on how frames are conceptualised and measured resulted in viewing framing as a research program than a unified paradigm [31]. Compared to a neutral-text condition, an indicative frame can hide a perceived risk, emotions and symbols within itself that often becomes an indicator for decision making. The perception of roles played by each of the conflict event thus can be performed the role of a pointer to move according to the prescribed conditions of political leaders. Benson [32] quotes institution as a standard practice to produce political news. When media institutions cleverly control media frames for political settlements indicative frames takes its birth. All frames are not used all times though media use multiple frames. Indicative frames have the capacity to hold wide range of concepts values and symbols although they are not directly signified. The capacity of indicative frames to filter items and to hide indications to particular goals helps to order the task of opinion formation shrewdly.

The ability of a journalist to frame indicators out of conflict circumstances is the success of these frames. Political symbols and identifications are read through the text as in the case of telling indirectly about the particular religion party or actors who are the key focuses of the conflict. Such indicative frames have the capacity to create extreme violence and conflict escalations. The simultaneous supply of terror, fear, symbolism and identity through frames creates crisis and uncertainty in minds of people. The Rwandan conflict of 1994 can be quoted as the best example. The domestic media framing of radio broadcasters supplies enormous indications that pushes the audience to hate and dehumanise members of the minority group [33] and served as an instrument of mobilisation for genocide. Though the amounts of hateful and inciting messages were not frequent and direct, the effect of constant indicators can probably lead to uncontrollable situations. This can also see in Indo-Pak conflicts as a direct trigger of conflict at many times.

Indicative frames are thus powerful, provocative and stimulus though it may not directly state the issue. Counter frames and arguments are strategic tackle with meanings attached indicative frames. These competing frames change the prominence and determination of importance depending the magnitude and intensity. Visibly indicative in nature, but practically these frames have a long term effects to threaten the entire peace process of the country and the ability to productively affect the public perception. The recent public perception provided by media as North Korea as a U.S. security threat is the best offered example.

Identity Frames

A conflict framing research and the concept of identity frames thinks about how individuals view themselves in the context of specific affiliations. It is the various ways in which people identify themselves or the group influence on how they view and respond to particular conflicts. Identity frames addresses the questions, "Who are you"? And "Where do you belongs to"? The basic human tendency of protecting the self-identity creating a sense of self is exploited [34] in identity frames. The 'self' is the sum total of our beliefs, values, group affiliations, morals, our principles and much more. Identity frames does not work in vacuum. The ability of the journalist to promote decisions that negatively impact the core area of our identity as a potential threat is the scope of these frames in conflict reports.

When there are conflicts between different identity frames, a political effort is executed to change individual's opinions and believes to mobilize groups if the frame target groups identity particularly [35]. The imbalances in conflict reporting when presented through an identity frame, the situation worsen and people response in a way that they "crop" the information that do not feature with an individual's core identity. These frames are much common in modern reporting and used frequently by political actors for social and group identification. A frequent discussed example of media imbalances in identity frames can be traced again from the Iraq War of 1991. In two weeks after the war, images of the protests in the mainstream media were often put side by side with images of U.S flag burning in Arab states [36]. A flip side of such anti-war frames creates identity risks and misrepresentations that can easily escalate the intensity of conflicts.

Group targeted frames or signature framing often depend upon identity for group oriented policies. Identity frames are positioned in a way that it can be easily accessible to the individual and weights are given resulting in a shift of opinion or a predetermined decided choice. Construction of a prime identity targeted on partisanship in conflicts, reinforce collective identity to affect public opinion to successfully mobilize the group [37] for personification. The news media through identity frames narrow down the access of wide thinking process since it is more or less play with emotions and cognitions rather than logical and rational reasoning. Identity frames are strongly affiliated with the particular group, (Irish conflict) racial backgrounds, (Iran-Iraq) or places (South-Asian) when comes to conflict. In short it is often related to the culture, context of the parties and the efforts made by the political and media personnel for motives. Thus the politicians when have to make a choice between the frames [38] the sensitive effects of identity frames is carefully taken care to inhibit the particular ways of looking at a conflict [39].

Manipulative frames

Most often these frames can be branded in conflict places during election times. This frame is a collective combination of logical fallacies, psychological manipulations, propaganda and agenda inbuilt in the contents of the text. These attention seeking frames are includes the creation of think tanks with journalistic skills who can measure the outcome of political agenda in conflict areas. These frames revolve around particular negative stereotypes likewise the representation of political conflicts in African states particularly focusing on the theme 'ancient hatred'. Manipulative frames are capable of broadcasting hateful and inciting messages diverting the attention from the focus point in conflicts. As part of the political resurgence, a practise of inject bias of the perspectives of particular interest [40] is involved in the practise of journalism. The idea of manipulative frames is too deterministic implying the audience as passive in appearance. The distinction by Chomsky [41] between 'masses' (80% of the population) and the 'political class' (20% of the population) is referred to quote the indoctrinate status quo that controls the entire system of democracy.

The elite consensuses detach the mass from the process of decision-making to sustain the power structure that dominates the social arena. The process is easily carried out in conflicts because a less time is affordable for decision

making during these situations. Importance given for constructive and elite sponsored frames in manipulations is more as such frames propagate social reality as a biased incentive. In manipulative frame, public opinions are political opinions framed to encourage a response beneficial to the parties involved. Purposeful or competing frames appear in manipulative tags when a robust political completion is highly institutionalised. Analysing the democratisation conflict carried out in Serbia, we should expect more pluralistic media coverage of the 2001 transitional justice and the 2008 election conflicts, which involved severe elite conflicts [42].

Mainstream media is the most obvious platform for media manipulative frames because of its ownership has a direct or indirect connection with the plethora of major corporate and political elites. These media are intertwined with government and politics triggering easy manipulations in fractions of seconds. In 2008, a report was so popular among the conflict researchers that Pentagon (the headquarters of the United Nations Department of Defense) ran a major campaign to present a good picture of the administration's war-time policies using retired generals and former Pentagon officials. The program started in the lead-up to the Iraq war of 2003 continuing till 2009 with vested interests in the subjects that they brought to analyse. The claim that media 'frames' the social reality has brought one to question the implications of it in political manipulative context. Media institutions also share a concentration on political power in conflict framing through several manipulative methods like distraction assuming public has a limited attention span and easily convinced.

Motivational Frames

Motivational frames are call for action frames. It is often used as an alarming frame in conflict situations to get ready for action plans. Benford and Snow [43] suggest motivational frames are how we argue for our definitions and solutions. Focusing the Moroccan social movement and the framing of 2009 Gaza war, motivational frames in conflict reporting can be well established. Internet was a prominent motivational framing medium of political advocacy and tactics for social movement for the formation of collective opinion in the war. Otherwise called as action frames, these frames can serve various mobilisation processes pointing out the possibilities and opportunities available to take part in direction action. Political manipulations are a key feature of motivational frames as it is exploited principally for social and political benefits. When we mix feelings with conventional social movements by large scale ubiquitous and univocal framing of a particular issue [44] the extracted product will be a motivational frame of reference. A mediated politics is the basic aim of any political actor who involved in such a framing. He is well trained to use opportunities in conflict so that it can create constrains leading to political openings. In short in motivational frames there is no fixed opportunity where opportunities are subjected to interpretations and controversies [45].

Motivational frames encourage people so it is often related to social movements and struggles in conflicts. When politicians necessitate a collective action to build a shared understanding or an injustice, these frames can coordinate the understandings and make the process of gathering fast. This frame works in a fixed plan and in careful circumstances as it involves different stages in its development. Diagnosing the problem or the conflict is the first step which leads to the process of prognostic views. Predicting or foreseeing the outcome through the situation develops the chance of motivational frames to determine whether a situation has to be exploited for achievements. This is the stage at which these frames take the swords of action attracting others to connect and continue to participate in a movement. Reviewing the 2010 Arab Spring that led to a historic transformations of proportions in the North African and Middle East Countries, reveal the use of social media for collective actions through motivational frames. Media frames were a core strategy ending an era of political status quo that dominated in the regions for decades.

Motivational frames are the vehicles or transmitters of 'content' coded with specific information and their focus on the symbolic dimensions induces the process of public opinion or social mobilisation. When other frames consider audience as passive, motivational frames stress the importance of people's participation pretending them as active involvers in the process of democracy. When media engage in such extraordinary frames are yet to be explored speculating the context at which a media mobilisation is excused. Political usage of such media frames are involved in conflict relations with a clear definition of identified opponents and goal oriented formal political system [46].

Peace Frames

Peace frames are directly related to the level of elite consensus [47]. The lower the level elite and political controversy concerning a conflict the more likely peace frames will dominate in media discourse. Galtung [48], one among the founding father of peace studies concerned with the inter-relational connections of conflict and media. His criticisms on the mainstream media as an agent of engaging in conflicts frames focusing on the elite and political parties leading him to coin the solution of 'peace journalism' and in our context 'peace frames'. The fundamental role of peace journalism and frames look at the issue that journalist could centre on the solutions to conflicts that emerge in political systems. But today peace journalism is an imaginary journalistic approach because conflicts are the way to create opportunities. Morality frames and free speech frames are extinct from the media as it potentially contributes to progressive resolution of peace journalism. Frames under peace category will shape public opinion and perception to the root cause and seeking solutions for them[49]. They explain the roles of the different actors (political) in the peace process.

The possibilities of peace frames to alternate the route of conflict journalism resulting in conflict transformation were reviewed by Galtung on four principles –peace/conflict, truth, people and solution [48]. The aptness of choosing words, phrases, metaphors and other contents in the news story using moral, peace-oriented and accurate frames promote objective journalism. Research on peace frames is ideal and develops a concentration of reconciliation in the war torn developing countries in South Asia (India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Afghanistan) and also in the countries like Iran and Somalia. Cases of media as an agent of peace is very less compared to other frames. The journalistic approaches and intervention in Barundi were stated as the first on the African continent to immense the seeds of contemporary practise of peace journalism [49]. The

independent radio production acted as a wave of peace producing programs promoting dialogue, peace and reconciliation. They produce 100 radio programs per month that exposes the real-life stories of people suffering from conflicts and how they risk their lives to save the life of someone of another ethnic group.

There were other ample cases to quote media as a peace propagator. A project initiative in Uganda –'promoting peace journalism through radio in Uganda', was another peace journalism initiative [50] where the mass media was engaged in democratic and development processes of the country. Those media peace promoters ensured to endeavour to present topical issues on human rights, justice, peace and promotion of unity. Thus, though the amount of peace initiative frames are less, it is not extinct. A mutual successive influence of media and polity without the aim of manipulations can promote peace and unity. When there is a competitive conflict involving two parties, a peace process frame will legitimately give expression to both the perspectives. Peace frames thus can be called as nationalistic frames during conflicts[I.b.i.d47] as an agent of reconciliation.

Dispute Frames

Though the research on media framing of different policies and political problems are flourished, the conceptualisation of media in conflict and dispute times hinders its advancements. The language and the angles covered by dispute frames with uncertainty in reporting create an environment of terror and isolation. As applied to politics, dispute frames are cavernous to explain why an issue matters and what might be the responsibility rather than what should be done. The frames are capable to boost media attention to a particular issue as in the case of Korean airline shoot down. The conflict was portrayed as an international and deliberate attack by soviets and as evil increasing the amount of terror and shock. The media tendency of explaining the conflicts in a horse race manner or as a win-loss consist imbalances that later develops into conflicts. Framing of Palestine-Israel conflict can be quoted hear as example. During the early stage of the conflict, the recurring media image of the war was that of a 'mighty Israeli Goliath... fighting a stone-throwing Palestine David [51].

In political and strategic communication leaders are often aware of attempts by opponents and rivals to frame certain political issues and conflicts. This provides them the opportunity to select when to apply dispute frames diverting the attentions from the causes of war and rationale for war. The television coverage of the Iraq war in Great Britain influences British public opinion by making it more acceptable to support pro-war government action [52]. American coverage of international news was covered and dominated by cold war frames [53] for decades that condemned communist aggression throughout. Injustice framing and villain approach to framing got motivated in dispute frames leading to a constructionist aim at influencing the public opinion. News coverage of 9/11 U.S. attack became narrow and increased thematic similarity and decreased the entire credibility of news media [54]. Dispute frames lead disputants to focus on some characteristics of a conflict while ignoring others. The focal point is pre or meta-schematic with perceptual sets of prior orientations.

In intractable disputes the presence of threats of potential loss rather than on opportunities for gains are more visible.

Losses are captured and scaled in high value than the gains. Disputes frames have the expectations about future events [55] and how they are going to affect by conflicts. This level of uncertainty emerged out from media frames are made use by political figures. The effect of such disputants framing the conflict determines the components of conflict outcome. Money gain, the relationship between the actors involved in the particular conflict, disputant satisfaction and the issues [56] circled in the settlement are the nucleus behind dispute frames more often. It is also one of the most seen and repeated frame whenever there is a political involvement in a conflict for gain. Dispute frames can be altered over time through interventional inventions and use of new reinforcement through shared perspectives.

Conclusion

Conflict scholars use the term framing from an interpretative viewpoint as its primary role is attention seeking. The utility of framing in conflict and political situations have heuristic value that has not yet been reviewed because of its vastness. Even a minute variation in the use of language, texts, signs and symbols in news stories affects the particular framing pattern and the output. The number and the type of frames media handle decide whether to escalate or reconcile a conflict. Conflict management frames though are less in number in modern context, responds to a range of alternative conflict management process. Frames are a medium of control and an interpretative device to steam a conflict or an alternative to find solutions to a conflict. The intervention of political involvement dilutes the task more complex with competing strategies. The control then shift from media personal to political elites who have a vested interest upon particular conflict dimensions.

The paper using the core concept of conflict framing analyse the intervention of political stakeholders and power manipulators control the modern economy of prominent media. It was a fair attempt to classify the frames that we usually come across when we subject to conflict reports and how the pattern of framing changes according the interest of achievement. Regardless, the potentiality of media in conflict can be a good tool in healthy and functional environment to ensure lasting peace and international safety. More than the mere role of a reflector or a propagandist, media's extended power and control as a puppet of peace promotion has yet to be launched.

References

1. O'Regan, M. Explaining Media Frames of Contested Foreign Conflicts: Irish National 'Opinion Leader' Newspapers' Frames of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict (July 2000 to July 2004). Networking Knowledge: Journal of the MeCCSA Postgraduate Network 2007, 1(2). Retrieved from https://ojs.meccsa.org.uk/index.php/netknow/article/view/27
2. Snyder Richard C, Bruck HW, Burton Sapin. Decision-Making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics. Foreign Policy Decision-Making (Revisited) 2002, 21-152. Doi: 10.1057/9780230107526_2.
3. Iyengar Shanto, Donald Kinder R. News that matters: television and American opinion. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1987.

4. Lewicki Roy J, Barbara Gray, Michael Elliott. Making sense of intractable environmental conflicts: frames and cases. Washington, DC: Island Press, 2003, 409-436.
5. Goffman Erving. Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. Print 1974.
6. Reese Stephen D, Oscar Gandy H, August Grant E. Framing public life: perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world. New York: Routledge 2010.
7. Kaufman S, Smith J. Framing and reframing in land use change conflicts. Journal of Architectural and Planning Research 1999;16:164-180.
8. Edelman Murray J. The symbolic uses of politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1985, 49. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.in/books?id=h163WQZ_Ma8C&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.
9. Shaw Donald Lewis, Maxwell McCombs E. The emergence of American political issues: the agenda-setting function of the press. St. Paul: West Pub. Co 1977, 5.
10. Nelson Thomas, Oxley M, Zoe A, Clawson Rosalee. Toward A Psychology of Framing Effects. n.p.: Political Behavior 1997;19:221-246. 10.1023/A:1024834831093.
11. Chong D, Druckman JN. A theory of framing and opinion formation in competitive elite environments. Journal of Communication 2007;57(1):99-118. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00331.x
12. Rothman J. Resolving identity-based conflict in nations, organizations, and communities. San Francisco, Calif: Jossey-Bass 1997, 21.
13. Shinar D. Cultural conflict in the Middle East: The media as peacemakers. In E. Gilboa (Ed.), Media and conflict: Framing issues, making policy, shaping opinion. NY: Transnational Publishers 2002, 281-94.
14. Kalyango J, Vultee F. Public attitudes toward media control and incitement of conflicts in Eastern Africa. n.p.: Media, War & Conflict 2012;5(2)119-137.
15. Mitchell J. Remembering the Rwandan genocide: Reconsidering the role of local and global media. Global Media Journal 2007;6(11):1-22.
16. Putnam L, Holmer M. Framing, Reframing, and Issue Development, in Putnam L. and Roloff, M.E. (Eds.), Communication and Negotiation, Newbury Park, CA: Sage 1992;20:128-155.
17. Mintz Alex, Steven Redd B. Framing Effects in International Relations. Synthese 2003;135(2):193-213. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20117363.
18. Maoz Zeev. Framing the National Interest: The Manipulation of Foreign Policy Decisions in Group Settings. World Politics 1990;43(1):77-110. Doi: 10.2307/2010552.
19. Taylor-Robinson M, Michelle, Redd, Steven. Framing and the Poliheuristic Theory of Decision: The United Fruit Company and the 1954 U.S.-Led Coup in Guatemala, in Alex Mintz (ed.), Integrating Cognitive and Rational Theories of Foreign Policy Decision Making, St. Martin's/Palgrave, New York 2002:978-1-137-07848-3_5.
20. Hart Paul't, Eric K Stern, and Bengt Sundelius. "The Eighth Chapter. Chap. 8 in Beyond Groupthink: Political Group Dynamics and Foreign Policy-Making. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 1997.
21. Brody, Assessing the President; and Richard A. Brody and Catherine Shapiro, Policy Failure and Policy Support: The Iran-Contra Affair and Public Assessments of President Reagan, Political Behavior 1989;64(11):353-69.
22. Gamson W, A Modigliani. Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. American Journal of Sociology 1989;95:1-37.
23. Entman R. Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication 1993;43:51-58.
24. Iyengar Shanto. Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Print 1991.
25. Scheufele DA. Agenda-setting, priming, and framing revisited: Another look at cognitive effects of political communication. Mass Communication & Society 2000;3:297-316.
26. Bryant Jennings, Miron Dorina. Theory and Research in Mass Communication. Journal of Communication 2006;54:662-704. 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2004.tb02650.x.
27. Fund for the Republic, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and Robert Maynard Hutchins Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions (U.S.). 1967. The Center magazine. [Santa Barbara, Calif.]: [Fund for the Republic, etc.]. Robert Karl Manoff in the March/April 1987.
28. Rubin Richard L, David Paletz L, Robert Entman M. Media Power Politics. Political Science Quarterly 1982;97(4):704. Doi: 10.2307/2149809.
29. Glascock J, Livesay CB, Ruggiero T. Religious involvement, Audience Demographics, and Media Bias. Journal of Media and Religion 2008, 256-270.
30. a) Aday Sean. The Real War Will Never Get on Television: An Analysis of Casualty Imagery in Television Coverage of the Iraq War Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Le Centre Sheraton Hotel, Montreal, Quebec, Canada 2004 <Not Available>. 2009-05-26 http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p73085_index.html
    b) Goddard Peter, Robinson Piers, Parry Katy. Patriotism meets plurality: reporting the 2003 Iraq War in the British press. Media, War & Conflict 2008;1:9-30. 10.1177/1750635207087623.
31. Paul Angelo D. News Framing as a Multi-paradigmatic Re- search Program: A Response to Entman, Journal of Communication 2002;52:870-88.
32. Benson Rodney. News Media as a Journalistic Field: What Bourdieu Adds to New Institutionalism, and Vice Versa 2006;23:187-202. 10.1080/10584600600629802.
33. Kellow CL, Steeves HL. The Role of Radio in the Rwandan Genocide. Journal of Communication 1998;48:107-128. 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1998.tb02762.x.
34. Wondolldeck Gray B, Bryan T. Us versus Them: How identities and Characterizations Influence Conflict. Environmental Practice 2003, 5(3).
35. Robert Benford D. *Talking Politics.* William A. Gamson, American Journal of Sociology

1994;99(4):1103-1104. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1086/230383

36. Kellner Douglas. Media Propaganda and Spectacle in the War on Iraq: A Critique of U.S. Broadcasting Networks. Cultural Studies 2004:4:143-145. 10.1177/1532708603262723.

37. Snow DA, Benford RD. Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. In B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi, & S. Tarrow (Eds.), From structure to action: Comparing movement participation across cultures, international social movement research. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press 1988, 197-217.

38. Davis Craig B, Roy Lewicki J. Environmental Conflict Resolution: Framing and Intractability- An Introduction. Environmental Practice 2003, 5(3).

39. Lewicki Roy J, Barbara Gray, Michael Elliott. Making Sense of Intractable Environmental Conflicts: Concepts and Cases. Island Press 2003.

40. Kuypers Jim A. Press Bias and Politics: How the Media Frame Controversial Issues. Westport, Conn: Praeger Print 2002.

41. Herman Edward S, Noam Chomsky. Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media. New York: Pantheon Books Print 1988.

42. Vladisavljević. N. 'Media Framing of Political Conflict: A Review of the Literature'. MeCoDEM working paper. University of Leeds 2015. (available online at http://www.mecodem.eu/publications/working-papers/)

43. Benford Robert D, Snow David A. Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. Annual review of sociology 2000, 611-639.

44. Johnston Hank, John Noakes A. Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Print 2005.

45. Gamson William A, David Meyer S. Framing Political Opportunity. Chapter. In Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings, edited by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, 275–90. Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1996. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511803987.014.

46. Della Porta D, Mario Diani. *Social Movements: An Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub Print 2006, 20.

47. Wolfsfeld Gadi. Media and the Path to Peace. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2004, 28. (available online at https://books.google.co.in/books?id=2Nwnjf3XLwcC&pg=PA28&lpg=PA28&dq=peace+frames+used+by+media&source=bl&ots=o6Avmk8L6-&sig=Ykk0uc5msrFd9T_jGO-YKnqPfYs&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiB8o-C7ojYAhVMMI8KHVQ7CSYQ6AEIQDAG#v=onepage&q=peace%20frames%20used%20by%20media&f=false)

48. Galtung Johan, Fischer Dietrich. High Road, Low Road: Charting the Course for Peace Journalism 2013;5:95-102. 10.1007/978-3-642-32481-9_8. In: Johan Galtung. Springer Briefs on Pioneers in Science and Practice. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg 1998, 5.

49. Hoffmann Julia, Virgil Hawkins. Communication and Peace: Mapping an Emerging Field. Print 2015:12:178.

50. Tayeebwa W. From conventional towards new frames of peace journalism: the Case of Uganda and Burundi. In Tukumbi, L.K. and Gahama, J. (eds.), Peace, Security and Post-Conflict Reconstruction in the Great Lakes Region. Dakar, Senegal: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa 2017;9:209-213.

51. Bisharah Marwān. Palestine/israel: Peace or Apartheid: Occupation, Terrorism, and the Future. London: Zed Books Print 2002, 21.

52. Lewis Justin. Television, Public Opinion and the War in Iraq: The Case of Britain. International Journal of Public Opinion Research 2004;16(3):295-310. 10.1093/ijpor/edh026.

53. Entman R. Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago. USA 2004.

54. Wiggins Bradley. Framing the Truth: U.S. Media Coverage during the War on Terror'. Research Gate. 2017. (available online at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237391095_Framing_the_Truth_US_Media_Coverage_during_the_War_on_Terror)

55. Heimer CA. Social structure, psychology, and the estimation of risk. Annual Review of Sociology 1988;14:491-519. (available online at http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.14.080188.002423)

56. Pinkley Robin, Northcraft GB. Conflict frames of reference: Implications for dispute processes and outcomes. Academy of Management Journal 1994;37:10. 2307/256777.